THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

VOLUME I

NEW YORK
DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY
FIFTH AVENUE AND 21ST STREET
1902

University Press:
JOHN WILSON AND SON, CAMBRIDGE, U.S.A.

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

I

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

BY THE REV.
ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE, D.D.
PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS, FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW

II

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

BY THE REV.
MARCUS DODS, D.D.
PROFESSOR OF EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY, NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH

NEW YORK
DODD, MEAD AND COMPANY
FIFTH AVENUE AND 21ST STREET
1902

GENERAL EDITOR'S PREFACE

THE *Expositor's Greek Testament* is intended to do for the present generation the work accomplished by Dean Alford's in the past. Of the influence of Dean Alford's book there is no need to speak. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the success and usefulness of Dean Alford's commentary in putting English-speaking students into possession of the accumulated results of the labours of scholars up to the time it was published. He made the best critical and exegetical helps, previously accessible only to a few readers, the common privilege of all educated Englishmen. Dean Alford himself would have been the first to say that he undertook a task too great for one man. Though he laboured with indefatigable diligence, twenty years together, from 1841 to 1861, were occupied in his undertaking. Since his time the wealth of material on the New Testament has been steadily accumulating, and no one has as yet attempted to make it accessible in a full and comprehensive way.

In the present commentary the works have been committed to various scholars, and it is hoped that the completion will be reached within five years from the present date, if not sooner. As the plan of Alford's book has been tested by time and experience, it has been adopted here with certain modifications, and it is hoped that as the result English-speaking students will have a work at once up to date and practically useful in all its parts.

It remains to add that the commentators have been selected from various churches, and that they have in every case been left full liberty to express their own views. The part of the editor has been to choose them, and to assign the limits of space allowed to each book. In this assignment the judgment of Dean Alford has appeared to be sound in the main, and it has been generally followed.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL.

PREFACE

In this Commentary on the Synoptical Gospels I give to the public the fruit of studies carried on for many years. These Gospels have taken a more powerful and abiding hold of me than any other part of the Scriptures. I have learnt much from them concerning Christ in the course of these years; not a little since I began to prepare this work for the press. I have done my best to communicate what I have learned to others. I have also laid under contribution previous commentators, ancient and modern, while avoiding the pedantic habit of crowding the page with long lists of learned names. I have not hesitated to introduce quotations, in Latin and Greek, which seemed fitted to throw light on the meaning. These, while possessing interest for scholars, may be passed over by English readers without much loss, as their sense is usually indicated.

In the critical notes beneath the Greek Text I have aimed at making easily accessible to the reader the results of the labours of scholars who have made the text the subject of special study; especially those contained in the monumental works of Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. Readers are requested to peruse what has been stated on that subject in the Introduction, and, in using the commentary, to keep in mind that I have always made what I regard as the most probable reading the basis of comment, whether I have expressly indicated my opinion in the critical notes or not.

In these days one who aims at a competent treatment of the Evangelic narratives must keep in view critical

methods of handling the story. I have tried to unite some measure of critical freedom and candour with the reverence of faith. If, in spite of honest endeavour, I have not succeeded always in realising this ideal, let it be imputed to the lack of skill rather than of good intention.

I rise from this task with a deepened sense of the wisdom and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. If what I have written help others to a better understanding of His mind and heart, I shall feel that my labour has not been in vain.

In the table of errata only such mistakes as more or less affect the sense are included; omissions and misplacements of aspirates and accents in Greek words, and the like, being omitted. In the preparation of this table I have received valuable aid from Mr. Vernon Bartlet, of Mansfield College, Oxford, and from Mr. John MacFadyen, of the Free Church College, Glasgow. I enjoyed the benefit of Mr. MacFadyen's assistance in reading the proofs of the second half of the work, and owe him earnest thanks, not only for increased accuracy in the printed text, but for many valuable suggestions.

The works of Dr. Gould on Mark and Dr. Plummer on Luke, in the *International Critical Commentary*, appeared too late to be taken advantage of in this commentary.

A. B. BRUCE.

GLASGOW.

THE GOSPELS

ACCORDING TO

MATTHEW, MARK AND LUKE

TABLE OF ERRATA

Page 70, col. 1, line 21 from top, delete comma after "errand".
" 72, " 2, line 17 from top, *for* πέμφας *read* πέμψας.
" 81, " 2, line 31 from top, *for* "particle" *read* "participle".
" 85, " 1, line 3 from foot, *for* "Saddusaic" *read* "Sadducaic".
" 88, " 2, line 13 from foot, *for* πειράξω *read* πειράζω.
" 92, " 2, line 17 from top, *for* "Phrynicus" *read* "Phrynichus"; again, p. 333, col. 2, line 6 from foot.
" 96, critical note, *for* "and old Latin and Syr. versions" *read* "most old Latin texts, and in Syr. Cur.".
" 103, col. 1, line 20 from foot, *for* σαπρὰ *read* πονηρὰ.
" 107, " 2, line 4 from foot, *for* "vv. 24, 25" *read* "vv. 25, 26".
" 109, " 1, line 13 from foot, *for* "substantive" *read* "subjunctive".
" 114, critical note, invert the two last clauses.
" 114, col. 2, line 7 from top, delete semicolon after "use".
" 117, " 1, line 11 from foot, *for* δοξασθῶσαν *read* δοξασθῶσιν.
" 119, " 2, last line, insert "into" before "law".
" 129, " 2, line 11 from top, *for* Δῶτε *read* "Δότε (in some minusc.)".
" 137, " 1, line 2 from foot, *for* "ver." *read* "v.".
" 153, " 2, line 2 from foot, *for* "makes" *read* "make".
" 154, " 1, line 13 from foot, *for* κράσπεδαι *read* κράσπεδα.
" 154, " 2, lines 17 and 3 from foot, *for* "tibicenes" *read* "tibicines".
" 156, " 1, line 25 from top, *for* εθαύμασεν *read* ἐθαύμασαν.
" 160, " 2, lines 22 and 24 from top, *for* "suspended *to*" *read* "suspended *from*".
" 160, " 2, line 24 from top, *for* φάσκωλα *read* φασκώλια.
" 161, " 2, line 4 from foot, *for* ἐκτινάξετε *read* ἐκτινάξατε.
" 167, " 1, line 10 from top, *for* "Vv. 31, 32" *read* "Vv. 32, 33".
" 172, " 1, line 17 from top, *for* "ver. 47" *read* "v. 47".
" 209, " 2, line 8 from top, *for* αὐτοῖς *read* αὐτούς.
" 222, " 1, line 3 from top, *for* "*profisisceretur*" *read* "*proficisceretur*".
" 225, " 2, line 21 from top, *for* κατησφαλήσατο *read* κατησφαλίσατο.
" 252, " 1, line 15 from foot, *for* "praerit" *read* "praeerit".
" 258, " 1, line 26 from top, *for* "imperiantiores" *read* "imperantiores".
" 275, " 1, line 3 from foot, *for* "diseased" *read* "deceased".
" 280, " 2, line 5 from top, *for* "*dubtor*" *read* "*ductor*".
" 286, Greek text, line 6, *for* ὁ ἐχόμενος *read* ὁ ἐρχόμενος.
" 289, col. 1, line 18 from foot, *for* "*preclusive*" *read* "*prelusive*".
" 295, " 2, line 14 from top, *for* "discunt" *read* "dicunt".
" 300, " 1, line 16 from foot, *for* ἐνύσταζαν *read* ἐνύσταξαν.
" 305, " 2, line 14 from foot, *for* ἐπισκέψασθέ *read* ἐπεσκέψασθέ.
" 320, " 2, lines 12 and 10 from foot, *for* "to strike" *read* "a stroke".
" 328, " 2, line 8 from foot, *for* "*antenno*" *read* "*antenna*".
" 332, " 1, line 8 from top, *for* "taint" *read* "taunt".
" 340, " 1, line 15 from top, place a rule after "Holy Ghost".
" 346, " 2, line 2 from top, *for* "ver 34, Mt. viii 19" *read* "ver. 24, Mt. viii. 29".
" 354, line 13, Greek text, insert νέον after οἶνον.
" 358, col. 2, line 15 from foot, *for* "He" *read* "Jesus".
" 362, " 2, line 13 from foot, *for* "30" *read* "31".
" 364, critical note 9, *for* οτι *read* οτε.
" 592, col. 1, line 8 from top, *for* "big" *read* "fig".

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

CONCERNING THE THREE GOSPELS.

Section I. The Connection.

1. The three first Gospels, bearing the names of Matthew, Mark and Luke, have, during the present century, been distinguished by critics from the fourth by the epithet *synoptical*. The term implies that these Gospels are so like one another in contents that they can be, and for profitable study ought to be, viewed together. That such is the fact is obvious to every reader. A single perusal suffices to shew that they have much in common in contents, arrangement and phraseology; and a comparison with the fourth Gospel only deepens the impression. There everything appears different — the incidents related, the thoughts ascribed to Jesus, the terms in which they are expressed, the localities in which the Great Personage who is the common subject of all the four narratives exercised His remarkable teaching and healing ministries.

2. Yet while these three Gospels present obtrusive resemblances, they also exhibit hardly less obtrusive differences. The differences are marked just because the books are on the whole so like one another. One cannot help asking: Seeing they are so like, why are they not more like? Why do they differ at all? Or the question may be put the other way: Seeing there are so many idiosyncrasies in each Gospel, how does it come about that notwithstanding these they all bear an easily recognisable family likeness? The idiosyncrasies, though not always so obvious as the resemblances, are unmistakable, and some of them stare one in the face. Each Gospel, *e.g.*, has some matter peculiar to itself; the first and the third a great deal. Then, while in certain parts of their narratives they follow the same order, in other places they diverge widely. Again, one cannot but be struck with the difference between the three records in regard to reporting the words of Jesus. Mark gives com-

paratively few; Matthew and Luke very many, and these for the most part very weighty and remarkable, insomuch that one wonders how any one undertaking to write a history of Christ's life could overlook them. Matthew and Luke again, while both giving much prominence to the words of Jesus, differ very widely in their manner of reporting them. The one collects the sayings into masses, apparently out of regard to affinity of thought; the other disperses them over his pages, and assigns to them distinct historical occasions.

3. These resemblances and differences, with many others not referred to, inevitably raise a question as to their cause. This is *the synoptical problem*, towards the solution of which a countless number of contributions have been made within the last hundred years. Many of these have now only a historical or antiquarian interest, and it would serve no useful purpose to attempt here an exhaustive account of the literature connected with this inquiry. While not insensible to the fascination of the subject, even on its curious side, as an interesting problem in literary criticism, yet I must respect the fact that we in this work are directly concerned with the matter only in so far as it affects exegesis. The statement therefore now to be made must be broad and brief.

4. All attempts at solution admit of being classified under four heads. First may be mentioned the hypothesis of *oral tradition*. This hypothesis implies that before our Gospels there were no written records of the ministry of Jesus, or at least none of which they made use. Their only source was the unwritten tradition of the *memorabilia* of that ministry, having its ultimate origin in the public preaching and teaching of the Apostles, the men who had been with Jesus. The statements made by the Apostles from time to time, repeated and added to as occasion required, caught up by willing ears, and treasured up in faithful memories: behold all that is necessary, according to the patrons of this hypothesis, to account for all the evangelic phenomena of resemblance and difference. The resemblances are explained by the tendency of oral tradition, especially in non-literary epochs and peoples, to become stereotyped in contents and even in phraseology, a tendency much helped by the practice of catechetical instruction, in which the teacher dictates sentences which his pupils are expected to commit to memory.[1] The differences are accounted for by the original diversity in the *memorabilia* communicated by different Apostles, by the measure of

[1] On the function of catechists as helping to stereotype the evangelic tradition *vide* Wright, *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, 1890. Mr. Wright is a thorough believer in the oral tradition.

fluidity inseparable from oral tradition due to defective memory, and of course in part also by the peculiar tastes, aims and individualities of the respective evangelists. This hypothesis has been chiefly in favour among English scholars, though it can boast likewise of influential supporters among continental critics, such as Gieseler and Godet. It points to a *vera causa*, and cannot be wholly left out of account in an endeavour to explain how written records of the evangelic tradition arose. There was a time doubtless when what was known of Jesus was on the lip only. How long that primitive phase lasted is matter of conjecture; some say from 30 to 60 A.D. It seems probable that the process of transferring from the lip to the page began considerably sooner than the later of these dates. When Luke wrote, many attempts had been made to embody the tradition in a written form (Luke i. 1). This points to a literary habit which would naturally exert its power without delay in reference to any matter in which men took an absorbing interest. And when this habit prevails writers are not usually content to remain in ignorance of what others have done in the same line. They want to see each other's notes. The presumption therefore is that while oral tradition in all probability was *a* source for our evangelists, it was not the only source, probably not even the chief source. There were other writings about the acts, and words, and sufferings of Jesus in existence before they wrote; they were likely to know these, and if they knew them they would not despise them, but rather use them so far as serviceable. In Luke's case the existence of such earlier writings, and his acquaintance with them, are not mere presumptions but facts; the only point on which there is room for difference of opinion is how far he took advantage of the labours of his predecessors. That he deemed them unsatisfactory, at least defective, may be inferred from his making a new contribution; that he drew nothing from them is extremely improbable. Much can be said for the view that among these earlier writings known to Luke was our Gospel of Mark, or a book substantially identical with it in contents, and that he used it very freely.

5. The last observation naturally leads up to the second hypothesis, which is that the authors of the synoptical Gospels used each other's writings, each successive writer taking advantage of earlier contributions, so that the second Gospel (in time) borrowed from the first, and the third from both first and second. Which borrowed from which depends of course on the order of time in which the three Gospels appeared. Six permutations are possible, and every

one of them has had its advocates. One of the most interesting, in virtue of the course it ran, is: Matthew, Luke, Mark. This arrangement was contended for by Griesbach, and utilised by Dr. Ferdinand Christian Baur in connection with his famous Tendency-criticism. Griesbach founded on the frequent *duality* in Mark's style, that is to say, the combination of phrases used *separately* in the same connection in the other synoptical Gospels: *e.g.*, "at even when the sun did set" (i. 32). In this phenomenon, somewhat frequently recurring, he saw conclusive proof that Mark had Matthew and Luke before him, and servilely copied from both in descriptive passages. Baur's interest in the question was theological rather than literary. Accepting Griesbach's results, he charged Mark not only with literary dependence on his brother evangelists, whence is explained his graphic style, but also with studied theological neutrality, eschewing on the one hand the Judaistic bias of the first Gospel, and on the other the Pauline or universalistic bias of the third; both characteristics, the literary dependence and the studied neutrality, implying a later date. Since then a great change of view has taken place. For some time the prevailing opinion has been that Mark's Gospel is the earliest not the latest of the three, and this opinion is likely to hold its ground. Holtzmann observes that the Mark hypothesis is a hypothesis no longer,[1] meaning that it is an established fact. And he and many others recognise in Mark, either as we have it or in an earlier form, a source for both the other synoptists, thereby acknowledging that the hypothesis of mutual use likewise has a measure of truth.

6. The third hypothesis is that of *one primitive Gospel* from which all three synoptists drew their material. The supporters of this view do not believe that the evangelists used each other's writings. Their contention is that all were dependent on one original document, an *Urevangelium* as German scholars call it. This primitive Gospel was, *ex hypothesi,* comprehensive enough to cover the whole ground. From it all the three evangelists took much in common, hence their agreement in matter and language in so many places. But how about their divergencies? How came it to pass that with the same document before them they made such diverse use of it? The answer is: it was due to the fact that they used, not identical copies of one document, but different recensions of the same document. By this flight into the dark region of conjectural recensions, whereof no trace remains, the *Urevangelium* hypothesis

[1] *Hand-Commentar*, p. 3.

was self-condemned to oblivion. With it are associated the honourable names of Lessing and Eichhorn.

7. The fourth and last hypothesis was propounded by Schleiermacher. He took for his starting-point the word διήγησις in the introduction of Luke's Gospel, and found in it the hint that not in one primitive Gospel of comprehensive character was the source exploited by our Gospels to be found, but rather in many Gospelets containing a record of some words or deeds of Jesus with which the writer had become acquainted, and which he specially desired to preserve. Each of our evangelists is to be conceived as having so many of these *diegeses* or Gospelets in his possession, and constructing out of them a larger connected story. In so far as they made use of copies of the same *diegesis*, there would be agreement in contents and style; in so far as they used Gospelets peculiar to their respective collections, there would be divergence; and of course diversity in the order of narration was to be expected in writings compiled from a handful of unconnected leaflets of evangelic tradition. In spite of the great name of its author, this hypothesis has found little support as an attempt to account for the whole phenomena of the Gospels. As a subordinate suggestion to explain the presence in any of the synoptists of elements peculiar to himself, it is worthy of consideration. Some of the particulars, *e.g.*, peculiar to Luke may have been found by him not in any large collection, but in a leaflet, as others may have been derived not from written sources large or small, but from a purely oral source in answer to local inquiries.

8. None of the foregoing hypotheses is accepted by itself as a satisfactory solution of the synoptical problem by any large number of competent critics at the present time. The majority look for a solution in the direction of a combination of the second and third hypotheses under modified forms. To a certain extent they recognise use of one Gospel in another, and there is an extensive agreement in the opinion that for the explanation of the phenomena not one but at least two primitive documents must be postulated. In these matters certainty is unattainable, but it is worth while making ourselves acquainted with what may be called the most probable working hypothesis. With this view I offer here a brief statement as to the present trend of critical opinion on the subject in question.

9. It is a familiar observation that, leaving out of account the reports of the teaching of Jesus contained in the first and third Gospels, the matter that remains, consisting of narratives of actions and events, is very much the same in all the three synoptists. Not

only so, the remainder practically consists of the contents of the second Gospel. It seems as if Matthew and Luke had made Mark the framework of their story, and added to it new material. This accordingly is now believed by many to have been the actual fact. The prevailing idea is that our Mark, or a book very like it in contents, was under the eye of the compilers of the first and third Gospels when they wrote, and was used by both as a source, not merely in the sense that they took from it this and that, but in the sense of adopting it substantially as it was, and making it the basis of their longer and more elaborate narratives. This crude statement of course requires qualification. What took place was not that the compilers of the first and third Gospels simply transcribed the second, page by page, as they found it in their manuscript, reproducing its contents in the original order, and each section *verbatim*. If that had been the case the synoptical problem would have been greatly simplified, and there would hardly have been room for difference of opinion. As the case stands the order of narration is more or less disturbed, and there are many variations in expression. The question is thus raised: On the hypothesis that Mark was a source for Matthew and Luke, in respect of the matter common to all the three, how came it to pass that the writers of the first and third Gospels deviated so much, and in different ways, from their common source in the order of events and in style? The general answer to the question, so far as order is concerned, is that the additional matter acted as a disturbing influence. The explanation implies that, when the disturbing influence did not come into play, the original order would be maintained. Advocates of the hypothesis try to show that the facts answer to this view; that is to say, that Mark's order is followed in Matthew and Luke, except when disturbance is explicable by the influence of the new material. One illustration may here be given from Matthew. Obviously the "Sermon on the Mount" exercised a powerful fascination on the mind of the evangelist. From the first he has it in view, and he desires to bring it in as soon as possible. Therefore, of the incidents connected with the commencement of the Galilean ministry reported in Mark, he relates simply the call of the four fisher Apostles, as if to furnish the Great Teacher with disciples who might form an audience for the great Discourse. To that call he appends a general description of the Galilean ministry, specifying as its salient features, preaching or teaching and healing. Then he proceeds to illustrate each department of the ministry, the teaching by the Sermon on the Mount in chapters v.–vii., the healing by a group of

miracles contained in chapters viii. and ix., including the cure of Peter's mother-in-law, the wholesale cures on the Sabbath evening, and the healing of the leper, all reported in the first chapter of Mark. Of course, in regard neither to the sermon nor to the group of miracles can the first Gospel lay claim to chronological accuracy. In the corresponding part of his narrative, Luke follows Mark closely, reporting the cure of the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum, of Peter's mother-in-law, of many sick people on the Sabbath evening, and of the leper in the same order. There is only one deviation. The call of Peter, which in Luke replaces that of the four, Peter and Andrew, James and John, comes between the Sabbath evening cures and the cure of the leper.

The variations in style raise a much subtler question, which can only be dealt with adequately by a detailed comparative exegesis, such as that so admirably exemplified in the great work of Dr. Bernhard Weiss on the Gospel of Mark and its synoptical parallels.[1] Suffice it to say here that it is not difficult to suggest a variety of causes which might lead to literary alteration in the use of a source. Thus, if the style of the source was peculiar, markedly individualistic, colloquial, faulty in grammar, one can understand a tendency to replace these characteristics by smoothness and elegance. The style of Mark is of the character described, and instances of literary correction in the parallel accounts can easily be pointed out. Another cause in operation might be misunderstanding of the meaning of the source, or disinclination to adopt the meaning obviously suggested. Two illustrative instances may be mentioned. In reporting the sudden flight of Jesus from Capernaum in the early morning, Mark makes Him say to the disciples in connection with the reason for departure, "to this end came I forth," *i.e.*, from the *town*. In Luke this is turned into, "therefore was I sent," *i.e.*, into the *world*.[2] In the incident of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Mark makes Jesus bid the two disciples say to the owner of the colt, "straightway He (Jesus) will send it back," *i.e.*, return it to its owner when He has had His use of it. In Matthew this is turned into, "straightway he (the owner) will send them (the ass and her colt)".[3] Yet another source of verbal alteration might be literary taste acting instinctively, leading to the substitution of one word or phrase for another, without conscious reason.

10. Thus far of the matter common to the three Gospels, or what may be called the triple tradition. But Matthew and Luke contain

[1] *Das Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen*, 1872.

[2] Mark i. 38, Luke iv. 43. [3] Mark xi. 3, Matthew xxi. 3.

much more than this, the additional matter in both consisting mainly of *words and discourses* of Jesus. Each Gospel has not a little peculiar to itself, but there is a large amount of teaching material common to the two, and though this common element is very differently reproduced as to historic connection and grouping, yet there is such a pervading similarity in thought and expression as to suggest forcibly the hypothesis of a second source as its most natural explanation. Assuming that the first and third evangelists borrowed their narrative of *events* from Mark, and that what needs accounting for is mainly the didactic element, it would follow that this hypothetical second source consisted chiefly, if not exclusively, of sayings spoken by the Lord Jesus. Whether both evangelists possessed this source in the same form, and had each his own way of using it, as dictated by his plan, or whether it came into their hands in different recensions, formed under diverse influences, and meant to serve distinct purposes, are questions of subordinate moment. The main question is: Did there exist antecedent to the composition of our first and third Gospels a collection of the words of Christ, which both evangelists knew and used in compiling their memoirs of Christ's public ministry? Modern critics, such as Weiss, Wendt, Holtzmann, Jülicher, concur in answering this question in the affirmative. The general result is that for the explanation of the phenomena presented by the synoptical Gospels, modern criticism postulates two main written sources: a book like our canonical Mark, if not identical with it, as the source of the narratives common to the three Gospels, and another book containing sayings of Jesus, as the source of the didactic matter common to Matthew and Luke.

11. These conclusions, which might be reached purely by internal inspection, are confirmed by the well-known statements of Papias, who flourished in the first quarter of the second century, concerning books about Christ written by Mark and Matthew. They are to this effect: "Mark, being the interpreter of Peter, wrote carefully, though not in order, as he remembered them, the things spoken or done by Christ". "Matthew wrote the *Logia* in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted these as he could."[1] The statements point to two books as the fountains of evangelic written tradition containing matter guaranteed as reliable as resting on the authority of two apostles, Peter and Matthew. The first of the two books is presumably identical with our canonical Mark. It is not against this

[1] Eusebii, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, lib. iii., c. 39.

that Papias represents Mark's work as including things *spoken* as well as done by Christ. For this is true of canonical Mark. Though, by comparison with Matthew and Luke, Mark is extremely meagre in the didactic element, yet he does report many very remarkable sayings of Jesus. But what of the other book? Is it to be identified with our Matthew? *Primâ facie* one would say no, because the Matthew of Papias is a book of *Logia*, which we naturally take to mean a book of oracles, or weighty words spoken by the Lord Jesus. But, on the other hand, it might be argued that *Logia* is simply a designation from the more prominent or characteristic part, and by no means excludes such narratives of events as we find in canonical Matthew. Indeed, it might be said that it would be difficult to compile a collection of sayings that should be interesting or even intelligible without the introduction of more or less narrative, if it were only by way of preface or historical setting. Granting that the leading aim was to report words, a minimum amount of narrative would still be necessary to make the report effective. And it might be added that it is, in many instances, only a minimum of narrative that we find in canonical Matthew, his historic statements being generally meagre in comparison with those in Mark and Luke. Hence, not a few critics and apologists still hold by the old tradition which practically identified the *Logia* of Papias with the Matthew of the New Testament. But the *Logia*, according to Papias, was written in Hebrew, and our canonical Matthew is in Greek which does not wear the aspect of a translation. This difficulty defenders of the old view do not find insurmountable. Yet the impression left on one's mind by such apologetic attempts is that of special pleading, or perhaps, one ought to say, of an honourable bias in favour of a venerable tradition, and of a theory which gives us, in canonical Matthew, a work proceeding directly from the hand of an apostle. If that theory could be established, the result would be highly satisfactory to many who at present stand in doubt. Meantime we must be content to acquiesce, provisionally, in a hypothesis, according to which we have access to the apostle Matthew's contribution only at second hand, in a Gospel from another unknown author which has absorbed a large portion, if not the whole, of the apostolic document. Even on this view we have the satisfaction of feeling that the three synoptists bring us very near to the original eye and ear witnesses. The essential identity, amid much diversity in form, of the words ascribed to our Lord in the two Gospels which draw upon the *Logia*, inspires confidence that the evangelic reports of these words, though secondary, are altogether reliable.

12. We cannot but wonder that a work so precious as the *Logia* of Matthew was allowed to perish, and earnestly wish that, if possible, it might even yet be restored. Attempts at gratifying this natural feeling have recently been made, and conjectural reconstructions of the lost treasure lie before us in such works as that of Wendt on the *Teaching of Jesus*,[1] and of Blair on the *Apostolic Gospel*.[2] A critical estimate of these essays cannot here be given. Of course they are tentative; nevertheless they are interesting, and even fascinating to all who desire to get behind the existing records, and as near to the actual words of our Lord as possible. And, though an approach to a consensus of opinion may never be reached, the discussion is sure to bear fruit in a more intimate acquaintance with the most authentic forms of many of our Lord's sayings. As another aid to so desirable a result, one must give a cordial welcome to such works as that of Resch on *Extracanonical Parallel Texts to the Gospels*.[3] Resch believes it possible, through the use of Codex Bezae, the old Italian and Syriac versions, and quotations from the Gospels in the early fathers, to get behind the text of our canonical Gospels, and to reach a truer reflection in Greek of the Hebrew original in the case of many sayings recorded in the *Logia* of Matthew. There will be various estimates of the intrinsic value of his adventurous attempt. Personally, I am not sanguine that much will come out of it. But one cannot be sorry that it has been made, and by one who thoroughly believes that he is engaged in a fruitful line of inquiry. It is well to learn by exhaustive experiment how much or how little may be expected from that quarter.

13. Among those who accept the hypothesis of the two sources a difference of opinion obtains on two subordinate points, *viz.*, first, the relation between the two sources used in Matthew and Luke, and, second, the relation between these two Gospels. Did Mark know and use the *Logia*, and did Matthew know Luke, or Luke Matthew? Dr. Bernhard Weiss answers the former question in the affirmative and the latter in the negative. From certain phenomena brought to light by a comparative study of the synoptists, he thinks it demonstrable that in many parts of his narrative Mark leans

[1] Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, Erster Theil. This part of Wendt's work has not been translated. His exposition of Christ's words has been translated by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[2] *The Apostolic Gospel, with a Critical Reconstruction of the Text*, by J. Fulton Blair, 1896. Mr. Blair's critical position differs widely from Wendt's, and his *Apostolic Gospel* contains much more besides words.

[3] *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien.*

on an older written source, whose accounts of evangelic incidents are reproduced in a more faithful manner in the companion Gospels, and especially in Matthew. This source he takes to be the *Logia* of the apostle Matthew. It follows from this, of course, that the *Logia* was not a mere collection of sayings, but a book containing histories as well, such narratives, *e.g.*, as those relating to the palsied man, the feeding of the 5000, and the blind man at Jericho. The phenomena on which Weiss rests his case are of two kinds. One group consists of minute agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark in narratives common to the three, as, *e.g.*, in the use of the words ἰδού and ἐπὶ κλίνης in the opening sentence of the story of the palsied man. The inference is that these phrases are taken from the *Logia*, implying of course that the story was there for those who chose to use it. The other group consists of sayings of Jesus found in Mark's Gospel, and reproduced also in Matthew and Luke in nearly identical form, yet not taken, it is held, from Mark, but from the *Logia*. The contention is that the close similarity can be accounted for only by the assumption that Mark, as well as his brother evangelists, took the words from the *Logia*. An instance in point may be found in the respective accounts of the reply of Jesus to the charge of being in league with Beelzebub. Wendt dissents from the inference of Weiss in both classes of cases. The one group of facts he explains by assuming that Luke had access to the first canonical gospel; in the second group he sees simply accidental correspondences between independent traditions preserved respectively in the *Logia* and in Mark.[1]

Section II. Historicity.

1. The Gospels *primâ facie* wear the aspect of books aiming at giving a true if not a full account of the life, and more especially of the public career, of Jesus Christ, the Author of the Christian faith. For Christians, writings having such an aim must possess unique interest. There is nothing an earnest believer in Christ more desires to know than the actual truth about Him: what He said, did, and experienced. How far do the books, the study of which is to engage our attention, satisfy this desire? To what extent are they historically reliable?

2. The question has been recently propounded and discussed:

[1] *Die Lehre Jesu*, Erster Theil, pp. 191-3. On the question whether the third evangelist used canonical Matthew, *vide* the *Abhandlung* of Edward Simons, Bonn, 1880.

What interest did the apostolic age take in the evangelic history, and the conclusion arrived at that the earthly life of Jesus interested it very little?[1] Now, there can be no doubt that, comparing that age with the present time, the statement is true. We live in an age when the historical spirit is in the ascendant, creating an insatiable desire to know the origins of every movement which has affected, to any extent, the fortunes of humanity. Moreover, Christianity has undergone an evolution resulting in types of this religion which are, on various grounds, unsatisfactory to many thoughtful persons. Hence has arisen a powerful reaction of which the watchword is — "Back to Christ," and to which additional intensity has been given by the conviction that modern types of Christianity, whether ecclesiastical, philosophical, or pietistic, all more or less foster, if they do not avow, indifference to the historic foundations of the faith. We have thus a religious as well as a scientific reason for our desire to know the actual Jesus of history. In the primitive era, faith was free to follow its native tendency to be content with its immediate object, the *Risen Lord*, and to rely on the inward illumination of the Holy Spirit as the source of all knowledge necessary for a godly life. This indifference might conceivably pass into hostility. Faith might busy itself in transforming unwelcome facts so as to make the history serve its purpose. For the historic interest and the religious are not identical. Science wants to know the actual facts; religion wants facts to be such as will serve its ends. It sometimes idealises, transforms, even invents history to accomplish this object. We are not entitled to assume, *à priori*, that apostolic Christianity entirely escaped this temptation. The suggestion that the faith of the primitive Church took hold of the story of Jesus and so transfigured it that the true image of Him is no longer recoverable, however sceptical, is not without plausibility. The more moderate statement that the apostolic Church, while knowing and accepting many facts about Jesus, was not interested in them as facts, but only as aids to faith, has a greater show of reason. It might well be that the teaching of Jesus was regarded not so much as a necessary source of the knowledge of truth, but rather as a confirmation of knowledge already possessed, and that the acts and experiences of Jesus were viewed chiefly in the light of verifications of His claim to be the Messiah. It does not greatly matter to us what the source of interest in the evangelic facts was so long as they are facts; if the primitive Church in its traditions concerning Jesus was simply utilising and

[1] *Vide* Von Soden's essay in the *Theologische Abhandlungen, Carl von Weizsäcker Gewidmet*, 1892.

not manufacturing history. There is good reason to believe that in the main this is the true state of the case. Not only so, there are grounds for the opinion that the historic spirit — interest in facts as facts — was not wanting even amid the fervour of the apostolic age. It may be worth while to mention some of these, seeing they make for the historicity of the main body of the evangelic tradition concerning the words, deeds, and sufferings of Jesus as these are recorded, *e.g.*, in the Gospel of Mark.

3. In this connection it deserves a passing notice that there existed in the primitive Church a party interested in the fact-knowledge of Jesus, the knowledge of Christ "after the flesh" in Pauline phrase, a Christ party. From the statement made by St. Paul in the text from which the phrase just quoted is taken, it has been inferred that the apostle was entirely indifferent to the historical element.[1] The inference seems to me hasty, but, be this as it may, what I am now concerned to point out is that, if St. Paul undervalued the facts of the personal ministry, there were those who did not. There was a party who made acquaintance with these facts a necessary qualification for the apostleship, and on this ground denied that St. Paul was an apostle. The assumption underlying the Tübingen tendency-criticism is that there were two parties in the apostolic Church interested in misrepresenting Jesus in different directions, one virtually making Him a narrow Judaist, the other making Him a Pauline universalist, neither party being worthy of implicit trust. This hypothesis presents a somewhat distorted view of the situation. It would be nearer the truth to say that there was a party interested in *facts* and another interested chiefly in *ideas*. The one valued facts without seeing their significance; the other valued ideas without taking much trouble to indicate the fact basis. To the bias of the former party we might be indebted for knowledge of many facts in the life of Jesus, the significance of which was not understood by the transmitters of the tradition.

4. Even within the Pauline party there were those who were interested in facts and in some measure animated by the historical spirit. So far from regarding Paulinists in general as idealists, we ought probably to regard St. Paul, in his passion for ideas and apparent indifference to biographic detail, as an exception, and to think of the majority of his followers as men who, while sympathising with his universalism, shared in no small measure the common Jewish realism. Of this type was *Luke*. The absence from his

[1] 2 Corinthians v. 16.

Gospel of even the rudiments of a doctrine of atonement, so conspicuous a topic in the Pauline epistles, will be remarked on hereafter; meantime I direct attention simply to its opening sentence. That prefatory statement is full of words and phrases breathing the fact-loving spirit: Πεπληροφορημένων πραγμάτων, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται, ἀκριβῶς, ἀσφάλειαν. The author wants to deal with facts believed; he wishes, as far as possible, to be guided by the testimony of eye-witnesses; he means to take pains in the ascertainment of the truth that the friend for whose benefit he writes may attain unto certainty. The question here is not how far he succeeded in his aim; the point insisted on is the aim itself, the historical spirit evinced. Luke may have been unconsciously influenced to a considerable extent by religious bias, preconceived opinion, accepted Christian belief, and therefore not sufficiently critical, and too easily satisfied with evidence; but he honestly wanted to know the historic truth. And in this desire he doubtless represented a class, and wrote to meet a demand on the part of Christians who felt a keen interest in the *memorabilia* of the Founder, and were not satisfied with the sources at command on account of their fragmentariness, or occasional want of agreement with each other.[1]

5. The peculiar character of the apostle who stood at the head of the primitive Jewish Church has an important bearing on the question of historicity. For our knowledge of *Peter* we are not wholly dependent on the documents whose historicity is in question. We have a rapid pencil-sketch of him in the epistles of St. Paul, easily recognisable as that of the same man of whom we have a more finished picture in the Gospels. A genial, frank, impulsive, outspoken, generous, wide-hearted man; not preoccupied with theories, illogical, inconsistent, now on one side, now on the other; brave yet cowardly, capable of honest sympathy with Christian universalism, yet under pressure apt to side with Jewish bigots. A most unsatisfactory, provoking person to deal with for such a man as St. Paul, with his sharply defined position, thorough-going adherence to principle, and firm resolute will. Yes, but also a very satisfactory source of first-hand traditions concerning Jesus; an excellent witness, if a weak apostle. A *source*, a copious fountain of information he was bound to be. We do not need Papias to tell us this. This disciple, open-hearted and open-mouthed, must speak concerning his beloved Master. It will not be long before everybody knows what he has to tell concerning the ministry of the Lord.

[1] Von Soden, in the essay above referred to, takes no notice of Luke's preface.

Papias reports that in Mark's Gospel we have the literary record of Peter's testimony. The statement is entirely credible. Peter would say more than others about Jesus; he would say all in a vivid way, and Mark's narrative reflects the style of an impressionable eye-witness. If it be a faithful report of Peter's utterances the general truth of its picture of Jesus may be implicitly relied on. For Peter was not a man likely to be biassed by theological tendency. What we expect from him is rather a candid recital of things as they happened, without regard to, possibly without perception of, their bearing on present controversies; a rough, racy, unvarnished story, unmanipulated in the interest of ideas or theories which are not in this man's line. How far the narratives of the second Gospel bear out this character will appear hereafter.

6. The other fact mentioned by Papias, *viz.*, that the apostle *Matthew* was the source of the evangelic tradition relating to the *words* of Jesus, has an important bearing on historicity. Outside the Gospels we have no information concerning this disciple such as we have of Peter in the Pauline letters. But we may safely assume the truth of the Gospel accounts which represent him as having been a tax-gatherer before he was called to discipleship. The story of his call, under the name of Matthew or Levi, is told in all the three synoptists, as is also the significant incident of the feast following at which Jesus met with a large company of publicans. There is reason to believe that in calling this disciple our Lord had in view not merely ultimate service as an apostle, but immediate service in connection with the meeting with the publicans; that, in short, Jesus associated Matthew with Himself that He might use him as an instrument for initiating a mission to the class to which he had belonged. But if the Master might call a fit man to discipleship for one form of immediate service, He might call him for more than one. Another service the ex-publican might be able to render was that of secretary. In his old occupation he would be accustomed to writing, and it might be Christ's desire to utilise that talent for noting down things worthy of record. The gift would be most in demand in connection with the teaching of the Master. The preservation of that element could not be safely trusted to memories quite equal to the retention of remarkable healing acts, accompanied by not less remarkable sayings. The use of the pen at the moment might be necessary. And of all the members of the disciple-circle the ex-publican was the likeliest man for that service. We are not surprised, therefore, that the function assigned to Matthew in connection with the evangelic tradition is the preservation of the *Logia*.

That is just the part he was fitted to perform. As little are we surprised that Mark's Gospel, based on Peter's recollections, contains so little of the teaching. Peter was not the kind of man to take notes, nor were discourses full of deep thought the kind of material he was likely to remember. What would make an indelible impression on him would be, not thought, but extraordinary deeds, accompanied by striking gestures, original brief replies to embarrassing questions and the like; just such things as we find reported in the second Gospel.

From Matthew the publican might be expected not only a record of Christ's *teaching* as distinct from His actions, but an *impartial* record. We should not suspect him any more than Peter of theological bias; least of all in the direction of Judaism. As a Galilean he belonged to a half-Gentile community, and as a publican he was an outcast for orthodox Jews. It was probably the humane spirit and wide sympathies of Jesus that drew him from the receipt of custom. If, therefore, we find in the *Logia* any sayings ascribed to Jesus of a universalistic character we do not feel in the least tempted to doubt their authenticity. If, on the other hand, we meet with words of an apparently opposite character we are not greatly startled and ready to exclaim, Behold the hand of an interpolator. We rather incline to see in the combination of seemingly incongruous elements the evidence of candid chronicling. It is the case of an honest reporter taking down this and that without asking himself whether this can be reconciled with that. That a deep, many-sided mind like that of Jesus might give birth to startling paradoxes is no wise incredible. Therefore, without undertaking responsibility for every expression, one may without hesitation endorse the sentiment of Jülicher, "that Jewish and anti-Jewish, revolutionary and conservative, new and old, freedom and narrowness in judgment, sensuous hopes and a spiritualism blending together present and future, meet together, by no means weakens our impression that Jesus really here speaks".[1]

7. The mere fact of the preservation of Mark's Gospel is not without a bearing on the question of historicity. In its own way it testifies to the influence of the historic as distinct from the religious spirit in the early period of the Christian era. It would not have been at all surprising if that Gospel had fallen out of existence, seeing that its contents have been absorbed into the more comprehensive Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Assuming the correctness

[1] *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 231.

of modern critical views, the *Logia* of the Apostle Matthew has disappeared; how did it come about that the second Gospel did not disappear also, especially in view of its defects, as they would be regarded, comparing it with the longer narratives of the same type? Whether the authors of the first and third Gospels aimed at superseding the *Logia* and Mark is a question that need not be discussed. From Luke's preface it might plausibly be inferred that he did aspire at giving so full and satisfactory an account of the life of Jesus as should render earlier attempts superfluous. If he did he was not successful. The Gospel without the story of the infancy, and the Sermon on the Mount, and the detailed appearances after the resurrection survived. It might be undervalued. There is evidence of preference and partiality for one Gospel as against another in Patristic literature. Clement of Alexandria, true to his philosophy, undervalued all the synoptists as compared with the fourth Gospel, because they showed merely the *body* of Jesus, while the fourth Gospel showed His *spirit*. Augustine regarded Mark as a mere *pedissequus* to Matthew, *en laquais*, as D'Eichthal irreverently but not incorrectly renders the word.[1] Still Mark held his place, mere lackey to Matthew though some supposed him to be. The reason might be in part that he had got too strong a hold before the companion Gospels appeared to be easily dislodged, and had to be accepted in spite of defects and apparent superfluousness. But I think there was also a worthier reason, a certain diffused thankfulness for every scrap of information concerning the Lord Jesus, especially such as was believed to rest on apostolic testimony. Mark's Gospel passed for a report of St. Peter's reminiscences of the Master; therefore by all means let it be preserved, though it contained no account of the childhood of Jesus, and very imperfect reports of His teaching and of the resurrection. It was apostolic, therefore to be respected; as apostolic it was trustworthy, therefore to be valued. In short, the presence of the second Gospel in the New Testament, side by side with Matthew and Luke, is a witness to the prevalence in the Church of the first century of the *historical* spirit acting as a check on the *religious* spirit, whose instinctive impulse would be to obliterate traces of discrepancy, and to suppress all writings relating to the Christian origins, which in their presentation of Jesus even seemed to sink below the level of the Catholic faith.

8. The foregoing five considerations all tend to make a favour-

[1] *Vide* his work *Les Evangiles*, p. 66.

able impression as to the historicity of the evangelic tradition in general. More special considerations are needful when the tradition is broken up into distinct divisions. The tradition consists of three layers. Faith would make three demands for information concerning its object: what did He teach? what did He do? how did He suffer? Some think that the first and most urgent demand would be for information concerning the teaching, and that only in the second place would there grow up a desire for narratives of facts and experiences. According to Holtzmann the order was: first the *Logia*, then the passion-drama, then the anecdotes of memorable acts.[1] I should be inclined to invert the order of the first two items, and to say: the Passion, the *Logia*, the memorable incidents. But the more important question is: how far can the evangelic records concerning these three departments of the tradition be trusted? Only a few hints can be given by way of answer here.

9. The narratives of the Passion, given in all the four Gospels with disproportionate fulness, have lately been subjected to a searching analysis in a sceptical spirit rivalling that of Strauss. Dr. Brandt,[2] after doing his utmost to shake our faith in the trustworthiness of these pathetic records, still leaves to us eight particulars, which even he is constrained to recognise as historical. These are: betrayal by one of the twelve; desertion by all of them; denial by Peter; death sentence under the joint responsibility of Jewish rulers and Roman procurator; assistance in carrying the cross rendered by Simon of Cyrene; crucifixion on a hill called Golgotha; the crime charged indicated by the inscription, "King of the Jews"; death, if not preceded by a prayer for the murderers, or by the despairing cry, "My God, my God," at least heralded by a loud voice. In these particulars we have the skeleton of the story, all that is needful to give the Passion tragic significance, and even form a basis for theological constructions. The items omitted, the process before the Sanhedrim, the interviews with Pilate and Herod, the mockery of the soldiers, the preferential release of Barabbas, the sneers of passers-by, the two thieves, the parting of the raiment, the words from the cross, the preternatural accompaniments of death, are all more or less of the nature of accessories, enhancing greatly the impressiveness of the picture, suggesting additional lessons, but not altering the character of the event as a whole.

But even accessories are important, and not to be lightly given

[1] Vide *Hand-Commentar*, pp. 13-17.

[2] *Die Evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christenthums*, 1893.

over to the tender mercies of sceptical critics. The reasons assigned for treating them as unhistoric are not convincing. They come mostly under three heads: The influence of Old Testament prophecy, the absence of witnesses, and the bias manifest in the accounts of the trial against the Jews and in favour of the Gentiles. By reference to the first a whole group of incidents, including the cry, "Eli, Eli," are summarily disposed of. Texts taken from Psalm xxii. and Isaiah liii. created corresponding facts. This is a gratuitous assumption. The facts suggested the prophecies, the prophecies did not create the facts. The facts were there, and the primitive disciples looked out for Messianic oracles to suit them, by way of furnishing themselves with an apologetic, for the thesis, Jesus is the Christ. In some cases the links of proof are weak; no one could have thought of the texts unless the facts had been there to suggest them. The plea of lack of witnesses applies to what took place between Jesus and the various authorities before whom He appeared: the High Priests, Pilate, Herod. Who, it is asked, were there to see or hear? Who likely to be available as witnesses for the evangelic tradition? We cannot tell; yet it is possible there was quite sufficient evidence, though also possible, doubtless, that the evangelists were not in all cases able to give exact verifiable information, but were obliged to give simply the best information obtainable. This, at least, we may claim for them, that they did their best to ascertain the facts. As to the alleged prejudice leading to unfair distribution of blame for our Lord's death between the Jewish authorities and the Roman governor, we may admit that there were temptations to such partiality, arising out of natural dislike of the Jews and unequally natural desire to win the favour of those who held the reins of empire. Yet on the whole it may be affirmed that the representation of the evangelists is intrinsically credible as in harmony with all we know about the principal actors in the great tragedy.

10. With regard to the *teaching*, it is of course obvious that all recorded sayings of Jesus do not possess the same attestation. Some words are found in all three synoptists, some in two, and not a few in only one. Yet in many instances we can feel as sure of the authenticity of sayings found in a single Gospel as of that of sayings occurring in all the three. Who can doubt, *e.g.*, that the word, "the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," emanated from the great Master? It is well in this connection to have before our minds the rules by which judgment should be guided. The following canons may legitimately be relied on:—

(*a*) Sayings supported by full synoptical attestation may be regarded as in substance authentic.

(*b*) Sayings unsupported by full synoptical attestation may be regarded as authentic when their absence from a particular Gospel can be explained by its plan, or by the idiosyncrasy of its author. This covers not a few omissions by Luke.

(*c*) Sayings found only in a single Gospel may be accepted as authentic when they sympathise with and form a natural complement to other well-attested sayings. This remark applies to the sayings in Luke vii. 47, xv. 7, concerning the connection between little forgiveness and little love, and about the joy of finding things lost, which are complementary to the saying in all three synoptists: "the whole need not a physician;" the three sayings together constituting a full apology for the relations between Jesus and the sinful.

(*d*) All sayings possess intrinsic credibility which suit the general historical situation. This applies to Christ's antipharisaic utterances, an element very prominent in Matthew, and very much restricted in Luke.

(*e*) All sayings may be accepted as self-attested and needing no other attestation which bear the unmistakable stamp of a unique religious genius, rise above the capacity of the reporters, and are reported by them simply as unforgettable memories of the great Teacher handed down by a faithful tradition.

The chief impulse to collecting the sayings of Jesus was not a purely historical interest, but a desire to find in the words of the Master what might serve as a rule to believers for the guidance of their life. Hence may be explained the topical grouping of sayings in Matthew and Luke, especially in the former, *e.g.*, in the tenth chapter, whose rubric might be: a directory for the mission work of the church; and in the eighteenth, which might be headed: how the members of the Christian brotherhood are to behave towards each other. The question suggests itself, Would the influence of the practical aim be confined to *grouping?* Would it not extend to modifications, expansions, additions, even inventions, that the words of the Master might cover all present requirements and correspond fully to present circumstances and convictions? On this topic Weizsäcker makes the following statement: "From the beginning the tradition consisted not in mere repetition, but in repetition combined with creative activity. And from the nature of the case this activity increased as time went on. Elucidations grew into text. The single saying was multiplied with the multiplication of its uses, or the words were referred to a definite case and correspondingly

modified. Finally, words were inserted into the text of Jesus' sayings, especially in the form of instances of narrative, which were only meant to make His utterances more distinct."[1] This may seem to open a door to licence, but second thoughts tend to allay our fears. The aim itself supplied a check to undue freedom. Just because disciples desired to follow the Master and make His words their law, they would wish to be sure that the reported sayings gave them the *thoughts* of Jesus at least, if not His *ipsissima verba*. Then there is reason to believe that the process of fixing the tradition was substantially completed when the memory of Jesus was recent, and the men who had been with Him were at hand to guide and control the process. Weizsäcker remarks that very little of the nature of accretion originated elsewhere than in the primitive church, and that the great mass of the evangelic tradition was formed under the influence of the living tradition.[2] That is to say, the freedom of the apostolic age was controlled by knowledge and reverence. It was known what the Master had taught, and great respect was cherished for His authority. If there was no superstitious concern as to literal accuracy, there was a loyal solicitude that the meaning conveyed by words should be true to the mind of Christ.

11. The incidents of the *Healing* Ministry, which form the bulk of the narrative of events, are complicated with the question of *miracle*. Those for whom it is an axiom that a miracle is impossible are tempted to pronounce on that ministry the summary and sweeping verdict, *unhistorical*. This is not a scientific procedure. The question of fact should be dealt with separately on its own grounds, and the question of explicability taken up only in the second place. There are good reasons for believing that the healing ministry, miraculous or not miraculous, was a great fact in the public career of Jesus. Healing is associated with teaching in all general notices of our Lord's work. Nine acts of healing, some of them very remarkable, are reported in all the synoptical Gospels. The healing element in the ministry is so interwoven with the didactic that the former cannot be eliminated without destroying the whole story. This is frankly acknowledged by Harnack, who, if he does not doubt the reality of miracles, attaches very little apologetic value to them.[3] The occasional notices in the Gospels of contemporary opinions, impressions, and theories regarding Christ's actions speak to something extraordinary over and above the preaching and teaching.

[1] *The Apostolic Age*, vol. ii., p. 62.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *History of Dogma*, vol. i., p. 65, note 3.

Mark's graphic report of the impression produced by Christ's first appearance in the synagogue of Capernaum may be cited as an instance. "What is this? A new teaching!—with authority He commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey Him."[1] This is a veritable reminiscence, and it points to a double surprise created by an original style of preaching, and by an unprecedented power. Still more significant are the theories invented to explain away the power. The Pharisees accounted for it, as displayed in the cure of demoniacs, by the suggestion of an alliance with Beelzebub. Herod said: "It is John whom I beheaded risen from the dead and exercising the power of the spirit world". The one theory was malevolent, the other absurd, but the point to be noticed is the existence of the theories. Men do not theorise about nothing. There were remarkable facts urgently demanding explanation of some sort.

The healing acts of Jesus then, speaking broadly, were to begin with facts. How they are to be explained, and what they imply as to the Person of the Healer, are questions for science and theology. It is not scientific to neglect the phenomena as unworthy of notice. As little is it scientific to make the solution easy by under-statement of the facts to be explained, as, *e.g.*, by viewing demoniacal possession as an imaginary disease. Demoniacal possession might be an imaginary *explanation* of certain classes of diseases, but the diseases themselves were serious enough, as serious as madness and epilepsy, which appear to have formed the physical basis of the malady.

Finally, it is not to be supposed that these healing acts, though indubitable facts, have no permanent religious value. Their use in the evidences of Christianity may belong to an antiquated type of apologetic, but in other respects their significance is perennial. Whether miraculous or not, they equally reveal the wide-hearted benevolence of Jesus. They throw a side light on His doctrine of God and of man, and especially on His conception of the ideal of life. The healing ministry was a tacit but effective protest against asceticism and the dualism on which it rests, and a proof that Jesus had no sympathy with the hard antithesis between spirit and flesh.

12. Before leaving the topic of historicity, it may be well here to refer to a line of evidence which, though not worked out, has been suggestively sketched by Professor Sanday in his Bampton Lectures

[1] Mark i. 27.

on *Inspiration*. The thesis to be proved is "that the great mass of the narrative in the first three Gospels took its shape before the destruction of Jerusalem, *i.e.*, within less than forty years of the events".[1] "Was there ever," asks Dr. Sanday, "an easier problem for a critic to decide whether the sayings and narratives which lie before him came from the one side of this chasm or the other?" Among the instances he cites are such as these: "If, therefore, thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and then rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee," etc. "Woe unto you, ye blind guides, which say, whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing," etc. "See thou tell no man, but go thy way, show thyself to the priest," etc. That is to say, the altar, the temple, the priesthood are still in existence. This is not decisive as to the date of our Gospels, but it is decisive as to much of the material contained in them having assumed fixed shape, either in oral or in written form, before the great crisis of Israel.

13. Historicity, be it finally noted, is not to be confounded with absolute accuracy, or perfect agreement between parallel accounts. Harmonistic is a thing of the past. It was a well-meant discipline, but it took in hand an insoluble problem, and it unduly magnified the importance of a solution, even if it had been possible. Questions as to occasions on which reported words and acts of Jesus were spoken or done, as to the connections between sayings grouped together in one Gospel, dispersed in the pages of another, as to the diverse forms of sayings in parallel reports, are for us now secondary. The broad question we ask as to the words of Jesus is: have we here, in the main, words actually spoken by Jesus, once or twice, now or then, in this connection or in that, in separate aphorisms or in connected discourse, in the form reported by this or that evangelist, or in a form not exactly reproduced by any of them, yet conveying a sense sufficiently reflected in all the versions? Is the Lord's prayer the Lord's at whatever time given to His disciples? Is the "Sermon on the Mount" made up of real utterances of Jesus, whether all spoken at one time, as Matthew's report seems to imply, or on various occasions, as we should infer from Luke's narrative? Did Jesus actually say: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners," whether with the addition, "to repentance," as it stands in Luke, or without, as in the genuine text of the same *Logia* in Matthew and Mark? Did He speak the parable of the lost sheep—whether in Matthew's form or in Luke's, or in a form differing verbally from

[1] Page 283.

both — to disciples, to Pharisees, or perhaps to neither, but to publicans, yet conveying in some form and to some audience the great thought that there was a passion in His heart and in the heart of God for saving lost men? It is greatly to be desired that devout readers of the Gospels should be emancipated from legal bondage to the theological figment of inerrancy. Till this is done, it is impossible to enjoy in full the Gospel story, or feel its essential truth and reality.

CHAPTER II.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK.

SECTION I. CONTENTS.

1. The second Gospel has no account of the birth and infancy of Jesus. The narrative opens with the prelude to the public ministry, the preaching and baptism of the prophet John; and the sequel consists of a rapid sketch of that ministry in a series of graphic tableaux from its commencement in Galilee to its tragic close in Jerusalem. This fact alone raises a presumption in favour of Mark's claim to be the earliest of the three synoptical Gospels. Other considerations pointing in the same direction are its comparative brevity and the meagreness of its account of Christ's teaching. This Gospel wears the aspect of a first sketch of the memorable career of one who had become an object of religious faith and love to the circle of readers for whose benefit it was written. As such it is entitled to precedence in an introduction to the three synoptists, though, in our detailed comments, we follow the order in which they are arranged in the New Testament. It is convenient to take Mark first for this further reason, that from its pages we can form the clearest idea of the general course of our Lord's history after He entered on His Messianic calling. In none of the three Gospels can we find a definite chronological plan, but it is possible from any one of them to form a general idea of the leading stages of the ministry, and most easily and clearly from the second.

2. The first stage was the *synagogue* ministry. After His baptism in the Jordan and His temptation in the wilderness, Jesus returned to Galilee and began to preach the "Gospel of the Kingdom of God".[1] The synagogue was the scene of this preaching. The first appearance of Jesus in a synagogue was in Capernaum, where He at once made a great impression both by His discourse and by the cure of a demoniac.[2] This was simply the commence-

[1] Mark i. 14. [2] Mark i. 27.

ment of a preaching tour in the synagogues of Galilee. Jesus made no stay in Capernaum. He left the town the day after He preached in its synagogue, very early in the morning.[1] He left so early in the day because He feared detention by the people. He left in such haste because He knew that He could preach in the synagogues only by the consent of the authorities, which might soon be withheld through sinister influence. This synagogue preaching naturally formed the first phase in Christ's work. The synagogue presented a ready opportunity of coming into contact with the people. Any man might speak there with the permission of the ruler. But he could speak only so long as he was a *persona grata*, and Jesus, conscious of the wide cleavage in thought and feeling between Himself and the scribes, could not but fear that He would not remain such long. It was now or never, at the outset or not at all, so far as the synagogue was concerned.

3. How long this synagogue ministry lasted is not expressly indicated. A considerable period is implied in the statement: "He preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee".[2] It is not necessary to take this strictly, especially in view of the populousness of Galilee, and the multitude of its towns large and small, as indicated by Josephus.[3] But the statement must be taken in earnest so far as to recognise that Jesus had a deliberate plan for a synagogue ministry in Galilee, and that He carried it out to a considerable extent. It is not improbable that it was interrupted by the influence of the scribes, whom we find lying in wait for Him on His return from the preaching tour to Capernaum.[4]

4. With the anecdote in which the scribes figure as captious critics of Jesus a new phase in the story begins. The keynote of the first chapter is *popularity;* that of the next is *opposition*. In this juxtaposition the evangelist is not merely aiming at dramatic effect, but reflecting in his narrative a real historical sequence. The popularity and the opposition were related to each other as cause and effect. It is true that having once entered on this second topic, he groups together a series of incidents illustrating the hostile attitude of the scribes, which have a topical rather than a temporal connection, in this probably following the example of his voucher, Peter. These extend from chap. ii. 1 to chap. iii. 6, constituting the

[1] Mark i. 35. [2] Mark i. 39.

[3] Josephus gives the number of towns at 204, the smallest having 15,000 inhabitants. *Vide* his *Vita*, chap. xlv., and *Bel. Jud.*, iii., 2, 3.

[4] Chap. ii. 1.

second division of the story, chap. i. 14-45 being the first. The two together set before us the two forces whose action and interaction can be traced throughout the drama, and whose resultant will be the cross: the favour of the people, the ill-will of their religious leaders.

5. Within the second group of anecdotes illustrating the hostility of the scribes, a place is assigned to an incident which ought not to be regarded as a mere subordinate detail under that general category, but rather as pointing to another phase of our Lord's activity co-ordinate in importance with the preaching in the synagogues. I refer to the meeting with the *publicans*, and in connection with that the call of Levi or Matthew.[1] That action of Jesus had a decisive effect in alienating the scribes, but meantime that is not the thing to be emphasised. We have to recognise in this new movement a second stage in the ministry of Jesus. First, preaching in the synagogues to the Jews of respectable character and good religious habit; next, a mission to the practically excommunicated, non-synagogue-going, socially outcast part of the community. Mark, more than his brother evangelists, shows his sense of the importance and significance of this new departure, especially by the observation: "there were many (publicans and sinners), and they followed Him".[2] That is to say, the class was large enough to demand special attention, and they were inviting attention and awakening interest in them by the interest they on their side were beginning to take in Jesus and His work. Without doubt this mission to the publicans bulked much larger in fact than it does in the pages of the evangelists or in the thoughts of average readers of the Gospel, and it must be one of the cares of the interpreter to make it appear in its true dimensions.[3] There is nothing in the Gospels more characteristic of Jesus, or of deeper, more lasting significance as to the nature and tendency of the Christian faith.

6. The third stage in the ministry of Jesus was the formation of a *disciple-circle*. Of the beginnings of this movement Mark gives us a glimpse in chap. i. 16-20, where he reports the call of the four fishermen, Peter and Andrew, James and John; and in the words Jesus is reported to have spoken to the first pair of brothers there is a clear indication of a purpose to gather about Him a band of men not merely for personal service but in order to training for a high calling. Levi's call, reported in chap. ii., is another indication of

[1] Chap. ii. 13-17. [2] Chap. ii. 15.

[3] *Vide* notes on this section in Matthew and in Mark.

the same kind. But it is in the section of the Gospel beginning at chap. iii. 7, and extending to chap. vi. 13, that the disciples properly come to the front. An intention on the part of the evangelist to give them prominence is betrayed in the pointed way in which he refers to them in iii. 7: "And Jesus *with the disciples* withdrew towards the sea".[1] A little further on in the same chapter we read of the retirement of Jesus to the mountain with a band of disciples, out of which He selects an inner circle of *twelve*.[2] And at various points in this division of the Gospel the disciple-band is referred to in a way to indicate that they are assuming a new importance to the mind of Jesus.[3]

7. This importance was due in part to dissatisfaction with the result of the general ministry among the people. Jesus had preached often, and healed many, in synagogue and highway, and had become in consequence the idol of the masses who gathered in increasing numbers from all quarters, and crowded around Him wherever He went, as we read in chap. iii. 7-12. But this popularity did not gratify Him; it rather bored Him. He did not weary in well-doing, but He was disappointed with the outcome. This disappointment found expression in the parable of the sower, which was really a critical estimate of the synagogue ministry to this sad effect: much seed sown; little fruit. From this comparatively fruitless ministry among the many, Jesus turned with yearning to the susceptible few in hope to find in them a good soil that should bring forth ripe fruit, thirty, sixty, or even an hundred fold. After a long enough time had elapsed to make it possible to form an estimate of the spiritual situation, He judged that in a disciple-circle lay His only chance of deep permanent influence. Hence He naturally sought to extricate Himself from the crowd, and to get away from collisions with unsympathetic scribes, that He might have leisure to indoctrinate the chosen band in the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven. Leisure, quiet, retirement — that more and more was His aim.

8. This desire for opportunity to perform the functions of a master is made more apparent by Mark than by the two other synoptists. He comes far short of them in his report of Christ's teaching, but he brings out much more clearly than they Christ's desire for undisturbed intercourse with the twelve, the reasons for it, and the persistent efforts of the Master to accomplish His object. It is from his pages we learn of the *escapes* of Jesus from the crowds

[1] *μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν* stands before *ἀνεχώρησεν* in the best texts.

[2] Chap. iii. 13.

[3] *Vide* iii. 31-35; iv. 10-25; vi. 7-13.

and from the scribes. These escapes, as reported by Mark, take place in all directions possible for one whose work lay on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee: towards the hill behind, towards the eastern shore, towards the northern borderland. Five in all are mentioned: one to the hill;[1] two to the eastern shore, first in an eastward,[2] then in a northerly direction;[3] two to the north, first to the borders of Tyre and Sidon,[4] next to the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi.[5] All had the same end in view: the instruction of the disciples. It was in connection with the first that the "Sermon on the Mount," or the Teaching on the Hill, though not mentioned by Mark, was doubtless communicated. The second and third attempts, the flights across the lake, were unsuccessful, being frustrated in the first case by an accidental meeting with a demoniac, and in the second by the determination of the multitude not to let Jesus get away from them. Therefore, to make sure, the Master had to retire with His disciples to the northern limits of the land, and even beyond them, into Gentile territory, that there He might, undisturbed, talk to His disciples about the crisis that He now clearly perceived to be approaching.

9. These last flights of Jesus take us on to a point in the story considerably in advance of the end of the third section, chap. vi. 13. The material lying between this place and chap. viii. 27 shows us the progress of the drama under the ever-intensifying influence of the two great forces, popularity and hostility. The multitude grows ever larger till it reaches the dimensions of 5000,[6] and the enmity of the scribes becomes ever more acute as the divergence of the ways of Jesus from theirs becomes increasingly manifest, and His abhorrence of their doctrines and spirit receives more unreserved expression.[7] After the encounter with the scribes occasioned by the neglect of the disciple-circle to comply with Rabbinical customs in the matter of ceremonial ablutions, Jesus felt that it was a mere matter of time when the enmity of His foes would culminate in an effort to compass His death. What He had now to do therefore was to prepare Himself and His disciples for the end. Accordingly, Mark reports that after that incident Jesus went thence into the borders of Tyre and Sidon, desiring that no one should know.[8] He could not be hid even there, and so to make sure of privacy He seems to have made a wide excursion into heathen territory, through Tyre and Sidon, possibly across the moun-

[1] Chap. iii. 13. [2] Chap. iv. 35. [3] Chap. vi. 30. [4] Chap. vii. 24.
[5] Chap. viii. 27. [6] Chap. vi. 44. [7] Chap. vii. 1-23. [8] Chap. vii. 24.

tains towards Damascus, and so through Decapolis back to Galilee.[1] Then followed, after an interval, the excursion to Caesarea Philippi, for ever memorable as the occasion on which Peter confessed his belief that his Master was the Christ, and the Master began to tell His disciples that He was destined ere long to suffer death at the hands of the scribes.[2]

10. From that point onwards Mark relates the last scenes in Galilee, the departure to the south, with the incidents on the way, the entry into Jerusalem, with the stirring incidents of the Passion Week, and, finally, the tragic story of the crucifixion. Throughout this later part of his narrative it is evident that the one great theme of conversation between Jesus and His disciples was the cross: His cross and theirs, the necessity of self-sacrifice for all the faithful, the rewards of those who loyally bear their cross, and the penalties appointed for those whose ruling spirit is ambition.[3]

Section II. Characteristics.

1. The outstanding characteristic of Mark is *realism*. I have in view here, not the graphic, descriptive, literary style which is generally ascribed to Mark, but the unreserved manner in which he presents the person and character of Jesus and of the disciples. He states facts as they were, when one might be tempted not to state them at all, or to exhibit them in a subdued light. He describes from the life, avoiding toning down, reticence, generalised expression, or euphemistic circumlocution. In this respect there is a great contrast between the second Gospel and the third, and it is only when we have made ourselves acquainted with the peculiarities of the two Gospels that we are able fully to appreciate those of either. The difference is this. Luke's whole style of presentation is manifestly influenced by the present position of Jesus and the disciples: Jesus the risen and exalted Lord, the disciples Apostles. For Mark Jesus is the Jesus of history, and the disciples are simply disciples. Luke writes from the view-point of reverential faith, Mark from that of loving vivid recollection. It is impossible by rapid citation of instances to give an adequate idea of these distinguishing features; all that can be done is to refer to a few examples in explanation of what I mean. In Mark's pages, Jesus before He begins His public career is a *carpenter*.[4] At the temptation He is *driven* by the Spirit

[1] Chap. vii. 31.
[2] Chap. viii. 27-33.
[3] *Vide* chap. ix. 33-50; x. 23-45.
[4] Chap. vi. 3.

into the wilderness.[1] His first appearance in the synagogue of Capernaum is so remarkable that people say to each other: "What is this? A new teaching! With authority commandeth He even unclean spirits, and they obey Him."[2] Early the following morning He makes what has the aspect of an unaccountable and undignified flight from Capernaum.[3] By-and-by when He is fully engrossed in His teaching and healing ministries His relatives come to rescue Him from His enthusiasm, deeming Him beside Himself.[4] On the day of the parable-discourse from the boat He makes another flight, He saying to the disciples: Let us go over to the other side; they promptly obeying orders suddenly given and carrying Him off from the crowd, even as He was.[5] Towards the end, on the ascent to Jerusalem, Jesus goes before the disciples, and His manner is such that those who follow are amazed.[6] When He sends for the colt on which He rides into the Holy City, He bids the two disciples promise to the owner that the colt will be returned when He has had His use of it.[7]

2. The realism of Mark makes for its historicity. It is a guarantee of first-hand reports, such as one might expect from Peter. Peter reverences his risen Lord as much as Luke or any other man. But he is one of the men who have been with Jesus, and he speaks from indelible impressions made on his eye and ear, while Luke reports at second-hand from written accounts for the most part. The same realism is a strong argument in favour of Mark's priority. It speaks to an early date before the feeling of decorum had become controlling as it is seen to be in Luke's Gospel. Mark is the archaic Gospel, written under the inspiration not of prophecy like Matthew, or of present reverence like Luke, but of fondly cherished past memories. In it we get nearest to the true human personality of Jesus in all its originality and power, and as coloured by the time and the place.[8] And the character of Jesus loses nothing by the realistic presentation. Nothing is told that needed to be hid. The homeliest facts reported by the evangelist only increase our interest and our admiration. One who desires to see the Jesus of history truly should con well the pages of Mark first, then pass on to Matthew and Luke.

3. By comparison with the companion Gospels Mark lacks a conspicuous didactic aim. The purpose of the writer seems to be

[1] Chap. i. 12. [2] Chap. i. 27. [3] Chap. i. 35-38. [4] Chap. iii. 21. [5] Chap. iv. 35. [6] Chap. x. 32. [7] Chap. xi. 3.
[8] *Vide* Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar*, p. 7.

mainly just to tell what he knows about Jesus. Some have tried to show that this Gospel is an endeavour to read into the evangelic history the ideas of Paulinism.[1] Others have maintained that the purpose of the writer is to observe a studied, calculated neutrality between Paulinism and Judaism.[2] These opposite views may be left to destroy each other. Others, again, have found in the book a contribution towards establishing Christians in the faith that Jesus was the Messiah, when that faith was tried by a delayed second coming.[3] A didactic programme has been supposed to be hinted at in the opening words: The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and attempts have been made to show that in the sequel this programme is steadily kept in view. I am by no means anxious to negative these last suggestions; all I say is that the didactic purpose is not prominent. The writer seems to say, not: "These are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," but more simply: "These are written that ye may know Jesus". This also makes for the historicity and early date of the archaic Gospel.

4. Among the more obvious characteristics of Mark's literary style are the use of dual phrases in descriptive passages, a liking for diminutives, occasional Latinisms, the frequent employment of εὐθὺς in narrative, and of the historical present, both tending to vividness, and giving the impression of an eye-witness. The rough vigour and crude grammar frequently noticeable in Mark's reports strengthen this impression. The style is colloquial rather than literary. To this in part is due the unsatisfactory state of the text. Mark's roughness and originality were too much for the scribes. They could not rest till they had smoothed down everything to commonplace. Harmonising propensities also are responsible for the multiplicity of variants, the less important Gospel being forced into conformity with the more important.

SECTION III. AUTHOR, DESTINATION, DATE.

1. The Gospel itself contains no indication as to who wrote it. That the writer was one bearing the name of Mark rests solely on an ecclesiastical tradition whose reliableness there has been no disposition to question. The Mark referred to has been from the

[1] So Pfleiderer in his *Urchristenthum*.

[2] So Dr. Baur and other members of the Tübingen school.

[3] So Dr. Bernhard Weiss, *vide Das Marcus Evangelium*, Einleitung, p. 23.

earliest times till now identified with the Mark named in Acts xii. 12, as the son of a Mary; in xiii. 5, 13, as the attendant of Paul and Barnabas on their mission journey; and in xv. 39, as the travelling companion of Barnabas alone after he had separated from Paul; also, in Colossians iv. 10, as the cousin (ἀνεψιός) of Barnabas; and, finally, in 2 Timothy iv. 11, and Philemon 24, as rendering useful services to Paul.

2. The explanations of Jewish customs, *e.g.*, ceremonial washings (chap. vii. 3-4), and words such as Talitha cumi, and Ephphatha, and the technical term "common" or "unclean" (v. 41, vii. 34, vii. 2) point to non-Jewish readers, and the use of Latinisms is most naturally accounted for by the supposition that the book was written among and for Roman Christians.

3. The dates of the Gospels generally have been a subject of much controversy, and the endless diversity of opinion means that the whole matter belongs largely to the region of conjecture. The very late dates assigned to these writings by the Tübingen school are now generally abandoned. By many competent critics the Synoptical Gospels are placed well within the first century, say, between the years 60 and 80. To condescend upon a precise year is impossible. One cannot even determine with absolute confidence whether the earliest of them, *i.e.*, Mark, was written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem. The point of practical importance is not the date at which a Gospel was composed, but the historical value of its materials. In this respect the claims of Mark, as we have seen, stand high.[1]

[1] On the Appendix of Mark, chap. xvi. 9-20, *vide* Notes *ad loc.*

CHAPTER III.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.

SECTION I. CONTENTS.

1. As has been stated in chap. i., the bulk of Mark's narrative is substantially taken up into Matthew's longer story. But to that narrative of the archaic Gospel is added much new material, consisting mainly of the teaching of our Lord. This teaching as reproduced in the first Gospel consists not of short pregnant sentences such as Mark has preserved, but of connected discourses of considerable length — the longest and the most important being that familiarly known as the "Sermon on the Mount". Whether this connected character is due to the Teacher or to the evangelist has been disputed, the bias of critical opinion being strongly in favour of the latter alternative. Extreme views on either side are to be avoided. That Jesus uttered only short pithy sayings is a gratuitous assumption. In connection with deliberate efforts to instruct the disciples, the presumption is in favour of continuous discourse. On the other hand, in some of the discourses reported in Matthew, *e.g.*, that in chap. x. on apostolic duties and tribulations, agglomeration is apparent. To what Jesus said to the twelve in sending them forth on their Galilean mission the evangelist, naturally and not inappropriately, adds weighty words which bear on the more momentous mission of the apostles as the propagandists in the wide world of the Christian faith. A similar instance of editorial combination of kindred matter only topically connected may be found in the parabolic discourse. Matthew's seven parables were doubtless all spoken by Jesus, but not that day. The parables spoken from the boat were probably all of one type, presenting together a critical review of Christ's past ministry among the people. On the other hand, I am inclined to think that the contents of chaps. xviii. and xxiii. for the most part belong to the respective occasions with which they are connected in the Gospel. The call for careful admonition to the twelve at Capernaum was urgent, and the Master

would have much to say to His offending disciples. Then nothing could be more fitting than that Jesus should at the close of His life deliver a final and full testimony against the spurious sanctity which He had often criticised in a fragmentary way, and which was now at last to cause His death.

2. The main interest of the question now under consideration revolves around the "Sermon on the Mount". That a discourse of some length was delivered on the mountain Luke's report proves. Luke, even in this case, breaks up much of Matthew's connected matter into short separate utterances, but yet he agrees with Matthew in ascribing to Jesus something like an oration. Though much abbreviated, his report of the discourse is still a discourse. The only question is which of the two comes nearer the original in length and contents. Now, the feeling is a very natural one that Jesus could hardly have spoken so long a discourse as Matthew puts into His mouth at one time, and to a popular audience. But two questions have to be asked here. Did Jesus address a popular audience? Did He speak all at one time in the sense of a continuous discourse of one hour or two hours' length? I am strongly inclined to answer both questions in the negative. Jesus addressed Himself to *disciples;* His discourse was *teaching*, not popular preaching—*Didache*, not *Kerygma*. And the time occupied in communicating that teaching was probably a week rather than an hour. Matthew's report, in chaps. v.-vii., in that case will have to be viewed as a summary of what the Great Teacher said to His disciples in a leisurely way on sundry topics relating to the Kingdom of Heaven, during a season of retreat on the summit of the hills to the west of the Galilean Lake. Instead of calling it the *Sermon* on the Mount, we should more properly designate it the *Teaching on the Hill.*[1]

3. The insertion of great masses of didactic matter into the framework of Mark's narrative weakens our sense of the progress of the history in reading Matthew. The didactic interest overshadowed the historical in the evangelist's own mind, with the result that his story does not present the aspect of a life-drama steadily moving on, but rather that of a collection of discourses furnished with slight historical introductions. The "Sermon on the Mount" comes upon us before we are prepared for it. To appreciate it fully we must realise that before it was spoken Jesus

[1] For further remarks on this point *vide* Notes on the Sermon at the beginning and throughout.

had preached in many synagogues and to many street crowds, and that a long enough time had elapsed for the Preacher to feel that His ministry had been to a large extent fruitless, and that to establish and perpetuate His influence He must now devote Himself to the careful instruction of a disciple-circle. The miscellaneousness of the parable-collection in chap. xiii. hides from us the fact that that day Jesus was sitting in judgment on His own past ministry and pronouncing on it the verdict: Much seed, little fruit; so justifying Himself for attending henceforth less to the many and more to the few.

4. While the connections of Matthew's discourses are topical rather than temporal, and the sense of progress in his narrative is comparatively weak, there is a manifest correspondence between the discourses he imputes to Jesus and the whole circumstances of the times in which Jesus lived. This remark applies especially to the criticism of Pharisaism, which occupies so prominent a place in the first Gospel, as compared, *e.g.*, with the third, in which that element retires comparatively into the background. Keen conflict between our Lord and the Scribes and Pharisees was inevitable, and the amount of controversial material in the first Gospel speaks strongly in favour of its fidelity to fact in this part of its record, even as the unique quality of the anti-Pharisaic sayings ascribed to Jesus bears witness to their originality. In the Teaching on the Hill the references to Scribism and Pharisaism are, as was fitting, the criticised parties not being present, didactic rather than controversial, but there can be little doubt that Jesus would take occasion there to indicate the difference between His religious ideas and those in vogue at the time. Here it is not Matthew that adds, but Luke that omits.

5. It has been maintained that Matthew's account of our Lord's teaching is not uniform in character—is, indeed, so discrepant as to suggest different hands writing in diverse interests and with conflicting theological attitudes. D'Eichthal, *e.g.*, is of opinion that the primitive Matthew was the earliest written Gospel, and that its contents were much the same as those found in canonical Mark; but that, through being the earliest, it had exceptional authority, and was therefore liable to be added to with a view to furnishing it with support in the teaching of Christ for developing Christianity.[1] D'Eichthal counts as many as forty-five "Annexes," gradually introduced in this way, including the history of the infancy, many

[1] *Les Evangiles.*

parables, numerous passages bearing on the Person of Christ, the Church, the Resurrection, the Second Advent, etc. From this questionable honour of becoming "a place of deposit" for new material, as Dr. Estlin Carpenter calls it,[1] Mark, according to D'Eichthal, was protected by its greater obscurity and inferior authority; hence its modest dimensions, and superior reliableness in point of fidelity to actual historic truth.

This theory is plausible, and we are not entitled to say *à priori* that it has no foundation in fact. Additions to the Gospels might creep in before they became canonical, as they crept in afterwards through the agency of copyists. The sayings about the indestructibility of the law (v. 17-19) and the founding of the Church (xvi. 18, 19) might *possibly* be examples in point. But possibility is one thing, probability another. To prove diversity of hand or successive deposits of evangelic tradition by men living at different times, and acting in the interest of distinct or even opposing tendencies, it is not enough to point to apparently conflicting elements and exclaim: "Behold a Gospel of contradictions".[2] On this topic I may refer readers to what has been already stated in discussing the subject of the historicity of the Gospels. And I may here add that it would not be difficult to conceive a situation for which the Gospel might have been written by one man, as it now stands. Dr. Weiss, indeed, has successfully done this in his work on the Gospel of Matthew and its parallels in Luke. He conceives the Gospel substantially as we have it to have been written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish State, when the faith of Jewish Christians in the Messiahship of Jesus would be sorely shaken by the events: the promised Messianic Kingdom passing away irretrievably from Israel and taking up its abode among Gentiles. The Gospel that was to meet this situation would have to show that Jesus was indeed the Messianic King, in whose history many prophetic oracles found their fulfilment; that He did His utmost to found the kingdom in Israel, but was frustrated by the unbelief of the people, and especially of its rulers; that, therefore, the kingdom was driven forth from Jewish soil, and was now to be found mainly in the Gentile Church, and there had been left to Israel only an inheritance of woe; that though Jesus had predicted this doom He nevertheless loved His people, had loyally and

[1] *The First Three Gospels*, p. 370.

[2] Dr. Estlin Carpenter, in the above work, p. 363, remarks: "Truly has the first Gospel been called a 'Gospel of contradictions'".

lovingly sought her good, had spoken with reverence of her God-given law (while treating with disrespect Rabbinical traditions), and honoured it by personal observance. This hypothesis fairly meets the requirements of the case. It covers the phenomena of the Gospel, and it is compatible with unity of plan and authorship.[1]

SECTION II. CHARACTERISTICS.

1. The most outstanding characteristic of the first Gospel is that it paints the life-image of Jesus in *prophetic colours*. While in Mark Jesus is presented realistically as a man, in Matthew He is presented as the *Christ*, verified as such by the applicability of many prophetic oracles to the details of His childhood, His public ministry, and His last sufferings.

2. If the realism of Mark makes for the historicity of this Gospel, the prophetic colouring so conspicuous in Matthew need not detract from the historicity of its accounts. This feature may be due in part to the personal idiosyncrasy of the writer and in part to his didactic aim. He may have set himself to verify the thesis, Jesus the Christ, for his own satisfaction, or it may have been necessary that he should do so in order to strengthen the faith of his first readers. In either case the presumption is that the operation he was engaged in consisted in discovering prophetic texts to answer facts ready to his hand, not in first making a collection of texts and then inventing facts corresponding to them. The facts suggested the texts, the texts did not create the facts, though in some instances they might influence the mode of stating facts. In this connection it is important to note that the evangelist applies his prophetic method to the whole of his material, including that which is common to him with Mark. He has his prophetic oracles ready to be attached as labels to events which Mark reports simply as matters of fact. Thus Mark's dry statement, "they went into Capernaum,"[2] referring to Jesus and His followers proceeding northwards from the scene of the baptism, in Matthew's hands assumes the character of a solemn announcement of an epoch-making event, whereby an ancient oracle concerning the appearing of a great light in Galilee of the Gentiles received its fulfilment.[3] Again, Mark's matter-of-fact report of the extensive healing function in Capernaum on the Sabbath evening is in Matthew adorned with a beautiful citation from Isaiah's famous

[1] *Vide* Weiss, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium und seine Lucas-parallelen*, p. 39.

[2] Mark i. 21.

[3] Matt. iv. 12-17.

oracle concerning the suffering servant of Jehovah.[1] Once more, to Mark's simple statement that Jesus withdrew Himself to the sea after the collision with the Pharisees, occasioned by the healing on a Sabbath of the man with a withered hand, the first evangelist attaches a fine prophetic picture, as if to show readers the true Jesus as opposed to the Jesus of Pharisaic imagination.[2] From these instances we see his method. He is not inventing history, but enriching history with prophetic emblazonments for apologetic purposes, or for increase of edification. Such is the fact, we observe, when we have it in our power to control his statements by comparison with Mark's; such we may assume to be the fact when we have not that in our power, as, *e.g.*, in the narrative relating to the birth and infancy of Jesus, in which prophetic citations are unusually abundant. The question as to the historicity of that narrative has its own peculiar difficulties, into which I do not here enter. The point I wish to make is that the numerous prophetic references cast no additional shadow of doubt on its historicity. Here too the evangelist is simply attaching prophetic oracles to what he regards as historic data. If invention has been at work it has not been in *his* imagination. This is manifest even from the very weakness of some of the citations, such as "Out of Egypt have I called my Son," "Rachel weeping for her children," and "He shall be called a Nazarene". Who could ever have thought of these unless there had been traditional data accepted by the Christian community (and by the writer of the Gospel) as facts? The last citation is especially far-fetched. It is impossible to say whence it is taken; it could never have entered into the mind of any one unless the fact of the settlement in Nazareth had been there to begin with, creating a desire to find for it also, if at all possible, some prophetic anticipation.

These prophetic passages served their purpose in the apologetic of the apostolic age. For us now their value is not apologetic, except indeed in a way not contemplated by the evangelist. Their occasional weakness as proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus can be utilised in the manner above hinted at in support of the historicity of the evangelic tradition. But the chief permanent value of these citations lies in the light they throw on the evangelist's own conception of Jesus. We see from them that he thought of Jesus as the Light of Galilee, the sympathetic Bearer of humanity's heavy burden, the Beloved of God, the Peacemaker, the Friend of weak-

[1] Matt. viii. 17. [2] Matt. xii. 15-21. *Cf.* Mark iii. 7.

ness, the Man who had it in Him by gifts and graces to perform a Christ's part for all the world. Truly a noble conception, which lends perennial interest to the texts in which it is embodied.

3. In the foregoing remarks I have anticipated to a certain extent what relates to the question of didactic aim. That the first Gospel has such an aim is obvious from the careful manner in which the prophetic argument is elaborated. The purpose is to confirm Jewish Christians in the faith that Jesus is the Christ. The purpose is revealed in the very first sentence and in the genealogy to which it forms a preface. "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of *David*, the Son of *Abraham*." The Son of David first, because on that hangs the Messianic claim; the Son of Abraham likewise, because that makes Him a Jew, a fellow-countryman of those for whose benefit the Gospel is written. The genealogy is the first contribution to the apologetic argument. The logic of it is this: "The Psalms and Prophets predict the coming of a great Messianic King who shall be a descendant of the house of David; this genealogy shows that Jesus possessed that qualification for Messiahship. He is the rod out of the stem of Jesse." Whoever compiled the genealogy did it under the impression that physical descent from David was indispensable to Jesus being the Christ. But it does not follow that the genealogy was manufactured to serve that purpose. The descent from David might be a well-known fact utilised for an apologetic aim. For us, though a fact, it is of no vital consequence. Our faith that Jesus is the Christ does not rest on any such external ground, but on spiritual fitness to be the world's Saviour. We reverse the logic of the Jewish Church. They reasoned: because David's Son, therefore the Christ. We reason: because the Christ, therefore David's Son at least in spirit.[1]

4. In speaking of the literary characteristics of Matthew it is necessary to keep in mind that some of these may come from the *Logia* of the apostle Matthew, and that others may be due to the evangelist. Critics ascribe to the apostolic source certain phrases of frequent recurrence, such as *καὶ ἰδού, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*. Among the features of the evangelist's own style they recognise the frequent use of such words as *τότε, λέγων, προσελθών, ὄχλοι, ἀποκριθείς, ἀναχωρεῖν, λεγόμενος*, and such phrases as *τί σοι δοκεῖ, συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν, κατ' ὄναρ, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ*.[2] By comparison with Mark, the style of this Gospel is smooth and correct.

[1] *Vide* notes on Matt. i. [2] *Vide* Weiss, *Matthäus-Evangelium*, pp. 23-4.

Section III. Author, Destination, Date.

1. If the views of modern critics as to the relation of the first Canonical Gospel to the *Logia*, compiled by the apostle Matthew, be well founded, then that apostle was not its author. Who the evangelist was is unknown. That he was a Jew is highly probable, that he was a Palestinian Jew has been generally assumed; but Weiss calls this in question. That he wrote in Greek is held to be proved by the use which he makes of the Septuagint in his citations of Old Testament prophecy, and by traces of dependence on the Greek Gospel of Mark. But the view that our Greek Gospel of Matthew is a translation by some unknown hand from a book with the same contents in the Hebrew tongue still has its advocates, among whom may be mentioned Schanz, of Tübingen.[1]

2. The destination of the Gospel was in all probability to a community of Jewish Christians, whose faith it was designed to strengthen. How it was fitted to serve this end has been indicated in Section I. § 5.

3. The probable date is shortly after the destruction of the Jewish State. Some things have been supposed to imply a much later date, *e.g.*, the commission to the disciples in chapter xxviii. 18, with its explicit Trinity, its pronounced universalism, and its doctrine of a spiritual presence. On these points the reader is referred to the commentary.

[1] *Vide* his *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Matthaus*, Einleitung.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO LUKE.

SECTION I. THE CONTENTS.

1. Luke's Gospel includes much of the narrative of Mark and large portions of the didactic matter contained in Matthew. There are numerous omissions in both departments, but on the other hand also considerable additions, especially in the didactic element. The third evangelist has greatly enriched the treasure of the parables, for it is in this important division of our Lord's teaching that his peculiar contribution chiefly lies. The amount of new matter suffices to raise the question as to its source. It can hardly be thought that the author of the first Gospel would have omitted so much valuable material, had it lain before his eye in the *Logia*. The hypothesis of a third source, therefore, readily suggests itself — a collection of reminiscences distinct from Mark and the book of *Logia*, whence Luke drew such beautiful parables as the *Good Samaritan*, the *Selfish Neighbour* and the *Unjust Judge*, the *Prodigal Son*, the *Unjust Steward*, *Lazarus and Dives*, and the *Pharisee and Publican*. The chapters on the infancy and on the resurrection, so entirely different from the corresponding chapters in Matthew, might suggest a fourth source, unless we suppose that the third included these.

2. The distribution of the material in this Gospel arrests attention. In the early part of the history, from chapters iv. 31 to vi. 16, the author follows pretty closely in the footsteps of Mark. Then comes in a digression, extending from vi. 17 to viii. 3, containing a version of the Sermon on the Mount, the stories of the Centurion and the Widow of Nain, the Message of the Baptist with relative discourse, and the woman in Simon's house. Thereafter Luke's narrative again flows in Mark's channel from the parable of the Sower onwards to the end of the Galilean ministry, as reported in the second Gospel (Mark iv. 1 to ix. 50. Luke viii. 4 to ix. 50), only

that the whole group of incidents contained in Mark vi. 45 to viii. 26 is omitted in Luke. Then at ix. 51 begins another longer digression, extending from that point to xviii. 14, consisting mainly of didactic matter, and containing the larger number of Luke's peculiar contributions to the evangelic tradition. Thereafter our author joins the company of Mark once more, and keeps beside him to the end of the Passion history.[1]

3. This lengthy insertion destroys the sense of progress in the story. The stream widens out into a lake, within which any movement perceptible is rather circular than rectilinear. It is a dogmatic section, and any indications of time and place it contains are of little value for determining sequence, or pointing out the successive stages of the journey towards Jerusalem mentioned in ix. 51. It may be affirmed, indeed, that throughout this Gospel the interest in historic sequence or in the causal connection of events is weak. Sometimes, as in the incident of Christ's appearance in the synagogue of Nazareth, the author, consciously and apparently with deliberate intention, departs from the chronological order.[2] Whatever, therefore, he meant by καθεξῆς in his preface, he cannot have intended to say that he had made it a leading aim to arrange his material as far as possible in the true order of events. Still less can it have been his purpose so to set forth his story that it should appear a historic drama in which all events prepare for and steadily lead up to the final catastrophe. When at ix. 22 we find Jesus announcing for the first time that "the Son of Man must suffer many things," it takes us by surprise. No reason has appeared in the previous narrative why it should come to that. It has indeed been made clear by sundry indications—at chapter v. 21; v. 30, 33; vi. 7-11; vii. 34, 50—that there was not a good understanding between Jesus and the Scribes and Pharisees; but from Luke's narrative by itself we could not have gathered that matters were so serious. Two important omissions and one transposition are largely responsible for this. Luke leaves out the collision between Jesus and the Pharisees in reference to the washing of hands (Mark vii. 1-23. Matt. xv. 1-20), and the demand for a sign (Mark viii. 11. Matt. xvi. 1); he throws the blasphemous insinuation of a league with Beelzebub into chapter xi., beyond the point at which he introduces the first announcement of the Passion. Therefore, the

[1] In the main, that is to say, for Luke's Passion history contains a number of peculiar elements.

[2] Chap. iv. 16-30; *vide v.* 23.

necessity (δεῖ) of that tragic issue is not apparent in the sense that it is the inevitable result of causes which have been shown to be in operation. For Luke the δεῖ refers exclusively to the prophetic oracles which predicted Messiah's sufferings. Jesus must die if these oracles are to be fulfilled. And for him it is a matter of course, and so he treats it in his narrative. The announcement of the Passion is not brought in as a new departure in Christ's communication with His disciples, as in the companion narratives, with indication of the place, and solemn introductory phrase: "He began to teach them". It is reported in a quite casual way, as if it possessed no particular importance. In connection with this it may be noted that Luke gives a very defective report of those words of our Lord concerning His death which may be said to contain the germs of a theory as to its significance. For particulars readers are referred to the notes.

Section II. Characteristics.

1. One very marked feature of this Gospel is what, for want of a better word, may be called the *idealisation* of the characters of Jesus and the disciples. These are contemplated not in the light of memory, as in Mark, but through the brightly coloured medium of faith. The evangelist does not forget that the Personages of whom he writes are now the Risen Lord, and the Apostles of the Church. Jesus appears with an aureole round His head, and the faults of the disciples are very tenderly handled. The truth of this statement can be verified only by a detailed study of the Gospel, and readers will find indications of proof at appropriate places in the notes. It applies equally to the Master and to His disciples, though Von Soden, in the article already referred to, states that the tendency in question appears mainly in the presentation of the conduct of the disciples, drawing from the supposed fact the precarious inference that the Apostolic Church cared little or nothing for the earthly history of Jesus.[1] The delicate treatment of the disciples is certainly very apparent. Luke, as Schanz remarks, ever spares the twelve; especially Peter. The stern word, "Get thee behind me," is not in this Gospel. The narrative of the denial is an interesting subject of study in this connection. But the whole body of the disciples are treated with equal consideration. Their faults —ignorance, weak faith, mutual rivalries—are acknowledged, yet

[1] *Vide Theologische Abhandlungen*, p. 138.

touched with sparing hand. Some narratives in which these faults appear very obtrusively, *e.g.*, the conversation about the leaven of the Pharisees, the ambitious request of James and John, and the anointing in Bethany, are omitted, as is also the flight of all the disciples at the apprehension of their Master. The weak faith of the disciples is very mildly characterised. "Where is your faith?" asks Jesus in the storm on the lake, in Luke's version of the story, instead of uttering the reproachful word: "Why are ye cowardly? Have ye not yet faith?" Their failure to watch in the garden of Gethsemane is apologetically described as sleeping *for sorrow*. In his portraiture of the Lord Jesus the evangelist gives prominence to the attributes of power, benevolence, and saintliness. The pictorial effect is brought out by omission, emphasis, and understatement. Among the omissions are the realistic word about that which defileth, about "dogs" in the story of the woman of Canaan which is wholly wanting, and the awful cry on the Cross: "My God, my God!" Among the things emphasised are those features in acts of healing which show the greatness of Christ's might and of the benefit conferred. Peter's mother-in-law suffers from a *great* fever; and the leper is *full* of leprosy. The hand restored on the Sabbath is the *right* hand, the centurion's servant is one *dear* to him, the son of the widow of Nain is an *only* son, the daughter of Jairus an *only* daughter, the epileptic boy at the hill of Transfiguration an *only* child. The holiness of Jesus is made conspicuous by the prominence given to prayer in connection with critical occasions, and by understatement where the incidents related might to ill-instructed minds seem to compromise that essential characteristic. Luke's narratives of the cleansing of the temple and the agony in Gethsemane may be referred to as striking illustrative instances of the latter. To the same category may be referred the treatment by Luke of the anti-Pharisaic element in Christ's teaching. Much is omitted, and what is retained is softened by being given, much of it, not as spoken *about*, but as spoken *to*, Pharisees by Jesus as a guest in their houses.[1]

2. The influence of the Christian consciousness of the time in which he wrote is traceable not only in Luke's presentation of the characters of Jesus and His disciples, but in his account of Christ's teaching. He seems to have in view throughout the use of the Lord's words for present guidance. Weizsäcker has endeavoured to analyse the didactic element in the third Gospel into doctrinal pieces

[1] Luke vii. 36-50; xi. 37-52; xiv. 1-24.

bearing on definite religious questions and interests of the primitive Church.[1] This may be carried too far, but the idea is not altogether baseless. In this Gospel the so-called "Sermon on the Mount" is really a *Sermon* (*Kerygma* not *Didache*) delivered to a Christian congregation with all the local and temporary matter eliminated and only the universal and perennial retained. The same adaptation to present and general use is apparent in the words, *καθ' ἡμέραν*, added to the law of cross-bearing (ix. 23).

3. The question may be asked whether this adaptation of the matter of the evangelic tradition to present conceptions and needs is to be set down to the account of Luke as editor, or is to be regarded as already existing in the documents he used. On this point there may be room for difference of opinion. J. Weiss in his commentary on Luke (Meyer, eighth edition) inclines to the latter alternative. Thus, in reference to Luke's mild version of Peter's denial, he remarks: "A monstrous minimising of the offence if Luke had Mark's account before him"; and he accordingly thinks he had not, but used instead a Jewish Christian source, giving a mitigated account of Peter's sin. Of such a source he finds traces throughout Luke's Gospel, following in the footsteps of Dr. Paul Feine, who had previously endeavoured to establish the existence of a precanonical Luke, *i.e.*, a first attempt to work up into a single volume the evangelic traditions in Mark, the *Logia*, and other sources, after the manner of the third Gospel.[2] This may be a perfectly legitimate hypothesis for solving certain literary problems connected with this Gospel, and the argument by which Feine seeks to establish it is entitled on its merits to serious consideration. But I hardly think it suffices to account for all the traces of editorial discretion in Luke's Gospel. It does not matter what documents Luke used; he exercised his own judgment in using them. If he did not, his relation to the work of redacting the memoirs of Jesus becomes so colourless that one fails to see what occasion there was for that imposing prefatory announcement in the opening sentence. A primitive Luke was ready to his hand, and he did not even contribute to it the colour of his own religious personality. Intention, bias, purpose to utilise the material for edification of believers were all there before he began. He did what? Added, perhaps, a

[1] *Vide* his *Untersuchungen über die Evangelischen Geschichte*, and his *Apostolic Age*, vol. ii.

[2] *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte*, 1891.

few anecdotes and sayings gleaned from other sources, oral or written!

4. Notwithstanding this pervading regard to what may be comprehensively called *edification*, the author of the third Gospel cannot justly be charged with indifference to historic truth. He professes in his preface to have in view *acribeia*, and the profession is to be taken in earnest. But he is writing not as a mere chronicler, but as one seeking to promote the religious welfare of those for whom he writes, and so must strive to combine accuracy, fidelity to fact, with practical utility. The task is a delicate one, and execution without error of judgment not easy. Even where mistakes are made, they are not to be confounded with bad faith. Nor should it be forgotten that Luke's peculiarities can be utilised for the apologetic purpose of establishing the general credibility of the evangelic tradition. Luke omits much. But it does not follow that he did not know. He may omit intentionally what he knows but does not care to report. Luke often understates. What a writer tones down he is tempted to omit. By simply understating, instead of omitting, he becomes a reluctant and therefore reliable witness to the historicity of the matter so dealt with. Luke often states strongly. Either he adds particulars from fuller information or he exaggerates for a purpose. Even in the latter case he witnesses to the truth of the basal narrative. A writer who has ideas to embody is tempted to invent when he cannot find what will suit his purpose. Luke did not invent but at most touched up stories given to his hand in trustworthy traditions.

5. The author of the third Gospel avowedly had a didactic aim. He wrote, so it appears from the preface, to confirm in the faith a friend called "most excellent (κράτιστε) Theophilus," expecting probably that the book would ultimately be useful for a wider circle. But there is no trace of a dominant theological or controversial aim. The writer, *e.g.*, is not a *Paulinist* in the controversial sense of the word. He is doubtless in sympathy with Christian universalism, as appears from his finishing the quotation from Isaiah beginning with "The voice of one crying in the wilderness," and ending with, "All flesh shall see the salvation of God" (iii. 6). Yet, in other places, *e.g.*, in the history of the infancy, the salvation brought by Jesus is conceived of as belonging to Israel, the chosen people (τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, i. 68; *cf.* ii. 10; vii. 16; xiii. 16; xix. 9). The author is not even Paulinist in a theological sense, as the absence from his pages of all words of Jesus bearing on a theory of atonement, already remarked on, sufficiently proves. He appears to be an

eclectic, rather than a man whose mind is dominated by a great ruling idea. Distinct, if not conflicting, tendencies or religious types find houseroom in his pages: Pauline universalism, Jewish particularism, Ebionitic social ideals, the blessedness of poverty, the praise of almsgiving. Geniality, kindliness of temper, is the personal characteristic of the evangelist. And if there is one thing more than another he desires to inculcate on his readers it is the *graciousness* of Christ. "Words of grace" (iv. 22) is his comprehensive title for the utterances of Jesus, and his aim from first to last is to show the Saviour as the friend of the sinful and the social outcast, and even of those who suffer justly for their crimes (vii. 36-50; xix. 1-10; xxiii. 39-43).

6. The literary aspect of this Gospel is a complex phenomenon. At times, especially in the preface, one gets the impression of a writer having at his command a knowledge of Greek possible only for one to whom it was his native tongue, an expert at once in the vocabulary and the grammatical structure of that language. But far oftener the impression is that of a Jew thinking in Hebrew and reflecting Hebrew idiom in phrase and construction. Hebraisms abound, especially in the first two chapters. Two explanations are possible: That the author was really a Jew, that his natural style was Hebrew-Greek, in which case it would have to be shown that the preface was no such marvellous piece of classicism after all; or that he was a Gentile well versed in Greek, but somewhat slavish in his copious use of Jewish-Christian sources, such as the primitive Luke for which Feine contends.

SECTION III. AUTHOR, DESTINATION, DATE.

1. The author of the third Gospel was also the author of the Acts of the Apostles, as appears in chap. i. 1 of the latter work, where the name of Theophilus recurs. Neither book bears the name of the writer, but uniform ancient tradition ascribes it to Luke, the companion of Paul, and by occupation a physician (Col. iv. 11). From the preface to the Gospel we gather that he had no personal knowledge of Jesus, but was entirely dependent on oral and written tradition.

2. From the prefaces of the Gospel and the book of Acts we learn that the author wrote for the immediate benefit of a single individual, apparently a man of rank, say a Roman knight. It is not necessary to infer that a larger circle of readers was not contemplated either by the writer or by the first recipient of his work.

3. The date cannot be definitely fixed. Opinion ranges from A.D. 63 to the early years of the second century. As late a date as say A.D. 90 is compatible with the writer being, in his younger years, a companion of St. Paul in his later missionary movements. The still later date of A.D. 100 or 105 would be required if it were certain, which it is not, that the writer used the *Antiquities* of Josephus, which were published about the year 93-94. Dr. Sanday, in his work entitled *Inspiration*, expresses the view that Acts was written about A.D. 80, and the Gospel some time in the five years preceding.

CHAPTER V.

THE TEXT, CRITICAL LANDMARKS, CRITICAL TESTS OF READINGS.

SECTION I. THE TEXT.

The Greek text given in this work is that known as the *Textus Receptus*, on which the Authorised Version of the New Testament is based. Representing the Greek text as known to Erasmus in the sixteenth century, and associated with the names of two famous printers, Stephen and Elzevir, whose editions (Stephen's 3rd, 1550, Elzevir's 2nd, 1633) were published when the apparatus at command for fixing the true text was scanty, and when the science of textual criticism was unborn, it may seem to be entirely out of date. But it is an important historical monument, and it is the Greek original answering to the English Testament still largely in use in public worship and in private reading. Moreover, while the experts in modern criticism have done much to provide a purer text, their judgments in many cases do not accord, and their results cannot be regarded as final. It is certain, however, that the texts prepared by such scholars as Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and the company of experts to whom we are indebted for the Revised Version, are incomparably superior to that of Stephen or of Elzevir, and that they must be taken into account by every competent commentator. That means that to the text must be annexed critical notes showing all important various readings, with some indication of the documentary authority in their favour, and of the value attached thereto by celebrated editors. This accordingly has been done, very imperfectly of course, still it is hoped sufficiently for practical purposes. Variations not affecting the sense, but merely the spelling or grammatical forms of words, have been for the most part disregarded. There are many variations in the spelling of proper names, of which the following are samples:—

Ναζαρέτ	Ναζαρέθ	Γεθσημανή	Γεθσημανεί
Ματθαῖος	Μαθθαῖος	Ἰωάννης	Ἰωάνης
Δαβίδ	Δαυείδ	Ἰεριχώ	Ἰερειχώ
Ἡλίας	Ἡλείας	Μωσῆς	Μωυσῆς
Καπερναούμ	Καφαρναούμ	Πιλάτος	Πειλᾶτος

Among other insignificant variations may be mentioned the presence or absence of ν final in verbs (ἔλεγε, ἔλεγεν); the omission or insertion of μ (λήψομαι, λήμψομαι); the assimilation or non-assimilation of ἐν and σὺν in compound verbs (συζητεῖν, συνζητεῖν; ἐκκακεῖν, ἐνκακεῖν); the doubling of μ, ν, ρ or the reverse (μαμμωνᾶς, μαμωνᾶς; γέννημα, γένημα; ἐπιρράπτει, ἐπιράπτει); the conjunction or disjunction of syllables (οὐκ ἔτι, οὐκέτι); οὕτως for οὕτω; the aorist forms εἶπον, ἦλθον, etc., replaced by forms in α (εἶπαν, ἦλθαν); single or double augment in certain verbs (ἐδυνάμην, ἠδυνάμην; ἔμελλον, ἤμελλον).

Section II. Critical Landmarks.

1. Up till 1831 editors of the New Testament in Greek had been content to follow in the wake of the *Textus Receptus*, timidly adding notes indicating good readings which they had discovered in the documents accessible to them in their time. Lachmann in that year inaugurated a new critical era by printing a text constructed directly from ancient documents without the intervention of any printed edition. It is not given to pioneers to finish the work they begin, and Lachmann's effort judged by present-day tests was far from perfect. "This great advance was marred by too narrow a selection of documents to be taken into account, and too artificially rigid an employment of them, and also by too little care in obtaining precise knowledge of some of their texts" (Westcott and Hort's *New Testament, Introduction*, p. 13). Tischendorf in Germany and Tregelles in England worthily followed up Lachmann's efforts, and made important contributions towards the ascertainment of the true text by adopting as their main guides the most ancient MSS., in place of the later documents which had formed the basis of the early printed editions. The critical editions of the Greek New Testament by these scholars appeared about the same time; Tischendorf's eighth edition (the important one which supersedes the earlier) bearing the date 1869, and the work of Tregelles being published in 1870. The characteristic feature of Tischendorf's edition is the predominant importance attached to the great Codex Sinaiticus (א), with the discovery of which his name is connected.

The defect common to it with the edition of Tregelles is failure to deal on any clear principle with the numerous instances in which the ancient texts on which they placed their reliance do not agree. All goes smoothly when Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus (B) and Codex Bezae (D) and the most ancient versions bear the same testimony; but what is to be done when the trusted guides follow divergent paths?

2. It is by the answer which they have given to this question that Westcott and Hort have made an epoch-making contribution to the science of Biblical Criticism in the first volume of their monumental work, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, published in 1881. Following up hints thrown out by earlier investigators, like Bengel and Griesbach, they discriminated three types of text prevalent in ancient times, before the period of eclectic revision which fixed to a great extent the character of the text in actual use throughout the Middle Ages and on to the dawn of modern criticism. To these types they gave the names *Western*, *Alexandrian*, and *Neutral*. The last epithet is to be understood only when viewed in relation to the other two. The Western and Alexandrian types of text had very well-marked characteristics. The Western was *paraphrastic*, the Alexandrian *literary*. The tendency of the one was to alter the primitive text by explanatory additions with a view to edification, made by men who combined to a certain extent the functions of copyist and commentator. The tendency of the other was to improve the text from a literary point of view by scholarly refinements. The *neutral* text is neutral in the sense of avoiding both these tendencies and aiming steadily at the faithful reproduction of the exemplar assumed to approach in its text as near as possible to the autographs. A text adhering honestly to this programme ought to be the most reliable guide to the original Greek Testament as it proceeded from the hands of the writers, making due allowance for errors in the exemplar and for mistakes in transcription. The result of investigation has been to justify this expectation.

3. The main representative of the Western text is Codex Bezae (D), containing the Gospels and the Acts. Of the Alexandrian text there is no pure example. This divergent stream broke up into rills, and lost itself as a mere element in mixed texts, like those of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Ephraemi (C). It is important to note by the way that these names do not denote local prevalence. The *Western* text was not merely Western. This divergent stream overflowed its banks and spread itself widely over the Church,

reaching even the East. Hence traces of its influence are to be found not merely in the old Latin versions, but also in the Syriac versions, *e.g.*, in what is called the Curetonian Syriac, and in the recently discovered Syriac version of the Four Gospels, which may be distinguished as the Sinaitic Syriac. Of the neutral text, the great, conspicuous, honourable monument is Codex *Vaticanus* (B), containing the Gospels, Acts, and Catholic epistles, and the epistles of St. Paul, as far as Heb. ix. 14; and being, especially in the Gospels, a nearly pure reproduction of a text uninfluenced by the tendencies of the Western and Alexandrian texts respectively. To this MS., belonging like Codex Sinaiticus to the fourth century, Westcott and Hort, after applying to it all available tests, assign the honour of being on the whole the nearest approach to the original verity in existence, always worthy of respect and often deserving to be followed when it stands alone against all comers. A very important conclusion if it can be sustained.

4. In recent years a certain reaction against the critical results of Westcott and Hort has been manifesting itself to the effect of imputing to them an overweening estimate of Codex B, analogous to that of Tischendorf for Codex א. Some scholars, such as Resch in Germany and Ramsay in this country, are disposed to insist that more value should be set on Codex D; the former finding in it the principal witness for the text of the Gospels in their precanonical stage, the assumption being that when the four-Gospel canon was constructed the text underwent a certain amount of revision. The real worth of this Codex is one of the unsettled questions of New Testament textual criticism. Interesting contributions have been made to the discussion of the question, such as those of J. Rendel Harris, and more may be expected.

SECTION III. CRITICAL TESTS OF READINGS.

1. The fixation of the true text is not a simple matter like that of following a single document, however trustworthy, like Codex B. Every editor may have his bias in favour of this or that MS., but all editors recognise the obligation to take into account all available sources of evidence — not merely the great uncial MSS. of ancient dates, but the cursives of later centuries, and, besides Greek MSS. of both kinds containing the whole or a part of the New Testament, ancient versions, Latin, Syriac, Egyptian, etc., and quotations in the early Fathers. The evidence when fully adduced is a formidable affair, demanding much space for its exhibition

(witness Tischendorf's eighth edition in two large octavos), and the knowledge of an expert for its appreciation. In such a work as the present the space cannot be afforded nor can the knowledge be expected even in the author, not to say in his readers. Full knowledge of the critical data through first-hand studies belongs to specialists only, who have made the matter the subject of lifelong labour. All one can do is to utilise intelligently their results. But because all cannot be specialists it is not profitless to have a juryman's acquaintance with the relative facts. It is the aim of the critical notes placed beneath the Greek text to aid readers to the attainment of such an acquaintance, and to help them to form an intelligent opinion as to the claims of rival readings to represent the true text. Fortunately, this can be done without adducing a very long array of witnesses.

2. For it turns out that there are certain groups of witnesses which often go together, and whose joint testimony is very weighty. Westcott and Hort have carefully specified these. They may here be indicated: —

For the Gospels the most important and authoritative group is ℵBCDL 33.

In this group L and 33 have hitherto not been referred to. L (Codex Regius), though belonging to the eighth century, represents an ancient text, and is often in agreement with ℵ and B. 33 belongs to the cursive class (which are indicated by figures), but is a highly valuable Codex, though, like all cursives, of late date. In his *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's New Testament, Dr. Caspar René Gregory quotes (p. 469) with approval the opinion of Eichhorn that this is the "queen of the cursives". In the above group, it will be noticed, representatives of the different ancient types — Western, Alexandrian, Neutral (D, ℵ, C, B) — are united. When they agree the presumption that we have the true text is very strong.

When D falls out we have still a highly valuable group in ℵBCL 33.

When DC and 33 drop out there remains a very trustworthy combination in ℵBL.

There are, besides these, several binary combinations of great importance. The following is the list given by Westcott and Hort for the Gospels: —

BL, BC, BT, BΞ, BD, AB, BZ, B 33, and for St. Mark BΔ.

In these combinations some new documents make their appearance.

T stands for the Greek text of the Graeco-Thebaic fragments of St. Luke and St. John (century v., ancient and non-Western).

Ξ = fragments of St. Luke (cent. viii., comparatively pure, though showing mixture).

A is the well-known Codex Alexandrinus of the fifth century, a chief representative of the "Syrian" text, that is, the revised text formed by judicious eclectic use of all existing texts, and meant to be *the* authoritative New Testament. This Codex contains nearly the whole New Testament except Matthew as far as chapter xxv. 5. For the Gospels it is of no independent value as a witness to the true text, but its agreements with B are important.

Δ = Codex Sangallensis, a Graeco-Latin MS. of the tenth century, and having many ancient readings, especially in Mark.

To these authorities has to be added, as containing ancient readings, and often agreeing with the best MSS., Codex Purpureus Rossanensis (Σ), published in 1883, edited by Oscar Von Gebhardt; of the sixth century, containing Matthew and Mark in full. Due note has been taken of the readings of this MS.

The foregoing represent the chief authorities referred to in the critical notes. In these notes I have not uniformly indicated my personal opinion. But in the commentary I have always adopted as the subject of remark the most probable reading. Reference to modern editors has been chiefly restricted to Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, meaning thereby no depreciation of the work done by others, but simply recognising these as the most important.

MSS. were corrected from time to time. Corrected copies are referred to by critics by letters or figures: thus, $\aleph^a$ (4th cent.), $\aleph^b$ (6th cent.), $\aleph^c$ (7th cent.), B^2 (4th cent.), B^3 (10th cent.).

Besides the above-named documents the following uncials are occasionally referred to in the critical notes:—

E cod. Basiliensis. 8th century (Gospels nearly entire).
G cod. Seidelii. 9th or 10th century (Gospels defective).
K cod. Cyprius. 9th century (Gospels complete).
M cod. De Camps, Paris. 9th century (Gospels complete).
N cod. Purpureus. 6th century (fragments of all the Gospels).
P cod. Guelpherbytanus I. 6th century (fragments of all the Gospels).
Q cod. Guelpherbytanus II. 5th century (fragments from Luke and John).
R cod. Nitriensis, London. 6th century (fragments of Luke).
U cod. Nanianus Venetus. 9th or 10th century (Gospels entire).
V cod. Mosquensis. 9th century (contains Matthew and Mark, and Luke nearly complete).
X cod. Monacensis. 9th or 10th century (fragments of all the Gospels).
Z cod. Dublinensis. 6th century (fragments of Matthew).
Γ cod. Oxoniensis et Petropolitanus. 10th century (four Gospels, Matthew and Mark defective).
Λ cod. Oxoniensis Tisch. 9th century (Luke and John entire).
Π cod. Petropolitanus Tisch. 9th century (Gospels nearly complete).
Φ cod. Beratinus. 5th century (Matthew and Mark with lacunae).

CHAPTER VI.

LITERATURE.

The following list of works includes only those chiefly consulted. Many others are occasionally referred to in the notes.

1. To the pre-Reformation period belong—

ORIGEN'S *Commentary on Matthew.* Books x.-xvii. in Greek (Matt. xiii. 36—xxii. 33), the remainder in a Latin translation (allegorical method of interpretation).

CHRYSOSTOM'S *Homilies on Matthew.* The Greek text separately edited in three vols. by Dr. Field (well worth perusal).

JEROME'S *Commentarius in Matthaeum* (a hasty performance, but worth consulting).

AUGUSTINE. *De Sermone Domini in monte.*

THEOPHYLACTUS (12th century, Archbishop in Bulgaria). *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas, Graece.*

EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENUS (Greek monk, 12th century). *Commentarius in quatuor Evangelia, Graece et Latine.* Ed. C. F. Matthaei, 1792 (a choice work).

2. From the sixteenth century downwards—

CALVIN. *Commentarii in Harmoniam ex Evangelistis tribus . . . compositam.*

BEZA. *Annotationes in Novum Testamentum.* 1556.

MALDONATUS. *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas* (Catholic). 1596.

PRICAEI (Price). *Commentarii in varios N. T. libros* (including Matthew and Luke, philological, with classical examples, good). 1660.

GROTIUS. *Annotationes in N. T.* (erudite and still worth consulting). 1644.

LIGHTFOOT. *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae.* 1644.

HEINSIUS. *Sacrarum exercitationum ad N. T. libri* xx. 1665.

RAPHEL. *Annotationes Philologicae in N. T., ex Xenophonte, Polybio, Arriano et Herodoto.* 1747.

OLEARIUS. *Observationes sacrae ad Evangelium Matthaei.* 1713.

WOLF. *Curae philologicae et criticae in N. T.* Five vols. 1741.

SCHÖTTGEN. *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in N. T.* 1733.

WETSTEIN. *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (full of classic citations). 1751.

BENGEL. *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (unique). 1734.

PALAIRET (French pastor at London, † 1765). *Observationes philologico-criticae in sacros N. T. libros.* 1752.

KYPKE. *Observationes sacrae in N. T. libros.* 1755.

ELSNER. *Observationes sacrae in N. T. libros* (the three last named, like Pricaeus, abound in classic examples). 1767.

LOESNER. *Observationes ad N. T. e Philone Alexandrino* (of the same class as Raphel). 1777.

KUINOEL. *Commentarius in libros N. T. historicos.* 1807.

FRITZSCHE. *Evangelium Matthaei recensuit.* 1826.

FRITZSCHE. *Evangelium Marci recensuit* (both philological). 1830.

DE WETTE. *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum N. T.* 1836-48.

BORNEMANN. *Scholiae in Lucae Evangelium.* 1830.

ALFORD. *The Greek Testament.* Four vols. 1849-61.

FIELD. *Otium Norvicense.* 1864.

BLEEK. *Synoptische Erklärung der drei ersten Evangelien.* 1862.

MEYER. *Commentary on the New Testament.* Sixth edition (T. & T. Clark).

MEYER. Eighth edition by Dr. Bernhard Weiss (*Matthew and Mark,* largely Weiss). 1890-92.

MEYER. Eighth edition by J. Weiss (son of Bernhard Weiss; *Luke,* also largely the editor's work). 1892.

WEISS. *Das Marcusevangelium und seine synoptischen Parallelen* (a contribution to comparative exegesis in the interest of his critical views on the synoptical problem). 1872.

WEISS. *Das Matthäusevangelium und seine Lucas-parallelen* (a work of similar character). 1876.

LUTTEROTH. *Essai d'Interprétation de quelques parties de l'Evangile selon Saint Matthieu.* 1864-76.

SCHANZ. *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Matthäus.* 1879.

SCHANZ. *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Marcus.* 1881.

SCHANZ. *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Lucas* (these three commentaries by Schanz, a Catholic theologian, are good in all respects, specially valuable for patristic references). 1883.

GODET. *Commentaire sur l'Evangile de Saint Luc.* 3[me] edition. 1888-89.

HAHN. *Das Evangelium des Lucas.* Two vols. 1892-94.

HOLTZMANN. *Die Synoptiker* in *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament* (advanced but valuable). 1892.

The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges; Matthew, Mark, and Luke. 1891-93.

The well-known lexical and grammatical helps, including Grimm, Cremer, Winer, and Buttman, have been consulted. Frequent reference has been made to Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament* (T. & T. Clark, 1894), both because of its excellence and its accessibility to students.

A new edition of Winer's *Grammatik* (the eighth) by Schmiedel is in course of publication; also of *Kühner* by Blass.

In the notes, the matter common to the three Gospels is most fully treated in Matthew, the notes in the other two Gospels being at these points supplementary and comparative.

The marginal references to passages of Scripture are simply supplementary to those in the notes.

It is hoped that most abbreviations used will need no special explanation, but the following table may be helpful :—

Mt. = Matthew.
Mk. = Mark.
Lk. = Luke.
O. T. = Old Testament.
N. T. = New Testament.
Sept. = Septuagint.
A. V. = Authorised Version.
R. V. = Revised Version.
C. N. T. = Cambridge New Testament.
Tisch. = Tischendorf.
Treg. = Tregelles.
W. H. = Westcott and Hort.
Ws. = Weiss (Dr. Bernhard).
Egypt. = Egyptian versions (*viz.*, the two following).
Cop. = Coptic (called Memphitic by W. H.).
Sah. = Sahidic (called Thebaic by W. H.).
Syrr. = Syriac versions.
Pesh. = Peshito (= Syrian Vulgate).
Syr. Cur. = Curetonian Syriac. (For Greek equivalent *vide* Baethgen's *Evangelienfragmente*).
Syr. Sin. = Sinaitic Syriac (recently discovered).
Latt. = Latin versions.
Vulg. = Vulgate (Jerome's revision of old Latin version).
Vet. Lat. = Vetus Latina (Old Latin, referred to also as It. = Itala). The codices of the old Latin are distinguished by the letters *a*, *b*, *c*, etc.
Minusc. = Minusculi (Codices), another name for cursives.

ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΤΘΑΙΟΝ

ΑΓΙΟΝ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.[1]

I. 1. [a] ΒΙΒΛΟΣ [b] γενέσεως ἸΗΣΟΥ Χριστοῦ, [c] υἱοῦ Δαβίδ,[2] υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ. 2. Ἀβραὰμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαάκ· Ἰσαὰκ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν

a Gen. ii. 4. Mk. xii. 26. Lk. iii. 4; xx. 42.
b ver. 18. Gen. xxxi. 13; xxxii. 9. Lk. i. 14. Jas. i. 23; iii. 6.
c xii. 23; xx. 19; xxii. 42.

[1] The title in T.R. (as above) is late. ℵB have simply Κατα Μαθθαιον. Other expanded forms occur.

[2] Δαβιδ is found only in minusc. ℵB have Δαυειδ. This is one of several variations in spelling occurring in the genealogy, among which may be named βοοζ (ver. 5) = βοες in W.H.; Ωβηδ (ver. 5) = Ιωβηδ, W.H.; Ματθαν (ver. 15) = Μαθθαν, W.H. For a list of such variations in the spelling of names in the three first Gospels *vide* p. 53.

THE TITLE. The use of the word εὐαγγέλιον in the sense of a book may be as old as the *Teaching of the twelve Apostles* (*Didache*, 8, 11, 15. *Vide* Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, 1893, p. 317, n. 1). The word passed through three stages in the history of its use. First, in the older Greek authors (Hom., *Od.* ξ, 152, 166), a *reward* for bringing good tidings; also a thank-offering for good tidings brought (Arist., *Eq.* 656). Next, in later Greek, the good tidings itself (2 Sam. xviii. 20, 22, 25, in Sept. In 2 Sam. iv. 10, εὐαγγέλια occurs in the earliest sense). This sense pervades the N. T. in reference to the good news of God, the message of salvation. Finally, it came very naturally to denote the books in which the Gospel of Jesus was presented in historic form, as in the *Didache* and in Justin M., *Apol.* i. 66, *Dial. con. Tryp.* 100. In the titles of the Gospels the word retains its second sense, while suggesting the third. εὐαγγ. κατὰ M. means the good news as reduced to writing by M. κατὰ is not = of, nor κατὰ Ματθαῖον = Ματθαίου, as if the sense were: The book called a "Gospel" written by Matthew. (*Vide* Fritzsche against this the older view, supported by Kuinoel.)

CHAPTER I. THE GENEALOGY AND BIRTH OF JESUS.—The genealogy may readily appear to us a most ungenial beginning of the Gospel. A dry list of names! It is the tribute which the Gospel pays to the spirit of Judaism. The Jews set much store by genealogies, and to Jewish Christians the Messiahship of Jesus depended on its being proved that He was a descendant of David. But the matter can hardly be so vital as that. We may distinguish between the question of fact and the question of faith. It may be that Jesus was really descended from David—many things point that way; but even if He were not He might still be the Christ, the fulfiller of O. T. ideals, the bringer-in of the highest good, if He possessed the proper *spiritual* qualifications. What although the Christ were not David's son in the physical sense? He was a priest after the order of Melchisedec, though ἀγενεαλόγητος; why not Messiah under the same conditions? He might still be a son of David in the sense in which John the Baptist was Elijah—in spirit and power, realising the ideal of the hero king. The kingdom of prophecy came only in a spiritual sense, why not also the king? The two hang together. Paul was not an apostle in the legitimist sense, not one of the men who had been with Jesus; yet he was a very real apostle.

Ἰακώβ. Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ. 3. Ἰούδας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Φαρὲς καὶ τὸν Ζαρὰ [d] ἐκ τῆς Θάμαρ· Φαρὲς δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐσρώμ· Ἐσρὼμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀράμ.

d similar const. in Gal. iv. 4, 22, 23.

So might Jesus be a Christ, though not descended from David. St. Paul writes (Gal. iii. 29): "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed". So might we say: If Jesus was fit to be the Christ in point of spiritual equipment, then was He of the seed of David. There is no clear evidence in the Gospels that Jesus Himself set value on Davidic descent; there are some things that seem to point the other way: *e.g.*, the question, "Who is my mother?" (Matt. xii. 47; Mk. iii. 33), and the other, "What think ye of the Christ, whose son is He?" (Matt. xxii. 42, *et par.*). There is reason to believe that, like St. Paul, He would argue from the spiritual to the genealogical, not *vice versâ:* not Christ because from David, but from David, at least ideally, because Christ on other higher grounds.

Ver. 1. **βίβλος γενέσεως κ.τ.λ.** How much does this heading cover: the whole Gospel, the two first chapters, the whole of the first chapter, or only i. 1-17? All these views have been held. The first by Euthy. Zigab., who argued: the birth of the God-man was the important point, and involved all the rest; therefore the title covers the whole history named from the most important part (**ἀπὸ τοῦ κυριωτέρου μέρους**). Some moderns (Ebrard, Keil, etc.) have defended the view on the ground that the corresponding title in O. T. (Gen. vi. 9; xi. 27, etc.) denotes not merely a genealogical list, but a history of the persons whose genealogy is given. Thus the expression is taken to mean *a book on the life of Christ* (liber de vita Christi, Maldon.). Against the second view and the third Weiss-Meyer remarks that at i. 18 a new beginning is made, while ii. 1 runs on as if continuing the same story. The most probable and most generally accepted opinion is that of Calvin, Beza, and Grotius that the expression applies only to i. 1-17. (Non est haec inscriptio totius libri, sed particulae primae quae velut extra corpus historiae prominet. Grotius.)

Ἰησου Χριστου. Christ here is not an appellative but a proper name, in accordance with the usage of the Apostolic age. In the body of the evangelistic history the word is not thus used; only in the introductory parts. (*Vide* Mk. i. 1; John i. 17.)

υἱοῦ Δ., υἱοῦ Α. Of David first, because with his name was associated the more specific promise of a Messianic king; of Abraham also, because he was the patriarch of the race and first recipient of the promise. The genealogy goes no further back, because the Gospel is written for the Jews. Euthy. Zig. suggests that David is placed first because he was the better known, as the less remote, as a great prophet and a renowned king. (**ἀπὸ τοῦ γνωριμωτέρου μᾶλλον ἀρξάμενος, ἐπὶ τὸν παλαιότερον ἀνῆλθεν.**) The word **υἱοῦ** in both cases applies to Christ. It can refer grammatically to David, as many take it, but the other reference is demanded by the fact that ver. 1 forms the superscription of the following genealogy. So Weiss-Meyer.

Vv. 2-16. The genealogy divides into three parts: from Abraham to David (vv. 2-6a); from David to the captivity (vv. 6b-11); from the captivity to Christ. On closer inspection it turns out to be not so dry as it at first appeared. There are touches here and there which import into it an ethical significance, suggesting the idea that it is the work not of a dry-as-dust Jewish genealogist, but of the evangelist; or at least worked over by him in a Christian spirit, if the skeleton was given to his hand. To note these is the chief interest of non-Rabbinical exegesis.

Vv. 2-6a. **καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ.** This is not necessary to the genealogical line, but added to say by the way that he who belonged to the tribe of Judah belonged also to *all* the tribes of Israel. (Weiss, Matthäusevang.) . . . Ver. 3. **τὸν Φαρὲς καὶ τὸν Ζαρά.** Zerah added to Perez the continuator of the line, to suggest that it was by a special providence that the latter was first born (Gen. xxxviii. 27-30). The evangelist is on the outlook for the unusual or preternatural in history as prelude to the crowning marvel of the virgin birth (Gradus futurus ad credendum partum e virgine. Grot.).—**ἐκ τῆς Θάμαρ.** Mention of the mother wholly unnecessary and unusual from a genealogical point of view, and in this case one would say, *primâ facie*, impolitic, reminding of a hardly readable story (Gen. xxxviii. 13-26). It is the first of four references to mothers

4. Ἀρὰμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀμιναδάβ· Ἀμιναδὰβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ναασσών· Ναασσὼν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαλμών. 5. Σαλμὼν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Βοὸζ ἐκ τῆς Ῥαχάβ· Βοὸζ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ὠβὴδ ἐκ τῆς Ῥούθ· Ὠβὴδ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεσσαί· 6. Ἰεσσαὶ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Δαβὶδ τὸν βασιλέα. Δαβὶδ δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς[1] ἐγέννησε τὸν Σολομῶντα[2] ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου· 7. Σολομὼν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ῥοβοάμ· Ῥοβοὰμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀβιά· Ἀβιὰ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀσά· 8. Ἀσὰ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσαφάτ· Ἰωσαφὰτ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωράμ· Ἰωρὰμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ὀζίαν· 9. Ὀζίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωάθαμ· Ἰωάθαμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἄχαζ· Ἄχαζ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐζεκίαν· 10. Ἐζεκίας

[1] ο βασιλευς omitted in ℵB, found in CL. Most modern editors omit.
[2] So in Δ. Σολομωνα in BCL and most uncials.

in the ancestry of Jesus, concerning whom one might have expected the genealogy to observe discreet silence: Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, Bathsheba; three of them sinful women, and one, Ruth, a foreigner. Why are they mentioned? By way of defence against sinister misconstruction of the birth of Jesus? So Wetstein: Ut tacitæ Judaeorum objectioni occurreretur. Doubtless there is a mental reference to that birth under some aspect, but it is not likely that the evangelist would condescend to apologise before the bar of unbelief, even though he might find means of doing so in the Jewish habit of glorying over the misdeeds of ancestors (Wetstein). Much more probable is the opinion of the Fathers, who found in these names a foreshadowing of the gracious character of the Gospel of Jesus, as it were *the Gospel in the genealogy*. Schanz follows the Fathers, except that he thinks they have over-emphasised the *sinful* element. He finds in the mention of the four women a hint of God's grace in Christ to the sinful and *miserable*: Rahab and Bathsheba representing the one, Tamar and Ruth the other. This view commends itself to many interpreters both Catholic and Protestant. Others prefer to bring the four cases under the category of the *extraordinary* exemplified by the case of Perez and Zerah. These women all became mothers in the line of Christ's ancestry by special providence (Weiss-Meyer). Doubtless this is at least part of the moral. Nicholson (New Com.) thinks that the introduction of Tamar and Ruth is sufficiently explained by Ruth iv. 11, 12, viewed as Messianic, of Rahab by her connection with the earlier Jesus (Joshua), and of Bathsheba because she was the mother of a second line culminating in Christ, as Ruth of a first culminating in David.—Ver. 6a. **τὸν Δαβὶδ τὸν βασιλέα,** David *the King*, the title being added to distinguish him from the rest. It serves the same purpose as if David had been written in large letters. At length we arrive at the great royal name! The materials for the first part of the genealogy are taken from Ruth iv. 18-22, and 1 Chron. ii. 5-15.

Vv. 6b-10, **ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου,** *vide* above. The chief feature in this second division of the genealogical table is the omission of three kings between Joram and Uzziah (ver. 8), *viz*., Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah. How is the omission to be explained? By inadvertence, or by intention, and if the latter, in what view? Jerome favoured the second alternative, and suggested two reasons for the intentional omission—a wish to bring out the number fourteen (ver. 17) in the second part of the genealogy, and a desire to brand the kings passed over with the stamp of *theocratic illegality*. In effect, manipulation with a presentable excuse. But the excuse would justify other omissions, *e.g.*, Ahaz and Manasseh, who, were as great offenders as any. One can, indeed, imagine the evangelist desiring to exemplify the severity of the Gospel as well as its grace in the construction of the list—to say in effect: God resisteth the proud, but He giveth grace to the lowly, and even the low. The hypothesis of manipulation in the interest of symbolic numbers can stand on its own basis without any pretext. It is not to be supposed that the evangelist was at all concerned to make sure that no link in the line was omitted. His one concern

δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Μανασσῆ· Μανασσῆς δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀμών· Ἀμὼν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσίαν· 11. Ἰωσίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεχονίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τῆς [e] μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος. 12. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν μετοικεσίαν Βαβυλῶνος, Ἰεχονίας ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαλαθιήλ· Σαλαθιὴλ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ζοροβάβελ· 13. Ζοροβάβελ δὲ ἐγέννησε

[e] again twice in ver. 17. Also in 2 Kings xxiv. 6; 1 Chron. v. 22. The verb (μετοικίζω) in Acts vii. 4, 43.

would be to make sure that no name appeared that did not belong to the line. He can hardly have imagined that his list was complete from beginning to end. Thus Nahshon (ver. 4) was the head of the tribe of Judah at the Exodus (Num. i. 7), yet between Hezron and him only two names occur—four names for 400 years. Each name or generation represents a century, in accordance with Genesis xv. 13-16. The genealogist may have had this passage in view, but he must have known that the actual succession embraced more links than four (*vide* Schanz on ver. 4). The hypothesis of inadvertence or error in consulting the text of the O. T., favoured by some modern commentators, is not to be summarily negatived on the ground of an *a priori* theory of inerrancy. It is possible that in reading 1 Chron. iii. 11 in the Sept. the eye leapt from Ὀχοζίας to Ὀζίας, and so led to omission of it and the two following names. (Ἀζαρίας, not Ὀζίας, is the reading in Sept., but Weiss assumes that the latter, Azariah's original name, must have stood in the copy used by the constructor of the genealogy.) The explanation, however, is conjectural. No certainty, indeed, is attainable on the matter. As a curiosity in the history of exegesis may be mentioned Chrysostom's mode of dealing with this point. Having propounded several problems regarding the genealogy, the omission of the three kings included, he leaves this one unsolved on the plea that he must not explain everything to his hearers lest they become listless (ἵνα μὴ ἀναπέσητε, *Hom.* iv.). Schanz praises the prudence of the sly Greek orator.

Ver. 11. Ἰωσίας ἐγεν. τὸν Ἰεχονίαν. There is an omission here also: Eliakim, son of Josiah and father of Jeconiah. It was noted and made a ground of reproach to Christians by Porphyry. Maldonatus, pressed by the difficulty, proposed to substitute for Jeconiah, Jehoiakim, the second of four sons ascribed to Josiah in the genealogist's source (1 Chron. iii. 14), whereby the expression τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ would retain its natural sense. But, while the two names are perhaps similar enough to be mistaken for each other, it is against the hypothesis as a solution of the difficulty that Jehoiakim did not share in the captivity (2 Kings xxiv. 6), while the words of ver. 11 seem to imply that the descendant of Josiah referred to was associated with his brethren in exile. The words ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος probably supply the key to the solution. Josiah brings us to the brink of the period of exile. With his name that doleful time comes into the mind of the genealogist. Who is to represent it in the line of succession? Not Jehoiakim, for though the deportation began in his reign he was not himself a captive. It must be Jeconiah (Jehoiakin), his son at the second remove, who was among the captives (2 Kings xxiv. 15). His "brethren" are his uncles, sons of Josiah, his grandfather; brethren in blood, and brethren also as representatives of a calamitous time—(*vide* Weiss-Meyer). There is a pathos in this second allusion to brotherhood. "Judah and his brethren," partakers in the promise (also in the sojourn in Egypt); "Jeconiah and his brethren," the generation of the promise eclipsed. Royalty in the dust, but not without hope. The omission of Eliakim (or Jehoiakim) serves the subordinate purpose of keeping the second division of the genealogy within the number fourteen.—Μετοικεσίας: literally *change of abode*, deportation, "carrying away," late Greek for μετοικία or μετοίκησις.—Βαβυλῶνος: genitive, expressing the *terminus ad quem* (*vide* Winer, § 30, 2 a, and *cf.* Matt. iv. 15, ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, x. 5, ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν).—ἐπὶ τ. μ., at the time of, during, the time being of some length; the process of deportation went on for years. *Cf.* Mk. ii. 26, ἐπὶ Ἀβιάθαρ, under the high priesthood of Abiathar, and Mk. xii. 26 for a similar use of ἐπὶ in reference to place, ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου—at the place where the story of the bush occurs. Μετὰ τ. μ. in ver. 12 means *after* not *during*, as some have supposed, misled by taking μετοικεσία as denoting the state of exile. *Vide* on this Fritzsche.

Vv. 12-15. In the last division the

τὸν Ἀβιούδ· Ἀβιοὺδ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐλιακείμ· 14. Ἐλιακεὶμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀζώρ· Ἀζὼρ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Σαδώκ· Σαδὼκ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀχείμ· Ἀχεὶμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐλιούδ· 15. Ἐλιοὺδ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐλεάζαρ· Ἐλεάζαρ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ματθάν· Ματθὰν δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ· 16. Ἰακὼβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰωσήφ, τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη [f] Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός.

[f] same expression in xxvii. 17, 22 ("Jesus called the Christ").

17. Πᾶσαι οὖν αἱ γενεαὶ ἀπὸ Ἀβραὰμ ἕως Δαβίδ, γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες· καὶ ἀπὸ Δαβὶδ ἕως τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος, γενεαὶ

genealogical table escapes our control. After Zerubbabel no name occurs in the O. T. We might have expected to find Abiud in 1 Chron. iii. 19, where the children of Zerubbabel are given, but Abiud is not among them. The royal family sank into obscurity. It does not follow that no pains were taken to preserve their genealogy. The priests may have been diligent in the matter, and records may have been preserved in the temple (Schanz). The Messianic hope would be a motive to carefulness. In any case we must suppose the author of the genealogy before us to give here what he found. He did not construct an imaginary list. And the list, if not guaranteed as infallibly accurate by its insertion, was such as might reasonably be expected to satisfy Hebrew readers. Amid the gloom of the night of legalism which broods over all things belonging to the period, this genealogy included, it is a comfort to think that the Messiahship of Jesus does not depend on the absolute accuracy of the genealogical tree.

Ver. 16. **Ἰακὼβ . . . τὸν Ἰωσήφ**: the genealogy ends with *Joseph*. It is then presumably his, not Mary's. But for apologetic or dogmatic considerations, no one would ever have thought of doubting this. What creates perplexity is that Joseph, while called the husband (**τὸν ἄνδρα**) of Mary, is not represented as the father of Jesus. There is no **ἐγέννησε** in this case, though some suppose that there was originally, as the genealogy came from the hand of some Jewish Christian, who regarded Jesus as the Son of Joseph (Holtzmann in H. C.). The *Sinaitic Syriac Codex* has "Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, *begat* Jesus," but it does not alter the story otherwise to correspond with Joseph's paternity. Therefore Joseph can only have been the legal father of Jesus. But, it is argued, that is not enough to satisfy the presupposition of the whole N. T., *viz.*, that Jesus was the actual son of David (**κατὰ σάρκα**, Rom. i. 3); therefore the genealogy *must* be that of Mary (Nösgen). This conclusion can be reconciled with the other alternative by the assumption that Mary was of the same tribe and family as Joseph, so that the genealogy was common to both. This was the patristic view. The fact may have been so, but it is not indicated by the evangelist. His aim, undoubtedly, is to set forth Jesus as the legitimate son of Joseph, Mary's husband, at His birth, and therefore the proper heir of David's throne.—**ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ι.** The peculiar manner of expression is a hint that something out of the usual course had happened, and prepares for the following explanation: **ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός**; not implying doubt, but suggesting that the claim of Jesus to the title *Christ* was valid if He were a legitimate descendant of David, as the genealogy showed Him to be.

Ver. 17. The evangelist pauses to point out the structure of his genealogy: three parts with fourteen members each; symmetrical, memorable; **πᾶσαι** does not imply, as Meyer and Weiss think, that in the opinion of the evangelist no links are omitted. He speaks simply of what lies under the eye. There they are, fourteen in each, count and satisfy yourself. But the counting turns out not to be so easy, and has given rise to great divergence of opinion. The division naturally suggested by the words of the text is: from Abraham to David, terminating first series, 14; from David, heading second series, to the captivity as limit, *i.e.*, to Josiah, 14; from the captivity represented by Jeconiah to *Christ*, included as final term, 14. So Bengel and De Wette. If objection be taken to counting David twice, the brethren of Jeconiah, that is, his uncles, may be taken as representing the concluding term of series 2, and Jeconiah himself as the first member of series 3 (Weiss-Meyer). The identical number

g Lk. i. 27; ii. 5. h Lk. xvii. 18. 1 Cor. iv. 2. i again in xxiv. 19. Lk. xxi. 23. j Mt. xx. 4. Mk. vi. 20. Lk. xx. 20. Rom. v. 7.

δεκατέσσαρες· καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβυλῶνος ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες.

18. ΤΟΥ δὲ Ἰησοῦ[1] Χριστοῦ ἡ γέννησις[2] οὕτως ἦν. [g] μνηστευθείσης γὰρ[3] τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς, [h] εὑρέθη [i] ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου. 19. Ἰωσὴφ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, [j] δίκαιος ὤν, καὶ μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν παρα-

[1] B inverts the order of the names (X. I.). I. X. in ℵCL, etc. Weiss (Meyer, 8th ed.) remarks B has a preference for "Christ Jesus".

[2] The best old MSS. read γενεσις . . . γεννησις is doubtless a correction of the scribe to bring the text into conformity with εγεννησε in the genealogy.

[3] γαρ omitted in ℵBC[1], etc. The sense is clearer without it.

in the three parts is of no importance in itself. It is a numerical symbol uniting three periods, and suggesting comparison in other respects, *e.g.*, as to different forms of government—judges, kings, priests (Euthy. Zig.), theocracy, monarchy, hierarchy (Schanz), all summed up in Christ; or as to Israel's fortunes: growth, decline, ruin—redemption urgently needed.

Vv. 18-25. THE BIRTH OF JESUS. This section gives the explanation which ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη (ver. 16) leads us to expect. It may be called *the justification of the genealogy* (Schanz), showing that while the birth was exceptional in nature it yet took place in such circumstances, that Jesus might justly be regarded as the legitimate son of Joseph, and therefore heir of David's throne. The position of the name **Τοῦ δὲ Ι. Χ.** at the head of the sentence, and the recurrence of the word **γένεσις**, point back to ver. 1; **γένεσις**, not **γέννησις**, is the true reading, the purpose being to express the general idea of origin, ortus, not the specific idea of generation (**ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐκαινοτόμησε τὸ κατὰ φύσιν ὄνομα τῆς γεννήσεως, γένεσιν αὐτὴν καλέσας**. Euthy. Zig. on ver. 1).

Ver. 18. **μνηστευθείσης . . . αὐτοὺς** indicates the position of Mary in relation to Joseph when her pregnancy was discovered. Briefly it was—betrothed, not married. **Πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν** means before they came together in one home as man and wife, it being implied that that would not take place before marriage. **συνελθεῖν** might refer to sexual intercourse, so far as the meaning of the word is concerned (*Joseph. Antiq.* vii. 9, 5), but the evangelist would not think it necessary to state that no such intercourse had taken place between the betrothed. That he would regard as a matter of course. Yet most of the fathers so understood the word; and some, Chrysostom, *e.g.*, conceived Joseph and Mary to be living together before marriage, but *sine concubitu*, believing this to have been the usual practice. Of this, however, there is no satisfactory evidence. The sense above assigned to **συνελ** corresponds to the verb **παραλαβεῖν**, ver. 20, **παρέλαβε**, ver. 25, which means to take home, *domum ducere*. The supposed reason for the practice alleged to have existed by Chrysostom and others was the protection of the betrothed (**δι' ἀσφάλειαν**, Euthy.). Grammarians (*vide* Fritzsche) say that **πρὶν ἢ** is not found in ancient Attic, though often in middle Attic. For other instances of, with infinitive, *vide* Mk. xiv. 30, Acts vii. 2; without **ἢ**, Mt. xxvi. 34, 75. On the construction of **πρὶν** with the various moods, *vide* Hermann ed. Viger, Klotz ed. Devarius, and Goodwin's Syntax.—**εὑρέθη . . . ἔχουσα**: **εὑρέθη**, not **ἦν**. (So Olearius, *Observ. ad Ev. Mat.*, and other older interpreters.) There was a discovery and a surprise. It was apparent (de Wette); **διὰ τὸ ἀπροσδόκητον** (Euthy.). To whom apparent not indicated. Jerome says: "Non ab alio inventa est nisi a Joseph, qui pene licentia maritali futurae uxoris omnia noverat".—**ἐκ πν. ἁγ.** This was not apparent; it belonged to the region of faith. The evangelist hastens to add this explanation of a painful fact to remove, as quickly as possible, all occasion for sinister conjecture. The expression points at once to immediate divine *causality*, and to the holy character of the effect: a solemn protest against profane thoughts.

Ver. 19. **Ι. ὁ ἀνὴρ**: proleptic, implying possession of a husband's rights and responsibilities. The betrothed man had a duty in the matter.—**δίκαιος . . . δειγμα-**

δειγματίσαι,[1] ἐβουλήθη λάθρα[2] [k] ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν. 20. ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ [l] ἐνθυμηθέντος, ἰδού, ἄγγελος Κυρίου [m] κατ' ὄναρ ἐφάνη αὐτῷ, λέγων, "Ἰωσήφ, υἱὸς Δαβίδ, μὴ φοβηθῇς [n] παραλαβεῖν Μαριὰμ[3] τὴν γυναῖκά σου· τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ Πνεύματός ἐστιν Ἁγίου. 21. τέξεται δὲ υἱόν, καὶ [o] καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν." 22. Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ [p] ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ[4] Κυρίου διὰ

k ver. 31, 32 xix. 3. Mk. x. 12 (in ref. to a husband).
l chap. ix. 4.
m chap. ii. 12, 13, 19, 22; xxvii. 19.
n again ver. 24.
o Lk. i. 13; ii. 21.
p chap. ii. 15; iii. 3; xxii. 31.

[1] B and ℵ[2] have the simple verb (δειγματισαι).

[2] λαθρᾳ in W.H.

[3] Μαριαν in BL (W.H. text). The Μαριαμ of the T. R. probably comes from the history of Christ's birth in Luke i., ii.

[4] The article του before κυριου is omitted in the best MSS.

τίσαι. He was in a strait betwixt two. Being δίκαιος, just, righteous, a respecter of the law, he could not overlook the apparent fault; on the other hand, loving the woman, he desired to deal with her as tenderly as possible: not wishing to expose *her* (αὐτὴν in an emphatic position before δειγματίσαι—the loved one. Weiss-Meyer). Some (Grotius, Fritzsche, etc.) take δίκαιος in the sense of *bonitas* or *benignitas*, as if it had been ἀγαθός, so eliminating the element of conflict.—ἐβουλήθη . . . αὐτήν. He finally resolved on the expedient of putting her away *privately*. The alternatives were exposure by public repudiation, or quiet cancelling of the bond of betrothal. Affection chose the latter. δειγματίσαι does not point, as some have thought, to judicial procedure with its penalty, death by stoning. λάθρα before ἀπολῦσαι is emphatic, and suggests a contrast between two ways of performing the act pointed at by ἀπολῦσαι. Note the synonyms θέλων and ἐβουλήθη. The former denotes inclination in general, the latter a deliberate decision between different courses—*maluit* (*vide* on chapter xi. 27).

Vv. 20-21. *Joseph delivered from his perplexity by angelic interposition.* How much painful, distressing, distracting thought he had about the matter day and night can be imagined. Relief came at last in a dream, of which Mary was the subject.—ταῦτα . . . ἐνθυμηθέντος: the genitive absolute indicates the time of the vision, and the verb the state of mind: revolving the matter in thought without clear perception of outget. ταῦτα, the accusative, not the genitive with περί: ἐνθ. περί τινος = *Cogitare de re*, ἐνθ. τι = *aliquid secum reputare.* Kühner, § 417, 9.—ἰδού: often in Mt after genitive absolute; vivid introduction of the angelic appearance (Weiss Meyer).—κατ' ὄναρ (late Greek condemned by Phrynichus. *Vide* Lobeck Phryn., p. 423. ὄναρ without preposition the classic equivalent), during a dream reflecting present distractions.—υἱὸς Δαβίδ: the angel addresses Joseph as son of David to awaken the heroic mood. The title confirms the view that the genealogy is that of Joseph.—μὴ φοβηθῇς: he is summoned to a supreme act of faith similar to those performed by the moral heroes of the Bible, who by faith made their lives sublime.—τὴν γυναῖκά σου, to take Mary, as thy wife, so in ver. 24—τὸ . . . ἁγίου: negativing the other alternative by which he was tormented. The choice lies between two extremes: most unholy, or the holiest possible. What a crisis!—ver. 21. τέξεται—Ἰησοῦν: Mary is about to bear a *son*, and He is to bear the significant name of *Jesus*. The style is an echo of O. T. story, Gen. xvii. 19, Sept., the birth of Isaac and that of Jesus being thereby placed side by side as similar in their preternatural character.—καλέσεις: a command in form of a prediction. But there is encouragement as well as command in this future. It is meant to help Joseph out of his doubts into a mood of heroic, resolute action. Cease from brooding anxious thought, think of the child about to be born as destined to a great career, to be signalised by His name Jesus — Jehovah the helper.—αὐτὸς γὰρ . . . ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν: interpretation of the name, still part of the angelic speech. αὐτὸς emphatic, he and no other. *Sins*, implying a spiritual conception of Israel's need.

q Is. vii. 14. τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, 23. q "Ἰδού, ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσουσι[1] τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ," ὅ ἐστι
r Mk. v. 41; xv. 22, 34. John i. 42. r μεθερμηνευόμενον, Μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Θεός. 24. Διεγερθεὶς[2] δὲ ὁ[3] Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου ἐποίησεν ὡς προσέταξεν αὐτῷ ὁ ἄγγελος
s Lk. i. 34. Κυρίου· καὶ παρέλαβε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, 25. καὶ οὐκ s ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτήν, ἕως οὗ[4] ἔτεκε τὸν[5] υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον[5] καὶ ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἸΗΣΟΥΝ.

[1] D has καλεσεις as in Sept. ver. of Is. vii. 14.

[2] Here again, as in ver. 19, the simple verb εγερθεις is used instead of the compound of T. R. in the best texts (ℵBCZ).

[3] ο omitted in ℵZΔ *al.*, bracketed in W.H.

[4] ου is omitted in B and bracketed in W.H.

[5] Instead of the words τον υιον αυτης τον πρωτοτοκον, ℵBZ 1, 33, some old Latin MSS., the Egyptian versions and Syr. Cur., have simply υιον. The expanded phrase of T. R., found in many copies, is doubtless imported from Lk. ii. 7.

Vv. 22-23. *The prophetic reference.* As it is the evangelist's habit to cite O. T. prophecies in connection with leading incidents in the life of Jesus, it is natural, with most recent interpreters, to regard these words, not as uttered by the angel, but as a comment of the narrator. The ancients, Chry., Theophy., Euthy., etc., adopt the former view, and Weiss-Meyer concurs, while admitting that in expression they reveal the evangelist's style. In support of this, it might be urged that the suggestion of the prophetic oracle to the mind of Joseph would be an aid to faith. It speaks of a son to be born of a virgin. Why should not Mary be that virgin, and her child that son? In favour of it also is the consideration that on the opposite view the prophetic reference comes in too soon. Why should not the evangelist go on to the end of his story, and then quote the prophetic oracle? Finally, if we assume that in the case of all objective preternatural manifestations, there is an answering subjective psychological state, we must conclude that among the thoughts that were passing through Joseph's mind at this crisis, one was that in his family experience as a "son of David," something of great importance for the royal race and for Israel was about to happen. The oracle in question might readily suggest itself as explaining the nature of the coming event. On all these grounds, it seems reasonable to conclude that the evangelist, in this case, means the prophecy to form part of the angelic utterance.

Ver. 22. τοῦτο δὲ . . . ἵνα πληρωθῇ. ἵνα is to be taken here, and indeed always in such connections, in its strict telic sense. The interest of the evangelist, as of all N. T. writers, in prophecy, was purely religious. For him O. T. oracles had exclusive reference to the events in the life of Jesus by which they were fulfilled. The virgin, ἡ παρθένος, supposed to be present to the eye of the prophet, is the young woman of Nazareth betrothed to Joseph the carpenter, now found to be with child.—Ἰδοὺ . . . Ἐμμανουήλ: in the oracle as here quoted, ἕξει (*cf.* ἔχουσα, ver. 18), is substituted for λήψεται, and καλέσεις changed into the impersonal καλέσουσι. Emmanuel = "with us God," implying that God's help will come through the child Jesus. It does not necessarily imply the idea of incarnation.

Vv. 24-25. *Joseph hesitates no more:* immediate energetic action takes the place of painful doubt. Euthymius asks: Why did he so easily trust the dream in so great a matter? and answers: because the angel revealed to him the thought of his own heart, for he understood that the messenger must have come from God, for God alone knows the thoughts of the heart.—ἐγερθεὶς . . . Κυρίου: rising up from the sleep (τοῦ ὕπνου), in which he had that remarkable dream, on that memorable night, he proceeded forthwith to execute the Divine command, the first, chief, perhaps sole business of that day.—καὶ παρέλαβεν . . . αὐτοῦ. He took Mary home as his wife, that her offspring might be his legitimate son and heir of David's throne.—Ver. 25. καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν . . . υἱόν: absolute habitual (note the imperfect) abstinence from

II. 1. Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἐν ἡμέραις Ἡρῴδου τοῦ βασιλέως, ἰδού, [a] μάγοι ἀπὸ [b] ἀνατολῶν

a again in vv. 7, 16 (*bis*). Acts xiii. 6, 8.
b chap. viii. 11; xxiv. 27. Lk. xiii. 29.

marital intercourse, the sole purpose of the hastened marriage being to legitimise the child.—**ἕως**: not till then, and afterwards? Here comes in a *quæstio vexata* of theology. Patristic and catholic authors say: not till then and never at all, guarding the sacredness of the virgin's womb. **ἕως** does not settle the question. It is easy to cite instances of its use as fixing a limit up to which a specified event did not occur, when as a matter of fact it did not occur at all. *E.g.*, Gen. viii. 7; the raven returned not till the waters were dried up; in fact, never returned (Schanz). But the presumption is all the other way in the case before us. Subsequent intercourse was the natural, if not the necessary, course of things. If the evangelist had felt as the Catholics do, he would have taken pains to prevent misunderstanding.—**υἱόν**: the extended reading (T. R.) is imported from Luke ii. 7, where there are no variants. **πρωτότοκον** is not a stumbling-block to the champions of the perpetual virginity, because the *first* may be the *only*. Euthymius quotes in proof Isaiah xliv. 6: "I am the first, and I am the last, and beside Me there is no God."—**καὶ ἐκάλεσεν**, he (not she) called the child Jesus, the statement referring back to the command of the angel to Joseph. Wünsche says that before the exile the mother, after the exile the father, gave the name to the child at circumcision (*Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien*, p. 11).

CHAPTER II. HISTORY OF THE INFANCY CONTINUED. The leading aim of the evangelist in this chapter is not to give biographic details as to the time and place of Christ's birth. These are disposed of in an introductory subordinate clause with a genitive absolute construction: "Jesus being born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the King": that is all. The main purpose is to show the reception given by the world to the new-born Messianic King. Homage from afar, hostility at home; foreshadowing the fortunes of the new faith: acceptance by the Gentiles, rejection by the Jews; such is the lesson of this new section. It is history, but not of the prosaic sort: history with a religious bias, and wearing a halo of poetry. The story forms a natural sequel to the preceding account. The **δὲ** in ver. 1, as in i. 18, is adversative only to the extent of taking the attention off one topic and fixing it on another connected and kindred. This, according to Klotz, who regards **δὲ** as a weak form of **δή**, is the original force of the particle. He says (in *Devarius*, p. 355): "Illa particula eam vim habet, ut abducat nos ab ea re, quae proposita est, transferat que ad id, quod, missa illa priore re, jam pro vero ponendum esse videatur".

Vv. 1-12. *Visit of the Magi*. Ver. 1, **ἐν Βηθλεέμ**: The first hint of the birthplace, and no hint that Bethlehem is not the home of the family.—**τῆς Ἰουδαίας**: to distinguish it from another Bethlehem in Galilee (Zebulon), named in Joshua xix. 15. Our Bethlehem is called Bethlehem-Judah in 1 Sam. xvii. 12, and Jerome thought it should be so written here—Bethlehem of Judah, not of Judaea, taking the latter for the name of the whole nation. The name means "house of bread," and points to the fertility of the neighbourhood; about six miles south of Jerusalem.—**ἐν ἡμέραις**, "in the days," a very vague indication of time. Luke aims at more exactness in these matters. It is enough for our evangelist to indicate that the birth of Jesus fell within the evil time represented by *Herod*. A name of evil omen; called the Great; great in energy, in magnificence, in wickedness; a considerable personage in many ways in the history of Israel, and of the world. Not a Jew, his father Antipater an Edomite, his mother an Arabian—the sceptre has departed from Judah—through the influence of Antony appointed King of Judaea by the Roman senate about forty years before the birth of Christ. The event here recorded therefore took place towards the close of his long reign; fit ending for a career blackened with many dark deeds.—**ἰδοὺ μάγοι**: "Behold!" introducing in a lively manner the new theme, and a very different class of men from the reigning King of Judaea. Herod, Magi; the one representing the ungodly element in Israel, the other the best element in the Gentile world; Magi, not kings as the legend makes them, but having influence with kings, and intermeddling much by astrological lore with the fortunes of individuals and peoples. The

c Acts xiii. 14 (in same const.). d vv. 7, 9, 10; xxiv. 29. 1 Cor. xv. 41.

c παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, 2. λέγοντες, "Ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; εἴδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν d ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ

homage of the Gentiles could not be offered by worthier representatives, in whom power, wisdom, and also error, superstition meet.—**μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατ. παραγ.**, Magi from the east came—so the words must be connected: not "came from the east"; from the east, the land of the sunrise; vague indication of locality. It is vain to inquire what precise country is meant, though commentators have inquired, and are divided into hostile camps on the point: Arabia, Persia, Media, Babylon, Parthia are some of the rival suggestions. The evangelist does not know or care. The east generally is the suitable part of the world for Magi to come from on this errand.—**εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα**: they arrived at Jerusalem, the capital, the natural place for strangers to come to, the precise spot connected with their errand to be determined by further inquiry. Note the Greek form of the name, usual with Matthew, Mark and John. In Luke, the Hebrew form **Ἰερουσαλήμ** is used. Beforehand, one would have expected the first evangelist writing for Jews to have used the Hebrew form, and the Pauline evangelist the Greek.

Ver. 2, **ποῦ . . . Ἰουδαίων**: the inquiry of the Magi. It is very laconic, combining an assertion with a question. The assertion is contained in **τεχθείς**. That a king of the Jews had been born was their inference from the star they had seen, and what they said was in effect thus: that a king has been born somewhere in this land we know from a star we have seen arising, and we desire to know where he can be found: "insigne hoc concisae orationis exemplum," Fritzsche. The Messianic hope of the Jews, and the aspiration after world-wide dominion connected with it, were known to the outside world, according to the testimony of non-Christian writers such as Josephus and Tacitus. The visit of the Magi in quest of the new-born king is not incredible.—**εἴδομεν . . . ἀνατολῇ**, we saw His star *in its rising*, not in the east, as in A. V., the plural being used for that in ver. 1. Always on the outlook, no heavenly phenomenon escaped them; it was visible as soon as it appeared above the horizon.—**ἀστέρα**, what was this celestial portent? Was it phenomenal only? an appearance in the heavens miraculously produced to guide the wise men to Judaea and Bethlehem; or a real astronomical object, a rare conjunction of planets, or a new star appearing, and invested by men addicted to astrology with a certain significance; or mythical, neither a miraculous nor a natural phenomenon, but a creation of the religious imagination working on slender data, such as the Star of Jacob in Balaam's prophecies? All these views have been held. Some of the fathers, especially Chrysostom, advocated the first, *viz.*, that it was a star, not **φύσει**, but **ὄψει μόνον**. His reasons were such as these: it moved from north to south; it appeared in the daytime while the sun shone; it appeared and disappeared; it descended down to the house where the child lay, and so indicated the spot, which could not be done by a star in the sky (Hom. vi.). Some modern commentators have laid under contribution the investigations of astronomers, and supposed the **ἀστήρ** to have been one of several rare conjunctions of planets occurring about the beginning of our era or a comet observed in China. *Vide* the elaborate note in Alford's Greek Testament. The third view is in favour with students of comparative religion and of criticism, who lay stress on the fact that in ancient times the appearance of a star was expected at the birth of all great men (De Wette), and who expect mythological elements in the N. T. as well as in the Old. (*Vide* Fritzsche, Strauss, L. J., and Holtzmann in H. C.) These diverse theories will probably always find their abettors; the first among the devout to whom the miraculous is no stumbling-block, the second among those who while accepting the miraculous desire to reduce it to a minimum, or at least to avoid its unnecessary extension, the third among men of naturalistic proclivities. I do not profess to be able to settle the question. I content myself with expressing general acquiescence in the idea thrown out by Spinoza in his discussion on prophecy in the *Tractatus theologico-politicus*, that in the case of the Magi we have an instance of a sign given, accommodated to the false opinions of men, to guide them to the truth. The whole system

[e]ἀνατολῇ, καὶ ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ." 3. Ἀκούσας δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς[1] [f]ἐταράχθη, καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα μετ' αὐτοῦ· 4. καὶ [g]συναγαγὼν πάντας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς τοῦ λαοῦ, [h]ἐπυνθάνετο παρ' αὐτῶν, ποῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γεννᾶται. 5. οἱ δὲ εἶπον[2]

e again v. 9, and in Lk. i. 78 (in the sense of rising). f chap. xiv. 26. Lk. i. 12. 1 Pet. iii. 14. g chap. xxii. 10. John xi. 47. Acts xiv. 27. h Cf. Acts xxiii. 20 (τὶ περί τινος).

[1] ο βασιλευς Ηρωδης in ℵBDZ. In the T. R. the order of the words is conformed to that in ver. 1.

[2] ειπαν in ℵB. All such forms have been corrected in the text which the T. R. represents and need not be further noticed.

of astrology was a delusion, yet it might be used by Providence to guide seekers after God. The expectation of an epoch-making birth was current in the east, spread by Babylonian Jews. That it might interest Magians there is no wise incredible; that their astrological lore might lead them to connect some unknown celestial phenomenon with the prevalent expectation is likewise credible. On the other hand, that legendary elements might get mixed up in the Christian tradition of the star-guided visit must be admitted to be possible. It remains to add that the use of the word **ἀστήρ**, not **ἀστρόν**, has been supposed to have an important bearing on the question as to the nature of the phenomenon. **ἀστήρ** means an individual star, **ἀστρόν** a constellation. But in the N. T. this distinction is not observed. (*Vide* Luke xxi. 5; Acts xxvii. 20; Heb. xi. 12; and Grimm's *Lexicon* on the two words.)

Ver. 3. **ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης ἐταράχθη**: **βασιλεὺς** before the name, not after, as in ver. 1, the emphatic position suggesting that it was as king and because king that Herod was troubled. The foreigner and usurper feared a rival, and the tyrant feared the rival would be welcome. It takes little to put evildoers in fear. He had reigned long, men were weary, and the Pharisees, according to Joseph (A. J. xvii. 2-4), had predicted that his family would ere long lose its place of power. His fear therefore, though the occasion may seem insignificant, is every way credible.—**καὶ πᾶσα Ι.**, doubtless an exaggeration, yet substantially true. The spirit of the city was servile and selfish. They bowed to godless power, and cared for their own interest rather than for Herod's. Few in that so-called holy city had healthy sympathies with truth and right. Whether the king's fears were groundless or not they knew not nor cared. It was enough that the fears existed. The world is ruled not by truth but by opinion.—**πασα**: is **Ιεροσόλυμα** feminine here, or is **ἡ πόλις** understood? or is it a construction, *ad sensum*, of the inhabitants? (Schanz).

Ver. 4. *Herod's measures.* — **καὶ συναγαγὼν . . . τοῦ λαοῦ.** Was this a meeting of the Sanhedrim? Not likely, as the elders are not mentioned, who are elsewhere named as the representatives of the people, *vide* xxvi. 3, "the chief priests, scribes and elders of the people". Here we read only of the chief priests and scribes of the people. The article is not repeated before **γραμματεῖς**, the two classes being joined together as the theological experts of the people. Herod called together the leading men among the priests and scribes to consult them as to the birth-place of Messiah. Holtzmann (H. C.), assuming that a meeting of the Sanhedrim is meant, uses the fact as an argument against the historicity of the narrative. The Herod of history slew the Sanhedrists wholesale, and did his best to lull to sleep Messianic hopes. It is only the Herod of Christian legend that convenes the Sanhedrim, and makes anxious inquiries about Messiah's birthplace. But the past policy of the king and his present action, as reported by the evangelist, hang together. He discouraged Messianic hopes, and, now that they have revived in spite of him, he must deal with them, and his first step is to consult the experts in as quiet a way as possible, to ascertain the whereabouts of the new-born child—**ἐπυνθάνετο**, etc.: it is not a historical question he submits to the experts as to where the Christ has been born, or shall be, but a theological one: where, according to the accepted tradition, is His birth-place? Hence **γεννᾶται**, present tense.

Vv. 5-6. *The answer of the experts.*— **οἱ δὲ εἶπον**, etc. This is not a Christian opinion put into the mouth of the scribes. It was the answer to be ex-

αὐτῷ, "Ἐν Βηθλεὲμ τῆς Ἰουδαίας. οὕτω γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, 6. 'Καὶ σύ, Βηθλεέμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, [i] οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα· ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ [j] ἐξελεύσεται [k] ἡγούμενος, ὅστις [l] ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραήλ.'" 7. Τότε Ἡρώδης, λάθρα[1] καλέσας τοὺς μάγους, [m] ἠκρίβωσε παρ' αὐτῶν τὸν χρόνον τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος, 8. καὶ πέμψας αὐτοὺς εἰς Βηθλεὲμ εἶπε, "Πορευθέντες [n] ἀκριβῶς [o] ἐξετάσατε[2] περὶ τοῦ παιδίου· [p] ἐπὰν δὲ εὕρητε, ἀπαγγείλατέ μοι, ὅπως κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ."

i here only. j in Heb. vii. 5 in same sense. k Acts vii. 10. Cf. Lk. xxii. 26. l John xxi. 16. Acts xx. 28. 1 Pet. v. 2. m here and in ver. 16. n Lk. i. 3. Acts xviii. 25. 1 Thess. v. 2. o chap. x. 11. John xx. 12. p Lk. xi. 12. Lk. xi. 34 (with aor. sub.).

[1] λαθρᾳ as in i. 19 in W.H.

[2] εξετασατε ακριβως in ℵBCD, which accords with Mt.'s usual order.

pected from them as reflecting the current opinion of the time. The Targum put upon the oracle in Micah a Messianic interpretation (Wetstein, and Wünsche, *Beiträge*). Yet with the Talmudists the Messiah was the one who should come forth from a strange, unknown place (Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 342). *Vide* on this point Schanz, who quotes Schegg as denying the statement of Wetstein, and refers to Celsus as objecting that this view about Messiah's birthplace was not current among the Jews. (Origen c. Celsum, i. 51. *Cf.* John vii. 27, and 42.)—**οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται,** etc.: The Scripture proof that Messiah's birth-place was Bethlehem is taken from Micah v. 2. The oracle put into the mouth of the experts consulted by Herod receives its shape from the hand of the evangelist. It varies very considerably both from the original Hebrew and from the Sept. The "least" becomes "by no means the least," "among the thousands" becomes "among the princes," and the closing clause, "who shall rule my people Israel," departs from the prophetic oracle altogether, and borrows from 2 Sam. v. 2, God's promise to David; the connecting link apparently being the poetic word descriptive of the kingly function common to the two places—**ποιμανεῖ** in Micah v. 3, **ποιμανεῖς** in 2 Sam. v. 2. The second variation arises from a different pointing of the same Hebrew word באלפי. בְּאַלְפֵי = among the thousands, בְּאַלֻּפֵי = among the heads of thousands. Such facts are to be taken as they stand. They do not correspond to modern ideas of Scripture proof.

Vv. 7, 8. *Herod's next step.*—**τότε Ἡρώδης . . . ἀστέρος**: **τότε,** frequent formula of transition with our evangelist, *cf.* vv. 16, 17; iii. 1, 5, 11, etc. Herod wished to ascertain precisely when the child the Magi had come to worship was born. He assumed that the event would synchronise with the ascent of the star which the Magi had seen in its rising, and which still continued to be seen (**φαινομένου**). Therefore he made particular inquiries (**ἠκρίβωσεν**) as to the time of the star, *i.e.*, the time of its first appearing. This was a blind, an affectation of great interest in all that related to the child, in whose destinies even the stars were involved.—Ver. 8. **καὶ πέμψας . . . αὐτῷ**: his hypocrisy went further. He bade the strangers go to Bethlehem, find out the whereabouts of the child, come back and tell him, that he also might go and worship Him. Worship, *i.e.*, murder! "Incredible motive!" (H.C.). Yes, as a *real* motive for a man like Herod, but not as a pretended one, and quite likely to be believed by these simple, guileless souls from the east.—**πέμψας εἶπεν**: the sending was synchronous with the directions according to De Wette, prior according to Meyer. It is a question of no importance here, but it is sometimes an important question in what relation the action expressed by the aorist participle stands to that expressed by the following finite verb. The rule certainly is that the participle expresses an action going before: one thing having happened, another thereafter took place. But there is an important class of exceptions. The aorist participle "may express time coincident with that of the verb, when the actions of the verb and the participle are practically one". Goodwin, Syntax, p. 52, and *vide* article there referred to by

9. Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπορεύθησαν· καὶ ἰδού, ὁ ἀστήρ, ὃν εἶδον ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, [q] προῆγεν αὐτούς, ἕως ἐλθὼν ἔστη [1] [r] ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον. 10. ἰδόντες δὲ τὸν ἀστέρα, ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην [s] σφόδρα· 11. καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, εὗρον [2] τὸ

q Mk. x. 32. Mt. xxi. 9 (with αὐτὸν W.H.)
r Ch. v. 14; xxi. 7; xxiii. 18.
s Ch. xvii. 6, 23; xviii. 31; xix. 25; xxvi. 22; xxvii. 54.

[1] εσταθη in ℵBCD.

[2] ειδον in all uncials, ευρον only in minusc. Came in probably from ver. 8 (ευρητε).

Prof. Ballantine in *Bibl. Sacra.*, 1884, on the application of this rule to the N. T., in which many instances of the kind occur. Most frequent in the Gospels is the expression **ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε**, which does not mean "having first answered he then proceeded to say," but "in answering he said". The case before us may be one of this kind. He sent them by saying "Go and search," etc.

Vv. 9, 10. *The Magi go on their errand to Bethlehem.* They do not know the way, but the star guides them. **ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀστὴρ**: looking up to heaven as they set out on their journey, they once more behold their heavenly guide.—**ὃν εἶδον ἐ. τ. ἀνατολῇ**: is the meaning that they had seen the star only at its rising, finding their way to Jesus without its guidance, and that again it appeared leading them to Bethlehem? So Bengel, and after him Meyer. Against this is **φαινομένου**, ver. 7, which implies continuous visibility. The clause **ὃν εἶδον**, etc., is introduced for the purpose of identification. It was their celestial guide appearing again.—**προῆγεν**: it kept going before them (imperfect) all the way till, arriving at Bethlehem, it took up its position (**ἐστάθη**) right over the spot where the child was. The star seemed to go before them by an optical illusion (Weiss-Meyer); it really, in the view of the evangelist, went before and stopped over the house (De Wette, who, of course, regards this as impossible in fact). Ver. 10, **ἰδόντες δὲ . . . χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα**: seeing the star standing over the sacred spot, they were overjoyed. Their quest was at an end; they had at last reached the goal of their long journey. **σφόδρα**, a favourite word of our evangelist, and here very appropriate after **μεγάλην** to express exuberant gladness, ecstatic delight. On the convoy of the star, Fritzsche remarks: "Fuit certe stellae pompa tam gravi tempore digna". Some connect the seeing of the star in ver. 10 with the beginning of the journey from Jerusalem to Bethlehem. They rejoiced, says Euthy. Zig. **ὡς εὑρόντες τὸν ἀψευδέστατον ὁδηγόν**

Ver. 11. *The Magi enter and do homage.*—**καὶ ε. ε. τ. οἰκίαν**: the *house*. In Luke the shepherds find the holy family in a *stable*, and the holy child lying in a manger; reconcilable by assuming that the Magi arrived after they had found refuge in a friend's house (*Epiphan. Theophy.*).—**εἶδον τ. π. αὐτοῦ**: **εἶδον** better than **εὗρον**, which seems to have been introduced by the copyists as not only in itself suitable to the situation, but relieving the monotony caused by too frequent use of **εἶδον** (vv. 9, 10). The child *with His mother*, Joseph not mentioned, not intentionally, that no wrong suspicions might occur to the Gentiles (*Rabanus in Aquin. Cat. Aur.*).—**καὶ πεσόντες . . . σμύρναν.** They come, eastern fashion, with full hands, as befits those who enter into the presence of a king. They open the boxes or sacks (**θησαυρούς**, some ancient copies seem to have read **πήρας** = sacculos, which Grotius, with probability, regards as an interpretative gloss that had found its way into the text, *vide* Epiphanius Adv. Haer. Alogi., c. 8), and bring forth *gold*, *frankincense* and *myrrh*, the two latter being aromatic gums distilled from trees.—**λίβανον**, in classic Greek, the tree, in later Greek and N. T., the gum, **τὸ θυμιώμενον = λιβανωτός**, *vide* Phryn. ed. Lobeck, p. 187. The gifts were of three kinds, hence the inference that the Magi were *three* in number. That they were *kings* was deduced from texts in Psalms and Prophecies (*e.g.*, Psalm lxxii. 10, Isaiah lx. 3), predicting that kings would come doing homage and bringing gifts to Messiah. The legend of the three kings dates as far back as Origen, and is beautiful but baseless. It grew with time; by-and-by the kings were furnished with names. The legendary spirit loves definiteness. The gifts would be products of the givers' country, or in high esteem and costly there. Hence the inference drawn by some that the Magi were from Arabia. Thus Grotius: "Myrrha nonnisi in Arabia nascitur, nec thus nisi apud Jabaeos Arabum portionem: sed et aurifera est felix Arabia". Gold and incense

παιδίον μετὰ Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ πεσόντες προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τοὺς [t] θησαυροὺς αὐτῶν προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δῶρα, χρυσὸν καὶ [u] λίβανον καὶ [v] σμύρναν. 12. καὶ χρηματισθέντες κατ' ὄναρ μὴ [w] ἀνακάμψαι πρὸς Ἡρώδην, δι' ἄλλης ὁδοῦ [x] ἀνεχώρησαν εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν.

13. Ἀναχωρησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν, ἰδοὺ, ἄγγελος Κυρίου φαίνεται κατ' ὄναρ[1] τῷ Ἰωσήφ, λέγων, "Ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἴσθι ἐκεῖ ἕως ἂν εἴπω σοί· μέλλει γὰρ Ἡρώδης ζητεῖν τὸ παιδίον, τοῦ ἀπολέσαι αὐτό." 14. Ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ νυκτός, καὶ ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἕως τῆς

t Cf. vi. 19-21. Lk. xii. 33. Heb. xi. 26 (= *contentum*).
u Rev. xviii. 13.
v John xix. 39.
w Lk. x. 6. Acts xviii. 21. Heb. x. 15.
x vv. 14, 22; iv. 12; ix. 24; xii. 15, al.

[1] B has **κατ οναρ εφανη** as in i. 20 (W.H. margin).

(**λίβανος**) are mentioned in Isaiah lx. 6 among the gifts to be brought to Israel in the good time coming. The fathers delighted in assigning to these gifts of the Magi mystic meanings: gold as to a king, incense as to God, myrrh as to one destined to die (**ὡς μέλλοντι γεύσασθαι θανάτου**). Grotius struck into a new line: gold = works of mercy; incense = prayer; myrrh = purity—to the disgust of Fritzsche, who thought such mystic interpretations beneath so great a scholar.

Ver. 12. *Their pious errand fulfilled, the Magi, warned to keep out of Herod's way, return home by another road.*—**χρηματισθέντες** points to divine guidance given in a dream (**κατ ὄναρ**); *responso accepto*, Vulg. The passive, in the sense of a divine oracle given, found chiefly in N. T. (Fritzsche after Casaubon). Was the oracle given in answer to a prayer for guidance? Opinions differ. It may be assumed here, as in the case of Joseph (i. 20), that the Magi had anxious thoughts corresponding to the divine communication. Doubts had arisen in their minds about Herod's intentions. They had, doubtless, heard something of his history and character, and his manner on reflection may have appeared suspicious. A skilful dissembler, yet not quite successful in concealing his hidden purpose even from these guileless men. Hence a sense of need of guidance, if not a formal petition for it, may be taken for granted. Divine guidance comes only to prepared hearts. The dream reflects the antecedent state of mind.—**μὴ ἀνακάμψαι**, not to turn back on their steps towards Jesus and Herod. Fritzsche praises the felicity of this word as implying that to go by Jerusalem was a roundabout for travellers from Bethel to the east. Apart from the question of fact, such a thought does not seem to be in the mind of the evangelist. He is thinking, not of the shortest road, but of avoiding Herod—**ἀνεχώρησαν**, they withdrew not only homewards, but away from Herod's neighbourhood. A word of frequent occurrence in our Gospel, four times in this chapter (vv. 13, 14, 22).

Vv. 13-23. *Flight to Egypt, massacre in Bethlehem, return to Nazareth.* These three stories have one aim. They indicate the omens which appear in beginnings—*omina principiis inesse solent* (Ovid). The fortunes of Christianity foreshadowed in the experiences of the holy child: welcomed by Gentiles, evil entreated by Jews. "The real contents of these sections embody an ideal aim" (Schanz).

Vv. 13-15. *Flight to Egypt.* Ver. 13, **φαίνεται**: assuming that this is the correct reading, the flight to Egypt is represented as following close on the departure of the Magi; the historic present, vividly introducing one scene after another. A subjective state of anxiety is here also to be presumed. Whence arising we can only conjecture. Did the Magi give a hint, mentioning Herod's name in a significant manner? Be that as it may, Joseph also gets the necessary direction.—**Ἐγερθεὶς . . . εἰς Αἴγυπτον**: Egypt—near, friendly, and the refuge of Israel's ancestors in days of old, if also their house of bondage.—**παράλαβε**, take with a view to taking care of (*cf.* John i. 11, "His own received Him not," **παρέλαβον**); *benigne*, Fritzsche—**ἕως . . . σοί**: either generally, till I give thee further orders (Fritzsche); or till I tell thee to return

[y] τελευτῆς Ἡρώδου· 15. ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ[1] Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, "Ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου." 16. Τότε Ἡρώδης, ἰδὼν ὅτι [z] ἐνεπαίχθη ὑπὸ τῶν μάγων, [a] ἐθυμώθη λίαν, καὶ ἀποστείλας [b] ἀνεῖλε πάντας τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἐν Βηθλεὲμ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς [c] ὁρίοις αὐτῆς, ἀπὸ [d] διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω, κατὰ τὸν χρόνον ὃν ἠκρίβωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων. 17. Τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ

y here only in N. T. Sept. (Gen. xxvii. 2) for מוֹת
z Ch. xx. 19; xxvii. 41, parall.
a here only in N. T. Gen. xxx. 2.
b Lk. xxii. 2: xxiii. 32 (Acts often).
c Ch. iv. 13; viii. 34; xv. 22; xix. 1.
d here only. Cf. Acts xxiv. 27.

[1] אBCD, etc., omit του.

(Meyer, Schanz); sense the same; the time of such new direction is left vague (ἂν with sub.).—μέλλει γὰρ: gives reason of the command.—τοῦ απολέσαι αὐτό: Herod's first purpose was to kill Mary's child alone. He afterwards killed many to make sure of the one. The genitive of the infinitive to express purpose belongs to comparatively late Greek. It occurs constantly in the Sept. and in N. T.—Ver. 14. ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς: Joseph promptly executes the command, νυκτὸς, before the day, indicating alarm as well as obedience. The words of the command in ver. 13 are repeated by the evangelist in ver. 14 to emphasise the obedient spirit of Joseph.—Ver. 15. καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ, etc.: the stay in Egypt cannot have been long, only a few months, probably, before the death of Herod (Nösgen).—ἵνα πληρωθῇ: another prophetic reference, this time proceeding directly from the evangelist; Hosea xi. 1, given after the Hebrew, not the Sept., which for בָּנָי has τέκνα αὐτοῦ. The oracle states a historical fact, and can therefore only be a typical prophecy. The event in the life of the infant Jesus may seem an insignificant fulfilment. Not so did it appear to the evangelist. For him all events in the life of the Christ possessed transcendent significance. Was it an event at all? criticism asks. Did the fact suggest the prophetic reference, or did the prophecy create the fact? In reply, be it said that the narratives in this chapter of the Infancy all hang together. If any one of them occurred, all might occur. The main question is, is Herod's solicitude credible? If so, then the caution of the Magi, the flight to Egypt, the massacre at Bethlehem, the return at the tyrant's death to Nazareth, are all equally credible.

Vv. 16-18. *The massacre.* Τότε: ominous *then*. When he was certain that the Magi were not going to come back to report what they had found at Bethlehem, Herod was enraged as one who had been befooled (ἐνεπαίχθη). Maddened with anger, he resolves on more truculent measures than he at first intended: kill all of a certain age to make sure of the one—such is his savage order to his obsequious hirelings. Incredible? Anything is credible of the man who murdered his own wife and sons. This deed shocks Christians; but it was a small affair in Herod's career, and in contemporary history.—ἐν Βηθ. καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῆς, in Bethlehem, and *around* in the neighbourhood, to make quite sure.—ἀπὸ διετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω: the meaning is clear—all children from an hour to two years old. But διετοῦς may be taken either as masculine, agreeing with παιδός understood = from a two-year-old child, or as a neuter adjective used as a noun = from the age of two years, *a bimatu* as in Vulg. There are good authorities on both sides. For a similar phrase, *vide* 1 Chron. xxvii. 23, ἀπὸ εἰκοσαετοῦς. Herod made his net wide enough; two years ensured an ample margin.—κατὰ τ. χ. . . . μάγων. Euthy. Zig. insists that these words must be connected, not with διετοῦς, but with κατωτέρω, putting a comma after the former word, and not after the latter. If, he argues, Herod had definitely ascertained from the Magi that the child must be two years old, he would not have killed those younger. They made Mary's child younger; Herod kept their time and added a margin: πλάτος ἕτερον αὐτὸς προσέθηκε. It does not seem to matter very much. Herod would not be very scrupulous. He was likely to add a margin in either case; below if they made the age two years, above if they made it less—ver. 18: still another prophetic reference, Jerem. xxxi. 15, freely reproduced from the Sept.; pathetic and poetic certainly, if the relevance be not conspicuously apparent. The evangelist introduces the prophetic passage in this case, not with ἵνα, but with τότε, sug-

ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ[1] Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, 18. "Φωνὴ ἐν Ῥαμᾶ ἠκούσθη, θρῆνος καὶ[2] κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολύς, Ῥαχὴλ κλαίουσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς· καὶ οὐκ ἤθελε[3] παρακληθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσί." 19. Τελευτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ἰδού, ἄγγελος Κυρίου κατ' ὄναρ φαίνεται[4] τῷ Ἰωσὴφ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, λέγων, 20. "Ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορεύου εἰς γῆν Ἰσραήλ· τεθνήκασι γὰρ οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου." 21. Ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦλθεν[5] εἰς γῆν Ἰσραήλ. 22. ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἀρχέλαος βασιλεύει

e Ch. xiii. 42, 50, al.
f 2 Cor. vii. 7.
g with acc. here only.
h Rom. xi. 3.
i Rev. v. 10 (with ἐπί and gen.).

[1] δια in ℵBCD; υπο not acc. to style of Evang. (Weiss in Meyer).

[2] θρηνος και om. ℵBZ; probably introduced to correspond with Sept.

[3] ηθελησε in DZ.

[4] φαινεται κατ οναρ, ℵBDZ.

[5] εισηλθεν in ℵBC.

gestive of a fulfilment not regarded as exclusive. The words, even in their original place, are highly imaginative. The scene of Rachel weeping for her children is one of several tableaux, which passed before the prophet's eye in a vision, in a dream which, on awaking, he felt to be sweet. It was poetry to begin with, and it is poetry here. Rachel again weeps over her children; hers, because she was buried there, the prophet's Ramah, near Gibeah, north of Jerusalem, standing for Bethlehem as far to the south. The prophetic passage did not create the massacre; the tradition of the massacre recalled to mind the prophecy, and led to its being quoted, though of doubtful appositeness in a strict sense. Jacob's beloved wife seems to have occupied an imaginative place also in Rabbinical literature. Wünsche quotes this from the *Midrasch*: "Why did Jacob bury Rachel on the way to Ephratah or Bethlehem? (Gen. xxxv. 16). Because he foresaw that the exiles would at some future time pass that way, and he buried her there that she might pray for them" (*Beiträge*, p. 11). Rachel was to the Hebrew fancy a mother for Israel in all time, sympathetic in all her children's misfortunes.

Vv. 19-21. *Joseph's return.* **Τελευτήσαντος δὲ τ. Ἡρ**: Herod died in 750 U.C. in his 70th year, at Jericho, of a horrible loathsome disease, rotten in body as in soul, altogether an unwholesome man (*vide* Joseph, Bell, i. 33, 1-5; Antiq., xvii. 6, 5; Euseb., H. E., i. 6, 8). The news of his death would fly swiftly, and would not take long to reach Egypt. There would be no need of an angel to inform Joseph of the fact. But his anxieties would not therefore be at an end. Who was to succeed Herod? Might he not be another of the same type? Might disorder and confusion not arise? Would it be safe or wise to return to Palestine? Guidance was again needed, desired and obtained.—**ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος . . . λέγων**: the guidance is given once more in a dream (**κατ' ὄναρ**). The anxious thoughts of the daytime are reflected in the dream by night, and the angelic message comes to put an end to uncertainty.—ver. 20. **Ἐγερθεὶς . . . Ἰσραήλ**: it is expressed in the same terms as those of the message directing flight to Egypt, except of course that the land is different, and the order not *flee* but *return.* "Arise, take the child and His mother." The words were as a refrain in the life of Joseph in those critical months.—**τεθνήκασι γὰρ**: in this general manner is the death of Herod referred to, as if in studious avoidance of the dreaded name. *They* are dead. The plural here (**οἱ ζητοῦντες**), as often, expressed a general idea, a class, though only a single person is meant (*vide* Winer, § 27, 2, and Exodus iv. 19). But the manner of expression may indicate a desire to dissipate completely Joseph's apprehensions. There is nothing, no person to fear: go! Ver. 21. **ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς . . . Ἰσραήλ**: prompt obedience follows, but **νυκτὸς** (ver. 14) is omitted this time. Joseph may wait till day; the matter is not so urgent. Then the word was **φεῦγε**. It was a flight for life, every hour or minute important.

Vv. 22-23. *Settlement in Nazareth in*

ἐπὶ[1] τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἀντὶ Ἡρώδου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,[2] ἐφοβήθη [j] ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν· χρηματισθεὶς δὲ κατ᾽ ὄναρ, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ [k] μέρη τῆς

j for ἐκεῖσε. Ch. xvii. 20. John xi. 8; xviii. 3.
k Ch. xv. 21; xvi. 13. Mk. viii. 10.

[1] Omit επι ℵB and several cursives. With επι the usual construction; therefore its omission here probably correct.

[2] ℵBC place Ηρωδου after τ. πατ. αυτου.

Galilee. Joseph returns with mother and child to *Israel*, but not to Judaea and Bethlehem.—**ἀκούσας . . . Ἡρῴδου**: Archelaos reigns in his father's stead. A man of kindred nature, suspicious, truculent (Joseph., Ant., 17, 11, 2), to be feared and avoided by such as had cause to fear his father.—**βασιλεύει**, reigns, not in the strict sense of the word. He exercised the authority of an ethnarch, with promise of a royal title if he conducted himself so as to deserve it. In fact he earned banishment. At Herod's death the Roman emperor divided his kingdom into four parts, of which he gave two to Archelaus, embracing Judaea, Idumaea and Samaria; the other two parts were assigned to Antipas and Philip, also sons of Herod: to Antipas, Galilee and Peraea; to Philip, Batanea, Trachonitis and Auranitis. They bore the title of Tetrarch, ruler of a fourth part (Joseph., Ant., 17, 11, 4).—**ἐφοβήθη ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν**. It is implied that to settle in Judaea was the natural course to follow, and that it would have been followed but for a special reason. Schanz, taking a hint from Augustine, suggests that Joseph wished to settle in Jerusalem, deeming that city the most suitable home for the Messiah, but that God judged the despised Galilee a better training school for the future Saviour of publicans, sinners and Pagans. This hypothesis goes on the assumption that the original seat of the family was Nazareth.—**ἐκεῖ**: late Greek for **ἐκεῖσε**. In later Greek authors the distinction between **ποῖ ποῦ, οἷ οὗ, ὅποι ὅπου, ἐκεῖ** and **ἐκεῖσε** practically disappeared. Rutherford's *New Phrynichus*, p. 114. *Vide* for another instance, Luke xxi. 2. Others explain the substitution as a case of attraction common in adverbs of place. The idea of remaining is in the mind = He feared to go thither to abide *there*. *Vide* Lobeck's *Phryn.*, p. 44, and Fritzsche.—**χρηματισθεὶς τῆς Γαλιλαίας**: again oracular counsel given in a dream, implying again mental perplexity and need of guidance. Going to Galilee, Judaea being out of the question, was not a matter of course, as we should have expected. The narrative of the first Gospel appears to be constructed on the assumption that Nazareth was not the original home of the holy family, and to represent a tradition for which Nazareth was the adopted home, Bethlehem being the original. "The evangelist did not know that Nazareth was the original seat of the family." Weiss, Matt. evang., p. 98.

Ver. 23. **κατῴκησεν. κατοικεῖν** in Sept. is used regularly for יָשַׁב in the sense of to dwell, and with **ἐν** in Luke and Acts (Luke xiii. 4; Acts i. 20, etc.) in the same sense. Here with **εἰς** it seems to mean going to settle in, adopting as a home, the district of Galilee, the particular town called Nazareth.—**εἰς πόλιν** is to be taken along with **κατῳ.** not with **ἐλθών**. Arrived in Galilee he transferred his family to Nazareth, as afterwards Jesus migrated to Capernaum to carry on there His ministry (iv. 13, where the same form of expression recurs).—**Ναζαρέτ**, a town in lower Galilee, in the tribe of Zebulon, nowhere mentioned in O. T. or Josephus. —**ὅπως πληρωθῇ**, etc.: a final prophetic reference winding up the history of the infancy. **ὅπως** not **ἵνα**, as usual, but with much the same meaning. It does not necessarily imply that a prophetic oracle consciously influenced Joseph in making his choice, but only that the evangelist saw in that choice a fulfilment of prophecy. But what prophecy? The reference is vague, not to any particular prophet, but to the prophets in general. In no one place can any such statement be found. Some have suggested that it occurred in some prophetic book or oracle no longer extant. "Don't ask," says Euthy. Zig., "in what prophets; you will not find: many prophetic books were lost" (after Chrys.). Olearius, in an elaborate note, while not adopting, states with evident sympathy this view as held by others. Jerome, following the Jewish scholars (eruditi Hebraeorum) of his time, believed the reference to be mainly to Isaiah xi., where mention is made of a branch (נֵצֶר) that shall

1 with εἰς. Ch. iv. 23. Acts vii. 4 (ἐν).

Γαλιλαίας, 23. καὶ ἐλθὼν [1] κατῴκησεν εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ [1] ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, Ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται

[1] This spelling is found in ℵBDL and adopted by W.H. **Ναζαρεθ** in CΣ. Other forms occur.

spring out of Jesse's root. This view is accepted by most modern scholars, Catholic and Protestant, the name of the town being viewed as a derivative from the Hebrew word (a feminine form). The epithet **Ναζωραῖος** will thus mean: "the man of Nazareth, the town of the offshoot". De Wette says: "In the spirit of the exegetical mysticism of the time, and applying what the Jews called *Midrasch*, deeper investigation, the word is used in a double sense in allusion at once to נֵצֶר, Isaiah xi. 1, *sprout*, and to the name of Nazareth". There may be something in the suggestion that the reference is to Judges xiii. 7: **ὅτι Ναζιραῖον θεοῦ ἔσται**, and the idea: one living apart in a secluded town. (So Furrer in *Die Bedentung der bibl. Geographie für d. bib. Exegese*, p. 15.)

This final prophetic reference in the history of the infancy is the weakest link in the chain. It is wasted effort to try to show its value in the prophetic argument. Instead of doing this, apologists would act more wisely by frankly recognising the weakness, and drawing from it an argument in favour of historicity. This may very legitimately be done. Of all the incidents mentioned in this chapter, the settlement in Nazareth is the only one we have other means of verifying. Whether it was the original or the adopted home of Jesus may be doubtful, but from many references in the Gospels we know that it was His home from childhood till manhood. In this case, therefore, we certainly know that the historic fact suggested the prophetic reference, instead of the prophecy creating the history. And the very weakness of the prophetic reference in this instance raises a presumption that that was the nature of the connection between prophecy and history throughout. It is a caveat against the critical theory that in the second chapter of Matthew we have an imaginary history of the infancy of Jesus, compiled to meet a craving for knowledge on the subject, and adapted to the requirements of faith, the rudiments of the story consisting of a collection of Messianic prophecies—the star of Jacob, princes bringing gifts, Rachel weeping for her children, etc. The last of the prophetic references would never have occurred to any one, whether the evangelist or any other unknown source of the tradition, unless there had been a fact going before, the settlement in Nazareth. But given the fact, there was a strong desire to find some allusion to it in the O. T. Faith was easily satisfied; the faintest allusion or hint would do. That was in this case, and presumably in most cases of the kind, the problem with which the Christian mind in the Apostolic age was occupied: not creating history, but discovering in evangelic facts even the most minute, prophetic fulfilments. The evangelist's idea of fulfilment may provoke a smile, but it might also awaken a feeling of thankfulness in view of what has been stated. It is with the prophetic references in the Gospels as with songs without words. The composer has a certain scene or state of mind in his view, and writes under its inspiration. But you are not in his secret, and cannot tell when you hear the music what it means. But let the key be given, and immediately you find new meaning in the music. The prophecies are the music; the key is the history. Given the prophecies alone and you could with difficulty imagine the history; given the history you can easily understand how religious fancy might discover corresponding prophecies. That the prophecies, once suggested, might react on the facts and lead to legendary modifications is of course not to be denied.

CHAPTER III. THE MINISTRY OF THE BAPTIST, AND THE BAPTISM OF JESUS. This chapter and part of the next, containing the narrative of the temptation (iv. 1-11), form the prelude to the public ministry of Jesus. John, of whom we have not heard before, appears as consecrating Jesus to His Messianic calling by baptism, and from the baptism Jesus passes to the scene of moral trial. In what year of Christ's life these events happened is not indicated. The new narrative begins with the vague phrase,

III. 1. [a] Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις [a] ἐκείναις [b] παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής, [c] κηρύσσων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ[1] λέγων, 2. "Μετανοεῖτε· [d] ἤγγικε γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν." 3. Οὗτος

a *Cf.* Ex. ii. 11, 23. Is. xxxviii. 1. b *Cf.* Heb. ix. 11 for same absolute use. c passim in Mt. Mk. & Lk. in ref. to the kingdom of God. *Cf.* Ex. xxxii. 5. d *Cf.* ἐγγίζομεν, Heb. vii. 19, and ἔγγυος, ver. 22 (= one who keeps us near to God).

[1] καὶ omitted in ℵB and Egypt. verss.

"in those days". But it is obvious from the contents that Jesus has now reached manhood; His thoughts and experiences are those of mature years. From childhood to manhood is an absolute blank in our Gospel. The evangelist gives a genesis of Christ's body, but no genesis of His mind. As we see it in the sequel, it is a miracle of wisdom. It too, doubtless, had its genesis and history, but they are not given or even hinted at. Christ is ushered on the scene an unexplained prodigy. One would like to know how He reached this unprecedented height of wisdom and grace (Luke ii. 52). The only possible source of knowledge is reasoning back from the outcome in the full-grown man. Jesus *grew*, and the final result may reveal in part the means and process of growth. The anti-Pharisaic spirit and clean-cut descriptions of Pharisaic ways imply antecedent study, perhaps in Rabbinical schools. The parables may not have been so *extempore* as they seem, but may be the ripe fruit of long brooding thought, things new and yet old.

Vv. 1-6. *John the Baptist appears* (Mark i. 1-6, Luke iii. 1-6). Ver. 1. **ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις**: the time when most vaguely indicated. Luke's narrative here (iii. 1) presents a great contrast, as if with conscious intent to supply a want. John's ministry is there dated with reference to the general history of the world, and Christ's age at His baptism is given. Luke's method is more satisfactory in a historical point of view, but Matthew's manner of narration is dramatically effective. He passes abruptly to the new theme, and leaves you to guess the length of the interval. A similarly indefinite phrase occurs in the story of Moses (Ex. ii. 11). There has been much discussion as to what period of time the evangelist had in view. Some say none, except that of the events to be related. "In those days," means simply, "in the days when the following events happened" (so Euthy. Zig.). Others suggest explanations based on the relation of our Gospel to its sources, *e.g.*, use of a source in which more was told about John, or anticipation of Mark i. 9, where the phrase is used in reference to Christ's coming to be baptised. Probably the best course is to take it as referring back from the apostolic age to the great creative epoch of the evangelic history = "In those memorable years to which we look back with wistful reverent gaze".—**παραγίνεται ὁ Ι.**: John appears on the stage of history—historical present, used "to give a more animated statement of past events" (Goodwin's Syntax, p. 11). John **ὁ βαπτιστὴς**, well known by this epithet, and referred to under that designation by Josephus (Antiq., xviii. 5, 2, on which *vide* Schürer; *Jewish History*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 23). Its currency naturally suggests that John's baptism was partly or wholly an originality, not to be confounded with proselyte baptism, which perhaps did not even exist at that time.—**κηρύσσων**, *preaching* as well as baptising, heralding the approach of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, standing especially in N. T. for proclamation of the good news of God, distinct from **διδάσκων** (iv. 23); a solemn word for a momentous matter.—**ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τ. Ἰουδαίας**: scene of the ministry, the pasture lands lying between the central range of hills and the Jordan and the Dead Sea, not all belonging to Judaea, but of the same character; suitable scene for such a ministry.

Ver. 2. **λέγων** introduces the burden of his preaching.—**μετανοεῖτε**. *Repent*. That was John's great word. Jesus used it also when He began to preach, but His distinctive watchword was *Believe*. The two watchwords point to different conceptions of the kingdom. John's kingdom was an object of awful dread—Jesus' of glad welcome. The message of the one was legal, of the other evangelic. Change of mind John deemed very necessary as a preparation for Messiah's advent.—**ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν**. The *Kingdom of Heaven*. This title is peculiar to Matthew. In the other Gospels it is called the *Kingdom of God*. Not used either by John or by

γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς ὑπὸ[1] Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, "[e]Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, 'Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου· εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς [f]τρίβους αὐτοῦ.'" 4. Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶχε τὸ [g]ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου, καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ· ἡ δὲ τροφὴ αὐτοῦ ἦν[2] [h]ἀκρίδες καὶ μέλι [i]ἄγριον.

e Is. xl. 3. f here and in parall. in sense of a worn path (τρίβω). g Ch. xxii. 11, xxviii. 3; clothing generally in Mt. vi. 25, 28. h Mk. i. 6. Rev. ix. 3, 7. i Mk. i. 6. Jude 13 (fierce).

[1] υπο here as in ii. 17 instead of δια in ℵBCD.

[2] αυτου after ην in ℵBCD. The T. R. is suspiciously smooth.

Jesus, says Weiss, but to be ascribed to the evangelist. There does not seem to be any urgent reason for this judgment. In Daniel ii. 44 the kingdom is spoken of as to be set up by "the God of heaven," and in the Judaistic period previous to the Christian era, when a transcendent conception of God began to prevail, the use of heaven as a synonym for God came in. Custom might cause it to be employed, even by those who did not sympathise with the conception of God as transcendent, outside and far off from the world (*vide* note in H. C., p. 55).

Ver. 3. **οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν**, etc.: the evangelist here speaks. He finds in John the man of prophecy who proclaims in the desert the near advent of Jehovah coming to deliver His people. He quotes *Isaiah* only. Mark (i. 2) quotes *Malachi* also, identifying John, not only with the voice in the desert, but with Elijah. Isaiah's herald is not merely a type of John in the view of the evangelist; the two are identical. The quotation follows the Sept., except that for **τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν** is substituted **αὐτοῦ**. Note where Matthew stops. Luke, the universalist, goes on to the end of the oracle. The mode of introducing the prophetic citation is peculiar. "This is he," not "that it might be fulfilled". Weiss (Meyer) thinks this an indication that the passage is taken from "the apostolic source".

Ver. 4. **αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ι.** The story returns to the historical person, John, and identifies him with the herald of prophecy. "This same John." Then follows a description of his way of life—his clothing and his food, the details conveying a life-like picture of the manner of the man: his habits congruous to his vocation.—**τὸ ἔνδυμα ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου**: his characteristic (**αὐτοῦ**) piece of clothing was a rough rude garment woven out of camel's hair, not as some have thought, a camel's skin. We read in Heb. xi. 37, of sheep skins and goat skins worn by some of God's saints, but not of camel skins. Fritzsche takes the opposite view, and Grotius. Euthy., following Chrysostom, says: "Do not ask who wove his garment, or whence he got his girdle; for more wonderful is it that he should live from childhood to manhood in so inhospitable a climate". John took his fashion in dress from Elijah, described (2 Kings i. 8) as "an hairy man, and girt with a girdle of leather about his loins". It need not be doubted that the investment is historical, not a legendary creation, due to the opinion that John was Elijah redivivus. The imitation in dress does not imply a desire to pass for Elijah, but expresses similarity of mood.—**ἡ δὲ τροφὴ**: his diet, as poor as his clothing, was mean.—**ἀκρίδες**: the last of four kinds of edible locusts named in Lev. xi. 22 (Sept.), still it seems used by the poor in the east; legs and wings stripped off, and the remainder boiled or roasted. "The Beduins of Arabia and of East Jordan land eat many locusts, roasted, boiled or baked in cakes. In Arabia they are sold in the market. They taste not badly" (Benzinger, *Hebraische Archäologie*). Euthy. reports to the same effect as to his own time: many eat it in those parts **τεταριχευμένον** (pickled). Not pleasant food, palatable only to keen hunger. If we may trust Epiphanius, the Ebionites, in their aversion to animal food, grudged the Baptist even that poor diet, and restricted him to cakes made with honey (**ἐγκρίδας ἐν μελίτι**), or to honey alone. *Vide* Nicholson's *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, p. 34, and the notes there. Also Suicer's *Thesaurus*, sub. v. **ἀκρίς**.—**μέλι ἄγριον**. Opinion is divided between *bee* honey and *tree* honey, *i.e*, honey made by wild bees in trees or holes in the rocks, or a liquid exuding from palms and fig trees. (On this also consult Nicholson, *Gospel of Hebrews*, p. 35.) Both were used as food, but our decision should incline to

5. Τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία [j] καὶ πᾶσα ἡ [j] περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· 6. καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο [1] ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ [2] ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, [k] ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. 7. Ἰδὼν δὲ πολλοὺς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα αὐτοῦ,[3] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "[l] Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς [m] ὑπέδειξεν

j Gen. xiii. 10 (same phrase). Mt. xiv. 35. Mk. i. 28 *al.*

k here and in Mk. i. 5 = to confess sin. Similar sense in Acts xix. 18. James v. 16.

l Ch. xii. 34; xxiii. 33. Lk. iii. 7.

m Lk. iii. 7 (same const. and sense).

[1] Some copies (C[2] 33) have παντες after εβαπτ.

[2] ℵBCΔ *al.* have ποταμω after Ιορ. which the scribes may have omitted as superfluous.

[3] αυτου omitted in ℵB and by Origen.

vegetable honey, on the simple ground that it was the poorer food. Bee honey was a delicacy, and is associated with milk in Scripture in descriptions of a fertile land. The vegetable product would suit best John's taste and state. "Habitatori solitudinis congruum est, non delicias ciborum, sed necessitatem humanae carnis explere." Jerome.

Vv. 5-6. *Effects of John's preaching.* Remarkable by his appearance, his message, and his moral intensity, John made a great impression. They took him for a prophet, and a prophet was a novelty in those days. His message appealed to the common Messianic hope, and proclaimed fulfilment to be at hand.—Τότε, *then*, general note of time, frequent in this Gospel—ἐξεπορεύετο imperfect, denoting continued action. The movement of course was gradual. It began on a small scale and steadily grew till it reached colossal dimensions. Each evangelist, in his own way, bears witness to this. Luke speaks of crowds (iii. 7), Mark and Matthew give graphic particulars, similar, but in diverse order. "All Judaea and all the Jerusalemites," says Mark. Jerusalem, Judaea and the Jordan country, Matthew. The historical order was probably the reverse of that in Matthew's narrative. First came those from the surrounding country—people living near the Jordan, on either side, in what is now called El. Ghor. Then the movement extended in widening circles into Judaea. Finally it affected conservative, disdainful Jerusalem, slow to be touched by new popular influences—Ἱεροσόλυμα, the Greek form here as in ii. 3, and generally in this Gospel. It is not said *all* Jerusalem, as in Mark. The remarkable thing is that any came from that quarter. Standing first, and without the "all," the reference means *even* Jerusalem. The πᾶσα in the other two clauses is of course an exaggeration. It implies, not that every human being went to the Jordan, but that the movement was *general*. The evangelist expresses himself just as we should do in a similar case. Πᾶς with the article means "the whole," without "every".—Ver. 6. καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο, the imperfect again. They were baptised as they came—ἐν τῷ Ἰορ. ποταμῷ. The word ποταμῷ, omitted in T. R., by all means to be retained. Dull prosaic scribes might deem it superfluous, as all men knew the Jordan was a river, but there is a touch of nature in it which helps us to call up the scene.—ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, by him, the one man. John would not want occupation, baptising such a crowd, one by one.—ἐξομολογούμενοι: confession was involved in the act of submitting to baptism at the hands of one whose preaching had for its burden, Repent. But there was explicit confession, frank, full (ἐκ intensifies), on the part of guilt-burdened men and women glad to get relief so. General or special confession? Probably both, now one, now the other, according to idiosyncrasy and mood. Confession was not exacted as a *conditio sine qua non* of baptism, but voluntary. The participle means, while confessing; not, provided they confessed. This confession of sins by individuals was a new thing in Israel. There was a collective confession on the great day of atonement, and individual confession in certain specified cases (Numb. v. 7), but no great spontaneous self-unburdenment of penitent souls—every man apart. It must have been a stirring sight.

Vv. 7-10. *Words of rebuke and warning to unwelcome vistors* (Luke iii. 7-9). Ver. 7. Ἰδὼν δὲ, etc.: among those who visited the Jordan were some, not a few, many indeed (πολλοὺς) of the

ὑμῖν [n] φυγεῖν ἀπὸ [o] τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; 8. ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀξίους [1] τῆς μετανοίας· 9. καὶ μὴ [p] δόξητε [q] λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς,

n *Cf.* Is xlviii. 20. Mk. xvi. 8. o for the idea of "the coming wrath," *vide* Rom. ii. 5. 1 Thess. i. 10. p Ch. vi. 7; xxvi. 53. q Ch. ix. 21. Lk. iii. 8. *Cf.* Ps. iv. 5; x. 6; xiv. 1.

[1] **καρπον αξιον** in ℵBCD and many other uncials. The reading in T. R. (found in L) may have come in from Lk. iii. 8, where it is undisputed.

Pharisees and Sadducees. The first mention of classes of whom the Gospels have much to say, the former being the legal precisians, virtuosi in religion, the latter the men of affairs and of the world, largely belonging to the sacerdotal class (consult Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*). Their presence at the scene of John's ministry is credible. Drawn doubtless by mixed motives, as persons of their type generally are, moral simplicity not being in their line; partly curious, partly fascinated, partly come to spy; in an ambiguous state of mind, neither decidedly in sympathy nor pronouncedly hostile. In any case they cannot remain indifferent to a movement so deep and widespread. So here they are; coming *to* (**ἐπὶ**) John's baptism, not to be baptised, nor coming *against*, as some (Olearius, *e.g.*) have thought, as if to put the movement down, but coming to witness the strange, novel phenomenon, and form their impressions. John did not make them welcome. His spirit was troubled by their presence. Simple, sensitive, moral natures instinctively shrink from the presence of insincerity, duplicity and craftiness.—**ἰδὼν**: how did they come under his observation? By their position in the crowd or on the outskirts of it, and by their aspect? How did he identify them as Pharisees and Sadducees? How did the hermit of the desert know there were such people? It was John's business to know all the moral characteristics of his time. These were the matters in which he took supreme interest, and he doubtless had means of informing himself, and took pains to do so. It may be assumed that he knew well about the *Essenes* living in his neighbourhood, by the shores of the Dead Sea, somewhat after his own fashion, and about the other two classes, whose haunts were the great centres of population. There might be Essenes too in the crowd, though not singled out, the history otherwise having no occasion to mention them.—**γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν**: sudden, irrepressible outburst of intense moral aversion. Why vipers? The ancient and mediæval interpreters (Chrysos., Aug., Theophy., Euthy.) had recourse in explanation to the fable of the young viper eating its mother's womb. The term ought rather to be connected with the following words about fleeing from the coming wrath. The serpents of all sorts lurking in the fields flee when the stubble is set on fire in harvest in preparation for the winter sowing. The Baptist likens the Pharisees and Sadducees to these serpents fleeing for their lives (Furrer in *Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, 1890). Professor G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 495, suggests the fires among the dry scrub, in the higher stretches of the Jordan valley, chasing before them the scorpions and vipers, as the basis of the metaphor. There is grim humour as well as wrath in the similitude. The emphasis is not on vipers but on *fleeing*. But the felicity of the comparison lies in the fact that the epithet suits very well. It implies that the Pharisees and Sadducees *are* fleeing. They have caught slightly the infection of repentance; yet John does not believe in its depth or permanence.—**τίς ὑπέδειξεν**: there is surprise in the question. Can it be possible that even you have learned to fear the approaching crisis? Most unlikely scholars.—**φυγεῖν ἀπὸ**: pregnant for "flee and escape from" (De Wette). The aorist points to possibility, going with verbs of hoping and promising in this sense (Winer, § xliv. 7 c.). The implied thought is that it is not possible = who encouraged you to expect deliverance? The aorist further signifies a momentary act: now or never.—**τῆς μελ. ὀργῆς**, the day of wrath impending, preluding the advent of the Kingdom. The idea of wrath was prominent in John's mind: the coming of the Kingdom an awful affair; Messiah's work largely a work of judgment. But he rose above ordinary Jewish ideas in this: they conceived of the judgment as concerning the heathen peoples; he thought of it as concerning the godless in Israel—Ver. 8. **ποιήσατε**

Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι δύναται ὁ Θεὸς [r] ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ. 10. ἤδη δὲ καὶ[1] ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ [r] ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν [s] ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται. 11. Ἐγὼ μὲν βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς[2] ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν· ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ [t] ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα

r *vide* ver. 8 and vii. 17-19; xiii. 26 *al.* *Cf.* Gen. i. 11.
s Ch. vii. 19; an eye, etc., v. 30; ἐκ τινος, Rom. xi. 24.
t Mk. i. 7. Lk. iii. 16. 1 Cor. xv. 9. 2 Cor. iii. 5 (=fit with inf.). 2 Cor. ii. 16 (πρός τι)

[1] **και** omitted in ℵBCDΔ and most modern editors.

[2] **βαπτιζω υμας** inverted in ℵB 1, 33.

οὖν, etc. "If, then, ye are in earnest about escape, produce fruit worthy of repentance; repentance means more than confession and being baptised." That remark might be applied to all that came, but it contained an innuendo in reference to the Pharisees and Sadducees that they were insincere even now. Honest repentance carries amendment along with it. Amendment is not expected in this case because the repentance is disbelieved in.—**καρπὸν**, collective, as in Gal. v. 22, fruit; the reading in T. R. is probably borrowed from Luke iii. 8. The singular is intrinsically the better word in addressing Pharisees who did good actions, but were not good. Yet John seems to have inculcated reformation in detail (Luke iii. 10-14). It was Jesus who proclaimed the inwardness of true morality. Fruit: the figure suggests that conduct is the outcome of essential character. Any one can do (**ποιήσατε**, *vide* Gen. i. 11) acts externally good, but only a good man can grow a crop of right acts and habits.

Vv. 9-10. *Protest and warning.* **καὶ μὴ δόξητε . . . τ. Ἀβραάμ**: the meaning is plain = do not imagine that having Abraham for father will do instead of repentance—that all children of Abraham are safe whatever betide. But the expression is peculiar: do not *think* to *say* within yourselves. One would have expected either: do not think within yourselves, or, do not say, etc. Wetstein renders: "ne animum inducite sic apud vosmet cogitare," with whom Fritzsche substantially agrees = do not presume to say, *cf.* Phil. iii. 4.—**πατέρα**, father, in the emphatic position = we have as father, Abraham; it is enough to be his children: the secret thought of all unspiritual Jews, Abraham's children only in the flesh. It is probable that these words (vv. 9, 10) were spoken at a different time, and to a different audience, not merely to Pharisees and Sadducees, but to the people generally. Vv. 7-12 are a very condensed summary of a preaching ministry in which many weighty words were spoken (Luke iii. 18), these being selected as most representative and most relevant to the purpose of the evangelist. Vv. 7-8 contain a word for the leaders of the people; vv. 9-10 for the people at large; vv. 11-12 a word to inquirers about the Baptist's own relation to the Messiah.—Ver. 10. **ἤδη δὲ ἡ ἀξίνη . . . κεῖται**: judgment is at hand. The axe has been placed (**κεῖμαι** = perfect passive of **τίθημι**) at the root of the tree to lay it low as hopelessly barren. This is the doom of every non-productive fruit tree.—**ἐκκόπτεται**, the present tense, expressive not so much of the usual practice (Fritzsche) as of the near inevitable event.—**μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν**, *in case* it produce not (**μὴ** conditional) *good* fruit, not merely fruit of some kind, degenerate, unpalatable.—**ε. πῦρ βάλλεται**, useless for any other purpose except to be firewood, as the wood of many fruit trees is.

Vv. 11, 12. *John defines his relation to the Messiah* (Mark i. 7-8; Luke iii. 15-17). This prophetic word would come late in the day when the Baptist's fame was at its height, and men began to think it possible he might be the Christ (Luke iii. 15). His answer to inquiries plainly expressed or hinted was unhesitating. No, not the Christ, there is a Coming One. He will be here soon. I have my place, important in its own way, but quite secondary and subordinate. John frankly accepts the position of herald and forerunner, assigned to him in ver. 3 by the citation of the prophetic oracle as descriptive of his ministry.—**ἐγὼ μὲν**, etc. **ἐγὼ** emphatic, but with the emphasis of subordination. My function is to baptise with *water*, symbolic of repentance.—**ὁ δὲ ο. μ. ἐρχόμενος.** He who is just coming (present participle). How did John know

u Lk. iii. 17. v Lk. iii. 17. w Ch. vi. 26; xiii. 30. Lk. xii. 18. Jer. l. 26. x Mk. ix. 43. Lk. iii. 17.

βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. 12. οὗ τὸ [u] πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ [v] διακαθαριεῖ τὴν ἅλωνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνάξει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν [w] ἀποθήκην,[1] τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ [x] ἀσβέστῳ."

[1] BL have **αυτου** after **αποθηκην** (W.H. marg.). L omits **αυτου** after **σιτον**.

the Messiah was just coming? It was an inference from his judgment on the moral condition of the time. Messiah was needed; His work was ready for Him; the nation was ripe for *judgment*. Judgment observe, for that was the function uppermost in his mind in connection with the Messianic advent. These two verses give us John's idea of the Christ, based not on personal knowledge, but on religious preconceptions. It differs widely from the reality. John can have known little of Jesus on the outer side, but he knew less of His spirit. We cannot understand his words unless we grasp this fact. Note the attributes he ascribes to the Coming One. The main one is *strength*—**ἰσχυρότερος** fully unfolded in the sequel. Along with strength goes *dignity*—**οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ**, etc. He is so great, august a personage, I am not fit to be His slave, carrying to and from Him for and after use His sandals (a slave's office in Judaea, Greece and Rome). An Oriental magnificent exaggeration.—**αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει**, returns to the Power of Messiah, as revealed in His work, which is described as a baptism, the better to bring out the contrast between Him and His humble forerunner.—**ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί.** Notable here are the words, **ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ**. They must be interpreted in harmony with John's standpoint, not from what Jesus proved to be, or in the light of St. Paul's teaching on the Holy Spirit, as the immanent source of sanctification. The whole baptism of the Messiah, as John conceives it, is a baptism of judgment. It has been generally supposed that the Holy Spirit here represents the grace of Christ, and the fire His judicial function; not a few holding that even the fire is gracious as purifying. I think that the grace of the Christ is not here at all. The **πνεῦμα ἅγιον** is a stormy wind of judgment; holy, as sweeping away all that is light and worthless in the nation (which, after the O. T. manner, is conceived of as the subject of Messiah's action, rather than the individual). The fire destroys what the wind leaves. John, with his wild prophetic imagination, thinks of three elements as representing the functions of himself and of Messiah: *water*, *wind*, *fire*. He baptises with water, in the running stream of Jordan, to emblem the only way of escape, amendment. Messiah will baptise with wind and fire, sweeping away and consuming the impenitent, leaving behind only the righteous. Possibly John had in mind the prophetic word, "our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away," Is. lxiv. 6; or, as Furrer, who I find also takes **πνεῦμα** in the sense of "wind," suggests, the "wind of God," spoken of in Is. xl. 7: the strong east wind which blights the grass (*Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft*, 1890). Carr, *Cambridge G. T.*, inclines to the same view, and refers to Is. xli. 16: "Thou shalt fan them, and the wind shall carry them away".

Ver. 12. This ver. follows up ver. 11, and explains the judicial action emblemed by wind and fire.—**οὗ τὸ πτύον ε. τ. χ. αὐτοῦ.** The construction is variously understood. Grotius takes it as a Hebraism for **ἐν οὗ χειρὶ τὸ πτύον**. Fritzsche takes **ἐν τ. χειρὶ αὐτοῦ** as epexegetical, and renders: "whose will be the fan, *viz.*, in His hand". Meyer and Weiss take **οὗ** as assigning a reason: "He (**αὐτὸς** of ver. 11) whose fan is in hand and who is therefore able to perform the part assigned to Him". Then follows an explanation of the *modus operandi*.—**διακαθαριεῖ** from **διακαθαρίζω**, late for classic **διακαθαίρω**. The idea is: He with His fan will throw up the wheat, mixed with the chaff, that the wind may blow the chaff away; He will then collect the straw, **ἄχυρον** (in Greek writers usually plural **τὰ ἄχυρα**, *vide* Grimm), and burn it with fire, and collect the wheat lying on the threshing floor and store it in His granary. So shall He thoroughly (**δια** intensifying) cleanse His floor. And the sweeping wind and the consuming fire are the emblems and measure of His power; stronger than mine, as the tempest and the devastating flames are mightier than the stream which I use as my element.—**ἅλων**, a place

13. Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην, τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. 14. ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης[1] [y] διεκώλυεν αὐτόν, λέγων, "Ἐγὼ [z] χρείαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ σὺ ἔρχῃ πρός με;" 15. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν,[2] "Ἄφες [a] ἄρτι· οὕτω γὰρ [b] πρέπον ἐστὶν ἡμῖν

y here only; for force of tense *cf.* Lk. i. 59. Acts vii. 16. z Ch. xiv. 16. John xiii. 10 (same const.). a John xiii. 37. 1 Cor. xiii. 12 (now, opp. to fut. time). b Heb. ii. 10. With acc. and inf., 1 Cor. xi. 13.

[1] **ιωαννης** omitted in ℵB sah. vers. (W.H. omit.)

[2] For **προς αυτον** B and it. vg. cop. versions have **αυτω**. Though weakly attested this reading accords best with the usage of the Evangelist. W.H. adopt it.

in a field made firm by a roller, or on a rocky hill top exposed to the breeze.—**ἀποθήκη** means generally any kind of store, and specially a grain store, often underground. Bleek takes the epithet **ἀσβέστῳ** applied to the fire as signifying: inextinguishable till all the refuse be consumed. It is usually understood absolutely.

Vv. 13-17. *Jesus appears, His baptism and its accompaniments* (Mark i. 9-11; Luke iii. 21-22). Ver. 13. **Τότε παρα. ὁ Ι. . . . Γαλιλαίας**: *then*, after John had described the Messiah, *appears on the scene*, **παραγίνεται**, the historical present again, as in ver. 1, with dramatic effect; *from Galilee*, where He has lived since childhood, *Jesus*, the real Christ; how widely different from the Christ conceived by the Baptist we know from the whole evangelic history. But shutting off knowledge gathered from other sources, we may obtain significant hints concerning the stranger from Galilee from the present narrative. He comes **ἐπὶ τὸν Ι. πρὸς τὸν Ἰωαν., τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ**. These words at once suggest a contrast between Jesus and the Pharisees and Sadducees. They came to the baptism as a phenomenon to be critically observed. Jesus comes *to* the Jordan (**ἐπὶ**), *towards* the Baptist (**πρὸς**) to enter into personal friendly relations with him (*vide* John i. 1, **πρὸς τὸν θεόν**), in order to be baptised by him (genitive of the infinitive expressing purpose). Jesus comes thoroughly in sympathy with John's movement, sharing his passion for righteousness, fully appreciating the symbolic significance of his baptism, and not only willing, but eager to be baptised; the Jordan in His mind from the day He leaves home. A very different person this from the leaders of Israel, Pharisaic or Sadducaic. But the sequel suggests a contrast also between Him and John himself.

Vv. 14-15. *John refuses*. It is instructive to compare the three synoptical evangelists in their respective narratives of the baptism of Jesus. Mark (i. 9) simply states the fact. Matthew reports perplexities created by the desire of Jesus to be baptised in the mind of John, and presumably in the minds of Christians for whom he wrote. Luke (iii. 21) passes lightly over the event in a participial clause, as if conscious that he was on delicate ground. The three narratives exhibit successive phases of opinion on the subject, a fact not without bearing on the dates and relations of the three Gospels. Matthew represents the intermediate phase. His account is intrinsically credible.—Ver. 14. **διεκώλυεν**: imperfect, pointing to a persistent (note the **διὰ**) but unsuccessful attempt to prevent. His reason was a feeling that if either was to be baptised the relation ought to be inverted. To understand this feeling it is not necessary to import a fully developed Messianic theology into it, imputing to the Baptist all that we believe concerning Jesus as the Christ and the sinless one. It is enough to suppose that the visitor from Galilee had made a profound moral impression on him by His aspect and conversation, and awakened thoughts, hopes, incipient convictions as to who He might be. Nor ought we to take too seriously the Baptist's statement: "I have need to be baptised of Thee". Hitherto he had had no thought of being baptised himself. He was the baptiser, not one feeling need to be baptised; the censor of sinners, not the sympathetic fellow-sinner. And just here lies the contrast between John and Jesus, and between the Christ of John's imagination and the Christ of reality. John was severe; Jesus was sympathetic. John was the baptiser of sinners; Jesus wished to be baptised, as if a sinner

c Lk. iii. 21. John i. 51. Acts x. 11 (with διὰ, Acts vii. 56).

πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην." Τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν. 16. Καὶ βαπτισθεὶς[1] ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέβη εὐθὺς[2] ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἰδού, [c] ἀνεῴχθησαν[3] αὐτῷ[4] οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδε τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ κατα

[1] βαπτισθεις δε in ℵBC vg. sah. cop.

[2] For ανεβη ευθυς ℵB have ευθυς ανεβη.

[3] B has ηνεωχθησαν.

[4] ℵB omit αυτω.

Himself, a brother of the sinful. In the light of this contrast we are to understand the baptism of Jesus. Many explanations of it have been given (for these, *vide* Meyer), mostly theological. One of the most feasible is that of Weiss (Matt.-Evan.), that in accordance with the symbolic significance of the rite as denoting death to an old life and rising to a new, Jesus came to be baptised in the sense of dying to the old natural relations to parents, neighbours, and earthly calling, and devoting Himself henceforth to His public Messianic vocation. The true solution is to be found in the ethical sphere, in the sympathetic spirit of Jesus which made Him maintain an attitude of solidarity with the sinful rather than assume the position of critic and judge. It was impossible for such an one, on the ground of being the Messiah, or even on the ground of sinlessness, to treat John's baptism as a thing with which He had no concern. Love, not a sense of dignity or of moral faultlessness, must guide His action. Can we conceive sinlessness being so conscious of itself, and adopting as its policy aloofness from sinners? Christ's baptism might create misunderstanding, just as His associating with publicans and sinners did. He was content to be misunderstood.

Ver. 15. The reasoning with which Jesus replies to John's scruples is characteristic. His answer is gentle, respectful, dignified, simple, yet deep.—**Ἄφες ἄρτι**—deferential, half-yielding, yet strong in its very gentleness. Does **ἄρτι** imply a tacit acceptance of the high position assigned to Him by John (Weiss-Meyer)? We may read that into it, but I doubt if the suggestion does justice to the feeling of Jesus.—**οὕτως γὰρ πρέπον**, a mild word when a stronger might have been used, because it refers to John as well as Jesus: fitting, becoming, congruous; *vide* Heb. ii. 10, where the same word is used in reference to the relation of God to Christ's sufferings. "It became Him."—**πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην**: this means more than meets the ear, more than could be explained to a man like John. The Baptist had a passion for righteousness, yet his conception of righteousness was narrow, severe, legal. Their ideas of righteousness separated the two men by a wide gulf which is covered over by this general, almost evasive, phrase: all righteousness or every form of it. The special form meant is not the mere compliance with the ordinance of baptism as administered by an accredited servant of God, but something far deeper, which the new era will unfold. John did not understand that love is the fulfilling of the law. But he saw that under the mild words of Jesus a very earnest purpose was hid. So at length he yielded—**τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτόν**.

Vv. 16, 17. *The preternatural accompaniments.* These have been variously viewed as meant for the people, for the Baptist, and for Jesus. In my judgment they concern Jesus principally and in the first place, and are so viewed by the evangelist. And as we are now making the acquaintance of Jesus for the first time, and desiring to know the spirit, manner, and vocation of Him whose mysterious birth has occupied our attention, we may confine our comments to this aspect. Applying the principle that to all objective supernatural experiences there are subjective psychological experiences corresponding, we can learn from the dove-like vision and the voice from heaven the thoughts which had been passing through the mind of Jesus at this critical period. These thoughts it most concerns us to know; yet it is just these thoughts that both believers and naturalistic unbelievers are in danger of overlooking; the one through regarding the *objective* occurrences as alone important, the other because, denying the objective element in the experience, they rush to the conclusion that there was no experience at all. Whereas the truth is that, whatever is to be said as to the objective element, the subjective at

βαῖνον ὡσεὶ [d] περιστεράν, καὶ [1] ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν. 17. καὶ ἰδού, φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα, "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ [e] εὐδόκησα." [2]

d Ch. x. 16; xxi. 12. Lk. ii. 24.
e Ch. xii. 18; xvii. 5. 1 Cor. x. 5. Heb. x. 38 (all with εν and dat.).

[1] אB omit και.

[2] אCL have ηυδοκ., which Tischendorf follows. W.H. as in T. R.

all events is real: the thoughts reflected and symbolised in the vision and the voice.

Ver. 16. εὐθὺς may be connected with βαπτισθεὶς, with ἀνέβη, or with ἠνεῴχθησαν in the following clause by a hyperbaton (Grotius). It is commonly and correctly taken along with ἀνέβη. But why say straightway ascended? Euthy. gives an answer which may be quoted for its quaintness: "They say that John had the people under water up to the neck till they had confessed their sins, and that Jesus having none to confess tarried not in the river". Fritzsche laughs at the good monk, but Schanz substantially adopts his view. There might be worse explanations.—καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεῴχθησαν, etc. When Jesus ascended out of the water the heavens opened and He (Jesus) saw the spirit of God descending as a dove coming upon Him. According to many interpreters, including many of the Fathers, the occurrence was of the nature of a vision, the appearance of a dove coming out of the heavens. ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐν φύσει περιστερᾶς, ἀλλ' ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς—Chrys. Dove-like: what was the point of comparison? Swift movement, according to some; soft gentle movement as it sinks down on its place of rest, according to others. The Fathers insisted on the qualities of the dove. Euthy. sums up these thus: φιλάνθρωπον γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἀνεξίκακον· ἀποστερούμενον γὰρ τῶν νεοσσῶν ὑπομένει, καὶ οὐδὲν ἧττον τοὺς ἀποστεροῦντας προσίεται. Καὶ καθαρώτατόν ἐστι, καὶ τῇ εὐωδίᾳ χαίρει. Whether the dove possesses all these qualities—philanthropy, patient endurance of wrong, coming lovingly to those who have robbed it of its young, purity, delight in sweet smells—I know not; but I appreciate the insight into the spirit of Christ which specifying such particulars in the emblematic significance of the dove implies. What is the O. T. basis of the symbol? Probably Gen. viii. 9, 10. Grotius hints at this without altogether adopting the view. Thus we obtain a contrast between John's conception of the spirit and that of Jesus as reflected in the vision. For John the emblem of the spirit was the stormy wind of judgment; for Jesus the dove with the olive leaf after the judgment by water was past.

Ver. 17. οὗτός ἐστιν: this is as if addressed to the Baptist; in Mk. i. 9, σὺ εἶ, as if addressed to Jesus.—ἐν ᾧ εὐδοκ: a Hebraism, חָפֵץ בְּ.—εὐδόκησα, aorist, either to express habitual satisfaction, after the manner of the Gnomic Aorist (*vide* Hermann's *Viger*, p. 169), or to denote the inner event = my good pleasure decided itself once for all for Him. So Schanz; *cf.* Winer, § 40, 5, on the use of the aorist. εὐδοκεῖν, according to Sturz, *De Dialecto Macedonica et Alexandrina*, is not Attic but Hellenistic. The voice recalls and in some measure echoes Is. xlii. 1, "Behold My servant, I uphold Him; My chosen one, My soul delights in Him. I have put My spirit upon Him." The title "Son" recalls Ps. ii. 7. Taking the vision, the voice, and the baptism together as interpreting the consciousness of Jesus before and at this time, the following inferences are suggested. (1) The mind of Jesus had been exercised in thought upon the Messianic vocation in relation to His own future. (2) The chief Messianic charism appeared to Him to be sympathy, love. (3) His religious attitude towards God was that of a Son towards a Father. (4) It was through the sense of sonship and the intense love to men that was in His heart that He discovered His Messianic vocation. (5) Prophetic texts gave direction to and supplied means of expression for His religious meditations. His mind, like that of John, was full of prophetic utterances, but a different class of oracles had attractions for Him. The spirit of John revelled in images of awe and terror. The gentler spirit of Jesus delighted in words depicting the ideal servant of God as clothed with meekness, patience, wisdom, and love.

CHAPTER IV. THE TEMPTATION, AND THE BEGINNING OF THE GALILEAN MINISTRY. It is in every way credible that the baptism of Jesus with its con-

IV. 1. Τότε ὁ[1] Ἰησοῦς [a] ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος, [b] πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. 2. καὶ [c] νηστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαρά-

a Lk. ii. 22; iv. 5. Acts ix. 39. Cf. Rom. x. 7. Heb. xiii. 20 (to lead up from the dead). b besides parall. 1 Cor. vii. 5. 1 Thess. iii. 5 (same sense). c Ch. vi. 18-20; ix. 14. Acts xiii. 2.

[1] B omits ο; bracketed in W.H.

nected incidents should be followed by a season of moral trial, or, to express it more generally, by a period of retirement for earnest thought on the future career so solemnly inaugurated. Retirement for prayer and meditation was a habit with Jesus, and it was never more likely to be put in practice than now. He had left home under a powerful impulse with the Jordan and baptism in view. The baptism was a decisive act. Whatever more it might mean, it meant farewell to the past life of obscurity and consecration to a new, high, unique vocation. It remained now to realise by reflection what this calling, to which He had been set apart by John and by heavenly omens, involved in idea, execution, and experience. It was a large, deep, difficult subject of study. Under powerful spiritual constraints Jesus had taken a great leap in the dark, if one may dare to say so. What wonder if, in the season of reflection, temptations arose to doubt, shrinking, regret, strong inclination to look back and return to Nazareth?

In this experience Jesus was alone inwardly as well as outwardly. No clear, adequate account could be given of it. It could only be faintly shadowed forth in symbol or in parable. One can understand how in one Gospel (Mk.) no attempt is made to describe the Temptation, but the fact is simply stated. And it is much more important to grasp the fact as a great reality in Christ's inner experience than to maintain anxiously the literal truth of the representation in Matt. and Luke. In the fight of faith and unbelief over the supernatural element in the story all sense of the inward psychological reality may be lost, and nothing remain but an external miraculous, theatrical transaction which utterly fails to impress the lesson that Jesus was veritably tempted as we are, severely and for a length of time, before the opening of His public career, in a representative manner anticipating the experiences of later date. All attempts to dispose summarily of the whole matter by reference to similar temptation *legends* in the case of other religious initiators like Buddha are to be deprecated. Nor should one readily take up with the theory that the detailed account of the Temptation in Matt. and Luke is simply a composition suggested by O. T. parallels or by reflection on the critical points in Christ's subsequent history. (So Holtzmann in H. C.) We should rather regard it as having its ultimate source in an attempt by Jesus to convey to His disciples some faint idea of what He had gone through.

Vv. 1-11. *The Temptation* (Mk. i. 12, 13; Luke iv. 1-13). Ver. 1. **Τότε**, then, implying close connection with the events recorded in last chapter, especially the descent of the Spirit.—**ἀνήχθη**, was led up, into the higher, more solitary region of the wilderness, the haunt of wild beasts (Mk. i. 13) rather than of men.—**ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος**. The divine Spirit has to do with our darker experiences as well as with our bright, joyous ones. He is with the sons of God in their conflicts with doubt not less than in their moments of noble impulse and heroic resolve. The same Spirit who brought Jesus from Nazareth to the Jordan afterward led Him to the scene of trial. The theory of desertion hinted at by Calvin and adopted by Olshausen is based on a superficial view of religious experience. God's Spirit is never more with a man than in his spiritual struggles. Jesus was mightily impelled by the Spirit at this time (*cf.* Mk.'s **ἐκβάλλει**). And as the power exerted was not physical but moral, the fact points to intense mental preoccupation.—**πειρασθῆναι**, to be tempted, not necessarily covering the whole experience of those days, but noting a specially important phase: to be tempted *inter alia*.—**πειράζω**, a later form for **πειράω**, in classic Greek, primary meaning to attempt, to try to do a thing (*vide* for this use Acts ix. 26, xvi. 7, xxiv. 6); then in an ethical sense common in O. T. and N. T., to try or tempt either with good or with bad intent, associated in some texts (*e.g.*, 2 Cor. xiii. 5) with **δοκιμάζω**, kindred in meaning. Note the omission of **τοῦ** before infinitive.—**ὑπὸ τ. διαβόλου**: in later Jewish theology the devil is the agent in all temptation with evil design. In the earlier period

κοντα[1] καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα,[2] ὕστερον ἐπείνασε. 3. καὶ προσελθὼν αὐτῷ[3] [d]ὁ πειράζων εἶπεν,[3] "Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰπὲ ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι ἄρτοι γένωνται." 4. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, "Γέγραπται, [e]'Οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται[4] ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ[5] παντὶ [e]ῥήματι [f]ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος Θεοῦ.'" 5. Τότε [f]παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν [g]ὁ διάβολος εἰς τὴν [g]ἁγίαν πόλιν, καὶ ἵστησιν[6] αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ

d ὁ πειρ. as a subst. in 1 Thess. iii. 5.
e Cf. Mk. ix. 32.
f Ch. xvii. 1.
g ἁ. π. again Ch. xxvii. 53. Rev. xi. 2.

[1] τεσσερ. both places in ℵBCL.

[2] τεσσαρ. before νυκτας in ℵD (Tisch.).

[3] ℵB omit this αυτω and ℵBD insert one after ειπεν (D with και before ειπεν).

[4] ℵBCD, etc., insert ο before ανθρωπος.

[5] CD have εν; επι in Sept. and retained by Tisch. and W.H.

[6] εστησεν in ℵBCDZ 1, 33, 209 (Tisch., W.H.). The reading in T. R. conforms to παραλαμβανει.

the line of separation between the divine and the diabolic was not so carefully defined. In 1 Sam. xxiv. 11 God tempts David to number the people; in 1 Chron. xxi. 1 it is Satan.—ver. 2. **καὶ νηστεύσας**. The fasting was spontaneous, not ascetic, due to mental preoccupation. In such a place there was no food to be had, but Jesus did not desire it. The aorist implies that a period of fasting preceded the sense of hunger. The period of forty days and nights may be a round number.—**ἐπείνασεν**, He at last felt hunger. This verb like **διψάω** contracts in **α** rather than **η** in later Greek. Both take an accusative in Matt. v. 6.

Vv. 3-4. *First temptation*, through hunger. Ver. 3. **προσελθὼν**, another of the evangelist's favourite words, implies that the tempter is conceived by the narrator as approaching outwardly in visible form.—**εἰπὲ ἵνα**: literally "speak in order that". Some grammarians see in this use of **ἵνα** with the subjunctive a progress in the later Macedonian Greek onwards towards modern Greek, in which **νά** with subjunctive entirely supersedes the infinitive. Buttmann (*Gram. of the N. T.*) says that the chief deviation in the N. T. from classic usage is that **ἵνα** appears not only after complete predicates, as a statement of design, but after incomplete predicates, supplying their necessary complements (*cf.* Mk. vi. 25, ix. 30). **εἰπὲ** here may be classed among verbs of commanding which take **ἵνα** after them.—**οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι**, these stones lying about, hinting at the desert character of the scene.—**ἄρτοι γεν.**, that the rude pieces of stone may be turned miraculously into loaves. Weiss (Meyer) disputes the usual view that the temptation of Jesus lay in the suggestion to use His miraculous power in His own behoof. He had no such power, and if He had, why should He not use it for His own benefit as well as other men's? He could only call into play by faith the power of God, and the temptation lay in the suggestion that His Messianic vocation was doubtful if God did not come to His help at this time. This seems a refinement. Hunger represents human wants, and the question was: whether Sonship was to mean exemption from these, or loyal acceptance of them as part of Messiah's experience. At bottom the issue raised was selfishness or self-sacrifice. Selfishness would have been shown either in the use of personal power or in the wish that God would use it.—Ver. 4. **ὁ δὲ ἀποκ. εἶπεν**: Christ's reply in this case as in the others is taken from Deuteronomy (viii. 3, Sept.), which seems to have been one of His favourite books. Its humane spirit with laws even for protecting the animals would commend it to His mind. The word quoted means, man is to live a life of faith in and dependence on God. Bread is a mere detail in that life, not necessary though usually given, and sure to be supplied *somehow*, as long as it is desirable. **Ζῆν ἐπὶ** is unusual, but good Greek (De Wette).

Vv. 5-7. *Second temptation*. **τότε παραλαμ. . . . τοῦ ἱεροῦ**: **τότε** has the force of "next," and implies a closer order of sequence than Luke's **καὶ** (iv. 5). **παραλαμβάνει**, historical present with dramatic effect; seizes hold of Him and carries Him to.—**τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν**: Jerusalem so named as if with affection (*vide* v. 35 and especially xxvii. 53, where the designation recurs).—**τὸ**

h here and in Lk. iv. 9.
i Ch. xvii. 9. Acts i. 2. Heb. xi. 20.
j Lk. x. 25. 1 Cor. x. 9.
k Ch. vi. 29. Lk. xii. 27.

[h] πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ λέγει[1] αὐτῷ, 6. "Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, βάλε σεαυτὸν κάτω· γέγραπται γάρ, 'Ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ [i] ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ, καὶ ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σοῦ.'" 7. Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Πάλιν γέγραπται, 'Οὐκ [j] ἐκπειράσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου.'" 8. Πάλιν παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν, καὶ δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν [k] δόξαν αὐτῶν, καὶ

[1] For λεγει Z has ειπεν.

πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ: some part of the temple bearing the name of "the winglet," and overhanging a precipice. Commentators busy themselves discussing what precisely and where it was.—Ver. 6. **βάλε σεαυτὸν κάτω**: This suggestion strongly makes for the symbolic or parabolic nature of the whole representation. The mad proposal could hardly be a temptation to such an one as Jesus, or indeed to any man in his senses. The transit through the air from the desert to the winglet, like that of Ezekiel, carried by a lock of his hair from Babylon to Jerusalem, must have been "in the visions of God" (Ezek. viii. 3), and the suggestion to cast Himself down a parabolic hint at a class of temptations, as the excuses in the parable of *the Supper* (Lk. xiv. 16) simply represent the category of *preoccupation*. What is the class represented? Not temptations through vanity or presumption, but rather to reckless escape from desperate situations. The second temptation, like the first, belongs to the category of *need*. The Satanic suggestion is that there can be no sonship where there are such inextricable situations, in proof of which the Psalter is quoted (Ps. xci. 11, 12).—**γέγραπται**, it stands written, not precisely as Satan quotes it, the clause **τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου** being omitted. On this account many commentators charge Satan with mutilating and falsifying Scripture.—Ver 7. Jesus replies by another quotation from Deut. (vi. 16).—**πάλιν**, on the other hand, not contradicting but qualifying: "Scriptura per scripturam interpretanda et concilianda," Bengel. The reference is to the incident at Rephidim (Ex. xvii. 1-7), where the people virtually charged God with bringing them out of Egypt to perish with thirst, the scene of this petulant outburst receiving the commemorative name of Massah and Meribah because they tempted Jehovah, saying: "Is Jehovah among us or not?" An analogous situation in the life of Jesus may be found in *Gethsemane*, where He did not complain or tempt, but uttered the submissive, "If it be possible". The leap down at that crisis would have consisted in seeking escape from the cross at the cost of duty. The physical fall from the pinnacle is an emblem of a moral fall. Before passing from this temptation I note that the hypothesis that it was an appeal to vanity presupposes a crowd at the foot to witness the performance, of which there is no mention.

Vv. 8-10. *Third temptation.* **εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν**, a mountain high enough for the purpose. There is no such mountain in the world, not even in the highest ranges, "not to be sought for in terrestrial geography," says De Wette. The vision of all the kingdoms and their glory was not physical.—**τοῦ κόσμου**. What world? Palestine merely, or all the world, Palestine excepted? or all the world, Palestine included? All these alternatives have been supported. The last is the most likely. The second harmonises with the ideas of contemporary Jews, who regarded the heathen world as distinct from the Holy Land, as belonging to the devil. The tempter points in the direction of a universal Messianic empire, and claims power to give effect to the dazzling prospect.—Ver. 9. **ἐὰν πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃς μοι.** This is the condition, homage to Satan as the superior. A naïve suggestion, but pointing to a subtle form of temptation, to which all ambitious, self-seeking men succumb, that of gaining power by compromise with evil. The danger is greatest when the end is *good*. "The end sanctifies the means." Nowhere is homage to Satan more common than in connection with sacred causes, the interests of truth, righteousness, and God. Nothing tests purity of motive so thoroughly as tempta-

λέγει[1] αὐτῷ, 9. "Ταῦτα πάντα σοι[2] δώσω, ἐὰν πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃς μοι." 10. Τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[l]Ὕπαγε,[3] Σατανᾶ· γέγραπται γάρ, 'Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου [m]προσκυνήσεις, καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ [n]λατρεύσεις.'" 11. Τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος· καὶ ἰδού, ἄγγελοι προσῆλθον καὶ [o]διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

12. ΑΚΟΥΣΑΣ δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς[4] ὅτι Ἰωάννης [p]παρεδόθη, ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· 13. καὶ [q]καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρέτ, ἐλθὼν κατῴκησεν εἰς Καπερναοὺμ[5] τὴν [r]παραθαλασσίαν, ἐν ὁρίοις

l very freq. in N. T. always intrans.
m with acc. here and in Lk. iv. 8, and in Rev.
n Lk. i. 74; ii. 37; iv. 8.
o Mk. i. 13.
p Ch. x. 19. Mk. i. 14.
q Heb. xi. 27.
r here only in N. T., in Sept. (*e.g.*, 2 Chron. viii. 17).

[1] ℵBCDZ have **ειπεν** (most mod. edd.).

[2] **παντα σοι** tr. ℵBCZ with several cursives.

[3] Some MSS. (DLZ) insert **οπισω μου**, obviously imported from xvi. 23.

[4] **ο Ι.** omit ℵBCDZ; probably the insertion is due to ver. 12 commencing a lesson in Lectionaries.

[5] This name is spelt **καφαρ.** in the older MSS. (ℵBDZ), which is adopted throughout by W.H.

tions of this class. Christ was proof against them. The prince of the world found nothing of this sort in Him (John xiv. 30). In practice this homage, if Jesus had been willing to render it, would have taken the form of conciliating the Pharisees and Sadducees, and pandering to the prejudices of the people. He took His own path, and became a Christ, neither after the type imagined by the Baptist, nor according to the liking of the Jews and their leaders. So He gained universal empire, but at a great cost.—Ver. 10. **ὕπαγε σατανᾶ.** Jesus passionately repels the Satanic suggestion. The **ὕπαγε σ.** is true to His character. The suggestions of worldly wisdom always roused in Him passionate aversion. The **ὀπίσω μου** of some MSS. does not suit this place; it is imported from Matt. xvi. 23, where it does suit, the agent of Satan in a temptation of the same sort being a disciple. Christ's final word to the tempter is an absolute, peremptory Begone. Yet He condescends to support His authoritative negative by a Scripture text, again from Deut. (vi. 13), slightly adapted, **προσκυνήσεις** being substituted for **φοβηθήσῃ** (the **μόνῳ** in second clause is omitted in Swete's Sept.). It takes the accusative here instead of dative, as in ver. 9, because it denotes worship proper (Weiss-Meyer). The quotation states a principle in theory acknowledged by all, but how hard to work it out faithfully in life!

Ver. 11. **τότε ἀφίησιν**: Then, when the peremptory **ὕπαγε** had been spoken. Nothing was to be made of one who would not do evil that good might come.—**καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελοι.** The angels were ministering to Him with food, presumably, in the view of the evangelist. It might be taken in a wider sense as signifying that angels ministered constantly to one who had decidedly chosen the path of obedience in preference to that of self-pleasing.

Vv. 12-25. *Beginnings of the Galilean ministry* (Mk. i. 14, 15; Lk. iv. 14, 15). In a few rapid strokes the evangelist describes the opening of the Messianic work of Jesus in Galilee. He has in view the great Sermon on the Mount, and the group of wonderful deeds he means thereafter to report, and he gives first a summary description of Christ's varied activities by way of introduction.

Vv. 12, 13. **ἀκούσας δὲ . . . Γαλιλαίαν**: note of time. Jesus returned to Galilee on hearing that John was delivered up, *i.e.*, in the providence of God, into the hands of his enemies. Further particulars as to this are given in chapter xiv. Christ's ministry in Galilee began when the Baptist's came to an end; how long after the baptism and temptation not indicated. Weiss (Meyer) thinks that in the view of the evangelist it was immediately after, and that the reference to John's imprisonment is meant simply to explain the choice of Galilee as the sphere of labour.—Ver. 13. **Ναζαρέτ.** Jesus naturally went to Nazareth first, but He did not tarry there.—**κατῴκησεν εἰς Καπερναοὺμ.** He went to settle (as in ii. 23) in Capernaum. This migration to

Ζαβουλὼν καὶ Νεφθαλείμ, 14. ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, 15. "Γῆ Ζαβουλὼν καὶ γῆ Νεφθαλείμ, [s] ὁδὸν θαλάσσης πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν, 16. ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει [1] εἶδε φῶς [2] μέγα, καὶ τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ [t] σκιᾷ θανάτου, φῶς [u] ἀνέτειλεν αὐτοῖς."

17. Ἀπὸ τότε [v] ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς κηρύσσειν καὶ λέγειν, "Μετανοεῖτε· ἤγγικε γὰρ [3] ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν." 18. Περιπατῶν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς [4] [w] παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδε δύο ἀδελφούς, Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντας

s Ch. x. 5.
t Lk. i. 79.
u Ch. xiii. 6. Mk. xvi. 2. James i. 11 (all intrans.).
v Ch. xi. 7, 20; xii. 1. Mk. iv. 1. Lk. iii. 8 *et al.* (on force of this word *vide* Grimm's *Lex.*).
w again xiii. 1. Mk. v. 21. *Cf.* Acts x. 6.

[1] **σκοτια**, BD.

[2] **φως** before **ειδεν** in ℵBCΣ (W.H.).

[3] The Syr. Cur. (Baethgen) omits **μετανοειτε** before **ηγγικε γαρ.**

[4] **ο I.** found in ELΔ; omit ℵBCD (beginning of a new lesson).

Capernaum is not formally noted in the other Gospels, but Capernaum appears in all the synoptists as the main centre of Christ's Galilean ministry. — **τὴν παραθαλασσίαν**, etc.: sufficiently defined by these words, "on the sea (of Galilee), on the confines of Zebulun and Naphthali". Well known then, now of doubtful situation, being no longer in existence. Tel Hûm and Khan Minyeh compete for the honour of the site. The evangelist describes the position not to satisfy the curiosity of geographers, but to pave the way for another prophetic reference.

Vv. 14-16. Jesus chose Capernaum as best suited for His work. There He was in the heart of the world, in a busy town, and near others, on the shore of a sea that was full of fish, and on a great international highway. But the evangelist finds in the choice a fulfilment of prophecy—**ἵνα πληρωθῇ**. The oracle is reproduced from Is. viii. 22, ix. 1, freely following the original with glances at the Sept. The style is very laconic: land of Zebulun and land of Naphthali, way of the sea (**ὁδὸν** absolute accusative for דֶּרֶךְ = *versus*, *vide* Winer, § 23), Galilee of the Gentiles, a place where races mix, a border population. The clause preceding, "beyond Jordan," is not omitted, because it is viewed as a reference to Peraea, also a scene of Christ's ministry.—Ver. 16. **ἐν σκοτίᾳ**, the darkness referred to, in the view of the evangelist, is probably that caused by the imprisonment of the Baptist (Fritzsche). The consolation comes in the form of a greater light, **φῶς μέγα**, great, even the greatest. The thought is emphasised by repetition and by enhanced description of the benighted situation of those on whom the light arises: "in the very home and shadow of death"; highly graphic and poetic, not applicable, however, to the cities of the plain more than to other parts of the land; descriptive of misery rather than of sin.

Ver. 17. **ἀπὸ τότε . . . κηρύσσειν**: After settling in Capernaum Jesus began to preach. The phrase **ἀπὸ τότε** offends in two ways, first as redundant, being implied in **ἤρξατο** (De Wette); next as not classic, being one of the degeneracies of the **κοινή**. Phrynichus forbids **ἐκ τότε,** and instructs to say rather **ἐξ ἐκείνου** (Lobeck's ed., p. 45)—**κηρύσσειν**, the same word as in describing the ministry of the Baptist (iii. 1). And the message is the same—**Μετανοεῖτε**, etc. "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The same in *word* but not in *thought*, as will appear soon. It may seem as if the evangelist meant to represent Jesus as simply taking up and continuing the arrested ministry of the Baptist. So He was in form and to outward appearance, but not in spirit. From the very first, as has been seen even in connection with the baptism, there was a deep-seated difference between the two preachers. Even Euthy. Zig. understood this, monk though he was. Repent, he says, with John meant "in so far as ye have erred" = amendment; with Jesus, "from the old to the new" (**ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν καινήν**) = a change from within. For the evangelist this was the absolute beginning of Christ's

ˣἀμφίβληστρον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἦσαν γὰρ ʸἁλιεῖς.[1] 19. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "ᶻΔεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων." 20. Οἱ δὲ εὐθέως ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. 21. Καὶ προβὰς ἐκεῖθεν, εἶδεν ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς, Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ Ζεβεδαίου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν, καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς. 22. οἱ δὲ εὐθέως ἀφέντες τὸ πλοῖον καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

23. Καὶ ᵃπεριῆγεν ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[2] διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ

x here only in N. T.; verb in Mk. i. 16; in Sept.
y Mk. i. 16, 17. Lk. v. 2.
z Ch. xi. 28; xxv. 34.
a with ἐν here only (true text); with acc. of place ix. 35; xxiii. 15. Mk. vi. 6.

[1] ℵC have **αλεεις**, B **αλειεις**.

[2] ℵBC have **εν ολη τη Γαλιλαια**. The acc. (T. R. as in D, etc.) is the more usual construction, hence preferred by ancient revisers. B omits **ο Ιησους**.

ministry. He knows nothing of an earlier activity.

Vv. 18-22. *Call of four disciples.* The preceding very general statement is followed by a more specific narrative relating to a very important department of Christ's work, the gathering of disciples. Disciples are referred to in the Sermon on the Mount (v. 1), therefore it is meet that it be shown how Jesus came by them. Here we have simply a sample, a hint at a process always going on, and which had probably advanced a considerable way before the sermon was delivered. — **περιπατῶν δὲ**: **δὲ** simply introduces a new topic, the time is indefinite. One day when Jesus was walking along the seashore He saw two men, brothers, names given, by occupation fishers, the main industry of the locality, that tropical sea (500 feet below level of Mediterranean) abounding in fish. He saw them, may have seen them before, and they Him, and thought them likely men, and He said to them, ver. 19: **Δεῦτε . . . ἀνθρώπων.** From the most critical point of view a genuine saying of Jesus; the first distinctively individual word of the Galilean ministry as recorded by Matthew and Mark. Full of significance as a self-revelation of the speaker. Authoritative yet genial, indicating a poetic idealistic temperament and a tendency to figurative speech; betraying the rudiments of a plan for winning men by select men. **Δεῦτε** plural form of **δεῦρο** = **δεῦρ' ἴτε**, **δεῦρο** being an adverb of place with the force of command, a verb of commanding being understood: here! after me; imperial yet kindly, used again in Matt. xi. 28 with reference to the labouring and heavy-laden. **δεῦτε** and **ἁλιεῖς** (= sea-people) are samples of old poetic words revived and introduced into prose by later Greek writers.—Ver. 20. The effect was immediate: **εὐθέως ἀφέντες**. This seems surprising, and we naturally postulate previous knowledge in explanation. But all indications point to the uniquely impressive personality of Jesus. John felt it; the audience in the synagogue of Capernaum felt it on the first appearance of Jesus there (Mk. i. 27); the four fishermen felt it.—**δίκτυα, ἀμφίβληστρον** in ver. 18. In xiii. 47 occurs a third word for a net, **σαγήνη**; **δίκτυον** (from **δικεῖν**, to throw) is the general name; **ἀμφίβληστρον** (**ἀμφιβάλλω**), anything cast around, *e.g.*, a garment, more specifically a net thrown with the hand; **σαγήνη**, a sweep-net carried out in a boat, then drawn in from the land (*vide* Trench, Synonyms of N. T., § 64).—Ver. 21. **ἄλλους δύο**, another pair of brothers, James and John, sons of Zebedee, the four together an important instalment of the twelve. The first pair were casting their nets, the second were mending them, **καταρτίζοντες**, with their father. —Ver. 22. **οἱ δὲ εὐθέως ἀφέντες**. They too followed immediately, leaving nets, ship, and *father* (*vide* Mk. i. 20) behind.

Vv. 23-25. *Summary account of the Galilean ministry.* A colourless general statement serving as a mere prelude to chapters v.-ix. It points to a ministry in Galilee, varied, extensive, and far-famed, conceived by the evangelist as antecedent to the Sermon on the Mount; not necessarily covering a long period of time, though if the expression "teaching in their synagogues" be pressed it must imply a good many Sabbath days.

b Ch. ix. 35; x. 1. c Ch. xiv. 1; xxiv. 6. d Ch. viii. 16; ix. 12 al. e Lk. xvi. 23, 28. f Ch. xvii. 15.

θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν [b] μαλακίαν ἐν τῷ λαῷ. 24. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν [1] ἡ [c] ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν· καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς [d] κακῶς ἔχοντας, ποικίλαις νόσοις καὶ [e] βασάνοις συνεχομένους, καὶ [2] δαιμονιζομένους, καὶ [f] σεληνιαζομένους, καὶ παραλυτικούς· καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς. 25. καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας, καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

[1] So in BD (W.H.), ἐξῆλθεν in ℵC.
[2] BC omit και, which is in C²D. The force of και = and especially.

The ministry embraced three functions: **διδάσκων, κηρύσσων, θεραπεύων** (ver. 23), teaching, preaching, healing. Jesus was an evangelist, a master, and a healer of disease. Matt. puts the teaching function first in accordance with the character of his gospel. The first gospel is weak in the evangelistic element compared with the third: **διδαχή** is more prominent than **κήρυγμα**. The healing function is represented as exercised on a large scale: **πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν**, every form of disease and ailment. Euthy. Zig. defines **νόσος** as the chronic subversion of health (**ἡ χρονία παρατροπὴ τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἕξεως**), **μαλακία** as the weakness in which it begins (**ἀρχὴ χαυνώσεως σώματος, πρoάγγελος νόσου**). The subjects of healing are divided into two classes, ver. 24. They brought to Him **πάντας τ. κ. ἔχ. ποικίλαις νόσοις**, all who were afflicted with various diseases (such as fever, leprosy, blindness); also those **βασάνοις συνεχομένους**, seized with diseases of a tormenting nature, of which three classes are named—the **καὶ** in T. R. before **δαιμον.** is misleading; the following words are epexegetical: **δαιμονιζομένους, σεληνιαζομένους, παραλυτικούς** = demoniacs, epileptics (their seizures following the phases of the moon), paralytics. These forms of disease are graphically called torments. (**βάσανος**, first a touch-stone, lapis Lydius, as in Pindar, Pythia, x. 105: **Πειρῶντι δὲ καὶ χρυσὸς ἐν βασάνῳ πρέπει καὶ νόος ὀρθός**; then an instrument of torture to extract truth; then, as here, tormenting forms of disease.) The fame, **ἡ ἀκοή**, of such a marvellous ministry naturally spread widely, **εἰς ὅλην τὴν Συρίαν**, throughout the whole province to which Palestine belonged, among Gentiles as well as Jews. Crowds gathered around the wonderful Man from all quarters: west, east, north, south; Galilee, Decapolis on the eastern side of the lake, Jerusalem and Judaea, Peraea. With every allowance for the exaggeration of a popular account, this speaks to an extraordinary impression.

CHAPTERS V.-VII. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. This extended utterance of Jesus comes upon us as a surprise. Nothing goes before to prepare us to expect anything so transcendently great. The impression made on the Baptist, the people in Capernaum Synagogue (Mk. i. 27), and the four fishermen speak to wisdom, power, and personal charm, but not so as to make us take the sermon as a thing of course. Our surprise is all the greater that there is so little antecedent narrative. By an effort of imagination we have to realise that much went before—preaching, teaching, interviews with disciples, conflicts with Pharisees, only once mentioned hitherto (iii. 7), yet here the leading theme of discourse.

The sermon belongs to the *didache*, not to the *kerygma*. Jesus is here the Master, not the evangelist. He ascends the hill to get away from the crowds below, and the disciples, now become a considerable band, gather about Him. Others are not excluded, but the **μαθηταὶ** are the audience proper. The discourse may represent the teaching, not of a single hour or day, but of a period of retirement from an exciting, exhausting ministry below, and all over Galilee; rest being sought in variation of work, evangelist and teacher alternately. A better name for these chapters than the *Sermon on the Mount*, which suggests a *concio ad populum*, might be *The Teaching on the Hill*. It may be a combination of several lessons. One very outstanding topic is Pharisaic righteousness. Christ evidently made it His business in one of the hill lessons to define controversially His position in reference to the prevailing type of piety, which we may assume to have been to

V. 1. ΙΔΩΝ δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους [a] ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος· καὶ [b] καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ, προσῆλθον αὐτῷ [1] οἱ [c] μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· 2. καὶ [d] ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς, λέγων, 3. "[e] Μακάριοι οἱ [f] πτωχοὶ

a same phrase ch. xiv. 23; xv. 29. Mk. iii. 13.
b here and in xiii. 48. Mk. ix. 35. Lk. iv. 20 *al.*, intrans. also Heb. i. 3, trans. 1 Cor. vi. 4. Eph. ii. 6 (*συνεκ*).
c frequent in Gospp. and Acts, nowhere else in N. T.
d again in xiii. 35.
e Ch. xi. 6; xiii. 16. Lk. i. 45; x. 23.
f Ch. xi. 5. Lk. iv. 18.

[1] B omits αυτω; bracketed as doubtful in W.H.

Him a subject of long and careful study before the opening of His public career. The portions of the discourse which bear on that subject can be picked out, and others not relating thereto eliminated, and we may say if we choose that the resulting body of teaching is the Sermon on the Mount (so Weiss). Perhaps the truth is that these portions formed one of the lessons given to disciples on the hill in their holiday summer school. The Beatitudes might form another, instructions on prayer (vi. 7-15) a third, admonitions against covetousness and care (vi. 19-34) a fourth, and so on. As these chapters stand the various parts cohere and sympathise wonderfully so as to present the appearance of a unity; but that need not hinder us from regarding the whole as a skilful combination of originally distinct lessons, possessing the generic unity of the Teaching on the Hill. This view I prefer to that which regards the sermon as a compendium of Christ's whole doctrine (De Wette), or the *magna charta* of the kingdom (Tholuck), though there is a truth in that title, or as an ordination discourse in connection with the setting apart of the Twelve (Ewald), or in its original parts an anti-Pharisaic manifesto (Weiss-Meyer). For comparison of Matthew's version of the discourse with Luke's see notes on Lk. vi. 20-49.

Chap. v. 1-2. *Introductory statement by evangelist.* **Ἰδὼν δὲ . . . εἰς τὸ ὄρος.** Christ ascended the hill, according to some, because there was more room there for the crowd than below. I prefer the view well put by Euthy. Zig.: "He ascended the near hill, to avoid the din of the crowd (**θορύβους**) and to give instruction without distraction; for He passed from the healing of the body to the cure of souls. This was His habit, passing from that to this and from this to that, providing varied benefit." But we must be on our guard against a double misunderstanding that might be suggested by the statement in ver. 1, that Jesus went up to the mountain, as if in ascetic retirement from the world, and addressed Himself henceforth to His disciples, as if they alone were the objects of His care, or to teach them an esoteric doctrine with which the multitude had no concern. Jesus was not monastic in spirit, and He had not two doctrines, one for the many, another for the few, like Buddha. His highest teaching, even the Beatitudes and the beautiful discourse against care, was meant for the million. He taught disciples that they might teach the world and so be its light. For this purpose His disciples came to Him when He sat down (**καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ**) taking the teacher's position (*cf.* Mk. iv. 1, ix. 35, xiii. 3). Lutteroth (*Essai d'Interprétation*, p. 65) takes **καθίσαντος** as meaning to camp out (*camper*), to remain for a time, as in Lk. xxiv. 49, Acts xviii. 11. He, I find, adopts the view I have indicated of the sermon as a summary of all the discourses of Jesus on the hill during a sojourn of some duration. The hill, **τὸ ὄρος**, may be most naturally taken to mean the elevated plateau rising above the seashore. It is idle to inquire what particular hill is intended.—Ver. 2. **ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα**: solemn description of the beginning of a weighty discourse.—**ἐδίδασκεν**, imperfect, implying continued discourse.

Vv. 3-12. *The Beatitudes.* Some general observations may helpfully introduce the detailed exegesis of these golden words.

1. They breathe the spirit of the scene. On the mountain tops away from the bustle and the sultry heat of the region below, the air cool, the blue sky overhead, quiet all around, and divine tranquillity within. We are near heaven here.

2. The originality of these sayings has been disputed, especially by modern Jews desirous to credit their Rabbis with such good things. Some of them, *e.g.*, the third, may be found in substance in the Psalter, and possibly many, or all of them, even in the Talmud. But what then? They are in the Talmud as a few grains of wheat lost in a vast heap

τῷ πνεύματι· ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ [g] βασιλεία τῶν [g] οὐρανῶν. 4. μακάριοι [1] οἱ [h] πενθοῦντες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται. 5. μακάριοι

g the name for the k. of G. in Mt., put into the Baptist's mouth, in iii. 2. His, not Christ's, acc. to Weiss *et al.* h Ch. ix. 15.

[1] The 2nd and 3rd Beatitudes (vv. 4, 5) are transposed in D, most old Latin texts, and in Syr. Cur. Tisch. adopts this order.

of chaff. The originality of Jesus lies in putting the due value on these thoughts, collecting them, and making them as prominent as the Ten Commandments. No greater service can be rendered to mankind than to rescue from obscurity neglected moral commonplaces.

3. The existence of another version of the discourse (in Lk.), with varying forms of the sayings, has raised a question as to the original form. Did Christ, *e.g.*, say "Blessed the poor" (Lk.) or "Blessed the poor in spirit" (Matt.)? This raises a larger question as to the manner of Christ's teaching on the hill. Suppose one day in a week of instruction was devoted to the subject of happiness, its conditions, and heirs, many things might be said on each leading proposition. The theme would be announced, then accompanied with expansions. A modern biographer would have prefaced a discourse like this with an introductory account of the Teacher's method. There is no such account in the Gospels, but there are incidental notices from which we can learn somewhat. The disciples asked questions and the Master answered them. Jesus explained some of His parables to the twelve. From certain parts of His teaching, as reported, it appears that He not only uttered great thoughts in aphoristic form, but occasionally enlarged. The Sermon on the Mount contains at least two instances of such enlargement. The thesis, "I am not come to destroy but to fulfil" (ver. 17), is copiously illustrated (vv. 21-48). The counsel against care, which as a thesis might be stated thus: "Blessed are the care-free," is amply expanded (vv. 25-34). Even in one of the Beatitudes we find traces of explanatory enlargement; in the last, "Blessed are the persecuted". It is perhaps the most startling of all the paradoxes, and would need enlargement greatly, and some parts of the expansion have been preserved (vv. 10-12). On this view both forms of the first Beatitude might be authentic, the one as theme, the other as comment. The theme would always be put in the fewest possible words; the first Beatitude therefore, as Luke puts it, **Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί**, Matthew preserving one of the expansions, not necessarily the only one. Of course, another view of the expansion is possible, that it proceeded not from Christ, but from the transmitters of His sayings. But this hypothesis is not a whit more legitimate or likely than the other. I make this observation, not in the spirit of an antiquated Harmonistic, but simply as a contribution to historical criticism.

4. Each Beatitude has a reason annexed, that of the first being "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven". They vary in the different Beatitudes as reported. It is conceivable that in the original themes the reason annexed to the first was common to them all. It was understood to be repeated like the refrain of a song, or like the words, "him do I call a Brahmana," annexed to many of the moral sentences in the Footsteps of the Law in the Buddhist Canon. "He who, when assailed, does not resist, but speaks mildly to his tormentors—him do I call a Brahmana." So "Blessed the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"; "blessed they who mourn, for," etc.; "blessed the meek, the hungry, for," etc. The actual reasons annexed, when they vary from the refrain, are to be viewed as explanatory comments.

5. It has been maintained that only certain of the Beatitudes belong to the authentic discourse on the mount, the rest possibly based on true *logia* of Jesus spoken at another time, being added by the evangelist, true to his habit of massing the teaching of Jesus in topical groups. This is the view of Weiss (in Matt. Evan., and in Meyer). He thinks only three are authentic—the first, third, and fourth—all pointing to the righteousness of the kingdom as the *summum bonum*: the first to righteousness as not yet possessed; the second to the want as a cause of sorrow; the third to righteousness as an object of desire. This view goes with the theory that Christ's discourse on the hill had reference exclusively to the nature of true and false righteousness.

6. A final, much less important ques-

οἱ [l]πρᾳεῖς· ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν. 6. μακάριοι οἱ [j]πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην· ὅτι αὐτοὶ [k]χορτασθήσονται.

l Ch. xi. 29; xxi. 5. 1 Pet. iii. 4.
j Ch. xxv. 34. Heb. vi. 12.
k Ch. xiv. 20.

tion in reference to the Beatitudes is that which relates to their number. One would say at a first glance eight, counting ver. 10 as one, vv. 11, 12 being an enlargement. The traditional number, however, is seven—vv. 10-12 being regarded as a transition to a new topic. This seems arbitrary. Delitsch, anxious to establish an analogy with the Decalogue, makes out ten—seven from ver. 3 to ver. 9, ver. 10 one, ver. 11 one, and ver. 12, though lacking the μακάριοι, the tenth; its claim resting on the exulting words, χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε. This savours of Rabbinical pedantry.

Ver. 3. μακάριοι. This is one of the words which have been transformed and ennobled by N. T. use; by association, as in the Beatitudes, with unusual conditions, accounted by the world miserable, or with rare and difficult conduct, *e.g.*, in John xiii. 17, "if ye know these things, happy (μακάριοι) are ye if ye do them". Notable in this connection is the expression in 1 Tim. i. 11, "The Gospel of the glory of the happy God". The implied truth is that the happiness of the Christian God consists in being a Redeemer, bearing the burden of the world's sin and misery. How different from the Epicurean idea of God! Our word "blessed" represents the new conception of felicity.—οἱ πτωχοί: πτωχός in Sept. stands for אֶבְיוֹן Ps. cix. 16, or עָנִי Ps. xl. 18: *the poor*, taken even in the most abject sense, *mendici*, Tertull. adv. Mar. iv. 14. πτωχός and πένης originally differed, the latter meaning poor as opposed to rich, the former destitute. But in Biblical Greek πτωχοί, πένητες, πραεῖς, ταπεινοί are used indiscriminately for the same class, the poor of an oppressed country. *Vide* Hatch, *Essays on Biblical Greek*, p. 76. The term is used here in a pregnant sense, absolute and unqualified at least to begin with; qualifications come after. From πτώσσω, to cower in dispiritment and fear, always used in an evil sense till Christ taught the poor man to lift up his head in hope and self-respect; the very lowest social class not to be despaired of, a future possible even for the mendicant. Blessedness possible for the poor in every sense; they, in comparison with others, under no disabilities, rather contrariwise—such is the first and fundamental lesson.—τῷ πνεύματι: Possibilities are not certainties; to turn the one into the other the soul or will of the individual must come in, for as Euthy. Zig. quaintly says, nothing involuntary can bless (οὐδὲν τῶν ἀπροαιρέτων μακαριστόν). "In spirit" is, therefore, added to develop and define the idea of poverty. The comment on the theme passes from the lower to the higher sphere. Christ's thought includes the physical and social, but it does not end there. Luke seems to have the social aspect in view in accordance with one of his tendencies and the impoverished condition of most members of the apostolic Church. To limit the meaning to that were a mistake, but to include that or even to emphasise it in given circumstances was no error. Note that the physical and spiritual lay close together in Christ's mind. He passed easily from one to the other (John iv. 7-10; Lk. x. 42, see notes there). τῷ πν. is, of course, to be connected with πτωχοί, not with μακάριοι. Poor *in spirit* is not to be taken objectively, as if spirit indicated the element in which the poverty is manifest—poor intellect: "homines ingenio et eruditione parum florentes" (Fritzsche) = the νήπιοι in Matt. xi. 25; but subjectively, poor in their own esteem. Self-estimate is the essence of the matter, and is compatible with real wealth. Only the noble think meanly of themselves. The soul of goodness is in the man who is really humble. Poverty laid to heart passes into riches. A high ideal of life lies beneath all. And that ideal is the link between the social and the spiritual. The poor man passes into the blessedness of the kingdom as soon as he realises what a man is or ought to be. Poor in purse or even in character, no man is beggared who has a vision of man's chief end and chief good.—αὐτῶν, emphatic position *theirs*, note it well. So in the following verses αὐτοι and αὐτων.—ἐστι, not merely in prospect, but in present possession. The kingdom of heaven is often presented in the Gospels apocalyptically as a thing in the future to be given to the worthy by way of external recompense. But this view pertains rather to the form of thought than to the essence of the matter. Christ speaks of the kingdom here not as a known quan-

l Heb. ii. 17. m Rom. xi. 30, 31. 1 Tim. i. 13, 16.

7. μακάριοι οἱ [l] ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ [m] ἐλεηθήσονται. 8. μακάριοι οἱ [n] καθαροί τῇ καρδίᾳ· ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν Θεὸν [o] ὄψονται. 9. μακάριοι

n 1 Tim. i. 5; ii. 22. o Heb. xii. 14 (seeing God).

tity, but as a thing whose nature He is in the act of defining by the aphorisms He utters. If so, then it consists essentially in states of mind. It is within. It is ourselves, the true ideal human.

Ver. 4. οἱ πενθοῦντες. Who are they? All who on any account grieve? Then this Beatitude would give utterance to a thoroughgoing optimism. Pessimists say that there are many griefs for which there is no remedy, so many that life is not worth living. Did Jesus mean to meet this position with a direct negative, and to affirm that there is no sorrow without remedy? If not, then He propounds a puzzle provoking thoughtful scholars to ask: What grief is that which will without fail find comfort? There can be no comfort where there is no grief, for the two ideas are correlative. But in most cases there is no apparent necessary connection. Necessary connection is asserted in this aphorism, which gives us a clue to the class described as οἱ πενθοῦντες. Their peculiar sorrow must be one which comforts itself, a grief that has the thing it grieves for in the very grief. The comfort is then no outward good. It lies in a right state of soul, and that is given in the sorrow which laments the lack of it. The sorrow reveals love of the good, and that love is possession. In so far as all kinds of sorrow tend to awaken reflection on the real good and ill of human life, and so to issue in the higher sorrow of the soul, the second Beatitude may be taken absolutely as expressing the tendency of all grief to end in consolation.—παρακληθήσονται, future. The comfort is latent in the very grief, but for the present there is no conscious joy, but only poignant sorrow. The joy, however, will inevitably come to birth. No noble nature abides permanently in the house of mourning. The greater the sorrow the greater the ultimate gladness, the "joy in the Holy Ghost" mentioned by St. Paul among the essentials of the Kingdom of God (Rom. xiv. 17).

Ver. 5. οἱ πραεῖς: in Sept. for עֲנָוִים in Ps. xxxvii. 11, of which this Beatitude is an echo. The men who suffer wrong without bitterness or desire for revenge, a class who in this world are apt to go to the wall. In this case we should have expected the Teacher to end with the common refrain: theirs is the kingdom of heaven, that being the only thing they are likely to get. Jean Paul Richter humorously said: "The French have the empire of the land, the English the empire of the sea; to the Germans belongs the empire of the *air*". But Jesus promises to the meek the empire of the solid earth—κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν. Surely a startling paradox! That the meek should find a foremost place in the kingdom of heaven is very intelligible, but "inherit the earth"—the land of Canaan or any other part of this planet—is it not a delusive promise? Not altogether. It is at least true as a doctrine of *moral tendency*. Meekness after all is a power even in this world, a "world-conquering principle" (Tholuck). The meek of England, driven from their native land by religious intolerance, have inherited the continent of America. Weiss (Meyer) is quite sure, however, that this thought was far (*ganz fern*) from Christ's mind. I venture to think he is mistaken.

The inverse order of the second and third Beatitudes found in Codex D, and favoured by some of the Fathers, *e.g.*, Jerome, might be plausibly justified by the affinity between poverty of spirit and meekness, and the natural sequence of the two promises: possession of the kingdom of heaven and inheritance of the earth. But the connection beneath the surface is in favour of the order as it stands in T. R.

Ver. 6. If the object of the hunger and thirst had not been mentioned this fourth Beatitude would have been parallel in form to the second: Blessed the hungry, for they shall be filled. We should then have another absolute affirmation requiring qualification, and raising the question: What sort of hunger is it which is sure to be satisfied? That might be the original form of the aphorism as given in Luke. The answer to the question it suggests is similar to that given under Beatitude 1. The hunger whose satisfaction is sure is that which contains its own satisfaction. It is the hunger for moral good. The passion for righteousness is righteousness in the deepest sense of the word.—πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες. These verbs, like all verbs of desire, ordinarily take the genitive of the object. Here and in

οἱ [p] εἰρηνοποιοί· ὅτι αὐτοὶ [1] [q] υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται. μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ἕνεκεν δικαιοσύνης· 10. ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν

p here only. The verb Col. i. 20.
q υἱοὶ Θ. in Lk. xx. 36. Rom. viii. 14, 19. Gal. iii. 26.

[1] αυτοι omitted in ℵCD it. vul. syr., bracketed in W.H. It may have been omitted by *homœoteleuton* and it seems needed for emphasis.

other places in N. T. they take the accusative, the object being of a spiritual nature, which one not merely desires to participate in, but to possess in whole. Winer, § xxx. 10, thus distinguishes the two constructions: διψῆν φιλοσοφίας = to thirst after philosophy; διψ. φιλοσοφίαν = to thirst for possession of philosophy as a whole. Some have thought that διὰ is to be understood before δικ., and that the meaning is: "Blessed they who suffer natural hunger and thirst on account of righteousness". Grotius understands by δικ. the way or doctrine of righteousness.

Ver. 7. This Beatitude states a self-acting law of the moral world. The exercise of mercy (ἔλεος, active pity) tends to elicit mercy from others—God and men. The chief reference may be to the mercy of God in the final awards of the kingdom, but the application need not be restricted to this. The doctrine of Christ abounds in great ethical principles of universal validity: "he that humbleth himself shall be exalted," "to him that hath shall be given," etc. This Beatitude suitably follows the preceding. Mercy is an element in true righteousness (Mic. vi. 8). It was lacking in Pharisaic righteousness (Matt. xxiii. 23). It needed much to be inculcated in Christ's time, when sympathy was killed by the theory that all suffering was penalty of special sin, a theory which fostered a pitiless type of righteousness (Schanz). Mercy may be practised by many means; "not by money alone," says Euthy. Zig., "but by word, and if you have nothing by tears" (διὰ δακρύων).

Ver. 8. οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ: τ. καρ. may be an explanatory addition to indicate the region in which purity shows itself. That purity is in the heart, the seat of thought, desire, motive, not in the outward act, goes without saying from Christ's point of view. Blessed the *pure*. Here there is a wide range of suggestion. The pure may be the spotless or faultless in general; the continent with special reference to sexual indulgence—those whose very thoughts are clean; or the pure in motive, the single-minded, the men who seek the kingdom as the *summum bonum* with undivided heart. The last is the most relevant to the general connection and the most deserving to be insisted on. In the words of Augustine the *mundum cor* is above all the *simplex cor*. Moral simplicity is the cardinal demand in Christ's ethics. The man who has attained to it is in His view perfect (Matt. xix. 21). Without it a large numerical list of virtues and good habits goes for nothing. With it character, however faulty in temper or otherwise, is ennobled and redeemed.—τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται: Their reward is the beatific vision. Some think the reference is not to the faculty of clear vision but to the rare privilege of seeing the face of the Great King (so Fritzsche and Schanz). "The expression has its origin in the ways of eastern monarchs, who rarely show themselves in public, so that only the most intimate circle behold the royal countenance" (Schanz) = the pure have access to the all but inaccessible. This idea does not seem to harmonise with Christ's general way of conceiving God. On the other hand, it was His habit to insist on the connection between clear vision and moral simplicity; to teach that it is the single eye that is full of light (Matt. vi. 22). It is true that the pure shall have access to God's presence, but *the* truth to be insisted on in connection with this Beatitude is that through purity, singleness of mind, they are qualified for seeing, knowing, truly conceiving God and all that relates to the moral universe. It is the pure in heart who are able to see and say that "truly God is good" (Ps. lxxiii. 1) and rightly to interpret the whole phenomena of life in relation to Providence. They *shall* see, says Jesus, casting His thought into eschatological form, but He means the pure are the men who see; the double-minded, the two-souled (δίψυχος, James i. 8) man is blind. Theophylact illustrates the connection between purity and vision thus: ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ κάτοπτρον, ἐὰν ᾖ καθαρὸν, τότε δέχεται τὰς ἐμφάσεις, οὕτω καὶ ἡ καθαρὰ ψυχὴ δέχεται ὄψιν θεοῦ.

Ver. 9. οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί: not merely those who have peace in their own souls

r Rom. ix. 1. Heb. vi. 18. s Lk. x. 21. t ver. 46. Ch. vi. 1, 2, 5, etc.

οὐρανῶν. 11. μακάριοί ἐστε, ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ διώξωσι, καὶ εἴπωσι πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα[1] καθ' ὑμῶν[2] r ψευδόμενοι,[3] ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ. 12. χαίρετε καὶ s ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ t μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· οὕτω γὰρ ἐδίωξαν τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.

[1] This word (in CΔΣ) is omitted in ℵBD. It may have been added to make the sense clear.

[2] καθ υμων before παν in D.

[3] Omitted in D; found in ℵBC *al.*

through purity (Augustine), or the peace-loving (Grotius, Wetstein), but the active heroic promoters of peace in a world full of alienation, party passion, and strife. Their efforts largely consist in keeping aloof from sectional strifes and the passions which beget them, and living tranquilly for and in the whole. Such men have few friends. Christ, the ideal peace-maker, was alone in a time given up to sectarian division. But they have their compensation—**υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται.** God owns the disowned and distrusted as His sons. They shall be called because they *are*. They shall be called at the great consummation; nay, even before that, in after generations, when party strifes and passions have ceased, and men have come to see who were the true friends of the Divine interest in an evil time.

Vv. 10-12. **οἱ δεδιωγμένοι ε. δικ.** The original form of the Beatitude was probably: Blessed the persecuted. The added words only state what is a matter of course. No one deserves to be called a persecuted one unless he suffers for righteousness' sake. The persecuted! They are not merely men who have passed through a certain experience, but men who bear abiding traces of it in their character. They are marked men, and bear the stamp of trial on their faces. It arrests the notice of the passer-by: commands his respect, and prompts the question, Who and whence? They are veteran soldiers of righteousness with an unmistakable air of dignity, serenity, and buoyancy about them.—**αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ β. τ. οὐρ.** The common refrain of all the Beatitudes is expressly repeated here to hint that theirs emphatically is the Kingdom of Heaven. It is the proper guerdon of the soldier of righteousness. It is his now, within him in the disciplined spirit and the heroic temper developed by trial.—Ver. 11. **μακάριοί ἐστε.** The Teacher expatiates as if it were a favourite theme, giving a personal turn to His further reflections. "Blessed are ye." Is it likely that Jesus would speak so early of this topic to disciples? Would He not wait till it came more nearly within the range of their experience? Nay, is the whole discourse about persecution not a reflection back into the teaching of the Master of the later experiences of the apostolic age, that suffering disciples might be inspired by the thought that their Lord had so spoken? It is possible to be too incredulous here. If it was not too soon to speak of Pharisaic righteousness it was not too soon to speak of suffering for true righteousness. The one was sure to give rise to the other. The disciple circle may already have had experience of Pharisaic disfavour. In any case Jesus saw clearly what was coming. He had had an apocalypse of the dark future in the season of temptation, and He deemed it fitting to lift the veil a little that His disciples might get a glimpse of it.—**ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν . . . ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ**: illustrative details pointing to persistent relentless persecution by word and deed, culminating in wilful, malicious, lying imputations of the grossest sort—**πᾶν πονηρὸν**, every conceivable calumny—**ψευδόμενοι**, lying, not merely in the sense that the statements are false, but in the sense of deliberately inventing the most improbable lies; their only excuse being that violent prejudice leads the calumniators to think nothing too evil to be believed against the objects of their malice—**ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ**, for Him who has undertaken to make you fishers of men. Do you repent following Him? No reason why.—Ver. 12. **χαίρετε καὶ ἀγ.** In spite of all, joy, exultation is possible—nay, inevitable. I not only exhort you to it, but I tell you you cannot help being in this mood, if once you throw yourselves enthusiastically into the warfare of God. **Ἀγαλλιάω** is a strong word of Hellenistic coinage, from **ἄγαν** and **ἅλλομαι**, to leap much, signifying irrepressible demonstrative gladness. This joy is inseparable from the heroic

13. "Ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ [u] ἅλας τῆς γῆς· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας [v] μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι [w] ἁλισθήσεται; εἰς οὐδὲν ἰσχύει ἔτι, εἰ μὴ βληθῆναι[1] ἔξω,

u Mk. ix. Lk. xiv. 34. Col. iv. 6.
v Lk. xiv. 34. Rom. i. 22. 1 Cor. i. 20. w here and in Mk. ix. 49.

[1] βληθεν in ℵBC 1, 33, Origen, which carries along with it the omission of και after εξω.

temper. It is the joy of the Alpine climber standing on the top of a snow-clad mountain. But the Teacher gives two reasons to help inexperienced disciples to rise to that moral elevation.—ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς . . . οὐρανοῖς. For evil treatment on earth there is a compensating reward in heaven. This hope, weak now, was strong in primitive Christianity, and greatly helped martyrs and confessors.—οὕτως γὰρ ε. τοὺς προφήτας. If we take the γὰρ as giving a reason for the previous statement the sense will be: you cannot doubt that the prophets who suffered likewise have received an eternal reward (so Bengel, Fritzsche, Schanz, Meyer, Weiss). But we may take it as giving a co-ordinate reason for joy = ye are in good company. There is inspiration in the "goodly fellowship of the prophets," quite as much as in thought of their posthumous reward. It is to be noted that the prophets themselves did not get much comfort from such thoughts, and more generally that they did not rise to the joyous mood commended to His disciples by Jesus; but were desponding and querulous. On that side, therefore, there was no inspiration to be got from thinking of them. But they were thoroughly loyal to righteousness at all hazards, and reflection on their noble career was fitted to infect disciples with their spirit.—τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν: words skilfully chosen to raise the spirit. Before you not only in time but in vocation and destiny. Your predecessors in function and suffering; take up the prophetic succession and along with it, cheerfully, its tribulations.

Vv. 13-16. *Disciple functions.* It is quite credible that these sentences formed part of the Teaching on the Hill. Jesus might say these things at a comparatively early period to the men to whom He had already said: I will make you fishers of men. The functions assigned to disciples here are not more ambitious than that alluded to at the time of their call. The new section rests on what goes before, and postulates possession of the attributes named in the Beatitudes. With these the disciples will be indeed the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Vitally important functions are indicated by the two figures. *Nil sole et sale utilius* was a Roman proverb (Pliny, H. N., 31, 9). Both harmonise with, the latter points expressly to, a universal destination of the new religion. The sun lightens all lands. Both also show how alien it was from the aims of Christ to be the teacher of an esoteric faith.

Ver. 13. ἅλας, a late form for ἅλς, ἅλος, masculine. The properties of salt are assumed to be known. Commentators have enumerated four. Salt is pure, preserves against corruption, gives flavour to food, and as a manuring element helps to fertilise the land. The last mentioned property is specially insisted on by Schanz, who finds a reference to it in Lk. xiv. 35, and thinks it is also pointed to here by the expression τῆς γῆς. The first, purity, is a quality of salt *per se*, rather than a condition on which its function in nature depends. The second and third are doubtless the main points to be insisted on, and the second more than the third and above all. Salt arrests or prevents the process of putrefaction in food, and the citizens of the kingdom perform the same function for the earth, that is, for the people who dwell on it. In Schanz's view there is a confusion of the metaphor with its moral interpretation. Fritzsche limits the point of comparison to indispensableness = ye are as necessary an element in the world as salt is; a needlessly bald interpretation. Necessary certainly, but why and for what?—τῆς γῆς might mean the land of Israel (Achelis, *Bergpredigt*), but it is more natural to take it in its widest significance in harmony with κόσμου. Holtzmann (H. C.) sets κόσμου down to the account of the evangelist, and thinks γῆς in the narrow sense more suited to the views of Jesus.—Ver. 14. μωρανθῇ. The Vulgate renders the verb *evanuerit*. Better Beza and Erasmus, *infatuatus fuerit*. If the salt become insipid, so as to lack its proper preserving virtue. Can this happen? Weiss and others reply: It does not matter for the point

x Ch. vii. 6. Lk. viii. 5. Heb. x. 29. y part. pass. in Lk. xii. 35. Heb. xii. 18 al.

καὶ [1] x καταπατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 14. Ὑμεῖς ἐστε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· οὐ δύναται πόλις κρυβῆναι ἐπάνω ὄρους κειμένη· 15. οὐδὲ y καίουσι λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ

[1] Omitted in MSS. named in preceding note.

of the comparison. Perhaps not, but it does matter for the felicity of the metaphor, which is much more strikingly apt if degeneracy can happen in the natural as well as in the spiritual sphere. Long ago Maundrell maintained that it could, and modern travellers confirm his statement. Furrer says: "As it was observed by Maundrell 200 years ago, so it has often been observed in our time that salt loses somewhat of its sharpness in the storehouses of Syria and Palestine. Gathered in a state of impurity, it undergoes with other substances a chemical process, by which it becomes really another sort of stuff, while retaining its old appearance" (*Ztscht. für M. und R.*, 1890). A similar statement is made by Thomson (*Land and Book*, p. 381). There is no room for doubt as to whether the case supposed can happen in the spiritual sphere. The "salt of the earth" can become not only partially but wholly, hopelessly insipid, losing the qualities which constitute its conservative power as set forth in the Beatitudes and in other parts of Christ's teaching (*e.g.*, Mat. xviii.). Erasmus gives a realistic description of the causes of degeneracy in these words: "Si vestri mores fuerint amore laudis, cupiditate pecuniarum, studio voluptatum, libidine vindicandi, metu infamiae damnorum aut mortis infatuati," etc. (Paraph. in Evan. Matt.).—**ἐν τίνι ἁλισ.** Not with what shall the so necessary salting process be done? but with what shall the insipid salt be salted? The meaning is that the lost property is irrecoverable. A stern statement, reminding us of Heb. vi. 6, but true to the fact in the spiritual sphere. Nothing so hopeless as apostate discipleship with a bright past behind it to which it has become dead—begun in the spirit, ending in the flesh.—**εἰς οὐδὲν**, useless for salting, good for nothing else any more (ἔτι).—**εἰ μὴ βληθὲν**, etc. This is a kind of humorous afterthought: except indeed, cast out as refuse, to be trodden under foot of man, *i.e.*, to make footpaths of. The reading **βληθὲν** is much to be preferred to **βληθῆναι**, as giving prominence to **καταπατεῖσθαι** as the main verb, pointing to a kind of use to which insipid salt can after all be put. But what a downcome: from being saviours of society to supplying materials for footpaths!

Ver. 14. **τὸ φῶς τ. κ.** The light, the sun of the moral world, conceived of as full of the darkness of ignorance and sin. The disciple function is now viewed as illuminating. And as under the figure of salt the danger warned against was that of becoming insipid, so here the danger to be avoided is that of obscuring the light. The light will shine, that is its nature, if pains be not taken to hide it.—**οὐ δύναται πόλις**, etc. As a city situate on the top of a hill cannot be hid, neither can a light fail to be seen unless it be expressly prevented from shining. No pains need to be taken to secure that the light shall shine. For that it is enough to be a light. But Christ knew that there would be strong temptation for the men that had it in them to be lights to hide their light. It would draw the world's attention to them, and so expose them to the ill will of such as hate the light. Therefore He goes on to caution disciples against the policy of obscuration.

Ver. 15. A parabolic word pointing out that such a policy in the natural sphere is unheard of and absurd.—**καίουσι**, to kindle, *accendere*, ordinarily neuter = *urere*; not as Beza thought, a Hebraism; examples occur in late Greek authors (*vide* Kypke, *Obser. Sac.*). The figure is taken from lowly cottage life. There was a projecting stone in the wall on which the lamp was set. The house consisted of a single room, so that the tiny light sufficed for all. It might now and then be placed under the *modius*, an earthenware grain measure, or under the bed (Mk. iv. 21); high, to keep clear of serpents, therefore without danger of setting it on fire (Koetsveld, *De Gelijkenissen*, p. 305). But that would be the exception, not the rule—done occasionally for special reasons, perhaps during the hours of sleep. Schanz says the lamp burned all night, and that when they wanted darkness they put it on the floor and covered it with the "bushel". Tholuck also thinks people might cover the light when they wished to keep it burning, when they had occasion to leave

τὴν λυχνίαν καὶ [z] λάμπει πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ. 16. οὕτω λαμψάτω τὸ φῶς ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅπως ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ [a] καλὰ ἔργα, καὶ δοξάσωσι τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

z Lk. xvii. 22, 24. Acts xii. 7. 2 Cor. iv. 6.

a *Cf.* Mt. xxvi. 10, Mk. xiv. 6, for an example of a "good work".

the room for a time. Weiss, on the other hand, thinks it would be put under a cover only when they wished to put it out (Matt.-Evan., p. 144). But was it ever put out? Not so, according to Benzinger (Heb. Arch., p. 124).

Ver. 16. **οὕτως**. Do ye as they do in cottage life: apply the parable.—**λαμψάτω**, let your light shine. Don't use means to prevent it, turning the rare exception of household practice into the rule, so extinguishing your light, or at least rendering it useless. Cowards can always find plausible excuses for the policy of obscuration—reasons of prudence and wisdom; gradual accustoming of men to new ideas; deference to the prejudices of good men; avoidance of rupture by premature outspokenness; but generally the true reason is fear of unpleasant consequences to oneself. Their conduct Jesus represents as disloyalty to God—**ὅπως**, etc. The shining of light from the good works of disciples glorifies God the Father in heaven. The hiding of the light means withholding glory. The temptation arises from the fact—a stern law of the moral world it is—that just when most glory is likely to accrue to God, least glory comes to the light-bearer; not glory but dishonour and evil treatment his share. Many are ready enough to let their light shine when honour comes to themselves. But *their* "light" is not true heaven-kindled light; their works are not **καλὰ**, noble, heroic, but **πονηρὰ** (vii. 17), ignoble, worthless, at best of the conventional type in fashion among religious people, and wrought often in a spirit of vanity and ostentation. This is *theatrical* goodness, which is emphatically not what Jesus wanted. Euthy. Zig. says: **οὐ κελεύει θεατρίζειν τὴν ἀρετήν.**

Note that here, for the first time in the Gospel, Christ's distinctive name for God, "Father," occurs. It comes in as a thing of course. Does it presuppose previous instruction? (So Meyer.) One might have expected so important a topic as the nature and name of God to have formed the subject of a distinct lesson. But Christ's method of teaching was not scholastic or formal. He defined terms by *discriminating use;* Father, *e.g.*, as a name for God, by using it as a motive to noble conduct. The motive suggested throws light on the name. God, we learn, as Father delights in noble conduct, as human fathers find joy in sons who acquit themselves bravely. Jesus may have given formal instruction on the point, but not necessarily. This first use of the title is very significant. It is *full*, solemn, impressive: your Father, He who is in the heavens; so again in ver. 45. It is suggestive of reasons for faithfulness, reasons of love and reverence. It hints at a reflected glory, the reward of heroism. The noble works which glorify the Father reveal the workers to be sons. The double-sided doctrine of this logion of Jesus is that the divine is revealed by the heroic in human conduct, and that the moral hero is the true son of God. Jesus Himself is the highest illustration of the twofold truth.

Vv. 17-20. *Jesus defines His position.* At the period of the Teaching on the Hill Jesus felt constrained to define His ethical and religious position all round, with reference to the O. T. as the recognised authority, and also to contemporary presentations of righteousness. The disciples had already heard Him teach in the synagogues (Matt. iv. 23) in a manner that at once arrested attention and led hearers to recognise in Him a new type of teacher (Mk. i. 27), entirely different from the scribes (Mk. i. 22). The sentences before us contain just such a statement of the Teacher's attitude as the previously awakened surprise of His audiences would lead us to expect. There is no reason to doubt their substantial authenticity though they may not reproduce the precise words of the speaker; no ground for the suggestion of Holtzmann (H. C.) that so decided a position either for or against the law was not likely to be taken up in Christ's time, and that we must find in these vv. an anti-Pauline programme of the Judaists. At a first glance the various statements may appear inconsistent with each other. And assuming their genuineness, they might easily be misunderstood, and give rise to disputes in the apostolic age, or be taken hold of in rival interests. The words of great epoch-making men generally have this fate. Though apparently contradictory they might all proceed

17. "Μὴ [b]νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον [c]καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφήτας· οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι. 18. ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἕως ἂν [d]παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, [e]ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία [f]κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.

b with ὅτι here and in x. 34 (ὅτι ἦλθον), oftener with inf. or an accus. with inf. c in same sense Acts v. 38, 39. Rom. xiv. 20. d Ch. xxiv. 34. Lk. xvi. 17. 2 Cor. v. 17. James i. 10. e here only. f Lk. xvi. 17 (*κερέα* in both pl. W.H.).

from the many-sided mind of Jesus, and be so reported by the genial Galilean publican in his *Logia*. The best guide to the meaning of the momentous declaration they contain is acquaintance with the general drift of Christ's teaching (*vide* Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, ii., 330). Verbal exegesis will not do much for us. We must bring to the words sympathetic insight into the whole significance of Christ's ministry. Yet the passage by itself well weighed is more luminous than at first it may seem.

Ver. 17. **Μὴ νομίσητε**: These words betray a consciousness that there was that in His teaching and bearing which might create such an impression, and are a protest against taking a surface impression for the truth.—**καταλῦσαι**, to abrogate, to set aside in the exercise of legislative authority. What freedom of mind is implied in the bare suggestion of this as a possibility! To the ordinary religious Jew the mere conception would appear a profanity. A greater than the O. T., than Moses and the prophets, is here. But the Greater is full of reverence for the institutions and sacred books of His people. He is not come to disannul either the law or the prophets. **ἢ** before **τ. προφ.** is not = **καὶ**. "Law" and "Prophets" are not taken here as one idea = the O. T. Scriptures, as law, prophets and psalms seem to be in Lk. xxiv. 44, but as distinct parts, with reference to which different attitudes might conceivably be taken up. **ἢ** implies that the attitude actually taken up is the same towards both. The prophets are not to be conceived of as coming under the category of law (Weiss), but as retaining their distinctive character as revealers of God's nature and providence. Christ's attitude towards them in that capacity is the same as that towards the law, though the Sermon contains no illustrations under that head. "The idea of God and of salvation which Jesus taught bore the same relations to the O. T. revelation as His doctrine of righteousness to the O. T. law" (Wendt, *Die L. J.*, ii., 344).—**πληρῶσαι**: the common relation is expressed by this weighty word. Christ protests that He came not as an abrogator, but as a *fulfiller*. What rôle does He thereby claim? Such as belongs to one whose attitude is at once free and reverential. He fulfils by realising in theory and practice an ideal to which O. T. institutions and revelations point, but which they do not adequately express. Therefore, in fulfilling He necessarily abrogates in effect, while repudiating the spirit of a destroyer. He brings in a law of the spirit which cancels the law of the letter, a kingdom which realises prophetic ideals, while setting aside the crude details of their conception of the Messianic time.

Vv. 18-19. These verses wear on first view a Judaistic look, and have been regarded as an interpolation, or set down to the credit of an over-conservative evangelist. But they may be reconciled with ver. 17, as above interpreted. Jesus expresses here in the strongest manner His conviction that the whole O. T. is a Divine revelation, and that therefore every minutest precept has religious significance which must be recognised in the ideal fulfilment.—**Ἀμὴν**, formula of solemn asseveration, often used by Jesus, never by apostles, found doubled only in fourth Gospel.—**ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ**, etc.: not intended to fix a period after which the law will pass away, but a strong way of saying *never* (so Tholuck and Weiss).—**ἰῶτα**, the smallest letter in the Hebrew alphabet.—**κεραία**, the little projecting point in some of the letters, *e.g.*, of the base line in *Beth*; both representing the minutiæ in the Mosaic legislation. Christ, though totally opposed to the spirit of the scribes, would not allow them to have a monopoly of zeal for the commandments great and small. It was important in a polemical interest to make this clear.—**οὐ μὴ π.**, elliptical = do not fear lest. *Vide* Kühner, Gram., § 516, 9; also Goodwin's Syntax, Appendix ii.—**ἕως ἂν π. γεν.**, a second protasis introduced with **ἕως** explanatory of the first **ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ**; *vide* Goodwin, § 510; not saying the same thing, but a kindred: eternal, lasting, till adequately fulfilled; the latter the more exact statement of Christ's thought.

19. ὃς ἐὰν οὖν [g] λύσῃ μίαν τῶν [h] ἐντολῶν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, καὶ διδάξῃ οὕτω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὃς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ, οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. 20. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ [i] περισσεύσῃ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν [1] πλεῖον τῶν [j] γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.

g John v. 18; vii. 23; x. 35.
h Ch. xv. 3; xix. 17; xxii. 40. Lk. i. 6. John xiii. 34.
i with παρα in Eccles. iii. 19. *Cf.* Rom. v. 15.
j sim. ellipt. const. 1 John ii. 2.

[1] **υμων** before **η δικ.** (= *your* righteousness) in ℵBLΔ *al.* T. R. as in SUΣ.

Ver. 19. **ὃς ἐὰν οὖν λύσῃ**, etc.: **οὖν** pointing to a natural inference from what goes before. Christ's view being such as indicated, He must so judge of the setter aside of any laws however small. When a religious system has lasted long, and is wearing towards its decline and fall, there are always such men. The Baptist was in some respects such a man. He seems to have totally neglected the temple worship and sacred festivals. He shared the prophetic disgust at formalism. Note now what Christ's judgment about such really is. A scribe or Pharisee would regard a breaker of even the least commandments as a miscreant. Jesus simply calls him the *least* in the Kingdom of Heaven. He takes for granted that he is an earnest man, with a passion for righteousness, which is the key to his iconoclastic conduct. He recognises him therefore as possessing real moral worth, but, in virtue of his impatient radical-reformer temper, not great, only little in the scale of true moral values, in spite of his earnestness in action and sincerity in teaching. John the Baptist was possibly in His mind, or some others not known to us from the Gospels.—**ὃς δ' ἂν ποίησῃ καὶ διδάξῃ**, etc. We know now who is least: who is great? The man who does and teaches to do all the commands great and small; great not named but understood—**οὗτος μέγας**. Jesus has in view O. T. saints, the piety reflected in the Psalter, where the great ethical laws and the precepts respecting ritual are both alike respected, and men in His own time living in their spirit. In such was a sweetness and graciousness, akin to the Kingdom as He conceived it, lacking in the character of the hot-headed law-breaker. The geniality of Jesus made Him value these sweet saintly souls.

Ver. 20. Here is another type still, that of the scribes and Pharisees. We have had two degrees of worth, the little and the great. This new type gives us the moral zero.—**λέγω γὰρ**. The **γὰρ** is somewhat puzzling. We expect **δὲ**, taking our attention off two types described in the previous sentence and fixing it on a distinct one. Yet there is a hidden logic latent in the **γὰρ**. It explains the **ἐλάχιστος** of the previous verse. The earnest reformer is a small character compared with the sweet wholesome performer, but he is not a moral nullity. That place is reserved for another class. I call him least, not nothing, for the scribe is the zero.—**πλεῖον τῶν γρ. κ. φ.**, a compendious comparison, **τῆς δικαιοσύνης** being understood after **πλεῖον**. Christ's statements concerning these classes of the Jewish community, elsewhere recorded, enable us to understand the verdict He pronounces here. They differed from the two classes named in ver. 18, thus: Class 1 set aside the least commandments for the sake of the great; class 2 conscientiously did all, great and small; class 3 set aside the great for the sake of the little, the ethical for the sake of the ritual, the divine for the sake of the traditional. That threw them outside the Kingdom, where only the moral has value. And the second is greater, higher, than the first, because, while zeal for the ethical is good, spirit, temper, disposition has supreme value in the Kingdom. These valuations of Jesus are of great importance as a contribution towards defining the nature of the Kingdom as He conceived it.

Nothing, little, great: there is a higher grade still, the highest. It belongs to Christ Himself, the Fulfiller, who is neither a sophistical scribe, nor an impatient reformer, nor a strict performer of all laws great and small, walking humbly with God in the old ways, without thought, dream or purpose of change, but one who lives above the past and the present in the ideal, knows that a change is impending, but wishes it to come gently, and so as to do full justice to all

21. Ἠκούσατε ὅτι [k] ἐρρέθη [1] τοῖς [l] ἀρχαίοις, Οὐ φονεύσεις· ὃς δ᾽ ἂν φονεύσῃ, [m] ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ [n] κρίσει· 22. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ εἰκῆ [2] ἔνοχος ἔσται τῇ κρίσει· ὃς δ᾽ ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, Ῥακά, [3] ἔνοχος ἔσται τῷ [o] συνεδρίῳ· ὃς

k Rom. ix. 12.
l again ver. 33. Lk. ix. 8, 19. Acts xv. 7. 2 Pet. ii. 5 (ethical). 2 Cor. v. 17.
m with dat. here four times; with gen. of punisht. Ch. xxvi. 66. Mk. xiv. 64.
n of the tribunal, here only.
o Ch. xxvi. 59. Mk. xiv. 55. Lk. xx. 66. Often in Acts.

[1] ερρηθη in BD; text in ℵLMΔ *al. pl.* (W.H.). ερρεθη was more usual in later Greek.

[2] εικη is an ancient gloss found in many late MSS. but omitted in ℵB, Origen, Vulgate, and in the best modern editions.

[3] ραχα in ℵ*D abc (Tisch.); text in ℵ^{b}BE (W.H.).

that is divine, venerable, and of good tendency in the past. His is the unique greatness of the reverently conservative yet free, bold inaugurator of a new time.

Vv. 21-26. *First illustration of Christ's ethical attitude*, taken from the Sixth Commandment. In connection with this and the following exemplifications of Christ's ethical method, the interpreter is embarrassed by the long-continued strifes of the theological schools, which have brought back the spirit of legalism, from which the great Teacher sought to deliver His disciples. It will be best to ignore these strifes and go steadily on our way.—Ver. 21. **Ἠκούσατε.** The common people knew the law by hearing it read in the synagogue, not by reading it themselves. The aorist expresses what they were accustomed to hear, an instance of the "gnomic" use. Tholuck thinks there may be an allusion to the tradition of the scribes, called *Shema*.—**τοῖς ἀρχαίοις** might mean: in ancient *times*, *to* the ancients, or *by* the ancients. The second is in accord with N. T. usage, and is adopted by Meyer, Weiss and Holtzmann (H. C.). How far back does Christ go in thought? To Moses or to Ezra? The expression is vague, and might cover the whole past, and perhaps is intended to do so. There is no reason *à priori* why the criticism should be restricted to the interpretation of the law by the scribes. Christ's position as fulfiller entitled Him to point out the defects of the law itself, and we must be prepared to find Him doing so, and there is reason to believe that in the sequel He actually does (so Wendt, *L. J.*, ii., 332).—**Οὐ φονεύσεις . . . κρίσει.** This is a correct statement, not only of the Pharisaic interpretation of the law, but of the law itself. As a law for the life of a nation, it could forbid and punish only the outward act. But just here lay its defect as a summary of human duty. It restrained the end not the beginning of transgression (Euthy. Zig.).—**ἔνοχος** = **ἐνεχόμενος**, with dative of the tribunal here.—Ver. 22. **ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν.** Christ supplies the defect, as a painter fills in a rude outline of a picture (**σκιαγραφίαν**), says Theophy. He goes back on the roots of crime in the feelings: anger, contempt, etc.—**πᾶς . . . αὐτοῦ.** Every one; universal interdict of angry passion.—**ἀδελφῷ**, not in blood (the classical meaning) or in faith, but by common humanity. The implied doctrine is that every man is my brother; companion doctrine to the universal Fatherhood of God (ver. 45).—**εἰκῆ** is of course a gloss; qualification of the interdict against anger may be required, but it was not Christ's habit to supply qualifications. His aim was to impress the main idea, anger a deadly sin.—**κρίσει**, here as in ver. 21. The reference is to the provincial court of seven (Deut. xvi. 18, 2 Chron. xix. 5, Joseph. Ant. iv. 8, 14) possessing power to punish capital offences by the sword. Christ's words are of course not to be taken literally as if He were enacting that the angry man be tried as a criminal. So understood He would be simply introducing an extension of legalism. He deserves to go before the seven, He says, meaning he is as great an offender as the homicide who is actually tried by them.

Ῥακά: left untranslated in A. V. and R. V.; a word of little meaning, rendered by Jerome "inanis aut vacuus absque cerebro". Augustine says a Jew told him it was not properly a word at all, but an interjection like *Hem.* Theophy. gives as an equivalent **σὺ** spoken by a Greek to a man whom he despised. And the man who commits this trivial offence (as it seems) must go before, not the provincial seven, but the supreme seventy, the Sanhedrim that tried the most heinous offences and sentenced to the severest

δ' ἂν εἴπῃ, Μωρέ, ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός. 23. Ἐὰν οὖν προσφέρῃς τὸ δῶρόν σου ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, κἀκεῖ μνησθῇς ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου [p] ἔχει τὶ κατὰ σοῦ, 24. ἄφες ἐκεῖ τὸ δῶρόν σου ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, καὶ ὕπαγε, πρῶτον [q] διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, καὶ τότε ἐλθὼν πρόσφερε τὸ δῶρόν σου. 25. [r] ἴσθι [s] εὐνοῶν τῷ [t] ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχύ, [u] ἕως ὅτου εἶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ,[1] μήποτέ σε [v] παραδῷ ὁ ἀντίδικος τῷ κριτῇ, καὶ ὁ κριτής σε

p ἔχειν τι κ. τινος here. Mk. xi. 25. Rev. ii. 4. Cf. Acts xxiv. 19 (πρός τινα).
q here only in N. T.
r ἴσθι with part. Lk. xix. 17.
s here only in N. T.
t Lk. xii. 58; xviii. 3. 1 Peter v. 8.
u ἕως ὅτου = while, here only.
v τινά τινι here and Ch. xviii. 34; xx. 18; xxvii. 2, etc.

[1] μετ αυτου before εν τ. οδῷ, ℵBDL.

penalties, *e.g.*, death by stoning! Trivial in appearance, the offence is deadly in Christ's eyes. It means *contempt* for a fellow-man, more inhuman than anger; a violent passion, prompting to words and acts often bitterly regretted when the hot temper cools down. **Μωρέ**, if a Greek word, the equivalent for נָבָל = fool, good for nothing, morally worthless. It may, as Paulus, and after him Nösgen, suggests, be a Hebrew word, מוֹרֶה (Num. xx. 24, Deut. xxi. 18), a rebel against God or against parents, the most worthless of characters. Against this Field (Otium Norvicense) remarks that it would be the only instance of a pure Hebrew word in the N. T. In either case the word expresses a more serious form of contempt than *Raca*. Raca expresses contempt for a man's head = you stupid! *More* expresses contempt for his heart and character = you scoundrel. The reckless use of such opprobrious epithets Jesus regarded as the supreme offence against the law of humanity.—**ἔνοχος . . . πυρός.** He deserves to go, not to the seven or the seventy, but to hell, his sin altogether damnable. Kuinoel thinks the meaning is: He deserves to be burned alive in the valley of Hinnom: *is dignus est qui in valle Hinnomi vivus comburatur.* This interpretation finds little approval, but it is not so improbable when we remember what Christ said about the offender of the little ones (Matt. xviii. 6). Neither burning alive nor drowning was actually practised. In these words of Jesus against anger and contempt there is an aspect of exaggeration. They are the strong utterance of one in whom all forms of inhumanity roused feelings of passionate abhorrence. They are of the utmost value as a revelation of character.

Vv. 23, 24. Holtzmann (H. C.) regards these verses, as well as the two following, as an addition by the evangelist. But the passage is at least in thorough harmony with what goes before, as well as with the whole discourse.—**Ἐὰν οὖν προσφέρῃς**, if thou art in the very act of presenting thine offering (present tense) at the altar.—**κἀκεῖ μνησθῇς . . . κατὰ σοῦ**, and it suddenly flashes through thy mind there that thou hast done something to a brother man fitted to provoke angry feeling in him. What then? Get through with thy worship as fast as possible and go directly after and make peace with the offended? No, interrupt the religious action and go on that errand first.—**ἄφες ἐκεῖ.** Lay it down on the spur of the moment before the altar without handing it to the priest to be offered by him in thy stead.—**καὶ ὕπαγε πρῶτον.** The **πρῶτον** is to be joined to **ὕπαγε**, not to the following verb as in A. V. and R. V. (**πρῶτον** stands after the verb also in chaps. vi. 33, vii. 5). First *go*: remove thyself from the temple, break off thy worship, though it may seem profane to do so.—**διαλλάγηθι . . . καὶ τότε . . . πρόσφερε**: no contempt for religious service expressed or implied. Holtzmann (H. C.) asks, did Jesus offer sacrifice? and answers, hardly. In any case He respected the practice. But, reconciliation before sacrifice: morality before religion. Significant utterance, first announcement of a great principle often repeated, systematically neglected by the religion of the time. *Placability* before sacrifice, *mercy* before sacrifice, *filial affection* and *duty* before sacrifice; so always in Christ's teaching (Matt. ix. 13, xv. 5). **πρόσφερε**: present; set about offering: plenty of time now for the sacred action.

Vv. 25, 26. There is much more reason for regarding this passage as an interpolation. It is connected only externally (by the references to courts of

w ver 33. Ch. xviii. 25; xxii. 21. Rom. xiii. 7.
x Mk. xii. 24.

παραδῷ[1] **τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ, καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθήσῃ. 26. ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως ἂν** [w] **ἀποδῷς τὸν ἔσχατον** [x] **κοδράντην. 27. Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις,**[2] **28. Οὐ μοιχεύσεις· ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς**[3]

[1] This second **σε παρ.** is omitted in ℵB. Luke's text may have suggested the addition.

[2] **τοις αρχαιοις** is wanting in MSS. except LMΔ.

[3] **επιθυμησαι** without pronoun, ℵ* (Tisch.); with **αυτην**, BDL *al.* (W.H. brackets); text MΣ. **αυτην** probably the true reading.

law) with what goes before, and it is out of keeping with the general drift of the teaching on the hill. It occurs in a different connection in Luke xii. 58, there as a solemn warning to the Jewish people, on its way to judgment, to repent. Meyer pleads that the *logion* might be repeated. It might, but only on suitable occasions, and the teaching on the hill does not seem to offer such an occasion. Kuinoel, Bleek, Holtzmann, Weiss and others regard the words as foreign to the connection. Referring to the exposition in Luke, I offer here only a few verbal notes mainly on points in which Matthew differs from Luke.—**ἴσθι εὐνοῶν**, be in a conciliatory mood, ready to come to terms with your opponent in a legal process (**ἀντίδικος**). It is a case of debt, and the two, creditor and debtor, are on the way to the court where they must appear together (Deut. xxi. 18, xxv. 1). Matthew's expression implies willingness to come to terms amicably on the *creditor's* part, and the debtor is exhorted to meet him half way. Luke's **δὸς ἐργασίαν** throws the willingness on the other side, or at least implies that the debtor will need to make an effort to bring the creditor to terms.—**παραδῷ**, a much milder word than Luke's **κατασύρῃ**, which points to rough, rude handling, dragging an unwilling debtor along whither he would rather not go.—**ὑπηρέτῃ**, the officer of the court whose business it was to collect the debt and generally to carry out the decision of the judge; in Luke **πράκτωρ**.—**κοδράντην** = *quadrans*, less than a farthing. Luke has **λεπτόν**, half the value of a **κοδ.**, thereby strengthening the statement that the imprisoned debtor will not escape till he has paid all he owes.

Vv. 27-30. *Second illustration*, taken from the seventh commandment. A grand moral law, in brief lapidary style guarding the married relation and the sanctity of home. Of course the Hebrew legislator condemned lust after another man's wife; it is expressly prohibited in the tenth commandment. But in practical working as a public law the statute laid main stress on the outward act, and it was the tendency of the scribes to give exclusive prominence to this. Therefore Christ brings to the front what both Moses and the scribes left in the background, the inward desire of which adultery is the fruit—Ver. 28.—**ὁ βλέπων**: the looker is supposed to be a husband who by his look wrongs his own wife.—**γυναῖκα**, married or unmarried.—**πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι.** The look is supposed to be not casual but persistent, the desire not involuntary or momentary, but cherished with longing. Augustine, a severe judge in such matters, defines the offence thus: "Qui hoc fine et hoc animo attenderit ut eam concupiscat; quod jam non est titillari delectatione carnis sed plene consentire libidini" (De ser. Domini). Chrysostom, the merciless scourge of the vices of Antioch, says: **ὁ ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν συλλέγων, ὁ μηδενὸς ἀναγκάζοντος τὸ θηρίον ἐπεισάγων, ἠρεμοῦντι τῷ λογισμῷ.** Hom. xvii. The Rabbis also condemned unchaste looks, but in how coarse a style compared with Jesus let this quotation given by Fritzsche show: "Intuens vel in minimum digitum feminae est ac si intueretur in locum pudendum". In better taste are these sayings quoted by Wünsche (Beiträge): "The eye and the heart are the two brokers of sin"; "Passions lodge only in him who sees".—**αὐτὴν** (bracketed as doubtful by W. H.): the accusative after **ἐπιθ.** is rare and late.—We cannot but think of the personal relations to woman of One who understood so well the subtle sources of sexual sin. Shall we say that He was tempted in all points as we are, but desire was expelled by the mighty power of a pure love to which every woman was as a daughter, a sister, or a betrothed: a sacred object of tender respect?

ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.[1] 29. εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς [y] σκανδαλίζει σε, [z] ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· [a] συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου, καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν. 30. καὶ εἰ ἡ δεξιά σου χεὶρ σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτὴν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἓν τῶν μελῶν σου, καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν.[2]

31. "Ἐρρέθη δέ, ὅτι[3] ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, δότω

y Ch. xviii. 6, 8, parall. 1 Cor. viii. 13 (= tempt). Ch. xv. 12; xvii. 27 (to give offence).

z Ch. xviii. 9.

a Ch. xviii. 6 with ἵνα. Ch. xix. 10 with inf.

[1] B has εαυτου.

[2] For the reading in text ℵB have εις γεενναν απελθη. The T. R. has doubtless been conformed to the reading in ver. 29. Had it stood here in the copies used by the scribes they would not have substituted the reading in ℵB.

[3] Omit. ℵ BDL.

Vv. 29, 30. *Counsel to the tempted*, expressing keen perception of the danger and strong recoil from a sin to be shunned at all hazards, even by excision, as it were, of offending members; two *named*, eye and hand, eye first as mentioned before.—**ὁ ὀφ. ὁ δεξιὸς**: the *right* eye deemed the more precious (1 Sam. xi. 2, Sach. xi. 17). Similarly ver. 30 the right hand, the most indispensable for work. Even these *right* members of the body must go. But as the remaining left eye and hand can still offend it is obvious that these counsels are not meant to be taken literally, but symbolically, as expressing strenuous effort to master sexual passion (*vide* Grotius). Mutilation will not serve the purpose; it may prevent the outward act, but it will not extinguish desire.—**σκανδαλίζει**, cause to stumble, not found in Greek authors but in Sept. Sirach. and in N. T. in a tropical moral sense. The noun **σκάνδαλον** is also of frequent occurrence, a late form for **σκανδάληθρον**, a trap-stick with bait on it which being touched the trap springs. Hesychius gives as its equivalent **ἐμποδισμός**. It is used in a literal sense in Lev. xix. 14 (Sept.).—**συμφέρει . . . ἵνα ἀπολ.**: **ἵνα** with subjunctive instead of infinitive (*vide* on ch. iv. 3). Meyer insists on **ἵνα** having here as always its telic sense and praises Fritzsche as alone interpreting the passage correctly. But, as Weiss observes, the mere destruction of the member is not the purpose of its excision. Note the impressive solemn repetition in ver. 30 of the thought in ver. 29, in identical terms save that for **βληθῇ** is substituted, in the true reading, **ἀπέλθῃ**. This logion occurs again in Matthew (xviii. 8, 9). Weiss (Marc.-Evang., 326) thinks it is taken here from the Apostolic document, *i.e.*, Matthew's book of Logia, and there from Mark ix. 43-47.

Vv. 31-32. *Third illustration*, subordinate to the previous one, connected with the same general topic, sex relations, therefore introduced less formally with a simple **ἐρρέθη δὲ**. This instance is certainly directed against the scribes rather than Moses. The law (Deut. xxiv. 1) was meant to mitigate an existing usage, regarded as evil, in woman's interest. The scribes busied themselves solely about getting the bill of separation into due legal form. They did nothing to restrain the unjust caprice of husbands; they rather opened a wider door to licence. The law contemplated as the ground of separation a strong loathing, probably of sexual origin. The Rabbis (the school of Shammai excepted) recognised whimsical dislikes, even a fancy for another fairer woman, as sufficient reasons. But they were zealous to have the bill in due form that the woman might be able to show she was free to marry again, and they probably flattered themselves they were defending the rights of women. Brave men! Jesus raised the previous question, and asserted a more radical right of woman—*not to be put away*, except when she put herself away by unfaithfulness. He raised anew the prophetic cry (Mal. ii. 16), *I hate putting away*. It was an act of humanity of immense significance for civilisation, and of rare courage, for He was fighting single-handed against widely prevalent, long established opinion and custom.—**ἀπολύσῃ**:

αὐτῇ [b]ἀποστάσιον· 32. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ[1] τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, [c]παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχᾶσθαι[2]· καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται.[3] 33. Πάλιν ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, Οὐκ [d]ἐπιορκήσεις, ἀποδώσεις δὲ τῷ Κυρίῳ τοὺς ὅρκους σου· 34. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ [e]ὀμόσαι ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ· 35. μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὅτι [f]ὑποπόδιόν ἐστι τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ· μήτε εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὅτι [g]πόλις ἐστὶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως· 36. μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὀμόσῃς, ὅτι

b here and in Ch. xix. 7.
c Acts xxvi. 29. 2 Cor. xi. 28.
d here only in N. T., twice in Sept.
e Ch. xxiii. 16-21 (with ἐν). Heb. vi. 13 (with κατά), ver. 35 (with εἰς).
f Lk. xx. 43. Heb. i. 13.
g this title for J. here and in Ps. xlvii. 3.

[1] πας ο απολυων in ℵBLΔ *al.* Text in D *al.*

[2] ℵBD have μοιχευθηναι.

[3] The clause και ος εαν . . . μοιχαται is wanting in D and bracketed in W.H. In B it runs ο απολελυμενην γαμησας.

the corresponding word in Greek authors is ἀποπέμπειν.—**ἀποστάσιον** = βιβλίον ἀποστασίου in Deut. xxiv. The husband is to give her her dismissal, with a bill stating that she is no longer his wife. The singular form in ιον is to be noted. The tendency in later Greek was to substitute ιον for ια, the plural ending. *Vide* Lobeck, *Phryn.*, p. 517.—**παρ. λ. πορνείας**: a most important exception which has given rise to much controversy that will probably last till the world's end. The first question is: Did Christ really say this, or is it not rather an explanatory gloss due to the evangelist, or to the tradition he followed? De Wette, Weiss, Holtzmann (H. C.) take the latter view. It would certainly be in accordance with Christ's manner of teaching, using strong, brief, unqualified assertions to drive home unfamiliar or unwelcome truths, if the word as He spoke it took the form given in Lk. xvi. 18: "Every one putting away his wife and marrying another committeth adultery". This was the fitting word to be spoken by one who hated putting away in a time when it was common and sanctioned by the authorities. A second question is: What does πορνεία mean? Schanz, a master, as becomes a Catholic, in this class of questions, enumerates five senses, but decides that it means adultery committed by a married woman. Some, including Döllinger (*Christenthum und Kirche: The First Age of Christianity and the Church*, vol. ii., app. iii.), think it means fornication committed before marriage. The predominant opinion, both ancient and modern, is that adopted by Schanz. A third question is: Does Christ, assuming the words to have been spoken by Him, recognise adultery as a ground of absolute divorce, or only, as Catholics teach, of separation *a toro et mensa?* Is it possible to be quite sure as to this point? One thing is certain. Christ did not come to be a new legislator making laws for social life. He came to set up a high ethical ideal, and leave that to work on men's minds. The tendency of His teaching is to create deep aversion to rupture of married relations. That aversion might even go the length of shrinking from severance of the tie even in the case of one who had forfeited all claims. The last clause is bracketed by W. H. as of doubtful genuineness. It states unqualifiedly that to marry a dismissed wife is adultery. Meyer thinks that the qualification unjustly dismissed, *i.e.*, not for adultery, is understood. Weiss (Meyer) denies this.

Vv. 33-37. *Fourth illustration: concerning oaths.* A new theme, therefore formally introduced as in ver. 21. **πάλιν** points to a new *series* of illustrations (Weiss, Mt.-Evan., p. 165). The first series is based on the Decalogue. Thou shalt not swear falsely (Lev. xix. 12), and thou shalt perform unto the Lord thy vows (Num. xxx. 3; Deut. xxiii. 22). What is wrong in these *dicta?* Nothing save what is left unsaid. The scribes misplaced the emphasis. They had a great deal to say, in sophistical style, of the oaths that were binding and not binding, nothing about the fundamental requirement of truth in the inward parts. Again, therefore, Jesus goes back on the previous question: Should there be any need for oaths? — Ver. 34. **ὅλως**, emphatic = παντελῶς, don't swear *at all.* Again an unqualified statement, to be taken not in the letter as a new law,

οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν ποιῆσαι.[1] 37. ἔστω[2] δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν, [h] ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστιν. 38. Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐῤῥέθη, [i] Ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλ-

h 2 Cor. i. 17-19. James v. 12.
i Ex. xxi. 24. Lev. xxiv. 20. Deut. xix. 21.

[1] ℵBL place ποιησαι before η μελαιναν. The T. R. represents an effort by the scribes to give a smoother reading.

[2] For εστω (ℵDL *al.*) BΣ have εσται, which expresses the injunction in the strongest way and is to be preferred (W.H. on margin).

but in the spirit as inculcating such a love of truth that so far as we are concerned there shall be no need of oaths. In civil life the most truthful man has to take an oath because of the untruth and consequent distrust prevailing in the world, and in doing so he does not sin against Christ's teaching. Christ Himself took an oath before the High Priest (Mt. xxvi. 63). What follows (vv. 34-6) is directed against the casuistry which laid stress on the words τῷ κυρίῳ, and evaded obligation by taking oaths in which the divine name was not mentioned: by heaven, earth, Jerusalem, or by one's own head. Jesus points out that all such oaths involved a reference to God. This is sufficiently obvious in the case of the first three, not so clear in case of the fourth.—λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν: white is the colour of old age, black of youth. We cannot alter the colour of our hair so as to make our head look young or old. *A fortiori* we cannot bring on our head any curse by perjury, of which hair suddenly whitened might be the symbol. Providence alone can blast our life. The oath by the head is a direct appeal to God. All these oaths are binding, therefore, says Jesus; but what I most wish to impress on you is: don't swear at all. Observe the use of μήτε (not μηδέ) to connect these different evasive oaths as forming a homogeneous group. Winer, sect. lv. 6, endorses the view of Herrmann in Viger that οὔτε and μήτε are *adjunctival*, οὐδέ and μηδέ *disjunctival*, and says that the latter add negation to negation, while the former divide a single negation into parts. Jesus first thinks of these evasive oaths as a bad class, then specifies them one after the other. Away with them one and all, and let your word be ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ. That is, if you want to give assurance, let it not be by an oath, but by simple repetition of your *yes* and *no*. Grotius interprets: let your yea or nay in *word* be a yea or nay in *deed*, be as good as your word even unsupported by an oath. This brings the version of Christ's saying in Mt. into closer correspondence with Jas. v. 12. ἤτω τὸ Ναί ναί, καὶ τὸ Οὔ οὔ. Beza, with whom Achelis (Bergpredigt) agrees, renders, "Let your affirmative discourse be a simple yea, and your negative nay". τὸ δὲ περισσὸν the surplus, what goes beyond these simple words.—ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, hardly "from the evil one," though many ancient and modern interpreters, including Meyer, have so understood it. Meyer says the neuter "of evil" gives a very insipid meaning. I think, however, that Christ expresses Himself mildly out of respect for the necessity of oaths in a world full of falsehood. I know, He means to say, that in certain circumstances something beyond yea and nay will be required of you. But it comes of evil, the evil of untruthfulness. See that the evil be not in you. Chrysostom (Hom. xvii.) asks: How evil if it be God's law? and answers: Because the law was good in its season. God acted like a nurse who gives the breast to an infant and afterwards laughs at it when it wants it after weaning.

Vv. 38-42. *Fifth illustration*, from the law of compensation. Ver. 38 contains the theme, the following vv. Christ's comment.—Ὀφθαλμὸν . . . ὀδόντος. An exact quotation from Ex. xxi. 24, Christ's criticism here concerns a precept from the oldest code of Hebrew law. Fritzsche explains the accusatives, ὀφθαλμόν, ὀδόντα, by supposing εἶναι to be understood: "Ye have heard that Moses wrote that an eye shall be for an eye". The simplest explanation is that the two nouns in the original passage are under the government of δώσει, Ex. xxi. 23. (So Weiss and Meyer after Grotius.) Tersely expressed, a sound principle of civil law for the guidance of the judge, acted on by almost all peoples, Christ does not condemn it: if parties come before the judge, let him by all means give fair compensation for injuries received. He simply leaves it on one side.

j Ch. xxvi. 67. Sept. Hosea xi. 4.
k Lk. vi. 29. (Hosea xi. 4).

μοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος· 39. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ· ἀλλ᾿ ὅστις σε [j] ῥαπίσει ἐπὶ [1] τὴν δεξιάν σου [k] σιαγόνα,[2] στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· 40. καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτῶνά σου λαβεῖν, ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον· 41. καὶ ὅστις σε

[1] For ρaπισει επι ℵBΣ have ραπιζει (pres.) εις. The επι of the T. R. conforms to the parall. in Luke.

[2] For σου σιαγονα BD have σιαγονα σου. Tisch. (with ℵ) omits σου. W.H. bracket it.

"Though the judge must give redress when demanded, you are not bound to ask it, and if you take My advice you will not." In taking up this position Jesus was in harmony with the law itself which contains dissuasives against vindictiveness, *e.g.*, Lev. xix. 18: "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people". The fault of the scribes did not lie in gainsaying this and introducing the *jus talionis* into private life, but in giving greater prominence to the legal than to the ethical element in the O. T. teaching, and in occupying themselves mainly with discussing the casuistry of compensation, *e.g.*, the items to be compensated for in a case of wounding—the pain, the cure, the loss of time, the shame, etc., and the money value of the whole. Jesus turned the minds of His disciples away from these trivialities to the great neglected ethical commonplace.

Ver. 39. **μὴ ἀντιστῆναι**: resist not, either by endeavouring to prevent injury or by seeking redress for it.—**τῷ πονηρῷ**, not the devil, as Chrys. and Theophy. thought; either the evil doer or the evil doing or done. Opinion is much divided between the last two meanings. The sense is the same in either case. The A. V. takes **πονηρῷ** as neuter, the R. V. as masculine. The former is on the whole to be preferred. Instances of injury in various forms are next specified to illustrate the general precept. These injuries have been variously distinguished—to body, and property, and freedom, Tholuck; *exemplum citatur injuriae, privatae, forensis, curialis*, Bengel; injuries connected with honour, material good, waste of time, Achelis, who points out that the relation of the three, Ex. in vv. 39-41, is that of an anti-climax, injuries to honour being felt most, and those involving waste of time least.—**ὅστις . . . ἄλλην**. In the following instances there is a climax: injury proceeds from bad to worse. It is natural to expect the same in this one. But when the right cheek has been struck, is it an aggravation to strike the left? Tholuck, Bleek, and Meyer suggest that the right cheek is only named first according to common custom, not supposed to be struck first. Achelis conceives the right cheek to be struck first with the back of the hand, then the left with a return stroke with the palm, harder than the first, and expressing in a higher measure intention to insult.—**ῥαπίζω** in class. Greek = to beat with rods; later, and in N. T., to smite with the palm of the hand; *vide* Lobeck, *Phryn.*, p. 175.—Ver. 40, **κριθῆναι** = **κρίνεσθαι** in 2 Cor. vi. 1, to sue at law as in A. V. Grotius takes it as meaning extra-judicial strife, while admitting that the word is used in the judicial sense in the Sept., *e.g.*, Job ix. 3, Eccles. vi. 10. Beza had previously taken the same view.—**χιτῶνα, ἱμάτιον**. The contention is supposed to be about the under garment or the tunic, and the advice is, rather than go to law, let him have not only it but also **καί**, the more costly upper robe, mantle, toga. The poor man might have several tunics or shirts for change, but only one upper garment, used for clothing by day, for bed-cover by night, therefore humanely forbidden to be retained over night as a pledge, Ex. xxii. 26.

Ver. 41. **ἀγγαρεύσει**, compel thee to *go* one mile in A. V. and R. V. Hatch (*Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 37) thinks it means compel thee to *carry his baggage*, a very probable rendering in view of the history of the word as he gives it. A Persian word, originally, introduced into the Greek, Latin, and Rabbinic languages, it denoted first to requisition men, beasts, beasts or conveyances for the courier system described in Herod. viii. 98, Xen. Cyr. viii. 6, 17; next in post-classical use under the successors of the Persians in the East, and under the Roman Empire, it was applied to the forced transport of military baggage by the inhabitants of a country through which troops were passing. Hatch remarks: "The

[l]ἀγγαρεύσει [m]μίλιον ἕν, [n]ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο. 42. τῷ [o]αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου[1]· καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι[2] μὴ ἀποστραφῇς. 43. Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη, Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν [p]πλησίον σου, καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου· 44. ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς,[3] καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, καὶ[4] διωκόντων

l Ch. xxvii. 32. Mk. xv. 21.
m here only.
n followed by μετὰ and gen. here and in Lk. xii. 58 (ἐπί τινα added).
o with acc. of person asked here. Ch. vi. 8. Lk. vi. 30.
p Ch. xix. 19. Lk. x. 27.

[1] δος in ℵBD. διδου (T. R.) conforms to Luke (vi. 30).

[2] W.H. give δανιζασθαι after ℵB*DΔ.

[3] One of the more important various readings occurs here. From ευλογειτε to υμας is omitted in ℵB, some ancient versions (including Syr. Sin.), and some cursives. The omitted part may be regarded as an importation in a harmonistic spirit from Lk. vi. 27. It is left out by most modern editors.

[4] των επηρεαζοντων υμας και also wanting in ℵB, and also imported from Lk. (vi. 28).

extent to which this system prevailed is seen in the elaborate provisions of the later Roman law: *angariae* came to be one of those modes of taxing property which, under the vicious system of the empire, ruined both individuals and communities". An instance in N. T. of the use of the word in this later sense occurs in Mt. xxvii. 32, Mk. xv. 31, in reference to Simon compelled to carry Christ's cross. We may conceive the compulsion in the present case to proceed from a military man.—**μίλιον**, a Roman mile, about 1600 yards, a late word.—**δύο**, in point of time, the additional mile = two, there and back, with proportional fatigue, a decided climax of hardship. But it is not merely a question of time, as Achelis thinks. The sense of oppression is involved, subjection to arbitrary military power. Christ's counsel is: do not submit to the inevitable in a slavish, sullen spirit, harbouring thoughts of revolt. Do the service cheerfully, and more than you are asked. The counsel is far-reaching, covering the case of the Jewish people subject to the Roman yoke, and of slaves serving hard masters. The three cases of non-resistance are not meant to foster an abject spirit. They point out the higher way to victory. He that magnanimously bears overcomes.

Ver. 42. This counsel does not seem to belong to the same category as the preceding three. One does not think of begging or borrowing as an injury, but at most as a nuisance. Some have doubted the genuineness of the logion as a part of the Sermon. But it occurs in Luke's redaction (vi. 30), transformed indeed so as to make it a case of the sturdy beggar who helps himself to what he does not get for the asking. Were there idle, lawless tramps in Palestine in our Lord's time, and would He counsel such treatment of them? If so, it is the extreme instance of not resisting evil.—**μὴ ἀποστραφῇς** with **τὸν θέλοντα** in accusative. One would expect the genitive with the middle, the active taking an accusative with genitive, *e.g.*, 2 Tim. iv. 4, **τὴν ἀκοὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας**. But the transitive sense is intelligible. In turning myself away from another, I turn him away from me. *Vide* Heb. xii. 25, 2 Tim. i. 15.

Vv. 43-48. *Sixth and final illustration: from the Law of Love.* To an old partial form of the law Jesus opposes a new universal one.—Ver. 43. **ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη**: said where, by whom, and about whom? The sentiment Jesus supposes His hearers to have heard is not found in so many words in the O. T. The first part, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour," occurs in Lev. xix. 18. The contrary of the second part is found in Ex. xxiii. 4, where humanity towards the straying or overburdened beast of an enemy is enjoined. It is to be hoped that even the scribes did not in cold blood sin against the spirit of this precept by teaching men to love their private friends and hate their private enemies. Does **πλησίον** then mean an Israelite, and **ἐχθρόν** a Gentile, and was the fault of the traditional law of love that it confined obligation within national limits? The context in Lev. xix. 18 gives **πλ.** that sense: "Thou shalt not bear any grudge against the children of thy people". On the other hand, the tendency of Israel's

q transitive-ly here only in N. T.; *vide* Gen. iii. 18.
r Lk. vii. 38, 44; xvii. 29. Jas. v. 17.

ὑμᾶς· 45. ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ q ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθούς, καὶ r βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. 46. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ[1] ποιοῦσι;

[1] Some editors, following DZ, prefer **ουτως** to **το αυτο**. W.H., while retaining **το αυτο**, which has the support of ℵBL, put **ουτως** on the margin.

election, and of certain texts (*vide* Ex. xxiii., Deut. vii.), was to foster aversion to the outside nations, and from Ezra onwards the spirit of Judaism was one of increasing hostility towards the *goyim*—*vide* Esther. The saying quoted by Jesus, if not an exact report of Rabbinical teaching, did no injustice to its general attitude. And the average Jew in this respect followed the guidance of his teachers, loving his own countrymen, regarding with racial and religious aversion those beyond the pale.—Ver. 44. **ἐχθροὺς** may be taken in all senses: national, private, religious. Jesus absolutely negatives hatred as inhuman. But the sequel shows that He has in view the enemies whom it is most difficult to love—**διωκόντων**: those who persecute on account of religion. The clauses imported into the T. R. from Luke have a more general reference to enmities arising from any cause, although they also receive a very emphatic meaning when the cause of alienation is religious differences. There are no hatreds so bitter and ruthless as those originating therein. How hard to love the persecutor who thinks he does God service by heaping upon you all manner of indignities. But the man who can rejoice in persecution (ver. 12) can love and pray for the persecutor. The cleavage between Christians and unbelievers took the place of that between the chosen race and the Gentiles, and tempted to the same sin.

Vv. 45-47. Characteristically lofty inducements to obey the new law; likeness to God (ver. 45); moral distinction among men (vv. 46, 47).—**υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν**: in order that ye may be indeed sons of God: *noblesse oblige*; God's sons must be Godlike. "Father" again. The new name for God occurs sixteen times in the Sermon on the Mount; to familiarise by repetition, and define by discriminating use.—**ὅτι**, not = **ὅς**, but meaning "because": for so your Father acts, and not otherwise can ye be His sons.—**ἀνατέλλει**, sometimes intransitive, as in Mt. iv. 16, Lk. xii. 54, here transitive, also in Sept., Gen. iii. 18, etc., and in some Greek authors (Pindar. Isth. vi., 110, *e.g.*) to cause to rise. The use of **καίειν** (ver. 15) and **ἀνατέλλειν** in an active sense is a revival of an old poetic use in later Greek (exx. of the former in Elsner).—**βρέχει** = *pluit* (Vulg.), said of God, as in the expression **ὕοντος τοῦ Διός** (Kypke, *Observ. Sac.*). The use of this word also in this sense is a revival of old poetic usage.—**πονηροὺς, ἀγαθοὺς**; **δικαίους, ἀδίκους**, not mere repetition. There is a difference between **ἀγαθός** and **δίκαιος** similar to that between generous and just. **πονηροὺς** may be rendered niggardly—*vide* on vi. 23. The sentiment thus becomes: "God makes His sun rise on niggardly and generous alike, and His rain fall on just and unjust". A similar thought in Seneca, *De benif.* iv. 26: "Si deos imitaris, da et ingratis beneficia, nam et sceleratis sol oritur, et piratis patent maria". The power of the fact stated to influence as a motive is wholly destroyed by a pantheistic conception of God as indifferent to moral distinctions, or a deistic idea of Him as transcendent, too far above the world, in heaven, as it were, to be able to take note of such differences. The divine impartiality is due to magnanimity, not to indifference or ignorance. Another important reflection is that in this word of Jesus we find distinct recognition of the fact that in human life there is a large sphere (sun and rain, how much these cover!) in which men are treated by Providence irrespectively of character; by no means a matter of course in a Jewish teacher, the tendency being to insist on exact correspondence between lot and character under a purely retributive conception of God's relation to man.—Ver. 46. **μισθὸν** here, and three times in next chapter; one of several words used in this connection of thought—**περισσὸν** (ver. 47), **τέλειοι** (ver. 48)—having a legal sound, and capable of being misunderstood. The scribes and Rabbis had much to say about merit

47. καὶ ἐὰν [s] ἀσπάσησθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς [1] ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι οὕτω [2] ποιοῦσιν; 48. ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς [t] τέλειοι, ὥσπερ [3] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς [4] τέλειός ἐστι.

s Ch. x. 12. Lk. x. 4. Cf. Heb. xi. 13 (saluting the promises).
t Ch. xix. 21. James i. 4; iii. 2. Heb. v. 14.

[1] Many copies have **φιλους**, but **αδελφους** is the reading of ℵBDZ.

[2] ℵBDZ have **εθνικοι** instead of **τελωναι** and **το αυτο** for **ουτω**. See below.

[3] **ως** in ℵBDLZΣ. **ωσπερ** possibly a literary refinement of the scribes.

[4] **ο ουρανιος** instead of **ο εν τ. ουρανοις** in ℵBDLZΣ.

and reward—*vide* Weber, *Die Lehre des Talmud*, c. xix. § 59, on the idea of Sechûth (merit). Totally opposed to Rabbinism, Jesus did not lose His balance, or allow Himself to be driven into extremes, after the usual manner of controversialists (Protestants and Catholics, *e.g.*). He speaks of **μισθὸς** without scruple (*cf.* on Lk. vi. 32).—**τελῶναι** (**τέλος**, tax, **ὠνέομαι**), first mention of a class often referred to in the Gospels, unpopular beyond their deserts; therefore, like women unjustly treated by husbands, befriended by Jesus; the humble agents of the great farmers of taxes, disliked as representing a foreign yoke, and on account of too frequent acts of injustice, yet human and kindly within their own class, loving those that loved them. Jesus took advantage of this characteristic to win their love by friendly acts.—Ver. 47. **ἀσπάσησθε**, "Salute," a very slight display of love from our Western point of view, a mere civility; more significant in the East; symbolic here of friendly relations, hence Tholuck, Bleek and others interpret, "to act in a friendly manner," which, as Meyer remarks, is, if not the *significatio*, at least the *adsignificatio*.—**περισσὸν**, used adverbially, literally "that which is over and above"; A. V., "more"; here, tropically = distinguished, unusually good = "quid magnum, eximium, insigne" (Pricaeus), so in Rom. iii. 1. In Plutarch, *Romulus*, xi., of one who excelled in casting horoscopes. Christ would awaken in disciples the ambition to excel. He does not wish them to be moral mediocrities, men of average morality, but to be morally superior, uncommon. This seems to come perilously near to the spirit of Pharisaism (*cf.* Gal. i. 14, **προέκοπτον**), but only seems. Christ commends *being* superior, not thinking oneself superior, the Pharisaic characteristic. Justin, Apol. i. 15, mixes vv. 46 and 47, and for **περισσὸν** puts **καίνον**, and for **τελῶναι**, or **ἐθνικοί**, **πόρνοι**. "If ye love those who love you what new thing do ye? for even fornicators do this."—**ἐθνικοί**, here as elsewhere in the Gospels associated with **τελῶναι** (Mt. xviii. 17). A good many of the publicans would be Gentiles. For a Jew it was a virtue to despise and shun both classes. Surely disciples will not be content to be on a moral level with them! Note that Jesus sees some good even in despised classes, social outcasts.

Ver. 48. *Concluding exhortation.* **οὖν**, from an ancient form of the participle of the verb **εἶναι** (Klotz, *Devar.*) = "things being so;" either a collective inference from all that goes before (vv. 21-47) or as a reflection on the immediately preceding argument. Both come to the same thing. Godlike love is commended in vv. 44-47, but the gist of all the six illustrations of Christ's way of thinking is: Love the fulfilling of the law; obviously, except in the case of oaths, where it is truth that is enjoined. But truth has its source in love; Eph. iv. 15: **ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ**, "truthing it in love".—**ἔσεσθε**, future, "ye shall be" = BE.—**ὑμεῖς**, ye, emphatic, in contrast with **τελ.** and **ἐθν.**, who are content with moral commonplace and conventional standards.—**Τέλειοι**, in general, men who have reached the end, touched the ideal, that at least their purpose, not satisfied with anything short of it. The **τέλειοι** are not men with a conceit of perfection, but aspirants—men who seek to attain, like Paul: **διώκω εἰ καὶ καταλάβω**, Phil. iii. 12, and like him, *single-minded*, their motto: **ἓν δέ**. Single-mindedness is a marked characteristic of all genuine citizens of the kingdom (Mt. vi. 33), and what the Bible means by perfection. All men who attain have one great ruling aim. That aim for the disciple, as here set forth, is Godlikeness—**ὡς ὁ πατὴρ . . . τέλειός ἐστιν**. God is what His sons aspire to be; He never sinks below the ideal: impartial, benignant, gracious love, even to the unworthy; for

VI. 1. "[a] ΠΡΟΣΕΧΕΤΕ[1] τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην[2] ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πρὸς τὸ [b] θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς· εἰ δὲ μήγε, μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν τοῖς[3] οὐρανοῖς. 2. ὅταν οὖν ποιῇς [c] ἐλεημοσύνην, μὴ [d] σαλπίσῃς ἔμπροσθέν σου, ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταὶ ποιοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς [e] ῥύμαις, ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπέχουσι τὸν

a followed by μὴ with inf. here, by μήποτε with subj. Lk. xxi. 34. b Ch. xxiii. 5. Mk. xvi. 11. c same phrase in Sir. vii. 10. Tobit iv. 7. Acts x. 2; xxiv. 17. d 1 Cor. xv. 52 and several times in Revel. e Lk. xiv. 21. Acts ix. 11; xii. 10.

[1] δε after προσεχετε in ℵLZ, inserted by Tisch. and W.H. within brackets. BD have no δε. It might have fallen out by similar ending (τε); on the other hand, it would stand here appropriately as a connecting particle of transition.

[2] ℵBD have δικαιοσυνην; doubtless the true reading, as a general caution against counterfeit righteousness was to be looked for first; then particular examples: alms, prayer, fasting.

[3] Tisch., on the authority of ℵD 1, 33, omits τοις.

that, not all conceivable attributes, is what is in view. ὡς, not in degree, that were a discouraging demand, but in kind. The kind very necessary to be emphasised in view of current ideas and practice, in which holiness was dissociated from love. The law "Be holy for I am holy" (Lev. xi. 44) was taken negatively and worked out in separation from the reputedly sinful. Jesus gave it positive contents, and worked it out in gracious love.

CHAPTER VI. THE SERMON CONTINUED. From Scribe law, the main theme of vv. 21-48, the Teacher passes to speak of Pharisaic practice. Ver. 1 describes the general character of Pharisaic righteousness. Then follow three special examples: *alms*, vv. 2-4; *prayer*, vv. 5-6; *fasting*, vv. 16-18. The transition from the one theme to the other was almost inevitable, and we may be sure that what follows formed part of the instruction on the hill.

Ver. 1. προσέχετε (τὸν νοῦν understood), to attend to; here, with μὴ following, take heed, be on your guard against.—δικαιοσύνην, not ἐλεημοσύνην (T. R.), is the reading demanded in a general introductory statement. Alms formed a very prominent part of Pharisaic righteousness, and was in Rabbinical dialect called righteousness, צדקה (*vide* Weber, p. 273), but it was not the whole, and it is a name for the whole category that is wanted in ver. 1. If Jesus spoke in Aramaic He might, as Lightfoot (Hor. Hebr.) suggests, use the word *tsedakah* both in the first and in the following three verses; in the first in the general sense, in the other places in the special sense of alms.—ἔμπροσθεν τ. ἀνθρώπων. In chap. v. 16 Christ commands disciples to let their light shine *before men*. Here He seems to enjoin the contrary. The contradiction is only apparent. The two places may be combined in a general rule thus: Show when tempted to *hide*, hide when tempted to *show*. The Pharisees were exposed, and yielded, to the latter temptation. They did their righteousness, πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι, *to be seen*. Their virtue was *theatrical*, and that meant doing only things which in matter and mode were commonly admired or believed by the doers to be. This spirit of ostentation Christ here and elsewhere represents as the leading feature of Pharisaism.—εἰ δὲ μήγε, a combination of four particles frequently occurring in the Gospels, meaning: *if at least ye do not attend to this rule, then*, etc. γὲ is a very expressive particle, derived by Klotz, *Devar*. ii. 272, from ΓΕΩ, *i.e.*, ΕΑΩ, or from ἄγε, and explained as meant to render the hearer attentive. Bäumlein, dissenting from Klotz's derivation, agrees substantially with his view of its meaning as isolating a thought from all else and placing it alone in the light (*Untersuchungen über Griechische Partikeln*, p. 54) = "Mark my words, for if you do not as I advise then," etc.—μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε: on μισθὸν, *vide* v. 46. The meaning is that theatrical virtue does not count in the Kingdom of God. Right motive is essential there. There may be a reward, there must be, else theatrical religion would not be so common; but it is not παρὰ τῷ πατρί.

μισθὸν αὐτῶν. 3. σοῦ δὲ ποιοῦντος ἐλεημοσύνην, μὴ γνώτω ἡ ἀριστερά σου τί ποιεῖ ἡ δεξιά σου, 4. ὅπως ᾖ σου ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη [1] ἐν τῷ [f] κρυπτῷ· καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ, αὐτὸς [2]

f Rom. ii. 29 (phrase).

[1] Tisch. has η σου ελεημοσυνη η, following ℵD (η σ. ελ. η). Most modern editors as in text.

[2] ℵBL omit αυτος, which is found in D.

Vv. 2-4. *Almsgiving.* Ver 2. ἐλεημοσύνην, mercy in general, but specifically alms, as a common mode of showing mercy. Compare our word charity.—σαλπίσῃς: to be understood metaphorically, as there is no evidence of the literal practice. Furrer gives this from Consul Wetstein to illustrate the word. When a man (in Damascus) wants to do a good act which may bring a blessing by way of divine recompense on his own family, *e.g.*, healing to a sick child, he goes to a water-carrier with a good voice, gives him a piece of money, and says "Sebil," *i.e.*, give the thirsty a fresh drink of water. The water-carrier fills his skin, takes his stand in the market, and sings in varied tones: "O thirsty, come to the drink-offering," the giver standing by, to whom the carrier says, as the thirsty drink, "God forgive thy sins, O giver of the drink" (*Zscht. für M. und R.*, 1890. *Vide* also his *Wanderungen d. d. H. L.*, p. 437).—ὑποκριταί, stage-players in classics, used in N. T. in a moral and sinister sense, and for the Christian mind heavily burdened with evil connotation—*hypocrites!* What a deepening of the moral sense is implied in the new meaning! The abhorrence of acting for effect in religion is due to Christ's teaching. It has not yet quite banished the thing. There are religious actors still, and they draw good houses.—συναγωγαῖς: where alms were collected, and apparently also distributed.—ῥύμαις, streets, in eastern cities narrow lanes, a late meaning; in earlier Greek = *impetus*—onset. *Vide* Rutherford's *New Phryn.*, 488. *Cf.* πλατειῶν, ver. 5. πλατεῖα, supp. ὁδός = a broad street.—δοξασθῶσιν: in chap. v. 16 God is conceived as recipient of the glory; here the almsgiver, giving for that purpose.—ἀμὴν introducing a solemn statement, and a very serious one for the parties concerned.—ἀπέχουσι, they have *in full;* they will get no more, nothing from God: so in Lk. vi. 24, Phil. iv. 18 (*vide* on Mk. xiv. 41). The hypocrite partly does not believe this, partly does not care, so long as he gets the applause of his public.—Ver. 3. μὴ γνώτω: in proverbial form a counsel to give with simplicity. Let not even thy left hand, if possible even thyself, know, still less other men; give without self-consciousness or self-complacency, the root of ostentation.—ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ: known to the recipient, of course, but to no other, so far as you are concerned, hardly even to yourself. "Pii lucent, et tamen latent," Beng.—ὁ βλέπων ε. τ. κ., who seeth in the dark. "Acquainted with all my ways." Ps. cxxxix., a comfort to the sincerely good, not to the counterfeits.—ἀποδώσει σοι: a certainty: and not merely of the future. The reward is present; not in the form of self-complacency, but in the form of spiritual health, like natural buoyancy, when all physical functions work well. A right-minded man is happy without reflecting why; it is the joy of living in summer sunshine and bracing mountain air. The ἐν τῷ φανερῷ here and in vv. 6 and 18, a gloss by some superficial copyist, ignores the inward present reward, and appeals in a new form to the spirit of ostentation.

Vv. 5-6. *Prayer.* ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, as the actors. We shrink from the harshness of the term "hypocrite". Jesus is in the act of creating the new meaning by the use of an old word in a new connection.—φιλοῦσι stands in place of an adverb. They love to, are wont, do it with pleasure. This construction is common in classics, even in reference to inanimate objects, but here only and in Mt. xxiii. 6-7 in N. T.—ἑστῶτες, ordinary attitude in prayer. στῆναι and καθῆσθαι seem to be used sometimes without emphasis to denote simply presence in a place (so Pricaeus).—συναγωγαῖς, γωνίαις τ. πλατ.: usual places of prayer, especially for the "actors," where men do congregate, in the synagogue for worship, at the corners of the broad streets for talk or business; plenty of observers in both cases. Prayer had been reduced to system among the Jews. Methodising, with stated hours and forms, began after

g Ch. xvi. 27. [g] ἀποδώσει σοι ἐν τῷ φανερῷ.[1] 5. Καὶ ὅταν προσεύχῃ, οὐκ ἔσῃ[2] h Ch. xxiii. 6. Lk. xx. 46. ὥσπερ[3] οἱ ὑποκριταί, ὅτι [h] φιλοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ ἐν ταῖς γωνίαις τῶν πλατειῶν ἑστῶτες προσεύχεσθαι, ὅπως ἂν[4] φανῶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι[5] ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν. 6. i Ch. xxiv. 26. Lk. xii. 3, 24. Sir. xxix. 12 al. in Sept. σὺ δέ, ὅταν προσεύχῃ, εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ [i] ταμιεῖόν[6] σου, καὶ κλείσας τὴν θύραν σου, πρόσευξαι τῷ πατρί σου τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ· καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ ἀποδώσει σοι ἐν τῷ φανερῷ.[7]

[1] ℵBD omit. This time L goes with the MSS. which have this reading. Doubtless a gloss, *vide* below.

[2] For προσευχη ουκ εση ℵB have προσευχησθε ουκ εσεσθε, adopted by W.H. and other editors.

[3] ως in ℵBDZ.

[4] αν omitted in ℵBDL.

[5] οτι omitted in ℵBDZ.

[6] ταμειον in W.H. So in ℵBDL (ταμιον, ℵD).

[7] ℵBDZ omit εν τω φανερω, followed by most modern editors.

Ezra, and grew in the Judaistic period; traces of it even in the later books of O. T., *e.g.*, Dan. vi. 10, 11 (*vide* Schultz, *Alt. Theol.*). The hour of prayer might overtake a man anywhere. The "actors" might, as De Wette suggests, be glad to be overtaken, or even arrange for it, in some well-frequented place. — **ὅπως φανῶσιν τ. α.** in order that they may appear to men, and have it remarked: how devout! Ver. 6: true prayer in contrast to the theatrical type.— **σὺ δὲ**, thou, my disciple, in opposition to the "actors".—**ὅταν**, when the spirit moves, not when the customary hour comes, freedom from rule in prayer, as in fasting (Mt. ix. 14), is taken for granted — **τὸ ταμεῖον**, late form for **ταμιεῖον** (Lobeck, *Phryn.*, 493), first a store-chamber, then any place of privacy, a closet (Mt. xxiv. 26). Note the **σου** after **ταμ.** and **θύραν** and **πατρί**, all emphasising isolation, *thy* closet, *thy* door, *thy* Father.—**κλείσας**, carefully shutting thy door, the door of thine own retreat, to exclude all but thy Father, with as much secrecy as if you were about a guilty act. What delicacy of feeling, as well as sincerity, is implied in all this; greatly to be respected, often sinned against.—**τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ**. He who is in the secret place; perhaps with allusion to God's presence in the dark holy of holies (Achelis). He is there in the place from which all fellowmen are excluded. Is social prayer negatived by this directory? No, but it is implied that social prayer will be a reality only in proportion as it proceeds from a gathering of men accustomed to private prayer.

Vv. 7-15. *Further instruction in prayer.* Weiss (Mt.-Evan.) regards this passage as an interpolation, having no proper place in an anti-Pharisaic discourse. Both the opinion and its ground are doubtful. As regards the latter, it is true that it is Gentile practice in prayer that is formally criticised, but it does not follow that the Pharisees were not open to the same censure. They might make long prayers, not in ignorance, but in ostentation (Lutteroth), as a display of devotional talent or zeal. But apart from the question of reference to the Pharisees, it is likely that prayer under various aspects formed one of the subjects of instruction in the course of teaching on the hill whereof these chapters are a digest.

Ver. 7. **βατταλογήσητε**; a **ἅπαξ λεγ.** in N. T., rarely used anywhere, and of doubtful derivation. Some (Erasmus, *e.g.*) have thought it was formed from Battus, the stammerer mentioned by Herod. (iv. 155), or from a feeble poet of the name who made long hymns full of repetitions (Suidas, Lexicon), but most now incline to the view that it is onomatopoetic. Hesychius (Lex.) takes this view of the kindred word, **βατταρίζειν** (**ἐμοὶ μὲν δοκεῖ κατὰ μίμησιν τῆς φωνῆς πεποίησθαι**). It points to the repetition without end of the same forms of words as a stammerer involuntarily repeats the same syllable, like the Baal worshippers

7. Προσευχόμενοι δὲ μὴ βαττολογήσητε,[1] ὥσπερ οἱ [j] ἐθνικοί·[2] [j] δοκοῦσι γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν [k] εἰσακουσθήσονται. 8. μὴ οὖν [l] ὁμοιωθῆτε αὐτοῖς· οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ[3] ὑμῶν ὧν [m] χρείαν ἔχετε, πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι αὐτόν. 9. οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς·

j Ch. v. 47 (in critical notes); xviii. 17.
k Lk. i. 13. Acts x. 31. 1 Cor. xiv. 31. Heb. v. 7.
l Ch. vii. 24, 26; xiii. 24.
m Ch. ix. 12; xxi. 3.

[1] ℵB have βαττα., which Tisch. and W.H. follow. L as in text. D has βλαττολ.

[2] B and Syr. Cur. have υποκριται.

[3] ℵB Sah. version have ο θεος before ο πατηρ (W.H. within brackets).

shouting from morning till noon, "O Baal, hear us" (1 Kings xviii. 26, *cf.* Acts xix. 34, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians"). This repetition is characteristic of Pagan prayer, and when it recurs in the Church, as in saying many Aves and Paternosters, it is Paganism redivivus.—**ἐθνικοί**, the second of three references to Pagans (v. 47, vi. 32) in the Sermon on the Mount, not to be wondered at. The Pagan world was near at hand for a Jew belonging to Galilee with its mixed population. Pagan customs would be familar to Galileans, and it was natural that Jesus should use them as well as the theory and practice of scribes and Pharisees to define by contrast true piety.—**πολυλογίᾳ**, epexegetical of **βατταλογ.** The Pagans thought that by endless repetitions and many words they would inform their gods as to their needs and weary them ("fatigare deos") into granting their requests. Ver. 8, **οὖν**, infers that disciples must not imitate the practice described, because it is Pagan, and because it is absurd. Repetition is, moreover, wholly uncalled for—**οἶδεν γὰρ.** The God whom Jesus proclaims—"your Father"—knows beforehand your needs. Why, then, pray at all? Because we cannot receive unless we desire, and if we desire, we will pray; also because things worth getting are worth asking. Only pray always as to a Being well informed and willing, in few words and in faith. With such thoughts in mind, Jesus proceeds to give a sample of suitable prayer.

Vv. 9-13. *The Lord's Prayer.* Again, in Lk. xi. 1-4—*vide* notes there. Here I remark only that Luke's form, true reading, is shorter than Matthew's. On this ground Camphausen (*Das Gebet des Herrn*) argues for its originality. But surely Matthew's form is short and elementary enough to satisfy all reasonable requirements! The question as to the original form cannot be settled on such grounds. The prayer, as here given, is, indeed, a model of simplicity. Besides the question as to the original form, there is another as to the originality of the matter. Wetstein says, "tota haec oratio ex formulis Hebraeorum concinnata est". De Wette, after quoting these words, asserts that, after all the Rabbinical scholars have done their utmost to adduce parallels from Jewish sources, the Lord's Prayer is by no means shown to be a *Cento*, and that it contains echoes only of well-known O. T. and Messianic ideas and expressions, and this only in the first two petitions. This may be the actual fact, but there is no need for any zeal in defence of the position. I should be very sorry to think that the model prayer was absolutely original. It would be a melancholy account of the chosen people if, after thousands of years of special training, they did not yet know what to pray for. Jesus made a new departure by inaugurating (1) freedom in prayer; (2) trustfulness of spirit; (3) simplicity in manner. The mere making of a new prayer, if only by apt conjunction of a few choice phrases gathered from Scripture or Jewish prayer-books, was an assertion of liberty. And, of course, the liberty obtains in reference to the new form as well as to the old. We may use the Paternoster, but we are not bound to use it. It is not in turn to become a fetish. Reformers do not arise to break old fetters only in order to forge new ones.

Ver. 9. **οὕτως**, thus, not after the ethnic manner.—**προσεύχεσθε**: present, pray so habitually.—**ὑμεῖς**: as opposed to the Pagans, as men (*i.e.*) who believe in an intelligent, willing God, your Father. The prayer which follows consists of six petitions which have often been elaborately explained, with learned discussions on disputed points, leaving the reader with the feeling that the new form is any thing but simple, and wondering how it ever came into universal use. Gospel has been turned into law, spirit into

Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, [n] ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· 10. ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· [o] γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, [p] ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ,

n 1 Pet. iii. 15. (Is. xxix. 23.) o Ch. xxvi. 42. Acts xxi. 14 (same phrase). p Acts vii. 51 (ὡς καὶ).

letter, poetry into prose. We had better let this prayer alone if we cannot catch its lyric tone.—**Πάτερ.** In Luke's form this name stands impressively alone, but the words associated with it in Matthew's version of the address are every way suitable. Name and epithet together—Father, in heaven—express reverential trust.—**Ἁγιασθήτω τ. ο. σου**: first petition—sanctified, hallowed be Thy name. Fritzsche holds that **σου** in this and the next two petitions is emphatic, **σοῦ** not **σου** enclitic. The suggestion gives a good direction for the expositor = may God the Father-God of Jesus become the one object of worship all the world over. A very natural turn of thought in view of the previous reference to the Pagans. Pagan prayer corresponded to the nature of Pagan deities—indifferent, capricious, unrighteous, unloving; much speaking, iteration, dunning was needed to gain their ear. How blessed if the whole pantheon could be swept away or fall into contempt, and the one worshipful Divinity be, in fact, worshipped, **ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς**; for this clause appended to the third petition may be conceived as common to all the first three. The One Name in heaven the One Name on earth, and reverenced on earth as in heaven. Universalism is latent in this opening petition. We cannot imagine Jesus as meaning merely that the national God of Israel may be duly honoured within the bounds of His own people.

Ver. 10. **Ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου**: second petition. The prayer of all Jews. Even the Rabbis said, that is no prayer in which no mention of the kingdom is made. All depends on how the kingdom is conceived, on what we want to come. The kingdom is as the King. It is the kingdom of the universal, benignant Father who knows the wants of His children and cares for their interests, lower and higher, that Jesus desires to come. It will come with the spread of the worship of the One true Divine Name; the paternal God ruling in grace over believing, grateful men. Thus viewed, God's kingdom *comes*, is not always here, as in the reign of natural law or in the moral order of the world.—**γενηθήτω τ. θ. σ.**: third petition. Camphausen, bent on maintaining the superior originality of Luke's form in which this petition is wanting, regards it as a mere pendant to the second, unfolding its meaning. And it is true in a sense that any one of the three first petitions implies the rest. Yet the third has its distinct place. The kingdom, as Jesus preached it, was a kingdom of grace. The second petition, therefore, is a prayer that God's *gracious* will may be done. The third, on the other hand, is a prayer that God's commanding will may be done; that the right as against the wrong may everywhere prevail.—**ὡς ἐν οὐρ. καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς.** This addendum, not without application to all three petitions, is specially applicable to this one. Translated into modern dialect, it means that the divine will may be perfectly, ideally done on this earth: as in heaven, so also, etc. The reference is probably to the angels, described in Ps. ciii., as doing God's commandments. In the O. T. the angels are the agents of God's will in nature as well as in Providence. The defining clause might, therefore, be taken as meaning: may God's will be done in the moral sphere as in the natural; exactly, always, everywhere.

The foregoing petitions are regarded by Grotius, and after him Achelis, as *pia desideria*, **εὐχαί**, rather than petitions proper—**αἰτήματα**, like the following three. The distinction is not gratuitous, but it is an exegetical refinement which may be disregarded. More important is it to note that the first group refers to the great public interests of God and His kingdom, placed first here as in vi. 33, the second to personal needs. There is a corresponding difference in the mode of expression, the verbs being in the third person in Group I., objective, impersonal; in the second in Group II., subjective, personal.

Ver. 11. *Fourth petition.* **τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν**: whatever the adjective qualifying **ἄρτον** may mean, it may be taken for granted that it is ordinary bread, food for the body, that is intended. All spiritualising mystical meanings of **ἐπιούσιον** are to be discarded. This is the one puzzling word in the prayer. It is a **ἅπαξ λεγ.**, not only in O. and N. T., but in Greek literature, as known not only to us, but even to Origen, who (*De Oratione*, cap. xxvii.) states that it

καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς[1] γῆς· 11. τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν [q] ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον· 12. καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ [r] ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς

q here and in Lk. xi. 3 (not found in Greek literature).
r Rom. iv. 4.

[1] **ℵBZΔ and some cursives omit της. So most modern editors.**

is not found in any of the Greeks, or used by private individuals, and that it seems to be a coinage (**ἔοικε πεπλάσθαι**) of the evangelists. It is certainly not likely to have proceeded from our Lord. This one word suffices to prove that, if not always, at least in uttering this prayer, Jesus spoke in Aramaean. He would not in such a connection use an obscure word, unfamiliar, and of doubtful meaning. The problem is to account for the incoming of such a word into the Greek version of His doubtless simple, artless, and well-understood saying. The learned are divided as to the derivation of the word, having of course nothing but conjecture to go on. Some derive it from **ἐπὶ** and **οὐσία**, or the participle of **εἶναι**; others from **ἐπιέναι**, or **ἡ ἐπιοῦσα** = the approaching day (**ἡμέρα** understood). In one case we get a qualitative sense—bread for subsistence, bread needed and sufficient (**τὰ δέοντα καὶ αὐτάρκη**. Prov. xxx. 8, Sept.), in the other, a temporal—bread of the coming day, *panem quotidianum* (Vulg., Lk., xi. 3), "daily bread". Either party argues against the other on grammatical grounds, *e.g.*, that derived from **οὐσία** the word should be **ἐπούσιος**, and that derived from **ἐπιοῦσα** it should be **ἐπιουσαῖος**. In either case the disputants are ready with their answer. Another source of argument is suitableness of the sense. Opponents of the temporal sense say that to pray for to-morrow's bread sins against the counsel, "Take no thought for the morrow," and that to pray, "Give us to-day our bread of to-morrow," is absurd (*ineptius*, Suicer, Thesaurus, s.v. **ἐπιούσιος**). On the other side it is said: Granting that the sense "sufficient" can be got from **ἐπὶ, οὐσία**, and granting its appropriateness, how comes it that a simpler, better-known word was not chosen to represent so plain a meaning? Early tradition should have an important bearing on the question. Lightfoot, in the appendix on the words **ἐπιούσιος** and **περιούσιος**, in his work "On a fresh Revision of the N. T.," summarises the evidence to this effect: Most of the Greeks follow Origen, who favoured derivation from **οὐσία**. But Aramaic Christians put for **ἐπιούσιος** *Mahar* = crastinum. (Jerome comm. in Mt.) The Curetonian Syriac has words meaning, "our bread continual of the day give us". The Egyptian versions have similar readings. The old Latin version has *quotidianum*, retained by Jerome in revision of L. V. in Lk. xi. 2, while *supersubstantialem* is given in Mt. vi. 11. The testimony of these early versions is important in reference to the primitive sense attached to the word. Still the question remains: How account for the coinage of such a word in Greek-speaking circles, and for the tautology: give us to-day (**σήμερον**, Mt.) or daily (**τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν**, Luke), the bread of to-morrow? In his valuable study on "The Lord's Prayer in the early Church" (*Texts and Studies*, 1891), Principal Chase has made an important contribution to the solution of this difficulty by the suggestion that the coinage was due to liturgical exigencies in connection with the use of the prayer *in the evening*. Assuming that the original petition was to the effect: "to us give, of the day, our bread," and that the Greek equivalent for the day was **ἡ ἐπιοῦσα**, the adjective **ἐπιούσιος** was coined to make the prayer suitable at all hours. In the morning it would mean the bread of the day now begun, in the evening the bread of to-morrow. But devotional conservatism, while adopting the new word as convenient, would cling to the original "of the day"; hence **σήμερον** in Matt. and **τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν** in Luke, along with **ἐπιούσιος**. On the whole the temporal meaning seems to have the weight of the argument on its side. For a full statement of the case on that side *vide* Lightfoot as above, and on the other the article on **ἐπιούσιος** in Cremer's Bib. Theol., W. B., 7th Aufl., 1893.

Ver. 12. *Fifth petition.* **ὀφειλήματα**, in classics literal debts, here moral debts, sins (**ἁμαρτίας** in Lk. xi. 4). The more men desire God's will to be done the more conscious they are of shortcoming. The more conscious of personal shortcoming, the more indulgent towards the faults of others even when committed against themselves. Hence the added

s Ch. xviii. 24 (literal). Lk. xiii. 4 (moral). Gal. v. 3 (logical obligation). t Lk. xi. 4. u Mk. xi. 25. Rom. v. 15-18. Gal. vi. 1. al. v Lk. xxiv. 17. w vv. 19, 20. Acts xiii. 41. James iv. 14.

ἀφίεμεν[1] τοῖς [s]ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν· 13. καὶ μὴ [t]εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.[2] 14. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ [u]παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος· 15. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν,[3] οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν. 16. [v]Ὅταν δὲ νηστεύητε, μὴ γίνεσθε ὥσπερ[4] οἱ ὑποκριταὶ [v]σκυθρωποί· [w]ἀφανίζουσι γὰρ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν,[5] ὅπως φανῶσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύοντες· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι[6]

[1] ℵBZ have αφηκαμεν, adopted by modern editors. αφιεμεν (T. R.) has probably come in from Luke (xi. 4).

[2] The Doxology οτι σου . . . αμην is wanting in ℵBDZ and is regarded by most modern critics as an ancient liturgical insertion. It is found in LΔΣ *al.*

[3] τα παραπτωματα αυτων wanting in ℵD, omitted by Tisch., bracketed by W.H., though found in BL.

[4] ως in ℵBDΔ.

[5] For αυτων B has εαυτων.

[6] T. R. has οτι with L. ℵBD omit.

words: ὡς καὶ ἡ. ἀφήκαμεν, etc. It is natural and comforting to the sincere soul to put the two things together. ὡς must be taken very generally. The prayer proceeds from child-like hearts, not from men trained in the distinctions of theology. The comment appended in vv. 14, 15 introduces an element of reflection difficult to reconcile with the spontaneity of the prayer. It is probably imported from another connection, *e.g.*, Mt. xviii. 35 (so Weiss-Meyer).

Ver. 13. *Sixth petition:* consists of two members, one qualifying or limiting the other.—μὴ . . . πειρασμόν, expose us not to moral trial. All trial is of doubtful issue, and may therefore naturally and innocently be shrunk from, even by those who know that the result may be good, confirmation in faith and virtue. The prayer is certainly in a different key from the Beatitude in V. 10. There Jesus sets before the disciple a heroic temper as the ideal. But here He does not assume the disciple to have attained. The Lord's Prayer is not merely for heroes, but for the timid, the inexperienced. The teacher is considerate, and allows time for reaching the heights of heroism on which St. James stood when he wrote (i. 2) πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου, ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις.—ἀλλὰ, not purely adversative, cancelling previous clause, but confirming it and going further (Schanz), in accordance with original meaning of ἀλλὰ, derived from ἄλλο or ἄλλα, and signifying that what is going to be said is another thing, *aliud*, in relation to what has been said, Klotz, *Devar.* ii., p. 2 = Lead us not into temptation, or so lead us that we may be safe from evil: May the issue ever be beneficent.—ῥῦσαι ἀπὸ, not ἐκ; the latter would imply actual implication in, the former implies danger merely. Both occur in N. T. (on the difference *cf.* Camphausen, Das G. des H.).—τοῦ πονηροῦ, either masculine or neuter, which? Here again there is an elaborate debate on a comparatively unimportant question. The probability is in favour of the masculine, the evil one. The Eastern naturally thought of evil in the concrete. But we as naturally think of it in the abstract; therefore the change from A. V. in R. V. is unfortunate. It mars the reality of the Lord's Prayer on Western lips to say deliver us from the evil one. Observe it is moral evil, not physical, that is deprecated.—ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν . . . Ἀμήν: a liturgical ending, no part of the original prayer, and tending to turn a religious reality into a devotional form.

On vv. 14-15 *vide* under ver. 12.

Vv. 16-18. *Fasting.* Ver. 16. ὅταν δὲ: transition to a new related topic.—σκυθρωποί, of sad visage, overdone of course by the "actors". Fasting, like

ἀπέχουσι τὸν μισθὸν αὐτῶν. 17. σὺ δὲ νηστεύων [x] ἄλειψαί σου τὴν κεφαλήν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου νίψαι· 18. ὅπως μὴ φανῇς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύων,[1] ἀλλὰ τῷ πατρί σου τῷ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ[2] καὶ ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ[2] ἀποδώσει σοι ἐν τῷ φανερῷ.[3]

19. "Μὴ [y] θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται [z] διορύσσουσι καὶ κλέπτουσι· 20. θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν. 21. ὅπου γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν,[4] ἐκεῖ ἔσται καὶ[5] ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν.[4] 22. Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός[6]· ἐὰν οὖν ὁ

x Mk. vi. 13. Lk. vii. 38, 46. James v. 14.

y Lk. xii. 21. Rom. ii. 5. 1 Cor. xvi. 2 *al.*

z Ch. xxiv. 43. Lk. xii. 39.

[1] B places **νηστευων** before **τοις ανθρωποις**.

[2] **κρυφαιω** in ℵBD.

[3] ℵBDL omit **εν τω φανερω**.

[4] ℵB have **σου**, which makes the reflection more pointed.

[5] B omits **και**.

[6] B adds **σου**.

prayer, was reduced to a system; twice a week in ordinary Pharisaic practice: Thursday and Monday (ascent and descent of Moses on Sinai), artificial gloom inevitable in such circumstances. In occasional fasting, in circumstances of genuine affliction, the gloom will be real (Lk. xxiv. 17).—**ἀφανίζουσιν—ὅπως φανῶσιν**, a play upon words, may be rendered in English "they disfigure that they may figure". In German: Unsichtbar machen, sichtbar werden (Schanz and Weiss).—Ver. 17. **ἄλειψαι, νίψαι**: not necessarily as if preparing for a feast (Meyer and Weiss), but performing the usual daily ablutions for comfort and cleanliness, so avoiding parade of fasting by neglect of them (Bleek, Achelis).

The foregoing inculcations of sincerity and reality in religion contribute indirectly to the illustration of the divine name Father which is here again defined by discriminating use. God *as* Father desires these qualities in worshippers. All close relations (father, son, husband, wife) demand real affection as distinct from parade.

Vv. 19-34. *Counsels against covetousness and care* (reproduced in Lk. xii. 22-34, with exception of vv. 22-23, which reappear in Lk. xi. 34-36). An interpolation, according to Weiss. Doubtless, if the Sermon on the Mount was exclusively an anti-Pharisaic discourse. But this homily might very well have formed one of the lessons on the hill, in connection with the general theme of the kingdom which needs to be defined in contrast to worldliness not less than to spurious types of piety.

Vv. 19-21. *Against hoarding.* **θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**, treasures upon earth, and therefore earthly, material, perishable, of whatever kind.—**σὴς**, moth, destructive of costly garments, one prominent sort of treasure in the East.—**βρῶσις**, not merely "rust," but a generic term embracing the whole class of agents which eat or consume valuables (so Beza, Fritzsche, Bleek, Meyer, etc.). Erosionem seu corrosionem quamlibet denotat, quum vel vestes a tineis vel vetustate et putredine eroduntur, vel lignum a cossibus et carie, frumentum a curculionibus, quales **τρῶγας** Graeci vocant, vel metalli ab aerugine, ferrugine, eroduntur et corroduntur (Kypke, Obs. Sac.).—**διορύσσουσιν**, dig through (clay walls), easier to get in so than through carefully barred doors (again in Matt. xxiv. 43). The thief would not find much in such a house.—Ver. 20. **θησ. ἐν οὐρανῷ**: not = heavenly treasures, says Fritzsche, as that would require **τοὺς** before **ἐν**. Grammatically this is correct, yet practically heavenly treasure is meant.—Ver. 21. **ὅπου θησ. . . . ἐκεῖ καρδία**. The reflection goes back on the negative counsel in ver. 19. Do not accumulate earthly treasures, for then your heart will be there, whereas it ought to be in heaven with God and the Kingdom of God.

Vv. 22-24. *Parable of the eye.* A difficult passage; connection obscure,

ὀφθαλμός σου [a] ἁπλοῦς ᾖ,[1] ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου [b] φωτεινὸν ἔσται· 23. ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρὸς ᾖ, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου [c] σκοτεινὸν ἔσται. εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστί, τὸ σκότος πόσον; 24. Οὐδεὶς δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσει, καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει· ἢ ἑνὸς [d] ἀνθέξεται, καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου [e] καταφρονήσει. οὐ δύνασθε Θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ [f] μαμμωνᾷ.[2] 25. διὰ

a Lk. xi. 34. b Ch. xvii. 5. Lk. xi. 34, 36. c Lk. xi. 34, 36. d Lk. xvi. 13. 1 Thess. v. 14. Tit. i. 9. e Ch. xviii. 10. Lk. xvi. 13. Rom. ii. 4 *al.* f Lk. xvi. 13.

[1] η before ο οφθαλμος σου απλους in ℵB.

[2] μαμωνα in all uncials.

and the evangelic report apparently imperfect. The parallel passage in Luke (xi. 33-36) gives little help. The figure and its ethical meaning seem to be mixed up, moral attributes ascribed to the physical eye which with these still gives light to the *body*. This confusion may be due to the fact that the eye, besides being the organ of vision, is the seat of expression, revealing inward dispositions. Physically the qualities on which vision depends are health and disease. The healthy eye gives light for all bodily functions, walking, working, etc.; the diseased eye more or less fails in this service. If the moral is to be found only in last clause of ver. 23, all going before being parable, then **ἁπλοῦς** must mean sound and **πονηρὸς** diseased, meanings which, if not inadmissible, one yet does not expect to find expressed by these words. They seem to be chosen because of their applicability to the moral sphere, in which they might suitably to the connection mean "liberal" and "niggardly". **ἁπλότης** occurs in this sense in Rom. xii. 8, and Hatch (Essays in B. G., p. 80) has shown that **πονηρός** occurs several times in Sept. (Sir.) in the sense of niggardly, grudging. He accordingly renders: "The lamp of the body is the eye. If therefore thine eye be liberal thy whole body shall be full of light; but if thine eye be grudging, thy whole body shall be full of darkness." Of course this leaves the difficulty of the mixing of natural and moral untouched. The passage is elliptical, and might be paraphrased thus: The eye is the lamp of the body: when it is healthy we see to do our daily work, when diseased we are in darkness. So with the eye of the soul, the heart, seat of desire: when it is free from covetousness, not anxious to hoard, all goes well with our spiritual functions —we choose and act wisely. When sordid passions possess it there is darkness within deeper than that which afflicts the blind man. We mistake the relative value of things, choose the worse, neglect the better, or flatter ourselves that we can have both.

Ver. 24. *Parable of the two masters.* **Οὐδεὶς**: In the natural sphere it is impossible for a slave to serve two masters, for each claims him as his property, and the slave must respond to one or other of the claims with entire devotion, either from love or from interest.—**ἢ γὰρ . . . μισήσει . . . ἀγαπήσει**: We may take this clause as referring to the case of honest preference. A slave has his likes and dislikes like other men. And he will not do things by halves. His preference will take the form of love, and his aversion that of hate.—**ἢ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται**, etc.: this clause may be taken as referring to the case of interest. The slave may not in his heart care for either of the rival masters. But he must seem to care, and the relative power or temper of one as compared to the other, may be the ground of his decision. And having decided, he attaches himself, **ἀνθέξεται**, to the one, and ostentatiously disregards the other. In ordinary circumstances there would be no room for such a competition of masters. But a case might occur in time of war when the conquered were sold into slavery.—**οὐ δύνασθε**, etc. Application of the parable to God and earthly possessions.—**μαμωνᾷ**, wealth personified = Plutus, a Chaldee, Syriac, and Punic word ("lucrum punice mammon dicitur," Aug. de S. D.) derived from טָמַן = to conceal or אָמַן to trust (*vide* Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.*, p. 1217). The meaning is not, "ye cannot serve God and have riches," but "ye cannot be faithful to God and make an idol of wealth". "Non dixit, qui habet divitias, sed qui servit divitiis," Jerome.

Vv. 25-34. *Counsels against care.* More suitable to the circumstances of the

τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ [g] μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν, τί φάγητε καὶ [1] τί πίητε· μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν, τί [h] ἐνδύσησθε. οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος; 26. [i] ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ [j] πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὅτι οὐ [k] σπείρουσιν, οὐδὲ [k] θερίζουσιν, οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτά· οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον [l] διαφέρετε αὐτῶν; 27. τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύνα-

g Ch. x. 19. Lk. x. 41; xii. 25. Phil. iv. 6 (various const.).
h Ch. xxii. 11. Mk. i. 6. Rom. xiii. 12. Eph. vi. 11. 1 Thess. v. 8 (last three exx. metaphorical). i Acts i. 11 (with εἰς). j Ch. viii. 20; xiii. 4. Lk. viii. 5. Acts x. 12. k John iv. l Ch. x. 31; xii. 12. Lk. xii. 24 (with μᾶλλον).

[1] η τι πιητε in B. This clause is wanting in ℵ, omitted by Tisch., and bracketed by W.H.

disciples than those against amassing treasures. "Why speak of treasures to us who are not even sure of the necessaries of life? It is for bread and clothing we are in torment" (Lutteroth).—Ver. 25, **διὰ τοῦτο**: because ye can be unfaithful to God through care as well as through covetousness.—**μὴ μεριμνᾶτε**: **μέριμνα** from **μερίς, μερίζω**, because care divides and distracts the mind. The verb is used in N. T. in various constructions and senses; sometimes in a good sense, as in 1 Cor. vii. 32: "The unmarried care for the things of the Lord," and xii. 25 in reference to the members of the body having the same care for each other. But the evil sense predominates. What is here deprecated is not work for bread and raiment, but worry, "Labor exercendus est, solicitudo tollenda," Jerome.—**οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ . . . ἐνδύματος**: the *life* not the soul; the natural life is more than *meat*, and the body more than the *clothing* which protects it, yet these greater things are given to you already. Can you not trust Him who gave the greater to give the less? But a saying like this, life is more than meat, in the mouth of Jesus is very pregnant. It tends to lift our thoughts above materialism to a lofty conception of man's chief end. It is more than an argument against care, it is a far-reaching principle to be associated with that other *logion*—a man is better than a sheep (Matt. xii. 12).—Ver. 26. **ἐμβλέψατε εἰς**, fix your eyes on so as to take a good look at (Mk. x. 21, xiv. 67).—**τὰ πετεινὰ τ. ου.**, the birds whose element is the air; look, not to admire their free, careless movements on the wing, but to note a very relevant fact—**ὅτι**, that without toil they get their food and live—**σπείρουσιν, θερίζουσιν, συνάγουσι ε. α.**: the usual operations of the husbandman in producing the staff of life. In these the birds have no part, yet your Father feedeth them. The careworn might reply to this: yes; they feed themselves at the farmer's expense, an additional source of anxiety to him. And the cynic unbeliever in Providence: yes, in summer; but how many perish in winter through want and cold! Jesus, greatest of all optimists, though no shallow or ignorant one, quietly adds: **οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶν**: do not ye differ considerably from them? They fare, on the whole, well, God's humble *creatures*. Why should *you* fear, *men*, God's *children*?

Ver. 27. **τίς δὲ**, etc. The question means: care is as bootless as it is needless. But there is much difference of opinion as to the precise point of the question. Does it mean, who by care can add a cubit to his height or who can add a short space of time, represented by a cubit, to the length of his life? **ἡλικία** admits of either sense. It means *stature* in Lk. xix. 3; *age* in John ix. 21, Heb. xi. 11. Most recent commentators favour the latter interpretation, chiefly influenced by the monstrosity of the supposition as referring to stature. Who could call adding a cubit, 1½ feet, to his height a very small matter, the expression of Lk. (**ἐλάχιστον**, xii. 26)? The application of a measure of length to length of days is justified by Ps. xxxix. 5: "Thou hast made my days as handbreadths". But Dr. Field strongly protests against the new rendering. Admitting, of course, that **ἡλικία** is ambiguous, and that in classic authors it oftener means age than stature, he insists that **πῆχυς** is decisive. "**πηχυς**," he remarks (Ot. Nor.), "is not only a measure of length, but that by which a man's *stature* was properly measured." Euthy. on this place remarks: "**καὶ μὴν οὐδὲ σπιθαμήν** (half a cubit) **οὐ δὲ δάκτυλον** (a 24th part): **λοιπὸν οὖν πῆχυν εἶπε, διότι κυρίως μέτρον τῶν ἡλικιῶν ὁ πῆχύς ἐστι.** Thus a short man is **τρίπηχυς**, a tall man **τετράπηχυς**." But how are we to get over the monstrosity of the supposition?

ται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ [m] πῆχυν ἕνα; 28. καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνᾶτε; καταμάθετε τὰ [n] κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ, πῶς αὐξάνει[1]· οὐ κοπιᾷ,[1] οὐδὲ νήθει[1]· 29. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδὲ Σολομὼν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ [o] περιεβάλετο ὡς ἓν τούτων. 30. εἰ δὲ τὸν [p] χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ, σήμερον ὄντα, καὶ αὔριον εἰς [q] κλίβανον βαλλόμενον, ὁ Θεὸς οὕτως [r] ἀμφιέννυσιν, οὐ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, [s] ὀλιγόπιστοι; 31. μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε, λέγοντες, Τί φάγωμεν, ἢ

m Lk. xii. 25. John xxi. 8. Rev. xxi. 17.
n Lk. xii. 27.
o ver. 31 (with τι). Lk. xii. 27.
p Ch. xiv. 19. Lk. xii. 28. Jas. i. 10 (of grass). Ch. xiii. 26. Mk. iv. 28 (of grain). 1 Cor. iii. 12 (of hay).
q here and Lk. xii. 28.
r Ch. xi. 8.
s Ch. viii. 26; xiv. 31; xvi. 8. Lk. xii. 28.

[1] אB have plurals (W.H.). The singulars are a grammatical correction (κρινα neut. pl. nom.) wholly unnecessary. The lilies are viewed singly.

Lutteroth helps us here by finding in the question of Jesus a reference to the growth of the human body from infancy to maturity. By that insensible process, accomplished through the aid of food, Gods adds to every human body more than one cubit. How impossible for you to do what God has done without your thinking of it! And if He fed you during the period of growth, can you not trust Him now when you have ceased to grow?

Vv. 28-30. *Lesson from the flowers.* **καταμάθετε**, observe well that ye may learn thoroughly the lesson they teach. Here only in N.T., often in classics. Also in Sept., *e.g.*, Gen. xxiv. 21: The man observed her (Rebekah), learning her disposition from her actions.—**τὰ κρίνα**, the *lilium Persicum*, *Emperor's crown*, according to Rosenmüller and Kuinoel; the red anemone, according to Furrer (Zscht. für M. und R.) growing luxuriantly under thorn bushes. All flowers represented by the lily, said Euthy. Zig. long ago, and probably he is right. No need to discover a flower of rare beauty as the subject of remark. Jesus would have said the same thing of the snowdrop, the primrose, the bluebell or the daisy. After **ἀγροῦ** should come a pause. Consider these flowers! Then, after a few moments' reflection: **πῶς**, not interrogative (Fritzsche), but expressive of admiration; vague, doubtful whether the growth is admired as to height (Bengel), rapidity, or rate of multiplication. Why refer to growth at all? Probably with tacit reference to question in ver. 27. Note the verbs in the plural (*vide* critical notes) with a neuter nominative. The lilies are viewed individually as living beings, almost as friends, and spoken of with affection (Winer, § 58, 3). The verb **αὐξάνω** in active voice is transitive in class., intransitive only in later writers.—**κοπιῶσιν, νήθουσιν**: illud virorum est, qui agrum colunt, hoc mulierum domisedarum (Rosenmüller). The former verb seems to point to the toil whereby bread is earned, with backward glance at the conditions of human growth; the latter to the lighter work, whereby *clothing*, the new subject of remark, is prepared.—Ver. 29. **λέγω δὲ**: the speaker is conscious He makes a strong statement, but He means it.—**οὐδὲ**, not even Solomon the magnificent, most glorious of the kings of Israel, and on state occasions most gorgeously attired.—**ἓν τούτων**: the lilies are in view, and one of them is singled out to vie with Solomon.—Ver. 30. **εἰ δὲ τὸν χόρτον.** Application. The beautiful flowers now lose their individuality, and are merged in the generic *grass*: mere weeds to be cut down and used as fuel. The natural sentiment of love for flowers is sacrificed for the ethical sentiment of love for man, aiming at convincing him of God's care.—**κλίβανον** (Attic **κρίβανος**, *vide* Lobeck, *Phryn.*, 179), a round pot of earthenware, narrow at top, heated by a fire within, dough spread on the sides; beautiful flowers of yesterday thus used to prepare bread for men! **ὀλιγόπιστοι**: several times in Gospels, not in classics; not reproachful but encouraging, as if bantering the careworn into faith. The difficulty is to get the careworn to consider these things. They have no eye for wild flowers, no ear for the song of birds. Not so Jesus. He had an intense delight in nature. Witness the sentiment, "Solomon in all his glory," applied to a wild flower! These golden words are valuable as revealing His genial poetic nature. They reflect also in an interesting way the *holiday mood* of the hour, up on the hill away from heat, and crowds, and human misery.

Vv. 31-33. *Renewed exhortation*

τί πίωμεν, ἢ τί περιβαλώμεθα; 32. πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη [t] ἐπιζητεῖ[1]· οἶδε γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος ὅτι [w] χρῄζετε τούτων ἁπάντων· 33. ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν [u] δικαιοσύνην[2] αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα [v] προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν· 34. μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε εἰς τὴν αὔριον· ἡ γὰρ αὔριον μεριμνήσει τὰ ἑαυτῆς.[3] [v] ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ [x] κακία αὐτῆς.

t Lk. xii. 30. Rom. xi. 7. Heb. xi. 19.
u Lk. xi. 8. Rom. xvi. 2 (gen. of pers.). 2 Cor. iii. 1.
v Mk. iv. 24. Lk. xii. 31. Heb. xii. 14.
w Ch. x. 25. 1 Pet. iv. 3.
x here only in N. T. in sense of trouble. Sept. Eccl. vii. 15; xii. 1. Amos iii. 6. Sir. xix. 6.

[1] Another grammatical correction (neut. pl. nom. ἔθνη), ℵB have επιζητουσι.

[2] ℵB omit του θεου, and B transposes the nouns and has την δικ. και την βασ. αυτου. Tisch. and W.H. retain the order as in T. R., omitting του θεου.

[3] τα εαυτης in EΣ (Δ τα περι αυτης). B*L have simply αυτης.

against care. Ver. 31. **οὖν**, goes back on ver. 25, repeating the counsel, reinforced by intervening argument.—Ver. 32. **τὰ ἔθνη**, again a reference to heathen practice; in vi. 7 to their battology in prayer, here to the kind of blessings they eagerly ask (**ἐπιζητοῦσιν**): material only or chiefly; bread, raiment, wealth, etc. I never realised how true the statement of Jesus is till I read the *Vedic Hymns*, the prayer book and song book of the Indian Aryans. With the exception of a few hymns to *Varuna*, in which sin is confessed and pardon begged, most hymns, especially those to *Indra*, contain prayers only for material goods: cows, horses, green pastures, good harvests.

> To wifeless men thou givest wives,
> And joyful mak'st their joyless lives;
> Thou givest sons, courageous, strong,
> To guard their aged sires from wrong.
> Lands, jewels, horses, herds of kine,
> All kinds of wealth are gifts of thine.
> Thy friend is never slain; his might
> Is never worsted in the fight.
> —Dr. Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, vol. v., p. 137.

—**οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ υ.**: Disciples must rise above the pagan level, especially as they worship not *Indra*, but a *Father in heaven*, believed in even by the Indian Aryans, in a rude way, under the name of Dyaus-Pitar, Heaven-Father. **γὰρ** explains the difference between pagans and disciples. The disciple has a Father who knows, and never forgets, His children's needs, and who is so regarded by all who truly believe in Him. Such faith kills care. But such faith is possible only to those who comply with the following injunction.—Ver. 33. **ζητεῖτε πρῶτον.** There is considerable variation in the text of this counsel. Perhaps the nearest to the original is the reading of B, which omits **τοῦ θεοῦ** with ℵ, and inverts the order of **βασ.** and **δικαι.** Seek ye His (the Father's) righteousness and kingdom, though it may be against this that in Luke (xii. 31) the kingdom only is mentioned, **πρῶτον** also being omitted: Seek ye His kingdom. This may have been the original form of the *logion*, all beyond being interpretation, true though unnecessary. Seeking the kingdom means seeking righteousness as the *summum bonum*, and the **πρῶτον** is implied in such a quest. Some (Meyer, Sevin, Achelis) think there is no second, not even a subordinate seeking after earthly goods, all that to be left in God's hands, our sole concern the kingdom. That is indeed the ideal heroic attitude. Yet practically it comes to be a question of first and second, supreme and subordinate, and if the kingdom be indeed first it will keep all else in its proper place. The **πρῶτον**, like the prayer against temptation, indicates consideration for weakness in the sincere.—**προστεθήσεται**, shall be *added*, implying that the main object of quest will certainly be secured.

Ver. 34. *Final exhortation against care.* Not in Luke's parallel section, therefore regarded by Weiss as a reflection appended by the evangelist, not drawn from apostolic doctrine. But it very fitly winds up the discourse. Instead of saying, care not about food and raiment, the Teacher now says finally, care not with reference to to-morrow, **εἰς τὴν αὔριον** (**ἡμέραν** understood). It comes to the same thing. To restrict care to to-day is to master it absolutely. It is the future that breeds anxiety and leads to hoarding.—**μεριμνήσει**: future, with force of an imperative = let it, with genitive (**αὐτῆς**, W.H.) like other verbs of care; in ver. 25, with accus.—**ἀρκετὸν**: a

a Lk. vi. 37. Rom. ii. 1, 3, 27; xiv. 3. Jas. iv. 11.
b Lk. vi. 41, 42.

VII. 1. "ΜΗ [a] κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε, κριθήσεσθε· 2. καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται[1] ὑμῖν. 3. Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ [b] κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου,

[1] Most uncials have the simple μετρηθησεται. The compound (T. R.) is in minusc. and Σ. Doubtless it came in originally from Lk. (vi. 38), being there the most probable reading.

neuter adjective, used as a noun; a sufficiency.—τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, for each successive day, the article distributive.—ἡ κακία, not the moral evil but the physical, the misery or affliction of life (not classical in this sense). In the words of Chrys. H. xxii., κακίαν φησι, οὐ τὴν πονηρίαν, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ τὴν ταλαιπωρίαν, καὶ τὸν πόνον, καὶ τὰς συμφόρας. Every day has some such troubles: "suas afflictiones, quas nihil est necesse metu conduplicare". Erasmus, *Paraph.* Fritzsche proposes a peculiar arrangement of the words in the second and third clauses. Putting a full stop after μεριμνήσει, and retaining the τὰ of T.R. before ἑαυτῆς, he brings out this sense: The things of itself are a sufficiency for each day, *viz.*, the evil thereof.

CHAPTER VII. THE SERMON CONTINUED AND CLOSED. The contents of this chapter are less closely connected and more miscellaneous than in the two preceding. In vv. 1-12 the polemic against Pharisaism seems to be continued and concluded. Vv. 6-11 Weiss regards as an interpolation foreign to the connection. It seems best not to be too anxious about discovering connections, but to take the weighty moral sentences of the chapter as they stand, as embodying thoughts of Christ at whatever time uttered, on the hill or elsewhere, or in whatever connection. Section 1-5 certainly deals with a Pharisaic vice, that of exalting ourselves by disparaging others, a very cheap way of attaining moral superiority. Jesus would have His disciples rise above Pagans, publicans, Sadducees, Pharisees, but not by the method of detraction.

Vv. 1-5. *Against judging.* Ver. 1. μὴ κρίνετε, judge not, an absolute prohibition of a common habit, especially in religious circles of the Pharisaic type, in which much of the evil in human nature reveals itself. "What levity, haste, prejudice, malevolence, ignorance; what vanity and egotism in most of the judgments pronounced in the world" (Lutteroth). *Judge not,* said Christ. *Judge,* it is your duty, said the Dutch pietists of last century through a literary spokesman, citing in proof Matt. xxiii. 33, when the Pharisees are blamed for neglecting "judgment". *Vide* Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus,* i., p. 328. How far apart the two types!—ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε: an important, if not the highest motive; not merely a reference to the final judgment, but stating a law of the moral order of the world: the judger shall be judged; to which answers the other: who judges himself shall not be judged (1 Cor. xi. 31). In Rom. ii. 1 St. Paul tacitly refers to the Jew as ὁ κρίνων. The reference there and here defines the meaning of κρίνειν. It points to the habit of judging, and the spirit as evinced by the habit, censoriousness leading inevitably to sinister judging, so that κρίνειν is practically equivalent to κατακρίνειν or καταδικάζειν (Lk. vi. 37).—ἐν ᾧ γὰρ, etc.: Vulgatissimum hoc apud Judaeos Adagium, says Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.). Of course; one would expect such maxims, based on experience, to be current among all peoples (*vide* Grotius for examples). It is the *lex talionis* in a new form: *character for character.* Jesus may have learned some of these moral adages at school in Nazareth, as we have all when boys learned many good things out of our lesson books with their collections of extracts. The point to notice is what the mind of Jesus assimilated—the best in the wisdom of His people—and the emphasis with which He inculcated the best, so as to ensure for it permanent lodgment in the minds of His disciples and in their records of His teaching.

Vv. 3-5. *Proverb of the mote and beam.* Also current among Jews and Arabs (*vide* Tholuck).—κάρφος, a minute dry particle of chaff, wood, etc.—δοκός, a wooden beam (*let in,* from δέχομαι) or joist, a monstrous symbol of a great fault. A beam in the eye is a natural impossibility; *cf.* the camel and the needle eye. The Eastern imagination was prone to exaggeration. This is a case of *tu quoque* (Rom. ii. 2), or rather of "thou much more". The faults may

τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ [c] δοκὸν οὐ [d] κατανοεῖς; 4. ἢ πῶς ἐρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, Ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἀπὸ[1] τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου· καὶ ἰδού, ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου; 5. ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου,[2] καὶ τότε [e] διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. 6. Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί· μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, μήποτε

c Lk. vi. 41, 42.
d Lk. vi. 41; xx. 23. Acts xxvii. 39. Cf. Lk. xii. 24, 27. Rom. iv. 19.
e Mk. viii. 25. Lk. vi. 42.
f Ch. xiii. 45. 1 Tim. ii. 9. Rev. xvii. 4; xviii. 16; xxi. 21.

[1] ℵBΣ have εκ, which is preferred by most modern edd. Weiss suspects conformity to the εκ in εκβαλω.

[2] ℵBC place εκ του οφθ. σου before την δοκον, so giving to the censor's own eye due emphasis.

be of the same kind: **κάρφος**, a petty theft, **δοκός**, commercial dishonesty on a large scale—"thou that judgest doest the same things" (Rom. ii. 2); or of a different sort: moral laxity in the publican, pride and inhumanity in the Pharisee who despised him (Lk. xviii. 9-14).—**βλέπεις, οὐ κατανοεῖς**: the contrast is not between seeing and failing to see, but between seeing and not choosing to see; ignoring, consciously overlooking. The censorious man is not necessarily ignorant of his own faults, but he does not let his mind rest on them. It is more pleasant to think of other people's faults.—Ver. 4. **ἐκβάλω**, hortatory conjunctive, first person, supplies place of imperative which is wanting in first person; takes such words as **ἄγε, φέρε**, or as here **ἄφες**, before it. *Vide* Goodwin, section 255. For **ἄφες** modern Greek has **ἄς**, a contraction, used with the subjunctive in the first and third persons (*vide* Vincent and Dickson, *Modern Greek*, p. 322).—Ver. 5. **ὑποκριτά**: because he acts as no one should but he who has first reformed himself. "What hast *thou* to do to declare my statutes?" Ps. l. 16.—**διαβλέψεις**, thou will see clearly, *vide* Mk. viii. 24, 25, where three compounds of the verb occur, with **ἀνά, διά**, and **ἐν**. Fritzsche takes the future as an imperative and renders: *se componere ad aliquid, curare; i.e.*, set thyself then to the task of, etc.

Ver. 6. *A complementary counsel.* No connecting word introduces this sentence. Indeed the absence of connecting particles is noticeable throughout the chapter: vv. 1, 6, 7, 13, 15. It is a collection of ethical pearls strung loosely together. Yet it is not difficult to suggest a connecting link, thus: I have said, "Judge not," yet you must know people, else you will make great mistakes, such as, etc. Moral criticism is inevitable. Jesus Himself practised it. He judged the Pharisees, but in the interest of humanity, guided by the law of love. He judged the proud, pretentious, and cruel, in behalf of the weak and despised. All depends on what we judge and why. The Pharisaic motive was egotism; the right motive is defence of the downtrodden or, in certain cases, *self*-defence. So *here*.—**Δότε** (in some minusc.), **βάλητε**, curious combination of imperative and subjunctive; a similar combination in next clause of future indicative with subjunctive: **καταπατήσουσι, ῥήξωσιν**. On the use of the future after **μήποτε** and other final particles, *vide* Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in N. T. Greek*, § 199.—**τὸ ἅγιον, τοὺς μαργαρίτας**: what is the holy thing, and what are the pearls? In a moral aphorism special indications are not to be expected, and we are left to our own conjectures. The "holy" and the "pearls" must define themselves for each individual in his own experience. They are the things which are sacred and precious for a man or woman, and which natural feeling teaches us to be careful not to waste or expose to desecration. For this purpose knowledge of the world, discrimination, is necessary. We must not treat all people alike, and show our valuables, religious experiences, best thoughts, tenderest sentiments, to the first comer. Shyness, reserve, goes along with sincerity, depth, refinement. In all shyness there is implicit judgment of the legitimate kind. A modest woman shrinks from a man whom her instinct discerns to be impure; a child from all hard-natured people. Who blames woman or child? It is but the instinct of self-preservation.—**κυσίν, χοίρων**. The people to be feared and shunned are those represented by dogs and swine, regarded by Jews as shameless and

καταπατήσωσιν[1] αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτῶν, καὶ στραφέντες [g]ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς. 7. Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτε, καὶ εὑρήσετε· [h]κρούετε, καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν. 8. πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει, καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει, καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.[2] 9. ἢ τίς ἐστιν[3] ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἐὰν[4] αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον [i]ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; 10. καὶ ἐὰν ἰχθὺν αἰτήσῃ,[5] μὴ

g Ch. ix. 17. Mk. ix. 18. Lk. ix. 42. Gal. iv. 27 (to break out into joy).
h Lk. xi. 9, 10; xii. 36. Acts xii. 16. Rev. iii. 20.
i Lk. xi. 11; xxiv. 30, 42. Acts xv. 30; xxvii. 15.

[1] καταπατησουσιν in BCLXΣ. Weiss against most critics thinks this combination of the fut. ind. with the subj. (ρηξωσιν) impossible. He ascribes the reading ου to a confusion of ου with ω. *Vide* below.

[2] ανοιγεται in B Cop. Syr. Cur. W.H. in margin. Weiss decides for this reading.

[3] BL omit εστιν, and among modern editors Treg. and W.H.

[4] For εαν αιτηση ℵBCLΔ have αιτησει. Tisch. and W.H. adopt this.

[5] For και εαν αιτηση ℵBC have η και αιτησει, which modern critics generally adopt.

unclean animals. There are such people, unhappily, even in the judgment of charity, and the shrewd know them and fight shy of them; for no good can come of comradeship with them. Discussions as to whether the dogs and the swine represent two classes of men, or only one, are pedantic. If not the same they are at least similar; one in this, that they are to be avoided. And it is gratuitous to limit the scope of the gnome to the apostles and their work in preaching the gospel. It applies to all citizens of the kingdom, to all who have a treasure to guard, a holy of holies to protect from profane intrusion.—μήποτε, lest perchance. What is to be feared?—καταπατήσουσιν, ῥήξωσιν: treading under foot (ἐν τ. π., *instrumental*, with, de Wette; *among*, Weiss) your pearls (αὐτοὺς), rending yourselves. Here again there is trouble for the commentators as to the distribution of the trampling and rending between dogs and swine. Do both do both, or the swine both, or the swine the trampling and the dogs the rending? The latter is the view of Theophylact, and it has been followed by some moderns, including Achelis. On this view the structure of the sentence presents an example of ἐπάνοδος or ὑστέρησις, the first verb referring to the second subject and the second verb to the first subject. The dogs—street dogs, without master, living on offal—rend, because what you have thrown to them, perhaps to propitiate them, being of uncertain temper at the best, is not to their liking; the swine trample under foot what looked like peas or acorns, but turns out to be uneatable.

Before passing from these verses (1-6) two curious opinions may be noted. (1) That ἅγιον represents an Aramaic word meaning ear-ornaments, answering to pearls. This view, once favoured by Michaelis, Bolten, Kuinoel, etc., and thereafter discredited, has been revived by Holtzmann (H. C.). (2) That ὀφθαλμός (vv. 3, 5) means, not the eye, but a village *well*. So Furrer. Strange, he says, that a man should need to be told by a neighbour that he has a mote in his eye, or that it should be a fault to propose to take it out! And what sense in the idea of a beam in the eye? But translate the Aramaic word used by Jesus, *well*, and all is clear and natural. A neighbour given to fault-finding sees a small impurity in a villager's well and tauntingly offers to remove it. Meantime his own boys, in his absence, throw a *beam* into his own well (*Zeitsch. für M. und R. Vide* also *Wanderungen*, p. 222).

Vv. 7-11. *Admonition to prayer:* presupposes deferred answer to prayer, tempting to doubt as to its utility, and consequent discontinuance of the practice. A lesson more natural at a later stage, when the disciples had a more developed religious experience. The whole subject more adequately handled in Luke xi. 1-13.—Ver. 7. Αἰτεῖτε, ζητεῖτε, κρούετε, threefold exhortation with a view to impressiveness; first literally, then twice in figurative language: seek as for an object lost, knock as at a barred door, appropriate after the parable of the neighbour in bed (Lk. xi. 5-8). The promise of answer is stated in corresponding terms.—δοθήσεται, εὑρήσετε, ἀνοιγήσεται.—Ver. 8, iteration in form

ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; 11. εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς, πονηροὶ ὄντες, [j] οἴδατε [k] δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν; 12. Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν [1] θέλητε ἵνα [l] ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς [l] ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς· οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται.

j Lk. xii. 56. 2 Pet. 9 (*vide* below, also Mt. xxvii. 65).

k Lk. xi. 13. Eph. iv. 8. Phil. iv. 17.

l Ch. xviii. 35; xx. 32; xxi. 40; xxv. 40, 45. Mk. v. 19, 20. Lk. i. 49 *al.* (with dat. of person in all cases cited. Not usual in classics).

[1] For αν ℵC have εαν, which has been adopted by Tisch. and W.H.

of a general proposition: πᾶς γὰρ, for every one, etc.—Ver. 9, ἢ answers to a state of mind which doubts whether God gives in answer to prayer at all, or at least gives what we desire.—τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄν: argument from analogy, from the human to the divine. The construction is broken. Instead of going on to say what the man of the parable will do, the sentence changes into a statement of what he will not do. Well indicated in W.H.'s text by a — after ἄρτον. The anacolouthon could be avoided by omitting the ἐστι of T. R. after τίς and μὴ before λίθον, when the sentence would stand: τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄν., ὃν αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ. But the broken sentence, if worse grammar, is better rhetoric.—μὴ λ. ἐπιδώσει, he will not give him a stone, will he? Bread, stone; fish, serpent. Resemblance is implied, and the idea is that a father may refuse his child's request but certainly will not mock him. Grotius quotes from Plautus: "Altera manu fert lapidem, panem ostentat altera". Furrer suggests that by ὄφιν is meant not a literal serpent, but a scaleless fish, therefore prohibited to be eaten (Lev. xi. 12), serpent-like, found in the Sea of Galilee, three feet long, often caught in the nets, and of course thrown away like the dogfish of our waters.—Ver. 11, πονηροί, morally evil, a strong word, the worst fathers being taken to represent the class, the point being that hardly the worst will treat their children as described. There is no intention to teach a doctrine of depravity, or, as Chrysostom says, to calumniate human nature (οὐ διαβάλλων τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν). The evil specially in view, as required by the connection, is selfishness, a grudging spirit: "If ye then, whose own nature is rather to keep what you have than to bestow it on others, etc." (Hatch, Essays in B. Gr., p. 81).—οἴδατε διδόναι *soletis* dare, Maldon. Wetstein; rather, have the sense to give; with the infinitive as in Phil. iv. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 5. Perhaps we should take the phrase as an elegant expression for the simple δίδοτε. So Palairet.—δόματα, four times in N. T. for the attic δῶρον, δώρημα; δομ. ἀγαθά, gifts good not only in quality (bread not stone, etc.) but even in measure, generous, giving the children more than they ask.—πόσῳ μᾶλλον, *a fortiori* argument.—ὁ πατήρ, etc., the Father whose benignant nature has already been declared.—Ver. 45. ἀγαθά, good things emphatically, *insignia dona*, Rosenm., and only good (Jas. i. 17, an echo of this utterance). This text is classic for Christ's doctrine of the Fatherhood of God.

Ver. 12. *The golden rule.* οὖν here probably because in the source, *cf.* καὶ in quotation in Heb. i. 6. The connection must be a matter of conjecture—with ver. 11, a, "Extend your goodness from children to all," Fritzsche; with ver. 11, b, "Imitate the divine goodness," Bengel; with vii. 1-5, vv. 6-11 being an interpolation, Weiss and Holtz. (H.C.). Lk. vi. 31 places it after the precept contained in Matt. v. 42, and Wendt, in his reconstruction of the *logia* (L. J., i. 61), follows that clue. The thought is certainly in sympathy with the teaching of Matt. v. 38-48, and might very well be expounded in that connection. But the meaning is not dependent on connection. The sentence is a worthy close to the discourse beginning at v. 17. "Respondent ultima primis," Beng. Here as there "law and prophets".—ἵνα with subjunctive after θέλητε, instead of infinitive.—πάντα οὖν . . . ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς. The law of nature, says Rosenmüller. Not quite. Wetstein, indeed, gives copious instances of something similar in Greek and Roman writers and Rabbinical sources, and the modern science of comparative religion enables us to multiply them. But recent commentators (including Holtz., H.C.) have remarked that, in these instances, the rule is stated in *negative* terms. So, *e.g.*, in Tobit,

m (with διά and gen. of way). Lk. xiii. 24. John x. 1. n Lk. xiii. 24.

13. "[m] Εἰσέλθετε διὰ τῆς [n] στενῆς πύλης· ὅτι [o] πλατεῖα ἡ πύλη,[1] καὶ [p] εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν, καὶ πολλοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰσερχόμενοι δι' αὐτῆς· 14. ὅτι στενὴ ἡ πύλη,[2] καὶ [q] τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωήν, καὶ ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν οἱ εὑρίσκοντες

o here only in N. T., several times in Sept. p here only in N. T., Sept. Ps. ciii. (iv.) 25. q here only in the sense of contracted.

[1] η πυλη is wanting in ℵ and many Fathers (Clem. Orig.), and omitted by W.H. and bracketed by Tisch. Weiss thinks it very suspicious.

[2] Some copies have τι for οτι and omit η πυλη, but the text as it stands is approved by W.H. Tisch. brackets η πυλη.

iv. 15, ὃ μισεῖς, μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς, quoted by Hillel in reply to one who asked him to teach the whole law while he stood on one leg. So also in the saying of Confucius: "Do not to others what you would not wish done to yourself," Legge, *Chinese Classics*, i. 191 f. The negative confines us to the region of *justice;* the positive takes us into the region of *generosity* or *grace*, and so embraces both law *and* prophets. We wish much more than we can claim—to be helped in need, encouraged in struggles, defended when misrepresented, and befriended when our back is at the wall. Christ would have us do all that in a magnanimous, benignant way; to be not merely δίκαιος but ἀγαθός.—νόμος καὶ προφῆται: perhaps to a certain extent a current phrase = all that is necessary, but, no doubt, seriously meant; therefore, may help us to understand the statement in v. 17, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil". The golden rule was Law and Prophets only in an ideal sense, and in the same sense only was Christ a fulfiller.—*Vide* Wendt, L. J., ii. 341.

Vv. 13, 14. *The two ways* (Lk. xiii. 23-25). From this point onwards we have what commentators call the *Epilogue* of the sermon introduced without connecting particle, possibly no part of the teaching on the hill, placed here because that teaching was regarded as the best guide to the right way. The passage itself contains no clue to the right way except that it is the way of *the few*. The allegory also is obscure from its brevity. Is the gate at the beginning or end of the way, or are gate and way practically one, the way narrow because it passes through a narrow doorway? Possibly Christ's precept was simply, "enter through the narrow gate" or "door" (θύρα, Luke's word), all the rest being gloss.—πύλης, the large entrance to an edifice or city, as distinct from θύρα, a common door; perhaps chosen by Lk. because in keeping with the epithet στενῆς.—ὅτι, etc.: explanatory enlargement to unfold and enforce the precept.—ἡ ὁδὸς: two ways are contrasted, either described by its qualities and end. The "way" in the figure is a common road, but the term readily suggests a manner of life. The Christian religion is frequently called "the way" in Acts (ix. 2, xix. 9, etc.). The wrong road is characterised as πλατεῖα and εὐρύχωρος, broad and roomy, and as leading to destruction (ἀπώλειαν). The right way (and gate, ἡ πύλη, is to be retained in ver. 14, though omitted in ver. 13) is described as στενὴ καὶ τεθλιμμένη, narrow and contracted, and as leading to life.—ζωήν, a pregnant word, true life, worth living, in which men realise the end of their being—the antithesis of ἀπώλεια. The one is the way of the many, πολλοί εἰσιν οἱ εἰσερ.; the other of the few, ὀλίγοι . . . οἱ εὑρίσκοντες. Note the word "finding". The way is so narrow or so untrodden that it may easily be missed. It has to be sought for. Luke suggests the idea of difficulty in squeezing in through the very narrow door. Both points of view have their analogue in life. The practical application of this counsel requires spiritual discernment. No verbal directory will help us. Narrow? Was not Pharisaism a narrow way, and the monastic life and pietism with its severe rules for separation from the "world" in amusement, dress, etc.?

Vv. 15-20. *Warning against pseudo-prophets*. Again, without connecting particle and possibly not a part of the Sermon on the Mount. But the more important question here is: Does this section belong to Christ's teaching at all, or has it been introduced by the Evangelist that false teachers of after days appearing in the Church might be condemned under the authority of the Master? (Holtz., H.C.). What occasion had

αὐτήν. 15. [r]Προσέχετε δὲ[1] ἀπὸ τῶν [s]ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτων, ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσι [t]λύκοι ἅρπαγες. 16. ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν [u]ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς· μήτι [v]συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλήν,[2] ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα; 17. οὕτω πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ[3]· τὸ δὲ [w]σαπρὸν δένδρον καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖ. 18. οὐ δύναται δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖν,[4] οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖν.[4] 19. πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ

r Ch. x. 17; xvi. 6, 11. Lk. xx. 46 (all with ἀπό τινος).
s Ch. xxiv. 11, 24 *al.*
t Acts xx. 29 *trop.*, so in Sept. Jer. v. 6 *al.*
u Ch. xi. 27.
v Ch. xiii. 28, 41 (with ἐκ).
w Ch. xii. 33; xiii. 48. Eph. iv. 29.

[1] ℵB omit δε (so W.H.).

[2] ℵBC have σταφυλας. The sing. comes from Lk. (vi. 44).

[3] B has ποιει καλους (W.H. margin).

[4] For ποιειν ℵ has ενεγκειν (Tisch. both places, W.H. 1st place).

Christ to speak of false prophets? The reference can hardly be to the Pharisees or the Rabbis. They were men of tradition, not prophetic, either in the true or in the false sense. But, apart from them, there might be another class of men in evidence in our Lord's day, who might be so characterised. It was a time of religious excitement; the force of custom broken, the deep fountains of the soul bursting forth; witness the crowds who followed John and Jesus, and the significant saying about the kingdom of heaven suffering violence (Matt. xi. 12). Such times call forth true prophets and *also* spurious ones, so far in religious sympathy with prevalent enthusiasms, but bent on utilising them for their own advantage in gain or influence, men of the Judas type. If such men, as is likely, existed, Jesus would have something to say about them, as about all contemporary religious phenomena.

Ver. 15. **Προσέχετε ἀπὸ**, take heed to and beware of.—**οἵτινες**, I mean, such as.—**ἐν ἐνδύμασι προβάτων.** Grotius, Rosenm. and Holtz. (H.C.) take this as referring to the dress worn (**ἐν μηλωταῖς**, Heb. xi. 37) as the usual badge of a prophet, but not without reference to the plausible manner of the wearer; deceptive and meant to deceive (Zechar. xiii. 4); gentle, innocent as sheep; speaking with "unction," and all but deceiving "the very elect". The manner more than the dress is doubtless intended. **ἔσωθεν δὲ**: manner and nature utterly different; within, **λύκοι ἅρπαγες**; greedy, sometimes for power, ambitious to be first; often for gain, money. The *Didache* speaks of a type of prophet whom it pithily names a **χριστέμπορος** (chap. xii.), a ***Christ-merchant.*** There have always been prophets of this type, "each one to his gain" (Is. lvi. 11), Evangel-merchants, traders in religious revival.—Ver. 16. **ἀπὸ τ. καρπῶν.** By the nature of the case difficult to detect, but discernible from their *fruit.* —**ἐπιγνώσεσθε.** Ye shall know them through and through (**ἐπί**) if ye study carefully the outcome of their whole way of life.

Vv. 16-20. ***An enlargement in parabolic fashion on the principle of testing by fruit.*** Ver. 16. **μήτι**, do they perhaps, **τι** suggesting doubt where there is none = men never do collect, or think of collecting, grapes from thorns or figs from thistles. And yet the idea is not absurd. There were thorns with grape-like fruit, and thistles with heads like figs (Holtz., H.C.). But in the natural sphere these resemblances never deceived; men saw at a glance how the matter stood.—Ver. 17. Another illustration from good and bad trees of the same kind. **ἀγαθὸν**, sound, healthy; **σαπρὸν**, degenerate, through age or bad soil. According to Phryn., **σαπρός** was popularly used instead of **αἰσχρός** in a moral sense (**σαπράν οἱ πολλοὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰσχράν**, p. 377). Each tree brings forth fruit answering to its condition.—Ver. 18. **οὐ δύναται**, etc. Nothing else is possible or looked for in nature.—Ver. 19. Men look on this as so certain that they do not hesitate to cut down and burn a degenerate tree, as if it were possible it might bring forth good fruit next year.—**μὴ ποιοῦν**, if it do not, that once ascertained. Weiss thinks this verse is imported from iii. 10, and foreign to the connection.—Ver. 20. **ἄραγε**: final inference, a very lively and forcible composite particle, again with similar effect

x Ch. xii. 50; xxi. 31 *al.*
y Ch. xxiv. 36. Lk. x. 12. 2 Thess. i. 10 *al.*
z Mk. ix. 38. Jas. v. 10.
a John i. 20. Heb. xi. 13 (τινι τι οτι, Acts xxiv. 14).

εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται. 20. ἄραγε ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς.

21. "Οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων μοι, Κύριε, Κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ἀλλ' ὁ ˣποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν[1] οὐρανοῖς. 22. πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι ἐν ʸἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, Κύριε, Κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι προεφητεύσαμεν,[2] καὶ ᶻτῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν; 23. καὶ τότε ᵃὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς, ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς·

[1] ℵBC have τοις before ουρανοις, which T. R., following many MSS., omits.

[2] ℵBCLZ have the augment at the beginning (επροφ.); adopted by modern editors.

in Matt. xvii. 26. The γε should have its full force as singling out for special attention; "at least from their fruits, if by no other means". It implies that to know the false prophet is hard. Ver. 22 explains why. He has so much to say, and show, for himself: devils cast out, souls saved, spiritual if not physical miracles done. What other or better "fruit" would you have? What in short is the test? Doctrine, good moral life? Is the false prophet necessarily a false teacher or an immoral man? Not necessarily though not unfrequently. But he is always a *self-seeking* man. The true prophet is Christ-like, *i.e.*, cares supremely for truth, righteousness, humanity; not at all for himself, his pocket, his position, his life. None but such can effectively preach Christ. This repetition of the thought in ver. 16 is not for mere poetical effect, as Carr (Camb. G. T.), following Jebb (*Sacred Literature*, p. 195), seems to think.

Vv. 21-23. *False discipleship.* From false teachers the discourse naturally passes to spurious disciples. Luke's version contains the kernel of this passage (Luke vi. 46). Something of the kind was to be expected in the teaching on the hill. What more likely than that the Master, who had spoken such weighty truths, should say to His hearers: "In vain ye call me Master, unless ye do the things which I say"? As it stands here the *logion* has probably, as Weiss suggests (Matt. Evang., p. 219), undergone expansion and modification, so as to give to the title "Lord," originally = מרי, Teacher, the full sense it bore when applied to Christ by the Apostolic Church, and to make the warning refer to false prophets of the Apostolic age using Christ's name and authority in support of anti-Christian tendencies, such as antinomianism (ἀνομίαν, ver. 23).—Ver. 21. ὁ λέγων, ὁ ποιῶν: Of all, whether disciples or teachers, the principle holds good without exception that not saying "Lord" but doing God's will is the condition of approval and admittance into the kingdom. Saying "Lord" includes taking Jesus for Master, and listening to His teaching with appreciation and admiration; everything short of carrying out His teaching in life. In connection with such lofty thoughts as the Beatitudes, the precept to love enemies and the admonition against care, there is a great temptation to substitute sentimental or æsthetic admiration for heroic conduct.—τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου. Christ's sense of His position as Master or Lord was free from egotism. He was simply the Son and Servant of the Father, whose will He and all who follow Him must obey; *my* Father here for the first time.—Ver. 22. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, the great dread judgment day of Jehovah expected by all Jews, with more or less solemn awe; a very grave reference.—τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι: thrice repeated, the main ground of hope. Past achievements, prophesyings, exorcisms, miracles are recited; but the chief point insisted on is: all was done in Thy name, honouring Thee, as the source of wisdom and power.—Ver 23. τότε. When they make this protestation, the Judge will make a counter-protestation.—ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς, I will own to them. Bengel's comment is: aperte, Magna *potestas* hujus dicti. But there is a certain apologetic tone in the expression, "I will confess" ("profess," A.V. and R.V.), as if to say: I ought to know men who can say so much for themselves, but I do not.—ὅτι, recita-

[b] ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ οἱ [c] ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν [d] ἀνομίαν. 24. Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους,[1] καὶ ποιεῖ αὐτούς, ὁμοιώσω αὐτὸν[2] ἀνδρὶ [e] φρονίμῳ, ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ[3] ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· 25. καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ [f] προσέπεσον τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσε· τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. 26. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὁμοιωθήσεται ἀνδρὶ [g] μωρῷ,

b Lk. ix. 39. Acts xiii. 13.
c Ch. xxvi. 10.
d Ch. xiii. 41. 1 John iii. 4.
e Ch. x. 16; xxiv. 45; xxv. 2, 4. Lk. xii. 42.
f here only in sense of beat against.
g Ch. xxii. 17, 19; xxv. 2, 8.

[1] B omits τουτους, which is bracketed by W.H. It seems needed, and may have fallen out by homœot.

[2] ℵBZ have ομοιωθησεται for ομοιωσω αυτον. So W.H.

[3] αυτου before την οικιαν in ℵBZΣ, so giving the pronoun due emphasis—*his* house.

tive, the exact words directly reported.—**οὐδέποτε**: never, at no point in that remarkable career when so many wonderful things were done in my name.—**ἀποχωρεῖτε**, etc.: an echo of Ps. vi. 9, and sentence of doom, like Matt. xxv. 41.

Vv. 24-27. *Epilogue* (Lk. vi. 47-49, which see for comparative exegesis). **οὖν**, ver. 24, may be taken as referring to the whole discourse, not merely to vv. 21-23 (Tholuck and Achelis). Such a sublime utterance could only be the grand finale of a considerable discourse, or series of discourses. It is a fit ending of a body of teaching of unparalleled weight, dignity, and beauty. The **τούτους** after **λόγους** (ver. 24), though omitted in B, therefore bracketed in W. H., is thoroughly appropriate. It may have fallen out through similar ending of three successive words, or have been omitted intentionally to make the statement following applicable to the whole of Christ's teaching. Its omission weakens the oratorical power of the passage. It occurs in ver. 26.

Ver. 24. **Πᾶς ὅστις**. Were the reading **ὁμοιώσω** adopted, this would be a case either of attraction **πᾶς** for **πάντα** to agree with **ὅστις** (Fritzsche), or of a broken construction: nominative, without a verb corresponding, for rhetorical effect. (Meyer, *vide* Winer, § lxiii., 2, d.)—**ἀκούει, ποιεῖ**: hearing and doing, both must go together; *vide* James i. 22-25, for a commentary on this *logion*. "Doing" points generally to *reality*, and what it means specifically depends on the nature of the saying. "Blessed are the poor in spirit"; doing in that case means *being* poor in spirit. To evangelic ears the word has a legal sound, but the doing Christ had in view meant the opposite of legalism and Pharisaism.—**ὁμοιωθήσεται**, not at the judgment day (Meyer), but, either shall be assimilated by his own action (Weiss), or the future passive to be taken as a Gerund = *comparandus est* (Achelis).—**φρονίμῳ**: perhaps the best rendering is "thoughtful". The type of man meant considers well what he is about, and carefully adopts measures suited to his purpose. The undertaking on hand is building a house—a serious business—a house not being meant for show, or for the moment, but for a lasting home. A well-selected emblem of religion.—**τὴν πέτραν**: the article used to denote not an individual rock, but a category—a rocky foundation.

Ver. 25. What follows shows his wisdom, justified by events which he had anticipated and provided for; not abstract possibilities, but likely to happen every year—certain to happen now and then. Therefore the prudence displayed is not exceptional, but just ordinary common sense.—**καὶ**: observe the five **καὶ** in succession—an eloquent *polysyndeton*, as grammarians call it; note also the rhythm of the sentence in which the war of the elements is described: down came the rain, down rushed the rivers, blew the winds; sudden, fell, terrible.—**προσέπεσαν**, they fell upon that house; rain on roof, river on foundation, wind on walls. And what happened? **καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσεν**. The elements fell on it, but it did not fall.—**τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ**: for a good reason, it was founded on the rock. The builder had seen to that.

Vv. 26-27. **μωρῷ**, Jesus seems here to offend against His own teaching, v. 22, but He speaks not in passion or contempt, but in deep sadness, and with humane intent to prevent such folly.

h Lk ii. 34. Cf. Rom. xi. 11.
i Ch. xxii. 33. Mk. i. 22; xi. 18. Lk. iv. 32 (all in ref. to Christ's doctrine).
j Mk. i. 23.

ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ[1] ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον· 27. καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι, καὶ προσέκοψαν[2] τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἔπεσε· καὶ ἦν ἡ [h]πτῶσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη." 28. Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε συνετέλεσεν[3] ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, [i]ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· 29. ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς [j]ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.[4]

[1] **αυτου** before **την οικιαν** in ℵBZΣ as in ver. 24.

[2] Some copies have **προσερρηξαν**.

[3] **ετελεσεν** in ℵBCZΣ.

[4] After **γραμματεις** ℵBΔΣ have **αυτων** (W.H. and other editors). Some copies add **και οι φαρισαιοι** (W.H. margin).

Wherein lay the second builder's folly? Not in deliberately selecting a bad foundation, but in taking no thought of foundation; in beginning to build at haphazard and anywhere; on loose sand (**ἄμμος**) near the bed of a mountain torrent. His fault was not an error in judgment, but inconsiderateness. It is not, as is commonly supposed, a question of two foundations, but of looking to, and neglecting to look to, the foundation. In the natural sphere no man in his senses commits such a mistake. But utterly improbable cases have to be supposed in parables to illustrate human folly in religion.—Ver. 27. **καὶ . . . ἄνεμοι**: exactly the same phrases as in ver. 25, to describe the oncome of the storm.—**προσέκοψαν**: a different word for the assault on the house—struck upon it with immediate fatal effect. It was not built to stand such rough handling. The builder had not thought of such an eventuality.—**ἔπεσεν, καὶ ἦν ἡ πτῶσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη**: not necessarily implying that it was a large building, or that the disaster was of large dimensions, like the collapse of a great castle, but that the ruin was complete. The fool's house went down like a house of cards, not one stone or brick left on another.

Allegorising interpretation of the rain, rivers and winds, and of the foundations, is to be avoided, but it is pertinent to ask, what defects of character in the sphere of religion are pointed at in this impressive parabolic *logion?* What kind of religion is it that deserves to be so characterised? The foolish type is a religion of imitation and without forethought. Children play at building houses, because they have seen their seniors doing it. There are people who play at religion, not realising what religion is for, but following fashion, doing as others do, and to be seen of others (Matt. vi. 1). Children build houses on the sea sand below high-tide mark, not thinking of the tide which will in a few hours roll in and sweep away their houselet. There are men who have religion for to-day, and think not of the trial to-morrow may bring.

Ver. 28. *Concluding statement as to the impression made by the discourse.* A similar statement occurs in Mk. i. 22, 27, whence it may have been transferred by Matthew. It may be assumed that so unique a teacher as Jesus made a profound impression the very first time He spoke in public, and that the people would express their feelings of surprise and admiration at once. The words Mark puts into the mouth of the audience in the synagogue of Capernaum are to the life (*vide* comments there). They saw, and said that Christ's way of speaking was new, not like that of the scribes to which they had been accustomed. Both evangelists make the point of difference consist in "authority".

Ver. 29. **ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων**: Fritzsche supplies, after **ἔχων, τοῦ διδάσκειν**, and renders, He taught as one having a right to teach, because He could do it well, "scite et perite," a master of the art. The thought lies deeper. It is an ethical, not an artistic or æsthetical contrast that is intended. The scribes spake *by* authority, resting all they said on traditions of what had been said before. Jesus spake *with* authority, out of His own soul, with direct intuition of truth; and, therefore, to the answering soul of His hearers. The people could not quite explain the difference, but that was what they obscurely felt.

CHAPTERS VIII., IX. THE HEALING MINISTRY OF JESUS. These two chapters consist mainly of miracle narratives,

VIII. 1. ΚΑΤΑΒΑΝΤΙ δὲ αὐτῷ[1] ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί· 2. καὶ ἰδού, [a]λεπρὸς ἐλθὼν[2] προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγων, "Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαί με [b]καθαρίσαι." 3. Καὶ [c]ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἥψατο αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[3] λέγων, "Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι." Καὶ

a Ch. x. 8; xi. 5; xxvi. 6. Lk. iv. 27; xvii. 12.
b Ch. x. 8; xi. 5. Lk. iv. 27; xvii. 14, 17.
c with τὴν χεῖρα often in Sept. and frequently in the Gospels (Ch. xii. 13, 49, etc.).

[1] For καταβαντι δε αυτω (the reading of ℵ *al.* adopted by Tisch.) ℵ[b]BC have καταβαντος δε αυτου. Z has the gen. also (και κατ. αυ.). The dative is a grammatical "improvement".

[2] For ελθων (in CKL, etc.) ℵBΔΣ have προσελθων. The προς has probably fallen out through homœot. (λεπρος).

[3] ℵBCZ omit ο Ιησους, which T. R. often introduces.

the greater number being reports of healing acts performed by Jesus, nine in all, being the second part of the programme sketched in chap. iv. 23-25. These wonderful works are not to be regarded, after the manner of the older apologists, as evidential signs appended to the teaching on the hill to invest it with authority. That teaching needed no external credentials; it spoke for itself then as now. These histories are an integral part of the self-revelation of Jesus by word and deed; they are demonstrations not merely of His power, but above all, of His *Spirit*. Therein lies their chief permanent interest, which is entirely independent of all disputes as to the strictly miraculous character of the events. This collection is not arranged in chronological order. The connection is topical, not temporal.

CHAPTER VIII. 1-4. *The leper* (Mk. i. 40-45; Lk. v. 12-16). This is the first individual act of healing reported in this Gospel, chap. iv. 23-24 containing only a general notice. It is a very remarkable one. No theory of moral therapeutics will avail here to eliminate the miraculous element. Leprosy is not a disease of the nerves, amenable to emotional treatment, but of the skin and the flesh, covering the body with unsightly sores. The story occurs in all three Synoptics, and, as belonging to the triple tradition, is one of the best attested. Matthew's version is the shortest and simplest here as often, his concern being rather to report the main fact and what Christ *said*, than to give pictorial details. Possibly he gives it as he found it in the Apostolic Document both in form and in *position*, immediately after Sermon on Mount, so placed, conceivably, to illustrate Christ's respectful attitude towards the law as stated in v. 17 (*cf.* viii. 4 and *vide* Weiss, Matt. Evan., p. 227).

Ver. 1. **καταβάντος αὐτοῦ** (for the reading *vide* above). Jesus descended from the hill towards Capernaum (ver. 5), but we must beware of supposing that the immediately following events all happened there, or at any one place or time. Mark seems to connect the cure of the leper with the preaching tour in Galilee (i. 40), and that of the palsied man with Christ's return therefrom (ii. 1). Jesus had ascended the hill to escape the pressure of human need. He descends, in Matt.'s narrative, to encounter it again—**ἠκολούθησαν**, large crowds gather about and follow Him.—**ἰδού**, the sign mark of the Apostolic Document according to Weiss; its lively formula for introducing a narrative.—**προσεκύνει**, prostrated himself to the ground, in the abject manner of salutation suitable from an inferior to one deemed much superior, and also to one who had a great favour to ask.—**Κύριε**: not implying in the leper a higher idea than that of Master or Rabbi.—**ἐὰν θέλῃς**: the leper's doubt is not about the power, for he probably knows what marvellous things have been happening of late in and around Capernaum, but about the *will*, a doubt natural in one suffering from a loathsome disease. Besides, men more easily believe in miraculous power than in miraculous love. **θέλῃς**, present subjunctive, not aorist, which would express something that might happen at a future time (*vide* Winer, § xlii., 2, b).—**καθαρίσαι**—of course the man means to cleanse by healing, not merely to pronounce clean. This has an important bearing on the meaning of the word in next ver.—**ἥψατο**, *touched* him, not to show that He was not under the law, and that to the pure nothing is unclean (Chrys., Hom. xxv.), but to evince His willingness and sympathy. The stretching out of the hand does not mean that, in touching, He might be as far off as

d here and in parall. e Ch. xviii. 10. Heb. viii. 5. f Ch. x. 18; xxiv. 14. Heb. iii. 5. g ver. 14; ix. 2. Mk. vii. 30. h Lk. xi. 53.

εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη [1] αὐτοῦ ἡ [d] λέπρα. 4. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[e] Ὅρα μηδενὶ εἴπῃς· ἀλλ' ὕπαγε, σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε [2] τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσέταξε Μωσῆς, [f] εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς." 5. Εἰσελθόντι δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ [3] εἰς Καπερναούμ, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἑκατόνταρχος παρακαλῶν αὐτόν, 6. καὶ λέγων, "Κύριε, ὁ παῖς μου [g] βέβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, [h] δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος."

[1] BZXΣ have the less correct, but none the less likely, εκαθεριcθη.

[2] BC have προσενεγκον. ℵ as in T. R.

[3] The dative is here also a correction. ℵBCZ have the gen. as in ver. 1.

possible to avoid defilement and infection (Weiss-Meyer). It was action suited to the word.—θέλω, "I *will*" pronounced in firm, cordial tone, carefully recorded by all the evangelists. καθαρίσθητι, naturally in the sense of the man's request. But that would imply a real miracle, therefore naturalistic interpreters, like Paulus and Keim, are forced to take the word in the sense of *pronouncing* clean, the mere opinion of a shrewd observer. The narrative of Matthew barely leaves room for this hypothesis. The other evangelists so express themselves as to exclude it.—ἐκαθαρίσθη: forthwith the leprosy disappeared as if by magic. The man was and looked perfectly well.

Ver. 4. ὅρα, see to it! Look you!—imperative in mood and *tone* (*vide* Mark's graphic account). Christ feared the man would be content with being well without being officially pronounced clean—physically healed, though not socially restored. Hence μηδενὶ εἴπῃς, ἀλλ' ὕπαγε, etc.: speak of it to nobody, but go *at once* and show thyself (δεῖξον), τῷ ἱερεῖ, to the priest who has charge of such matters. What was the purpose of this order? Many good commentators, including Grot., Beng. and Wetstein, say it was to prevent the priests hearing of the cure before the man came (lingering on the road to tell his tale), and, in spite, declaring that he was *not* clean. The truth is, Jesus desired the benefit to be complete, socially, which depended on the priest, as well as physically. If the man did not go at once, he would not go at all.—τὸ δῶρον, *vide* Lev. xiv. 10, 21; all things to be done according to the law; no laxity encouraged, though the official religion was little worthy of respect (*cf.* Matt. v. 19).—εἰς μαρτύριον, as a certificate to the public (αὐτοῖς) from the constituted authority that the leper was clean. The direction shows Christ's confidence in the reality of the cure. The whole story is a picture of character. The touch reveals *sympathy;* the accompanying word, "I will, be clean," prompt, cordial, laconic, immense energy and vitality; the final order, reverence for existing institutions, fearlessness, humane solicitude for the sufferer's future well-being in every sense.

Vv. 5-13. *The centurion's son or servant* (Lk. vii. 1-10). Placed by both Matthew and Luke after Sermon on Mount, by the latter immediately after.—Ver. 5. εἰσελθόντος, aorist participle with another finite verb, pointing to a completed action. He had entered Capernaum when the following event happened. Observe the genitive absolute again with a dative of the same subject, αὐτῷ, following προσῆλθεν. ἑκατόνταρχος, a Gentile (ver. 10), probably an officer in the army of Herod Antipas.—Ver. 6. Κύριε again, not necessarily expressing any advanced idea of Christ's person.—παῖς may mean either son or servant. Luke has δοῦλος, and from the harmonistic point of view this settles the matter. But many, including Bleek and Weiss (Meyer), insist that παῖς here means son.—βέβληται, perf. pointing to a chronic condition; bed-ridden in the house, therefore not with the centurion.—παραλυτικός, a disease of the nerves, therefore emotional treatment might be thought of, had the son only been present. But he could not even be brought on a stretcher as in another case (Matt. ix. 1) because not only παραλ., but δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος, not an ordinary feature of paralysis.—Ver. 7. This is generally taken as an offer on Christ's part to go to the house. Fritzsche finds in it a question, arranging the words (T. R.) thus: καί, λέγει α. ὁ. Ι., Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν; and rendering: "And," saith Jesus to him, "shall I go and heal him?" = is that

7. Καὶ[1] λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[2] "Ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν." 8. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς[3] ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος ἔφη, "Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ [i]ἱκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς· ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰπὲ λόγον,[4] καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου. 9. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι [j]ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν,[5] ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας· καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ." 10. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασε, καὶ εἶπε τοῖς ἀκολουθοῦσιν, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ

i with ἵνα here and in Lk. vii. 6; *vide* at Mt. iii. 11.
j Lk. vii. 8.

[1] B and many vers. (including Syr. Cur.) omit the και, so giving an expressive asyndeton.

[2] ℵB omit ο Ιησους.

[3] αποκριθεις δε in ℵB 33.

[4] ℵBC have λογῳ, adopted by both Tisch. and W.H.

[5] ℵB *al.* add τασσομενος, adopted within brackets by W.H. "Manifestly out of Lk.," Weiss in Meyer.

what you wish? The following verse then contains the centurion's reply. This is, to say the least, ingenious.—Ver. 8, **ἱκανὸς**, the Baptist's word, chap. iii. 11, but the construction different in the two places, there with infinitive, here with **ἵνα**: I am not fit in order that. This is an instance illustrating the extension of the use of **ἵνα** in later Greek, which culminated in its superseding the infinitive altogether in modern Greek. On the N. T. use of **ἵνα**, *vide* Burton, M. and T., §§ 191-222. Was it because he was a Gentile by birth, and also perhaps a heathen in religion, that he had this feeling of unworthiness, or was it a purely personal trait? If he was not only a Gentile but a Pagan, Christ's readiness to go to the house would stand in remarkable contrast to His conduct in the case of the Syro-Phenician woman. But *vide* Lk. vii. 5.—**εἰπὲ λόγῳ**, speak (and heal) with a word. A bare word just where they stand, he thinks, will suffice.—Ver. 9, **καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ**: he argues from his own experience not with an air of self-importance, on the contrary making light of his position as a commander.—**ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν**, spoken in modesty. He means: I also, though a very humble person in the army, under the authority of more important officers, still have a command over a body of men who do implicitly as I bid them. Fritzsche rightly suggests that **ἄνθρωπος ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν** does not express a single idea = "a man under authority". He represents himself as a man *with* authority, though in a modest way. A comma might with advantage be placed after **εἰμι**. The centurion thinks Jesus can order about disease as he orders his soldiers—say to fever, palsy, leprosy, *go*, and it will *go*. His soldiers *go*, his slaves *do* (Carr, C. G. T.).

Ver. 10. In ver. 13 we are told that Jesus did not disappoint the centurion's expectation. But the interest of the cure is eclipsed for the evangelist by the interest of the Healer's admiration, certainly a remarkable instance of a noteworthy characteristic of Jesus: *His delight in signal manifestations of faith.* Faith, His great watchword, as it was St. Paul's. This value set on faith was not a mere idiosyncrasy, but the result of insight into its nobleness and spiritual virtue.—**καὶ εἶπε**: Christ did not conceal His admiration; or His sadness when He reflected that such faith as this Gentile had shown was a rare thing in *Israel*.—**Ἀμὴν**: He speaks solemnly, not without emotion.—**παρ' οὐδενὶ**: This is more significant than the reading of T. R., assimilated to Lk. vii. 9. The **οὐδὲ** implies that Israel was the home of faith, and conveys the meaning *not even* there. But **παρ' οὐδενὶ** means not even in a single instance, and implies that faith in notable degree is at a discount among the elect people. Such a sentiment at so early a period is noteworthy as showing how far Jesus was from cherishing extravagant hopes of setting up a theocratic kingdom of righteousness and godliness in Israel.

Vv. 11-12. This *logion* is given by Luke (xiii. 28-29) in a different connection, and it may not be in its historical

k Ch. xvi. 19, parall. Lk. xiii. 29 (parall. to this text). l Ch. xxii. 13; xxv. 30 (same phrase). m Ch. xiii. 42, 50; xxv. 30 (same phrase). n parall. John iv. 52. Acts xxviii. 8.

τοσαύτην πίστιν[1] εὗρον. 11. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἥξουσι, καὶ [k]ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· 12. οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς [l]τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται [m]ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων." 13. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῳ, "Ὕπαγε, καὶ[2] ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι." Καὶ ἰάθη ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ[3] ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.[4]

14. Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Πέτρου, εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν, 15. καὶ ἥψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ [n]πυρετός· καὶ ἠγέρθη, καὶ διηκόνει

[1] Authorities are much divided between the reading **ουδε εν τω I. . . . ευρον** (T. R.), which is found in ℵCLΔΣ *al.* (Tisch.), and **παρ ουδενι τοσαυτην πιστιν εν τω I. ευρον**, found in B, old Latin verss., Syr. Cur., Egypt. verss., and several cursives (W.H.). The former has probably come in from Lk. vii. 9.

[2] ℵB omit **και**. *Vide* below.

[3] ℵB omit **αυτου**, also superfluous.

[4] **απο της ωρας εκεινης** in CΔΣ.

place here. But its import is in thorough harmony with the preceding reflection on the spiritual state of Israel. One who said the one thing was prepared to say the other. At whatever time said it would give offence. It is one of the heavy burdens of the prophet that he cannot be a mere patriot, or say complimentary things about his nation or his Church. **ἀνακλιθήσονται**: Jesus expresses Himself here and throughout this *logion* in the language of His time and people. The feast with the patriarchs, the outer darkness, the weeping and the gnashing of teeth (observe the article before **σκότος, κλαυθμὸς, βρυγμὸς**, implying that all are familiar ideas) are stock phrases. The imagery is Jewish, but the thought is anti-Jewish, universalistic, of perennial truth and value.

Ver. 13. **ὕπαγε**, etc.: compressed impassioned utterance, spoken under emotion = Go, as thou hast believed be it to thee; cure as thorough as thy faith. The **καὶ** before **ὡς** in T. R. is the addition of prosaic scribes. Men speaking under emotion discard expletives.

Weizsäcker (*Untersuchungen über die Evang. Gesch.*, p. 50) remarks on the felicitous juxtaposition of these two narratives relatively to one another and to the Sermon on Mount. "In the first Jesus has to do with a Jew, and demands of him observance of the law. In this respect the second serves as a companion piece, the subject of healing being a heathen, giving occasion for a word as to the position of heathens. The two combined are happily appended to a discourse in which Jesus states His attitude to the law, forming as complements of each other a commentary on the statement."

Vv. 14-15. *Cure of a fever: Peter's mother-in-law* (Mark i. 29-31; Luke iv. 38, 39). This happened much earlier, at the beginning of the Galilean ministry, the second miracle-history in Mark and Luke. Mark at this point becomes Matthew's guide, though he does not follow implicitly. Each evangelist has characteristic features, the story of the second being the original.—Ver. 14. **ἐλθὼν**, coming *from* the synagogue on a Sabbath day (Mark i. 29) with fellow-worshippers not here named. The story here loses its flesh and blood, and is cut down to the essential fact.—**εἰς τ. ο. Πέτρου**: Peter has a house and is married, and already he receives his disciple name (*Simon* in Mark).—**πενθερὰν**. It is Peter's mother-in-law that is ill.—**βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν**, lying in bed, fevered. Had she taken ill since they left to attend worship, with the suddenness of feverish attacks in a tropical climate? **βεβλημένην** is against this, as it naturally suggests an illness of some duration; but on the other hand, if she had been ill for some time, why should they need to tell Jesus after coming back from the synagogue? (Mark i. 30). **πυρέσσ.** does not necessarily

αὐτοῖς.[1] 16. [o] Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δαιμονιζομένους πολλούς· καὶ ἐξέβαλε τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ, καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν· 17. ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, 'Αὐτὸς τὰς [p] ἀσθενείας ἡμῶν ἔλαβε, καὶ τὰς νόσους ἐβάστασεν.'

18. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πολλοὺς ὄχλους[2] περὶ αὐτόν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν [q] εἰς τὸ [q] πέραν. 19. καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν

o same phrase. Ch. xiv. 15, 23; xxvii. 57, and in Mk. and John.
p Lk. v. 15; viii. 2. Acts xxviii. 9. 1 Tim. v. 23.
q phr. freq. in Mt. and Mk. (ver. 28, Ch. xiv. 22. Mk. iv. 35 *al.*).

[1] αυτω in ℵBCΣ *al.* αυτοις (in LΔ) has come in from parall.

[2] B has οχλον; ℵ οχλους, which once introduced was enlarged into πολλους οχλους (ℵ^c CLΔΣ *al.*), not a usual expression in Mt.

imply a serious attack, but *vide* Luke iv. 38.—Ver. 15. ἥψατο. He touched her hand; here to cure, in Mark to raise her up.—ἠγέρθη, διηκόνει: she rose up at once and continued to serve at the meal; all present but Jesus only referred to here (αὐτῳ, plural in Mark, but inappropriate here). Not only the fever but the weakness it causes left her. "Ordinarily a long time is required for recovery, but then all things happened at once" (Chryst., Hom. xxvii.). Not a great miracle or interesting for anything said; but it happened at an early time and in the disciple circle; Peter the informant; and it showed Christ's *sympathy* (ver. 17).

Vv. 16-17. *Events of that Sabbath evening* (Mark i. 32-34; Luke iv. 40, 41). A general statement, which, after iv. 23 f., might have been dispensed with; but it is in the source (Mark) in the same context, and it gives our evangelist a welcome opportunity of quoting a prophetic text in reference to Christ's healing work. Ver. 16. Ὀψίας γενομένης: vague indication of time on any day, but especially a Sabbath day. There were two evenings, an early and a late (Ex. xxx. 8). Which of them was it; before or after sunset? Mark is more exact.—δαιμον. πολλούς: why a crowd just then, and why especially demoniacs brought to be healed? For explanation we must go to Mark. The preaching of Jesus in the synagogue that Sabbath day, and the cure of a *demoniac* (Mark i. 21-28), had created a great sensation, and the result is a crowd gathered at the door of Peter's house at sunset, when the Sabbath ended, witb their sick, especially with demoniacs.—Ver. 17. Prophetic citation, apposite, felicitous; setting Christ's healing ministry in a true light; giving prominence not to the thaumaturgic but to the sympathetic aspect; from the Hebrew original, the Sept. making the text (Is. liii. 4) refer to sin. The Hebrew refers to sicknesses and pains. It is useless to discuss the precise meaning of ἔλαβεν and ἐβάστασεν: took and bore, or took and bore *away*; subjective or objective? The evangelist would note, not merely that Jesus actually did remove diseases, but that He was *minded* to do so; such was His bent.

Vv. 18-34. *Excursion to the eastern shore with its incidents* (Mark iv. 35—v. 20; Luke viii. 22-39). These narratives make a large leap forward in the history. As our evangelist is giving a collection of healing incidents, the introduction of vv. 18-22, *disciple interviews*, and even of vv. 23-27, a *nature* miracle, needs an explanation. The readiest is that he found these associated with the Gadara incident, his main concern, in his source or sources, the whole group in the Apostolic Document (so Weiss). Besides, as the evangelist did not apparently make himself the slave of his plan, it was natural to give together incidents that possibly (?) happened on the same eventful journey, though Luke (ix. 57-62) gives the disciple interviews in a different connection.

Ver. 18. Ἰδὼν . . . περὶ αὐτόν. The evangelist makes a desire to escape from the crowd the motive of the journey. This desire is still more apparent in Mark, but the crowd and the time are different. The multitude from which Jesus escapes, in Mark's narrative, is that gathered on the shore to hear the parable-discourse from a boat on the lake.—ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν. Grotius thinks this elliptical for: ἐκέλευσε πάντα ἑτοιμάσαι εἰς τὸ ἀπ. Beza renders: *indixit profectionem* = He ordered departure. τοὺς μαθητάς is understood, not men-

r Lk. ix. 58; xii. 32.
s Lk. ix. 58.
t Lk. ix. 58.
u Ch. xix. 8. Lk. viii. 32 (with inf.). 1 Cor. xvi. 7. Heb. vi. 3 (absol.).
v Ch. xiv. 12. Lk. ix. 59; xvi. 22.

αὐτῷ, "Διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι, ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ." 20. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Αἱ ʳ ἀλώπεκες ˢ φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ᵗ κατασκηνώσεις· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει, ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ." 21. Ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ[1] εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, ᵘ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ ᵛ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου." 22. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[2] εἶπεν[3] αὐτῷ, "Ἀκολούθει μοι,

[1] ℵB omit αυτου, which here as often elsewhere occurs in T. R., where it is not required.

[2] On the authority of ℵ, Tisch. omits ο Ιησους found in BCLΔ *al.*

[3] λεγει in ℵBC.

tioned because they alone could be meant.—Ver. 19, εἷς, either "*one*, a scribe" (Weiss and very decidedly Meyer, who says that εἷς never in N. T. = τὶς), or "a *certain* scribe," indefinite reference, so Fritzsche, falling back on Suicer, I., p. 1037, and more recently Bleek and others. *Vide* Winer, § xviii. 9, who defends the use of εἷς for τὶς as a feature of later Greek.—γραμματεὺς, a scribe! even one of that most unimpressionable class, in spirit and tendency utterly opposed to the ways of Jesus. A Saul among the prophets. He has actually become warmed up to something like enthusiasm. A striking tribute to the magnetic influence of Jesus.—ἀκολουθήσω: already more or less of a disciple—perhaps he had been present during the teaching on the hill—he proposes now to become a constant attendant, and to begin at once, going on this journey with the companions of Jesus, now grown to a larger group than the four (Matt. iv. 18 f.). Quite honestly meant, but—ver. 20, λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰ. Jesus distrusted the *class*, and the *man*, who might be better than the average, still he was a scribe. Christ's feeling was not an unreasoning or invincible prejudice, but a strong suspicion and aversion justified by insight and experience. Therefore He purposely paints the prospect in sombre colours to prevent a connection which could come to no good.—αἱ ἀλώπεκες, etc.: a notable saying; one of the outstanding *logia* of Jesus, in style and spirit characteristic; not querulous, as if lamenting His lot, but highly coloured to repel an undesirable follower. Foxes have holes, and birds resting places, roosts (not nests, which are used only for breeding), *but*—ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: a remarkable designation occurring here for the first time. It means much for the Speaker, who has chosen it deliberately, in connection with private reflections, at whose nature we can only guess, by study of the many occasions on which the name is used. Here it seems to mean the man simpliciter (son of man = man in Hebrew or Syriac), *the unprivileged Man:* not only no exception to the rule of ordinary human experience in the way of being better off, but rather an exception in the way of being worse off; for the rule is, that all living creatures, even beasts, and still more men, have their abodes, however humble. If it be Messianic, it is in a hidden enigmatical way. The whole speech is studiously enigmatical, and calculated to chill the scribe's enthusiasm. Was Jesus speaking in parables here, and hinting at something beyond the literal privations of His life as a wanderer with no fixed home? The scribe had his spiritual home in Rabbinical traditions, and would not be at ease in the company of One who had broken with them. Jesus had no place where He could lay His head in the *religion* of His time (*vide* my *With Open Face*, chap. ix.).

Vv. 21-22. *Another disciple.* Ἕτερος, another, not only numerically (ἄλλος), but in type. The first was enthusiastic; this one is hesitating, and needs to be urged; a better, more reliable man, though contrasting with his neighbour unfavourably.—τῶν μαθητῶν: the expression seems to imply that the scribe was, or in spite of the repellent word of Jesus, had become, a regular disciple. That is possible. If the scribe insisted, Jesus would suffer him to become a disciple, as He did Judas, whom doubtless He instinctively saw through from the beginning. But not likely. The inference may be avoided by rendering with Bleek: "another, one of the disciples".—

καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς." 23. Καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ[1] πλοῖον, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. 24. καὶ ἰδού, [w] σεισμὸς μέγας ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, ὥστε τὸ πλοῖον [x] καλύπτεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδε. 25. καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ[2] ἤγειραν αὐτόν, λέγοντες,

w here only = tempest. Ch. xxiv. 7; xxvii. 54 *al.* (earthquake).
x Lk. viii. 16 (τί τινι). Ch. x. 26. 2 Cor. iv. 3 (*vide* from knowledge).

[1] το omitted in ℵ[b]BC 33.

[2] οι μαθηται αυτου wanting in ℵB; added for clearness, but not needed.

ἐπίτρεψόν μοι: he wished, before setting out from Capernaum, on the journey to the eastern side of the lake, to attend to an urgent domestic duty; in fact to bury his father. In that climate burial had to take place on the day of death. Permission would have involved very little delay of the voyage, unless, with Chrysostom, we include under **θάψαι** all that goes along with death and burial, arranging family affairs, distribution of inheritance, etc. There would not probably be much trouble of that sort in the case of one belonging to the Jesus-circle.—Ver. 22, **Ἀκολούθει μοι**: the reply is a stern refusal, and the reason apparently hard and unfeeling—**ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς . . . νεκρούς**: word for word the same in Luke (ix. 60), an unforgettable, mystic, hard saying. The dead must be taken in two senses = let the spiritually dead, not yet alive to the claims of the kingdom, bury the naturally dead. Fritzsche objects, and finds in the saying the paradox: "let the dead bury each other the best way they can," which, as Weiss says, is not a paradox, but nonsense. Another eccentric idea of some commentators is that the first **νεκροὺς** refers to the *vespillones*, the corpse-bearers who carried out the bodies of the poor at night, in Hebrew phrase, the men of the dead. Take it as we will, it seems a hard, heartless saying, difficult to reconcile with Christ's denunciation of the Corban casuistry, by which humanity and filial piety were sacrificed on the altar of religion (Matt. xv. 3-6). But, doubtless, Jesus knew to whom He was speaking. The saying can be understood and justified; but it can also very easily be misunderstood and abused, and woe to the man who does so. From these two examples we see that Jesus had a startling way of speaking, which would create reflection, and also give rise to remark. *Vide* on Lk. ix. 57-62, where *three* cases are given, the above two included.

Vv. 23-27. *Storm on the lake* (Mk. iv. 35-41, Lk. viii. 22-25). Ver. 23. **ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ** might be called a dative absolute; if taken as dative after **ἠκολούθησαν**, the **αὐτῷ** after this verb is superfluous. This short sentence is overcharged with pronouns (**αὐτοῦ** after **μαθηταί**).—**τὸ πλοῖον** (**τὸ** omitted in Lk.), the ship in readiness in accordance with previous instructions (ver. 18). Ver. 24, **ἰδοὺ** indicates sudden oncome.—**σεισμὸς ἐν τ. θ.**, literally an earthquake of the sea, the waters stirred to their depths by the winds referred to in vv. 26, 27; **λαῖλαψ** in Mark and Luke = hurricane.—**ὥστε**, here with infinitive, used also with finite moods (*e.g.*, Gal. ii. 13). In the one case **ὥστε** indicates aim or tendency, in the other it asserts actual result (*vide* Goodwin, p. 221, also Baümlein, *Schulgrammatik*, §§ 593, 594). Klotz, *Devar.*, ii. p. 772, gives as the equivalent of **ὥστε**, with infinitive, *ita ut;* with indicative, *itaque* or *quare*.—**καλύπτεσθαι**, was covered, hidden, the waves rising high above the boat, breaking on it, and gradually filling it with water (*cf.* Mark and Luke).—**αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκάθευδεν**: dramatic contrast = but He was sleeping (imperfect), the storm notwithstanding. Like a general in time of war Jesus slept when He could. He had fallen asleep before the storm came on, probably shortly after they had started (Lk. viii. 23, **πλεόντων αὐτῶν ἀφύπνωσεν**: while they sailed He went off to sleep), soothed by the gliding motion. It was the sleep of one worn by an intense life, involving constant strain on body and mind. The mental tension is apparent in the words spoken to the two disciples (vv. 20-22). Words like these are not spoken in cold blood, or without waste of nervous power. Richard Baxter describes Cromwell as "of such vivacity, hilarity, and alacrity as another man hath when he hath drunken a cup too much" (Reliquiae Baxt.). "Drunken, but not with wine," with a great epoch-making enthusiasm. The storm did not wake the sleeper. A tempest, the sublime

y Mk. iv. 40. Rev. xxi. 8. z here and parall. of the wind and sea (Ps. cv. 8). a here and parall. b Mk. xiii. 1. Lk. i. 29; vii. 39. 1 John iii. 1.

"Κύριε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς,[1] ἀπολλύμεθα." 26. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Τί [y] δειλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι;" Τότε ἐγερθεὶς [z] ἐπετίμησε τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο [a] γαλήνη μεγάλη. 27. οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες, "[b] Ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;"[2]

[1] ημας, another addition for clearness, wanting in ℵB; more expressive without.

[2] ℵB transpose υπακ. αυτω (so Tisch., W.H.).

in nature, is a lullaby to a great spirit. The Fathers viewed the sleep and the storm theologically, both arranged for beforehand, to give time for cowardice to show itself (Chrys., Hom. xxviii.), to let the disciples know their weakness and to accustom them to trials (Theophyl.). A docetic Christ, an unreal man, a theatrical affair!—Ver. 25. **προσελθόντες**: one of our evangelist's favourite words.—**ἤγειραν**: they would not have waked Him if they could have helped it. They were genuinely terrified, though experienced sailors accustomed to rough weather.—**Κύριε, σῶσον . . . ἀπολλύμεθα**: laconic speech, verbs unconnected, utterance of fear-stricken men. Luke's **ἐπιστάτα, ἐπιστάτα** is equally descriptive. Who could tell exactly what they said? All three evangelists report differently.—Ver. 26, **δειλοί, ὀλιγόπιστοι**, He chides *them* first, then the winds, the chiding meant to calm fear. Cowards, men of little faith! harsh in tone but kindly meant; expressive really of personal fearlessness, to gain ascendency over panic-stricken spirits (*cf.* Luke).—**τότε ἐγερθεὶς**: He had uttered the previous words as He lay, then with a sudden impulse He rose and spoke imperial words to the elements: *animos discipulorum prius, deinde mare composuit* (Bengel).—**ἀνέμοις, θαλάσσῃ**: He rebuked both. It would have been enough to rebuke the winds which caused the commotion in the water. But the speech was impassioned and poetic, not scientific.—**γαλήνη μεγάλη**: antithetic to **σεισμὸς μέγας**, ver. 24.—Ver. 27, **οἱ ἄνθρωποι**: who? Naturally one would say the disciples with Jesus in the boat, called men to suit the tragic situation. But many think others are referred to, men unacquainted with Jesus: "quibus nondum innotuerat Christus" (Calvin); either with the disciples in the boat, and referred to alone (Jerome, Meyer) or jointly (De Wette, Bleek), or who afterwards heard the story (Hilary, Euthy., Fritzsche: "homines, quotquot hujus portenti nuntium acceperant," and Weiss). Holtzmann (H. C.) says they might be the men in the other ships mentioned in Mk. iv. 36, but in reality the expression may simply point to the contrast between the disciples as men and the divine power displayed.—**ποταπὸς . . . οὗτος**, what manner of person? The more classic form is **ποδαπός** = from what land? where born? possibly from **ποῦ** and **ἀπο**, with a euphonic δ (Passow). **ποταπός**, in later use, = of what sort? *vide* Lobeck, Phryn., p. 56.—This story of the triple tradition is a genuine reminiscence of disciple life. There was a storm, Jesus slept, the disciples awoke Him in terror. He rebuked the winds and waves, and they forthwith subsided. The only escape of naturalism from a miracle of power or Providence (Weiss, *Leben Jesu*) is to deny the causal sequence between Christ's word and the ensuing calm and suggest coincidence. The storm sudden in its rise, equally sudden in its lull.

Vv. 28-34. *The demoniacs of Gadara* (Mk. v. 1-20, Lk. viii. 26-39). This narrative raises puzzling questions of all sorts, among them a geographical or topological one, as to the scene of the occurrence. The variations in the readings in the three synoptical gospels reflect the perplexities of the scribes. The place in these readings bears three distinct names. It is called the territory of the *Gadarenes*, the *Gerasenes*, and the *Gergesenes*. The reading in Mk. v. 1 in B, and adopted by W.H., is **Γερασηνῶν**, and, since the discovery by Thomson (*Land and Book*, ii. 374) of a place called Gersa or Kersa, near the eastern shore of the lake, there has been a growing consensus of opinion in favour of *Gerasa* (not to be confounded with Gerasa in Gilead, twenty miles east of the Jordan) as the true name of the scene of the story. A place near the sea seems to be demanded by the circumstances, and Gadara on the Hieromax

28. Καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ[1] εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν,[2] [c] ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἐξερχόμενοι [d] χαλεποὶ λίαν, ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἐκείνης· 29. καὶ ἰδού, ἔκραξαν, λέγοντες, "[e] Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ,[3] υἱὲ τοῦ

c Ch. xxviii. 9. Lk. viii. 27; xiv. 31 (in a hostile sense).
d here and 2 Tim. iii. 1 (Isa. xviii. 2).
e Mk. i. 24. Lk. iv. 34.

[1] Dat. again by way of grammatical correction for the gen. abs. found in ℵbBC and adopted by Tisch., W.H., etc.

[2] So in ℵcC³L *al.*, Memph. vers., Origen. Γαδαρηνων in ℵ*BC*ΔΣ *al.*, adopted by Tisch., Treg., W.H., Weiss. *Vide* below.

[3] Ιησου is wanting in ℵBCL. Comes in from Mk. Modern editors omit.

was too far distant. The true reading in Matthew (v. 28) nevertheless is Γαδαρηνῶν. He probably follows Mark as his guide, but the village Gerasa being obscure and Gadara well known, he prefers to define the locality by a general reference to the latter. The name Gergesa was a suggestion of Origen's made incidentally in his Commentary on John, in connection with the place named in chap. i. 28, Bethabara or Bethany, to illustrate the confusion in the gospel in connection with names. His words are: Γέργεσα, ἀφ' ἧς οἱ Γεργεσαῖοι, πόλις ἀρχαία περὶ τὴν νῦν καλουμένην Τιβεριάδα λίμνην, περὶ ἣν κρημνὸς παρακείμενος τῇ λίμνῃ, ἀφ' οὗ δείκνυται τοὺς χοιροὺς ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμόνων καταβεβλῆσθαι (in Ev. Ioan., T. vi. c. 24). Prof. G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography*, p. 459, note, pronounces Gerasa "impossible". But he means Gerasa in Decapolis, thirty-six miles away. He accepts Khersa, which he identifies with Gergesa, as the scene of the incident, stating that it is the only place on the east coast where the steep hills come down to the shore.

Ver. 28. δύο, *two*, in Mark and Luke one. According to some, *e.g.*, Holtzmann (H. C.), the two includes the case reported in Mk. i. 23-27, Lk. iv. 31-37, omitted by Matthew. Weiss' hypothesis is that the two is an inference from the plurality of demons spoken of in his source (*vide* Matt.-Evan., p. 239). The harmonists disposed of the difficulty by the remark that there might be two though only one is spoken of in the other accounts, perhaps because he was the more violent of the two (so Augustine and Calvin).—ἐκ τῶν μνημείων, the precipitous hills on the eastern shore are a limestone formation full of caves, which were doubtless used for burying the dead. There the demoniacs made their congenial home.—χαλεποὶ λίαν, fierce exceedingly; λίαν, one of our evangelist's favourite words. These demoniacs were what one would call dangerous madmen; that, whatever more; no light matter to cure them, say by "moral therapeutics".—ὥστε μὴ ἰσχύειν, again ὥστε with infinitive (with μὴ for negative). The point is not that nobody passed that way, but that the presence of the madmen tended to make it a place to be shunned as dangerous. Nobody cared to go near them. Christ came near their lair by accident, but He would not have been scared though He had known of their presence.

Ver. 29. ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν: sudden, startling, unearthly cry, fitted to shock weak nerves. But not the cry of men about to make an assault. The madmen, whom all feared and shunned, were subdued by the aspect of the stranger who had arrived in the neighbourhood. To be taken as a fact, however strange and mysterious, partly explained by the fact that Jesus was not afraid of them any more than He had been of the storm. They felt His power in the very look of His eye. τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί: an appropriate speech even in the mouth of one demoniac, for he speaks in the name of the legion of devils (Mk. v. 8) by which he conceives himself possessed. Identifying himself with the demons, he shrinks from the new comer with an instinctive feeling that He is a foe.—υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ: ὁ ἅγιος τ. θ. in the Capernaum Synagogue case; strange, almost incredible divination. Yet "insanity is much nearer the kingdom of God than worldly-mindedness. There was, doubtless, something in the whole aspect and manner of Jesus which was fitted to produce almost instantaneously a deep, spiritual impression to which child-like, simple, ingenuous souls like the Galilean fishermen, sinful, yet honest-hearted men like those who met at Matthew's feast,

Θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε [f]πρὸ [f]καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;" 30. Ἦν δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν [g]ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν [h]βοσκομένη. 31. οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, "Εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς, ἐπίτρεψον ἡμῖν ἀπελθεῖν[1] εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων." 32. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὑπάγετε." Οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων[2]· καὶ ἰδού, [i]ὥρμησε πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη τῶν χοίρων[3] [j]κατὰ τοῦ [j]κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν.

f same phr. 1 Cor. iv. 5 (Sir. xxx. 24).
g here and parall.
h Mk. v. 14. Lk. viii. 32; xv. 15. John xxi. 15, 17.
i parall. and Acts xix. 29 (Acts vii. 57, ἐπί τινα).
j parall.

[1] For the reading επιτρεψον ημιν απελθειν in T. R. ℵB have αποστειλον; adopted by modern editors. The T. R. conforms to Lk. (viii. 32).

[2] For εις την αγελην των χοιρων ℵBC have τους χοιρους (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] ℵBCΔΣ omit των χοιρων.

readily surrendered themselves. Men with shattered reason also felt the spell, while the wise and the strong-minded too often used their intellect, under the bias of passion or prejudice, to resist the force of truth. In this way we may account for the prompt recognition of Jesus by the Gadarene demoniac. All that is necessary to explain it is the Messianic hope prevalent in Gadara as elsewhere, and the sight of Jesus acting on an impressionable spirit" (Bruce, *The Miraculous Element in the Gospels* p. 187).—**πρὸ καιροῦ**: before the appointed time of judgment. The article wanting here before κ. as in other phrases in N. T., *e.g.*, ἐν καιρῷ, Matt. xxiv. 45.—**βασανίσαι**, to torment with pain in Hades, described as a place of torment in Lk. xvi. 28, *cf.* ver. 23.

Ver. 30. **μακρὰν**: the Vulgate renders *non longe*, as if οὐ had stood in the Greek before μακ. But there are no variants here. Mark and Luke have ἐκεῖ, which gives rise to an apparent discrepancy. Only apparent, many contend, because both expressions are relative and elastic: *at a distance*, yet within view; *there*, in that neighbourhood, but not quite at hand. Elsner refers to Lk. xv. 20: μακρὰν, "et tamen in conspectu, ut, Luc. xv. 20: Ἔτι δὲ αὐτοῦ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος, εἶδεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ". On ἐκεῖ he remarks: "docet in ea regione et vicinia fuisse, nec distantiam describit". Weiss against Meyer denies the relativity of μακρὰν, and takes it as meaning "a long way off," while visible. —**βοσκομένη**: far removed from ἦν, and not to be joined with it as if the feeding were the main point, and not rather the *existence* of the herd there. The ill attested reading βοσκομένων brings out the meaning better. A herd of swine which were feeding in the hill pastures. The swine, doubtless, belonged to Gentiles, who abounded in Peræa.—Ver. 31. **οἱ δαίμονες**: unusual designation, commonly δαιμόνια.—**παρεκάλουν**: the request was made by the possessed in the name of the demons.—**ἀπόστειλον**: the reading of the T. R. (ἐπίτρεψον ἀπελθεῖν) taken from Luke expresses, in a milder form, Christ's share of responsibility in a transaction of supposed doubtful character. The demoniac would have no scruple on that score. His request was: if you are to cast us out, send us not to hell, but into the swine.—**ὑπάγετε**: Christ's laconic reply, usually taken to mean: go into the swine, but not necessarily meaning more than "begone". So Weiss, who holds that Jesus had no intention of expressing acquiescence in the demoniac's request. (*Matt. Evan.* and Weiss-Meyer, "Hinweg mit euch.".) —Ver. 32. **οἱ δὲ . . . χοίρους**: the entrance of the demons into the swine could not, of course, be a matter of observation, but only of inference from what followed.—**ἰδοὺ**, introducing a sudden, startling event—**ὥρμησεν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη**: the mad downrush of the herd over the precipice into the lake. Assuming the full responsibility of Jesus for the catastrophe, expositors have busied themselves in inventing apologies. Euthy. gives four reasons for the transaction, the fourth being that only thereby could it be conclusively shown that the devils had left the demoniacs. Rosenmüller suggests that two men are worth more than ever so many swine. The lowest depth of bathos in this line was touched by Wetstein when he suggested that, by cutting up the drowned swine, salting the meat or making smoke-dried hams (*fumosas pernas*), and selling them to Gen-

33. οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα, καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων. 34. καὶ ἰδού, πᾶσα ἡ πόλις ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν [1] τῷ [2] Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτόν, παρεκάλεσαν ὅπως [3] [k] μεταβῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.

k Ch. xi. 1; xii. 9; xv. 29 (with ἐκεῖθεν).

[1] For συναντησιν (CLΔΣ) ℵB 1, 33, have υπαντησιν (Tisch., W.H.), a preferable word. *Vide* below.

[2] For τω (B) ℵC have του, adopted by Tisch. and put in margin by W.C.

[3] For οπως B has ινα.

tiles who did not object to eat suffocated animals, the owners would escape loss. But the learned commentator might be jesting, for he throws out the suggestion for the benefit of men whom he describes as neither Jews, Gentiles, nor Christians.

Vv. 33-34. *The sequel.* **ἔφυγον**: the swineherds fled. No wonder, in view of such a disaster. If the demoniacs, in the final paroxysm before return to sanity, had anything to do with bringing it about, the superstitious terror with which they were regarded would add to the panic.—**ἀπήγγειλαν**: they reported what had happened to their masters and to everybody they met in the town.—**πάντα**, what had befallen the swine.—**καὶ τὰ τ. δαιμονιζομένων**: they could not know the whole truth about the demoniacs. The reference must be to some visible connection between the behaviour of the madmen and the destruction of the herd. They told the story from their own point of view, not after interviewing Jesus and His company.—Ver. 34. **πᾶσα ἡ πόλις**: an exaggeration of course, *cf.* accounts in Mark and Luke.—**εἰς ὑπάντησιν . . . Ι.**, to a meeting with Jesus. The noun occurs again in Matt. xxv. 1, and John xii. 13; in Matt. xxv. 6 **ἀπάντησιν** is used instead of it. **εἰς ἀπαν.** occurs in Sept. for לִקְרַאת. The two nouns are little used in Greek authors. The change from one to the other in Matt. xxv. 1, 6 implies a slight difference in meaning; **ὑπάντησις** = accidental chance, or stealthy meeting; **ἀπάντησις**: an open designed meeting. The stealthy character of the meeting implied in **ὑπὸ** is well illustrated in **ὑπήντησαν**, ver. 28, of this narrative. The statement that the whole city went out to meet Jesus implies a report laying the blame of the occurrence on Him. But Matthew's account is very summary, and must be supplemented by the statements in Mark and Luke, from which it appears that some came from the town to inquire into the matter, "to see what had happened," and that in the course of their inquiries they met Jesus and learned what they had not known before, the change that had come over the demoniac. It was on their giving in their report to their fellow-townsmen, connecting the cure with the catastrophe, that the action reported in ver. 34 took place.—Ver. 34. **παρεκάλεσαν**: same word as in ver. 31 in reference to the demoniacs. They did not order or drive Him out. They *besought* in terms respectful and even subdued. They were afraid of this strange man, who could do such wonderful things; and, with all due respect, they would rather He would withdraw from their neighbourhood.

This would be an oft-told tale, in which different versions were sure to arise, wherein fact and explanation of fact would get mixed up together. The very variations in the synoptical accounts witness to its substantial historicity. The apologist's task is easy here, as distinct from that of the harmonist, which is difficult. The essential outline of the story is this. A demoniac, *alias* a madman, comes from the tombs in the limestone caves to meet Jesus, exhibiting in behaviour and conversation a double consciousness. Asked his name, he calls himself Legion. In the name of the "Legion" he begs that the demons may enter the swine. Jesus orders the demons to leave their victim. Shortly after a herd of swine feeding on the hills rushed down the steep into the sea and were drowned. Tradition connected the rush of the swine with the demons leaving their former victim and entering into them. But, as already remarked, the causal connection could not be a matter of observation but only of inference. The rush might, as Weiss suggests, be caused by the man, in his final paroxysm, chasing them. But that also is matter of conjecture. The

IX. 1. KAI ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ[1] πλοῖον [a] διεπέρασε καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν [b] ἰδίαν πόλιν. 2. καὶ ἰδού, προσέφερον αὐτῷ παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον· καὶ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν εἶπε τῷ παραλυτικῷ, "[c] Θάρσει, τέκνον, ἀφέωνταί[2] σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου."[3]

a Ch. xiv. 34. Mk. v. 21; vi. 53. Lk. xvi. 26.
b Lk. ii. 3 (in various MSS.).
c again ver. 22. Ch. xiv. 27 (plur., to the 12). Mk. x. 49.

[1] το omitted by ℵBLX.

[2] ℵB have the form αφιενται (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] The reading αφεωνται σοι αι αμ. σου in T. R. is from Lk. (v. 20). ℵB have σου αι αμαρ. D has σοι αι αμ.

real cause of the catastrophe is a mystery. Rosenmüller suggests that at a hot season of the year one in a herd of swine might undergo a morbid seizure, begin to run wildly about, and be followed sequaciously by the whole flock. He mentions an occurrence of the kind at Erfurt, recent when he wrote. Lutteroth, no rationalist, suggests "vertigo," permitted by Jesus to befall the swine, that the demoniac might have in their behaviour a sensible sign of deliverance, and so be rid of his fixed idea (*vide* his *Essai D'Interp.*, 3eme Partie, p. 27, note). On the nature of demoniacal possession, *vide* my *Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, pp. 172-190; *vide* also notes on Mark.

CHAPTER IX. THE HEALING MINISTRY CONTINUED. Vv. 1-8. *The palsied man* (Mark ii. 1-12; Luke vi. 17-26). Ver. 1. **ἐμβὰς**: Jesus complied with the request of the men of Gerasa, who had intimated so plainly that they did not want any more of His company. Whatever His purpose in crossing over to the eastern shore may have been, it was frustrated by an event which in some respects was an unexpected disaster. Was it rest only or a new sphere of work He was seeking there? *Vide* notes on Mark.—**εἰς τ. ἰδίαν π.**: entering the boat which had been moored to the shore Jesus returned with His disciples to *His own* city, to distinguish it from Gerasa, the city that shut its gates against Him; so named here only. When precisely the following incident happened cannot be ascertained. Luke's indication of time is the vaguest possible; "on one of the days" Matthew and Mark give it in different sequence, but their narratives have this in common, that they make the incident occur on arrival in Capernaum after an excursion; in either case the first mentioned, though not the same in both. *Vide* notes on Mark.

Ver. 2. **καὶ ἰδοὺ**: usual formula for introducing an important incident.—**προσέφερον**, the imperfect, implying a process, the details of which, extremely interesting, the evangelist does not give. By comparison with Mark and Luke the narrative is meagre, and defective even for the purpose of bringing out the features to which the evangelist attaches importance, *e.g.*, the value set by Jesus on the *faith* evinced. His eye is fixed on the one outstanding novel feature, the word of Jesus in ver. 6. In view of it he is careful, while omitting much, to mention that the invalid in this instance was brought to Jesus, **ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον**, lying on a couch. To the same cause also it is due that a second case of paralysis cured finds a place in this collection, though the two cases have different features: in the one physical torments, in the other mental depression.—**πίστιν αὐτῶν**, the faith of the men who had brought the sick man to Him. The common assumption that the latter is included in the **αὐτῶν** is based on dogmatic grounds.—**θάρσει, τέκνον**: with swift sure diagnosis Jesus sees in the man not faith but deep depression, associated probably with sad memories of misconduct, and uttering first a kindly hope-inspiring word, such as a physician might address to a patient: cheer up, child! He deals first with the disease of the soul.—**ἀφίενται**: Jesus declares the forgiveness of his sins, not with the authority of an exceptional person, but with sympathy and insight, as the interpreter of God's will and the law of the universe. That law is that past error need not be a doom; that we may take pardon for granted; forgive ourselves, and start anew. The law holds, Jesus believed, both in the physical and in the moral sphere. In combining pardon with healing of bodily disease in this case, He was virtually announcing a general law. "Who forgiveth all thine *iniquities*, who healeth all thy *diseases*," Ps. ciii. 3.

3. Καὶ ἰδού, τινὲς τῶν γραμματέων εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, "Οὗτος [d] βλασφημεῖ." 4. Καὶ ἰδὼν[1] ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς [e] ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν, "[f] Ἱνατί ὑμεῖς[2] ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρὰ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; 5. τί γάρ ἐστιν [g] εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν, Ἀφέωνταί[3] σοι[4] αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· ἢ εἰπεῖν, Ἔγειραι[5] καὶ περιπάτει; 6. ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας," (τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ,) "Ἐγερθεὶς[6] ἆρόν σου τὴν κλίνην, καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου." 7. Καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

d Ch. xxvi. 65. Mk. ii. 7 (W. H.) used absolutely.
e Ch. xii. 25. Heb. iv. 12.
f Ch. xxvii. 46. Lk. xiii. 7. 1 Cor. x. 29.
g Mk. ii. 9. Lk. v. 23 (with inf.). Mt. xix. 24. Lk. xvi. 17 (with acc. and inf.).

[1] For ιδων (ℵCD, Tisch.) BM have ειδως. The tendency of the scribes would be to use the same word as in ver. 2. W.H. has ειδως in text but bracketed, ιδων in margin.

[2] ℵBCD omit υμεις.

[3] αφιενται ℵ[2]B.

[4] σου in ℵBCDL.

[5] εγειρε ℵBCDLΣ.

[6] εγειρε in B and D with και; the more forcible word.

Ver. 3. **τινὲς τ. γραμματέων**: some *scribes* present on this occasion. Ominous fact duly introduced by **ἰδού**; its significance still more distinctly recognised by Luke, who gives it prominent mention at the beginning of his narrative (ver. 17). Sure sign of the extent, depth, and quality of Christ's influence.—**βλασφημεῖ**: of course; the prophet always is a scandalous, irreverent blasphemer from the conventional point of view. The scribes regarded forgiveness purely under the aspect of prerogative, and in self-defence Jesus must meet them on their own ground. His answer covers the whole case. There is more than prerogative in the matter; there is the right, duty, privilege, and power of every man to promote faith in pardon by hearty proclamation of the law of the moral world. This is dealt with first.—Ver. 4. **ἐνθυμήσεις**: Jesus intuitively read their thoughts as He read the mental state of the sick man.—**ἵνα τί**: elliptical for **ἵνα τί γένηται** understood = in order that what may happen, do you, etc. (*vide* Bäumlein, *Schul. Gram.*, § 696, and Goodwin's *Syn.*, § 331). — Ver. 5. **εὐκοπώτερον** (from **εὖ** and **κόπος**, whence **εὔκοπος**; in N.T. (Gospels) only the comparative neuter is found, as here). The question as to ability, **δύναμις**, is first disposed of; which is *easier*.—**εἰπεῖν**: they are both alike easy to *say*; the vital matter is saying with effect. Saying here stands for doing. And to do the one thing was to do the other. To heal was to forgive. It is implied that it is easier to forgive than to make a palsied man strong. Christ means that the one is ordinary, the other extraordinary; the one is within the power of any man, the other belongs only to the exceptional man; there is no assumption in declaring pardon, there is pretension in saying "arise and walk".—Ver. 6. **ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε**: transition to the other aspect, that of **ἐξουσία**, the point raised by the scribes when they *looked* a charge of blasphemy.—**ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀν., ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**: these two phrases point at supposed disabilities for forgiving. "Forgiveness takes place in heaven, and is the exclusive prerogative of God," was the thesis of the scribes. "It may be exercised even on earth, and by the Son of Man," is the counter thesis of Christ. Therefore "Son of Man" must be a title not of dignity but of humiliation. Here = one whom ye think lightly of; even He can forgive.—**τότε λέγει**. Jesus stops short in His speech to the scribes and turns to the sick man, saying: **ἔγειρε**, etc., also in ver. 6, intransitive. The reading **ἔγειραι** in T.R., ver. 6, is a correction of style, the use of the active intransitively being condemned by grammarians. Hence this various reading always occurs. (*Vide* Suidas, s.v., and Buttman, *Gramm.*, p. 56.)—**τὴν κλίνην**, a light piece of furniture, easily portable. — **ὕπαγε**: all three actions, *arising*, *lifting*, *walking*, conclusive evidence of restored power. — Ver.

8. ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐθαύμασαν,[1] καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν Θεόν, τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

9. Καὶ [h] παράγων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖθεν εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ [i] τελώνιον, Ματθαῖον λεγόμενον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ἀκολούθει μοι." Καὶ [j] ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν[2] αὐτῷ. 10. Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ [k] ἀνακειμένου[3] ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ[4] ἰδού, πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ

h ver. 27 (with ἐκεῖθεν). 1 Cor. vii. 31 (= passeth away). i here and in parall. j Mk. ii. 14. Lk. v. 28. (Hebrew idiom; *cf.* Num. xxii. 20). k Ch. xxii. 10; xxvi. 7, 20. Mk. xiv. 18. Lk. xxii. 27.

[1] **εφοβηθησαν** in ℵBD (Tisch., W.H.) **εθαυμασαν** (CLΔ *al.*) gives a commonplace idea more to the taste of the scribes.

[2] **ηκολουθει** in ℵD (Tisch.).

[3] **ανακειμενου αυτου** in ℵ^{c}C, as in text in most MSS.

[4] **και** omitted in ℵD.

7. Said, done; a convincing *argumentum ad hominem*. Who would dispute the right to forgive to one who could do that, or persist in the charge of blasphemy against Him? At least those who do will get little sympathy from the mass of spectators.—Ver. 8. **ἰδόντες οἱ ὄχλοι**. The people are free from the petty jealousies and pedantic theories of the professional class; broad facts settle the matter for them. They probably had no scruples about the forgiving, but if they had the miracle would put an end to them: the *manifest* authority and power a witness of the *non-apparent* (**ποιεῖται τὴν φανερὰν [ἐξουσίαν] τεκμήριον τῆς ἀφανοῦς**. Euthy.).—**ἐφοβήθησαν**, they feared; may point to a change of mind on the part of some who at first were influenced by the disapproving mood of the scribes. The solemn frown of those who pass for saints and wise men is a formidable thing, making many cowards. But now a new fear takes the place of the old, perhaps not without a touch of superstition.

Vv. 9-13. *The publican feast* (Mk. ii. 13-17; Lk. v. 27-32). The point of interest for the evangelist in this narrative is not the *call* of the publican disciple, but the feast which followed, a feast of publicans and "sinners" at which Jesus was present proclaiming by action what He formerly proclaimed by word: a sinful past no doom. The story, though not a miracle-history, finds a place here because it follows the last in Mark, in whose Gospel the incident of the palsied man forms the first of a group serving one aim—to show the beginnings of the conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders. The same remark applies to the next section.

Ver. 9. **παράγων ἐκεῖθεν**: passing along from the scene of the last incident, Jesus arrives at the custom-house of Capernaum (**τελώνιον**).—**εἶδεν . . . Ματθαῖον λεγ.**: there He saw a man named *Matthew*. (On the identity of Matthew with Levi in Mark and Luke, *vide* Mark.) Capernaum being near the boundary and on the caravan road between Egypt and Damascus, Matthew would be a busy man, but, doubtless, Christ and he have met before.—**Ἀκολούθει μοι**: Jesus acted on His own plans, but the recent encounter with the scribes would not be without influence on this new departure—the call of a *publican*. It was a kind of defiance to the party who cherished hard thoughts not only about pardon but about those who needed pardon. An impolitic step the worldly-wise would say; sure to create prejudice. But those who are too anxious to conciliate the prejudices of the *present* do nothing for the *future*.—**ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν**: prompt compliance, probably with some astonishment at the invitation.

Ver. 10. **καὶ ἐγένετο**, etc. The narrative of this incident in all three Synoptists is condensed, and the situation not clear. What house is meant (**ἐν τῇ οἰκ.**), and why so *many* (**πολλοί**)? "There were many," Mark remarks, emphatically (ii. 15), and the **ἰδοὺ** here implies that something important took place. Luke infers (for we need not suppose independent information) that it is a *feast* (**δοχὴν**), and, doubtless, he is right. But given by whom? Levi, according to Luke. It may have been so, but not necessarily as the prime mover; possibly, nay, probably, as the agent of his new Master. Our thoughts have been too much biassed by the assumption that the call of Matthew in

ἐλθόντες συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. 11. καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εἶπον[1] τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Διατί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;" 12. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[2] ἀκούσας εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[3] "Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. 13. πορευθέντες δὲ μάθετε τί [l]ἐστιν, '[m]Ἔλεον[4] θέλω, καὶ οὐ θυσίαν·' οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν."[5]

l Mk. ix. 10. Lk. viii. 9. Acts x. 17 (=means).
m again in Ch. xii. 7 fr. Hosea vi. 7.

[1] ελεγον ℵBCL (Tisch., W.H.). ειπον in D *al.*

[2] ℵBD omit Ιησους (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] ℵBCD omit αυτοις (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] ℵBCD have ελεος. ελεον is a gram. cor.

[5] εις μετανοιαν is wanting in ℵBDΔΣ. It is a clear case of harmonising assimilation. *Vide* on Lk. v. 32 for its effect on the sense.

this section is the main thing, and the feast an accompanying incident, a farewell feast of Matthew's in which Jesus passively partook. The truth, probably, is that the call was a preliminary to the feast, the first step in the working out of a plan. Jesus aims at a mission among the reprobated classes, and His first step is the call of Matthew to discipleship, and His second the gathering together, through him, of a large number of these classes to a social entertainment; the place of meeting being, possibly, not a private house, whether Christ's or Matthew's, but a public hall. If Matthew's house or Simon's (in which Jesus probably had His home, *vide* Mark) was large enough to have a quadrangular court, the gathering might be there, where, according to Faber, *Archæologie der Hebräer*, p. 408, meetings of various sorts were held. In any case it was a great affair—scores, possibly hundreds, present, too large for a room in a house, a conventicle meeting, so to speak; a meeting with such people in the Synagogue not being possible. For further remarks *vide* on Mark.—**τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ**: publicans naturally, if Matthew was the host, but why ἁμαρ.? He was a respectable man; are the ἁμαρ. simply the **τελῶναι** as viewed from the outside, so named in anticipation of the Pharisaic description of the party? If Jesus was the inviter, they might be a distinct class, and worse, very real sinners, for His aim was a mission among the social Pariahs.

Ver. 11. **ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρ.** Here was a good chance for the critics, really a scandalous affair!—**τοῖς μαθηταῖς.** They spoke to the disciples, possibly, as Euthy. Zig. suggests, to alienate them from the Master, possibly lacking courage to attack Him face to face.

Ver. 12. **ὁ δὲ ἀ. εἶπεν**: to whom? Were the fault-finders present to hear?—**οὐ χρείαν**, etc.: something similar can be cited from classic authors, *vide* instances in Grotius, Elsner, and Wetstein. The originality lies in the application = the physician goes where he is needed, therefore, I am here among the people you contemptuously designate publicans and sinners. The first instalment, this, of Christ's noble apology for associating with the reprobates—a great word. Ver. 13. **πορευθέντες μάθετε**: a common expression among the Rabbis, but they never sent men to learn the particular lesson that God prefers mercy to sacrifice.—**καὶ οὐ**, does not imply that sacrifice is of *no* account.—**ἔλεος** (**ἔλεον** in T. R., a correction by the scribes), accusative neuter. Masculine nouns of 2nd declension are often neuter 3rd in N. T. and Sept.—**ἦλθον**: Jesus speaks as one having a mission.—**ἁμαρτωλούς**: and it is to the sinful, in pursuance of the principle embodied in the prophetic oracle—a mission of mercy. The words **ἰσχύοντες**, ver. 12, and **δικαίους**, ver. 13, naturally suggest the Pharisees as the class meant. Weiss, always nervously afraid of allegorising in connection with parabolic utterances, protests, contending that it is indifferent to the sense of the parable whether there be any "whole" or righteous. But the point is blunted if there be no allusion. **καλέσαι** here has the sense of calling to a feast.

Vv. 14-17. *The fast-question* (Mk. ii. 18-22; Lk. v. 33-39). **Τότε.** Our evangelist makes a temporal connection

14. Τότε [n] προσέρχονται αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου, λέγοντες, "Διατί ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν πολλά,[1] οἱ δὲ μαθηταί σου οὐ νηστεύουσι;" 15. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ [n] νυμφῶνος πενθεῖν, [o] ἐφ' ὅσον μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν ὁ [p] νυμφίος; ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν [q] ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν. 16. οὐδεὶς δὲ [r] ἐπιβάλλει [s] ἐπίβλημα [t] ῥάκους [t] ἀγνάφου ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ· [u] αἴρει γὰρ τὸ πλήρωμα

n in parall. *Vide* also Tobit vi. 14, 17.
o 2 Pet. i. 13 (same phrase).
p in parall. and Ch. xxv. 1. John ii. 9; iii. 29. Rev. xviii. 23.
q here and in parall.
r here, in parall., in same sense. *Cf.* Mk. xi. 7.
s here and in parall.
t same phr. in Mk. ii. 21.
u without object here and in Mk. ii. 21.

[1] **πολλα** is in a large number of uncials, including ℵ[c]CDLΔΣ. Yet it looks like a gloss and is wanting in ℵ*B 27, 71. Tisch. and W.H. omit.

out of what in Mark is merely topical, another of the group of incidents showing Jesus in conflict with current opinion and practice. Where it happened cannot be determined, but it is brought in appositely after the feast of the publicans, serving with it to illustrate the free unconventional life of the Jesus-circle.—**προσέρχονται . . . οἱ μαθ. Ἰωάννου.** The interrogants here are John's disciples; in Mark, unknown persons *about* John's disciples with the Pharisees; in Luke, who treats this incident as a continuation of the last, the fault-finders are the same as before (**οἱ δὲ**). Mark probably gives the true state of the case. Some persons unknown, at some time or other, when other religious people were fasting, and the Jesus-circle were observed not to be fasting, came and remarked on the dissidence.—**διατί**: the interrogants wanted to know the reason. But the important thing for us is the *fact*, that Jesus and His disciples did not conform to the common custom of religious people, including the disciples of the Baptist. It is the first instance of an extensive breach with existing religious usage.—**οὐ νηστεύουσι**: the broad patent fact; if they did any fasting it was not apparent.

Ver. 15. **καὶ εἶπεν**: The question drew from Jesus three pregnant parabolic sayings: bright, genial, felicitous impromptus; the first a happy apology for His disciples, the other two the statement of a general principle.—**οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος.** The mere suggestion of this name for the disciples explains all. Paranymphs, friends of the bridechamber, companions of the bridegroom, who act for him and in his interest, and bring the bride to him. How can they be sad (**μὴ δύνανται πενθεῖν**)? The point to note is that the figure was *apposite*. The life of Jesus and His disciples was like a wedding feast—they the principal actors. The disciples took their tone from the Master, so that the ultimate fact was the quality of the personal piety of Jesus. Therein lay the reason of the difference commented on. It was not irreligion, as in the case of the careless; it was a different type of religion with a Father-God, a kingdom of grace open to all, hope for the worst, and spiritual spontaneity.—**ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι.** While the Bridegroom is with them life will be a wedding feast; when He is taken from them it will make a great difference; *then* (**τότε**) they will grieve, and therefore fast: a hidden allusion to the tragic end foreseen by Jesus of this happy free life, the penalty of breaking with custom.

Vv. 16, 17. The substitution of **νηστεύουσιν** for **πενθεῖν**, in the close of ver. 15, implicitly suggested a principle which is now explicitly stated in parabolic form: the great law of *congruity;* practice must conform to mood; the spirit must determine the form. These sayings, apparently simple, are somewhat abstruse. They must have been over the head of the average Christian of the apostolic age, and Luke's version shows that they were diversely interpreted. Common to both is the idea that it is bootless to mix heterogeneous things, old and new in religion. This cuts two ways. It defends the old as well as the new; the fasting of John's disciples as well as the non-fasting of Christ's. Jesus did not concern Himself about Pharisaic practice, but He was concerned to defend His own disciples without disparagement of John, and also to prevent John's way and the respect in which he was justly held from creating a prejudice against Himself. The double application of the principle was therefore present to His mind.—Ver. 16, **οὐδεὶς . . . παλαιῷ.** No

αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱματίου, καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται. 17. οὐδὲ [v] βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μήγε, ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοί, καὶ ὁ οἶνος, ἐκχεῖται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται[1]· ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινούς, καὶ ἀμφότερα[2] [w] συντηροῦνται.

18. Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἰδού, ἄρχων ἐλθὼν[3] προσεκύνει [w] αὐτῷ, λέγων, "Ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν· ἀλλὰ ἐλθὼν [x] ἐπίθες τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐπ' αὐτήν, καὶ [y] ζήσεται." 19. Καὶ ἐγερθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠκολούθησεν[4] αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

v here, parall. John xiii. 5 (of liquids). Ch. xxvi. 12 (ἐπί τινος).
w Lk. v. 38 (T. R.).
x Mk. xvi. 15. Acts ix. 17 (same const.).
y Mk. xvi. 11. John v. 25. Acts ix. 41. Rom. xiv. 9.

[1] For the future, in most MSS., ℵB have απολλυνται (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] All uncials have αμφοτεροι.

[3] The reading is in confusion here. B has after αρχων εις προσελθων, probably the true reading out of which all variants arose (τις for εις; εις om.; ελθων for προσ.; εις ελθων, ελθων.).

[4] ℵCD have the imp. B as in text.

one putteth a patch of an unfulled, raw piece of cloth (ῥάκος from ῥήγνυμι) on an old garment.—τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ, the filling, the patch which fills; of it, *i.e.*, the old garment, not of the unfulled cloth (Euthy., Grotius, De W., etc.).—αἴρει ἀπὸ, taketh from = tears itself away by contraction when wetted, taking a part of the old garment along with it.—καὶ . . . γίνεται, and so a worse rent takes place. This looks in the direction of an apology for John and his disciples (so Weiss) = they and we are in sympathy in the main, but let them not assimilate their practice to ours; better remain as they are; imitation would only spoil a good type of piety. What is to be done with the unfulled cloth is not indicated, but it goes without saying. Let it remain by itself, be fulled, and then turned into a good new garment.

Ver. 17. The new parable of the wine and wine-skins is introduced, not merely because the Speaker is full of matter, but because it enables Him aptly to show both sides of the question, the twofold application of the principle.—οὐδὲ βάλλουσιν: nobody puts new wine into old skins; νέος applied to wine, καινός to skins (ἀσκοὺς καινούς). νέος is new in time, καινός in quality. That which is new in time does not necessarily deteriorate with age; it may even improve. That which is new in quality always deteriorates with age, like skins or cloth, *vide* Trench's *Synonyms*, lx.—εἰ δὲ μήγε, *vide ad* vi. 1: two disastrous consequences ensue: skins burst, wine spilt. The reason not stated, assumed to be known. New wine ferments, old skins have lost their toughness and stretchableness. "They have become hard leather and give no more" (Koetsveld, *De Gelijkenissen*, p. 99). That is the one side—keep the old to the old.—ἀλλὰ βάλλουσι . . . συντηροῦνται: this is the other—the new to the new; new wine in fresh skins, and both are preserved as suiting one another. With reference to the two parables, Schanz remarks that, in the first, the point of comparison is the distinction between part and whole, in the second form and contents are opposed to each other. So after him, Holtzmann in H.C. Weiss takes both parables as explaining the practice of John's disciples, Holtzmann as giving reasons why Christ's disciples differed from all others. The truth as above indicated lies between.

Vv. 18-26. *The daughter of Jairus, with interlude* (Mk. v. 21-43; Lk. viii. 40-56). Given by Matthew in immediate connection with the discourse on fasting, but by Mark, and Luke following him, in connection with the return from the eastern shore, after the story of the demoniac. Ver. 18. ἰδοὺ . . . λέγων: exactly the same formula as in viii. 2.—ἄρχων, an important person, a ruler of synagogue, according to Mark.—εἷς: peculiar here, but taken from Mark where it is intelligible, the suppliant being there described as *one* of the rulers of the synagogue. The word puzzled the scribes, and gave rise to great variation in the text.—ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν: This statement of Matthew, compared with those of Mark and Luke, which make the father say his daughter was dying,

z here only in N.T. Lev. xv. 33.
a Ch. xiv. 36; xxiii. 5. Mk. vi. 56. Lk. viii. 44 (Num. xv. 37).

20. Καὶ ἰδού, γυνὴ [z] αἱμορροοῦσα δώδεκα ἔτη, προσελθοῦσα ὄπισθεν, ἥψατο τοῦ [a] κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ. 21. ἔλεγε γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῇ, "Ἐὰν μόνον ἅψωμαι τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ, σωθήσομαι." 22. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιστραφεὶς [1] καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν εἶπε, "Θάρσει, θύγατερ ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε." Καὶ ἐσώθη ἡ γυνὴ ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.. 23. Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἄρχοντος, καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς

[1] **στραφεις** ℵBDΣ (Tisch., W.H.).

has created work for the harmonists. The patristic view (Chrys., Theophy., Euthy.), that the statement was an inference from the condition in which he left her, or a natural exaggeration, has been adopted by many. Probably it is an inaccuracy of the evangelist's due to abbreviation. The girl was dead when Jesus arrived; that was all he cared about. The ruler thought Jesus could do anything *short* of raising from the dead, save even *in articulo mortis*. But our evangelist gives him credit for more faith; that Jesus can bring back from the dead, at least when death has just taken place.—**ζήσεται**, not remain living, but revive, come to life again (Fritzsche).—Ver. 19. **ἐγερθεὶς** apparently refers back to ver. 10, implying close sequence—feasting, fasting, dying; such is life indeed.

Vv. 20-22. The story is suspended at this point by an interlude.—Ver. 20, **καὶ ἰδού**, a new applicant for help appears on the scene, on the way to Jairus' house.—**γυνὴ . . . ἔτη**, a woman who had suffered for twelve years from some kind of bloody flux.—**ὄπισθεν**: realistic feature; from womanly shame or the morbid shrinking of chronic ill-health, or out of regard to he law concerning uncleanness (Lev. xv.).—**κρασπέδου**, Hebrew צִיצִת (Num. xv. 38), fringes at the four corners of the outer garment to remind of the commandments. In dress Jesus was not nonconformist. His mantle, **ἱμάτιον**, had its **κράσπεδα** like other people's.—**ἥψατο**, touched one of the tassels; the least possible degree of contact enough to ensure a cure, without notice; faith, superstition and cunning combined. Ver. 21. **ἔλεγε γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῇ**: such was her little private scheme. Ver. 22, **ὁ δὲ Ἰ. στραφεὶς καὶ ἰδών**. Matthew's narrative here is simple as compared with that of Mark and Luke, probably a transcript from Apostolic Document, concerned mainly about the words of Jesus. So far as our evangelist is concerned the turning round of Jesus might be an accident, or due to consciousness of a nervous jerk instinctively understood to mean something.—**θάρσει, θύγατερ**, again as in ix. 2, a terse, cordial sympathetic address; there *child* to a man, here *daughter* to a mature woman.—**πίστις**, no notice taken of the superstition or the cunning, only of the good side; mark the rhythm: **ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε**, again in Lk. vii. 50, where, with **πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην**, it forms a couplet.—**σέσωκεν**, perfect, not future, to convey a feeling of confidence = you are a saved woman.—**καὶ ἐσώθη**, and so she was from that hour. A true story in the main, say Strauss and Keim, strictly a case of faith-cure.

Vv. 23-26. The narrative returns to the case of Jairus' daughter. Ver. 23, **ἐλθὼν . . . καὶ ἰδὼν**, circumstantial participles leading up to what Jesus said, the main fact.—**τοὺς αὐλητὰς**, etc.: the girl was only just dead, yet already a crowd had gathered about the house, brought together by various motives, sympathy, money, desire to share in the meat and drink going at such a time (so Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., *ut ederent et biberent*), and of course making a confused din.—**θορυβούμενον**, the part. = a relative with finite verb = the crowd which was making a din. The crowd, besides the **αὐλῆται**, tibicines, flute-players, would include some hired mourning women (Jerem. ix. 17), *præficæ*, whose duty it was to sing *nænia* in praise of the dead. Mourning, like everything else, had been reduced to system, two flutes and one mourning woman at the burial of a wife incumbent on the poorest man (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.). The practice in Greece and Rome was similar, proofs in Grotius, Elsner, Wetstein. *Vide* also Marquardt, *Handbuch der Röm. Alterthümer*, vol. vii., p. 341, where it is stated that by the twelve Tables the number of *tibicines* was limited to ten, and that before the Punic war, at least, *præficæ* were employed.—

[b] αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν ὄχλον [c] θορυβούμενον, λέγει αὐτοῖς,[1] 24. "Ἀναχωρεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανε τὸ κοράσιον, ἀλλὰ [d] καθεύδει." Καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. 25. Ὅτε δὲ [e] ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος, εἰσελθὼν [f] ἐκράτησε τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἠγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον. 26. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ [g] φήμη αὕτη εἰς ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην.

27. Καὶ παράγοντι ἐκεῖθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ δύο τυφλοί, κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες, "[h] Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, υἱὲ[2] Δαβίδ." 28. Ἐλθόντι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ τυφλοί, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Πιστεύετε ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι;" Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Ναί, Κύριε." 29. Τότε ἥψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν, λέγων, "Κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν." 30. Καὶ ἀνεῴχθησαν[3] αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί· καὶ [i] ἐνεβριμήσατο[4] αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων, "Ὁρᾶτε μηδεὶς γινωσκέτω." 31. Οἱ δὲ ἐξελθόντες [j] διεφήμισαν αὐτὸν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ γῇ ἐκείνῃ.

b Rev. xviii. 22.
c Mk. v. 39. Acts xvii. 5; xx. 10.
d 1 Thess. v. 10 (= to be dead).
e Ch. xxi. 12.
f Mk. i. 31.
g Lk. iv. 14.
h Ch. xv. 22; xx. 30.
i Mk. i. 43.
j Ch. xxviii. 15. Mk. i. 45.

[1] For λεγει αυτοις ℵBD have ελεγεν.
[2] For υιε B has υιος.
[3] ηνεωχ. in BD.
[4] ενεβριμηθη in ℵB, a less usual form avoided by scribes.

Ver. 24. **ἀναχωρεῖτε**, retire! Hired mourning distasteful to Jesus, who gladly avails Himself of this opportunity of dismissing them.—**οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανε**, no need of you yet, for the maid (**κοράσιον**, dim. for **κόρη**, but = puella in late Greek) is not dead. A welcome word to naturalistic commentators, giving a plausible basis for the hypothesis of an apparent death or swoon (Schleier., Keim, etc.), not to be taken prosaically as meant to deny death. Yet Carr (C. G. T.) thinks it open to question whether it ought not to be taken literally, and doubtful whether **κοιμᾶσθαι** is ever used in a metaphorical sense in the N. T. or elsewhere. The derisive laughter of the crowd (**κατεγέλων**) is good evidence to the contrary.—**ἐξεβλήθη**: not to be pressed as implying physical force, *non vi et manibus, sed voce jussuque* (Fritzsche), a tone and manner not to be resisted, the house therefore soon cleared of the noisy crowd.—Ver. 26, **ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φ.**, against the wish of Jesus, who did not desire raising the dead to be regarded as a part of His ordinary work. Perhaps that was why He said: "she sleepeth" (Weiss, L. J., Marcus-Evang.).—**τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην**: Weiss thinks the expression implies that the evangelist is a stranger to Palestine (Weiss-Meyer).

Vv. 27-31. *Two blind men*.—This miracle-narrative and the next are comparatively colourless and uninteresting. They bring under notice two new types of disease, blindness and possession accompanied with dumbness. The interest in both cases, however, lies not so much in the cures as in the words spoken.—Ver. 27. **τυφλοί**, blindness common from limestone dust in the air and changing temperature.—**υἱὸς Δ.**, Messianic appellation, first time addressed to Jesus, a point of interest for the evangelist; not welcome to Jesus, who feared the awakening of false expectations. Therefore He took no notice of them on the way to His house, whither He retired after the last incident.—Ver. 28. **ἐλθόντι εἰς τ. ο. προσῆλθον**: they follow, and Jesus at last takes notice of them, asking if they have faith in His power. His previous conduct might throw doubt on His willingness, but that is dispelled by speaking to them.—**ναί**, a prompt glad yes is their answer. Ver. 30.—**ἠνεῴχθησαν**, a Hebraism. The Jews thought of blind eyes as shut, and of seeing eyes as open.—**ἐνεβριμήθη**, sternly enjoined (*vide* Mk. i. 43). The paraphrase of Euthy. Zig. gives a vivid idea of the meaning, "looked severely, contracting His eyebrows, and shaking His head at them, as they are wont to do who wish to make sure that secrets will be kept".—Ver. 31. **ἐν ὅλῃ τ. γ. ε.** (*vide* remarks on ver. 26).

k Ch. xii. 22.
l Acts xvii. 31. 1 Cor. vi. 2; xiv. 21 (same use of ἐν, *vide* also Sir. xiii. 4; xxx. 13).
m Ch. iv. 23, but there intrans., here with accus.

32. Αὐτῶν δὲ ἐξερχομένων, ἰδού, προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπον[1] [k] κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον. 33. καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου, ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός· καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι[2] οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ." 34. Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον, "[l] Ἐν τῷ [l] ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια."

35. ΚΑΙ [m] περιῆγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας, διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, καὶ θεραπεύων πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν ἐν

[1] ℵB omit ανθρωπον. [2] ℵBCD omit οτι.

Vv. 32-34. *The dumb demoniac* (Lk. xi. 14). A slight narrative, very meagre in comparison with the story of the Gerasene demoniac, the interest centring in the conflicting comments of spectators which probably secured for it a place in the *Logia* of Matthew. Ver. 32. **Αὐτῶν ἐξερχομένων**: while the two blind men are going out they bring another sufferer to the great Healer; an incessant stream of applicants for aid flowing towards His door.—**κωφὸν**: dumbness the apparent symptom. The word literally means blunt, and in Homer (*Il.*, ii. 390) is applied to a weapon. In N. T. it is used with reference to the senses and faculties, here the faculty of speech (ver. 33, **ἐλάλησεν**), in xi. 5, that of hearing.—**δαιμονιζόμενον**, the inferred cause. It was known that the dumbness was not due to any physical defect. Speech seemed to be prevented by some foreign spiritual power; the mental disease, possibly, melancholy.—Ver. 33. **ἐλάλησεν**: that cured, speech followed.—**ἐθαύμασαν**: the crowd present wondered, hearing one speak whom they had so long known to be dumb.—**οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη**, etc.: thus they expressed their surprise; the like was never seen in Israel. **ἐφάνη** is impersonal, the reference being to the change in the man; the manner of expression is colloquial, and it is idle to discuss the precise meaning of **οὕτως**, and what nominative is to be supplied to **ἐφάνη**. It is more to the purpose to inquire why this seemingly minor miracle should make so great an impression. Perhaps we should not isolate it, but take it along with the other marvels that followed in quick succession as joint causes of admiration. The people were worked up into a high measure of astonishment which, at last, found vent in these words. So in effect Euthy., also Rosenmüller ("tot signa, tam admirabilia, tam celeriter, neque contactu tantum, sed et verbo, et in omni morborum genere").—Ver. 34. **οἱ δὲ Φαρ. ἔλεγον**. The multitude admired, *but* the *Pharisees* said. They are watching closely the words and acts of Jesus and forming their theories. They have got one for the cures of demoniacs.—**ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τ. δ**: He casts out demons in the power of the prince of demons. Probably they did not believe it, but it was plausible. How differently men view the same phenomenon (*vide* on Matt. xii. 22 f.).

Vv. 35-38. These verses look both backwards and forwards, winding up the preceding narrative of words and deeds from chap. v. onwards, and introducing a new aspect of Christ's work and experience. The connection with what follows is strongest, and the verses might, with advantage, have formed the commencement of chap. x. Yet this general statement about Christ's teaching and healing ministry (ver. 35) obviously looks back to iv. 23, 24, and, therefore, fitly ends the story to which the earlier summary description of the ministry in Galilee forms the introduction. It is, at the same time, the prelude to a second act in the grand drama (chap. ix. 35—xiv. 12). In the first act Jesus has appeared as an object of general admiration; in the second He is to appear as an object of doubt, criticism, hostility.

Ver. 36. **Ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους**: in the course of His wanderings Jesus had opportunities of observing the condition of the people, and at length arrived at a clear, definite view as to the *moral and religious situation*. It was very sombre, such as to move His compassion (**ἐσπλαγχνίσθη**, post classical, in Gospels only). The state of things suggested two pictures to His mind: a neglected flock of sheep, and a harvest going to waste for lack of reapers. Both imply, not only a pitiful plight of the people, but a blameworthy neglect of duty on the

τῷ λαῷ.[1] 36. ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους, [n] ἐσπλαγχνίσθη περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἦσαν ἐκλελυμένοι[2] καὶ ἐρριμμένοι[3] ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα. 37. τότε λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Ὁ μὲν [o] θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι· 38. δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ, ὅπως [p] ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ."

n here only with περί; with ἐπί, Ch. xiv. 11. Mk. vi. 34; viii. 2 *al.*
o Ch. xiii. 30, 39. Mk. iv. 29. John x. 4. Lk. x. 2.
p Lk. x. 2.

[1] εν τω λαω brought in probably from iv. 23. BC[1]DΔΣ omit (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] εκλελυμενοι (T. R.) is a very weakly-supported reading, having only one important uncial, L, on its side. ℵBCDΔΣ *al.* have εσκυλμενοι, doubtless the true reading.

[3] The variation here is simply a matter of spelling: ερ. in ℵBCL (Tisch., W.H.), ερρ. (T. R.) ΓΔ ρερ. D.

part of their religious guides—the shepherds by profession without the shepherd heart, the spiritual husbandmen without an eye for the whitening fields and skill to handle the sickle. The Pharisaic comments on the Capernaum mission festival (ix. 11) were sufficient to justify the adverse judgment. Their question on that occasion meant much, and would not be forgotten by Jesus.—**ἐσκυλμένοι, ἐριμμένοι**, graphic words, clear as to general import, though variously understood as to their precise meaning. The former may mean "flayed" (from σκῦλον, Holtz., H. C.), or "hunted" and tired out (Weiss-Meyer), the practical sense is "exhausted by long, aimless wandering, foot-sore and fleece-torn". The other points to the natural sequel—lying down, scattered about (ῥίπτω), here one, there another, on the hill side, just where they found themselves unable to go a step further. A flock can get into such a condition only when it has no shepherd to care for it and guide it to the pastures.

Vv. 37, 38. **θερισμὸς**: a new figure coming in abruptly in the narrative, but not necessarily so close together in Christ's mind. The one figure suits the mood of passive sympathy; the other, that of the harvest, suits the mood of active purpose to help. It would not be long in the case of Jesus before the one mood passed into the other. He could not be a mere pitying spectator. He must set on foot a mission of help. The Capernaum feast was the first stage; the mission of the twelve the second. The word "harvest" implies spiritual susceptibility. Weiss protests against this inference as allegorising interpretation of a parabolic saying which simply points to the want of suitable labourers (*vide* L. I., ii. 119). So also Schanz maintains, against Euthy., that not susceptibility but need is pointed to. But, as against Weiss, it is pertinent to ask: what suggested the figure of a harvest if not possibilities of gain to the kingdom of God, given sympathetic workers? This hopeful judgment as to the people of the land, contrasted with Pharisaic despair and contempt, was characteristic of Jesus (*vide* my *Kingdom of God*, chap. v.).—**ἐργάται ὀλίγοι**: professional labourers, men busying themselves with inculcation of moral and religious observances, abundant; but powerless to win the people because without sympathy, hope, and credible acceptable Gospel. Their attempts, if any, only make bad worse—(sub legis onere ægrotam plebem, Hilary). "Few"—as yet only *one* expert, but He is training others, and He has faith in prayer for better men and times.—Ver. 38. **δεήθητε**: the first step in all reform—deep, devout desire out of a profound sense of need. The time sick and out of joint—God mend it!—**ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ**, etc. The prayer, expressed in terms of the parabolic figure, really points to the ushering in of a new era of grace and humanity—*Christian* as opposed to Pharisaic, legal, Rabbinical. In the old time men thought it enough to care for themselves even in religion; in the new time, the impulse and fashion would be to care for others. **ἐκβάλῃ**, a strong word (*cf.* Mk. iv. 29, ἀποστέλλει), even allowing for the weakened force in later Greek, implying Divine sympathy with the urgent need. Men *must* be raised up who can help the time. Christ had thorough faith in a benignant Providence. Luke gives this *logion* in connection with the mission of the seventy (x. 2).

a Ch. xii. 43. Mk. i. 23, 26; iii. 11. Lk. iv. 33, 36 *al.* (in ref. to demons.).
b once only in Mt. and Mk. (vi. 30), often in Lk.

X. 1. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν πνευμάτων [a] ἀκαθάρτων, ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν, αὐτά, καὶ θεραπεύειν πᾶσαν νόσον καὶ πᾶσαν μαλακίαν. 2. Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα [b] ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστι ταῦτα· πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος, καὶ Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ· Ἰάκωβος[1] ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ· Φίλιππος, καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος· 3. Θωμᾶς, καὶ Ματθαῖος ὁ τελώνης· Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, καὶ

[1] ℵB have και before Ιακωβος.

Chapter X. The Galilean Mission. The beginnings of the mission to the neglected "lost" sheep of Israel may be found in the Capernaum feast (ix. 10). As time went on Jesus felt increasingly the pressure of the problem and the need for extended effort. Matthew's call was connected with the first stage of the movement, and that disciple was Christ's agent in bringing together the gathering of publicans and sinners. He is now about to employ all the intimate disciples He has collected about Him and through them to spread the movement all over Galilee. They will be a poor substitute for Himself, yet not wholly useless like the scribes, for they have heard His teaching on the hill and imbibed somewhat of His spirit of love.

Vv. 1-15. *The Twelve: their names, mission, and relative instructions* (Mk. iii. 14-19, vi. 7-13, Lk. ix. 1-6).

Ver. 1. **προσκαλεσάμενος**: this does not refer to the call to become disciples, but to a call to men already disciples to enter on a special mission.—**τοὺς δώδεκα**, *the Twelve.* The article implies that a body of intimate disciples, twelve in number, already existed. The evangelist probably had Mk. iii. 14 in view. He may also reflect in his language the feeling of the apostolic age to which *the Twelve* were familiar and famous. Hitherto we have made the acquaintance of five of the number (iv. 18-22, ix. 9). Their calls are specially reported to illustrate how the body of twelve grew.—**ἐξουσίαν**, authority, not to preach, as we might have expected, but to *heal.* The prominence given to healing in this mission may surprise and disappoint, and even tempt to entertain the suspicion that the exalted ideas concerning the Twelve of after years have been read into the narrative. This element is certainly least prominent in Mark. Yet to some extent it must have had a place in the mission. The people in Galilee had all heard of Jesus and His work, and it was no use sending the Twelve unless they could carry with them something of His power.—**πνευμάτων α.**, genitive objective, as in John xvii. 3, Rom. ix. 21. **ὥστε ἐκ . . . καὶ θεραπεύειν**, dependent also on **ἐξουσίαν** (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 5), **ὥστε** with infinitive indicating tendency of the power. **πᾶσαν νόσον**, etc., echo of iv. 23.

Ver. 2. **τῶν δὲ δώδ. ἀποστόλων**: etc., the evangelist finds here a convenient place for giving the names of the Twelve, called here for the first and last time **ἀπόστολοι**, with reference at once to the immediate minor mission (from **ἀποστέλλειν**, *vide* v. 5) and to the later great one. One half of them are for us mere names, and of one or two even the names are doubtful, utterly obscure, yet, doubtless, in their time and sphere faithful witnesses. They are arranged in pairs, as if following the hint of Mark that they were sent out by *two and two*, each pair connected with a **καὶ** (so in Luke, not in Mark).—**πρῶτος**: at the head of the list stands Peter, first not only numerically (Meyer) but in importance, a sure matter of fact, though priestly pretensions based on it are to be disregarded. He is first in all the lists.—**ὁ λεγ. Πέτρος**: a fact already stated (iv. 18), here repeated probably because the evangelist had his eye on Mark's list (iii. 16) or possibly to distinguish this Simon from another in the list (No. 11). Ver. 3. **Βαρθολομαῖος**, the 6th, one of the doubtful names, commonly identified with *Nathanael* (John i. 46).—**Ματθαῖος ὁ τελώνης**, one of four in the list with epithets: Peter the *first*, Simon the *zealot*, Judas the *traitor*, Matthew the *publican*; surely not without reason, except as echoing ix. 9 (Meyer). Matthew stands second in his pair here, before Thomas in Mark and Luke. Position and epithet agree, indicative, Euthy. suggests, of modesty and self-abasement.—Ver. 4. **Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος**: Luke gives **τὸν καλ. Ζηλωτὴν** = the zealot, possibly a piece of in-

Λεββαῖος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Θαδδαῖος[1] **4. Σίμων ὁ Κανανίτης,**[2] **καὶ Ἰούδας**[3] **Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ καὶ** [c] **παραδοὺς αὐτόν.**

5. Τούτους τοὺς δώδεκα ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, παραγγείλας αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθητε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθητε· 6. πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ [d] **πρόβατα τὰ** [d] **ἀπολωλότα** [e] **οἴκου Ἰσραήλ. 7. πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε, λέγοντες, Ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. 8. ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε,**

c again in ref. to Judas, Ch. xxvi. 15; xxvii. 3, 4 *al.*
d Ch. xv. 24.
e Ch. xv. 24. Acts ii. 36. vii. 42.

[1] D has **Λεββαιος** (**εος**) alone. ℵB have **Θαδδαιος** alone. The reading in T. R. as above is simply a conflate reading combining the two by a connecting phrase, **ο επικληθεις**.

[2] BCDL have **Καναναιος**, probably the true form.

[3] **ο** before **Ισκαρ.** in ℵBDΔ.

formation based on an independent reliable source, or his interpretation of the Hebrew word קַנְאָנִי. The form **Καναναῖος** seems to be based on the idea that the word referred to a place. Jerome took it to mean "of Cana," "de vico Chana Galilaeae". **Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης**: last in all the lists, as Peter is first. The epithet is generally taken as denoting the place to which he belonged: the man of Issachar (Grotius); but most render: the man of Kerioth (in Judah, Joshua xv. 24, Jer. xlviii, 41); in that case the one non-Galilean disciple. The ending, **-ωτης**, is Greek; in Mark the Hebrew ending, **-ωθ**, is given.

Vv. 5-15. *Instructions to the missioners.* Ver. 5. **Τούτους τ. δώδ**: *These, the Twelve,* Jesus sent forth, under the injunctions following (**παραγγείλας**).—**εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθ. μὴ ἀπέλθητε.** This prohibition occurs in Matthew only, but there is no reason to doubt its authenticity except indeed that it went without saying. The very prohibition implies a consciousness that one day the Gospel would go the way of the Gentiles just as Mt. v. 17 implies consciousness that fulfilling, in the speaker's sense, would involve annulling.—**ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν**, the way *towards* (Meyer), the genitive being a genitive of motion (Fritzsche, Kühner, § 414, 4), or a way within or of, parallel to **πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν** in next clause.—**εἰς π. Σαμ.**, not even in Samaria should they carry on their mission. The prohibition is total. **πόλιν** does not refer to the chief city (Erasmus, Annot., *metropolis*) or to the towns as distinct from the rural parts through which at least they might *pass* (Grotius). It means any considerable centre of population. The towns and villages are thought of as the natural sphere of work (ver. 11). The reason of the double prohibition is not given, but doubtless it lay in the grounds of policy which led Christ to confine His own work to Israel, and also in the crude religious state of the disciples.—Ver. 6. **ἀπολωλότα**, "the *lost* sheep," an expression consecrated by prophetic use (Jer. l. 6, Sweet's ed., xxvii. 6), the epithet here first introduced, often occurring in Gospels, was used by Jesus not in blame but in pity. "Lost" in His vocabulary meant "neglected" (ix. 36), in danger also of course, but not finally and hopelessly given over to perdition, salvable if much needing salvation. The term is ethical in import, and implies that the mission had moral and religious improvement mainly in view, not mere physical benefit through healing agency; teaching rather than miraculous acts.—Ver. 7. **πορευόμενοι κηρύσσετε**, as ye go, keep preaching; participle and finite verb, both present. Preaching first in the Master's thoughts, if not in the evangelist's (ver. 1).—**ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τ. ο.**, the theme is, of course, the kingdom longed for by all, constantly on the lips of Jesus. The message is: It has come nigh to you and is here. Very general, but much more, it may be taken for granted, was said. The apprentice apostles could as yet make no intelligent theoretic statement concerning the *Kingdom*, but they could tell not a little about the *King*, the Master who sent them, the chief object of interest doubtless for all receptive souls. It was a *house* mission (not in synagogue) on which they were sent (ver. 12). They were to live as guests in selected dwellings, two in one, and two in another, for a time, and their preaching would take the form of familiar conversation on what they had seen and

f Rom. iii. 24. g Lk. xviii. 12; xxi. 19. Acts i. 18; viii. 20; xxii. 28.

λεπροὺς καθαρίζετε, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε,[1] δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε. [f] δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε. 9. Μὴ [g] κτήσησθε χρυσόν, μηδὲ ἄργυρον, μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν, 10. μὴ πήραν εἰς ὁδόν, μηδὲ δύο χιτῶνας, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα, μηδὲ ῥάβδον· ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τῆς

[1] νεκρους εγειρετε is wanting in L, but well attested by ℵBCDΣ. The position varies in MSS., after δαιμ. εκβαλλ. in PΔ, before λεπ. καθαρ. in ℵBCDΣ.

heard Jesus do and say. They would talk by the hour, healing acts would be very occasional, one or two in a village.

Ver. 8. **νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε.** This clause is wanting in several Codd., including L, so often associated with ℵB in good readings. It is, however, too well attested to be omitted. It must either have found a place in the autograph, or it must have crept in as a gloss at a very early period. The evangelist's aim seems to be to represent Christ as empowering the disciples to do the works He is reported to have done Himself in chaps. viii., ix. That purpose demands the inclusion of raising the dead as the crowning miracle of the group (raising of daughter of Jairus). Yet it is hard to believe that Jesus would give power to the disciples to do, as an ordinary part of their mission, what He Himself did only on one or two exceptional occasions. The alternatives seem to be either an early gloss introduced into the text, or an inaccuracy on the part of the evangelist. Meyer takes the former view, Weiss apparently the latter. We cannot take the phrase in a spiritual sense, the other clauses all pointing to physical miracles. This clause is not in the accounts of Mark and Luke. The seventy on their return (Luke x. 17) make no mention of raising the dead.

Ver. 9. **μὴ κτήσησθε**: Vulgate: nolite possidere. But the prohibition is directed not merely against possessing, but against *acquiring* (**κέκτημαι**, perfect = possess). The question is as to the scope of the prohibition. Does it refer merely to the way, or also to the mission? In one case it will mean: do not anxiously procure extensive provision for your journey (Meyer); in the other it will mean, more comprehensively: do not procure for the way, or during the mission, the things named. In other words, it will be an injunction to begin and carry on the mission without reward. Though the reference seems to be chiefly to the starting point, it must be in reality to their conduct during the mission. There was no need to say: do not obtain gold before starting, for that was practically impossible. There was need to say: do not take gold or silver from those whom you benefit, for it was likely to be offered, and acceptance of gifts would be morally prejudicial. That, therefore, is what Jesus prohibits, true to His habit of insisting on the supreme value of motive. So Jerome (condemnatio avaritiae), Chrys., Hilary, etc. So also Weiss. Holtz. (H.C.), while concurring in this interpretation, thinks the prohibition suits better the conduct of the *Christ-merchants* in the *Didache* than the circumstances of the disciples.—**χρυσὸν, ἄργυρον, χαλκὸν**: an anticlimax, not gold, not silver, not even a copper.—**εἰς τὰς ζώνας**, in your girdles, used for this purpose as well as for gathering up the loose mantle, or in purses suspended from the girdle. "It was usual for travellers to carry purses (**φασκώλια**) suspended from their girdles, in which they carried the pence" (Euthy.).—Ver. 10. **πήραν**, a wallet for holding provisions, slung over the shoulder (Judith xiii. 10, **πήραν τῶν βρωμάτων**).—**δύο χιτῶνας**: not even two under-garments, shirts; one would say very necessary for comfort and cleanliness in a hot climate, and for travellers along dusty roads. In Mark the prohibition seems to be against wearing two at the same time (vi. 8); here against carrying a spare one for a change. Possibly we ought not to take these instructions too literally, but in their spirit.—**ὑποδήματα**: this does not mean that they were to go barefooted, but either without a spare pair, or without more substantial covering for the feet (shoes) than the light sandals they usually wore—mere soles to keep the feet off the hard road. Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.*) distinguishes between the two thus: "usus delicatoris fuerunt calcei, durioris atque utilioris sandalia". He states that there were sandals, whose soles were of wood, and upper part of leather, the two joined by nails, and that they were sometimes made of rushes or the bark of palms.

τροφῆς αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.[1] 11. Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθητε, [h] ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστι· κἀκεῖ μείνατε, ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε. 12. εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν. 13. καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ᾖ ἡ οἰκία ἀξία, ἐλθέτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ' αὐτήν· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ᾖ [i] ἀξία, ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς [i] ἐπιστραφήτω. 14. καὶ ὃς ἐὰν[2] μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς, μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι[3] τῆς [j] οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης, ἐκτινάξατε τὸν [j] κονιορτὸν[4] τῶν ποδῶν

h Ch. ii. 8. John xxi. 12.
i Ch. xii. 44. 1 Pet. ii. 25.
j Lk. ix. 5; x. 11. Acts xiii. 51; xxii. 23.

[1] ℵBCL omit εστιν. [2] αν in ℵBDL. [3] ℵBD add εξω.
[4] ℵC add εκ (Tisch.). BD omit (with T. R.). W.H. have it on margin.

—ῥάβδον: not even a staff! That can hardly be meant. Even from the romantic or picturesque point of view the procession of pilgrim missioners would not be complete without a staff each in their hand. If not a necessity, at least, it was no luxury. Mark allows the staff, creating trouble for the harmonists. Grotius suggests: no second staff besides the one in hand! Glassius, quoted by Fritzsche in scorn, suggests a staff shod with iron (scipio) for defence. Ebrard, with approval of Godet, thinks of two different turns given to the Aramaic original כי אם מטה = either "if you take one staff it is enough," or "if, etc., it is too much". Really the discrepancy is not worth all this trouble. Practically the two versions come to the same thing: take only a staff, take not even a staff; the latter is a little more hyperbolical than the former. Without even a staff, is the *ne plus ultra* of austere simplicity and self-denial. Men who carry out the spirit of these precepts will not labour in vain. Their life will preach the kingdom better than their words, which may be feeble and helpless. "Nothing," says Euthy., "creates admiration so much as a simple, contented life" (βίος ἄσκευος καὶ ὀλιγαρκής). — ἄξιος . . . τ. τροφῆς: a maxim universally recognised. A labourer of the type described is not only worthy but sure of his meat; need have no concern about that. This is one of the few sayings of our Lord referred to by St. Paul (1 Cor. ix. 14), whose conduct as an apostle well illustrates the spirit of the instructions to the Twelve.

Vv. 11-15. ἐξετάσατε (ἐκ ἐτάζω, from ἐτεός, true; to inquire as to the truth of a matter). A host to be carefully sought out in each place: not to stay with the first who offers.—ἄξιος points to personal moral worth, the deciding consideration to be goodness, not wealth (worth so much). The host to be a man generally respected, that no prejudice be created against the mission (ne praedicationis dignitas suscipientis infamiâ deturpetur, Jerome).—μείνατε: having once secured a host, abide with him, shift not about seeking better quarters and fare, hurting the feelings of the host, and damaging your character, as self-seeking men.—Ver. 12. τὴν οἰκίαν, the house selected after due inquiry.—ἀσπάσασθε, salute it, not as a matter of formal courtesy, but with a serious mind, saying: "peace be with you," thinking the while of what peace the kingdom can bring.—Ver. 13. ἐὰν μὲν ᾖ ἡ ὀ. ἀξία: after all pains have been taken, a mistake may be made; therefore the worthiness of the house is spoken of as uncertain (ᾖ, in an emphatic position, so μὴ ᾖ, in next clause).—ἐλθέτω ἡ εἰρήνη . . . ἐπιστραφήτω. The meaning is: the word of peace will not be spoken in vain; it will bless the speaker if not those addressed. It is always good to wish peace and good for others, however the wish may be received. There is a tacit warning against being provoked by churlish treatment. Ver. 14. ὃς ἐὰν μὴ δέξηται: Christ contemplates an unfavourable result of the mission in the host's house, or in the town or village generally. The construction of the sentence is anacolouthistic, beginning one way, ending another: rhetorical in effect, and suitable to emotional speech; *cf.* Lk. xxi. 6: "these things ye see—days will come in which not one stone will be left upon another" (*vide* Winer, § 63, on such constructions).—ἐξερχόμενοι: when an unreceptive attitude has once been decidedly taken up, there is nothing for it but to go away. Such a crisis severely tests the temper and spirit of promoters of good causes.—ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν: a symbolic act practised by the Pharisees on passing from heathen to Jewish soil, the former being regarded as unclean

ὑμῶν. 15. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, [k] ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται γῇ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρων ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.

16. "Ἰδού, ἐγὼ [l] ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων· γίνεσθε οὖν φρόνιμοι ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, καὶ [m] ἀκέραιοι ὡς αἱ περιστεραί. 17. [n] προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· παραδώσουσι γὰρ ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν [o] μαστιγώσουσιν ὑμᾶς·

k Ch. xi. 22, 24. Lk. x. 12, 14.
l Ch. xi. 10; xxiii. 34. Rom. x. 15.
m Rom. xvi. 19. Phil. ii. 15.
n vide at Ch. vii. 15.
o Ch. xx. 19; xxiii. 34. Mk. x. 34. Lk. xviii. 33. John xix. 11. Heb. xii. 6.

(Light., Hor. Heb.): Easy to perform, not easy to perform in a right spirit; too apt to be the outcome of irritation, disappointment, and wounded vanity = they did not appreciate *me*, I abandon them to their fate. Christ meant the act to symbolise the responsibility of the inhabitants for the result = leave the place, feeling that you have done your duty, not in anger but in sadness. The act, if performed, would be a last word of warning (**εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς**, Mark and Luke). Grotius and Bleek understand it as meaning: "we have nothing more to do with you".—Ver. 15. **γῇ Σ. καὶ Γ.**: Sodom and Gomorrah, a byword for great iniquity and awful doom (Is. i. 9), **γῇ**, land for people.—**ἀνεκτότερον**: yet the punishment of these wicked cities, tragic though it was, or the punishment still in store, more endurable than that of city or village which rejects the message of the kingdom. This may seem an exaggeration, the utterance of passion rather than of sober judgment, and a dangerous thing to say to raw disciples and apprentice missionaries. But the principle involved is plain: the greater the privilege rejected the greater the criminality. The utterance reveals the high value Jesus set on the good tidings He commissioned the Twelve to preach.

Vv. 16-39. *Prophetic picture of future apostolic tribulations.* An interpolation of our evangelist after his manner of grouping *logia* of kindred import. The greater part of the material is given in other connections in Mark, and especially in Luke. No feeling of delicacy should prevent even the preacher from taking this view, as it destroys all sense of the natural reality of the Galilean mission to suppose that this passage formed part of Christ's instructions to the Twelve in connection therewith. Reading into the early event the thoughts and experiences of a later time was inevitable, but to get a true picture of the life of Jesus and His disciples, we must keep the two as distinct as possible. There may be a doubt as to ver. 16. It stands at the beginning of the instructions to the Seventy in Luke (x. 2), which, according to Weiss (Matth. Evang., p. 263), are really the instructions to the Twelve in their most original form. But it is hard to believe that Jesus took and expressed so pessimistic a view of the Galilean villagers to whom He was sending the Twelve, as is implied in the phrase, "sheep among wolves," though He evidently did include occasional unreceptivity among the possible experiences of the mission. He may indeed have said something of the kind with an understood reference to the hostility of Pharisaic religionists, but as it stands unqualified, it seems to bear a colouring imported from a later period.

Ver. 16. **ἰδού**, something important is going to be said.—**ἐγὼ**, emphatic, Jesus is conscious that connection with Him will be a source not only of power, but of trouble to the Twelve.—**ἐν μέσῳ**: not *to* wolves (**πρὸς λύκους**, Chrys.). They were not sent for that purpose, which would be a mission to destruction, but on an errand of which that would be an incident. **ἐν** is used here as often, especially in later Greek writers, with a verb of motion to indicate a subsequent chronic state, "the result of a love of conciseness" (Winer, § 50, 4, a).—**γίνεσθε . . . περιστεραί**. The serpent, the accepted emblem of wisdom (Gen. iii. 1; Ps. lviii. 5)—wary, sharp-sighted (Grotius); the dove of simplicity (Hos. vii. 11, "silly dove," **ἄνους**, Sept.).—**ἀκέραιοι (α, κεράννυμι)**, unmixed with evil, purely good. The ideal resulting from the combination is a prudent simplicity; difficult to realise. The proverb seems to have been current among the Jews. "God says: 'with me the Israelites are simple as the dove, but against the heathen cunning as the serpent'" (Wünsche, *Beiträge*).—Ver. 17. **τῶν ἀνθρώπων**: Weiss, regarding ver. 17 as the beginning of an interpolation, takes **τῶν** generically = the whole race of men conceived of as on the whole hostile to the truth =

18. καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. 19. ὅταν δὲ παραδιδῶσιν[1] ὑμᾶς, μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί λαλήσητε· [p] δοθήσεται γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τί λαλήσετε[2]· 20. οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν. 21. [q] Παραδώσει δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν [q] εἰς θάνατον, καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον· καὶ [r] ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς, καὶ [s] θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς. 22. καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου· ὁ δὲ [t] ὑπομείνας [u] εἰς

p Ch. xx. 23.
q Mat. xiii. 12. 2 Cor. iv. 11 (same phrase).
r Mk. xiii. 12. (Deut. xix. ii. Micah vii. 6.)
s Ch. xxvi. 59; xxvii. 1. 2 Cor. vi. 9.
t Ch. xxiv. 13. Rom. xii. 12.
u Ch. xxiv. 13. Lk. xviii. 5. John xiii. 1.

[1] ℵB have παραδωσιν (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] ℵBC have λαλησητε = what ye ought to speak. The fut. ind. (T. R.) = what ye will speak. The former is to be preferred. DL omit the whole clause from δοθησεται to λαλησητε, an error of similar ending.

κόσμος in the fourth Gospel (xv. 19; xvii. 14). It seems more natural to find in it a reference to the **λύκοι** of ver. 16. Beware of the class of men I have in view. So Eras., Elsner, Fritzsche.—**συνέδρια**, the higher tribunals, selected to represent courts of justice of all grades, to denote the serious nature of the danger.—**συναγωγαῖς**. The synagogue is referred to here, not merely as a place of worship, but as a juridical assembly exercising discipline and inflicting penalties (Grotius). Among these was scourging (**μαστιγώσουσιν**, *vide* Acts xxii. 19; xxvi. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 24).—Ver. 18. **ἡγεμόνας**, provincial governors, including the three degrees: Propraetors, Proconsuls, and Procurators. From the point of view of the evangelist, who conceives the whole discourse as connected with the Galilean mission confined to Jews, the reference can only be to Roman governors in *Palestine*. But in Christ's mind they doubtless had a larger scope, and pointed to judicial tribulations in the larger, Gentile world.—**εἰς μαρτύριον**. The compensation for the incriminated will be that when they stand on their defence, they will have an opportunity of witnessing for the Master (**ἕνεκεν ἐμου**) and the Cause. Observe the combination **καὶ δὲ** in first clause of this verse, **καὶ** before **ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας**, **δὲ** after it. It introduces a further particular under a double point of view, with **καὶ** so far as similar, with **δὲ** so far as different (Bäumlein, *Schulgram.*, § 675, also *Gr. Partikeln*, 188, 9). A more formidable experience.

Vv. 19-22. **μὴ μεριμνήσητε**, etc.: a second counsel against anxiety (Matt. vi. 25), this time not as to food and raiment, but as to speech at a critical hour. With equal emphasis: trouble not yourselves either as to manner or matter, word or thought (**πῶς ἢ τί**).—**δοθήσεται**: thought, word, tone, gesture—everything that tends to impress—all will be given at the critical *hour* (**ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ**). In the former instance anxiety was restricted to the *day* (Matt. vi. 34). Full, absolute inspiration promised for the supreme moment.—**οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς**, etc.: not you but the divine Spirit the speaker. **οὐ, ἀλλὰ**, non tam quam, interprets Grotius, followed by Pricaeus, Elsner, Fritzsche, etc. = not so much you as; as if it were an affair of division of labour, so much ours, so much, and more, God's. It is, however, all God's, and yet all ours. It is a case of *immanent* action, **τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν**, not of a transcendent power coming in upon us to help our infirmity, eking out our imperfect speech. Note the Spirit is called the Spirit **τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν**, echo of vi. 32. Some of the greatest, most inspired utterances have been speeches made by men on trial for religious convictions. A good conscience, tranquillity of spirit, and a sense of the greatness of the issue involved, make human speech at such times touch the sublime. Theophy. distinguishes the human and the divine in such utterances thus: ours to confess, God's to make a wise apology (**τὸ μὲν ὁμολογεῖν ἡμέτερον, τὸ δὲ σοφῶς ἀπολογεῖσθαι Θεοῦ**).—Ver. 22. **εἰς τέλος**, to the end (of the tribulations) described (vv. 21-22); to the end, and not merely at the beginning (Theophy., Beza, Fritzsche, Weiss, etc.). No easy thing to do, when such inhumanities and barbarities are going on, all natural and family affections outraged. But it helps to know, as is here

[v here only in the sense of going over. Similar phrases in Greek and Latin authors.]

τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται. 23. ὅταν δὲ διώκωσιν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, φεύγετε εἰς τὴν ἄλλην.[1] ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ [v] τελέσητε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ[2] Ἰσραήλ, ἕως ἂν[3] ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 24. Οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, οὐδὲ

[1] ετεραν in ℵB (W.H. αλλην in margin).

[2] BD omit the article.

[3] ℵBX omit αν.

ndirectly intimated, that there will be an end, that religious animosities will not last for ever. Even persecutors and guillotineers get weary of their savage work. On εἰς τέλος Beza remarks: declarat neque momentaneam neque perpetuam hanc conditionem fore.—οὗτος σωθήσεται, *he*, emphatic, he and no other, shall be saved, in the day of final award (James i. 12, "shall receive the crown of life"); also, for the word is pregnant, shall be saved from moral shipwreck. How many characters go miserably down through cowardice and lack of moral fibre in the day of trial!

Ver. 23. ὅταν δὲ: the thought takes a new comforting turn, much needed to reconcile disciples to the grim prospect. With courage and loyalty effort for self-preservation is quite compatible. Therefore, when they persecute here flee there.—ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ, in *this* city, pointing to it, *this* standing for *one*.—φεύγετε, flee, very unheroic apparently, but the bravest soldier, especially an old campaigner, will avail himself of cover when he can.

εἰς τὴν ἑτέραν: the reading of ℵB is to be preferred to ἄλλην of the T.R., the idea being: flee not merely to another city numerically distinct, but to a city presumably different in spirit (*vide* vi. 24 and xi. 16), where you may hope to receive better treatment. Thus the flight, from being a mere measure of self-preservation, is raised to the dignity of a policy of prudence in the interest of the cause. Why throw away life here among a hostile people when you may do good work elsewhere?—Ἀμὴν γὰρ: reason for the advice solemnly given; an important declaration, and a perplexing one for interpreters.—οὐ μὴ, have no fear lest, ye will certainly not, have finished—τελέσητε. In what sense? "gone over" (A.V.) in their evangelising tour, or done the work of evangelising thoroughly? (ad fidei et evangelicae virtutis perfectionem—Hilary). The former is the more natural interpretation. And yet the connection of thought seems to demand a mental reference to the quality of the work done. Why tarry at one place as if you were under obligation to convert the whole population to the kingdom? The thing cannot be done. The two views may be combined thus: ye shall not have gone through the towns of Israel evangelising them in even a superficial way, much less in a thorough-going manner. Weiss takes the word τελ. as referring not to mission work but to flight = ye shall not have used all the cities as places of refuge, *i.e.*, there will always be some place to flee to. This is beneath the dignity of the situation, especially in view of what follows.—ἕως ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ. Here again is the peculiar title *Son of Man*: impersonal, but used presumably as a synonym for "I". What does it mean in this connection? And what is the coming referred to? The latter question can be best answered at a later stage. It has been suggested that the title Son of Man is here used by Christ in opposition to the title *Son of David*. The meaning of ver. 23 on that view is this: do not think it necessary to tarry at all hazards in one place. Your work anywhere and everywhere must be very imperfect. Even success will mean failure, for as soon as they have received the tidings of the kingdom they will attach wrong ideas to it, thinking of it as a national kingdom and of me as the "Son of David". No thorough work can be done till the Son of *Man* has come, *i.e.*, till a universal Gospel for humanity has begun to be preached (Lutteroth). This is a fresh suggestion, not to be despised, on so obscure a subject. We are only feeling our way as to the meaning of some of Christ's sayings. Meantime, all that we can be sure of is that Christ points to some event not far off that will put a period to the apostolic mission.

Vv. 24, 25 point to another source of consolation—companionship with the Master in tribulation. A hard lot, but mine as well as yours; you would not expect to be better off than the Master

δοῦλος ὑπὲρ τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ. 25. [w] ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ [x] ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ. εἰ τὸν [y] οἰκοδεσπότην[1] Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκάλεσαν,[2] πόσῳ μᾶλλον τοὺς οἰκιακοὺς[3] αὐτοῦ; 26. Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς· οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται· καὶ κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. 27. ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ [z] σκοτίᾳ, εἴπατε ἐν τῷ [z] φωτί· καὶ ὃ [a] εἰς τὸ

w vide Ch. vi. 34.
x ἵνα after ἀρκ. Similar phrases in Ch. v. 29, 30; xviii. 6. Lk. xvii. 2 al.
y Ch. xx. 1, 11.
z Lk. xii. 3.
a Lk. i. 44. Acts xi. 22.

[1] B has οικοδεσποτη (dat.). W.H. put this reading in the margin.

[2] επεκαλεσαν in ℵ[c]BCΔΣ *al.* adopted by most editors. ℵ has the middle voice.

[3] B has the dative here also.

and Lord.—Ver. 25. ἀρκετὸν, not as in vi. 34 a neuter adjective used as a noun, but a predicate qualifying the clause ἵνα γεν., etc., as noun to verb ἐστι understood. ἵνα γένηται instead of the infinitive; ὁ δοῦλος instead of τῷ δούλῳ dependent like τῷ μαθητῇ on ἀρκετὸν, by attraction of the nearer word γένηται (*vide* Winer, § 66, 5).—οἰκοδεσπότην (-τῃ, B.) points to a more intimate relation between Jesus and the Twelve, that of a head of a house to a family, implying greater honour for the latter, and suggesting an added motive for patient endurance of the common lot.—οἰκοδεσπότης is a late form. Earlier writers said οἰκίας δεσπότης, Lob., Phryn., p. 373.—βεελζεβοὺλ: an opprobrious epithet; exact form of the word and meaning of the name have given more trouble to commentators than it is all worth. Consult Meyer *ad loc.*, Weiss (Meyer) remarks that the name of the Prince of the demons is not yet sufficiently explained. A question of interest is: did the enemies of Jesus call Him Beelzebul (or Beelzebub), or did they merely reproach Him with connection with Beelzebub? Weiss, taking ver. 25 b as an explanatory gloss of the evangelist, based on ix. 3, xii. 24, adopts the latter view; De Wette and Meyer the former. The reading of Codex B, οἰκοδεσπότῃ, favours the second alternative. The dative requires the verb ἐπικάλεσαν to be taken in the sense of to cast up to one. Assuming that the evangelist reports words of Jesus instead of giving a comment of his own, they may quite well contain the information that, among the contemptuous epithets applied to Jesus by His enemies, was this name. It may have been a spiteful pun upon the name, master of the house.—πόσῳ μᾶλλον implies that still worse names will be applied to the Twelve. *Dictis respondet eventus*, remarks Grotius, citing in proof the epithets γόητας, impostores, applied to the apostles and Christians by Celsus and Ulpian, and the words of Tacitus: *convictos in odio humani generis*, and the general use of ἄθεοι as a synonym for Christians.—οἰκιακοὺς (again in ver. 36), those belonging to a household or family (from οἰκία, whence also the more common οἰκεῖος bearing a similar meaning).

Vv. 26, 27. μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε: "fear not," and again "fear not" in ver. 28, and yet again, 31, says Jesus, knowing well what temptation there would be to fear. οὖν connects with vv. 24, 25; fear not the inevitable for all connected with me as you are, take it calmly. γάρ supplies a reason for fearlessness arising out of their vocation. It is involved in the apostolic calling that those who exercise it should attract public attention. Therefore, fear not what cannot be avoided if you would be of any use. Fear suits not an apostle any more than a soldier or a sailor, who both take coolly the risks of their calling.—κεκαλυμμένον, ἀποκαλυφθήσεται; κρυπτὸν, γνωσθήσεται: the two pairs of words embody a contrast between Master and disciples as to relative publicity. As movements develop they come more under the public eye. Christ's teaching and conduct were not wholly covered and hidden. There was enough publicity to ensure ample criticism and hostility. But, relatively, His ministry was obscure compared to that of the apostles in after years to which the address looks forward. Therefore, more not less, tribulation to be looked for. The futures ἀποκαλ. γνωσ. with the relative virtually express intention; *cf.* Mk. iv. 22, where ἵνα occurs; the hidden is hidden in order to be revealed. That is the law of the case to which apostles must reconcile themselves.—Ver. 27. σκοτίᾳ, the darkness of the initial stage; the begin-

οὖς ἀκούετε, κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν [b] δωμάτων. 28. καὶ μὴ [c] φοβηθῆτε[1] ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων[2] τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι· φοβήθητε[3] δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γεέννῃ. 29. οὐχὶ δύο [d] στρουθία ἀσσαρίου πωλεῖται; καὶ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν [e] ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν· 30 ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι [f] ἠριθμημέναι εἰσί. 31. μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε[4]· πολλῶν στρουθίων δια-

b Ch. xxiv. 17. Mk. xiii. 15. Lk. v. 19; xvii. 31.
c with ἀπό. Lk. xii. 4.
d Lk. xii. 6, 7.
e 1 Pet. iii. 1; iv. 9.
f Lk. xii. 7. Rev. vii. 9.

[1] So in BDΣ, adopted by W H. Many MSS. have φοβεισθε.

[2] ℵCDΔΣ have the Alexandrian form αποκτεννοντων.

[3] φοβεισθε here in ℵBC against D.

[4] φοβεισθε in ℵBDL (Tisch., W.H *al.*).

nings of great epoch-making movements always obscure.—φωτί, the light of publicity when causes begin to make a noise in the wide world.—εἰς τὸ οὖς: a phrase current among Greeks for confidential communications. For such communications to disciples the Rabbis used the term לְחַשׁ, to whisper. λαληθέν may be understood = what ye hear spoken into the ear.—δωμάτων, on the roofs; not a likely platform from our western point of view, but the *flat*-roofed houses of the East are in view. δῶμα in classics means house; in Sept. and N. T., the flat roof of a house; in modern Greek, terrace. *Vide* Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 121.—κηρύξατε, proclaim with loud voice, suitable to your commanding position, wide audience, and great theme.

Vv. 28-31. New antidote to fear drawn from a greater fear, and from the paternal providence of God. φοβήθητε ἀπὸ like the Hebrew יָרֵא מִן, but also one of several ways in which the Greeks connected this verb with its object.—τὸ σῶμα: that is all the persecutor as such can injure or destroy He not only cannot injure the soul, but the more he assails the physical side the safer the spiritual.—τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψ. καὶ σ. Who is that? God, say most commentators. Not so, I believe. Would Christ present God under this aspect in such close connection with the Father who cares even for the sparrows? What is to be greatly feared is not the final condemnation, but that which leads to it—temptation to forsake the cause of God out of regard to self-interest or self-preservation. Shortly the counsel is: fear not the persecutor, but the tempter, not the man who kills you for your fidelity, but the man who wants to buy you off, and the devil whose agent he is.—Ver. 29 στρουθία, dim. for στρουθός, small birds in general, sparrows in particular.—ἀσσαρίου, a brass coin, Latin *as*, 1/10 of a δραχμή = about ¾d. The smallness of the price makes it probable that sparrows are meant (Fritzsche). We are apt to wonder that *sparrows* had a price at all.—ἓν . . . οὐ looks like a Hebraism, but found also in Greek writers, "cannot be called either a Graecism or a Hebraism; in every case the writer aims at greater emphasis than would be conveyed by οὐδείς, which properly means the same thing, but had become weakened by usage" (Winer, § 26).—ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. Chrys. paraphrases: εἰς παγίδα (Hom. 34), whence Bengel conjectured that the primitive reading was not γῆν but πάγην, the first syllable of a little used word falling out. But Wetstein and Fritzsche have pointed out that ἐπὶ does not suit that reading. The idea is that not a single sparrow dies from any cause on wing or perch, and falls dead to the earth.—ἄνευ τ. πατρὸς υ., Origen (c. Celsum, i. 9) remarks: "nothing useful among men comes into existence without God" (ἀθεεί). Christ expresses a more absolute faith in Providence, "the meanest creature passes not out of existence unobserved of your Father".—Ver. 30. ὑμῶν, emphatic position: *your* hairs.—τρίχες: of little value all together, can be lost without detriment to life or health.—πᾶσαι, all, every one without exception.—ἠριθμημέναι, counted. Men count only valuable things, gold pieces, sheep, etc. Note the perfect participle. They have been counted once for all, and their number noted; one hair cannot go amissing unobserved.—Ver. 31. π. σ. διαφέρετε: once more, as in vi. 26, a comparison between men and birds as to value: ye of more worth than many

φέρετε ὑμεῖς. 32. Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις [g] ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν[1] οὐρανοῖς. 33. ὅστις δ᾽ ἂν [h] ἀρνήσηταί με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι αὐτὸν κἀγὼ[2] ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν[3] οὐρανοῖς. 34. Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον [i] βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν. 35. ἦλθον διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς αὐτῆς· 36. καὶ ἐχθροὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οἱ οἰκιακοὶ αὐτοῦ. 37. Ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος· καὶ ὁ φιλῶν υἱὸν ἢ θυγατέρα ὑπὲρ

g also in Lk. xii. 8 (with εν and dat.).
h Ch. xxvi. 70, 72. Lk. xii. 9.
i John xx. 25. Jas. iii. 3. Rev. xiv. 16, 19.

[1] τοις before ουρανοις in BCΣ. [2] καγω αυτον in ℵBDΔΣ.
[3] τοις before ουρ. in BX (W.H. adopt the art. both in 1 and in 3).

sparrows; one hair of your head as much worth to God as one sparrow. "It is a litotes to say that there is a great difference between many sparrows and a human being" (Holtz., H.C.). There is really no comparison between them. It was by such simple comparisons that Jesus insinuated His doctrine of the absolute worth of man.

Vv. 32, 33. *Solemn reference to the final Judgment.* οὖν points back to ver. 27, containing injunction to make open proclamation of the truth.—πᾶς ὅστις: nominative absolute at the head of the sentence.—ἐν ἐμοί, ἐν αὐτῷ: observe these phrases after the verb in ver. 32 compared with the use of the accusative με, αὐτὸν in the following verse: "confess *in* me," "deny me," "confess *in* him," "deny him". Chrysostom's comment is: we confess by the grace of Christ, we deny destitute of grace. Origen (Cremer, *Catenae*, i. p. 80) interprets the varying construction as indicating that the profit of the faithful disciple lies in fellowship with Christ and the loss of the unfaithful in the lack of such fellowship. (ὅρα δέ, εἰ μὴ τὸ πλεονέκτημα τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁμολογοῦντος, ἤδη ὄντως ἐν χριστῷ δηλοῦται, ἐκ τοῦ, "κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ" ὁμολογεῖν· τὸ δὲ κακὸν τοῦ ἀρνουμένου, ἐκ τοῦ μὴ συνῆφθαι τῇ ἀρνήσει τὸ "ἐν ἐμοί," ἢ τὸ "ἐν αὐτῷ".)

Vv. 34-39. The whole foregoing discourse, by its announcements and consolations, implies that dread experiences are in store for the apostles of the faith. To the inexperienced the question might naturally suggest itself, why? Can the new religion not propagate itself quietly and peaceably? Jesus meets the question of the surprised disciple with a decided negative.—Ver. 34. μὴ νομίσητε, do not imagine, as you are very likely to do (*cf.* v. 17).—ἦλθον βαλεῖν: the use of the infinitive to express aim is common in Matt., but Christ has here in view result rather than purpose, which are not carefully distinguished in Scripture. For βαλεῖν Luke has δοῦναι, possibly with a feeling that the former word does not suit εἰρήνην. It is used specially with reference to μάχαιραν. The aorist points to a sudden single action. Christ came to bring peace on earth, but not in an immediate magical way; peace at last through war (Weiss, Matt. Evang.).—μάχαιραν: Luke substitutes διαμερισμόν. The connecting link may be that the sword divides in two (Heb. iv. 12). Grotius says that by the word there should be understood: "non bellum sed dissidium".—Ver. 35. Description of the discord.—διχάσαι, to divide in two (δίχα), to separate in feeling and interest, here only in N.T.; verifies the truth of Grotius' comment as to the "sword".—ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. In this and the following clauses it is the *young* that are set against the *old*. "In all great revolutions of thought the change begins from the young" (Carr, Cambridge Gr. T.).—νύμφην, a young wife, here as opposed to πενθερᾶς, a daughter-in-law.—Ver. 36. ἐχθροί: the predicate standing first for emphasis; *enemies*, not friends as one would expect, the members of one's family (οἰκιακοί, as in ver. 25). The passage reproduces freely Micah vii. 6.—Ver. 37. Such a state of matters imposes the necessity of making a very painful choice between relatives and truth.—φιλῶν: this verb denotes natural affection as distinct from ἀγαπάω, which

ἐμέ, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος· 38. καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος. 39. ὁ εὑρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὑρήσει αὐτήν. 40. Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. 41. ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην [j] εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου μισθὸν προφήτου λήψεται· καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου μισθὸν δικαίου λήψεται· 42. καὶ ὃς ἐὰν [1] [k] ποτίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτήριον [l] ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ."

j cf. Ch. xviii. 20.
k Ch xxv. 35, 37, 42; xxvii. 48. Lk. xiii. 15. Rom. xii. 20.
l Rev. iii. 15 (here only = cold water).

[1] ος αν in BD.

points to love of an ethical kind. The distinction corresponds to that between *amare* and *diligere*. *Vide* Trench, *Synonyms*, and Cremer, s. v., **ἀγαπάω**.—**μου ἄξιος**. The Master is peremptory; absolutely demands preference of His cause to all claims of earthly relations.—Ver. 38. **σταυρὸν**. There is here no necessary allusion to the death of Jesus Himself by crucifixion, though one possessing such insight into the course of events, as this whole discourse indicates, must have known quite well when He uttered the words what awaited Himself, the worst possible probable if not certain. The reference is to the custom of the condemned person carrying his own cross. Death by crucifixion, though not practised among the Jews, would be familiar to them through Roman custom. *Vide* Grotius for Greek and Roman phrases, containing figurative allusions to the cross. This sentence and the next will occur again in this Gospel (Matt. xvi. 24, 25).—Ver. 39. **εὑρὼν . . . ἀπολέσει, ἀπολέσας. . . . εὑρήσει**: crucifixion, death ignominious, as a criminal—horrible; but horrible though it be it means salvation. This paradox is one of Christ's great, deep, yet ever true words. It turns on a double sense of the term ψυχή as denoting now the lower now the higher life. Every wise man understands and acts on the maxim, "dying to live".

Vv. 40-42. The following sentences might have been spoken in connection with the early Galilean mission, and are accordingly regarded by Weiss as the conclusion of the instructions then given. Luke gives their gist (x. 16) at the close of the instructions to the seventy. After uttering many awful stern sayings, Jesus takes care to make the last cheering. He promises great rewards to those who receive the missionaries, thereby "opening the houses of the whole world to them," Chrysos.—Ver. 40. **ἐμε δέχεται**: first the principle is laid down that to receive the messenger is to receive the Master who sent him (Matt. xxv. 40), as to receive the Master is to receive God.—Ver. 41. Then in two distinct forms the law is stated that to befriend the representative of Christ and God ensures the reward belonging to that representative.—**εἰς ὄνομα**, having regard to the fact that he is a prophet or righteous man. The prophet is the principal object of thought, naturally, in connection with a mission to preach truth. But Christ knows (vii. 15) that there are false prophets as well as true; therefore from vocation He falls back on personal character. Here as everywhere we see how jealously He made the ethical interest supreme. "See," says Chrys., commenting on ver. 8, "how He cares for their morals, not less than for the miracles, showing that the miracles without the morals are nought" (Hom. 32). So here He says in effect: let the prophet be of no account unless he be a just, good man. The fundamental matter is character, and the next best thing is sincere respect for it. To the latter Christ promises the reward of the former.—**ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον . . . μισθὸν δ. λήψεται**: a strong, bold statement made to promote friendly feeling towards the moral heroes of the world in the hearts of ordinary people; not the utterance of a didactic theologian scientifically measuring his words. Yet there is a great principle underlying, essentially the same as that involved in St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. The man who has goodness enough to reverence the ideal of goodness approximately or perfectly realised in another,

XI. 1. Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, [a] μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ διδάσκειν καὶ κηρύσσειν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν.

2. Ὁ ΔΕ Ἰωάννης ἀκούσας ἐν τῷ [b] δεσμωτηρίῳ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, πέμψας δύο [1] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτῷ, 3. "Σὺ

a Ch. xii. 9; xv. 29 (with ἐκεῖθεν).
b Acts v. 21, 23; xvi. 26.

[1] ℵBCDΔΣ have δια. δυο is a harmonistic assimilation to Lk.

though not in himself, shall, in the moral order of the world, be counted as a good man.—Ver. 42. The last word, and the most beautiful; spoken with deep pathos as an aside; about the disciples rather than to them, though heard by them. "Whosoever shall do the smallest service, were it but to give a drink to one of these little ones (ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων, *cf.* Matt. xxv. 40) in the name of a disciple, I declare solemnly even he shall without fail have his appropriate reward."—ψυχροῦ: expressive word for water, indicating the quality valued by the thirsty; literally a cup of the *cool*, suggesting by contrast the heat of the sun and the fierce thirst of the weary traveller. No small boon that cup in Palestine! "In this hot and dry land, where one can wander for hours without coming on a brook or an accessible cistern, you say 'thank you' for a drink of fresh water with very different feelings than we do at home" (Furrer, *Wanderungen durch das Heilige Land*, p. 118). — Fritzsche remarks on the paucity of particles in vv. 34-42 as indicating the emotional condition of the speaker.

CHAPTER XI. JESUS JUDGED BY AND JUDGING HIS CONTEMPORARIES. We are not to suppose any close connection in time between the events related in this chapter and the Galilean mission. The reverse is implied in the vague introductory statement, that when Jesus had completed His instructions to the Twelve He went away on a teaching and preaching tour among the towns. The important thing is to realise that all that is related here must have taken place after there had been time for the methods, aims, spirit, and way of life of Jesus to manifest themselves, and so to become the subject of general remark. It was a matter of course that a man of such depth, originality, unconventionality, energy and fearless independence would sooner or latter provoke criticism of all shades; from mild, honest doubt to decided reprobation. However popular at first, He must become at last comparatively isolated. By the time the events here related occurred, the reaction had fully set in, and the narrative shows how extensive it was, embracing within its sphere of influence the best in the land represented by the Baptist; the commercial class represented by three cities named; the professional class—the "wise and understanding"; and the zealots in religion.

Ver. 1. ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν διατάσσων. The participle here with a verb signifying to cease as often with verbs signifying to begin, continue, persevere, etc., *vide* Goodwin, § 879. ἐκεῖθεν, from that place, the place where the mission was given to the Twelve. Where that was we do not know; probably in some place of retirement (dans la retraite, Lutteroth).—πόλεσιν αὐτῶν: the pronoun does not refer to the disciples (μαθηταῖς) as Fritzsche thinks, but to the people of Galilee. While He sent out the Twelve to preach, He continued preaching Himself, only avoiding the places they visited, "giving room to them and time to do their work, for, with Him present and healing, no one would have cared to go near them," Chrysos., Hom. 36.

Vv. 2-6. *Message from the Baptist* (Lk. vii. 18-23). Ver. 2. δεσμωτηρίῳ (from δεσμόω, δεσμός, a bond), in prison in the fortress of Machærus by the Dead Sea (Joseph., Antiq., 18, 5, 2), a fact already alluded to in iv. 12. By this time he has been a prisoner a good while, long enough to develop a *prison mood*.—ἀκούσας: not so close a prisoner but that friends and followers can get access to him (*cf.* Matt. xxv. 36, 43).—τὰ ἔργα τοῦ χριστοῦ: this the subject in which the Baptist is chiefly interested. What is Jesus doing? But the evangelist does not say the works of *Jesus*, but of *the Christ*, *i.e.*, of the man who was believed to be the Christ, the works which were supposed to point Him out as the Christ. In what spirit reported, whether simply as news, with sympathy or with jealousy, not indicated.—πέμψας: the news set John on musing, and led to a message of inquiry—διὰ τ. μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, by his

εἶ ὁ [c]ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἕτερον [d]προσδοκῶμεν; 4. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ, ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε· 5. τυφλοὶ [e]ἀναβλέπουσι, καὶ[1] χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσι· λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσι· νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, καὶ

c John vi. 14. Heb. x. 37.
d Lk. i. 21; vii. 19; viii. 40. Acts x. 24. 2 Pet. iii. 12, 14 (all with accus.).
e Ch. xx. 34. Mk. x. 41. Lk. xviii. 41 (= to recover sight).

[1] The texts show some unimportant variations in ref. to the και in this and the following clauses. In the best MSS. there is a και before νεκροι.

disciples, possibly the same men who brought the news. There would be constant coming and going between Galilee and Machærus. The construction is Hebraistic = sent by the hand of.—Ver. 3. **εἶπεν αὐτῷ**, said to Jesus by them, of course.—**Σὺ εἶ**: the question a grave one and emphatically expressed: *Thou*, art Thou **ὁ ἐρχόμενος**? Art Thou He whom I spoke of as the One coming after me when I was baptising in the Jordan (iii. 11)? It is a question whether Jesus be indeed the *Christ*. Lutteroth, basing on the hypothesis that for popular Jewish opinion the Christ and the coming One (a prophet like Moses) were different persons, interprets the question thus: "Art Thou, Jesus, whom I know to be the Christ, also the coming Prophet, or must we expect another to fill that rôle?"—**ἢ ἕτερον**, not **ἄλλον**, which would have been more appropriate on Lutteroth's view = a numerically distinct person. **ἕτ.** suggests a different kind of person.—**προσδοκῶμεν**: may be present indicative (for future) as Beza and Fritzsche take it, or present subjunctive deliberative = ought we to look? (Meyer-Weiss, Holtz., H.C.), the latter preferable. What was the *animus* or psychological genesis of the question? Doubt in John's own mind, or doubt, bred of envy or jealousy, in the minds of his disciples, or not doubt on Baptist's part, but rather incipient faith? Alternative (2), universal with the fathers (except Tertullian, vide *de præscrip.*, 8, *de baptis.*, 10); (1) common among modern commentators; (3) favoured by Keim, Weizsäcker, and Holtz., H.C.: "beginnende Disposition zum Glauben an Jesu Messianität". The view of the fathers is based on a sense of decorum and implicit reliance on the exact historical value of the statements in fourth Gospel; No. (3), the budding faith hypothesis, is based on too sceptical a view as to the historic value of even the Synoptical accounts of John's early relations with Jesus; No. (1) has everything in its favour. The effect of confinement on John's prophetic temper, the general tenor of this chapter which obviously aims at exhibiting the moral isolation of Jesus, above all the wide difference between the two men, all make for it. Jesus, it had now become evident, was a very different sort of Messiah from what the Baptist had predicted and desiderated (*vide* remarks on chap. iii. 11-15). Where were the axe and fan and the holy wind and fire of judgment? Too much patience, tolerance, gentleness, sympathy, geniality, mild wisdom in this Christ for his taste.

Vv. 4-6. *Answer of Jesus*. Ver. 4. **ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰ.**: go back and report to *John* for *his* satisfaction.—**ἃ ἀκ. καὶ βλέπετε**, what you are seeing and hearing, not so much at the moment, though Luke gives it that turn (vii. 21), but habitually. They were not to tell their master anything new, but just what they had told him before. The one new element is that the facts are stated in terms fitted to recall prophetic oracles (Isaiah xxxv. 5, lxi. 1), while, in part, a historic recital of recent miracles (Matt. viii., ix.). Probably the precise words of Jesus are not exactly reproduced, but the sense is obvious. Tell John your story over again and remind him of those prophetic texts. Let him study the two together and draw his own conclusion. It was a virtual invitation to John to revise his Messianic idea in hope he would discover that after all *love* was the chief Messianic charism.—Ver. 5. **ἀναβλέπουσιν**: used also in classics to express recovery of sight.—**κωφοὶ**, here taken to mean *deaf*, though in ix. 32, 33, it means *dumb*, showing that the prophecy, Isaiah xxxv. 5, is in the speaker's thoughts.—**πτωχοὶ**: vague word, might mean literal poor (De W.) or spiritual poor, or the whole people in its national misery (Weiss, Matt. Evan.), best defined by such a text as ix. 36, and such facts as that reported in ix. 10-13.—**εὐαγγελίζονται**: might be middle = the poor preach, and so taken by Euthy. Zig. (also as an alternative by Theophy.), for "what can be poorer than fishing (ἁλιευτικῆς)?" The poor in that case =

πτωχοὶ [f] εὐαγγελίζονται · 6. καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν, ὃς ἐὰν[1] μὴ [g] σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί." 7. Τούτων δὲ πορευομένων, ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγειν τοῖς ὄχλοις περὶ Ἰωάννου, "Τί ἐξήλθετε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; 8. [h] κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου [i] σαλευόμενον; ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις[2] ἠμφιεσμένον; ἰδού, οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ [j] φοροῦντες ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλέων εἰσίν[3] 9 ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθετε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην[4]; ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου · 10. οὗτος γάρ[5] ἐστι περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, 'Ἰδού, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατα-

f Heb. iv. 2 (passive also).
g Ch. xiii. 57; xxvi. 31. Mk. vi. 3. Lk. vii. 23 (all with ἐν).
h Ch. xii. 20 (Is. xlii. 3). Lk. vii. 24.
i Ch. xxiv. 29, parall. Heb. xii. 27.
j John xix. 5. Rom. xiii. 4. 1 Cor. xv. 49. Jas. ii. 3

[1] αν in BD (W.H.).

[2] ℵBDZ omit ιματιοις, which has come in from Lk. (vii 25).

[3] ℵBCD omit εισιν.

[4] ℵBZ have προφητην ιδειν forming the 2nd question So Tisch. and W.H.

[5] ℵBDZ omit γαρ, which has been introduced to clear the sense which it rather obscures.

the Twelve sent out to preach the kingdom. That, too, was characteristic of the movement, though not *the* characteristic intended, which is that the poor, the socially insignificant and neglected, are evangelised (passive, as in Heb. iv. 2).—Ver. 6. **μακάριος** (*vide* v. 3), possessed of rare felicity. The word implies that those who, on some ground or other, did not stumble over Jesus were very few. Even John not among them! On **σκανδαλίζω** *vide ad.* v. 29. **ἐν ἐμοί**, in anything relating to my public ministry, as appearing inconsistent with my Messianic vocation.

Vv. 7-15. *Judgment of Jesus concerning the Baptist* (Lk. vii. 24-30). Characteristically magnanimous, while letting it be seen that He is aware of John's limits and defects. Ver. 7. **τούτων δὲ πορευομένων**: while John's messengers were in the act of going, Jesus began at once, without any delay, to make a statement which He deemed necessary to prevent injurious inferences from the message of the Baptist, or the construction He had put on it as implying doubt regarding Himself.—**τοῖς ὄχλοις**: the interrogation had taken place in presence of many. Jesus was always in a crowd, except when He took special steps to escape. The spectators had watched with interest what Jesus would say about the famous man. Therefore, *more* must be said; a careful opinion expressed.—**τί ἐξήλθετε . . . θεάσασθαι**: it might be taken for granted that most of them had been there. The catechetical method of stating His opinion of John lively and impressive to such an audience. They had gone to see as well as hear and be baptised, curiosity plays a great part in popular religious movements.—**κάλαμον**. Plenty of reeds to be seen. "What a vast space of time lies between the days of the Baptist and us! How have the times changed! Yet the stream flows in the old bed. Still gently blows the wind among the sighing reeds."—Furrer, *Wanderungen*, 185. Many commentators (Grot., Wet., Fritzsche, De W.) insist on taking **καλ.** literally = did ye go, etc., to see a reed, or the reeds on the Jordan banks shaken by the wind? This is flat and prosaic. Manifestly the individualised reed is a figure of an inconstant, weak man; just enough in John's present attitude to suggest such a thought, though not to justify it.—Ver. 8. **ἀλλὰ** assumes the negative answer to the previous question and elegantly connects with it the following = "No; well, then, did you, etc.?"—**ἐν μαλακοῖς**, neuter, **ἱματίοις** not necessary, in precious garments of any material, silk, woollen, linen; the fine garments suggestive of refinement, luxury, effeminacy.—**ἰδοὺ οἱ τ. μ. φοροῦντες**: **ἰδοὺ** points to a well-known truth, serving the same purpose as **δή** here; those *accustomed* to wear, **φορ.**, frequentative, as distinct from **φέροντες**, which would mean bearing without reference to habit.—**οἴκοις τ. βασ.**, in palaces which courtiers frequent. Jesus knows their flexible, superfine ways well; how different from those of the

σκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.' 11. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ [k] ἐγήγερται ἐν [l] γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ· ὁ δὲ [m] μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν·

k Ch. xxiv. 11, 24. Lk. vii. 16. John vii. 52.
l here and in Lk. vii. 28.
m Ch. xxii. 32. Mk. iv. 31. Lk. vii. 28; ix. 48.

rudely clad and rudely mannered, uncompromising Baptist!—Ver. 9. **ἀλλὰ τί ἐξ.**: one more question, shorter, abrupt, needing to be supplemented by another (Weiss-Meyer)—why then, seriously, went ye out? **προφήτην ἰδεῖν**;—to see a *Prophet?*—**ναί**, yea! right at last; a prophet, indeed, with all that one expects in a prophet—vigorous moral conviction, integrity, strength of will, fearless zeal for truth and righteousness; utterly free from the feebleness and time-serving of those who bend like reeds to every breath of wind, or bow obsequiously before greatness.—**καὶ περισσότερον π.**, a prophet and more, something above the typical prophet (*vide* on v. 47). The clause introduced by **ναί**, as **λέγω ὑμῖν** shows, expresses Christ's own opinion, not the people's (Weiss). —Ver. 10. **οὗτος . . . γέγραπται.** The **περισσότερον** verified and explained by a prophetic citation. The oracle is taken from Malachi iii., altered so as to make the Messianic reference apparent—**μου** changed into **σου**. By applying the oracle to John, Jesus identifies him with the messenger whom God was to send to prepare Messiah's way. This is his distinction, **περισσότερον**, as compared with other prophets. But, after all, this is an external distinction, an accident, so to speak. Some prophet must be the forerunner, if Messiah is to come at all, the last in the series who foretell His coming, and John happens to be that one—a matter of good fortune rather than of merit. Something more is needed to justify the **περισσότερον**, and make it a proper subject for eulogy. That is forthcoming in the sequel.

Vv. 11-12. This is the further justification of the **περισσ.** desiderated. Ver. 11. **ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν.** First Christ expresses His personal conviction in solemn terms. What follows refers to John's intrinsic worth, not to his historic position as the forerunner. The latter rests on the prophetic citation. Christ's aim now is to say that the Baptist's *character* is equal to his *position:* that he is *fit* to be the forerunner. For Christ being the forerunner is no matter of luck. God will see that the right man occupies the position; nay, none but the right man can successfully perform the part.—**οὐκ ἐγήγερται**, there hath not arisen; passive with middle sense, but the arising *non sine numine*, "surrexit divinitus, quomodo existunt veri Prophetae," Elsner; *cf.* Mt. xxiv. 11, Lk. vii. 16, *vide* also Judges ii. 18, iii. 9.—**ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν** = among mankind, a solemn way of expressing the idea. The meaning, however, is not that John is the greatest man that ever lived. The comparison moves within the sphere of Hebrew prophecy, and practically means: John the greatest of all the prophets. A bold judgment not easily accepted by the populace, who always think the dead greater than the living. Christ expresses Himself strongly because He means to say something that might appear disparaging. But He is in earnest in His high estimate, only it is not to be understood as asserting John's superiority in all respects, *e.g.*, in authorship. The point of view is *capacity to render effective service to the Kingdom of God.*—**ὁ δὲ μικρότερος.** Chrysostom took this as referring to Jesus, and, connecting **ἐν τ. β. τ. οὐρ.** with **μείζων**, brought out the sense: He who is the less in age and fame is greater than John in the Kingdom of Heaven. The opinion might be disregarded as an exegetical curiosity, had it not been adopted by so many, not only among the ancients (Hilar., Ambr., Theophy., Euthy.), but also among moderns (Eras., Luth., Fritzsche). In the abstract it is a possible interpretation, and it expresses a true idea, but not one Jesus was likely to utter then. No doubt John's inquiry had raised the question of Christ's standing, and might seem to call for comparison between questioner and questioned. But Christ's main concern was not to get the people to think highly of Himself, but to have high thoughts of the kingdom. What He says, therefore, is that any one in the kingdom, though of comparatively little account, is greater than John. Even the least is; for though **μικρότερος**, even with the article, does not necessarily mean **μικρότατος** (so Bengel), it amounts to that. The affirmative holds even in case of the highest degree of inferiority. The implication is that John was not in the kingdom as a historical movement (a

12. ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ ἕως ἄρτι, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν [n] βιάζεται, καὶ βιασταὶ [o] ἁρπάζουσιν αὐτήν. 13. πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ νόμος ἕως Ἰωάννου προεφήτευσαν[1]· 14. καὶ

n here and in Lk. xvi. 16 (middle there).
o cf. Phil. ii. 6 (ἁρπαγμός).

[1] ℵBCDZ have the augment at the beginning (επροφ.). Δ has no augment.

simple matter of fact), and the point of comparison is the dominant spirit. The moral sternness of John was his greatness and also his weakness. It made him doubt Jesus, kept him aloof from the kingdom, and placed him below any one who in the least degree understood Christ's gracious spirit, *e.g.*, one of the Twelve called in x. 42 "these little ones".

Ver. 12. The statement just commented on had to be made in the interests of truth and the Kingdom of God, but having made it Jesus reverts with pleasure to a tone of eulogy. This verse has created much diversity of opinion, which it would take long to recount. I find in it two thoughts: one expressed, the other implied. (1) There has been a powerful movement since John's time towards the Kingdom of God. (2) The movement derived its initial impetus from John. The latter thought is latent in ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἡμ. Ἰωάν. The movement dates from John; he has the credit of starting it. This thought is essential to the connection. It is the ultimate justification of the περισσότερον (ver. 9). The apostle Paul adduced as one argument for his apostleship called in question by Judaists *success*, which in his view was not an accident but God-given, and due to fitness for the work (2 Cor. ii. 14, iii. 1-18). So Christ here in effect proves John's fitness for the position of forerunner by the success of his ministry. He had actually made the kingdom come. That was the true basis of his title to the honourable appellation, "preparer of the way"; without that it had been an empty title, though based on any number of prophecies. That success proved fitness, adequate endowment with moral force, and power to impress and move men. This being seen to be Christ's meaning, there is no room for doubt as to the *animus* of the words βιάζεται, βιασταί. They contain a favourable, benignant estimate of the movement going on, not an unfavourable, as, among others, Weiss thinks, taking the words to point to a premature attempt to bring in the kingdom by a false way as a political creation (Weiss-Meyer). Of course there were many defects, obvious, glaring, in the movement, as there always are. Jesus knew them well, but He was not in the mood just then to remark on them, but rather, taking a broad, generous view, to point to the movement as a whole as convincing proof of John's moral force and high prophetic endowment. The two words βιαζ., βιασ. signalise the vigour of the movement. The kingdom was being seized, captured by a storming party. The verb might be middle v., and is so taken by Beng., "sese vi quasi obtrudit," true to fact, but the passive is demanded by the noun following. The kingdom is forcefully taken (βιαίως κρατεῖται, Hesychius) by the βιασταί. There is probably a tacit reference to the kind of people who were storming the kingdom, from the point of view, not so much of Jesus, as of those who deemed themselves the rightful citizens of the kingdom. "Publicans and sinners" (ix. 9-12), the ignorant (xi. 25). What a rabble! thought Scribes and Pharisees. Cause of profound satisfaction to Jesus (ver. 25).

Vv. 13-15. Conclusion of speech about John. Ver. 13. The thought here is hinted rather than fully expressed. It has been suggested that the sense would become clearer if vv. 12 and 13 were made to change places (Maldonatus). This inversion might be justified by reference to Lk. xvi. 16, where the two thoughts are given in the inverse order. Wendt (L. J., i. 75) on this and other grounds arranges the verses 13, 14, 12. But even as they stand the words can be made to yield a fitting sense, harmonising with the general aim, the eulogy of John. The surface idea is that the whole O. T., prophets of course, and even the law in its predictive aspects (by symbolic rites and foreshadowing institutions) pointed forward to a Kingdom of God. The kingdom coming—the burden of O. T. revelation. But what then? To what end make this observation? To explain the impatience of the stormers: their determination to have at last by all means, and in some form, what had so long been foretold? (Weiss). No; but to define by contrast John's

εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἠλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι. 15. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν,[1] ἀκουέτω. 16. Τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην; ὁμοία ἐστὶ παιδαρίοις[2] ἐν ἀγοραῖς καθημένοις,[3] καὶ προσφωνοῦσι τοῖς ἑταίροις αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγουσιν,[4] 17. Ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε· ἐθρηνήσαμεν ὑμῖν,[5] καὶ οὐκ ἐκόψασθε.

[1] BD omit ακουειν, which has come in from Mk. and Lk. where the addition of this word to the phrase is usual.

[2] παιδιοις in all uncials.

[3] καθημενοις before εν in ℵBCDL, etc., with ταις before αγοραις in ℵBZ.

[4] ℵBDZ have α προσφωνουντα . . . λεγουσιν, and for εταιροις BCDLΔΣ *al.* have ετεροις.

[5] ℵBDZ omit υμιν, which may have been added to assimilate with first clause.

position. Observe ἕως Ι. goes not with the subject, but with the verb. Prophets (and even law) *till* John *prophesied*. The suggestion is that he is not a mere continuator of the prophetic line, one more repeating the message: the kingdom *will come*. His function is peculiar and exceptional. What is it? Ver. 14 explains. He is the Elijah of Malachi, herald of the Great Day, usherer in of the kingdom, the man who says not merely "the kingdom will come," but "the kingdom is here"; says it, and makes good the saying, bringing about a great movement of repentance.—εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι: the identification of John with Elijah to be taken *cum grano*, not as a prosaic statement of fact. Here, as always, Christ idealises, seizes the essential truth. John was all the Elijah that would ever come, worthy to represent him in spirit, and performing the function assigned to Elijah *redivivus* in prophecy. Some of the Fathers distinguished two advents of Elijah, one in spirit in the Baptist, another literally at the second coming of Christ. Servile exegesis of the letter. δέξασθαι has no expressed object: the object is the statement following. Lutteroth supplies "him" = the Baptist. In the θέλετε Weiss finds a tacit allusion to the impenitence of the people: Ye are not willing because ye know that Elijah's coming means a summons to repentance.—Ver. 15. A proverbial form of speech often used by Jesus after important utterances, here for the first time in Matt. The truth demanding attentive and intelligent ears (ears worth having; taking in the words and *their import*) is that John is Elijah. It implies much—that the kingdom is here and the king, and that the kingdom is moral not political.

Vv. 16-19. *Judgment of Jesus on His religious contemporaries* (Lk. vii. 31-35). It is advisable not to assume as a matter of course that these words were spoken at the same time as those going before. The discourse certainly appears continuous, and Luke gives this utterance in the same connection as our evangelist, from which we may infer that it stood so in the common source. But even there the connection may have been topical rather than temporal; placed beside what goes before, because containing a reference to John, and because the contents are of a critical nature. Ver. 16. τίνι ὁμοιώσω: the parable is introduced by a question, as if the thought had just struck Him.—τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην. The occasion on which the words following were spoken would make it clear who were referred to. Our guide must be the words themselves. The subjects of remark are not the βιασταὶ of ver. 12, nor the ὄχλοι to whom Jesus had been speaking. Neither are they the whole generation of Jews then living, including Jesus and John (Elsner); or even the bulk of the Jewish people, contemporaries of Jesus. It was not Christ's habit to make severe animadversions on the "people of the land," who formed the large majority of the population. He always spoke of them with sympathy and pity (ix. 37, x. 6). γενεά might mean the whole body of men then living, but it might also mean a particular class of men marked out by certain definite characteristics. It is so used in xii. 39, 41, 42, 45; xvi. 4. The class or "race" there spoken of is in one case the Scribes and Pharisees, and in the other the Pharisees and Sadducees. From internal evidence the reference here also is mainly to the Pharisees. It is a class who spoke of

18. Ἦλθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων, καὶ λέγουσι, Δαιμόνιον ἔχει. 19. ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν, Ἰδού, ἄνθρωπος [p] φάγος καὶ [q] οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων [1]

p Lk. vii. 34.
q Lk. vii. 34.

[1] ℵB have εργων, which Tisch. and W.H. adopt. Though supported by a great array of MSS. (including CDL) τεκνων may be suspected of assimilation to the reading in Lk.

Jesus as reported in ver. 19. Who can they have been but the men who asked: Why does He eat with publicans and sinners (ix. 11)? These vile calumnies are what have come out of that feast, in the same sanctimonious circle. Luke evidently understood the Pharisees and lawyers (νομικοί) to be the class referred to, guided probably by his own impression as to the import of the passage (*vide* Lk. vii. 30).—παιδίοις . . . ἀγοραῖς: Jesus likens the Pharisaic γενεά to children in the market-place playing at marriages and funerals, as He had doubtless often seen them in Nazareth. The play, as is apt to happen, has ended in a quarrel.—προσφ. τοῖς ἑτέροις . . . λέγουσιν. There are two parties, the musicians and the rest who are expected to dance or mourn according to the tune, and they are at cross purposes, the moods not agreeing: ἑτέροις, the best attested reading, may point to this discrepancy in temper = a set differently inclined.—ηὐλήσαμεν: the flute in this case used for merriment, not, as in x. 23, to express grief.—ἐθρηνήσαμεν: we have expressed grief by singing funeral dirges, like the mourning women hired for the purpose (*vide ad* ix. 23).—ἐκόψασθε: and ye have not beat your breasts in responsive sorrow. This is the parable to which Jesus adds a commentary. Without the aid of the latter the general import is plain. The γενεά animadverted on are like children, not in a good but in a bad sense: not child-like but childish. They *play* at religion; with all their seeming earnestness in reality triflers. They are also fickle, fastidious, given to peevish fault-finding, easily offended. These are recognisable features of the Pharisees. They were great zealots and precisians, yet not in earnest, rather haters of earnestness, as seen in different ways in John and Jesus. They were hard to please: equally dissatisfied with John and with Jesus; satisfied with nothing but their own artificial formalism. They were the only men in Israel of whom these things could be said with emphasis, and it may be taken for granted that Christ's animadversions were elicited by pronounced instances of the type.—Ver. 18. The commentary on the parable showing that it was the reception given to John and Himself that suggested it.—μήτε ἐσθ. μήτε πιν.: eating and drinking the two parts of diet; not eating nor drinking = remarkably abstemious, ascetic, that his religious habit; μήτε not οὔτε, to express not merely the fact, but the opinion about John. *Vide* notes on chap. v. 34.—δαιμόνιον ἔχει: is possessed, mad, with the madness of a gloomy austerity. The Pharisee could wear gloomy airs in fasting (vi. 16), but that was *acting*. The Baptist was in earnest with his morose, severely abstinent life. Play for them, grim reality for him; and they disliked it and shrank from it as something weird. None but Pharisees would dare to say such a thing about a man like John. They are always so sure, and so ready to judge. Ordinary people would respect the ascetic of the wilderness, though they did not imitate him.—Ver. 19. ὁ υἱὸς τ. α.: obviously Jesus here refers to Himself in third person where we might have expected the first. Again the now familiar title, defining itself as we go along by varied use, pointing Jesus out as an exceptional person, while avoiding all conventional terms to define the exceptional element.—ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων: the "Son of Man" is one who eats and drinks, *i.e.*, non-ascetic and social, one of the marks interpretative of the title = *human, fraternal*.—καὶ λέγουσι, and they say: what? One is curious to know. Surely this genial, friendly type of manhood will please! — ἰδοὺ, lo! scandalised sanctimoniousness points its finger at Him and utters gross, outrageous calumnies.—φάγος, οἰνοπότης, φίλος, an *eater* with emphasis = a glutton (a word of late Greek, Lob., Phryn., 434), a *wine-bibber;* and, worse than either, for φίλος is used in a sinister sense and implies that Jesus was the comrade of the worst characters, and like them in conduct. A malicious nick-name at first, it is now a name of honour: the sinner's lover. The Son of

r Mk. xvi. 14 (with accus. of thing).
s Lk. x. 13 (long ago). 2 Cor. xii. 19 ("all this time," R.V.).
t Lk. x. 13 (Jonah iii. 6).
u Ch. xviii. 7; xxvi. 39, 64 (frequent in Lk.).

αὐτῆς. 20. Τότε ἤρξατο r ὀνειδίζειν τὰς πόλεις, ἐν αἷς ἐγένοντο αἱ πλεῖσται δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐ μετενόησαν. 21. "Οὐαί σοι, Χοραζίν, οὐαί σοι, βηθσαϊδάν, ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, s πάλαι ἂν ἐν t σάκκῳ καὶ t σποδῷ μετενόησαν. 22. u πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ ὑμῖν. 23. Καὶ σύ, Καπερναούμ, ἡ [1] ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθεῖσα,[1] ἕως ᾅδου καταβιβασθήσῃ[2]· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Σοδόμοις ἐγένοντο[3] αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν σοί, ἔμειναν[4] ἂν

[1] ℵBCDL Syr. Cur. read **μη εως ουρανου υψωθηση**, which recent editors adopt. Weiss thinks it has no sense, as **μη** implies a negative answer, and gives as the true reading **ἢ ἕως οὐρ. ὑψώθης**.

[2] BD have **καταβηση** (W.H.).

[3] ℵBCD have **εγενηθησαν** (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] **εμεινεν** in ℵBC (W.H.).

Man takes these calumnies as a thing of course and goes on His gracious way. It is not necessary to reflect these characteristics of Jesus and John back into the parable, and to identify them with the piping and wailing children. Yet the parable is so constructed as to exhibit them very clearly in their distinctive peculiarities by representing the children not merely employed in play and quarrelling over their games, which would have sufficed as a picture of the religious Jews, but as playing at marriages and funerals, the former symbolising the joy of the Jesus-circle, the latter the sadness of the Baptist-circle (*vide* my *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 420).—**καὶ ἐδικαιώθη**, etc. This sentence wears a gnomic or proverbial aspect ("verba proverbium redolere videntur," Kuinoel, similarly, Rosenmüller), and the aorist of **ἐδικ.** may be taken as an instance of the gnomic aorist, expressive of what is usual; a law in the moral sphere, as elsewhere the aorist is employed to express the usual course in the natural sphere, *e.g.*, in James i. 11. Weiss-Meyer strongly denies that there are any instances of such use of the aorist in the N. T. (On this aorist *vide* Goodwin, *Syntax*, p. 53, and Bäumlein, § 523, where it is called the aorist of experience, "der Erfahrungswahrheit".)—**ἀπὸ**, in, in view of (*vide* Buttmann's *Gram.*, p. 232, on **ἀπὸ** in N. T.).—**ἔργων**: the reading of ℵB, and likely to be the true one just because **τέκνων** is the reading in Luke. It is an appeal to results, to *fruit* (vii. 20), to the future. Historical in form, the statement is in reality a prophecy. Resch, indeed (*Agrapha*, p. 142), takes **ἐδικ.** as the (erroneous) translation of the Hebrew prophetic future used in the Aramaic original = now we are condemned, but wait a while. The **καὶ** at the beginning of the clause is not = "but". It states a fact as much a matter of course as is the condemnation of the unwise. Wisdom, condemned by the foolish, is always, of course, justified in the long run by her works or by her children.

Vv. 20-24. *Reflections by Jesus on the reception given to Him by the towns of Galilee* (Lk. x. 13-15). Ver. 20. **τότε**, *then*, cannot be pressed. Luke gives the following words in instructions to the Seventy. The real historical occasion is unknown. It may be a reminiscence from the preaching tour in the synagogues of Galilee (Mt. iv. 23). The reflections were made after Jesus had visited many towns and wrought many wonderful works (**δυνάμεις**).—**οὐ μετενόησαν**: this the general fact; no deep, permanent change of mind and heart. Christ appearing among them a nine days' wonder, then forgotten by the majority preoccupied with material interests.—Ver. 21. **Χοραζίν, Βηθσαϊδάν**: the former not again mentioned in Gospels, the latter seldom (*vide* Mk. vi. 45, viii. 22; Lk. ix. 10), yet scenes of important evangelic incidents, probably connected with the synagogue ministry in Galilee (iv. 23). The Gospels are brief records of a ministry crowded with events. These two towns may be named along with Capernaum because all three were in view where Christ stood when He

[v] μέχρι τῆς σήμερον. 24. πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι γῇ Σοδόμων ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ σοί." 25. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ [w] ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "[x] Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας[1] ταῦτα ἀπὸ [y] σοφῶν καὶ

v Ch. xxviii 15 (same phrase).
w Ch. xii. 38; xv. 15; xvii. 4 al. (in sense of beginning to speak).
x Lk. x. 21. Rom. xiv. 11; xv. 9.
y Lk. x. 21 (Jewish). Mt. xxiii. 34 (Christian). 1 Cor. i. 26 (Pagan).

[1] ℵBD have the simple εκρυψας.

uttered the reproachful words, say on the top of the hill above Capernaum: Bethsaida on the eastern shore of Jordan, just above where it falls into the lake; Chorazin on the western side on the road to Tyre from Capernaum (Furrer, *Wanderungen*, p. 370). They may also have been prosperous business centres selected to represent the commercial side of Jewish national life. Hence the reference to *Tyre* and *Sidon*, often the subject of prophetic animadversion, yet not so blameworthy in their impenitence as the cities which had seen Christ's works.—ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ: in black sackcloth, and with ashes on the head, or sitting in ashes like Job (iii. 8). — Ver. 22. πλὴν: contracted from πλέον = moreover, for the rest, to put the matter shortly; not adversative here, though sometimes so used. — Ver. 23. The diversity in the reading μὴ or ἡ ἕως, etc., does not affect the sense. In the one case the words addressed to Capernaum contain a statement of fact by Jesus; in the other a reference to a feeling prevailing in Capernaum in regard to the facts. The fact implied in either case is distinction on some ground, probably because Capernaum more than all other places was favoured by Christ's presence and activity. But there may, as some think (Grotius, Rosen., De Wette, etc.), be a reference to trade prosperity. "Florebat C. piscatu mercatu, et quae alia esse solent commoda ad mare sitarum urbium" (Grot.). The reference to Tyre and Sidon, trade centres, makes this not an idle suggestion. And it is not unimportant to keep this aspect in mind, as Capernaum with the other two cities then become representatives of the trading spirit, and show us by sample how that spirit received the Gospel of the kingdom. Capernaum illustrated the common characteristic most signally. Most prosperous, most privileged spiritually, and—most unsympathetic, the population being taken as a whole. Worldliness as unreceptive as counterfeit piety represented by Pharisaism, though not so offensive in temper and language. No calumny, but simply invincible indifference.—ἕως οὐρανοῦ, ἕως ᾅδου: proverbial expressions for the greatest exaltation and deepest degradation. The reference in the latter phrase is not to the future world, but to the judgment day of Israel in which Capernaum would be involved. The prophetic eye of Jesus sees Capernaum in ruins as it afterwards saw the beautiful temple demolished (chap. xxiv. 2).

Vv. 25-27. *Jesus worshipping* (Lk. x. 21, 22). It is usual to call this golden utterance a prayer, but it is at once prayer, praise, and self-communing in a devout spirit. The occasion is unknown. Matthew gives it in close connection with the complaint against the cities (ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ), but Luke sets it in still closer connection (ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ) with the return of the Seventy. According to some modern critics, it had no occasion at all in the life of our Lord, but is simply a composition of Luke's, and borrowed from him by the author of Matthew: a hymn in which the Pauline mission to the heathen as the victory of Christ over Satan's dominion in the world is celebrated, and given in connection with the imaginary mission of the Seventy (*vide* Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, p. 445). But Luke's preface justifies the belief that he had here, as throughout, a tradition oral or written to go on, and the probability is that it was taken both by him and by Matthew from a common document. Wendt (L. J., pp. 90, 91) gives it as an extract from the book of *Logia*, and supposes that it followed a report of the return of the disciples (the Twelve) from their mission.

Ver. 25. ἀποκριθεὶς, answering, not necessarily, to anything said, but to some environment provocative of such thoughts.—ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι (= לְ הוֹדָה, Gen. xxix. 35, etc.). In iii. 6 this compound means to make full con-

z Lk. x. 21. Acts xiii. 7. 1 Cor. i. 19. a 1 Cor. ii. 10. Phil. iii. 15. b Lk. x. 21. Rom. ii. 20. 1 Cor. iii. 1. Heb. v. 13. c Eph. i. 5, 7. Phil. ii. 13. d 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

[z] συνετῶν, καὶ [a] ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ [b] νηπίοις. 26. ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως ἐγένετο [c] εὐδοκία [1] ἔμπροσθέν σου. 27. Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου· καὶ οὐδεὶς [d] ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν

[1] **ευδοκια εγενετο** in ℵB, making **ευδοκια** more emphatic.

fession (of sin). Here it = to make frank acknowledgment of a situation in a spirit partly of resignation, partly of thanksgiving.—**ἔκρυψας**. The fact stated is referred to the causality of God, the religious point of view; but it happens according to laws which can be ascertained.—**ταῦτα**: the exact reference unknown, but the statement holds with reference to Christ's whole teaching and healing ministry, and the revelation of the kingdom they contained.—**σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν**: the reference here doubtless is to the Rabbis and scribes, the accepted custodians of the wisdom of Israel. *Cf.* **σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων** in Deut. iv. 6 applied to Israel. The rendering "wise and *prudent*" in A. V. is misleading; "wise and *understanding*" in R. V. is better.—**νηπίοις** (fr. **νη** and **ἔπος**, non-speaking) means those who were as ignorant of scribe-lore as babes (*cf.* John vii. 49 and Heb. v. 13). Their ignorance was their salvation, as thereby they escaped the mental preoccupation with preconceived ideas on moral and religious subjects, which made the scribes inaccessible to Christ's influence (*vide* my *Parabolic Teaching*, pp. 333, 334). Jesus gives thanks with all His heart for the receptivity of the babes, not in the same sense or to the same extent for the non-receptive attitude of the wise (with De Wette and Bleek against Meyer and Weiss). No distinction indeed is expressed, but it goes without saying, and the next clause implies it.—Ver. 26. **ναί** reaffirms with solemn emphasis what might appear doubtful, *viz.*, that Jesus was content with the state of matters (*vide* Klotz, *Devar.*, i. 140). *Cf.* ver. 9.—**πατήρ**: nominative for vocative.—**ὅτι**, because, introducing the reason for this contentment.—**οὕτως**, as the actual facts stand, emphatic ("sic maxime non aliter," Fritzsche).—**εὐδοκία**, a pleasure, an occasion of pleasure; hence a purpose, a state of matters embodying the Divine Will, a Hellenistic word, as is also the verb **εὐδοκέω** (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 21, where the whole thought is similar). Christ resigns Himself to God's will. But His tranquillity is due likewise to insight into the law by which new Divine movements find support among the **νήπιοι** rather than among the **σοφοί**.—Ver. 27. **πάντα**, all things necessary for the realisation of the kingdom (Holtz., H.C.). The **πάντα** need not be restricted to the hiding and revealing functions (Weiss, Nösgen). Hiding, indeed, was no function of Christ's. He was always and only a revealer. For the present Jesus has only a few *babes*, but the future is His: Christianity the coming religion.—**παρεδόθη**, aorist, were given. We might have expected the future. It may be another instance of the aorist used for the Hebrew prophetic future (*vide ad* ver. 19). In Mt. xxviii. 18 **ἐδόθη** again to express the same thought. The reference probably is to the eternal purpose of God: on the use of the aorist in N. T., *vide* note on this passage in Camb. G. T.—**ἐπιγινώσκει**, thoroughly knows.—**τὸν υἱὸν . . . πατήρ**, Christ's comfort amid the widespread unbelief and misunderstanding in reference to Himself is that His *Father* knows Him perfectly. No one else does, not even John. He is utterly alone in the world. Son here has a Godward reference, naturally arising out of the situation. The Son of *Man* is called an evil liver. He lifts up His heart to heaven and says: God my Father knows me, His Son. The thought in the first clause is connected with this one thus: the future is mine, and for the present my comfort is in the Father's knowledge of me.—**οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα . . . ὁ υἱὸς**: a reflection naturally suggested by the foregoing statement. It is ignorance of the Father that creates misconception of the Son. Conventional, moral and religious ideals lead to misjudgment of one who by all He says and does is revealing God as He truly is and wills. The men who know least about God are those supposed to know most, and who have been most ready to judge Him, the "wise and understanding". Hence the additional reflection, **καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υ. ἀποκαλύψαι**. Jesus

βούληται [e] **ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι. 28.** [f] **Δεῦτε πρός με πάντες οἱ** [g] **κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι, κἀγὼ** [h] **ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς. 29. ἄρατε**

e ὁ υἱός absolutely here and in Ch. xxiv. 36; xxviii. 19. Mk. xiii. 32. f *vide* Ch. iv. 19. g here and in John iv. 6. Rev. ii. 3 (with the sense of weariness, *cf.* Is. xl. 31, οὐ κοπιάσουσι. Sir. li. 27, ἐκοπίασα). h 1 Cor. xvi. 18. Philem. 20 (Sir. li. 27, the noun).

here asserts His importance as the revealer of God, saying in effect: "The wise despise me, but they cannot do without me. Through me alone can they attain that knowledge of God which they profess to desire above all things." This was there and then the simple historic fact. Jesus was the one person in Israel who truly conceived God. The use of **βούληται** is noticeable: not to whomsoever He reveals Him, but to whomsoever He is *pleased* to reveal Him. The emphasis seems to lie on the *inclination*, whereas in Mt. i. 19 **θέλων** appears to express the wish, and **ἐβουλήθη** rather the deliberate purpose. Jesus meets the haughty contempt of the "wise" with a dignified assertion that it depends on his inclination whether they are to know God or not. On the distinction between **βούλομαι** and **θέλω**, *vide* Cremer, Wörterbuch, s. v. **βούλομαι.** According to him the former represents the direction of the will, the latter the will active (Affect. Trieb). Hence **βουλ.** can always stand for **θελ.**, but not *vice versâ.*

Vv. 28-30. *The gracious invitation.* Full of O. T. reminiscences, remarks Holtz., H.C., citing Isaiah xiv. 3; xxviii. 12; lv. 1-3; Jer. vi. 16; xxxi. 2, 25, and especially Sirach vi. 24, 25, 28, 29; li. 23-27. De Wette had long before referred to the last-mentioned passage, and Pfleiderer has recently (*Urch.*, 513) made it the basis of the assertion that this beautiful logion is a composition out of Sirach by the evangelist. The passage in Sirach is as follows: **ἐγγίσατε πρός με ἀπαίδευτοι, καὶ αὐλίσθητε ἐν οἴκῳ παιδείας. διότι ὑστερεῖτε ἐν τούτοις, καὶ αἱ ψυχαὶ ὑμῶν διψῶσι σφόδρα. ἤνοιξα τὸ στόμα μου, καὶ ἐλάλησα, κτήσασθε ἑαυτοῖς ἄνευ ἀργυρίου. τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν ὑποθετε ὑπὸ ζυγόν, καὶ ἐπιδέξασθω ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν παιδείαν· ἐγγύς ἐστιν εὑρεῖν αὐτήν· ἴδετε ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν ὅτι ὀλίγον ἐκοπίασα, καὶ εὗρον ἐμαυτῷ πολλὴν ἀνάπαυσιν.*** There are unquestionably kindred thoughts and corresponding phrases, as even Kypke points out ("Syracides magna similitudine dicit"), and if Sirach had been a recognised Hebrew prophet one could have imagined Matthew giving the gist of this rhetorical passage, prefaced with an "as it is written". It is not even inconceivable that a reader of our Gospel at an early period noted on the margin phrases culled from Sirach as descriptive of the attitude of the one true **σοφός** towards men to show how willing he was to communicate the knowledge of the Father-God, and that his notes found their way into the text. But why doubt the genuineness of this *logion?* It seems the natural conclusion of Christ's soliloquy; expressing His intense yearning for receptive scholars at a time when He was painfully conscious of the prevalent unreceptivity. The words do not smell of the lamp. They come straight from a saddened yet tenderly affectionate, unembittered heart; simple, pathetic, sincere. He may have known Sirach from boyhood, and echoes may have unconsciously suggested themselves, and been used with royal freedom quite compatibly with perfect originality of thought and phrase. The reference to wisdom in ver. 19 makes the supposition not gratuitous that Jesus may even have had the passage in Sirach consciously present to His mind, and that He used it, half as a quotation, half as a personal manifesto. The passage is the end of a prayer of *Jesus*, the Son of Sirach, in which that earlier Jesus, personating wisdom, addresses his fellowmen, inviting them to share the benefits which **σοφία** has conferred on himself. Why should not Jesus of Nazareth close *His* prayer with a similar address in the name of wisdom to those who are most likely to become her children—those whose ear sorrow hath opened? This view might meet Martineau's objection to regarding this logion as authentic, that

* Of the above the R.V. gives the following translation: "Draw near unto me, ye unlearned, and lodge in the house of instruction. Say wherefore are ye lacking in these things, and your souls are very thirsty? I opened my mouth and spake. Get her for yourselves without money. Put your neck under the yoke, and let your soul receive instruction. She is hard at hand to find. Behold with your eyes how that I laboured but a little, and found for myself much rest."

i Acts xv. 10. Gal. v. i. τὸν [1] ζυγόν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, καὶ μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι πρᾷός [1] εἰμι καὶ
j Ch. xii. 43. Rev. xiv. 11 (Wisdom iv. 7). ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ· καὶ εὑρήσετε [j] ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν.
k Lk. vi. 35. Rom. ii. 4. 30. ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου [k] χρηστός, καὶ τὸ φορτίον μου ἐλαφρόν ἐστιν."

[1] πραυς in ℵBCD (Tisch., W.H.).

it is not compatible with the humility of Jesus that He should so speak of Himself (*Seat of Authority*, p. 583). Why should He not do as another Jesus had done before Him: speak in the name of wisdom, and appropriate her attributes?

Ver. 28. **Δεῦτε**: *vide ad* iv. 19, again authoritative but kindly.—**κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι**, the fatigued and burdened. This is to be taken metaphorically. The kind of people Jesus expects to become "disciples indeed" are men who have sought long, earnestly, but in vain, for the *summum bonum*, the knowledge of God. There is no burden so heavy as that of truth sought and not found. Scholars of the Rabbis, like Saul of Tarsus, knew it well. In coming thence to Christ's school they would find rest by passing from letter to spirit, from form to reality, from hearsay to certainty, from traditions of the past to the present voice of God.—**κἀγὼ** and *I* emphatic, with side glance at the reputed "wise" who do not give rest (with Meyer against Weiss).—Ver. 29. **ζυγόν**: current phrase to express the relation of a disciple to a master. The Rabbis spoke of the "yoke of the law". Jesus uses their phrases while drawing men away from their influence.—**μάθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ**: not merely learn from my example (Buttmann, *Gram.*, 324; *on*, that is, from the case of), but, more comprehensively, get your learning from me; take me as your Master in religion. The thing to be learned is not merely a moral lesson, humility, but the whole truth about God and righteousness. But the mood of Master and scholar must correspond, He meek as they have become by sorrowful experience. Hence **ὅτι πραΰς . . . τῇ καρδίᾳ**: not *that*, but *for* I am, etc. What connection is there between this spirit and knowledge of God? This: a proud man cannot know God. God knoweth the proud afar off (Ps. cxxxviii. 6), and they know God afar off. God giveth the grace of intimate knowledge of Himself to the lowly.—**ἀνάπαυσιν**: *rest*, such as comes through finding the true God, or through satisfaction of desire, of the hunger of the soul.—Ver. 30. **χρηστός**, kindly to wear. Christ's doctrine fits and satisfies our whole spiritual nature—reason, heart, conscience, "the sweet reasonableness of Christ".—**φορτίον**, the burden of obligation.—**ἐλαφρόν**: in one respect Christ's burden is the heaviest of all because His moral ideal is the highest. But just on that account it is light. Lofty, noble ideals inspire and attract; vulgar ideals are oppressive. Christ's commandment is difficult, but not like that of the Rabbis, *grievous*. (*Vide With Open Face.*)

CHAPTER XII. CONFLICTS WITH THE PHARISEES. This chapter delineates the growing alienation between Jesus and the Pharisees and scribes. The note of time (**ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ**, ver. 1) points back to the situation in which the prayer xi. 25-30 was uttered (*vide* ver. 25, where the same expression is used). All the incidents recorded reveal the captious mood of Israel's "saints and sages". They have now formed a thoroughly bad opinion of Jesus and His company. They regard Him as immoral in life (xi. 19); irreligious, capable even of blasphemy (assuming the divine prerogative of forgiving sin, ix. 3); an ally of Satan even in His beneficence (xii. 24). He can do nothing right. The smallest, most innocent action is an offence.

Vv. 1-8. *Plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath* (Mk. ii. 23-28; Lk. vi. 1-5). Sabbath observance was one of the leading causes of conflict between Jesus and the guardians of religion and morality. This is the first of several encounters reported by the evangelist. According to Weiss he follows Mark, but with sayings taken directly from the Apostolic Source.

Vv. 1, 2. **σάββασιν**: dative plural, as if from **σάββατ-ατος**, other cases (genitive, singular and plural, dative, singular, accusative, plural) are formed from **σάββατον** (*vide* ver. 2).—**διὰ τῶν σπορίμων** might mean through fields adapted for growing grain, but the context requires fields actually sown; fields of corn.—**ἐπείνασαν**: for the form *vide* iv. 2. This word supplies the motive for the action, which Mark leaves vague.—

XII. 1. ᾿ΕΝ ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπορεύθη ὁ ᾿Ιησοῦς τοῖς σάββασι διὰ τῶν [a] σπορίμων· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπείνασαν, καὶ ἤρξαντο [b] τίλλειν [c] στάχυας καὶ ἐσθίειν. 2. οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπον αὐτῷ, "᾿Ιδού, οἱ μαθηταί σου ποιοῦσιν, ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ." 3. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οὐκ [d] ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησε Δαβίδ, ὅτε ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς[1] καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ; 4. πῶς εἰσῆλθεν [e] εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους [f] τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν,[2] οὓς[3] οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν, οὐδὲ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι μόνοις; 5. Ἢ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ, ὅτι τοῖς σάββασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον [f] βεβηλοῦσι, καὶ [g] ἀναίτιοί εἰσι;

a here and in parall.
b here and in parall.
c here, parall. and Mk. iv. 28.
d Ch. xix. 4; xxi. 16, 42; xxiv. 15 *al.*
e Heb. ix. 2.
f Acts xxiv. 6 (often in Sept.).
g here and in ver. 7.

[1] The **αυτος** (LΣ) comes from Mk. (ii. 25); it is omitted in ℵBCDΔ *al.*

[2] **εφαγον** in ℵB.

[3] **ο** in BD. The reading of T. R. (**εφαγεν ους**) is from Mk.

ἤρξαντο: perhaps emphasis should be laid on this word. No sooner had they *begun* to pluck ears than fault was found. Pharisees on the outlook for offences. So Carr, Camb. G. T.—Ver. 2. **ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν π. ἐ. σαββάτῳ.** The emphasis here lies on the last word. To help oneself when hungry with the hand was humanely allowed in the Deuteronomic law (Deut. xxiii. 25), only to use the sickle was forbidden as involving waste. But according to the scribes what was lawful on other days was unlawful on Sabbath, because plucking ears was *reaping*. "Metens Sabbato vel tantillum, reus est" (Lightfoot rendering a passage from the Talmud). Luke adds **ψώχοντες**, rubbing with the hands. He took the offence to be *threshing*. Microscopic offence in either case, proving *primâ facie* malice in the fault-finders. But honest objection is not inconceivable to one who remembers the interdict placed by old Scottish piety on the use of the razor on Sabbath. We must be just even to Pharisees.

Vv. 3-8. *Christ's defence.* It is twofold. (1) He shields disciples by examples: David and the priests; to both the fault-finders would defer (vv. 3-5); (2) He indicates the principles involved in the examples (vv. 6-8). The case of David was apposite because (*a*) it was a case of eating, (*b*) it probably happened on Sabbath, (*c*) it concerned not only David but, as in the present instance, *followers*; therefore **οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ**, ver. 3, carefully added. (*b*) does not form an element in the defence, but it helps to account for the reference to David's conduct. In that view Jesus must have regarded the act of David as a Sabbatic incident, and that it was may not unnaturally be inferred from 1 Sam. xxi. 6. *Vide* Lightfoot, *ad loc.*—This was probably also the current opinion. The same remark applies to the attendants of David. From the history one might gather that David was really alone, and only pretended to have companions. But if, as is probable, it was usually assumed that he was accompanied, Jesus would be justified in proceeding on that assumption, whatever the fact was (*vide* Schanz, *ad loc*).—Ver. 4. **εἰσῆλθεν, ἔφαγον,** *he* entered, *they* ate. Mark has **ἔφαγεν.** Weiss explains the harsh change of subject by combination of apostolic source with Mark. The two verbs point to two offences against the law: entering a holy *place*, eating holy *bread*. The sin of the disciples was against a holy *time*. But the principle involved was the same = ceremonial rules may be overruled by higher considerations.—**ὃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν. οὓς** in Mark and Luke agreeing with **ἄρτους**, and here also in T. R., but **ὃ** doubtless the true reading; again presenting a problem in comparative exegesis (*vide* Weiss-Meyer). **ὃ** ought to mean "which *thing* it was not lawful to do," but it may be rendered "which *kind of bread*," etc.—**εἰ μή**, except, absolutely unlawful, except in case of priests.—Ver. 5. This reference to the priests naturally leads on to the second instance taken from their systematic breach of the technical Sabbath law in the discharge of sacerdotal duty.—**ἢ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε,** have ye not read? not of course the statement following, but directions on which such a construction could be put, as in Numb. xxviii. 9, concerning the burnt offering of two lambs. They had

6. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζων[1] ἐστὶν ὧδε. 7. εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε τί [h] ἐστιν, "Ἔλεον[2] θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν," οὐκ ἂν [i] κατεδικάσατε τοὺς ἀναιτίους. 8. κύριος γάρ ἐστι καὶ[3] τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου."

h ἐστιν = means, *vide* Lk. viii. 9, 11.
i Lk. vi. 37. Jas. v. 6 (the pass. in ver. 37).

[1] μειζον in ℵBD *al.* μειζων (LΔ) is a misjudged attempt at correction.

[2] This is another grammatical correction (*vide* ix. 13), ελεος in ℵBCD.

[3] και omitted in ℵBCD, etc. It comes in from the parall.

read often enough, but had not understood. As Euthy. Zig. remarks, Jesus reproaches them for their vain labour, as not understanding what they read (μὴ ἐπιγινώσκουσιν ἃ ἀναγινώσκουσι).—βεβηλοῦσι, profane, on the Pharisaic view of the Sabbath law, as an absolute prohibition of work. Perhaps the Pharisees themselves used this word as a technical term, applicable even to permissible Sabbath labour. So Schanz after Schöttgen.

Vv. 6-8. *The principles involved.* The facts stated raise questions as to the reasons. The Pharisees were men of rules, not accustomed to go back on principles. The passion for minutiæ killed reflection. The reasons have been already hinted in the statement of the cases: ὅτι ἐπείνασεν, ver. 3; ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ver. 5: *hunger*, the *temple*; human needs, higher claims. These are referred to in inverse order in vv. 6-7.—Ver. 6. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν: solemn affirmation, with a certain tone in the voice.—τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν. Though they might not have thought of the matter before, the claim of the temple to overrule the Sabbath law would be admitted by the Pharisees. Therefore, Jesus could base on it an argument *a fortiori*. The Sabbath must give way to the temple and its higher interests, therefore to something higher still. What was that something? Christ Himself, according to the almost unanimous opinion of interpreters, ancient and modern; whence doubtless the μείζων of T. R. But Jesus might be thinking rather of the *kingdom* than of the king; a greater *interest* is involved here, that of the kingdom of God. Fritzsche takes μεῖζον as = teaching men, and curing them of vice then going on. It may be asked: How did the interest come in? The disciples were following Jesus, but what was *He* about? What created the urgency? Whence came it that the disciples needed to pluck ears of standing corn? We do not know. That is one of the many *lacunæ* in the evangelic history. But it may be assumed that there was something urgent going on in connection with Christ's ministry, whereby He and His companions were overtaken with extreme hunger, so that they were fain to eat unprepared food (ἀκατέργαστον σῖτον, Euthy. Zig. on ver. 7).—Ver. 7. The principle of human need stated in terms of a favourite prophetic oracle (ix. 13).—εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε . . . οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε: the form of expression, a past indicative in protasis, with a past indicative with ἂν in apodosis, implies that the supposition is contrary to fact (Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, § 248). The Pharisees did not know what the oracle meant; hence on a previous occasion Jesus bade them go and learn (ix. 13). If their pedantry blinded them to distinctions of higher and lower in institutions, or rather made them reckon the least the greatest command, minutiæ testing obedience, it still more deadened their hearts to the claims of mercy and humanity. Of course this idolatry went on from bad to worse. For the Jews of a later, templeless time, the law was greater than the temple (Holtz., in H.C., quoting Weber).—ἀναιτίους: doubly guiltless: as David was through imperious hunger, as the priests were when subordinating Sabbath, to temple, requirements.—Ver. 8. This weighty logion is best understood when taken along with that in Mark ii. 27 = the Sabbath for man, not man for the Sabbath. The question is: Does it merely state a fact, or does it also contain the rationale of the fact? That depends on the sense we give to the title *Son of Man*. As a technical name = Messiah, it simply asserts the authority of Him who bears it to determine how the Sabbath is to be observed in the Kingdom of God. As a name of humility, making no obtrusive exceptional claims, like Son of David or Messiah, it suggests a reason for the lordship in sympathy with the ethical principle embodied in the prophetic oracle. The title does not indeed mean mankind, or any man, *homo quivis*, as Grotius and Kuinoel

9. Καὶ [j] μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν. 10. καὶ ἰδού, ἄνθρωπος ἦν τὴν[1] χεῖρα ἔχων [k] ξηράν· καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, "Εἰ ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεύειν[2];" ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ. 11. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τίς ἔσται[3] ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃς ἕξει πρόβατον ἕν, καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασιν

j Ch. xi. 1.
k parall. and John v. 3.

[1] ℵBC omit ην την. The text of Mt. as in T. R. has been influenced by that in Mk. (iii. 1).

[2] So in BC (W.H.), θεραπευσαι in ℵDL (Tisch.).

[3] εσται is omitted in CLXΣ, and bracketed in W.H. This is found in XBΔ rel.

think. It points to Jesus, but to Him not as an exceptional man ("der einzigartige," Weiss), but as the *representative* man, maintaining solidarity with humanity, standing for the *human* interest, as the Pharisees stood for the supposed *divine*, the real divine interest being identical with the human. The radical antithesis between Jesus and the Pharisees lay in their respective ideas of *God*. It is interesting to find a glimpse of the true sense of this *logion* in Chrysostom: περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγων. Ὁ δὲ Μάρκος καὶ περὶ τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως αὐτὸν τοῦτο εἰρηκέναι φησίν. Hom. xxxix.—κύριος, not to the effect of abrogation but of interpretation and restoration to true use. The weekly rest is a beneficent institution, God's holiday to weary men, and the Kingdom of Heaven, whose royal law is love, has no interest in its abolition.

Vv. 9-14. *A Sabbath cure* (Mk. iii. 1-6; Lk. vi. 6-11): not necessarily happening immediately after. Matthew and Luke follow Mark's order, which is topical, not historical; another instance of collision as to Sabbath observance.—Ver. 9. καὶ μεταβὰς . . . αὐτῶν. The αὐτῶν seems to imply that our evangelist takes the order as one of close temporal sequence (Mark says simply "into a synagogue," iii. 1). In that case the αὐτῶν would refer to the fault-finding Pharisees of the previous narrative, piqued by Christ's defence and bent on further mischief (*vide* Weiss-Meyer). The narrative comes in happily here as illustrating the scope of the principle of humanity laid down in connection with the previous incident.—Ver. 10. καὶ ἰδού, here, as in viii. 2, ix. 2, introducing in a lively manner the story.—ξηράν, a *dry* hand, possibly a familiar expression in Hebrew pathology (De Wette); useless, therefore a serious enough affliction for a working man (a mason, according to Hebrew Gospel, Jerome *ad loc.*), especially if it was the *right* hand, as Luke states. But the cure was not urgent for a day, could stand over; therefore a good test case as between rival conceptions of Sabbath law.—ἐπηρώτησαν. The Pharisees asked a question suggested by the case, as if eager to provoke Jesus and put Him to the proof. Mark says they observed Him, waiting for Him to take the initiative. The former alternative suits the hypothesis of immediate temporal sequence.—εἰ ἔξεστιν, etc. After λέγοντες we expect, according to classic usage, a direct question without εἰ. The εἰ is in its place in Mark (ver. 2), and the influence of his text may be suspected (Weiss) as explaining the incorrectness in Matthew. But εἰ in direct questions is not unusual in N. T. (Mt. xix. 3; Lk. xiii. 23, xxii. 49), *vide* Winer, § 57, 2, and Meyer *ad loc.* In Mark's account Christ, not the Pharisees, puts the question.

Vv. 11, 12. *Christ's reply*, by two home-thrusting questions and an irresistible conclusion.—τίς . . . ἄνθρωπος. One is tempted here, as in vii. 9, to put emphasis on ἄνθρωπος: who of you not dead to the feelings of a man? Such questions as this and that in Lk. xv. 4 go to the root of the matter. Humanity was what was lacking in the Pharisaic character.—πρόβατον ἕν: *one* sheep answering to the one working hand, whence perhaps Luke's ἡ δεξιὰ (vi. 6).—ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ. The case supposed might quite well happen; hence in the protasis ἐὰν with subjunctive, and in the apodosis the future (Burton, N. T. Moods and Tenses, § 250). A solitary sheep might fall into a ditch on a Sabbath, and that is what its owner would do if he were an ordinary average human being, *viz.*, lift it out at once. What would the *Pharisee* do? It is easy to see what he would be tempted to do if the one sheep were his own. But would he have allowed such action as a general rule? One would

εἰς [1] βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσει αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ; 12. πόσῳ οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος προβάτου; ὥστε ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασι καλῶς ποιεῖν." 13. Τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, "Ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου.[1]" Καὶ ἐξέτεινε, καὶ [m] ἀποκατεστάθη [2] ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη. 14. Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι [n] συμβούλιον [n] ἔλαβον κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐξελθόντες [3] ὅπως αὐτὸν

l Ch. xv. 14. Lk. vi. 39.
m here and in parall. in same sense. Ch. xvii. 11. Mk. ix. 12 (to restore social state). Heb. xiii. 19 (to friends).
n Ch. xxii. 15; xxvii. 1, 7; xxviii. 12.

[1] ℵBL have σου before την χειρα.

[2] απεκ. in ℵBLΔΣ *al.* D has αποκ. as in T. R.

[3] ℵBCDΣ place εξελθοντες at the beginning of the sentence (Σ with και before εξελθοντες).

infer so from the fact that Jesus argued on such questions *ex concesso*. In that case the theory and practice of contemporary Pharisees must have been milder than in the Talmudic period, when the rule was: if there be no danger, leave the animal in the ditch till the morrow (*vide* Buxtorf, Syn. Jud., c. xvi.). Grotius suggests that later Jewish law was made stricter out of hatred to Christians.—Ver. 12. **πόσῳ οὖν διαφέρει**, etc. This is another of those simple yet far-reaching utterances by which Christ suggested rather than formulated His doctrine of the infinite worth of man. By how much does a human being differ from a sheep? That is the question which Christian civilisation has not even yet adequately answered. This illustration from common life is not in Mark and Luke. Luke has something similar in the Sabbath cure, reported in xiv. 1-6. Some critics think that Matthew combines the two incidents, drawing from his two sources Mark and the Logia.—**ὥστε**, therefore, and so introducing here rather an independent sentence than a dependent clause expressive of result.—**καλῶς ποιεῖν**: in effect, to do good = **εὖ ποιεῖν**, *i.e.*, in the present case to heal, **θεραπεύειν**, though in Acts x. 33, 1 Cor. vii. 37, the phrase seems to mean to do the morally right, in which sense Meyer and Weiss take it here also. Elsner, and after him Fritzsche, take it as = *præclare agere*, pointing to the ensuing miracle. By this brief prophetic utterance, Jesus sweeps away legal pedantries and casuistries, and goes straight to the heart of the matter. Beneficent action never unseasonable, of the essence of the Kingdom of God; therefore as permissible and incumbent on Sabbath as on other days. Spoken out of the depths of His religious consciousness, and a direct corollary from His benignant conception of God (*vide* Holtz., H. C., p. 91).

Vv. 13, 14. *The issue: the hand cured, and Pharisaic ill-will deepened.* Ver. 13. **τότε λέγει**. He heals by a *word: sine contactu sola voce, quod ne speciem quidem violati Sabbati habere poterat* (Grotius).—**Ἔκτεινόν σου τ. χ.** Brief authoritative word, possessing both physical and moral power, conveying life to the withered member, and inspiring awe in spectators.—**καὶ ἐξέτ. καὶ ἀπεκατ.** The double **καὶ** signifies the quick result ("celeritatem miraculi," Elsner). Grotius takes the second verb as a participle rendering: he stretched out his restored hand, assuming that not till restored could the hand be stretched out. The healing and the outstretching may be conceived of as contemporaneous.—**ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη**: the evangelist adds this to **ἀπεκατ.** to indicate the completeness. We should have expected this addition rather from Luke, who ever aims at making prominent the greatness of the miracle, as well as its benevolence.—Ver. 14. **ἐξελθόντες**: overawed for the moment, the Pharisaic witnesses of the miracle soon recovered themselves, and went out of the synagogue with hostile intent.—**συμβούλιον ἔλαβον**, consulted together = **συμβουλεύεσθαι**.—**κατ' αὐτοῦ**, against Him. Hitherto they had been content with finding fault; now it is come to plotting against His life—a tribute to His power.—**ὅπως**, etc.: this clause indicates generally the object of their plotting, *viz.*, that it concerned the life of the obnoxious one. They consulted not how to compass the end, but simply agreed together that it was an end to be steadily kept in view. The murderous will has come to birth, the way will follow in due course. Such is the evil fruit of Sabbath controversies.

ἀπολέσωσιν. 15. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς γνοὺς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν· καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι[1] πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας· 16. καὶ [o] ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ [p] φανερὸν αὐτὸν [p] ποιήσωσιν· 17. ὅπως[2] πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, 18. "Ἰδού, ὁ παῖς μου, ὃν ᾑρέτισα· ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, εἰς ὃν[3] [q] εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχή μου· θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ· οὐκ [r] ἐρίσει, οὐδὲ [s] κραυγάσει· 19. οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. 20. κάλαμον [t] συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει, καὶ λῖνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει· ἕως ἂν [u] ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νῖκος τὴν κρίσιν. 21. καὶ ἐν[4] τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσι."

o Ch. xvi. 20 (W.H.). Mk. viii. 30 (with ἵνα). Mk. iii. 12 (with ἵνα μη as here).
p here and Mk. iii. 12.
q with accus. as here (W.H.). Heb. x. 6, 18.
r here only.
s John xi. 43. Acts xxii. 23.
t Mk. v. 4; xiv. 3. Lk. ix. 39. John x. 4.
u ver. 35. Ch. xiii. 52.

[1] ℵB omit οχλοι, which is inconsistent with παντας. [2] ℵBCD have ινα.
[3] ℵB have simply ον. [4] Most uncials omit εν, which is found in D it. vg.

Vv. 15-21. *Jesus retires; prophetic portraiture of His character.* Verses 15 and 16 are abridged from Mk. iii. 7-12, which contains an account of an extensive healing ministry. The sequel of the Sabbatic encounter is very vague. The one fact outstanding and noteworthy is the withdrawal of Jesus, conscious of having given deep offence, but anxious to avoid tragic consequences for the present. It is to that fact mainly that the evangelist attaches his fair picture of Jesus, in prophetic language. It is happily brought in here, where it gains by the contrast between the real Jesus and Jesus as conceived by the Pharisees, a miscreant deserving to die. It is not necessary to suppose that the historical basis of the picture is to be found exclusively in vv. 15, 16, all the more that the statement they contain is but a meagre reproduction of Mk. iii. 7-12, omitting some valuable material, *e.g.*, the demoniac cry: "Thou art the Son of God". The historic features answering to the prophetic outline in the evangelist's mind may be taken from the whole story of Christ's public life as hitherto told, from the baptism onwards. Luke gives his picture of Jesus at the beginning (iv. 16-30) as a frontispiece, Matthew places his at the end of a considerable section of the story, at a critical turning point in the history, and he means the reader to look back over the whole for verification. Thus for the evangelist ver. 18 may point back to the baptism (iii. 13-17), when the voice from heaven called Jesus God's beloved Son; ver. 19 to the teaching on the hill (v.-vii.), when the voice of Jesus was heard not in the street but on the mountain top, remote from the crowd below; ver. 20 to the healing ministry among the sick, physically bruised reeds, poor suffering creatures in whom the flame of life burnt low; ver. 21 to such significant incidents as that of the centurion of Capernaum (viii. 5-13). Broad interpretation here seems best. Some features, *e.g.*, the reference to judgment, ver. 20, second clause, are not to be pressed.

The quotation is a very free reproduction from the Hebrew, with occasional side glances at the Sept. It has been suggested that the evangelist drew neither from the Hebrew nor from the Sept., but from a Chaldee Targum in use in his time (Lutteroth). It is certainly curious that he should have omitted Is. xlii. 4, "He shall not fail nor be discouraged," etc., a most important additional feature in the picture = Messiah shall not only not break the bruised reed, but He shall not be Himself a bruised reed, but shall bravely stand for truth and right till they at length triumph. Admirable historic materials to illustrate that prophetic trait are ready to our hand in Christ's encounters with the Pharisees (ix. 1-17, xii. 1-13). Either Matthew has followed a Targum, or been misled by the similarity of Is. xlii. 3 and 4, or he means ver. 20 to bear a double reference, and read: He shall neither *break* nor *be* a bruised reed, nor allow to be quenched either in others or in Himself the feeble flame: a strong, brave, buoyant, ever-victorious hero, helper of the weak, Him-

22. Τότε προσηνέχθη[1] αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός· καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν τυφλὸν καὶ[2] κωφὸν καὶ λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν. 23. καὶ [v] ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι καὶ ἔλεγον, "Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαβίδ;" 24. Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες εἶπον, "Οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβοὺλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων." 25. Εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς[3] τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Πᾶσα βασιλεία [w] μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς [x] ἐρημοῦται· καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς, οὐ σταθήσεται.

v Mk. ii. 12. Lk. viii. 56. Acts ii. 7, 12 al.
w 1 Cor. i. 13; vii. 33.
x Lk. xi. 17. Rom. xvii. 16; xviii. 16.

[1] B Cur. Syr. Cop. have προσηνεγκαν with δαιμονιζομενον τυφλον και κωφον. Most MSS. as in T. R. W.H. adopt the reading of B, putting T. R. in the margin.

[2] ℵBD and some versions omit τυφλον και, also the και before λαλειν.

[3] ℵBD omit ο Ιησους.

self a stranger to weakness.—ᾑρέτισα (ver. 18), an Ionic form in use in Hellenistic Greek, here only in N. T., often in Sept. = αἱρέομαι. Hesychius under ᾑρετισάμην gives as equivalents ἠγάπησα, ἐπιθύμησα, ἠθέλησα, ἠράσθην.—κραυγάσει (ver. 19), late form for κράζω. Phrynicus, p. 337, condemns as illiterate use of κραυγασμός instead of κεκραγμός. On the words οὐδὲ κρ. Pricaeus remarks: "Sentio clamorem intelligi qui nota est animi commoti et effervescentis". He cites examples from Seneca, Plutarch, Xenophon, etc.—ἀκούσει is late for ἀκούσεται. Verbs expressing organic acts or states have *middle* forms in the future (*vide* Rutherford, *New Phrynicus*, pp. 138, 376-412).—ἕως, ver. 20, followed by subjunctive, with ἄν as in classics, in a clause introduced by ἕως referring to a future contingency.—τῷ ὀνόματι, ver. 21, dative after ἐλπιοῦσιν; in Sept., Is. xlii. 4, with ἐπί. This construction here only in N. T.

Vv. 22-37. *Demoniac healed and Pharisaic calumny repelled* (Mk. iii. 19-30; Lk. xi. 14-23—*cf.* Mt. ix. 32-34). The healing of a blind and dumb demoniac has its place here not for its own sake, as a miracle, but simply as the introduction to another conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees. It is a story of wicked calumny repelled. The transition from the fair picture of the true Jesus to this hideous Pharisaic caricature is highly dramatic in its effect.

Vv. 22, 23. τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, blind as well as dumb. The demoniac in ix. 32 dumb only. But dumbness here also is the main feature; hence in last clause κωφὸν only, and λαλεῖν before βλέπειν.—ὥστε with infinitive, expressing here not merely tendency but result.—Ver. 23. ἐξίσταντο: not implying anything exceptionally remarkable in the cure; a standing phrase (in Mark at least) for the impression made on the people. They never got to be familiar with Christ's wonderful works, so as to take them as matters of course.—μήτι implies a negative answer: they can hardly believe what the fact seems to suggest = can this possibly be, etc.? Not much capacity for faith in the average Israelite, yet honest-hearted compared with the Pharisee.—ὁ υἱὸς Δαβιδ: a popular title for the Messiah.

Ver. 24. Οἱ δὲ φαρισαῖοι. They of course have a very different opinion. In Mark these were men come down from Jerusalem, to watch, not to lay hold of Jesus, Galilee not being under the direct jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim then (*vide* on Mark).—Οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλλει, etc.: theory enunciated for second time, unless ix. 34 be an anticipation by the evangelist, or a spurious reading. What diversity of opinion! Christ's friends, according to Mark, thought Him "beside Himself"—mad, Messiah, in league with Beelzebub! Herod had yet another theory: the marvellous healer was John *redivivus*, and endowed with the powers of the other world. All this implies that the healing ministry was a great fact.—οὐκ . . . εἰ μή: the negative way of putting it stronger than the positive. The Pharisees had to add εἰ μή. They would gladly have said: "He does not cast out devils at all". But the fact was undeniable; therefore they had to invent a theory to neutralise its significance.—ἄρχοντι, without article, might mean, *as prince*, therefore able to communicate such power. So Meyer, Weiss, *et al.* But the article may be omitted after Βεελζεβοὺλ as after βασιλεύς, or on account of the following genitive.

26. **καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς τον Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη· πῶς οὖν σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; 27. καὶ εἰ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσι; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν ἔσονται κριταί.**[1] 28. **εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ**[2] **ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα [y] ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ.**

y Rom. ix. 31. 2 Cor. x. 14. Phil. iii. 16. 1 Thess. ii. 16 (in all = to reach).

[1] ℵBD have **κριται εσονται υμων**.

[2] Most uncials have **εγω** *after* εν **Πνευματι θεου**, on which the emphasis ought to lie.

So Schanz. Whether the Pharisees believed this theory may be doubted. It was enough that it was plausible. To reason with such men is vain. Yet Jesus did reason for the benefit of disciples.

Vv. 25-30. *The theory shown to be absurd.*—Ver. 25. **εἰδὼς τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις.** Jesus not only heard their *words*, but knew their thoughts, the malicious feelings which prompted their words, and strove so to present the case as to convict them of bad faith and dishonesty.—**πᾶσα βασιλεία**, etc.: statement of an axiom widely exemplified in human affairs: division fatal to stability in kingdoms and cities.—**σταθήσεται**: 1st future passive with an intransitive sense, *vide* Winer, § 38, 1.—Ver. 26 applies the axiom to Satan. **εἰ**, introduces a simple particular supposition without reference to its truth.—**ἐμερίσθη**: the aorist has the force of a perfect. Satan casting out Satan means self-stultification; *ipso facto*, self-division results. Against the argument it might be objected: Kingdoms and cities do become divided against themselves, regardless of fatal consequences, why not also Satan? Why should not that happen to Satan's kingdom which has happened even to the Christian Church? Jesus seems to have credited Satan with more astuteness than is possessed by states, cities, and churches. Satan may be wicked, He says in effect, but he is not a fool. Then it has to be considered that communities commit follies which individuals avoid. Men war against each other to their common undoing, who would be wiser in their own affairs. One Satan might cast out another, but no Satan will cast out himself. And that is the case put by Jesus. Some, *e.g.*, De Wette and Fritzsche, take **ὁ Σατανᾶς τ. Σ. ἐκβάλλει** as = one Satan casting out another. But that is not Christ's meaning. He so puts the case as to make the absurdity evident. *Ex hypothesi* He had a right to put it so; for the theory was that Satan directly empowered and enabled Him to deliver men from his (Satan's) power.—Ver 27. To the previous convincing argument Jesus adds an *argumentum ad hominem*, based on the exorcism then practised among the Jews, with which it would appear the Pharisees found no fault.—**οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν**, not of course Christ's disciples (so most of the Fathers), for the Pharisaic prejudice against Him would extend to them, but men belonging to the same school or religious type, like-minded. By referring to their performances Jesus put the Pharisees in a dilemma. Either they must condemn both forms of dispossession or explain why they made a difference. What they would have said we do not know, but it is not difficult to suggest reasons. The Jewish exorcists operated in conventional fashion by use of herbs and magical formulæ, and the results were probably insignificant. The practice was sanctioned by custom, and harmless. But in casting out devils, as in all other things, Jesus was original, and His method was *too effectual*. His power, manifest to all, was His offence.—**κριταί.** Jesus now makes the fellow-religionists of the Pharisees their judges. On a future occasion He will make John the Baptist their judge (xxi. 21-27). Such home-thrusts were very inconvenient.

Ver. 28. *The alternative:* if not by Satan then by the Spirit of God, with an inevitable inference as to the worker and His work.—**ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ.** Luke has **ἐν δακτύλῳ θ.** The former seems more in keeping with the connection of thought as defending the ethical character of Christ's work assailed by the Pharisees. If, indeed, the spirit of God were regarded from the *charismatic* point of view, as the source of miraculous gifts, the two expressions would be synonymous. But there is reason to believe that by the time our Gospel was written the Pauline conception of the Holy Spirit's influence as chiefly *ethical* and *immanent*, as distinct from that of the primitive apostolic church, in which it was charismatic and transcendent, had gained currency (*vide* my *St. Paul's*

29. ἢ πῶς δύναταί τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ διαρπάσαι,[1] ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον δήσῃ τὸν ἰσχυρόν; καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει.[2] 30. ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ, κατ' ἐμοῦ

[1] BCXΣ have the simple αρπασαι. διαρπασαι (ℵDLΔ *al.*) conforms either to Mk. or to the next clause.

[2] ℵDΣ (Tisch.) have διαρπαση. BCL *al. pl.* have διαρπασει, as in T. R.

Conception of Christianity, chap. xiii.). A trace of the new Pauline view may be found in Mt. x. 20: "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father speaking in you". The influence is *within*, and the product is not unintelligible utterance, like that of the speaker with tongues (1 Cor. xii., xiv.), but wise, sincere apology for the faith. But why then did Luke not adopt this Pauline phrase? Because one of his main aims was to bring out the miraculousness of Christ's healing works; that they were done by the very finger of God (Exod. viii. 15).—ἔφθασεν. Fritzsche takes this word strictly as signifying not merely: the kingdom of God has come nigh you (ἤγγικεν, Lk. x. 9), but: has come nigh sooner than you expected. The more general sense, however, seems most suitable, as it is the usual sense in the N. T. The point at issue was: do the events in question mean Satan's kingdom come or God's kingdom come? It must be one or other; make up your minds which.—Ver. 29. To help them to decide Jesus throws out yet another parabolic line of thought.—ἤ, if all that I have said does not convince you consider this. The parable seems based on Is. xlix. 24, 25, and like all Christ's parabolic utterances appeals to common sense. The theme is, spoiling the spoiler, and the argument that the enterprise implies *hostile purpose* and success in it *superior power*. The application is: the demoniac is a captive of Satan; in seeking to cure him I show myself Satan's *enemy;* in actually curing him I show myself Satan's *master*.—τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ: the article is either generic, or individualising after the manner of parabolic speech. Proverbs and parables assume acquaintance with their characters.—σκεύη, household furniture (Gen. xxxi. 37); ἁρπάσαι, seize (Judges xxi. 22).—διαρπάσει, make a clean sweep of all that is in the house, the owner, bound hand and foot, being utterly helpless. The use of this compound verb points to the thoroughness of the cures wrought on demoniacs, as in the case of the demoniac of Gadara: quiet, clothed, sane (Mk. v. 15).—Ver. 30. One begins at this point to have the feeling that here, as elsewhere, our evangelist groups sayings of kindred character instead of exactly reproducing Christ's words as spoken to the Pharisees. The connection is obscure, and the interpretations therefore conflicting. On first view one would say that the adage seems more appropriate in reference to lukewarm disciples or undecided hearers than to the Pharisees, who made no pretence of being on Christ's side. Some accordingly (*e.g.*, Bleek, after Elwert and Ullmann) have so understood it. Others, including Grotius, Wetstein, De Wette, take the ἐγώ of the adage to be Satan, and render: he who, like myself, is not with Satan is against him. Kypke, *Observ. Sac.*, says: "Prima persona posita est a servatore pro quacunque alia, proverbialiter, hoc sensu: *qui socius cujusdam bella cum alio gerentis non est, is pro adversario censeri solet. Cum igitur ego me re ipsa adversarium Satanae esse ostenderim, nulla specie socius ejus potero vocari.*" This certainly brings the saying into line with the previous train of thought, but if Jesus had meant to say that He surely would have expressed Himself differently. The Fathers (Hilary, Jerome, Chrys.) took the ἐγώ to be Jesus and the ὁ μὴ ὢν to be Satan. So understood the adage contains a fourth concluding argument against the notion of a league between Jesus and Satan. Most modern interpreters refer the ὁ μ. ω. to the Pharisees. Schanz, however, understands the saying as referring to the undecided among the people. The only serious objection to this view is that it makes the saying irrelevant to the situation.—σκορπίζει: late for the earlier σκεδάννυμι, *vide* Lob., Phryn., p. 218. As to the metaphor of gathering and scattering, its natural basis is not apparent. But in all cases, when one man scatters what another gathers their aims and interests are utterly diverse. Satan is the arch-waster, Christ the collector, Saviour.

Vv. 31, 32. *Jesus changes His tone from argument to solemn warning.* Ver.

ἐστι. καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ, [z] σκορπίζει. 31. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, Πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ [a] βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἡ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.[1] 32. καὶ ὃς ἂν[2] εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται[3] αὐτῷ, οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

z Lk. xi. 23. John x. 12; xvi. 32. 2 Cor. ix. 9.
a Ch. xv. 19. Mk. iii. 28; vii. 22. Eph. iv. 31 (evil speaking generally). Ch. xxvi. 65. Mk. ii. 7; xiv. 64. John x. 33 (against God).

[1] אB omit **τοις ανθρωποις**, which seem to be simply an echo of **τ. αν.** in the previous clause.

[2] **ος εαν** in most uncials. D has **ος αν**, as in T. R.

[3] For **ουκ αφεθησεται** found in most uncials B has **ου μη αφεθη**, which W.H. place in the margin.

31. **διὰ τοῦτο** connects not merely with preceding verse, but with the whole foregoing argument. Mark more impressively introduces the blasphemy-*logion* with a solemn **ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν**.—**πᾶσα ἁμαρτία**, etc. A broad preliminary declaration of the pardonableness of human sin of all sorts, and especially of sins of the tongue, worthy and characteristic of Jesus, and making what follows more impressive.—**ἡ δὲ τ. Π. βλασ. οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται**: pointed, emphatic exception. Evidently the Spirit here is taken ethically. He represents the moral ideal, the absolutely good and holy. Blasphemy against the Spirit so conceived unpardonable—that is our Lord's deliberate judgment.—**βλασφημία**, injurious speech (from **βλάπτω** and **φήμη**), in such a case will mean speaking of the holy One as if He were unholy, or, in the abstract, calling good evil, not by misunderstanding but through antipathy to the good.—Ver. 32. So serious a statement needs to be carefully guarded against misapprehension; therefore Jesus adds an explanatory declaration.—**λόγον κατὰ τ. υ. τ. ἀνθρώπου**. Jesus distinguishes between a word against the Son of Man and a word against the Holy Ghost. The reference in the former is to Himself, presumably, though Mark at the corresponding place has "the sons of men," and no special mention of a particular son of man. Christ gives the Pharisees to understand that the *gravamen* of their offence is not that they have spoken evil of Him. Jesus had no exceptional sensitiveness as to personal offences. Nor did He mean to suggest that offences of the kind against Him were more serious or less easily pardonable than such offences against other men, say, the prophets or the Baptist. Many interpreters, indeed, think otherwise, and represent blasphemy against the Son of Man as the higher limit of the forgiveable. A grave mistake, I humbly think. Jesus was as liable to honest misunderstanding as other good men, in some respects more liable than any, because of the exceptional originality of His character and conduct. All new things are liable to be misunderstood and decried, and the best for a while to be treated as the worst. Jesus knew this, and allowed for it. Men might therefore honestly misunderstand Him, and be in no danger of the sin against the Holy Ghost (*e.g.*, Saul of Tarsus). On the other hand, men might dishonestly calumniate any ordinary good man, and be very near the unpardonable sin. It is not the *man* that makes the difference, but the source of the blasphemy. If the source be ignorance, misconception, ill-informed prejudice, blasphemy against the Son of Man will be equally pardonable with other sins. If the source be malice, rooted dislike of the good, selfish preference of wrong, because of the advantage it brings, to the right which the good seek to establish, then the sin is not against the man but against the cause, and the Divine Spirit who inspires him, and though the agent be but a humble, imperfect man, the sinner is perilously near the unpardonable point. Jesus wished the Pharisees to understand that, in His judgment, that was their position.—**οὔτε, οὔτε** analyse the negation of pardon, conceived as affecting both worlds, into its parts for sake of emphasis (*vide* on V. 34-36). Dogmatic inferences, based on the double negation, to possible pardon after death, are precarious. Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.) explains the double negation by reference to the Jewish legal doctrine that, in contrast to other sins, profaning the name of God

33. [a]Ἢ ποιήσατε τὸ δένδρον καλόν, καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ καλόν, ἢ ποιήσατε τὸ δένδρον σαπρὸν, καὶ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτοῦ σαπρόν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκεται. 34. Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν, πονηροὶ ὄντες; ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ [b]περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας τὸ στόμα λαλεῖ. 35. ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας[1] [c]ἐκβάλλει τὰ[2] ἀγαθά· καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει πονηρά. 36. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργόν, ὃ ἐὰν λαλήσωσιν[3] οἱ ἄνθρωποι, [d]ἀποδώσουσι περὶ αὐτοῦ [d]λόγον ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως. 37. ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ."

b Lk. vi. 45. Mk. viii. 8. 2 Cor. viii. 14.
c Ch. xiii. 52. Lk. x. 35 (in same sense).
d Lk. xvi. 2. Acts xix. 40. 1 Pet. iv. 5.

[1] Most uncials omit της καρδιας. It comes from Lk. (vi. 45).

[2] BD *al.* omit τα, which, however, is found in ℵCLΔΣ and retained by W.H. on the margin.

[3] For ο εαν λαλησωσιν ℵBC have ο λαλησουσιν, D λαλουσιν.

could be expiated only by death, unpardonable in *this* life. Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, says Jesus, in conscious antithesis, pardonable neither here nor there: "neque ante mortem, neque per mortem".

Vv. 33-37. *Kindred Logia.* With the word concerning blasphemy the self-defence of Jesus against Pharisaic calumny reached its culmination and probably (as in Mark's report) its close. The sentences following seem to be accretions rather than an organic part of the discourse. They substantially reproduce sayings found in Sermon on Mount (vii. 16-20), there directed against false prophets, here against false religionists.—Ver. 35 is found in Luke's version of the Sermon (vi. 45). They might have been remarks made to the disciples about the Pharisees, as in xvi. 6, though in their present form direct address is implied (*vide* ver. 34). Their essential import is that the nature or heart of a man determines his speech and action. Given the tree, the fruit follows.—Ver. 33. **ποιήσατε = εἴπατε** (Euthy. Zig.), judge, pronounce; call both tree and fruit good, or evil; they must both be of one kind, in fact and in thought (*vide* Kypke, *ad loc.*). The reference of the adage has been much discussed: to the Pharisees or to Christ? Kypke replies: to Christ if you connect with what goes before, to the Pharisees if with what follows. As an adage the saying admits of either application. The Fathers favoured the reference to Christ, whom Meyer follows.—Ver. 34. **Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν**, *vide* iii. 7. John and Jesus agree in thinking the Pharisees a viper-brood. Both conceive them as morally hopeless. The Baptist wonders that they should come to a baptism of repentance. Jesus thinks them far on the way to final impenitence. But the point He makes here is that, being what they are, they cannot but speak evil. The poison of their nature must come out in their words.—Ver. 35. **ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄ.**: good in the sense of benignant, gracious, kindly, the extreme moral opposite of the malignant viper-nature.—**θησαυροῦ**: in ver. 34 the heart is conceived as a fountain, of which speech is the overflow, here as a treasure whose stores of thought and feeling the mouth freely distributes.—**ἐκβάλλει** suggests speech characterised by energy, passion. There was no lack of emphasis in Pharisaic comments on Jesus. They hissed out their malevolent words at Him, being not heartless but bad-hearted. But *cf.* texts referred to on margin.—Ver 36. **πᾶν ῥ. ἀργὸν**: speech being the outcome of the heart, no word is insignificant, not even that which is **ἀργόν**, ineffectual (**α, ἔργον**), insipid, "idle". It is an index of thoughtlessness if not of malice. This verse contains an important warning, whether spoken at this time or not.—Ver. 37. **ἐκ γὰρ τ. λόγων σου.** Judgment by *words* here taught; in Mt. xxv. 31-46 judgment by the presence or absence of kind deeds. No contradiction, for words are viewed as the index of a good or bad heart: bad positively, like that of the Pharisees, who spoke wickedly; bad negatively, like that of the thoughtless, who speak senselessly. On the teaching of this passage *cf.* James iii.

38. Τότε ἀπεκρίθησάν[1] τινες τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν." 39. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ [e] μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον [f] ἐπιζητεῖ· καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ, εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου. 40. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦν Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας. 41. Ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ· καὶ

e Ch. xvi. 4. Mk. viii. 38. Jas. iv. 4.
f *vide* at Ch. vi. 32.

[1] ℵBCDLΣ insert αυτω before τινες.

Vv. 38-45. *A sign asked and refused, with relative discourse* (Lk. xi. 16, 29-36). Both Matt.'s and Luke's reports convey the impression that the demand for a sign, and the enunciation of the Satanic theory as to Christ's cures of demoniacs, were synchronous. If they were the demand was impudent, hypocritical, insulting. Think of the men who could so speak of Christ's healing ministry wanting a sign that would satisfy them as to His Messianic claims!—Ver. 38. **σημεῖον**: what kind of a sign? They thought the cure of demoniacs a sign from *hell*. Elsewhere we read of their asking a sign from *heaven* (xvi. 1). From what quarter was the sign now asked to come from? Perhaps those who made the demand had no idea; neither knew nor cared. Their question really meant: these signs won't do; if you want us to believe in you you must do something else than cast out devils. The apparent respect and earnestness of the request are feigned: "teacher, we desire from *you* (emphatic position) to see a sign". It reminds one of the mock homage of the soldiers at the Passion (xxvii. 27, 31).—Ver. 39. **γενεὰ**, as in xi. 16, a moral class, "quae in omni malitia et improbitate vivit," Suicer, s. v. **γενεά**.—**μοιχαλίς**, unfaithful to God as a wife to a husband, apt description of men professing godliness but ungodly in heart.—**ἐπιζητεῖ**, hankers after, as in vi. 32; characteristic; men that have no light within crave external evidence, which given would be of no service to them. Therefore: **οὐ δοθήσεται**: it will not be given either by Jesus or by any one else. He declines, knowing it to be vain. No sign will convince them; why give one?—**εἰ μὴ**, etc.: except the sign of Jonah the prophet, which was no sign in their sense. What is referred to? But for what follows we should have said: the preaching of repentance by Jonah to the Ninevites. So Lk. xi. 30 seems to take it. Jonah preached repentance to the men of Nineveh as the only way of escape from judgment. Jesus points to that historic instance and says: Beware! Jonah was not the only prophetic preacher of repentance; but, as Nineveh is held up as a reproach to the persons addressed, to single him out was fitting.—Ver. 40 gives an entirely different turn to the reference. The verse cannot be challenged on critical grounds. If it is an interpolation it must have become an accepted part of the text before the date of our earliest copies. If it be genuine then Jesus points to His resurrection as the appropriate sign for an unbelieving generation, saying in effect: you will continue to disbelieve in spite of all I can say or do, and at last you will put me to death. But I will rise again, a sign for your confusion if not for your conversion. For opposite views on this interpretation of the sign of Jonah, *vide* Meyer *ad loc.* and Holtzmann in H.C.—Ver. 41. Application of the reference in ver. 39. The men of Nineveh are cited in condemnation of the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus. *Cf.* similar use of historic parallels in xi. 20-24.—**πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ**, more than Jonah, *cf.* ver. 6; refers either to Jesus personally as compared with Jonah, or to His ministry as compared with Jonah's. In the latter case the meaning is: there is far more in what is now going on around you to shut you up to repentance than in anything Jonah said to the men of Nineveh (so Grotius).—Ver. 41. **βασίλισσα νότου** is next pressed into the service of putting unbelievers to shame. The form **βασίλισσα** was condemned by Phryn., but Elsner cites instances from Demosthenes and other

ἰδού, πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε. 42. [g] βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν· ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν [h] περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶντος καὶ ἰδού, πλεῖον Σολομῶντος ὧδε. 43. Ὅταν δὲ τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' [i] ἀνύδρων τόπων, ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκει. 44. τότε λέγει, Ἐπιστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου,[1] ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον· καὶ ἐλθὸν εὑρίσκει [j] σχολάζοντα, [k] σεσαρωμένον καὶ

g Lk. xi. 31. Acts viii. 27. Rev. xviii. 7.
h Lk. xi. 31. Rom. x. 18. Heb. vi. 16.
i Lk. xi. 24. 2 Pet. ii. 17. Jude 12.
j 1 Cor. vii. 5 (to have leisure).
k Lk. xi. 25; xv. 8.

[1] ℵBDZ read εις τον οικον μου επιστρεψω. The reading in T. R. is assimilated to Lk. (xi. 24).

good writers. J. Alberti also (Observ. Philol.) cites an instance from Athenaus, lib. xiii. 595: βασίλισσ' ἔσει Βαβυλῶνος. The reference is to the story in 1 Kings x. and 2 Chron. ix. concerning the Queen of Sheba visiting Solomon.—ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς. Elsner quotes in illustration the exhortation of Isocrates not to grudge to go a long way to hear those who profess to teach anything useful.—πλεῖον Σ., again a claim of superiority for the present over the great persons and things of the past. On the apparent egotism of these comparisons, *vide* my *Apologetics*, p. 367; and remember that Jesus claimed superiority not merely for Himself and His work, but even for the least in the Kingdom of Heaven (xi. 11).

Vv. 43-45. *A comparison. Cf.* Lk. xi. 24-26. Formerly Jesus had likened the evil race of Pharisaic religionists to children playing in the market-place (xi. 16-19). Now He uses expelled demons to depict their spiritual condition. The similitude moves in the region of popular opinion, and gives a glimpse into the superstitions of the time. We gather from it, first, that the effects of the arts of exorcists were temporary; and, second, the popular theory to explain the facts: the demon returned because he could not find a comfortable home anywhere else. On this *vide* Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. The parable was naturally suggested by the cure of the demoniac (ver. 22).—Ver. 43. δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων: the haunts of demons, as popularly conceived, were places uninhabited by men, deserts and graveyards. The demon in Tobias viii. 3 flies to the uppermost parts of Egypt; and in Baruch iv. 35 a land desolated by fire is to become tenanted by demons.—διέρχεται ζητοῦν: the spirit keeps moving on in quest of a resting place; like a human being he feels ill at ease in the monotonous waste of sand.—οὐκ εὑρίσκει: in Luke εὑρίσκον. The change from participle to finite verb is expressive. The failure to find a resting place was an important fact, as on it depended the resolve to return to the former abode.—Ver. 44. σχολάζοντα σ. καὶ κ. = untenanted and ready for a tenant, inviting by its clean, ornamented condition. The epithets simply describe in lively pictorial manner the risk of repossession. But naturally commentators seek spiritual equivalents for them. Ornamented how? With *grace*, say some (Hilary, Chrys., Godet), with *sin*, others (Orig., Jer., Euthy., Weiss, etc.). The ornamentation must be to the taste of the tenant. And what is that? Neither for sin nor for grace, but for sin counterfeiting grace; a form of godliness without the power; sanctity which is but a mask for iniquity. The house is decorated reputedly for God's occupancy, really for the devil's.—σεσαρωμένον; σαροῦν is condemned by Phryn.; "when you hear one say σάρωσον bid him say παρακόρησον".—Ver. 45. ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα, etc. This feature is introduced to make the picture answer to the moral condition of the Pharisees as conceived by Jesus. The parable here passes out of the region of popular imagination and natural probability into a region of deeper psychological insight. Why should the demon want associates in occupancy of the house? Why not rather have it all to himself as before?—οὕτως ἔσται, etc. Ethical application. The general truth implied is: moral and religious reform may be, has been, succeeded by deeper degeneracy. The question naturally suggests itself: what is the historical range of the application? It has been answered variously. From the lawgiving till the present time (Hil., Jer.); from the exile till now (Chrys., Grotius, etc.); from the Baptist till now (Weiss, etc.). Christ gives no hint of

[l] κεκοσμημένον. 45. τότε πορεύεται καὶ [m] παραλαμβάνει μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα [n] πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ· καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. οὕτως ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ πονηρᾷ." 46. Ἔτι δὲ [1] αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις, ἰδού, ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἱστήκεισαν ἔξω, [o] ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι. 47. εἶπε δέ τις αὐτῷ, "Ἰδού, ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ἑστήκασι, ζητοῦντές σοι λαλῆσαι." [2] 48. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε τῷ εἰπόντι [3] αὐτῷ, "Τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου; καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ ἀδελφοί μου;" 49. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ [4] ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν, "Ἰδού, ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. 50. ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν."

l Lk. xi. 25. Ch. xxiii. 29 (of tombs).
m Ch. xvii. 1.
n compar. here and in Lk. xi. 26.
o Ch. xxi. 46. Mk. xii. 12. Lk. v. 18. John v. 18 (with inf. = to endeavour).

[1] ℵB omit δε (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] The whole of ver. 47 is wanting in ℵBL and is omitted by W.H. Tisch. puts it within brackets. It is an explanatory gloss.

[3] λεγοντι in ℵBDZ.

[4] ℵDΣ omit αυτου (Tisch.). BC retain it (W.H. within brackets).

what period was in His thoughts, unless we find one in the epithet μοιχαλὶς (ver. 39), which recalls prophetic charges of unfaithfulness to her Divine Husband against Israel, and points to the exile as the crisis at which she seriously repented of that sin. It is not at all likely that Christ's view was limited to the period dating from John's ministry. Moral laws need large spaces of time for adequate exemplification. The most instructive exemplification of the degeneracy described is supplied by the period from Ezra till Christ's time. With Ezra ended *material* idolatry. But from that period dates the reign of legalism, which issued in Rabbinism, a more subtle and pernicious idolatry of the *letter*, the more deadly that it wore the fair aspect of zeal for God and righteousness.

Vv. 46-50. *The relatives of Jesus* (Mk. iii. 31-35; Lk. viii. 19-21). Matthew and Mark place this incident in connection with the discourse occasioned by Pharisaic calumny. Luke gives it in a quite different connection. The position assigned it by Matthew and Mark is at least fitting, and through it one can understand the motive. Not vanity: a desire to make a parade of their influence over their famous relative on the part of mother and brethren (Chrys., Theophy., etc.), but solicitude on His account and a desire to extricate Him from trouble. This incident should be viewed in connection with the statement in Mk. iii. 21 that friends thought Jesus beside Himself. They wished to rescue Him from Himself and from men whose ill-will He had, imprudently, they probably thought, provoked.—Ver. 46. ἀδελφοὶ, brothers in the natural sense, sons of Mary by Joseph? Presumably, but an unwelcome hypothesis to many on theological grounds.—εἱστήκεισαν, pluperfect, but with sense of imperfect (Fritzsche). They had been standing by while Jesus was speaking.—ἔξω, on the outskirts of the crowd, or outside the house into which Jesus entered (Mk. iii. 19).—Ver. 47 (wanting in ℵBL) states what is implied in ver. 48 (τῷ λέγοντι), that some one reported to Jesus the presence of His relatives.—Ver. 48. τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου. One might have expected Jesus, out of delicacy, to have spoken only of His brethren, leaving the bearing of the question on His mother to be inferred. But the mention of her gave increased emphasis to the truth proclaimed. The question repels a well-meant but ignorant interference of natural affection with the sovereign claims of duty. It reveals a highly strung spirit easily to be mistaken for a morbid enthusiasm.—Ver. 49. ἐκτείνας τ. χ.: an eloquent gesture, making the words following, for those present, superfluous.—ἰδού, etc. There

a Ch. xxvii. 62. Mk. iv. 1; vi. 30; vii. 1 (with πρὸς τινα).

XIII. 1. ʼEN δὲ[1] τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ[2] τῆς οἰκίας ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· 2. καὶ a συνήχθησαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλοι πολλοί, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ[3] πλοῖον ἐμβάντα καθῆσθαι· καὶ

[1] ℵBΣ omit δε, which the ancient revisers seem to have inserted regularly as a transitional particle.

[2] ℵZ have εκ (Tisch.). B has neither εκ nor απο (W.H. omit απο and have εκ in margin).

[3] ℵBCLZΣ omit το.

are idealists, promoters of pet schemes, and religious devotees whom it would cost no effort to speak thus; not an admirable class of people. It did cost Jesus an effort, for He possessed a warm heart and unblighted natural affections. But He sacrificed natural affection on the altar of duty, as He finally sacrificed His life.—Ver. 50. Definition of spiritual kinsmanship. The highest brotherhood based on spiritual affinity.—**ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ**: a general present supposition expressed by the subjunctive with **ἂν** followed by present indicative.—**τὸ θέλημα τ. πατρός μ. τ. ἐν οὐρανοῖς**: this probably comes nearest to Christ's actual words. In such a solemn utterance He was likely to mention His Father, whose supreme claims His filial heart ever owned. Mark has "the will of God"; Luke "those who hear and do the word of God"; obviously secondary.

CHAPTER XIII. JESUS TEACHING IN PARABLES. The transition from the sultry, sombre atmosphere of chap. xii. into the calm, clear air of Christ's parabolic wisdom would be as welcome to the evangelist as it is to us. Yet even here we do not altogether escape the shadow of unbelief or spiritual insusceptibility. We read of much good seed wasted, bad seed sown among good, fish of all sorts caught in the net. The adoption of the parabolic method of teaching, indeed, had its origin in part in disappointing experiences; truths misapprehended, actions misunderstood, compelling the Teacher to fall back on natural analogies for explanation and self-defence. All the synoptists recognise the importance of this type of teaching by their formal manner of introducing the first of the group of seven parables contained in Matthew's collection. *Cf.* Mt. xiii. 3; Mk. iv. 2; Lk. viii. 4. Matthew's way of massing matter of the same kind most effectually impresses us with the significance of this feature in Christ's teaching ministry. That Jesus spoke all the seven parables grouped together in this chapter at one time is not certain or even likely. In the corresponding section Mark gives only two of the seven (*Sower* and *Mustard Seed*). Luke has the *Sower* only. The *Sower*, the *Tares*, and the *Drag net* may have formed a single discourse, as very closely connected in structure and import. Perhaps we should rather say had a place in the discourse from the boat, which seems to have been a review of the past ministry of Jesus, expressing chiefly disappointment with the result. Much besides parables would be spoken, the parables being employed to point the moral: much seed, little fruit, and yet a beginning made destined to grow; the situation to be viewed with patience and hope. Just how many of the parables reported by the evangelists were spoken then it is impossible to determine.

Vv. 1-9. *The Parable of the Sower* (Mk. iv. 1-9; Lk. viii. 4-8). Ver. 1. **ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ**. The parable stands in the same connection in Mark (not in Luke), but not as following in immediate temporal sequence. No stress should be laid on Matthew's phrase "on that day".—**ἐξελθὼν τῆς οἰκίας**: the house in which Jesus is supposed to have been when His friends sought for Him, though Matthew makes no mention of it (*vide* Mk. iii. 19).—**ἐκάθητο**: as at the teaching on the hill (v. 1), suggestive of lengthened discourse. The Teacher sat, the hearers stood.—Ver. 2. **ὄχλοι πολλοί**, great numbers of people in all the accounts, compelling the Teacher to withdraw from the shore into the sea, and, sitting in a boat, to address the people standing on the margin. Much interest, popularity of the Teacher still great, and even growing; yet He has formed a very sober estimate of its value, as the parable following shows.—Ver. 3. **ἐν παραβολαῖς**: this method of teaching was not peculiar to Jesus—it was common among Easterns—but His use of it was unique in felicity and in the

πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν [b] αἰγιαλὸν εἱστήκει. 3. καὶ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ἐν [c] παραβολαῖς, λέγων, "Ἰδού, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν. 4. καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν, ἃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν· καὶ ἦλθε[1] τὰ πετεινά, καὶ [d] κατέφαγεν αὐτά. 5. ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ [e] πετρώδη, ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν· καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλε, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος[2] γῆς· 6. ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος [f] ἐκαυματίσθη, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν, [g] ἐξηράνθη. 7. ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας, καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι, καὶ ἀπέπνιξαν[3] αὐτά. 8. ἄλλα δὲ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν, καὶ ἐδίδου καρπόν, ὃ μὲν ἑκατόν, ὃ δὲ ἑξήκοντα, ὃ δὲ τριάκοντα. 9. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν[4] ἀκουέτω." 10. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Διατί ἐν παραβολαῖς

b ver. 48. John xxi. 4. Acts xxi. 5; xxvii. 39, 49.
c frequent in Gospp. and in Heb. ix. 9; xi. 19.
d Lk. xv. 30. John ii. 17.
e ver. 20. Mk. iv. 5, 16.
f Mk. iv. 6. Rev. xvi. 8, 9.
g Ch. xxi. 19, 20. John xv. 6. Jas. i. 11.

[1] B has **ελθοντα τα πετεινα κατεφαγεν**, which W.H. put in the text, placing **ηλθον τ. π. και** in the margin.

[2] B has **της** before **γης**.

[3] ℵD have **επνιξαν** (Tisch.). BCZΣ *al.* and many min. have **απεπνιξαν** (W.H. with **επνιξαν** in margin).

[4] ℵBL omit **ακουειν**, which comes from parall.

importance of the lessons conveyed. Abstract *a priori* definitions of the word serve little purpose; we learn best what a parable is, in the mouth of Jesus, by studying the parables He spoke. Thence we gather that to speak in parables means to use the familiar in nature or in human life (in the form of a narrative or otherwise) to embody unfamiliar truths of the spiritual world.

Vv. 3-9. *The Parable.*—Ver. 3. **ὁ σπείρων**: either **ὁ** generic, or the Sower of my story.—**τοῦ σπείρειν**: the infinitive of purpose with the genitive of article, very frequent in N. T. and in late Greek. —Ver. 4. **παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν**: not the highway, of which there were few, but the footpath, of which there were many through or between the fields.—Ver. 5. **ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη**, upon shallow ground, where the rock was near the surface (**οὐκ εἶχεν γῆν πολλήν**).—Ver. 6. **ἐκαυματίσθη**, it was scorched (by the sun) (*cf.* Rev. xvi. 8), which had made it spring earliest: promptly quickened, soon killed.—Ver. 7. **ἐπὶ τὰς ἀκάνθας**. Fritzsche prefers the reading **εἰς** because the seed fell not on thorns already sprung up, but on ground full of thorn seeds or roots. But the latter idea, which is the true one, can be expressed also by **ἐπί**.—**ἀνέβησαν**: the thorns sprang up as well as the corn, and growing more vigorously gained the upper hand.—**ἔπνιξαν**. Euthy. Zig. finds this idea in **ἀνέβησαν**, for which he gives as synonym **ὑπερίσχυσαν**.—Ver. 8. **καλήν**, genuinely good land free from all the faults of the other three: soft, deep, clean.—**ἐδίδου**, yielded. In other texts (iii. 8, 10; vii. 17) **ποιεῖν** is used.—**ἑκατόν, ἑξήκοντα, τριάκοντα**: all satisfactory; 30 good, 60 better, 100 best (Gen. xxvi. 12).—Ver. 9. **ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκ. ἀκ.** An invitation to think of the hidden meaning, or rather a hint that there was such a meaning. The description of the land in which the sower carried on his operations would present no difficulties to the hearers: the beaten paths, the rocky spots, the thorny patches were all familiar features of the fields in Palestine, and the fate of the seed in each case was in accordance with common experience. But why paint the picture? What is the moral of the story? That Jesus left them to find out.

Vv. 10-17. *The disciples ask an explanation.* There is some difficulty in forming a clear idea of this interlude. Who asked? The Twelve only, or they and others with them, as Mark states (iv. 10)? And when? Immediately after the parable was spoken, or, as was more likely, after the teaching of the day was over? The one certain point is that an explanation was asked and given.—Ver. 10. **διατί ἐν παραβολαῖς**: Matthew makes the question refer to the method of teaching, Mark and Luke to the meaning of the parables spoken. The two questions were closely connected,

λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς;" 11. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "[g]Ὅτι ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται. 12. ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται· ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει, ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 13. διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσι, καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, οὐδὲ συνιοῦσι. 14. καὶ [h]ἀναπληροῦται ἐπ'[1] αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου, ἡ λέγουσα, 'Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε· καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε. 15. [i]ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶ [j]βαρέως ἤκουσαν, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν [k]ἐκάμμυσαν· μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι, καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι, καὶ [l]ἐπιστρέψωσι, καὶ ἰάσωμαι[2] αὐτούς.' 16. Ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ

h Gal. vi. 2. Phil. ii. 20.
i Acts xxviii. 27.
j Acts xxviii. 27.
k Acts xxviii. 27.
l Mk. iv. 12. Lk. xxii. 32. Acts iii. 19; xxviii. 27 (absol. = reform).

[1] ℵBC omit επι, which may have been added by the grammarians to make the const. clearer.

[2] ιασομαι in most uncials. Reading of T.R. in XΔ.

and both doubtless in the minds of the disciples. A more serious difficulty arises in connection with Christ's answer to their question, which seems to say that He adopted the parabolic method in order to hide the truths of the kingdom from unspiritual minds. Nothing is more certain than that Jesus neither did nor could adopt any such policy, and if the evangelists ascribed it to Him then we should have no alternative but to agree with those who, like Holtzmann (H. C.) and Jülicher (*Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, pp. 131, 149, *vide* also his *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 228), maintain that the evangelists have mistaken His meaning, reading *intention* in the light of *result*. It is much better to impute a mistake to them than an inhuman purpose to Christ.

Ver. 11. **τὰ μυστήρια**: the word, as here used, might suggest the idea of a mysterious esoteric doctrine concerning the Kingdom of God to be taught only to a privileged inner circle. But the term in the N. T. means truths once hidden now revealed, made generally known, and in their own nature perfectly intelligible. So, *e.g.*, in Eph. iii. 9, Col. i. 26. Jesus desired to make the truths of the kingdom of God known to all; by parables if they could not be understood otherwise. His aim was to enlighten, not to mystify.—Ver. 12. This moral apothegm is given only in Matt. It contains a great truth, whether spoken or not on this occasion. For the construction, *vide* at x. 14.—**περισσευθήσεται**: again in Mt. xxv. 29, where the saying is repeated. This use of the passive in a neuter sense belongs to late Greek.—Ver. 13. **διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι**. Mark and Luke have **ἵνα**, the former assigning a reason, the latter ascribing a purpose. In Matt. Jesus says: I speak in parables because seeing they do not see, etc.; which ought naturally to mean: they are dull of apprehension, therefore I do my best to enlighten them.—Vv. 14, 15. The prophetic citation, given by Matthew only, may be due to him, though put into the mouth of Jesus. It is conceivable, however, that Jesus might use Isaiah's words in Isaiah's spirit, *i.e.*, ironically, expressing the bitter feeling of one conscious that his best efforts to teach his countrymen would often end in failure, and in his bitterness representing himself as sent to stop ears and blind eyes. Such utterances are not to be taken as deliberate dogmatic teaching. If, as some allege, the evangelists so took them, they failed to understand the mind of the Master. The quotation exactly follows the Sept. The verb **καμμύω** (ver. 15, **ἐκάμμυσαν**) is condemned by Phryn. as barbarous, the right word being **καταμύειν**.—Vv. 16, 17. In Mk. (iv. 13) Jesus reproaches the disciples for their ignorance; here He congratulates them on their faculty of seeing and hearing (spiritually).—**ὑμῶν**: in emphatic position, suggesting contrast between disciples and the multitude.—**μακάριοι**, *vide* on chap. v. 3.—**ὅτι βλ.**, because, not for *what*, they see.—**ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω**: introducing an important statement.—**προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι**, same

ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσι· καὶ τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν,[1] ὅτι ἀκούει.[2] 17. ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε, καὶ οὐκ εἶδον· καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν. 18. Ὑμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπείροντος.[3] 19. Παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας καὶ μὴ συνιέντος, ἔρχεται ὁ πονηρός, καὶ [m] ἁρπάζει τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν σπαρείς. 20. Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, καὶ εὐθὺς μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνων

m Acts viii. 39.

[1] B omits υμων (bracketed in W.H.).

[2] ακουουσι in ℵBCDXΣ. ακουει a grammatical correction (neut. pl. nom. ωτα).

[3] σπειραντος in ℵBX. σπειροντος conforms to ver. 3.

combination as in x. 41. The felicity now consists in the things seen and heard. The perceiving senses and the things to be perceived imply each other, neither by themselves yield enjoyment. This passage is given by Lk. (x. 23, 24) in a more suitable connection (report on their mission by the Seventy). Here it creates an exaggerated impression as to the extent of the new departure. The parabolic teaching of Jesus, as exemplified in the Sower and other parables here collected, was not an absolutely new feature. He had always been speaking more or less in parables ("Fishers of Men," iv. 19; "Salt of the Earth," "City on a Hill," v. 13, 14; "Two Builders," vii. 24-27; "Whole need not a Physician," ix. 12; "New Garment and New Wine," ix. 16, 17, etc.). Some of the parables in this connection, the *Treasure* and the *Pearl*, *e.g.*, may be gems preserved from some otherwise forgotten synagogue discourses, say those delivered in the preaching tour through Galilee.

Vv. 18-23. *Interpretation of the Sower* (Mk. iv. 14-20; Lk. viii. 11-15). Ver. 18. **ὑμεῖς**, emphatic, ye privileged ones.—**οὖν** referring to the happiness on which they have been congratulated.—Ver. 16. **ἀκούσατε τ. π.**: not, hear it over again, but, what it means.—**σπείραντος**, aorist, of the man who sowed in the story just told.—Ver. 19. **παντὸς ἀκούοντος**, in the case of any one who hears, "for the classical **ἐάν τις ἀκούσῃ**" (Camb. G. T.). It may be a case of interrupted construction, the sentence beginning with the intention to make the genitive dependent on an **ἐκ τῆς καρδίας** before **ἁρπάζει** (so Weiss).—**τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας**: the *Sower*, unlike the other parables in this chapter, contains no hint that it concerns the kingdom. But in Christ's discourses that almost went without saying.—**μὴ συνιέντος**: "not taking it in," a phrase which happily combines the physical fact of the parable with the figurative sense.—**ὁ πονηρός**, the evil one, Satan, represented by the innocent birds of the parable. What a different use of the emblem from that in vi. 26!—**ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ**: we should hardly say of truth not understood that it had been sown in the *heart*. But heart is used in Scripture in a wide sense, as the seat of intellect as well as of feeling. The word in the case supposed is in the mind, as the seed is in the ground: on it, if not in it; in it as words, if not as truth.—**οὗτός ἐστιν**, etc., this is he sown, etc., said of the man, not of the seed. Sign and thing signified identified, *cf.* "this is my body". Properly, the seed sown, etc., represents the case of such a man. So throughout the interpretation.—Ver. 20. **μετὰ χαρᾶς λ.**: this is the new feature in the second type added to the hearing of the first; hearing and receiving with joy characteristic of quick emotional shallow natures, but not of them only. Deep earnest natures also have joy in truth found, but with a difference.—**οὐκ ἔχει**: instead of the participle **ἔχων** under the influence of Mk.'s text (Weiss).—**πρόσκαιρος**, temporary, *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 18.—Ver. 22. **ἀκούων**, hearing alone predicated of the third type, but receiving both intellectually and emotionally implied; everything necessary present except purity of heart, singleness of mind. Hearing is to be taken here in a pregnant sense as distinct from the hearing that is no hearing (ver. 13).—**μέριμνα τ. α. ἀπάτη τ. π.**: together = worldliness. Lust for money and care go together and between them spoil many an earnest religious nature.—**ἄκαρπος** may refer either to the man

αὐτόν· 21. οὐκ ἔχει δὲ ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλὰ [n] πρόσκαιρός ἐστι· γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον, εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται. 22. Ὁ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων, καὶ ἡ [o] μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου[1] καὶ ἡ [p] ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται. 23. Ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν[2] σπαρείς, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν λόγον ἀκούων καὶ συνιών[3]· ὃς [q] δὴ καρποφορεῖ, καὶ ποιεῖ ὁ[4] μὲν ἑκατόν, ὁ δὲ ἑξήκοντα, ὁ δὲ τριάκοντα."

n Mk. iv. 17. 2 Cor. iv. 18. Heb. xi. 25.
o Lk. viii. 14; xxi. 34. 2 Cor. xi. 28.
p Mk. iv. 19. Eph. iv. 22. Col. ii. 8. 2 Thess. ii. 10. Heb. iii. 13. 2 Pet. ii. 13 (?).
q here and in Lk. ii. 15. Acts xiii. 2; xv. 36. 1 Cor. vi. 20. 2 Cor. xii. 1 (?). Heb. ii. 16 (with πον).

[1] ℵBD omit τουτου, which is an explanatory addition of the scribes.

[2] ℵBCLΔΣ have επι την καλην γην instead of the reading in T.R., which echoes ver. 8.

[3] συνιεις in ℵBD.

[4] *Vide* below.

(Meyer) or to the word (λόγον just before; Bengel, Weiss); sense the same. There is fruit in this case; the crop does not wither in the blade: it reaches the green ear, but it never ripens.—Ver. 23. **ἀκούων καὶ συνιείς.** The specific feature of the fourth and alone satisfactory type is not brought out either in Mt. or in Mk. but only in Lk. by his happy phrase: **ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ.** The third type understands (Mt.) and receives into the heart (Mk.), but the fourth in addition receives into a clean, *i.e.*, a "good and honest," heart.—**ὃς δή**: **δή** occurs here for the first time in Mt., and only a few times altogether in the N. T., but always with marked expressiveness. According to Passow and Baümlein (*Grammatik*, § 669, and *Untersuchungen über G. Partikeln*, p. 98), connected with **δῆλος** in origin and meaning, and signifying that the thing stated is clear, specially important, natural in the given circumstances.—**ὃς δή** here = who, observe, or of course. Given such conditions, fruitfulness certainly results. — **καρποφορεῖ**, bringeth forth fruit such as is desired: ripe, useful.—**ὁ** in last clause may be pointed either **ὁ μὲν, ὁ δὲ** (T. R.) or **ὃ μὲν, ὃ δὲ** (W. H.). In the former case the meaning is: this man brings forth 100 fold, that man, etc.; in the latter, **ὃ** is accusative neuter after **ποιεῖ**, and refers to the fruit. Opinion very much divided, sense the same.

This interpretation of the *Sower* raises two questions: Was it needed? Does it really explain the parable? which is in effect to ask: Does it proceed from Jesus? As to the former: could not even the general hearer, not to speak of the Twelve, understand the parable well enough? True, no hint that it related to the kingdom was given, but, as already remarked, that might go without saying. Jesus had all along been using similitudes explaining His meaning rather than needing explanation. Then parabolic speech was common even in Rabbinical circles, a source at once of entertainment and of light to hearers. In Mt.'s report the disciples do not even ask an explanation, so that that given comes on us as a surprise (Holtz. in H. C.). Christ's audience might at least carry away the general impression that He was dissatisfied with the result of His ministry, in many cases in which His teaching seemed to Him like seed cast on unproductive places. It might require further reflection, more than the majority were capable of, to comprehend the reasons of failure. Self-knowledge and observation of character were needed for this. As to the interpretation given, it has been objected (Weiss, Jülicher, etc.) that it is allegorical in method, and that, while going into details as to the various persons and things mentioned in the parable and their import, it fails to give the one main lesson which it, like every parable, is designed to teach; in short, that we cannot see the wood for the trees. As to this it may be remarked: (1) There is a tangible difference between allegory and parable. Allegory and interpretation answer to each other part by part; parable and interpretation answer to each other as wholes. (2) Christ's parables are for the most part not allegories. (3) It does not follow that none of them can be. Why should the use of allegory be interdicted to Him?

24. [w]Ἄλλην παραβολὴν [r]παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ σπείροντι[1] καλὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ· 25. ἐν δὲ τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρὸς καὶ ἔσπειρε[2] ζιζάνια [s]ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σίτου, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν.

r again ver. 31.
s Mk. vii. 31. Rev. vii. 17.

[1] ℵBMXΔΠΣ have σπειραντι.

[2] Bℵ[b] it. vg. several cursives have the compound επεσπειρεν (Tisch., W.H.).

May the Sower not be an exception? That it is has been ably argued by Feine in *Jahrbücher für Prot. Theologie*, 1888, *q. v.* (4) The exclusion of so-called allegorising interpretation may be carried to a pedantic extreme in connection with all the parables, as it is, indeed, in my opinion, especially by Weiss. Thus we are told that in the saying "the whole need not a physician," Jesus did not mean to suggest that He was a physician but only to hint the special claims of a class on His attention. But the question may be asked in every case: What was the genesis of the parable? How did it grow in Christ's mind? The Sower, *e.g.*? Was it not built up of likenesses spontaneously suggesting themselves now and then; of Himself to a sower, and of various classes of hearers to different kinds of soil? In that case the "allegorical" interpretation is simply an analysis of the parable into its genetic elements, which, on that view, have more than the merely descriptive value assigned to them by Weiss. (5) As to missing the main lesson amid details: is it not rather given, Eastern fashion, through the details: the preaching of the kingdom not always successful, failure due to the spiritual condition of hearers? That is how we Westerns, in our abstract generalising way, put it. The Orientals conveyed the general through concrete particulars. Jesus did not give an abstract definition of the Fatherhood of God. He defined it by the connections in which He used the title Father. That Jesus talked to His disciples about the various sorts of hearers, their spiritual state, and what they resembled, I think intrinsically likely. It is another question whether His interpretation has been exactly reproduced by any of the Synoptists.

Vv. 24-30. *The Tares.* This parable has some elements in common with that in Mk. iv. 26-29, whence the notion of many critics that one of the two has been formed from the other. As to which is the original, opinion is much divided. (*Vide* Holtz., H. C.) *Both*, I should say. The resemblance is superficial, the lesson entirely different. The *Sower* describes past experiences; the *Tares* is prophetic of a future state of things. But may it not be a creation of apostolic times put into the mouth of Jesus? No, because (1) it is too original and wise, and (2) there were beginnings of the evil described even in Christ's lifetime. Think of a Judas among the Twelve, whom Jesus treated on the principle laid down in the parable, letting him remain among the disciples till the last crisis. It may have been his presence among the Twelve that suggested the parable.

Ver. 24. **παρέθηκεν**, again in ver. 31, usually of food, here of parable as a mental entertainment; used with reference to *laws* in Ex. xxi. 1, Deut. iv. 44.—**ὡμοιώθη**, aorist used proleptically for the future; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 28.—**ἀνθρώπῳ**, likened to *a man*, inexactly, for: "to the experience of a man who," etc., natural in a popular style.—**σπείραντι**, aorist because the seed had been sown when the event of the parable took place.—**καλὸν**, good, genuine, without mixture of other seeds.—Ver. 25. **ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν** = during the night.—**ὁ. ὁ. ἐχθρὸς**, his enemy. Weiss (Matt.-Evang., 347) thinks this feature no part of the original parable, but introduced to correspond with the interpretation (ver. 39), no enemy being needed to account for the appearance of the "tares," which might grow then as now from seed lying dormant in the ground. Christ's parables usually comply with the requirements of natural probability, but sometimes they have to depart from them to make the parable answer to the spiritual fact; *e.g.*, when all the invited are represented as refusing to come to the feast (Lk. xiv. 16-24). The appearance of the "tares" might be made a preternatural phenomenon out of regard to the perfect purity of the seed, and the great abundance of bad men in a holy society. A few scattered stalks might spring up in a natural way, but whence so many?—**ἐπέσπειρεν**, deliberately sowed *over* the wheat seed as thickly as if no other seed were there.

t Mk. iv. 27. Heb. ix. 4. Jas. v. 18. 26. ὅτε δὲ ^t^ἐβλάστησεν ὁ χόρτος, καὶ καρπὸν ἐποίησε, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια. 27. προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου εἶπον αὐτῷ, Κύριε, οὐχὶ καλὸν σπέρμα ἔσπειρας ἐν τῷ σῷ ἀγρῷ; πόθεν οὖν ἔχει τὰ[1] ζιζάνια; 28. Ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς, Ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. οἱ δὲ δοῦλοι εἶπον αὐτῷ,[2] Θέλεις οὖν ἀπελθόντες συλλέξωμεν αὐτά; 29. Ὁ δὲ ἔφη,[3] Οὔ· μήποτε συλλέγοντες τὰ ζιζάνια, ^u^ἐκριζώσητε ἅμα αὐτοῖς τὸν σῖτον. 30. ἄφετε συναυξάνεσθαι ἀμφότερα μέχρι[4] τοῦ θερισμοῦ· καὶ ἐν τῷ[5] καιρῷ τοῦ θερισμοῦ ἐρῶ τοῖς ^v^θερισταῖς, Συλλέξατε πρῶτον τὰ ζιζάνια, καὶ δήσατε αὐτὰ εἰς[6] ^w^δέσμας πρὸς τὸ κατακαῦσαι αὐτά· τὸν δὲ σῖτον συναγάγετε[7] εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην μου."

u Ch. xv. 13. Lk. xvii. 6. Jude 12.
v here and in ver. 39.
w here and in Exod. xii. 22.

[1] The art. τα in T.R. (ℵLX) is wanting in ℵbBCD *al.*

[2] B omits δουλοι (W.H.) and BC have αυτω λεγουσιν for ειπον αυτω (T.R.). ℵD have λεγ. αυτω (Tisch.).

[3] φησιν in ℵBC.

[4] BD have εως, which W.H. adopt, putting αχρι and μεχρι in margin.

[5] τω (in ℵCL) is omitted in most uncials.

[6] εις omitted in LXΔ and bracketed in W.H.

[7] B has συναγετε (W.H. with συναγαγετε in margin).

—ζιζάνια = bastard wheat, darnel, *lolium temulentum*, common in Palestine (Furrer, *Wanderungen*, p. 293), perhaps a Semitic word. Another name for the plant in Greek is αἶρα (Suidas, Lex.).—Ver. 26. τότε ἐφάνη, not distinguishable in the blade, not till it reached the ear, then easily so by the form, the ear branching out with pickles on each twig (Koetsveld, *De Gelijk.*, p. 25).—Ver. 27. οὐχὶ κ. σ. ἔσπειρας, etc.: the surprise of the work people arises from the extent of the wild growth, which could not be explained by bad seed (with so careful a master) or natural growth out of an unclean soil. The tares were all over the field.—Ver. 28. ἐχθρὸς ἄν.: an inference from the state of the field—fact not otherwise or previously known.—θέλεις . . . συλλέξωμεν, deliberative subjunctive in 1st person with θέλεις, 2nd person; no ἵνα used in such case (Burton, M. and T., § 171). The servants propose to do what was ordinarily done, and is done still (*vide* Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 426, and Furrer, *Wanderungen*, 293: "men, women and children were in many fields engaged in pulling the weeds," in which he includes "den Lolch"). — Ver. 29. οὔ, emphatic; laconic "no," for good reason.—μήποτε: the risk is that wheat and "tares" may be uprooted together.—ἅμα, with dative (αὐτοῖς) but not a preposition, the full phrase is ἅμα σὺν: "at the same time with," as in 1 Thess. iv. 17, v. 10. On this word *vide* Bos, *Ellip. Graec.*, p. 463, and Klotz, *Devar.*, ii. 97. The roots being intertwined, and having a firm hold of the soil, both wheat and tares might be pulled up together. —Ver. 30. Συλλέξατε πρῶτον: before or after cutting down the crop? Not said which; order of procedure immaterial, for now the wheat is *ripe*.—δήσατε εἰς δέσμας; the εἰς, omitted in some MSS., is not necessary before a noun of same meaning with the verb. Fritzsche thinks the expression without preposition more elegant. Meyer also omits, with appeal to Kühner on verbs with double accusatives.—This parable embodies the great principle of bad men being tolerated for the sake of the good. It relegates to the end the judgment which the contemporaries of Jesus, including the Baptist, expected at the beginning of the Messianic kingdom (Weiss-Meyer).

Vv. 31-35. *The Mustard Seed and the Leaven* (Lk. xiii. 18-21 (both); Mk. iv. 30-32 (Mustard Seed)). A couplet of brief parables of brighter tone than the two already considered, predicting great extensive and intensive development of the Kingdom of God; from Luke's narrative (xiii. 10), apparently part of a synagogue discourse. It is intrinsically probable that Jesus in all His addresses

31. Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν [x] κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ· 32. ὃ μικρότερον μέν ἐστι πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων· ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ, μεῖζον τῶν [y] λαχάνων ἐστί, καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ὥστε ἐλθεῖν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ [z] κατασκηνοῦν[1] ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ."

33. Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν [a] ζύμῃ, ἣν [b] λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία, ἕως οὗ [c] ἐζυμώθη ὅλον."

34. Ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν παραβολαῖς τοῖς ὄχλοις, καὶ χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐκ[2] ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς· 35. ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, "Ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου· ἐρεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.[3]

x Ch. xvii. 20. Lk. xvii. 6 (same phrase). John xii. 24. 1 Cor. xv. 37 (the word).
y Mk. iv. 32. Lk. xi. 42. Rom. xiv. 2.
z parall. Acts ii. 26 (Ps. ciii. (iv.) 12).
a Ch. xvi. 12. Ch. xvi. 6, 11. Mk. viii. 15. Lk. xii. 1 (fig.). 1 Cor. v. 6. Gal. v. 9 (proverbially).
b same use of word in ver. 31.
c 1 Cor. v. 6. Gal. v. 9.

[1] κατασκηνοιν in BD.

[2] ουδεν in ℵBCΔ; ουκ in Mk. iv. 34, hence here in T.R.

[3] B (and ℵb) omits κοσμου. So Tisch., W.H. *al.* Weiss suggests that the omission in B is an oversight.

in the synagogue and to the people used more or less the parabolic method. To this extent it may be literally true that "without a parable spake He not unto them" (ver. 34).

Ver. 31. **σινάπεως**: from **σίναπι**, late for **νάπυ** in Attic, which Phryn. recommends to be used instead (Lobeck, 288).—Ver. 32. **ὃ**, neuter, by attraction of **σπερμάτων**, instead of **ὃν** in agreement with **κόκκῳ**, masculine. — **μικρότερον**, not less perhaps than all the seeds in the world. An American correspondent sent me a sample of the seeds of the *cotton tree*, which he thinks Christ would have made the basis of His parable had He spoken it in America.—**μεῖζον τῶν λαχάνων**, greater than (all) the *herbs*. The comparison implies that it too is an herb. There would be no point in the statement that a plant of the nature of a tree grew to be greater than all garden herbs. This excludes the mustard tree, called *Salvadora Persica*, to which some have thought the parable refers.—**δένδρον**, not in nature but in size; an excusable exaggeration in a popular discourse. Koetsveld remarks on the greatly increased growth attained by a plant springing from a single seed with plenty of room all round it (*De Gelijk.*, p. 50).—**ὥστε** here indicates at once tendency and result, large enough to make that possible, and it actually happened. The birds haunted the plant like a tree or shrub. Mark refers only to the possibility (iv. 32).—**κατασκηνοῦν** (*cf.* **κατασκηνώσεις**, viii. 20), not *nidulari*, to make nests (Erasmus), but to "lodge," as in A. V. The mustard plant is after all of humble size, and gives a very modest idea of the growth of the kingdom. But it serves admirably to express the thought of a growth *beyond expectation*. Who would expect so tiny a seed to produce such a large herb, a monster in the garden?—Ver. 33. **ὁμοία . . . ζύμῃ**, like in respect of pervasive influence. In Rabbinical theology leaven was used as an emblem of evil desire (Weber, p. 221). Jesus had the courage to use it as an emblem of the best thing in the world, the Kingdom of God coming into the heart of the individual and the community.—**ἐνέκρυψεν**, hid by the process of kneading.—**ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη**: **ἕως** with the indicative, referring to an actual past occurrence.

Both these parables show how thoroughly Jesus was aware that great things grow from minute beginnings. How different His idea of the coming of the kingdom from the current one of a glorious, mighty empire coming suddenly, full grown! Instead of that a mustard seed, a little leaven!

Vv. 34, 35 contain a reflection more suitable for the close of the collection of parables in this chapter, brought in here apparently because the evangelist has

36. Τότε ἀφεὶς τοὺς ὄχλους, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ὁ Ἰησοῦς[1]· καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες, "Φράσον[2] ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολὴν τῶν ζιζανίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ." 37. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[3] "Ὁ σπείρων τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· 38. ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος· τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα, οὗτοί [d] εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας· τὰ δὲ ζιζάνιά εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ· 39. ὁ δὲ ἐχθρὸς ὁ σπείρας αὐτά ἐστιν ὁ διάβολος· ὁ δὲ θερισμὸς [e] συντέλεια τοῦ[4] αἰῶνός ἐστιν· οἱ δὲ θερισταὶ ἄγγελοί εἰσιν. 40. ὥσπερ οὖν συλλέγεται τὰ ζιζάνια, καὶ πυρὶ κατακαίεται οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου.[5] 41. ἀποστελεῖ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ, καὶ συλλέξουσιν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ [f] σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν, 42. καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν [g] κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ

d same phrase in Ch. viii. 12.
e ver. 49. Ch. xxiv. 3; xxviii. 20. Heb. ix. 26
f Ch. xvi. 23; xviii. 7. Rom. xiv. 13.
g Rev. i. 15; ix. 2.

[1] ℵBD omit ο Ι. [2] ℵB have διασαφησον. φρασον probably comes from xv. 15.
[3] ℵBD omit αυτοις. [4] ℵBD omit του. [5] ℵBD omit τουτου.

under his eye Mark's narrative, in which a similar reflection is attached to the parable of the mustard seed (iv. 33-34).—Ver. 34. **χωρὶς παραβολῆς**, etc.: if this remark apply to Christ's popular preaching generally, then the parables reported, like the healing narratives, are only a small selection from a large number, a fragrant posy culled from the flower garden of Christ's parabolic wisdom.—**ἐλάλει**: imperfect, pointing to a regular practice, not merely to a single occasion.—Ver. 35. Prophetic citation from Ps. lxxviii. 2, suggested by **παραβολαῖς** in Sept., second clause, free translation from Hebrew.—**ἐρεύξομαι** in Sept. for הַבִּיעַ in Ps. xix. 2, etc. (not in lxxviii. 2), a poetic word in Ionic form, bearing strong, coarse meaning; used in softened sense in Hellenistic Greek. Chief value of this citation: a sign that the parabolic teaching of Jesus, like His healing ministry, was sufficiently outstanding to call for recognition in this way.

Vv. 36-43. *Interpretation of the Tares.* Not in Apostolic Document; style that of evangelist; misses the point of the parable—so Weiss (Matt.-Evang., p. 351). But if there was *any* private talk between Jesus and the Twelve as to the meaning of His parables, this one was sure to be the subject of conversation. It is more abstruse than the *Sower*, its lesson deeper, the fact it points to more mysterious. The interpretation given may of course be very freely reproduced.—Ver. 36. **φράσον** (**διασαφησον** ℵB) again in xv. 15: observe the unceremonious style of the request, indicative of intimate familiar relations. Hesychius gives as equivalents for **φράζει, δεικνύει, σημαίνει, λέγει**, etc.—**διασαφ.** in Deut. i. 5 = make clear, a stronger expression.—Ver. 37. **ὁ σπείρων**: identified here with the *Son of man* (not so in interpretation of *Sower*).—**ὁ κόσμος**, the wide world; universalism.—Ver. 38. **σπέρμα**, not the word this time, but the children of the kingdom.—**ζιζάνια**, the sons of the wicked one (**τοῦ πονηροῦ**, the devil).—Ver. 39. **συντέλεια αἰῶνος**, the end of the world; phrase peculiar to this Gospel.—**θερισταὶ ἄγγελοι.** Weiss thinks this borrowed from Mt. xxiv. 31, and certainly not original. Perhaps not as a dogmatic interpretation, but quite possibly as a poetic suggestion.—Ver. 40. This and the following verses enlarge on the final separation.—Ver. 41. **ἀποστελεῖ**: *cf.* chap. xxiv. 31.—**συλλέξουσιν**, collect, and so separate.—**τὰ σκάνδαλα**: abstract for concrete; those who create stumbling blocks for others.—**καὶ**, epexegetical, not introducing a distinct class, but explaining how the class already referred to cause others to stumble.—**ποιοῦντας τ. ἀνομίαν**: *cf.* vii. 23, where for **ποι.** stands **ἐργαζόμενοι**. Has **ἀνομίαν** here the technical sense of religious libertinism, or the general sense of moral transgression? Assuming the former alternative, some critics find here the sign-mark of a later apostolic time.—Ver. 42. **ἐκεῖ ἔσται**, etc.: held to be inappropriate

βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. 43. τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν. Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν[1] ἀκουέτω.

44. "Πάλιν[2] ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, ὃν εὑρὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔκρυψε, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ ὑπάγει, καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει πωλεῖ,[3] καὶ ἀγοράζει τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκεῖνον.

45. "Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ[4] [h]ἐμπόρῳ, ζητοῦντι καλοὺς μαργαρίτας· 46. ὃς εὑρὼν[5] ἕνα [i]πολύτιμον μαργαρίτην, ἀπελθὼν πέπρακε πάντα ὅσα εἶχε, καὶ ἠγόρασεν αὐτόν.

[h] Rev. xvii. (4 times).
[i] John xii. 3. 1 Pet. i. 7 (compar.). Cf. Ch. xxvi. 7 (βαρυτ.).

[1] ℵB omit ακουειν.

[2] BD omit παλιν.

[3] πωλει before παντα in ℵD. B gives πωλει the same position but omits παντα. So W.H. with παντα in margin.

[4] ℵB omit. W.H. relegate to margin.

[5] ευρων δε in ℵBDL verss. (Tisch., W.H.).

here, because the gnashing of teeth is caused by *cold*, not by fire (Holtz., H. C.); appropriate in viii. 12, where the doom is rejection into the outer darkness.—Ver. 43. **ἐκλάμψουσι**: *vide* Dan. xii. 2, which seems to be in view; an expressive word suggestive of the sun emerging from behind a cloud. The mixture of good and evil men in this world hides the characters of both.

Vv. 44-53. *Three other parables: the Treasure, the Pearl, the Net*. Ver. 36 would seem to imply that the evangelist took these as spoken only to disciples in the house. But as the *Net* is closely connected in meaning with the *Tares*, it is more probable that these parables also are extracts from popular discourses of Jesus, which, like all the others, would gain greatly if seen in their original setting. The *Treasure* and the *Pearl* would have their fitting place in a discourse on the kingdom of God as the *highest good* (Mt. vi. 33).—Ver. 44. **ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ**: the article may be generic, indicating the field as the locality, as distinct from other places where treasures were deposited.—**ἔκρυψε**, he hid once more what some one had previously hidden; the occurrence common, the occasions various.—**χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ**, in his joy rather than through joy over it, as many take the genitive, though both are admissible. The joy natural in a poor peasant; not less so the cunning procedure it inspired; ethically questionable, but parables are not responsible for the morality of their characters.—**ὑπάγει, πωλεῖ**, etc., four historic presents one after the other, in sympathy with the finder, and with lively effect.—**πάντα ὅσα** all required for the purpose, yet the all might not amount to much: the field minus the treasure of no great value. Worth while, the treasure being a pure gain. The point of the parable is that the kingdom of heaven outweighs in value all else, and that the man who understands this will with pleasure part with all. It helps to show the reasonableness of the sacrifice for the kingdom Jesus demanded.

Ver. 45. **ἐμπόρῳ ζ. κ. μ.** A pearl merchant who went to the pearl fisheries to purchase from the divers, of course selecting the best; a connoisseur in valuables.—Ver. 46. **πολύτιμον**: precious because exceptionally large, well-shaped, and pure; such rare, but met with now and then.—**ἀπελθὼν**: he is taken by surprise, has not as much with him as will purchase it on the spot, sees it is worth his whole stock, agrees to buy and promises to return with the price.—**πέπρακε, ἠγόρασεν**, a perfect with an aorist. Not to be disposed of by saying that the former is an "aoristic" perfect (Burton, § 88).—**πέπρακε** points to a momentous step, taken once for all and having lasting effects. A great venture, a risky speculation. The treasure in the field was a sure gain for the finder, but it remained to be seen what the pearl merchant would get for his one pearl. After the sale of his stock the purchase of the one pearl was a matter of course. In the former of

j here only in N.T.

k here only. *Vide* Lk. x. 34 (επιβιβ.).

l here only (ἀγγεῖον. Ch. xxv. 4), *vide* critical note 1.

m *vide* below and at Ch. xxvii. 57.

47. "Πάλιν ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν σαγήνῃ βληθείσῃ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ· 48. ἥν, ὅτε ἐπληρώθη, [k] ἀναβιβάσαντες ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν, καὶ καθίσαντες, συνέλεξαν τὰ καλὰ εἰς [l] ἀγγεῖα,[1] τὰ δὲ σαπρὰ ἔξω ἔβαλον· 49. οὕτως ἔσται ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος· ἐξελεύσονται οἱ ἄγγελοι, καὶ ἀφοριοῦσι τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκ μέσου τῶν δικαίων, 50. καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων." 51. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[2] "Συνήκατε ταῦτα πάντα;" 52. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Ναί, κύριε."[2] Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Διὰ τοῦτο πᾶς γραμματεὺς [m] μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν[3] τῶν οὐρανῶν ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά."

[1] **αγγη** in ℵBC. [2] ℵBD omit **λεγει α. ο. Ι.**, also **κυριε** after **ναι**.
[3] ℵBCΣ have **τη βασιλεια**. The reading in T.R. is a grammatical correction.

these two parables the Kingdom of Heaven appears as the object of a glad though accidental finding of a sure possession; in the latter as the object of *systematic quest* and *venturesome faith*. The difference between seekers and finders must not be exaggerated. The pearl merchant was also a finder. No one would set out on a journey to seek one unique pearl (Koetsveld). The spiritual class he represents are seekers after God and wisdom, finders of the Kingdom of God, of a good beyond their hope. Such seekers, however, are on the sure way to find.

Vv. 47-50. *The Net.* **σαγήνῃ**, *vide* on iv. 21.—**ἐκ παντὸς γένους συν.**: a matter of course, not intended but inevitable; large movements influence all sorts of people.—Ver. 48. **καθίσαντες συνέλεξαν**: equally a matter of course; a thing to be done deliberately, of which the sitting attitude is an emblem. There is a time for everything; the time for sorting is at the end of the fishing.—**σαπρὰ**, *vide* on vii. 17. Vv. 49, 50 contain the interpretation in much the same terms as in 41, 42.

Vv. 51, 52. *Conclusion of the parabolic collection.*—Ver. 52 contains an important logion of Jesus preserved by Matthew only, and connected by him with the parabolic teaching of Jesus. In this connection **καινὰ καὶ παλαιά** of course points to the use of the old familiar facts of nature to illustrate newly revealed truths of the kingdom. But we should not bind ourselves too strictly to this connection, keeping in mind Matthew's habit of grouping; all the more that, as Wendt has pointed out (*Die Lehre Jesu*, ii. 349), the idea expressed by **γραμματεὺς** does not get justice. It naturally points to acquaintance with the O. T., and combined with **μαθητευθεὶς ε. τ. β.** teaches that that knowledge may be usefully united with discipleship in the lore of the kingdom. In Wendt's words: "One remains in possession of the old, recognised as of permanent value, yet is not restricted to it, but along with it possesses a precious new element".—**μαθητεύειν** is here used transitively as in xxviii. 19, Acts xiv. 21.—**ἐκβάλλει** points to free distribution of treasures by the householder. He gives out new or old according to the nature of the article. The mere scribe, Rabbinical in spirit, produces only the old and stale. The disciple of the kingdom, like the Master, is always fresh-minded, yet knows how to value all old spiritual treasures of Holy Writ or Christian tradition.

Vv. 53-58. *Visit to Nazareth* (Mk. vi. 1-6, *cf.* Lk. iv. 16-30). In Mk. this is the next section after the parables, deducting what had previously been reported in Mt. (chaps. viii. and ix.), a pretty sure sign that our evangelist has Mk. under his eye. We can here see how he handles his source—substantial reproduction of the contents, no slavish copying of style, editorial discretion in reporting certain details. No attempt should be made to connect with the foregoing passage, except perhaps by

53. Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας, μετῆρεν ἐκεῖθεν· 54. καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν [a] πατρίδα αὐτοῦ, ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν, ὥστε ἐκπλήττεσθαι[1] αὐτοὺς καὶ λέγειν, "Πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὕτη καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις; 55. οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός; οὐχὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ λέγεται Μαριάμ, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωσῆς[2] καὶ Σίμων καὶ Ἰούδας; 56. καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ οὐχὶ πᾶσαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσι; πόθεν οὖν τούτῳ ταῦτα πάντα; 57. Καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης [o] ἄτιμος, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ[3] καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ." 58. Καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλάς, διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν.

n here and in Mk. parall. Lk. iv. 23, 24. John iv. 44. Heb. xi. 14.

o Mk. vi. 4. 1 Cor. iv. 10; xii. 23.

[1] εκπλησσ. in most uncials.

[2] Ιωσηφ in BCΣ. Ιωσης is probably from Mk.

[3] BD omit αυτου. ℵZ have ιδια before πατριδι, which Tisch. and W.H. place in margin.

the general category of prevalent unreceptivity to which also the following narrative (xiv. 1-12) may be relegated.—Ver. 53. μετῆρεν: in classics to transfer something from one place to another. Hellenistic, intransitive = to remove oneself; one of Matthew's words (xix. 1).—Ver. 54. πατρίδα, in classics fatherland. Here and in parallels evidently = native town, home. *Vide* ver. 56 and Lk. iv. 16.—συναγωγῇ, singular, not plural, as in Vulgate. One syn. index of size of town (Grotius).—ὥστε, with infinitive: tendency and actual result. They were astonished and said: πόθεν . . . δυνάμεις, wisdom and marvellous works; of the latter they had heard, of the former they had had a sample. Whence? that is the question; not from schools, parentage, family, social environment, or mere surroundings and circumstances of any kind.—Ver. 55. ὁ τ. τέκτονος υἱός: Mk. has ὁ τέκτων, which our evangelist avoids; the son of *the carpenter*, one only in the town, well known to all.—Μαριὰμ . . . Ἰάκωβος, etc., names given of mother and brothers, to show how well they know the whole family. And this other man just come back is simply another of the family whose name happens to be Jesus. Why should He be so different? It is an absurdity, an offence, not to be commonplace. The irritation of the Nazareans is satisfactory evidence of the extraordinary in Jesus.—Ver. 57. Proverb, not Jewish merely, but common property of mankind; examples from Greek and Roman authors in Pricaeus and Wetstein, including one from Pindar about fame fading at the family hearth (Olymp. Ode, xii. 3).—Ver. 58. Here also editorial discretion is at work. Mark states that Jesus was not able to work miracles in Nazareth, and that He marvelled at their unbelief. Matthew changes this into a statement that He did few miracles there because of their unbelief, and passes over the marvelling in silence.

Chapter XIV. Death of the Baptist: Commencement of a New Division of the Evangelic History.

Vv. 1-12. *Death of the Baptist* (Mk. vi. 14-29, Lk. ix. 7-9). This section might with advantage have been given as a short chapter by itself, and a new start made with the feeding of the thousands which forms the first of a series of narratives together giving the story of the *later* Galilean ministry (xiv. 13—xx. 16). In this section (1-12) Matthew still has his eye on Mark, the story of the fate of the Baptist being there the next after the section in reference to mother and brethren, excepting the mission of the Twelve (Mk. vi. 7-13) already related in Mt. (x. 5-15). Indeed from this point onwards Matthew follows Mark's order. In the foregoing part of this Gospel the parallelism between it and Mark has been disturbed by the desire of the evangelist to draw largely on his other source, the Logia, and introduce teaching materials bearing on all the topics suggested in his introductory sketch of Christ's early Galilean ministry: *Didache*, chaps. v.-vii.; *apostolic mission* (iv. 18-

a vide iv. 24.
b Ch. xxvii. 64; xxviii. 7 (with ἀπό).
c Mk. vi. 14. Gal. v. 6. Jas. v. 16.
d Ch. xxii. 28. Mk. vi. 18. 1 Cor. v. 1; vii. 2, 29.
e Ch. xxi. 26. 46. Phil. ii. 2, 9. Philem. 17.

XIV. 1. ἘΝ ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἤκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης[1] τὴν a ἀκοὴν Ἰησοῦ, καὶ εἶπε τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ, 2. "Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ Βαπτιστής· αὐτὸς b ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις c ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ." 3. Ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάννην ἔδησεν αὐτὸν[2] καὶ ἔθετο ἐν φυλακῇ,[3] διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ. 4. ἔλεγε γὰρ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης,[4] "Οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι d ἔχειν d αὐτήν." 5. Καὶ θέλων αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ἐφοβήθη τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ὡς e προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

[1] τετρααρχης in ℵCZΔ. So Tisch. and W.H., though BD spell as in T.R.

[2] ℵB omit αυτον, which is an undisputed reading in Mk., whence it may have been imported.

[3] ℵB read εν φυλακη απεθετο, which Tisch. and W.H. adopt.

[4] ℵD omit art. before I. and BZ place αυτω after I.

22), chap. x.; *Baptist* (chap. iii.), chap. xi.; *Pharisees* (chap. iii. 7-9), chap. xii.; *popular preaching* (iv. 23), chap. xiii. Chaps. viii., ix. disturb the order by grouping incidents illustrating the healing ministry.

Ver. 1. **ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ.** Mk. connects with return of Twelve from their mission (vi. 14), Mt. apparently with immediately preceding section. But the phrase recalls xi. 25, xii. 1, and it may be the evangelist is thinking generally of a time of prevailing insusceptibility (Weiss-Meyer).—**Ἡρώδης**: Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea for many years (4-39 A.D.), married to the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia; like his father Herod the Great in cunning, ambition, and love of splendour in building and otherwise, whereof the new city of Tiberias was a monument (Schürer, *Gesch.*, i. 359).—**ἀκοὴν**, *vide* iv. 24. The fame of Jesus penetrated at last even into the royal palace, where very different matters occupied the attention, ordinarily.—Ver. 2. **παισὶν αὐτοῦ**: not his sons, but his servants, *i.e.*, the courtiers, great men in their way, not the menials in the palace. The king would propound his odd theory in familiar talk, not in solemn conclave.—**οὗτός ἐστιν**, etc. It is this theory we have to thank for the narrative following, which in itself has no special connection with the evangelic history, though doubtless Christians would naturally read with interest the fate of the forerunner of Jesus. The king has the Baptist on the brain; and remarkable occurrences in the religious world recall him at once to mind. It is John! *he* (**αὐτὸς**) is risen; theory begotten of remorse; odd enough, but better than Pharisaic one begotten of malevolence; both witnessing to the extraordinary in Christ's career.—**διὰ τοῦτο**: the living John did no miracles, but no saying what a dead one *redivivus* can do?—**ἐνεργοῦσιν**, not: he does the mighty works, but: the powers (**δυνάμεις**) work in him, the powers of the invisible world, vast and vague in the king's imagination.

Ver. 3. **γὰρ** implies that the following story is introduced to make the king's theory intelligible. "Risen" implies previous death, and how that came about must be told to show the *psychological* genesis of the theory. It is the superstitious idea of a man who has murder on his conscience.—**κρατήσας**, etc.: fact referred to already in iv. 12, xi. 2; here the reason given. Of course Herod seized, bound, and imprisoned John through his agents.—**διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα**: a woman here, as so often, the cause of the tragedy.—**γυναῖκα Φ.**: *vide* on Mk.—Ver. 4. **ἔλεγε γὰρ ὁ I.** The progressive imperfect, with force of a pluperfect. John had been saying just before he was apprehended (Burton, Moods and Tenses, § 29).—**οὐκ ἔξεστιν**: doubly unlawful; as adultery, and as marriage within prohibited degrees (Lev. xviii. 16, xx. 21).—Ver. 5. **θέλων**: *cf.* i. 19. Mark gives a fuller statement as to Herod's feelings towards John. No injustice is done Herod here by ascribing to him a wish to get rid of John. There are always mixed feelings in such cases. Compare the relations of Alcibiades to Socrates as described by Plato (**Συμπόσιον**).—**ἐφοβήθη τ. ὄ.**: that for one

6. [f] γενεσίων δὲ ἀγομένων[1] τοῦ Ἡρώδου, ὠρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, καὶ ἤρεσε τῷ Ἡρώδῃ· 7. ὅθεν μεθ᾽ ὅρκου ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐὰν[2] αἰτήσηται. 8. Ἡ δὲ [g] προβιβασθεῖσα ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς, "Δός μοι," φησίν, "ὧδε ἐπὶ [h] πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ." 9. Καὶ ἐλυπήθη[3] ὁ βασιλεύς, διὰ δὲ[3] τοὺς ὅρκους καὶ τοὺς συνανακειμένους ἐκέλευσε δοθῆναι· 10. καὶ πέμψας [i] ἀπεκεφάλισε τὸν[4] Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. 11. καὶ ἠνέχθη ἡ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι, καὶ ἐδόθη τῷ κορασίῳ· καὶ ἤνεγκε τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς. 12. καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦραν τὸ σῶμα,[5] καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτό[6]· καὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν

f Cf. Gen. xl. 20, ἡμέρα γενέσεως.
g Acts xix. 33 (συν- in W.H.).
h Lk. xi. 39.
i Mk. vi. 16, 27. Lk. ix. 9.

[1] ℵBDLZ have the dat. γενεσιοις and γενομενοις for αγομενων; the reading in T.R. is a grammatical correction.

[2] αν in BD.

[3] BD have λυπηθεις and omit δε. The reading of the T.R. is an attempt by resolution of the construction to make the meaning clear.

[4] ℵBZ omit τον.

[5] ℵBCDLΣ several cursives have πτωμα, for which σωμα has been substituted as more delicate.

[6] ℵB have αυτον. αυτο in Mk. (vi. 29).

thing; also feared God and his conscience a *little*, not enough. It is well when lawless men in power fear anything.—**ὅτι . . . εἶχον**: they took John to be, regarded him as, a prophet.—**εἶχον** does not by itself mean to hold in high esteem (*in pretio habere*, Kypke). The point is that John for the people passed for a prophet, belonged to a class commanding religious respect (so Fritzsche, Meyer, etc.). *Vide* xxi. 46.

Ver. 6. **γενεσίοις γενομένοις**: one expects the genitive absolute as in T.R., which just on that account is to be suspected. The dative of time. But *cf.* Mk. vi. 21, where we have **γενομένης** and **γενεσίοις** occurring together, and *vide* Weiss, Mk.-Evang., p. 221, on the literary connection between the two texts. Most commentators take **γενεσίοις** as referring to Herod's birthday. Some, *e.g.*, Grotius, think of the anniversary of the accession to the throne = birthday of his *reign*. In classic Greek it means a feast in honour of the dead on their birthday, **γενέθλια** being the word for a birthday feast, *vide* Lobeck, Phryn., 103. Loesner, Observ. ad N. T. e. Phil. Alex., cites instances from Phil. of the use of both words in the sense of a birthday feast.—**ἡ θυγάτηρ τ. Ἡρῳδ.**: Salome by name.—**ἐν τῷ μέσῳ**, implies a festive assembly, as fully described in Mk.—Ver. 7. **ὡμολόγησεν**, confessed by oath; obligation to keep a promise previously given. *Cf.* Mk. vi. 22, where the fact is more fully stated. The account in Matt. seems throughout secondary.—Ver. 8. **προβιβασθεῖσα**: not "before instructed," as in A. V., but "brought to this point"; urged on. It should require a good deal of "educating" to bring a young girl to make such a grim request. But she had learnt her lesson well, and asked the Baptist's head, as if she had been asking a favourite dish (**ὡς περί τινος ἐδέσματος διαλεγομένη**, Chrys., Hom. xlviii.). Kypke cites two instances of the rare use of the word in the sense of instruction.—**ὧδε** here and now, on the spot, **ἐξαυτῆς** in Mk. That was an essential part of the request. No time must be left for repentance. If not done at once under the influence of wine and the momentary gratification given by the voluptuous dance, it might never be done at all. This implies that the Baptist was at hand, therefore that the feast was at Machaerus, where there was a palace as well as a fortress.—Ver. 9. **λυπηθεὶς**: participle used concessively, *though* grieved he granted the request; the grief quite compatible with the truculent wish in ver. 5.—**βασιλεύς**: only by courtesy.—**ὅρκους**, plural, singular in ver. 7; spoken in passion, more like profane swearing than deliberate utterance once for all of a solemn oath. —Ver. 10. **ἀπεκεφάλισε**: expressive word, all too clear in meaning, though not found in Attic usage, or apparently

τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 13. καὶ ἀκούσας[1] ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν. καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν

j Mk. vi. 33. αὐτῷ [j] πεζῇ[2] ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.

14. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς[3] εἶδε πολὺν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη

k Mk. vi. 5, 13; xvi. 18. 1 Cor. xi. 30.

l Acts xxvii. 9 (same sense).

ἐπ' αὐτούς,[4] καὶ ἐθεράπευσε τοὺς [k] ἀρρώστους αὐτῶν. 15. Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης, προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ[5] λέγοντες, "Ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, καὶ ἡ ὥρα ἤδη [l] παρῆλθεν· ἀπόλυσον[6] τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὰς κώμας ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς βρώματα." 16. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν· δότε

[1] ακουσας δε ℵBDLZ. [2] πεζοι ℵJLZ. [3] ℵBD omit ο Ι.
[4] αυτοις in most uncials; επ αυτους only in minus.; from Mk.
[5] ℵBZ omit αυτου. [6] ℵCZ add ουν, which W.H. place in margin.

much used at all; a plebeian word according to Salmasius, cited by Kypke, who gives instances from late authors.—Ver. 11. **ἠνέχθη**, not expressly said "there and then," but all points to immediate production of the head on a platter in the banqueting hall before the guests; gruesome sight!—**ἐδόθη, ἤνεγκε**: what a nerve the girl must have had! her mother's nature in her; the dancing and the cool acceptance of the horrible gift well matched.—**κορασίῳ**: not to be taken strictly; a young unmarried woman, say, of twenty (Holtz., H. C.). The dancing of a mere girl would have been no entertainment to the sensual revellers. The treat lay in the indecency.—Ver. 12. **πτῶμα**: carcase, used absolutely in this sense only in late writers. Earlier writers would say **πτῶμα νεκροῦ**. Lobeck, Phryn., 375.

Vv. 13-21. *Jesus retires; feeding of thousands* (Mk. vi. 30-44; Lk. ix. 10-17).—Ver. 13. **ἀκούσας**, having heard of the fate of John from John's disciples (ver. 12). —**ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν**: withdrew from where He was when the report reached Him; locality not indicated. Mark connects the retirement with the return of the Twelve from their mission, and the report they gave, and assigns as motive rest for the missionaries. The two events might synchronise, and escape from Herod's dangerous neighbourhood might be a joint motive for retirement. But against this is the speedy return (ver. 34).—**ἐν πλοίῳ**: naturally suggests a place near the sea as starting-point. But it may be rather intended to indicate in what direction they were going—to the eastern side of the lake.—**εἰς ἐ. τ. κατ' ἰδίαν**. These phrases have certainly more point in Mk. as referring to a multitude from which they wished to escape.—**οἱ ὄχλοι**: no previous mention of the crowds, and no hint that Jesus wished to get away from them; looks like a digest of a fuller narrative, such as that in Mk.—**πεζῇ** (or **πεζοί**), on foot, but not implying that all literally walked; there were sick among them who could not. The contrast is between going by sea and going by *land*. *Cf.* Acts xx. 13. Classical instances in philological commentaries (Wetstein, Kypke, Elsner, etc.).—Ver. 14. **ἐξελθὼν**, in this place, naturally means going forth from His retreat, in Mk. (vi. 34) going out of the ship, the crowd having arrived on the spot before Him. To escape from the people always difficult, now apparently more than ever. Evidently a time of special excitement, popularity at its height, though according to Fourth Gospel about to undergo a speedy decline.—**ἐσπλαγχνίσθη**, deponent passive, pitied; Hellenistic, and based on the Hebrew idea of the bowels as the seat of compassion; used by Symmachus in translation of Deut. xiii. 9.—**ἐθεράπευσε**: Mark gives prominence to the element of instruction; healing alone mentioned here.

Vv. 15-21. *The feeding*.—Ver. 15. **ὀψίας γενομένης**: might mean sunset as in viii. 16, but from the nature of the case must mean afternoon from 3 to 6, the first of the "two evenings".—**ἔρημος**, comparatively uninhabited, no towns near.—**ἡ ὥρα ἤδη παρῆλθεν**, the meaning not clear. Mk. has: **ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς** = already the hour is advanced. Various suggestions have been made: eating time (Grot.), healing and teaching time (Fritzsche), daytime (Meyer) is past. Weiss, with most probability, takes **ὥρα**

αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν." 17. Οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Οὐκ ἔχομεν ὧδε εἰ μὴ πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἰχθύας." 18. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Φέρετέ μοι αὐτοὺς ὧδε."[1] 19. Καὶ κελεύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοὺς χόρτους,[2] καὶ[3] λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, [m] εὐλόγησε· καὶ [n] κλάσας ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις. 20. καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦραν τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων, δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις. 21. οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων. 22. Καὶ εὐθέως [o] ἠνάγκασεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς[4] τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ[5] ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ[6] πλοῖον, καὶ [p] προάγειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πέραν, ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ τοὺς ὄχλους. 23. καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους, ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος κατ' ἰδίαν

m Ch. xxvi. 26. 1 Cor. x. 16.
n Ch. xxvi. 26. Acts ii. 46 *al.*
o Acts xxvi. 11. Gal. ii. 3, 14.
p Ch. xxi. 31; xxvi. 32. Mk. x. 32.

[1] **ωδε αυτους** in ℵBZ. [2] ℵBC have **επι του χορτου**; D the sing. also, but accus.
[3] BLΔΣ omit **και**. [4] **ο I.** wanting in ℵBCDΔΣ.
[5] Most uncials omit, but BXΣ retain **αυτου**.
[6] B and several cursives (1, 33, 124) omit **το**. W.H. place in margin.

= time for sending them away to get food.—**ἀπόλυσον**: though late for the purpose, not too late; dismiss them forthwith.—Ver. 16. **οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν**, etc.: even if, as some think, what happened was that under the moral influence of Jesus the people present generously made the provisions they had brought with them available for the company at large, the character of Jesus appears here in a commanding light. No situation appears to Him desperate, no crisis unmanageable. No need to go. Give ye them to eat, resources will be forthcoming (*cf.* Exod. xiv. 15). And they *were*, how we cannot tell. The story is a fact supported by the testimony of all four evangelists, not a baseless legend, or a religious allegory.—Ver. 17. **πέντε ἄρτους κ. δ. ἰχ.** A very modest supply even for the disciple circle. They seem, under the influence of Jesus, to have been a care-free company, letting to-morrow look after itself. "Learn the philosophy of the Twelve, and how they despised food. Being twelve they had only so much, and they readily gave up these" (Chrysos., H. xlix.). Five loaves and two fishes, all that was known to be in that vast gathering.—Ver. 18. **φέρετε**, etc.: Christ's imperial way in critical situations often arrests attention. "Stretch forth thine hand" (xii. 13). "Bring them hither to me."—Ver. 19. **κελεύσας, λαβὼν, ἀναβλέψας**, participles without copula all leading up to **εὐλόγησεν**, the central chief action: rapid, condensed narrative, briefly, simply, recounting an amazing event.—**εὐλόγησεν** with accusative (**ἄρτους**) understood. He blessed the loaves and fishes.—**καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν**, then dividing them gave them to the disciples, who in turn gave to the multitude.—**τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ εὐλογίᾳ αὔξων καὶ πληθύνων αὐτούς**, Origen.—Ver. 20. **δώδεκα κοφ. πλ.** is in appos. with **τὸ περισσεῦον τ. κ.** They took the surplus of the broken pieces to the extent of twelve baskets.—**κοφίνους**, answering to the Rabbinical קופא, a basket of considerable size ("ein grosses Behältniss," Wünsche). Each of the Twelve had one. The word recalls the well-known line of Juvenal (*Sat.* iii. 14): "Judaeis, quorum cophinus foenumque suppellex," on which and its bearing on this place *vide* Schöttgen (Hor. Tal.) and Elsner.—Ver. 21. **πεντακισχίλιοι**, 5000 *men*, not counting women and children. This helps us to attach some definite meaning to the elastic words, **ὄχλος ὄχλοι**, so frequently occurring in the Gospels. Doubtless this was an exceptionally great gathering, yet the inference seems legitimate that **ὄχλος** meant hundreds, and **πολὺς ὄχλος** thousands.

Vv. 22-36. *The return voyage* (Mk. vi. 45-56).—Ver. 22. **ἠνάγκασεν**: a strong word needing an explanation not here given, supplied in John vi. 15. Of course there was no physical compulsion, but there must have been urgency on Christ's part, and unwillingness on the part of disciples. Fritzsche objects to special

προσεύξασθαι. Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης, μόνος ἦν ἐκεῖ. 24. τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν[1] [q] βασανιζόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων· ἦν γὰρ ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος. 25. Τετάρτῃ δὲ φυλακῇ τῆς νυκτὸς ἀπῆλθε[2] πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[3] περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης.[4] 26. καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ[5] ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν[6] περιπατοῦντα ἐταράχθησαν, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι [r] φάντασμά ἐστι." καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν. 27. εὐθέως[7] δὲ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[8] λέγων, "Θαρσεῖτε· ἐγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε." 28. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε[9] "Κύριε, εἰ σὺ εἶ, κέλευσόν με πρός σε ἐλθεῖν[10] ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα." 29. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, "Ἐλθέ." Καὶ καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου ὁ[11] Πέτρος περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα, ἐλθεῖν[12] πρὸς

q Mk. vi. 48 (there of the men, here of the ship).

r Mk. vi. 49 (Wisdom xvii. 14 (15)).

[1] For μεσον . . . ην B. some verss. and minuss. have here σταδιους πολλους απο της γης απειχεν, which W.H. adopt, putting the reading of T.R. in margin. It is the undisputed reading in Mk.

[2] ηλθεν in ℵBΣ verss.

[3] Omit ο Ι. ℵBCD.

[4] ℵBΔΘ several cursives have the accus. here.

[5] οι δε μαθ. ιδοντες α. in BD.

[6] της θαλασσης in ℵBCD.

[7] ευθυς in ℵBD here as always in Mk., whence it may have come. In Mk. this is a standing variation. It need not be again referred to.

[8] ο Ι. before αυτοις in B, omitted in ℵD, bracketed in W.H.

[9] The order of words varies here. W.H., after B, have αποκ. δε ο Π. ειπεν α.

[10] ℵBCDΔΣ many cursives have ελθειν προς σε.

[11] Art. omitted in ℵBD.

[12] και ηλθεν in BD.

emphasis, and renders: "auctor fuit discipulis, ut navem conscenderent".—ἕως οὗ ἀπολύσῃ, subjunctive, here used where optative would be used in classic Greek. *Cf.* xviii. 30, and *vide* Burton, § 324.—Ver. 23. ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος. After dismissing the crowd Jesus retired into the mountainous country back from the shore, glad to be alone—κατ' ἰδίαν, even to be rid of the Twelve for a season.—προσεύξασθαι: "Good for prayer the mountain, and the night, and the solitude (μόνωσις), affording quiet, freedom from distraction (τὸ ἀπερίσπαστον), and calm" (Euthy. Zig.).—ὀψίας γεν. refers, of course, to a later hour than in ver. 15.—Ver. 24. μέσον, an adjective agreeing with πλοῖον (Winer, § 54, 6), signifies not merely in the middle strictly, but any appreciable distance from shore. Pricaeus gives examples of such use. But the reading of B, probably to be preferred, implies that the boat was many stadii (25 or 30, John vi. 19 = 3 to 4 miles) from the eastern shore.—ὑπὸ τῶν κυμάτων: not in Mk., and goes without saying; when there are winds there will be waves.—ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος: what wind? From what quarter blowing? What was the starting-point, and the destination? Holtz. (H. C.) suggests that the voyage was either from Bethsaida Julias at the mouth of the upper Jordan to the north-western shore, or from the south end of the plain el-Batiha towards Bethsaida Julias, at the north end, citing Furrer in support of the second alternative, *vide* in Mk.—Ver. 25. τετάρτῃ φυλ. = 3 to 6, in the early morning, πρωΐ.—ἐπὶ τ. θ.: the readings in this and the next verse vary between genitive and accusative. The sense is much the same. The evangelist means to represent Jesus as really walking on the sea, not on the land above the sea level (Paulus, Schenkel). Holtz. (H. C.), regarding it as a legend, refers to O. T. texts in which God walks on the sea.—Ver. 26. φάντασμα: a little touch of sailor superstition natural in the circumstances; presupposes the impression that they saw something walking on the sea.—Ver. 27. ἐλάλησεν, Jesus spoke; the words given (θαρσεῖτε, etc.), but the mere sound of His voice would be enough.

Vv. 28-32. *Peter-episode*, peculiar to Mt. The story is true to the character

τὸν Ἰησοῦν. 30. βλέπων δὲ τὸν ἄνεμον ἰσχυρὸν[1] ἐφοβήθη· καὶ ἀρξάμενος [s] καταποντίζεσθαι ἔκραξε, λέγων, "Κύριε, σῶσόν με." 31. Εὐθέως δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ὀλιγόπιστε, εἰς τί [t] ἐδίστασας;" 32. Καὶ ἐμβάντων[2] αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, [u] ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος· 33. οἱ δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ ἐλθόντες[3] προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες, "Ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ υἱὸς εἶ."

34. Καὶ διαπεράσαντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν γῆν[4] Γεννησαρέτ. 35. καὶ ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον ἐκείνην, καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας· 36. καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, ἵνα μόνον ἅψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὅσοι ἥψαντο, [v] διεσώθησαν.

s Ch. xviii. 6 only.
t Ch. xxviii. 17 only.
u Mk. iv. 39; vi. 51.
v Lk. vii. 8. Acts xxiii. 24; xxvii. 43, 44; xxviii. 1, 4. 1 Pet. iii. 20.

[1] Omitted in ℵB. [2] αναβαντων in ℵBD. [3] Wanting in ℵBΣ.
[4] ℵBD *al.* have επι instead of εις and omit την γην.

of Peter.—Ver. 30. βλέπων τὸν ἄνεμον, seeing the wind, that is, the effects of it. It is one thing to see a storm from the deck of a stout ship, another to see it in midst of the waves.—καταποντίζεσθαι: he walked at first, now he begins to sink; so at the final crisis, so at Antioch (Gal. ii. 11), so probably all through. A strange mixture of strength and weakness, bravery and cowardice; a man of generous impulses rather than of constant firm will. "Peter walked on the *water* but feared the *wind*: such is human nature, often achieving great things, and at fault in little things."—(πολλάκις τὰ μεγάλα κατορθοῦσα, ἐν τοῖς ἐλάττοσι ἐλέγχεται, Chrys., H. l.).—Ver. 32. ἐδίστασας: again in xxviii. 17, nowhere else in N. T., from δίς, double, hence to be of two minds, to doubt (*cf.* δίψυχος, James i. 8).—ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν: Jesus and Peter.—ἐκόπασεν: used in narrative of first sea-anecdote by Mk., iv. 39 = exhausted itself (from κόπος).—Ver. 33. οἱ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ: *cf.* οἱ ἄνθρωποι in viii. 27; presumably the disciples alone referred to.—ἀληθῶς θ. υ. εἶ, a great advance on ποταπός (viii. 27). The question it implies now settled: Son of God.

Vv. 34-36. *Safe arrival.*—διαπεράσαντες, having covered the distance between the place where Jesus joined them and the shore.—ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν: they got to *land*; the general fact important after the storm.—εἰς Γεννησαρέτ, more definite indication of locality, yet not very definite; a district, not a town, the rich plain of Gennesaret, four miles long and two broad.—Ver. 35. καὶ ἐπιγνόντες, etc.: again popular excitement with its usual concomitants. The men of the place, when they recognised who had landed from the boat, sent round the word: Jesus has come! They bring their sick to Him to be healed.—Ver. 36. παρεκάλουν, etc.: they have now unbounded confidence in Christ's curative powers; think it enough to touch (μόνον ἅψωνται) the hem of His mantle.—διεσώθησαν: they are not disappointed; the touch brings a *complete* cure (διὰ in composition). The expression, ὅσοι ἥψαντο, implies that all who were cured touched: that was the uniform means. Mk.'s expression, ὅσοι ἂν ἥ., leaves that open.

CHAPTER XV. WASHING OF HANDS; SYROPHENICIAN WOMAN; SECOND FEEDING. The scene changes with dramatic effect from phenomenal popularity on the eastern shore, and in Gennesaret, to embittered ominous conflict with the jealous guardians of Jewish orthodoxy and orthopraxy. The relations between Jesus and the religious *virtuosi* are becoming more and more strained and the crisis cannot be far off. That becomes clear to Jesus now, if it was not before (xvi. 21).

Vv. 1-20. *Washing of hands* (Mk. vii. 1-23).—Ver. 1. τότε connects naturally with immediately preceding narrative concerning the people of Gennesaret with unbounded faith in Jesus seeking healing by mere touch of His garment. Probably the one scene led to the other: growing popular enthusiasm deepening Pharisaic hostility.—προσέρχονται (οἱ) ἀ. Ι. If οἱ be omitted, the sense is that certain persons came to Jesus from Jerusalem. If it be retained, the sense is: certain persons belonging to Jerusalem came from it, the preposition ἐν being

a Acts i. 25 (with ἀπό). b Mk. vii. 3, 5, 9, 13. 1 Cor. xi. 2. Gal. i. 14. Col. ii. 8. 2 Thess. ii. 15; iii. 6. c Mk. vii. 10; ix. 39. Acts xix. 9. d Ch. xvi. 26; xxvii. 24. Mk. v. 26; Heb. xiii. 9 al.

XV. 1. TOTE προσέρχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ οἱ[1] ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι,[2] λέγοντες, 2. "Διατί οἱ μαθηταί σου [a]παραβαίνουσι τὴν [b]παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν,[3] ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν." 3. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Διατί καὶ ὑμεῖς παραβαίνετε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν; 4. Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἐνετείλατο, λέγων,[4] 'Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σοῦ,[5] καὶ τὴν μητέρα·' καί, 'Ὁ [c]κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτω·' ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε, 5. Ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί, Δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ [d]ὠφεληθῇς, καὶ[6] οὐ μὴ

[1] ℵBD omit οι. [2] Φαρ. και γραμ. in ℵBD. [3] ℵBΔ Orig. omit αυτων.
[4] For ενετειλατο λεγων BD have simply ειπεν. [5] ℵBCD omit σου.
[6] ℵBCD omit και, which affects the construction; *vide* below.

changed into ἀπὸ by attraction of the verb.—**φαρ. καὶ γρ.**, usually named in inverse order, as in T.R. Our evangelist makes the whole party come from Jerusalem; Mk., with more probability, the scribes only. The guardians of tradition in the Capital have their evil eye on Jesus and co-operate with the provincial rigorists.—Ver. 2. **διατί οἱ μαθ. σου παραβ.**: no instance of offence specified in this case, as in ix. 10 and xii. 1. The zealots must have been making inquiries or playing the spy into the private habits of the disciple circle, seeking for grounds of fault-finding (*cf.* Mk. vii. 2).—**παραβαίνουσι**: strong word (Mk.'s milder), putting breach of Rabbinical rules on a level with breaking the greatest moral laws, as if the former were of equal importance with the latter. That they were was deliberately maintained by the scribes (*vide* Lightfoot).—**τὴν παράδοσιν τ. π.**: not merely the opinion, *dogma*, *placitum*, of the elders (Grotius), but opinion expressed *ex cathedra*, custom originated with authority by the ancients. The "elders" here are not the living rulers of the people, but the past bearers of religious authority, the more remote the more venerable. The "tradition" was unwritten (**ἄγραφος διδασκαλία**, Hesych.), the "law upon the lip" reaching back, like the written law (so it was pretended), to *Moses*. Baseless assertion, but believed; therefore to attack the **παράδοσις** a Herculean, dangerous task. The assailants regard the act imputed as an unheard-of monstrous impiety. That is why they make a general charge before specifying the particular form under which the offence is committed, so giving the latter as serious an aspect as possible.—**οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται**, etc.: granting the fact it did not necessarily mean deliberate disregard of the tradition. It might be an occasional carelessness on the part of some of the disciples (**τινάς**, Mk. vii. 2) which even the offenders would not care to defend. A time-server might easily have evaded discussion by putting the matter on this ground. The Pharisees eagerly put the worst construction on the act, and Jesus was incapable of time-serving insincerity, thus conflict was inevitable.—**νίπτεσθαι**, the proper word before meat, **ἀπονίπτεσθαι**, after, Elsner, citing Athenaeus, lib. ix., cap. 18.—**ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν**, Hebrew idiom for taking food. The neglect charged was not that of ordinary cleanliness, but of the technical rules for securing ceremonial cleanness. These were innumerable and ridiculously minute. Lightfoot, referring to certain Rabbinical tracts, says: "lege, si vacat, et si per taedium et nauseam potes".

Vv. 3-6. *Christ's reply*; consists of a counter charge and a prophetic citation (vv. 7-9) in the inverse order to that of Mk.—Ver. 3. **καὶ ὑμεῖς**: the retort, if justifiable, the best defence possible of neglect charged = "we transgress the tradition because we want to keep the commands of God: choice lies between these; you make the wrong choice". Grave issue raised; no compromise possible here.—**διὰ τ. π. ὑμῶν**: not rules made by the parties addressed (Weiss-Meyer), but the tradition which ye idolise, your precious *paradosis*.—Ver. 4. **ὁ γὰρ θεὸς**: counter charge substantiated. The question being the validity of the tradition and its value, its evil tendency might be illustrated at will in connection with any moral interest. It might have been illustrated directly in connection

τιμήσῃ[1] τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ ἢ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ· 6. καὶ [e] ἠκυρώσατε τὴν ἐντολὴν[2] τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν. 7. Ὑποκριταί, [f] καλῶς προεφήτευσε[3] περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαΐας, λέγων, 8. ‘Ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαὸς οὗτος τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν, καὶ τοῖς χείλεσί με τιμᾷ[4] ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ. 9. [g] μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με,

e Mk. vii. 13. Gal. iii. 17.
f Mk. vii. 6; xii. 28. Lk. xx. 39. John iv. 17. Ironically in Mk. vii. 9. 2 Cor. xi. 4.
g here and in Mk. vii. 7 (from Is. xxix. 13).

[1] ℵBCDΔΣ have τιμησει. τιμηση answers to ειπῃ, and being made dependent on ος αν by και is part of the protasis.

[2] τον λογον in BD (W.H.); τον νομον in ℵC (Tisch., W.H. marg.).

[3] Augment at beg., επροφ, in ℵBCDL.

[4] The T.R. gives the quotation in full. ℵBDL have ο λαος ουτος τοις χειλεσι με τιμα. Tisch., W.H. (ουτος ο λαος and αγαπη for τιμα in margin).

with moral purity *versus* ceremonial. The actual selection characteristic of Jesus as *humane*, and felicitous as exceptionally *clear*.—τίμα . . . τελευτάτω: fifth commandment (Ex. xx. 12), with its penal sanction (Ex. xxi. 16).—Ver. 5 shows how that great law is compromised.—ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγ.: the emphatic antithesis of ὑμεῖς to Θεὸς, a pointed rebuke of their presumption. The scribes rivals to the Almighty in legislation. "Ye say": the words following give not the *ipsissima verba* of scribe-teaching or what they would acknowledge to be the drift of their teaching, but that drift as Jesus Himself understood it = "This is what it comes to."—"Δῶρον" = let it be a gift or offering devoted to God, to the temple, to religious purposes, *i.e.*, a Corban (Mk. vii. 11); magic word releasing from obligation to show honour to parents in the practical way of contributing to their support. Of evil omen even when the "gift" was *bonâ fide*, as involving an artificial divorce between religion and morality; easily sliding into disingenuous *pretexts* of vows to evade filial responsibilities; reaching the lowest depth of immorality when lawmakers and unfilial sons were in league for common pecuniary profit from the nefarious transaction. Were the fault-finders in this case chargeable with receiving a commission for trafficking in iniquitous legislation, letting sons off for a percentage on what they would have to give their parents? Origen, Jerome, Theophy., Lutteroth favour this view, but there is nothing in the text to justify it. Christ's charge is based on the practice specified even at its best: honest pleading of previous obligation to God as a ground for neglecting duty to parents. Lightfoot (Hor. Heb.) understands the law as meaning that the word Corban, even though profanely and heartlessly spoken, bound not to help parents, but did not bind really to give the property to sacred uses. "Ad dicanda sua in sacros usus per haec verba nullatenus tenebatur ad non juvandum patrem tenebatur inviolabiliter."—οὐ μὴ τιμήσει, he shall not honour = he is exempt from obligation to: such the rule in effect if not in words of the scribes in the case. The future here has the force of the imperative as often in the Sept. (*vide* Burton, M. and T., § 67). If the imperative meaning be denied, then οὐ μὴ τ. must be taken as a comment of Christ's. Ye say, "whosoever," etc.; in these circumstances of course he will not, etc. As the passage stands in T.R. the clause καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ, etc., belongs to the protasis, and the apodosis remains unexpressed = he shall be free, or guiltless, as in A. V.—Ver. 6. ἠκυρώσατε, ye invalidated, by making such a rule, the aorist pointing to the time when the rule was made. Or it may be a gnomic aorist: so ye are wont to, etc. The verb ἀκυρόω belongs to later Greek, though Elsner calls the phrase "bene Graeca".—διὰ . . . ὑμῶν: an account of *your* tradition, again to mark it as their idol, and as theirs alone, God having no part in it, though the Rabbis taught that it was given orally by God to Moses.—Ver. 7. ὑποκριταί: no thought of conciliation; open war at all hazards. "Actors," in their zeal for God, as illustrated in the case previously cited. God first, parents second, yet God not in all their thoughts.—καλῶς, appositely, to the purpose. Isaiah might not be thinking of the Pharisees, but certainly the quotation is very felicitous in reference to them, exactly describing their religious character. Mt. follows Mk. in quoting;

h here and in parall. in Gospp. frequent in Paul.
i Mk. vii. 7. Col. ii. 22 (not in profane authors).
j here only in N.T.
k Ch. xxiii. 16, 24. Acts i. 16. Rom. ii. 19.
l here only (in Ch. xiii. 36, T.R.).

διδάσκοντες [h] διδασκαλίας, [i] ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων.'" 10. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀκούετε καὶ συνίετε. 11. οὐ τὸ εἰσερχόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον· ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος, τοῦτο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον." 12. Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ [1] εἶπον [2] αὐτῷ, "Οἶδας ὅτι οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν;" 13. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, "Πᾶσα [j] φυτεία, ἣν οὐκ ἐφύτευσεν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος, ἐκριζωθήσεται. 14. ἄφετε αὐτούς [k] ὁδηγοί εἰσι τυφλοὶ τυφλῶν [3]· τυφλὸς δὲ τυφλὸν ἐὰν ὁδηγῇ, ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται." 15. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "[l] Φράσον

[1] ℵBD and several cursives omit **αυτου**. [2] **λεγουσιν** in BD.

[3] Instead of **οδηγοι . . . τυφλων** BDLZ have **τυφλοι εισι οδηγοι** (W.H.). ℵ has the same inverted, **οδ. εισι τυφ.**

neither follows closely the Sept. (Is. xxix. 13).—Ver. 8. **ἡ δὲ καρδία**, etc.: at this point the citation is particularly apposite. They were far from the true God in their thoughts who imagined that He could be pleased with gifts made at the expense of filial piety. Christ's God abhorred such homage, still more the hypocritical pretence of it.

Vv. 10, 11. *Appeal to the people*: a mortal offence to the Pharisees and scribes, but made inevitable by publicity of attack, the multitude being in the background and overhearing all.—**ἀκούετε καὶ συνίετε**: abrupt, laconic address; a fearless, resolute tone audible.—Ver. 11. Simple direct appeal to the moral sense of mankind; one of those emancipating words which sweep away the cobwebs of artificial systems; better than elaborate argument. It is called a parable in ver. 15, but it is not a parable in the strict sense *here* whatever it may be in Mk. (*vide* notes there). Parables are used to illustrate the ethical by the natural. This saying is itself ethical: **τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος** refers to words as expressing thoughts and desires (ver. 19).—**οὐ τὸ ἐρ. εἰς τὸ στόμα**: refers to food of all sorts; clean food taken with unclean hands, and food in itself unclean. The drift of the saying therefore is: ceremonial uncleanness, however caused, a small matter, moral uncleanness the one thing to be dreaded. This goes beyond the tradition of the elders, and virtually abrogates the Levitical distinctions between clean and unclean. A sentiment worthy of Jesus and suitable to an occasion when He was compelled to emphasise the supreme importance of the ethical in the law—the ethical emphatically *the* law of God (**τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ**, ver. 3).

Vv. 12-14. *Disciples report impression made on Pharisees by the word spoken to the people.* Not in Mark.—Ver. 12. **ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν**: double offence—(1) appealing to the people at all; (2) uttering *such* a word revolutionary in character.—Ver. 13. **ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς**, etc.: the disciples were afraid, but Jesus was indignant, and took up high ground.—**φυτεία** for **φύτευμα**, a plant, "not a wild flower but a cultivated plant" (Camb. G. T.), refers to the Rabbinical tradition; natural figure for doctrine, and so used both by Jesus and Greeks (*vide* Schöttgen and Kypke). Kypke remarks: "pertinet huc parabola **περὶ τοῦ σπείροντος**".—**ὁ πατήρ μου**: the statement in the relative clause is really the main point, that the tradition in question was a thing with which God as Jesus conceived Him had nothing to do. This is an important text for Christ's doctrine of the Fatherhood as taught by discriminating use of the term **πατήρ**. The idea of God implied in the Corban tradition was that His interest was antagonistic to that of humanity. In Christ's idea of God the two interests are coincident. This text should be set beside xii. 50, which might easily be misunderstood as teaching an opposite view.—**ἐκριζωθήσεται**. This is what will be, and what Jesus wishes and works for: uprooting, destruction, root and branch, no compromise, the thing wholly evil. The response of the traditionalists was crucifixion.—Ver. 14. **ἄφετε**: the case hopeless, no reform possible; on the road to ruin.—**τυφλοί εἰσιν ὁδηγοί**: the reading in B is very laconic = blind men

ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην."[1] 16. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[1] εἶπεν, "[m] Ἀκμὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς [n] ἀσύνετοί ἐστε; 17. οὔπω[2] νοεῖτε, ὅτι πᾶν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς [o] ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται; 18. τὰ δὲ ἐκπορευόμενα ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχεται, κἀκεῖνα κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. 19. ἐκ γὰρ τῆς καρδίας ἐξέρχονται [o] διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί, [p] φόνοι, [p] μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, ψευδομαρτυρίαι, βλασφημίαι. 20. ταῦτά ἐστι τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον· τὸ δὲ ἀνίπτοις χερσὶ φαγεῖν οὐ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον."

21. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Τύρου

m here only.
n Rom. i. 21, 31; x. 19.
o Mk. vii. 21. Lk. ii. 35; ix. 47; xxiv. 38. 1 Cor. iii. 20. Jas. ii. 4.
p These are the only words common to this list with that in Gal. v. 19; both doubtful there.

[1] ℵBZ omit ταυτην and Ιησους (D also omits Ι.). [2] ου in BDZ.

are the leaders, the suggestion being: we know what happens in that case. The point is the inevitableness of ruin. What follows expresses what has been already hinted.—τυφλὸς δὲ τ. ἐ. ὁδ.: if blind blind lead; ὁδηγῇ, subjunctive, with ἐὰν as usual in a present general supposition.—ἀμφότεροι, both: Rabbis or scribes and their disciples. Christ despaired of the teachers, but He tried to rescue the people; hence vv. 10, 11.

Vv. 15-20. *Interpretation of saying* in ver. 11.—Ver. 15. Πέτρος, spokesman as usual (ὁ θερμὸς καὶ πανταχοῦ προφθάνων, Chrys., Hom. li.).—παραβολήν, here at least, whatever may be the case in Mk., can mean only a dark saying, σκοτεινὸς λόγος (Theophy. in Mk.), "oratio obscura" (Suicer). The saying, ver. 11, was above the understanding of the disciples, or rather in advance of their religious attainments; for men often deem thoughts difficult when, though easy to understand, they are hard to *receive*. The Twelve had been a little scandalised by the saying as well as the Pharisees, though they did not like to say so (καὶ αὐτοὶ ἠρέμα θορυβούμενοι, Chrys.).—Ver. 16. ἀκμὴν, accusative of ἀκμή, the point (of a weapon, etc.) = κατ' ἀκμὴν χρόνου, at this point of time, *still;* late Greek, and condemned by Phryn., p. 123 (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔτι).—ἀσύνετοί ἐστε. Christ chides the Twelve for making a mystery of a plain matter ("quare parabolice dictum putet quod perspicue locutus est," Jerome). Very simple and axiomatic to the Master, but was it ever quite clear to the disciples? In such matters all depends on possessing the requisite spiritual sense. Easy to see when you have eyes.—Ver. 17. ἀφεδρῶνα: here only, probably a Macedonian word = *privy;* a vulgar word and a vulgar subject which Jesus would gladly have avoided, but He forces Himself to speak of it for the sake of His disciples. The idea is: from food no moral defilement comes to the soul; such defilement as there is purely physical, passing through the bowels into the place of discharge. Doubtless Jesus said this, otherwise no one would have put it into His mouth. Were the Twelve any the wiser? Probably the very rudeness of the speech led them to think.—Ver. 18. ἐκπορευόμενα: words representing thoughts and desires, morally defiling, or rather revealing defilement already existing in the heart, seat of thought and passion.—Ver. 19. φόνοι, etc.: breaches of Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Commandments in succession.—Ver. 20. Emphatic final reassertion of the doctrine.

Vv. 21-28. *Woman of Canaan* (Mk. vii. 24-30). This excursion to the north is the result of a passionate longing to escape at once from the fever of popularity and from the *odium theologicum* of Pharisees, and to be alone for a while with the Twelve, with nature, and with God. One could wish that fuller details had been given as to its duration, extent, etc. From Mk. we infer that it had a wide sweep, lasted for a considerable time, and was not confined to Jewish territory. *Vide* notes there.

Ver. 21. ἀνεχώρησεν, *cf.* xii. 15.—εἰς τὰ μέρη Τ. καὶ Σ.: towards or into? Opinion is much divided. De Wette cites in favour of the latter, Mt. ii. 22, xvi. 23, and disposes of the argument against it based on ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων ἐκείνων (ver. 22) by the remark that it has force only if ὅρια, contrary to the usage of the evangelist, be taken as = boundaries instead of territories. On the whole, the conclusion must be that the narrative leaves the point uncertain. On psychological

καὶ Σιδῶνος. 22. καὶ ἰδού, γυνὴ Χαναναία ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων ἐκείνων ἐξελθοῦσα ἐκραύγασεν[1] αὐτῷ,[2] λέγουσα, "Ἐλέησόν με, κύριε, υἱὲ[3] Δαβίδ· ἡ θυγάτηρ μου κακῶς δαιμονίζεται." 23. Ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον. καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἠρώτων[4] αὐτόν, λέγοντες, "Ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν, ὅτι κράζει [q] ὄπισθεν ἡμῶν." 24. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, "Οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ." 25. Ἡ δὲ ἐλθοῦσα προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγουσα, "Κύριε, [r] βοήθει μοι." 26. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, "Οὐκ ἔστι καλὸν[5] λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων, καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις."

q Lk. xxiii. 26 (with gen. as here).

r Mk. ix. 22, 24. Acts xvi. 9; xxi. 28. 2 Cor. vi. 2. Heb. ii. 18.

[1] **εκραζεν** in BDΣ (W.H.). The aor. **εκραξεν** in ℵZ (Tisch. and W.H. marg.). The imperfect is truer to life.

[2] ℵBCZΣ omit **αυτω**. [3] **υιος** in BD. [4] **ηρωτουν** in ℵBCDX.

[5] **ουκ εστι καλον** is so weightily supported (all the great uncials with exception of D) that one can hardly refuse to accept it as the true reading. Yet the reading of D, **ουκ εξεστι**, has strong claims, just on account of the severity it implies and because the other reading is that of Mk.

grounds the presumption is in favour of the view that Jesus crossed the border into heathen territory. After that interview with sanctimonious Pharisees who thought the whole world outside Judea unclean, it would be a refreshment to Christ's spirit to cross over the line and feel that He was still in God's world, with blue sky overhead and the sea on this hand and mountains on that, all showing the glory of their Maker. He would breathe a freer, less stifling atmosphere there.—Ver. 22. **Χαναναία**: the Phoenicians were descended from a colony of Canaanites, the original inhabitants of Palestine, Gen. x. 15 (*vide* Benziger, *Heb. Arch.*, p. 63). *Vide* notes on Mk.—**ἐλ. με**, pity *me*, the mother's heart speaks.—**υἱὲ Δ.** The title and the request imply some knowledge of Jesus. Whence got? Was she a proselyte? (De Wette.) Or had the fame of Jesus spread thus far, the report of a wonderful healer who passed among the Jews for a descendant of David? The latter every way likely, *cf.* Mt. iv. 24. There would be some intercourse between the borderers, though doubtless also prejudices and enmities —Ver. 23. **ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἀπ.**: a new style of behaviour on the part of Jesus. The *rôle* of indifference would cost Him an effort.—**ἠρώτων** (ουν W. and H. as if contracted from **ἐρωτέω**), besought; in classics the verb means to inquire. In N. T. the two senses are combined after analogy of שָׁאַל. The disciples were probably surprised at their Master's unusual behaviour; a reason for it would not occur to them. They change places with the Master here, the larger-hearted appearing by comparison the narrow-hearted.—**ἀπόλυσον**, get rid of her by granting her request.—**ὅτι κράζει**: they were moved not so much by pity as by dread of a sensation. There was far more sympathy (though hidden) in Christ's heart than in theirs. Deep natures are often misjudged, and shallow men praised at their expense.—Ver. 24. **οὐκ ἀπεστάλην**: Jesus is compelled to explain Himself, and His explanation is *bonâ fide*, and to be taken in earnest as meaning that He considered it His duty to restrict His ministry to Israel, to be a shepherd exclusively to the lost sheep of Israel (**τὰ πρόβατα τ. ἀ.**, *cf.* ix. 36), as He was wont to call them with affectionate pity. There was probably a mixture of feelings in Christ's mind at this time; an aversion to recommence just then a healing ministry at all—a craving for rest and retirement; a disinclination to be drawn into a ministry among a heathen people, which would mar the unity of His career as a prophet of God to Israel (the drama of His life to serve its purpose must respect the limits of time and place); a secret inclination to do this woman a kindness if it could in any way be made exceptional; and last but not least, a feeling that her request was really not isolated but representative = the Gentile world in her inviting Him, a fugitive from His own land, to come over and help them, an omen of the transference of the kingdom from Jewish to Pagan soil.

27. Ἡ δὲ εἶπε, "Ναί, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ[1] τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν [s]ψιχίων τῶν [t]πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς [t]τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν." 28. Τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Ὦ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις." Καὶ ἰάθη ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης.

s Mk. vii. 28. Lk. xvi. 21.
t same phr. in Lk. xvi. 21.

29. Καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἦλθε παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας· καὶ ἀναβὰς εἰς τὸ ὄρος, ἐκάθητο ἐκεῖ. 30. καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, ἔχοντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν χωλούς, τυφλούς, κωφούς, [u]κυλλούς,[2] καὶ ἑτέρους πολλούς, καὶ ἔρριψαν αὐτοὺς παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ[3] καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς· 31. ὥστε τοὺς ὄχλους[4] θαυμάσαι, βλέποντας κωφοὺς λαλοῦντας,[5] κυλλοὺς ὑγιεῖς,[6] χωλοὺς περιπατοῦντας, καὶ τυφλοὺς βλέποντας· καὶ

u Ch. xviii. 8. Mk. ix. 42.

[1] B omits γαρ, which therefore W H. bracket. As Weiss suggests it may have fallen out *per incuriam*. It seems needed. *Vide* below.

[2] The order in which these four words (χωλους, etc.) are given varies. B has κυλλους before τυφλους, which W.H. adopt. The order of T.R. is supported only by late MSS.

[3] αυτου for του Ι. in ℵBDL.

[4] τον οχλον in ℵCDΔ.

[5] B has ακουοντας.

[6] ℵ omits this clause.

Vv. 25-28. *Entreaty renewed at close quarters with success.*—Ver. 25. ἡ δὲ ἐλθοῦσα, etc. Probably the mother read conflict and irresolution in Christ's face, and thence drew encouragement.—Ver. 26. οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν, etc.: seemingly a hard word, but not so hard as it seems. First, it is not a simple monosyllabic negative, leaving no room for parley, but an argument inviting further discussion. Next, it is playful, humorous, bantering in tone, a parable to be taken *cum grano*. Third, its harshest word, κυναρίοις, contains a loophole. κυνάρια does not compare Gentiles to the dogs without, in the street, but to the household dogs belonging to the family, which got their portion though not the children's.—Ver. 27. ναί, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ, etc.: eager assent, not dissent, with a gleam in the eye on perceiving the advantage given by the comparison = Yes, indeed, Lord, for even, etc. Kypke cites an instance from Xenophon of the combination ναί καὶ γὰρ in the same sense.—ψιχίων, dimin. from ψίξ, a bit, crumb, found only in N. T. (here and in Mk. vii. 28, Lk. xvi. 21), another diminutive answering to κυνάρια = the little pet dogs, eat of the minute morsels. Curiously felicitous combination of ready wit, humility and faith: wit in seizing on the playful κυνάρια and improving on it by adding ψίχια, humility in being content with the smallest crumbs, faith in conceiving of the healing asked as only such a crumb for Jesus to give.—Ver. 28. Immediate compliance with her request with intense delight in her faith, which may have recalled to mind that of another Gentile (Mt. viii. 10).—ὦ γύναι: exclamation in a tone enriched by the harmonies of manifold emotions. What a refreshment to Christ's heart to pass from that dreary pestilential traditionalism to this utterance of a simple unsophisticated moral nature on Pagan soil. The transition from the one scene to the other unconsciously serves the purposes of consummate dramatic art.

Vv. 29 31. *Return to the Sea of Galilee* (Mk. vii. 31-37).—Ver. 29. παρὰ τ. θ. τ. Γαλ., to the neighbourhood of the Sea of Galilee; on which side? According to Mk., the eastern, approached by a circuitous journey through Sidon and Decapolis. Weiss contends that Mt. means the western shore. The truth seems to be that he leaves it vague. His account is a meagre colourless reproduction of Mk.'s. He takes no interest in the route but only in the incidents at the two termini. He takes Jesus north to the borders of Tyre to met the woman of Canaan, and back to Galilee to feed the multitude a second time.—εἰς τὸ ὄρος, as in v. 1, and apparently for the same purpose: ἐκάθητο ε., sat down there to teach. This ascent of the hill bordering the lake is not in Mk.—Ver.

v Mk. viii. 2 (ἡμέραι, true reading as here). Cf. Lk. ix. 28, Acts v. 7 for const.
w Mk. viii. 2. Acts xi. 23; xiii. 43. 1 Tim. v. 5.
x Mk. viii. 3.
y Mk. viii. 7.
z Mk. vi. 40 (absol.); viii. 6 (ἐπὶ τῆς γ.). Lk. xi. 37 (=ἀνακλίνομαι). John xxi. 20 al.

ἐδόξασαν τὸν Θεὸν Ἰσραήλ. 32. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπε, "Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη v ἡμέρας [1] τρεῖς w προσμένουσί μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι. καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς x νήστεις οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ." 33. Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ,[2] "Πόθεν ἡμῖν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ ἄρτοι τοσοῦτοι, ὥστε χορτάσαι ὄχλον τοσοῦτον;" 34. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Ἑπτά, καὶ ὀλίγα y ἰχθύδια." 35. Καὶ ἐκέλευσε τοῖς ὄχλοις [3] z ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· 36. καὶ λαβὼν [4] τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας,[5] εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκε [6] τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,[7] οἱ δὲ

[1] ημεραι in most uncials. ℵ and Origen have the accus. (ημερας T.R.), obviously a grammatical correction.

[2] ℵB omit.

[3] For εκελ. τοις οχ. ℵBD have παραγγειλας τω οχλω.

[4] For και λαβων ℵBD have ελαβε.

[5] ℵBD insert και before ευχαριστησας.

[6] εδιδου in ℵBD.

[7] ℵBD omit αυτου.

30. χωλούς, etc.: the people wanted healing, not teaching, and so brought their sick and suffering to Jesus.—ἔρριψαν: they threw them at His feet either in care-free confidence, or in haste, because of the greatness of the number. Among those brought were certain classed as κυλλούς, which is usually interpreted "bent," as with rheumatism. But in xviii. 8 it seems to mean "mutilated". Euthy. takes κυλλοὶ = οἱ ἄχειρες, and Grotius argues for this sense, and infers that among Christ's works of healing were restorations of lost limbs, though we do not read of such anywhere else. On this view ὑγιεῖς, ver. 31, will mean ἀρτίους, *integros*.—Ver. 31. λαλοῦντας: this and the following participles are used substantively as objects of the verb βλέποντας, the action denoted by the participles being that which was seen.—ἐδόξασαν τ. θ. Ἰσραήλ. The expression suggests a non-Israelite crowd and seems to hint that after all for our evangelist Jesus is on the east side and in heathen territory. But it may point back to ver. 24 and mean the God who conferred such favours on Israel as distinct from the heathen (Weiss-Meyer).

Vv. 32-38. *Second feeding* (Mk. viii. 1-9).—Ver. 32. σπλαγχνίζομαι, with ἐπὶ as in Mk. viii. 2, with περὶ in ix. 36, xiv. 14. In the first feeding Christ's compassion is moved by the sickness among the multitude, here by their hunger.—ἡμέραι τρεῖς: that this is the true reading is guaranteed by the unusual construction, the accusative being what one expects. The reading of D adopted by Fritzsche, which inserts εἰσι καὶ after τρεῖς, though not to be accepted as the true reading, may be viewed as a solution of the problem presented by the true reading, *vide* Winer, § 62, 2.—νήστεις, fasting (νη, ἐσθίω similar to νήπιος from νη, ἔπος), here and in parallel text in Mk. only. The motive of the miracle is not the distance from supplies but the exhausted condition of the people after staying three days with Jesus with quite inadequate provision of food. Mk. states that some were far from home (viii. 3), implying that most were not. But even those whose homes were near might faint (ἐκλυθῶσι, Gal. vi. 9) by the way through long fasting.—Ver. 33. τοσοῦτοι, ὥστε χορτάσαι. ὥστε with infinitive may be used to express a consequence involved in the essence or quality of an object or action, therefore after τοσοῦτος and similar words; *vide* Kühner, § 584, 2, *aa*.—Ver. 34. πόσους ἄρτους: the disciples have larger supplies this time than the first after three days, and when the supplies of the multitude are exhausted: *seven* loaves and several small fishes.—Ver. 36. εὐχαριστήσας, a late Greek word ("does not occur before Polybius in the sense of *gratias agere*"—Camb. N. T.), condemned by Phryn., who enjoins χάριν εἰδέναι instead (Lobeck, p. 18). Elsner dissents from the judgment of the ancient grammarians, citing instances from Demosthenes, etc.—Ver. 37. ἑπτά σπυρίδας: baskets different in number and in name. Hesychius

μαθηταὶ τῷ ὄχλῳ.[1] 37. Καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦραν[2] τὸ περισσεῦον τῶν κλασμάτων, ἑπτὰ [a] σπυρίδας πλήρεις. 38. οἱ δὲ ἐσθίοντες ἦσαν τετρακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες, χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων.

[a] Ch. xvi. 10. Mk. viii. 8, 20. Acts ix. 25.

39. Καὶ ἀπολύσας τοὺς ὄχλους ἐνέβη εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια Μαγδαλά.[3]

XVI. 1. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Σαδδουκαῖοι πειράζοντες ἐπηρώτησαν[4] αὐτὸν σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτοῖς.

[1] τοις οχλοις in ℵBL *al.* [2] ηραν after κλασματων in BD.

[3] Μαγαδαν in ℵBD, adopted in Tisch., W.H., etc., and doubtless the true reading. Μαγδαλα is a known substituted for an unknown.

[4] επηρωτων in ℵ (Tisch. and W.H. marg.).

defines σπυρίς: τὸ τῶν πυρῶν ἄγγος = wheat-basket; perhaps connected with σπεῖρα, suggesting a basket made of rope-net; probably larger than κόφινος, for longer journeys (Grotius). Or does the different kind of basket point to different nationality; Gentiles? Hilary contends for Gentile recipients of the second blessing, with whom Westcott (*Characteristics of Gospel Miracles*, p. 13) agrees.—Ver. 39. Μαγαδάν: the true reading, place wholly unknown, whence probably the variants.

CHAPTER XVI. SIGN SEEKERS: CAESAREA PHILIPPI. Again a dramatically impressive juxtaposition of events. First an ominous encounter with ill-affected men professedly in quest of a sign, then in a place of retreat a first announcement in startlingly plain terms of an approaching tragic crisis.

Vv. 1-12. *Demand for a sign* (Mk. viii. 11-21).—Ver. 1. προσελθόντες: one of Mt.'s oft-recurring descriptive words.—φαρ. καὶ Σαδδ., a new combination, with sinister purpose, of classes of the community not accustomed to act together; wide apart, indeed, in social position and religious tendency, but made allies *pro tem.* by common dislike to the movement identified with Jesus. Already scribes by themselves had asked a sign (xii. 38). Now they are joined by a party representing the priestly and governing classes among whom the "Sadducees" were to be found (Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*). Mk. mentions only the Pharisees (ver. 11), but he makes Jesus refer to the leaven of Herod in the subsequent conversation with the disciples, whence might legitimately be inferred the presence of representatives of that leaven. These Mt. calls "Sadducees," probably the better-known name, and practically identical with the Herod leaven. The "Herodians" were, I imagine, people for whom Herod the Great was a hero, a kind of Messiah, all the Messiah they cared for or believed in, one who could help worldly-minded Israelites to be proud of their country (*vide* Grotius on Mt. xvi. 6). It was among Sadducees that such hero-worshippers were likely to be found.—ἐπηρώτησαν: here like the simple verb (xv. 23) = requested, with infinitive, ἐπιδεῖξαι, completing the object of desire.—σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ: before (xii. 38) only a *sign*. Now a sign *from heaven*. What might that be? Chrys. (Hom. liii.) suggests: to stop the course of the sun, to bridle the moon, to produce thunder, or to change the air, or something of that sort. These suggestions will do as well as any. Probably the interrogators had no definite idea what they wanted, beyond desiring to embarrass or nonplus Christ.

Vv. 2-4. *Reply of Jesus.*—Vv. 2 and 3, though not in B and bracketed by W. H., may be regarded as part of the text. Somewhat similar is Lk. xii. 54-56. On some occasion Jesus must have contrasted the shrewd observation of His contemporaries in the natural sphere with their spiritual obtuseness.—Ver 2. εὐδία, fine weather! (εὐ, Διός genitive of Ζεύς).—πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ ὁ.: that the sign = a ruddy sky in the *evening* (πυῤῥίζειν in Lev. xiii. 19, 24).—Ver. 3. χειμών, a storm to-day; sign the same, a ruddy sky in the *morning*.—στυγνάζων, late but expressive = *triste coelum*. No special meteorological skill indicated thereby, only the average power of observation based on experience, which is common to mankind. Lightfoot credits the Jews with

a Sir. iii. 15. 2. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὀψίας[1] γενομένης λέγετε, [a]Εὐδία· b Acts xxvii. 20 (same sense). Ch. xxiv. 20 (winter) al. c Mk. x. 22. πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός. 3. καὶ πρωΐ, Σήμερον [b]χειμών· πυρράζει γὰρ [c]στυγνάζων ὁ οὐρανος. ὑποκριταί,[2] τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθε;[1] 4. γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ· καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ, εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου."[3] Καὶ d Mk. viii. 14 (with inf.). Heb. vi. 10; xiii. 2, 16 (with gen.). Phil. iii. 13 (accus.). καταλιπὼν αὐτούς, ἀπῆλθε.

5. Καὶ ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ[4] εἰς τὸ πέραν [d]ἐπελάθοντο ἄρτους λαβεῖν. 6. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων." 7. Οἱ δὲ διελογί-

[1] From **οψιας** to **δυνασθε**, end of ver. 3, is bracketed as doubtful by modern editors. The passage is wanting in ℵBVXΓ, Syr. Cur., and Syr. Sin. Orig., etc.

[2] DLΔ omit. [3] ℵBDL omit **του προφητου**. [4] ℵBCD omit **αυτου**.

special interest in such observations, and Christ was willing to give them full credit for skill in that sphere. His complaint was that they showed no such skill in the ethical sphere; they could not discern the signs of the times (**τῶν καιρῶν**: the reference being, of course, chiefly to their own time). Neither Pharisees nor Sadducees had any idea that the end of the Jewish state was so near. They said **εὐδία** when they should have said **χειμών**. They mistook the time of day; thought it was the eve of a good time coming when it was the morning of the judgment day. For a historical parallel, *vide* Carlyle's *French Revolution*, book ii., chap. i., *Astraea Redux*.—Ver. 4. *Vide* chap. xii. 39.

Vv. 5-12. The one important thing in this section is the reflection of Jesus on what had just taken place. The historical setting is not clear. Jesus left the sign seekers after giving them their answer. The disciples cross the lake; in which direction? With or without their Master? They forget to take bread. When? On setting out or after arrival at the other side? **ἐλθόντες εἰς τ. π.**, ver. 5, naturally suggests the latter, but, as Grotius remarks, the verb **ἔρχεσθαι** in the Gospels sometimes means *ire* not *venire* (*vide, e.g.*, Lk. xv. 20). Suffice it to say that either in the boat or after arrival at the opposite side Jesus uttered a memorable word.—Ver. 6. **ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε**: an abrupt, urgent admonition to look out for, in order to take heed of, a phenomenon of very sinister import; in Scottish idiom "see and beware of". More impressive still in Mk.: **ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε**, a duality giving emphasis to the command (**ἀναδίπλωσις, ἐμφαίνουσα ἐπίτασιν τῆς παραγγελίας**, Euthy.).—**ζύμης**: leaven, here conceived as an evil influence, working, however, after the same manneras the leaven in the parable (xiii. 33). It is a spirit, a *zeitgeist*, insinuating itself everywhere, and spreading more and more in society, which Jesus instinctively shrank from in horror, and from which He wished to guard His disciples.—**τῶν φαρ. καὶ Σαδ.**: one leaven, of two parties viewed as one, hence no article before **Σαδ.** Two leavens separately named in Mk., but even there juxtaposition in the warning implies affinity. The leaven of Pharisaism is made thoroughly known to us in the Gospels by detailed characterisation. Sadducaism very seldom appears on the stage, and few words of Jesus concerning it are recorded; yet enough to indicate its character as secular or "worldly". The two classes, antagonistic at many points of belief and practice, would be at one in dislike of single-hearted devotion to truth and righteousness, whether in the Baptist (iii. 7) or in Jesus. This common action in reference to either might not be a matter of arrangement, and each might come with its own characteristic mood: the Pharisee with bitter animosity, the Sadducee with good-natured scepticism and in quest of amusement, as when they propounded the riddle about the woman married to seven brothers. Both moods revealed utter lack of appreciation, no friendship to be looked for in either quarter, both to be dreaded.—Ver. 7. **ἐν ἑαυτοῖς**: either each man in his own

ζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν." 8. Γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[1] "Τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, ὀλιγόπιστοι ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβετε[2]; 9. οὔπω νοεῖτε, οὐδὲ [e] μνημονεύετε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους τῶν πεντακισχιλίων, καὶ πόσους κοφίνους ἐλάβετε; 10. οὐδὲ τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους τῶν τετρακισχιλίων, καὶ πόσας σπυρίδας[3] ἐλάβετε; 11. πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε, ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἄρτου[4] εἶπον ὑμῖν προσέχειν[5] ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων; 12. Τότε συνῆκαν, ὅτι οὐκ εἶπε προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τοῦ ἄρτου,[6] ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων.

e 1 Thess. ii. 9. 2 Tim. ii. 8. Rev. xviii. 5 (with accus.). Gal. ii. 10. Col. iv. 18. Heb. xi. 15; xiii. 7 (with gen.).

[1] ℵBDLΔΣ *al.* omit **αυτοις**.
[2] ℵBD have **εχετε** (W.H.).
[3] **σφυριδας** in BD.
[4] **αρτων** in ℵBCL.
[5] For **προσεχειν** ℵBCL have **προσεχετε δε**.
[6] **των αρτων** in BL.

mind (Weiss), or among themselves, apart from the Master (Meyer).—**ὅτι** may be recitative or = "because". He gives this warning because, etc.; sense the same. They take the Master to mean: don't buy bread from persons belonging to the obnoxious sects! or rather perhaps: don't take your directions as to the leaven to be used in baking from that quarter. *Vide* Lightfoot *ad loc.* Stupid mistake, yet pardonable when we remember the abruptness of the warning and the wide gulf between Master and disciples: He a prophet with prescient eye, seeing the forces of evil at work and what they were leading to; they very commonplace persons lacking insight and foresight. Note the solitariness of Christ.—Ver. 8. **ὀλιγόπιστοι**: always thinking about *bread, bread* instead of the kingdom and its fortunes, with which alone the Master was occupied.—Vv. 9, 10. And with so little excuse in view of quite recent experiences, of which the vivid details are given as if to heighten the reproach.—Ver. 11. **προσέχετε**, etc.: warning repeated without further explanation, as the meaning would now be self-evident.—Ver. 12. **συνῆκαν**, they now understood, at least to the extent of seeing that it was a question not of loaves but of something spiritual. One could wish that they had understood that from the first, and that they had asked their Master to explain more precisely the nature of the evil influences for their and our benefit. Thereby we might have had in a sentence a photograph of Sadducaism, *e.g.*—**διδαχῆς**, "doctrine"; that was in a general way the import of the **ζύμη**. But if Jesus had explained Himself He would have had more to say. The *dogmas* and *opinions* of the two parties in question were not the worst of them, but the spirit of their life: their dislike of real godliness.

Vv. 13-28. *At Caesarea Philippi* (Mk. viii. 27—ix. 1; Lk. ix. 18-27). The crossing of the lake (ver. 5) proved to be the prelude to a second long excursion northwards, similar to that mentioned in xv. 21; like it following close on an encounter with ill-affected persons, and originating in a kindred mood and motive. For those who regard the two feedings as duplicate accounts of the same event these two excursions are of course one. "The idea of two journeys on which Jesus oversteps the boundaries of Galilee is only the result of the assumption of a twofold feeding. The two journeys are, in truth, only parts of one great journey, on which Jesus, coming out of heathen territory, first touches again the soil of the holy land, in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi." Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 256. Be this as it may, this visit to that region was an eventful one, marking a crisis or turning-point in the career of Jesus. We are at the beginning of the fifth act in the tragic drama: the shadow of the cross now falls across the path. Practically the ministry in Galilee is ended, and Jesus is here to collect His thoughts and to devote Himself to the disciplining of His disciples. Place and time invite to reflection and forecast, and afford leisure for a calm survey of the whole situation. Note that at this point Lk. again joins his fellow-evangelists in his narrative. We have missed him from xiv. 23 onwards (*vide* notes on Lk.).

Ver. 13. **Ἐλθὼν**: here again this verb

13. Ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου ἠρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγων, "Τίνα με[1] λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;" 14. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννην τὸν Βαπτιστήν· ἄλλοι δὲ Ἠλίαν· ἕτεροι δὲ Ἱερεμίαν, ἢ ἕνα τῶν

[1] ℵB and most versions omit με, which has probably come in from the parallels. The omission of με requires the , after εἶναι to be deleted.

may mean not arriving at, but setting out for, or on the way: *unterwegs*, Schanz. So Grotius: *cum proficisceretur, non cum venisset*. Fritzsche dissents and renders: *postquam venerat*. Mk. has ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ to indicate where the conversation began. On the whole both expressions are elastic, and leave us free to locate the ensuing scene at any point on the road to Caesarea Philippi, say at the spot where the city and its surroundings came into view.—Καισαρείας τ. φ.: a notable city, romantically situated at the foot of the Lebanon range, near the main sources of the Jordan, in a limestone cave, in the province of Gaulonitis, ruled over by the Tetrarch Philip, enlarged and beautified by him with the Herodian passion for building, and furnished with a new name (Paneas before, changed into Caesarea of Philip to distinguish from Caesarea on the sea). "A place of exceedingly beautiful, picturesque surroundings, with which few spots in the holy land can be compared. What a rush of many waters; what a wealth and variety of vegetation!" Furrer, *Wanderungen*, 414. *Vide* also the description in Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, and in Professor G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*.—τίνα λέγουσιν, etc.: with this grand natural scene possibly or even probably (why else name it?) in view, Jesus asked His disciples a significant question meant to lead on to important disclosures. The question is variously reported by the synoptists, and it is not easy to decide between the forms. It would seem simpler and more natural to ask, "whom do, etc., that *I* am?" (με εἶναι, Mk. and Lk.). But, on the other hand, at a solemn moment Jesus might prefer to speak impersonally, and ask: "whom . . . that the *Son of Man* is?" (Mt.). That title, as hitherto employed by Him, would not prejudge the question. It had served rather to keep the question who He was, how His vocation was to be defined, in suspense till men had learned to attach new senses to old words. It is intrinsically unlikely that He would combine the two forms of the question, and ask: "whom, etc., that *I*, the *Son of Man*, am?" as in the T. R. That consideration does not settle what Mt. wrote, but it is satisfactory that the best MSS. leave out the με. The question shows that Jesus had been thinking of His past ministry and its results, and it may be taken for granted that He had formed His own estimate, and did not need to learn from the Twelve how He stood. *He had come to the conclusion that He was practically without reliable following outside the disciple circle*, and that conviction is the key to all that follows in this memorable scene. How the influential classes, the Pharisees, and the priests and political men = Sadducees, were affected was apparent. Nothing but hostility was to be looked for there. With the common people on the other hand He had to the last been popular. They liked His preaching, and they took eager advantage of His healing ministry. But had they got a definite faith about Him, as well as a kindly feeling towards Him; an idea well-rooted, likely to be lasting, epoch-making, the starting-point of a new religious movement? He did not believe they had, and He expected to have that impression confirmed by the answer of the Twelve, as indeed it was.

Ver. 14. *Reply of disciples*: the general effect being: opinions of the people, favourable but crude, without religious definiteness and depth, with no promise of future outcome.—Ἰωάν., Ἠλίαν., Ἱερεμ. Historic characters, recent or more ancient, *redivivi*—that the utmost possible: unable to rise to the idea of a wholly new departure, or a greater than any character in past history; conservatism natural to the common mind. All three personages whose return might be expected; the Baptist to continue his work cut short by Herod, Elijah to prepare the way and day of the Lord (Mal. iv. 5), Jeremiah to bring back the ark, etc., which (2 Maccab. ii. 1-12) he had hid in a cave. Jeremiah is classed with the other well-known prophets (ἢ ἕνα τ. π.), and the supporters of that hypothesis are called ἕτεροι, as if to distinguish them not merely numeri-

προφητῶν." 15. Λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι;" 16. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπε, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ [f] ζῶντος." 17. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς[1] ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βὰρ Ἰωνᾶ, ὅτι [g] σὰρξ καὶ [g] αἷμα οὐκ [h] ἀπεκάλυψέ

f Ch. xxvi. 63. Heb. iii. 12; ix. 14; x. 31 (an attribute of God).
g 1 Cor. xv. 50. Gal. i. 16. Eph. vi. 12. Heb. ii. 14 (the same phrase in all).
h Ch. xi. 25. Gal. i. 15.

[1] αποκριθεις δε in ℵBD, cursives.

cally (ἄλλοι) but generically: a lower type who did not connect Jesus with Messiah in any way, even as forerunner, but simply thought of Him as one in whom the old prophetic charism had been revived.

Vv. 15, 16. *New question and answer.*—Ver. 15. ὑμεῖς δὲ, and you? might have stood alone, perhaps did originally. Jesus invites the Twelve to give Him their own view. The first question was really only introductory to this. Jesus desires to make sure that He, otherwise without reliable following, has in His disciples at least the nucleus of a community with a definite religious conviction as to the meaning of His ministry and mission.—Ver. 16. Σίμων Πέτρος: now as always spokesman for the Twelve. There may be deeper natures among them (John?), but he is the most energetic and outspoken, though withal emotional rather than intellectual, strong, as passionate character is, rather than with the strength of thought, or of a will steadily controlled by a firm grasp of great principles: not a rock in the sense in which St. Paul was one.—σὺ εἶ . . . τοῦ ζῶντος: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," in Mk. simply "Thou art the Christ," in Lk. "the Christ of God". One's first thought is that Mk. gives the original form of the reply; and yet in view of Peter's vehement temperament one cannot be perfectly sure of that. The form in Mt. certainly answers best to the reply of Jesus, *vide* on ver. 17. In any case the emphasis lies on that which is common to the three reports: the affirmation of the *Christhood* of Jesus. That was what differentiated the disciples from the favourably disposed multitude. The latter said in effect: at most a forerunner of Messiah, probably not even that, only a prophet worthy to be named alongside of the well-known prophets of Israel. The Twelve through Peter said: not merely a prophet or a forerunner of the Messiah, but the Messiah Himself. The remainder of the reply in Mt., whether spoken by Peter, or added by the evangelist (to correspond, as it were, to *Son of Man* in ver. 13), is simply expansion or epexegesis. If spoken by Peter it serves to show that he spoke with emotion, and with a sense of the gravity of the declaration. The precise theological value of the added clause cannot be determined.

Vv. 17-19. *Solemn address of Jesus to Peter*, peculiar to Mt., and of doubtful authenticity in the view of many modern critics, including Wendt (*Die Lehre Jesu*, i., p. 181), either an addendum by the evangelist or introduced at a later date by a reviser. This question cannot be fully discussed here. It must suffice to say that psychological reasons are in favour of something of the kind having been said by Jesus. It was a great critical moment in His career, at which His spirit was doubtless in a state of high tension. The firm tone of conviction in Peter's reply would give Him a thrill of satisfaction demanding expression. One feels that there is a hiatus in the narratives of Mk. and Lk.: no comment on the part of Jesus, as if Peter had delivered himself of a mere trite commonplace. We may be sure the fact was not so. The terms in which Jesus speaks of Peter are characteristic—warm, generous, unstinted. The style is not that of an ecclesiastical editor laying the foundation for Church power, and prelatic pretensions, but of a noble-minded Master eulogising in impassioned terms a loyal disciple. Even the reference to the "Church" is not unseasonable. What more natural than that Jesus, conscious that His labours, outside the disciple circle, have been fruitless, so far as permanent result is concerned, should fix His hopes on that circle, and look on it as the nucleus of a new regenerate Israel, having for its *raison d'être* that it accepts Him as the Christ? And the name for the new Israel, ἐκκλησία, in His mouth is not an anachronism. It is an old familiar name for the congregation of Israel, found in Deut. (xviii. 26; xxiii. 2) and Psalms (xxii. 36), both books well known to

i here and in xviii. 17 in Gospels.
j Lk. xxi. 36 (W.H.); xxiii. 23.
k Lk. xi. 52. Rev. i. 18; iii. 7; ix. 1; xx. 1.
l Ch. xviii. 18.

σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς [1] οὐρανοῖς. 18. Κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω, ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν [i] ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ᾅδου οὐ [j] κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς, 19. καὶ [2] δώσω σοὶ τὰς [k] κλεῖς [3] τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν· καὶ ὃ ἐὰν [4] [l] δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· καὶ ὃ ἐὰν [5] [l] λύσῃς ἐπὶ

[1] B omits **τοις**, which W.H. bracket. [2] ℵBD omit **και**. (W.H.). [3] **κλειδας** in ℵBL (W.H.). [4] **ο αν** in BD. [5] **ο αν** in D.

Jesus.—Ver. 17. **μακαρίος**: weighty word chosen to express a rare and high condition, virtue, or experience ("hoc vocabulo non solum beata, sed etiam rara simul conditio significatur," Beng.). It implies satisfaction with the quality of Peter's faith. Jesus was not easily satisfied as to that. He wanted no man to call Him Christ under a misapprehension; hence the prohibition in ver. 20. He congratulated Peter not merely on believing Him to be the Messiah, but on having an essentially right conception of what the title meant.—**Σ. βαριωνᾶ**: full designation, name, and patronymic, suiting the emotional state of the speaker, and the solemn character of the utterance, echo of an Aramaic source, or of the Aramaic dialect used then, if not always, by Jesus.—**σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα**: synonym in current Jewish speech for "man". "Infinitâ frequentiâ hanc formulam loquendi adhibent Scriptores Judaici, eaque homines Deo opponunt." Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. *Vide* ver. 23. There is a tacit contrast between Peter's faith, and the opinions of the people just recited, as to source. Flesh and blood was the source of these opinions, and the fact is a clue to the meaning of the phrase. The contrast between the two sources of inspiration is not the very general abstract one between creaturely weakness and Divine power (Wendt, *Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist*, p. 60). "Flesh and blood" covers all that can contribute to the formation of religious opinion of little intrinsic value—tradition, custom, fashion, education, authority, regard to outward appearance. Hilary, and after him Lutteroth, takes the reference to be to Christ's flesh and blood, and finds in the words the idea: if you had looked to my flesh you would have called me Christ, the Son of *David*, but higher guidance has taught you to call me *Son of God*.—**ὁ πατήρ μου**: this is to be taken not in a merely ontological sense, but, ethically, so as to account for the quality of Peter's faith. The true conception of Christhood was inseparable from the true conception of God. Jesus had been steadily working for the transformation of both ideas, and He counted on the two finding entrance into the mind together. No one could truly conceive the Christ who had not learned to think of God as the Father and as *His* Father. There were thus two revelations in one: of God as Father, and of Christ by the Father. Peter had become a *Christian*.

Ver. 18. **κἀγὼ**: emphatic, something very important about to be said to Peter and about him.—**πέτρος, πέτρᾳ**, a happy play of words. Both are appellatives to be translated "thou art a rock and on this rock," the two being represented by the same word in Aramaean (כֵּיפָא). Elsewhere in the Gospels **Πέτρος** is a proper name, and **πέτρα** only is used in the sense of rock (vii. 24). What follows is in form a promise to Peter as reward of his faith. It is as personal as the most zealous advocates of Papal supremacy could desire. Yet it is as remote as the poles from what they mean. It is a case of extremes meeting. Christ did not fight to death against one form of spiritual despotism to put another, if possible worse, in its room. Personal in form, the sense of this famous logion can be expressed in abstract terms without reference to Peter's personality. And that sense, if Christ really spoke the word, must be simple, elementary, suitable to the initial stage; withal religious and ethical rather than ecclesiastical. The more ecclesiastical we make it the more we play into the hands of those who maintain that the passage is an interpolation. I find in it three ideas: (1) The **ἐκκλησία** is to consist of men confessing Jesus to be the Christ. This is the import of **ἐπὶ τ. τ. π. οἰκοδομήσω μου τ. ἐκ.** Peter, believing that truth, is the foundation,

τῆς γῆς, ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς." 20. Τότε διεστείλατο[1] τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ[2] ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς[3] ὁ Χριστός.

21. [m]Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς[4] δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα,[5] καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι, καὶ

m Ch. iv. 17; xxvi. 16. Lk. xvi. 16.

[1] επετιμησεν in BD. W.H. place it in text with διεστειλατο in margin. Mk. has επετιμησεν in the corresponding place.

[2] ℵBCD omit αυτου, which so often stands in T. R. where the best texts want it.

[3] ℵBLXΓΔ omit Ιησους.

[4] For ο Ιησους ℵB, Cop. have Ιησους Χριστος; D Ιησους without the art. *Vide* below.

[5] εις I. before απελθειν in ℵBD cursives.

and the building is to be of a piece with the foundation. Observe the emphatic position of μου. The ἐκκλησία is Christ's; confessing Him as Christ in Peter's sense and spirit = being Christian. (2) The new society is to be = the kingdom realised on earth. This is the import of ver. 19, clause 1. The keys are the symbol of this identity. They are the keys of the gate without, not of the doors within. Peter is the gate-keeper, not the οἰκονόμος with a bunch of keys that open all doors in his hands (against Weiss).—κλειδούχου ἔργον τὸ εἰσάγειν, Euthy. Observe it is not the keys of the *church* but of the *kingdom*. The meaning is: Peter-like faith in Jesus as the Christ admits into the Kingdom of Heaven. A society of men so believing = the kingdom realised. (3) In the new society the *righteousness* of the kingdom will find approximate embodiment. This is the import of ver. 19, second clause. Binding and loosing, in Rabbinical dialect, meant forbidding and permitting to be done. The judgment of the Rabbis was mostly wrong: the reverse of the righteousness of the kingdom. The judgment of the new society as to conduct would be in accordance with the truth of things, therefore valid in heaven. That is what Jesus meant to say. Note the perfect participles δεδεμένον, λελυμένον = shall be a thing bound or loosed once for all. The truth of all three statements is conditional on the Christ spirit continuing to rule in the new society. Only on that condition is the statement about the πύλαι ᾅδου, ver. 18, clause 2, valid. What precisely the verbal meaning of the statement is—whether that the gates of Hades shall not prevail in conflict against it, as ordinarily understood; or merely that the gates, etc., shall not be stronger than it, without thought of a conflict (Weiss), is of minor moment; the point is that it is not an absolute promise. The ἐκκλησία will be strong, enduring, only so long as the faith in the Father and in Christ the Son, and the *spirit* of the Father and the Son, reign in it. When the Christ spirit is weak the Church will be weak, and neither creeds nor governments, nor keys, nor ecclesiastical dignities will be of much help to her.

Ver. 20. διεστείλατο (T. R.), "charged" (A. V.) not necessarily with any special emphasis = *graviter interdicere*, but = *monuit* (Loesner and Fritzsche). *Cf.* Heb. xii. 20, where a stronger sense seems required. For ἐπετίμησε in BD here and in Mk. Euthy. gives κατησφαλίσατο = to make sure by injunction.—τοῖς μαθηταῖς: all the disciples are supposed to say amen to Peter's confession, thinking of God and of Jesus as he thought, though possibly not with equal emphasis of conviction.—ἵνα . . . ὁ Χριστός: no desire to multiply hastily recruits for the new community, supreme regard to quality. Jesus wanted no man to call Him *Christ* till he knew what he was saying: no hearsay or echoed confession of any value in His eyes.—αὐτός, the same concerning whom current opinions have just been reported (ver. 14). It was hardly necessary to take pains to prevent the faith in His Messiahship from spreading prematurely in a crude form. Few would call such an one as *Jesus* Christ, save by the Holy Ghost. The one temptation thereto lay in the generous beneficence of Jesus.

Vv. 21-28. *Announcement of the*

n Mk. viii. 32. *Cf.* Acts xvii. 5; xviii. 26.
o *Cf.* Heb. viii. 12.
p Mk. viii. 33. Rom. viii. 5. Phil. ii. 5; iii. 19.

τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι. 22. καὶ ⁿ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾷν αὐτῷ λέγων,[1] "ᵒἽλεώς σοι, κύριε· οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο." 23. Ὁ δὲ στραφεὶς εἶπε τῷ Πέτρῳ, "Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ, σκάνδαλόν μου εἶ[2]· ὅτι οὐ ᵖ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ

[1] For ηρ. επιτιμαν α. λεγων, which conforms to Mk., B has λεγει α. επιτιμων (W.H. marg.).

[2] ει εμου in ℵB (Tisch., W.H.).

Passion with relative conversation (Mk. viii. 31—ix. 1; Lk. ix. 22-27).—Ver. 21. **ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο** (*vide* iv. 17) marks pointedly a new departure in the form of explicit intimation of an approaching final and fatal crisis. Time suitable. Disciples could now bear it, it could not be much longer delayed. Jesus could now face the crisis with composure, having been satisfied by Peter's confession that His labour was not going to be in vain. He then *began* to show, etc., for this was only the first of several communications of the same kind.—**Χριστὸς** after **Ἰησοῦς** in ℵB is an intrinsically probable reading, as suiting the solemnity of the occasion and greatly enhancing the impressiveness of the announcement. Jesus, the *Christ*, to be crucified! But one would have expected the article before **Χρ.**—**πολλὰ παθεῖν**, the general fact.—**ἀπὸ . . . γραμματέων**, the three constituent parts of the Sanhedrim—elders, priests, scribes.—**ἀποκτανθῆναι**: one hard special fact, be *killed*.—**ἐγερθῆναι**: this added to make the other fact not altogether intolerable.

Ver. 22. Peter here appears in a new character; a minute ago speaking under inspiration from heaven, now under inspiration from the opposite quarter.—**ἤρξατο**, began to chide or admonish. He did not get far. As soon as his meaning became apparent he encountered prompt, abrupt, peremptory contradiction.—**Ἵλεώς σοι**: Elsner renders *sis bono placidoque animo*, but most (Erasmus, Grotius, Kypke, Fritzsche, etc.) take it = *absit!* God avert it! Vehement utterance of a man confounded and horrified. Perfectly honest and in one sense thoroughly creditable, but suggesting the question: Did Peter after all call Jesus *Christ* in the true sense? The answer must be: Yes, *ethically*. He understood what kind of man was fit to be a Christ. But he did not yet understand what kind of treatment such a man might expect from the world. A noble, benignant, really righteous man Messiah must be, said Peter; but why a man of *sorrow* he had yet to learn.—**οὐ μὴ ἔσται**, future of perfect assurance: it will not, cannot be.—Ver. 23. **ὕπαγε ὀ. μ. Σ.**: tremendous crushing reply of the Master, showing how much He felt the temptation; calm on the surface, deep down in the soul a very real struggle. Some of the Fathers (Origen, Jerome) strive to soften the severity of the utterance by taking *Satanas* as an appellative = **ἀντικείμενος**, *adversarius*, *contrarius*, and pointing out that in the Temptation in the wilderness Jesus says to Satan simply **ὕπαγε** = depart, but to Peter **ὕπ. ὀπίσω μου** = take thy place behind me and be follower, not leader. But these refinements only weaken the effect of a word which shows that Jesus recognises here His old enemy in a new and even more dangerous form. For none are more formidable instruments of temptation than well-meaning friends, who care more for our comfort than for our character.—**σκάνδαλον**: not "offensive to me," but "a temptation to me to offend," to do wrong; a virtual apology for using the strong word **Σατανᾶ**.—**οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ**, etc., indicates the point of temptation = *non stas a Dei partibus* (Wolf), or **φρονεῖν**, etc. = *studere rebus*, etc. (Kypke), to be on God's side, or to study the Divine interest instead of the human. The important question is: What precisely are the two interests? They must be so conceived as not entirely to cancel the eulogium on Peter's faith, which was declared to be not of man but of God. Meyer's comment on **τὰ τ. ἀ.**—concerned about having for Messiah a mere earthly hero and prince (so Weiss also)—is too wide. We must restrict the phrase to the instinct of self-preservation = save your life at all hazards. From Christ's point of view that was the import of Peter's suggestion; preference of natural life to duty = God's interest. Peter himself did not see that these were the alternatives; he thought

τῶν ἀνθρώπων." 24. Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, [q] ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν [r] σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. 25. ὃς γὰρ ἂν[1] θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν [s] ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εὑρήσει αὐτήν· 26. τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται[2] ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν τὸν [t] κόσμον [t] ὅλον κερδήσῃ, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ [u] ζημιωθῇ; ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ; 27. μέλλει γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ· καὶ τότε ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν [v] πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ. 28. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰσί τινες τῶν ὧδε ἑστηκότων,[3] οἵτινες οὐ μὴ [w] γεύσωνται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [x] ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ."

q Mk. viii. 34. Ch. xxvi. 34 (of Peter's denial).
r Ch. x. 38. Mk. viii. 34 (x. 21, T.R.). Lk. ix. 23; xiv. 27.
s Ch. x. 39. Mk. viii. 35. Lk. xvii. 33.
t Ch. xxvi. 13. Rom. i. 8.
u Mk. viii. 36. Lk. ix. 25 (ἑαυτόν).
v Lk. xxiii. 51. Acts xix. 18. Rom. viii. 13.
w John viii. 52. Heb. ii. 9.
x Lk. xxiii. 42.

[1] εαν in ℵBC. [2] ωφεληθησεται in ℵBL cursives. [3] εστωτων in ℵBCDLΣ.

the two opposite interests compatible, and both attainable.

Vv. 24-28. *General instruction on the subject of the two interests.*—Ver. 24. **εἶπε τοῖς μαθ.**: in calm, self-collected, didactic tone Jesus proceeds to give the disciples, in a body, a lesson arising out of the situation.—**εἴ τις θέλει**: *wishes*, no compulsion; **οὐ βιάζομαι**, Chrys., who remarks on the wisdom of Jesus in leaving every man free, and trusting to the attraction of the life: **αὐτὴ τοῦ πράγματος ἡ φύσις ἱκανὴ ἐφελκύσασθαι.**—**ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν**: here only, intimates that discipleship will call for self-denial, or self-subordination. Chrys. illustrates the meaning by considering what it is to deny *another* = not to assist him, bewail him or suffer on his account when he is in distress.—**τὸν σταυρὸν** looks like a trait introduced after Christ's passion. It need not be, however. Punishment by crucifixion was known to the Jews through the Romans, and it might be used by Jesus as the symbol of extreme torment and disgrace, even though He did not then know certainly that He Himself should meet death in that particular form. It became a common expression, but the phrase **ἀράτω τ. σ.** would sound harsh and startling when first used. *Vide* on Mt. x. 38.—Ver. 25. *Vide* x. 39. The Caesarea crisis was the most appropriate occasion for the first promulgation of this great ethical principle. It was Christ's first contribution towards unfolding the significance of His suffering, setting it forth as the result of a fidelity to righteousness incumbent on all.

Ver. 26. This and the following verses suggest aids to practice of the philosophy of dying to live. The statement in this verse is self-evident in the sphere of the lower life. It profits not to gain the whole world if you lose your life, for you cannot enjoy your possession; a life lost cannot be recovered at any price. Jesus wishes His disciples to understand that the same law obtains in the higher life: that the soul, the spiritual life, is incommensurable with any outward possession however great, and if forfeited the loss is irrevocable. This is one of the chief texts containing Christ's doctrine of the absolute worth of man as a moral subject. For the man who grasps it it is easy to be a hero and face any experience. To Jesus Christ it was a self-evident truth.—**ζημιωθῇ**, not suffer injury to, but forfeit. Grotius says that the verb in classics has only the dative after it = *mulctare morte*, but Kypke and Elsner cite instances from Herod., Dion., Hal., Themis., etc., of its use with accusative.—**ἀντάλλαγμα**: something given in exchange. *Cf.* 1 Kings xx. 2, Job xxviii. 15 (Sept.), a price to buy back the life lower or higher; both impossible.—Ver. 27. **μέλλει** points to something near and certain; note the emphatic position.—**ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τ. δ.**, the counterpart experience to the passion; stated objectively in reference to the *Son of Man*, the passion spoken of in the second person (ver. 21). In Mk. both are objectively put; but the disciples understood the reference to be personal (Mk. viii. 32). This belongs to a third group of texts to be taken into account in an attempt

a Mk. ix. 2. Lk. xxiv. 51 (T.R.). b Mk. ix. 2. Rom. xii. 2. 2 Cor. iii. 18.

XVII. 1. ΚΑΙ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ [a] ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν. 2. καὶ [b] μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαμψε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ

to fix the import of the title—those which refer to apocalyptic glory in terms drawn from Daniel vii. 13.—τότε ἀποδώσει: the Son of Man comes to make final awards. The reference to judgment comes in to brace up disciples to a heroic part. It is an aid to spirits not equal to this part in virtue of its intrinsic nobleness; yet not much of an aid to those to whom the heroic life is not in itself an attraction. The absolute worth of the true life is Christ's first and chief line of argument; this is merely subsidiary.—Ver. 28. A *crux interpretum*, supposed by some to refer to the Transfiguration (Hilary, Chrys., Euthy., Theophy., etc.); by others to the destruction of Jerusalem (Wetstein, etc.); by others again to the origins of the Church (Calvin, Grotius, etc.). The general meaning can be inferred with certainty from the purpose to furnish an additional incentive to fidelity. It is: Be of good courage, there will be ample compensation for trial *soon*; for some of you even before you die. This sense excludes the Transfiguration, which came *too soon* to be compensatory. The uncertainty comes in in connection with the form in which the general truth is stated. As to that, Christ's speech was controlled not merely by His own thoughts but by the hopes of the future entertained by His disciples. He had to promise the advent of the Son of Man in His Kingdom or of the Kingdom of God in power (Mk.) within a generation, whatever His own forecast as to the future might be. That might postulate a wider range of time than some of His words indicate, just as some of His utterances and His general spirit postulate a wide range in space for the Gospel (universalism) though He conceived of His own mission as limited to Israel. If the *logion* concerning the Church (ver. 18) be genuine, Jesus must have conceived a Christian *era* to be at least a possibility, for why trouble about founding a Church if the wind-up was to come in a few years? The words of Jesus about the future provide for two possible alternatives: for a near advent and for an indefinitely postponed advent. His promises naturally contemplate the former; much of His teaching about the kingdom easily fits into the latter.—γεύσωνται θ.: a Hebrew idiom, but not exclusively so. For examples of the figure of tasting applied to *experiences*, *vide* Elsner in Mk. For Rabbinical use, *vide* Schöttgen and Wetstein.—ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι, subjunctive after ἑ. ἂν as usual in classics and N. T. in a clause referring to a future contingency depending on a verb referring to future time.

CHAPTER XVII. THE TRANSFIGURATION; THE EPILEPTIC BOY; THE TEMPLE TRIBUTE. Three impressive tableaux connected by proximity in time, a common preternatural aspect, and deep moral pathos.

Vv. 1-13. *The Transfiguration* (Mk. ix. 2-13, Lk. ix. 28-36).—Ver. 1. μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ. This precise note of time looks like exact recollection of a strictly historical incident. Yet Holtzmann (H. C.) finds even in this a mythical element, based on Exodus xxiv. 16: the six days of Mt. and Mk. and the eight days of Lk., various expressions of the thought that between the confession of the one disciple and the experience of the three a *sacred week* intervened. Of these days we have no particulars, but on the principle that in preternatural experiences the subjective and the objective correspond, we may learn the psychological antecedents of the Transfiguration from the Transfiguration itself. The thoughts and talk of the company of Jesus were the prelude of the vision. A thing in itself intrinsically likely, for after such solemn communications as those at Caesarea Philippi it was not to be expected that matters would go on in the Jesus-circle as if nothing had happened. In those days Jesus sought to explain from the O.T. the δεῖ of xvi. 21, showing from Moses, Prophets, and Psalms (Lk. xxiv. 44) the large place occupied by suffering in the experience of the righteous. This would be quite as helpful to disciples summoned to bear the cross as any of the thoughts in xvi. 25-28.—Πέτ., Ἰάκ., Ἰωάν.: Jesus takes with Him the three disciples found most capable to understand and sympathise. So in Gethsemane. Such differences exist in all disciple-circles, and they cannot be ignored by the teacher.—ἀναφέρει, leadeth up; in this sense not usual; of sacrifice in Jas. ii. 21 and in

ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς. 3. καὶ ἰδού, ὤφθησαν[1] αὐτοῖς Μωσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας, μετ' αὐτοῦ [c] συλλαλοῦντες.[2] 4. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε τῷ Ἰησοῦ, "Κύριε, [d] καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι· εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσωμεν[3] ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν, καὶ Μωσῇ μίαν, καὶ μίαν Ἠλίᾳ." 5. Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδού, νεφέλη φωτεινὴ ἐπεσκίασεν αὐτούς· καὶ ἰδού, φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης, λέγουσα, "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε."[4] 6. Καὶ

c Acts xxv. 12 (μετά τινος). Mk. ix. 4. Lk. ix. 30; xxii. 4 (dat.). Lk. iv. 36 (πρὸς ἀλλήλους).
d Ch. xviii. 8 parall.; xxvi. 24. Rom. xiv. 21. 1 Cor. vii. 8; ix. 15.

[1] ωφθη ℵBD, which, the verb coming before the two nom., is legitimate. The T. R. is a grammatical correction of ancient revisers.

[2] ℵB place μετ' αυτου after συλλαλουντες.

[3] ποιησω in ℵBC. *Vide* below.

[4] ακουετε αυτου in ℵBD.

Heb. vii. 27, xiii. 15.—ὄρος ὑψηλὸν: Tabor the traditional mountain, a tradition originating in fourth century with Cyril of Jerusalem and Jerome. Recent opinion favours Hermon. All depends on whether the six days were spent near Caesarea Philippi or in continuous journeying. Six days would take them far. "The Mount of Transfiguration does not concern geography"—Holtz. (H. C.).—Ver. 2. μετεμορφώθη, *transfiguratus est*, Vulgate; became altered in appearance. Such transformation in exalted states of mind is predicated of others, *e.g.*, of Iamblichus (Eunapius in I. Vitâ 22, cited by Elsner), and of Adam when naming the beasts (Fabricius, *Cod. Pseud. V. T.*, p. 10).—ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, so as to be visible to them, *vide* vi. 1. Luke's narrative seems to imply that the three disciples were asleep at the beginning of the scene, but wakened up before its close.—καὶ ἔλαμψε . . . φῶς: these words describe the aspect of the transformed person; face sun-bright, raiment pure white.—Ver. 3. καὶ ἰδοὺ introduces a leading and remarkable feature in the scene: ὤφθη αὐτοῖς, there appeared to the three disciples, not necessarily an absolutely real, objective presence of Moses and Elias. All purposes would be served by an appearance in *vision.* Sufficient objectivity is guaranteed by the vision being enjoyed by all the three, which would have been improbable if purely subjective. Recognition of Moses and Elias was of course involved in the vision. For a realistic view of the occurrence the question arises, how was recognition possible? Euthy. Zig. says the disciples had read descriptions of famous men, including Moses and Elias, in old Hebrew books. Another suggestion is that Moses appeared with the law in his hand, and Elias in his fiery chariot.—συλλαλοῦντες μ. ἀ., conversing with Jesus, and, it goes without saying (Lk. does say it), on the theme uppermost in all minds, the main topic of recent conversations, the *cross;* the vision, in its *dramatis personæ* and their talk, reflecting the state of mind of the seers.—Ver. 4. ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Π. Peter to the front again, but not greatly to his credit.—καλόν ἐστιν, etc., either it is good for us to be here = the place is pleasant—so usually; or it is well that we are here—we the disciples to serve you and your visitants—Weiss and Holtzmann (H. C.). Pricaeus, in illustration of the former, cites Anacreon:

Παρὰ τὴν σκιὴν Βάθυλλε
Κάθισον· καλὸν τὸ δένδρον.
Τίς ἂν οὖν ὁρῶν παρέλθοι
Καταγώγιον τοιοῦτον.

—Ode 22.

This sense—*amaenus est, in quo commoremur, locus*, Fritzsche—is certainly the more poetical, but not necessarily on that account the truer to the thought of the speaker, in view of the remark of Lk. omitted in Mt., that Peter did not know what he was saying.—ποιήσω, deliberative substantive with θέλεις preceding and without ἵνα; the singular—shall I make?—suits the forwardness of the man; it is his idea, and he will carry it out himself.—τρεῖς σκηνάς: material at hand, branches of trees, shrubs, etc. Why three? One better for persons in converse. The whole scheme a stupidity. Peter imagined that Moses and Elias had come to stay. Chrys. suggests that Peter here indirectly renews the policy of resistance to going up to Jerusalem (*Hom.* lvi.).

Vv. 5-8. νεφέλη φωτεινή, a luminous

ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν, καὶ [f]ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα. 7. καὶ προσελθὼν[1] ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἥψατο αὐτῶν, καὶ εἶπεν, "Ἐγέρθητε καὶ [g]μὴ φοβεῖσθε." 8. Ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, οὐδένα εἶδον, εἰ μὴ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.

9. Καὶ [h]καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ[2] τοῦ ὄρους, ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων, "Μηδενὶ εἴπητε τὸ [i]ὅραμα, ἕως οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ."[3] 10. Καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ,[4] λέγοντες, "Τί οὖν οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγουσιν, ὅτι

e Ch. xxvi. 39. Lk. v. 12; xvii. 16 (same const.).
f Ch. xxvii. 54.
g Ch. xxviii. 5, 10.
h Ch. viii. 1 (with ἀπὸ, more commonly with ἐκ, as here in W.H.).
i here only in Gospels and in Acts (vii. 31, etc.).

[1] προσηλθεν ο Ι. και in ℵBD; αψαμενος αυτων ειπεν in ℵB.

[2] εκ in ℵBCD *al.*; απο in Σ.

[3] εγερθη in BD; αναστη in ℵC. W.H. place the former in the text and the latter in margin.

[4] αυτου in BCD but wanting in ALZ.

cloud, still a cloud capable of casting a shadow, though a faint one ("non admodum atram," Fritzsche). Some, thinking a shadow incompatible with the light, render **ἐπεσκίασεν** *tegebat, circumdabat*. Loesner cites passages from Philo in support of this meaning.—**αὐτούς**. Whom? the disciples? Jesus, Moses, and Elias? all the six? or the two celestial visitants alone? All these views have been held. The second the more probable, but impossible to be certain.—**καὶ ἰδού**, again introducing a main feature: first the visitants, now the voice from heaven. Relation of the ear to the voice the same as that of the eye to the visitants.—**οὗτος**: the voice spoken this time *about* Jesus; at the baptism *to* Him (Mk. i. 11), meant for the ear of the three disciples. The voice to be taken in connection with the announcement of the coming passion. Jesus God's well-beloved as self-sacrificing.—**ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ**: to be taken in the same connection = hear Him when He speaks to you of *the cross*. *Hunc audite, nempe solum, plena fide, perfectissimo obsequio, universi apostoli et pastores praesertim*, Elsner.—Ver. 6. **καὶ ἀκούσαντες**, etc.: divine voices terrify poor mortals, especially when they echo and reinforce deep moving thoughts within.—Ver. 7. **ἁψάμενος . . . εἶπεν**: a touch and a word, human and kindly, from Jesus, restore strength and composure.—Ver. 8. And so ends the vision.—**ἐπάραντες τ. ὀ.**, etc., raising their eyes they see no one but Jesus. Moses and Elias gone and Jesus in His familiar aspect; the dazzling brightness about face and garments vanished.

Vv. 9-13. *Conversation while descending the hill.*—Ver. 9. **μηδενὶ εἴπητε**: injunction of secrecy. The reason of the injunction lies in the nature of the experience. Visions are for those who are prepared for them. It boots not to relate them to those who are not fit to receive them. Even the three were only partially fit; witness their terror (ver. 6).—**τὸ ὅραμα**, the *vision*, justifying the view above given of the experience held, among others, by Elsner, Herder, Bleek and Weiss. Herder has some fine remarks on the analogy between the experiences of Jesus at His baptism and on the Mount, six days after the announcement at Caesarea Philippi, and those of other men at the time of moral decisions in youth and in the near presence of death (*vide* his *Vom Erlöser der Menschen*, §§ 18, 19).—**ἕως οὗ**, followed by subjunctive without **ἄν**; in this case (*cf.* xvi. 28) one of future contingency at a past time. The optative is used in classics (*vide* Burton, § 324). Not *till* the resurrection. It is not implied that Jesus was very desirous that they should then begin to speak, but only that they could then speak of the vision intelligently and intelligibly. Christ's tone seems to have been that of one making light of the recent experience (as in Lk. x. 20).—Ver. 10. **τί οὖν**, etc.: does the **οὖν** refer to the prohibition in ver. 9 (Meyer), or to the appearance of Moses and Elias, still in the minds of the three disciples, and the lateness of their coming (Euthy., Weiss), or to the shortness of their stay? (Grotius, Fritzsche, Olsh., Bleek, etc.). Difficult to decide, owing to fragmentariness of report; but it is

Ἠλίαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον;" 11. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[1] ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[2] "Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται πρῶτον,[3] καὶ ʲ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα· 12. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι Ἠλίας ἤδη ἦλθε, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν· οὕτω καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν." 13. Τότε συνῆκαν οἱ μαθηταί, ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

j vide at Ch. xii. 13.

14. Καὶ ἐλθόντων αὐτῶν[4] πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον, προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἄνθρω-

[1] ℵBDLZ omit Ιησους. [2] BD omit αυτοις.

[3] ℵBD omit πρωτον, which probably has come in from ver. 10.

[4] ℵBZ sah. omit αυτων.

most natural to take οὖν in connection with preceding verse, only not as referring to the prohibition of speech *pro tem.*, but to the apparent slighting tone in which Jesus spoke. If the recent occurrence is not of vital importance, why then do the scribes say so? To lay the emphasis (with Weiss) on πρῶτον, as if the disciples were surprised that Moses and Elias had not come sooner, before the Christ, is a mistake. The advent would appear to them soon enough to satisfy the requirements of the scribes—just at the right time, after they had recognised in Jesus the Christ = Thou art the Christ we know, and lo! Elias is here to prepare the way for Thy public recognition and actual entry into Messianic power and glory. The sudden disappearance of the celestials would tend to deepen the disappointment created by the Master's chilling tone, so that there is some ground for finding in οὖν a reference to that also.—Ver 11. ἔρχεται: present, as in ii. 4, *praesens pro futuro*, Raphel (*Annotationes* in S.S.), who cites instances of this *enallage temporis* from Xenophon. Wolf (*Curae Phil.*), referring to Raphel, prefers to find in the present here no note of time, but only of the order of coming as between Elias and Christ. It is a didactic, timeless present. So Weiss.—ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα. This word occurs in Sept., Mal. iv. 5, for which stands in Lk. i. 17: ἐπιστρέψαι; the reference is to restitution of right moral relations between fathers and children, etc. Raphel cites instances of similar use from Polyb. The function of Elias, as conceived by the scribes, was to lead Israel to the *Great Repentance*. *Vide* on this, Weber, *Die Lehren des T.*, pp. 337-8.—Ver. 12. λέγω δὲ: Jesus finds the prophecy as to the advent of Elias fulfilled in John the Baptist, so still further reducing the significance of the late vision. The contrast between the mechanical literalism of the scribes and the free spiritual interpretation of Jesus comes out here. Our Lord expected no literal coming of Elijah, such as the Patristic interpreters (Hilary, Chrys., Theophy., Euthy., etc.) supposed Him to refer to in ver. 11. The Baptist was all the Elijah He looked for.—οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν: they did not recognise him as Elijah, especially those who professionally taught that Elijah must come, the scribes.—ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ, etc. Far from recognising in him Elijah, and complying with his summons to repentance, they murdered him in resentment of the earnestness of his efforts towards a moral ἀποκατάστασις (Herod, as representing the *Zeitgeist.*).—ἐν αὐτῷ: literally, in him, not classical, but similar construction found in Gen. xl. 14, and elsewhere (Sept.).—οὕτως: Jesus reads His own fate in the Baptist's. How thoroughly He understood His time, and how free He was from illusions!—Ver. 13. τότε συνῆκαν: the parallel drawn let the three disciples see who the Elijah was alluded to by their Master. What a disenchantment: not the glorified visitant of the night vision, but the beheaded preacher of the wilderness, the true Elijah!

Vv. 14-21. *The epileptic boy* (Mk. ix. 14-29; Lk. ix. 37-43).—Very brief report compared with Mk.—Ver. 14. ἐλθόντων: the αὐτῶν of T. R. might easily be omitted as understood from the connection.—γονυπετῶν, literally, to fall upon the knees, in which sense it would naturally take the dative (T. R., αὐτῷ); here used actively with accusative = to *beknee* him (Schanz, Weiss).—Ver. 15. σεληνιάζεται, he is moonstruck; the symptoms as described are those of epilepsy, which were supposed to become aggravated with the phases of

πος [k] γονυπετῶν αὐτῷ,[1] καὶ λέγων, 15. "Κύριε, ἐλέησόν μου τὸν υἱόν, ὅτι σεληνιάζεται καὶ κακῶς πάσχει[2]· πολλάκις γὰρ πίπτει εἰς τὸ πῦρ, καὶ πολλάκις εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ. 16. καὶ προσήνεγκα αὐτὸν τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι." 17. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ [l] διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι μεθ' ὑμῶν[3]; ἕως πότε [m] ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; φέρετέ μοι αὐτὸν ὧδε." 18. Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον, καὶ ἐθεραπεύθη ὁ παῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης. 19. Τότε προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπον, "Διατί ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό;" 20. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[4] εἶπεν[5] αὐτοῖς, "Διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν[6] ὑμῶν. ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν,

k with τινα here (W. H.) and in Mk. x. 17; with ἔμπροσθέν τινος, Ch. xxvii. 29.
l Phil. ii. 15. (Deut. xxxii. 5).
m Mk. ix. 19. Lk. ix. 41. 2 Cor. xi. 19. Eph. iv. 2. Col. iii. 13 (all with gen., accus. more common in classics).

[1] **αυτον** in nearly all uncials. **αυτω** is a "mechanical repetition" (Weiss) of the previous **αυτω**.

[2] **εχει** in ℵBLZ; as the more usual word it is to be suspected. W.H. introduce it with hesitation.

[3] **μεθ υμων εσομαι** in ℵBCDZ.

[4] ℵBD omit **Ιησους**.

[5] ℵBD 33, etc., have **λεγει**.

[6] **ολιγοπιστιαν** in ℵB cursives, and adopted by most editors, though **απιστιαν** in CD and other uncials as involving a severer reflection has much to recommend it. The tendency would be to tone down.

the moon (*cf.* iv. 25).—**κακῶς πάσχει** (**ἔχει** W. H. text), good Greek. Raphel (*Annot.*) gives examples from Poly. = suffers badly.—Ver. 16. **τοῖς μαθηταῖς**: the nine left behind when Jesus and the three ascended the Mount. The fame of Jesus and His disciples as healers had reached the neighbourhood, wherever it was.—**οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν**: the case baffled the men of the Galilean mission.—Ver. 17. **ὦ γενεὰ**: exclamation of impatience and disappointment, as if of one weary in well-doing, or averse to such work just then. Who are referred to we can only conjecture, and the guesses are various. Probably more or less all present: parent, disciples, scribes (Mk. ix. 14). Jesus was far away in spirit from all, lonely, worn out, and longing for the end, as the question following (**ἕως πότε**, etc.) shows. It is the utterance of a fine-strung nature, weary of the dulness, stupidity, spiritual insusceptibility (**ἄπιστος**), not to speak of the moral perversity (**διεστραμμένη**) all around Him. But we must be careful not to read into it peevishness or ungraciousness. Jesus had not really grown tired of doing good, or lost patience with the bruised reed and smoking taper. The tone of His voice, gently reproachful, would show that. Perhaps the complaint was spoken in an undertone, just audible to those near, and then, aloud: **φέρετέ μοι**: bring him to me, said to the crowd generally, therefore plural.—Ver. 18. **τὸ δαιμόνιον**: the first intimation in the narrative that it is a case of possession, and a hint as to the genesis of the theory of possession. Epilepsy presents to the eye the aspect of the body being in the possession of a foreign will, and all diseases with which the notion of demoniacal possession was associated have this feature in common. "Judaeis usitatissimum erat morbos quosdam graviores, eos praesertim, quibus vel distortum est corpus vel mens turbata et agitata phrenesi, malis spiritibus attribuere." Lightfoot, Hor. Heb., *ad loc.* The **αὐτῷ** after **ἐπετίμησεν** naturally refers to the demon. This reference to an as yet unmentioned subject Weiss explains by the influence of Mk.

Ver. 19. **κατ' ἰδίαν**: the disciples have some private talk with the Master as to what has just happened.—**διατί οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν**: the question implies that the experience was exceptional; in other words that on their Galilean mission, and, perhaps, at other times, they had possessed and exercised healing power.—Ver. 20. **διὰ τὴν ὀλιγοπιστίαν**, here only, and just on that account to be preferred to **ἀπιστίαν** (T. R.); a word coined to express the fact exactly: too little faith for the occasion (*cf.* xiv. 31).

ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ Μετάβηθι [n] ἐντεῦθεν [1] [o] ἐκεῖ, καὶ μεταβήσεται· καὶ οὐδὲν [p] ἀδυνατήσει ὑμῖν. 21. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γένος οὐκ ἐκπορεύεται, εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ." [2]

22. ἈΝΑΣΤΡΕΦΟΜΕΝΩΝ [3] δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Μέλλει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, 23. καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται." [4] Καὶ ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα.

n ἔνθεν (W. H.) here and in Lk. xvi. 26 (*vide* critical note there).
o *vide* Ch. ii. 22 for similar use.
p Lk. i. 37 (Gen. xviii. 14).

[1] **μεταβα** in ℵB; **ενθεν** in ℵBD.

[2] This whole verse is wanting in ℵB 33, some Latin verss., Syrr. verss. (Cur. Hier. Sin.). CDLΔΣ and many other uncials have it. It is doubtless a gloss foisted into the text.

[3] ℵB 1 it. vg. have **συστρεφομενων** changed into the more easily understood **αναστρ.** (T. R.).

[4] B has **αναστησεται** (W.H. margin).

That was a part of the truth at least, and the part it became them to lay to heart.—**ἀμὴν**, introducing, as usual, a weighty saying.—**ἐὰν ἔχητε**, if ye have, a present general supposition.—**κόκκον σινάπεως** proverbial for a small quantity (xiii. 31), a minimum of faith. The purpose is to exalt the power of faith, not to insinuate that the disciples have not even the minimum. Schanz says they had no miracle faith ("fides miraculorum").—**τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ**, the Mount of Transfiguration visible and pointed to.—**μετάβα** (**-βηθι** T. R.), a poetical form of imperative like **ἀνάβα** in Rev. iv. 1. *Vide* Schmiedel's *Winer*, p. 115.—**ἔνθεν ἐκεῖ** for **ἐντεῦθεν ἐκεῖσε**.—**μεταβήσεται**: said, done. Jesus here in effect calls faith an "uprooter of mountains," a phrase current in the Jewish schools for a Rabbi distinguished by legal lore or personal excellence (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, *ad* Mt. xxi. 21, Wünsche).—**ἀδυνατήσει** used in the third person singular only in N. T. with dative = to be impossible; a reminiscence of Mk. ix. 23 (Weiss).—Ver. 21. *Vide* on Mk. ix. 29.

Vv. 22-23. *Second announcement of the Passion* (Mk. ix. 30, 31; Lk. ix. 44, 45).—Ver. 22. **συστρεφομένων α.**, while they were moving about a reunited band.—**ἐν τ. Γ.**: they had got back to Galilee when the second announcement was made. Mk. states that though returned to familiar scenes Jesus did not wish to be recognised, that He might carry on undisturbed the instruction of the Twelve.—**μέλλει**, etc.: the great engrossing subject of instruction was the *doctrine of the cross*.—**παραδίδοσθαι**: a new feature not in the first announcement. Grotius, in view of the words **εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων**, thinks the reference is to God the Father delivering up the Son. It is rather to recent revelations of disaffection within the disciple-circle. For if there were three disciples who showed some receptivity to the doctrine of the cross, there was one to whom it would be very unwelcome, and who doubtless had felt very uncomfortable since the Caesarea announcement.—**παραδ.** contains a covert allusion to the part He is to play.—Ver. 23. **ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα**, they were all greatly distressed; but no one this time ventured to remonstrate or even to ask a question (Mk. ix. 32). The prediction of resurrection seems to have counted for nothing.

Vv. 24-27. *The temple tax.*—In Mt. only, but unmistakably a genuine historic reminiscence in the main. Even Holtzmann (H. C.) regards it as history, only half developed into legend.—Ver. 24. **εἰς Καπ.**: home again after lengthened wandering with the satisfaction home gives even after the most exhilarating holiday excursions.—Ver. 24. **προσῆλθον οἱ**, etc.: home-coming often means return to care. Here are the receivers of custom, as soon as they hear of the arrival, demanding tribute. From the Mount of Transfiguration to money demands which one is too poor to meet, what a descent! The experience has been often repeated in the lives of saints, sons of God, men of genius.—**τὰ δίδραχμα**: a **δίδραχμον** was a coin equal to two Attic drachmae, and to the Jewish half shekel

q here only in N.T. Frequent in Sept. for שֶׁקֶל
r Rom. xiii. 6.
s Ch. xxii. 17. Mk. xii. 14.
t John x. 5. Acts vii. 6. Heb. xi. 9, 34.

24. Ἐλθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Καπερναούμ, προσῆλθον οἱ τὰ [q] δίδραχμα λαμβάνοντες τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ εἶπον, "Ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν οὐ [r] τελεῖ τὰ[1] δίδραχμα;" 25. Λέγει, "Ναί." Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν[2] εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, προέφθασεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων, "Τί σοι δοκεῖ, Σίμων; οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τίνων[3] λαμβάνουσι τέλη ἢ [s] κῆνσον; ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν, ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν [t] ἀλλοτρίων;" 26. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος,[4] "Ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων." Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ

[1] אD omit τα here (Tisch.); BCL retain it (W.H.).

[2] εισελθοντα in א (-τι D); ελθοντα in B. Tisch. adopts the former; W.H. the latter, with εισελθοντα in margin.

[3] B has τινος, which W.H. place in the margin.

[4] For λεγει . . . Π. אBCL have ειποντος δε (Tisch., W.H.). The T. R. is a grammatical correction. The adoption of ειποντος requires a comma before εφη instead of a full stop as in T. R.

= about fifteen pence; payable annually by every Jew above twenty as a tribute to the temple. It was a tribute of the post-exilic time based on Exodus xxx. 13-16. After the destruction of the Temple the tax continued to be paid to the Capitol (Joseph. Bel. I. vii. 6, 7). The time of collection was in the month Adar (March).—**τῷ Π.** Peter evidently the principal man of the Jesus-circle for outsiders as well as internally.—**οὐ τελεῖ.** The receivers are feeling their way. Respect for the Master (**διδάσκαλος**) makes them go to the disciples for information, and possibly the question was simply a roundabout hint that the tax was overdue.—Ver. 25. **ναί**: this prompt, confident answer may be either an inference from Christ's general bearing, as Peter understood it, or a statement of fact implying past payment.—**ἐλθόντα ε. τ. ο.** The meeting of the tax collectors with Peter had taken place outside; it had been noticed by Jesus, and the drift of the interview instinctively understood by Him.—**προέφθασεν**, anticipated him, here only in N. T. Peter meant to report, but Jesus spoke first, having something special to say, and a good reason for saying it. In other circumstances He would probably have taken no notice, but left Peter to manage the matter as he pleased. But the Master is aware of something that took place among His disciples on the way home, not yet mentioned by the evangelist but about to be (xviii. 1), and to be regarded as the key to the meaning of this incident. The story of what Jesus said to Peter about the temple dues is really the prelude to the discourse following on humility, and that discourse in turn reflects light on the prelude.—**τί σοι δοκεῖ**; phrase often found in Mt. (xviii. 12, xxi. 28, etc.) with lively colloquial effect: what think you?—**τέλη ἢ κῆνσον**, customs or tribute; the former taxes on wares, the latter a tax on persons = indirect and direct taxation. The question refers specially to the latter.—**ἀλλοτρίων**, foreigners, in reference not to the nation, but to the royal family, who have the privilege of exemption.—Ver. 26. **ἄραγε** on the force of this particle *vide* at vii. 20. The **γε** lends emphasis to the exemption of the **υἱοί**. It virtually replies to Peter's **ναί** = then you must admit, what your answer to the collectors seemed to deny, that the *children* are free. The reply is a *jeu d'esprit*. Christ's purpose is not seriously to argue for exemption, but to prepare the way for a moral lesson.

Ver. 27. **ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλ.**, that we may not create misunderstanding as to our attitude by asking exemption or refusing to pay. Nösgen, with a singular lack of exegetical insight, thinks the scandal dreaded is an appearance of disagreement between Master and disciple! It is rather creating the impression that Jesus and His followers despise the temple, and disallow its claims. And the aim of Jesus was to fix Peter's attention on the fact that He was anxious to avoid giving offence thereby, and in that view abstained from insisting on personal claims. Over against the spirit of ambition, which has begun to show itself among His disciples, He

Ἰησοῦς, "Ἄραγε ἐλεύθεροί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοί. 27. ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδαλίσωμεν[1] αὐτούς, πορευθεὶς εἰς τὴν[2] θάλασσαν, βάλε [u] ἄγκιστρον, καὶ τὸν ἀναβάντα πρῶτον ἰχθὺν ἆρον· καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, εὑρήσεις [v] στατῆρα· ἐκεῖνον λαβὼν δὸς αὐτοῖς [w] ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ."

u here only in N.T.
v here only in N.T.
w Cf. ἀντὶ πολλῶν, Ch. xx. 28.

[1] σκανδαλιζωμεν in ℵLX, adopted by Tisch. and placed in marg. by W.H.

[2] Many uncials (ℵBLΔ *al.*) omit την.

sets His own spirit of self-effacement and desire as far as possible to live peaceably with all men, even with those with whom He has no religious affinity.—**πορευθεὶς ἐ. θ.** Generally the instruction given is: go and fish for the money needful to pay the tax.—**ἄγκιστρον**, a hook, not a net, because very little would suffice; one or two fish at most.—**πρῶτον ἰχθὺν**: the very first fish that comes up will be enough, for a reason given in the following clause.—**ἀνοίξας . . . στατῆρα**: the words point to something marvellous, a fish with a stater, the sum wanted, in its mouth. Paulus sought to eliminate the marvellous by rendering **εὑρήσεις** not "find" but "obtain," *i.e.*, by sale. Beyschlag (*Das Leben Jesu*, p. 304) suggests that the use of an ambiguous word created the impression that Jesus directed Peter to catch a fish with a coin in its mouth. Ewald (*Geschichte Christus*, p. 467) thinks Jesus spoke very much as reported, but from the fact that it is not stated that a fish with a coin in its mouth was actually found, he infers that the words were not meant seriously as a practical direction, but were a spirited proverbial utterance, based on rare examples of money found in fishes. Weiss is of opinion that a simple direction to go and fish for the means of payment was in the course of oral tradition changed into a form of language implying a miraculous element. This view assumes that the report in Mt. was derived from oral tradition (*vide* Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, ii. 47, and my *Miraculous Element in the Gospel*, pp. 231-5). In any case the miracle, not being reported as having happened, cannot have been the important point for the evangelist. What he is chiefly concerned about is to report the behaviour of Jesus on the occasion, and the words He spoke revealing its motive.—**ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ**: various questions occur to one here. Did the collectors expect Jesus only to pay (for Himself and His whole company), or did their question mean, does He also, even He, pay? And why pay only for Peter along with Himself? Were all the disciples not liable: Andrew, James and John there, in Capernaum, not less than Peter? Was the tax strictly collected, or for lack of power to enforce it had it become practically a voluntary contribution, paid by many, neglected by not a few? In that case it would be a surprise to many that Jesus, while so uncompromising on other matters, was so accommodating in regard to money questions. He would not conform to custom in fasting, Sabbath keeping, washing, etc., but He would pay the temple tax, though refusal would have had no more serious result than slightly to increase already existing ill-will. This view sets the generosity and nobility of Christ's spirit in a clearer light.

CHAPTER XVIII. MORAL TRAINING OF THE DISCIPLES. In this and the next two chapters the centre of interest is the spiritual condition of the Twelve, and the necessity thereby imposed on their Master to subject them to a stern moral discipline. The day of Caesarea had inaugurated a spiritual crisis in the disciple-circle, which searched them through and through, and revealed in them all in one form or another, and in a greater or less degree, moral weakness: disloyalty to the Master (xvii. 22), vain ambition, jealousy, party spirit. The disloyal disciple seems to have taken to heart more than the others the gloomy side of the Master's predictions, the announcement of the Passion; his more honest-hearted companions let their minds rest on the more pleasing side of the prophetic picture, the near approach of the kingdom in power and glory, so that while remaining true to the Master their hearts became fired with ambitious passions.

Vv. 1-14. *Ambition rebuked* (Mk. ix. 33-50; Lk. ix. 46-50, xv. 3-7, xvii. 1-4).—Ver. 1. **ἐν ἐκ. τ. ὥρᾳ**: in that hour; the expression connects what follows very closely with the tax incident, and shows that the two things were intimately associated in the mind of the evangelist.—

a Ch. xi. 11; xxiii. 11. Mk. ix. 34. Lk. ix. 46.
b John xii. 40 (επιστ. T.R.). Acts vii. 39.
c Ch. xxiii. 12. Lk. xiv. 11; xviii. 14.
d Ch. xxiv. 5 parall.

XVIII. 1. ʼΕΝ ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ ʼΙησοῦ, λέγοντες, "Τίς ἄρα [a] μείζων ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν; 2. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ ʼΙησοῦς [1] παιδίον ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, 3. καὶ εἶπεν, "ʼΑμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ [b] στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. 4. ὅστις οὖν [c] ταπεινώσῃ [2] ἑαυτὸν ὡς τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μείζων ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. 5. καὶ ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται παιδίον τοιοῦτον ἓν [3] [d] ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται·

[1] ℵBL *al.* omit ο Ι.

[2] ταπεινωσει in all uncials.

[3] εν before παιδιον in BDLZ; τοιουτο in ℵBLΔ for the more usual τοιουτον in T. R. (εν παιδιον τοιουτο in Tisch. and W.H.).

τίς ἄρα μείζων: who then is greater, etc.? The ἄρα may be taken as pointing back to the tax incident as suggesting the question, but not to it alone, rather to it as the last of a series of circumstances tending to force the question to the front: address to Peter at Caesarea Philippi; three disciples selected to be with the Master on the Hill of Transfiguration. From Mk. we learn that they had been discussing it on the way home.—**ἐν τ. βασ. τ. οὐ.**, in the Kingdom of Heaven; this is wanting in Mk., where the question is a purely personal one; who is the greater (among us, now, in your esteem)? In Mk. the question, though referring to the present, who *is*, etc., points to the future, and presents a more general aspect, but though it wears an abstract look it too is personal in reality = which of us now is the greater for you, and shall therefore have the higher place in the kingdom when it comes? It is not necessary to conceive every one of the Twelve fancying it possible he might be the first man. The question for the majority may have been one as to the respective claims of the more prominent men, Peter, James, John, each of whom may have had his partisans in the little band.—Ver. 2. **παιδίον**: the task of Jesus is not merely to communicate instruction but to rebuke and exorcise an evil spirit, therefore He does not trust to words alone, but for the greater impressiveness uses a child who happens to be present as a vehicle of instruction. The legendary spirit which dearly loves certainty in detail identified the child with Ignatius, as if that would make the lesson any the more valuable!—Ver. 3. **ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε**: unless ye turn round so as to go in an opposite direction. "Conversion" needed and demanded, even in the case of these men who have left all to follow Jesus! How many who pass for converted, regenerate persons have need to be converted over again, more radically! Chrys. remarks: "We are not able to reach even the faults of the Twelve; we ask not who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven, but who is the greater in the Kingdom of Earth: the richer the more powerful" (Hom. lviii.). The remark is not true to the spirit of Christ. In His eyes vanity and ambition in the sphere of religion were graver offences than the sins of the worldly. His tone at this time is markedly severe, as much so as when He denounced the vices of the Pharisees. It was indeed Pharisaism in the bud He had to deal with. Resch suggests that **στραφῆτε** here simply represents the idea of becoming *again* children, corresponding to the Hebrew idiom which uses שׁוּב = **πάλιν** (*Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu Mt. and Mk.*, p. 213).—**ὡς τὰ παιδία**, like the children, in unpretentiousness. A king's child has no more thought of greatness than a beggar's.—**οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε**, ye shall not enter the kingdom, not to speak of being *great* there. Just what He said to the Pharisees (*vide* on chap. v. 17-20).—Ver. 4. **ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν**: the most difficult thing in the world for saint as for sinner. Raphel (*Annot.* in S. S.) distinguishes three forms of self-humiliation: in mind (Phil. ii. 3), by words, and by acts, giving classical examples of the latter two. It is easy to humble oneself by self-disparaging words, or by symbolic acts, as when the Egyptian monks wore hoods, like children's caps (Elsner), but to be humble in *spirit*, and so child-like!—**ὁ μείζων**. The really humble man is as great in the moral world as he is rare.

6. ὃς δ᾿ ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν [e] μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ, [f] συμφέρει αὐτῷ, ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνικὸς ἐπὶ[1] τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ [g] καταποντισθῇ ἐν τῷ [h] πελάγει τῆς θαλάσσης. 7. Οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων· ἀνάγκη γάρ ἐστιν[2] ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα. πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ,[3] δι᾿ οὗ τὸ σκάνδαλον

e Cf. ἐλαχίστων in Ch. xxv. 40.
f Ch. v. 29, 30.
g here and in Ch. xiv. 30.
h here and Acts xxvii. 5. The phrase ἐν τ. π. τ. θαλάσσης here only

[1] For επι ℵBLZ have περι.

[2] Omitted in BL (W.H.); found in ℵD (Tisch.).

[3] εκεινω wanting in ℵDFLΣ; found in B but not adopted by W.H. It looks like an echo of xxvi. 24, yet it answers well to the solemn tone of our Lord's utterance on this occasion.

Vv. 5-7.—Ver. 5. **δέξηται**: the discourse passes at this point from being child-like to gracious treatment of a child and what it represents.—**ἓν παιδίον τοιοῦτο**: the real child present in the room passes into an *ideal* child, representing all that the spirit of ambition in its struggle for place and power is apt to trample under foot. So in effect the majority of commentators; a few, including Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, Weiss, hold that the reference is still to a real child. In favour of this view is Luke's version: "Whoso receiveth *this child*," etc. (ix. 48). But the clause **ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου** raises the child into the ideal sphere. The reception required does not mean natural kindness to children (though that also Christ valued), but esteeming them as fellow-disciples in spite of their insignificance. A child may *be* such a disciple, but it may also *represent* such disciples, and it is its representative function that is to be emphasised.—Ver. 6. **σκανδαλίσῃ**: the opposite of receiving; treating harshly and contemptuously, so as to tempt to unbelief and apostasy. The pride and selfish ambition of those who pass for eminent Christians make many infidels. —**ἕνα τ. μ. τ.**: one of the large class of little ones; not merely child believers surely, but all of whom a child is the emblem, as regards social or ecclesiastical importance. Those who are caused to stumble are always little ones: "majores enim scandala non recipiunt," Jerome. *One* of them: "frequens *unius* in hoc capite mentio," Bengel. This is the one text in which Jesus speaks of Himself as the object of faith (*vide The Kingdom of God*, p. 263).—**συμφέρει . . . ἵνα**: *vide* on v. 29. Fritzsche finds here an instance of attraction similar to that in x. 25, **καὶ ὁ δοῦλος, ὡς ὁ κ. ἀ.** Instead of saying **συμφέρει α. κρεμασθῆναι . . . ἵνα καταποντισθῇ**, the writer puts both verbs in the subjunctive after **ἵνα**.—**μύλος ὀνικὸς**. The Greeks called the upper millstone **ὄνος** the ass (**ὁ ἀνώτερος λίθος**, Hesychius), but they did not use the adjective **ὀνικὸς**. The meaning therefore is a millstone driven by an ass, *i.e.*, a large one, as distinct from smaller sized ones driven by the hand, commonly used in Hebrew houses in ancient times. "Let such a large stone be hung about the neck of the offender to make sure that he sink to the bottom to rise no more"—such is the thought of Jesus; strong in conception and expression, revealing intense abhorrence.—**ἐν τῷ πελάγει τ. θ.**: in the deep part of the sea. So Kypke, who gives examples; another significantly strong phrase. Both these expressions have been toned down by Luke.—**καταποντισθῇ**: drowning was not a form of capital punishment in use among the Jews. The idea may have been suggested by the word denoting the offence, **σκανδαλίσῃ**. Bengel remarks: "apposita locutio in sermone de scandalo, nam ad *lapidem* offensio est" = "let the man who puts a stone in the path of a brother have a stone hung about his neck," etc. Lightfoot suggests as the place of drowning the Dead Sea, in whose waters nothing would sink without a weight attached to it, and in which to be drowned was a mark of execration.—Ver. 7. **οὐαὶ τῷ κοσμῳ**: woe to the world, an exclamation of pity at thought of the miseries that come upon mankind through ambitious passions. Some (Bleek, Weiss, etc.) take **κόσμος** in the sense of the ungodly world, as in later apostolic usage, and therefore as causing, not suffering from, the offences deplored. This interpretation is legitimate but not inevitable, and it seems better to take the word in the

ἔρχεται. 8. Εἰ δὲ ἡ χείρ σου ἢ ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔκκοψον αὐτὰ[1] καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλόν σοι ἐστὶν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ κυλλόν,[2] ἢ δύο χεῖρας ἢ δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον. 9. καὶ εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζει σε, ἔξελε αὐτὸν καὶ βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ· καλόν σοι ἐστὶ [i] μονόφθαλμον εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός. 10. Ὁρᾶτε μὴ καταφρονήσητε ἑνὸς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς [j] διὰ [j] παντὸς

i here and in Mk. ix. 47.
j Mk. v. 5. Lk. xxiv. 53. Acts ii. 25. Rom. xi. 10 *al.*

[1] **αυτον** in ℵBDLΣ. **αυτα** a grammatical correction.

[2] **κυλλον η χωλον** in ℵB (Tisch., W.H.).

more general sense of humanity conceived of as grievously afflicted with "scandals" without reference to who is to blame. They are a great fact in the history of mankind, by whomsoever caused.—**ἀπὸ τ. σ.**: by reason of; points to the ultimate source of the misery.—**τῶν σκανδάλων**: the scandals; a general category, and a black one.—**ἀνάγκη γάρ**: they are inevitable; a fatality as well as a fact, on the wide scale of the world; they cannot be prevented, only deplored. No shallow optimism in Christ's view of life.—**πλὴν**: adversative here, setting the woe that overtakes the *cause* of offences, over against that of those who *suffer* from them. Weiss contends that it is not adversative here any more than in xi. 23, but simply conducts from the general culpability of the world to the guilt of every particular cause of scandal, even when he does not belong to the world.

Vv. 8, 9. These verses are one of Mt.'s dualities, being found with some variations in the Sermon on the Mount (chap. 29-30). Repetition perhaps due to use of two sources, but in sympathy with the connection of thought in both places. Since the offender is the greater loser in the end, it is worth his while to take precautions against being an offender.—Ver. 8. **χείρ, πούς**: mentioned together as instruments of violence.—**καλόν . . . ἢ**: the positive for the comparative, or ἢ used in sense of *magis quam*. Raphel and Kypke cite instances of this use from classics. It may be an imitation of Hebrew usage, in which the comparative is expressed by the positive, followed by the preposition *min*. "A rare classical usage tends to become frequent in Hellenistic Greek if it be found to correspond to a common Hebrew idiom" (Carr, in Camb. N. T.).—**κυλλὸν**: with reference to hand, mutilated; wanting one or both hands.—**χωλόν**: in a similar condition regarding the feet (*cf.* xi. 5; xv. 30).—Ver. 9. **ὀφθαλμός**, the eye, referred to as the means of expressing *contempt*; in chap. v. 29 as inciting to *lust*.—**μονόφθαλμον**, properly should mean having only one eye by nature, but here = wanting an eye, for which the more exact term is **ἑτερόφθαλμος**, *vide* Lobeck, Phryn., p. 136.

Vv. 10-14. Still the subject is the child as the ideal representative of the insignificant, apt to be despised by the ambitious. From this point onwards Mt. goes pretty much his own way, giving logia of Jesus in general sympathy with the preceding discourse, serving the purpose of moral discipline for disciples aspiring to places of distinction.—Ver. 10. **ὁρᾶτε μὴ καταφ.**: μὴ with the subj. in an object clause after a verb meaning to take heed; common N. T. usage; *vide* Matt. xxiv. 4; Acts xiii. 40, etc.—**ἑνὸς**, *one*, again.—**λέγω γὰρ**: something solemn to be said.—**οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν**, etc. In general abstract language, the truth Jesus solemnly declares is that God, His Father, takes a special interest in the little ones in all senses of the word. This truth is expressed in terms of the current Jewish belief in guardian angels. In the later books of O. T. (Daniel), there are guardian angels of *nations*; the extension of the privilege to individuals was a further development. Christ's words are not to be taken as a dogmatic endorsement of this post-exilian belief exemplified in the story of Tobit (chap. v.). The same remark applies to the passages in which the law is spoken of as given through angelic mediation (Acts vii. 53; Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2). The **λέγω γὰρ** does not mean "this belief is true," but "the idea it embodies, God's special care for

[k] βλέπουσι τὸ [k] πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς.[1] 11. ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.[2] 12. Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; ἐὰν γένηταί τινι ἀνθρώπῳ ἑκατὸν πρόβατα, καὶ πλανηθῇ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν· οὐχὶ ἀφεὶς[3] τὰ ἐννενηκονταεννέα, ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη[4] πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ τὸ πλανώμενον; 13. καὶ ἐὰν [l] γένηται εὑρεῖν αὐτό, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι χαίρει ἐπ' αὐτῷ μᾶλλον, ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐννενηκονταεννέα τοῖς μὴ πεπλανημένοις. 14. οὕτως οὐκ ἔστι θέλημα [m] ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν[5] τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἵνα ἀπόληται εἷς[6] τῶν μικρῶν τούτων. 15. Ἐὰν δὲ ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ[7] ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ὕπαγε καὶ[8] [n] ἔλεγξον αὐτὸν μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνου. ἐάν σου ἀκούσῃ, [o] ἐκέρδησας τὸν ἀδελφόν σου· 16. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀκούσῃ, παράλαβε μετὰ σοῦ ἔτι ἕνα

k this phrase here only.
l Acts xx. 16. Gal. vi. 14 (same const. with inf. as here, *cf.* in ver. 12).
m Ch. xi. 26. Lk. x. 21.
n Lk. iii. 19. 1 Tim. v. 20.
o 1 Cor. ix. 19-22. 1 Pet. iii. 1.

[1] B has **εν τω ουρανω** (W.H. margin, bracketed).

[2] Ver. 11 is wanting in ℵBL, 1, 13, 33, Egyptian verss., Syrr. Jerus. Sin., Orig., etc.; doubtless imported from Lk. xix. 10.

[3] **αφησει** in BL (Tisch., W.H.); D has **αφιησιν**. [4] **και** after **ορη** in BL.

[5] **μου** in B *al.* [6] **εν** in ℵBDL. **εις** is a grammatical correction.

[7] ℵB omit **εις σε**. [8] ℵBD omit **και**.

the little, is true". This is an important text for Christ's doctrine of the Fatherhood. It teaches that, contrary to the spirit of the world, which values only the *great*, the Father-God cares specially for that which is apt to be despised.—**βλέπουσι τ. πρ.** In Eastern courts it is the confidential servants who see the face of the king. The figure is not to be pressed to the extent of making God like an Eastern despot.—Ver. 11 an interpolation from Lk. xix. 10, *q. v.*

Vv. 12-14. *Parable of straying sheep* (Lk. xv. 4-7); may seem less appropriate here than in Lk., but has even here a good setting, amounting to a climax = God cares not only for the lowly and little but even for the low—the morally erring. In both places the parable teaches the precious characteristically Christian doctrine of the worth of the individual at the worst to God.—Ver. 12. **τί ὑ. δοκεῖ** as in xvii. 25.—**ἐὰν γένηταί τ. ἀ. ἑ. πρόβατα**: if a man happen to have as *large* a number, yet, etc.—**καὶ π. ἓν**: only *one* wanderer, out of so many.—**πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ**: does he not go and seek the one?—Ver. 13. **καὶ . . . αὐτό**: if it *happen* that he finds it. In Lk. he searches till he finds it. — **ἀμὴν λέγω**: specially solemn, with a view to the application to the moral sphere of what in the natural sphere is self-evident.—Ver. 14, application of the parable less emphatic than in Lk.—**θέλημα**, a will, for an object of will.—**ἔμπροσθεν τ. π. μ.**: before the face of = for, etc.

Vv. 15-17. *How to deal with an erring brother.*—The transition here is easy from warning against giving, to counsel how to receive, offences. The terms are changed: **μίκρος** becomes **ἀδελφός**, giving offence not suiting the idea of the former, and for **σκανδαλίζειν** we have the more general **ἁμαρτάνειν**.—Vv. 16 and 17 have something answering to them in Lk. xvii. 3, coming in there after the group of parables in chaps. xv. and xvi., in which that of the Shepherd has its place; whence Wendt recognises these verses as an authentic logion probably closely connected with the parable in the common source. Ver. 17 he regards as an addition by the evangelist or a later hand. Holtzmann (H. C.) regards the whole section (15-17) as a piece of Church order in the form of a logion of the Lord.

Ver. 15. **ἁμαρτήσῃ**: apart from the doubtful **εἰς σὲ** following, the reference appears to be to private personal offences, not to sin against the Christian name, which every brother in the community has a right to challenge, especially those closely connected with the offender. Yet perhaps we ought not too rigidly to draw a line between the two in an ideal community of love.—**μεταξὺ σ. κ. ἀ. μ.**: the phrase implies that some one has the right and duty of taking the initiative. So far it is a personal affair to begin with. The simpler and more classical expression would be **μόνος μόνον**.—**ἀκούσῃ**, hear, in the sense of

ἢ δύο, ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων ἢ τριῶν σταθῇ πᾶν ῥῆμα. 17. ἐὰν δὲ [p] παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ, ἔστω σοι ὥσπερ ὁ ἐθνικὸς καὶ ὁ τελώνης. 18. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν τῷ [1] οὐρανῷ· καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν τῷ [1] οὐρανῷ. 19. πάλιν [2] λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐὰν δύο ὑμῶν [q] συμφωνήσωσιν [3] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς περὶ παντὸς πράγματος οὗ ἐὰν αἰτήσωνται,

p here only (Esther iii. 3, 8).

q Ch. xx. 2, 13. Lk. v. 36. Acts v. 9; xv. 15.

[1] B omits τῳ first time and ℵB second time.

[2] B and many other uncials add αμην after παλιν (W.H. in brackets).

[3] συμφωνησουσιν in ℵBDLΔ (Tisch.).

submitting to admonition.—**ἐκέρδησας**: gained as a *friend*, as a *fellow-member* of the Kingdom of God, or as a *man* = saved him from moral ruin? All three alternatives find support. Is it necessary or possible to decide peremptorily between them?—Ver. 16. **ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀ.** After a first failure try again, with added influence.—**παράλαβε . . . ἵνα ἢ δύο.** This bears a juridical aspect (Schanz), but it does not really pass out of the moral sphere: ethical influence alone contemplated; consensus in moral judgment carries weight with the conscience. —**ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος**, etc.: reference to the legal provision in Deut. xix. 15 in a literary rather than in a legal spirit.—Ver. 17. **ἐὰν δὲ π. ἀ.** Try first a minimum of social pressure and publicity, and if that fail have recourse to the maximum. —**εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ**: speak to the "Church"—the brotherhood of believers in the Christ. This to be the widest limit for the ultimate sphere of moral influence, as *ex hypothesi* the judgment of this new community will count for more to its members than that of all the world beyond.—**ἔστω σοι**, etc.: this failing, the offender puts himself outside the society, and there is nothing for it but to treat him as a heathen or a publican; which does not mean with indifference or abhorrence, but carefully avoiding fellowship with him in sin, and seeking his good only as one without. There is no reference in this passage to ecclesiastical discipline and Church censures. The older interpreters, in a theologico-polemical interest, were very anxious to find in it support for their developed ideas on these topics. The chief interest of historic exegesis is to divest it of an ecclesiastical aspect as much as possible, for only so can it suit the initial period, and be with any probability regarded as an utterance of Jesus. As such it may be accepted, when interpreted, as above. If, as we have tried to show, it was natural for Jesus to speak of a new community of faith at Caesarea, it was equally natural that He should return upon the idea in the Capernaum lesson on humility and kindred virtues, and refer to it as an instrument for promoting right feeling and conduct among professed disciples.—Ver. 18. Renewed promise of power to bind and loose, this time not to Peter alone, as in xvi. 19, but to all the Twelve, not *qua* apostles, with ecclesiastical authority, but *qua* disciples, with the ethical power of morally disciplined men. The Twelve for the moment are for Jesus = the *ecclesia*: they were the nucleus of it. The binding and loosing generically = exercising judgment on conduct; here specifically = treating sin as pardonable or the reverse—a particular exercise of the function of judging.

Vv. 19, 20. *Promise of the power and presence of God to encourage concord.*—Ver. 19. **πάλιν ἀμὴν**: a second *amen*, introducing a new thought of parallel importance to the former, in ver. 18. —**ἐὰν δύο**: two; not the measure of Christ's expectation of agreement among His disciples, but of the moral power that lies in the sincere consent of even two minds. It outweighs the *nominal* agreement of thousands who have no real bond of union.—**συμφωνήσωσιν**: agree, about what? not necessarily only the matters referred to in previous context, but anything concerning the Kingdom of God.—**περὶ παντὸς πράγματος**: concerning every or any matter, offences committed by brethren included of course.—**γενήσεται**: it shall be; what absolute confidence in the laws of the moral world!—**παρὰ τ. π. μ.**: from my Father. The Father-God of Jesus is here defined as a lover of peace and

γενήσεται αὐτοῖς παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. 20. οὗ γάρ εἰσι δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι [r] εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν."[1]

21. Τότε προσελθὼν αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπε,[2] "Κύριε, [s] ποσάκις ἁμαρτήσει εἰς ἐμὲ ὁ ἀδελφός μου, καὶ ἀφήσω αὐτῷ; ἕως [t] ἑπτάκις;" 22. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐ λέγω σοι ἕως ἑπτάκις, ἀλλ' ἕως

r Ch. xxviii 19. Acts viii. 16; xix. 5. 1 Cor. i. 13 (all of baptism into —εἰς—a name).
s Ch. xxiii. 37. Lk. xiii. 34.
t Lk. xvii. 4.

[1] This verse in Codex Bezae runs "for there are not (ουκ εισιν γαρ), etc., with whom (παρ' οις) I am not in the midst of them". Syr. Sin. has a similar reading.

[2] αυτω after ειπε in BD (Tisch., W.H., bracketed). ℵ omits αυτω.

fraternal concord. In this verse we have a case of attraction, of the main subject into the conditional clause. Resolved the sentence would run: πᾶν πρᾶγμα, ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωσιν, ἐὰν συμφωνήσουσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ, γενήσεται αὐτοῖς.—Ver. 20. δύο ἢ τρεῖς. Jesus deals in small numbers, not from modesty in His anticipations, but because they suit the present condition, and in jealousy for the moral quality of the new society.—συνηγμένοι εἰς, etc., not gathered to confess or worship my name, but gathered as believers in me. It is a synonym for the new society. The *ecclesia* is a body of men gathered together by a common relation to the name of the Christ: a Christian synagogue as yet consisting of the Twelve, or as many of them as were really one in heart.—ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν, etc.: there *am* I, now, with as many of you, my disciples, as are one in faith and brotherly love; not with any more even of you: far away from the man of ambitious, not to say traitorous, mind. There *am* I in reference to the future. His presence axiomatically certain, therefore expressed as a present fact, even with reference to a future time—a promise natural from One looking forward to an early death. Similar in import to Mt. xxviii. 20. For similar sayings of the Rabbis concerning the presence of the Divine Majesty, or the Shechinah, among two or three sitting in judgment or studying the law, *vide* Lightfoot and Schöttgen.

Vv. 21, 22. *Peter's question about forgiving.*—The second of two interpellations in the course of Christ's discourse (*vide* Mk. ix. 38-41; Lk. ix. 49, 50). Such words touch sensitive consciences, and the interruptions would be welcomed by Jesus as proof that He had not spoken in vain.—Ver. 21. ποσάκις, etc.: the question naturally arose out of the directions for dealing with an offending brother, which could only be carried out by one of placable disposition. Their presupposition is that a fault confessed is to be forgiven. But how far is this to go? In Lk. xvii. 3 the case is put of seven offences in a day, each in turn repented of and confessed. Is there not reason for doubting the sincerity of repentance in such a case? Or is this not at least the extreme limit? Such is Peter's feeling.—ἁμαρτήσει, ἀφήσω: two futures instead of ποσ. ἁμαρτήσαντι ἀφήσω: Hebrew idiom instead of Greek.—ἕως ἑπτάκις: Peter meant to be generous, and he went considerably beyond the Rabbinical measure, which was three times (Amos i. 6): "quicunque remissionem petit a proximo, ne ultra quam ter petat," Schöttgen.—Ver. 22. οὐ: emphatic "no" to be connected with ἕως ἑπτάκις. Its force may be brought out by translating: no, I tell you, not till, etc.—ἀλλὰ ἕ. ἑ. ἑ.: Christ's reply lifts the subject out of the legal sphere, where even Peter's suggestion left it (seven times and no more—a hard rule), into the evangelic, and means: *times without number*, infinite placability. This alone decides between the two renderings of ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά: seventy-seven times and seventy times seven, in favour of the latter as giving a number (490) practically equal to infinitude. Bengel leans to the former, taking the termination κις as covering the whole number seventy-seven, and referring to Gen. iv. 24 as the probable source of the expression. Similarly some of the Fathers (Orig., Aug.), De Wette and Meyer. The majority adopt the opposite view, among whom may be named Grotius and Fritzsche, who cite the Syriac version in support. On either view there is inexactness in the expression. Seventy times seven requires the termination κις at both words. Seventy-seven times requires the κις at

[u] ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά. 23. Διὰ τοῦτο ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, ὃς ἠθέλησε [v] συνᾶραι λόγον μετὰ τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ. 24. ἀρξαμένου δὲ αὐτοῦ συναίρειν, προσηνέχθη[1] αὐτῷ εἷς[2] ὀφειλέτης μυρίων [w] ταλάντων. 25. μὴ ἔχοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι, ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ[3] πραθῆναι, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ[4] καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καὶ πάντα ὅσα εἶχε[5] καὶ ἀποδοθῆναι. 26. πεσὼν οὖν ὁ δοῦλος προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, λέγων, Κύριε,[6] [x] μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοί,[7] καὶ πάντα σοι[8] ἀποδώσω. 27. σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ

u here only (Gen iv. 24).
v here and in Ch. xxv. 19 (same const.).
w here and in Ch. xxv. 15.
x Lk. xviii. 7. 1 Cor. xiii. 4. James v. 7.

[1] προσηχθη in BD (W.H.); as in T. R., ℵLΔ *al.* (Tisch.).

[2] εις αυτω in ℵB (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] ℵBDL omit αυτου.

[4] ℵB omit this αυτου also (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] B has εχει, which, just because of its singularity as a present among preterites, is to be preferred to ειχε, though found in most uncials.

[6] BD omit.

[7] DL have επ' εμε.

[8] σοι before αποδωσω in ℵBL.

the end of the second word rather than at end of first: either ἑπτὰ καὶ εβδο . . . κις, or εβδομ . . . τα ἑπτάκις.

Vv. 23-35. *Parable of unmerciful servant.*—Ver. 23. διὰ τοῦτο suggests that the aim of the parable is to justify the apparently unreasonable demand in ver. 22: unlimited forgiveness of injuries. After all, says Jesus, suppose ye comply with the demand, what do your remissions amount to compared to what has been remitted to you by God?—ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ: a man, a king; king an afterthought demanded by the nature of the case. Only a great monarch can have such debtors, and opportunity to forgive such debts.—συνᾶραι λογον (found again in xxv. 19), to hold a reckoning.—δούλων: all alike servants or slaves in relation to the king. So human distinctions are dwarfed into insignificance by the distance between all men and God.—Ver. 24. εἷς: *one* stood out above all the rest for the magnitude of his debt, who, therefore, becomes the subject of the story.—ὀφειλέτης μ. τ.: a debtor of, or to the extent of, a thousand talents—an immense sum, say millions sterling; payment hopeless; that the point; exact calculations idle or pedantic. It may seem to violate natural probability that time was allowed to incur such a debt, which speaks to malversation for years. But the indolence of an Eastern monarch must be taken into account, and the absence of system in the management of finance. As Koetsveld (*De Gelijk.*, p. 286) remarks: "A regular control is not in the spirit of the Eastern. He trusts utterly when he does trust, and when he loses confidence it is for ever."—Ver. 25. πραθῆναι . . . ἔχει: the order is given that the debtor be sold, with all he had, *including his wife and children;* hard lines, but according to ancient law, in the view of which wife and children were simply *property.* Think of their fate in those barbarous times! But parables are not scrupulous on the score of morality.—καὶ ἀποδοθῆναι: the proceeds of sale to be applied in payment of the debt.—Ver. 26. μακροθύμησον: a Hellenistic word, sometimes used in the sense of deferring anger (Prov. xix. 11 (Sept.), the corresponding adjective in Ps. lxxxvi. 15; *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. v. 14). That sense is suitable here, but the prominent idea is: give me time; wrath comes in at a later stage (ver. 34).—πάντα ἀποδώσω: easy to *promise;* his plea: better wait and get all than take hasty measures and get only a part.—Ver. 27. σπλαγχνισθεὶς: touched with pity, not unmixed perhaps with contempt, and associated possibly with rapid reflection as to the best course, the king decides on a magnanimous policy.—ἀπέλυσεν, τὸ δάνειον ἀφῆκεν: two benefits conferred; set free from imprisonment, debt absolutely cancelled, not merely time given for payment. A third benefit implied, continuance in office. The policy adopted in hope that it will ensure good behaviour in time to come (Ps. cxxx. 4); perfectly credible even in an Eastern monarch.

Vv. 28-34. *The other side of the picture.*—Ver. 28. ἕνα τ. συνδούλων α.: a *fellow*-slave though a humble one, which he should have remembered, but did not.

ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου [1] ἀπέλυσεν αὐτόν, καὶ τὸ [y] δάνειον ἀφῆκεν αὐτῷ. 28. Ἐξελθὼν δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος [1] εὗρεν ἕνα τῶν συνδούλων αὐτοῦ, ὃς ὤφειλεν αὐτῷ ἑκατὸν δηνάρια, καὶ κρατήσας αὐτὸν [z] ἔπνιγε, λέγων, Ἀπόδος μοι [2] ὅ τι [3] ὀφείλεις. 29. πεσὼν οὖν ὁ σύνδουλος αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ [4] παρεκάλει αὐτόν, λέγων, Μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοί,[5] καὶ πάντα [6] ἀποδώσω σοι. 30. ὁ δὲ οὐκ ἤθελεν, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν εἰς φυλακήν, ἕως οὗ [7] ἀποδῷ τὸ ὀφειλόμενον. 31. ἰδόντες δὲ [8] οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτοῦ τὰ γενόμενα ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα·

y here only (Deut. xv. 8; xxiv. 11).
z here and in Mk. v. 13 (of drowning).

[1] B omits εκεινου here (W.H. in brackets) and εκεινος in ver. 28.

[2] ℵBDL omit μοι.

[3] ℵBCD and other uncials have ει τι. ο τι (T. R.) only in minus., rejected by modern editors.

[4] εις τ. π. αυτου omitted in ℵBCDL and by modern editors.

[5] So in ℵB and many uncials. CDL have επ' εμε.

[6] παντα is feebly attested and unsuitable to the case.

[7] εως in ℵBCL. [8] ουν in ℵBD.

—ἑκατὸν δηνάρια: some fifty shillings; an utterly insignificant debt, which, coming out from the presence of a king, who had remitted so much to him, he should not even have remembered, far less been in the mood to exact.—κρατήσας α. ἔπνιγε: seizing, he choked, throttled him, after the brutal manner allowed by ancient custom, and even by Roman law. The act foretokens merciless treatment: no remission of debt to be looked for in this quarter.—ἀπόδος εἴ τι ὀφ. In the εἴ τι some ingenious commentators (Fritzsche, *e.g.*) have discovered Greek urbanity! ("Non sine urbanitate Graeci a conditionis vinculo aptarunt, quod a nulla conditione suspensum sit.") Weiss comes nearer the truth when he sees in it an expression of "merciless logic". He will have payment of whatever is due, were it only a penny.—Ver. 29. μακροθύμησον, etc.: the identical words he used himself just a few minutes ago, reminding him surely of his position as a pardoned debtor, and moving him to like conduct. —Ver. 30. οὐκ ἤθελεν: no pity awakened by the words which echoed his own petition. "He would not." Is such conduct credible? Two remarks may be made on this. In parabolic narrations the improbable has sometimes to be resorted to to illustrate the unnatural behaviour of men in the spiritual sphere, *e.g.*, in the parable of the feast (Lk. xiv. 16-24) *all* refuse; how unlikely! But the action of the pardoned debtor is not so improbable as it seems. He acts on the instinct of a base nature, and also doubtless in accordance with long habits of harsh tyrannical behaviour towards men in his power. Every way a bad man: greedy, grasping in acquisition of wealth, prodigal in spending it, unscrupulous in using what is not his own. —Ver. 31. ἰδόντες οἱ σ. ἐλυπήθησαν: the other fellow-servants were greatly vexed or grieved. At what? the fate of the poor debtor? Why then not pay the debt? (Koetsveld). Not sympathy so much as annoyance at the unbecoming conduct of the merciless one who had obtained mercy was the feeling.—διεσάφησαν: reported the *facts* (*narraverunt*, Vulg.), and so threw light on the character of the *man* (*cf.* Mt. xiii. 36, W. and H.).—τῷ κ. ἑαυτῶν, to *their own* master, to whom therefore they might speak on a matter affecting his interest.—Ver. 32. δ. πονηρέ: the king could understand and overlook dishonesty in money matters, but not such inhumanity and villainy.—π. τ. ὀφειλὴν. ἐ.: huge, uncountable.—ἐπεὶ παρεκάλεσάς με, when you entreated me. In point of fact he had not, at least in words, asked remission but only time to pay. Ungenerous himself, he was incapable of conceiving, and therefore of appreciating such magnificent generosity.—Ver. 33. οὐκ ἔδει; was it not your duty? an appeal to the sense of decency and gratitude.—καὶ σὲ . . . ἠλέησα. There was condescension in putting the two cases together as parallel. Ten thousand acts of forgiveness such as the culprit was asked to

καὶ ἐλθόντες διεσάφησαν τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτῶν[1] πάντα τὰ γενόμενα. 32. Τότε προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ λέγει αὐτῷ, Δοῦλε πονηρέ, πᾶσαν τὴν [a] ὀφειλὴν ἐκείνην ἀφῆκά σοι, ἐπεὶ παρεκάλεσάς με· 33. οὐκ ἔδει καὶ σὲ ἐλεῆσαι τὸν σύνδουλόν σου, ὡς καὶ ἐγώ σε ἠλέησα; 34. καὶ ὀργισθεὶς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν τοῖς [b] βασανισταῖς, ἕως οὗ ἀποδῷ πᾶν τὸ ὀφειλόμενον αὐτῷ.[2] 35. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐπουράνιος[3] ποιήσει ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ἀφῆτε ἕκαστος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν ὑμῶν τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν."[4]

a Rom. xiii. 7. 1 Cor. vii. 3.

b here only.

[1] εαυτων in ℵBC. D has αυτων as in T. R. *Vide* below.

[2] αυτω omitted in BD (W.H.).

[3] ουρανιος in ℵBDL. επουρανιος is not found elsewhere in Mt.

[4] τα παρ. αυτων are wanting in ℵBDLΣ and most editors omit them.

perform would not have equalled in amount one act such as he had got the benefit of. The fact in the spiritual sphere corresponds to this.—Ver. 34. **ὀργισθεὶς**: roused to just and extreme anger.—**βασανισταῖς**: not merely to the gaolers, but to the tormentors, with instructions not merely to keep him safe in prison till the debt was paid, but still more to make the life of the wretch as miserable as possible, by place of imprisonment, position of body, diet, bed, etc., if not by instruments of pain. The word, chosen to suit the king's mood, represents a subjective feeling rather than an objective fact.

Ver. 35. *Application.* — **οὕτως**: so, *mutatis mutandis*, for feelings, motives, methods rise in the moral scale when we pass to the spiritual sphere. So in general, not in all details, on the same principle; merciless to the merciless.—**ὁ πατήρ μ. ὁ οὐρ.**: Jesus is not afraid to bring the Father in in such a connection. Rather He is here again defining the Father by discriminating use of the name, as One who above all things abhors mercilessness.—**μου**: Christ is in full sympathy with the Father in this.—**ὑμῖν**: to *you*, my own chosen disciples. —**ἕκαστος**: every man of you.—**ἀπὸ τῶν καρδιῶν**: from your hearts, no sham or lip pardon; real, unreserved, thorough-going, and in consequence again and again, times without number, because the heart inclines that way.

CHAPTER XIX. FAREWELL TO GALILEE. In Mt.'s narrative the journey of Jesus to the south, reported in ver. 1, marks the close of the Galilean ministry. Not so obviously so in Mk.'s (see notes there), though no hint is given of a return to Galilee. It is not perfectly clear whether the incidents reported are to be conceived as occurring at the southern end of the journey, or on the way within Galilee or without. The latter alternative is possible (*vide* Holtz., H. C., p. 214). The incidents bring under our notice a variety of interesting characters: Pharisees with captious questions, mothers with their children, a man in quest of the *summum bonum*, with words and acts of Jesus corresponding. But the disciplining of the Twelve still holds the central place of interest. Last chapter showed them at school in the house, this shows them at school on the way.

Vv. 1, 2. *Introductory*, *cf.* Mk. x. 1.—Ver. 1. **καὶ ἐγένετο . . . λόγους τούτους**: similar formulae after important groups of *logia* in xii. 28, xi. 1, xiii. 53.—**μετῆρεν**: also in xiii. 53, *vide* notes there; points to a change of scene worthy of note, as to Nazareth, which Jesus rarely visited, or to Judaea, as here. —**ἀπὸ τ. Γαλιλαίας**. The visit to Nazareth was a movement within Galilee. This is a journey out of it not necessarily final, but so thought of to all appearance by the evangelist.—**εἰς τὰ ὅρια τ. Ἰ. π. τ. Ἰ.**: indicates either the destination = to the coasts of Judaea beyond the Jordan; or the end *and* the way = to the Judaea territory by the way of Peraea, *i.e.*, along the eastern shore of Jordan. It is not likely that the writer would describe Southern Peraea as a part of Judaea, therefore the second alternative is to be preferred. Mk.'s statement is that Jesus went to the coasts of Judaea *and* (**καὶ**, approved reading, instead of **διὰ τοῦ** in T. R.) beyond Jordan. Weiss thinks that Mt.'s version arose from misunderstanding of Mk. But his understanding may have been a

XIX. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, [a] μετῆρεν ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας [b] πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. 2. καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ. 3. Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ[1] Φαρισαῖοι πειράζοντες αὐτόν, καὶ λέγοντες αὐτῷ,[2] "Εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ[3] ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν;" 4. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[4] "Οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας[5] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς, 5. καὶ εἶπεν, 'Ἕνεκεν τούτου [c] καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα· καὶ προσκολληθήσεται[6] τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα

a Ch. xiii. 53.
b Ch. iv. 15.
c Mk. x. 7. Eph. v. 31, fr. Gen. ii. 24.

[1] οι omitted in BCLΔ *al.*
[2] αυτω omitted in ℵBCLΣ *al.* D has it.
[3] ℵBL omit ανθρωπω.
[4] ℵBDL omit αυτοις.
[5] κτισας in B, 1, 22, 33, 124, sah. cop. (W.H.).
[6] The simple κολληθησεται in BD *al.* (modern editors). The compound (T. R.) is from the Sept.

true one, for Mk.'s statement may mean that Peraea was the first reached station (Holtz., H. C.), implying a journey on the eastern side. The suggestion that the writer of the first Gospel lived on the eastern side, and means by **πέραν** the western side (Delitsch and others), has met with little favour.—Ver. 2. **ἠκολούθησαν**: the crowds follow as if there had been no interruption, in Mt.; in Mk., who knows of a time of hiding (ix. 30), they reassemble (x. 1).—**ἐθεράπευσεν α. ἐκεῖ**: a healing ministry commences in the south; in Mk. a teaching ministry (x. 1).

Vv. 3-9. *The marriage question* (Mk. x. 2-9).—Ver. 3. **Φ. πειράζοντες**: Pharisees again, tempting of course; could not ask a question at Jesus without sinister motives.—**εἰ ἔξεστιν**: direct question in indirect form, *vide* on xii. 10.—**ἀπολῦσαι . . . κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν**: the question is differently formulated in the two accounts, and the answer differently arranged. In Mk. the question is absolute = may a man put away his wife at all? in Mt. relative = may, etc. . . . for every reason? Under the latter form the question was an attempt to draw Jesus into an internal controversy of the Jewish schools as to the meaning of Deut. xxiv. 1, and put Him in the dilemma of either having to choose the unpopular side of the school of Shummai, who interpreted עֶרְוַת דָּבָר strictly, or exposing Himself to a charge of laxity by siding with the school of Hillel. It was a petty scheme, but characteristic. Whether the interrogants knew what Jesus had taught on the subject of marriage and divorce in the Sermon on the Mount is uncertain, but in any case all scribes and Pharisees knew by this time what to expect from Him. For **κατὰ** in the sense of *propter*, *vide* instances in Hermann's Viger, 632, and Kypke.—Ver. 4. **οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε**: the words quoted are to be found in Gen. i. 27, ii. 24.—**ὁ κτίσας**: the participle with article used substantively = the Creator.—**ἀπ' ἀρχῆς** goes along with what follows, Christ's purpose being to emphasise the primitive state of things. From the beginning God made man, male and female; suited to each other, needing each other.—**ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ**: "one male and one female, so that the one should have the one; for if He had wished that the male should dismiss one and marry another He would have made more females at the first," Euthy.—Ver. 5. **καὶ εἶπεν**: *God* said, though the words as they stand in Gen. may be a continuation of Adam's reflections, or a remark of the writer.—**ἕνεκεν τούτου**: connected in Gen. with the story of the woman made from the rib of the man, here with the origin of sex. The sex principle imperiously demands that all other relations and ties, however intimate and strong, shall yield to it. The cohesion this force creates is the greatest possible.—**οἱ δύο**: these words in the Sept. have nothing answering to them in the Hebrew, but they are true to the spirit of the original.—**εἰς σάρκα μίαν**: the reference is primarily to the physical

μίαν;" 6. ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία· ὃ οὖν ὁ Θεὸς [d] συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω." 7. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Τί οὖν Μωσῆς ἐνετείλατο δοῦναι βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτήν[1];" 8. Λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι Μωσῆς πρὸς τὴν [e] σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν ὑμῖν ἀπολῦσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν· ἀπ' ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτω. 9. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι[2] ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, εἰ [f] μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ,[3] καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾶται· καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται."[4] 10. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ,[5] "Εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μετὰ τῆς γυναικός, οὐ [f] συμφέρει

d here and in Mk. x. 9.
e Mk. x. 5; xvi. 14. (Deut. x. 16. Sir. xvi. 10.)
f John xviii. 14 (accus. and inf.). 2 Cor. xii. 1 (inf. as here).

[1] ℵDLZ omit αυτην.
[2] BDZ old Lat. verss. omit οτι.
[3] μη for ει μη in most uncials. The explanatory ει (T. R.) is only in minus. BD have παρεκτος λογου πορνειας, followed by ποιει αυτην μοιχευθηναι in B.
[4] The clause και ο απολ. γαμησας μοιχαται is omitted in ℵDLΣ but found in BCΔZ. The true reading is doubtful and the passage has puzzled editors.
[5] ℵB omit αυτου, found in the greater number of uncials.

fleshly unity. But flesh in Hebrew thought represents the entire man, and the ideal unity of marriage covers the whole nature. It is a unity of soul as well as of body: of sympathy, interest, purpose.—Ver. 6. ὥστε with indicative, expressing actual result as Christ views the matter. They *are* no longer two, but one flesh, one spirit, one person.—ὃ οὖν: inference from God's will to man's duty. The creation of sex, and the high doctrine as to the cohesion it produces between man and woman, laid down in Gen., interdict separation. Let the Divine Syzygy be held sacred! How small the Pharisaic disputants must have felt in presence of such holy teaching, which soars above the partisan views of contemporary controversialists into the serene region of ideal, universal, eternal truth!

Vv. 7-9. τί οὖν, etc.: such doctrine could not be directly gainsaid, but a difficulty might be raised by an appeal to Moses and his enactment about a bill of divorce (Deut. xxiv. 1). The Pharisees seem to have regarded Moses as a patron of the practice of putting away, rather than as one bent on mitigating its evil results. Jesus corrects this false impression.—Ver. 8. πρὸς τ., with reference to.—σκληροκαρδίαν: a word found here and in several places in O. T. (Sept.), not in profane writers; points to a state of heart which cannot submit to the restraints of a high and holy law, literally uncircumcisedness of heart (Deut. x. 16; Jer. iv. 4).—ἐπέτρεψεν, permitted, not enjoined. Moses is respectfully spoken of as one who would gladly have welcomed a better state of things; no blame imputed except to the people who compelled or *welcomed* such imperfect legislation (ὑμῶν twice in ver. 8).—ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, etc.: the state of things which made the Mosaic rule necessary was a declension from the primitive ideal.—Ver. 9, *vide* notes on Mt. v. 31, 32.

Vv. 10-12. *Subsequent conversation with the disciples.*—Christ's doctrine on marriage not only separated Him *toto cœlo* from Pharisaic opinions of all shades, but was too high even for the Twelve. It was indeed far in advance of all previous or contemporary theory and practice in Israel. Probably no one before Him had found as much in what is said on the subject in Gen. It was a new reading of old texts by one who brought to them a new view of man's worth, and still more of woman's. The Jews had very low views of woman, and therefore of marriage. A wife was bought, regarded as property, used as a household drudge, and dismissed at pleasure—*vide* Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.*, pp. 138-146.—Ver. 10. αἰτία: a vague word. We should say: if such be the state of matters as between husband and wife, and that is doubtless what is meant. So interpreted, αἰτία would = *res, conditio.* (So Grotius.) Fritzsche regards the phrase ἡ αἰτία τ. ἀ. μ. τ. γ. as in a negligent way expressing the idea: if the reason compelling a man to live with a wife be so stringent (no separation save for adultery). If we interpret αἰτία in the light of ver. 3 (κατὰ π. αἰτίαν) the word will mean cause of separation. The sense is the same, but

γαμῆσαι." 11. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οὐ πάντες [g] χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον,[1] ἀλλʼ οἷς δέδοται. 12. εἰσὶ γὰρ [h] εὐνοῦχοι, οἵτινες ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτω· καί εἰσιν εὐνοῦχοι, οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· καί εἰσιν εὐνοῦχοι, οἵτινες εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω."

13. Τότε προσηνέχθη [2] αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς, καὶ προσεύξηται· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς· 14. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν,[3] "Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία, καὶ μὴ [i] κωλύετε αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖν

g 2 Cor. vii. 2 (ἡμᾶς).
h Acts viii. 27.
i Lk. xxiii. 2 Acts xvi. 6; xxiv. 23. Heb. vii. 23 (same const., acc. and inf.).

[1] B Orig. omit **τουτον** (W.H.).

[2] ℵBCDL and most other uncials have the pl. **προσηνεχθησαν**. The sing. (T. R. after late uncials) is a gram. cor. to correspond with neut. pl. nom. (**παιδία**).

[3] ℵCDL add **αυτοις**.

in any view the manner of expression is somewhat helpless, as was not unnatural in the circumstances. Euthy. gives both meanings = **αἰτία συζυγίας** and **αἰτία διαζευγνύουσα**, with a preference for the former.—**ἀνθρώπου** here = *vir*, *maritus;* instances of this use in Kypke, Palairet, etc.

Ver. 11. **ὁ δὲ εἶπεν**. Jesus catches up the remark of the disciples, and attaches to it a deeper sense than they thought of. Their idea was that marriage was not worth having if a man must put up with all the faults and caprices of a woman, without possibility of escape, except by gross misconduct. He thinks of the celibate state as in certain cases desirable or preferable, irrespective of the drawbacks of married life, and taking it even at the best.—**τὸν λόγον** thus will mean: what you have said, the suggestion that the unmarried condition is preferable.—**χωροῦσι** = *capere*, receive, intellectually and morally, for in such a case the two are inseparable. No man can understand as a matter of theory the preferableness of celibacy under certain circumstances, unless he be capable morally of appreciating the *force* of the circumstances.—**ἀλλʼ οἷς δέδοται**: this phrase points chiefly to the moral capacity. It is not a question of intelligence, nor of a merely natural power of continence, but of attaining to such a spiritual state that the reasons for remaining free from married ties shall prevail over all forces urging on to marriage. Jesus lifts the whole subject up out of the low region of mere personal taste, pleasure, or convenience, into the high region of the Kingdom of God and its claims.—Ver. 12 is an explanatory commentary on **δέδοται**.—**εὐνοῦχος**: keeper of the bedchamber in an Oriental harem (from **εὐνή**, bed, and **ἔχω**), a jealous office, which could be entrusted only to such as were incapable of abusing their trust; hence one who has been emasculated. Jesus distinguishes three sorts, two physical and one ethical: (1) those born with a defect (**ἐγεννήθησαν οὕτως**); (2) those made such by art (**εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων**); (3) those who make themselves eunuchs (**εὐνούχισαν ἑαυτοὺς**).—**διὰ τὴν β. τ. ὀ.**, for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. This explains the motive and the nature of ethical eunuchism. Here, as in xv. 17, Jesus touches on a delicate subject to teach His disciples a very important lesson, *viz.*, that the claims of the Kingdom of God are paramount; that when necessary even the powerful impulses leading to marriage must be resisted out of regard to them.—**ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν χωρείτω**: by this final word Jesus recognises the severity of the demand as going beyond the capacity of all but a select number. We may take it also as an appeal to the spiritual intelligence of His followers = see that ye do not misconceive my meaning. Is not monasticism, based on vows of life-long celibacy, a vast baleful misconception, turning a military requirement to subordinate personal to imperial interests, as occasion demands, into an elaborate ascetic system?

Vv. 13-15. *Children brought for a blessing* (Mk. x. 13-16; Lk. xviii. 15-17).—Ver. 13. **τότε**: if the order of the narrative reflect the order of events, this invasion by the children was a happy coincidence after those words about the sacred and indissoluble tie of

j for const. cf. 1 Cor. iii. 21; vi. 19.

k here and in ver. 29 and parall. Ch. xxv. 46. Lk. x. 25, for the *summum bonum* in Synop. Gospels.

πρός με[1]· ʲτῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν." 15. Καὶ ἐπιθεὶς αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας,[2] ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν.

16. ΚΑΙ ἰδού, εἷς προσελθὼν εἶπεν αὐτῷ,[3] "Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ,[4] τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω, ἵνα ἔχω[5] ᵏζωὴν ᵏαἰώνιον;" 17. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,

[1] με in BCD; εμε in ℵLΔ.

[2] ℵBDLΔ place αυτοις after χειρας (Tisch., W.H.). [3] ℵB have αυτω ειπεν.

[4] ℵBDL Orig. Hil. omit αγαθε, which probably comes in from the parall., to which, indeed, Mt.'s version has been assimilated throughout (ver. 17) in T. R.

[5] σχω in BD Orig. (W. H.).

marriage and the duty of subordinating even it to the claims of the kingdom.—**προσηνέχθησαν**, passive, by whom brought not said, the point of the story being how Jesus treated the children.—**ἵνα τ. χ. ἐπιθῇ**, that He *may* lay His hands on them: the action being conceived of as present (*Klotz ad Devar*, p. 618).—**καὶ προσεύξηται**: the imposition of hands was a symbol of prayer and blessing, possibly in the minds of those who brought the children it was also a protection from evil spirits (Orig.).—**ἐπετίμησαν αὐτοῖς**: the **αὐτοῖς** ought in strict grammar to mean the children, but it doubtless refers to those who brought them. The action of the disciples was not necessarily mere officiousness. It may have been a Galilean incident, mothers in large numbers bringing their little ones to get a parting blessing from the good, wise man who is leaving their country, unceremoniously crowding around Him, affectionately mobbing Him in a way that seemed to call for interference. This act of the mothers of Galilee revealed how much they thought of Jesus.—Ver. 14. **ἄφετε, μὴ κωλύετε**: visits of the children never unseasonable; Jesus ever delighted to look on the living emblems of the true citizen of the Kingdom of God; pleased with them for what they were naturally, and for what they signified.—**τοιούτων**, of such, *i.e.*, the child-*like;* repetition of an old lesson (xviii. 3).—Ver. 15. **ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν**; He departed thence, no indication whence or whither. The results of this meeting are conceivable. Christians may have come out of that company. Mothers would not forget Him who blessed their children on the way to His cross, or fail to speak of the event to them when they were older.

Vv. 16-22.—*A man in quest of the "summum bonum"* (Mk. x. 17-22; Lk. xviii. 18-23).—A phenomenon as welcome to Jesus as the visit of the mothers with their children: a man not belonging to the class of self-satisfied religionists of whom He had had ample experience; with moral ingenuousness, an open mind, and a good, honest heart; a malcontent probably with the teaching and practice of the Rabbis and scribes coming to the anti-Rabbinical Teacher in hope of hearing from Him something more satisfying. The main interest of the story for us lies in the revelation it makes of Christ's method of dealing with inquirers, and in the subsequent conversation with the disciples.

Ver. 16. **ἰδού**, lo! introduces a story worth telling.—**εἷς**: one, singled out from the crowd by his approach towards Jesus, and, as the narrative shows, by his spiritual state.—**Διδάσκαλε**: this reading, which omits the epithet **ἀγαθέ**, doubtless gives us the true text of Mt., but in all probability not the exact terms in which the man addressed Jesus. Such a man was likely to accost Jesus courteously as "good Master," as Mk. and Lk. both report. The omission of the epithet eliminates from the story the basis for a very important and characteristic element in Christ's dealing with this inquirer contained in the question: "Why callest thou me good?" which means not "the epithet is not applicable to me, but to God only," but "do not make ascriptions of goodness a matter of mere courtesy or politeness". The case is parallel to the unwillingness of Jesus to be called *Christ* indiscriminately. He wished no man to give Him any title of honour till he knew what he was doing. He wished this man in particular to think carefully on *what* is good, and *who*, all the more that there were competing types of goodness to choose from, that of the Pharisees, and that exhibited in His own teaching.—**τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω**: the **ἀγαθὸν** is omitted in the parallels,

"Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός.[1] εἰ δὲ θέλεις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωήν,[2] [l]τήρησον[3] τὰς ἐντολάς." 18. Λέγει αὐτῷ, "[m]Ποίας;" Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε, "Τό, οὐ φονεύσεις· οὐ μοιχεύσεις· οὐ κλέψεις· οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις· 19. τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου[4] καὶ τὴν μητέρα· καί, ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν." 20. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ νεανίσκος, "Πάντα ταῦτα[5] ἐφυλαξά-

l Ch. xxiii. 3; xxviii. 20 (in sense of observe).

m Ch. xxii. 36.

[1] For the clause τι με λεγεις . . . θεος in T. R., ℵBDL, many verss. (including Syr. Cur. and Sin.) Orig. read τι με ερωτας περι του αγαθου; εις εστιν ο αγαθος, which the R. V. and most modern editors adopt. Harmonistic assimilation is probably responsible for the T. R.

[2] ℵBCDL place εισελθειν after ζωην.

[3] τηρει in BD. [4] ℵBCD omit σου. [5] ταυτα παντα in BD.

but it is implied; of course it was something good that would have to be done in order to obtain eternal life. What good shall I do? Fritzsche takes this as not = *quid boni faciam?* but = *quid, quod bonum sit, faciam?* that is, not = what particular good action shall, etc., but = what in the name of good, etc. This is probably right. The man wants to know what the good really is . . . that by doing it he may attain eternal life. It was a natural question for a thoughtful man in those days when the teaching and practice of the religious guides made it the hardest thing possible to know what the good really was. It is a mistake to conceive of this man as asking what specially good thing he might do in the spirit of the type of Pharisee who was always asking, What is my duty and I will do it? (Schöttgen). Would Jesus have *loved* such a man, or would such a man have left His presence *sorrowful?*—ζωὴν αἰώνιον: an alternative name for the *summum bonum* in Christ's teaching, and also in current Jewish speech (Wünsche, *Beiträge*). The Kingdom of God is the more common in the Synoptics, the other in the fourth Gospel.—Ver. 17. τί με ἐρωτᾷς, etc.: it seems as if Jesus thought the question superfluous (so Weiss and Meyer), but this was only a teacher's way of leading on a pupil = "of course there is only one answer to that: God is the one good being, and His revealed will shows us the good He would have us do". A familiar old truth, yet new as Christ meant it. How opposed to current teaching we know from Mt. xv. 4-9.—εἰ δὲ θέλεις, etc., but, to answer your question directly, if, etc.—τήρει (ησον) τ. ἐν.: a vaguer direction then than it seems to us now. We now think only of the Ten Words. Then there were many commands of *God* besides these; and many more still of the *scribes*, hence most naturally the following question.—Ver. 18. ποίας; not = τίνας (Grotius), but what sort of commands: out of the multitude of commands divine and human, which do you mean? He had a shrewd guess doubtless, but wanted to be sure. Christ's reply follows in this and subsequent verse, quoting in direct form prefaced with τό the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and fifth commands of the Decalogue with that to love a neighbour as ourselves from Lev. xix. 18. This last Origen regarded as an interpolation, and Weiss thinks that the evangelist has introduced it from xxii. 39 as one that could not be left out. If it be omitted the list ends with the fifth, a significantly emphatic position, reminding us of Mt. xv. 4, and giving to the whole list an antithetic reference to the teaching of the scribes. In sending the inquirer to the *second* table of the Decalogue as the sum of duty, Jesus gave an instruction anything but commonplace, though it seem so to us. He was proclaiming the supremacy of the *ethical*, a most important second lesson for the inquirer, the first being the necessity of using moral epithets carefully and sincerely. From the answer given to this second lesson it will appear whereabouts the inquirer is, a point Jesus desired to ascertain.

Vv. 20-22. ὁ νεανίσκος, the *youth;* whence known? from a special tradition (Meyer); an inference from the expression ἐκ νεότητός μου in Mk. x. 20 (Weiss).—ἐφύλαξα (-άμην). Kypke and Elsner take pains to show that the use of this verb (and of τηρεῖν, ver. 17) in the sense of obeying commands is good Greek. More

μην ἐκ νεότητός μου[1]· τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ;" 21. Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Εἰ θέλεις [n] τέλειος εἶναι, ὕπαγε, [o] πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, καὶ δὸς πτωχοῖς· καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ[2]· καὶ [p] δεῦρο, ἀκολούθει μοι." 22. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ νεανίσκος τὸν λόγον,[3] ἀπῆλθε λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα[4] πολλά.

n vide Ch. v. 48.
o Ch. xiii. 44.
p Ch. iv. 19; xi. 28 (pl. form δεῦτε).

23. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι [q] δυσκόλως πλούσιος[5] εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν

q here and in parall.

[1] For εφυλαξαμην εκ νεοτητος μου (from the parall.) ℵBL have simply εφυλαξα.
[2] εν ουρανοις in BCD.
[3] τον λογον (as in T. R.) in CD; τον λογον τουτον in B (W.H. in brackets).
[4] B has χρηματα, which even W.H. have disregarded.
[5] πλουσιος δυσκολως in ℵBCDLZ.

important is it to note the declaration the verb contains: all these I have kept from youth. To be taken as a simple fact, not stated in a self-righteous spirit (Weiss-Meyer), rather sadly as by one conscious that he has not thereby reached the desired goal, real rest in the highest good found. The exemplary life *plus* the dissatisfaction meant much: that he was not a morally commonplace man, but one with affinities for the noble and the heroic. No wonder Jesus felt interested in him, "loved him" (Mk. x. 21), and tried to win him completely. It may be assumed that the man appreciated the supreme importance of the *ethical*, and was not in sympathy with the tendency of the scribes to subordinate the moral to the ritual, the commands of God to the traditions of the elders.—**τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ**: the question interesting first of all as revealing a *felt* want: a good symptom; next as betraying perplexity = I am on the right road, according to your teaching; why then do I not attain the rest of the true godly life? The question, not in Mk., is implied in the tone of the previous statement, whether uttered or not.—Ver. 21. **εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι** (on **τέλειος** *vide* v. 48): if you wish to reach your end, the true life and the rest it brings.—**ὕπαγε**, etc.: go, sell off, distribute to the poor, and then come, follow me—such is the advice Christ gives: His final lesson for this inquirer. It is a subjective counsel relative to the individual. Jesus sees he is well-to-do, and divines where the evil lies. It is doubtful if he cares passionately, supremely for the true life; doubtful if he be **τέλειος** in the sense of *single-mindedness*. It is not a question of one more thing to do, but of the state of the heart, which the suggestion to sell off will test. The invitation to become a disciple is seriously meant. Jesus, who repelled some offering themselves, thinks so well of this man as to desire him for a disciple. He makes the proposal *hopefully*. Why should so noble a man not be equal to the sacrifice? He makes it with the firm belief that in no other way can this man become happy. *Noblesse oblige*. The nobler the man the more imperative that the heroic element in him have full scope. A potential apostle, a possible Paul even, cannot be happy as a mere wealthy merchant or landowner. It is "a counsel of perfection," but not in the ascetic sense, as if poverty were the sure way to the higher Christian life; rather in the sense of the adage: of him to whom much is given shall much be required.—Ver. 22. **ἀπῆλθεν**: he would have to go away in any case, even if he meant to comply with the advice in order to carry it into effect. But he went away **λυπούμενος**, in genuine distress, because placed in a dilemma between parting with wealth and social position, and forfeiting the joy of discipleship under an admired Master. What was the final issue? Did "the thorns of avarice defile the rich soil of his soul" (Euthy.), and render him permanently unfruitful, or did he at last decide for the disciple life? At the worst see here the miscarriage of a really noble nature, and take care not to fall into the vulgar mistake of seeing in this man a Pharisee who came to tempt Jesus, and who in professing to have kept the commandments was simply a boastful liar. (So Jerome: "Non voto discentis sed tentantis interrogat . . . mentitur adolescens".)

Vv. 23-27. *Conversation ensuing* (Mk. x. 23-27; Lk. xviii. 24-27).—Ver. 23.

οὐρανῶν. 24. πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστι [r] κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος[1] ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν,[2] ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν." 25. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ[3] ἐξεπλήσσοντο σφόδρα, λέγοντες, "Τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι;" 26. Ἐμβλέψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "[s] Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστι, [s] παρὰ δὲ Θεῷ πάντα δυνατά ἐστι."[4]

27. Τότε ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἰδού, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν

[r] Ch. iii. 4; xxiii. 24.

[s] Rom. ii. 13 (Gen. xviii. 14).

[1] τρηματος in ℵB.

[2] The majority of uncials have εισελθειν (Tisch.), but BDX have διελθειν as in T. R. This reading requires εισελθειν in the next clause (so in BD).

[3] αυτου wanting in ℵBCDLZΔ.

[4] εστι is omitted in BCΔ *al.* Though found in parall. (Lk.), from which it has probably been imported, the sentence is more impressive without it.

ἀμὴν, introduces as usual a solemn utterance.—**πλούσιος**: the rich man is brought on the stage, not as an object of envy or admiration, which he is to the worldly-minded, but as an object of commiseration.—**δυσκόλως εἰσελεύσεται**, etc.: because with difficulty shall he enter the Kingdom of Heaven. This is stated as a matter of observation, not without sympathy, and not with any intention to pronounce dogmatically on the case of the inquirer who had just departed, as if he were an absolutely lost soul. His case suggested the topic of wealth as a hindrance in the divine life.—**δυσκόλως**: the adjective δύσκολος means difficult to please as to food (δυς, κόλον), hence morose; here used of things, occurs only in this saying in N. T.—Ver. 24. **πάλιν δὲ λέγω**: reiteration with greater emphasis. The strange language of Jesus here reveals a keen sense of disappointment at the loss of so promising a man to the ranks of discipleship. He sees so clearly what he might be, were it not for that miserable money.—**εὐκοπώτερον**, etc.: a comparison to express the idea of the impossible. The figure of a camel going through a needle-eye savours of Eastern exaggeration. It has been remarked that the variation in the parallel accounts in respect to the words for a needle and its eye shows that no corresponding proverb existed in the Greek tongue (Camb. G. T.). The figure is to be taken as it stands, and not to be "civilised" (*vide* H. C.) by taking **κάμηλος** (or **κάμιλος**, Suidas) = a cable, or the wicket of an Oriental house. It may be more legitimate to try to explain how so grotesque a figure could become current even in Palestine. Furrer suggests a camel driver leaning against his camel and trying to put a coarse thread through the eye of a needle with which he sews his sacks, and, failing, saying with comical exaggeration: I might put the camel through the eye easier than this thread (Tscht., für M. und R.).—**τρήματος** from **τιτράω**, to pierce.—**ῥαφίδος**, a word disapproved by Phryn., who gives **βελόνη** as the correct term. But *vide* Lobeck's note, p. 90. It is noticeable that Christ's tone is much more severe in reference to wealth than to wedlock. Eunuchism for the kingdom is optional; possession of wealth on the other hand seems to be viewed as all but incompatible with citizenship in the kingdom.

Ver. 25. **ἐξεπλήσσοντο σφόδρα**: the severity of the Master's doctrine on wealth as on divorce (ver. 10) was more than the disciples could bear. It took their breath away, so to speak.—**τίς ἄρα**, etc.: it seemed to them to raise the question as to the possibility of salvation generally. The question may represent the cumulative effect of the austere teaching of the Master since the day of Caesarea. The imperfect tense of **ἐξεπλήσσοντο** may point to a continuous mood, culminating at that moment.—Ver. 26. **ἐμβλέψας** denotes a look of observation and sympathy. Jesus sees that He has made too deep an impression, depressing in effect, and hastens to qualify what He had said: "with mild, meek eye soothing their scared mind, and relieving their distress" (Chrys., *Hom.* lxiii.).—**παρὰ ἀνθρώποις**, etc.: practically this reflection amounted to saying that the previous remark was to be taken *cum grano*, as referring to *tendency* rather than to *fact*. He did not mean that it was as impossible for a rich *man* to be saved as for a camel to pass through a

πάντα, καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι· τί ἄρα ἔσται ἡμῖν;" 28. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι, ἐν τῇ ᵗ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθίσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς[1] ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, ᵘ κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. 29. καὶ πᾶς ὅς[2] ἀφῆκεν οἰκίας, ἢ ἀδελφούς, ἢ ἀδελφάς, ἢ πατέρα, ἢ μητέρα, ἢ γυναῖκα,[3] ἢ τέκνα, ἢ ἀγρούς, ᵛ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου,[4] ἑκατονταπλασίονα[5] λήψεται. καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει. 30. πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, καὶ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι.

t Titus iii. 5.
u Lk. xxii. 30. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.
v Lk. xxi. 12.

[1] ℵDLZ have και αυτοι (Tisch.), και υμεις in BCX, which Weiss thinks a mechanical conformation to υμεις in first clause. W.H. retain υμεις, but in brackets.

[2] οστις in most uncials.

[3] BD omit η γυναικα—a most probable omission.

[4] του εμου ονοματος in ℵB.

[5] πολλαπλασιονα in BL.

needle-eye, but that the tendency of wealth was to act powerfully as an obstructive to the spiritual life.

Vv. 27-30. *A reaction* (Mk. x. 27-31; Lk. xviii. 28-30).—Ver. 28. **εἶπεν δὲ Π.**: from depression the disciples, represented by Peter, pass to self-complacent buoyancy—their natural mood.—**ἰδοὺ** points to a fact deserving special notice in view of the recent incident.—**ἡμεῖς**, *we*, have done what that man failed to do: left all and followed Thee.—**τί ἄρα**, etc.: a question not given in Mk. and Lk., but implied in Peter's remark and the tone in which it was uttered: what shall be to us by way of recompense? Surely we shall attain what seems so hard for some to reach.—Ver. 28. **ἀμὴν**: introducing a solemn statement.—**ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκ.**: not a nominative absolute (Palairet, *Observ.*), but being far from the verb, **ὑμεῖς** is repeated (with **καὶ**) after **καθίσεσθε**.—**ἐν τ. παλιγγενεσίᾳ** to be connected with **καθίσεσθε** following. This is a new word in the Gospel vocabulary, and points to the general renewal —"re-genesis (nova erit genesis cui praeerit Adamus ii., Beng.)"—in the end of the days, which occupied a prominent place in Jewish apocalyptic hopes. The colouring in this verse is so strongly apocalyptic as to have suggested the hypothesis of interpolation (Weizsäcker), or of a Jewish Christian source (Hilgenfeld). It is not in the parallels, but something similar occurs in Lk. xxii. 30. Commentators translate this promise, so strongly Jewish in form, into Christian ideas, according to their taste, reading into it what was not there for the disciples when it was spoken.—Ver. 29. General promise for all faithful ones.—**ἀδελφούς**, etc.: detailed specification of the things renounced for Christ.—**πολλαπλασίονα λήψεται**: shall receive manifoldly the things renounced, *i.e.*, in the final order of things, in the new-born world, as nothing is said to the contrary. Mk. and Lk. make the compensation *present*.—**καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον**: this higher boon, the *summum bonum*, over and above the compensation in kind. Here the latter comes first; in chap. vi. 33 the order is reversed.—Ver. 30. **πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται**, etc., but many first ones shall be last, and last ones first. Fritzsche reverses the meaning = many being last shall be first, so making it accord with xx. 16. The words are so arranged as to suggest taking **πρῶτ. ἔσχ.** and **ἔσχ. πρῶτ.** as composite ideas, and rendering: many shall be first-lasts, and last-firsts = there shall be many reversals of position both ways. This aphorism admits of many applications. There are not only many instances under the same category but many categories: *e.g.*, first in *this world*, last in the Kingdom of God (*e.g.*, the wealthy inquirer and the Twelve); first in *time*, last in power and fame (the Twelve and Paul); first in *privilege*, last in Christian faith (Jews and Gentiles); first in *zeal* and self-sacrifice, last in quality of service through vitiating influence of low motive (legal and evangelic piety). The aphorism is adapted to frequent use in various connections, and may have been uttered on different occasions by Jesus (*cf.* Lk. xiii. 30: Jew and Gentile), and the sphere of its application can only be determined by the context. Here it is the last of those above indicated, not the first, as Weiss holds; also Holtzmann (H. C.),

XX. 1. Ὁμοία γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, ὅστις ἐξῆλθεν ἅμα πρωῒ μισθώσασθαι ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ. 2. συμφωνήσας δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐργατῶν [a] ἐκ [a] δηναρίου τὴν ἡμέραν, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ. 3. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν [b] περὶ τὴν[1] τρίτην ὥραν, εἶδεν ἄλλους ἑστῶτας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ [c] ἀργούς· 4. κἀκείνοις[2] εἶπεν, Ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν ᾖ δίκαιον δώσω ὑμῖν. οἱ δὲ ἀπῆλθον. 5. Πάλιν[3] ἐξελθὼν περὶ ἕκτην καὶ ἐννάτην ὥραν ἐποίησεν ὡσαύτως. 6. Περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑνδεκάτην ὥραν[4] ἐξελθών, εὗρεν ἄλλους ἑστῶτας ἀργούς,[5] καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Τί ὧδε ἑστήκατε [d] ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἀργοί;

a Cf. Ch. xxvii. 7. Lk. xvi. 9. Acts i. 18.
b Ch. xxvii. 46. Acts x. 9.
c Ch. xii. 36. 1 Tim. v. 13. Titus i. 12.
d Rom. viii. 36; x. 21.

[1] την (T. R.), found in Δ, is omitted in ℵBCD.
[2] So in CDLΣ; και εκεινοις in ℵB and many others.
[3] δε after παλιν in ℵCDL. BX omit δε (W.H. in brackets).
[4] ℵBDL omit ωραν (Tisch., W.H.). [5] ℵBDL omit αργους (Tisch., W.H.).

though admitting that there may be reference also to the self-complacent mood of Peter. The δὲ after πολλοὶ implies that this is *the* reference. It does not introduce a new subject, but a contrasted view of the same subject. The connection of thought is: self-sacrifice such as yours, Peter, has a great reward, but beware of self-complacency, which may so vitiate the quality of service as to make one first in sacrifice last in the esteem of God.

CHAPTER XX. PARABLE OF THE HOURS; TWO SONS OF ZEBEDEE; BLIND MAN AT JERICHO.

Vv. 1-16. *Parable of the hours*, peculiar to Mt., and, whatever its real connection as spoken by Jesus, to be interpreted in relation to its setting as here given, which is not impossible. The parable is brought in as illustrating the aphorism in xix. 30.—Ver. 1. ὁμοία γὰρ etc.: γὰρ points back to previous sentence about first-lasts and last-firsts. —ἀνθ. οἰκοδ.: *vide* xiii. 52.—ἅμα πρωῒ: at early dawn (similar use of ἅμα in classics), at the beginning of the day, which was reckoned from six to six.—μισθώσασθαι: hiring has a prominent place in this parable, at the first, third, sixth, ninth, eleventh hour. Why so many servants wanted that day? This feature obtains natural probability by conceiving that it is the season of grape-gathering, which must be done at the proper time and promptly; the more hands the better (Koetsveld, *De Gelijk.*).—Ver. 2. ἐκ δηναρίου: on the basis of a penny; the agreement sprang out of the offer, and acceptance, of a denarius as a day's wage (so Meyer, Weiss, etc.).—τὴν ἡμέραν = *per diem*, only a single day is contemplated in the parable.—Ver. 3. τρίτην ὥ.: the article τὴν before τρίτην in T. R., omitted in W. H., is not necessary before an ordinal.—ἑστῶτας ἐ. τ. ἀγ.: the market-place there as here, the place where masters and men met.—ἀργοὺς (α and ἔργον), not = idle in habit, but unemployed and looking for work.—Ver. 4. καὶ ὑμεῖς: he had got a fair number of workers in the morning, but he is pleased to have more for an urgent piece of work. The expression has reference to the Master's mood rather than to the men's knowledge of what had taken place at the first hour.—ὃ ἐὰν δίκαιον: no bargain this time, only a promise of fair equitable dealing, will be *just* at *least*, give in proportion to length of service; privately intends to do more, or at least is that way inclined.—Ver. 5. ἐποίησεν ὡσαύτως: repetition of the action at sixth and ninth hours; more men still on similar footing.—Ver. 6. περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑνδεκ.: the δὲ marks this final procedure as noteworthy. We begin to wonder at all this hiring, when we see it going on *even at the last hour*. Is the master a humorist hiring out of benevolence rather than from regard to the exigencies of the work? Some have thought so (Olshausen, Goebel, Koetsveld), and there seems good ground for the suggestion, though even this unusual procedure may be made to appear probable by conceiving the master as anxious to finish the work on hand that day, in which case even an hour's work from a sufficient number of willing hands

7. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἡμᾶς ἐμισθώσατο. λέγει αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν ᾖ δίκαιον λήψεσθε.[1] 8. Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης λέγει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος τῷ [e] ἐπιτρόπῳ αὐτοῦ, Κάλεσον τοὺς ἐργάτας, καὶ ἀπόδος αὐτοῖς[2] τὸν μισθόν, [f] ἀρξάμενος [f] ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἕως τῶν πρώτων. 9. καὶ ἐλθόντες[3] οἱ περὶ τὴν ἑνδεκάτην ὥραν ἔλαβον [g] ἀνὰ [g] δηνάριον. 10. ἐλθόντες δὲ[4] οἱ πρῶτοι ἐνόμισαν ὅτι πλείονα[5] λήψονται· καὶ ἔλαβον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀνὰ δηνάριον.[6] 11. λαβόντες δὲ [h] ἐγόγγυζον κατὰ τοῦ οἰκοδεσπότου, 12. λέγοντες, Ὅτι[7] οὗτοι οἱ ἔσχατοι μίαν ὥραν [i] ἐποίησαν, καὶ ἴσους ἡμῖν αὐτοὺς[8] ἐποίησας, τοῖς βαστάσασι τὸ βάρος τῆς ἡμέρας

e Lk. viii. 3. Gal. iv. 2.
f Lk. xxiii. 5; xxiv. 27, 47. Acts i. 22, etc.
g Lk. ix. 3; x. 1. John iv. 6. Rev. iv. 8; xxi. 21.
h Lk. v. 30 (πρός τινα). John vi. 41, 61 (περί τινος); vi. 43 (μετ' ἀλλήλων). 1 Cor. x. 10 (absol.).
i Acts xv. 33. 2 Cor. xi. 25. James iv. 13.

[1] The words και ο εαν . . . ληψεσθε come in from ver. 4, and are wanting in ℵBDLZ.

[2] αυτοις wanting in ℵCLZ, but found in BD and many other uncials (W.H. in margin).

[3] So in ℵCL and many other uncials; ελθοντες δε in BD (W.H.).

[4] και ελθοντες in BCD (W.H.).

[5] πλειον in BCNZΣ.

[6] ανα δην. καὶ αυτοι in ℵBLZ.

[7] ℵBD omit οτι.

[8] αυτους ημιν in ℵDLZ. BCN as in text. W.H., former in text, latter in margin.

may be of value.—τί ὧδε ἑστήκατε, etc., why *stand* ye here (ἑστήκ., perfect active, neuter in sense, and used as a present) all the day idle? The question answers itself: no man would stand all the day in the market-place idle unless because he wanted work and could not get it.—Ver. 7. ὑπάγετε καὶ ὑμεῖς: these words said this time with marked emphasis = *you too go*, though it be so late. This employer would probably be talked of among the workers as a man who had a hobby—a character; they might even laugh at his peculiar ways. The clause about payment in T. R. is obviously out of place in this case. The pay the last gang were *entitled* to was not worth speaking about.

Vv. 8-12. *The evening settlement.*—Ver. 8. ἀρξάμενος: a pregnant word, including not only the commencement of the process of paying but its progress. There is an ellipsis, καὶ ἐλθὼν being understood before ἕως (Kypke). Grotius thinks this does not really mean beginning with the last comers, but without regard to order of coming in, so that no one should be overlooked. He fails to see that the idiosyncrasy of the master is a leading point, indeed the key to the meaning of the parable. This beginning with the last is an eccentricity from an ordinary everyday-life point of view. The master chooses to do so: to begin with those who have no claims.—Ver. 9. ἀνὰ δηνάριον, a denarius *each;* ἀνὰ is distributive = "accipiebant singuli denar.". For this use of ἀνὰ *vide* Herrmann's *Viger*, p. 576.—Ver. 10. οἱ πρῶτοι: the intermediates passed over, as non-essential to the didactic purpose, we arrive at the first, the men hired on a regular bargain in the morning.—ἐνόμισαν: they had noticed the paying of the last first, and had curiously watched to see or hear what they got, and they come with great expectations: twelve hours' work, therefore twelve times the sum given to the one-hour men.—καὶ αὐτοί: surprising! only a penny! What a strange, eccentric master! He had seen expectation in their faces, and anticipated with amusement their chagrin. The money was paid by the overseer, but he was standing by enjoying the scene.—Ver. 11. ἐγόγγυζον: imperfect; the grumbling went on from man to man as they were being paid; to the overseer, but at (κατὰ) the master, and so that he could overhear.—Ver. 12. Their grievous complaint.—οὗτοι, *these*, with a workman's contempt for a sham-worker.—ἐποίησαν. Some (Wetstein, Meyer, Goebel, etc.) render, *spent* = they put in their one hour: without doing any work to speak of. The verb

καὶ τὸν ʲ καύσωνα. 13. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν ἑνὶ αὐτῶν, Ἑταῖρε, οὐκ ἀδικῶ σε· οὐχὶ δηναρίου συνεφώνησάς μοι; 14. ἆρον τὸ σὸν καὶ ὕπαγε. θέλω δὲ[1] τούτῳ τῷ ἐσχάτῳ δοῦναι ὡς καὶ σοί· 15. ἢ[2] οὐκ ἔξεστί μοι ποιῆσαι ὃ θέλω[3] ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς; εἰ[4] ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρός ἐστιν, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀγαθός εἰμι; 16. οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι, καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι· πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί."[5]

j Lk. xii. 51. Jas. i. 11.

[1] θελω εγω in B (W.H. in margin). [2] BDLZ omit η.

[3] ο θελω ποιησαι in ℵBDLZ, so giving to ο θελω due emphasis (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] η in ℵBCDNΣ (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] πολλοι γαρ . . . εκλεκτοι wanting in ℵBLZ; brought in from chap. xxii. 14.

is used in this sense (*e.g.*, Acts xv. 33), and one is strongly tempted to adopt this rendering as true to the contemptuous feeling of the twelve-hour men for the one-hour men. Kypke remarks against it that if ἐποίησαν had been meant in this sense = "commorati sunt," the word ὧδε = ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι would have been added. Perhaps the strongest reason against it is that the one-hour men had worked with such good will (that goes without saying) that even prejudiced fellow-workers could not ignore the fact. So we must take ἐποίησαν = worked.—τὸ βάρος, τὸν καύσωνα: these the points of their case: not that they had worked hard while the others had not, but that they had borne the burden of a whole day's work, and worked through the heat of the day, and now came to be paid, weary and sweat-stained. (Some take καύσωνα as referring to the sirocco or south-east wind; hot, dry and dust-laden. On the winds of Palestine, *vide* Benzinger, *Heb. Arch.*, p. 30.) What was one hour in the late afternoon, however hard the last comers worked, to that! And yet they are made equal (ἴσους)! Surely good ground for complaint!

Vv. 13-15. *The master's reply.*—Ver. 13. ἑνί, to *one* of them. It would have been undignified to make a speech in self-defence to the whole gang. That would have been to take the matter too seriously. The master selects a man, and quietly speaks his mind to him.—ἑταῖρε, friend, comrade; familiar and kindly. *Cf.* Lk. xv. 31.—Ver. 14. ἆρον τὸ σόν, take thine, thy stipulated denarius. It looks as if this particular worker had refused the penny, or was saucily handing it back.—θέλω, I choose, it is my pleasure; emphatically spoken. *Summa hujus verbi potestas*, Beng.—τούτῳ τ. ἐσχ.: one of the eleventh-hour men singled out and pointed to.—Ver. 15. οὐκ ἔξεστι: right asserted to act as he chooses in the matter.—ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς: in matters within my own discretion—a truism; the question is: what belongs to that category? Fritzsche and De Wette render: in my own affairs; Meyer: in the matter of my own property.—ἢ (W.H.) introduces an alternative mode of putting the case, which explains how the complainants and the master see the matter so differently, they seeing in it an injustice, he a legitimate exercise of his discretion.—πονηρός, *vide* on vi. 22-24.—ἀγαθός, generous; doing more than justice demands. So Bengel. *Cf.* Rom. v. 7 for the distinction between δίκαιος and ἀγαθός.

Ver. 16. Christ here points the moral of the parable = xix. 30, the terms ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι changing places, the better to suit the story. The meaning is not: the last as the first, and the first as the last, all treated alike. True, all get the same sum; at least the last and first do, nothing being said of those between; but the point of the parable is not that the reward is the same. The denarius given to all is not the central feature of the story, but the *will* of the master, whose character from a commercial point of view is distinctly eccentric, and is so represented to make it serve the didactic purpose. The method of this master is commercially unworkable; combination of the two systems of legal contract and benevolence must lead to perpetual trouble. All must be dealt with on one footing. And that is what it will come to with a master of the type indicated. He will abolish contract, and engage all on the footing of generously rewarding generous service. The parable does not bring

17. ΚΑΙ ἀναβαίνων ὁ Ἰησοῦς[1] εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παρέλαβε τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, καὶ[2] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, 18. "Ἰδού, ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ γραμματεῦσι· καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ,[3] 19. καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι· καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσεται."

20. Τότε προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου μετὰ τῶν

[1] B begins this section thus: μελλων δε αναβαινειν I., which W.H. adopt and Tr. places on margin, Weiss approving, viewing the reading in T. R. as a reminiscence of Mk.

[2] και εν τη οδω in ℵBLZ (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] εις θανατον in ℵ (Tisch.). B omits (W.H. θανατω within brackets).

this out fully, as it gives the story only of a single day. It suggests rather than adequately illustrates its own moral, which is that God does not love a legal spirit. In the parable the men who worked on contract, and, as it came out at the end, in a legal temper, got their penny, but what awaits them in future is not to be employed at all. Work done in a legal spirit does not count in the Kingdom of God. In reward it is last, or even nowhere. This is the *trend* of the parable, and so viewed it has a manifest connection with Peter's self-complacent question. On this parable *vide* my *Parabolic Teaching of Christ.*

Vv. 17-19. *Third prediction of the passion* (Mk. x. 32-34; Lk. xviii. 31-34).—The first in xvi. 21; the second in xvii. 22. In the first it was stated generally that Jesus was about πολλὰ παθεῖν. Here the πολλὰ are detailed. In the second mention was made of betrayal (παραδίδοται, xvii. 31) into the hands of *men.* Here the "men" resolve into priests, scribes, and Gentiles.—Ver. 17. ἀναβαίνων: going up from Peraea to the ridge on which the Holy City stood. The reading μέλλων ἀναβ. may indicate that they are already on the west side of the Jordan, and about to commence the ascent (Weiss-Meyer).—εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα: face being now turned directly towards Jerusalem, thought naturally turns to what is going to happen there.—κατ᾽ ἰδίαν: there is a crowd of pilgrims going the same way, so Jesus must take aside His disciples to speak on the solemn theme what is specially meant for their ear.—ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, in the way, *vide* Mk.'s description, which is very graphic.—Ver. 18. ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν! a memorable fateful *anabasis!* It excites lively expectation in the whole company, but how different the thoughts of the Master from those of His followers!—κατακρινοῦσι, they shall sentence Him to death; a new feature.—Ver. 19. ἐμπαῖξαι, μαστιγῶσαι, σταυρῶσαι, mock, scourge, crucify; all new features, the details of the πολλὰ παθεῖν. Note the parts assigned to the various actors: the Jews condemn, the Gentiles scourge and crucify.

Vv. 20-28. *The two sons of Zebedee* (Mk. x. 35-45).—Ver. 20. τότε (in Mk. the vaguer καί), *then;* let us hope not quite immediately after, but it need not have been long after. How soon children forget doleful news and return to their play; a beneficent provision of nature in their case, that grief should be but a summer shower. Or did James and John with their mother not hear the sad announcement, plotting perhaps when the Master was predicting?—ἡ μήτηρ: in Mk. the two brothers speak for themselves, but this representation is true to life. Mothers can be very bold in their children's interest.—αἰτοῦσα, begging; the petitioner a woman and a near relative, not easy to resist.—τι: vague; no verbal indication as yet what is wanted; her attitude showed she had a request to make, the manner revealing that it is something important, and also perhaps that it is something that should not be asked.—Ver. 21. εἰπὲ ἵνα: *vide* on iv. 3.—καθίσωσιν, etc. = let them have the first places in the kingdom, sitting on Thy right and left hand respectively. After ἐκ δεξιῶν, ἐξ εὐωνύμων, μερῶν is understood = on the right and left parts. *Vide* Bos, *Ellipses Graecae,* p. 184, who cites an instance of the latter phrase from Diod. Sic. So this was all that came out of the discourse on child-likeness! (xviii. 3 ff.). But Jesus had also

υἱῶν αὐτῆς, προσκυνοῦσα καὶ αἰτοῦσά τι παρ[1] αὐτοῦ. 21. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Τί θέλεις;" Λέγει αὐτῷ,[2] "Εἰπὲ ἵνα καθίσωσιν οὗτοι οἱ δύο υἱοί μου, εἷς [k] ἐκ δεξιῶν σου,[3] καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων,[4] ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου." 22. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε. δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον, ὃ ἐγὼ μέλλω πίνειν, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι;"[5] Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Δυνάμεθα." 23. Καὶ[6] λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Τὸ μὲν ποτήριόν μου πίεσθε, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα, ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθήσεσθε· τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ[7] ἐξ εὐωνύμων μου,[8] οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν[9] δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς [l] ἡτοίμασται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου." 24. Καὶ

k Ch. xxii. 44; xxvi. 64. Heb. i. 13.

l Ch. xxv. 34, 41. 1 Cor. ii. 9.

[1] παρ' in ℵCNXZ *al.* (Tisch.). απ' in BD (W.H. text, παρ margin).

[2] η δε ειπεν in B.

[3] σου wanting in ℵB.

[4] σου added in ℵBCNZ *al.* Wanting n D.

[5] The clause και το βαπτισμα . . . βαπτισθηναι in this and the next verse is omitted in ℵBDLZ. It has doubtless been mported from Mk.

[6] ℵBDZ omit και.

[7] και in ℵCDZ (Tisch.), η in BL, Lat. verss. 1, 33 (W.H. margin).

[8] μου omitted in ℵBCDL *al.*

[9] CDΔ insert τουτο before δουναι.

spoken of thrones in the new Genesis, and that seems to have fired their imagination and stimulated their ambition. And "the gentle and humble" John was in this plot! Conventional ideas of apostolic character need revision.

Ver. 22. Jesus meets this bold petition as He met the scribe's offer of discipleship (viii. 19), aiming at disenchantment by pointing out what it involved: throne and suffering going together. — **τὸ ποτήριον**: the cup, emblem of both good and evil fortune in Hebrew speech (Ps. xi. 6; xxiii. 5); here of suffering. —**δυνάμεθα**, we are able; the prompt, decided answer of the two brothers to whom Jesus had addressed His question. Had they then laid to heart what Jesus had said shortly before concerning His passion, and subsequent resurrection, and made up their minds to share His sufferings that they might so gain a high place in the kingdom? Had they already caught the martyr spirit? It is possible. But it is also possible that they spoke without thinking, like Peter on the hill.—Ver. 23. **τὸ μὲν π. μ. πίεσθε**, as for my cup, ye shall drink of it: predictive of the future fact, and also conferring a privilege = I have no objection to grant you companionship in my sufferings; that favour may be granted without risk of abuse.—**τὸ δὲ καθίσαι**, etc., but as for sitting on right and left hand, that is another affair.—**οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι** = is not a matter of mere personal favour: favouritism has no place here; it depends on fitness. That is the meaning of the last clause, **οἷς ἡτοίμασται ὑ. τ. π. μ.** = it is not an affair of arbitrary favour on the part of the father any more than on my part. Thrones are for those who are fit to sit on them, and prepared by moral trial and discipline to bear the honour worthily: **τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων δυναμένοις γενέσθαι λαμπροῖς**—Chrys., *Hom.* lxv. The same Father illustrates by supposing an **ἀγωνοθέτης** to be asked by two athletes to assign to them the crowns of victory, and replying: "it is not mine to give, but they belong to those for whom they are prepared by struggle and sweat" (**ἀπὸ τῶν πόνων καὶ τῶν ἱδρώτων**).

Vv. 24-28. *Commotion in the disciple-circle.*—Ver. 24. **οἱ δέκα**: the Twelve were all on one moral level, not one superior to ambitious passion, or jealousy of it in another. Therefore the conduct of the *two* greatly provoked the ten.—**ἠγανάκτησαν** Passow derives from **ἄγαν** and **ἄγω**, and gives as original sense to be in a state of violent excitement like new wine fermenting. The ten were "mad" at the two; pitiful exhibition in the circumstances, fitted to make Jesus doubt His choice of such men. But better were not to be found.—Ver. 25. **προσκαλεσάμενος**: Jesus had to call them to Him, therefore they had had

ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα [m] ἠγανάκτησαν περὶ τῶν δύο ἀδελφῶν. 25. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς εἶπεν, "Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν [n] κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι [o] κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. 26. οὐχ οὕτως δὲ[1] ἔσται[2] ἐν ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι, ἔστω[3] ὑμῶν διάκονος· 27. καὶ ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος, ἔστω[3] ὑμῶν δοῦλος· 28. ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ [p] λύτρον ἀντὶ [q] πολλῶν."

m Ch. xxi. 15; xxvi. 8. Mk. x. 14, 41; xiv. 4. Lk. xiii. 14.
n Mk. x. 42. 1 Pet. v. 3 (Acts xix. 16 = to gain the mastery, overpower).
o Mk. x. 42.
p Mk. x. 45 (Ex. xxi. 30. Levit. xix. 20. Num. xxxv. 31).
q Rom. viii. 29. Heb. ii. 10; ix. 28.

[1] ℵBDZΣ omit δε. [2] εστιν in BDZ (W.H.).
[3] Some MSS. have εσται, which is adopted by W.H. in both places.

the decency not to quarrel in His presence. *Magistro non praesente*, Beng.—**κατακυριεύουσιν**: in the Sept. used in the sense of rule, Gen. i. 28, Ps. lxxii. 8; here the connection requires the idea of "lording it over," the **κατὰ** having intensive force; so also in the *apax. leg.* **κατεξουσιάζουσιν**, following = play the tyrant.—**τῶν ἐθνῶν**: from these occasional references to the outside peoples we get Christ's idea of the Pagan world; they seek material good (vi. 32), use repetition in prayer (vi. 7), are subject to despotic rule.—**οἱ μεγάλοι**, the grandees.—**αὐτῶν** after the two verbs in both cases refers to the **ἐθνῶν**. Grotius takes the second as referring to the **ἄρχοντες**, and finds in the passage this sense: the rulers, monarchs, lord it over the people, and their grandees lord it over them, the rulers, in turn; a picture certainly often true to life. Perhaps the intention is to suggest that the rule of the magnates is more oppressive than that of their royal masters: they strain their authority. "Ipsis saepe dominis imperantiores," Beng.—Ver. 26. **οὐχ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐ. ὑ.** It is not so among you. The **ἔσται** of T.R. is probably conformed to the two following **ἔσται**, but it is true to the meaning. Jesus speaks of a state of matters He desires, but which does not yet exist. The present spirit of the Twelve is essentially secular and pagan.—**μέγας, διάκονος**: *greatness by service* the law of the Kingdom of God, whereby greatness becomes another thing, not self-asserted or arrogated, but freely conceded by others.—Ver. 27. **πρῶτος** may be a synonym for **μέγας = μέγιστος** (De W.) and **δοῦλος** for **διάκονος**; or in both cases increased emphasis may be intended, **πρῶτος** pointing to a higher place of dignity, **δοῦλος** to a lower depth of servitude. Burton (M. and T. in N.T., § 68) finds in the two **ἔσται** in vv. 26 and 27 probable instances of the third person future used imperatively.

Ver. 28. **ὥσπερ, καὶ γὰρ** in Mk.; both phrases introducing reference to the *summum exemplum* (Bengel) in an emphatic way.—**περ** lends force to **ὡς** = even as, observe.—**ὁ υ. τ. ἀνθρώπου**: an important instance of the use of the title. On the principle of defining by discriminating use it means: the man who makes no pretensions, asserts no claims.—**οὐκ ἦλθε** points to the chief end of His mission, the general character of His public life: not that of a *Pretender* but that of a *Servant*.—**δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν**, to give His life, to that extent does the service go. *Cf.* Phil. ii. 8: **μέχρι θανάτου**, there also in illustration of the humility of Christ. It is implied that in some way the death of the Son of Man will be serviceable to others. It enters into the life plan of the Great Servant.—**λύτρον**, a ransom, characterises the service, another new term in the evangelic vocabulary, suggesting rather than solving a theological problem as to the significance of Christ's death, and admitting of great variety of interpretation, from the view of Origen and other Fathers, who regarded Christ's death as a price paid to the *devil* to ransom men from bondage to him, to that of Wendt, who finds in the word simply the idea that the example of Jesus in carrying the principle of service as far as to die tends by way of moral influence to deliver men's minds from every form of spiritual bondage (*Die Lehre Jesu*, ii. 510-517). It is an interesting question, What clue can be found in Christ's own words, as hitherto reported, to the use by Him on this occasion of the term **λύτρον**, and to

29. ΚΑΙ ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Ἱεριχώ, ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ʳ ὄχλος πολύς. 30. καὶ ἰδού, δύο τυφλοὶ καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ἰησοῦς παράγει, ἔκραξαν, λέγοντες, "Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, κύριε,[1] υἱὸς[2] Δαβίδ." 31. Ὁ δὲ ὄχλος ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ʳ σιωπήσωσιν. οἱ δὲ μεῖζον ἔκραζον, λέγοντες, "Ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς, ˢ κύριε, υἱὸς Δαβίδ." 32. Καὶ στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ˢ ἐφώνησεν αὐτούς, καὶ εἶπε, "Τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν;" 33. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, ἵνα ἀνοιχθῶσιν[3] ἡμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί."[4] 34. Σπλαγχνισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἥψατο τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν[5] αὐτῶν· καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέβλεψαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί,[6] καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

r Ch. xxvi. 63. Mk. iii. 4; ix. 34; x. 48; xiv. 61. Lk. xix. 40. Acts xviii. 9.
s Ch. xxvi. 24, 74 parall. (intrans. to emit a sound); here and in Ch. xxvii. 47. Mk. ix. 35; x. 49, etc. (to call to oneself, with acc.). Lk. xiv. 12 (to invite). John xiii. 13 (to call by a name).

[1] κυριε ελεησον ημας in BLZ. ℵD omit κυριε (Tisch.). Same order in ver. 31 in ℵBDLZ.

[2] υιε in ℵCDLΣ (Tisch., W.H. margin).

[3] ανοιγωσιν in ℵBDLZ. [4] οι οφ. ημων in ℵBDLZ.

[5] ομματων in BDLZ. T. R. follows ℵCN in using the more common word οφθαλμων.

[6] αυτων οι οφθαλμοι wanting in ℵBDLZ and omitted by modern editors.

the sense in which He uses it? Wendt contends that this is the best method of getting at the meaning, and suggests as the most congenial text Mt. xi. 28-30. I agree with him as to method, but think a better clue may be found in Mt. xvii. 27, the word spoken by Jesus in reference to the *Temple Tax*. That word *began* the striking course of instruction on humility, as this word (xx. 28) *ends* it, and the end and the beginning touch in thought and language. The *didrachmon* was a λύτρον (Exodus xxx. 12), as the life of the Son of Man is represented to be. The tax was paid ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ. The life is to be given ἀντὶ πολλῶν. Is it too much to suppose that the Capernaum incident was present to Christ's mind when He uttered this striking saying, and that in the earlier utterance we have the key to the psychological history of the term λύτρον? On this subject *vide* my book *The Kingdom of God*, pp. 238-241.

Vv. 29-34. *Blind men* (man) *at Jericho* (Mk. x. 46-52, Lk. xviii. 35-43). The harmonistic problems as to the locality of this incident (leaving Jericho Mt. and Mk., entering, Lk.) and the number of persons healed (one Mk. and Lk., two Mt.) may be left on one side, as also the modern critical attempts to account for the origin of the discrepancies. Those interested may consult for the former Keil and Nösgen, for the latter Holtz., H.C., and Weiss-Meyer.—Ver. 29. ἀπὸ Ἱεριχὼ from Jericho, an important town every way; "the key—the '*Chiavenna*'—of Palestine to any invader from this quarter" (Stanley, *Sinai and Palestine*, p. 305; the whole account there given should be read), situated in an oasis in the Judaean desert, caused by streams from the mountains above and springs in the valley; with a flourishing trade and fine buildings, Herod's palace included; two hours distant from the Jordan; from thence to the summit a steep climb through a rocky ravine, haunt of robbers.—ὄχλος πολύς, a great crowd going to the feast in Jerusalem.—Ver. 30. ἀκούσαντες, etc. Luke explains that the blind man learnt that Jesus was passing in answer to inquiry suggested by the noise of a crowd. He knew who Jesus was: the fame of Jesus the Nazarene (Mk. and Lk.), the great Healer, had reached his ear.—υἱὸς Δ.: popular Messianic title (ix. 28, xv. 22).—Ver. 31. ἐπετίμησεν: same word as in xix. 13, and denoting similar action to that of the disciples in reference to the children, due to similar motives. Officious reverence has played a large part in the history of the Church and of theology.—μεῖζον ἔκραζον, they cried out the more; of course, repression ever defeats itself; μεῖζον, adverb, here only.—Ver. 32, ἐφώνησεν might mean "addressed them" (Fritzsche), but "called them" seems to

XXI. 1. ΚΑΙ ὅτε ἤγγισαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Βηθφαγὴ πρὸς[1] τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, τότε ὁ[2] Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλε δύο μαθητάς, 2. λέγων αὐτοῖς, "Πορεύθητε[3] εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν ἀπέναντι[4] ὑμῶν· καὶ εὐθέως εὑρήσετε ὄνον δεδεμένην, καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς· λύσαντες ἀγάγετέ[5] μοι. 3. καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ τι, ἐρεῖτε, Ὅτι ὁ Κύριος

[1] B has **εις** for **προς**, which Weiss thinks has come from the parall.
[2] **ο** is wanting in BD (Tisch., W.H.).
[3] **πορευεσθε** in ℵBDLZ Orig.
[4] **κατεναντι** in ℵBCDLZ (Tisch., Trg., W.H.).
[5] **αγετε** in BD (W.H. in margin).

suit the situation better; *cf.* the parallels.—**τί θέλετε**, etc., what do you wish me to do for you? Not a superfluous question; they were *beggars* as well as blind; they might want *alms* (*vide* Mk. x. 46). Mt. says nothing about their being beggars, but the question of Jesus implies it.—Ver. 33. **ἵνα ἀνοιγῶσιν οἱ ὀφ.** They desire the greater benefit, opening of their eyes, which shows that the eyes of their mind were open as to Christ's power and will.—**ἀνοιγῶσιν**, 2nd aorist subjunctive, for which the T. R. has the more common 1st aorist. — Ver. 34. **σπλαγχνισθεὶς.** Note the frequent reference to Christ's pity in this gospel (ix. 36, xiv. 14, xv. 32, and here).—**τῶν ὀμμάτων**, a synonym for **ὀφθαλμῶν**, as if with some regard to style which the scribes might have been expected to appreciate, but have not, witness the threefold use of the same word in T. R.—**ἠκολούθησαν**, they followed Him, like the rest, without guide (*sine hodego*, Beng.), so showing at once that their eyes were opened and their hearts grateful.

Chapter XXI. Entry into Jerusalem, etc.—Vv. 1-11. *The entry* (Mk. xi. 1-11, Lk. xix. 29-44).—Ver. 1, **ὅτε ἤγγισαν ε. Ἱ.**, *when*, etc. The evangelist does not, like a modern tourist, make formal announcement of the arrival at a point near Jerusalem when the Holy City came first into view, but refers to the fact in a subordinate clause. The manner of entry is the more important matter for him.—**εἰς Βηθφαγὴ**, to *Bethphage* = the house of figs, mentioned here and in the synoptical parallels, nowhere else in O. or N. T., but from Talmudic sources appears to have been a better known and more important place than Bethany (Buxtorf, Talm. Lex., p. 1691). No trace of it now.—**εἰς τ. Ὄ. τ. Ἐλαιῶν**, to the Mount of Olives; the **εἰς**, in all the three phrases used to define the position, means near to, towards, not into.—**τότε**, then, introducing what for the evangelist is the main event. Bengel's comment is: *vectura mysterii plena innuitur.* It is possible to import *too much* mystery into the incident following.—Ver. 2. **εἰς τὴν κώμην**, that is, naturally, the one named, though if we take **εἰς** before **Βηθφαγὴ** as = into, it might be Bethany, on the other side of the valley. Some think the two villages were practically one (Porter, *Handbook for Syria and Palestine*, p. 180).—**ὄνον δ. καὶ πῶλον**, a she-ass with her foal, the latter alone mentioned in parall.; both named here for a reason which will appear.—**λύσαντες ἀγάγετε**, loose and bring; without asking leave, as if they were their own.—Ver. 3. **ἐάν τις**, etc. Of course it was to be expected that the act would be challenged.—**ἐρεῖτε**, ye shall say, future with imperative force.—**ὅτι**, recitative, introducing in direct form the words of the Master.—**ὁ Κύριος**, the Lord or Master; not surely = Jehovah (Alford, G. T.), but rather to be taken in same sense as in Mt. viii. 25, or in ver. 30 of this chap.—**αὐτῶν χρείαν ἔχει**, hath need of them; in what sense? Looking to the synop. narratives alone, one might naturally infer that the need was *physical*, due to the fatigue of a toilsome, tedious ascent. But according to the narrative in 4th Gospel the starting point of the day's journey was Bethany (xii. 1, 12). The prophetic reference in ver. 4 suggests a wholly different view, *viz.*, that the animals were needed to enable Jesus to enter Jerusalem in a manner conformable to prophetic requirements, and worthy of the Messianic King. One is conscious of a certain reluctance to accept this as the exclusive sense of the **χρεία**. Lutteroth suggests that Jesus did not wish to mix among the crowd of pilgrims on foot lest His arrival should be concealed and

αὐτῶν χρείαν ἔχει· εὐθέως δὲ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτούς." 4. Τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον[1] γέγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, 5. 'Εἴπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών, Ἰδού, ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταί σοι, πραῢς καὶ [a] ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ[2] πῶλον υἱὸν [b] ὑποζυγίου.' 6. Πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς προσέταξεν[3] αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 7. ἤγαγον τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον, καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω[4] αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν,[5] καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν επάνω αὐτῶν. 8. ὁ δὲ [c] πλεῖστος ὄχλος [d] ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· ἄλλοι δὲ ἔκοπτον κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων, καὶ ἐστρώννυον ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

a here only in sense of mounting (*cf.* ἐπιβιβάζω in Lk. x. 34; xix. 35. Acts xxiii. 24).
b here and in 2 Pet. ii. 16.
c here only (= greatest part of). Mk. iv. 1 (W.H.) (= very great). 1 Cor. xiv. 27 (= at most, adv.).
d Mk. xiv. 15. Lk. xxii. 12. Acts ix. 34.

[1] ℵCDLZ omit ολον, which is found in BNΣ. It is probably an echo of Ch. i. 22 (Weiss) (W.H. omit).

[2] και επι in ℵBLN. CD with many others omit the επι as in T. R. (ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον in Zech. ix. 9, Sept.).

[3] συνεταξεν in BCD. [4] επ αυτων in ℵBDLZ. [5] ℵBD omit αυτων.

the interest awakened by His presence lessened.—Ver. 4. ἵνα πληρωθῇ: ἵνα is to be taken here as always in this Gospel, in its strictly final sense. Such is the view of the evangelist and the view he wishes his readers to take. But it does not follow from this that Christ's whole action proceeded from a conscious intention to fulfil a prophecy. On the contrary, the less intention on His part the greater the apologetic value of the correspondence between prophecy and fact. Action with intention might show that He claimed to be, not that He *was*, the Messiah. On the other hand, His right to be regarded as the Messiah would have stood where it was though He had entered Jerusalem on foot. That right cannot stand or fall with any such purely external circumstance, which can at best possess only the value of a symbol of those spiritual qualities which constitute intrinsic fitness for Messiahship. But Jesus, while fully aware of its entirely subordinate importance, might quite conceivably be in the mood to give it the place of a symbol, all the more that the act was in harmony with His whole policy of avoiding display and discouraging vulgar Messianic ideas and hopes. There was no pretentiousness in riding into Jerusalem on the foal of an ass. It was rather the meek and lowly One entering in *character*, and in a character not welcome to the proud worldly-minded Jerusalemites. The symbolic act was of a piece with the use of the title "Son of Man," shunning Messianic pretensions, yet making them in a deeper way.—Ver. 5. The prophetic quotation, from Zech. ix. 9, prefaced by a phrase from Isaiah lxii. 11, with some words omitted, and with some alteration in expression as compared with Sept.

Vv. 7-11. τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον: that both were brought is carefully specified in view of the prophetic oracle as understood by the evangelist to refer to two animals, not to one under two parallel names.—ἐπέθηκαν: the two disciples spread their upper garments on the two beasts, to make a seat for their Master.—καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπ. αὐτῶν: if the second αὐτῶν be taken to have the same reference as the first the meaning will be that Jesus sat upon both beasts (alternately). But this would require the imperfect of the verb instead of the aorist. It seems best, with many ancient and modern interpreters, to refer the second αὐτῶν to the garments, though on this view there is a certain looseness in the expression, as, strictly speaking, Jesus would sit on only one of the mantles, if He rode only on one animal. Fritzsche, while taking the second α. as referring to ἱμάτια, thinks the evangelist means to represent Jesus as riding on both alternately.—Ver. 8. ὁ δὲ πλεῖστος ὄχλος, etc., the most part of the crowd, follow the example of the two disciples, and spread their upper garments on the way, as it were to make a carpet for the object of their enthusiasm, after the manner of the peoples honouring their kings (*vide* Wetstein, *ad loc.*).—ἄλλοι δὲ ἔκοπτον: others, a small number comparatively, took to cutting down branches

e here, parall. and Lk. ii. 14. f Ch. xxviii. 4 (metaph. as here). Ch. xxvii. 51. Heb. xii. 26 (literally). g Mk. xi. 15. John ii. 15. h Mk. xi. 15 (Hag. ii. 22. Job ix. 5). i Ch. xxiii. 2.

9. οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι οἱ προάγοντες[1] καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον, λέγοντες, "᾿Ωσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου· ᾿Ωσαννὰ ᵉἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις." 10. Καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ᶠἐσείσθη πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, λέγουσα, "Τίς ἐστιν οὗτος;" 11. Οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἔλεγον, "Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ προφήτης,[2] ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας." 12. ΚΑΙ εἰσῆλθεν ὁ[3] Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ,[4] καὶ ἐξέβαλε πάντας τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν ᵍκολλυβιστῶν ʰκατέστρεψε, καὶ τὰς ⁱκαθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων

[1] ℵBCDL add αυτου.
[2] ο προφητης Ιησους in ℵBD sah. cop.
[3] ο omitted in ℵBCΔ.
[4] του θεου omitted in ℵBL verss. (W.H. omit in text).

of trees and scattering them about on the way. Had they no upper garments, or did they not care to use them in that way? The branches, if of any size, would not improve the road, neither indeed would the garments. Lightfoot, perceiving this—"hoc forsan equitantem prosterneret"—thinks they used garments and branches to make booths, as at the feast of tabernacles. It was well meant but embarrassing homage.—Ver. 9. **οἱ ὄχλοι**, the crowd divided into two, one in front, one in rear, Jesus between. —**ἔκραζον**: lip homage followed the carpeting of the way, in words borrowed from the Psalter (Ps. cxviii. 25, 26), and variously interpreted by commentators. —**᾿Ωσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δ.** Hosanna (we sing) to the son of David (Bengel).—**εὐλογημένος**, etc. (and we say), "Blessed, etc.," repeating words from the Hallel used at the passover season.—**᾿Ωσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις** = may our Hosanna on earth be echoed and ratified in heaven! All this homage by deed and word speaks to a great enthusiasm, the outcome of the Galilean ministry; for the crowd consists of Galileans. Perhaps the incident at Jericho, the healing of the blind men, and the vociferated title Son of David with which they saluted the Healer, gave the keynote. A little matter moves a crowd when it happens at the right moment. The mood of a festive season was on them.—Ver. 10. **ἐσείσθη**: even Jerusalem, frozen with religious formalism and socially undemonstrative, was stirred by the popular enthusiasm as by a mighty wind or by an earthquake (**σεισμός**), and asked (ver. 11), **τίς οὗτος;—ὁ προφήτης**, etc.: a circumstantial answer specifying name, locality, and vocation; not a low-pitched answer as Chrys. (and after him Schanz) thought (**χαμαίζηλος ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ γνώμη, καὶ ταπεινὴ καὶ σεσυρμένη**, Hom. lxvi.), as if they were ashamed of their recent outburst of enthusiasm. Rather spoken with pride = the man to whom we have accorded Messianic honours is a countryman of ours, Jesus, etc.

Vv. 12-17. *Jesus visits the Temple* (Mk. xi. 11, 15-19, Lk. xix. 45-48).—Ver. 12. **εἰσῆλθεν**, etc. He entered the Temple. When? Nothing to show that it was not the same day (*vide* Mk.). —**ἐξέβαλεν**. The fourth Gospel (ii. 14 f.) reports a similar clearing at the beginning of Christ's ministry. Two questions have been much discussed. Were there one or two acts of this kind? and if only one was it at the beginning or at the end as reported by the Synop.? However these questions may be decided it may be regarded as one of the historic certainties that Jesus did once at least and at some time sweep the Temple clear of the unholy traffic carried on there. The consent of the evangelists and the moral originality of the act vouch for the fact.—**πάντας τοὺς πωλ. καὶ ἀγ.**, the article not repeated after **καὶ**. Sellers and buyers viewed as one company. Kindred in occupation and spirit, to be cleared out wholesale.—**τὰς τραπέζας**, etc.: these tables were in the court of the Gentiles, in the booths (*tabernae*) where all things needed for sacrifice were sold, and the money changers sat ready to give to all comers the *didrachma* for the temple tax in exchange for ordinary money at a small profit.—**κολλυβιστῶν**, from **κόλλυβος**, a small coin, change money, hence *agio;* hence our word to denote those who traded in exchange, condemned by Phryn., p. 440, while approving **κόλλυβος**. Theophy.

τὰς περιστεράς. 13. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Γέγραπται, 'Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται·' ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε[1] [j]σπήλαιον λῃστῶν." 14. Καὶ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ τυφλοὶ καὶ χωλοὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτούς. 15. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τὰ θαυμάσια ἃ ἐποίησε, καὶ τοὺς παῖδας[2] κράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ λέγοντας, "Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ," ἠγανάκτησαν, 16. καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ἀκούεις τί οὗτοι λέγουσιν;" Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ναί· οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε, 'Ὅτι ἐκ στόματος νηπίων καὶ [k]θηλαζόντων κατηρτίσω αἶνον;'" 17. καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ηὐλίσθη ἐκεῖ.

j John xi. 38. Heb. xi. 38. Rev. vi. 15.

k here intrans. Lk. xi. 27 (with μαστούς). Ch. xxiv. 19. Mk. xiii. 17. Lk. xxi. 23 (to suckle).

[1] ποιειτε in ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] τους after παιδας as well as before in ℵBDLN.

says: κολλυβισταί εἰσιν οἱ παρ' ἡμῖν λεγόμενοι τραπεζῖται· κόλλυβος γὰρ εἶδός ἐστι νομίσματος εὐτελῆς, ὥσπερ ἔχομεν τυχὸν ἡμεῖς τοὺς ὀβολοὺς ἢ τὰ ἀργύρια (*vide* Hesychius and Suicer).—τὰς περιστεράς, doves, the poor man's offering. The traffic was necessary, and might have been innocent; but the trading spirit soon develops abuses which were doubtless rampant at that period, making passover time a Jewish "Holy Fair," a grotesque and offensive combination of religion with shady morality.—Ver. 13. γέγραπται, it stands written, in Isaiah lvi. 7; from the Sept. but with omission of πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, retained in Mk., and a peculiarly appropriate expression in the circumstances, the abuse condemned having for its scene the court of the Gentiles.—σπήλαιον λῃστῶν, a den of robbers, a strong expression borrowed from another prophet (Jer. vii. 11), pointing probably to the avarice and fraud of the traders (τὸ γὰρ φιλοκερδὲς λῃστρικὸν πάθος ἐστι, Theophy.), taking advantage of simple provincials. This act of Jesus has been justified by the supposed right of the zealot (Num. xxv. 6-13), which is an imaginary right: "ein unfindbar Artikel" (Holtz., H. C.), or by the reforming energy befitting the Messiah (Meyer). It needed no other justification than the indignation of a noble soul at sight of shameless deeds. Jesus was the only person in Israel who could do such a thing. All others had got accustomed to the evil.

Vv. 14-17, peculiar to Mt.—Ver. 14. τυφλοὶ καὶ χωλοί: that the blind and lame in the city should seek out Jesus is perfectly credible, though reported only by Mt. They would hear of the recent healing at Jericho, and of many other acts of healing, and desire to get a benefit for themselves.—Ver. 15. τὰ θαυμάσια: here only in N.T., the wonderful things, a comprehensive phrase apparently chosen to include all the notable things done by Jesus (Meyer), among which may be reckoned not only the cures, and the cleansing of the temple, but the enthusiasm which He had awakened in the crowd, to the priests and scribes perhaps the most offensive feature of the situation.—τοὺς παῖδας, etc.: the boys and girls of the city, true to the spirit of youth, caught up and echoed the cry of the pilgrim crowd and shouted in the temple precincts: "Hosanna, etc.". ἠγανάκτησαν, they were piqued, like the *ten* (xx. 24).—Ver. 16. ἀκούεις, etc., the holy men attack the least objectionable phenomenon because they could do so safely; not the enthusiasm of the crowd, the *Messianic* homage, the act of zeal, all deeply offensive to them, but the innocent shouts of children echoing the cry of seniors. They were forsooth unseemly in such a place! Hypocrites and cowards! No fault found with the desecration of the sacred precincts by an unhallowed traffic.—ναί, *yes, of course:* cheery, hearty, yea, not without enjoyment of the ridiculous distress of the sanctimonious guardians of the temple.—οὐδ. ἀνέγνωτε as in xix. 4: felicitous citation from Ps. viii. 3, not to be prosaically interpreted as if children in arms three or four years old, still being suckled according to the custom of Hebrew mothers, were among the shouting juniors. These prompt happy citations show how familiar Jesus was with the O. T.—Ver. 17. Βηθανίαν, Bethany, 15 stadia from Jerusalem (John xi. 18), resting place of Jesus in the Passion week—

18. Πρωΐας [1] δὲ ἐπανάγων [2] εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἐπείνασε· 19. καὶ ἰδὼν συκῆν μίαν ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, ἦλθεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτήν, καὶ οὐδὲν εὗρεν ἐν αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ φύλλα μόνον· καὶ λέγει αὐτῇ, [3] "Μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ καρπὸς γένηται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα." Καὶ ἐξηράνθη [l] παραχρῆμα ἡ συκῆ. 20. Καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες, "Πῶς παραχρῆμα ἐξηράνθη ἡ συκῆ;" 21. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν, καὶ μὴ [m] διακριθῆτε, οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς συκῆς ποιήσετε, ἀλλὰ κἂν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ εἴπητε, Ἄρθητι καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, γενήσεται· 22. καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ, πιστεύοντες, λήψεσθε."

l here twice, frequently in Lk. and Acts.

m Acts x. 20. Rom. iv. 20; xiv. 23. James i. 6.

23. ΚΑΙ ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ [4] εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, προσῆλθον αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ, λέγοντες, "Ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; καὶ τίς σοι ἔδωκε τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;"

[1] **πρωι** in ℵBD. [2] **επαναγαγων** in ℵBL.

[3] **ου** before **μηκετι** in BL. Wanting in ℵCD.

[4] **ελθοντος αυτου** in ℵBCDL. The reading in T. R. (dat.) is a grammatical correction.

true friends there (*vide* Stanley, S. and P.).—**ηὐλίσθη**, passed the night; surely not in the open air, as Wetstein and Grotius think. At passover time quarters could not easily be got in the city, but the house of Martha and Mary would be open to Jesus (*cf.* Lk. xxi. 57).

Vv. 18-22. *The barren fig tree* (Mk. xi. 12-14, 19-26).—The story of two morning journeys from Bethany to Jerusalem (*vide* Mk.) is here compressed into one.—Ver. 18. **ἐπείνασε**, He felt hungry. The fact seems to favour the hypothesis of a bivouac under the sky overnight. Why should one be hungry leaving the hospitable house of friends? This was no difficulty for the Fathers who regarded the hunger as assumed (**σχηματίζεται πεινᾶν**, Euthy.).—Ver. 19. **συκῆν μίαν**: **εἷς** in late Greek was often used for **τις**, but the meaning here probably is that Jesus looking around saw a solitary fig tree.—**ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ**, by the wayside, not necessarily above (Meyer).—**ἦλθεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτήν**, came close to it, not climbed it (Fritzsche).—**εἰ μὴ φύλλα**, leaves only, no fruit. Jesus expected to find fruit. Perhaps judging from Galilean experience, where by the lake-shore the fig time was ten months long (Joseph., Bell. J., iii. 108. *Vide* Holtz., H. C.), but *vide* on Mk. xi. 13.—**οὐ μηκέτι**, etc.: according to some writers this was a prediction based on the observation that the tree was diseased, put in the form of a doom. So Bleek, and Furrer, who remarks: "Then said He, who knew nature and the human heart, 'This tree will soon wither'; for a fig tree with full leaf in early spring without fruit is a diseased tree" (Wanderungen, p. 172).—**καὶ ἐξ. παραχρῆμα**, *cf.* Mk.'s account.—Ver. 20. **οἱ μαθηταὶ**, etc.: the disciples wondered at the *immediate* withering of the tree. Did they expect it to die, as a diseased tree, gradually?—Ver. 21 contains a thought similar to that in xvii. 20, *q.v.*—**τὸ τῆς συκῆς**, the matter of the fig tree, as if it were a small affair, not worth speaking about. The question of the disciples did not draw from Jesus explanations as to the motive of the malediction. The cursing of the fig tree has always been regarded as of symbolic import, the tree being in Christ's mind an emblem of the Jewish people, with a great show of religion and no fruit of real godliness. This hypothesis is very credible.

Vv. 23-27. *Interrogation as to authority* (Mk. xi. 27-33, Lk. xx. 18), wherewith suitably opens the inevitable final conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders of the people.—Ver. 23. **ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ** **ἐ. τ. ἱ.**: coming on the second day to the temple, the place of concourse, where He was sure to meet His foes, nothing loath to speak His mind to them.—**διδάσκοντι**: yet He came to teach, to do good, not merely to fight.—**ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ**, by what sort of authority? the question ever asked by the representa-

24. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ[1] ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ λόγον ἕνα, ὃν ἐὰν εἴπητέ μοι, κἀγὼ ὑμῖν ἐρῶ ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ. 25. τὸ βάπτισμα[2] Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;" Οἱ δὲ διελογίζοντο παρ'[3] ἑαυτοῖς, λέγοντες, "Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν, Διατί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; 26. ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, φοβούμεθα τὸν ὄχλον· πάντες γὰρ [a] ἔχουσι τὸν Ἰωάννην ὡς προφήτην."[4] 27. Καὶ ἀποκριθέντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπον, "Οὐκ οἴδαμεν." Ἔφη αὐτοῖς καὶ αὐτός, "Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ. 28. Τί δὲ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; ἄνθρωπος εἶχε τέκνα δύο,[5] καὶ[6] προσελθὼν τῷ πρώτῳ εἶπε, Τέκνον,

[a] *vide* Ch. xiv. 5.

[1] Some copies omit δε. ℵBCD have it.

[2] το before Ιωαννου in ℵBCZ.

[3] BL have εν (W.H. in brackets).

[4] ως προφητην before εχουσι in ℵBCLZ (so in modern editions).

[5] So in ℵCDL *al.* δυο τεκνα in B (W.H. in margin).

[6] και is found in BCD and other uncials but wanting in ℵLZ. Tisch. omits and W.H. relegate to the margin.

tives of established order and custom at epoch-making initiators. So the Judaists interrogated St. Paul as to his right to be an apostle.—ταῦτα, vague (*cf.* xi, 25) and comprehensive. They have in view all the offences of which Jesus had been guilty, throughout His ministry —all well known to them—whatever He had done in the spirit of unconventional freedom which He had exhibited since His arrival in Jerusalem.—καὶ τίς: the second question is but an echo of the first: the quality of the authority (ποίᾳ) depends on its source.—ταύτην, this authority, which you arrogate, and which so many unhappily acknowledge. It was a question as to the legitimacy of an undeniable influence. That spiritual power accredits itself was beyond the comprehension of these legalists.—Ver. 24. Jesus replies by an embarrassing counter-question as to the ministry of the Baptist. —λόγον ἕνα, hardly: *one* question for your *many* (Beng.) rather: a question, or thing, one and *the same* (*cf.* for εἷς in this sense Gen. xli. 25, 26; 1 Cor. iii. 8, xi. 5), an analogous question as we should say; one answer would do for theirs and for His.—Ver. 25. τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ Ἰ., the baptism as representing John's whole ministry.—ἐξ οὐρ. ἢ ἐξ ἀνθ., from heaven or from men? The antithesis is foreign to legitimist modes of thought, which would combine the two: *from* heaven but *through* men; if not through men not from heaven. The most gigantic and baleful instance of this fetish in modern times is the notion of church sacraments and orders depending on ordination. On the same principle St. Paul was no apostle, because his orders came to him "not from men nor by man," Gal. i. 1.—ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, etc. The audible and formal answer of the scribes was οὐκ οἴδαμεν, in ver. 27. All that goes before from ἐὰν to προφήτην is the reasoning on which it was based, either unspoken (παρ' or ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Mt.) or spoken to each other (πρός, Mk. xi. 31); not likely to have been overheard, guessed rather from the puzzled expression on their faces.—οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε: the reference here may be to John's witness to Jesus, or it may be general = why did ye not receive his message as a whole?—Ver. 26. ἐὰν δὲ, etc.: the mode of expression here is awkward. Meyer finds in the sentence an *aposiopesis* = "if we say of men—we fear the people". What they mean is: we must not say of men, because we fear, etc. (*cf.* Mk.).—Ver. 27. οὐδὲ ἐγὼ, etc.: Jesus was not afraid to answer their question, but He felt it was not worth while giving an answer to opportunists.

Vv. 28-32. *Parable of the two sons,* in Mt. only, introduced by the familiar formula, τί δὲ ὑμῖν δοκεῖ (xvii. 25, xviii. 12), and having for its aim to contrast the conduct of the Pharisees towards the Baptist with that of the publicans. And as the publicans are simply used as a foil to bring out more clearly the Pharisaic character, the main subject of remark, it is highly probable that the son who represents the Pharisee was mentioned first, and the son who represents the

ὕπαγε, σήμερον ° ἐργάζου ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου.[1] 29. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν,[2] Οὐ θέλω· ὕστερον δὲ [p] μεταμεληθείς, ἀπῆλθε. 30. Καὶ προσελθὼν τῷ δευτέρῳ εἶπεν ὡσαύτως. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Ἐγώ, κύριε· καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθε. 31. Τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησε τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός;" Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ,[3] "Ὁ πρῶτος."[4] Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἱ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 32. ἦλθε γὰρ πρὸς ὑμᾶς Ἰωάννης[5] ἐν [q] ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ, οἱ δὲ τελῶναι καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐπίστευσαν αὐτῷ· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδόντες οὐ[6] μετεμελήθητε ὕστερον τοῦ πιστεῦσαι αὐτῷ.

o Lk. xiii. 14. John v. 17; ix. 4. 2 Thess. iii. 10.
p Ch. xxvii. 3. 2 Cor. vii. 8. Heb. vii. 21.
q Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 2 (ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας).

[1] μου is wanting in ℵCDLΔΣ. Tisch., Trg., omit, W.H. relegate to margin.

[2] B inverts the order of the two answers, so that verses 29, 30 stand thus: εγω, κυριε, και ουκ απηλθεν. προσελθων δε τω δευτερω ειπεν ωσαυτως. ο δε αποκριθεις ειπεν. ου θελω· υστερον μεταμεληθεις απηλθε. Though supported only by some cursives and versions this reading of B commends itself as the true one, and it has been adopted by W.H. and Weiss. *Vide* below. Syr. Sin. is not on the side of B.

[3] ℵBDL omit αυτω.

[4] Of course this should be ὁ ὕστερος on B's reading of vv. 29, 30. So in B.

[5] Ιωαννης before προς υ. in ℵBCL. [6] ουδε in B. Some cursives and versions.

publican second; the order in which they stand in B, and adopted by W. and H. The parable, therefore, should read thus: "A certain man had two sons. He said to one, Go work, etc. He replied, Yes, sir, and went not. To the other he said the same. He replied, I will not, and afterwards went."—Ver. 28. τῷ ἀμπελῶνι: constant need of work in a vineyard, and of superintendence of workers.—Ver. 29. ἐγώ: laconic and emphatic as if eager to obey—κύριε, with all due politeness, and most filial recognition of paternal authority, the two words = our "Yes, sir".—Ver. 30. οὐ θέλω, I will not, I am not inclined; rude, sulky, unmannerly, disobedient, and making no pretence to filial loyalty.—Ver. 31. To the question, Who did the will of the father? the answer, when the parable is arranged as above, must, of course, be ὁ ὕστερος; the *nay*-sayer, not the *yea*-sayer. It is a wonder any answer was given at all when the purport of the parable was so transparent.—ἀμὴν λέγω ὑ.: introducing here, as always, a very important assertion. The statement following would give deadly offence to the Pharisees.—τελῶναι, πόρναι, the publicans and the harlots, the two socially lowest classes. Jesus speaks here from definite knowledge, not only of what had happened in connection with the Baptist ministry, but of facts connected with His own. He has doubtless reminiscences of the "Capernaum mission" (chap. viii. 9-13) to go upon.—προάγουσιν, go before, anticipate (προλαμβάνουσιν, Euthy.), present tense: they are going before you now; last first, first last. Chrysostom, in Hom. lxvii., gives an interesting story of a courtesan of his time in illustration of this.—Ver. 32. ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης: not merely in the sense of being a good pious man with whose life no fault could be found (Meyer; the Fathers, Chrys., Euthy., Theophy.), but in the specific sense of following their own legal way. John was a conservative in religion not less than the Pharisees. He differed from them only by being thoroughly sincere and earnest. They could not, therefore, excuse themselves for not being sympathetic towards him on the ground of his being an innovator, as they could with plausibility in the case of Jesus. The meaning thus is: He cultivated legal piety like yourselves, yet, etc.—ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰδόντες, when ye saw how the sinful took John's summons to repent ye did not even late in the day follow their example and change your attitude. They were too proud to take an example from publicans and harlots.—τοῦ πιστεῦσαι, inf. of result with τοῦ.

Vv. 33-46. *Parable of the rebellious vine-dressers* (Mk. xii. 1-12, Lk. xx. 9-19).—Ver. 33. ἄλλην π. ἀ., hear another parable; spoken at the same time, and

33. "ʳἌλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε. ἄνθρωπός τις[1] ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης, ὅστις ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ʳφραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκε, καὶ ˢὤρυξεν ἐν αὐτῷ ᵗληνόν, καὶ ᾠκοδόμησε ᵘπύργον, καὶ ἐξέδοτο[2] αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν. 34. ὅτε δὲ ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν, ἀπέστειλε τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς γεωργούς, λαβεῖν τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτοῦ· 35. καὶ λαβόντες οἱ γεωργοὶ τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ, ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, ὃν δὲ ᵛἐλιθοβόλησαν. 36. πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρώτων· καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ὡσαύτως. 37. ὕστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων, ʷἘντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. 38. Οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε, ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, καὶ κατάσχωμεν[3] τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ.

r Mk. xii. 1. Lk. xiv. 23. Eph. ii. 14.
s Ch. xxv. 18. Mk. xii. 1.
t Rev. xiv. 19, 20; xix. 15.
u Mk. xii. 1. Lk. xiii. 4; xiv. 28.
v Ch. xxiii. 37. Lk. xiii. 34. Acts vii. 58.
w Lk. xviii. 3, 4. Heb. xii. 9.

[1] τις wanting in many uncials.

[2] εξεδετο in ℵBCL. εξεδοτο is a grammatical correction.

[3] ισχωμεν in ℵBDLZ.

of kindred import. The abrupt introduction betrays emotion. Jesus is aware that He has given mortal offence, and here shows His knowledge by foreshadowing His own doom. The former parable has exposed the insincerity of the leaders of Israel, this exposes their open revolt against even *divine* authority.—**ἀμπελῶνα**: it is another *vineyard* parable. They were both probably extemporised, the one suggesting the other, the picture of *non*doing calling up the companion picture of *mis*doing.—**φραγμὸν ἀ. περιέθηκε**, etc.: detailed description of the pains taken by the landlord in the construction of the vineyard, based on Isaiah's song of the vineyard (chap. v. 2), all with a view to fruitfulness, and to fruit of the best kind; for the owner, at least, is very much in earnest: a hedge to protect against wild beasts, a press and vat that the grapes may be squeezed and the juice preserved, a tower that the ripe fruit may not be stolen.—**ἐξέδετο**, let it out on hire; on what terms—whether for a rent in money or on the *metayer* system, produce divided between owner and workers—does not here appear. The latter seems to be implied in the parallels (Mk. xii. 2, **ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν**, Lk. xx. 10, **ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ**).—**ἀπεδήμησεν**, went abroad, to leave them freedom, and also to give them time; for the newly planted vines would not bear fruit for two or three years. No unreasonableness in this landlord.—Ver. 34. **καιρὸς**: not merely the season of the year, but the time at which the new vines might be expected to bear.—**τοὺς καρποὺς**: the *whole*, apparently implying a money rent. The mode of tenure probably not thought of by this evangelist.—**αὐτοῦ** should probably be referred to the owner, not to the vineyard = "his fruits," as in A. V.—Ver. 35. **λαβόντες οἱ γ.**, etc. The husbandmen treat the messengers in the most barbarous and truculent manner: beating, killing, stoning to death; highly improbable in the natural sphere, but another instance in which parables have to violate natural probability in order to describe truly men's conduct in the spiritual sphere. On **ἔδειραν** Kypke remarks: the verb **δέρειν** for *verberare* is so rare in profane writers that some have thought that for **ἔδειραν** should be read **ἔδηραν**, from **δαίρω**.—Ver. 36. **πλείονας τ. π.**, more than the first. Some take **πλ.** as referring to quality rather than number: *better* than the former (Bengel, Goebel, etc.), which is a legitimate but not likely rendering. The intention is to emphasise the number of persons sent (prophets).—**ὡσαύτως**: no difference in the treatment; savage mood chronic.—Ver. 37. **ὕστερον**, not afterwards merely, but finally, the last step was now to be taken, the mission of the son and heir; excuses conceivable hitherto: doubt as to credentials, a provoking manner in those sent, etc.; not yet conclusively proved that deliberate defiance is intended. The patient master will make that clear before taking further steps.—**ἐντραπήσονται** (pass. for mid.), they will show respect to. It is assumed that they will have no difficulty in knowing him.—Ver. 38. **ἰδόντες**: neither have they; they

39. καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος καὶ ἀπέκτειναν. 40. ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, τί ποιήσει τοῖς γεωργοῖς ἐκείνοις;" 41. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς· καὶ τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἐκδόσεται[1] ἄλλοις γεωργοῖς, οἵτινες ἀποδώσουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς καρποὺς ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν." 42. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς [x] γραφαῖς, 'Λίθον ὃν [y] ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας· παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστι θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν;'

x Ch. xxvi. 54. Mk. xiv. 49. Lk. xxiv. 27. John v. 39.
y Mk. viii. 31; xii. 10. Lk. ix. 22. Heb. xii. 17 *al.*

[1] εκδωσεται in all uncials nearly. εκδοσεται in minus. only.

recognise at once the son and heir, and resolve forthwith on desperate courses, which are at once carried out. They eject the son, kill him, and seize the inheritance. The action of the parable is confined to a single season, the messengers following close on each other. But Jesus obviously has in His eye the whole history of Israel, from the settlement in Canaan till His own time, and sees in it God's care about fruit (a holy nation), the mission of the successive prophets to insist that fruit be forthcoming, and the persistent neglect and disloyalty of the people. *Neglect*, for there was no fruit to give to the messengers, though that does not come out in the parable. The picture is a very sombre one, but it is broadly true. Israel, on the whole, had not only not done God's will, but had badly treated those who urged her to do it. She killed her prophets (Mt. xxiii. 37).

Vv. 40-46. *Application*.—**ὅταν οὖν ἔλθῃ ὁ κ.**, etc.: what would you expect the owner to do after such ongoings have been reported to him? Observe the subjunctive after **ὅταν** compared with the indicative **ἤγγισεν** after **ὅτε**, ver. 34. **ὅτε** points to a definite time past, **ὅταν** is indefinite (*vide* Hermann, *Viger*, p. 437).—Ver. 41. **λέγουσι**, they say: who? the men incriminated, though they could not but see through the thin veil of the allegory. In Mk. and Lk. the words appear to be put into Christ's mouth.—**κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει**: a solemn fact classically expressed ("en Graeci sermonis peritiam in Matthaeo"—Raphel, Annot.) = He will badly destroy bad men.—**οἵτινες**, such as; he will give out the vineyard to husbandmen of a different stamp.—**τ. κ. ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς αὐτῶν**: the fruits in their (the fruits') seasons, regularly year by year.—Ver. 42. **οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε**, etc.: another of Christ's impromptu felicitous quotations; from Ps. cxviii. 22, 23 (Sept.). This quotation contains, in germ, another parable, in which the ejected and murdered heir of the former parable becomes the rejected stone of the builders of the theocratic edifice; only, however, to become eventually the accepted honoured stone of God. It is an apposite citation, because probably regarded as Messianic by those in whose hearing it was made (it was so regarded by the Rabbis—Schöttgen, *ad loc.*), and because it intimated to them that by killing Jesus they would not be done with Him.—Ver. 43. **διὰ τοῦτο**, introducing the application of the oracle, and implying that the parties addressed are the builders = therefore.—**ἡ βασιλεία τ. θ.**: the doom is forfeiture of privilege, the kingdom taken from them and given to others.—**ἔθνει**, to a nation; previously, as Paul calls it, a *no nation* (**οὐκ ἔθνει**, Rom. x. 19), the reference being, plainly, to the heathen world.—**ποιοῦντι τ. κ. α.**: *cf.* iii. 8, 10; vii. 17, bringing forth the fruits of it (the kingdom). The hope that the new nation will bring forth the fruit is the ground of the transference. God elects with a view to usefulness; a useless elect people has no prescriptive rights.—Ver. 44. This verse, bracketed by W.H., found in the same connection in Lk. (xx. 18), looks rather like an interpolation, yet it suits the situation, serving as a solemn warning to men meditating evil intentions against the Speaker.—**ὁ πεσὼν**: he who falls on the stone, as if stumbling against it (Is. viii. 14).—**συνθλασθήσεται**, shall be broken in pieces, like an earthen vessel falling on a rock. This compound is found only in late Greek authors.—**ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ**, on whom it shall fall, in judgment. The distinction is between men who believe not in the Christ through misunderstanding and those who reject Him through an evil heart of unbelief. Both suffer in

43. Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς. 44. καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον [z]συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, [a]λικμήσει αὐτόν"[1] 45. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὰς παραβολὰς αὐτοῦ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι περὶ αὐτῶν λέγει· 46. καὶ ζητοῦντες αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἐπειδὴ[2] ὡς[3] προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον.

z Lk. xx. 18.
a Lk. xx. 18.

[1] This whole ver. (44) is omitted in D, 33, old Latin versions, Orig., etc. Tisch. omits and W.H. bracket. Weiss regards it as genuine, and thinks that if it had come in from Lk. it would have stood after ver. 42.

[2] επει in ℵBDL. [3] εις in ℵBL.

consequence, but not in the same way, or to the same extent. The one is broken, hurt in limb; the other crushed to powder, which the winds blow away.—**λικμήσει**, from **λικμός**, a winnowing fork, to winnow, to scatter to the winds, implying reduction to dust capable of being so scattered = grinding to powder (*conteret*, Vulg.). For the distinction taken in this verse, *cf.* chaps. xi. 6; xii. 31, 32.—Ver. 45. The priests and Pharisees of course perceived the drift of these parabolic speeches about the two sons, the vine-dressers, and the rejected stone, and (ver. 46) would have apprehended Him on the spot (Lk. xx. 19) had they not feared the people.—**ἐπεὶ**, since, introducing the reason of the fear, same as in ver. 26.—**εἰς προφήτην** = **ὡς π.**, ver. 26, and in xiv. 5, also in reference to John. On this use of **εἰς** *vide* Winer, § 32, 4, b.

CHAPTER XXII. PARABLE OF THE WEDDING FEAST AND ENCOUNTERS WITH OPPONENTS. — Vv. 1-14. *The royal wedding.*—This parable is peculiar to Mt., and while in some respects very suitable to the situation, may not unreasonably be suspected to owe its place here to the evangelist's habit of grouping kindred matter. The second part of the parable referring to the man without a wedding robe has no connection with the present situation, or with the Pharisees who are supposed to be addressed. Another question has been much discussed, *viz.*, whether this parable was spoken by Jesus at all on any occasion, the idea of many critics being that it is a parable of Christ's reconstructed by the evangelist or some other person, so as to make it cover the sin and fate of the Jews, the calling of the Gentiles, and the Divine demand for righteousness in all recipients of His grace. The resemblance between this parable and that of the *Supper*, in Lk. xiv. 16-24, is obvious. Assuming that Jesus uttered a parable of this type, the question arises: which of the two forms given by Mt. and Lk. comes nearer to the original? The general verdict is in favour of Luke's. As to the question of the authenticity of Mt.'s parable, the mere fact that the two parables have a common theme and many features similar is no proof that both could not proceed from Jesus. Why should not the later parable be the same theme handled by the same Artist with variations so as to make it serve a different while connected purpose, the earlier being a parable of *Grace*, the later a parable of *Judgment* upon grace despised or abused? If the didactic aim of the two parables was as just indicated, the method of variation was preferable to the use of two parables totally unconnected. "What is common gives emphasis to what is peculiar, and bids us mark what it is that is judged" (*The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 463). The main objections to the authenticity of the parable are its allegorical character, and its too distinct anticipation of history. The former objection rests on the assumption that Jesus uttered no parables of the allegorical type. On this, *vide* remarks on the parable of the *Sower*, chap. xiii.

Ver. 1. **ἐν παραβολαῖς**, the plural does not imply more than one parable, but merely indicates the style of address = parabolically.—Ver. 2. **γάμους**, a wedding feast; plural, because the festivities lasted for days, seven in Judges xiv. 17. The suggestion that the feast is connected with the handing over of the kingdom to the son ("quem pater successorem declarare volebat," Kuinoel) is not to be despised. The marriage

XXII. 1. ΚΑΙ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς,[1] λέγων, 2. "Ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, ὅστις ἐποίησε [a] γάμους τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ· 3. καὶ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ [b] καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους εἰς τοὺς γάμους, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελον ἐλθεῖν. 4. Πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους, λέγων, Εἴπατε τοῖς κεκλημένοις, Ἰδού, τὸ [c] ἄριστόν μου ἡτοίμασα,[2] οἱ [d] ταῦροί μου καὶ τὰ [e] σιτιστὰ τεθυμένα, καὶ πάντα ἕτοιμα· δεῦτε εἰς τοὺς γάμους. 5. Οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον, ὁ μὲν[3] εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὁ δὲ[3] εἰς[4] τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ· 6. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ κρατήσαντες

a here several times; xxv. 10. Lk. xii. 36; xiv. 8 (in all plural).
b *vide* Ch. ix. 13. 1 Cor. x. 27.
c Lk. xi. 38; xiv. 12.
d Acts xiv. 13. Heb. ix. 13; x. 4.
e here only in N. T. (Joseph, *Ant.*, viii. 2, 4. *Cf.* σιτευτός in Lk. xv. 23, 27, 30).

[1] **αυτοις** after **παραβολαις** in ℵBDL (modern editors).

[2] **ητοιμακα** in ℵBCDLΣ and adopted by modern editors.

[3] **οσ μεν, ος δε** in ℵBCLΣ, several cursives.

[4] **επι** in ℵBCD, 13, 33, 69, etc.

and recognition of the son as heir to the throne might be combined, which would give to the occasion a political significance, and make appearance at the marriage a test of loyalty. Eastern monarchs had often many sons by different wives, and heirship to the throne did not go by primogeniture, but by the pleasure of the sovereign, determined in many cases by affection for a favourite wife, as in the case of Solomon (Koetsveld, *de Gelijk.*)—Ver. 3. **καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους**, to invite the already invited. This second invitation seems to accord with Eastern custom (Esther vi. 14). The first invitation was given to the people of Israel by the prophets in the Messianic pictures of a good time coming. This aspect of the prophetic ministry was welcomed. Israel never responded to the prophetic demand for *righteousness*, as shown in the parable of the vine-dressers, but they were pleased to hear of God's gracious visitation in the latter days, to be invited to a feast in the indefinite future time. How they would act when the feast was due remained to be seen.—**τοὺς δούλους**, the servants, are John the Baptist and Jesus Himself, whose joint message to their generation was: the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand, feast time at length arrived.—**οὐκ ἤθελον ἐλθεῖν**. Israel in all her generations had been willing in a general way, quite intending to come; and the generation of John and Jesus were also willing in a general way, if it had only been the right son who was going to be married. How could they be expected to accept the obscure Nazarene for Bridegroom and Heir?—Ver. 4. **ἄλλους δούλους** refers to the apostles whose ministry gave to the same generation a second chance.—**εἴπατε**: the second set of messengers are instructed what to say; they are expected not merely to invite to but to *commend* the feast, to provoke desire.—**ἰδού**, to arrest attention.—**ἄριστόν μου**, the midday meal, as distinct from **δεῖπνον**, which came later in the day (*vide* Lk. xiv. 12, where both are named = early dinner and supper). With the **ἄριστον** the festivities begin.—**ἡτοίμακα**, perfect, I have in readiness.—**ταῦροι, σιτιστὰ**, bulls, or oxen, and fed beasts: speak to a feast on a vast scale.—**τεθυμένα**, slain, and therefore must be eaten without delay. The word is often used in connection with the slaying of sacrificial victims, and the idea of sacrifice may be in view here (Koetsveld).—**πάντα**, etc.: all things ready, come to the feast. This message put into the mouths of the second set of servants happily describes the ministry of the apostles compared with that of our Lord, as more urgent or aggressive, and proclaiming a more developed gospel. "They talked as it were of oxen and fed beasts and the other accompaniments of a feast, with an eloquence less dignified, but more fitted to impress the million with a sense of the riches of Divine grace" (*The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*).

Vv. 5-7. **οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον**. The Vulgate resolves the participle and translates: "neglexerunt et abierunt," so also the A.V. and R.V.; justly, for the participle points out the state of mind

τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ [f] ὕβρισαν καὶ ἀπέκτειναν. 7. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς [1] ὠργίσθη, καὶ πέμψας τὰ [g] στρατεύματα [2] αὐτοῦ ἀπώλεσε τοὺς φονεῖς ἐκείνους, καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν [h] ἐνέπρησε. 8. Τότε λέγει τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ, Ὁ μὲν γάμος ἕτοιμός ἐστιν, οἱ δὲ κεκλημένοι οὐκ ἦσαν ἄξιοι. 9. πορεύεσθε οὖν ἐπὶ τὰς [i] διεξόδους τῶν ὁδῶν, καὶ ὅσους ἂν εὕρητε, καλέσατε εἰς τοὺς γάμους. 10. Καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς συνήγαγον πάντας ὅσους [3] εὗρον, πονηρούς [j] τε καὶ ἀγαθούς· καὶ ἐπλήσθη ὁ γάμος [4] ἀνακειμένων.

f Lk. xi. 45; xviii. 32. Acts xiv. 5.
g Lk. xxiii. 11. Acts xxiii. 10, 27. Rev. ix. 16; xix. 14, 19.
h here only in N. T.
i here only in N. T. (Ps. i. 3; cxix. 136).
j This part. is rare in Mt.; here, Ch. xxvii. 47, xxviii. 12. Often in Acts and Heb.

[1] For ακουσας δε ο βασ. ℵBL have ο δε βασιλευς.

[2] D has το στρατευμα (Trg. in margin).

[3] ους in ℵD (W.H).

[4] νυμφων in ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.).

which gave rise to the conduct specified. They treated the pressing invitations and glowing descriptions of the servants with indifference.—**ὃς μὲν, ὃς δὲ**: this one to his own (**ἴδιον** for **αὐτοῦ** = *proprius* for *suus*) field, that one to his trading (**ἐμπορίαν** here only in N. T. *Cf.* Lk. at this point).—Ver. 6. **λοιποὶ**, the rest, as if **οἱ ἀμελήσαντες** were only a part, the greater part, of the invited, while the expression by itself naturally covers the whole. Weiss finds in **λοιποὶ** a trace of patching: the parable originally referred to the people of Israel as a whole, but Mt. introduced a reference to the Synedrists and here has them specially in view as the **λοιποί**. Koetsveld remarks on the improbability of the story at this point: men at a distance—rulers of provinces—could not be invited in the morning with the expectation of their being present at the palace by midday. So far this makes for the hypothesis of remodelling by a second hand. But even in Christ's acknowledged parables improbabilities are sometimes introduced to meet the requirements of the case; *e.g.*, in Lk.'s version of the parable *all* refuse.—**κρατήσαντες . . . ὕβ. καὶ ἀπέκτειναν**: acts of open rebellion inevitably leading to war. This feature, according to Weiss, lies outside the picture. Not so, if the marriage feast was to be the occasion for recognising the son as heir. Then refusal to come meant withholding homage, rebellion in the bud, and acts of violence were but the next step.—Ver. 7. **τὰ στρατεύματα**: the plural appears surprising, but the meaning seems to be, not separate armies sent one after another, but forces. —**ἀπώλεσε, ἐνέπρησεν**: the allegory here evidently refers to the destruction of Jerusalem; no argument against authenticity, if xxiv. 2 be a word of Jesus. Note that the destruction of Jerusalem is represented as taking place before the calling of those without = the Gentiles. This is not according to the historic fact. This makes for authenticity, as a later allegorist would have been likely to observe the historical order (*vide* Schanz).

Vv. 8-10. **τότε**: after the second set of servants, as many as survived, had returned and reported their ill-success.—**λέγει**, he says to *them*.—**ἕτοιμος**, ready, and more.—Ver. 9. **ἐπὶ τὰς διεξόδους**, variously interpreted: at the crossing-places of the country roads (Fritzsche, De Wette, Meyer, Goebel); or at the places in the city whence the great roads leading into the country start (Kypke, Loesner, Kuinoel, Trench, Weiss). "According as we emphasise one or other prep. in the compound word, either: the places whence the roads run out, or Oriental roads passing into the city through gates" (Holtz, H. C.). The second view is the more likely were it only because, the time pressing, the place where new guests are to be found must be near at hand. In the open spaces of the city, strangers from the country as well as the lower population of the town could be met with; the foreign element = Gentiles, mainly in view.—Ver. 10. **πονηρούς τε καὶ ἀγαθούς**: not in the mood to make distinctions. **τε** connects **πον.** and **ἀγαθ.** together as one company = all they found, of all sorts, bad or good, the market-place swept clean.—**ἐπλήσθη**, was filled; satisfactory after the trouble in getting guests at all.—**νυμφὼν**, the marriage dining-hall; in ix. 15 the bridechamber.

k Lk. xxiii. 55. 11. εἰσελθὼν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς [k] θεάσασθαι τοὺς ἀνακειμένους εἶδεν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου· 12. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Ἑταῖρε, πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε μὴ ἔχων ἔνδυμα γάμου; Ὁ δὲ [1] ἐφιμώθη.

l ver. 34. Mk. i. 25; iv. 39. Lk. iv. 35. 1 Tim. v. 18. 13. τότε εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς [1] τοῖς διακόνοις, Δήσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας, ἄρατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκβάλετε [2] εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. 14. πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί."

[1] ειπεν after βασιλευς in ℵBL, cursives.

[2] For αρατε α. και εκβ. ℵBL have simply εκβαλετε αυτον (W.H.).

Vv. 11-14. *The man without a wedding garment*.—Though this feature has no connection with the polemic against the Sanhedrists, it does not follow, as even Weiss (Matthäus-Evang.) admits, that it was not an authentic part of *a* parable spoken by Jesus. It would form a suitable pendant to any parable of grace, as showing that, while the door of the kingdom is open to all, personal holiness cannot be dispensed with.—Ver. 11. **θεάσασθαι**: we are not to suppose that the king came in to look out for offenders, but rather to show his countenance to his guests and make them welcome.—**ἄνθρωπον**, etc.: while he was going round among the guests smiling welcome and speaking here and there a gracious word, his eye lighted on a man without a wedding robe. Only one? More might have been expected in such a company, but one suffices to illustrate the principle. —**οὐκ ἐνδεδ.**, we have here an example of occasional departure from the rule that participles in the N. T. take **μή** as the negative in all relations.—Ver. 12. **ἑταῖρε**, as in xx. 13.—**πῶς εἰσῆλθες ὧδε**: the question might mean, By what way did you come in? the logic of the question being, had you entered by the door you would have received a wedding robe like the rest, therefore you must have come over a wall or through a window, or somehow slipped in unobserved (Koetsveld). This assumes that the guests were supplied with robes by the king's servants, which in the circumstances is intrinsically probable. All had to come in a hurry as they were, and some would have no suitable raiment, even had there been time to put it on. What the custom was is not very clear. The parable leaves this point in the background, and simply indicates that a suitable robe was necessary, however obtained. The king's question probably means, how dared you come hither without, etc.?—**μὴ ἔχων**: **μὴ** this time, not **οὐ**, as in ver. 11, implying blame. Euthymius includes the question as to how the man got in among the things not to be inquired into, **διὰ τὴν αὐτονομίαν** (freedom) **τῆς παραβολῆς**.—**ὁ δὲ ἐφιμώθη**, he was dumb, not so much from a sense of guilt as from confusion in presence of the great king finding fault, and from fear of punishment.—Ver. 13. **τοῖς διακόνοις**, the servants waiting on the guests, *cf*. Lk. xxii. 27, John ii. 5.—**δήσαντες, ἐκβάλετε**: disproportionate fuss, we are apt to think, about the rude act of an unmannerly clown. Enough surely simply to turn him out, instead of binding him hand and foot as a criminal preparatory to some fearful doom. But matters of etiquette are seriously viewed at courts, especially in the East, and the king's temper is already ruffled by previous insults, which make him jealous for his honour. And the anger of the king serves the didactic aim of the parable, which is to enforce the lesson: sin not because grace abounds. After all the doom of the offender is simply to be turned out of the festive chamber into the darkness of night outside.—**ἐκεῖ ἔσται**, etc.: stock-phrase descriptive of the misery of one cast out into the darkness, possibly no part of the parable. On this expression Furrer remarks: "How weird and frightful, for the wanderer who has lost his way, the night, when clouds cover the heavens, and through the deep darkness the howling and teeth-grinding of hungry wolves strike the ear of the lonely one! Truly no figure could more impressively describe the anguish of the God-forsaken" (*Wanderungen*, p. 181).—Ver. 14. **πολλοὶ γὰρ**: if, as **γὰρ** might suggest, the concluding aphorism referred exclusively to the fate of the unrobed guest, we should be obliged to conclude that the story did not supply a good illustration of its truth, only one

15. Τότε πορευθέντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι συμβούλιον ἔλαβον ὅπως αὐτὸν [m] παγιδεύσωσιν ἐν λόγῳ. 16. καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν, λέγοντες,[1] "Διδάσκαλε, [n] οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ, καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διδάσκεις, καὶ οὐ [n] μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός, οὐ γὰρ [o] βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων.

m here only in N. T., *vide* below.
n Mk. xii. 14. John x. 13; xii. 6. 1 Pet. v. 7 (with περί τινος).
o 2 Cor. x. 7 (τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον).

[1] λεγοντας in ℵBL in agreement with μαθητας. The reading λεγοντες has CDΔΣ *al.* in its favour, but modern editors prefer the other.

out of many guests called being rejected. But the gnome really expresses the didactic drift of the whole parable. From first to last many were called, but comparatively few took part in the feast, either from lack of will to be there or from coming thither irreverently.

Vv. 15-22. *The tribute question* (Mk. xii. 13-17, Lk. xx. 20-26).—In this astute scheme the Synedrists, according to Mk., were the prime movers, using other parties as their agents. Here the Pharisees act on their own motion.—Ver. 15. **τότε**, then, with reference to xxi. 46, when the Synedrists were at a loss how to get Jesus into their power.—**συμβούλιον ἔλαβον** may refer either to process: consulting together; or to result: formed a plan.—**ὅπως**, either *how* (*quomodo*, Beza, *wie*, H. C.), which, however, would more naturally take the future indicative (Fritzsche), or, better, *in order that*.—**παγιδεύσωσιν**, they might ensnare, an Alexandrine word, not in classics, here and in Sept. (*vide* Eccl. ix. 12).—**ἐν λόγῳ**, by a word, either the question they were to ask (**δι' ἐρωτήσεως**, Euthy.), or the answer they hoped He would give (Meyer). For the idea, *cf.* Is. xxix. 21.—Ver. 16. **ἀποστέλλουσιν**, as in Mk. xii. 13; there intelligible, here one wonders why the sent of Mk. should be senders of others instead of acting themselves. The explanation may be that the leading plotters felt themselves to be discredited with Jesus by their notorious attitude, and, therefore, used others more likely to succeed. More than fault-finding is now intended—even to draw Jesus into a compromising utterance.—**τοὺς μαθητὰς α.**, disciples, apparently meant to be emphasised; *i.e.*, *scholars*, not masters; young men, presumably not incapable of appreciating Jesus, in whose case a friendly feeling towards Him was not incredible, as in the case of older members of the party.—**μετὰ τ. Ἡρῳδιανῶν**, with *Herodians*, named here only in Mat., associated with Sadducees in Mk. viii. 15; why so called is a matter of conjecture, and the guesses are many: *soldiers* of Herod (Jerome); *courtiers* of Herod (Fritzsche, following Syr. ver.); Jews belonging to the northern tetrarchies governed by members of the Herod family (Lutteroth); favourers of the Roman dominion (Orig., De W., etc.); sympathisers with the desire for a national kingdom so far gratified or stimulated by the rule of the Herod family. The last the most probable, and adopted by many: Wetstein, Meyer, Weiss, Keil, Schanz, etc. The best clue to the spirit of the party is their association with the Pharisees here. It presumably means sympathy with the Pharisees in the matter at issue; *i.e.*, *nationalism versus* willing submission to a foreign yoke; only not religious or theocratic, as in case of Pharisees, but *secular*, as suited men of Sadducaic proclivities. The object aimed at implies such sympathy. To succeed the snare must be hidden. Had the two parties been on opposite sides Jesus would have been put on His guard. The name of this party probably originated in a kind of hero-worship for Herod the Great. *Vide* on xvi. 1.—**λέγοντας**, etc., the snare set with much astuteness, and well baited with flattery, the bait coming first.—**διδάσκαλε**, teacher, an appropriate address from scholars in search of knowledge, or desiring the solution of a knotty question.—**οἴδαμεν**, we know, everybody knows. Even Pharisees understood so far the character of Jesus, as here appears; for their disciples say what they have been instructed to say. Therefore their infamous theory of a league with Beelzebub (xii. 24) was a sin against light; *i.e.*, against the Holy Ghost. Pharisaic scholars might even feel a sentimental, half-sincere admiration for the character described, nature not yet dead in them as in their teachers. The points in the character specified are—

p here only in N. T. 17. εἰπὲ[1] οὖν ἡμῖν, τί σοι δοκεῖ; ἔξεστι δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι, ἢ οὔ;" 18. Γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν εἶπε, "Τί με πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί; 19. ἐπιδείξατέ μοι τὸ [p] νόμισμα τοῦ κήνσου." Οἱ δὲ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δηνάριον. 20. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς,[2] "Τίνος ἡ [q] εἰκὼν αὕτη καὶ ἡ [r] ἐπιγραφή;" 21. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ,[3] "Καίσαρος." Τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς, "[s] Ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι· καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ." 22. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες ἐθαύμασαν· καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον.

q here, parall., Rom. i. 23; viii. 29 al. Heb. x. 1.
r Mk. xii. 16. Lk. xx. 24. Mk. xv. 26. Lk. xxiii. 38.
s parall. and Rom. xiii. 7 in same sense.

[1] ειπον in LZ, and adopted by Tisch. and W.H., though ειπε is found in ℵBC.

[2] DLZ add ο Ιησους after αυτοις and W.H. put it in margin.

[3] ℵB omit αυτω.

(1) sincerity—ἀληθής; (2) fidelity, as a religious teacher—καὶ τ. ὁ τ. θ. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διδάσκεις; (3) fearlessness—οὐ μέλει, etc.; (4) no respecter of persons—οὐ βλέπεις, etc. = will speak the truth to all and about all impartially. The compliment, besides being treacherous, was insulting, implying that Jesus was a reckless simpleton who would give Himself away, and a vain man who could be flattered. But, in reality, they sinned in ignorance. Such men could not understand the character of Jesus thoroughly: *e.g.*, His humility, His wisdom, and His superiority to partisan points of view.—Ver. 17. εἰπὸν οὖν, etc.: the snare, a question as to the lawfulness *in a religious point of view* (ἔξεστι—*fas est*, Grotius) of paying tribute to Caesar. The question implies a possible antagonism between such payment and duty to God as theocratic Head of the nation. *Vide* Deut. xvii. 15.—ἢ οὔ: yes or no? they expect or desire a negative answer, and they demand a plain one—*responsum rotundum*, Bengel; for an obvious reason indicated by Lk. (xx. 20). They demanded more than they were ready to give, whatever their secret leanings; no fear of them playing a heroic part.

Vv. 18-22. *Christ's reply and its effect.*—Ver. 18. πονηρίαν, ὑποκριταί, wickedness, hypocrites; the former the evangelist's word, the latter Christ's, both thoroughly deserved. It was a wicked plot against His life veiled under apparently sincere compliments of young inquirers, and men of the world who posed as admirers of straightforwardness.—Ver. 19. τὸ νόμισμα (Latin *numisma*, here only in N. T.) τοῦ κήνσου, the current coin of the tribute, *i.e.*, in which the tribute was paid, a roundabout name for a denarius (Mark).—δηνάριον, a Roman coin, silver, in which metal tribute was paid (Pliny, N. H., 33, 3, 15; Marquardt, Röm. Alt., 3, 2, 147).—Ver. 20. ἡ εἰκὼν: the coin produced bore an image; perhaps not necessarily, though Roman, as the Roman rulers were very considerate of Jewish prejudices in this as in other matters (Holtzmann, H. C.), but at passover time there would be plenty of coins bearing Caesar's image and inscription to be had even in the pockets of would-be zealots.—Ver. 21. ἀπόδοτε, the ordinary word for paying dues (Meyer), yet there is point in Chrysostom's remark: οὐ γάρ ἐστι τοῦτο δοῦναι, ἀλλ' ἀποδοῦναι· καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς εἰκόνος, καὶ ἀπο τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς δείκνυται (H. lxx.). The image and inscription showed that *giving* (ver. 17) tribute to Caesar was only giving *back* to him his own. This was an unanswerable *argumentum ad hominem* as addressed to men who had no scruple about using Caesar's coin for ordinary purposes, but of course it did not settle the question. The previous question might be raised, Had Caesar a right to coin money for Palestine, *i.e.*, to rule over it? The coin showed that he was ruler *de facto*, but not necessarily *de jure*, unless on the doctrine that might is right. The really important point in Christ's answer is, not what is said but what is implied, *viz.*, that national independence is not an ultimate *good*, nor the patriotism that fights for it an ultimate *virtue*. This doctrine Jesus held in common with the prophets. He virtually asserted it by distinguishing between the things of Caesar and the things of God. To have treated these as one, the latter category absorbing the former, would have been to say: The kingdom of God means the kingdom restored to Israel. By treating

23. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαῖοι, οἱ[1] λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, 24. "Διδάσκαλε, Μωσῆς εἶπεν, ''Ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων τέκνα, [t] ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναστήσει σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.' 25. Ἦσαν δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοί· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος γαμήσας[2] ἐτελεύτησε· καὶ μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα, ἀφῆκε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. 26. ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ δεύτερος, καὶ ὁ τρίτος, ἕως τῶν ἑπτά. 27. ὕστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανε καὶ[3] ἡ γυνή. 28. ἐν τῇ οὖν ἀναστάσει,[4] τίνος τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔσται γυνή; πάντες γὰρ ἔσχον αὐτήν." 29. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "[u] Πλα-

t here only in N. T. (Gen. xxxiv. 9; xxxviii. 8).

u Mk xii. 24, 27. 1 Cor. vi. 9; xv. 33. Gal. vi. 7. Heb. v. 2. James i. 16 (all intrans.).

[1] ℵBDZ omit οι (Tisch., W.H.). It might fall out by similar ending of previous word. *Vide* below.

[2] **γημας** in ℵBLΣ, several cursives. **γαμησας** has probably been substituted as the more usual word.

[3] **και** omitted in ℵBLΔ, found in D; may have come in from Mk.

[4] **ουν** after **αναστασει** in ℵBDL.

them as distinct Jesus said in effect: The kingdom of God is not of this world, it is possible to be a true citizen of the kingdom and yet quietly submit to the civil rule of a foreign potentate. This is the permanent didactic significance of the shrewd reply, safe and true (*tutum et verum*, Bengel), by which Jesus outwitted His crafty foes.—Ver. 22. **ἐθαύμασαν**, wondered; the reply a genuine surprise, they had not thought it possible that He could slip out of their hands so completely and so easily.

Vv. 23-33. *The Sadducaic puzzle* (Mk. xii. 18-27, Lk. xx. 27-38).—Ver. 23. **προσῆλθον**, approached, but with different intent, aiming at amusement rather than deadly mischief. Jesus was of no party, and the butt of all the parties.—**λέγοντες**, with **οἱ**, introduces the creed of the Sadducees; without it, what they said to Jesus. They came and said: We do not believe in the resurrection, and we will prove to you its absurdity. This is probably Mt.'s meaning. He would not think it necessary to explain the tenets of the Sadducees to Jewish readers. —Ver. 24. **Μωσῆς εἶπεν**, what is put into the mouth of all is a free combination of Deut. xxv. 5, 6, with Gen. xxxviii. 8. In the latter text the Sept. has **ἐπιγαμβρεύσαι** for the Heb. יַבֵּם = to perform the part of a *levir* (Latin for brother-in-law) by marrying a deceased brother's widow having no children. An ancient custom not confined to Israel, but practised by Arabians and other peoples (*vide* Ewald, *Alterthümer*, p. 278; Benzinger, *H. A.*, p. 345).—Ver. 25. **παρ' ἡμῖν**: this phrase "with us," in Matthew only, seems to turn an imaginary case into a fact (Holtz., H. C.). A fact it could hardly be. As Chrys. humorously remarks after the second the brothers would shun the woman as a thing of evil omen (**οἰωνίσαντο ἂν τὴν γυναῖκα**, H. lxx.).—Ver. 26. **ἕως τῶν ἑπτά** till the seven, *i.e.*, till the number was exhausted by death. "Usque eo dum illi septem extincti essent" (Fritzsche).—Ver. 28. **οὖν**, introducing the puzzling question based on the case stated.—**γυνή** either subject = whose will the *woman* be? or better, the article being wanting, predicate = whose *wife* will she be? *Cf.* Luke, where **γυνή** is used twice.—**πάντες γὰρ ἔ. α.**, all had her, and therefore (such is the implied thought) all had equal rights. Very clever puzzle, but not insuperably difficult even for Talmudists cherishing materialistic ideas of the resurrection life, who gave the *first* husband the prior claim (Schöttgen).

Vv. 29-33. *Christ's answer.*—One at first wonders that He deigned to answer such triflers; but He was willing meekly to instruct even the perverse, and He never forgot that there might be receptive earnest people within hearing. The Sadducees drew from Him one of His great words.—Ver. 29. **πλανᾶσθε**, ye err, passionless unprovocative statement, as if speaking indulgently to ignorant men.—

νᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς, μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 30. ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν, οὔτε ἐκγαμίζονται,[1] ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν[2] οὐρανῷ εἰσι. 31. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν, οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, λέγοντος, 32. 'Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαάκ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ;' Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ[3] Θεὸς Θεὸς[4] νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζώντων." 33. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.

34. Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἐφίμωσε τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, 35. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν [v] νομικός, πειράζων αὐτόν, καὶ λέγων,[5] 36. "Διδάσκαλε, ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη

v Lk. vii. 30; x. 25; xi. 45; xiv. 3. Tit. iii. 13.

[1] γαμιζονται in ℵBDL; the compound in many uncials.

[2] ℵBL have τω before ουρανω. DΔΣ omit.

[3] ℵD (Tisch.) omit ο. W.H. in brackets.

[4] The second θεος is wanting in ℵBDLΔ *al.* It has been added to make the meaning clear.

[5] και λεγων is probably a mechanical addition. It is wanting in ℵBL 33, Egypt. verss.; found in DΔΣ. Tisch. and W.H. omit.

μὴ εἰδότες, etc.: doubly ignorant; of the Scriptures and of God's power, the latter form of ignorance being dealt with first.—Ver. 30. ἐν γὰρ τ. ἀναστάσει might be rendered, with Fritzsche, in the resurrection *life* or state, though in strictness the phrase should be taken as in ver. 28.—ὡς ἄγγελοι, as angels, so far as marriage is concerned, not necessarily implying sexlessness as the Fathers supposed.—ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ refers to the resurrected dead (Weiss), not to angels (Meyer) = they live an angelic life in heaven; by the transforming power of God.—Ver. 31. Thus far of the mode, now of the fact of resurrection.—οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε, have ye not read? Many times, but not with Christ's eyes. We find what we bring.—τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν, that said to *you;* to Moses first, but a word in season for the Sadducaic state of mind.—Ver. 32. Ἐγώ εἰμι, etc., quoted from Ex. iii. 6. The stress does not lie on εἰμι, to which there is nothing corresponding in the Hebrew, but on the relation implied in the title: God of Abraham. Note in this connection the repetition of the Divine name before each of the patriarchal names, and here the article ὁ before θεὸς each time (not so in Sept.). The idea is that the Eternal could not stand in such intimate connection with the merely temporal. The argument holds *a fortiori* in reference to Christ's name for God, *Father*, which compels belief in human immortality, and in the immortality of all, for God is Father of all men, whereas the text quoted might avail in proof only of the immortality of the *great ones*, the heroes of the race.—οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς, with the article θεὸς is subject, and the idea: God does not belong to the dead; without, it would be predicate = He is not a God of the dead. On second θεὸς *vide* critical notes.

Vv. 34-40. *The great commandments* (Mk. xii. 34).—In a still more marked degree than in the case of the man in quest of eternal life, Mk.'s account presents the subject of this incident in a more favourable light than that of Mt. The difference must be allowed to stand. Mk.'s version is welcome as showing a good side even in the scribe or Pharisee world.—Ver. 34. ἀκούσαντες, hearing; not without pleasure, if also with annoyance, at the uniform success of Jesus.—ἐφίμωσεν: silenced, muzzled, from φιμός, a muzzle (ver. 12, used in literal sense in Deut. xxv. 4).—Ver. 35. εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν, one of the men who met together to consult, after witnessing the discomfiture of the scribes, acting in concert with them, and hoping to do better.—νομικὸς: here only in Mt., several times in Lk. for the scribe class = a man well up in the law.—Ver. 36. ποία ἐντολὴ: what sort of a commandment? it is a question not about an individual commandment, but about the qualities that determine greatness in the legal region. This was a question of the schools. The dis-

ἐν τῷ νόμῳ;" 37. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν[1] αὐτῷ, "Ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου, ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου, καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου. 38. αὕτη ἐστὶ πρώτη καὶ μεγάλη[2] ἐντολή. 39. δευτέρα δὲ[3] ὁμοία αὐτῇ,[4] Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. 40. ἐν ταύταις ταῖς δυσὶν ἐντολαῖς ὅλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ʷ κρέμανται."[5]

41. Συνηγμένων δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων, 42. "Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ περὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τίνος υἱός ἐστι;"

w with ἐν τινι here only; with ἐκ and gen. in Acts xxviii. 4; with ἐπι and gen., Gal. iii. 13 (of one hanging on a cross).

[1] For ο δε Ιησους ειπεν ℵBL, Egypt. verss., have ο δε εφη. So Trg., Tisch., W.H., Ws.

[2] μεγαλη και πρωτη in ℵBDLZ. The scribes would be apt to introduce the inverted order (as in T. R.) as the more natural.

[3] ℵB omit δε.

[4] For ομοια αυτη B has simply ομοιως, which W.H. place in the margin. Perhaps it is the true reading.

[5] In ℵBDLZΣ the verb comes before οι προφηται and is singular; doubtless the true reading.

tinction between little and great was recognised (*vide* chap. v. 19), and the grounds of the distinction debated (*vide* Schöttgen, *ad loc.*, who goes into the matter at length). Jesus had already made a contribution to the discussion by setting the ethical above the ritual (xv. 1-20, *cf.* xix. 18-22).—Ver. 37. **ἀγαπήσεις**, etc. Jesus replies by citing Deut. vi. 5, which inculcates supreme, devoted love to God, and pronouncing this the great (μεγάλη) and greatest, first (πρώτη) commandment. The clauses referring to heart, soul, and mind are to be taken cumulatively, as meaning love to the uttermost degree; with "all that is within" us (πάντα τὰ ἐντός μου, Ps. ciii. 1). This commandment is cited not merely as an individual precept, but as indicating the spirit that gives value to all obedience.—Ver. 39. **δευτέρα**: a second commandment is added from Lev. xix. 18, enjoining loving a neighbour as ourselves. According to T. R., this second is declared like to the first (ὁμοία αὐτῇ). The laconic reading of B (δευτ. ὁμοίως) amounts to the same thing = the second is also a great, first commandment, being, though formally subordinate to the first, really the first in another form: love to God and love to man one. Euthy. Zig. suggests that Jesus added the second commandment in tacit rebuke of their lack of love to Himself.—Ver. 40. **ὁ. ὁ νόμος κρέμαται.** Jesus winds up by declaring that on these two hangs, is suspended, the whole law, also the prophets = the moral drift of the whole O. T. is *love;* no law or performance of law of any value save as love is the soul of it. So Jesus soars away far above the petty disputes of the schools about the relative worth of isolated precepts; teaching the organic unity of duty.

Vv. 41-46. *Counter question of Jesus* (Mk. xii. 35-37; Lk. xx. 41-44).—Not meant merely to puzzle or silence foes, or even to hint a mysterious doctrine as to the Speaker's person, but to make Pharisees and scribes, and Synedrists generally, revise their whole ideas of the Messiah and the Messianic kingdom, which had led them to reject Him.—Ver. 42. **τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ**; what think you? first generally of the Christ (περὶ τ. Χ.); second more particularly as to His descent (τίνος υἱός ἐστι).—**τοῦ Δαβίδ**, David's, the answer expected. Messiah *must* be David's son: that was the great idea of the scribes, carrying along with it hopes of royal dignity and a restored kingdom.—Ver. 43. **πῶς οὖν**, etc.: the question is meant to bring out another side of Messiah's relation to David, based on an admittedly Messianic oracle (Ps. cx. 1), and overlooked by the scribes. The object of the question is not, as some have supposed, to deny *in toto* the Sonship, but to hint doubt as to the *importance* attached to it. Think out the idea of Lordship and see where

λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Τοῦ Δαβίδ." 43. Λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Πῶς οὖν Δαβὶδ [x] ἐν [x] πνεύματι κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ[1]; 44. λέγων, 'Εἶπεν ὁ[2] Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον[3] τῶν ποδῶν σου.' 45. Εἰ οὖν Δαβὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστι;" 46. Καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο αὐτῷ ἀποκριθῆναι[4] λόγον· οὐδὲ [y] ἐτόλμησέ τις ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπερωτῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐκέτι.

x Cf. πνεύματι in Gal. v. 5.

y here, parall., John xxi. 12 al. (with inf.).

[1] ℵBDLZ put καλει first, but differ in the order of κυριον αυτον.

[2] ο omitted in ℵBDZ.

[3] υποκατω in ℵBDL *al.*

[4] αποκ. αυτω in ℵBDLZΔΣ.

it will lead you, said Jesus in effect. The scribes began at the wrong end: at the physical and material, and it landed them in secularity. If they had begun with Lordship it would have led them into the spiritual sphere, and made them ready to accept as Christ one greater than David in the spiritual order, though totally lacking the conventional grandeur of royal persons, only an unpretending Son of *Man*.

CHAPTER XXIII. THE GREAT ANTI-PHARISAIC DISCOURSE. This is one of the great discourses peculiar to the first Gospel. That some such words were spoken by Jesus in Jerusalem in the Passion week may be inferred from Mk. xii. 38-40, Lk. xx. 45-47. The few sentences there reported look like a fragment, just enough to show that there must have been more—too meagre (*gar zu dürftig.*, De W.) to have been all that Jesus said on such a large topic at such a solemn time. A weighty, deliberate, full, final statement, in the form of a dying testimony, was to be expected from One who had so often criticised the prevailing religious system in an occasional manner in His Galilean ministry—a summing up in the head-quarters of scribism of past prophetic censures uttered in the provinces. In such a final protest repetitions might be looked for (Nösgen). In any case, whether all the words here brought together were spoken at this time or not, the evangelist did well to collect them into one body, and he could not have introduced the collection at a more appropriate place.

Vv. 1-12. *Introduction to the discourse.*—Ver. 1. **τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τ. μαθηταῖς**: the discourse is about scribes and Pharisees, but the audience is conceived to consist of the disciples and the people. Meyer describes the situation thus: in the foreground Jesus and His disciples; a little further off the **ὄχλος**; in the background the Pharisees.—Ver. 2. **ἐπὶ τ. M. καθέδρας**, on the seat of Moses, short for, on the seat of a teacher whose function it was to interpret the Mosaic Law. The Jews spoke of the teacher's seat as we speak of a professor's chair.—**ἐκάθισαν**, in effect, a gnomic aorist = *solent sedere* (Fritzsche), not a case of the aorist used as a perfect = have taken and now occupy, etc. (Erasmus). Burton (Syntax) sees in this and other aorists in N. T. a tendency towards use of aorist for perfect not yet realised: "rhetorical figure on the way to become grammatical idiom, but not yet become such," § 55.—**οἱ Φαρ.** Wendt (*L. J.*, i., 186) thinks this an addition by the evangelist, the statement strictly applying only to the scribes.—Ver. 3. **εἴπωσιν**, say, in the sense of enjoining; no need therefore of **τηρεῖν** as in T. R.—**ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε**: The natural order if the previous **τηρεῖν** be omitted. The diverse tenses are significant, the former pointing to detailed performance, the latter to habitual observance. Christ here recognises the legitimacy of the scribal function of interpretation in a broad way, which may appear too unqualified and incompatible with His teaching at other times (Mt. xv. 1-20) (so Holtz., H. C.). Allowance must be made for Christ's habit of unqualified statement, especially here when He is going to attack in an uncompromising manner the conduct of the Jewish doctors. He means: as teachers they have their place, but beware of following their example.—Ver. 4 illustrates the previous statement.—**δεσμεύουσι**, etc., they bind together, like sheaves, heavy backloads of rules. Think, *e.g.*, of the innumerable rules for Sabbath observance similar to that prohibiting rubbing ears of corn as work—threshing. — **δυσβάστακτα** may be a

XXIII. 1. ΤΟΤΕ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησε τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, λέγων, 2. "Ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν[a] οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι· 3. πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν[1] εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν τηρεῖν,[2] τηρεῖτε καὶ ποιεῖτε[3]· κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν μὴ ποιεῖτε· λέγουσι γὰρ καὶ οὐ ποιοῦσι. 4. [a] δεσμεύουσι γὰρ[4] φορτία βαρέα καὶ δυσβάστακτα,[5] καὶ ἐπιτιθέασιν ἐπὶ τοὺς [b] ὤμους τῶν ἀνθρώπων· τῷ δὲ δακτύλῳ[6] αὐτῶν οὐ θέλουσι [c] κινῆσαι αὐτά. 5. πάντα δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσι πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. [d] πλατύνουσι δὲ[7] τὰ [e] φυλακτήρια αὐτῶν, καὶ μεγαλύνουσι τὰ κράσπεδα τῶν ἱματίων αὐτῶν[8]· 6. φιλοῦσί τε[9] τὴν [f] πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις, καὶ

a here only in this sense (Gen. xxxvii. 7. Judith viii. 3, δράγματα). Lk. viii. 29. Acts xxii. 4 (to put in chains).
b here and in Lk. xv. 5.
c Ch. xxvii. 39. Mk. xv. 29 (to move the head to and fro). Acts xxiv. 5 (to excite, metaph.).
d 2 Cor. vi. 11, 13 (of the broadening or enlarging of the heart).
e here only in N. T.
f Lk. xiv. 7, 8.

[1] εαν in ℵLZΔΣ; αν in BD (Tisch., W.H. have εαν).

[2] ℵBDLZ omit τηρειν.

[3] ℵBDLZ invert the order of the two verbs. D has ποιειτε, the rest ποιησατε.

[4] δε in ℵBDLΔΣ.

[5] ℵL omit και δυσβαστακτα (Tisch.). BDΔΣ have the words, which may have come in from Lk. (xi. 46), but may also be a genuine reading (W.H. in margin).

[6] For τω δε δακτυλω ℵBDL read αυτοι δε τω δακ.

[7] γαρ in ℵBDL, curs. verss.

[8] ℵBD omit των ιματιων αυτων.

[9] δε in ℵBDLΔΣ.

spurious reading imported from Lk. xi. 46, but it states a fact, and was doubtless used by Jesus on some occasion. It shows by the way that He had no thought of unqualified approval of the *teaching* of the scribes.—ἐπὶ τ. ὤμους, on the shoulders, that they may feel the full weight, demanding punctual compliance.—αὐτοὶ δὲ τ. δακτύλῳ, etc., they are not willing to move or touch them with a finger; proverbial (Elsner) for will not take the smallest trouble to keep their own rules. A strong statement pointing to the subtle ways of evading strict rules invented by the scribes. "The picture is of the merciless camel or ass driver who makes up burdens not only heavy, but unwieldy and so difficult to carry, and then placing them on the animal's shoulders, stands by indifferent, raising no finger to lighten or even adjust the burden" (Carr, C. G. T.).

Vv. 5-7. The foregoing statement is of course to be taken *cum grano*. Teachers who absolutely disregarded their own laws would soon forfeit all respect. In point of fact they made a great show of zeal in doing. Jesus therefore goes on to tax them with acting from low motives.—Ver. 5. πάντα δὲ, etc., in so far as they comply with their rules they act with a view to be seen of men. This is a repetition of an old charge (Mt. vi.).—πλατύνουσι γὰρ, etc.: illustrative instances drawn from the phylacteries and the tassels attached to the upper garment, the former being broadened, the latter lengthened to attract notice. The phylacteries (φυλακτήρια) were an admirable symbol at once of Pharisaic ostentation and Pharisaic make-believe. They were little boxes attached to the forehead and the left arm near the heart, containing pieces of parchment with certain texts written on them (Ex. xiii. 1-10, 11-17; Deut. vi. 4-10; xi. 13-22) containing figurative injunctions to keep in memory God's laws and dealings, afterwards mechanically interpreted, whence these visible symbols of obedience on forehead and arm. The size of the phylacteries indexed the measure of zeal, and the wearing of large ones was apt to take the place of obedience. It was with the Pharisees as with Carlyle's advertising hatter, who sent a cart through the street with a huge hat in it instead of making good hats. For details on phylacteries and fringes consult works on Jewish antiquities. Lund, *Jüdischen Heiligthümer* (1701), has a chapter (p. 796) on the dress of the Pharisees with pictorial illustrations. It has been discussed whether the name

g parall. and Lk. xi. 43. τὰς g πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, 7. καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, καὶ καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ῥαββί, ῥαββί[1]· 8. ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε, ῥαββί· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ καθηγητής, ὁ Χριστός[2]· πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε. 9. καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν,[3] ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.[4] 10. μηδὲ κληθῆτε, h καθηγηταί· εἷς γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν ὁ καθηγητής,[5] ὁ Χριστός. 11. ὁ δὲ μείζων ὑμῶν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος. 12. ὅστις δὲ ὑψώσει ἑαυτόν, ταπεινωθήσεται· καὶ ὅστις ταπεινώσει ἑαυτόν, ὑψωθήσεται.

h here only in N. T.

13. "Οὐαὶ δὲ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι κατεσθίετε τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν, καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχό-

[1] ℵBLΔΣ omit the second ραββι.

[2] BU, several cursives, have ο διδασκαλος instead of ο καθ. ο Χριστος, which seems a gloss from ver. 10.

[3] υμων before ο πατηρ in ℵBZ.

[4] ο ουρανιος for ο εν τ. ουρανοις in ℵBL.

[5] οτι καθηγ. υμ. εστιν εις in BDL.

φυλ. points to the keeping of the law or to the use of these things as amulets to ward off harm. The former was doubtless originally in view, but the superstitious abuse would soon creep in. The word is the equivalent in Hellenistic Greek for the Chaldee תְּפִלִּין, prayers. —Ver. 6. πρωτοκλισίαν: with religious ostentation goes social vanity, love of the first place at feasts, and first seats (πρωτοκαθεδρίας) in synagogues; an insatiable hunger for prominence.—Ver. 7. τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς, the (usual) salutations, in themselves innocent courtesies, but coveted because offered in public places, and as demonstrations of respect. —ῥαββί, literally, my great one, like the French *monsieur;* in Christ's time a new title of honour for the Jewish doctors (*vide* Lightfoot, *Ewald. Gesch. Christi*, p. 305; Schürer, ii., p. 315, who says the title came into use after the time of Christ).—Ver. 8. ὑμεῖς, *you*, emphatic: the Twelve, an earnest aside to them in especial (an interpolation by the evangelist, Weiss-Meyer), be not ye called Rabbi.—μὴ κληθῆτε, "Do not seek to be called, if others call you this it will not be your fault". Euthy. Zig.—Ver. 9. πατέρα = abba, another title of honour for the Rabbis (Schöttgen). The clause is to be translated: a father of you call not upon earth = do not pronounce this sacred name with reference to men. *Vide* Winer, § 64, 4, and *cf.* Heb. iii. 13. —Ver. 10. καθηγηταί, kindred with ὁδηγοὶ (ver. 16), guides, leaders in thought, desiring abject discipleship from followers. *Gradatio: Rabbi, pater, ductor*, Beng. The threefold counsel shows the intensely anti-prelatic spirit of Jesus. In spite of this earnest warning the love of pre-eminence and leadership has prevailed in the Church to the detriment of independence, the sense of responsibility, and loyalty to God.—ὁ Χριστός: in this place though not in ver. 8 a part of the true text, but possibly an addition by the evangelist ("a proof that Matthew here speaks, not Jesus," H. C.).—Vv. 11, 12, repeat in substance the teaching of xx. 26: xviii. 4, worth repeating and by no means out of place here.

Vv. 13-31. *The seven woes.*—There are eight, if we count that in ver. 13 of T. R., but as this ver. is omitted in the best MSS. and appears to be a gloss from Mk. and Lk. I do not count it. *Vide* notes on Mk. xii. 40. These woes seem to be spoken directly to the scribes and Pharisees. Weiss regards this as a rhetorical apostrophe, the disciples being the real audience throughout.—Ver. 14. ὑποκριταί. *Vide* at vi. 2. This epithet is applied to the scribes and Pharisees in each of the woes with terrific iteration. —κλείετε, ye shut the gates or the doors of the Kingdom of God, conceived as a city or palace. This the real effect of their action, not the ostensible. They

μενοι· διὰ τοῦτο λήψεσθε περισσότερον κρίμα.[1] 14. Οὐαὶ[2] ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι κλείετε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ὑμεῖς γὰρ οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε, οὐδὲ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν. 15. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι περιάγετε τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν [i] ξηρὰν ποιῆσαι ἕνα [j] προσήλυτον, καὶ ὅταν γένηται, ποιεῖτε αὐτὸν υἱὸν γεέννης διπλότερον ὑμῶν. 16. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί, οἱ λέγοντες, Ὃς ἂν ὀμόσῃ ἐν τῷ ναῷ, οὐδέν ἐστιν· ὃς δ' ἂν ὀμόσῃ ἐν

i Heb. xi. 29 (without γῆς in T. R., with in W.H.).
j Acts ii. 10; vi. 5; xiii. 43.

[1] Ver. 13 omitted in ℵBDLZ, some cursives, versions (including Syr. Sin.), Fathers, and by modern editors.

[2] δὲ must be supplied here if ver. 13 be omitted.

claimed to be opening the Kingdom while really shutting it, and therein lay their hypocrisy.—**ἔμπροσθεν τ. ἀ.**: as it were in men's faces, when they are in the act of entering.—**ὑμεῖς γὰρ**, etc. *Cf.* v. 20. They thought themselves certainly within, but in the judgment of Jesus, with all their parade of piety, they were without.—**τ. εἰσερχομένους**, those in the mood to enter, in the act of entering; the reference is to sincere seekers after God, and the statement is that the scribes were the worst advisers such persons could go to: the effect of their teaching would be to keep them out. This is the position implied throughout the Sermon on the Mount and in xi. 28-30.—Ver. 15. The second woe is the complement of the first: it represents the false guides, as, while utterly incompetent for the function, extremely eager to exercise it.—**περιάγετε**, ye move about, intransitive, the accusative following being governed by **περὶ**.—**τ. ξηρὰν**, the dry (land), sometimes **ὑγρὰ** is similarly used for the sea (examples in Elsner). *Cf.* **ψυχρόν** for cold water in x. 42. To compass sea and land is proverbial for doing anything with great zeal.—**π. ἕνα προσήλυτον**, to make a *single* proselyte. The zeal here ascribed to the Pharisees seems in one sense alien to their character as described in Lk. xviii. 11. One would expect them rather to be pleased to be a select few superior to all others than to be animated with a burning desire to gain recruits whether from Jews or from Gentiles. For an elaborate discussion of the question as to the existence of the proselytising spirit among the Jews *vide* Danz's treatise in Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Tal. illustratum*, p. 649. *Vide* also Wetstein, *ad loc.* Wünsche (*Beiträge*, p. 285) cites passages from the Talmud to prove that the Pharisees, far from being addicted to proselytising, were rather reserved in this respect. He concludes that Mt. xxiii. 15 must refer not to making proselytes to Judaism from Gentiles, but to making additions to their sect from among Jews (*Sectirerei*). This, however, is against the meaning of **προσήλυτος**. Assuming the fact to have been as stated, the point to be noted is that the Pharisees and scribes aimed chiefly, not at bringing men into the Kingdom of God, but into their own coterie.—**διπλότερον ὑ.**, twofold more, *duplo quam*, Vulgate. Kypke, while aware that the comparative of **διπλοῦς** (**διπλότερος**) does not occur in profane writers, thinks it is used here in the sense of deceitful, and renders, ye make him a son of *gehenna*, more fraudulent, more hypocritical than yourselves. Briefly the idea is: the more converted the more perverted, "je bekehrter desto verkehrter" (Holtz., H. C.).

Vv. 16-22. *The third woe* refers to the Jesuitry of the scribes in the matter of oaths; the point emphasised, however, is their stupidity in this part of their teaching (*cf.* Mt. v. 33 f.), where Christ's teaching is directed against the use of oaths at all.—Ver. 16. **ὁδηγ. τυφλοί**, *blind* guides, not only deceivers but deceived themselves, lacking spiritual insight even in the simplest matters. Three instances of their blindness in reference to oaths are directly or indirectly indicated: oaths by the temple and the gold of the temple, by the altar and the offerings on it, by heaven and the throne of God therein. The principle underlying Rabbinical judgments as to the relative value of oaths seems to have been: the special form more binding than the general; therefore *gold* of the temple more than the temple, sacrifice on

τῷ χρυσῷ τοῦ ναοῦ, [k] ὀφείλει. 17. μωροὶ καὶ τυφλοί· τίς γὰρ μείζων ἐστίν, ὁ χρυσός, ἢ ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἁγιάζων [1] τὸν χρυσόν; 18. καί, Ὃς ἐὰν ὀμόσῃ ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐδέν ἐστιν· ὃς δ' ἂν ὀμόσῃ ἐν τῷ δώρῳ τῷ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, ὀφείλει. 19. μωροὶ καὶ [2] τυφλοί· τί γὰρ μεῖζον, τὸ δῶρον, ἢ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἁγιάζον τὸ δῶρον; 20. ὁ οὖν ὀμόσας ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ ὀμνύει ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ· 21. καὶ ὁ ὀμόσας ἐν τῷ ναῷ ὀμνύει ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ [l] κατοικοῦντι [3] αὐτόν· 22. καὶ ὁ ὀμόσας ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὀμνύει ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ [m] καθημένῳ ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ.

k absol. here and in ver. 18 only.

l Lk. xiii. 4 (W.H.). Acts i. 19; ii. 9, 14, and other places (with acc. of place).

m Ch. xxviii. 2, with επανω and gen.

[1] **αγιασας** in ℵBDZ.

[2] **μωραι και** omitted in ℵDLZ. BCΔΣ as in T. R.; Tisch. omits; W.H. relegate to margin.

[3] **κατοικησαντι** in CDLZΔΣ *al.* **κατοικουντι** in ℵB it. vul. Tisch., W.H., with **κατοικησαντι** in margin.

altar more than altar, throne of God in heaven more than heaven. Specialising indicated greater earnestness. Whether these forms of oath were actually used or current, and what precisely they meant, *e.g.*, gold of the temple: was it ornament, utensil, or treasure? is immaterial. They may have been only hypothetical forms devised to illustrate an argument in the schools.—**οὐδέν ἐστι, ὀφείλει**: the formulae for non-binding and binding oaths; it is nothing (the oath, *viz.*); he is indebted, bound to performance = חייב.—Ver. 17. **τίς γὰρ μεῖζον**: Jesus answers this question by asserting the opposite principle to that laid down by the Rabbis: the general includes and is more important than the particular, which He applies to all the three cases (vv. 17, 19, 22). This is the more logical position, but the main point of difference is *moral*. The tendency of the Rabbis was to enlarge the sphere of insincere, idle, meaningless speech. Christ's aim was to inculcate absolute sincerity = always mean what you say; let none of your utterances be merely conventional generalities. Be as much in earnest when you say "by the temple" as when you say "by the gold of the temple"; rather be so truthful that you shall not need to say either.

Vv. 23-24. *The fourth woe* refers to tithe-paying (Lk. xi. 42).—**ἀποδεκατοῦτε**: a Hellenistic word = ye pay tithes, as in Gen. xxviii. 22; to take tithes from in Heb. vii. 5, 6.—**ἡδύοσμον, ἄνηθον, κύμινον**: garden herbs—mint (literally, sweet smelling), dill, also aromatic, cumin (*Kümmel*, German) with aromatic seeds. All marketable commodities, used as condiments, or for medicinal purposes, presumably all tithable, the point being not that the Pharisees were wilful in tithe-paying, but that they were extremely scrupulous. *Vide* articles in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*. The Talmud itself, however, in a sentence quoted by Lightfoot ("decimatio oleorum est a Rabbinis") represents tithing of herbs as a refinement of the Rabbis.—**τὰ βαρύτερα**: either, the weightier, in the sense of xxii. 36 (Meyer), or the more difficult to do, in the sense of ver. 14 (Weiss after Fritzsche). The idea seems to be: they made a great show of zeal in doing what was easy, and shirked the serious and more arduous requirements of duty.—**τ. κρίσιν**, righteous judgment, implying and = the love of righteousness, a passion for justice.—**τὸ ἔλεος**, neuter, after the fashion of later Greek, not **τὸν ἔλεον**, as in T. R.: mercy; sadly neglected by Pharisees, much insisted on by Jesus.—**τ. πίστιν**, faith, in the sense of fidelity, true-heartedness. As a curiosity in the history of exegesis may be cited the use of this text by Schortinghuis, a Dutch pietist of the eighteenth century, in support of the duty of judging the spiritual state of others (**κρίσιν**)! *Vide* Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, i., 329.—**ταῦτα** the greater things last mentioned.—**ἔδει**, it was your duty to do.—**κἀκεῖνα**, and those things, the tithings, etc.: this the secondary duty; its subordinate place might be brought out by rendering: "while not neglecting to pay tithes as scrupulously as you please". Bengel thinks **ταῦτα** and **ἐκεῖνα** here refer not to the order of the words but to the relative import-

23. "Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι [n] ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον, καὶ ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸν ἔλεον [1] καὶ τὴν πίστιν· ταῦτα [2] ἔδει ποιῆσαι, κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφιέναι.[3] 24. ὁδηγοὶ τυφλοί, οἱ [4] [o] διϋλίζοντες τὸν [p] κώνωπα, τὴν δὲ κάμηλον [q] καταπίνοντες. 25. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι καθαρίζετε τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ [5] [r] ἁρπαγῆς καὶ [s] ἀκρασίας. 26. Φαρισαῖε τυφλέ, καθάρισον πρῶτον τὸ ἐντὸς τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τῆς παροψίδος,[6] ἵνα γένηται καὶ τὸ ἐκτὸς αὐτῶν [7] καθαρόν.

n Lk. xi. 42; xviii. 12. Heb. vii. 5.
o here only in N. T. (Amos vi. 6).
p here only in N. T.
q Rev. xii. 16 (same sense). 1 Cor. xv. 54. 2 Cor. v. 4. Heb. xi. 29 (to swallow up).
r Lk. xi. 39. Heb. x. 34.
s 1 Cor. vii. 5.

[1] το ελεος in ℵBDL. τον ελεον a grammatical correction.

[2] δε after ταυτα in BCLΔΣ.

[3] αφειναι in ℵBL. αφιεναι in CDΔΣ *al.*

[4] οι omitted in ℵBL, by oversight, Weiss thinks. Tisch. retains, W.H. omit.

[5] CD omit εξ, which, however, is in ℵBLΔΣ, and is retained by Tisch., W.H., and other editors.

[6] και της παροψιδος is in ℵBCLΔΣ *al.*, but is omitted by D, and may be a mechanical repetition from ver. 25 (Tisch. omits, W.H. bracket).

[7] αυτου in BD and several cursives, the natural reading if και της παροψ. be omitted.

ance of the things ("non pro serie verborum, sed pro ratione rerum"). On this view "these" means tithe-paying.—Ver. 24. διυλίζοντες (διά and ὕλη, Passow), a little used word, for which Hesychius gives as a synonym, διηθέω, to strain through.—τὸν κώνωπα, τὴν κάμηλον, *the* gnat, *the* camel: article as usual in proverbial sayings. The proper object of the former part. is οἶνον: straining the wine so as to remove the unclean midge. Swallowing the camel is a monstrous supposition, but relevant, the camel being unclean, chewing the cud but not parting the hoof (Lev. xi. 4). The proverb clinches the lesson of the previous verse.

Vv. 25-26. *Fifth woe*, directed against externalism (Lk. xi. 39-41).—τῆς παροψίδος, the dish, on which viands were served. In classics it meant the meat, not the dish (τὸ ὄψον οὐχὶ δὲ τὸ ἀγγεῖον, Phryn., p. 176). Rutherford (New Phryn., p. 265) remarks that our word "dish" has the same ambiguity.—ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ἐξ: within both cup and plate are full of, or from. ἐκ is either redundant or it points to the fulness as resulting from the things following: filled with wine and meat purchased by the wages of unrighteousness: luxuries acquired by plunder and licence. The verb γέμουσι occurs again in ver. 27 without ἐκ, and this is in favour of the second view. But on the other hand in ver. 26 the vessels are conceived of as defiled by ἁρπαγή and ἀκρασία, therefore presumably as filled *with* them. Here as in vi. 22, 23, the physical and ethical are mixed in the figure.—Ver. 26. φαρισαῖε τυφλέ: change from plural to singular with increased earnestness, and a certain friendliness of tone, as of one who would gladly induce the party addressed to mend his ways.—καθάρισον: if ἐκ, ver. 35, is taken = by, then this verb will mean: see that the wine in the cup be no more the product of robbery and unbridled desire for other people's property (Weiss and Meyer). On the other view, that the cup is filled with these vices, the meaning will be, get rid of them.—ἵνα γένηται, etc., in order that the outside may become clean. The ethical cleanness is conceived of as ensuring the ceremonial. Or, in other words, ethical purity gives all the cleanness you need ("all things are clean unto you," Lk. xi. 41). Practically this amounts to treating ceremonial cleanness as of little account. Christ's way of thinking and the Pharisaic were really incompatible.

Vv. 27-28. *Sixth woe*, referring to no special Pharisaic vice, but giving a graphic picture of their hypocrisy in

27. "Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι παρομοιάζετε[1] ᵗτάφοις ᵘκεκονιαμένοις, οἵτινες ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνονται ᵛὡραῖοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν ὀστέων νεκρῶν καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας. 28. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνεσθε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις δίκαιοι, ἔσωθεν δὲ μεστοί ἐστε[2] ὑποκρίσεως καὶ ἀνομίας. 29. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τοὺς τάφους τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ κοσμεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν δικαίων, καὶ λέγετε, 30. Εἰ ἦμεν[3] ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἂν ἦμεν[3] ʷκοινωνοὶ αὐτῶν[4] ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῶν προφητῶν. 31. ὥστε μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς, ὅτι υἱοί ἐστε τῶν φονευσάντων τοὺς προφήτας· 32. καὶ ὑμεῖς πληρώσατε[5] τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν. 33. ὄφεις, γεννήματα

t Ch. xxvii. 61, 64, 66; xxviii. 1. Rom. iii. 13.
u Acts xxiii. 3.
v Acts iii. 2, 10. Rom. x. 15.
w Lk. v. 10. 1 Cor. x. 18, 20. Heb. x. 33.

[1] B 1 have the simple ομοιαζετε, which W.H. place in the margin.

[2] εστε μεστοι in ℵBCDL 13, 33, 69 *al.*

[3] ημεθα in both places in most uncials, including ℵBCDL.

[4] αυτων before κοινωνοι in BD (W.H.).

[5] πληρωσετε in B 60, επληρωσατε in D; both, according to Weiss, arising from inability to understand the sense of the imperative (W.H. have B's reading in margin).

general (*cf.* Lk. xi. 44).—Ver. 27. **παρομοιάζετε**, in B **ὁμοιάζετε**, under either form an *apax leg.*—**κεκονιαμένοις** (from **κονία**, dust, slaked lime), whitewashed, referring to the practice of whitewashing the sepulchres in the month Adar, before passover time, to make them conspicuous, inadvertent approach involving uncleanness. They would be wearing their fresh coat just then, so that the comparison was seasonable (*vide* Wetstein, *ad loc.*).—**ἔξωθεν, ἔσωθεν**, again a contrast between without and within, which may have suggested the comparison.—**ὡραῖοι**, fair, without; the result but not the intention in the natural sphere, the aim in the spiritual, the Pharisee being concerned about *appearance* (chap. vi.).—**ὀστέων**, etc., revolting contrast: without, quite an attractive feature in the landscape; within, only death-fraught loathsomeness.—Ver. 28. **οὕτω**, etc.: the figure apposite on both sides; the Pharisaic character apparently saintly; really inwardly, full of godlessness and immorality (**ἀνομίας**), the result being gross systematic hypocrisy.

Vv. 29-33. *Final woe* (Lk. xi. 47-48), dealing with yet another phase of hypocrisy and a new form of the contrast between without and within; apparent zeal for the honour of deceased prophets, real affinity with their murderers.—Ver. 29. **οἰκοδομεῖτε**, may point to repair or extension of old buildings, or to new edifices, like some modern monuments, the outcome of dilettante hero-worship.—**τάφους, μνημεῖα**, probably synonyms, though there may have been monuments to the dead apart from burying places, to which the former word points.—**προφητῶν** and **δικαίων** are also practically synonymous, though the latter is a wider category.—**κοσμεῖτε** points to decoration as distinct from building operations. Fürrer (*Wanderungen*, p. 77) suggests that Jesus had in view the tomb of Zechariah, the prophet named in the sequel, in the valley of Jehoshaphat, which he describes as a lovely little temple with ornamental half and quarter pillars of the Ionic order.—**λέγετε**: they not merely thought, or said by deed, but actually so pointed the moral of their action, not trusting to others to draw the inference.—Ver. 30. **ἤμεθα**, not in classics, **ἤμην** the usual form of sing. in N. T. being also rare; the imperfect, but must be translated in our tongue, "if we had been". For the imperfect, used when we should use a pluperfect, *vide* Mt. xiv. 4, and consult Burton, § 29.—**οὐκ ἂν ἤμεθα**, the indicative with **ἂν**, as usual in suppositions contrary to fact, *vide* Burton, § 248.—Ver. 31. **ὥστε**, with indicative expressing result = therefore.—**ἑαυτοῖς**, to and against yourselves. Jesus reads more meaning into their words than they intended: "our fathers"; yes! they *are* your fathers, in spirit as well as in blood.—Ver. 32. **καί**, and, as ye have called yourselves their sons,

ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης; 34. Διὰ τοῦτο, ἰδού, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ [x] γραμματεῖς· καὶ[1] ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενεῖτε καὶ σταυρώσετε, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μαστιγώσετε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν, καὶ διώξετε ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν· 35. ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυνόμενον[2] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ τοῦ δικαίου, ἕως τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχίου, ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξὺ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου. 36. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἥξει ταῦτα πάντα[3] ἐπὶ τὴν

[x] *vide* Ch. xiii. 52.

[1] ℵBΔΣ 1, 13, 33, 69 *al.* omit και, found in CDL.

[2] εκχυννομενον in ℵBCDΔΣ *al.*, 1, 33 *al.*

[3] παντα ταυτα in BXΔΣ (W.H. in margin); as in T. R., in ℵCDL, Vul. Cop. (Tisch., W.H. in text).

so show yourselves to be such indeed (Weiss).—πληρώσατε. The reading πληρώσετε is due to shrinking from the idea conveyed by the imperative. To the same cause is due the permissive (Grotius *al.*) or ironical (De W.) senses put upon the imperative. Christ means what He says: "Fill up the measure of your fathers; crown their misdeeds by killing the prophet God has sent to *you*. Do at last what has long been in your hearts. The hour is come."—Ver. 33. Awful ending to a terrific charge, indicating that the men who are predestined to superlative wickedness are appropriately doomed to the uttermost penalty.—ὄφεις, γεν. ἐχιδνῶν; already stigmatised as false, fools, blind, they are now described as venomous, murderous in thought and deed. *Cf.* iii. 7.—πῶς φύγητε, the deliberative conjunctive. "The verb of a deliberative question is most frequently in the first person, but occasionally in the second or third. Mt. xxiii. 33, Rom. x. 14."—Burton, § 170.

Vv. 34-36. *Peroration* (Lk. xi. 49-51). —Ver. 34. διὰ τοῦτο. The sense requires that this be connected with both vv. 32 and 33. The idea is that all God's dealings with Israel have been arranged from the first so as to ensure that the generation addressed shall fill up the measure of Israel's guilt and penalty. The reference of ἀποστέλλω is not confined to what had been done for that generation. It covers all the generations from Abel downwards. The form in which the thought is expressed at first creates a contrary impression: Ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω. But either the ἐγὼ is used in a suprahistorical sense, or it must be regarded as a somewhat unsuitable word, and the correct expression of the source found in Luke's ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν, what follows becoming thus a quotation, either in reality from some unknown writing, as many think, or in the conception of the speaker. I see no insuperable difficulty in taking Mt.'s form as the original. Olshausen conceives of Jesus as speaking, not as a personality involved in the limits of temporal life, but as the Son of God, as the essential wisdom of God. The ἐγὼ might be justified without this high reference to the Divinity of Jesus, as proceeding from His prophetic consciousness in an exalted state of mind. The prophet habitually spoke in the name of God. Jesus also at such a great moment might speak, as it were impersonally, in the name of God, or of wisdom. Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 274 ff., endeavours to show that "the wisdom of God" was, like "the Son of Man," one of the self-designations of Jesus. Whether that be so or not, I think it is clear from this passage, and also from Mt. xi. 28-30 (*vide* remarks there), that He did sometimes, as it were, personate wisdom. The present ἀποστέλλω, regards the history of Israel *sub specie aeternitatis*, for which the distinction of present and past does not exist.—προφήτας, etc.: these names for the Sent clearly show that past and present are both in view. It is not merely the *apostles*, γραμματεῖς (*cf.* xiii. 52) = ἀποστόλους, Lk. xi. 49, that are in view.—σταυρώσετε, a hint at the impending tragic event, the Speaker one of the Sent.—καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν, etc.: a glance at the fortunes of the Twelve. *Cf.* chap. x. 16-23.—Ver. 35. ὅπως ἔλθῃ: divine intention read in the light of result. God sent messengers that they might be killed, and that Israel by killing them might deserve to suffer in the final generation wrath to the uttermost. *Vide* on Mt. xxii. 10.—αἷμα, thrice named: "ter

γενεὰν ταύτην. 37. Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα [y] ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου, [z] ὃν [z] τρόπον ἐπισυνάγει [a] ὄρνις [1] τὰ [b] νοσσία ἑαυτῆς [2] ὑπὸ τὰς [c] πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε; 38. ἰδού, ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος [3]. 39. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, Οὐ μή με ἴδητε ἀπ' ἄρτι, ἕως ἂν εἴπητε, Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου."

y Ch. xxiv. 31. Mk. xiii. 27. Lk. xiii. 34; pass. Mk. i. 33. Lk. xii. 1; xvii. 37.
z same phrase in Lk. xiii. 34. Acts i. 11; vii. 28. 2 Tim. iii. 8.
a here and in Lk. xiii. 34. b here in N. T. (Ps. lxxxiv. 3). c Lk. xiii. 34. Rev. iv. 8; ix. 9; xii. 14.

[1] **ορνις** before **επισυναγει** in ℵBDL 1, 33, 69 *al.*

[2] **αυτης** in ℵDΔΣ 33 (Tisch.). B has neither **αυτης** nor **εαυτης** (W.H. have **αυτης**, but within brackets).

[3] BL omit **ερημος**, found in very many uncials (ℵCDΔΣ *al.*) and versions. The omission might be an assimilation to Lk. (xiii. 35), where the word is wanting in many of the best MSS., but it is more likely to be an explanatory gloss. *Vide* below.

hoc dicitur uno hoc versu magna vi," Bengel.—**ἀπὸ τ. ἁ.**, etc., from the blood of Abel, the first martyr, mentioned in the first book of the Hebrew Bible, to the blood of Zechariah, the prophet named in the last book (2 Chron. xxiv. 20-22).—**υἱοῦ Βαραχίου**, the designation of the last but one of the minor prophets, applied here to the other Zechariah, by inadvertence either of the evangelist or of an early copyist.—**ὃν ἐφονεύσατε**, whom ye (through your spiritual ancestors) slew; fact as stated in 2 Chron. xxiv. 21.—Ver. 36. **ἀμὴν**: solemn introduction of a statement terrible to think of: sins of countless generations accumulating for ages, and punished in a final representative generation; true, however terrible.

Vv. 37-39. *Apostrophe to the Holy City* (Lk. xiii. 34).—**Εἶτα πρὸς τὴν πόλιν ἀποστρέφει τὸν λόγον.** Chrys., H. lxxiv. —Ver. 37. **Ἱερουσαλήμ**, the Hebrew form of the name, exceptional in Mt., very appropriate to the solemn situation. Twice spoken; why? "It is the fashion of one pitying, bewailing, and greatly loving," Chrys. —**ἀποκτείνουσα, λιθοβολοῦσα**: present participles, denoting habit and repute, now and always behaving so—killing, stoning.—**πρὸς αὐτήν**, to *her*, not to *thee*, because the participles are in the nominative, while **Ἱερουσαλήμ** is vocative: "exemplum compellationis per vocativum ad quam deinceps non amplius spectatur" (Fritzsche). Grotius regards the transition from second to third person as an Orientalism.—**ποσάκις**, how often; on this word has been based the inference of frequent visits to Jerusalem not mentioned in the Synoptics. But the allusion *may be* to the whole history of Israel (so Orig., Hil., Jer.,) and to the whole people, as the children of the metropolis, the Speaker still continuing to speak in the name of God, as in ver. 34, and including Himself among God's agents.—**ὄρνις**, a bird or fowl; after Plato, a hen; so here, the emblem of anxious love. **θερμὸν τὸ ζῶον περὶ τὰ ἔκγονα**, Chrys. She gathers her chickens under her wings for protection against impending danger. This Jesus and all the prophets desired to do; a truth to be set over against the statement in vv. 34-35, which seems to suggest that God's aim was Israel's damnation.—**τὰ νοσσία** (Attic, **νεοσσία**: form disapproved by Phryn., p. 206), her brood of young birds. *Cf.* Ps. lxxxiv. 4, where, as here, a pathetic use is made of the emblem.—**οὐκ ἠθελήσατε**, ye would not, though I would (**ἠθέλησα**). Man's consent necessary.—Ver. 38. **ἰδοὺ**, etc., solemn, sorrowful abandonment of the city to its fate.—**ἀφίεται ὑμῖν**, spoken to the inhabitants of Israel.—**ὁ οἶκος ὑ.**, your house, *i.e.*, the city, not the temple; the people are conceived of as one family.—**ἔρημος**, wanting in BL, and omitted by W.H., is not necessary to the sense. The sentence is, indeed, more impressive without it: "Behold your house is abandoned to your care: those who would have saved you giving up further effort". What will happen left to be imagined; just what **ἔρημος** expresses—desolation.—Ver. 39. **ἀπ' ἄρτι**, from this moment, Christ's prophetic work

XXIV. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐξελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ[1] καὶ [a]προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτῷ τὰς οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ. 2. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[2] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οὐ βλέπετε πάντα ταῦτα[3]; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, ὃς οὐ μὴ[4] [a]καταλυθήσεται." 3. Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν, προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ κατ' ἰδίαν, λέγοντες, "Εἰπὲ ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται; καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς [b]παρουσίας, καὶ τῆς[5] [c]συντελείας

a parall. Ch. xxvi. 61. Acts vi. 14. 2 Cor. v. 1. Gal. ii. 18.
b again vv. 27, 37, 39, nowhere else in Gospp., frequent in Epistles.
c *vide* Ch. xiii. 39.

[1] **απο του ιερου επορευετο** in ℵBDLΔΣ (so modern editors).

[2] For **ο δε Ιησους** ℵBDL *al.* versions have **ο δε αποκριθεις** without **Ιησους**.

[3] **ταυτα παντα** in ℵBCLX *al.* D has the words in same order as T. R.

[4] **μη** is wanting ℵBCDLXΔΣ *al.*

[5] **της** omitted in ℵBCL 1, 33 *al.*

done now: it remains only to die.—**ἕως ἂν εἴπητε**: a future contingency on which it depends whether they shall ever see Him again (Weiss in Meyer). He will not trouble them any more till their mood change and they be ready to receive Him with a Messianic salutation.

The exquisite finish of this discourse, in the case of ordinary orators, would suggest premeditation and even writing. We have no means of knowing to what extent Jesus had considered beforehand what He was to say on this momentous occasion. The references to the whited sepulchres and the tombs of the prophets show that the speech was in part at least an *extempore* utterance.

CHAPTER XXIV. THE APOCALYPTIC DISCOURSE. This chapter and its synoptical parallels (Mk. xiii., Lk. xxi.) present, in many respects, the most difficult problem in the evangelic records. Many questions may be, have been, asked concerning this discourse on things to come. Which of the three versions comes nearest to what Jesus said? Did He say all that is here reported on this occasion, or have we in all the versions, more or less, a combination of words spoken at different times? Were the words here collected, all of them, or even the greater number of them, ever spoken by Jesus at any time; have the evangelists not worked up into the discourse a Jewish, or Jewish-Christian, apocalypse, or given us a composition of their own, consisting of certain logia of the Master, as the nucleus, with additions, modifications, and comments in the light of subsequent events? Finally, what is the didactic significance of the discourse, what did Jesus mean to teach His disciples respecting the themes treated: the Ruin of the Holy City, the Coming of the Son of Man, and the End of the Age, and the connection between these things? A history of opinion on these topics cannot here be given; a confident attempt at answering the questions propounded I am not prepared to make; perhaps a final satisfactory solution of the problem is not attainable. I offer only a few general considerations which may, at least, help readers to assume a right attitude towards the problem, and to bring to the study of the discourse a sympathetic spirit.

1. The time was suitable for some such utterance. The situation was this: Jesus expecting death in a few days; convinced that the moral and religious condition of the Jewish people is hopelessly bad, and that it must ere long end in disaster and ruin; surrounded by friends who are to be, after the decease of their Master, the missionaries of a new faith in a troublous time, when an old world is going down and a new world is coming into being. Here surely is an occasion to provoke the prophetic mood! At such supreme crises prophetic utterances, apocalyptic forecasts, are inevitable. Here they are, whomsoever we have to thank for them. From whom are they more likely to have proceeded than from Him who had such clear insight into the moral forces at work, and into the spiritual phenomenology of the time?

2. The aim of any prophetic discourse Jesus might deliver at this crisis, like that of all true prophecy, would be *ethical;* not to foretell, like a soothsayer, but to forewarn and forearm the representatives of a new faith, so that they might not lose their heads or their hearts in an evil perplexing time—not to gratify curiosity but to fortify against coming trial.

τοῦ αἰῶνος;" 4. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "[d] Βλέπετε, μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ. 5. πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, λέγοντες, Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός· καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσι.

d with μὴ and aor. sub. Mk. xiii. 5. Lk. xxi. 8. Acts xiii. 40. 1 Cor. viii. 9; x. 12. Gal. v. 15. Heb. xii. 25; with μὴ and fut. ind. Col. ii. 8. Heb. iii. 12.

3. Prophetic utterance with such an aim would not need to be exact in statements as to dates and details, but only to be true as to the sequence and general character of events. From all we know of Hebrew prophecy it was to be expected that the prophesying of Jesus would possess only this latter kind of truth, instead of being like a "history of events before they come to pass". The version of the evangelic apocalypse that least resembles the description of prophecy now quoted from Butler's *Analogy* (part ii., chap. vii.) will come nearest to the original utterance. This consideration tells in favour of Mt. and Mk.

4. All prophetic or apocalyptic utterances have much in common; phraseology and imagery tending to become stereotyped. The prophetic literature of the O. T. had indeed provided a vocabulary, which by the Christian era had become normative for all speech concerning the future. Hence Jewish, Jewish-Christian, and Pauline utterances of this kind would in many particulars resemble one another, and it might be difficult to decide by mere internal evidence from what circle any particular utterance emanated. But it is not probable that the evangelists would introduce into a professed report of a discourse by Jesus a current apocalypse of known Jewish origin unless they had reason to believe that Jesus had adopted it, or endorsed its forecast of the future (*vide* Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen über die Evang. Gesch.*, pp. 126, 551).

5. As we have seen reason to believe that in previous reports of our Lord's Discourses (*e.g.*, of the *Sermon on the Mount* and of the *Mission Discourse*, chap. x.) grouping of kindred material irrespective of historical occasion has taken place, so we cannot be surprised if traces of a similar procedure present themselves here. The remark applies especially to the latter part of the chapter, vv. 37-51, which contain logia given by Lk. in other connections (chaps. xii. and xvii.).

Vv. 1-3. *Introduction* (*cf.* Mk. xiii. 1-4; Lk. xxi. 5-7).—Ver. 1. **ἐξελθὼν**, going out from the temple, within whose precincts the foregoing anti-Pharisaic manifesto had been spoken. The position assigned to **ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ** before the verb, **ἐπορ.** in the best MSS., suggests connection with **ἐξελθὼν**. Some, however (Weiss, Schanz, etc.), insist that the words must be taken with **ἐπορ.** to give to the latter a definite sense. In reality they go along with both, the full meaning being: going out from the temple. He was going away from it, when, etc.—**ἐπορεύετο**: the imperfect, indicating an action in progress when something else happened. There is an emphasis on the idea of the verb. He was going away, like one who did not mean to return. Hence the action of the disciples next reported.—**ἐπιδεῖξαι**: they came to their Master, going before in a deeply preoccupied mood, and tried to change the gloomy current of His thoughts by inviting Him to look back at the sacred structure; innocent, woman-like but vain attempt.—**τὰς οἰκοδομὰς**: the whole group of buildings belonging to the holy house; magnificent, splendid, as described by Josephus (B. J., v., 5, 6), appearing to one approaching from a distance like a snow mountain (**ὄρει χιόνος πλήρει**) topped with golden pinnacles, which for forty years, in his Napoleonic passion for architecture, Herod the Great had been building to the glory of God and of himself.—Ver. 2. **ὁ δὲ ἀποκ.**, *but*, adversatively. He answered, in a mood entirely different from theirs.—**οὐ βλέπετε**; do you not see all these things? = you ask me to look at them, let me ask you in turn to take a good look at them.—**ταῦτα**: these *things*, not buildings, implying indifference to the splendours admired by the disciples.—**οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ**, etc.: not an exact description *ex eventu*, but a strong statement of coming destruction (by fire) in prophetically coloured language (Micah iii. 12; Jer. xxvi. 18). So Holtz., H.C.—Ver. 3. An interval of silence would naturally follow so stern a speech. This verse accordingly shows us Jesus with His disciples now on the other side of the Kidron, and sitting on the slope of Olivet, with face turned towards Jerusalem; Master and disciples sitting apart, and thinking their own thoughts. Satisfied that the Master means what He has said, and not daring to dispute His prophetic insight, they accept the

6. Μελλήσετε δὲ ἀκούειν πολέμους καὶ [e]ἀκοὰς πολέμων. ὁρᾶτε, μὴ [f]θροεῖσθε· δεῖ γὰρ πάντα[1] γενέσθαι. ἀλλ' οὔπω ἐστὶ τὸ τέλος. 7. Ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος, καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν· καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί,[2] καὶ σεισμοὶ [g]κατὰ [g]τόπους.

e vide Ch. iv. 24.
f Mk. xiii. 7. 2 Thess. ii. 2.
g same phrase in Mk. xiii. 8.

[1] παντα omitted in ℵDBL 1, 33, 209. The sentence is more impressive without.

[2] ℵBD *a b e ff*[2] omit και λοιμοι possibly by similar ending (Weiss). The words are in CΔΣ *al.* Mod. editions omit (Trg. in margin).

fate predicted for Jerusalem, and now desire to know the when and how.—**κατ' ἰδίαν** looks like a borrow from Mk., where it refers to four of the disciples coming apart from the rest. It goes without saying that none but the Twelve were there.—**τί τὸ σημεῖον τ. σ. π.**, etc. The questioners took for granted that all three things went together: destruction of temple, advent of Son of Man, end of the current age. Perhaps the association of the three helped them to accept the first as a fact. Weizsäcker (*Untersuchungen*, p. 549, note 1) suggests that the second and third questions are filled in by the evangelist to correspond with the answer. So also Weiss in Meyer. The *main* subject of interrogation is the predicted ruin: when will it happen, and how shall it be known when it is at hand, so as to be prepared for it? *Cf.* Mk. and Lk., where this alone is the subject of question.—**παρουσία** (literally *presence*, second presence) and **συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος** are the technical terms of the apostolic age, for the second advent of Christ and the close of the present order of things, and they occur in Mt., only so far as the Gospels are concerned. Do not the ideas also belong to that age, and are not the questions here put into the mouth of the Twelve too advanced for disciples?

Vv. 4-14. *Signs prelusive of the end.* (Mk. xiii. 5-13, Lk. xxi. 8-19).—Ver 4. **βλέπετε**: again (*vide* ver. 2), but here = see to it, take heed. *Cf.* Heb. iii. 12.—**πλανήσῃ**, lest any one *deceive* you; striking the practical ethical keynote of the whole discourse: its aim not to gratify curiosity, but to guard against deception and terror (**μὴ θροεῖσθε**, ver. 6)—heads cool, hearts brave, in a tragic epoch.—Ver. 5. **πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται**, etc., the *first* omen the advent of *pseudo-Messiahs.* This first mentioned, quite naturally. Ruin of Jerusalem and the nation will come through revolt against Rome, and the deepest cause of revolt will be the *Messianic hope* as popularly understood. Volcanic outbursts of Messianic fanaticism inevitable, all the more that they have rejected the true spiritual Christ. Josephus testifies that this was the chief incentive to war against Rome (B. J., vi. 54). The aim of the popular Messianic hope was independence, and all leaders of movements having that goal in view came in the name of "Christs," whether they formally assumed that name or not. It is doubtful if any did before the destruction of Jerusalem, but that does not falsify Christ's prediction, which is expressed in terms of an *idea* rather than in technical terms suggested by fact. It is not a *vaticinium ex eventu;* yet strictly true, if we understand by one coming in the name of Christ a leader of the fight for liberty (*vindicem libertatis*, Grotius).—**πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν.** The political Christs, leaders of the war against Rome, deceived the bulk of the people. Jesus wished His followers to hold entirely aloof from the movement. To warn them against sympathising with it was by no means superfluous (*vide* Lk. xxiv. 21, Acts i. 6).—Ver. 6. *Second sign: wars.*—**πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς π.**: vague phrase suitable to the prophetic style, not *ex eventu;* well rendered in A. V. "wars and rumours of wars" = wars near and remote (Bengel, Meyer), or better: "actual and threatened" (Speaker's *Com.*). The reference is not to wars anywhere in the world, but to those in the Holy Land, arising, as they were sure sooner or later to do, out of Messianic fanaticisms. Christ speaks not out of foreknowledge of the actual facts as reported by contemporary historians and collected by modern commentators (Grotius, etc.), but by prophetic logic: given Messianic hopes misdirected, hence wars, hence ruin.—**μελλήσετε**, future of a verb, whose very meaning points to the future: ye will be about to hear, by-and-by, not for a while; often delusive times of peace before tragic times of war. *Vide* Carlyle's *French Revolution*, book i.—**ὁρᾶτε, μὴ θροεῖσθε**, see, be not scared

b Mk. xiii. 8. Acts ii. 24. 1 Thess. v. 3.

8. πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ [b] ὠδίνων. 9. Τότε παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς θλίψιν, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. 10. καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοί, καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσι, καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους·

out of your wits (**θροέω**, originally = cry aloud; later use = to terrify, as if with a scream; here passive in neuter sense). This reference to coming wars of liberation was natural, and necessary if the aim was to fortify disciples against future events. Nevertheless at this point, in the opinion of many critics, begins the so-called "Jewish apocalypse," which Mk. and after him Mt. and Lk. have interwoven with the genuine utterance of Jesus. The latter embraces all about false Christs and apostolic tribulations (4-5, 9-14, 22-23), the former all about war, flight, and the coming of the Son of Man with awful accompaniments (7-8, 15-22, 29-31). *Vide* Wendt, L. J., i., p. 10 f., where the two series are given separately, from Mk., following in the main Weiffenbach. This critical analysis is ingenious but not convincing. Pseudo-Christs in the sense explained and wars of liberation went together in fact, and it was natural they should go together in prophetic thought. The political Messiahs divorced from the politics become mere ghosts, which nobody need fear.—**δεῖ γὰρ γ.** Their eventual coming is a divine necessity, let even that consideration act as a sedative; and for the rest remember that the beginning of the tragedy is not the end.—**ἀλλ' οὔπω τ. τ.**: the end being the thing inquired about—the destruction of the temple and all that went along with it.—Ver. 7. Further development of the war-portent, possibly here the prophetic range of vision widens beyond the bounds of Palestine, yet not necessarily. In support of limiting the reference to Palestine Kypke quotes from Josephus words describing the zealots as causing strife between people and people, city and city, and involving the nation in civil war (B. J., iv., 6).—**λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοί**, famines and pestilences, the usual accompaniments of war, every way likely to be named together as in T. R.—**καὶ σεισμοί**, and earthquakes, representing all sorts of unusual physical phenomena having no necessary connection with the political, but appealing to the imagination at such times, so heightening the gloom. Several such specified in commentaries (*vide*, *e.g.*, Speaker's *C.*, and Alford, from whom the particulars are quoted), but no stress should be laid on them.—**κατὰ τόπους**: most take this as meaning not earthquakes *passing from place to place* (Meyer) but here and there, *passim*. *Vide* Elsner and Raphel, who cite classic examples. Grotius enumerates the places where they occurred.—Ver. 8. **πάντα δὲ**: yet all these but a beginning of pains. It is not necessary to find here an allusion to the Rabbinical idea of the birth pangs of Messiah, but simply the use of a natural and frequent Biblical emblem for distress of any sort. As to the date of the Rabbinical idea *vide* Keil. The *beginning*: such an accumulation of horrors might well appear to the inexperienced the end, hence the remark to prevent panic.

Vv. 9-14. *Third sign*, drawn from apostolic experiences. This passage Weiss regards as an interpolation into the prophetic discourse by Matthew following Mark. It certainly resembles Mt. x. 17-22 (much less, however, than the corresponding passage in Mk.), and individual phrases may be interpolations: but something of the kind was to be expected here. The disciples were not to be mere spectators of the tragedy of the Jewish nation destroying itself. They were to be active the while, preaching the gospel of the kingdom, propagating the new faith, bringing in a new world. Jesus would have them go on with their work undistracted by false enthusiasms, or warlike terrors, and to this end assures them that they will have both to do and to suffer a great deal before the final crisis of Jerusalem comes. The ground of this prophetic forecast as to their experience is faith that God will not allow the work He (Jesus) has inaugurated to perish. The gospel will be preached widely, with whatever tribulations to the preachers.—Ver. 9. **θλίψιν**, from **θλίβω**, originally pressure (**στένωσις**, Hesychius), in N. T. tropical, pressure from the evils of life, affliction. Again in ver. 29, in reference to the Jewish people. The apostles also are to have their *thlipsis*.—**ἀποκτενοῦσιν ὑμᾶς**, they will kill you. Lk. xxi. 16 has "some of you" (**ἐξ ὑμῶν**). Some qualification of the blunt statement is needed; such as: they will be in the mood to kill you (*cf.*

11. καὶ πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐγερθήσονται, καὶ πλανήσουσι πολλούς· 12. καὶ διὰ τὸ [i] πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν [j] ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν· 13. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται. 14. καὶ κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι. καὶ τότε ἥξει [k] τὸ τέλος. 15. Ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε τὸ [l] βδέλυγμα τῆς [m] ἐρημώσεως, τὸ ῥηθὲν

i here and in Acts vi. 7; vii. 17; ix. 31; xii. 24.
j here only in N. T.
k Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 24 (τὸ τέλος absolutely).
l Mk. xiii. 14. Lk. xvi. 15. Rev. xvii. 4, 5; xxi. 27.
m Mk. xiii. 14. Lk. xxi. 20.

John xvi. 2).—**τῶν ἐθνῶν**, not in Mark, universalising the statement = hated by all the nations, not Jews only.—Ver. 10. **σκανδαλισθήσονται**: natural sequel of apostolic tribulation, many weak Christians made to stumble (*vide* xiii. 21); this followed in turn by mutual treachery and hatred (**καὶ ἀλλήλους**, etc.).—Ver. 11. **ψευδοπροφῆται**, false prophets. The connection requires that these should be within the Christian community (otherwise in ver. 24), giving false presentations of the faith with corrupt motives. A common feature in connection with new religious movements (*vide* on vii. 15).—Ver. 12. **ἀνομίαν**. Weiss and Holtzmann (H. C.) take this in the specific sense of antinomianism, a libertine type of Christianity preached by the false prophets or apostles, the word in that sense of course to be credited to the evangelist. The word as used by Christ would naturally bear the general sense of godlessness or iniquity. We may wonder at the use of such a word in connection with nascent Christianity. It would require a considerable time to make room for such degeneracy. But the very point Jesus wishes to impress is that there will be room for that before the final crisis of Israel comes.—**ψυγήσεται**, etc., will cool the love of many. **ψ.** is an apax leg. 2nd future passive of **ψύχω**, to breathe. One of the sad features of a degenerate time is that even the good loose their fervour.—**ἀγάπη**, love of the brotherhood, here only in this sense in Synoptical Gospels, the distinctive virtue of the Christian, with a new name for a new thing.—Ver. 13. **ὁ ὑπομείνας**, he that endureth; the verb used absolutely without object. The noun **ὑπομονή** is another of the great words of the N. T., Love and Patience, primary virtues of the Christian: doing good, bearing ill. The endurance called for is not merely in love (Fritzsche), but in the faith and life of a Christian in face of all the evils enumerated.—**εἰς τέλος**, to the end, *i.e.*, of the **θλίψις**, as long as there are trials to endure.—**σωθήσεται**, shall be saved in the sense of xvi. 25. The implied truth underlying this test is that there will be ample time for a full curriculum of trial testing character and sifting the true from the false or temporary Christian.—Ver. 14 asserts the same thing with regard to the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom: time for preaching it in the whole world, to all nations, before the end. Assuming that the terminus is the same this statement seems inconsistent with that in x. 23. But the aim is different in the two cases. On the earlier occasion Jesus wished to ensure that all Israel should hear the gospel before the end came; therefore He emphasised the shortness of the time. Here He wishes to impress on the disciples that the end will not be for a good while, therefore He emphasises the amount of preaching that can be done. Just on this account we must not strain the phrases **ἐν ὅλῃ τ. οἰκ., πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθ.** They simply mean: extensively even in the heathen world. But they have the merit of setting before the disciples a large programme to occupy their minds and keep them from thinking too much of the coming catastrophe.

Vv. 15-22. *The end at last* (Mk. xiii. 14-20, Lk. xxi. 20-24).—**ὅταν οὖν**, when *therefore*, referring partly to the preceding mention of the end, partly to the effect of the whole preceding statement: "This I have said to prevent premature alarm, not, however, as if the end will never come; it will, when therefore, etc."; the sequel pointing out the sign of the end now near, and what to do when it appears.—**τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως**: this the awful portent; what? The phrase is taken from Daniel as expressly stated in following clause (**τὸ ῥηθὲν**, etc.), *vide* Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11. There and in 1 Macc. i. 54 it seems to refer to some outrage on Jewish religious feeling in connection with the temple (**ᾠκοδόμησαν β. ἐρ. ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον** are the words in 1 Macc. i. 54, similarly in vi. 7). In a Jewish apoca-

n Acts vi. 13 (of the temple); cf. John xi. 48 (τόπος, of the land). διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου, ἑστὸς ἐν [n] τόπῳ ἁγίῳ· (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω·) 16. τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν ἐπὶ[1] τὰ ὄρη· 17. ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβαινέτω[2] ἆραί τι[3] ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ· 18. καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω ὀπίσω ἆραι τὰ ἱμάτια[4] αὐτοῦ. 19. οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. 20. προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ

[1] εις in BDΔΣ *al.* The parall. have εις, and just on that account επι (ℵLZ) may be the true reading.

[2] καταβατω in ℵBDLZΣ *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] τα in BLZΔΣ *al.* τι in D.

[4] το ιματιον in ℵBDLZΣ *al.* The plural is pointless.

lypse, which this passage is by some supposed to form a part of, it might be expected to bear a similar meaning, a technical sense for a stereotyped expression. Not so on the lips of Jesus, who was not the slave of phrases but their master, using them freely. Then as employed by Him it must point to some broad, easily recognisable fact, which His followers could at once see and regard as a signal for flight; a fact not merely shocking religious feeling but threatening life, which He would have no disciple sacrifice in a cause with which they could have no sympathy. Then finally, true to the prophetic as distinct from the apocalyptic style, it must point to something revealing prophetic insight rather than a miraculous foresight of some very special circumstance connected with the end. This consideration shuts out the statue of Titus or Caligula or Hadrian (Jerome), the erection of a heathen altar, the atrocities perpetrated in the temple by the Zealots, etc. Luke gives the clue (ver. 20). The horror is the *Roman army*, and the thing to be dreaded and fled from is not any religious outrage it may perpetrate, but the *desolation* it will inevitably bring. That is the emphatic word in the prophetic phrase.—**ἐρημώσεως** is genitive of apposition = the horror which consists in desolation of the land. The appearance of the Romans in Palestine would at once become known to all. And it would be the signal for flight, for it would mean the end near, inevitable and terrible.—**ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ**, one naturally thinks of the temple or the holy city and its environs, but a "holy place" in the prophetic style might mean the holy *land*. And Jesus can hardly have meant that disciples were to wait till the fatal hour had come.—**ὁ ἀναγινώσκων**, etc.: this is most likely an interpolated remark of the evangelist bidding his readers note the correspondence between Christ's warning word and the fact. In Christ's own mouth it would imply too much stress laid on Daniel's words as a guide, which indeed they are not. In Mark there is no reference to Daniel, therefore the reference there must be to the gospel (on this verse consult Weiss-Meyer).

Ver. 16. **οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰ.**, those in Judaea who have no part in the struggle, with special reference to disciples of Jesus. There would naturally be some in the city, therefore the counsel to fly must refer to a point of time antecedent to the commencement of the siege.—**ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη**, to the mountains outside of Judaea, *i.e.*, east of the Jordan; general as befits prophetic speech. The actual place of refuge was Pella, as we learn from Eusebius, H. E., iii., 5, 3.—Vv. 17, 18 vividly express the urgency of the flight.—**ὁ ἐπὶ τ. δ.**, etc., the man on the house top must fly without stopping to get articles of value in the house down the outside stair and off.—**τὰ ἐκ τ. οἰκ.**, elliptical = the things in his house, from his house.—**ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ**, let the man in the field, on hearing the fatal report, fly in his tunic, not returning home for his upper robe. "No man works in his mantle, the peasant leaves it at home, now as in Christ's time" (Furrer, *Wanderungen*, p. 117).—Vv. 19, 20 describe the pathos of the situation: woe to women with child, they cannot get rid of their burden; and to women nursing, they cannot abandon their children as men can their money or their clothes (**διὰ τὸν δεσμὸν τῆς φύσεως**, Euthy. *Cf.* Chrys. and Theophy.). A touch this worthy of Jesus, sign mark of genuineness.—Ver. 20. **προσεύχεσθε**,

φυγὴ ὑμῶν [o] χειμῶνος, μηδὲ ἐν[1] σαββάτῳ. 21. Ἔσται γὰρ τότε θλίψις μεγάλη, οἵα οὐ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἕως τοῦ νῦν, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται. 22. καὶ εἰ μὴ [p] ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· διὰ δὲ τοὺς [q] ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι. 23. Τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ, Ἰδού, ὧδε ὁ Χριστός, ἢ ὧδε, μὴ πιστεύσητε. 24. Ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, καὶ [r] δώσουσι [r] σημεῖα μεγάλα καὶ [s] τέρατα, ὥστε πλανῆσαι,[2] εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς. 25. ἰδού, προείρηκα

o *vide* Ch. xvi. 3.
p here and in Mk. xiii. 20 in N.T., *vide* below.
q vv. 24, 31. Mk. xiii. 20, 22. Lk. xviii. 7 (all apparently with a special sense).
r Acts ii. 19 (Deut. xiii. 1).
s always plural and coupled with *σημεῖα* (John iv. 48. Acts ii. 19, 43, etc.).

[1] ℵBΔΣ *al.* omit εν.

[2] πλανησαι is the reading of BXΔΣ *al.*, and probably the true one. ℵD have πλανηθηναι (Tisch.). LZ have πλανασθαι (W.H. with πλανησαι in margin).

etc. (ἵνα μὴ with subjunctive instead of infinitive as often in N. T. after verbs of exhorting, etc.), pray that your flight be not in winter (χειμῶνος, genitive of time) or on the *Sabbath* (σαββάτῳ, dative of time). The Sabbatarianism of this sentence is a sure sign that it was not uttered by Jesus, but emanated from a Jewish source, say many, *e.g.*, Weizsäcker (*Untersuchungen*, p. 124), Weiffenbach (*Wiederkunftsgedanke*, i., p. 103) approving. But Jesus could feel even for Sabbatarians, if they were honest, as for those who, like John's disciples, *fasted*.—Vv. 21, 22. *The extremity of the distress*.—Ver. 21 represents it as unparalleled before or after, in terms recalling those of Daniel xii. 1; ver. 22 as intolerable but for the shortness of the agony.—ἐκολοβώθησαν (from κολοβός, κόλος, mutilated) literally to cut off, *e.g.*, hands or feet, as in 2 Sam. iv. 12; here figuratively to cut short the time: *nisi breviati fuissent* (Vulgate). The aorist here, as in next clause (ἐσώθη), is used proleptically, as if the future were past, in accordance with the genius of prophecy.—οὐκ ἂν, etc.: the οὐκ must be joined to the verb, and the meaning is: all flesh would be *not saved;* joined to πᾶσα the sense would be not all flesh, *i.e.*, only some, would be saved.—ἐσώθη refers to escape from physical death; in ver. 13 the reference is to salvation in a higher sense. This is one of the reasons why this part of the discourse is regarded as not genuine. But surely Jesus cared for the safety both of body and soul (*vide* x. 22, 30). The epistle of Barnabas (iv.) contains a passage about shortening of the days, ascribed to Enoch. Weizsäcker (*Untersuchungen*, p. 125) presses this into the service of the Jewish apocalypse hypothesis.—διὰ δὲ τ. ἐκλεκτοὺς: the use of this term is not foreign to the vocabulary of Jesus (*vide* xxii. 14), yet it sounds strange to our ears as a designation for Christians. It occurs often in the Book of Enoch, especially in the Similitudes. The Book begins: "The words of the blessing of Enoch, wherewith he blessed the elect and righteous who will be living in the day of tribulation when all the wicked and godless are removed" (*vide* Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 58). The idea attaching to the word here seems to be: those selected for deliverance in a time of general destruction = the preserved. And the thought expressed in the clause is that the preserved are to be preservers. Out of regard to their intercessions away amid the mountains, the days of horror will be shortened. A thought worthy of Jesus.

Vv. 23-28. *False Christs again* (Mk. xiii. 21-23, Lk. xvii. 23, 24, 37).—Ver. 24. ψευδόχριστοι, in the same sense as in ver. 5; there referred to as the cause of all the trouble, here as promising deliverance from the trouble they, or their like, have created. What would one not give for a Deliverer, a Messiah at such a dire crisis! The demand would create the supply, men offering themselves as Saviours from Rome's power, with prophets (ψευδοπροφῆται) preaching smooth things, and assuring a despairing people of deliverance at the last hour.—μὴ πιστεύσητε, says Jesus (ver. 23), do not believe them: no salvation possible; listen not, but flee.—καὶ δώσουσιν, etc., and will give great signs and wonders. The words recall Deut. xiii. 1. Desperate situations require a full use of all possible powers of persua-

ὑμῖν. 26. ἐὰν οὖν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν, Ἰδού, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστί, μὴ ἐξέλθητε· Ἰδού, ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, μὴ πιστεύσητε. 27. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ [t] ἀστραπὴ ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ[1] ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 28. ὅπου γὰρ[2] ἐὰν ᾖ τὸ πτῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ [u] ἀετοί. 29. Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων, ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ

t Ch. xxviii. 3. Lk. x. 18; xi. 36 (of the gleam of a lamp); xvii. 24; several times in Rev. (pl.).
u Lk. xvii. 37. Rev. iv. 7; viii. 13 (W.H.); xii. 14.

[1] Most uncials (ℵBD, etc.) omit και.

[2] ℵBDL omit γαρ.

sion: signs and wonders, or the pretence of them: easily accepted as such by a fanaticised multitude, and sometimes so clever and plausible as to tempt the wise to credence.—**ὥστε**, with infinitive to express tendency; often inclusive of result, but not here.—**εἰ δυνατὸν**, if possible, the implication being that it is not. If it were the consequence would be fatal. The "elect" (**τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς**)—selected by Providence for safety in the evil day—would be involved in the general calamity. Christians, at Israel's great crisis, were to be saved by *unbelief* in pseudo-messiahs and pseudo-prophets. —Ver. 25. **ἰδοὺ π. ὑ.**, emphatic *nota bene*, showing that there will be real danger of misplaced fatal confidences. Hence further expatiation on the topic in vv. 26-28 in graphic, pithy, laconic speech. —Ver. 26. **ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ**, a likely place for a Christ to be (Moses, Israel's first deliverer).—**μὴ ἐξέλθητε**, go not out (*cf.* xi. 7, 8, 9).—**ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις** (*vide* vi. 6), in the secret chambers, the plural indicating the kind of place, not any particular place. Both expressions—in the desert, in the secret recesses—point to non-visibility. The false prophets bid the people put their faith in a Messiah not in evidence, the *Great Unseen* = "The hour is come, and the man is somewhere, out of view, not far away, take my word for it". Interpreters who seek for exact historical fulfilments point to Simon son of Gioras, and John of Giscala: the former the Messiah in the desert of Tekoah, gathering a confiding multitude about him; the latter the Messiah in the secret places, taking possession of the interior part of the temple with its belongings in the final struggle (*vide* Josephus, B. J., iv., 9, 5 and 7; v. 6, 1, and Lutteroth, *ad loc.*).—Ver. 27. **ὥσπερ γὰρ**, etc.: the coming of the true Messiah, identified with the Son of Man, compared to the lightning, to suggest a contrast between Him and the false Christs as to *visibility*, and enforce the counsel to pay no heed to those who say: He is here, or He is there.—Ver. 28. **πτῶμα**, carcase, as in xiv. 12, *q.v.*—**ἀετοί**, eagles, doubtless the carrion vultures are meant. The reference of this proverbial saying, as old as the book of Job (xxxix. 30), in this place is not clear. In the best text it comes in without connecting particle, the **γὰρ** of T. R. being wanting. If we connect it with ver. 27 the idea will be that Messiah's judicial function will be as universal as His appearance (Meyer and Weiss). But does not ver. 28 as well as ver. 27 refer to what is said about the false Christs, and mean: heed not these pretended Saviours; Israel cannot be saved: she is dead and must become the prey of the vultures? (So Lutteroth.) In this view the Jewish people are the carcase and the Roman army the eagles.

Vv. 29-31. *The coming of the Son of Man* (Mk. xiii. 24-27, Lk. xxi. 25-28).—Thus far the eschatological discourse has been found to bear on the predicted tragic end of Jerusalem. At this point the **παρουσία**, which, according to the evangelist, was one of the subjects on which the disciples desired information, becomes the theme of discourse. What is said thereon is so perplexing as to tempt a modern expositor to wish it had not been there, or to have recourse to critical expedients to eliminate it from the text. But nothing would be gained by that unless we got rid, at the same time, of other sayings of kindred character ascribed to Jesus in the Gospels. And there seems to be no reason to doubt that some such utterance would form a part of the eschatological discourse, even if the disciples did not ask instruction on the subject. The revelation as to the last days of Israel naturally led up to it, and the best clue to the meaning of the *Parusia-logion* may be to regard it as a pendant to that revelation.

Ver. 29. **εὐθέως**. Each evangelist expresses himself here in his own way,

ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ ᵛφέγγος αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ[1] τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. 30. καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῷ[2] οὐρανῷ· καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς. 31. καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ ʷσάλπιγγος φωνῆς[3] μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσι τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ἀπ' ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως[4] ἄκρων αὐτῶν.

v Mk. xiii. 24. Lk. xi. 33 (T. R.).

w 1 Cor. xv. 52. 1 Thess. iv. 16. Heb. xii. 19, etc.

[1] ℵD have εκ (Tisch.). απο in BLXΔΣ (W.H.). [2] ℵBL omit τω.

[3] ℵLΔ omit φωνης (Tisch., W.H. relegate to the margin). BD (και φωνης) XΣ *al* have it and it is doubtless genuine.

[4] B 1, 13, 69 add των after εως (W.H. insert, but bracketed).

Lk. most obviously adapting his words to suit the fact of a *delayed parusia*. Mt.'s word naturally means: immediately, following close on the events going before, the *thlipsis* of Jerusalem. One of the ways by which those to whom εὐθέως is a stumbling block strive to evade the difficulty is to look on it as an inaccurate translation by the Greek Matthew of פִּתְאֹם, supposed to be in Hebrew original. So Schott, *Comm. Ex. Dog.*—ὁ ἥλιος . . . σαλευθήσονται: a description in stock prophetic phrases (Is. xiii. 9, xxxix. 4, Joel iii. 15, etc.) of what *seems* to be a general collapse of the physical universe. Is that really what is meant? I doubt it. It seems to me that in true prophetic Oriental style the colossal imagery of the physical universe is used to describe the political and social consequences of the great Jewish catastrophe: national ruin, breaking up of religious institutions and social order. The physical stands for the social, the shaking of heaven for the shaking of earth (Haggai ii. 6); or in the prophetic imagination the two are indissolubly blended: stars, thrones, city walls, temples, effete religions tumbling down into one vast mass of ruin. If this be the meaning εὐθέως is to be strictly taken.—φέγγος, applicable to both sun and moon, but oftener applied to the moon or stars; φῶς oftenest to the sun, but also to the moon. *Vide* Trench, *Syn.*, p. 163.—Ver. 30. καὶ τότε. Amid the general crash what longing would arise in Christian hearts for the presence of the Christ! To this longing the announcement introduced by these words "and *then*" responds.—τὸ σημεῖον τ. υἱ. τ. ἀ. The question what is this sign has greatly perplexed commentators, who make becoming confessions of ignorance. "We must not be positive in conjecturing," Morrison. "What this shall be it is vain to conjecture," Cambridge N. T. Is the reference not to Daniel vii. 13, "one *like* the Son of Man," and the meaning: the sign which *is* the Son of Man, τ. υ. τ. ἀ. being genitive of appos.? So Weiss after Storr and Wolf.—("σημεῖον υἱοῦ, similis est illis quibus profani passim utuntur quando dicunt βία Ἡρακλέος," *i.e.*, "vis Herculis seu ipse Hercules," Wolf, *Curae Phil.*) Christ His own sign, like the lightning or the sun, *self-evidencing*.—καὶ τότε κόψονται, etc.: a clause not in Mk. and obscure in meaning; why mourn? because they recognise in the Coming One their Judge? or because they see in Him one who had been despised and rejected of men, and penitently (taking the sin home to themselves) acknowledge His claims? ("believed on in the world," 1 Tim. iii. 16).—ἐρχόμενον . . . πολλῆς, description of the coming, here as in xvi. 27, xxvi. 64, in terms drawn from Daniel vii. 13.—Ver. 31. μετὰ σάλπιγγος φ. μ., with a trumpet of mighty sound, another stock phrase of prophetic imagery (Is. xxvii. 13).—καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσι τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς α., and they (the angels or messengers) shall collect *the elect* (as in vv. 22, 24), showing that the advent is described in terms suited to the situation previously depicted. The Christ comes for the comfort of those preserved from the general ruin.—ἐκ τῶν τ. ἀνέμων: not merely from the mountains east of the Jordan, but from every quarter of the

32. "Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ἤδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς γένηται [x] ἁπαλός, καὶ τὰ φύλλα ἐκφύῃ, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ [y] θέρος· 33. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδητε πάντα ταῦτα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις. 34. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,[1] οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, ἕως ἂν πάντα ταῦτα γένηται. 35. Ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται,[2] οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι. 36. Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς[3] ὥρας οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν,[4] εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μου[5] μόνος. 37. Ὥσπερ δὲ[6] αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ Νῶε, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ[7] ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ

x here and in Mk. xiii. 28.
y here and in Mk. xiii. 28. Lk. xxi. 30 (Gen. viii. 22. Prov. vi. 8).

[1] BDL add οτι after υμιν (W.H.).

[2] BDL read παρελευσεται. The plural (T. R.) is a grammatical correction.

[3] ℵBDΔ *al.* omit της before ωρας.

[4] After ουρανων ℵBD, old Latin vers., and some cursives add ουδε ο υιος, which is adopted by most modern editors.

[5] ℵBDLΔΣ omit μου. [6] γαρ in BD. [7] ℵBL omit και.

earth where faithful souls are found; echo of Is. xxvii. 13 again audible here.—ἀπ' ἄκρων, etc., echo of phrases in Deut. xxx. 4, Ps. xix. 7. This *Parusia-logion* is not to be regarded as a didactic statement, but simply as a λόγος παρακλήσεως for the comfort of anxious spirits. With that aim it naturally places the *Parusia* within the reach of those it is designed to comfort. After the ruin of Israel there is no history; only the wind-up. Jerusalem destroyed, the curtain falls. Christ's didactic words suggest another aspect, a delayed *Parusia*, *vide* on xvi. 28. From the foregoing exposition it appears that the coming of the Son of Man is not to be identified with the judgment of Jerusalem, but rather forms its preternatural background.

Vv. 32-36. *Parabolic close* (Mk. xiii. 28-32, Lk. xxi. 29-33).—Ver. 32. ἀπὸ τῆς συκῆς, etc., from the fig tree learn its parable, rapid condensed speech befitting the tense state of mind; learn from that kind of tree (article generic) the lesson it can teach with regard to the moral order: Tender branch, young leaf = summer nigh. Schott, *Comm. Ex. Dog.*, p. 125, renders ἀπὸ τ. σ. *ope ficus* = ficum contemplando. On the form εκφυη *vide* notes on Mk.—Ver. 33. οὕτως κ. ὑ, so do ye also when ye see all these things, recognise that it is nigh, at the doors. What are "these things"? what "it"? The former are the things mentioned in vv. 15-21 (ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε, ver. 15), the latter is the παρουσία.—Ver. 34. Solemn assurance that the predicted will come to pass.—πάντα ταῦτα is most naturally taken to mean the same things as in ver. 33, the main subject of the discourse, the impending destruction of the Jewish state. Jesus was quite certain that they would happen within the then living generation (ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη), not merely through miraculous foresight but through clear insight into the moral forces at work.—Ver. 35. Declaration similar to that in chap. v. 18 concerning the validity of the law.—Ver. 36. περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς ὥρας, of that day and hour. The reference is to the coming of the Son of Man, the expression throughout the N. T. having the value of an "indisputable fixed *terminus technicus*," Weiffenbach, *Wiederkunftsgedanke*, p. 157.—οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, no one knows, a statement made more emphatic by application to the angels of heaven, and even to the Son (οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός). The meaning is not that Jesus disclaims even for Himself knowledge of the precise day, month, or year of what in ver. 34 He has declared will happen within the present generation; whether, *e.g.*, the crisis of the war would be in 69 or 70 A.D. That is too trivial a matter to be the subject of so solemn a declaration. It is an intimation that all statements as to the time of the παρουσία must be taken in a qualified sense as referring to a subject on which certain knowledge is not attainable or even desirable. It looks like Jesus correcting Himself, or using two ways of speaking, one for comfort (it will be soon), and one for caution (it

ἀνθρώπου. 38. ὥσπερ[1] γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταῖς πρὸ τοῦ ᵃκατακλυσμοῦ, ᵃτρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες, γαμοῦντες καὶ ἐκγαμίζοντες,[2] ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθε Νῶε εἰς τὴν ᵇκιβωτόν, 39. καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, ἕως ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἦρεν ἅπαντας, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ[3] ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

40. "Τότε δύο ἔσονται[4] ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ· ὁ[5] εἷς παραλαμβάνεται, καὶ ὁ[5] εἷς ἀφίεται. 41. δύο ᶜἀλήθουσαι ἐν τῷ μύλωνι[6]· μία παραλαμβάνεται, καὶ μία ἀφίεται.

42. "Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε ποίᾳ ὥρᾳ[7] ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται· 43. ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε, ὅτι εἰ ᾔδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποίᾳ φυλακῇ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἄν, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ᵈεἴασε

z Lk. xvii. 27. 2 Pet. iii. 6.
a here and in John, vide reff. below and remarks.
b Lk. xvii. 27. Heb. ix. 4; xi. 7. 1 Pet. iii. 20. Rev. xi. 19.
c Lk. xvii. 35.
d Lk. iv. 41. Acts xiv. 16 al. 1 Cor. x. 13 (with acc. of person and inf.).

[1] ως in ℵBL. [2] ℵD have the simple γαμιζοντες (Tisch., W.H.).
[3] BD omit και. [4] εσονται δυο in ℵB. [5] ο in both places omitted in ℵBDL.
[6] μυλω in ℵBLΔΣ. D has μυλωνι. [7] ημερα in ℵBDΔΣ, cursives.

may not be so soon as even I think or you expect). His whole manner of speaking concerning the second advent seems to have two faces; providing on the one hand for the possibility of a Christian era, and on the other for an accelerated *Parusia*.

Vv. 37-42. *Watch therefore* (*cf.* Lk. xvii. 26-30, 34-36).—Ver. 37. **αἱ ἡμέραι τ. Νῶε**, the history of Noah used to illustrate the uncertainty of the *Parusia*.—Ver. 38. **ἦσαν** with the following participles is not an instance of the periphrastic imperfect. It rather stands by itself, and the particles are descriptive predicates. Some charge these with sinister meaning: **τρώγοντες**, hinting at gluttony because often used of beasts, though also, in the sense of eating, of men (John vi. 58, xiii. 18). So Beza and Grotius; **γαμοῦντες καὶ γαμίζοντες**, euphemistically pointing at sexual licences on both sides (Wolf, "omnia vagis libidinibus miscebantur"). The idea rather seems to be that all things went on as usual, as if nothing were going to happen. In the N. T., and especially in the fourth Gospel, **τρώγω** seems to be used simply as a synonym for **ἐσθίω**. In like manner all distinction between **ἐσθίειν** and **χορτάζεσθαι** (= to feed cattle in classics) has disappeared. *Vide* Mk. vii. 27, 28, and consult Kennedy, *Sources of New Testament Greek*, p. 82.—Ver. 39. **οὐκ ἔγνωσαν**, they did not know, scil., that the flood was coming till it was on them.—Ver. 40, 41 graphically illustrate the suddenness of the *Parusia*.—**εἷς εἷς** (ver. 40) instead of **εἷς ἕτερος**, so **μία μία** in ver. 41. Of these idioms Herrmann in *Viger* (p. 6) remarks: "Sapiunt Ebraismum".—**παραλαμβάνεται, ἀφίεται**, one is taken, one left. The reference may either be to the action of the angels, ver. 31 (Meyer), or to the judicial action of the Son of Man seizing some, leaving free others (Weiss-Meyer). The sentences are probably proverbial (Schott), and the terms may admit of diverse application. However applied, they point to opposite destinies.—**ἀλήθουσαι**, grinding: **ἀλήθω**, late for **ἀλέω**, condemned by Phryn., p. 151.—**ἐν τῷ μύλωνι** (T. R.), in the mill *house*.—**ἐ. τ. μύλῳ** (W.H.), in or with the millstone. The reference is to a handmill, which required two to work it when grinding was carried on for a considerable time—women's work (*vide* Robinson, i., 485; Furrer, *Wand.*, p. 97; Benzinger, p. 85, where a figure is given).—Ver. 42. **γρηγορεῖτε**, watch, a frequently recurring exhortation, implying not merely an uncertain but a delayed *Parusia*, tempting to be off guard, and so making such repeated exhortations necessary.—**ποίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ**, on what sort of a day, early or late; so again in ver. 43, at what sort of a watch, seasonable or unseasonable.

Vv. 43-51. *Two parables: the Thief* and *the Two Servants*, enforcing the lesson: Watch!—Ver. 43. **γινώσκετε**, observe, *nota bene*.—**εἰ ᾔδει**: supposition contrary to fact, therefore verbs in prot. and apod. indicative.—**ὁ κλέπτης**, admirably selected character. It is the thief's business to keep people in the dark as to the time of his coming, or as to his coming at all.—**οἰκοδεσπότης** suggests the idea of a great man, but in reality it

διορυγῆναι[1] τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ. 44. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι· ὅτι ᾗ ὥρᾳ οὐ δοκεῖτε,[2] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται. 45. Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος, ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ[3] ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας[4] αὐτοῦ, τοῦ διδόναι[5] αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφὴν [e]ἐν [e]καιρῷ; 46. μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει ποιοῦντα οὕτως.[6] 47. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτόν. 48. Ἐὰν δὲ εἴπῃ ὁ κακὸς δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, Χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου[7] ἐλθεῖν,[8] 49. καὶ ἄρξηται τύπτειν τοὺς συνδούλους,[9] ἐσθίειν δὲ καὶ πίνειν[10] μετὰ τῶν μεθυόντων, 50. ἥξει ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ οὐ προσδοκᾷ, καὶ ἐν ὥρᾳ ᾗ οὐ γινώσκει, 51. καὶ [g]διχοτομήσει αὐτόν, καὶ τὸ [h]μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν [h]θήσει· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

e Lk. xii. 42. 1 Pet. v. 6.
f Ch. xxv. 5. Lk. i. 21 (to tarry, with ἐν); xii. 45. Heb. x. 37.
g here and in Lk. xii. 46.
h same phrase in Lk. xii. 46.

[1] διορυχθηναι ℵDIL; as in T. R. in BΔΣ.
[2] η ου δοκειτε ωρα in ℵBDI.
[3] ℵBDIL 1, 33 *al.* omit αυτου.
[4] οικετειας in BILΔΣ (W.H.). θεραπειας in D *al.*
[5] δουναι in ℵBCDLΔΣ. διδοναι is from Lk.
[6] ουτως ποιουντα in ℵBCDL.
[7] μου before ο κυριος in ℵBCDL *al.*
[8] ℵB 33 omit ελθειν.
[9] ℵBCDL add αυτου.
[10] εσθιη δε και πινη in ℵBCDL.

is a poor peasant who is in view. He lives in a clay house, which can be dug through (sun-dried bricks), *vide* διορυχθῆναι in last clause. Yet he is the master in his humble dwelling (*cf.* on vi. 19).—Ver. 45. τίς, who, taken by Grotius, Kuinoel, Schott, etc. = εἴ τις, *si quis*, supposing a case. But, as Fritzsche points out, the article before π. δοῦλος is inconsistent with this sense.—πιστὸς, φρόνιμος: two indispensable qualities in an upper servant, trusty and judicious.—θεραπείας (T. R.), service = body of servants, οἰκετείας (B., W.H.), household = domestics.—Ver. 46 answers the question by felicitation.—μακάριος, implying that the virtue described is rare (*vide* on chap. v. 3): a rare servant, who is not demoralised by delay, but keeps steadfastly doing his duty.—ἐπὶ π. τ. ὑπάρχουσι, this one among a thousand is fit to be put in charge of the whole of his master's estate.—Ver. 48. The other side of the picture—ἐὰν δὲ . . . ἐκεῖνος: not the same individual, but a man placed in the same *post* ("cui eadem provincia sit demandata," Schott).—χρονίζει (again in xxv. 8): the servant begins to reflect on the fact that his lord is late in coming, and is demoralised.—ἄρξηται, he (now) begins to play the tyrant (τύπτειν) and to indulge in excess (ἐσθίῃ καὶ πίνῃ, etc.). Long delay is necessary to produce such complete demoralisation.—Ver. 50. ἥξει: the master comes at last, and of course he will come unexpected. The delay has been so long that the unworthy servant goes on his bad way as if the master would never come at all.—Ver. 51. διχοτομήσει, he will cut him in sunder as with a saw, an actual mode of punishment in ancient times, and many commentators think that this barbarous penalty is seriously meant here. But this can hardly be, especially as in the following clause the man is supposed to be still alive. The probable meaning is: will cut him in two (so to speak) with a *whip* = thrash him, the base slave, unmercifully. It is a strong word, selected in sympathy with the master's rage. So Schott: "verberbus multis eam castigavit". Koetsveld, *De Gelijk.*, p. 246, and Grimm (Thayer) but ith whesitancy. Beza and Grotius interpret: will divide him from the family = dismiss him.—μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, with the hypocrites, *i.e.*, eye-servants, who make a great show of zeal under the master's eye, but are utterly negligent behind his back. In Lk. the corresponding phrase is τῶν ἀπίστων, the unfaithful.

XXV. 1. "ΤΟΤΕ ὁμοιωθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν δέκα παρθένοις, αἵτινες λαβοῦσαι τὰς [a] λαμπάδας αὐτῶν[1] ἐξῆλθον εἰς ἀπάντησιν[2] τοῦ νυμφίου.[2] 2. πέντε δὲ ἦσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν[3] φρόνιμοι,[4] καὶ αἱ[5] πέντε μωραί.[4] 3. αἵτινες[6] μωραί, λαβοῦσαι τὰς λαμπάδας ἑαυτῶν,[7] οὐκ ἔλαβον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν [b] ἔλαιον· 4. αἱ δὲ φρόνιμοι ἔλαβον ἔλαιον ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις αὐτῶν[8] μετὰ τῶν λαμπάδων αὐτῶν.[8] 5. χρονίζοντος δὲ τοῦ νυμφίου, [c] ἐνύσταξαν πᾶσαι καὶ ἐκάθευδον.

a John xviii. 3. Acts xx. 8. Rev. iv. 5; viii. 10.
b Mk. vi. 13. Lk. x. 34. Jas. v. 14 (for healing). Lk. vii. 46. Heb. i. 9 (used at feasts for anointing). Lk. xvi. 6. Rev. vi. 6; xviii. 13 (commerce).
c 2 Pet. ii. 3 (Ps. lxxvi. 7).

[1] εαυτων in BDL (W.H.).

[2] υπαντησιν in ℵBC (Tisch., W.H.). After νυμφιου is added και της νυμφης in DΣ it. vul. Syr. Sin., Or., Hil., W.H. place this reading in margin, and it calls for further discussion. *Vide* below for Resch's view.

[3] εξ αυτων ησαν in ℵBCDLZΔΣ.

[4] μωραι, φρονιμοι in ℵBCDLZΣ, several cursives.

[5] αι omitted in ℵBCDLZΣ, 33 *al.*

[6] αι γαρ for αιτινες in ℵBCLΣ 33.

[7] αυτων in BCDΔ. ℵL have neither αυτ. nor εαυτ. (Tisch.).

[8] First αυτων omit ℵBDLZ. For second ℵB have εαυτων.

Chapter XXV. Three Eschatological Parables. These parables (especially the first and third) are appropriately introduced by Mt. at this place, whether actually uttered in immediate connection with the Olivet discourse, or during the Passion week, or otherwise. In his reproduction of the book of Logia, Wendt gives the group of parables inculcating constant preparedness for the *Parusia*, including *the Waiting Servants* (Lk. xii. 35-38); *the Thief* (Mt. xxiv. 43, 44; Lk. xii. 39, 40); *the Upper Servant* (Mt. xxiv. 45-51; Lk. xii. 42, 48), and *the Ten Virgins* (Mt. xxv. 1-12; Lk. xiii. 25), a somewhat earlier place (L. J., i., pp. 118-122).

Vv. 1-13. *Parable of the Ten Virgins*, in Mt. only.—Ver. 1. **τότε**, then, connecting what follows in the evangelist's mind with the time referred to in the previous parable, *i.e.*, with the *Parusia*. —**δέκα παρθένοις**: *ten* virgins, not as the usual number—as to that no information is available—but as one coming readily to the mind of a Jew, as we might in a similar case say a dozen.—**αἵτινες**, such as; **αἱ** might have been used, but the tendency in N. T. and late Greek is to prefer **ὅστις** to **ὅς**.—**τὰς λαμπάδας α.**, their *torches* consisting of a wooden staff held in the hand, with a dish at the top, in which was a piece of cloth or rope dipped in oil or pitch (*vide* Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*). Rutherford (*New Phrynicus*, p. 131) says that **λαμπάδας** is here used in the sense of oil lamps, and that in the common dialect **λαμπάς** became equivalent to **λύχνος**.—**εἰς ὑπ(ἀπ-)άντησιν**: *vide* at viii. 34.—**τοῦ νυμφίου**: the bridegroom, who is conceived of as coming with his party to the house of the bride, where the marriage feast is to take place, contrary to the usual though possibly not the invariable custom (Judges xiv. 10). The parable at this point seems to be adapted to the spiritual situation—the Son of Man coming again. Resch thinks **καὶ τῆς νύμφης** a true part of the original parable, without which it cannot be understood (*Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu Mt. und Mk.*, p. 300).—Ver. 2. **πέντε μωραί, πέντε φρόνιμοι**: equal numbers of both, not intended to represent the proportion in the spiritual sphere; foolish, wise, not bad and good, but imprudent and prudent, thoughtless and thoughtful. Even the "foolish" might be very attractive, lovable girls; perhaps might have been the favourites at the feast: for wisdom is apt to be cold; foolish first named in best MSS., and properly, for they play the chief *rôle* in the story, and are first characterised in the sequel.—Ver. 3. **ἔλαιον**: the statement about the foolish, indicating the nature or proof of their folly, is that they took their lamps but did not take oil. None? or only not a supply sufficient for an emergency—possible delay? Goebel (*Die Parabeln Jesu*) decides for

d here only in sense of trim.
e Ch. iii. 9; xvi. 8; xxiii. 34. Rom. viii. 23. 1 Cor. xi. 31 (all instances of the reflex. pron. used in ref. to 1st and 2nd pers.).

6. μέσης δὲ νυκτὸς κραυγὴ γέγονεν, Ἰδού, ὁ νυμφίος ἔρχεται,[1] ἐξέρχεσθε εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ.[2] 7. Τότε ἠγέρθησαν πᾶσαι αἱ παρθένοι ἐκεῖναι, καὶ [d] ἐκόσμησαν τὰς λαμπάδας αὐτῶν.[3] 8. αἱ δὲ μωραὶ ταῖς φρονίμοις εἶπον, Δότε ἡμῖν ἐκ τοῦ ἐλαίου ὑμῶν, ὅτι αἱ λαμπάδες ἡμῶν σβέννυνται. 9. Ἀπεκρίθησαν δὲ αἱ φρόνιμοι, λέγουσαι, Μήποτε οὐκ[4] ἀρκέσῃ ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν· πορεύεσθε δὲ[5] μᾶλλον πρὸς τοὺς πωλοῦντας, καὶ ἀγοράσατε [e] ἑαυταῖς. 10. ἀπερ-

[1] ερχεται omit ℵBCDLZ (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] Omit αυτου ℵB (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] εαυτων in ℵABLZΣ.

[4] ου μη in BCDXΔΣ (W.H.), ουκ in ℵALZ (Tisch., W.H., in margin).

[5] The best authorities omit δε.

the former view. His idea of the whole situation is this: the virgins meet at the bride's house, there wait the announcement of the bridegroom's approach, then *for the first time* proceed to light their lamps, whereupon the foolish find that there is nothing in the dish except a dry wick, which goes out shortly after being lighted. In favour of this view he adduces the consideration that the other alternative makes the wise too wise providing for a rare occurrence. Perhaps, but on the other hand Goebel's view makes the foolish too foolish, and also irrelevantly foolish, for in the case supposed they would have been at fault even if the bridegroom had not tarried. But the very point of the parable is to illustrate the effect of *delay*. On the various ways of conceiving the situation, *vide The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*.—Ver. 4. **ἐν τοῖς ἀγγείοις**: the wise took oil *in the vessels*, *i.e.*, in vessels, with an extra supply, distinct from the cups at the top of the torches containing oil.—Ver. 5. **χρονίζοντος τ. ν.**: no reason given for delay, a possibility in natural life, *the* point on which the spiritual lesson, be ready, hinges. —**ἐνύσταξαν**, they nodded, aorist, because a transient state; **ἐκάθευδον**, and remained for some time in slumber, imperfect, because the state continuous. Carr (Camb. N. T.) cites Plato, *Apol. Socr.*, as illustrating the discriminating use of the two verbs in reference to the two stages of sleep.—**πᾶσαι**, *all*, sleep in the circumstances perfectly natural and, everything being ready, perfectly harmless.—Ver. 6. **ἰδοὺ ὁ νυμφίος**: at length at midnight a cry is raised by some one *not* asleep—*lo! the bridegroom;* laconic, rousing, heard by all sleepers.—**ἐξέρχεσθε εἰς. ἀπάντησιν**, go forth to meeting: no words that can be dispensed with here either. Go forth whence? from the bride's house (Goebel); from some inn, or private dwelling on the way, whither they have turned in on finding that the bridegroom tarried (Bleek, Meyer, Weiss). On *this* point Goebel's view is to be preferred.—Ver. 7. **ἐκόσμησαν**: trimmed, or proceeded to trim, for which the imperfect would have been more suitable. In the case of the five foolish it was an action attempted rather than performed, begun rather than completed.—Ver. 8. **σβέννυνται**: are *going* out, as in R. V.—Ver. 9. **μήποτε**: lest, implying, and giving a reason for, an unexpressed declinature. Kypke renders, *perhaps, fortasse*, citing examples from classics, also Loesner, giving examples from Philo. Elsner suggests that **ὁρᾶτε** or **βλέπετε** is understood before **μήποτε**. Schott, putting a comma after **ὑμῖν**, and omitting **δὲ** after **πορεύεσθε**, translates thus: lest perchance there be not enough for us and you, go rather to them that sell, etc. ("ne forte oleum neque nobis neque vobis sufficiat, abite potius," etc.).—**πορεύεσθε**, etc.: this seems a cold, ungenerous suggestion on the part of the wise, and apparently untrue to what was likely to occur among girls at such a time. Could the oil really be got at such a time of night? and, supposing it could, would going not throw them out of the festivities? Augustine says: "non consulentium sed irridentium est ista responsio" (Serm. xc., iii., 8). More humanely, in the modern spirit, Koetsveld suggests that the marriage procession to music and song was very slow, and that there was a fair chance of overtaking it after the purchase (*De Gelijk.*, p. 220). Let us hope so; but I fear we must fall back on the fact that "sudden emergencies bring

χομένων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀγοράσαι, ἦλθεν ὁ νυμφίος· καὶ αἱ ἕτοιμοι εἰσῆλθον μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς γάμους, καὶ ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα. 11. ὕστερον δὲ ἔρχονται καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ παρθένοι, λέγουσαι, Κύριε, κύριε, ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν. 12. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς. 13. Γρηγορεῖτε οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἡμέραν οὐδὲ τὴν ὥραν, ἐν ᾗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.[1]

14. "Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος [f] ἀποδημῶν ἐκάλεσε τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους, καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ· 15. καὶ ᾧ μὲν ἔδωκε πέντε τάλαντα, ᾧ δὲ δύο, ᾧ δὲ ἕν, ἑκάστῳ [g] κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν

[f] Ch. xxi. 33. Mk. xiii. 1. Lk. xv. 13; xx. 9.
[g] 2 Cor. viii. 3.

[1] The words **εν η ο υιος τ. α. ερ.** are omitted in ℵABCDLXΔΣ 33 *al. plur.*, and by modern editors.

into play a certain element of selfishness," and take the advice of the wise as simply a refusal to be burdened with their neighbours' affairs.

Ver. 10. **ἀπερχομένων**, etc., the foolish took the advice and went to buy, and *in so doing acted in character;* foolish in that as in not having a good supply of oil. *They should have gone on without oil*, the great matter being to be in time. By reckoning this as a point in their folly we bring the foolish virgins into analogy with the foolish builder in chap. vii. 26. *Vide* notes there, and also *The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 505 f. Of course, on this view the oil has no significance in the spiritual sphere. It plays a great part in the history of interpretation. For Chrys. and Euthy., the lamp = virginity, and the oil = pity, and the moral is: continence without charity worthless; a good lesson. "Nothing," says the former, "is blinder than virginity without pity; thus the people are used to call the merciless dark (**σκοτεινούς**)," Hom. lxxviii.—**ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα**, the door was shut, because all the guests were supposed to be within; no hint given by the wise virgins that more were coming. This improbable in the natural sphere.—Ver. 11. **κύριε, κύριε**, etc., master, master, open to us; a last, urgent, desperate appeal, knocking having preceded (Lk. xiii. 25) without result. The fear that they are not going to be admitted has seized their hearts.—Ver. 12. **οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς**, I do not know you, in the natural sphere not a judicial penalty for arriving too late, but an inference from the late arrival that those without cannot belong to the bridal party. The solemn tone, however (**ἀμὴν λ. ὑ.**), shows that the spiritual here invades the natural. Pricaeus refers to Lk. xi. 7 as helping to understand the temper of the speech from within = do not trouble me, the door is shut.—Ver. 13. The moral, **γρηγορεῖτε**, watch; not directed against sleep (ver. 5) but against lack of forethought. The reference of the parable to the *Parusia*, according to Weiss (Meyer), is imposed upon it by the evangelist.

Vv. 14-30. *Parable of the Talents* (*cf.* Lk. xix. 11-28), according to Weiss (Mt.-Ev., 535) and Wendt (L. J., i., 145) not a *Parusia*-parable originally, but spoken at some other time, and inculcating, like the parable of the unjust steward, skill and fidelity in the use of earthly goods.—Ver. 14. **ὥσπερ**: suggests a comparison between the parabolic history and the course of things in the kingdom, but the apodosis carrying out the comparison is omitted.—**γὰρ** implies that the point of comparison is in the view of the evangelist the same as in the preceding parable.—**ἀποδημῶν**, about to go abroad.—**ἐκάλεσε**, etc., called his own servants and delivered to them his means; not an unnatural or unusual proceeding introduced against probability for the sake of the moral lesson; rather the best thing he could do with his money in his absence, dividing it among carefully selected slaves, and leaving them to do their best with it. Investments could not then be made as now (*vide* Koetsveld, p. 254).—Ver. 15. **πέντε, δύο, ἕν**: the number of talents given in each case corresponded to the master's judgment of the capacity (**δύναμιν**) of each man. All were supposed to be trustworthy and more or less capable. Even one talent represented a considerable sum, especially for that period when a *denarius* was a day's wage.—**καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν**, and then he went away. So ends the account of the master's action.—**εὐθέως** should be connected with **πορευθεὶς**, whereby it gains

δύναμιν· καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν εὐθέως. 16. πορευθεὶς δὲ[1] ὁ τὰ πέντε τάλαντα λαβὼν εἰργάσατο[2] ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐποίησεν[3] ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα.[4] 17. ὡσαύτως καὶ[5] ὁ τὰ δύο ἐκέρδησε καὶ αὐτὸς[6] ἄλλα δύο. 18. ὁ δὲ τὸ ἓν λαβὼν ἀπελθὼν ὤρυξεν ἐν τῇ γῇ,[7] καὶ ἀπέκρυψε[8] τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. 19. Μετὰ δὲ χρόνον πολὺν[9] ἔρχεται ὁ κύριος τῶν δούλων ἐκείνων, καὶ συναίρει μετ' αὐτῶν λόγον.[10] 20. καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ τὰ πέντε τάλαντα λαβὼν προσήνεγκεν ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα, λέγων, Κύριε, πέντε τάλαντά μοι παρέδωκας· ἴδε, ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.[11] 21. Ἔφη δὲ[12] αὐτῷ

[1] ℵB omit δε, the insertion of which is due to the ευθεως being taken as belonging to απεδημησεν. It should be taken with πορευθεις (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] ηργασατο in ℵBDL.

[3] εκερδησεν in BCDLΣ (W.H.). ℵ has εποιησεν (Tisch.).

[4] BL omit this second ταλαντα (W.H.).

[5] και omitted in ℵCL (Tisch., W.H., in text, insert in margin).

[6] καί αυτος omit ℵBCL.

[7] γην in ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.).

[8] εκρυψεν in ℵABCDL 33.

[9] πολυν χρονον in ℵBCDL.

[10] λογον before μετ αυτων in ℵBCDLΣ.

[11] επ αυτοις omit ℵBDL.

[12] δε omitted in ℵBCDLΣ, also in ver. 22 after προσελθων in ℵB.

significance as indicating the temper of the servant. He lost no time in setting about plans for trading, with the talents entrusted to him (so Fritzsche, Weiss, Schanz, and Holtz., H. C.).—Ver. 16. εἰργάσατο ἐν αὐτοῖς, traded in or with them, used in classics also in this sense but without any preposition before the dative of the material.—ἄλλα πέντε, other five, which speaks to a considerable period in the ordinary course of trade.—Ver. 17. ὡσαύτως, in like manner; that absolutely the same proportion between capital and gain should be maintained in the two cases was not likely but possible, and the supposition is convenient for the application.—Ver. 18. ὤρυξεν ἐν, etc., dug up the earth, and hid the silver of his master. Not dishonest—the master had not misjudged as to that—but indolent, unenterprising, timid. What he did was often done for safety. The master might have done it himself, but he wanted increase as well as safety. In Lk.'s parable the same type of man buries his pound *in a napkin*. A talent was too large to be put up that way.

Vv. 19-23.—Ver. 19. πολὺν χρόνον, the master returns after *a long time*, an important expression in a parable relating to the *Parusia*, as implying long delay.—συναίρει λόγον, maketh a reckoning, as in xviii. 23.—Ver. 20. The first servant gives his report: bringing five and five, he presents them to his master, and says: ἴδε, as if inviting him to satisfy himself by counting.—Ver. 21. εὖ, well done! excellent! = εὖγε in classics, which is the approved reading in Lk. xix. 17. Meyer takes it as an adverb, qualifying πιστός, but standing in so emphatic a position at the head of the sentence and so far from the word it is supposed to qualify it inevitably has the force of an interjection—ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, devoted and faithful: two prime virtues in the circumstances. On the sense of ἀγαθός, *vide* xx. 15.—ἐπὶ π. σε καταστήσω, I will set thee over many things. The master means to make extensive use of the talents and energy of one who had shown himself so enthusiastic and trustworthy in a limited sphere.—εἴσελθε ε. τ. χαρὰν τ. κ. σ. This clause seems to be epexegetical of the previous one, or to express the same idea under a different form. χαρά has often been taken as referring to a feast given on the occasion of the master's return (so De Wette, Trench, etc.). Others (Reuss, Meyer, Weiss, Speaker's *Com.*) take it more generally as denoting the master's state of joy. Thus viewed, the word takes us into the spiritual sphere, the joy of the Lord having nothing in common with the affairs of the bank (Reuss, *Hist. Ev.*). Weiss thinks this second description of the reward pro-

ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ, [h] Εὖ, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστός, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω· εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου. 22. Προσελθὼν δὲ καὶ ὁ τὰ δύο τάλαντα λαβὼν[1] εἶπε, Κύριε, δύο τάλαντά μοι παρέδωκας· ἴδε, ἄλλα δύο τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς.[1] 23. Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ, Εὖ, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστός, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω· εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου. 24. Προσελθὼν δὲ καὶ ὁ τὸ ἓν τάλαντον εἰληφὼς εἶπε, Κύριε, ἔγνων σε ὅτι [i] σκληρὸς εἶ ἄνθρωπος, θερίζων ὅπου οὐκ ἔσπειρας, καὶ συνάγων ὅθεν οὐ [j] διεσκόρπισας· 25. καὶ φοβηθεὶς, ἀπελθὼν ἔκρυψα τὸ τάλαντόν σου ἐν τῇ γῇ· ἴδε, ἔχεις τὸ σόν. 26. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Πονηρὲ δοῦλε καὶ [k] ὀκνηρέ, ᾔδεις ὅτι θερίζω ὅπου οὐκ ἔσπειρα, καὶ συνάγω, ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισα· 27. ἔδει οὖν σε[2] βαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριον[3] μου τοῖς [l] τραπεζίταις· καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ [m] ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν [n] τόκῳ. 28. ἄρατε οὖν ἀπ᾽

h here and in ver. 23 only.
i here only of a man. John vi. 60 (of a word). Jas. iii. 4 (of the wind).
j Ch. xxvi. 31. Mk. xiv. 27 (of a flock). Lk. xv. 13; xvi. 1 (of property).
k here and in Rom. xii. 11.
l here only.
m Heb. xi. 19 (in same sense).
n Lk. xix. 23.

[1] ABCLΔΣ omit **λαβων**. ℵD have it. Probably a gloss, as is also **επ αυτοις** (wanting in ℵBDL) at the end of ver. 22.

[2] **σε ουν** in ℵBCL 33.

[3] **τα αργυρια** in ℵB.

ceeds from the evangelist interpreting the parable allegorically of Messiah's return. But we escape this inference if we take the phrase "the joy of thy lord" as = the joy of *lordship* (*herilis gaudii*, Grotius, and Elsner after him). The faithful slave is to be rewarded by admission to fellowship in possession, partnership. *Cf.* **μέτοχοι τοῦ χριστοῦ** in Heb. iii. 14 = sharers ("fellows") with Christ, not merely "partakers of Christ".—Ver. 23. Praise and recompense awarded to the second servant in identical terms: reward the same in recognition of equal devotion and fidelity with unequal ability a just law of the Kingdom of God, the second bearing on "Work and Wages" there. For the first, *vide* on xx. 1-16. Euthymius remarks **ἴση ἡ τιμὴ διότι καὶ ἴση ἡ σπουδή**.

Vv. 24-30.—Ver. 24. **εἰληφώς**, the perfect participle, instead of **λαβὼν** in ver. 20, because the one fact as to him is that he is the man who has *received* a talent of which he has made no *use*. (So Weiss in Meyer.)—**ἔγνων σε ὅτι** for **ἔγνων ὅτι συ**, by attraction.—**σκληρὸς**, "hard": grasping, ungenerous, taking all to himself, offering no inducements to his servants, as explained in the proverbial expressions following: **θερίζων**, etc., reaping where you do not sow, and gathering where (**ὅθεν** instead of **ὅπου**, a word signifying *de loco*, instead of a word signifying *in loco*; *vide* Kypke for other examples) you did not scatter with the fan = appropriating everything produced on his land by the labour of his servants, without giving them any share—no inducement to work for such a curmudgeon of a master: all toil, no pay. Compare this with the *real* character as revealed in: "Enter thou into the joy of lordship".—Ver. 25. **φοβηθεὶς**, etc., fearing: loss of the talent by trade; he thought the one thing to make sure of, in the case of such a master, was that what he had got might be *safe*.—**ἐν τῇ γῇ**: the primitive bank of security. *Vide* xiii. 44.—**ἴδε ἔχεις τὸ σόν**: see you have what belongs to you; no idea that the master was entitled not only to the talent, but to what it might earn.—Ver. 26. **πονηρὲ** (*vide* on vi. 23), "wicked" is too general a meaning: mean-spirited or grudging would suit the connection better.—**πονηρὸς** is the fitting reply to **σκληρὸς**, and the opposite of **ἀγαθὸς**. You call me hard, I call you a churl: with no heart for your work, unlike your fellow-servant who put his whole heart into his work.—**ὀκνηρέ**, slothful; a poor creature altogether: suspicious, timid, heartless, spiritless, idle.—**ᾔδεις**, etc.: a question, neither making an admission nor expressing surprise or anger, but leading up to a charge of inconsistency = If that was your idea of me, why then, etc.—Ver. 27. **ἔδει**, etc., you ought in that case to have cast my silver to the money-changers, or bankers. That could have been done without

αὐτοῦ τὸ τάλαντον, καὶ δότε τῷ ἔχοντι τὰ δέκα τάλαντα. 29. Τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι παντὶ δοθήσεται, καὶ περισσευθήσεται· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ[1] μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ ὃ ἔχει, ἀρθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. 30. Καὶ τὸν ° ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον ἐκβάλλετε[2] εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον. ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

o Lk. xvii. 10.

31. "Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι[3] ἄγγελοι μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, 32. τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καὶ συναχθήσεται[4] ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ ἀφοριεῖ[5] αὐτοὺς ἀπ᾽ ἀλλήλων, ὥσπερ ὁ ποιμὴν ἀφορίζει τὰ

[1] For **απο δε του** ℵBDL have **του δε** (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] **εκβαλετε** in ℵABCLXΔΣ.

[3] ℵBDL omit **αγιοι**.

[4] **συναχθησονται** in ℵBDLΣ. The singular is a grammatical correction.

[5] **αφορισει** in ℵLΔ (Tisch., W.H.). BD have **αφοριει** as in T. R. (Weiss).

trouble or risk, and with profit to the master.—**ἐγὼ**, apparently intended to be emphatic, suggesting a distribution of offices between servant and master = yours to put it into the bank, mine to take it out. So Field (*Otium Nor.*), who, following a hint of Chrys., translates: "And I should have gone (**ἐλθὼν**) to the bank and received back mine own (or demanded it) with interest".—**σὺν τόκῳ**, literally, with offspring: a figurative name for interest on money.—Ver. 28. **ἄρατε**, etc., take the one talent from the man who made *no* use of it, and give it to the man who will make *most* use of it.—Ver. 29. General principle on which the direction rests pointing to a law of life, hard but inexorable.—Ver. 30. **ἀχρεῖον**, useless. Palairet renders *injuriosum;* Kypke, *improbum.* Being **useless**, he was both injurious and unjust. The useless man does wrong all round, and there is no place for him either in this world or in the Kingdom of God. His place is in the outer darkness.

Difference of opinion prevails as to whether this parable refers to the use of material goods for the Kingdom of God, or to the use of spiritual gifts. It is not, perhaps, possible to decide in ignorance of the historical occasion of the parable, nor is it necessary, as the same law applies.

Vv. 31-46. *The Judgment programme.*—Much diversity of opinion has prevailed in reference to this remarkable passage; as to the subjects of the judgment, and the authenticity of this judgment programme as a professed logion of Jesus. Are the judged all mankind, Christian and non-Christian, or Christians only, or non-Christian peoples, including unbelieving Jews, or the Jewish people excluded? Even as early as Origen it was felt that there was room for doubt on such points. He says (*Comm. in Ev. M.*): "Utrum segregabuntur gentes omnes ab omnibus qui in omnibus generationibus fuerint, an illae tantum quae in consummatione fuerint derelictae, aut illae tantum quae crediderunt in Deum per Christum, et ipsae utrum omnes, an non omnes, non satis est manifestum. Tamen quibusdam videtur de differentiâ eorum, quae crediderunt haec esse dicta." Recent opinion inclines to the view that the programme refers to heathen people only, and sets forth the principle on which they shall be judged. As to the authenticity of the logion critics hold widely discrepant views. Some regard it as a composition of the evangelists. So Pfleiderer, *e.g.*, who sees in it simply the literary expression of a genial humane way of regarding the heathen on the part of the evangelist, an unknown Christian author of the second century, who had charity enough to accept Christlike love on the part of the heathen as an equivalent for Christian faith (*Urchristenthum*, p. 532). Holtzmann, H. C., also sees in it a second-hand composition, based on 4 Esdras vii. 33-35, Apoc. Bar. lxxxiii. 12. Weiss, on the other hand, recognises as basis an authentic logion of Jesus, setting forth love as the test of true discipleship, which has been worked over by the evangelist and altered into a judgment programme for *heathendom.* Wendt (*L. J.*, p. 186) thinks that the logion in its original form was such a programme. This seems to be the most probable opinion.

πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν [p] ἐρίφων, 33. καὶ στήσει τὰ μὲν πρόβατα ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, τὰ δὲ ἐρίφια ἐξ εὐωνύμων.

34. "Τότε ἐρεῖ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ, Δεῦτε, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ [q] καταβολῆς [q] κόσμου. 35. ἐπείνασα γάρ, καὶ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν· ἐδίψησα, καὶ ἐποτίσατέ με· [r] ξένος ἤμην, καὶ [s] συνηγάγετέ με· 36. γυμνός, καὶ περιεβάλετέ με· ἠσθένησα, καὶ [t] ἐπεσκέψασθέ με· ἐν φυλακῇ ἤμην, καὶ ἤλθετε πρός με. 37. Τότε ἀποκριθήσονται αὐτῷ οἱ δίκαιοι, λέγοντες, Κύριε, πότε σὲ εἴδομεν πεινῶντα, καὶ ἐθρέψαμεν; ἢ διψῶντα, καὶ ἐποτίσαμεν· 38. πότε δέ σε εἴδομεν ξένον, καὶ συνηγάγομεν; ἢ γυμνόν, καὶ περιεβάλομεν;

p Lk. xv. 29.
q Lk. xi. 50. John xvii. 24. Heb. iv. 3; ix. 26 *al.*
r Ch. xxvii. 7. Acts xvii. 21. Eph. ii. 19. Heb. xi. 13.
s here and in vv. 38, 43 (Deut. xxii. 2. Josh. ii. 18. Judges xix. 18).
t Lk. i. 68, 78; vii. 16. Acts vii. 23. Jas. i. 27.

Ver. 31. **ὅταν δὲ**, the description following recalls xxiv. 30, to which the **ὅταν** seems to refer.—Ver. 32. **πάντα τὰ ἔθνη** naturally suggests the heathen peoples as distinct from Jews, though the latter may be included, notwithstanding the fact that in one respect their judgment day had already come (xxiv. 15-22).—**ἀφοριεῖ**: first a process of separation as in the interpretation of the parable of the tares (xiii. 49).—**τά πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων**, the sheep from the young goats. Sheep and goats, though feeding together under the care of the same shepherd, seem of their own accord to separate into two companies. Tristram and Furrer bear witness to this.—Ver. 33. **καὶ στήσει**, etc., the bare placing of the parties already judges, the good on the right, the evil on the left; sheep emblems of the former, goats of the latter. Why? No profit from goats, much from sheep; from their wool, milk, lambs, says Chrys., Hom. lxxix. Lust and evil odour secure for the goat its unenviable emblematic significance say others: "id animal et libidinosum et olidum" (Grotius). Lange suggests stubbornness as the sinister quality. More important is the point made by Weiss that the very fact that a separation is necessary implies that all were one flock, *i.e.*, that the judged in the view of Jesus are all professing Christians, disciples true or false.

Vv. 34-40. **οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός μου**, my Father's blessed ones, the participle being in effect a substantive.—**κληρονομήσατε**, etc.: this clause Weiss regards as a proof that the parable originally referred to disciples, as for them only could the kingdom be said to be prepared from the foundation of the world. Wendt, holding the original reference to have been to the heathen, brackets the words from **οἱ εὐλογ.** to **κόσμου** as of doubtful authenticity.—Ver. 35. **ἐπείνασα, ἐδίψησα, ξένος ἤμην**, hungry, thirsty, a stranger. The claims created by these situations are universally recognised though often neglected; to respond to them is a duty of "common humanity".—**συνηγάγετέ με**, ye received me (into your house) (*cf.* Judges xix. 18.—**οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνὴρ συνάγων με εἰς οἰκίαν**). Meyer, Weiss, and others, with stricter adherence to the literal meaning of the word, render: ye gathered me into the bosom of your family; Fritzsche: ye admitted me to your table ("simul convivio adhibuistis").—Ver. 36. **γυμνὸς, ἠσθένησα, ἐν φυλακῇ**, deeper degrees of misery demanding higher degrees of charity; naked = ill clad, relief more costly than in case of hunger or thirst; sick, calling for sympathy prompting to visits of succour or consolation; in prison, a situation at once discreditable and repulsive, demanding the highest measure of love in one who visits the prisoner, the temptation being strong to be ashamed of one viewed as a criminal, and to shrink from his cell, too often dark and loathsome.—**ἐπεσκέψασθέ με**, this verb is often used in the O. T. and N. T. in the sense of gracious visitation on the part of God (for פָּקַד in Sept.) (*vide* Lk. i. 78, and the noun **ἐπισκοπή** in Lk. xix. 44).—Ver. 37. **κύριε**, not necessarily spoken by disciples supposed to know or believe in Jesus (Weiss). The title fits the judicial dignity of the person addressed by whomsoever used. In disclaiming the praise accorded those who call the Judge **κύριος** virtually deny personal acquaintance with Him.—Ver. 40. **ἐφ' ὅσον**, in so far as = **καθ' ὅσον**

39. πότε δέ σε εἴδομεν ἀσθενῆ,[1] ἢ ἐν φυλακῇ, καὶ ἤλθομεν πρός σε; 40. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐρεῖ αὐτοῖς, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐφʼ ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου[2] τῶν ἐλαχίστων, ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε.

41. "Τότε ἐρεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἐξ εὐωνύμων, Πορεύεσθε ἀπʼ ἐμοῦ, οἱ[3] [u] κατηραμένοι, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ. 42. ἐπείνασα γάρ, καὶ οὐκ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν· ἐδίψησα, καὶ οὐκ ἐποτίσατέ με· 43. ξένος ἤμην, καὶ οὐ συνηγάγετέ με· γυμνός, καὶ οὐ περιεβάλετέ με· ἀσθενής, καὶ ἐν φυλακῇ, καὶ οὐκ ἐπεσκέψασθέ με. 44. Τότε ἀποκριθήσονται αὐτῷ[4] καὶ αὐτοί, λέγοντες, Κύριε, πότε σὲ εἴδομεν πεινῶντα, ἢ διψῶντα, ἢ ξένον, ἢ γυμνόν, ἢ ἀσθενῆ, ἢ ἐν φυλακῇ, καὶ οὐ διηκονήσαμέν σοι; 45. Τότε ἀποκριθήσεται αὐτοῖς, λέγων, Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐφʼ ὅσον οὐκ ἐποιήσατε ἑνὶ τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων, οὐδὲ ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε. 46. Καὶ ἀπελεύσονται οὗτοι εἰς [v] κόλασιν αἰώνιον· οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον."

u Mk. xi. 21. Lk. vi. 28. Rom. xii. 14. Jas. iii. 9.

v here and in 1 John iv. 18 in N. T. (Ezek. xiv. 3. Wisdom xi. 14; xvi. 24 *al.* in Sept.).

[1] BD have ασθενουντα (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] B omits των αδελφων μου, probably an error of similar ending.

[3] ℵBL 33 omit οι, a significant omission. *Vide* below.

[4] αυτω has only minus. to support it.

(Heb. vii. 20, used of time in Mt. ix. 15).—**ἑνὶ . . . ἐλαχίστων**, the Judge's brethren spoken of as a body apart, not *subjects*, but rather *instruments*, of judgment. This makes for the non-Christian position of the judged. The brethren are the Christian poor and needy and suffering, in the first place, but ultimately and inferentially any suffering people anywhere. Christian sufferers represent Christ, and human sufferers represent Christians.—**τῶν ἐλαχίστων** seems to be in apposition with **ἀδελφῶν**, suggesting the idea that the brethren of the Son of Man are the insignificant of mankind, those likely to be overlooked, despised, neglected (*cf.* x. 42, xviii. 5).

Vv. 41-46. **κατηραμένοι**, cursed, not *the* cursed (**οἱ** wanting), and without **τοῦ πατρός μου**. God has no cursed ones.—**εἰς τὸ πῦρ**, etc., the eternal fire is represented as prepared not for the condemned men, but for the devil and his angels. Wendt brackets the clause **κατηραμένοι . . . ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ** to suggest that as Jesus spoke it the passage ran: go away from me, for I was hungry, etc.—Vv. 42, 43, simply negative all the statements contained in vv. 35, 36.—Ver. 44 repeats in summary form the reply of the **δίκαιοι**, *mutatis mutandis*, rapidly enumerating the states of need, and disclaiming, with reference to all, neglect of service, **οὐ διηκονήσαμέν σοι**; ver. 45 repeats ver. 40 with the omission of **τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου** and the addition of **οὐκ** before **ἐποιήσατε**.—Ver. 46. **κόλασιν**, here and in 1 John iv. 18 (**ὁ φόβος κόλασιν ἔχει**), from **κολάζω** = mutilation or pruning, hence suggestive of corrective rather than of vindictive punishment as its tropical meaning. The use of this term in this place is one of the exegetical grounds rested on by those who advocate the "larger hope". Another is the strict meaning of **αἰώνιος**: agelong, not everlasting. From the combination results the phrase: agelong, pruning, or discipline, leaving room for the hope of ultimate salvation. But the doctrine of the future states must ultimately rest on deeper considerations than those supplied by verbal interpretation. Weiss (Mt.-Evang.) and Wendt (L. J.) regard ver. 46 as an interpolation by the evangelist.

The doctrine of this passage is that love is the essence of true religion and the ultimate test of character for all men Christian or non-Christian. All who truly love are implicit Christians. For such everywhere the kingdom is prepared. They are its true citizens and God is their Father. In calling those

XXVI. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, 2. "Οἴδατε ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας [a] τὸ πάσχα γίνεται, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι." 3. Τότε συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς[1] καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς τὴν [a] αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τοῦ λεγομένου Καϊάφα, 4. καὶ συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα τὸν Ἰησοῦν κρατή-

a vv. 58, 69. Mk. xiv. 54, 66; xv. 16. Lk. xi. 21; xxii. 55. John xviii. 15. *Vide* below.

[1] **και οι γραμματεις** omitted in ℵABDL (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

who love the Father's blessed ones Jesus made an important contribution to the doctrine of the Fatherhood, defining by discriminating use the title "Father".

Chapters XXVI.-XXVII. The Passion History. These chapters give with exceptional fulness and minuteness of detail the story of Christ's last sufferings and relative incidents. The story finds a place in all four Gospels (Mk. xiv., xv.; Lk. xxii., xxiii.; John xviii., xix.), showing the intense interest felt by Christians of the apostolic age in all that related to the Passion of their Lord. Of the three strata of evangelic tradition relating respectively to what Jesus *taught*, what He *did*, and what He *suffered*, the last-named probably came first in origin. Men could wait for the words and deeds, but not for the awful tale of suffering. Even Holtzmann, who puts the teaching first, recognises the Passion drama as the nucleus of the tradition as to memorable facts and experiences. In the formation of the Passion chronicle the main facts would naturally come first; around this nucleus would gather gradually accretions of minor incidents, till by the time the written records began to be compiled the collection of *memorabilia* had assumed the form it bears, say, in the Gospel of Mark; the historic truth on the solemn subject, at least as far as it could be ascertained. The passionless tone of the narrative in all four Gospels is remarkable; the story is told in subdued accent, in few simple words, as if the narrator had no interest in the matter save that of the historian: **ἀπαθῶς ἅπαντα διηγοῦνται, καὶ μόνης τῆς ἀληθείας φροντίζουσι.** Euthy. Zig. *ad* v. 67.

Chapter xxvi. and parallels contain the *anointing*, the *betrayal*, the *Holy Supper*, the *agony*, the *apprehension*, the *trial*, the *denial by Peter*.

Vv. 1-5. *Introductory* (Mk. xiv. 1, 2, Lk. xxii. 1, 2).—Vv. 1-2 contain a prediction by Jesus two days before Passover of His approaching death; vv. 3-5 a notice of a consultation by the authorities as to how they might compass His death. In the parallels the former item appears as a mere date for the latter, the prediction being eliminated.—Ver. 1. **πάντας τ. λόγους τούτους**, all these sayings, most naturally taken as referring to the contents of chaps. xxiv., xxv., though a backward glance at the whole of Christ's teaching is conceivable. Yet in case of such a comprehensive retrospect why refer only to words? Why not to both *dicta et facta*?—Ver. 2. **τὸ πάσχα**, used both of festival, as here, and of victim, as in ver. 17. The Passover began on the 14th of Nisan; it is referred to here for the first time in our Gospel.—**παραδίδοται**, present, either used to describe vividly a future event (Burton, M. T., § 15) or to associate it with the feast day as a fixture (**γίνεται**), "calendar day and divine decree of death fixed beyond recall" (Holtz., H. C.), or to imply that the betrayal process is already begun in the thought of the false-hearted disciple.—Ver. 3. **τότε**, two days before Passover.—**συνήχθησαν** points to a meeting of the Sanhedrim.—**εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν** denotes the meeting place, either the *palace* of the high priest in accordance with the use of **αὐλή** in later Greek (Weiss), or the court around which the palatial buildings were ranged (Meyer) = *atrium* in Vulgate, followed by Calvin. In the latter case the meeting would be informal. In any case it was at the high priest's quarters they met: whereupon Chrys. remarks: "See the inexpressible corruption of Jewish affairs. Having lawless proceedings on hand they come to the high priest seeking authority where they should encounter hindrance" (Hom. lxxix.).—**Καϊάφα**, Caiaphas, surname, Joseph his name, seventeen years high priest (*vide* Joseph, Ant., 18, 2, 2; 4, 3).—Ver. 4. **ἵνα** with subjunctive after a verb of effort or plan; in classic Greek oftener **ὅπως** with future indicative (Burton, § 205).—**δόλῳ** by,

σωσι δόλῳ,[1] καὶ ἀποκτείνωσιν. 5. ἔλεγον δέ, "Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, ἵνα μὴ θόρυβος γένηται ἐν τῷ λαῷ."

6. Τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, 7. προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ γυνὴ [b]ἀλάβαστρον [b]μύρου ἔχουσα[2] βαρυτίμου,[3] καὶ [c]κατέχεεν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν[4] αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου· 8. ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ[5] ἠγανάκτησαν, λέγοντες, "Εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὕτη; 9. ἠδύνατο[6] γὰρ τοῦτο τὸ μύρον[7] πραθῆναι

b Mk. xiv. 3. Lk. vii. 37 (gender doubtful).
c Mk. xiv. 3 (*cf.* const.).

[1] δολω κρατησωσι in ℵABDLΔΣ (Tisch., W.H., Ws.). T. R. supported only by minus.

[2] εχουσα before αλαβαστρον μυρου in ℵBDL 13, 33, 69, etc.

[3] πολυτιμου in ℵADL (Tisch.) as in T. R. in BΓΔΣ (W.H.). πολυτιμου probably comes from John xii. 3.

[4] επι της κεφαλης in ℵBD 1, 13, 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.). [5] ℵBDL omit αυτου.

[6] εδυνατο in ℵBLΔ. [7] ℵABDL *al.* omit το μυρον (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

craft, a method characteristic of clerics; *indigna consultatio* (Bengel); cowardly and merciless.—Ver. 5. ἔλεγον δέ: δὲ points back to ver. 1, which fixes the passion in Passover time, while the Synedrists thought it prudent to keep off the holy season for reason given.—μή, etc., to avoid uproar apt to happen at Passover time, Josephus *teste* (B. J., i., 4, 3).

Vv. 6-13. *Anointing in Bethany* (Mk. xiv. 3-9, *cf.* John xii. 1-11). Six days before Passover in John; no time fixed in Mt. and Mk. Certainly within Passion week. The thing chiefly to be noted is the setting of this pathetic scene, between priestly plotting and false discipleship. "Hatred and baseness on either hand and true love in the midst" (*Training of the Twelve*).—Ver. 6. τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ, etc.: indicates the scene, in Bethany, and in the house of Simon known as the leper (the one spoken of in viii. 2?). The host of Lk. vii. 36 ff. was a Simon. On the other hand, the host of John xii. 1 f., or at least a prominent guest, was Lazarus, brother of Martha and Mary. This and other points of resemblance and difference raise the question: do all the four evangelists tell the same story in different ways? On this question endless diversity of opinion has prevailed. The probability is that there were two anointings, the one reported with variations by Mt., Mk., and John, the other by Lk.; and that the two got somewhat mixed in the tradition, so that the precise details of each cannot now be ascertained. Happily the ethical or religious import of the two beautiful stories is clear.—Ver. 7. ἀλάβαστρον, an "alabaster" (vase), the term, originally denoting the material, being transferred to the vessel made of it, like our word "glass" (Speaker's *Com.*), in common use for preserving ointments (Pliny, N.H., iii., 3). An alabaster of nard (μύρου) was a present for a king. Among five precious articles sent by Cambyses to the King of Ethiopia was included α μύρου ἀλάβ. (Herod., iii., 20). On this ointment and its source *vide* Tristram, *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 484 (quoted in notes on Mk.).—βαρυτίμου (here only in N. T.), of great price; this noted to explain the sequel.—κεφαλῆς: she broke the vase and poured the contents on the *head* of Jesus, feet in John; both possible; must be combined, say the Harmonists.—Ver. 8. ἠγανάκτησαν, as in xx. 24. The disciple-circle experienced various annoyances from first to last: Syrophenician woman, mothers and children, ambition of James and John, Mary of Bethany. The last the most singular of all. Probably all the disciples disapproved more or less. It was a *woman's* act, and they were *men*. She was a poet and they were somewhat prosaic.—ἀπώλεια, waste, a precious thing thrown away. To how many things the term might be applied on similar grounds! The lives of the martyrs, *e.g.*, *cui bono?* That is the question; not so easily answered as vulgar utilitarians think. Beside this criticism of Mary place Peter's revolt against the death of Jesus (xvi. 22).—Ver. 9. δοθῆναι, etc., to be given (the proceeds, subject easily understood) to the *poor*. How much better a use than

πολλοῦ, καὶ δοθῆναι πτωχοῖς." 10. Γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί [d] κόπους [d] παρέχετε τῇ γυναικί; ἔργον γὰρ καλὸν εἰργάσατο [1] εἰς ἐμέ. 11. πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν· ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε. 12. βαλοῦσα γὰρ αὕτη το μύρον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματός μου πρὸς τὸ [e] ἐνταφιάσαι με ἐποίησεν. 13. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, λαληθήσεται καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὕτη, εἰς [f] μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς."

14. Τότε πορευθεὶς εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας Ἰσκαριώτης, πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς, 15. εἶπε, "Τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι, κἀγὼ

d Lk. xi. 7; xviii. 5. Gal. vi. 17.

e John xix. 40 (Gen. l. 2).

f Mk. xiv. 9. Acts x. 4 (Sir. xlv. 16 *al.*).

[1] ηργασατο in ℵD (Tisch., W.H.). ειρ. in BL.

to waste it in the expression of a sentiment!—Ver. 10. **γνοὺς**, perceiving though not hearing. We have many mean thoughts we would be ashamed to speak plainly out.—**τί κόπους παρέχετε**, etc., why trouble ye the woman? a phrase not frequent in classic authors, though similar ones occur, and even this occasionally (*vide* Kypke); found not only here but in Lk. xi. 7, xviii. 5, Gal. vi. 17, the last place worthy to be associated with this; St. Paul and the heroine of Bethany kindred spirits, liable to "troubles" from the same sort of people and for similar reasons.—**καλὸν**, noble, heroic: a deed done under inspiration of uncalculating love.—Ver. 11 suggests a distinction between general ethical categories and duties arising out of special circumstances. Common men recognise the former. It takes a genius or a passionate lover to see and swiftly do the latter. Mary saw and did the rare thing, and so achieved an ἔργον καλὸν.—**ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ π.**, "a melancholy litotes" (Meyer).—Ver. 12. **πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφ.**, to prepare for burial by embalming; so near is my death, though ye thought not of it: effect of the woman's act, not her conscious purpose. The Syriac version introduces a *quasi*. She meant nothing but to show her love, quickened possibly by instinctive foreboding of ill. But an act done in that spirit was the best embalming of Christ's body, or rather of His act in dying, for the two acts were kindred. Hence naturally the solemn declaration following, an essential part of the story, of indubitable authenticity.—Ver. 13. **τὸ εὐ. τοῦτο**, *this* gospel, the gospel of my death of love.—**ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ**: after **ὅπου ἐὰν** might seem superfluous; not so, however: it serves to indicate the range of the "wheresoever": wide as the world, universality predicted for Christianity, and also for the heroine of the anointing. Chrysostom, illustrating Christ's words, remarks: Even those dwelling in the British Isles (**Βρεττανικὰς νήσους**) speak of the deed done in a house in Judaea by a harlot (*Hom.* lxxx.: Chrys. identifies the anointing here with that in Lk. vii.).

Vv. 14-16. *Judas offers to betray Jesus* (Mk. xiv. 10, 11, Lk. xxii. 3-6).—Ver. 14. **τότε**, then, the roots of the betrayal go much further back than the Bethany scene—*vide* on xvii. 22, 23—but that scene would help to precipitate the fatal step. Death at last at hand, according to the Master's words. Then a base nature would feel uncomfortable in so unworldly company, and would be glad to escape to a more congenial atmosphere. Judas could not breathe freely amid the odours of the ointment and all it emblemed.—**εἷς τ. δ.**, one of the Twelve (!).—Ver. 15. **τί θέλετε**, etc., what are ye willing to give me? Mary and Judas extreme opposites: she freely spending in love, he willing to sell his Master for money. What contrasts in the world and in the same small circle! The mercenary spirit of Judas is not so apparent in Mk. and Lk.—**κἀγὼ**, etc.: **καὶ** introducing a co-ordinate clause, instead of a subordinate clause, introduced by **ὥστε** or **ἵνα**; a colloquialism or a Hebraism: the traitor mean in style as in spirit.—**ἔστησαν**, they placed (in the balance) = weighed out. Many interpret: they agreed = **συνεφώνησαν**. So Theophy.: "Not as many think, instead of **ἐζυγοστάτησαν**". This corresponds with Mk. and Lk., and the likelihood is that the money would not be paid till the work was done (Fritzsche). But Mt. has the prophecies ever in view, and uses here a prophetic word (Zech. xi. 12, **ἔστησαν τὸν μισθόν μου τρι. ἀργ.**, Sept.), indifferent as to the time when

g here only in this sense. ὑμῖν παραδώσω αὐτόν;" Οἱ δὲ ᵍἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια· 16. καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἐζήτει ʰεὐκαιρίαν ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῷ.

h Lk. xxii. 6.

17. ΤΗι δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ, λέγοντες αὐτῷ,[1] "Ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμέν σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα;" 18. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, "Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὸν ⁱδεῖνα, καὶ εἴπατε αὐτῷ, Ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει, Ὁ καιρός μου ἐγγύς ἐστι· πρὸς σὲ ʲποιῶ τὸ ʲπάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου." 19. Καὶ ἐποίησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὡς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

i here only.

j Heb. xi. 28.

20. Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης ἀνέκειτο μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα. 21. καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν εἶπεν, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με." 22. Καὶ λυπούμενοι σφόδρα ἤρξαντο λέγειν αὐτῷ ἕκαστος

[1] ℵBDLΔ omit αυτω.

payment was made. Coined money was in use, but the shekels may have been weighed out in antique fashion by men careful to do an iniquitous thing in the most orthodox way. Or there may have been no weighing in the case, but only the use of an ancient form of speech after the practice had become obsolete (Field, *Ot. Nor.*). The amount = about three or four pounds sterling, a small sum for such a service; too small thinks Meyer, who suggests that the real amount was not known, and that the sum was fixed in the tradition to suit prophecy.—Ver. 16. **εὐκαιρίαν**, a good occasion, the verb, **εὐκαιρέω** (Mk. vi. 31), belongs to late Greek (Lobeck, *Phryn.*, p. 125).

Vv. 17-19. *Arrangements for Paschal Feast* (Mk. xiv. 12-16, Lk. xxii. 7-13).—Ver. 17. **τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τ. ἀ.** The sacred season which began on the 14th Nisan and lasted for seven days, was two feasts rolled into one, the Feast of the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and it was called by either name indifferently.—**ποῦ**, where? A much more perplexing question is: when? Was it on the evening of the 13th (beginning of 14th), as the Fourth Gospel seems to say, or on the evening of the following day, as the synoptical accounts seem to imply, that Jesus kept the Paschal Feast? This is one of many harmonistic problems arising out of the Gospel narratives from this point onwards, on which an immense amount of learned labour has been spent. The discussions are irksome, and their results uncertain; and they are apt to take the attention off far more important matters: the essentials of the moving tale, common to all the evangelists. We must be content to remain in doubt as to many points.—**θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν**, the deliberative subjunctive, without **ἵνα** after **θέλεις**.—Ver. 18. **ὑπάγετε**, go ye into the city, *i.e.*, Jerusalem.—**πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα**, to such a one, evidently no sufficient direction. Mk. and Lk. are more explicit. Mt. here, as often, abbreviates. Doubtless a previous understanding had been come to between Jesus and an unknown friend in Jerusalem. Euthy. suggests that a roundabout direction was given to keep Judas in ignorance as to the rendezvous.—**ὁ καιρός μου**, my time (of death). Some (Grotius, Speaker's *Com.*, Carr, Camb. N.T.) find in the words a reason for anticipating the time of the Paschal Feast, and so one of the indications, even in the Synoptics, that John's date of the Passion is the true one.—**ποιῶ τ. π.**, I make or keep (present, not future), a usual expression in such a connection. Examples in Raphel.—**μετὰ τ. μ.**: making thirteen with the Master, a suitable number (*justa* **φρατρία**, Grotius), between the prescribed limits of ten and twenty. The lamb had to be entirely consumed (Ex. xii. 4, 43). Did Jesus and the Twelve eat the Paschal lamb?

Vv. 20-25. *The presence of a traitor announced* (Mk. xiv. 18-21, Lk. xxii. 21-23).—Vv. 20, 21. **ὀψίας δὲ γ.** It is evening, and the company are at supper, and during the meal (**ἐσθιόντων αὐ.**, ver. 21) Jesus made a startling announcement. At what stage is not indicated. Elsner suggests a late stage: "Cum fere comedissent; vergente ad finem coenâ," because an early announcement would have killed appetite.—Ver. 21. **παραδώσει με**, shall betray me. General announcement, without any clue to the individual, as in Mk. ver. 18.—Ver. 22.

αὐτῶν,[1] "Μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, κύριε;" 23. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, "Ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ [k] τρυβλίῳ τὴν χεῖρα,[2] οὗτός με παραδώσει. 24. ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [l] ὑπάγει, καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ· οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος." 25. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν εἶπε, "Μήτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ῥαββί;" Λέγει αὐτῷ, "[m] Σὺ [m] εἶπας."

26. Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν[3] ἄρτον, καὶ εὐλογήσας, ἔκλασε καὶ ἐδίδου[4] τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ[4] εἶπε, "Λάβετε, φάγετε·

k here and in parall.

l here and in Mk. xiv. 21 in sense of dying.

m ver. 64.

[1] εις εκαστος without αυτων in ℵBCLZ 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] την χειρα before εν τω τρυβλιω in ℵABLZ.

[3] ℵBCDLZ omit τον.

[4] For εδιδου τ. μ. και ειπε ℵBDLZ, cursives, have δους τ. μ. ειπεν.

λυπούμενοι seems a weak word, and the addition of the evangelist's pet word σφόδρα does not make it strong. None of the accounts realistically express the effect which must have been produced.—ἤρξαντο helps to bring out the situation: they *began* to inquire after some moments of mute astonishment.—μήτι ἐγώ, etc., can it be I? expecting or hoping for a negative answer; yet not too sure: probably many of them were conscious of fear; even Peter might be, quite compatibly with his boldness a little later.—Ver. 23. ὁ ἐμβάψας, he who dipped, dips, or shall have dipped. The aorist participle decides nothing as to time, but merely points to a single act, as distinct from a process (*cf.* the present in Mk.). The expression in Mt. does not necessarily identify the man unless we render: who has just dipped, and conceive of Jesus as dipping immediately after. (So Weiss.) In favour of this view it may be said that there was no sense in referring to a single act of dipping, when there would be many in the course of the meal, unless the circumstances were such as to make it indicate the individual disciple. The mere dipping in the same dish would not identify the traitor, because there would be several, three or four, doing the same thing, the company being divided into perhaps three groups, each having a separate dish.—τὴν χεῖρα. The ancients used their hands, not knives and forks. So still in the East.—τρυβλίῳ. Hesychius gives for this word ὀξοβάφιον = acetabulum, a vessel for vinegar. Hence Elsner thinks the reference is to a vessel full of bitter herbs steeped in vinegar, a dish partaken of at the beginning of the meal. More probably the words point to a dish containing a mixture of fruit—dates, figs, etc.—vinegar and spices, in which bread was dipped, the colour of bricks or mud, to remind them of the Egyptian bondage (*vide* Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.*, p. 831). The custom of dipping here referred to is illustrated by the following from Furrer (*Wanderungen*, p. 133): "Before us stood two plates, one with strongly spiced macaroni, the other with a dish of fine cut leeks and onions. Spoons there were none. There were four of us who dipped into the same dish."—Ver. 24. ὑπάγει, goeth, a euphemism for death. *Cf.* John xiii. 33.—καλὸν ἦν without the ἄν, not unusual in conditional sentences of this sort: supposition contrary to fact (*vide* Burton, M. T., §§ 248-9).

Vv. 26-29. *The Lord's Supper* (Mk. xiv. 22-25; Lk. xxii. 19, 20).—Ver. 26. ἐσθ. δὲ αὐτῶν: same phrase as in ver. 21, with δὲ added to introduce *another* memorable incident of the paschal supper. No details are given regarding that meal, so that we do not know how far our Lord followed the usual routine, for which consult Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, or Smith's *Dictionary*, article *Passover*. Neither can we with certainty fix the place of the Holy Supper in the paschal meal, or in relation to the announcement of the traitor. The evangelists did not concern themselves about such subordinate matters.—λαβὼν, etc., having taken a cake of bread and given thanks He broke it. The benediction may have been an old form put to a new use, or original.—εὐλογήσας has not ἄρτον for its object, which would in that case have been placed after it.—δοὺς, etc., giving

τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου." 27. Καὶ λαβὼν τὸ[1] ποτήριον, καὶ[2] εὐχαριστήσας, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· 28. τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς[3] διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. 29. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι[4] οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γεννήματος[5] τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν [n]τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ [n]πατρός μου."

n Ch. xiii. 43 (similar exp.).

[1] ℵBLZΔΣ omit το (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

[2] και is in ℵBD, but wanting in CLZΔΣ 1, 33. W.H. put it in brackets.

[3] For μου, το της καινης ℵBLZ have μου της, omitting καινης. D has the same with καινης.

[4] ℵBDZΣ omit οτι (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

[5] γενηματος in ℵABCDL *al. pl.*

to the disciples; the cake broken into as many morsels, either in the act of giving or before the distribution began.—**λάβετε φάγετε**, take, eat.—**λάβετε** only in Mk. (W. and H.).—**φάγετε** probably an interpretative addition, true but unnecessary, by our evangelist.—**τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου**, this is my body. The **ἐστι** is the copula of symbolic significance. Jesus at this sacred moment uses a beautifully simple, pathetic, and poetic symbol of His death. But this symbol has had the fate of all religious symbolism, which is to run into fetish worship; in view of which the question is raising itself in some thoughtful minds whether discontinuance, at least for a time, of the use of sacraments would not be a benefit to the religion of the spirit and more in harmony with the mind of Christ than their *obligatory* observance.—Ver. 27. **ποτήριον**, a cup, the article being omitted in best MSS. It is idle, and in spirit Rabbinical, to inquire which of the four cups drunk at the paschal feast. The evangelist had no interest in such a question.—**εὐχαριστήσας**: a different word from that used in reference to the bread, but similar in import = having given thanks to God. Observe, Jesus was in the mood, and able, at that hour, to thank and praise, confident that good would come out of evil. In Gethsemane He was able only to *submit*.—**λέγων**, etc.: Mk.'s statement that all drank of the cup, Mt. turns into a direction by Jesus to do so, liturgical practice influencing the report here as in **φάγετε**. Jesus would use the fewest words possible at such an hour.—Ver. 28. **τὸ αἷμά μου**: the very colour of the wine suggestive; hence called **αἷμα σταφυλῆς** in Deut. xxxii. 14; my blood, pointing to the passion, like the breaking of the bread.—**τῆς διαθήκης** (for the two gen. **μου** τ. δ. dependent on **αἷμα**, *vide* Winer, 30, 3, 3), the blood of me, of the *covenant*. The introduction of the idea appropriate to the circumstances: dying men make wills (**διατίθενται οἱ ἀποθνήσκοντες**, Euthy.). The epithet **καινῆς** in T. R. is superfluous, because involved in the idea. The covenant of course is new. It is Jeremiah's new covenant come at last. The blood of the covenant suggests an analogy between it and the covenant with Israel ratified by sacrifice (Ex. xxiv. 8).—**τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον**: the shedding for many suggests sacrificial analogies; the present participle vividly conceives that which is about to happen as now happening; **περὶ πολλῶν** is an echo of **ἀντὶ πολλῶν** in xx. 28.—**εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν**: not in Mk., and may be a comment on Christ's words, supplied by Mt.; but it is a true comment. For what else could the blood be shed according to Levitical analogies and even Jeremiah's new covenant, which includes among its blessings the complete forgiveness of sin?—Ver. 29 contains an express statement of the fact implied in the preceding actions, *viz.*, that death is near. It is the last time I will drink paschal (**τούτου** τ. γ., etc.) wine with you. I am to die at this passover. The second half of the sentence is not to be taken prosaically. It is the thought of meeting again, brought in to brighten the gloom of the leave-taking ("so tritt zu dem Lebewohl ein Gedanke an das Wiedersehen," Holtz., H.C.). To disentangle figure from fact in this poetic utterance about the new

30. Καὶ ° ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν. 31. τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ. γέγραπται γάρ, 'Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται[1] τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης.' 32. μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με, προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν." 33. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Εἰ καὶ[2] πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι." 34. Ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί, πρὶν ᵖ ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με." 35. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος, "Κἂν δέῃ με σὺν σοὶ ἀποθανεῖν, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσομαι." Ὁμοίως καὶ πάντες οἱ μαθηταὶ εἶπον.

o Mk. xiv. 26 (absol. as here).

p ver. 74. Mk. xiv. 30, 68. Lk. xxii. 34, 60. John xiii. 38; xviii. 27.

[1] διασκορπισθησονται in ℵABCLΣ. The sing. a correction.

[2] και omitted in most uncials.

wine is impossible. Hence such comments as those of Bengel and Meyer, to the effect that καινὸν points to a new kind of wine ("novitatem dicit plane singularem," Beng.), serve no purpose. They turn poetry into prose, and pathos into bathos.

The remarkable transaction narrated in vv. 26-29 was an acted parable proclaiming at once the fact and the epoch-making significance of the approaching passion. It sets in a striking light the personality of Jesus; His originality, His tenderness, His mastery of the situation, His consciousness of being through His life and His death the inaugurator of a new era.—Was Judas present? Who can tell? Lk.'s narrative seems to imply that he was. Mt. and Mk. give no sign. They cannot have regarded his absence as of vital importance.

Vv. 30-46. *Gethsemane* (Mk. xiv. 26-42, Lk. xxii. 39-46).—Ver. 30. ὑμνήσαντες. With this participle, referring to the last act within the supper chamber—the singing of the paschal hymn (the Hallel, part 2, Ps. 115-118, or possibly a *new* song, Grotius)—we pass without, and after talk between Jesus and the disciples, arising out of the situation, arrive at the scene of another sacred memory of the passion eve. If, as is said (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*), it was required of Jews that they should spend passover night in Jerusalem, the spirit of Jesus led Him elsewhere—towards the Mount of Olives, to the garden of the agony.—Ver. 31. τότε, then, on the way through the valley between the city and Olivet, the valley of Jehoshaphat (Kedron), suggestive of prophetic memories (Joel iii., Zech. xiii., xiv.), leading up, as well as the present situation, to the topic.—πάντες, all; one false-hearted, all without exception weak.—ἐν ἐμοὶ, in what is to befal me.—ἐν τῇ ν. τ. So near is the crisis, a matter of hours. The shadow of Gethsemane is beginning to fall on Christ's own spirit, and He knows how it must fare with men unprepared for what is coming.—γέγραπται γάρ: in Zech. xiii. 7, freely reproduced from the Hebrew.—Ver. 32 predicts a brighter future to alleviate the gloom. The Shepherd will yet again go before His flock (προάξω, *pastoris more*, Grotius), leading them.—εἰς τ. Γαλιλαίαν, the place of reunion. This verse is wanting in the Fayum Fragment, which Harnack regards as a sign of its great antiquity. Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 495.—Ver. 33. εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, if, or although, all shall be offended; the future implies great probability of the case supposed; Peter is willing to concede the likelihood of the assertion in reference to all the rest.—ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε, *I, never*, vehemently spoken and truly, *so far as he knows himself;* sincere in feeling, but weaker than he is aware of.—Ver. 34. ἐν. τ. τ. ν., repetition of statement in ver. 31, with added emphasis (ἀμὴν, etc.), and = never? this night I tell you.—πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι: more exact specification of the time to make the statement more impressive = before the dawn.—ἀλέκτωρ, poetic form for ἀλεκτρυών. This fowl not mentioned in O. T.; probably introduced into Palestine after the exile, possibly from Babylon (Benzinger, pp. 38, 94). Not allowed to be kept in Jerusalem according to Lightfoot, but this is contradicted by others (Schöttgen, Wünsche). In any case the prohibition would not apply to the Romans. Though no hens had been in Jerusalem, Jesus might have spoken the words to mark

q Mk. xiv. 32. John iv. 5. Acts i. 18, 19; iv. 34 (pl. lands); v. 3, 8; xxviii. 7 (pl.).
r Mk. xiv. 33. Phil. ii. 26.
s parall. Mk. vi. 2, 26. Lk. xviii. 23, 24.
t here and in Mk. xiv. 35.

36. ΤΟΤΕ ἔρχεται μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς [q] χωρίον λεγόμενον Γεθσημανῆ, καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς, "Καθίσατε αὐτοῦ, ἕως οὗ[1] ἀπελθὼν προσεύξωμαι ἐκεῖ."[2] 37. Καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ [r] ἀδημονεῖν. 38. τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς, "[s] Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε μετ' ἐμοῦ." 39. Καὶ προελθὼν[3] μικρόν, ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ προσευχόμενος, καὶ λέγων, "Πάτερ μου, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, [t] παρελθέτω ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο· πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὡς σύ." 40. Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, καὶ εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, "Οὕτως οὐκ

[1] The reading varies here, some MSS. having **εως ου** (B, etc.), some **εως αν** (DLΔ), some **εως ου αν** (ℵCM).

[2] **εκει προσευξωμαι** in ℵBDL 33 *al.*

[3] So in BΣ (W.H. in text). Most uncials read **προσελθων** (Tisch., W.H., in margin). Weiss thinks this an assimilation to Mt.'s usual expression, and **προελθων** the true reading.

the time of night.—**τρὶς**, thrice, suggestive of denial in *aggravated form;* on which, not on the precise number of times, as an instance of miraculous prediction, stress should be laid.—Ver. 35. Intensified protestation of fidelity—**καὶ** before **ἐάν** (**κἂν**) intensive, introducing an extreme case, death for the Master.—**οὐ μή**, making the predictive future emphatically negative = I certainly will not.—**ὁμοίως**, similarly, weaker than Mk.'s **ὡσαύτως**. Very improbable, thinks De Wette. But the disciples were placed in a delicate position by Peter's protestations, and would have to say something, however faint-heartedly.

Vv. 36-46. *The agony* (so called from the word **ἀγωνία** in Lk. xxii. 44, a **ἅπαξ λεγ.**).—Ver. 36. **χωρίον**, a place in the sense of a property or farm = *villa* in Vulgate, *ager*, Hilary, *Grundstück*, Weizsäcker's translation.—**Γεθσημανῆ**, probably = גַּת שְׁמָן, an oil press. Descriptions of the place now identified with it in Robinson's *Researches*, Furrer's *Wanderungen*, and Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*. — **καθίσατε αὐτοῦ**: Jesus arranges that a good distance shall be between Himself and the body of the disciples when He enters the valley of the shadow of death. He expects no help from them.—**ἐκεῖ**, there! pointing to the place visible in the moonlight.—Ver. 37. **παραλαβὼν**: He takes the same three as at the transfiguration along with Him that they may be near enough to prevent a feeling of utter isolation.—**ἤρξατο**, He began. This beginning refers to the appearance of distress; the inward beginning came earlier. He hid His feelings till He had reduced His following to three; then allowed them to appear to those who, He hoped, could bear the revelation and give Him a little sympathy.—**ἀδημονεῖν**, of uncertain derivation. Euthy. gives as its equivalent **βαρυθυμεῖν**, to be dejected or heavy-hearted.—Ver. 38. **τοτὲ λέγει αὐτ.**: He confides to the three His state of mind without reserve, as if He wished it to be known. *Cf.* the use made in the epistle to the Hebrews of this frank manifestation of weakness as showing that Christ could not have usurped the priestly office, but rather simply submitted to be made a priest (chap. v. 7, 8).—**περίλυπος**, overwhelmed with distress, "über und über traurig" (Weiss).—**ἕως θανάτου**, mortally = death by anticipation, showing that it was the Passion with all its horrors vividly realised that was causing the distress. Hilary, true to his docetic tendency, represents Christ as distressed on account of the three, fearing they might altogether lose their faith in God.—**ὧδε**: the three stationed nearer the scene of agony to keep watch there.—Ver. 39. **μικρὸν**, a little space, presumably near enough for them to hear (*cf.* Lk. xxii. 41).—**ἐπὶ πρόσωπον**, on His face, not on knees, *summa demissio* (Beng.).—**πάτερ**, Father! Weiss in Markus-Evang. seems to think that the one word Abba was all the three heard, the rest of the prayer being an

ἰσχύσατε μίαν ὥραν γρηγορῆσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ; 41. γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν. τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής." 42. Πάλιν [u] ἐκ [u] δευτέρου ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο, λέγων, "Πάτερ μου, εἰ οὐ δύναται τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον[1] παρελθεῖν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ,[2] ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὸ πίω, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου." 43. Καὶ ἐλθὼν εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς πάλιν[3] καθεύδοντας· ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ [v] βεβαρημένοι. 44. Καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτούς, ἀπελθὼν πάλιν,[4] προσηύξατο ἐκ τρίτου, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών.[5] 45. τότε ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ,[6] καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Καθεύδετε τὸ[7] λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε· ἰδού, ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν. 46. ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν. ἰδού, ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με."

u Mk. xiv. 72. John ix. 24. Acts xi. 9. Heb. ix. 28.

v Mk. xiv. 40 (T. R.). Lk. ix. 32; xxi. 34. [2] Cor. i. 8; v. 14.

[1] ℵABCLΔ omit το ποτηριον (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] ℵBDL omit απ εμου (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] παλιν ευρεν αυτους in ℵBCDLΣ.

[4] παλιν απελθων in ℵBCDL.

[5] ℵBL have a second παλιν after ειπων.

[6] Most uncials omit αυτου.

[7] το omitted in BCL.

expansion and interpretation by the evangelist. But if they heard one word they could hear more. The prayer uttered in such a state of distress would be a *loud outburst* (*cf.* μετὰ κραυγῆς ἰσχυρᾶς, Heb. v. 7), *at once*, therefore before the disciples had time to fall asleep or even get drowsy.—τὸ ποτήριον τ., this cup (of death).—πλὴν, etc., howbeit not as I wish, but as Thou, expressively elliptical; no doubt spoken in a calmer tone, the subdued accent suggestive of a change of mood even if the very words did not distinctly reach the ear of the three. Grotius, from theological solicitudes, takes θέλω = θέλοιμι, "vellem" ("more Hebraeorum, qui neque potentialem neque optativum modum habent").—Ver. 40. ἔρχεται: not necessarily immediately after uttering the foregoing prayer. Jesus may have lain on the ground for a considerable time silent.—τῷ Πέτρῳ: all three were asleep, but the reproach was most fitly addressed to Peter, the would-be valiant and loyal disciple.—οὕτως: Euthy. puts a mark of interrogation after this word, whereby we get this sense: So? Is this what it has come to? You were not able to watch with me one hour! A spirited rendering in consonance with Mark's version.

Vv. 42-46. *Further progress of the agony.*—That Jesus had not yet reached final victory is apparent from His complaint against the disciples. He came craving, needing a sympathy He had not got. When the moment of triumph comes He will be independent of them.—Ver. 42. λέγων, saying; whereupon follow the words. Mark simply states that Jesus prayed to the same effect.—οὐ δύναται: οὐ not μὴ. He knows that it is not possible, yet the voice of nature says strongly: would that it were!—Ver. 43. καθεύδοντας: again! surprising, one would say incredible on first thoughts, but not on second. It was late and they were sad, and sadness is soporific.—Ver. 44. Jesus leaves them sleeping and goes away again for the final struggle, praying as before.—Ver. 45. καθεύδετε λ. κ. ἀναπαύεσθε, sleep now and rest, not ironical or reproachful; nor yet seriously meant, but concessive = ye may sleep and rest indefinitely so far as I am concerned; I need no longer your watchful interest. The Master's time of weakness is past; He is prepared to face the worst.—ἡ ὥρα: He expects the worst to begin forthwith; the cup, which He prayed might pass, to be put immediately into His hands.—παραδίδοται, betrayal the first step, on the point of being taken.—ἁμαρτωλῶν, the Synedrists, with whom Judas has been bargaining.—ἐγείρ. ἄγωμ., sudden change of mood, on signs of a hostile approach: arise, let us go; spoken as if by a general to his army.—ὁ παραδιδούς, the traitor is seen to be coming. It is noticeable that throughout the narrative, in speaking of the action of Judas, the verb παραδίδωμι is used instead of προδίδωμι: the former expresses the idea of delivering to death,

47. Καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδού, Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα ἦλθε, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ [w] ξύλων, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ. 48. ὁ δὲ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς σημεῖον, λέγων, "Ὃν ἂν φιλήσω, αὐτός ἐστι· κρατήσατε αὐτόν." 49. Καὶ εὐθέως, προσελθὼν τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἶπε, "Χαῖρε, ῥαββί," καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. 50. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ᾧ [1] πάρει;" Τότε προσελθόντες ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας

[w] here and in parall. = cudgels.

[1] εφ ο in ℵABCDLΔ, etc. (modern editors).

the latter of delivering into the hands of those who sought His life (Euthy. on ver. 21).

The scene in the garden is intrinsically probable and without doubt historical. The temptation was to suppress rather than to invent in regard both to the behaviour of Jesus and to that of His disciples. It is not the creation of theology, though theology has made its own use of it. It is recorded simply because it was known to have happened.

Vv. 47-56. *The apprehension* (Mk. xiv. 43-52, Lk. xxii. 47-53).—**εἷς τ. δώδεκα**, as in ver. 14, repeated not for information, but as the literary reflection of the chronic horror of the apostolic church that such a thing should be possible. That it was not only possible but a fact is one of the almost undisputed certainties of the passion history. Even Brandt, who treats that history very sceptically, accepts it as fact (*Die Evangelische Geschichte*, p. 18).—**μετ' αὐτοῦ**, etc.: the description of the company to whom Judas acted as guide is vague; **ὄχ. πολ.** is elastic, and might mean scores, hundreds, thousands, according to the standard of comparison.—**ὄχλος** does not suggest soldiery as its constituents, neither does the description of the arms borne—swords and staves. Lk. (xxii. 52, **στρατηγοὺς τ. ἱεροῦ**) seems to have in his mind the temple police, consisting of priests and Levites with assistants, and this view appears intrinsically probable, though Brandt (*E. G.*, p. 4) scouts it. The Jewish authorities would make arrangements to ensure their purpose; the temple police was at their command, and they would send a sufficiently large number to overpower the followers of their victim, however desperate their resistance.—Ver. 48. **ἔδωκεν**: the traitor, as he approached the place where he shrewdly guessed Jesus would be, *gave* (*dedit*, Vulg.), not *had given*. His plan was not cut and dry from the first. It flashed upon him as he drew near and began to think how he would meet his Master. The old charm of the Master reasserts itself in his soul, and he feels he must salute Him affectionately. At the same instant it flashes upon him that the kiss which both smouldering love and cowardice compel may be utilised as a sign. Inconsistent motives? Yes, but such is human nature, especially in the Judas type: two-souled men, drawn opposite ways by the good and evil in them; betraying loved ones, then hanging themselves.—Ver. 48. **αὐτός ἐστιν**, He and no other is the man.—Ver. 49. **κατεφίλησεν**, kissed Him heartily. In late Greek there was a tendency to use compounds with the force of the simple verb, and this has been supposed to be a case in point (De Wette). But coming after **φιλήσω**, ver. 48, the compound verb is plainly used with intention. It occurs again in Lk. vii. 38, 45, xv. 20, obviously with intensive force. What a tremendous contrast between the woman in Simon's house (Lk. vii.) and Judas! Both kissed Jesus fervently: with strong emotion; yet the one could have died for Him, the other betrays Him to death. Did Jesus remember the woman at that moment?—Ver. 50. **ἑταῖρε**: so might a master salute a disciple, and disciple or companion is, I think, the sense of the word here (so Elsner, Palairet, Wolf, Schanz, Carr, Camb. N. T.). It answers to **ῥαββί** in the salute of Judas.—**ἐφ' ὃ πάρει**, usually taken as a question: "ad quid venisti?" Vulg. Wherefore art thou come? A.V. "Wozu bist du da?" Weizsäcker. Against this is the grammatical objection that instead of **ὃ** should have been **τί**. Winer, § 24, 4, maintains that **ὃς** might be used instead of **τίς** in a direct question in late Greek. To get over the difficulty various suggestions have been made: Fritzsche renders: friend, for what work you are come! taking **ὃ = οἷον**. Others treat the sentence as elliptical, and supply words before or after: *e.g.*, *say* for what you are come (Morison), or what you have come for, *that do*, R. V., Meyer, Weiss. The last is least satisfactory, for Judas had already done it, as Jesus instinctively

ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν. 51. Καὶ ἰδού, εἷς τῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ, ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, [x] ἀπέσπασε τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πατάξας τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ [y] ὠτίον. 52. τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀπόστρεψόν σου τὴν μάχαιραν[1] εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς· πάντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ ἀπολοῦνται. 53. ἢ δοκεῖς ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι ἄρτι[2] παρακαλέσαι τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ παραστήσει μοι πλείους ἢ[3] δώδεκα λεγεῶνας ἀγγέλων; 54. πῶς οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί, ὅτι οὕτω δεῖ γενέσθαι;"

55. Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς ὄχλοις, "Ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξήλθετε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων [z] συλλαβεῖν με; καθ'

[x] here only in same sense. (Mk. simple verb). *Cf.* Lk. xxii. 41. Acts xx. 30; xxi. 1.

[y] Mk. xiv. 47 (T. R.). Lk. xxii. 51. John xviii. 10 (T. R.).

[z] parall. Acts i. 16; xii. 3; xxiii. 27.

[1] σου after την μαχαιραν in ℵBDL.

[2] αρτι after παραστησει μοι in ℵBL 33 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] For πλειους η ℵBD have πλειω. The reading in T. R. is a grammatical correction uncalled for, as the construction in πλειω δ. λεγεωνας is good Greek.

knew. Fritzsche's suggestion is ingenious, and puts a worthy thought into Christ's mouth. Perhaps the best solution is to take the words as a question in *effect*, though not in *form*. Disciple, for which, or as which you are present? Comrade, and as a comrade here? So Judas pretended, and by the laconic phrase Jesus at once states and exposes the pretence, possibly pointing to the crowd behind in proof of the contrary. So in effect Beng.: "hoccine illud est cujus causa ad es"; also Schanz. The point is that the Master gives the false disciple to understand that He does not believe in his paraded affection.

Vv. 51-54. *Blood drawn.*—ἰδού, introducing a second scene connected with the apprehension (*cf.* ver. 47); the use of a weapon by one of Christ's disciples. A quite likely occurrence if any of them happened to have weapons in their hands, though we may wonder at that. It might be a large knife used in connection with the Paschal feast. Who used the weapon is not said by the Synop. Did they know? The article before μάχαιραν might suggest that the whole party were armed, each disciple having his sword. The fear that they might be explains the largeness of the band following Judas.—Ver. 52. ἀπόστρεψον: Jesus could not encourage the use of arms by His disciples, and the order to sheathe the weapon He was sure to give. The accompanying word, containing a general legal maxim: draw the sword, perish with the sword (the subsequent history of the Jewish people a tragic exemplification of its truth), suitably enforces the order. Weiss thinks that this word recorded here was spoken by Jesus at some other time, if at all, for it appears to be only a free reproduction of Rev. xiii. 10 (Meyer, ed. Weiss). This and the next two verses are wanting in Mk. and Lk.—Ver. 53 gives another reason for not using the sword: if it were God's will that His Son should be rescued it could be done in a different way. The way suggested is described in military language, the verbs παρακαλεῖν and παριστάναι being both used in classics in connection with military matters, and the word λεγεῶνας suggesting the battalions of the Roman army.—δώδεκα, twelve legions, one for each of the twelve disciples.—πλείω, even more than that vast number, Divine resources boundless. The free play of imagination displayed in this conception of a great army of angels evinces the elasticity of Christ's spirit and His perfect self-possession at a critical moment.—Ver. 54. πῶς οὖν: refers to both forms of aid, that of the sword and that of angels (Grotius, Fritzsche); rescue in any form inconsistent with the predicted destiny of Messiah to be a sufferer.—ὅτι οὕτω, etc., the purport of all prophetic scripture is that thus it should be: apprehension and all that is to follow.

Vv. 55, 56. *Jesus complains of the manner of His apprehension.*—ἐν ἐκ. τ. ὥρᾳ, connects with ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν in ver. 50. Having said what was necessary to the bellicose disciple, Jesus turns to the party who had come to arrest Him,

ἡμέραν πρὸς ὑμᾶς[1] ἐκαθεζόμην διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ,[2] καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με. 56. τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν, ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν." Τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ[3] πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον.

57. ΟΙ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα, ὅπου οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι συνήχθησαν. 58. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ἀπὸ[4] μακρόθεν, ἕως τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἔσω ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν, ἰδεῖν

[1] ℵBL 33 omit προς υμας (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] εν τω ιερω before εκαθεζομην in ℵBL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] B has αυτου after μαθηται (W.H. in margin).

[4] BD have απο (W.H. in brackets). ℵCLΔ omit (Tisch.).

here called τοῖς ὄχλοις.—ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν, etc.: the words may be taken either as a question or as a statement of fact. In either case Jesus complains that they have arrested Him as if He were a robber or other criminal. A robber as distinct from a thief (*vide* Trench, *Synonyms*) is one who uses violence to possess himself of others' property, and Christ's complaint is in the first place that they have treated Him as one who meant to offer resistance. But the reference to His past habit in the sequel seems to show that He has another complaint in His mind, *viz.*, that they have regarded Him as one *hiding from justice*. The allusion is to the invasion of His privacy in the garden, and the implied suggestion that they have put a false construction on His presence there. They think He has been seeking escape from His fate when in fact He has been bracing Himself up for it! To what misconstruction the holiest and noblest actions are liable, and how humiliating to the heroic soul! It was thoroughly characteristic of Jesus that He should feel the humiliation, and that He should at once give expression to the feeling. This against Brandt (p. 6), who thinks this utterance in no respect appropriate to the situation.—καθ' ἡμέραν, etc.: Jesus asks in effect why they did not apprehend Him while, for several days in succession, He sat in the temple precincts teaching. To this it might be replied that that was easier said than done, in midst of a miscellaneous crowd containing not a few friends of the obnoxious teacher (so Brandt). But what Jesus is concerned to point out is, not the practicability of arrest in the temple, but that His behaviour had been fearless. How could they imagine that a man who spoke His mind so openly could slink away into hiding-places like an evil-doer? Brandt remarks that the complaint is addressed to the wrong persons: to the underlings rather than to the hierarchs. It is addressed to those who actually apprehended Jesus, whoever they were. Who composed that crowd it would not be easy in the dark to know.—Ver. 56. τοῦτο δὲ: a formula of the evangelist, introducing another reference by Jesus to the prophecies in these terms, ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν, etc. Jesus reconciles Himself to the indignity in the manner of His arrest, as to the arrest itself, and all that it involved, by the thought that it was in His "cup" as described by the prophets. The prophetic picture of Messiah's experience acted as a sedative to His spirit.—τότε, then, when the apprehension had been effected, and meekly submitted to by Jesus.—πάντες, Peter included.—ἔφυγον, fled, to save themselves, since their Master could not be saved. This another bitter drop in the cup: absolute loneliness.

Vv. 57-68. *Before Caiaphas* (Mk. xiv. 53-65; Lk. xxii. 54, 66-71).—πρὸς Καιάφαν, to Caiaphas, who sent them forth, and who expects their return with their victim.—ὅπου: where, *i.e.*, in the palace of Caiaphas.—γρ. καὶ πρ.: scribes and presbyters, priests and presbyters in ver. 3. Mk. names all the three; doubtless true to the fact.—συνήχθησαν, were assembled, waiting for the arrival of the party sent out to arrest Jesus. In Mk. the coming together of the Sanhedrim appears to be synchronous with the arrival of Jesus. This meeting happens when the world is asleep, and when

τὸ τέλος. 59. Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι[1] καὶ τὸ συνέδριον ὅλον ἐζήτουν [a] ψευδομαρτυρίαν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὸν θανατώσωσι, 60. καὶ[2] οὐχ [b] εὗρον· καὶ πολλῶν [c] ψευδομαρτύρων προσελθόντων, οὐχ εὗρον.[2] ὕστερον δὲ προσελθόντες δύο ψευδομάρτυρες[3] 61. εἶπον, "Οὗτος ἔφη, Δύναμαι καταλῦσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ [d] διὰ τριῶν [d] ἡμερῶν οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτόν."[4] 62. Καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνῃ; τί οὗτοί σου [e] καταμαρτυροῦσιν;"

a Ch. xv. 19.
b Ch. xii. 43.
c 1 Cor. xv. 15.
d parall. Mk. ii. 1. Acts xxiv. 17. Gal. ii. 1.
e Ch. xxvii. 13. Mk. xiv. 60.

[1] ℵBDL 69 *it. vg.*, Egypt. verss., omit οι πρεσβυτεροι, which comes in from ver. 57.

[2] For the passage και ουκ ευρον . . . ουκ ευρον ℵBCL verss. have και ουκ ευρον πολλων ψευδομαρτυρων προσελθοντων (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

[3] ℵBL omit ψευδομαρτυρες.

[4] B omits αυτον (W.H.).

judicial iniquity can be perpetrated quietly.—Ver. 58 is the prelude to the story of Peter's denial, which is resumed at ver. 69 after the account of the trial. Similarly in Mk. Lk. gives the story without interruption.—**μακρόθεν**, from afar: Peter followed his Master, having after a while recovered from the general panic; more courageous than the rest, yet not courageous enough; just enough of the hero in him to bring him into the region of temptation.—**ἕως τ. αὐ.** *Cf.* Mk., ver. 54.—**ἰδεῖν τὸ τέλος**: to see the end; a good Greek phrase. Motives: curiosity and honest interest in the fate of his loved Master. Jerome puts these alternatively: "vel amore discipuli vel humana curiositate".

Vv. 59-68. *The trial.*—Ver. 59. **τ. συν. ὅλον**, the *whole* Sanhedrim, *cf.* **πάντες** in Heb. iii. 16, the statement in both cases admitting of a few exceptions. — **ψευδομαρτυρίαν**, *false* evidence, of course in the first place from the evangelist's point of view (**μαρτυρίαν** in Mk.), but substantially true to the fact. They wanted evidence for a foregone conclusion; no matter though it was false if it only looked true and hung fairly well together. Jesus was apprehended to be put to death, and the trial was only a blind, a form rendered necessary by the fact that there was a Procurator to be satisfied.—Ver. 60. **οὐκ εὗρον**: they found not false witness that looked plausible and justified capital punishment.—**πολλῶν π. ψ.**: it was not for want of witnesses of a kind; many offered themselves and made statements, but they did not serve the purpose: either trivial or inconsistent; conceivable in the circumstances: coming forward on the spur of the moment from the crowd in answer to an invitation from prejudiced judges eager for damnatory evidence. Those who responded deserved to be stigmatised as false. None but base, mean creatures would have borne evidence in such a case.—**δύο**, only two had anything to say worth serious attention.—Ver. 61. **οὗτος ἔφη**, this person said: then follows a version of a word really spoken by Jesus, of a startling character, concerning destroying and rebuilding the temple. An inaccurate report of so remarkable a saying might easily go abroad, and the version given by the two witnesses seems from xxvii. 40 to have been current. They might, therefore, have borne wrong evidence without being false in intention.—**δύναμαι**, in an emphatic position, makes Jesus appear as one boasting of preternatural power, and **τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ**, as irreverently parading His power in connection with a sacred object.—**διὰ τ. ἡ.**, literally *through* three days = after: for similar use of the preposition, *vide* Gal. ii. 1. The meaning is: after three days I will complete the rebuilding, so that **διὰ** in effect is = **ἐν** in John ii. 19.—Ver. 62. **ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρ.**: the high priest rose up not because he felt the evidence just led to be very serious, rather in irritation because the most damaging statements amounted to nothing more serious. A man could not be sentenced to death for a boastful word (Grotius).—**οὐδὲν ἀποκρίνῃ . . . καταμαρτυροῦσιν**: either one question as in Vulg.: "nihil respondes ad ea quae isti adversum te testificantur?" or two as in A. V. and R. V., so also Weizsäcker: answerest Thou nothing? what do these witness against Thee? It is an attempt of a baffled man to draw Jesus into explanations about the saying which will make it more damaging as evidence against Him. What about this pretentious word

63. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐσιώπα. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς [1] ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "[f] Ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς, εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ." 64. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Σὺ εἶπας. πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ." 65. Τότε ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς [g] διέρρηξε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, λέγων, "Ὅτι [2] ἐβλασφήμησε· τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; ἴδε, νῦν ἠκούσατε τὴν βλασφημίαν αὐτοῦ.[3] 66. τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ;" Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον, "[h] Ἔνοχος θανάτου ἐστί." 67. Τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ [i] ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν· οἱ δὲ ἐρράπισαν, λέγοντες, 68. "Προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, Χριστέ, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;"

f here only.
g Mk. xiv. 63. Acts xiv. 14.
h Mk. xiv. 64. Mk. iii. 29 (T. R.), with gen. of penalty (Gen. xxvi. 11).
i Mk. xiv. 65. 1 Cor. iv. 11. 2 Cor. xii. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 20.

[1] BLZ vul. Copt. *al.* omit **αποκριθεις**.

[2] ℵBDLZΣ 33 omit **οτι**.

[3] ℵBDLZ omit **αυτου**.

of yours; is it true that you said it, and what does it mean?—Ver. 63. **ἐσιώπα**: Jesus seeing the drift of the questions gave the high priest no assistance, but continued silent.—**ἐξορκίζω** (**ἐξορκόω** more common in classics). The high priest now takes a new line, seeing that there is no chance of conviction any other way. He puts Jesus on His oath as to the cardinal question of Messiahship.—**εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς**, etc.: not two questions but one, Son of God being exegetical of the title Christ. If He was the one He was the other *ipso facto*.—Ver. 64. **σὺ εἶπας**: in current phrase = I am. Was Jesus morally bound to answer? Why not continue silent? First, the whole ministry of Jesus had made the question inevitable. Second, the high priest was the proper person to ask it. Third, it was an important opportunity for giving expression to His Messianic self-consciousness. Fourth, silence would, in the cirumstances, have amounted to denial.—**πλὴν** not = "nevertheless," but rather = nay more: I have something more startling to tell you. What follows describes the future of the Son of Man in apocalyptic terms, and is meant to suggest the thought: "the time is coming when you and I shall change places; I then the Judge, you the prisoners at the bar".

Vv. 65-68. **τότε**: At last they have, or think they have, Him at their mercy.—**διέρρηξεν**, etc.: a very imposing act as the expression of true emotion; in reality a theatrical action demanded by custom and performed in accordance with rule: length and locality of rent, the garments to be rent (the nether; all of them, even if there were ten, said the Rabbinical rule: note the plural here, **τὰ ἱμάτια**), all fixed. A common custom among Eastern peoples. It was highly proper that holy men should seem shocked immeasurably by "blasphemy". — **ἐβλασφήμησεν**: Was it blasphemy for a man to call Himself Messiah in a country where a Messiah was expected? Obviously not. It might be to call oneself Messiah falsely. But that was a point for careful and deliberate examination, not to be taken for granted. The judgment of the high priest and the obsequious vote of the Sanhedrim were manifestly premature. But it does not follow from this that the evangelist's account of the trial is unhistorical (Brandt, p. 62). The Sanhedrists, as reported, behave *suo more*.—Ver. 66. **ἔνοχος θανάτου**: death the penalty of blasphemy, Lev. xxiv. 15, and of being a false prophet, Deut. xviii. 20.—Vv. 67-68: to judicial injustice succeed personal indignities: spitting in the face (**ἐνέπτυσαν**), smiting with the fist (**ἐκολάφισαν**, not Attic, **κονδυλίζω** used instead), or with the open hand (**ἐρράπισαν**, originally to beat with rods). Euthy. Zig. distinguishes the two last words thus: **κολαφισμὸς** is a stroke on the neck with the hollow of the hand so as to make a noise, **ῥαπισμὸς** a stroke on the face. The perpetrators of these outrages in Mk. are **τινὲς** and **οἱ ὑπηρέται**, the former word presumably pointing to some Sanhedrists. In Mt. the connection suggests Sanhedrists alone. Incredible that they should condescend to so unworthy proceedings, one is inclined to say. Yet it was night, there was intense dislike, and they might feel

69. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔξω ἐκάθητο[1] ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ, καὶ προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ μία [j] παιδίσκη, λέγουσα, "Καὶ σὺ ἦσθα μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Γαλιλαίου." 70. Ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, λέγων, "Οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις." 71. Ἐξελθόντα δὲ αὐτὸν[2] εἰς τὸν [k] πυλῶνα, εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἄλλη, καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἐκεῖ, "Καὶ[3] οὗτος ἦν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου." 72. Καὶ πάλιν ἠρνήσατο [l] μεθ' ὅρκου, "Ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον." 73. Μετὰ μικρὸν δὲ προσελθόντες οἱ ἑστῶτες εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ, "Ἀληθῶς καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ· καὶ γὰρ ἡ [m] λαλιά σου [n] δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ." 74. Τότε ἤρξατο καταναθεματίζειν[4] καὶ ὀμνύειν, "Ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον." Καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε. 75. καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ[5] Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος αὐτῷ,[6] "Ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με." καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω [o] ἔκλαυσε πικρῶς.

j parall. Lk. xii. 45. Acts xii. 13. Gal. iv. 22.
k Lk. xvi. 20. Acts x. 17; xiv. 13.
l Ch. xiv. 7 (same phrase).
m John iv. 42; viii. 43.
n 1 Cor. xv. 27. Gal. iii. 11.
o Ch. ii. 18. Mk. v. 38, 39. Lk. vi. 21, 25.

[1] εκαθητο εξω in ℵBDLZ.
[2] ℵBLZ omit this αυτον.
[3] ℵBD omit και before ουτος.
[4] The mass of uncials have καταθεματιζειν.
[5] The article is wanting in most uncials.
[6] ℵBDL omit αυτω.

they did God service by disgracing a pretender. Hence the invitation to the would-be christ to prophesy (προφήτευσον) who smote him when he was struck behind the back or blindfolded (Mk. xiv. 65). Thus did they fill up the early hours of the morning on that miserable night. Sceptical critics, *e.g.*, Brandt, p. 69, also Holtz., H. C., suggest that the colouring of this passage is drawn from O. T. texts, such as Micah iv. 14 (Sept. v. 1, A. V.), Is. l. 6, liii. 3-5, 1 Kings xxii. 24, and that probably the texts created the "facts". That of course is abstractly possible, but the statement of the evangelist is intrinsically probable, and it is to be noted that not even in Mt. is there a "that it might be fulfilled".

Vv. 69-75. *Peter's denial* (Mk. xiv. 66-72, Lk. xxii. 54-62). The discrepancies of the four accounts here are perplexing but not surprising. It would be difficult for any one present in the confused throng gathered within the palace gate that night to tell exactly what happened. Peter himself, the hero of the tale, had probably only hazy recollections of some particulars, and might not always relate the incident in the same way. Harmonistic efforts are wasted time. Comparative exegesis may partly explain how one narrative, say Mt.'s, arose out of another, *e.g.*, Mk.'s (Weiss, Marcus-Evang.). But on the whole it is best to take each version by itself, as one way of telling a story, which in the main is accepted even by writers like Brandt as one of the certainties of the Passion history.

Ver. 69. **ὁ δὲ Π.**: **δὲ** resumes the Peter-episode introduced at ver. 58.—**ἐκάθητο**, was sitting, while the judicial proceedings were going on.—**αὐλῇ**, here means the court, *atrium;* the trial would take place in a chamber within the buildings surrounding the court.—**μία π.**, *one* servant girl, to distinguish from another referred to in ver. 71 (ἄλλη).—**καὶ σὺ**, you too, as if she had seen Jesus in company with His disciples, Peter one of them, recognisable again, perhaps during the last few days.—**Γαλιλαίου**: He a Galilean; you, too, by your tongue.—Ver. 70. **οὐκ οἶδα**, etc.: affectation of extreme ignorance. So far from knowing the man I don't even know what you are talking about. This said *before all* (ἔμπ. πάντων). First denial, entailing others to follow.—Ver. 71. **εἰς τ. πυλῶνα**, to or towards the gateway, away from the crowd in the court.—**ἄλλη** (παιδίσκη), another saw him, and said, not to him, but to others there (not easy to escape!).—**οὗτος**, etc., this person, pointing to him, was, etc.—Ver. 72. **μεθ' ὅρκου**: second denial, more emphatic, with an oath, and more direct: I know not the man (**τὸν ἄν.**).—Ver. 73. **οἱ ἑστῶτες**, loungers; seeing Peter's confusion, and amusing themselves by tormenting him. — **ἀληθῶς**, beyond doubt, you, too, are one of them; of the notorious gang.—**ἡ λαλιά**: They had

XXVII. 1. ΠΡΩΙΑΣ δὲ γενομένης, συμβούλιον ἔλαβον πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτόν· 2. καὶ δήσαντες αὐτὸν ἀπήγαγον, καὶ παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν Ποντίῳ[1] Πιλάτῳ τῷ ἡγεμόνι.

3. Τότε ἰδὼν Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδοὺς[2] αὐτόν, ὅτι κατεκρίθη, μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπέστρεψε[3] τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ

[1] **αυτον Ποντιω** omitted in ℵBLΣ; C omits **αυτον**. The words are an explanatory gloss.

[2] **παραδους** in BL 33. [3] **εστρεψε** in ℵBL (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

heard him speak in his second denial, which so leads up to a third. Galilean speech was defective in pronouncing the gutturals, and making שׁ = ת.—Ver. 74. **καταθεματίζειν** (here only **καταναθ.** in T. R., probably belonging to vulgar speech, Meyer), to call down curses on himself, sign of irritation and desperation; has lost self-control completely. —**καὶ εὐθὺς**: just after this passionate outburst *a cock crew*.—"Magna circumstantia," Beng.—Ver. 75. **καὶ ἐμνήσθη**: The cock crowing caused a sudden revulsion of feeling, and flashed in on Peter's mind the light of a vivid recollection: the word his Master had spoken.—**πρὶν**, etc., repeated as in ver. 34.—**ἐξελθὼν**, going out, neither in fear of apprehension (Chrys., Euthy.) nor from shame (Orig., Jer.), but that he might give free rein to penitent feeling.—**ἔκλαυσεν**, wept loudly, as distinct from **δακρύειν** (John xi. 35), to shed tears.

CHAPTER XXVII. THE PASSION HISTORY CONTINUED.—Vv. 1, 2. *Morning meeting of the Sanhedrim* (Mk. xv. 1, Lk. xxii. 66, xxiii. 1).—Ver. 1. **συμβούλιον ἔλαβον**: this consultation took place at a meeting of Sanhedrim, which was probably only a continuation of the night meeting, though regarded as formally a second meeting, to keep right with the law which humanely required, at least, two sittings in a grave criminal case; the Sanhedrists in this, as in all things, careful to observe the letter, while sinning against the spirit of the law. Those who were present at the night meeting would scarcely have time to go home, as the hearing of many witnesses (xxvi. 59) would take hours. Absent members might be summoned to the morning meeting (Elsner), or might come, knowing that they were expected. —**πάντες** points to a full meeting, as does also **τοῦ λαοῦ** after **πρεσβύτεροι**. The meeting was supremely important, though in one respect *pro formâ*. The law or custom required a death sentence to be pronounced during day-time. Therefore, the vote of the night meeting had to be formally confirmed. Then they had to consider in what shape the case was to be put so as to ensure the consent of Pilate to the execution of their sentence; a most vital matter.—**ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτόν**, so that they might compass His death; the phrase seems meant to cover both aspects of the business on hand: the formal sentence of death, and the adoption of means for securing that it might be carried into effect.—**ὥστε**, with infinitive, here expresses tendency: that He should die the drift of all done. The result as yet remained uncertain.—Ver. 2. **δήσαντες**: no mention of binding before in Mt.'s narrative. If Jesus was bound at His apprehension the fetters must have been taken off during the trial.—**ἀπήγαγον**, etc., they led Him away and delivered Him to Pontius Pilate. No mention at this point what they had resolved to say to Pilate. That comes out in Pilate's questioning. Pilate was a very undesirable judge to come to with such a cause, a poor representative of Roman authority; as described by Philo. and Josephus, as destitute of fear of God or respect for justice, as the unjust judge of the parable; but, like him, accessible on the side of self-interest, as, no doubt, the Sanhedrists knew very well.—**τῷ ἡγεμόνι**, the governor; a general title for one exercising supreme authority as representing the emperor. The more specific title was **ἐπίτροπος**, procurator. The ordinary residence of procurators was Caesarea, on the sea coast, but it was their custom to be in Jerusalem at passover time, with a detachment of soldiers, to watch over the public peace.

Vv. 3-10. *The despair of Judas*.—Peculiar to Matthew; interesting to the evangelist as a testimony even from the

τοῖς[1] πρεσβυτέροις, 4. λέγων, "Ἥμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα [a] ἀθῷον." Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς; σὺ ὄψει."[2] 5. Καὶ ῥίψας τὰ ἀργύρια ἐν τῷ ναῷ,[3] ἀνεχώρησε· καὶ ἀπελθὼν [b] ἀπήγξατο. 6. Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς λαβόντες τὰ ἀργύρια εἶπον, "Οὐκ ἔξεστι βαλεῖν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν [c] κορβανᾶν, ἐπεὶ [d] τιμὴ αἵματός ἐστι." 7. Συμβούλιον δὲ λαβόντες, ἠγόρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ [e] κεραμέως, εἰς [f] ταφὴν τοῖς ξένοις. 8. διὸ ἐκλήθη ὁ ἀγρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀγρὸς αἵματος, ἕως τῆς σήμερον. 9. τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος, 'Καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου, ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ· 10. καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως, καθὰ συνέταξέ μοι Κύριος.'

a here and in ver. 24.
b here only in N. T. (Tobit iii. 10).
c here only.
d here, ver. 9. Acts iv. 34. 1 Cor. vi. 20 al.
e Rom. ix. 21.
f here only.

[1] ℵBCL 33 omit τοις. [2] οψη in the most important uncials.
[3] εις τον ναον in ℵBL 33, 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

false disciple to the innocence of Jesus, and the wickedness of His enemies, and as a curious instance of prophecy fulfilled.—Ver. 3. **τότε** connects the repentance of Judas with the leading of Jesus away to Pilate which he regarded as sealing his fate. What happened was but the natural result of the apprehension which he himself had brought about, and he doubtless had the natural issue in view at the moment of apprehension. But reaction had set in, partly as a matter of course in a "two-souled" man, partly at sight of the grim reality: his Master led to death by his assistance (ὅτι κατεκρίθη).—**μεταμεληθεὶς**, regretting, rueing what he had done: wishing it were undone.—**ἀπέστρεψε** (ἔστρεψε W.H. as in Is. xxxviii. 8), returned the thirty pieces of silver, a sign in such a nature that the repentance as far as it went was very real.—**ἥμαρτον**, I sinned, I did wrong.—**παραδοὺς ἁ. ἀ.** explains how. The sinning and the betraying are one, therefore the participle does not point to an act antecedent to that of the main verb.—**αἷμα ἀθῷον**, innocent blood, for the blood of an innocent person. So in Deut. xxvii. 25. Palairet cites examples to prove that Greek writers used αἷμα as = ἄνθρωπος.—**τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς**; that is not our concern.—**σὺ ὄψει**, look thou to that = "tu videris," a Latinism. The sentiment itself a *Cainism*. "Ad modum Caini loquuntur vera progenies Caini" (Grotius).—Ver. 5. **εἰς τὸν ναόν**, not in that part of the temple where the Sanhedrim met (Grotius), or in the temple at large, in a place accessible to laymen (Fritzsche, Bleek), or near the temple (Kypke), but in the holy place itself (Meyer, Weiss, Schanz, Carr, Morison); the act of a desperate man determined they should get the money, and perhaps hoping it might be a kind of atonement for his sin.—**ἀπήγξατο**, strangled himself; usually reconciled with Acts i. 18 by the supposition that the rope broke. The suggestion of Grotius that the verb points to death from *grief* ("non laqueo sed moestitiâ") has met with little favour.—Ver. 6. **κορβανᾶν**, the treasury, referred to by this name by Joseph. (B. J. ii. 9, 4).—**τιμὴ αἵματός ἐστι**: exclusion of blood money from the treasury, an extension of the law against the wages of harlotry (Deut. xxiii. 18).—Ver. 7. **τὸν ἀγρὸν τ. κεραμέως**, the field of the potter. The smallness of the price has suggested to some (Grotius, *e.g.*) that it was a field for potter's clay got cheap because worked out. But in that case it would naturally be called the field of the potters.—**ξένοις** most take as referring to Jews from other lands dying at Jerusalem at passover time.—Ver. 8. **ἀγρὸς αἵματος** = *aceldama*, Acts i. 18, name otherwise explained there.—**ἕως τῆς σήμερον**: phrase frequent in O. T. history; sign of late date of Gospel, thinks De Wette.

Vv. 9, 10. *Prophetic reference*, **τότε**, as in ii. 17, not **ἵνα** or **ὅπως**.—**διὰ Ἱερεμίου**, by Jeremiah, in reality by Zechariah (xi. 13), the reference to Jeremiah probably due to there being somewhat similar texts in that prophet (xviii. 2, 3, xxxii. 6-15) running in the evangelist's mind. A petty error. More serious is the question whether this is not a case of prophecy creating "facts," whether the whole story here told is not a legend growing out of the O. T. text

11. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔστη[1] ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ ἡγεμόνος· καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ ἡγεμών, λέγων, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;" Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔφη αὐτῷ,[2] "Σὺ λέγεις." 12. Καὶ ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο. 13. τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος, "Οὐκ ἀκούεις πόσα σοῦ καταμαρτυροῦσι;" 14. Καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ πρὸς οὐδὲ ἓν ῥῆμα, ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν ἡγεμόνα λίαν.

[1] ℵBCLΣ have **εσταθη**, for which the scribes substituted the more usual **εστη**.

[2] **αυτω** has the support of ABXΔΣ, but Tisch. and W.H. (in text) on the authority of ℵL omit it.

quoted. So Brandt, who thinks the betrayal the only fact in the story of Judas, all the rest legendary (*E. G.*, p. 11). The truth rather seems to be that facts, historical traditions, suggested texts which otherwise would never have been thought of. This may be inferred from the manipulation necessary to make the prophecy correspond to the facts: **ἔλαβον**, 1st person singular in Sept., 3rd person plural here = they took; the expression "the children of Israel" introduced with apparent intention to make the nation responsible for the betrayal; the substitution of the phrase "the field of the potter" for "the house of the Lord". And after all the manipulation how different the circumstances in the two cases! In the one case it is the prophet himself, valued at a petty sum, who cast his price into the House of the Lord; in the other, it is the priests, who bought the life of the prophet of Nazareth for a small sum, who give the money for a potter's field. The only real point of resemblance is the small value set upon a prophet in either case. It is a most unsatisfactory instance of prophetic fulfilment, almost as much so as that in Mt. ii. 23. But its very unsatisfactoriness makes for the historicity of the story. That the prophetic text, once associated with the story in the minds of believers, reacted on the manner of telling it, *e.g.*, as to the *weighing* of the price (xxvi. 15), and the casting of the money into the holy place (xxvii. 5), is conceivable.

Vv. 11-26. *Jesus before Pilate* (Mk. xv. 2-15, Lk. xxiii. 2-7, 13-25).—Ver. 11. **ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς**: **δὲ** resumes an interrupted story (ver. 2).—**σὺ εἶ**, etc.: Art Thou the King of the Jews? The question reveals the form in which the Sanhedrists presented their accusation. They had translated "Christ" into "King of the Jews" for Pilate's benefit, so astutely giving a political aspect to what under the other name was only a question of religion, or, as a Roman would view it, superstition. A most unprincipled proceeding, for the confession of Jesus that He was the Christ no more inferred a political animus than their own Messianic expectations.—**σὺ λεγέις** = yes. One is hardly prepared for such a reply to an equivocal question, and there is a temptation to seek escape by taking the words interrogatively = dost thou say so? or evasively, with Theophy. = *you* say, I make no statement. Explanations such as are given in John xviii. 33-37 were certainly necessary.—Ver. 12. The accusations here referred to appear to have been made on the back of Pilate's first question and Christ's answer. Mark indicates that they were copious. Luke formulates the charge before Pilate begins to interrogate (xxiii. 2). The purpose of their statements would be to substantiate the main charge that Jesus claimed to be King of the Jews in a sense hostile to Roman supremacy. What were the materials of proof? Possibly perverse construction of the healing ministry, of the consequent popularity, of Christ's brusquely independent attitude towards Rabbinism, suggesting a defiant spirit generally.—**οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο** (note use of 1st aorist middle instead of the more usual **ἀπεκρίθη**). Jesus made no reply to these plausible mendacities, defence vain in such a case.—Ver. 13. Pilate noting His silence directs His attention to what they have been saying.—Ver. 14. **καὶ οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη**: still no reply, though no disrespect to the governor intended.—**ὥστε θαυμάζειν**, etc., the governor was very much (**λίαν**, at the end, emphatic) astonished: at the *silence*, and at the *man*; the silence attracting

15. Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν [g] εἰώθει ὁ ἡγεμὼν [h] ἀπολύειν ἕνα τῷ ὄχλῳ [i] δέσμιον, ὃν ἤθελον. 16. εἶχον δὲ τότε δέσμιον [j] ἐπίσημον, λεγόμενον Βαραββᾶν. 17. συνηγμένων οὖν αὐτῶν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος, "Τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν; Βαραββᾶν, ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν;" 18. ᾔδει γὰρ ὅτι [k] διὰ [k] φθόνον παρέδωκαν αὐτόν. 19. Καθημένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, λέγουσα, "Μηδέν σοι καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ· πολλὰ γὰρ ἔπαθον σήμερον κατ' ὄναρ δι' αὐτόν." 20. Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἔπεισαν τοὺς ὄχλους, ἵνα αἰτήσωνται τὸν Βαραββᾶν,

g Mk. x. 1. Lk. iv. 16. Acts xvii. 2.
h Acts iii. 13.
i here and in Mk. xv. 6 in Gospp. Acts xvi. 25, 27. Eph. iii. 1 *al.*
j Rom. xvi. 7 (in a good sense).
k Phil. i. 16.

attention to the Silent One.—A new type of Jew this. The result of his observation is a favourable impression; how could it be otherwise? Pilate was evidently not alarmed by the charge brought against Jesus. Why? Apparently at first glance he saw that the man before him was not likely to be a pretender to royalty in any sense that he need trouble himself about. The σὺ in an emphatic position in ver. 11 suggests this = *You* the King of the Jews! Then there was nothing to bear out the pretension: no position, prestige, wealth, following; no troops, etc. (Grotius).

Vv. 15-18. *Appeal to the people.*—Pilate, not inexperienced in Jewish affairs, nor without insight into the ways of the ruling class, suspects that there are two sides to this matter. The very accusation suggests that the accused may be innocently popular, and the accusers jealous. An existing custom gives the opportunity of putting this to the test.—Ver. 15. **κατὰ ἑορτὴν**, at feast time (*singulis festis*, Hermann, *Viger*, p. 633), not all feasts, but the passover meant.—**εἰώθει**, was accustomed; time and circumstances of the origin of this custom unknown; a custom likely to arise sooner or later, as it symbolised the nature of the passover as a passing over (Weiss-Meyer), and helped to make the governor's presence at that season wear a gracious aspect; on that account probably originating under the Romans.—Ver. 16. **εἶχον**: they, the people (ὄχλῳ, ver 15).—**ἐπίσημον**: pointing not to the magnitude of his crime, but to the fact that for some reason or other he was an object of popular interest.—**Βαραββᾶν**, accusative of **Βαραββᾶς** = son of a father, or with double ρ, and retaining the ν at the end, Bar-Rabban = son of a Rabbi. Jerome in his Commentary on Mt. mentions that in the Hebrew Gospel the word was interpreted *filius magistri eorum*. Origen mentions that in some MSS. this man bore the name *Jesus*, an identity of name which makes the contrast of character all the more striking. But the reading has little authority.—Ver. 17. **τίνα θέλετε ἀπολύσω**. Here Pilate seems to take the initiative; in Mk. he is first reminded of the custom (xv. 8). Mk.'s whole account is fuller and clearer.—**Βαρ. ἢ Ἰησ.** The two names put before the people, as presumably both popular more or less, Barabbas for some unknown reason, Jesus by inference from being called "Christ". No favouritism implied. Pilate is feeling his way, wants to do the popular thing as safest for himself.—Ver. 18. **ᾔδει**, he knew, perhaps too strong a word, the fact being that he shrewdly suspected—knew his men, and instinctively divined that if Jesus was a popular favourite the Pharisees would be jealous. This explains his *sang froid* in reference to the title "King of the Jews," also his offering the name of Jesus to the people.

Vv. 19-20. *Interlude of Pilate's wife*, in Mt. alone probably introduced to explain the bias of Pilate in favour of Jesus apparent in the sequel (Weiss-Meyer).—Ver. 19. **μηδὲν**, etc., nothing to thee and that just one = have nothing to do with proceedings against Him.—**πολλὰ γὰρ**: reason for the advice, an unpleasant dream in the morning (**σήμερον**, to-day, early). The historicity of this incident is of course doubted, the use made of it, with embellishments, in apocryphal writings (Acta Pilati) being pressed into the service. But it is quite credible nevertheless. First, the wife of Pilate might be there, for it had become customary for wives to accompany provincial governors. Tacitus, *Ann.* iii. 33, 34, mentions an unsuccessful attempt in the senate to put down the practice. Second, she had a husband that much needed good advice, and would often get it from a good wife. Third, it was a womanly act.

τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀπολέσωσιν. 21. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἡγεμὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Βαραββᾶν."[1] 22. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος, "Τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν;" Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ[2] πάντες, "Σταυρωθήτω." 23. Ὁ δὲ ἡγεμὼν[3] ἔφη, "Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν;" Οἱ δὲ [l]περισσῶς ἔκραζον, λέγοντες, "Σταυρωθήτω." 24. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Πιλάτος, ὅτι οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον θόρυβος γίνεται, λαβὼν ὕδωρ, [m]ἀπενίψατο τὰς χεῖρας ἀπέναντι[4] τοῦ ὄχλου, λέγων, "Ἀθῷός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δικαίου[5] τούτου· ὑμεῖς ὄψεσθε." 25. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς εἶπε, "Τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν." 26. Τότε ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν· τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν [n]φραγελλώσας παρέδωκεν ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.

l Mk. x. 26; xv. 14 (W. H.). Acts xxvi. 11.
m here only.
n here and in Mk. xv. 15.

[1] τον before Βαρ. in ℵBL 1, 33.
[2] αυτω omitted in ℵABDΔΣ.
[3] ℵB 33, 69 omit ηγεμων.
[4] κατεναντι in BD (W.H. in text bracketed). ℵLΔΣ have απεναντι (Tisch.).
[5] BD omit του δικαιου, which probably has crept in from ver. 19.

Vv. 20-26. *Result of the appeal to the people.*—Ver. 20. **οἱ δὲ ἀρχ.**, etc.: the Sanhedrists saw the danger, and set themselves to bias the popular judgment, not sure what might otherwise happen—with success, **ἔπεισαν**. So when, after due interval, the governor put the question, the reply was (ver. 21) **τὸν Βαραββᾶν**, and to the further question what then was to be done with Jesus: the unanimous (**πάντες**) reply was **Σταυροθήτω**. Where were the men who had a few days ago shouted Hosanna? If there, how fickle; if absent, why? Or were they silent, cowed by the prevailing mood?—Ver. 23. **τί γὰρ κακὸν**: elliptical, implying unwillingness to carry out the popular will. (Fritzsche, Grotius.) Some, Palairet, Raphel, etc., take **γὰρ** as redundant.—**περισσῶς ἔκραζον**, they kept crying out more loudly. *Cf.* Mk., where the force of **περισσῶς** comes out more distinctly.—Ver. 24. **ὅτι οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ**, that it was no use, but rather only provoked a more savage demand, as is the way of mobs.—**λαβὼν ὕδωρ**, etc.: washed his hands, following a Jewish custom, the meaning of which all present fully understood, accompanying the action with verbal protestations of innocence. This also, with the grim reply of the people (ver. 25), peculiar to Mt.; a "traditional addition" (Weiss).—Ver. 26. **τότε ἀπέλυσεν**: Pilate, lacking the passion for justice, judges not according to the merits but according to policy. When he discovered that Jesus was not a popular favourite, in fact had no friends, he had no more interest in Him, but acted as the people wished, loosing Barabbas and delivering Jesus to be crucified, after having first subjected Him to scourging (**φραγελλώσας** = *flagello*, a Latinism probably borrowed from Mk.). Such was the barbarous practice of the Romans. It is alluded to by Josephus (B. J., v. 11, 1) in these terms: **μαστιγούμενοι δὴ καὶ προβασανιζόμενοι τοῦ θανατου πᾶσαν αἰκίαν ἀνεσταυροῦντο τοῦ τείχους ἀντικρύ.** Brandt thinks that the alleged custom of releasing a prisoner had no existence, and that the story in the Gospels arose out of an occurrence at a later time, the release of a prisoner the son of a Rabbi concerned in a tumult. The Christians said: they release the son of the Scribe and they crucified our Jesus, and at last the incident was read back into the story of the Passion (*E. G.*, pp. 94-105).

Vv. 27-31. *Jesus the sport of the soldiery* (Mk. xv. 16-20).—Ver. 27. **τότε**: when Jesus had been sentenced to crucifixion.—**οἱ στρατιῶται τ. ἡ.**, the soldiers of the governor, *i.e.*, his bodyguard.—**παραλαβόντες**, etc.: they conducted Jesus from the scene of judgment (without) to the **πραιτώριον**, *i.e.*, the official residence of the procurator, either Herod's palace, or more probably a palace connected with the fort Antonia, with barracks attached. The word has various meanings: a general's tent, a governor's residence, the barracks of the Praetorian

27. ΤΟΤΕ οἱ στρατιῶται τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, παραλαβόντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἰς τὸ ᵃ πραιτώριον, συνήγαγον ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν· 28. καὶ ἐκδύσαντες[1] αὐτόν, περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ χλαμύδα κοκκίνην[2]· 29. καὶ πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν[3] αὐτοῦ, καὶ κάλαμον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν[4] αὐτοῦ· καὶ γονυπετήσαντες ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, ἐνέπαιζον[5] αὐτῷ, λέγοντες, "Χαῖρε, ὁ βασιλεὺς[6] τῶν Ἰουδαίων·" 30. καὶ ἐμπτύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν, ἔλαβον τὸν κάλαμον, καὶ ἔτυπτον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. 31. Καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν χλαμύδα, καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι. 32. Ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ εὗρον

ᵃ Mk. xv. 16. John xviii. 28-33; xix. 9. Acts xxiii. 35. Phil. i. 13.

[1] BD and some old Latin codd. have **ενδυσαντες**, which Weiss thinks has been changed into **εκ.** from not being understood. *Vide* below.

[2] **χλαμυδα κοκκινην** before **περιεθηκαν** in ℵBDL 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] **επι της κεφαλης** in ℵBL 69.

[4] **εν τη δεξια** in ℵABDLΣ 1, 33, 69 *al.*

[5] **ενεπαιζαν** in ℵBDL.

[6] BDΔ have **βασιλευ** (W.H. in brackets, **ο βασ.** in margin).

guard, the Praetorian guard itself.—**συνήγαγον**, etc.: gathered about Him (for sport) the whole **σπεῖραν**, at most a cohort of 600, more probably a maniple of 200. ("**σπεῖρα**, anything *twisted round* like a ball of thread, is a translation of 'manipulus'; a wisp of hay." Carr in Cam. N. T., *ad loc.*) A large number to assemble for such a purpose, but Roman soldiers at passover time would always be on the alert for serious work or sport, and here was no ordinary chance of both, a man sentenced to be crucified who passed for King of the Jews. What more natural than to make sport of Him, and through Him to show their contempt for the Jewish people? (Holtzmann, H.C.).—Ver. 28. **ἐκδύσαντες** (or **ἐνδ.**) **α.**: taking off (or putting on) His clothes. If we adopt the former reading, the implied situation will be this: Jesus first stripped for scourging, then reclothed; then *stripped again* at the commencement of the mocking process. If the latter, this: Jesus after scourging led naked to the praetorium, there clothed, all but His upper garment, instead of which they put on **χλαμύδα κ.** (Meyer).—**χλαμ. κοκκίνην**, a scarlet cloak, probably a soldier's *sagum*. Carr renders a soldier's *scarf*, and suggests that it may have been a worn-out scarf of Pilate's (Herod's, Elsner). The ridicule would be more lifelike if it was really a fine article that might be, or had been, worn by a potentate.—**πλέξαντες σ. ἐξ ἀ.**, weaving out of thorns a crown; not, say Meyer and Weiss, hard and sharp, so as to cause great pain, but young, flexible, easily plaited, the aim being to ridicule not to inflict torture. Possibly, but the soldiers would not make a point of avoiding giving pain. They would take what came first to hand.—**κάλαμον**, a reed; apparently under the gov. of **ἐπέθηκαν**, but really the object of **ἔθηκαν**, understood.—**γονυπετήσαντες**: after the investiture comes the homage, by lowly gesture and worshipful salutation: **χαῖρε βασιλεῦ τ. Ἰ.** Hail, King of the Jews. A mockery of the nation in intention quite as much as of the particular victim. Loesner (*Observ. ad N. T.*) adduces from Philo. (*in Flaccum*, 6) a historic parallel, in which the youth of Alexandria treat similarly a half-witted person, Karabas, the real design being to insult Herod Agrippa. Schanz and Holtzmann also refer to this incident.—Ver. 30. At this point rough sport turns into brutal treatment, as the moment for execution of the sentence approaches.—**ἐμπτύσαντες**: spitting, substituted for kissing, the final act of homage, followed by striking with the mock sceptre (**ἔτυπτον ε. τ. κ.**).—Ver. 31. **ἐξέδυσαν**, etc.: they took off the mock royal robe, and put on again His own garments (**τὰ ἱμάτια**, the upper garments, but why the plural ?). No mention of the crown; left on according to some of the ancients, Origen, *e.g.*: "semel imposita et nunquam detracta"; and, according to the same Father, con-

p Ch. v. 41. q John iv. 7, 10. r Acts viii. 23. s Lk. xiii. 1 (same const.).

ἄνθρωπον Κυρηναῖον, ὀνόματι Σίμωνα· τοῦτον [p] ἠγγάρευσαν ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ. 33. ΚΑΙ ἐλθόντες εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Γολγοθᾶ, ὅς [1] ἐστι λεγόμενος κρανίου τόπος,[2] 34. [q] ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ [q] πιεῖν ὄξος [3] μετὰ [r] χολῆς [s] μεμιγμένον· καὶ γευσάμενος οὐκ ἤθελε [4] πιεῖν. 35. Σταυρώσαντες

[1] ο in most uncials. [2] κρανιου τοπος λεγομενος in ℵBL 1, 33 *al.*

[3] οινον in ℵBDL (Tisch., W.H.). Weiss thinks it possible that οινος has come from Mk.

[4] ηθελησεν in ℵBDLΣ.

sumed by the head of Jesus (" consumpta a capite Jesu "). Taken off doubtless along with the rest, for there must be no mockery of Jesus or Jews before the public. Such proceedings only for the barracks (Holtz., H.C.).

Vv. 32-38. *Crucifixion* (Mk. xv. 21-27; Lk. xxiii. 26, 35-38).—This part of the story begins with the closing words of ver. 31: " they led Him away to be crucified ".—Ver. 32. **ἐξερχόμενοι**: going out (of the city) according to later Roman custom, and in harmony also with Jewish usage (Num. xv. 35, 1 Kings xxi. 23, Acts vii. 58).—**ἄνθρ. Κυρ.**: a man of Cyrene, in Libya, presumably recognisable as a stranger, with whom liberties might be taken.—**ἠγγάρευσαν**, compelled; a military requisition. *Cf.* at chap. v. 41.—**ἵνα ἄρῃ τ. σ.** Jesus, carrying His cross according to the custom, has broken down under His burden. Gethsemane, betrayal, the ordeal of the past sleepless night, scourging, have made the flesh weak. No compassion for Him in finding a substitute; the cross must be carried, and the soldiers will not.—**σταυρὸν**: see on ver. 35.—**Γολγοθᾶ**: Weiss remarks on the double **λεγόμενον**—before the name, and in the following interpretation—and thinks it a sign that Mt. is copying from Mk. One wonders indeed why Mt., writing for Jews, should explain the word at all.—**κρανίου τόπος**, place of a skull (" Calvariae locus," Vulg., whence " Calvary " in A. V.), of skulls rather, say many interpreters; a place of execution, skulls lying all about (Jerome started this view). Recent interpreters (including Schanz) more naturally take the word as pointing to the shape of the hill. The locality is quite uncertain.

Ver. 34. **οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς μ.**, wine mingled with gall. Mk. has **ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶν.**, wine drugged with myrrh, a drink given by a merciful custom before execution to deaden the sense of pain. The wine would be the sour wine or posca used by Roman soldiers. In Mk. Jesus declines the drink, apparently without tasting, desiring to suffer with clear mind. In Mt. He tastes (**γευσάμενος**) and then declines, apparently because unpalatable, suggesting a different motive in the offerers, not mercy but cruelty; maltreatment in the very drink offered. To this view of the proceeding is ascribed the **μετὰ χολῆς** of Mt.'s text, not without the joint influence of Ps. lxix. 22 (Meyer and Weiss). Harmonists strive to reconcile the two accounts by taking **χολή** as signifying in Hellenistic usage any bitter liquid (*quamvis amaritiem*, Elsner), and therefore among other things myrrh. Prov. v. 4, Lament. iii. 15 (Sept.), in which **χολή** stands for wormwood, לַעֲנָה, are cited in proof of this. Against the idea that Mt.'s text has been altered from Mk.'s under the influence of Ps. lxix. 22, is the retention of **οἶνος** (**ὄξος** in Ps. and in T. R.) and the absence of any reference to the passage in the usual style—" that it might be fulfilled," etc.

Ver. 35. **σταυρώσαντες** (from **σταυρόω**, to drive stakes; in later Greek, and in N. T., to impale on a stake, **σταυρός**). All the evangelists touch lightly the fact of crucifixion, hurrying over the painful subject as quickly as possible; Mt., most of all, disposing of it in a participial clause. Many questions on which there has been much discussion suggest themselves, *e.g.*, as to the structure and form of the cross: did it consist of an upright beam (*palus*, *stipes*) and a cross beam (*patibulum*, *antenna*), or of the former only, the hands being nailed to the beam above the head? (so Fulda, *Das Kreuz und die Kreuzigung*, 1878). Was Christ's cross a *crux commissa* (T) or a *crux immissa* (†)? Or is this distinction a purely imaginary one, as Fulda (p. 126) maintains against Justus Lip-

δὲ αὐτόν, [t] διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, [u] βάλλοντες [1] [u] κλῆρον· ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου, 'Διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.' [2] 36. Καὶ καθήμενοι [v] ἐτήρουν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ. 37. Καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν [w] αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην, "Οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων." 38. Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λῃσταί, εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων.

t Lk. xi. 17, 18; xii. 52, 53; xxii. 17. Acts ii. 3, 45.
u the phrase here and in parall.
v ver. 54. Ch. xxviii. 4. Acts xii. 5, 6 (same sense).
w Mk. xv. 26. Acts xxv. 18, 27.

[1] βαλοντες in ℵAD (W.H. in margin).

[2] From ινα πληρωθη to end of ver. 35 is omitted in ℵABDLΣ. It has probably come in from John xix. 24.

sius, till Fulda the great authority on the subject of crucifixion? The work of the more recent writer should certainly be consulted before coming to a final decision on the form of the cross or the method of crucifixion. Another question is, what did Jesus carry to the place of execution: the upright post or the cross beam? (the latter according to Marquhardt, *Röm. Alter.* vii. 1, 1). And how was His body fixed to the cross: were the feet, *e.g.*, *nailed* as well as the hands, or only tied to the beam with a rope or with wands or left free? The passages cited from ancient authors bearing on the subject, Artemidorus, Plautus, Seneca, are diversely interpreted, and the practice does not seem to have been invariable. Crucifixion was at best a rude mode of executing justice, and, especially in time of war, seems to have been performed by soldiers in diverse fashions, according to their whim (**ἄλλον ἄλλῳ σχήματι πρὸς χλεύην**, Joseph., v. 11, 1; plates showing various forms in Fulda). Still there would be a normal mode, and in the case of Jesus, when only one or two were put to death, it would probably be followed. His cross has generally been supposed to have been a *crux immissa*, with the accusation on the point of the upright post above the cross beam, with a peg whereon to sit. Whether His feet were pierced with nails cannot be certainly determined. Paulus took the negative side in the interest of the hypothesis that Jesus did not really die on the cross; Meyer strongly maintains the contrary, *vide ad loc.* The fragment of the Gospel of Peter speaks of nails in the hands only: "then they drew the nails from the hands of the Lord". Fulda takes the same view, representing the hands as nailed, the feet as tied to the beam.—**τὰ ἱμάτια**: the probability is that Jesus had been stript absolutely naked (**γυμνοὶ σταυροῦνται**, Artemid., *Oneirocritica*, ii. 58). On the dividing of the garments *vide* John xix. 23 f. The prophetic reference **ἵνα πληρωθῇ** in T. R. has little authority, and seems inserted from John xix. 24, by a scribe who thought it what the first evangelist should say. This is a second instance where a chance of prophetic citation is not taken advantage of.—Ver. 36: this statement about the executioners sitting down to watch Jesus takes the place of a statement as to the time of execution in Mk. The purpose apparently was to guard against a rescue.—Ver. 37: this fact is mentioned out of its proper place. It is probable that the placard with the accusation was fixed up before the cross was erected. As it stands in Mt.'s narrative, it looks like an after-thought of the soldiers as they sat keeping watch, their final jest at the expense of their victim and the nation to which He belonged. What the custom was as to this is not known. Of the various versions of the inscription Mk.'s is the shortest: THE KING OF THE JEWS; to this Mt. prefixes: This is Jesus.—Ver. 38: **τότε** introduces the fact mentioned as an accompaniment of the crucifixion of Jesus, without indicating its precise place in the course of events.—**σταυροῦνται**, the historical present with lively effect; and passive, probably to imply that this act was performed by other soldiers. This very slight notice grows into a considerable incident in the hands of Luke.

Vv. 39-44. *Taunts of spectators* (Mk. xv. 29-32; Lk. xxiii. 35-37, 39). The last drop in Christ's bitter cup. To us it may seem incredible that even His worst enemies could be guilty of anything so brutal as to hurl taunts at one suffering the agonies of crucifixion. But men then felt very differently from us, thanks to the civilising influence of the

x vide Ch. xxiii. 4.

39. Οἱ δὲ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτόν, x κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν, 40. καὶ λέγοντες, "Ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν, σῶσον σεαυτόν· εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] κατάβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ." 41. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ[2] οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἔλεγον, 42. "Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι. εἰ[3] βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ ἐστι, καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, καὶ πιστεύσομεν αὐτῷ.[4] 43. πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν[5]· ῥυσάσθω νῦν αὐτόν,[6] εἰ θέλει αὐτόν. εἶπε γάρ, Ὅτι Θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός." 44. Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ οἱ λῃσταὶ οἱ y συσταυρωθέντες[7] αὐτῷ ὠνείδιζον αὐτῷ.[8]

y Rom. vi. 5. Gal. ii. 20 (in fig. sense).

[1] ει υιος θεου ει in B (W.H. in margin).

[2] ομοιως simply in ℵAL (Tisch.). ομοιως και in BK (W.H. in brackets).

[3] ℵBDL omit ει.

[4] επ αυτον in ℵBL.

[5] επι τω θεω in B (W.H. in margin).

[6] ℵBL 33 omit αυτον.

[7] συν αυτω in ℵBDL.

[8] αυτον in all uncials.

Christian faith, which has made the whole details of the Passion history so revolting to the Christian heart. These sneers at the great Sufferer are not invented fulfilments of prophecy (Ps. xxii. 7, 8; so Brandt), but belong to the certainties of the tragic story as told by the synoptists.—Ver. 39. **οἱ παραπορευόμενοι**, the passers by: the place of crucifixion therefore near a road; going to or from the temple services (*Speaker's Com.*); or on work-day business, the 13th not the 14th of the month? (Fritzsche, De Wette).—**κινοῦντες τ. κ. α.**, shaking or nodding the head in the direction of the cross, as if to say: that is what it has come to.—Ver. 40. **ὁ καταλύων** (*cf.* **ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα**, xxiii. 37), this and the other taunts seem to be echoes of words said to or about Jesus at the trial, of which a report has already gone abroad among the populace. Whether the saying about destroying the temple was otherwise known can only be a matter of conjecture.—**εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τ. θ.**: Jesus had confessed Himself to be the Son of God at the trial (xxvi. 64).—**κατάβηθι**: the God of this world and all men of the world have but one thought as to Sonship; of course it means exceptional *privilege*. What can a Son of God have to do with a cross?—Ver. 41. **ὁμοίως**, etc.: one might have expected the dignitaries, priests, scribes, elders, to have left that low-minded work to the mob. But they condescend to their level, yet with a difference. They speak *about* the Sufferer, not *to* Him, and in a tone of affected seriousness and fairness.—Ver. 42. **ἄλλους ἔσωσεν**, etc., He saved others, Himself He cannot save. Both *facts;* the former they can now afford to admit, and they do so all the more readily that it serves as a foil to the other fact patent to everybody.—**βασιλεὺς Ἰ.** Messianic King—the claim involved in the confession before the Sanhedrim, refuted by the cross, for who could believe that Messiah would be crucified?—**καταβάτω νῦν**, etc.: yet let Him come down now from the cross, and we will believe on Him at once. These pious scoffers profess their readiness to accept descent from the cross as the conclusive *sign from heaven* they had always been asking for.—Ver. 43. This looks like a mere echo of Ps. xxii. 9 (not a literal quotation from the Sept., however, rather recalling Is. xxxvi. 5) rather than a word likely to be spoken by the Sanhedrists. What did they know about the personal piety of Jesus? Probably they were aware that He used to call God "Father," and that may be the basis of the statement, along with the confession of Sonship before the Sanhedrim: **θεοῦ εἰμι υἱός.**—**νῦν**, *now* is the time for testing the value of His trust, a plausible wicked sneer.—**εἰ θέλει αὐτόν**, if He love Him, an emphatic if, the love disproved by the fact.—**θέλει** is used in the sense of love in the Sept. (Ps. xviii. 20; xli. 12). Palairet gives examples of a similar use in Greek authors.—Ver. 44: the co-crucified brigands join with the mob and the priests in ribaldry.—**τὸ αὐτὸ**: Fritzsche supplies **ἐποίουν** after this phrase and renders: the same thing

45. Ἀπὸ δὲ ἕκτης ὥρας σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης· 46. περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐννάτην ὥραν ἀνεβόησεν[1] ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγων, "Ἡλί, Ἡλί,[2] λαμὰ[3] σαβαχθανί;" τοῦτ' ἔστι, "Θεέ μου, Θεέ μου, ἱνατί με [a]ἐγκατέλιπες;" 47. Τινὲς δὲ τῶν ἐκεῖ [a]ἑστώτων[4] ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι Ἡλίαν φωνεῖ οὗτος." 48. Καὶ εὐθέως δραμὼν εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν, καὶ λαβὼν [a]σπόγγον, πλήσας τε ὄξους, καὶ περιθεὶς καλάμῳ, ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν· 49. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔλεγον,[5] "Ἄφες, ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας σώσων αὐτόν."[6]

a Mk. xv. 34. 2 Cor. iv. 9. 2 Tim. iv. 10, 16. Heb. x. 25; xiii. 5. Mk. xv. 36. John xix. 29.

[1] εβοησεν in BL 33, 69 (Trg., W.H.) from Mk.?

[2] Ελωι, Ελωι in B (W.H. in text).

[3] λεμα in ℵBL; there are other variants.

[4] εστηκοτων in ℵBCL 33.

[5] BD have ειπαν (W.H. in brackets).

[6] ℵBCL add αλλος δε λαβων λογχην ενυξεν αυτου την πλευραν και εξηλθεν υδωρ και αιμα (W.H. in double brackets). It is an early addition from John xix. 34.

did the robbers, for they too reproached Him ("idem vero etiam latrones fecerunt, nempe ei conviciati sunt"). It seems simpler to take αὐτὸ as one of two accusatives, depending on ὠνείδιζον, αὐτόν following (the true reading) being the other. *Vide* Winer, § 32, 4.

Vv. 45-49. *Darkness without and within* (Mk. xv. 33-36, Lk. xxiii. 44-46).—Ver. 45. ἀπὸ δὲ ἕκτης ὥρας: three hours, according to Mark (ver. 25, *cf.* 33), after the crucifixion the darkness came on. This is the first reference in Matthew to a time of day. The definiteness of the statement in this respect seems to vouch for the historicity of the fact stated. Those who find in it legend or myth point to the Egyptian darkness, and prophetic texts such as Amos viii. 9, Joel ii. 20, etc. (none of which, however, are cited by the evangelist), as explaining the rise of the story. The cause of this darkness is unknown (*vide* notes on Mark). It could not, of course, be an eclipse of the sun at full moon. Origen saw this and explained the phenomenon by the hypothesis of dense masses of cloud hiding the sun. Others (Paulus, De Wette, etc.) have suggested a darkening such as is wont to precede an earthquake. To the evangelist the event probably appeared supernatural.—ἐπὶ π. τ. γῆν, Origen and many after him restrict the reference to Palestine. The fragment of the Gospel of Peter limits it to Judaea (πᾶσαν τ. Ἰουδαίαν). In the thought of the evangelist the expression had probably a wider though indefinite range of meaning, the whole earth (Weiss) or the whole Roman world (Grotius).—ἕως ὥ. ἐννάτης: the end as exactly indicated as the beginning, another sign of historicity. The fact stated probably interested the evangelist as an emblem of the spiritual eclipse next to be related.—Ver. 46. ἠλί, ἠλί, etc.: the opening words of Ps. xxii., but partly at least in Aramaic not in Hebrew, wholly so as they stand in Codex B (W.H.), ἐλωί, ἐλωί, etc., corresponding exactly to the version in Mark.—ἠλί, ἠλί, if the true reading in Matthew, seems to be an alteration made to suit what follows, whereby the utterance of Jesus becomes a mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic. It is not likely that Jesus would so express Himself. He would speak wholly either in Hebrew or in Aramaic, saying in the one case: "eli eli lamah asavtani"; in the other: "eloi eloi lema savachtani". The form the utterance assumed in the earliest evangelic report might be an important clue. This Resch finds in the reading of Codex D, which gives the words in Hebrew. Resch holds that D often preserves the readings of the *Urevangelium*, which, contrary to Weiss, he believes to have contained a Passion history in brief outline (*Agrapha*, p. 53). Brandt expresses a similar view (*E. G.*, pp. 228-232). The probability is that Jesus spoke in Hebrew. It is no argument against this that the spectators might not understand what He said, for the utterance was not meant for the ears of men. The historicity of the occurrence has been called in question on the ground that one in a state of dire distress would not express his feelings in borrowed

50. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ [b] ἀφῆκε τὸ [b] πνεῦμα. 51. Καὶ ἰδού, τὸ [c] καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο [1] ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω· καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐσείσθη, καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐσχίσθησαν· 52. καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα ἀνεῴχθησαν, καὶ πολλὰ σώματα τῶν [d] κεκοιμημένων [e] ἁγίων ἠγέρθη,[2] 53. καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων, μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ, εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν, καὶ [f] ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς.

b here only in N.T. (Gen. xxxv. 18).
c here in parall. and in Heb. vi. 19; ix. 3; x. 20.
d 1 Cor. xv. 18, 20. 1 Thess. iv. 13, 15 *al.*
e here only in Gospp.
f Heb. ix. 24 (pass. as here).

[1] εις δυο after κατω in BCL (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] ηγερθη is as usual the sing. to suit a neut. pl. nom. ηγερθησαν in ℵBDL.

phrases. The alternative is that the words were put into the mouth of Jesus by persons desirous that in this as in all other respects His experience should correspond to prophetic anticipations. But who would have the boldness to impute to Him a sentiment which seemed to justify the taunt: "Let Him deliver Him if He love Him"? Brandt's reply to this is: Jewish Christians who had not a high idea of Christ's Person (*E. G.*, p. 245). That in some Christian circles the cry of desertion was an offence appears from the rendering of "eli eli" in Evang. Petri—ἡ δύναμίς μου ἡ δ. μ. = my strength, my strength. Its omission by Luke proves the same thing.—Ver. 47. τινὲς δὲ: not Roman soldiers, for they knew nothing about Elias; might be Hellenistic Jews who did not understand Hebrew or Aramaean (Grotius); more probably heartless persons who only affected to misunderstand. It was poor wit, and showed small capacity for turning to advantage the words spoken. How much more to the purpose to have said: Hear Him! He actually confesses that His God in Whom He trusted has forsaken Him.—Ver. 48. εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν, one of the bystanders, not one of the τινὲς, with some human pity, acting under the impression, how got not indicated, that the sufferer was afflicted with thirst.—ὄξους, sour wine, posca, the drink of Roman soldiers, with sponge and reed at hand, for use on such occasions.—Ver. 49. ἄφες: either redundant coalescing with ἴδωμεν = let us see (*cf.* chap. vii. 4), *age videamus*, Grotius (*vide* also Burton, M. T., § 161), or meaning: hold, stop, don't give Him the drink, let us see whether Elias will come (ἔρχεται, comes without fail) to help Him. The latter is the more probable. The λοιποὶ belong to the scoffing crew. The remainder of this verse about the spear thrust—another, final, act of mercy, though attested by important MSS., seems to be imported from John xix. 34. It is omitted in R. V.

Vv. 50-56. *Death and its accompaniments* (Mk. xv. 37-41, Lk. xxiii. 46-49).—Ver. 50. πάλιν, pointing back to the cry in ver. 46.—φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. The Fathers found in the loud cry a proof that Jesus died voluntarily, not from physical exhaustion. Some modern writers, on the contrary, regard the cry as the utterance of one dying of a ruptured heart (Dr. Stroud on *The Physical Cause of Christ's Death;* Hanna, *The Last Day of Our Lord's Passion*). Mt.'s narrative, like Mk.'s, gives the impression that the cry was inarticulate. Brandt recognises this cry as historical.—Ver. 51. καὶ ἰδού, introducing solemnly a series of preternatural accompaniments, all but the first peculiar to Mt.—τὸ καταπέτασμα, the veil between the holy place and the most holy.—ἐσχίσθη: this fact, the rending of the veil, is mentioned by all the Synoptists, though Lk. introduces it at an early point in the narrative. It might have happened, as a natural event, an accidental coincidence, though it is not so viewed by the evangelist. A symbolic fiction, according to Brandt. The legendary spirit took hold of this event, magnifying the miracle. In the Hebrew Gospel the rending of the veil is transformed into the fracture of the lintel of the temple: "Superliminare templi infinitae magnitudinis fractum esse atque divisum" (Jerome, *Com.*).—καὶ ἡ γῆ, etc.: an earthquake, preceding and conditioning the greatest marvel of all, the opening of the graves and the resurrection of many saints (vv. 52 and 53). We seem here to be in the region of Christian legend. Certainly the legendary spirit laid hold of this feature with great eager-

54. Ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἰδόντες τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα,[1] ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα, λέγοντες, "Ἀληθῶς Θεοῦ υἱὸς[2] ἦν οὗτος."

55. Ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ γυναῖκες πολλαὶ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, αἵτινες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ· 56. ἐν αἷς ἦν Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ μήτηρ, καὶ ἡ μήτηρ τῶν υἱῶν Ζεβεδαίου.

57. ΟΨΙΑΣ δὲ γενομένης, ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, τοὔνομα Ἰωσήφ, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθήτευσε[3] τῷ Ἰησοῦ· 58. οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ, ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

[1] γινομενα in BD. [2] BD have υιος θεου (W.H. in margin).

[3] So in BLΔ. ℵCD have εμαθητευθη, which, though adopted by Tisch and W.H. (text), may be suspected of assimilation to the form used in Chap. xiii. 52, xxviii. 19. *Vide* below.

ness, expanding and going into details, giving, *e.g.*, the names of those who rose: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc. (*Vide Evang. Nicod.*, c. 17, and *The Acts of Pilate* in Thilo's *Codex Apocryphus*, N. T., p. 810).—Ver. 53. μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ, after the raising (active) of Jesus (by God), *i.e.*, after Christ's own resurrection: not after the raising (of them) by Him, as if αὐτοῦ were genitive subjective. So Fritzsche, who, however, brackets the phrase as a doubtful reading. ἔγερσιν occurs here only in N. T.—Ver. 54. ἑκατόνταρχος = κεντυρίων in Mk., the officer in charge of the detachment entrusted with the execution, not hitherto mentioned.—οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, etc.: the whole military party make pious reflections in Mt.; in Mk., with more probability, the centurion only.—καὶ τὰ γινόμενα, and (generally) the things happening, the earthquake included. For a similar use of καὶ *vide* xxvi. 59.—υἱὸς θεοῦ: Lk. substitutes for this "a just man". In the centurion's mouth the words would mean more than that and less than the sense they bear for a Christian = a hero, an extraordinary man. Yet Lk.'s rendering is to the point, because the Roman soldier is conceived as seeing in the events the anger of the gods at the treatment of an innocent man.—Ver. 55. γυναῖκες, *women*, bolder than men, love casting out fear. Lk. associates with them others called οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ, His acquaintance, which might include the disciples. Though they fled panic-stricken they may have rallied and returned to see the end, either along with the women or mixed in the crowd, and so have become qualified afterwards for witnessing to what happened. It is no argument against this that no mention is made of them in the narratives. It is no part of the plan of the evangelists to indicate the sources of their information. The women are not mentioned for this purpose, but because they have a part to play in the sequel. If they had been introduced as witnesses it would not have been made so clear that they stood "afar off" (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν). In like manner that Peter followed his Master to the judgment hall is told, not that he may be available as a witness, but because there is a story of denial to relate about him.—πολλαί, *many*, a tribute to the impression made on feminine hearts by the Galilean ministry; for it was from Galilee they came, as the following clause states (αἵτινες, etc., defining them as women who knew Him well, loved Him warmly, and served Him devotedly).—Ver. 56. ἐν αἷς: three out of the many named, with a reference to the sequel, or as the best known. Mary of Magdala (first mention in Mt.), Mary, the mother of a well-known pair of brothers, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee (Salome in Mk.).

Vv. 57-66. *Burial* (Mk. xv. 42-47, Lk. xxiii. 50-56). ἦλθεν, etc., there came (to the place of crucifixion, the centre of interest in the preceding narrative) a *man* (unknown to readers), *rich* (this fact put in the forefront by Mt.—εὐσχήμων βουλευτής in Mk. On εὐσχήμων Phrynichus remarks that the vulgar take it as = rich, or in good social position, while the ancients took it as applying to the noble or symmetrical. Mt. may be following vulgar usage, but also with an eye to Is. liii. 9: "with the rich in

τότε ὁ Πιλάτος ἐκέλευσεν ἀποδοθῆναι τὸ σῶμα.[1] 59. καὶ λαβὼν τὸ σῶμα ὁ Ἰωσὴφ [g] ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ[2] σινδόνι καθαρᾷ, 60. καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ, ὃ [h] ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ· καὶ προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου, ἀπῆλθεν. 61. ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία, καθήμεναι ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου.

62. ΤΗι δὲ [i] ἐπαύριον, ἥτις ἐστὶ μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν, συνήχθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πρὸς Πιλάτον, 63. λέγοντες, "Κύριε, ἐμνήσθημεν ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὁ [j] πλάνος εἶπεν ἔτι ζῶν, Μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας

g here and in Lk. xxiii. 53. John xx. 7.
h Mk. xv. 46 (Ex. xxi. 33).
i Mk. xi. 12. John i. 29. Acts x. 9 al.
j 2 Cor. vi. 8. 1 Tim. iv. 1 (adj.). 2 John 7.

[1] ℵBL omit το σωμα (Tisch., W.H.).
[2] BD have εν before σινδονι (W.H. in brackets).

His death"); *from Arimathaea* (Ramathaim Zophim, 1 Sam. i. 1); *the name Joseph*, and the relation to Jesus that of a *disciple* (ἐμαθήτευσε, which, if the correct reading, is an instance of the use of this verb in a neuter sense. *Cf.* xiii. 52, xxviii. 19, Acts xiv. 21).—Ver. 58. **προσελθὼν**: from the cross Joseph returns, and approaches Pilate to beg the body of Jesus for burial. In the case of the crucified such a request was necessary, but was generally granted ("Eorum in quos animadvertitur corpora non aliter sepeliuntur quam si fuerit petitum et permissum". Ulpian. de Cadav. punit. in Justinian, *Corpus Jur. Civ.* xlviii. 24, 1). The general practice was to leave the bodies to waste. The privilege of burial was sometimes granted for money. There is nothing to show that Pilate condescended to such meanness, at least in the present instance, though Theophy. suggests that he did.—**ἐκέλευσεν ἀποδοθῆναι**, he ordered it to be delivered.—Ver. 59. **ἐνετύλιξεν** (little used, found in Aristophanes), wrapped.—**σινδόνι καθαρᾷ**, in clean, *i.e.*, never before used linen.—**σινδών** is of uncertain derivation and varying sense, being applied to cloths of diverse material, but here generally understood as meaning linen cloth, wrapped in strips round the body as in the case of mummies in Egypt, the body being first washed (Acts ix. 37). As to this way of preparing dead bodies for burial we have no details in O. T. (Benzinger, p. 163).—Ver. 60. **ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ**, in his *own* new tomb, recently prepared for himself. This not brought out in parallels.—**ἐλατόμησεν** (λᾶς τέμνω): the aorist for the pluperfect, as in ver. 55; he had hewn out of the rock = **ἐν τῇ, πέτρᾳ**, the article pointing to the custom of making sepulchres in rock.—**λίθον μέγαν**: the usual mode of shutting the door of the tomb; the Jews called the stone golal, the roller.—**ἀπῆλθεν**: the entombment over, Joseph went away; but the Dead One was not left alone.—Ver. 61. **ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ**, etc., but, in contrast to Joseph, there was there Mary, the woman of Magdala, also the other Mary, sitting in front of the tomb.—**τάφου** here, as in xxiii. 27, 29, used of a place of burial, not of the act of burial. The word is peculiar to Mt. in the N. T.

Vv. 62-66. *Precautions against theft of the body;* peculiar to Mt., and among the less certain elements of the Passion history, owing its origin and presence in this Gospel apparently to the exigencies of the primitive Christian apologetic against Jewish unbelief, which, as we gather from ver. 64, must have sought to invalidate the faith in the resurrection of Jesus by the hypothesis of theft accounting for an empty grave. The transactions here recorded effectually dispose of that hypothesis by making theft impossible. Is the story true, or must we, with Meyer, relegate it to the category of unhistorical legend? Meyer founds largely on the impossibility of Christ predicting so distinctly as is here implied, even to His own disciples, His resurrection. That means that the priests and Pharisees could have had no such solicitude as is ascribed to them. All turns on that. If they had such fears, so originating, it would be quite natural to take precautions against a trick. I think it quite possible that even independently of the saying in chap. xii. 40, given as spoken *to* Pharisees, it had somehow reached their ears that Jesus had predicted His Passion, and in speaking of it was wont to connect with it the idea

ἐγείρομαι. 64. κέλευσον οὖν [k] ἀσφαλισθῆναι τὸν τάφον ἕως τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας· μήποτε ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ[1] νυκτὸς[2] κλέψωσιν αὐτόν, καὶ εἴπωσι τῷ λαῷ, Ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν· καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἐσχάτη [l] πλάνη χείρων τῆς πρώτης." 65. Ἔφη δὲ[3] αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος, "Ἔχετε [m] κουστωδίαν· ὑπάγετε, ἀσφαλίσασθε ὡς οἴδατε." 66. Οἱ δὲ πορευθέντες ἠσφαλίσαντο τὸν τάφον, σφραγίσαντες τὸν λίθον μετὰ τῆς κουστωδίας.

k Acts xvi. 24.
l here only in Gospels, frequent in Epp.
m here and in Ch. xxviii. 11.

[1] ℵB omit αυτου, found in CDL *al.* (W.H. place it in margin).
[2] νυκτος wanting in many uncials (Tisch., W.H. omit).
[3] BL and other uncials omit δε (Tisch., W.H., in margin).

of rising again, and it was natural that at such a time they should not despise such reports.

Ver. 62. τῇ ἐπαύριον, the next day, *i.e.*, the Jewish Sabbath, curiously described as the day (ἥτις) μετὰ τὴν παρασκευήν, the more important day defined by reference to the less important, suggesting that Mt. has his eye on Mk.'s narrative (xv. 42). So Weiss-Meyer.—Ver. 63. ἐκεῖνος: contemptuous reference, as to one not worthy to be named, and far off, a thing of the past removed for ever by death.—ὁ πλάνος: a wanderer in the first place, then derivatively, from the character of many wanderers, in N. T. a deceiver.—ἐγείρομαι, present for future, expressing strong confidence.—Ver. 64. ἕως τ. τρίτης ἡμέρας: the definite specification of time here and in ver. 63 may have been imported into the story in the course of the tradition.—ἡ ἐσχάτη πλάνη, the last delusion = faith in the resurrection, belief in the Messiahship of Jesus being the first.—χείρων, worse, not so much in character as in consequences, more serious.—Ver. 65. ἔχετε: probably imperative, not indicative = have your watch, the ready assent of a man who thinks there is not likely to be much need for it, but has no objections to gratify their wish in a small matter. So most recent interpreters—Meyer, Weiss, Holtz., Weizsäcker, Morison, Spk., *Com.*, Alford. The Vulgate takes it as indicative = *habetis*, which Schanz follows. This rendering implies that Pilate wished them to be content with what they had already, either their own temple watch or soldiers already put at their disposal. Carr (Camb. N. T.) doubts the correctness of the modern interpretation on the ground that no clear example of the use of ἔχειν in the sense of "to take" occurs in either classical or Hellenistic Greek.—κουστωδίαν, a guard, a Latinism, a natural word for the Roman Pilate to use.—ὑπάγετε ἀσφαλίσασθε, the three verbs: ἔχ. ὑπάγ. ἀσφαλ., following each other without connecting particles form an asyndeton "indicating impatience on the part of Pilate" (Camb. N. T.).—ὡς οἴδατε, as ye know how.—Ver. 66. ἠσφαλίσαντο is to be taken with the last clause.—μετὰ τῆς κουστωδίας, which points to the main means of securing the tomb against plunder. The participial clause.—σφραγίσαντες τὸν λίθον—is a parenthesis pointing to an additional precaution, sealing the stone, with a thread over it and sealed to the tomb at either end. The worthy men did their best to prevent theft, and—the resurrection!

Chapter XXVIII. The Resurrection and the Great Commission.

Vv. 1-10. *The open grave* (Mk. xvi. 1-8, Lk. xxiv. 1-11).—Ver. 1. ὀψὲ . . . . σαββάτων, a curious and puzzling note of time, inconsistent with itself if translated "late on Sabbath, towards daybreak on the first day of the week," and on the assumption that the day is supposed to begin and end at sunset. That would give, as the time at which the events to be narrated happened, the afternoon of one day and the early morning of the next. Of course the two clauses are meant to coincide in meaning, and a way out of the difficulty must be sought. One is to take ὀψὲ as = *post*, after the Sabbath, or late in comparison with the Sabbath, σαββάτων in clause 1 being in effect a genitive of comparison. So Euthy. and Grotius, who take σαββ. as = the whole passover week, De Wette, Weizsäcker, etc. Another is to take ὀψὲ as = not later *than*, but late *on*, and to assume that the day is conceived to begin and end with sunrise according to the civil mode of reckoning. So Kypke, Meyer, Weiss, Morison. Authorities are divided as to

a Lk. xxiii. 54, *vide* notes there.

b here only in N.T. (Gen. v. 3).

XXVIII. 1. ΌΨΕ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ [a] ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων, ἦλθε Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία, θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον. 2. Καὶ ἰδού, σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας· ἄγγελος γὰρ Κυρίου καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, προσελθὼν [1] ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας,[2] καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ. 3. ἦν δὲ ἡ [b] ἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπή, καὶ τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ λευκὸν ὡσεὶ [3] χιών. 4. ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ ἐσείσθησαν οἱ τηροῦντες, καὶ ἐγένοντο [4] ὡσεὶ [3] νεκροί. 5. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπε ταῖς γυναιξί, "Μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς· οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ζητεῖτε. 6. οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἠγέρθη γάρ, καθὼς εἶπε. δεῦτε, ἴδετε τὸν τόπον ὅπου

[1] και before προσελθων in ℵBCL.

[2] ℵBD omit απο της θυρας (so Tisch. and W.H.).

[3] ℵBD have ως here, and with these LΔ in end of ver. 4.

[4] εγενηθησαν in ℵBCDL.

Greek usage, Meyer and Weiss, *e.g.*, contending that ὀψὲ always means lateness of the period specified, and still current. Holtzmann, H. C., remarks that only from the second clause do we learn that by the first is not meant the evening of the Sabbath, but the end of the night following, conceived as still belonging to the Sabbath.—τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ, supply ἡμέρᾳ or ὥρᾳ.—εἰς μίαν. σ., towards day one of the *week* (*Sabbath* in first clause). —ἦλθε, came, singular though more than one concerned, as in xxvii. 56, 61. Mary of Magdala, evidently the heroine among the women.—θεωρῆσαι τ. τ., to see the sepulchre; no word of anointing, that being excluded by the story of the watch. —Ver. 2. The particulars in this and the following two verses are peculiar to Mt.: first, an earthquake (σεισμὸς), as in xxvii. 51; second, an angel descending from heaven; third, the angel rolling away the stone; fourth, the angel sitting on the stone as guard.—Ver. 3. ἰδέα (here only in N. T.; in Sept., Dan. i. 13, 15), the appearance, aspect (of the countenance of the angel). *Vide* Trench, *Syn.*, p. 262, on μορφή, σχῆμα, ἰδέα.—ὡς ἀστραπὴ (xxiv. 27), as lightning—brilliant, dazzling.—τὸ ἔνδυμα α., his raiment as distinct from his face—ὡς χιών, white as snow (*cf.* Mt. xvii. 2).—Ver. 4. ὡς νεκροί: the keepers, through fear of the angel, were shaken as by an earthquake, and became as *dead men*—stupefied, helpless, totally incapacitated for action by way of preventing what is assumed, though not directly stated, to have happened. The resurrection is not described.

Vv. 5-7. *The angel speaks to the women.*—μὴ φοβεῖσθε ὑμεῖς, fear not *ye*, with tacit reference to the guards.—οἶδα γὰρ: γὰρ gives a reason for the soothing tone of the address. The angel recognises them as friends of the crucified.—Ver. 6. οὐκ ἔστιν, etc.: with what sublime simplicity and brevity is the amazing story told! "Versus hic incisa habet perquam apta" (Beng.). The last clause is better without the epithet ὁ κύριος, more in keeping with the rest. Bengel calls it *gloriosa appellatio*, but, as Meyer remarks, just on that account it was more liable to be added than omitted.—Ver. 7. ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι: introducing "quite in his own (the evangelist's) manner of expression" (Weiss) the command of the angel = go quickly and tell, etc.—προάγει: present; He is even now going before you into Galilee; in accordance with the prediction in xxvi. 32 the risen Shepherd is on His way to the pre-appointed rendezvous.—ὄψεσθε, there shall ye *see* Him, and be able to satisfy yourselves that He is indeed risen. With this word ends the message to the disciples.—ἰδοὺ εἶπον ὑμῖν, behold I said it to you = note what I say, and see if it do not come true. Mark has καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν = as He said to you, referring to the promise of Jesus, and forming part of the message to the disciples.

Vv. 8-10. *Appearance of Jesus to the women on the way to deliver their message.*—Ver. 8. ἀπελθοῦσαι: the reading of T. R. (ἐξελθ.) implies that they had been within the tomb, of which no mention is made in Matthew. They went away from, not out of, the tomb.—

ἔκειτο ὁ Κύριος.[1] 7. καὶ ταχὺ πορευθεῖσαι εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν· καὶ ἰδού, προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε. ἰδού, εἶπον ὑμῖν." 8. Καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι[2] ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης, ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ. 9. ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,[3] καὶ ἰδού, ὁ[4] Ἰησοῦς ἀπήντησεν[5] αὐταῖς, λέγων, "Χαίρετε." Αἱ δὲ προσελθοῦσαι ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας, καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ. 10. τότε λέγει αὐταῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· "Μὴ φοβεῖσθε· ὑπάγετε, ἀπαγγείλατε τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἵνα ἀπέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, κἀκεῖ με ὄψονται."

[1] ℵB 33 omit **ο κυριος** (W.H. relegate to margin).

[2] **απελθουσαι** in ℵBCL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] From **ως δ. επορ.** to **αυτου** is omitted in ℵBD 33, 69 and many versions, and left out by modern editors. The passage may have fallen out by similar ending (**αυτου—αυτου**).

[4] ℵBCDLΔ omit **ο**.

[5] ℵBC have **υπηντησεν**.

ἀπὸ τ. μν., depending on **ἀπελθοῦσαι**, in Mark on **ἔφυγον**.—**μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης**, with fear and great joy. This union of apparently opposite emotions is true to human nature. All powerful tides of gladness cause nervous thrills that feel like fear and trembling. *Cf.* Isaiah lx. 5 and Phil. ii. 12. The fear and trembling St. Paul speaks of is the result of an exhilarating consciousness of having a great solemn work in hand —a race to run, a prize to win.—Ver. 9. **καὶ ἰδοὺ**, and behold, another surprise (ver. 2). They are on the way to tell the disciples that they are to be favoured with a meeting in Galilee, and lo they are privileged to meet the risen One themselves.—**ὑπήντησεν**, *cf.* chap. viii. 34, xxv. 1-6.—**ἐκράτησαν**, etc., they took hold of His feet and cast themselves before Him; the gesture befitting the circumstances, an unlooked-for meeting with one who has been crucified and whose aspect is greatly changed. Impossible to resume the old familiar relations as if nothing had happened.—Ver. 10. **μὴ φοβεῖσθε**: kindly in word and tone, meant to remove the embarrassment visible in their manner.—**ὑπάγετε, ἀπαγγείλατε**, another asyndeton as in xxvii. 65. The instructions to the women simply repeat, in much the same words, those given by the angel (ver. 7), with the exception that the disciples are spoken of by the kindly name of "brethren".

The similarity of vv. 9, 10 to John xx. 14-18 has been remarked on (*vide* Weiss, Meyer, on ver. 9). It has been lately commented on in connection with the theory of a "four-gospel Canon" prepared by the Presbyters of Asia Minor in the beginning of the second century. *Vide Der Schluss des Marcus-Evangeliums der Vier-Evangelien-Kanon und die Kleinasiatischen Presbyter*, by Dr. Paul Rohrbach. Rohrbach's idea is that when this Canon was prepared the editors altered more or less the statements of the Synoptists as to the visions of the Risen Christ so as to bring them somewhat into harmony with those of the fourth Gospel. For this purpose Mark's original ending was cancelled and the present one, vv. 9-20, put in its place. The editorial procedure in the case of Matthew consisted in inserting vv. 9, 10 in the narrative, thus providing for at least one vision in Jerusalem, and making room for more, and so cancelling the impression otherwise produced that Jesus was seen only in Galilee. In support of the view that vv. 9, 10 are an editorial addition at a later date Rohrbach adduces the fact that the narrative has an appearance of continuity when they are omitted, and also that the instructions of Jesus to the women are a mere echo of those given by the angel.

Vv. 11-15. *The guards and the priests.*—Ver. 11. **πορευομένων δὲ α.**, while the women go on their errand, the guards, crestfallen, play their poor part. Some of them (**τινὲς**) go into the city and report in their own way to the priests all that has happened.—Ver. 13. **ἀργύρια**:

11. Πορευομένων δὲ αὐτῶν, ἰδού, τινὲς τῆς κουστωδίας ἐλθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν ἅπαντα τὰ γενόμενα. **12.** καὶ συναχθέντες μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, συμβούλιόν τε λαβόντες, ἀργύρια ἱκανὰ ἔδωκαν τοῖς στρατιώταις, **13.** λέγοντες, "Εἴπατε, Ὅτι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς ἐλθόντες ἔκλεψαν αὐτὸν ἡμῶν κοιμωμένων, **14.** καὶ ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ[1] τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, ἡμεῖς πείσομεν αὐτόν,[2] καὶ ὑμᾶς [c] ἀμερίμνους ποιήσομεν." **15.** Οἱ δὲ λαβόντες τὰ[3] ἀργύρια ἐποίησαν ὡς ἐδιδάχθησαν. καὶ διεφημίσθη ὁ λόγος οὗτος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις μέχρι τῆς σήμερον.[4]

c 1 Cor. vii. 32 (Wisdom vi. 16; vii. 23).

16. Οἱ δὲ ἕνδεκα μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, εἰς τὸ

[1] BD have **υπο** instead of **επι** (W.H. in margin), probably because **ηκουσθη** was understood in the usual sense. *Vide* below.

[2] ℵB omit **αυτον**. [3] ℵB omit **τα**, which W.H. relegate to the margin.

[4] BDL vulg. add **ημερας** (W.H. in brackets), which just because it is unusual is probably genuine (Tisch. omits).

the holy men thoroughly understand the power of money; silver pieces, shekels are meant.—**ἱκανὰ** probably means here a considerable number, not a number sufficient to bribe the soldiers (Meyer and Weiss). They gave with a free hand. This sense of **ἱκανός** is frequent in the N. T. *Vide, e.g.*, Mk. x. 46, of the crowd following Jesus at Jericho, and Acts xxvii. 9 (of time).—Ver. 13. **εἴπατε**, introducing the lie they put into the mouths of the soldiers. The report to be set abroad assumes that there is a fact to be explained, the disappearance of the body. And it is implied that the statement to be given out as to that was known by the soldiers to be false: *i.e.*, they were perfectly aware that they had not fallen asleep at their post and that no theft had taken place. The lie for which the priests paid so much money is suicidal; one half destroys the other. Sleeping sentinels could not know what happened.—Ver. 14. **ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ**, either: if this come to the ears of, etc., as in A. V., or: if this come to a hearing, a trial, before, etc., as in R. V. margin. The latter is preferred by many modern commentators. The reading **ἐπὶ τ. ἡ.** suits the second sense best. *Cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 1, 1 Tim. v. 19.—**ἡμεῖς**, emphatic, implying a great idea of their influence, on their part.—**πείσομεν**, will persuade him; how not said, money conceivably in their minds. Kypke renders: will appease; so also Loesner ("aliquem pacare vel precibus vel donis"), citing examples from Philo. The ordinary punishment for falling asleep on the watch was death. Could soldiers be persuaded by any amount of money to run such a risk? Of course they might take the money and go away laughing at the donors, meaning to tell their general the truth. Could the priests expect anything else? If not, could they propose the project seriously? The story has its difficulties.—**ἀμερίμνους**, free from grounds of anxiety; guaranteed against all possible unpleasant consequences. Bengel's comment on this verse is: "Quam laboriosum bellum mendacii contra veritatem!"—Ver. 15. This verse states that the soldiers did as instructed, so originating a theft theory, which, according to our evangelist, was current in his day at the time he wrote in Jewish circles.

Vv. 16-20. *The meeting in Galilee*, peculiar to Mt.—Ver. 16. **οἱ δὲ ἕνδεκα μ.**, the *eleven*, not merely to discount Judas, but to indicate that what follows concerns the well-known Twelve (minus one), the future Apostles of the faith.—**εἰς τὸ ὄρος**, to the mountain, a more specific indication of the locality than any previously reported. Conjectures have been made as to the mountain meant, *e.g.*, that on which the hill teaching was communicated. An interesting suggestion but unverifiable.—**οὗ**, an adverb = *ubi*, used pregnantly so as to include *quo:* whither Jesus had bid them go, and where He wished them to remain.—**ἐτάξατο**: if this points to an instruction given expressly by Jesus, it is strange that the evangelist has not recorded it. It rather seems to presuppose an understanding based on experiences of the Galilean ministry as to the rendezvous.

ὄρος οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 17. καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτόν, προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ[1]· οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν. 18. καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία [d] ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ [d] ἐπὶ[2] γῆς. 19. πορευθέντες οὖν[3] μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,

d Ch. vi. 10; xvi. 19; xviii. 18 (similar phrases).

[1] ℵBD 33 it. omit αυτω.

[2] επι γης in ℵΑΔΣ *al.* (Tisch.). επι της γης in BD (W.H in brackets).

[3] ουν in ΒΔΠΣ, verss. (W.H.). ℵA and other uncials omit (Tisch.).

The meeting place would be some familiar haunt, recalling many past associations and incidents, only imperfectly recorded in the Gospels. If there was such a retreat among the mountains often resorted to, it would doubtless be the scene of the hill teaching, as well as of other unrecorded disciple experiences. The disciples would need no express direction to go there. Instinct would guide them.—Ver. 17. A very meagre statement, the whole interest of the evangelist being absorbed by the words spoken by Jesus.—**προσεκύνησαν** as in ver. 9, but the men less demonstrative than the women; no mention of seizing Jesus by the feet.—**οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν**: but some doubted (*cf.* xiv. 31, in reference to Peter). This clause seems to qualify and limit the previous statement as to the worshipping, giving this sense: they worshipped, *i.e.*, the most of them, for some were in doubt. So Meyer, who cites in support Klotz, *Ad Devar*, whose statement is to the effect that in passages of this kind containing a clause with **δὲ** without a **μέν** preceding, a universal affirmation is first made and then a division follows, which shows that a universal affirmation was not really intended (p. 358). Various methods have been adopted to get rid of the unwelcome conclusion that some of the eleven did not do homage, *e.g.*, by taking **ἐδίστασαν** as a pluperfect (Fritzsche, Grotius), or by finding the doubters among the 500 mentioned by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 6), or even by altering the text **οἱ δὲ** into **οὐδέ** (Beza). The whole narrative is so brief and vague as to lend support to the hypothesis that in the appearance of Jesus here recorded we have not one particular occurrence, but a general picture of the Christophanies, in which mingled conflicting feelings of reverent recognition and hesitation as to the identity of the person played their part. Such is the view of Keil, Steinmeyer, and Holtzmann (H. C.).

Vv. 18-20. *The final commission.*—Ver. 18. **προσελθὼν**, approaching; the speech of Jesus is majestic, but His bearing is friendly, meant to set them free from doubt and fear.—**ἐλάλησε**: this may seem a word not sufficiently dignified for the communication made. But it is often used, especially in Hebrews, in reference to divine revelations (*vide*, *e.g.*, chap. i. 1).—**ἐδόθη μοι**, there was given to me; the aorist as in xi. 27, the thought of which earlier text this utterance reiterates and amplifies. The reference may be to the resurrection, and the meaning that that event *ipso facto* placed Jesus in a position of power. *Cf.* Rom. i. 4.—**πᾶσα ἐξουσία**, every form of authority; command of all means necessary for the advancement of the Kingdom of God.—**ἐν οὐρανῷ**: this points to session on His celestial throne at the right hand of God. Jesus speaks as one already in heaven. There is no account of the ascension in Mt. It is conceived as involved in the resurrection.—**ἐπὶ γῆς**: upon earth, the whole earth. The two phrases together point to a universal cosmic dominion. But so far as earth is concerned, the dominion is only a matter of right or theory, a problem to be worked out. Hence what follows.—Ver. 19. **πορευθέντες οὖν**: the **οὖν** omitted in many texts aptly expresses the connection. The commission to the Apostles arises out of the power claimed = all power has been given to me on earth, go ye *therefore*, and make the power a reality.—**μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη**: make disciples (act., *cf.* at xxvii. 57) *of all the nations* (*cf.* x. 5, "go not into the way of the Gentiles").—**βαπτίσαντες**: baptism the condition of discipleship = make disciples by baptising; the sole condition, circumcision, and everything particularistic or Judaistic tacitly negatived. Christian baptism referred to here only in this Gospel.—**αὐτοὺς** refers to **ἔθνη**, a *constr. ad sensum*, as in Acts xv. 17; Rom. ii. 14. In the anabaptist controversy **αὐτοὺς** was taken

βαπτίζοντες[1] αὐτοὺς [e] εἰς τὸ [e] ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος, 20. διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς [f] τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν· καὶ ἰδού, ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς [g] συντελείας τοῦ [g] αἰῶνος. Ἀμήν."[2]

e Acts viii. 16; xix. 5. Rom. vi. 3. 1 Cor. i. 13; x. 2. Gal. iii. 27 (all with εις and accus.). f *vide* at Ch. xix. 17. g *vide* at Ch. xiii. 39.

[1] **βαπτισαντες** in BD (W.H. margin). **βαπτιζοντες** (T.R., W.H., text). The reading of T.R. (ℵΔΣ) is probably a conformation to **διδασκοντες** in next clause.

[2] The **Αμην** is not found in ℵABD 1, 33, and is left out by modern editors.

by the opponents of infant baptism as referring to **μαθητὰς** in **μαθητεύσατε**, and the verb was held to mean "teach". For some references to this extinct controversy *vide* Wetstein, *ad loc.*, and Hermann's *Viger*, p. 61.—**εἰς τὸ ὄνομα**, into the name, *i.e.*, as confessing the name which embodies the essence of the Christian creed.—**τοῦ πατρὸς**, etc.: it is the name not of one but of three, forming a baptismal Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It is not said into the names of, etc., nor into the name of the Father, and the name of the Son, and the name of the Holy Ghost—whence might be deduced the idea of a Trinity constituting at the same time a Divine Unity. But this would probably be reading more into the words than was intended.—Ver. 20. **διδάσκοντες α.**, teaching them, present participle, implying that Christian instruction is to be a continuous process, not subordinate to and preparing for baptism, but continuing after baptism with a view to enabling disciples to walk worthily of their vocation.—**τηρεῖν**: the teaching is with a view not to *gnosis* but to practice; the aim not orthodox opinion but right living.—**πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν**: the materials of instruction are to be Christ's own teaching. This points to the desirableness for the Church's use of an oral or written tradition of Christ's words: *these* to be the rule of faith and practice.—**καὶ ἰδοὺ**, introducing an important promise to the missionaries of the new universal religion to keep them in courage and good hope amid all difficulties.—**ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν**, *I* the Risen, Exalted, All-powerful One, with *you* my apostles and representatives engaged in the heroic task of propagating the faith.—**εἰμί**, *am*, not will be, conveying the feeling of certainty, but also spoken from the eternal point of view, *sub specie aeternitatis*, for which distinctions of here and there, now and then, do not exist. *Cf.* John viii. 58, "before Abraham was I am". In the Fourth Gospel the categories of the Absolute and the Eternal dominate throughout. — **πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας**, all the days, of which, it is implied, there may be many; the vista of the future is lengthening.—**ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος**, until the close of the current age, when He is to come again; an event, however, not indispensable for the comfort of men who are to enjoy an uninterrupted spiritual presence.

This great final word of Jesus is worthy of the Speaker and of the situation. Perhaps it is not to be taken as an exact report of what Jesus said to His disciples at a certain time and place. In it the real and the ideal seem to be blended; what Jesus said there and then with what the Church of the apostolic age had gradually come to regard as the will of their Risen Lord, with growing clearness as the years advanced, with perfect clearness after Israel's crisis had come. We find here (1) a cosmic significance assigned to Christ (all power in heaven and on earth); (2) an absolutely universal destination of the Gospel; (3) baptism as the rite of admission to discipleship; (4) a rudimentary baptismal Trinity; (5) a spiritual presence of Christ similar to that spoken of in the Fourth Gospel. To this measure of Christian enlightenment the Apostolic Church, as represented by our evangelist, had attained when he wrote his Gospel, probably after the destruction of Jerusalem. Therein is summed up the Church's confession of faith conceived as uttered by the lips of the Risen One. "Expressly not as words of Jesus walking on the earth, but as words of Him who appeared from heaven, the evangelist here presents in summary form what the Christian community had come to recognise as the will and the promise of their exalted Lord" (Weiss-Meyer).

ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΡΚΟΝ

ΑΓΙΟΝ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

I. 1. ἈΡΧΗ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ[1]· 2. ὡς[2] γέγραπται ἐν τοῖς προφήταις,[3] "Ἰδού ἐγὼ[4] ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν

[1] The title υιου τ. Θ. is wanting in ℵ and omitted by Tisch. and W.H. (in text). Most uncials and many verss. have it. Its omission is probably due to similar ending. BDL omit του.

[2] καθως in ℵBLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] For εν τοις π. in many uncials ℵBDLΔ 33, Lat. and Syr. verss., have εν τω Ισαια τω π. The T.R. is a gram. cor.

[4] εγω is in ℵLΔΣ (Tisch.), but wanting in BD (W.H.).

Chapter I. The Baptist. The Baptism and Temptation of Jesus. Beginnings of the Galilean Ministry.—Vv. 1-8. *The appearance and ministry of the Baptist* (Mt. iii. 1-12, Lk. iii. 1-18).—Ver. 1. ἀρχὴ, etc.: This verse may best be taken as the superscription of the whole Gospel, and as meaning: Here begins the Gospel concerning Jesus Christ the Son of God. So viewed it should be made to stand apart, ver. 2 beginning a new section as in the Greek Testament of W. and H. If we connect ver. 1 closely with vv. 2-4 it will contain the statement that the Gospel of Jesus Christ began with the ministry of the Baptist. On this view the connection of the sentences may be taken in two ways: either ver. 1 may be joined closely to ver. 2, the resulting sense being: the beginning of the Gospel (was) as it is written = was in accordance with the prophetic oracle predicting the introduction of Messiah by a forerunner, the story of the Baptist then following as the fulfilment of the prophecy; or vv. 2, 3 may be bracketed as a parenthesis, and ver. 1 connected with ver. 4, yielding this sense: the beginning of the Gospel was or became (ἐγένετο) John the Baptist. All three ways give a perfectly good meaning. In favour of the first view is the absence of the article before ἀρχὴ, against it has been alleged (Holtzmann, H. C.) that καθὼς in Matthew and Mark always connects with what goes before, never introduces a protasis as in Lk. vi. 31.—τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰ. Χ., the good news *concerning*, not *preached by*, Ἰ. Χ. being genitive objective; not quite the evangelic record, but on its way to that final meaning of εὐαγγέλιον. "Christ" here appears as a proper name, as in Mt. i. 1.—υἱοῦ τ. Θεοῦ: this title, even if omitted, is implicit in the title *Christ*, but it is every way likely to have formed a part of the original text, as indicating the point of view in which Jesus is to be presented to readers of the Gospel. Without assuming any acquaintance on the part of the evangelist with the Gospel of the Infancy in Matthew and Luke we may say that this title takes the place of the opening chapters in these Gospels. It is all that Mark offers to gratify the curiosity to which these chapters owe their origin. Who is this remarkable Personage of whom you write? He is "the Son of God". How much that was meant to convey cannot be certainly determined.

Vv. 2-4. καθὼς introduces a prophetic

σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.[1] 3. Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, "Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου· εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ." 4. Ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης[2] βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ[3] κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. 5. καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα, καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμῖται· καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο πάντες[4] ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ,[5] ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. 6. ἦν δὲ[6] Ἰωάννης[6] ἐνδεδυμένος τρίχας καμήλου, καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐσθίων[7] ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον. 7. Καὶ ἐκήρυσσε, λέγων, "Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς [a]κύψας λῦσαι τὸν

[a] John viii. 6, 8.

[1] εμπροσθεν σου omitted in ℵBDL *al.* It is probably from Mt. xi. 10.
[2] ο before βαπτιζων in ℵBLΔ (Tisch., Trg., W.H.).
[3] και in ℵDL *al.* (Tisch.), but wanting in 13, 33 *al.* (W.H. omit).
[4] παντες before και εβαπ. in ℵBDLΔ. [5] υπ αυτου before εν τω Ι. in ℵBL 33.
[6] και ην in ℵBL 33, and ο before Ι. in ℵBLΣ. [7] εσθων in ℵBLΔ 33.

citation as protasis to the historical statement about John in ver. 4 = in accordance with, etc., John appeared. The prophetic reference and the historical statement are given in inverse order in Matthew.—ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ, in Isaiah, the actual quotation being from Isaiah and Malachi (ver. 2) conjointly. An inaccuracy doubtless, but not through an error of memory (Meyer and Weiss), but through indifference to greater exactness, the quotation from Isaiah being what chiefly occupied the mind. It is something analogous to attraction in grammar. It is Mark's only prophetic citation on his own account.—ἰδοὺ begins the quotation from Mal. iii. 1, given as in Mt. xi. 10, with μου, after προσώπου and ὁδόν, changed into σου.—Ver. 3. Quotation from Is. xl. 3 as in Mt. iii. 3.—Ver. 4. ἐγένετο Ἰ.: in accordance with, and in fulfilment of, these prophetic anticipations, *appeared John*.—ὁ βαπτίζων = the Baptist (substantive participle), that the function by which he was best known. — εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν: this clause (in Luke, not in Matthew) may plausibly be represented as a Christianised version of John's baptism (Weiss), but of course John's preaching and baptism implied that if men really repented they would be forgiven (Holtz., H. C.).

Vv. 5-8. Ver. 5 describes the widespread character of the movement much as in Mt., only that Judaea comes before Jerusalem, and the district of the Jordan is not mentioned.—Ver. 6 describes John's way of life as in Mt., ἐνδεδυμένος standing for εἶχεν τὸ ἔνδυμα, and ἔσθων for ἡ τροφὴ ἦν.—Ver. 7. καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν, introducing a special and very important part of his *kerygma: inter alia* he kept saying—anxious to prevent men from forming a wrong impression of his position. This is what makes mention of his ministry relevant in the evangelic record.—λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα, to loose the latchet of, instead of τὰ ὑποδ. βαστάσαι; a stronger expression of subordination, practically the same idea.—Ver. 8. πνεύματι ἁγίῳ: καὶ πυρί omitted, whereby the view presented of Messiah's function becomes less judicial, more Christian. Mt.'s account here is truer to John's conception of the Messiah. Mk.'s was probably influenced by the destination of his Gospel for Gentile readers.

Vv. 9-11. *The baptism of Jesus* (Mt. iii. 13-17; Lk. iii. 21, 22).—Ver. 9. ἐν ἐκείναις τ. ἡ. = in those days; an indefinite note of time = while John was carrying on his ministry of preaching and baptising.—ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς, came Jesus, with what feelings, as compared with Pharisees and Sadducees, *vide* notes on Mt.—ἀπὸ Ναζ. τ. Γαλ., from *Nazareth*, presumably His home; of *Galilee*, to define the part of the country for outsiders; only Galilee mentioned in Mt.—εἰς τὸν Ἰ.: ἐν with dative in ver. 5. The expression is pregnant, the idea of descending into the river being latent in εἰς.—ὑπὸ Ἰωαν., by John; no hesitation indicated; *cf.* remarks on three synoptical narratives on this point in Mt. It does

[b] ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ. 8. ἐγὼ μὲν[1] ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ἐν[2] ὕδατι· αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν[2] Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ." 9. Καὶ[3] ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρὲτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην.[4] 10. καὶ εὐθέως[5] ἀναβαίνων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, εἶδε σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανούς, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ὡσεὶ[6] περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον ἐπ'[7] αὐτόν· 11. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ[8] εὐδόκησα." 12. Καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτὸν [c] ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. 13. καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ[9] ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα,[10] πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ, καὶ ἦν μετὰ τῶν θηρίων· καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

b here. Lk. iii. 16. John i. 29 (Acts xxii. 28 of thongs to bind prisoners).

c cf. in Mt. ix. 38. John x. 4.

[1] ℵBL 33, 69 verss. omit μεν, doubtless a gram. cor. to answer to δε.

[2] The first εν not in ℵBΔ cursives, the second not in BL (Tisch. omits first, W.H. both).

[3] B omits και (W.H. in margin).

[4] εις τον Ι. υπο Ιω. in ℵBDL 33, 69 *al.*

[5] The best texts have ευθυς uniformly in Mk.

[6] ως in ℵABDLΔ.

[7] εις αυτον in BD 13, 69.

[8] σοι in ℵBLΔΣ (Tisch., W.H.).

[9] ℵABDL 33 omit εκει, meant originally perhaps as a substitute for εν τη ερημω following.

[10] τεσσ. ημερας in ℵBL 33.

not even appear whether John had any suspicion that the visitor from Nazareth was ὁ ἰσχυρότερος, of whom he had spoken. The manner in which the baptism of Jesus is reported is the first instance of the *realism* of this Gospel, facts about Jesus stated in a naked manner as compared, *e.g.*, with Lk., who is influenced by religious decorum.—Ver. 10. εὐθὺς, straightway, a favourite word of Mk.'s, to be taken with εἶδε = as soon as He had ascended, etc., He *saw*. For similar usage in reference to εἶτα *vide* Hermann, *Viger*, p. 772.—σχιζομένους, being rent asunder, a sudden event; a stronger word than that used in Mt. and Lk. (ἀνεῴχθησαν—ῆναι). The subject of εἶδε is Jesus.—εἰς αὐτόν: this reading suggests the idea of a descent not merely upon (ἐπὶ) but *into* Him, as if to take up its abode; henceforth the immanent spirit of Jesus.

Vv. 12, 13. *The temptation* (Mt. iv. 1-11; Lk. iv. 1-13).—Ver. 12. ἐκβάλλει: historic present, much used in Mk. with lively effect; introduces a new situation. The first thing the Spirit does (εὐθὺς) is to *drive* Jesus into the wilderness, the expression not implying reluctance of Jesus to go into so wild a place (Weiss), but intense preoccupation of mind. Allowing for the weakening of the sense in Hellenistic usage (H. C.), it is a very strong word, and a second instance of Mk.'s *realism:* Jesus *thrust* out into the inhospitable desert by force of *thought*. De Wette says that the ethical significance of the temptation is lost in Mk.'s meagre narrative, and that it becomes a mere marvellous adventure. I demur to this. The one word ἐκβάλλει tells the whole story, speaks as far as may be the *unspeakable*. Mt. and Mk. have tried to tell us what happened, but have they given us more than a dim shadow of the truth?—Ver. 13. πειραζόμενος, being tempted, presumably the whole time; doubtless the real truth. Two powers at work all through, the Spirit of God and the spirit of evil.—ἦν μετὰ τ. θηρ.: not merely pictorial or intended to hint danger; meant rather to indicate the uninhabited nature of the place; no supplies obtainable there, hunger therefore a part of the experience.—οἱ ἄγγελοι: angels as opposed, not to devils (Schanz), but to human beings, of whom there were none.—διηκόνουν, ministered; in what way not said, but implying exhaustion. These few touches of Mk. suggest a vivid picture of a spiritual crisis: intense preoccupation, instinctive retreat into congenial grim solitudes, temptation, struggle, fierce and protracted, issuing

14. ΜΕΤΑ δὲ[1] τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην, ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας[2] τοῦ Θεοῦ, 15. καὶ λέγων,[3] "Ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς, καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε, καὶ [d] πιστεύετε [d] ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ."

d John iii. 15 (with ἐν).

16. Περιπατῶν δὲ[4] παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, εἶδε Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ,[5] βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον[6] ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς· 17. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων." 18. Καὶ εὐθέως ἀφέντες τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν[7] ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ. 19. Καὶ προβὰς ἐκεῖθεν[8] ὀλίγον, εἶδεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ καταρτίζοντας τὰ δίκτυα. 20. καὶ εὐθέως ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς· καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαῖον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ μετὰ τῶν μισθωτῶν, ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ.

[1] μετα δε in ℵLΔΣ (Tisch.). και μετα in BD (W.H.).
[2] της βασ. omit ℵBL 33; brought in by scribes as the usual phrase.
[3] και λεγων omitted in ℵ; Tisch., W.H., in brackets; found in BLΔ.
[4] και παραγων in ℵBDL 13, 33, 69 *al.* T.R. assimilated to Mt. iv. 18.
[5] Σιμωνος in ℵBL.
[6] For βαλλ. αμφιβλ. (from Mt. iv. 18) ℵBL 33 have αμφιβαλλοντες (Tisch., W.H.).
[7] αυτων omitted in ℵBCL.
[8] BDL omit εκειθεν.

in weakness, calling for preternatural aid.

Vv. 14-20. *The Galilean ministry begins* (Mt. iv. 12-22; Lk. iv. 14).—Ver. 14. τὸ εὐαγγ. τ. θεοῦ: *the Gospel of God*, the good news sent by God to men through Jesus, a strong name for Christ's message.—Ver. 15. ἡ βασιλεία τ. θ.: this defines more precisely the gospel Jesus preaches. It is the gospel of the Kingdom of God. But even this is vague. The kingdom may be differently conceived: as an awful thing or as a beneficent thing. The summons following throws light on its nature.—μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε: "repent" echoes John's preaching, and savours of awe, but "*believe*" is a new word, and presumably *the* watchword of the new ministry. And the name for the message to be believed settles the nature of the kingdom. Its coming is *good news* (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ). For πιστεύειν ἐν, *vide* Gal. iii. 26, Eph. i. 13.—Ver. 16. ἀμφιβάλλοντες: just because different from Mt.'s expression, to which the T. R. assimilates Mk.'s, is likely to be the true reading, and is very expressive: casting about (their nets understood, here only).—Ver. 17. γενέσθαι: I will make you *become*, implying a gradual process of training; therefore the disciples called as early as possible.—Ver. 20. μετὰ μισθωτῶν: they left their father *with the hired assistants*. This is taken by some as a merely pictorial trait, but others justly regard it as a touch of humanity. It comforted Mk. and probably his voucher Peter that the two brothers did not need to leave their father *alone*. He could do without them.

Vv. 21-28. *First appearance in the synagogue; first impressions* (Lk. iv. 31-37).—Ver. 21. εἰς πορεύονται: Jesus and the four newly acquired disciples *enter* or *arrive at*.—Καπ., Capernaum; first mention. From Mk.'s narrative alone we should gather that Jesus arrived at Capernaum on His way northwards from the south--from the Jordan to Galilee, then along the shore of the lake to Capernaum.—εὐθέως: seems to imply arrival on Sabbath.—σάββασιν: dative plural as if from σάββας; plural, after analogy of names for feast days (τὰ ἄζυμα, τὰ γενέσια, τὰ ἐγκαίνια).—ἐδίδασκε: Mt. in his general summary of the Galilean ministry applies both this word and κηρύσσω to Christ's synagogue utterances. These, addressed to a

21. Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καπερναούμ· καὶ εὐθέως τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν, ἐδίδασκε.[1] **22.** καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς. **23.** Καὶ [2] ἦν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ἄνθρωπος [e] ἐν πνεύματι [e] ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ ἀνέκραξε, **24.** λέγων, "Ἔα,[3] τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδα [4] σε τίς εἶ, [f] ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ." **25.** Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων, "Φιμώθητι, καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ." **26.** Καὶ [g] σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον, καὶ κράξαν [5] φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ. **27.** καὶ [h] ἐθαμβήθησαν πάντες,[6] ὥστε συζητεῖν πρὸς αὐτούς,[7]

e again in Ch. v. 12.
f same exp. in John vi. 69 (W.H.).
g Ch. ix. 20. Lk. ix. 39.
h Ch. x. 24, 32 (Wisdom xvii. 3).

[1] **εισελθων . . . εδιδασκε** (T.R.) is the reading of BD (W.H. text). Some copies omit **εισελθων**, and place **εδιδασκε** before **εις τ. συν.**; so ℵL (Tisch., W.H., in margin. Ws. retains, T.R.).

[2] **και ευθυς** in ℵBL 33; **ευθυς** left out because not understood.

[3] **εα** not in ℵBD. It probably comes in from Lk. (iv. 34).

[4] **οιδαμεν** in ℵLΔ (Tisch., W.H., in margin), **οιδα** in BCDΣ; probably correct.

[5] **φωνησαν** in ℵBL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] **απαντες** in ℵBL; **παντες** in CDΔ *al.*

[7] ℵCDΔΣ have **προς εαυτους** (W.H. marg.). ℵB have simply **αυτους** (Tisch., W.H., text. Ws.).

popular audience, would come more properly under the head of *kerygma* than of *didache.*—Ver. 22. **ἐξεπλήσσοντο**: they were amazed; a strong word, several times in Mk. (Mt. vii. 28).—**ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων**, etc.: a similar remark in Mt. vii. 29 (see notes there) appended to Sermon on Mount. Mk. gives no discourse, but only notes the impression made. "A poor substitute for the beautiful Sermon on the Mount" (Schanz). Doubtless, but let us be thankful for what we do get: a record of the impression made by Christ's very first appearance in the synagogue, witnessing to a *striking individuality.* Mk. omits much, and is in many ways a meagre Gospel, but it makes a distinctive contribution to the evangelic history *in showing by a few realistic touches* (this one of them) *the remarkable personality of Jesus.*

Vv. 23-28. *The demoniac.*—Ver. 23. **εὐθὺς**: almost = **ἰδοὺ**, Matthew's word for introducing something important.—**αὐτῶν**, in *their* synagogue, *i.e.*, the synagogue of the same men who had been surprised at Christ's preaching. They are to get a new surprise, though one would have been enough for one day. We also get a surprise, for nothing in Mark's narrative thus far has prepared us to expect such an event as is reported. In his general sketch of the Galilean ministry (iv. 23-25) Matthew combines the three features: preaching, teaching, and *healing.*—**ἐν π. ἀ.** = *with* an unclean spirit (Maldonatus, Holtz., H. C.), in the power of, possessed by, Meyer, Weiss, Keil, etc. An unclean spirit is Mark's standing name for what Matthew commonly calls **δαίμων** or **δαιμόνιον**.—Ver. 24. **τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί**, what to *us* and to Thee. The diseased man speaks for the demon in him, and the demon speaks for the fraternity as all having one interest. For the phrase used in a similar sense *vide* 1 Kings xvii. 18.—**Ναζαρηνέ**: first certain intimation (*cf.* ver. 9) that Jesus belonged to Nazareth. The corresponding adjective in Matthew is **Ναζωραῖος** (ii. 23).—**ἦλθες ἀ. ἡ.** may be either a question or an assertion, the sense of the whole passage being: Thou art come to destroy us, for I know well who Thou art —the Holy One of God (Fritzsche). The epithet, **ἅγιος**, applied to Jesus is in antithesis to **ἀκαθάρτῳ**.—Ver. 25. **φιμώθητι**: *vide* at Mt. xxii. 12.—Ver. 26. **σπαράξαν**, convulsing, throwing into a spasm. This reveals a characteristic of the malady under which the man suffered. He appears to have been an epileptic. The Gadarene demoniac was a madman. This was the final fit before recovery.—Ver. 27. **ἐθαμβήθησαν**: another strong word peculiar to Mark = they were

λέγοντας, "Τί ἐστι τοῦτο; τίς ἡ διδαχὴ ἡ καινὴ αὕτη, ὅτι [1] κατ' ἐξουσίαν καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;" 28. Ἐξῆλθε δὲ [2] ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς [3] εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

29. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες, ἦλθον [4] εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου, μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. 30. ἡ δὲ πενθερὰ Σίμωνος κατέκειτο [l] πυρέσσουσα. καὶ εὐθέως λέγουσιν

l here and in Mt. viii. 14.

[1] The scribes have flattened the text here into commonplace, and left only one cause of wonder instead of two. The true reading, because realistic, true to life, is doubtless that of ℵBL: διδαχη καινη κατ εξουσιαν και, in which κατ' ἐξ. may be joined either to what goes before or to what follows.

[2] και εξηλθεν in ℵBCDLΔΣ.

[3] BCL add πανταχου after ευθυς. It may have fallen out by similar ending (αυτου).

[4] εξελθων ηλθεν in BDΣ old Latin verss. (W.H. marg.). The T.R. conforms to ver. 21.

astonished, *i.e.*, at the sudden and complete recovery. They saw at a glance that the attack had not run its usual course.—ὥστε with the infinitive here expressing result.—συζητεῖν, to seek together; in N. T. tropical = to inquire of one another, to discuss. The word occurs several times in Mark.—τί ἐστι τοῦτο. The question refers to the whole appearance of Jesus in the synagogue that day. One surprise following close on another provoked wondering inquiry as to the whole phenomenon. The words following state the twofold ground of their astonishment: (1) διδαχὴ καινὴ κατ' ἐξουσίαν, a style of teaching new as to authoritativeness (entirely different from the familiar type of the scribes); (2) καὶ τοῖς πνεύμασι τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις ἐπιτάσσει, etc., also He commandeth the unclean spirits so that they obey Him. Both equally unlooked for: the former a moral miracle, the latter a physical; both revealing an imperial spirit exercising sway over the minds and bodies of men.—Ver. 28. ἡ ἀκοὴ, the report, as in Mt. xiv. 1, xxiv. 6.—εὐθὺς, expressive of the lightning speed with which rumour travels = πανταχοῦ = πανταχοῖ, in every direction.—εἰς ὅλην τ. π. τ. Γαλ., a vague phrase suggestive of a wide range of circulation, even beyond the boundaries of Galilee. But that can hardly be meant. Recent interpreters take it as meaning that the fame spread into the *Galilean environment of Capernaum*, along the lake north and south, and back into the hill country.

Similarity at certain points in this incident to the story of the Gadarene demoniac, especially in the deprecatory speech (ver. 24, Mt. viii. 29), has suggested the hypothesis of borrowing on one side or other. Keim thinks this not a real history but an acted programme, like the change of water into wine in John ii., and like the preaching programme in Lk. iv. (L. J., ii. 165, 203), a mere duplicate of the Gadara story. Weiss thinks the words spoken by the demoniac (ver. 34) are borrowed from that story, and that Mark reproduces the features with which Peter was wont to describe such cases. The lifelike reflections of the spectators (ver. 27) powerfully witness for the reality of the occurrence.

Vv. 29-31. *Cure of Peter's mother-in-law* (Mt. viii. 14, 15; Lk. iv. 38, 39).—ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον: even if the reading of B (participle and verb singular) be the true one, as it probably is just because the more difficult, the implied fact is that Jesus left the synagogue accompanied by His disciples, probably all four, Simon and Andrew as well as James and John. Jesus came from the synagogue to the house of Simon and Andrew, *with them*, and with James and John.—Ver. 30. πυρέσσουσα (same word in Matthew), fevered, or feverish, doubtless a common occurrence in the damp, marshy flats by the lake.—λέγουσι αὐτῷ π. α., forthwith they tell Him about her, not necessarily as expecting Him to heal her, but to account for her absence, or as one naturally tells a friend of family troubles.—Ver. 31. ἤγειρεν, etc., He took hold of her hand and so raised her up, the cure taking place simultaneously. In Matthew the *touch* (ἥψατο) is the

αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς. 31. καὶ προσελθὼν ἤγειρεν αὐτήν, κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς[1]· καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ [j] πυρετὸς εὐθέως,[2] καὶ διηκόνει[j] αὐτοῖς. 32. Ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης, ὅτε [k] ἔδυ[3] ὁ ἥλιος, ἔφερον πρὸς αὐτὸν πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας καὶ τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους· 33. καί ἡ πόλις ὅλη ἐπισυνηγμένη ἦν[4] πρὸς τὴν θύραν. 34. καὶ ἐθεράπευσε πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις· καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλε, καὶ οὐκ ἤφιε λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν αὐτόν.

35. Καὶ πρωῒ ἔννυχον[5] λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθε, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, κἀκεῖ προσηύχετο. 36. καὶ [l] κατεδίωξαν[6] αὐτὸν ὁ[7]

j parall. John iv. 52. Acts xxviii. 8.
k here and in Lk. iv. 40 (Gen. xxviii. 11).
l here only in N.T.

[1] ℵBL omit αυτης. [2] ℵBCL 33 *al.* omit ευθεως.

[3] BD have εδυσε, which being used transitively by the Greeks was likely to be corrected into εδυ by the ancient revisers.

[4] For η πολις . . . ην ℵBCDL 33 have ην ολη η πολις επισυνηγμενη (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] εννυχα in ℵBCDL (modern editions).

[6] κατεδιωξεν in ℵB, which revisers would readily change into the plural.

[7] ℵBL omit ο.

means of cure. Holtz. (H. C.) thinks Jesus took hold of her hand simply by way of greeting, and that the result was unexpected, Jesus thus discovering an unsuspected power.

Vv. 32-34. *Cures on Sabbath evening* (Mt. viii. 16, 17; Lk. iv. 40, 41).—Ver. 32. **ὀψίας**, etc.: exact indication of time by two phrases, on the arrival of evening when the sun set; evening a vague phrase = late afternoon. It was *Sabbath*, and the people would wait till sunset when Sabbath closed. Hence the double note of time. So most recent commentators, also Victor Ant. in Cramer's Catenae (**ἐπειδὴ ἐνόμιζον μὴ ἐξεῖναί τινι θεραπεύειν σαββάτῳ, τούτου χάριν τοῦ σαββάτου τὸ πέρας ἀνέμενον**). Matthew and Luke divide Mark's phrases between them. The first sufficed for Matthew because he says nothing of its being *Sabbath*. This instance of duality in expression in Mark has done service in connection with Griesbach's hypothesis that Mark is made up from Matthew and Luke.—**κακῶς ἔχοντας**, such as were ailing, peculiar to Mark.—**τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους**: them specially, because of what happened in the synagogue.—Ver. 33. **ὅλη ἡ πόλις**, a colloquial exaggeration.—**πρὸς τ. θύραν**: the door of Peter's house. Meyer thinks that in the interval Jesus had gone to His own house, and that it was there the people gathered. But does Mark's gospel think of Jesus as having a residence in Capernaum? Weiss answers in the negative.—Ver. 34. **πολλούς**, many; not all? In Matthew *many* are brought and *all* are healed.—**ἤφιε**, allow, imperfect, as if from **ἀφίω** with augment on preposition, again in xi. 16; *prorsus barbara* (Fritzsche).—**ὅτι ᾔδεισαν α.**, because they knew Him. On the insight of demoniacs *cf.* at Mt. viii. 28 ff.

Vv. 35-39. *Flight from Capernaum* (Lk. iv. 42-44).—Ver. 35. **πρωΐ**, early, an elastic word, the last watch from three to six, defined more exactly by **ἔννυχα λίαν** = much in the night, at the beginning of the watch, or at the dark hour before dawn.—**ἔννυχα** is the neuter plural of **ἔννυχος**, nocturnal, used as an adverb (here only).—**ἀναστὰς**, etc.: He rose up, went out of Capernaum, went away to a desert, solitary place, and there engaged in prayer. It was a kind of flight from Capernaum, the scene of those remarkable occurrences; "flight from the unexpected reality into which His ideal conception of His calling had brought Him," Holtz., H. C. The real reason of the flight was doubtless a desire to preach in as many synagogues as possible before the hostility of the scribes, instinctively dreaded, had time to act obstructively. Jesus had a plan of a preaching tour in Galilee (*vide* ver. 38), and He felt He could not begin too soon. He left in the night, fearing opposition from the people.—Ver. 36. **κατεδίωξεν**: followed Him up; almost pursued Him as a fugitive; verb singular, though more than one followed,

Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ· 37. καὶ εὑρόντες αὐτόν,[1] λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Ὅτι πάντες ζητοῦσί σε." 38. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἄγωμεν[2] εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας [m] κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα κἀκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξελήλυθα."[3] 39. Καὶ ἦν[4] κηρύσσων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.

m here only.

40. Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρός, παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ γονυπετῶν αὐτόν,[5] καὶ[6] λέγων αὐτῷ, "Ὅτι, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι." 41. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[7] σπλαγχνισθείς, ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἥψατο αὐτοῦ,[8] καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι." 42. Καὶ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ,[9] εὐθέως, ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.

[1] ℵBL have **ευρον αυτον και**.

[2] ℵBCL 33 add **αλλαχου**, a rare word (here only in Mk.), and apparently superfluous, therefore likely to be omitted.

[3] ℵBCL 33 have **εξηλθον**, doubtless the true reading, changed into **εξεληλυθα** because the meaning was not understood and under the influence of Lk. Jesus is explaining why He left Capernaum so hastily. *Vide* below.

[4] **ηλθεν** in ℵBL Cop. Aeth. verss. (Tisch., W.H.). **ην** is from Lk. (iv. 44).

[5] BD omit **και γονυπετων αυτον**, possibly by homoeot. ℵL have **και γονυ.** without **αυτον**.

[6] ℵB 69 omit **και**.

[7] For **ο δε I.** ℵBD have simply **και** (Tisch., W.H.).

[8] **αυτου ηψατο** in ℵBL.

[9] **ειπ. αυτου** is a gloss, omitted in ℵBDL.

Peter, the chief of them, being thought of mainly. A strong term like **ἐκβάλλει**, ver. 12, all allowance made for weakened force in Hellenistic usage.—Ver. 37. **πάντες ζητοῦσί σε**: all seek Thee, not merely all the people of Capernaum, but all the world: "nemo non te quaerit," Fritzsche; a colloquial exaggeration.—Ver. 38. **ἄγωμεν**: let us go, intransitive; not so used in Greek authors.—**κωμοπόλεις**: village towns; towns as to extent of population, villages as without walls (Kypke); *Oppidula* (Beza); here only in N. T., found in Strabo.—**κηρύξω**: that there I may *preach*, no word of healing; because no part of His vocation (Klostermann); because subordinate to the preaching (Schanz).—**ἐξῆλθον**: I came out (from *Capernaum*, ver. 35). This may seem *trivial* (Keil), but it appears to be the real meaning, and it is so understood by Meyer, Weiss, Holtz., and even Schanz. The Fathers understood the words as meaning: "I am come from heaven". So Keil. In this clause Weiss finds evidence that in Mk.'s narrative Jesus has no home in Capernaum. He has visited it, done good in it, and now He wants to go elsewhere.—Ver. 39. **ἦλθεν** (*vide* critical notes).—**εἰς τ. συν.** may be connected with **ἦλθεν**, and the sentence will run thus: He came, preaching, to their synagogues, all over Galilee; also casting out devils, the healing ministry being referred to as subordinate to the teaching. If we connect **εἰς τὰς συν.** with **κηρύσσων** the word "synagogues" will refer to the assemblies rather than to the places = preaching to their synagogues, as we might say "preaching to their churches" or "congregations". For similar expressions *cf.* xiii. 10, xiv. 9, John viii. 26. This short verse contains the record of an extensive preaching tour, of which not a single discourse has been preserved. Doubtless some of the parables were spoken on these occasions. Note the *synagogue*, not the *market place*, was the scene of Christ's addresses; His work religious, not political (Schanz).

Vv. 40-45. *The leper* (Mt. viii. 1-4; Lk. v. 12-16).—Ver. 40. **καὶ ἔρχεται**, etc., and there cometh to Him, historic present as so often; where this happened not said, probably an incident of the preaching tour; "in one of the cities," says Lk.—**ἐὰν θέλῃς δύν.**: the leper has seen or heard enough of Christ's healing ministry to be sure as to the *power*. He doubts the will, naturally from the nature of the disease, especially if it be the first cure of the kind, or the first so far as the man knows.—Ver. 41. **σπλαγχνισθείς**, having compassion. Watch carefully

43. Καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ, εὐθέως ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν, 44. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ὅρα, μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἴπῃς· ἀλλ' ὕπαγε, σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ἃ προσέταξε Μωσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς." 45. Ὁ δὲ ἐξελθὼν ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν πολλὰ καὶ διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, ὥστε μηκέτι αὐτὸν δύνασθαι [n] φανερῶς εἰς πόλιν [1] εἰσελθεῖν· ἀλλ' ἔξω ἐν [2] ἐρήμοις τόποις ἦν, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν πανταχόθεν.[3]

n John vii. 10. Acts x. 9.

[1] The order of the words varies in the MSS.

[2] επ in ℵBLΔ.

[3] παντοθεν in many uncials (Tisch., W.H.).

the portraiture of Christ's *personality* in this Gospel, Mk.'s speciality.—Ver. 42. **ἀπῆλθεν**, etc.: another instance of duality, the leprosy left him, and he or it was cleansed. Lk. has the former of the two phrases, Mt. the latter.—**καθαρίζειν** is Hellenistic for **καθαίρειν**.—Ver. 43. **ἐμβριμησάμενος**, etc.: assuming a severe aspect, *vide* notes on the word at Mt. ix. 30, especially the quotation from Euthy. Zig.—**ἐξέβαλεν α.**, thrust him out of the synagogue or the crowd. It is not quite certain that the incident happened in a synagogue, though the inference is natural from the connection with ver. 39. Lepers were not interdicted from entering the synagogue. These particulars are peculiar to Mk., and belong to his character sketching. He does not mean to impute real anger to Jesus, but only a masterful manner dictated by a desire that the benefit should be complete = away out of this, to the priest; do what the law requires, that you may be not only clean but recognised as such by the authorities, and so received by the people as a leper no longer.—Ver. 44. **εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς**: for a testimony from priest to people, without which the leper would not be received as clean.—Ver. 45. What Jesus feared seems to have happened. The man went about telling of his cure, and neglecting the means necessary to obtain social recognition as cured.—**τὸν λόγον**: "the matter," A. V. Perhaps we should translate strictly the *word*, *i.e.*, the word Jesus spoke: "I will, be thou clean". So Holtz. after Fritzsche. So also Euthy. Zig. (**διεφήμιζε τὸν λόγον, ὃν εἴρηκεν αὐτῷ ὁ χριστὸς, δηλαδὴ τὸ θέλω, καθαρίσθητι, ὡς μετ' ἐξουσίας γενόμενον**).—**εἰς πόλιν**: the result was that Jesus could not enter openly into *a city*, a populous place, but was obliged to remain in retired spots. This cure and the popularity it caused may have co-operated to bring Christ's synagogue ministry to an abrupt termination by stirring up envy. Jesus was between two fires, and His order to the leper, go, show thyself, had a double reference: to the man's good and to the conciliation of the scribes and synagogue rulers.—**καὶ ἤρχοντο**, etc.: and (still) they kept coming from all quarters. Popularity at its height. There is nothing corresponding to ver. 45 in Mt.

CHAPTER II. INCIPIENT CONFLICT. This chapter and the first six verses of the next report incidents which, though not represented as happening at the same time, have all one aim: to exhibit Jesus as becoming an object of disfavour to the religious classes, the scribes and Pharisees. Sooner or later, and soon rather than later, this was inevitable. Jesus and they were too entirely different in thought and ways for good will to prevail between them for any length of time. It would not be long before the new Prophet would attract their attention. The comments of the people in Capernaum synagogue, doubtless often repeated elsewhere, on the contrast between His style of teaching and that of the scribes, would soon reach their ears, and would not tend to promote a good understanding. That was one definite ground of offence, and others were sure to arise.

Vv. 1-12. *The palsied man* (Mt. ix. 1-8; Lk. v. 17-26).—Ver. 1. The reading of ℵBL (W.H.) with **εἰσελθὼν** for **εἰσῆλθεν** in T. R., and omitting **καὶ** before **ἠκούσθη**, gives a ruggedly anacolouthistic construction ("and entering again into Capernaum after days it was heard that He was at home"), which the T. R. very neatly removes. The construction of the sentence, even as it stands in the critically approved text, may be made smoother by taking **ἠκούσθη** not im-

II. 1. Καὶ πάλιν εἰσῆλθεν[1] εἰς Καπερναοὺμ δι᾽ ἡμερῶν· καὶ[2] ἠκούσθη ὅτι εἰς οἶκόν[3] ἐστι· 2. καὶ εὐθέως συνήχθησαν πολλοί, ὥστε μηκέτι [a] χωρεῖν μηδὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν θύραν· καὶ [b] ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν [b] λόγον. 3. Καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτόν, παραλυτικὸν φέροντες,[4] [c] αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων. 4. καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσαι[5] αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, [d] ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν, καὶ [e] ἐξορύξαντες χαλῶσι τὸν κράββατον,[6] ἐφ᾽ ᾧ[7] ὁ παραλυτικὸς κατέκειτο.

a John ii. 6; xxi. 25.
b Ch. iv. 33.
c Mt. iv. 6.
d here only.
e Gal. iv. 15 (to dig out the eyes).

[1] εισελθων παλιν in ℵBDL; probably correct just because of the halting const. which the T.R. rectifies.

[2] ℵBL omit και; for the connection of the words *vide* below.

[3] ℵBDLΣ have εν οικω (Tisch., W.H. in text). But εις οικον (CΔ *al.*) is to be preferred as the more difficult.

[4] ℵBL have φεροντες προς αυτον παραλυτικον.

[5] προσενεγκαι in ℵBL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] Spelt κραβαττον in most uncials.

[7] οπου in ℵBDL. εφ ω (T.R.) is explanatory.

personally, but as referring to Jesus. He entering, etc., was heard of as being at home (Schanz and Holtzmann alternatively).—πάλιν, again, a second time, i. 21 mentioning the first. He has not been there apparently since He left it (i. 35) on the preaching tour in Galilee. —δι᾽ ἡμερῶν: after days, *cf.* Gal. ii. 1; classical examples of this use of διὰ in Wetstein and Elsner. The expression suggests a short period, a few days, which seems too short for the time required for the preaching tour, even if it had been cut short by hostile influence, as is not improbable. The presence of scribes at this scene is very significant. They appear hostile in attitude on Christ's return to Capernaum. They had probably been active before it. Fritzsche translates: *interjectis pluribus diebus*. For a considerable time διὰ χρόνου would be the appropriate phrase. We get rid of the difficulty by connecting δι᾽ ἡμερῶν with ἠκούσθη (Kloster.), the resulting meaning being that days elapsed after the arrival in Capernaum before people found out that Jesus was there. He had been absent possibly for months, and probably returned quietly.—ἐν οἴκῳ or εἰς οἶκον (T. R.) = at home (in Peter's house presumably); εἰς οἶκον suggests the idea of entrance.—Ver. 2. συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ: with the extraordinary incidents of some weeks or months ago fresh in their memory, a great gathering of the townspeople was inevitable.—ὥστε, etc.: the gathering was phenomenal; not only the house filled, but the space round about the door crowded—no room for more people even there (μηδὲ), not to speak of within. —τὸν λόγον: the phrase has a secondary sound, as if an echo of the speech of the apostolic church, but the meaning is plain. Jesus was preaching the gospel of the kingdom when the following incident happened. Preaching always first. —Ver. 3. ἔρχονται: historic present with lively effect. The arrival creates a stir.—φέροντες: this may mean more than the four who actually carried the sick man (ὑπὸ τεσσάρων), friends accompanying. The bearers might be *servants* (Schanz).—Ver. 4. The particulars in this verse not in Mt., who did not care how they found their way to Jesus; enough for him that they succeeded *somehow*.—προσεγγίσαι (T. R.): here only in N. T. to approach; προσενέγκαι (W.H.), to bring near (the sick man understood) to Him, Jesus.—ἀπεστέγασαν τ. σ., removed the roof, to which they would get access by an outside stair either from the street or from the court.—ὅπου ἦν, where He was; where was that? in an upper room (Lightfoot and Vitringa), or in a room in a one-storied house (Holtz., H. C.), or not in a room at all, but in the *atrium* or *compluvium*, the quadrangle of the house (Faber, *Archäol.*, Jahn, *Archäol.*). In the last-mentioned case they would have to remove the parapet (battlement, Deut. xxii. 8) and let the man down into the open space.—ἐξορύξαντες: not something additional to but explanatory of ἀπεστέγασαν = they unroofed by digging through the material—tiles, laths, and

5. ἰδὼν δὲ[1] ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ, "Τέκνον, ἀφέωνταί[2] σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου."[3] 6. Ἦσαν δέ τινες τῶν γραμματέων ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι, καὶ διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, 7. "Τί[4] οὗτος οὕτω λαλεῖ βλασφημίας[5]; τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός;" 8. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς [f] τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὕτως[6] διαλογίζονται ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[7] "Τί ταῦτα διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; 9. τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν τῷ παραλυτικῷ, Ἀφέωνταί[8] σοι[9] αἱ

f Ch. viii. 12.

[1] και ιδων in ℵBCL.

[2] B 33 have αφιενται. αφεωνται conforms to Lk. (v. 20), and is to be suspected.

[3] For σοι αι αμ. σου (from Lk.) ℵBDLΔ have σου αι αμ.

[4] οτι in B (W.H. marg.).

[5] In the T.R., ουτος ουτω λαλει βλασφημιας, we detect the hand of harmonising and prosaic revisers once more. The true reading is τι (B, οτι) ουτος ουτως λαλει; βλασφημει (ℵBDL). *Vide* below.

[6] B omits ουτως (W.H. in brackets).

[7] λεγει in ℵBL 33. B omits αυτοις (W.H. in brackets).

[8] αφιενται in ℵB.

[9] σου in ℵBL *al.*

plaster.—**κράβαττον**: a small portable couch, for the poor, for travellers, and for sick people; condemned by Phryn., p. 62; **σκίμπους** the correct word. Latin *grabatus*, which may have led Mk. to use the term in the text.—Ver. 5. **τὴν πίστιν α.**, their faith, that of the bearers, shown by their energetic action, the sick man not included (οὐ τὴν πίστιν τοῦ παραλελυμένου ἀλλὰ τῶν κομισάντων, Victor Ant., Cramer, Cat.).—**τέκνον**, child, without the cheering **θάρσει** of Mt.

Vv. 6-12. Thus far of the sick man, how he got to Jesus, and the sympathetic reception he met with. Now the scribes begin to play their part. They find their opportunity in the sympathetic word of Jesus: thy sins be forgiven thee; a word most suitable to the case, and which might have been spoken by any man.—**τινες τ. γρ.**: Lk. makes of this simple fact a great affair: an assembly of Pharisees and lawyers from all quarters—Galilee, Judaea, Jerusalem, hardly suitable to the initial stage of conflict.—**ἐκεῖ καθήμενοι**: sitting there. If the posture is to be pressed they must have been early on the spot, so as to get near to Jesus and hear and see Him distinctly.—**ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις α.**: they looked like men shocked and disapproving. The popularity of Jesus prevented free utterance of their thought. But any one could see they were displeased and why. It was that speech about forgiveness.—Ver. 7. **τί οὗτος οὕτω λάλει; βλασφημεῖ.** This reading of ℵBDL is far more lifelike than that of the T. R., which exemplifies the tendency of copyists to smooth down into commonplace whatever is striking and original = why does this person thus speak? He blasphemes. The words suggest a gradual intensification of the fault-finding mood: first a general sense of surprise, then a feeling of impropriety, then a final advance to the thought: why, this is blasphemy! It was nothing of the kind. What Jesus had said did not necessarily amount to more than a declaration of God's willingness to forgive sin to the penitent. They read the blasphemy into it.—Ver. 8. **εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς**: Jesus read their thoughts *at once*, and through and through (**ἐπί**).—**τῷ πνεύματι**, by His *spirit*, as distinct from the ear, they having said nothing.—Vv. 9, 10, *vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 11. **σοὶ λέγω**, I say to thee, a part of Christ's speech to the man in Mk., not likely to have been so really; laconic speech, the fewest words possible, characteristic of Jesus.—**ἔγειρε**, means something more than *age* (Fritzsche) = come, take up thy bed. Jesus bids him do two things, each a conclusive proof of recovery: *rise*, then go to thy house on thine own feet, with thy sick-bed on thy shoulder.—Ver. 12 tells how the man did as bidden, to the astonishment of all spectators.—**πάντας**, all, without exception, scribes included? (Kloster.) It might have been so had the sentence stopped

ἁμαρτίαι, ἢ εἰπεῖν, Ἔγειραι,[1] καὶ[2] ἆρόν σου τὸν κράββατον,[3] καὶ περιπάτει; 10. ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀφιέναι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς[4] ἁμαρτίας, (λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ,) 11. Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειραι,[5] καὶ[6] ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν σου, καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου." 12. Καὶ ἠγέρθη εὐθέως, καὶ[7] ἄρας τὸν κράββατον, ἐξῆλθεν ἐναντίον[8] πάντων· ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας, καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν Θεόν, λέγοντας,[9] "Ὅτι οὐδέποτε οὕτως[10] εἴδομεν."

13. Καὶ ἐξῆλθε πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. 14. Καὶ παράγων εἶδε Λευῒν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ἀκολούθει μοι." Καὶ ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ. 15. Καὶ ἐγέ-

[1] εγειρε in ℵCD *al.* (Tisch.). εγειρου in BL (W.H.).
[2] και in ℵBΔ (Tisch.), omit CDL (W.H. in brackets).
[3] τον κραβ. σου in ℵBCDLΣ.
[4] επι της γης αφιεναι in ℵCDLΔΣ (Tisch.). αφ. αμαρ. επι τ. γ. in B (W.H. text).
[5] εγειρε in most uncials.
[6] και omit ℵBCDL.
[7] και ευθυς in ℵBCL.
[8] εμπροσθεν in ℵBL.
[9] B omits (W.H. in brackets). D has και λεγειν.
[10] ουτως ουδεποτε ℵBDL.

there. For no doubt the scribes were as much astonished as their neighbours at what took place. But they would not join in the praise to God which followed.—**οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἴδομεν**: elliptical, but expressive, suited to the mental mood = so we never saw, *i.e.*, we never saw the like.

N.B.—The title "Son of Man" occurs in this narrative for the first time in Mk.'s Gospel; for its import *vide* on Mt.

Vv. 13-27. *Call of Levi, feast following* (Mt. ix. 9-13; Lk. v. 27-32). This incident is not to be conceived as following immediately after that narrated in the foregoing section.—Ver. 13 interrupts the continuity of the history. It states that Jesus went out again (*cf.* i. 16) alongside (**παρὰ**) the sea, that the multitude followed Him, and that He taught them. A very vague general notice, serving little other purpose than to place an interval between the foregoing and following incidents.—Ver. 14. **Λευῒν**. Levi, the son of Alphaeus, the name here and in Lk. different from that given in first gospel, but the incident manifestly the same, and the man therefore also; Levi his original name, Matthew his apostle name. Mk. names Matthew in his apostle list (iii. 18), but he fails to identify the two, though what he states about Levi evidently points to a call to apostleship similar to that to the four fishermen (i. 16, 20). The compiler of the first Gospel, having Mk. before him, and, noticing the omission, substituted the name Matthew for Levi, adding to it **λεγόμενον** (ix. 9) to hint that he had another name.—**ἀκολούθει μοι**: a call to apostleship (in terms identical in all three Synoptics), and also *to immediate service in connection with the mission to the publicans* (*vide* on Mt.).—Ver. 15. **ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτου**: whose house? Not perfectly clear, but all things point to that of Levi. There is no mention of a return to Capernaum, where Jesus dwelt. The custom house may have been outside the town, nearer the shore. Then if the house of Jesus (Peter's) had been meant, the name of Jesus should have stood after **οἰκία** instead of at the close of the verse. The main point to note is that whatever house is meant, it must have been large enough to have a hall or court capable of accommodating a large number of people. Furrer assumes as a matter of course that the gathering was in the court. "Here in the court of one of these ruined houses sat the Saviour of the lost in the midst of publicans and sinners" (*Wanderungen*, p. 375).—**πολλοὶ**, etc.: *many* to be taken in earnest, not slurred over, as we are apt to do when we think of this feast as a private entertainment given by Mt. to his *quondam* friends, Jesus being nothing more than a guest.—**ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ**: Mk. here takes

νετο ἐν τῷ[1] κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ἦσαν γὰρ πολλοί, καὶ ἠκολούθησαν[2] αὐτῷ. 16. καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι,[3] ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐσθίοντα[4] μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν,[5] ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Τί[6] ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει;"[7] 17. Καὶ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἰατροῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. οὐκ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν."[8]

[1] Instead of **εγενετο εν τω** ℵBL 33 have simply **γινεται** (W.H.).

[2] **ηκολουθουν** in ℵBLΔ (modern editors).

[3] For **και οι Φ.** BLΔ have **των Φαρισαιων**, which doubtless the ancient scribes stumbled at as unusual.

[4] For **αυτον εσθιοντα** B 33 have **οτι εσθιει** (W.H., R.G.T.), ℵDL **οτι ησθιε** (Tisch.). The T.R. follows ACΔΣ.

[5] **αμαρτωλων και τελωνων** in BDL 33, to be preferred just because unusual.

[6] Omit **τι** BL 33 (W.H.).

[7] ℵBD omit **και πινει**, which the scribes would be ready to insert.

[8] ℵABDLΔΣ *al*. verss. omit **εις μετανοιαν**, which has been imported from Lk.

pains to prevent us from overlooking the **πολλοὶ** of the previous clause = for they, the publicans, and generally the people who passed for sinners, were *many*, and they had begun to follow Him. Some (Schanz, Weiss, etc.) think the reference is to the *disciples* (**μαθηταῖς**), mentioned here for first time, therefore a statement that they were numerous (more, *e.g.*, than *four*), quite apposite. But the stress of the story lies on the publicans, and Christ's relations with *them*. (So Holtz., H. C.) It was an interesting fact to the evangelist that this class, of whom there was a large number in the neighbourhood, were beginning to show an interest in Jesus, and to follow Him about. To explain the number Elsner suggests that they may have gathered from various port towns along the shore. Jesus would not meet such people in the synagogue, as they seem to have been excluded from it (*vide* Lightfoot and Wünsche, *ad* Mt. xviii. 17). Hence the necessity for a special mission.—Ver. 16. **ἔλεγον**: the scribes advance from *thinking* (ii. 6) to *speaking*; not yet, however, *to* Jesus but *about* Him to His disciples. They note, with disapproval, His kindly relations with "sinners". The publicans and other disreputables had also noted the fact. The story of the palsied man and the "blasphemous" word, "thy sins be forgiven thee," had got abroad, making them prick up their ears, and awakening decided interest in these tabooed circles, in the "Blasphemer".—Ver. 17. **καλέσαι**: to call, suggestive of invitations to a *feast* (Fritzsche, Meyer, Holtz.), and making for the hypothesis that Jesus, not Matthew, was the real host at the social gathering: the whole plan His, and Matthew only His agent; *vide* notes on Mt. He called to that particular feast as to the feast of the kingdom, the one a means to the other as the end.—**δικαίους, ἁμαρτωλούς**: Jesus preferred the company of the sinful to that of the righteous, and sought disciples from among them by preference. The terms are not ironical. They simply describe two classes of society in current language, and indicate with which of the two His sympathies lay.

Vv. 18-22. *Fasting* (Mt. ix. 14-17, Lk. v. 33-39).—Ver. 18. **καὶ**, *and*, connection purely topical, another case of conflict.—**ἦσαν νηστεύοντες**, either: were wont to fast (Grotius, Fritzsche, Schanz, etc.), or, and this gives more point to the story: were fasting at that particular time (Meyer, Weiss, Holtz., H. C.).—**ἔρχονται καὶ λέγ.**, they come and say, quite generally; they = people, or some representatives of John's disciples, and the Pharisees.—Ver. 19. **μὴ δύνανται**, etc.: the question answers

18. Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων[1] νηστεύοντες· καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Διατί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ[2] τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσι;" 19. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστι, νηστεύειν; ὅσον χρόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἔχουσι τὸν νυμφίον,[3] οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν· 20. ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.[4] 21. καὶ[5] οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου ἐπιρράπτει ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ[6] εἰ δὲ μή, αἴρει τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ[7] τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται. 22. καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή, ῥήσσει[8] ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος[9] τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐκχεῖται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται[10]· ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον."[11]

[1] For των Φαρισαιων ℵABCD *al.* verss. have Φαρισαιοι.
[2] ℵBCL have μαθηται after οι.
[3] ℵBCL arrange thus: εχουσι τον ν. μετ αυτων.
[4] εν εκεινη τη ημερα in ℵABCDLΔΣ, etc. [5] και omit ℵABCLΔ 33.
[6] επι ιματιον παλαιον in ℵBCDL. The dat. conforms to Mt.
[7] απ αυτου in ℵBLΣ. [8] ρηξει in ℵBCDL 33.
[9] ℵBCDL 13, 69 *al.* omit ο νεος.
[10] BL (D in part) read ο οιν. απολλυται και οι ασ. T.R. conforms to Mt.
[11] ℵB omit βλητεον (from Lk.). D and old Lat. verss. omit the whole clause.

itself, and is allowed to do so in Mt. and Lk. Mk. at the expense of style answers it formally in the negative.—ὅσον χρόνον, etc. For all this the Syriac Vulgate has a simple *no*.—Ver. 20. Here also the style becomes burdened by the sense of the solemn character of the fact stated: there will come days when the Bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast—in that day! This final expression, ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ, singular, for plural in first clause, is very impressive, although Fritzsche calls it *prorsus intolerabile*. There is no ground for the suggestion that the phrase is due to the evangelist, and refers to the Friday of the Passion Week (Holtz., H. C.). It might quite well have been used by Jesus.—Ver. 21. ἐπιρράπτει, sews upon, for ἐπιβάλλει in Mt. and Lk.; not in Greek authors, here only in N. T.; in Sept., Job xvi. 15, the simple verb.—εἰ δὲ μή: *vide* on εἰ δὲ μήγε in Mt. ix. 17.—αἴρει, etc.: that which filleth up taketh from it (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ)—the new, *viz.*, from the old; the second clause explanatory of the first.—καὶ χ. σ. γ., and a worse rent takes place.—Ver. 22. ῥήξει. Pricaeus (*ad* Mt. ix. 17) quotes from Seneca (83 Epist.): "musto dolia ipsa rumpuntur"—of course, *a fortiori*, old *skins*.—καὶ ὁ οἶνος, etc.: and the wine is lost, also the skins.—ἀλλὰ, etc.: this final clause, bracketed in W. and H., with the βλητέον, probably inserted from Lk., gives very pithy expression to the principle taught by the parable: but new wine into new skins! As to the bearing of both parables as justifying both John and Jesus, *vide* notes on Mt., *ad loc.*

Vv. 23-28. *The Sabbath question* (Mt. xii. 1-8, Lk. vi. 1-5).—Ver. 23. καὶ ἐγ.: connection with foregoing topical, not temporal; another case of conflict.—αὐτὸν παραπορεύεσθαι: ἐγένετο is followed here by the infinitive in first clause, then with καὶ and a finite verb in second clause. It is sometimes followed by indicative with καὶ, and also without καὶ (*vide* Burton's *Syntax*, § 360).—παραπορ. stands here instead of διαπορ. in Lk., and the simple verb with διὰ after it in Mt. It seems intended to combine the ideas of going through and alongside. Jesus went through a corn field on a footpath with grain on either side.—ὁδὸν ποιεῖν is a puzzling phrase. In

23. Καὶ ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι [1] διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ [2] ὁδὸν ποιεῖν [3] τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας. 24. καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, "Ἴδε, τί ποιοῦσιν ἐν [4] τοῖς σάββασιν, ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι;" 25. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλεγεν [5] αὐτοῖς, "Οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε, τί ἐποίησε Δαβίδ, ὅτε χρείαν ἔσχε καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ; 26. πῶς [6] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ [g] ἐπὶ [g] Ἀβιάθαρ τοῦ [7] ἀρχιερέως, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστι φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, [8] καὶ ἔδωκε καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσι;" 27. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο, οὐχ [9] ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον. 28. ὥστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου."

g Lk. iii. 2; iv. 27. Acts xi. 28.

[1] BCD have διαπορ. (Lk.). ℵBCDLΔ place αυτον εν τοις σαββασι before the verb.

[2] οι μαθ. before ηρξαντο in ℵBCDL 33, 69 *al.*

[3] B has οδοποιειν (W.H. margin).

[4] ℵABCDΔΣ it. vulg. omit εν.

[5] ℵBCL omit αυτος (most modern editions. Ws. after Meyer dissents). For ελεγεν ℵCL it. vulg. have λεγει (Tisch., W.H., Ws.).

[6] BD omit πως (W.H. in brackets).

[7] ℵBL omit του.

[8] τους ιερεις in ℵBL.

[9] και ουχ in ℵBCLΔΣ 33 verss.

classic Greek it means to make a road = *viam sternere*, ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι meaning to make way = *iter facere*. If we assume that Mk. was acquainted with and observed this distinction, then the meaning will be: the disciples began to make a path by pulling up the stalks (τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχυας), or perhaps by trampling under foot the stalks after first plucking off the *ears*. The ἤρξαντο in that case will mean that they began to do that when they saw the path was not clear, and wished to make it more comfortable for their Master to walk on. But it is doubtful whether in Hellenistic Greek the classic distinction was observed, and Judges xvii. 8 (Sept.) supplies an instance of ὁδὸν ποιεῖν = making way, "as he journeyed". It would come natural to Mk. to use the phrase in the sense of *iter facere*. If we take the phrase in this sense, then we must, with Beza, find in the passage a *permutata verborum collocatio*, and translate as if it had run: ὁδὸν ποιοῦντες τίλλειν: "began, as they went, to pluck," etc. (R. V.). The former view, however, is not to be summarily put aside because it ascribes to the disciples an apparently wanton proceeding. If there was a right of way by use and wont, they would be quite entitled to act so. The only difficulty is to understand how a customary path could have remained untrodden till the grain was ripe, or even in the ear. On this view *vide* Meyer. Assuming that the disciples made a path for their Master by pulling up the grain, with which it was overgrown, or by trampling the straw after plucking the ears, what did they do with the latter? Mt. and Lk. both say or imply that the plucking was in order to *eating* by hungry men. Meyer holds that Mk. knows nothing of this hunger, and that the eating of the ears came into the tradition through the allusion to David eating the shewbread. But the stress Mk. lays on *need* and *hunger* (duality of expression, ver. 25) shows that in his idea hunger was an element in the case of the disciples also.—Ver. 24. ἔλεγον αὐτῷ. In this case they speak *to* Christ against His disciples; indirectly against Him.—ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν: the offence was not trampling the grain or straw, but plucking the ears; reaping on a small scale; rubbing = threshing, in Lk.—χρείαν ἔσχε καὶ ἐπείνασεν: another example of Mk.'s duality, intelligible only if *hunger* was the point of the story. The verbs are singular, because David (αὐτὸς) is the hero, his followers in the background. — Ver. 26. ἐπὶ

III. 1. ΚΑΙ εἰσῆλθε πάλιν εἰς τὴν[1] συναγωγήν, καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος [a] ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα, 2. καὶ [b] παρετήρουν[2] αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεύσει αὐτόν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ. 3. καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα,[3] "Ἔγειραι[4] εἰς τὸ μέσον." 4. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθοποιῆσαι,[5] ἢ κακοποιῆσαι; ψυχὴν σῶσαι, ἢ ἀπο-

a Ch. ix. 18.
b Lk. vi. 6; xiv. 1; xx. 20. Acts ix. 24.

[1] ℵB omit την, which may have come in from Lk. (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] So in ℵBL. CDΔΣ have the middle (Lk.).

[3] τω την χειρα εχοντι ξηραν in BL (W.H.). ℵCΔ have την ξηραν χειρα εχοντι (Tisch.).

[4] εγειρε in most uncials.

[5] αγαθον ποιησαι in ℵD (Tisch.). BCLΔΣ have αγαθοπ. as in T.R. (possibly assimilated to κακοποιησαι, W.H.).

Ἀβιάθαρ ἀρ.: under A., a note of time, also implying his sanction: the sanction of a distinguished sacerdotal character = of *Abiathar as priest*. But Ahimelech was the priest then (1 Sam. xxi. 2 f.). Either a natural error arising from the close connection of David with Abiathar, the well-known high priest, or we must adopt one or other of the solutions proposed: father and son, Ahimelech and Abiathar, both bore both names (1 Sam. xxii. 20, 2 Sam. viii. 17, 1 Chron. xviii. 16)—so the Fathers; Abiathar, the son, Ahimelech's assistant at the time, and mentioned as the more notable as approving of the conduct of his own father and of David (Grotius); **ἐπὶ** taken in the sense it bears in Mk. xii. 26 (**ἐπὶ βάτου**)—in the passage about Abiathar—not a satisfactory suggestion.—Ver. 27. **καὶ ἔλεγεν**, etc., and He said to them; this phrase is employed to introduce a saying of Jesus containing a great principle. The principle is that the Sabbath is only a means towards an end—man's highest good. Strange that Mk. should have been allowed to have a monopoly of this great word! For this saying alone, and the parable of gradual growth (iv. 26-29), his Gospel was worth preserving. —Ver. 28. **ὥστε**: wherefore, so then, introducing a thesis of co-ordinate importance, while an inference from the previous statement.—**ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ.**: the Son of Man, as representing the *human* interest, as opposed to the falsely conceived divine interest championed by the Pharisees.—**καὶ τ. σ.**, even of the Sabbath, so inviolable in your eyes. Lord, not to abolish but to interpret and keep in its own place, and give it a new name.

CHAPTER III. THE SABBATH QUESTION CONTINUED. THE DISCIPLE-CIRCLE. Another Sabbatic conflict completes the group of incidents (five in all) designed to illustrate the opposition of the scribes and Pharisees to Jesus. Then at v. 7 begins a new section of the history, extending to vi. 13, in which the *disciples* of Jesus are, speaking broadly, the centre of interest. First the *people*, then their *religious heads*, then the *nucleus of the new society*.

Vv. 1-6. *The withered hand* (Mt. xii. 9-14, Lk. vi. 6-11).—Ver. 1. **καὶ**: connection simply topical, another instance of collision *in re* Sabbath observance.—**πάλιν**: as was His wont on Sabbath days (i. 21, 39). —**συναγωγήν**: without the article (ℵB), into a synagogue, place not known.—**ἐξηραμμένην**, dried up, the abiding result of injury by accident or disease, not congenital—"non ex utero, sed morbo aut vulnere; haec vis participii," Beng.—Ver. 2. **παρετήρουν**, they were watching Him; who, goes without saying: the same parties, *i.e.*, men of the same class, as those who figure in the last section. This time bent on finding Jesus Himself at fault *in re* the Sabbath, instinctively perceiving that His thoughts on the subject must be wholly diverse from theirs.—Ver. 3. **ἔγειρε εἰς**: pregnant construction = arise and come forth into the midst. Then, the man standing up in presence of all, Jesus proceeds to catechise the would-be fault-finders.—Ver. 4. **ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι**, either: to do good or evil to one, or to do the morally good or evil. Recent commentators favour the latter as essential to the cogency of Christ's argument. But the former seems more consonant to

κτεῖναι;" Οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων. 5. καὶ ᶜπεριβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ' ὀργῆς, ᵈσυλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ ᵉπωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, "Ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου."[1] Καὶ ἐξέτεινε, καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.[2] 6. Καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εὐθέως μετὰ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν συμβούλιον ἐποίουν[3] κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσι.

c Lk. vi. 10 and several times elsewhere; in Mk. always in mid.
d here only in N.T.
e Rom. xi. 25. Eph. iv. 18.

7. ΚΑΙ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησε μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ[4] πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἠκολούθησαν[5] αὐτῷ,[5] καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, 8. καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας, καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· καὶ οἱ[6] περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα,

[1] B omits σου (W.H. χειρα without σου in marg.).

[2] υγιης ως η αλλη has little attestation; comes from Mt.

[3] εδιδουν in BL; unusual and therefore altered into εποιουν, or εποιησαν.

[4] μετα τ. μ. α. ανεχωρησεν in ℵBCDLΔ *al.*; the true reading, *vide* below.

[5] ηκολουθησεν and without αυτω in ℵBCL. The position of the verb in the sentence varies.

[6] Omit οι ℵBCLΔ.

the situation. It was a question of performing an act of healing. Christ assumes that the ethically good coincides with the *humane* (Sabbath made for man). Therein essentially lay the difference between Him and the Pharisees, in whose theory and practice religious duty and benevolence, the divine and the human, were divorced. To do good or to do evil, these the only alternatives: to omit to do good in your power is to do evil; not to save life when you can is to destroy it.—ἐσιώπων, they were silent, sullenly, but also in sheer helplessness. What could they reply to a question which looked at the subject from a wholly different point of view, the ethical, from the legal one they were accustomed to? There was nothing in common between them and Jesus.—Ver. 5. περιβλεψάμενος, having made a swift, indignant (μετ' ὀργῆς) survey of His foes.—συλλυπούμενος: this *present*, the previous participle aorist, implying habitual pity for men in such a condition of blindness. This is a true touch of Mk.'s in his portraiture of Christ.—τῆς καρδίας: singular, as if the whole class had but one heart, which was the fact so far as the *type* of heart (hardened) was concerned.—Ver. 6. ἐξελθόντες: the stretching forth of the withered hand in obedience to Christ's command, conclusive evidence of cure, was the signal for an immediate exodus of the champions of orthodox Sabbath-keeping; full of wrath because the Sabbath was broken, and especially because it was broken by a *miracle* bringing fame to the transgressor—the result plots (συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν, here only) without delay (εὐθὺς) against His life.—μετὰ τῶν Ἡρῳδιανῶν, with the Herodians, peculiar to Mk.; first mention of this party. A perfectly credible circumstance. The Pharisaic party really aimed at the life of Jesus, and they would naturally regard the assistance of people having influence at court as valuable.

Vv. 7-12. *The fame of Jesus spreads notwithstanding* (*vide* Mt. iv. 25, xii. 15 f.; Lk. vi. 17-19).—Ver. 7. μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν, *with the disciples*: note—they now come to the front. We are to hear something about them to which the notice of the great crowd is but the prelude. Hence the emphatic position before the verb.—πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν: as if to a place of retreat (*vide* ver. 9). πολὺ πλῆθος: πολὺ, emphatic, a vast, exceptionally great crowd, in spite, possibly in consequence, of Pharisaic antagonism. Of course this crowd did not gather in an hour. The history is very fragmentary, and blanks must be filled up by the imagination. Two crowds meet—(1) πολὺ πλῆθος from Galilee; (2) from more remote parts: Judaea, Jerusalem, Idumaea, Peraea, and the district of Tyre and Sidon—πλῆθος πολύ (ver. 8): a considerable crowd, but not so great.—ἀπο τ. Ἰδουμαίας: Idumaea, mentioned here only, "then practically the southern

f here only in sense of crowding. *Cf.* Mt. vii. 14. Elsewhere metaphorical.
g here only in same sense.
h here and in Mt. xii. 16 (= to make one known).

πλῆθος πολύ, ἀκούσαντες[1] ὅσα ἐποίει,[1] ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. 9. καὶ εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα πλοιάριον προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ, διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μὴ [f]θλίβωσιν αὐτόν. 10. πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐθεράπευσεν, ὥστε [g]ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ, ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται, ὅσοι εἶχον μάστιγας· 11. καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρει,[2] προσέπιπτεν[2] αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔκραζε,[2] λέγοντα, "Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ." 12. Καὶ πολλὰ ἐπετίμα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ αὐτὸν [h]φανερὸν ποιήσωσι.[3] 13. Καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἤθελεν αὐτός· καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. 14. καὶ ἐποίησε δώδεκα,[4] ἵνα ὦσι μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν, 15. καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους, καὶ[5] ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια· 16. καὶ

[1] **ακουοντες** in ℵBD; **ποιει** in BL (W.H.).

[2] **εθεωρουν, προσεπιπτον, εκραζον** in best MSS. The sing. a gram. cor. (neut. pl. nom.).

[3] **ποιωσι** in B[3]DL, as in T.R. in ℵBCΔΣ (Tisch. former, W.H. latter).

[4] ℵBCΔ add **ους και αποστολους ωνομασε**, probably an importation from Lk.

[5] **θεραπευειν τους νοσους και** omitted in ℵBCLΔ.

Shephelah, with the Negeb."—G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, p. 239. Mentioned by Josephus (B. J., iii. 3-5) as a division of Judaea.—Ver. 9. **ἵνα πλοιάριον προσκαρτερῇ**: a boat to be always in readiness, to get away from the crowds. Whether used or not not said; shows how great the crowd was.—Ver. 10. **ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν**: so that they knocked against Him; one of Mk.'s vivid touches. They hoped to obtain a cure by contact anyhow brought about, even by rude collision.—**μάστιγας**, from **μάστιξ**, a scourge, hence tropically in Sept. and N. T., a providential scourge, a disease; again in v. 29, 34.—Ver. 11. **ὅταν ἐθ.** In a relative clause like this, containing a past general supposition, classical Greek has the optative without **ἄν**. Here we have the imperfect indicative with **ἄν** (**ὅτε ἄν**). *Vide* Klotz., *ad Devar*, p. 690, and Burton, *M. and T.*, § 315. Other examples in chap. vi. 56, xi. 19.—**προσέπιπτον**, fell *before* (**ἐπιπίπτειν**, above, to fall *against*).—**Σὺ εἶ ὁ υ. τ. θ.**: again an instance of spiritual clairvoyance in demoniacs. *Vide* at Mt. viii. 29.—Ver. 12. This sentence is reproduced in Mt. xii. 16, but without special reference to demoniacs, whereby it loses much of its point.

Vv. 13-19a. *Selection of the Twelve* (*cf.* Mt. x. 2-4, Lk. vi. 12-16).—Ver. 13. **εἰς τὸ ὄρος.** He ascends *to the hill*; same expression as in Mt. v. 1; reference not to any particular hill, but to the hill country flanking the shore of the lake; might be used from whatever point below the ascent was made.—**προσκαλεῖται**, etc., He calls to Him those whom He Himself (**αὐτός** after the verb, emphatic) wished, whether by personal communication with each individual, or through disciples, not indicated. It was an invitation to leave the vast crowd and follow Him up the hill; addressed to a larger number than twelve, from whom the Twelve were afterwards selected.—**ἀπῆλθον π. α.**: they left the crowd and followed after Him.—Ver. 14. He is now on the hill top, surrounded by a body of disciples, perhaps some scores, picked out from the great mass of followers.—**καὶ ἐποίησε δώδεκα**: and He made, constituted as a compact body, *Twelve*, by a second selection. For use of **ποιεῖν** in this sense *vide* 1 Sam. xii. 6, Acts ii. 36, Heb. iii. 2. God "made" Jesus as Jesus "made" the Twelve. What the process of "making" in the case of the Twelve consisted in we do not know. It might take place after days of close intercourse on the hill.—**ἵνα ὦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ**, that they might be (constantly) with Him; first and very important aim of the making, mentioned only by Mk—training contemplated.—**ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ**: to send them out on a preaching and healing mission, also in view, but only after a while. This verb frequent in Mk. Note the absence of **τοῦ** before **κηρύσσειν** and **ἔχειν** (ver. 15).—Ver. 16. **καὶ ἐποίησεν τ. δ.**, and He

[i] ἐπέθηκε[1] τῷ Σίμωνι ὄνομα[2] Πέτρον· 17. καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου· καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὀνόματα Βοανεργές,[3] ὅ ἐστιν, Υἱοὶ βροντῆς· 18. καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, καὶ Φίλιππον, καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον, καὶ Ματθαῖον, καὶ Θωμᾶν, καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, καὶ Θαδδαῖον, καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν Κανανίτην,[4] 19. καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώτην,[5] ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν.

Καὶ ἔρχονται[6] εἰς οἶκον· 20. καὶ συνέρχεται πάλιν[7] ὄχλος, ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς μήτε[8] ἄρτον φαγεῖν. 21. καὶ ἀκούσαντες [j] οἱ

i here and in ver. 17 only in sense of adding a name.

j the phrase here only in N.T. (1 Macc. ii. 17; xiii. 52).

[1] To **και επεθηκε** ℵBCΔ prefix **και εποιησε τους δ.**; a probable reading, *vide* below.

[2] **ονομα τω Σιμωνι** in ℵBCLΔ.

[3] **Βοανηργες** in ℵABCLΔ 33.

[4] **Καναναιον** in ℵBCDLΔ 33 it. vulg.

[5] **Ισκαριωθ** in ℵBCLΔ 33.

[6] **ερχεται** in ℵB. The plural (T.R.) is a correction.

[7] **ο** before **οχλος** in ℵBDL (W.H. bracketed).

[8] **μητε** in ℵBDΣ (Tisch.). **μηδε** in BLΔ 33 (W.H.).

appointed *as* the Twelve—the following persons, the twelve names mentioned being the object of **ἐποίησε**, and **τοὺς δ.** being in apposition.—**Πέτρον** is the first name, but it comes in very awkwardly as the object of the verb **ἐπέθηκε**. We must take the grammar as it stands, content that we know, in spite of crude construction, what is meant. Fritzsche (after Beza, Erasmus, etc.) seeks to rectify the construction by prefixing, on slender critical authority, **πρῶτον Σίμωνα**, then bracketing as a parenthesis **καὶ ἐπέθηκε . . . Πέτρον** = first Simon (and He gave to Simon the name Peter).—Ver. 17. **Βοανεργές** = בְּנֵי רְגֶשׁ as pronounced by Galileans; in Syrian = sons of *thunder;* of *tumult*, in Hebrew. Fact mentioned by Mk. only. Why the name was given not known. It does not seem to have stuck to the two disciples, therefore neglected by the other evangelists. It may have been an innocent pleasantry in a society of free, unrestrained fellowship, hitting off some peculiarity of the brothers. Mk. gives us here a momentary glimpse into the inner life of the Jesus-circle—Peter, whose new name did live, doubtless the voucher. The traditional interpretation makes the epithet a tribute to the eloquence of the two disciples (**διὰ τὸ μέγα καὶ διαπρύσιον ἠχῆσαι τῇ οἰκουμένῃ τῆς θεολογίας τὰ δόγματα.** Victor Ant.).—Ver. 18. **Ματθαῖον.** One wonders why Mk. did not here say: Levi, to whom He gave the name Matthew. Or did this disciple get his new name independently of Jesus? This list of names shows the importance of the act of selecting the Twelve. He gives the names, says Victor Ant., that you may not err as to the designations, lest any one should call himself an apostle (**ἵνα μὴ ὁ τυχὼν εἴπῃ ἀπόστολος γεγονέναι**).

Vv. 19b-21. *The friends of Jesus think Him out of His senses;* peculiar to Mk. One of his realisms which Mt. and Lk. pass over in silence.—Ver. 19b. **καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον**, and He cometh home ("nach Haus," Weizs.) to house-life as distinct from hill-life (**εἰς τὸ ὄρος**, ver. 13). The formal manner in which this is stated suggests a sojourn on the hill of appreciable length, say, for some days. How occupied there? Probably in giving a course of instruction to the disciple-circle; say, that reproduced in the "Sermon on the Mount" = the "Teaching on the Hill," *vide* introductory notes on Mt. v.—Ver. 20. The traditional arrangement by which clause b forms part of ver. 19 is fatal to a true conception of the connection of events. The R. V., by making it begin a new section, though not a new verse, helps intelligence, but it would be better still if it formed a new verse with a blank space left between. Some think that in the original form of Mk. the Sermon on the Mount came in here. It is certainly a suitable place for it. In accordance with the above suggestion the text would stand thus:—

Ver. 19. And Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed Him.

Ver. 20. And He cometh home.

Ver. 21. And the multitude cometh together again, etc.

συνέρχεται: the crowd, partially dis-

k 2 Cor. v. 13.

1 Ch. ix. 29; xvi. 17.

παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξῆλθον κρατῆσαι αὐτόν· ἔλεγον γάρ, "Ὅτι [k] ἐξέστη."

22. Καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει," καὶ "Ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων

persed, reassembles (implying lapse of an appreciable interval). Jesus had hoped they would go away to their homes in various parts of the country during His absence on the hill, but He was disappointed. They lingered on.—**ὥστε**, etc.: the crowding about the house and the demand for sight and succour of the Benefactor were so great that they (Jesus and His companions) could not find leisure not even (**μηδὲ**) *to take food*, not to speak of rest, or giving instruction to disciples. Erasmus (*Adnot.*) thinks the reference is to the multitude, and the meaning that it was so large that there was not *bread* for all, not to speak of *kitchen* (*obsonia*).—Ver. 21 introduces a new scene into the lively drama. The statement is obscure partly owing to its brevity (Fritzsche), and it is made obscurer by a piety which is not willing to accept the surface meaning (so Maldonatus—"hunc locum difficiliorem pietas facit"), which is that the friends of Jesus, having heard of what was going on—wonderful cures, great crowds, incessant activity—set out from where they were (**ἐξῆλθον**) with the purpose of taking Him under their care (**κρατῆσαι αὐτόν**), their impression, not concealed (**ἔλεγον γὰρ**, they had begun to say), being that He was in an unhealthy state of excitement bordering on insanity (**ἐξέστη**). Recent commentators, German and English, are in the main agreed that this is the true sense.—**οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ** means either specifically His relatives ("sui" Vulg., **οἱ οἰκεῖοι α.**—Theophy), so Raphel, Wetstein, Kypke, Loesner, with citations from Greek authors, Meyer and Weiss, identifying the parties here spoken of with those referred to in ver. 31; or, more generally, persons well disposed towards Jesus, an outer circle of disciples (Schanz and Keil).—**ἀκούσαντες**: not to be restricted to what is mentioned in ver. 20; refers to the whole Galilean ministry with its cures and crowds, and constant strain. Therefore the friends might have come from a distance, Nazareth, *e.g.*, starting before Jesus descended from the hill. That their arrival happened just then was a coincidence.—**ἔλεγον γὰρ**: for they were saying, *might* refer to others than those who came to lay hold of Jesus—to messengers who brought them news of what was going on (Bengel), or it might refer quite impersonally to a report that had gone abroad ("rumor exierat," Grotius), or it might even refer to the Pharisees. But the reference is almost certainly to the friends. Observe the parallelism between **οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγον γὰρ, ὅτι ἐξέστη** and **οἱ γραμματεῖς, οἱ ἔλεγον, ὅτι βεελ. ἔχει** in ver. 22 (Fritzsche points this out in a long and thorough discussion of the whole passage).—**ἐξέστη**: various ways of evading the idea suggested by this word have been resorted to. It has been referred to the crowd = the crowd is mad, and won't let Him alone. Viewed as referring to Jesus it has been taken = He is exhausted, or He has left the place = they came to detain Him, for they heard that He was going or had gone. Both these are suggested by Euthy. Zig. Doubtless the reference is to Jesus, and the meaning that in the opinion of His friends He was in a state of excitement bordering on insanity (*cf.* ii. 12, v. 42, vi. 51). **δαίμονα ἔχει** (Theophy.) is too strong, though the Jews apparently identified insanity with possession. Festus said of St. Paul: "Much learning doth make thee mad". The friends of Jesus thought that much *benevolence* had put Him into a state of enthusiasm dangerous to the health both of body and mind. Note: Christ's healing ministry created a need for theories about it. Herod had his theory (Mt. xiv.), the friends of Jesus had theirs, and the Pharisees theirs: John *redivivus*, disordered mind, Satanic possession. That which called forth so many theories must have been ***a great fact***.

Vv. 22-30. *Pharisaic theory as to the cures of demoniacs wrought by Jesus* (Mt. xii. 22-37, Lk. xv. 17-23).—Ver. 22. **οἱ γραμ. οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱ.**, the scribes from *Jerusalem*. The local Pharisees who had taken the Herodians into their murderous counsels had probably also communicated with the Jerusalem authorities, using all possible means to compass their end. The representatives of the southern scribes had probably arrived on the scene about the same time as the friends of Jesus, although it is not inconceivable that Mk. introduces the narrative regarding them here because

ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια."[m] 23. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτούς, ἐν παραβολαῖς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Πῶς δύναται Σατανᾶς Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν; 24. καὶ ἐὰν βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι ἡ βασιλεία ἐκείνη· 25. καὶ ἐὰν οἰκία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν μερισθῇ, οὐ δύναται[1] σταθῆναι ἡ οἰκία ἐκείνη[2]· 26. καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν καὶ μεμέρισται,[3] οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι,[4] ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει. 27. οὐ[5] δύναται οὐδεὶς τὰ[6] σκεύη τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ, εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν[6] αὐτοῦ, διαρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον ἰσχυρὸν δήσῃ, καὶ τότε τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει. 28. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τὰ [m] ἁμαρτήματα τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,[7] καὶ[8]

m Rom. iii. 25. 1 Cor. vi. 18.

[1] δυνησεται in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.). δυναται conforms to ver. 24.

[2] η οικια εκεινη στηναι in BL (Trg., W.H.). σταθηναι in ℵCD (Tisch.).

[3] και εμερισθη in BL (W.H.), εμερισθη και in ℵCΔ (Tisch.).

[4] στηναι in ℵBCL (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] αλλ before ου in ℵBCLΔ 33 *al.*

[6] εις την οικιαν του ισχυρου εισελθων τα σκευη αυτου in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[7] τα αμαρ. after ανθρωπων in ℵABCDL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[8] αι after και in ℵABCEFGLΔΣ (Tisch., W.H.).

of the resemblances and contrasts between their theory and that of the friends. Mt. sets the incident in different relations, yielding a contrast between Pharisaic ideas and those of the people respecting the cure of demoniacs by Jesus (xii. 22 f.).—**Βεελζεβοὺλ ἔχει**, He *hath* Beelzebub, implying that Beelzebub hath Him, using Him as his agent. The expression points to something more than an alliance, as in Mt., to possession, and that on a grand scale; a divine possession by a base deity doubtless, god of flies (Beelzebub) or god of dung (Beelzebul), still a god, a sort of Satanic incarnation; an involuntary compliment to the exceptional power and greatness of Jesus.—**ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τ. δ.**: the assumption is that spirits are cast out by the aid of some other spirit stronger than those ejected.—Ver. 23. **προσκαλεσάμενος**: Jesus, not overawed by the Jerusalem authorities, invites them to come within talking distance, that He may reason the matter with them.—**ἐν παραβολαῖς**, in figures: kingdom, house, plundering the house of a strong man. Next chapter concerning the parabolic teaching of Jesus casts its shadow on the page here. The gist of what Jesus said to the scribes in refutation of their theory is: granting that spirits are cast out by aid of another spirit, more is needed in the latter than superior *strength*. There must be qualitative difference—in nature and interest. The argument consists of a triple movement of thought. 1. The absurdity of the theory is broadly asserted. 2. The principle on which the theory is wrecked is set forth in concrete form. 3. The principle is applied to the case in hand. —**πῶς δύναται**, etc., how can Satan cast out Satan? It is not a question of *power*, but of motive, what interest can he have? A stronger spirit casting out a weaker one of the same kind? (so Fritzsche).—Vv. 24, 25 set forth the principle or *rationale* embodied in two illustrations. The theory in question is futile because it involves suicidal action, which is not gratuitously to be imputed to any rational agents, to a kingdom (ver. 24), to a house (ver. 25), and *therefore* not to Satan (ver. 26).—Ver. 27 by another figure shows the true state of the case. Jesus, not in league with Satan or Beelzebub, but overmastering him, and taking possession of his goods, human souls. The saying is given by Mk. much the same as in Mt.

Vv. 28, 29. *Jesus now changes His tone.* Thus far He has *reasoned* with the scribes, now He solemnly *warns* to this effect. You do not believe your own theory; you know as well as I how absurd it is, and that I must be casting out devils by a very different spirit from

βλασφημίαι ὅσας[1] ἂν βλασφημήσωσιν· 29. ὃς δ' ἂν βλασφημήσῃ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, οὐκ ἔχει ἄφεσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλ' ἔνοχός ἐστιν[2] αἰωνίου κρίσεως[3]·" 30. ὅτι ἔλεγον, "Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει." 31. Ἔρχονται οὖν[4] οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ[5] καὶ ἔξω ἑστῶτες[6] ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτόν, φωνοῦντες[7] αὐτόν. 32. καὶ ἐκάθητο ὄχλος περὶ αὐτόν·[8] εἶπον δὲ[9] αὐτῷ, "Ἰδού, ἡ μήτηρ σου

[1] οσα in ℵBDΔ. οσας a gram. cor.

[2] εσται in ℵDLΔ (Tisch.), εστιν in BC (W.H.).

[3] αμαρτηματος in ℵBLΔ 33 Lat. Codd. κρισεως (T.R.) is explanatory of a difficult word.

[4] For ερχ. ουν ABCLΔ have και ερχονται (W.H.). ℵD have και ερχεται.

[5] η μητηρ α. και οι αδελφοι in ℵBCDLΔ. The plural verb gave rise to the transposition in T.R.

[6] στηκοντες in BCΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[7] καλουντες in ℵBCL.

[8] περι αυτον οχλος in ABCLΔΣ.

[9] και λεγουσιν in ℵBCDLΔ.

Beelzebub. You are therefore not merely mistaken *theorists*, you are men in a very perilous *moral* condition. Beware!—Ver. 28. **ἀμὴν**: solemn word, introducing a solemn speech uttered in a tone not to be forgotten.—**πάντα ἀφεθήσεται**, all things shall be forgiven; magnificently broad proclamation of the wideness of God's mercy. The saying as reproduced in Lk. xii. 10 limits the reference to sins of speech. The original form, Weiss thinks (in Meyer), but this is very doubtful. It seems fitting that when an exception is being made to the pardonableness of sin, a broad declaration of the extent of pardon should be uttered.—**τοῖς υἱοῖς τ. ἀ.**, to the sons of men; this expression not in Mt., but in its place a reference to blasphemy against the *Son of Man*. To suspect a literary connection between the two is natural. Which is the original form? Mk.'s? (Holtz., H. C., after Pfleiderer.) Mt.'s? (Weiss in Meyer.) The latter the more probable. *Vide* on ver. 30.—**τὰ ἁμαρ. καὶ αἱ βλ.**: either in apposition with and explicative of **πάντα**, or **τὰ ἁμαρ.**, the subject which **πάντα** qualifies. The former construction yields this sense: all things shall be forgiven to, etc., the sins and the blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme. The last clause qualifying **βλασφημίαι** (**ὅσα ἐὰν βλ.**) which takes the place of **πάντα** in relation to **ἁμαρτ.** is in favour of the latter rendering = all sins shall be forgiven, etc., and the blasphemies, etc.—Ver. 29. The great exception, blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.—**εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα**: hath not forgiveness *for ever*. *Cf.* the fuller expression in Mt.—**ἀλλ' ἔνοχός ἐστιν**, but is guilty of. The negative is followed by a positive statement of similar import in Hebrew fashion.—**αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος**: of an eternal sin. As this is equivalent to "hath never forgiveness," we must conceive of the sin as eternal in its guilt, not in itself as a sin. The idea is that of an *unpardonable* sin, not of a sin eternally repeating itself. Yet this may be the ultimate ground of unpardonableness: unforgivable because never repented of. But this thought is not necessarily contained in the expression. —Ver. 30. **ὅτι ἔλεγον**, etc., because they said: "He hath an unclean spirit," therefore He said this about blasphemy against the Holy Ghost—such is the connection. But what if they spoke under a misunderstanding like the friends, puzzled what to think about this strange man? That would be a sin against the Son of Man, and as such pardonable. The distinction between blasphemy against the Son of Man and blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, taken in Mt. xii. 31, is essential to the understanding of Christ's thought. The mere saying, "He hath an unclean spirit," does not amount to the unpardonable sin. It becomes such when it is said by men who know that it is not true; then it means calling the Holy Spirit an unclean spirit. Jesus believed that the scribes were in that position, or near it.

Vv. 31-35. *The relatives of Jesus* (Mt. xii. 46-50, Lk. viii. 19-21).—Ver. 31. **ἔρχονται**, even without the **οὖν** following in T. R., naturally points back

καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου [1] ἔξω ζητοῦσί σε". 33. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, λέγων, [2] "Τίς ἐστιν ἡ μήτηρ μου ἢ [3] οἱ ἀδελφοί μου [4];" 34. Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος [n] κύκλῳ τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν [5] καθημένους, λέγει, "[n] Ἴδε, ἡ μήτηρ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου. 35. ὃς γὰρ [6] ἂν ποιήσῃ τὸ θέλημα [7] τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀδελφή μου [8] καὶ μήτηρ ἐστί."

n Ch. vi. 6. Lk. ix. 12. Rom. xv. 19. Rev. iv. 6; v. 11; vii. 11.

[1] D adds **και αι αδελφαι σου**, which may have fallen out by similar ending in ℵBCLΔ (W.H. margin).

[2] **και αποκριθεις α. λεγει** in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] **και** in ℵBCLΔ.

[4] BD omit this **μου**.

[5] **τους περι α. κυκλω** in ℵBCLΔ.

[6] **γαρ** omitted in B.

[7] **τα θεληματα** in B (W.H. margin).

[8] **μου** omitted in ℵABDLΔ.

to ver. 21. The evangelist resumes the story about Christ's friends, interrupted by the encounter with the scribes (so Grotius, Bengel, Meyer, Weiss, Holtz.; Schanz and Keil dissent).—**στήκοντες**, from **στήκω**, a late form used in present only, from **ἕστηκα**, perfect of **ἵστημι**.—Ver. 32. The crowd gathered around Jesus report the presence of His relatives. According to a reading in several MSS., these included *sisters* among those present. They might do so under a mistake, even though the sisters were not there. If the friends came to withdraw Jesus from public life, the sisters were not likely to accompany the party, though there would be no impropriety in their going along with their mother. They are not mentioned in ver. 31. On the other hand, **ἀδελφὴ** comes in appropriately in ver. 35 in recognition of female disciples, which may have suggested its introduction here.—Ver. 33. **τίς ἐστιν**, etc., who is my mother, and (who) my brothers? an apparently harsh question, but He knew what they had come for.—Ver. 34. **περιβλεψάμενος**, as in ver. 5, there in anger, here with a benign smile.—**κύκλῳ**: His eye swept the whole circle of His audience; a good Greek expression.—Ver. 35. **ὃς ἂν**, etc.: whosoever shall do the will of God ("of my Father in heaven," Mt.), definition of true discipleship.—**ἀδελφός, ἀδελφή, μήτηρ**: without the article, because the nouns are used figuratively (Fritzsche). This saying and the mood it expressed would confirm the friends in the belief that Jesus was in a morbid state of mind.

CHAPTER IV. PARABOLIC TEACHING. In common with Mt., Mk. recognises that teaching in parables became at a given date a special feature of Christ's didactic ministry. He gives, however, fewer samples of that type than the first evangelist. Two out of the seven in Mt., with one peculiar to himself, three in all; in this respect probably truer to the actual history of the particular day. Teaching in parables did not make an absolutely new beginning on the day on which the Parable of the Sower was spoken. Jesus doubtless used similitudes in all His synagogue discourses, of which a few samples may have been preserved in the *Mustard Seed*, the *Treasure*, and the *Pearl*.

Vv. 1-9. *The Sower* (Mt. xiii 1-9, Lk. viii. 4-8).—Ver. 1. **πάλιν ἤρξατο**. After spending some time in teaching disciples, Jesus resumes His wider ministry among the people in the open air: at various points along the shore of the sea (**παρὰ τ. θ.**). Speaking to larger crowds than ever (**ὄχλος πλεῖστος**), which could be effectively addressed only by the Speaker getting into a boat (**πλοῖον, τὸ πλοῖον** would point to the boat which Jesus had asked the disciples to have in readiness, iii. 9), and sailing out a little distance from the shore, the people standing on the land as close to the sea as possible (**πρὸς τ. θ.**).—Ver. 2. **πολλά**: a vague expression, but implying that the staple of that day's teaching consisted of parables, probably all more or less of the same drift as the parable of the *Sower*, indicating that in spite of the ever-growing crowds Jesus was dissatisfied with the results of His popular ministry in street and synagogue = much seed-sowing, little fruit. The formation of the disciple-circle had revealed that dissatisfaction in another way. Probably some of the parables spoken in the boat have not been preserved, the *Sower*

IV. 1. ΚΑΙ πάλιν ἤρξατο διδάσκειν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν· καὶ συνήχθη[1] πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος πολύς,[2] ὥστε αὐτὸν ἐμβάντα εἰς τὸ πλοῖον[3] καθῆσθαι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦν[4]. 2. καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς πολλά, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, 3. "Ἀκούετε. ἰδού, ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ[5] σπεῖραι· 4. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν, ὃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθε τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ[6] καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό. 5. ἄλλο δὲ[7] ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες, ὅπου οὐκ εἶχε γῆν πολλήν· καὶ εὐθέως ἐξανέτειλε, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν βάθος[8] γῆς· 6. ἡλίου δὲ ἀνατείλαντος[9] ἐκαυματίσθη,[10] καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν

[1] συναγεται in ℵBCLΔ (modern editors).

[2] πλειστος in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H., *al.*).

[3] εις πλοιον εμβαντα in ℵBCL. DΔ have same order with το before πλοιον.

[4] ησαν in ℵBCLΔ 33. ην is a gram. cor.

[5] Omit του ℵB, found in CLΔ.

[6] Omit του ουρανου ℵABCLΔΣ.

[7] και αλλο (αλλα D 33) in ℵBCLΔ.

[8] βαθος γης in ℵACLΔΣ, but B has της γ., and perhaps this is the true reading, though recent editors adopt the other.

[9] και οτε ανετειλεν ο ηλιος in ℵBCLΔ. T.R. conforms to Mt.

[10] BD have εκαυματισθησαν (W.H. margin).

serving as a sample.—ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ α. In the teaching of that day He said *inter alia* what follows.—Ver. 3. ἀκούετε: hear! listen! a summons to attention natural for one addressing a great crowd from a boat quite compatible with ἰδού, which introduces the parable (against Weiss in Meyer). The parable is given here essentially as in Mt., with only slight variations: σπεῖραι (ver. 3) for σπείρειν; ὃ μὲν (ver. 4) for ἃ μεν, ἄλλο (vv. 5, 7) for ἄλλα. To the statement that the thorns choked the grain (συνέπνιξαν αὐτό), Mk. adds (ver. 7) καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκεν, an addition not superfluous in this case, as it would have been in the two previous, because the grain in this case reaches the *green ear*. To be noted further is the expansion in ver. 8, in reference to the seed sown on good soil, Mt. says it yielded fruit (ἐδίδου καρπὸν), Mk. adds ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενον, καὶ ἔφερεν, all three phrases referring to ἄλλα at the beginning of the verse. The participles taken along with ἐδίδου καρπὸν distinguish the result in the fourth case from those in the three preceding. The first did not spring up, being picked up by the birds, the second sprang up but did not grow, withered by the heat, the third sprouted and grew up but yielded no (ripe) fruit, choked by thorns (Grotius).—καὶ ἔφερεν introduces a statement as to the quantity of fruit, the degrees being arranged in a climax, 30, 60, 100, instead of in an anti-climax, as in Mt., 100, 60, 30.—Ver. 9. καὶ ἔλεγεν: this phrase is wanting in Mt., and the summons to reflection is more pithily expressed there = who hath ears let him hear. The summons implies that understanding is possible even for those without.

Vv. 10-12. *Disciples ask an explanation of the parable* (Mt. xiii. 10-17, Lk. viii. 9-10). Ver. 10. κατὰ μόνας (ὁδούς or χώρας understood), alone—οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν, those about Him, not = οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ (iii. 21), nor = the Twelve, who are separately mentioned (σὺν τ. δωδ.); an outer circle of disciples from which the Twelve were chosen.—τὰς παραβολάς, *the parables*, spoken that day. They asked Him about them, as to their meaning. The plural, well attested, implies that the parables of the day had a common drift. To explain one was to explain all. They were a complaint of the comparative fruitlessness of past efforts.—Ver. 11. ὑμῖν, to *you* has been given, so as to be a permanent possession, the

ῥίζαν ἐξηράνθη. 7. καὶ ἄλλο ἔπεσεν εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας· καὶ ἀνέβησαν αἱ ἄκανθαι, καὶ συνέπνιξαν αὐτό, καὶ καρπὸν οὐκ ἔδωκε. 8. καὶ ἄλλο[1] ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν· καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξάνοντα,[2] καὶ ἔφερεν ἓν[3] τριάκοντα, καὶ ἓν[3] ἑξήκοντα, καὶ ἓν[3] ἑκατόν." 9. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς,[4] "Ὁ ἔχων[5] ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω." 10. Ὅτε δὲ[6] ἐγένετο [a] καταμόνας, ἠρώτησαν[7] αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὴν παραβολήν.[8] 11. καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὸ μυστήριον[9] τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω, ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται· 12. ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσι, καὶ μὴ ἴδωσι· καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσι, καὶ μὴ συνιῶσι· μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσι, καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς τὰ ἁμαρτήματα."[10] 13. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην; καὶ πῶς πάσας τὰς παραβολὰς γνώσεσθε; 14. ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον σπείρει. 15. οὗτοι δέ εἰσιν οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ὅπου σπείρεται ὁ λόγος, καὶ

a here and in Lk. ix. 18.

[1] αλλα in ℵBCL. αλλο conforms to that in ver. 7.

[2] αυξανομενον in ACDLΔ (Tisch.). αυξανομενα in ℵB (W.H.) agreeing with αλλα.

[3] Most uncials have εν thrice (= ἓν). ℵCΔ have εις thrice (Tisch., Trg.). BL have εις εν εν (W.H. text), out of which the other readings probably grew.

[4] Most uncials and many verss. omit αυτοις.

[5] ℵBCDΔ have ος εχει., ο εχων is from parall.

[6] και οτε in ℵBCDLΔ.

[7] ηρωτων ABLΔ 33 (-ουν ℵC, Tisch.).

[8] τας παραβολας in ℵBCLΔ.

[9] το μυστηριον διδοται (without γνωναι) in ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.).

[10] ℵBCL omit τα αμαρτηματα, which is an explanatory gloss.

mystery of the Kingdom of God. They have been initiated into the secret, so that for them it is a secret no longer, not by explanation of the parable (Weiss), but independently. This true of them so far as disciples; discipleship means initiation into the mystery. In reality, it was only partially, and by comparison with the people, true of the disciples.—γνῶναι in T. R. is superfluous. —τοῖς ἔξω refers to the common crowd. —ἐν παραβολαῖς: all things take place as set forth in parables. This implies that the use of parables had been a standing feature of Christ's popular *kerygma*, in synagogue and street.—Ver. 12 seems to state the aim of the parabolic method of teaching as being to keep the people in the dark, and prevent them from being converted and forgiven. This cannot really have been the aim of Jesus. *Vide* notes on the parable of the Sower in Mt., where the statement is softened somewhat.

Vv. 13-20. *Explanation of the Sower* (Mt. xiii. 18-23, Lk. viii. 11-15), prefaced by a gentle reproach that explanation should be needed.—Ver. 13. οὐκ οἴδατε . . . γνώσεσθε: not one question = know ye not this parable, and how ye shall know all, etc. (so Meyer and Weiss), but two = know ye not this parable? and how shall ye, etc. (so most), the meaning being, not: if ye know not the simpler how shall ye know the more difficult? but rather implying that to understand the Sower was to understand all the parables *spoken that day* (πάσας τὰς παρ.). They had all really one burden: the disappointing result of Christ's past ministry.—Ver. 14, in effect, states that the seed is the word.—Ver. 15. οἱ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν: elliptical for, those in whose case the seed falls along the way = the "way-side" men, and so in the other cases.—ὅπου for εἰς οὓς, Euthy. Zig.—Ver. 16. ὁμοίως would stand more naturally before οὗτοι = on the same method of interpretation.—σπειρόμενοι: this class are identified with the seed rather than with the soil, but the sense, though crudely expressed,

ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν, εὐθέως ἔρχεται ὁ Σατανᾶς καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν.[1] 16. καὶ οὗτοί εἰσιν ὁμοίως οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ πετρώδη σπειρόμενοι, οἵ, ὅταν ἀκούσωσι τὸν λόγον, εὐθέως μετὰ χαρᾶς λαμβάνουσιν αὐτόν, 17. καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι ῥίζαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, ἀλλὰ πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν· εἶτα γενομένης θλίψεως ἢ διωγμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον, εὐθέως σκανδαλίζονται. 18. καὶ οὗτοί[2] εἰσιν οἱ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας σπειρόμενοι, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούοντες,[3] 19. καὶ αἱ μέριμναι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου,[4] καὶ ἡ ἀπάτη τοῦ πλούτου, καὶ αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι εἰσπορευόμεναι συμπνίγουσι τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἄκαρπος γίνεται. 20. καὶ οὗτοί[5] εἰσιν οἱ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν σπαρέντες, οἵτινες ἀκούουσι τὸν λόγον καὶ παραδέχονται, καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν, ἓν τριάκοντα, καὶ ἓν ἑξήκοντα, καὶ ἓν ἑκατόν."
21. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Μήτι[6] ὁ λύχνος ἔρχεται,[7] ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν

[1] For **εν τ. κ. α.** (T.R.) B has **εις αυτους** (Trg., W.H.), ℵCLΔ **εν αυτοις** (Tisch.).
[2] **αλλοι** in ℵBCDLΔ.
[3] **ακουσαντες** in ℵBCDLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).
[4] **τουτου** is an explanatory gloss not found in the best MSS.
[5] **εκεινοι** in ℵBCLΔ.
[6] **οτι** before **μητι** in BL (Tisch., W.H.).
[7] **ερχεται** before **ο λυχνος** in ℵBCDLΔ.

is plain. They are the "rocky ground" men.—Ver. 18. **ἄλλοι εἰσὶν**, there are others; **ἄλλοι**, well attested (**οὗτοί** in T. R.), is significant. It fixes attention on the third type of hearers as calling for special notice. They are such as, lacking the thoughtlessness of the first and shallowness of the second class, and having some depth and earnestness, might be expected to be fruitful; a less common type and much more interesting. —Ver. 19 specifies the hindrances, the choking thorns—**μέριμναι τ. α.**, cares of life, in the case of thoughtful devout poor (Mt. vi. 25 f.).—**ἀπάτη τ. πλ.**, the deceitfulness of wealth in the case of the commercial class (Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum: Mt. xi. 21-23. *Vide* notes there).—**αἱ π. τ. λ. ἐπιθυμίαι**, the lusts for other things—sensual vices in the case of publicans and sinners (chap. ii. 13-17). Jesus had met with such cases in His past ministry.—Ver. 20. **παραδέχονται**, receive, answering to **συνιείς** in Mt. This does not adequately differentiate the fourth class from the third, who also take in the word, but not it *alone*. Lk. has supplied the defect.—**εν** might be either **ἓν** = this one 30, that one 60, etc., or **ἐν** = in 30, and in 60, and in 100 = good, better, best, not inferior, respectable, admirable. The lowest degree is deemed satisfactory. On the originality of the interpretation and on the whole parable *vide* in Mt.

Vv. 21-25. *Responsibilities of disciples* (Mt. v. 15, x. 26, vii. 2; Lk. viii. 16-18). True to His uniform teaching that privileges are to be used for the benefit of others, Jesus tells His disciples that if they have more insight than the multitude they must employ it for the common benefit. These sentences in Mk. represent the first special instruction of the disciples. Two of them, vv. 21, 24, are found in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. v. 15, vii. 2). The whole of them come in appositely here, and were probably spoken at this time. (*Cf.* Lk. viii. 16-18, where they are partially given in the same connection.) In any case, their introduction in connection with the parables is important as showing that Mk. can hardly have seriously believed, what he certainly seems to say, that Jesus spoke parables to blind the people.—Ver. 21. **μήτι ἔρχεται**, does the light *come*, for is it brought, in accordance with classic usage in reference to things without life; example in Kypke, *e.g.*, **οὐκ ἔμειν' ἐλθεῖν τράπεζαν νυμφίαν**. Pindar, *Pyth.*, iii., 28 = "non exspectavit donec adferretur mensa sponsalis".—**ὑ. τ. κλίνην**: not necessarily a table-couch (Meyer), might

μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν ἐπιτεθῇ [1]; 22. οὐ γάρ ἐστί τι κρυπτόν, ὃ ἐὰν μὴ [2] φανερωθῇ· οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον, ἀλλ' ἵνα εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθῃ [3]· 23. εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω." 24. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Βλέπετε τί ἀκούετε. ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν, καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν.[4] 25. ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἔχῃ,[5] δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὃς οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ."

26. Καὶ ἔλεγεν, "Οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς ἐὰν [6]

[1] τεθη in ℵBCDLΔ *al.*

[2] Instead of ο εαν μη ℵBΔ have εαν μη ινα (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] ελθη εις φαν. in ℵCDLΔ.

[4] τοις ακουουσιν is a gloss, omitted in ℵBCDLΔ.

[5] For αν εχη ℵBCLΔ have εχει.

[6] ℵBDLΔ 33 *al.* omit εαν.

be a bed, high enough to be in no danger of being set on fire. *Vide* on Mt. v. 15. The moral: let your light shine that others may know what ye know.—Ver. 22. Double statement of the law that the hidden is to be revealed; 1st, predictively: there is nothing hidden which shall not be revealed; 2nd, interpretatively, with reference to the purpose of the hider: nor did anything become concealed with any other view than that it should eventually come to manifestation. —ἀπόκρυφον (ἀποκρύπτω), here and in Lk. viii. 17, Col. ii. 3.—ἀλλ': in effect = εἰ μὴ *nisi*, but strictly ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον is understood to be repeated after it = nothing becomes concealed absolutely, but it is concealed in order that, etc. This is universally true. Things are hid because they are precious, but precious things are meant to be used at some time and in some way. All depends on the time and the way, and it is there that diversity of action comes in. Christ's rule for that was: show your light when it will glorify God and benefit men; the world's rule is: when safe and beneficial to self.—Ver. 23. In ver. 9 a summons to try to understand the parable; here a summons to those who have understood, or shall understand, the parable, or the great theme of all the parables, to communicate their knowledge. Fritzsche, after Theophy. and Grot., thinks that in vv. 21, 22, Jesus exhorts His disciples to the culture of piety or virtue, not to the diffusion of their light, giving, as a reason, that the latter would be inconsistent with the professed aim of the parables to prevent enlightenment!—Ver. 24. βλέπετε, etc., take heed what you hear or how (πῶς, Lk.), see that ye hear to purpose.—ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ, etc. = careful hearing pays, the reward of *attention* is *knowledge* (ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε τὴν προσοχὴν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν ἡ γνῶσις, Euthy. Zig.). In Mt. vii. 2 the apothegm is applied to judging. Such moral maxims admit of many applications. The idea of measuring does not seem very appropriate here. Holtz. (H. C.) thinks ver. 24 interrupts the connection.—προστεθήσεται implies that the reward will be out of proportion to the virtue; the knowledge acquired to the study devoted to the subject. There shall be given over and above, not to those who hear (T. R., τοῖς ἀκούουσιν), but to those who think on what they hear. This thought introduces ver. 25, which, in this connection, means: the more a man thinks the more he will understand, and the less a man thinks the less his power of understanding will become. "Whoso hath attention, knowledge will be given to him, and from him who hath not, the seed of knowledge will be taken. For as diligence causes that seed to grow, negligence destroys it," Euthy.

Vv. 26-29. *Parable of the Blade, the Ear, and the Full Corn.*—Peculiar to Mark and beyond doubt a genuine utterance of Jesus, the doctrine taught being over the head of the reporter and the Apostolic Church generally.—Ver. 26. καὶ ἔλεγεν, and He said, to whom? The disciples in private, or the crowd from the boat? The absence of αὐτοῖς after ἔλεγεν (*cf.* vv. 21, 24) is not conclusive against the former, as Weiss and Meyer think. On the latter view vv. 21-25 are a parenthesis. In any case this new parable *refers* to the disciples as representing the fertile soil, and is a pendant to the parable of the Sower, teaching that even in the case of

ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ τὸν σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, 27. καὶ καθεύδῃ καὶ ἐγείρηται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, καὶ ὁ σπόρος βλαστάνῃ [1] καὶ μηκύνηται [2] ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός. 28. [b] αὐτομάτη γὰρ [3] ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτα [4] στάχυν, εἶτα [4] πλήρη σῖτον [5] ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ. 29. ὅταν δὲ παραδῷ [6] ὁ καρπός, εὐθέως ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι [c] παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός."

b here and in Acts xii. 10.

c here only in the sense of being present.

30. Καὶ ἔλεγε, "Τίνι [7] ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ; ἢ ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλωμεν αὐτήν [8]; 31. ὡς κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὅς, ὅταν σπαρῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότερος [9] πάντων τῶν σπερμά-

[1] **βλαστα** in BCDLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] **μηκυνεται** in BD, implying that **βλαστα** is also indicative.

[3] **γαρ** omit ℵABCL.

[4] **ειτεν** in ℵBLΔ.

[5] **πληρης σιτος** in BD (Alford, Tisch., Trg., W.H.). CΣ have **πληρης σιτον**, which W.H. (appendix) regard as probably the true reading, **πληρης** being an indeclinable adjective as in Acts vi. 5. Weiss, on the other hand, regards this reading of CΣ as a half correction.

[6] **παραδοι** in ℵBDΔ. CL have **παραδω**.

[7] **πως** in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H. *al.*).

[8] **εν τινι αυτην παραβολη θωμεν** in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[9] **μικροτερον ον** in ℵBL(**ων**)Δ 33, **εστι** (in T.R. supplying the place of **ον**) being omitted (Tisch., W.H.).

the fourth type of hearers the production of fruit is a gradual process demanding time. Put negatively it amounts to saying that Christ's ministry has as yet produced no fruit properly speaking at all, but only in some cases met with a soil that gives promise of fruit (the disciples). The parable reveals at once the discrimination and the patience of Jesus. He knew the difference between the blade that would wither and that which would issue in ripe grain, and He did not expect this result in any case *per saltum*. A parable teaching this lesson was very seasonable after that of the Sower.—Ver. 27. **καθεύδῃ . . . ἡμέραν**, sleep and rise night and day, suggestive of the monotonous life of a man who has nothing particular to do beyond waiting patiently for the result of what he has already done (seed sown). The presents express a habit, while **βάλῃ**, ver. 26, expresses an act, done once for all.—**βλαστᾷ** (the reading in BDL, etc., as if from **βλαστάω**) may be either indicative or subjunctive, the former if we adopt the reading **μηκύνεται** (BD., etc.) = and the seed sprouts and lengthens.—**ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός**, how knoweth not (nor careth) he, perfectly indifferent to the *rationale* of growth; the fact enough for him.—Ver. 28. **αὐτομάτη** (**αὐτός** and **μέμαα** from absolute **μάω**, to desire eagerly), self-moved, spontaneously, without external aid, and also beyond external control; with a way and will, so to speak, of its own that must be respected and waited for. Classical examples in Wetstein, Kypke, Raphel, etc.—**καρποφορεῖ**, beareth fruit, intransitive. The following nouns, **χόρτον, στάχυν**, are not the object of the verb, but in apposition with **καρπὸν** (**καρπὸν φέρει**) or governed by **φέρει**, understood (**φέρει**, *quod ex* **καρποφορεῖ** *petendum*, Fritzsche).—**πλήρης σῖτος**, this change to the nominative (the reading of BD) is a tribute to the importance of the final stage towards which the stages of blade and ear are but preparatory steps = then is the *full ear*. Full = ripe, *perfect*, hence the combination of the two words in such phrases as **πλήρη καὶ τέλεια τἀγαθὰ** quoted by Kypke from Philo. The specification of the three stages shows that *gradual growth* is the point of the parable (Schanz).—Ver. 29. **παραδοῖ** (**παραδόω**), when the fruit *yields* itself, or *permits* (by being ripe). The latter sense (for which classical usage can be cited) is preferred by most recent commentators.

Vv. 30-32. *The Mustard Seed* (Mt. xiii. 31-32, Lk. xiii. 18, 19).—Ver. 30. **πῶς . . . θῶμεν** (*vide* above). This introductory question, especially as given in the text

των ἐστὶ[1] τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· 32. καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναβαίνει, καὶ γίνεται πάντων τῶν λαχάνων μείζων,[2] καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν." 33. Καὶ τοιαύταις παραβολαῖς πολλαῖς ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον, καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν· 34. χωρὶς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς· κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ[3] [d] ἐπέλυε πάντα.

35. ΚΑΙ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὀψίας γενομένης, "Δι-

d cf. Acts xix. 39.

[1] μικροτερον ον in ℵBL(ων)Δ 33, εστι (in T.R. supplying the place of ον) being omitted (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] μειζον παντων των λαχ. in ℵBCL 33. D has the same order with μειζων.

[3] τοις ιδιοις μαθ. in ℵBCLΔ.

of W.H., is very graphic = how shall we liken the Kingdom of God, or in (under) what parable shall we place it? The form of expression implies that something has been said before creating a need for figurative embodiment, something pointing to the insignificance of the beginnings of the Kingdom. The two previous parables satisfy this requirement = the word fruitful only in a few, and even in them only after a time. What is the best emblem of this state of things?—Ver. 31. ὡς κόκκῳ: ὡς stands for ὁμοιώσωμεν = let us liken it to a grain, etc.; κόκκον would depend on θῶμεν.—ὃς ὅταν σπαρῇ . . . καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ: the construction of this passage as given in critical texts is very halting, offering a very tempting opportunity for emendation to the scribes who in the T. R. have given us a very smooth readable text (*vide* A. V.). Literally it runs thus: "which when it is sown upon the earth, being the least of all the seeds upon the earth—and when it is sown," etc. The R. V. improves this rugged sentence somewhat by substituting "yet" for "and" in last clause. It is hardly worth while attempting to construe the passage. Enough that we see what is meant. In the twice used ὅταν σπαρῇ, the emphasis in the first instance lies on ὅταν, in the second on σπαρῇ (Bengel, Meyer). By attending to this we get the sense: which being the least of all seeds *when* it is sown or at the time of sowing, yet when it is *sown*, after sowing, springs up, etc.—μικρότερον ὂν is neuter by attraction of σπερμάτων, though κόκκῳ going before is masculine. —Ver. 32. μεῖζον π. τ. λαχάνων, the greatest of all the herbs, still only an herb; no word of a tree here as in Matthew and Luke, though comparatively tree-like in size, making great boughs (κλάδους μεγάλους), great relatively to its kind, not to forest trees. Mark's version here is evidently the more original.

Vv. 33, 34. *Conclusion of the parable collection* (Mt. xiii. 34, 35).—Ver. 33. τοιαύταις π. π., with *such* parables, many of them, He was speaking to them the word, implying that the three—*sower; blade, ear and full corn; mustard seed*—are given as samples of the utterances from the boat, all of one type, about seed representing the word, and expressing Christ's feelings of disappointment yet of hope regarding His ministry. *Many* is to be taken *cum grano*.—καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν = as they were able to understand, as in 1 Cor. xiv. 2, implying that parables were employed to make truth *plain* (De Wette).—Ver. 34. χωρὶς παραβολῆς, etc., without a parable He was not wont to speak to the people, not merely that day, but at any time.—ἐπέλυε, etc., He was in the habit of interpreting all things (*viz.*, the parables in private to His own disciples, the Twelve, *cf.* ἐπιλύσεως, 2 Peter i. 20). This does not necessarily imply that the multitude understood nothing, but only that Jesus, by further talk, made the disciples understand *better*. Yet on the whole it must be admitted that in his account of Christ's parabolic teaching Mark seems to vacillate between two opposite views of the function of parables, one that they were used to make spiritual truths plain to popular intelligence, the other that they were riddles, themselves very much needing explanation, and fitted, even intended, to hide truth. This second view might be suggested and fostered by the fact that some of the parables express recondite spiritual truths.

Vv. 35-41. *Crossing the lake* (Mt. viii. 18, 23-27, Lk. viii. 22-25).—ἐν ἐκείνῃ τ. ἡ., on *that* day, the day of the parable

ἔλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν." 36. Καὶ ἀφέντες τὸν ὄχλον, παραλαμβάνουσιν αὐτὸν ὡς ἦν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ· ^e^καὶ ἄλλα ^e^δὲ [1] πλοιάρια [2] ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. 37. καὶ γίνεται λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου μεγάλη [3]· τὰ δὲ [4] κύματα ^f^ἐπέβαλλεν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ὥστε αὐτὸ ἤδη γεμίζεσθαι.[5] 38. καὶ ἦν αὐτὸς [6] ἐπὶ [7] τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ ^g^προσκεφάλαιον καθεύδων· καὶ διεγείρουσιν [8] αὐτόν, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Διδάσκαλε, οὐ ^h^μέλει σοι ὅτι ἀπολλύμεθα;" 39. Καὶ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησε τῷ ἀνέμῳ, καὶ εἶπε τῇ θαλάσσῃ, "Σιώπα, πεφίμωσο." Καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη. 40. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί ^i^δειλοί ἐστε οὕτω; πῶς οὐκ [9] ἔχετε πίστιν;" 41. Καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν, καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούουσιν [10] αὐτῷ;"

e καὶ δὲ in Mt. x. 18. John vi. 51. 1 John i. 3 al.
f here only in same sense.
g here only.
h Lk. x. 40 (with ὅτι).
i here. Mt. viii. 26. Rev. xxi. 8.

[1] ℵBCLΔ omit δε, found in D; no other instance of και . . . δε in Mk.

[2] πλοια in ℵABCDΔΣ. [3] μεγαλη ανεμου in BDLΔ.

[4] και τα for τα δε in ℵBCDLΔ.

[5] ωστε ηδη γεμιζεσθαι το πλοιον in ℵ^a^BCDLΔ: rugged style, but none the less likely to be true.

[6] αυτος ην in ℵBCLΔ. [7] εν in ℵABCDLΔ.

[8] εγειρουσιν in ℵBCΔ. [9] ουπω in ℵBDLΔ (W.H.).

[10] υπακουει in BL (W.H.). So ℵCΔ, but with αυτω before verb. *Vide* below.

discourse, the more to be noted that Mark does not usually trouble himself about temporal connection.—**διέλθωμεν**, let us cross over, spoken to the Twelve, who are in the boat with Jesus.—Ver. 36. This verse describes the manner in which Christ's wish was carried out—it was in effect a flight along the only line of retreat, the shore being besieged by the crowd = leaving (**ἀφέντες**, not dismissing) the crowd they carry Him off (*avehunt*, Grotius) as He was in the ship (**ὡς ἦν = ὡς εἶχεν**) *sine apparatu* (Bengel) and *sine mora;* but there were also other boats with Him, *i.e.*, with His boat. This last fact, peculiar to Mark, is added to show that even seawards escape was difficult. Some of the people had got into boats to be nearer the Speaker. The **δὲ** after **ἄλλα**, though doubtful, helps to bring out the sense. This is another of Mark's realisms.—Ver. 37. **γίνεται λαῖλαψ**: *cf.* Jonah i. 4, **ἐγένετο κλύδων μέγας**.—**ἐπέβαλλεν**, were dashing (intransitive) against and into (**εἰς**) the ship.—**γεμίζεσθαι**, so that already (**ἤδη**) the ship was *getting full.*—Ver. 38. **τὸ προσκεφάλαιον**, the pillow, a part of the ship, as indicated by the article (Bengel); no soft luxurious pillow, probably of wood (Theophy., Euthy.); "the leathern cushion of the steersman" (Maclear, Camb. N. T.); the low bench at the stern on which the steersman sometimes sits, and the captain sometimes rests his head to sleep (Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, p. 62).—Ver. 39. Observe the poetic parallelism in this verse: wind and sea separately addressed, and the corresponding effects separately specified: lulled wind, calmed sea. The evangelist realises the dramatic character of the situation.—**σιώπα, πεφίμωσο**, silence! hush! laconic, majestic, probably the very words.—**ἐκόπασεν**, ceased, as if tired blowing, from **κόπος** (*vide* at Mt. xiv. 32).—Ver. 40. **τί δειλοί**, etc., duality of expression again. Matthew gives the second phrase, Luke the gist of both.—Ver. 41. **ἐφοβήθησαν φ. μ.**: nearly the same phrase as in Jonah i. 16.—**τίς ἄρα οὗτός**; who then is this? One would have thought the disciples had been prepared by this time for anything. Matthew indeed has **οἱ ἄνθρωποι**, suggestive of other than disciples, as if such surprise in *them* were incongruous. But their emotional condition, arising out of the dangerous situation, must be taken into account. For the rest Jesus was always giving them surprises; His mind and character had so many sides.—**ὑπακούει**, singular, the wind and the sea thought of separately, each a wild lawless element, not given to obeying: even the *wind*, even the *sea*, obeys Him!

V. 1. ΚΑΙ ἦλθον εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν.[1] 2. καὶ ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ[2] ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου, εὐθέως ἀπήντησεν[3] αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μνημείων ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ, 3. ὃς τὴν [a] κατοίκησιν εἶχεν ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις[4]· καὶ οὔτε ἁλύσεσιν οὐδεὶς[5] ἠδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι, 4. διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν πολλάκις πέδαις καὶ ἁλύσεσι δεδέσθαι, καὶ [b] διεσπᾶσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τὰς ἁλύσεις, καὶ τὰς πέδας συντετρίφθαι, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτὸν ἴσχυε[6] [c] δαμάσαι· 5. καὶ διαπαντὸς νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν[7] ἦν κράζων καὶ [d] κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις. 6. Ἰδὼν δὲ[8] τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ

a here only in N.T.
b here and in Acts xxiii. 10.
c Jas. iii. 7, 8.
d here only in N.T.

[1] Γερασηνων in ℵBD it. vg. (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] εξελθοντος αυτου in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] υπηντησεν in ℵBCDLΔ.

[4] μνημασι in ℵABCLΔΣ.

[5] ουδε αλυσει ουκετι ουδεις in BCL; for ουδε and ουκετι ουδεις the consensus is greater (+ℵDΔ).

[6] ισχυεν αυτον in many uncials.

[7] εν τοις μν. και εν τοις ορ. in the best copies.

[8] και ιδων in ℵBCLΔ.

CHAPTER V. THE GERASENE DEMONIAC. THE DAUGHTER OF JAIRUS. THE WOMAN WITH AN ISSUE. This group of incidents is given in the same order in all three synoptists, but in Matthew not in immediate sequence.—Vv. 1-20. *The Gerasene Demoniac* (Mt. viii. 28-34, Lk. viii. 26-39).—Ver. 1. εἰς τὴν χῶραν τ. Γερασηνῶν: on the proper name to the place *vide* at the parallel place in Mt.—Ver. 2. ἐξελ. αὐτοῦ . . . ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ; note the correction of style in Luke. Mark's incorrectness is to be preferred as emphasising the fact that the meeting with the demoniac took place immediately after leaving the boat. Just on that account the εὐθὺς before ὑπήντησεν (omitted in B) is unnecessary.—ἐκ τ. μνημείων, from the tombs, as in Mt., ἐκ τῆς πόλεως in Lk.; the former doubtless the *fact*. Luke's phrase probably means that he belonged to the city, not necessarily implying that he came from it just then (*vide* Lk. viii. 27, last clause).—Vv. 3-5 elaborately describe the man's condition, as if the evangelist or rather his informant (Peter) were fascinated by the subject; not a case of idle word-painting, but of realistic description from vivid, almost morbid, recollection. Holtzmann (H. C.) refers to Is. lxv. 4, 5, as if to suggest that some elements of the picture—dwelling in tombs, eating swine's flesh—were taken thence.—τὴν κατ., *the*, *i.e.* his dwelling, implying though not emphasising constant habit (*perpetuum*, Fritzsche), Lk., "for a long time".—οὐδὲ, οὐκέτι, οὐδεὶς: energetic accumulation of negatives, quite in the spirit of the Greek language. At this point the sentence breaks away from the relative construction as if in sympathy with the untamable wildness of the demoniac.—Ver. 4 tells how they had often tried to bind the madman, feet (πέδαις) and hands (ἁλύσεσι, with chains, for the hands *here*, in contrast to πέδαις, chains for the feet; usually it means chains in general).—συντετρῖφθαι: the use of a distinct verb in reference to the fetters suggests that they were of different material, either cords (Meyer) or wooden (Schanz), and that we should render συντετ., not "broken in pieces" (A.V.), but rubbed through as if by incessant friction.—Ver. 5. As the previous verse depicts the demoniac strength, so this the utter misery of the poor sufferer.—διὰ παντὸς νυκ. κ. ἡμέρ., incessantly night time and day time, even during night when men gladly get under roof (Weiss, Mc.-Evang.) and when sleep makes trouble cease for most: no sleep for this wretch, or quiet resting-place.—ἐν τ. μνήμασι κ. ἐ. τ. ὄρεσι, in tombs or on mountains, in cave or out in the open, there was but one occupation for him: not rest or sleep, but ceaseless outcry and self-laceration (κράζων, κατακόπτων ἑαυτ. λίθοις).

Vv. 6-13. *Meeting with Jesus*. This desperate case will test Christ's power to heal. Madness, as wild and untamable as the wind or the sea. What is going to happen?—Ver. 6. ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, from

μακρόθεν, ἔδραμε καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ,[1] 7. καὶ κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπε,[2] "Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; [a] ὁρκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν, μή με βασανίσῃς." 8. ἔλεγε γὰρ αὐτῷ, "Ἔξελθε, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου." 9. Καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, "Τί σοι ὄνομα[3];" Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη, λέγων, "Λεγεὼν[4] ὄνομά μοι,[5] ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν." 10. Καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλά, ἵνα μὴ αὐτοὺς ἀποστείλῃ[6] ἔξω τῆς χώρας. 11. ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τὰ ὄρη[7] ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη· 12. καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ δαίμονες[8] λέγοντες, "Πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν." 13. Καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς εὐθέως ὁ Ἰησοῦς.[9] καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους· καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἦσαν δὲ[10]

[a] Acts xix. 13 (same const.).

[1] αυτον in ℵBCLΔ instead of the more usual αυτω of T.R.

[2] λεγει in ℵABCLΔΣ.

[3] ονομα σοι in most uncials. D has σοι ον. (so in Mk.).

[4] και λεγει αυτω Λεγιων in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] BD add εστιν.

[6] αυτα αποσ. in BCΔ. D has αυτους.

[7] τω ορει in all uncials.

[8] παντες οι δαιμ. omit ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[9] ℵBCLΔ omit ευθεως ο I.

[10] ℵBCDLΔ omit ησαν δε.

afar, a relative expression, a favourite pleonasm in Mk. (xiv. 54, xv. 40).—**προσεκύνησεν**: worshipful attitude, as of one who feels already the charm or spell of Him before whom he kneels; already there is a presentiment and commencement of cure, though not yet welcome.—Ver. 7. **τ. θ. τοῦ ὑψίστου**; Mt. has **τοῦ θεοῦ** only. Luke gives the full expression = the Son of God Most High. Which is the original? Weiss (Meyer) says Mt.'s, Mk. adding **τ. ὑψ.** to prepare for the appeal to One higher even than Jesus, in **ὁρκίζω** following. But why should not the demoniac himself do that?—**ὁρκίζω**: in classics to make swear, in N. T. (here and in Acts xix. 13) to adjure with double accusative; not good Greek according to Phryn.; **ὁρκόω** the right word.—**μή με βασανίσῃς**: no **πρὸ καιροῦ** as in Mt., the reference apparently to the *present* torment of demoniac or demon, or both; either shrinking from cure felt to be impending.—Ver. 8. **ἔλεγεν γὰρ**, for He was about to say: not yet said, but evident from Christ's manner and look that it was on His tongue; the conative imperfect (Weiss).—Ver. 9. **τί σοι ὄνομα**; instead of saying at once what He had meant to say, Jesus adopts a roundabout method of dealing with the case, and asks the demoniac his name, as if to bring him into composure.—**Λεγιὼν**: from the Roman legion not a rare sight in that region, emblem of irresistible power and of a multitude organised into unity; the name already naturalised into Greek and Aramaean. The use of it by the demoniac, like the immediate recognition of Jesus as a God-like person, reveals a sensitive, fine-strung mind wrecked by insanity.—Ver. 10. **παρεκάλει**: *he*, Legion, in the name of the demons, beseeches earnestly (**πολλὰ**) that He would not send *them* (**αὐτὰ**) out of the region (**χώρας**). Decapolis, beloved by demons, suggests Grotius, because full of Hellenising apostate Jews, *teste* Joseph. (A. J., xvii., 11).—Ver. 11. **ἐκεῖ**, there, near by. *Cf.* Mt. viii. 30.—**πρὸς τῷ ὄρει**; on the mountain side.—Ver. 12. **πέμψον**: send us into the *swine;* no chance of permission to enter into *men;* no expectation either of the ensuing catastrophe.—Ver. 13. **καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν**: permission not command to enter; in Mt. not even that, simply a peremptory: Depart! *Vide* notes there.—**εἰσῆλθον**: an inference from the sequel; neither exit nor entrance could be seen. There was doubtless a *coincidence* between the cure and the catastrophe.—**ὡς δισχίλιοι**: about 2000, an estimate of the herds possibly exaggerated.—**ἐπνίγοντο** (**πνίγω**, to choke), were drowned, used in this

ὡς δισχίλιοι· καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. 14. Οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες τοὺς χοίρους[1] ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀνήγγειλαν[2] εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. καὶ ἐξῆλθον[2] ἰδεῖν τί ἐστι τὸ γεγονός· 15. καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ θεωροῦσι τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον καὶ[3] ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγεῶνα· καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν· 16. καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες, πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ, καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων. 17. καὶ ἤρξαντο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν. 18. Καὶ ἐμβάντος[4] αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ὁ δαιμονισθείς, ἵνα ᾖ μετ' αὐτοῦ.[5] 19. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[6] οὐκ ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου πρὸς τοὺς σούς, καὶ ἀνάγγειλον[7] αὐτοῖς ὅσα σοι ὁ Κύριος[8]

[1] και οι βοσ. αυτους in ℵBCDLΔ.

[2] απηγ. and ηλθον in ℵBL (CD have απηγ.).

[3] και omitted in ℵBDLΔ.

[4] εμβαινοντος in ℵABCDLΔΣ 33.

[5] μετ αυτου η in ℵABCLΔ.

[6] For ο δε I. the same authorities have simply και.

[7] απαγ. in ℵBCΔ.

[8] ο κυριος σοι in BCΔ.

sense in Joseph., A. J., x., 7, 5, regarding Jeremiah in the dungeon.

Vv. 14-20. *Sequel of the story.*—Ver. 14. **εἰς τὴν πόλιν**, etc.: the herds of course ran in breathless panic-stricken haste to report the tragedy *in the city and in the neighbouring farms* (**ἀγρούς**).—**καὶ ἦλθον**, etc.: and the people in town and country as naturally went to see what had happened. Their road brings them straight to Jesus (ver. 15), and they see there a sight which astonishes them, the well-known and dreaded demoniac completely altered in manner and aspect: sitting (**καθήμενον**) quiet, not restless; clothed (**ἱματισμένον** here and in Lk. viii. 35), implying previous nakedness, which is expressly noted by Lk. (viii. 27), sane (**σωφρονοῦντα**), implying previous madness. For this sense of the verb *vide* 2 Cor. v. 13. Some take the second and third participle as subordinate to the first, but they may be viewed as co-ordinate, denoting three distinct, equally outstanding, characteristics: "sedentem, vestitum, sanae mentis, cum antea fuisset sine quiete, vestibus, rationis usu" (Bengel)—all this had happened to the man who had had the Legion! (**τὸν ἐσχ. τ. λεγιῶνα**)—**ἐσχηκότα**, perfect in sense of pluperfect. Burton, § 156.—**ἐφοβήθησαν**: they were afraid, of the sane man, as much as they had been of the insane, *i.e.*, of the power which had produced the change.—Ver. 16. The eye-witnesses in further explanations to their employers now connect the two events together—the cure and the catastrophe—not representing the one as cause of the other, but simply as happening close to each other. The owners draw a natural inference: cure cause of catastrophe, and (ver. 17) request Jesus, as a dangerous person, to retire.—**ἤρξαντο**, *began* to request, pointing to transition from vague awe in presence of a great change to desire to be rid of Him whom they believed to be the cause both of it and of the loss of their swine. Fritzsche takes **ἤρξαντο** as meaning that Jesus did not need much pressure, but withdrew on the first hint of their wish.—Ver. 18. **ἐμβαίνοντος**, embarking, the same day? Jesus had probably intended staying some days on the eastern shore as on the hill (iii. 13), to let the crowd disperse.—**ἵνα μετ' αὐτοῦ ᾖ**: an object clause after verb of exhorting with **ἵνα**, and subjunctive instead of infinitive as often in N. T., that he might be with Him (recalling iii. 14). The man desired to become a regular disciple. Victor of Ant., Theophy., Grotius, and partly Schanz think his motive was fear lest the demons might return.—Ver. 19. Jesus refuses, and, contrary to His usual practice, bids the healed one go and spread the news, as a kind of missionary to Decapolis, as the Twelve were to Galilee. The first apostle of the heathen (Holtz. (H. C.) after Volkmar). Jesus determined that those who would not have Himself should have His repre-

ἐποίησε,[1] καὶ ἠλέησέ σε." 20. Καὶ ἀπῆλθε καὶ ἤρξατο κηρύσσειν ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει, ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.

21. ΚΑΙ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν, συνήχθη ὄχλος πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ ἦν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν. 22. Καὶ ἰδού,[2] ἔρχεται εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων, ὀνόματι Ἰάειρος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν, πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ· 23. καὶ παρεκάλει[3] αὐτὸν πολλά, λέγων, "Ὅτι τὸ [f] θυγάτριόν μου ἐσχάτως ἔχει· ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας,[4] ὅπως[5] σωθῇ καὶ ζήσεται."[5] 24. Καὶ ἀπῆλθε μετ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς, καὶ συνέθλιβον αὐτόν.

25. Καὶ γυνή τις[6] οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἔτη δώδεκα,[7] καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν, 26. καὶ [g] δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῆς[8]

f again ver. 31.

g Lk. xv. 14. Acts xxi. 24. 2 Cor. xii. 15. Jas. iv. 3.

[1] πεποιηκεν in ℵABCLΣ.

[2] Omit ιδου ℵBDLΔ.

[3] παρακαλει in ℵACL (Tisch., W.H., text). παρεκαλει in BDΔ (W.H. margin).

[4] τας χειρας αυτη in ℵBCLΔ.

[5] ινα σωθη και ζηση in ℵBCDLΔ (οπως and ζησεται from Mt.).

[6] Omit τις ℵABCLΔ (found in DΣ).

[7] δωδεκα ετη in ℵBCLΔ.

[8] αυτης in BLΣ (W.H. text), εαυτης in CDΔ (Tisch., W.H., margin).

sentative.—πεποίηκεν, perfect, the effect abiding: hath done for me, as you see.—ἠλέησέν σε: pitied thee at the time of cure. ὅσα may be understood before ἠλ. = and how, etc., or καὶ ἠλ. may be a Hebraising way of speaking for ἐλεήσας σε (Grotius).—Κυριός: the subject to the two verbs = God, as in O. T. Sept.—Ver. 20. ἐν τῇ Δεκαπόλει: he took a wide range; implying probably that he was known throughout the ten cities as the famous madman of Gerasa. What was the effect of his mission in that Greek world? Momentary wonder at least (ἐθαύμαζον), perhaps not much more.

Vv. 21-43. *The daughter of Jairus and the woman with bloody issue* (Mt. ix. 18-26, Lk. viii. 40-56).—Ver. 21. ὄχλος πολὺς: the inescapable crowd, in no hurry to disperse, gathers again about Jesus, on His return to the western shore.—ἐπ' αὐτόν: not merely *to*, but *after* Him, the great centre of attraction (*cf.* πρὸς α., ii. 13, iv. 1).—παρὰ τ. θ., by the sea (here and there); how soon after the arrival the incident happened not indicated (*cf.* Mt. ix. 18 for sequence and situation), nor is the motive of the narrative. Weiss suggests that the Jairus story is given as another instance of unreceptivity, ver. 40 (Meyer).—Ver. 22. εἷς τ. ἀ.: the expression implies a plurality of synagogues, each having its chief ruler. The reference is probably to Capernaum.—Ver. 23. θυγάτριόν μ.: an instance of Mk.'s love of diminutives, again in vii. 25.—ἐσχάτως ἔχει, is extremely ill, at death's door (in Mt. dead), stronger than κακῶς ἔχει, a late Greek phrase (examples in Elsner, Wetstein, Kypke, etc.), disapproved by Phryn. (Lobeck, p. 389).—ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς: either used as an imperative (*cf.* 1 Tim. i. 3, ἵνα παραγγείλῃς), or dependent on some verb understood, *e.g.*, δέομαί σου (Palairet), ἥκω (Fritzsche); better παρακαλέω σε, the echo of παρεκάλει going before (Grotius. Similarly Euthy. Zig.).

Vv. 25-34. *The woman with an issue.*—Ver. 25. ἐν ῥύσει α. = αἱμορροοῦσα of Mt.: in or with a flux of blood. So in Lk. also.—Ver. 26. Details about the case, similarly in Lk., not in Mt.; either they expand or Mt. abbreviates.—πολλὰ παθοῦσα: no wonder, remarks Lightfoot, in view of the endless prescriptions for such a case, of which he gives samples (*Hor. Heb.*); physicians of the empiric or prescientific type.—τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς, her means, *cf.* οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ, iii. 21.—μηδὲν ὠφελ: nothing profited, the subjective negative, μηδὲν, implies disappointed expectation.—Ver. 27. ἀκούσασα: to simplify the construction

πάντα, καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα, 27. ἀκούσασα[1] περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὄπισθεν, ἥψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· 28. ἔλεγε γάρ, "Ὅτι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ ἅψωμαι,[2] σωθήσομαι." 29. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι [h] ἴαται ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος. 30. καὶ εὐθέως ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπιγνοὺς ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν, ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ, ἔλεγε, "Τίς μου ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων;" 31. Καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, "Βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε, καὶ λέγεις, Τίς μου ἥψατο;" 32. Καὶ περιεβλέπετο ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦτο ποιήσασαν. 33. ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα, εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν ἐπ'[3] αὐτῇ, ἦλθε καὶ προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. 34. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Θύγατερ,[4] ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε· ὕπαγε εἰς εἰρήνην, καὶ ἴσθι

h cf. John i. 40 (μένει).

[1] τα after ακ. in ℵBCΔ 33 (Tisch., W.H. See below).

[2] οτι εαν αψωμαι καν τ. ι. in ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.). The reading in T.R. is a simplification.

[3] ℵBCDL omit επ (in AΣ *al.*). Δ has εν.

[4] θυγατηρ in BD (W.H.).

of this long sentence (vv. 25, 26, 27) we may, with Fritzsche, connect this participle with γυνή, ver. 25, and treat all between as a parenthesis = a certain woman (whose case was, etc.) having heard, etc.—**τὰ περὶ τ. Ἰ.** The importance of the τὰ (ℵ*BC*Δ. W.H.) here is that with it the expression means not merely that the woman had heard of the return of Jesus from the east side, but that she had for the first time heard of Christ's healing ministry in general. She must have been a stranger from a distance, *e.g.*, from *Caesarea Philippi*, her home, according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, vii., 18), her house identifiable with a statue reproducing the gospel incident before the door; possibly a heathen, but more probably, from her behaviour, a Jewess—stealing a cure by touch when touch by one in her state was forbidden (Lev. xv. 19-27).—Ver. 29. **ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγή**: perhaps this means no more than Lk.'s statement that the flux was stopped, but the expression seems chosen to signify a complete permanent cure—not merely the stream but the fountain dried.—**ἔγνω τ. σ.**: she was conscious that the flow had ceased (ἔγνω διὰ τοῦ σώματος μηκέτι ῥαινομένου τοῖς σταλαγμοῖς, Euthy. Zig.).—Ver. 30. **ἐπιγνοὺς τὴν . . . δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν**, conscious of the going forth of the healing virtue; ἐξελθ. is the substantive participle as object of the verb ἐπιγνούς. The statement as given by Mk. (and Lk.) implies that the cure was not wrought by the will of Jesus. But it may nevertheless have been so. Jesus may have felt the touch, divined its meaning, and consented to the effect. *Vide* on Mt., *ad loc.*—**τίς μου ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων**: who touched me on my clothes? This verb here, as usual, takes genitive both of person and thing (Buttmann's *Grammar*, *N. T.*, p. 167).—Ver. 31. **τὸν ὄχ. συνθλίβοντά σε**, the crowd squeezing Thee, as in ver. 24. The simple verb in iii. 9. The compound implies a greater crowd, or a more eager pressure around Jesus. How exciting and fatiguing that rude popularity for Him!—Ver. 32. **περιεβλέπετο**: Jesus, knowing well the difference between touch and touch, regardless of what the disciples had plausibly said, *kept looking around* in quest of the person who had touched Him meaningfully.—**τὴν τ. ποιήσασαν**: feminine, a *woman's* touch. Did Jesus know that, or is it the evangelist choosing the gender in accordance with the now known fact? (Meyer and Weiss). The former possible, without preternatural knowledge, through extreme sensitiveness.—Ver. 33. **φοβ. καὶ τρέμ.**, fearing and trembling, the two states closely connected and often combined (2 Cor. vii. 15, Eph. vi. 5, Phil. ii. 12).—**εἰδυῖα**, etc., explains her emotion: she knew what had happened to her, and thought what a dreadful thing it would be to have the surreptitiously obtained

ὑγιὴς ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγός σου." 35. Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἔρχονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπέθανε· τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τὸν διδάσκαλον;" 36. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εὐθέως[1] ἀκούσας[2] τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον λέγει τῷ ἀρχισυναγώγῳ, "Μὴ φοβοῦ, μόνον [i] πίστευε." 37. Καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὐδένα αὐτῷ[3] συνακολουθῆσαι, εἰ μὴ Πέτρον[4] καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου. 38. καὶ ἔρχεται[5] εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θόρυβον,[6] κλαίοντας καὶ [j] ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά. 39. καὶ εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Τί [k] θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε; τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει." 40. Καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ[7] ἐκβαλὼν ἅπαντας,[8] παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου

i Ch. xv. 32; xvi. 16, 17 (absol.).
j 1 Cor. xiii. 1.
k Mt. ix. 23. Acts xvii. 5; xx. 10.

[1] Omit ευθεως ℵBDLΔ.
[2] παρακουσας in ℵBLΔ, changed into ακουσας because not understood.
[3] μετ αυτου in ℵBCLΔ.
[4] τον before Π. in ℵBCΔ, omitted to conform with Ιακ. Ιωαν.
[5] ερχονται in ℵABCDΔ, changed into ερχεται to agree with θεωρει (LΣ *al.*).
[6] και before κλαιοντας in many uncials. D omits.
[7] αυτος δε in ℵBCDLΔ.
[8] παντας in ℵABCLΔΣ.

benefit recalled by an offended benefactor disapproving her secrecy and her bold disregard of the ceremonial law.—**πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν**, the whole truth, which would include not only what she had just done, but her excuse for doing it—the pitiful tale of chronic misery. From that tale impressively told, heard by disciples, and not easily to be forgotten, the particulars in ver. 26 were in all probability derived.—Ver. 34. The woman had already heard the fame of Jesus (ver. 27). From what Jesus said to her she would for the first time get some idea of His exquisite sympathy, delicately expressed in the very first word: **θύγατερ**, *daughter*, to a mature woman, probably not much, if at all, younger than Himself! He speaks not as *man* to *woman*, but as *father* to *child*.

Note how vivid is Mark's story compared with the meagre colourless version of Mt.! A lively impressionable eyewitness, like Peter, evidently behind it.

Vv. 35-43. *The story of Jairus' daughter resumed.*—Ver. 35. **ἀπὸ τ. ἀρχισ.**, from the ruler of the synagogue, *i.e.*, from his *house*, as in A.V. (ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας τ. σ., Euthy.). The ruler is supposed to be with Jesus all the time.—Ver. 36. **παρακούσας**: might mean to disregard, as in Mt. xviii. 17 (with genitive). So Meyer; but here probably it means overhearing a word not spoken directly to Him. The two senses are quite compatible. Jesus might overhear what was said and disregard its import, *i.e.*, act contrary to the implied suggestion that nothing could now be done in the case. The latter He certainly did.—**πίστευε**, present, continue in a believing mood, even in presence of *death*.—Ver. 37. **συνακολουθῆσαι**: here with **μετά**, in xiv. 51, and Lk. xxiii. 49 with dative.—**τὸν Πέτρον**, etc., Peter, James, and John; earliest trace of preference within the disciple-circle. Not in Mt., but followed by Lk. The three chosen to be witnesses of a specially remarkable event. Perhaps the number of disciples was restricted to three not to crowd the house.—Ver. 38. **θεωρεῖ**: what was going on within the house appealed to both eye and ear; here the scene is described from the spectacular side—a multitude of people seen making a confused din (**θόρυβον**), in which sounds of weeping and howling without restraint (**πολλά**) are distinguishable.—**καὶ** after **θόρυβον** is epexegetic, and **κλαίοντας** and **ἀλαλάζοντας** special features under it as a general. Flute playing (Mt. ix. 23) not referred to.—Ver. 40. **κατεγέλων**: this the point of the story for the evangelist, thinks Weiss, hence related after the demoniac—common link, the unbelief of

ἦν τὸ παιδίον ἀνακείμενον.[1] 41. καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου, λέγει αὐτῇ, "Ταλιθά, κοῦμι[2]·" ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, "Τὸ κοράσιον, (σοὶ λέγω) ἔγειραι."[3] 42. Καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτει, ἦν γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα· καὶ ἐξέστησαν[4] ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ. 43. καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλά, ἵνα μηδεὶς γνῷ[5] τοῦτο· καὶ εἶπε δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν.

VI. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ ἦλθεν[6] εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· 2. καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου, ἤρξατο ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ διδάσκειν[7] καὶ πολλοὶ[8] ἀκούοντες ἐξεπλήσσοντο, λέγοντες, "Πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα; καὶ τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα αὐτῷ,[9] ὅτι καὶ δυνάμεις τοιαῦται διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ

[1] אBDLΔ omit ανακειμενον, an explanatory gloss.

[2] κουμ in אBCLΣ 33. κουμι in DΔ, which Weiss thinks the true reading against Tisch., Trg., W.H.

[3] εγειρε in most uncials. [4] Add ευθυς after εξεστησαν אBCLΔ 33.

[5] γνοι in ABDL (Tisch., W.H.). γνω in אCΔΣ.

[6] ερχεται in אBCLΔ, changed into ηλθεν to conform to εξηλθεν.

[7] διδασ. εν τη συν. in אBCDLΔ. [8] οι πολλοι in BL (Tisch., W.H.).

[9] τουτω in אBCLΔ, changed into αυτω to improve the style. The two τουτω life-like.

the people. But surely in this case incredulity was very excusable!—τὸν πατέρα, etc.: father, mother, and the three disciples taken into the sick chamber, the former as parents, the latter as witnesses.—Ver. 41. Ταλιθά κοῦμ, maiden, rise! first instance in which the words of Jesus, as spoken in Aramaic, are given. Jesus may have been a bilingual, sometimes using Greek, sometimes Syriac. He would use the vernacular on a pathetic occasion like this. The word Ταλιθά, feminine of Teli (טְלִי), is found in the Hebrew only in the plural (טְלָאִים).—Ver. 42. περιεπάτει, etc.: the diminutive κοράσιον might suggest the idea of a mere child, therefore, after stating that she *walked about*, it is added that she was *twelve years old*. In Mk. only.—Ver. 43. διεστείλατο: that the girl had recovered could not be hid, but that she had been brought back from death might be. Jesus wished this, not desiring that expectations of such acts should be awakened.—δοθῆναι φαγεῖν: she could walk and *eat;* not only alive, but well: "graviter aegroti vix solent cibum sumere," Grotius.—εἶπεν here takes the infinitive after it, not, as often, ἵνα with subjunctive.

CHAPTER VI. AT NAZARETH. MISSION OF THE TWELVE. HEROD AND JOHN. FEEDING OF THE THOUSANDS. SEA INCIDENT. The first two of the miscellaneous group of narratives contained in this chapter (vv. 1-13) are regarded by some (Weiss, Schanz, etc.) as forming the conclusion of a division of the Gospel beginning at iii. 7, having for its general heading: *The disciple-circle* versus *the unreceptive multitude.* Such analysis of the Gospels into distinct masses is useful provided it be not overdone.

Vv. 1-6a. *Jesus at Nazareth* (Mt. xiii. 53-58, *cf.* Lk. iv. 16-30).—Ver. 1. ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν. It is not said, but it is very probable, that this was another of Christ's attempts to escape from the crowd into a scene of comparative quiet and rest (the *hill*, iii. 13, the *eastern shore*, v. 1, *Nazareth*, vi. 1). Mt. gives this incident at the close of the parable collection; Lk. at the beginning of the Galilean ministry. Mk.'s connection is the most historical, Lk.'s is obviously an anticipation. It is the same incident in all three Gospels.—πατρίδα: *vide* notes on Mt., *ad loc.*—οἱ μαθηταὶ α. Mt. omits this.—Ver. 2. ἤρξατο διδάσκειν, etc.: Jesus did not go to Nazareth for the purpose of preaching, rather for rest; but that He should preach was inevit-

γίνονται[1]; 3. οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς Μαρίας,[2] ἀδελφὸς δὲ[3] Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσῆ[4] καὶ Ἰούδα καὶ Σίμωνος; καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ αὐτοῦ ὧδε πρὸς ἡμᾶς;" Καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ. 4. ἔλεγε δὲ[5] αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προφήτης ἄτιμος, εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι[6] καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ."[6] 5. Καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἐκεῖ οὐδεμίαν δύναμιν ποιῆσαι,[7] εἰ μὴ ὀλίγοις ἀρρώστοις ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας, ἐθεράπευσε. 6. καὶ ἐθαύμαζε[8] διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν· καὶ περιῆγε τὰς κώμας [a]κύκλῳ διδάσκων.

a Ch. iii. 34 reff.

[1] For **οτι . . . γινονται** should stand **και αι δυναμεις τοι. δια τ. χ. γινομεναι** as in ℵB (W.H.). The crude construction suits the mood of the speakers.

[2] ℵBCLΔ have before **Μαρ. της**, omitted to assimilate to following names.

[3] **και αδελ.** in ℵBCDLΔ. [4] **Ιωσητος** in BDLΔ 33. [5] **και ελεγεν** in ℵBCDLΔ 33.

[6] **συγγενευσιν αυτου** in BLΣ (Tisch., W.H.). [7] **ποιησαι ουδ. δυν.** in ℵBCLΔ.

[8] **εθαυμασεν** in ℵB (Tisch., W.H., text). T.R. as in CDL (W.H. margin).

able; therefore, the Sabbath coming round, He appeared in the synagogue, and spoke.—**πόθεν τούτῳ ταῦτα**: laconic; comprehensive, vague question, covering the discourse just heard and all that had been reported to them about their townsman, with the one word **ταῦτα**: such speech, such wisdom (**τίς ἡ σοφία**), such powers (**δυνάμεις**, not wrought there), in such a well-known person (**τούτῳ**).—Ver. 3. **ὁ τέκτων**: avoided by Mt., who says the carpenter's *son:* one of Mk.'s realisms. The ploughs and yokes of Justin M. (c. Trypho., 88) and the apocryphal Gospels pass beyond realism into vulgarity.—**ἐσκανδαλίζοντο**: what they had heard awakened admiration, but the external facts of the speaker's connections and early history stifled incipient faith; *vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 4. **ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν α.**, among his kinsmen. This omitted in Mt., **ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ α.** covering it.—Ver. 5. **οὐκ ἠδύνατο**, etc., He was not *able* to do any mighty work, which is qualified by the added clause, that He placed His hands on a few *ailing* persons (**ἀρρώστοις**); quite minor cures, not to be compared with those reported in the previous chapter. For this statement Mt. substitutes: He did not there many mighty works.—Ver. 6. **ἐθαύμασεν**, etc. Jesus marvelled at the *faith* of the centurion. Nazareth supplied the opposite ground for astonishment. There Jesus found an amount of stupid unreceptivity for which His experience in Decapolis and elsewhere had not prepared Him. It was the *ne plus ultra* in that line. This wonder Mt. omits, merely noting the unbelief as cause of the non-performance of miracles. We are to conceive of it as bringing about this result, not by frustrating attempts at healing, but by not giving Jesus an opportunity. The people o Nazareth were so consistently unbelieving that they would not even bring their sick to Him to be healed (Klostermann), and, as Euthy. Zig. remarks, it was not fitting that Jesus should benefit them against their will (**οὐκ ἔδει βιαίως εὐεργετεῖν αὐτούς**).

Vv. 6b-13. *Mission of the Twelve* (Mt. x. 1-15, Lk. ix. 1-6).—Ver. 6b may either be connected with the foregoing narrative, when it will mean that Jesus, rejected by the Nazareans, made a teaching tour among the villages around (Fritzsche, Meyer), or it may be taken as an introduction to the following narrative = Jesus resumes the *rôle* of a wandering preacher in Galilee (i. 38, 39) and associates with Himself in the work His disciples (Schanz, Weiss, Klostermann, etc.). This brief statement in Mark: and He went round about the villages in a circle teaching, answers to Matt. ix. 35-38, where the motive of the mission of the Twelve is more fully explained.—Ver. 7. **ἤρξατο**, etc.: Jesus calling to Him (**προσκαλεῖται**, *vide* iii. 13) the Twelve *began* at length to do what He had intended from the first (Weiss), *viz.*, to send them forth as missioners (**ἀποστέλλειν**).—**δύο δύο**, two (and) two, Hebraic for **κατά** or **ἀνά δύο**; two together, not one by one, a humane arrangement.—**ἐδίδου**, imperfect, as

7. ΚΑΙ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν [b]δύο δύο, καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων. 8. καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν, εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον· μὴ πήραν, μὴ ἄρτον,[1] μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην [c]χαλκόν· 9. ἀλλ᾽ [d]ὑποδεδεμένους [e]σανδάλια· καὶ "μὴ ἐνδύσησθε[2] δύο χιτῶνας." 10. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθητε εἰς οἰκίαν, ἐκεῖ μένετε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε ἐκεῖθεν. 11. καὶ ὅσοι[3] ἂν μὴ δέξωνται[3] ὑμᾶς, μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν, ἐκτινάξατε τὸν [f]χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται Σοδόμοις ἢ Γομόρροις ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ."[4] 12. Καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυσσον[5] ἵνα μετανοήσωσι[6]· 13. καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλλον, καὶ ἤλειφον ἐλαίῳ πολλοὺς ἀρρώστους καὶ ἐθεράπευον.

b here only in N.T. (Gen. vi. 19, 20).
c Ch. xii. 41.
d Acts xii. 8. Eph. vi. 15.
e Acts xii. 8 (Is. xx. 2. Judith x. 4; xvi. 9).
f Rev. xviii. 19 (=dust).

[1] μη αρτον μη πηραν in ℵBCLΔ. The order of T.R. conforms to Lk. (so in D).

[2] ενδυσασθαι is the reading of W.H. (text), on slight authority. LΣ have ενδεδυσθαι. The T.R. is supported by ℵACDΔ, and is adopted by Tisch., Trg. (text), Weiss (W.H. margin).

[3] ος αν τοπος μη δεξηται in ℵBLΔ (Tisch., W.H.). The T.R. is an adaptation to ακουσωσιν in next clause, which refers to the people in the place.

[4] From αμην λεγω υμιν to εκεινη is an importation from Mt. not found in ℵBCDLΔ.

[5] εκηρυξαν in ℵBCDLΔ. The imperfect (T.R.) is an assimilation to εξεβαλλον in ver. 13.

[6] μετανοωσιν in BDL (Tisch., W.H.). μετανοησωσι (ℵCΔ) sympathises with εκηρυξαν.

specifying an accompaniment of the mission, not pointing to separate empowerment of each pair.—**ἐξουσίαν τ. π. τ. α.**, power *over* unclean spirits, alone mentioned by Mark, *cf.* Matthew and Luke.—Ver. 8. **εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον**: *vide* in Matthew, *ad loc.*—**χαλκόν**: no mention of gold and silver, brass the only money the poor missionaries were likely to handle.—Ver. 9. **ἀλλὰ . . . σανδάλια**, but shod with sandals.—**μηδὲ ὑποδήματα**, says Matthew, reconcilable either by distinguishing between sandals and shoes (*vide* on Matthew), or by understanding **μηδὲ** before **ὑποδεδεμένους** (Victor Ant.).—**δυο χιτῶνας**: In Mark the prohibition is not to wear (**ἐνδύσησθε**) two tunics, in Matthew and Luke not to possess a spare one. The sentence in vv. 8, 9 presents a curious instance of varying construction: first **ἵνα** with the subjunctive after **παρήγγειλεν** (ver. 8), then **ὑποδεδεμένους**, implying an infinitive with accusative (**πορεύεσθαι** understood), then finally there is a transition from indirect to direct narration in **μὴ ενδύσησθε**.—Ver. 10. **ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖθεν**, there, in the house; thence, from the village.—Ver. 11. **καὶ ὃς ἂν τ. . . . ὑμων**: another instance of inconsequent construction beginning with a relative clause and passing into a conditional one = and whatever place does not receive you, if (**ἐάν** understood) they, its people, do not listen to you (so Schanz and Weiss in Meyer).—**ὑποκάτω**, the dust that is *under* your feet, instead of **ἐκ** and **ἀπὸ** in Matthew and Luke. The dust of *their* roads adhering to your feet, shake it off and leave it behind you. Vv. 12, 13 report the carrying out of the mission by the Twelve through preaching and healing.—**ἵνα μετανοῶσιν**: the burden of their preaching was, Repent. Luke has the more evangelic term, **εὐαγγελιζόμενοι**. The other aspect of their ministry is summed up in the expulsion of many demons, and the cure of many suffering from minor ailments, **ἀρρώστους** (*cf.* ver. 5). In Mark's account the powers of the Twelve appear much more restricted than in Matthew (*cf.* x. 8). The use of oil in healing (**ἐλαίῳ**) is to be noted. Some have regarded this as a mark of late date (Baur). Others (Weiss, Schanz) view it as a primitive

g 1 Cor. iii. 13; xiv. 25. Phil. i. 13.
h *vide* Mt. xiv. 2.

14. Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, (g φανερὸν γὰρ g ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,) καὶ ἔλεγεν,[1] "Ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐκ νεκρῶν ἠγέρθη,[2] καὶ διὰ τοῦτο h ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ." 15. Ἄλλοι[3] ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι Ἡλίας ἐστίν·" ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι προφήτης ἐστίν, ἢ[4] ὡς εἷς τῶν προφητῶν." 16. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης εἶπεν,[5] "Ὅτι[6] ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτός[7] ἐστιν· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν."[7] 17. Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησε τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ[8] φυλακῇ, διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν.

[1] So in ℵACLΔΣ (Tisch., W.H., margin). *Vide* below.
[2] **εγηγερται εκ νεκρων** in ℵBDLΔ 33.
[3] Many uncials add **δε**.
[4] ℵBCL omit **εστιν η** (Tisch., W.H.).
[5] **ελεγεν** in ℵBCLΔ 33.
[6] **οτι** omit ℵBDL 33.
[7] For **ουτος . . . εκ νεκ.** ℵBLΔ have simply **ουτος ηγερθη**.
[8] **τη** is found only in minusc.

practice (*vide* James v. 14). Many conjectural opinions have been expressed as to the function or significance of the oil. According to Lightfoot and Schöttgen it was much used at the time by physicians.

The instructions to the Twelve present an interesting problem in criticism and comparative exegesis. It is not improbable that two versions of these existed and have been drawn upon by the synoptists, one in the *Logia* of Matthew, reproduced, Weiss thinks, substantially in Lk. x. (mission of Seventy), the other in Mk. vi., used (Weiss) in Lk. ix. 1-6. Matthew, according to the same critic, mixes the two. Similarly Holtzmann, who, however, differs from Weiss in thinking the two versions entirely independent. Weiss reconstructs the original version of the *Logia* thus:—

1. Mt. ix. 38 = Lk. x. 2, prayer for labourers.
2. Lk. x. 3 = go forth, I send you as lambs among wolves.
3. Mt. x. 5, 6, go not to Samaria, but to Israel only.
4. Lk. x. 4-11, detailed instructions.

Vv. 14-16. *Herod and Jesus* (Mt. xiv. 1, 2, Lk. ix. 7-9).—Ver. 14. **ἤκουσεν**: Herod *heard*, what? Christ's name, **τὸ ὁ. α.** (**φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγέν.**, a parenthesis)? Or all that is stated in vv. 14, 15, court opinion about Jesus (from **φανερὸν** to **προφητῶν**, a parenthesis)? Both views have been held, but the simplest view is that Herod heard of the doings of the Twelve, though it is difficult to believe that the report of their mission was the first tidings he had received of the great work of Jesus, especially in view of the understanding between the Pharisees and *Herodians* mentioned in iii. 6. In the reports which reached Herod the Twelve were merged in their Master. He was the hero of the whole Galilean movement. Such is the import of the statement that His name had become known.—**βασιλεὺς**: strictly, Herod was only a tetrarch (Matthew and Luke), but it was natural for Mark writing for the Roman world to use this title, as it was applied freely in Rome to all eastern rulers.—**ἔλεγεν**, he said, *i.e.*, Herod. **ἔλεγον**, the reading of BD, and adopted by W.H., puts the saying into the mouth of the court people. Matthew has taken it the former way, Luke the latter. The theory that Jesus was John risen looks more like the creation of a troubled conscience than the suggestion of light-minded courtiers, unless indeed it was thrown out by them as a jest, and yet it appears to be the aim of the evangelist first to report the opinions of others and then to give the king's, emphatically endorsing one of the hypotheses.—**ἐγήγερται**, is risen, and is now alive and *active*, the latter the point emphasised.—**ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δ.**: *vide* notes on Matthew.—**Ἡλίας**, Elias *redivivus*, with extraordinary power and mission.—Ver. 15. **προφήτης**, etc., a prophet *like* one of the old prophets, not any of them *redivivus*. Luke understands it in the latter sense.—Ver. 16. **Ἰώαννην**: the accusative incorporated with the relative clause by

18. ἔλεγε γὰρ ὁ Ἰωάννης τῷ Ἡρώδῃ, "Ὅτι οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι ἔχειν τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου." 19. Ἡ δὲ Ἡρωδιὰς ἐνεῖχεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἤθελεν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι· καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο. 20. ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν· καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ, πολλὰ ἐποίει,[1] καὶ ἡδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουε. 21. καὶ γενομένης ἡμέρας εὐκαίρου, ὅτε Ἡρώδης τοῖς γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ δεῖπνον ἐποίει[2] τοῖς μεγιστᾶσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς

i Lk. xi. 53.

j Rev. vi. 15; xviii. 23.

[1] ηπορει in ℵBL. Memph. vers. (R.V., Tisch., Trg., marg., W.H., Ws.). εποιει (T.R.) in ACDΔΠΣΦ, etc. Lat. and Syr. verss.

[2] εποιησεν in ℵBCDLΔ.

attraction both in position and in construction; *vide* Winer, § xxiv. 2, and Viger, p. 33. The king's statement is very emphatic = the man whom I beheaded, John, he is risen (that is what it all means).

Vv. 17-29. *Story of Herod and the Baptist* (Mt. xiv. 3-12). Herod's endorsement of the theory that Jesus is John *redivivus* gives a convenient opportunity for reporting here *post eventum* the Baptist's fate. The report is given in aorists which need not be translated as pluperfects (as in A. V. and R. V.).—Ver. 17. **αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡ.**, for the same Herod, who made the speech just reported, etc.—**τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου**: some have supposed that the mistake is here made of taking Herodias for the wife of Philip the tetrarch, who in reality was husband of her daughter Salome (so Holtz. in H. C.). Herodias had previously been the wife of a rich man in Jerusalem, step-brother of Herod Antipas, referred to by Josephus (Ant. J., xviii., 5, 4) by the name of Herod, the family name. He may, of course, have borne another name, such as Philip. Even if there be a slip it is a matter of small moment compared to the moral interest of the gruesome story.—Ver. 19. **ἡ δὲ Ἡρ.**: the murderous mood is by Mark ascribed to Herodias; in her it would certainly be strongest and unchecked by any other feeling. In Herod, if the mood was there, it was accompanied by worthier impulses (*vide* on Matthew).—**ἐνεῖχεν**, had a grudge (χόλον understood, so Fritzsche *al.*) against him (**αὐτῷ**, dative of disadvantage); or, kept in mind what John had said, treasured up against him, with fixed hate and purpose of revenge.—**καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο**, and was not able, to compass her end for a while.—Ver. 20 gives the reason.—**ἐφοβεῖτο**, feared, a mixture of reverence and superstitious dread towards the prophet and man of God.—**συνετήρει**, not merely *observed him* (A. V.)—this too neutral and colourless—*kept him safe* (R. V.) from her fixed malice often manifested but not likely to have its way with him in ordinary circumstances.—**ἀκούσας πολλὰ** implies frequent meetings between the Baptist and the king, either at Machaerus or at Tiberias.—**ἠπόρει**, the true reading, not only on critical grounds (attested by ℵBL), but also on psychological, corresponding exactly to the character of the man—a **δίψυχος ἀνὴρ**—drawn two ways, by respect for goodness on the one hand, by evil passions on the other. He was at a loss what to do in the matter of his wife's well-known purpose, shiftless (ἀπορεῖν, to be without resources); half sympathised with her wish, yet could not be brought to the point.—**ἡδέως α. ἤκουεν**, ever heard him with pleasure; every new hearing exorcising the vindictive demon, even the slightest sympathy with it, for a time.

Vv. 21-29. *The fatal day*.—Ver. 21. **εὐκαίρου**, a day *convenient* for the long cherished purpose of Herodias; so regarded by her as well as by the evangelist. She had a chance then, if ever, and might hope that by wine, love, and the assistance of obsequious guests, her irresolute husband would at last be brought to the point (Grotius). The word occurs again in the N. T., Heb. iv. 16, **εὔκαιρον βοήθειαν** = seasonable succour.—**μεγιστᾶσιν** (**μεγιστᾶνες** from **μέγιστος**), *magnates*. A word belonging to Macedonian Greek, condemned by Phryn. (p. 196: **μέγα δυναμένοι** the right expression), frequent in Sept. With these magnates, the civil authorities, are named the chief military men (**χιλιάρχοις**) and the socially important persons of Galilee (**πρώτοις**)—an imposing gathering on Herod's birthday.—Ver. 22. **ἤρεσεν**, it, the dancing, *pleased* Herod

χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Γαλιλαίας, 22. καὶ εἰσελθούσης τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς[1] Ἡρωδιάδος, καὶ ὀρχησαμένης, καὶ ἀρεσάσης[2] τῷ Ἡρώδῃ καὶ τοῖς συνανακειμένοις, εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς[3] τῷ κορασίῳ, "Αἴτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοί·" 23. καὶ ὤμοσεν αὐτῇ, "Ὅτι ὃ ἐάν[4] με αἰτήσῃς, δώσω σοί, ἕως ἡμίσους τῆς βασιλείας μου." 24. Ἡ δὲ[5] ἐξελθοῦσα εἶπε τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς, "Τί αἰτήσομαι[6];" Ἡ δὲ εἶπε, "Τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ."[7] 25. Καὶ εἰσελθοῦσα εὐθέως [k] μετὰ σπουδῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, ᾐτήσατο, λέγουσα, "Θέλω ἵνα μοι δῷς ἐξ αὐτῆς[8] ἐπὶ πίνακι τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ." 26. Καὶ περίλυπος γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, διὰ τοὺς ὅρκους καὶ τοὺς συνανακειμένους[9] οὐκ ἠθέλησεν αὐτὴν ἀθετῆσαι.[10] 27. καὶ εὐθέως ἀποστείλας ὁ βασιλεὺς σπεκουλάτωρα[11] ἐπέταξεν ἐνεχθῆναι[12] τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ[13] ἀπελθὼν ἀπεκεφάλισεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, 28. καὶ ἤνεγκε τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πίνακι, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν τῷ κορασίῳ· καὶ τὸ κοράσιον ἔδωκεν

k Rom. xii. 8. 2 Cor. vii. 11, 12; viii. 7, 8, 16. Heb. vi. 11. 2 Pet. i. 5. Jude 3.

[1] For αυτης της ℵBDLΔ have αυτου (omitting της), adopted by W.H. contrary, Weiss thinks, to all history, all grammar, and the context (*vide* in Meyer).

[2] For και αρεσ. ℵBCL 33 have ηρεσεν.

[3] ο δε βασιλ. ειπεν in ℵBCLΔ 33.

[4] BΔ have ο τι εαν, the most probable reading (W.H. text).

[5] For η δε ℵBLΔ 33 have και.

[6] αιτησωμαι in ℵABCDGLΔ 33.

[7] βαπτιζοντος in ℵBLΔ.

[8] εξαυτης δως μοι in ℵBCLΔ.

[9] ανακειμενους in BCLΔ.

[10] αθετ. αυτην in ℵBCLΔ.

[11] σπεκουλατορα in ℵABL *al.*

[12] ενεγκαι in ℵBCΔ (T.R. in DL).

[13] For ο δε BCLΔ have και.

and his guests.—τ. κορασίῳ, to the girl, as in v. 41-2, not necessarily a child; the word was used familiarly like the Scotch word "lassie"; disapproved by Phryn., p. 73.—αἴτησόν με . . . ὤμοσεν: promise first, followed by oath after a little interval, during which the girl naturally hesitated what to ask.—Ver. 23. ἡμίσους, genitive of ἥμισυς, like ἡμίση (τὰ, plural), a late form = *the half*, of my kingdom: maudlin amorous generosity.—Ver. 24. She goes out to ask advice of her mother, implying that she had not previously got instructions as Matthew's account suggests.—Ver. 25. εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς, without delay and with quick step, as of one whose heart was in the business. There had been no reluctance then on the girl's part, no need for much educating to bring her to the point; *vide* remarks on προβιβασθεῖσα in Mt. xiv. 8. Her mother's child.—ἐξαυτῆς (supply ὥρας), on the spot, at once; request proffered with a cool pert impudence almost outdoing the mother.—Ver. 26. περίλυπος γενόμενος: a concessive clause, καίπερ understood = and the king, though exceedingly sorry, yet, etc.—ὅρκους: there might be more oaths than one (*vide* on Matthew), but the plural was sometimes used for a single oath. Schanz cites instances from Aeschylus and Xenophon. —ἀθετῆσαι α., to slight her, by treating the oath and promise as a joke; a late word, used, in reference to persons, in the sense of breaking faith with (here only). Kypke renders the word here: "noluit fidem illi datam fallere," citing instances from Diod., Polyb., and Sept. —Ver. 27. σπεκουλάτορα = speculator in Latin, literally a watcher, a military official of the empire who acted partly as courier, partly as a police officer, partly as an executioner; illustrative citations in Wetstein. The word found its way into the Jewish language (here only).—Ver. 29 relates how the disciples of John buried the carcase of their master.—ἐν μνημείῳ, in a tomb. The phrase recalls

αὐτὴν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτῆς. 29. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἦλθον, καὶ ἦραν τὸ πτῶμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔθηκαν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ[1] μνημείῳ.

30. Καὶ συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ πάντα, καὶ[2] ὅσα ἐποίησαν καὶ ὅσα ἐδίδαξαν. 31. καὶ εἶπεν[3] αὐτοῖς, "Δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε[4] ὀλίγον." Ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοί, καὶ οὐδὲ φαγεῖν ηὐκαίρουν.[5] 32. καὶ ἀπῆλθον εἰς ἔρημον τόπον τῷ πλοίῳ[6] κατ' ἰδίαν. 33. Καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας οἱ ὄχλοι,[7] καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν[8] πολλοί· καὶ πεζῇ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων [l] συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ, καὶ [m] προῆλθον αὐτούς, καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς

l Acts iii. 11.
m Lk. xxii. 47.

[1] Omit τω most uncials (D has it).
[2] Omit και ℵBCDLΔΣ.
[3] λεγει in ℵBCLΔ 33.
[4] αναπαυσασθε in ℵBCΔ.
[5] ευκαιρουν in most uncials.
[6] τω πλ. εις ερ. τοπον in ℵBLΔ.
[7] Omit οι οχ. ℵABDLΔΣ *al.*
[8] BD have εγνωσαν and without an object (αυτον or αυτους).

to mind the burial of Jesus. Did the evangelist wish to suggest for the reflection of his readers a parallel between the fate of the Baptist and that of Christ? (So Klostermann).

Vv. 30-33. *Return of the Twelve* (Mt. xiv. 13, Lk. ix. 10, 11).—Ver. 30 transfers us from the past date of the horrible deed just related to the time when the fame of Jesus and His disciples recalled the deed of guilt to Herod's mind.—**συνάγονται οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν**, the *apostles* (here only, and not in the technical sense of after days, but = the men sent out on the Galilean mission, the *missioners*) gather to Jesus. Where? after how long? and what has Jesus been doing the while? No answer is possible. These are gaps in the evangelic history.—**πάντα ὅσα ἐπ.**: suggests that they had great things to tell, though vv. 12, 13 create very moderate expectations. The repetition of **ὅσα** before **ἐδίδαξαν** = how much they had taught ("quanta docuerant," Fritzsche), may surprise. The teaching element could not be extensive in the range of topics. Yet, if it took the form of *personal narrative concerning Jesus*, it might be copious enough, and really the principal feature of the mission. *Vide* notes on Mt., chap. x.—Ver. 31. **ὑμεῖς αὐτοί**, either: you yourselves, *vos ipsi*, without the crowd (Meyer, Schanz), or, better: you the same men who have been hard at work and need rest (Weiss in Meyer, Holtz., H. C.). This sympathy of Jesus with the Twelve reflects His own craving for rest which He often unsuccessfully strove to obtain.—**ἀναπαύσασθε**, aorist, only a breathing space in a life of toil.—**οἱ ἐρ. καὶ οἱ ὑπάγ.** Many coming and going: a constant stream of people on some errand; no sooner done with one party than another presented itself—no leisure.—**οὐδὲ φαγεῖν εὐκαίρουν**: no leisure (*cf.* **εὔκαιρος**, ver. 21), even to eat; imperfect, implying that it was not a solitary occurrence. What was the business on hand? *Probably a political movement in Christ's favour with which the Twelve sympathised. Vide* John vi. 15.—Ver. 32. **τῷ πλοίῳ**. The boat which stood ready for service (iii. 9).—**κατ' ἰδίαν**, privately, *i.e.*, with Jesus only in the boat, and without other boats accompanying. As to the reason for this withdrawal into privacy *cf.* Mk.'s account with Mt.'s (xiv. 13), who connects with the report of John's death. Beyond doubt, Mk.'s is the correct account. The excursion was an attempt to escape from the crowd and from dangerous illusions; again without success.—Ver. 33 explains why.—**εἶδον**, etc., they (the people) saw them departing.—**ἐπέγνωσαν** (or **ἔγνωσαν**, BD) is better without an object (**αὐτοὺς** or **αὐτὸν**) = they knew, not who they were, but what they were after, where they were going, doubtless from the course they were steering.—**πεζῇ** (from **πεζός**, adjective **ὁδῷ**, understood), on foot, by land round the end of the lake.—**συνέδραμον**, they ran together, excited and exciting, each town on the way contributing its rill to the growing stream of eager human beings; what a picture! The

αὐτόν.[1] 34. καὶ ἐξελθὼν εἶδεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς[2] πολὺν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτοῖς,[3] ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα· καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς πολλά. 35. Καὶ ἤδη ὥρας πολλῆς γενομένης, προσελθόντες αὐτῷ[4] οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν,[4] "Ὅτι ἔρημός ἐστιν ὁ τόπος, καὶ ἤδη ὥρα πολλή· 36. ἀπόλυσον αὐτούς, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες εἰς τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς καὶ κώμας, ἀγοράσωσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἄρτους[5]· τί γὰρ φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν."[5] 37. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν." Καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Ἀπελθόντες ἀγοράσωμεν διακοσίων δηναρίων[6] ἄρτους, καὶ δῶμεν[7] αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν." 38. Ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; ὑπάγετε καὶ[8] ἴδετε." Καὶ γνόντες λέγουσι, "Πέντε, καὶ δύο ἰχθύας." 39. Καὶ ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι[9] πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. 40. καὶ ἀνέπεσον πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, ἀνὰ[10] ἑκατὸν καὶ ἀνὰ[10] πεντήκοντα. 41. καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εὐλόγησε· καὶ κατέκλασε τοὺς ἄρτους, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ[11] ἵνα παραθῶσιν[12] αὐτοῖς· καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισε πᾶσι· 42. καὶ ἔφαγον πάντες, καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· 43. καὶ ἦραν κλασμάτων δώδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις,[13]

[1] ℵBLΔ omit και συνηλθον προς αυτον (Tisch., W.H.). [2] Omit ο I. ℵAB *al. pl.*
[3] αυτους in ℵBD. [4] ελεγον in ℵBLΔ.
[5] For αρτους . . . εχουσιν ℵBLΔ have simply τι φαγωσιν (Tisch., W.H.).
[6] δην. διακ. in ℵABLΔ. [7] δωσωμεν in ℵBD. -ομεν LΔ (W.H.).
[8] και omit ℵBDL 33. [9] ανακλιθηναι in ℵB. ανακλιναι DLΔ.
[10] κατα in ℵBD (Tisch., W.H.). [11] αυτου omit ℵBLΔ.
[12] παρατιθωσιν in ℵBLΔ. [13] B has κλασματα δ. κοφινων πληρωματα (W.H.).

ultimate result, a congregation of 5000. This the climax of popularity, and, from the fourth Gospel we learn, its crisis (chap. vi.).—προῆλθον, "outran" (A. V.), anticipated = φθάνειν in classics.

Vv. 34-44. *The feeding* (Mt. xiv. 14-21, Lk. ix. 11-17).—Ver. 34. ἤρξατο διδάσκειν, He began to teach, constrained by pity (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη), though weary of toil and of *popularity*. To *teach*; Mt. says to *heal*. There could be few, if any, sick in a crowd that had come in such a hurry.—Ver. 35. ὥρας πολλῆς, it being late in the day.—πολύς was extensively used by the Greeks in all sorts of connections, time included; examples in Kypke and Hermann's *Viger*, p. 137 f. The phrase recurs in last clause of this verse (ὥρα πολλή).—Ver. 37. δηναρ. διακ. ἄρτους, loaves of (purchasable for) 200 denarii; the sum probably suggested by what the Twelve knew they were in possession of at the time = seven pounds in the purse of the Jesus-circle (Grotius, Holtz., H. C.).—Ver. 39. συμπόσια συμ. Hebraistic for ἀνα συμ. (*cf.* δύο δύο, ver. 7) = in dining companies.—ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ, on the green grass; a reedy, marshy place near the mouth of the Jordan at the north end of the lake. *Vide* Stanley's description (Sinai and Palestine).—Ver. 40. πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ = ἀνα πρασίας, in garden flower plots, or squares, picturesque in fact and in description, bespeaking an eye-witness of an impressionable nature like Peter.—Ver. 43. καὶ ἦραν, etc., and they took up, as fragments (κλάσματα, BL), the fillings (πληρώματα) of twelve baskets.—καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων, and of the fishes, either over and above what was in the twelve baskets (Fritzsche), or some fragments of the fishes included in them (Meyer).—Ver. 44. πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες, 5000 men: one loaf for 1000! Mt. adds: χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων, women and children not counted. Of these, in the circumstances, there would

καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἰχθύων. 44. καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες τοὺς ἄρτους ὡσεὶ[1] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες. 45. Καὶ εὐθέως ἠνάγκασε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν, ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύσῃ[2] τὸν ὄχλον. 46. καὶ [n] ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. 47. Καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης, ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. 48. Καὶ εἶδεν[3] αὐτοὺς βασανιζομένους ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν· ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἄνεμος ἐναντίος αὐτοῖς. καὶ[3] περὶ τετάρτην φυλακὴν τῆς νυκτὸς ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτούς, περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης· καὶ ἤθελε παρελθεῖν αὐτούς. 49. οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης,[4] ἔδοξαν φάντασμα εἶναι,[5] καὶ ἀνέκραξαν· 50. πάντες γὰρ αὐτὸν εἶδον, καὶ ἐταράχθησαν. καὶ εὐθέως[6] ἐλάλησε μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Θαρσεῖτε· ἐγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε." 51. Καὶ ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος· καὶ λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ[7] ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο, καὶ

n Lk. ix. 61; xiv. 33. Acts xviii. 8.

[1] ℵBDLΔ omit ωσει. [2] απολυει in ℵBL. απολυσῃ is from Mt.

[3] ιδων in ℵBDLΔ, which (D excepted) also omit και before περι τεταρτην φυλακην. ειδεν και is a simplification of the construction.

[4] Tr. (επι τ. θ. περιπ.) ℵBLΔ 33.

[5] οτι φαντασμα εστιν in ℵBLΔ 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] ο δε ευθυς in ℵBLΔ.

[7] ℵBLΔ omit εκ περισσου (W.H.). It suits the situation and may have fallen out by oversight, or been omitted as superfluous, though really not so.

be few, therefore probably not referred to by Mk.

Vv. 45-52. *Another sea-anecdote* (Mt. xiv. 22-33). Luke drops out here and does not join his brother evangelists till we come to viii. 27.—Ver. 45. **εὐθὺς**: no time to lose; it was getting late.—**ἠνάγκασε**, *vide* on Mt.—**εἰς τὸ πέραν**: we are apt to take this as a matter of course as = to the other (western) side of the lake, and consequently to assume that **πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν** points to a Bethsaida there, distinct from Bethsaida Julias (John i. 44). But the expression **εἰς τ. π.** may mean from the south end of the plain El Batiha, on the eastern side, to the north end towards Bethsaida Julias, the rendezvous for the night. In that case the contrary wind which overtook the disciples would be the prevailing wind from the north-east, driving them in an opposite direction away from Bethsaida towards the western shore. This is the view advocated by Furrer. *Vide Zeitschrift des Palästina-Vereins*, B. ii. (1879). Holtz., H. C., thinks that either this view must be adopted or the true reading in the clause referring to B. must be that represented in some Latin copies: "trans fretum *a* Bedsaida," C. Veron.; "*a* Bethsaida," C. Monac.—Ver. 46. **ἀποταξάμενος**, having dismissed them, *i.e.*, the multitude; late Greek condemned by Phryn., p. 23 (**ἔκφυλον πάνυ**).—Ver. 48. **ἐν τῷ ἐλαύνειν**, in propelling (the ship with oars).—**περὶ τετ. φυλ.**, about the fourth watch, between three and six in the morning, towards dawn.—**ἤθελε παρελθεῖν**, He wished to pass them—"praeterire eos," Vul.; it appeared so to them.—Ver. 50. Not quite an instance of Mark's habit of iteration: explains how they came to think it was a phantasm. All saw what looked like Jesus, yet they could not believe it was He, a real man, walking on the water; therefore they took fright and rushed to the conclusion: a spectre!—Ver. 51. **ἐκόπασεν**, as in iv. 39—**λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ**, very exceedingly, a double superlative, a most likely combination for Mark, though **ἐκ περ.** is wanting in some important MSS. and omitted in W.H. *Cf.* **ὑπερεκπερισσοῦ** in Eph. iii. 20.—Ver. 52 reflects on the astonishment of the Twelve as blameworthy in view of

ἐθαύμαζον.[1] 52. οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις· ἦν γὰρ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν[2] °πεπωρωμένη.

53. ΚΑΙ διαπεράσαντες ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν[3] Γενησαρέτ,[4] καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν. 54. καὶ ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου, εὐθέως ἐπιγνόντες αὐτόν, 55. περιδραμόντες[5] ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον[6] ἐκείνην, ἤρξαντο ἐπὶ τοῖς κραββάτοις τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ᵖπεριφέρειν, ὅπου ἤκουον ὅτι ἐκεῖ[7] ἐστι. 56. καὶ ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο εἰς κώμας ἢ[8] πόλεις ἢ[8] ἀγρούς, ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς ἐτίθουν[9] τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας, καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἅψωνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἥπτοντο[10] αὐτοῦ, ἐσώζοντο.

o Ch. viii. 17. John xii. 40. Rom. xi. 7. 2 Cor. iii. 14.

p 2 Cor. iv. 10. Eph. iv. 14.

[1] ℵBLΔ omit και εθαυμαζον, which is superfluous.

[2] For ην γαρ . . . αυτων ℵBLΔ have αλλ ην, etc., and AℵBΣ αυτων η καρ.

[3] επι τ. γ. ηλθον in ℵBLΔ 33.

[4] εις before Γεν. in ℵBLΔ 33.

[5] περιεδραμον in ℵBLΔ 33 (with και before ηρξαντο).

[6] χωραν in ℵBLΔ 33.

[7] εκει omit ℵBLΔ.

[8] εις before πολεις and αγρους in ℵBDΔ.

[9] ετιθεσαν in ℵBLΔ.

[10] ηψαντο in ℵBDLΔ 33 *al.*

the recent feeding of the multitude. One might rather have expected a reference to the stilling of the storm in crossing to Decapolis. But that seems to have appeared a small matter compared with walking on the sea. The evangelist seems anxious to show how much the Twelve needed the instruction to which in the sequel Jesus gives Himself more and more.

Vv. 53-56. *The landing* (Mt. xiv. 34-36).—Ver. 53. προσωρμίσθησαν (πρὸς ὁρμίζω from ὅρμος), they came to anchor, or landed on the beach; here only in N. T.—Ver. 55. ἐπὶ τοῖς κραββάτοις, upon their beds, *vide* ii. 4.—περιφέρειν, to carry about from place to place. If they did not find Jesus at one place, they were not discouraged, but carried their sick to another place where He was likely to be. Their energy, not less than the word κραββάτοις, recalls the story in ii. 1-12.—ὅπου ἤκουον ὅτι ἐστιν, not: wherever He was = ὅπου ἦν, but: wherever they were told He was; ἐστιν, present, from the point of view of those who gave the information in indirect discourse. *Vide* on this, Burton, M. and T., § 351.—Ver. 56. κώμας, πόλεις, ἀγρούς: point probably to a wider sphere of activity than the plain of Gennesaret. This was practically the close of the healing ministry, in which the expectation and faith of the people were wound up to the highest pitch.

CHAPTER VII. WASHING OF HANDS. SYROPHENICIAN WOMAN. A DEAF-MUTE HEALED.—Vv. 1-23. *Concerning ceremonial ablutions* (Mt. xv. 1-20).—Ver. 1. καὶ connects what follows very loosely with what goes before: not temporal sequence but contrast between phenomenal popularity and hostility of the religious leaders of the people, in the view of the evangelist.—τινὲς τῶν γραμ., etc., some of the scribes who had come from Jerusalem, *cf.* iii. 22, and remarks there.—Ver. 2. καὶ ἰδόντες: the sentence beginning with these words properly runs on to the end of ver. 5, but the construction of so long a sentence overtaxes the grammatical skill of the writer, so it is broken off unfinished after the long explanatory clause about Jewish customs, vv. 3-4—a kind of parenthesis—and a new sentence begun at ver. 5 = and seeing, etc. (for the Pharisees, etc.), and the Pharisees and scribes ask; instead of: they ask, etc. The sense plain enough, though grammar crude.—τινὰς τ. μαθ., *some* of the disciples, not all. When? On their evangelistic tour? (Weiss; Holtz., H. C.) We have here, as in i. 24, a case of attraction = seeing some that they eat (ὅτι ἐσθίουσι, W.H.), for seeing that some eat (ὅτι τινὲς ἐσ.).—ἀνίπτοις, unwashed, added to explain for Gentile readers the technical term κοιναῖς = profane (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 14).—Vv. 3-4. Ex-

VII. 1. ΚΑΙ συνάγονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καί τινες τῶν γραμματέων, ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων· 2. καὶ ἰδόντες τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ [a] κοιναῖς[1] χερσί, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις, ἐσθίοντας[1] ἄρτους[2] ἐμέμψαντο[3]· 3. (οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐὰν μὴ [b] πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας, οὐκ ἐσθίουσι, κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων· 4. καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς, ἐὰν μὴ [c] βαπτίσωνται,[4] οὐκ ἐσθίουσι· καὶ ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, [d] βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων καὶ κλινῶν[5]·) 5. ἔπειτα[6] ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, "Διατί οἱ μαθηταί σου οὐ [e] περιπατοῦσι[7] κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ ἀνίπτοις[8] χερσὶν ἐσθίουσι τὸν ἄρτον;" 6. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς[9] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι καλῶς προεφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται, 'Οὗτος ὁ λαὸς τοῖς χείλεσί με

a ver. 5. Acts x. 14. Rom. xiv. 14. Heb. x. 29.
b here only.
c Lk. xi. 38.
d Col. ii. 12. Heb. vi. 2; ix. 10.
e Acts xxi. 21. Rom. viii. 4.

[1] **οτι** before **κοιναις** with **εσθιουσι** in ℵBLΔ 33 (W.H.).

[2] **τους** before **αρτους** in ℵBDLNΔΣ.

[3] Omit **εμεμψαντο** ℵABLΔ. It was doubtless introduced to help the construction.

[4] ℵB have **ραντισωνται** (W.H. text).

[5] **και κλινων** is omitted in ℵBLΔ (W.H. marg.), but found in D. It might fall out by similar ending, and was hardly likely to be added as a gloss.

[6] **και** in ℵBDL 33.

[7] **ου περι. οι μαθ. σου** in ℵBLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[8] **κοιναις** in ℵBD for **ανιπτοις**, which seems an explanatory substitute.

[9] Omitted in ℵBLΔ 33, also **οτι** before **καλως**.

planatory statement about Jewish customs, not in Mt.—**πάντες οἱ Ἰουδ.**: the Pharisees, the thorough-going virtuosi in religion, were a limited number; but in this and other respects the Jews generally followed ancient custom. The expression reminds us of the Fourth Gospel in its manner of referring to the people of Israel—the Jews—as foreigners. Mark speaks from the Gentile point of view.—**πυγμῇ**, with the fist, the Vulgate has here *crebro*, answering to **πυκνά**, a reading found in ℵ. Most recent interpreters interpret **πυγμῇ** as meaning that they rubbed hard the palm of one hand with the other closed, so as to make sure that the part which touched food should be clean. (So Beza.) For other interpretations *vide* Lightfoot, Bengel, and Meyer.—Ver. 4. **ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς**, from market (coming understood = **ὅταν ἔλθωσι** in D), a common ellipsis, examples in Raphel, Kypke, and Bos, Ell. Gr., p. 98.—**ῥαντίσωνται** (ℵB), they sprinkle. The reading, **βαπτίσωνται** (T.R.), may be interpreted either as = dipping of the *hands* (*mersionem manuum*, Lightfoot, Wetstein), or, bathing of the *whole body*. (Meyer. "The statement proceeds by way of climax: before eating they wash the hands always. When they come from market they take a bath before eating.")—**ποτηρίων, ξεστῶν, χαλκίων**: the evangelist explains how the Jews not only cleansed their own persons, but also all sorts of household utensils—altogether a serious business, that of preserving ceremonial purity. The two first articles, cups and jugs, would be of wood; earthen vessels when defiled had to be broken (Lev. xv. 12). The second word, **ξεστῶν**, is a Latinism = *sextus* or *sextarius*, a Roman measure = 1½ English pints; here used without reference to contents = *urceus* in Vulg.—**χαλκίων** = vessels of brass. The **καὶ κλινῶν**, added in some MSS., will mean couches for meals on which diseased persons may have lain (lepers, etc.).—Ver. 5. At last we come to the point, the complaint of the jealous guardians of Jewish custom, as handed down from the elders (**κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τ. π.**), against the disciples of Jesus, and indirectly against Jesus Himself.—**διατί οὐ περιπατοῦσι κατὰ**: for this Mt. substitutes **δ. παραβαίνουσι**.

Vv. 6-13. *The reply of Jesus.* It con-

τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ. 7. μάτην δὲ σέβονταί με, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας, ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων·' 8. Ἀφέντες γὰρ[1] τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρατεῖτε τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, βαπτισμοὺς ξεστῶν καὶ ποτηρίων, καὶ ἄλλα παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε."[2] 9. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Καλῶς[f] ἀθετεῖτε τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν τηρήσητε. 10. Μωσῆς γὰρ εἶπε, 'Τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου·' καί, 'ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτάτω·' 11. Ὑμεῖς δὲ λέγετε, Ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί, Κορβᾶν, (ὅ ἐστι, δῶρον,) ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς· 12. καὶ[3] οὐκέτι ἀφίετε αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ποιῆσαι τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ[4] ἢ τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ,[4] 13. ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν ᾗ παρεδώκατε· καὶ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ποιεῖτε." 14. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος πάντα[5] τὸν ὄχλον, ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀκούετέ[6] μου πάντες, καὶ συνίετε.[6] 15. οὐδέν ἐστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτόν, ὃ δύναται

f 1 Cor. i. 19. Gal. ii. 21; iii. 15. Heb. x. 28.

[1] γαρ omitted in ℵBLΔ.

[2] All after ανθρωπων is omitted in ℵBLΔ, and is obviously a gloss taken from ver. 4.

[3] Omit και ℵBDΔ.

[4] ℵBDL omit αυτου in both places.

[5] παλιν instead of παντα (substituted for a word not understood) in ℵBDLΔ, Vulg. Cop.

[6] ακουσατε in BDL and συνετε in BLΔ. The presents in T.R. are from Mt.

sists of a prophetic citation and a countercharge, given by Mt. in an inverted order. Commentators, according to their bias, differ as to which of the two versions is secondary.—Ver. 6. καλῶς: twice used in Mk. (ver. 9), here = appositely, in ver. 9 ironically = bravely, finely. The citation from Isaiah is given in identical terms in the two accounts.—Ver. 8. At this point Mk.'s account seems secondary as compared with Mt.'s. This verse contains Christ's comment on the prophetic oracle, then, ver. 9, He goes on to say the same thing over again.—Ver. 10. Μωσῆς, *Moses;* God in Mt., the same thing in Jewish esteem.—Ver. 11. Κορβᾶν: Mk. gives first the Hebrew word, then its Greek equivalent.—Ver. 12. Here again the construction limps; it would have been in order if there had been no λέγετε after ὑμεῖς at beginning of ver. 11 = but ye, when a man says, etc., do not allow him, etc.—Ver. 13. ᾗ παρεδώκατε, which ye have delivered. The receivers are also transmitters of the tradition, adding their quota to the weight of authority.—παρόμοια τοιαῦτα πολλὰ: many such similar things, a rhetorically redundant phrase (*such, similar*) expressive of contempt. *Cf.* Col. ii. 21, Heb. ix. 10.

Vv. 14-16. *The people taken into the discussion.* — προσκαλεσάμενος: the people must have retired a little into the background, out of respect for the Jerusalem magnates.—ἀκούσατέ μου, etc., hear me all ye, and understand; a more pointed appeal than Mt.'s: hear and understand.—Ver. 15. This saying is called a parable in ver. 17, and Weiss contends that it must be taken strictly as such, *i.e.*, as meaning that it is not foods going into the body through the mouth that defile ceremonially, but corrupt matters issuing from the body (as in leprosy). Holtzmann, H. C., concurs. Schanz dissents on the ground that on this view the connection with unclean hands is done away with, and a quite foreign thought introduced. Mt., it is clear, has not so understood the saying (xv. 11), and while he also calls it a parable (ver. 15) he evidently means thereby an obscure, enigmatical saying, needing explanation. Why assume that Mk. means anything more? True, he makes Jesus say, not that which cometh

αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι[1]· ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκπορευόμενα ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνά[2] ἐστι τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον. 16. εἴ τις ἔχει ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω.[3] 17. Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, [g] ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς παραβολῆς.[4] 18. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς [h] ἀσύνετοί ἐστε; οὐ νοεῖτε ὅτι πᾶν τὸ ἔξωθεν εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι; 19. ὅτι οὐκ εἰσπορεύεται αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν· καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζον[5] πάντα τὰ βρώματα." 20. Ἔλεγε δέ, "Ὅτι τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενον, ἐκεῖνο κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον. 21. ἔσωθεν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς καρδίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐκπορεύονται, μοιχεῖαι, πορνεῖαι, φόνοι, 22. κλοπαί,[6] πλεονεξίαι, πονηρίαι, δόλος, ἀσέλγεια, ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, βλασφημία, ὑπερηφανία, ἀφροσύνη. 23. πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσωθεν ἐκπορεύεται, καὶ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον."

g Ch. xi. 29. Lk. xx. 40 (τινά τι).

h Rom. i. 21, 31; x. 19.

[1] κοινωσαι αυτον in ℵLΔ (B το κοινουν α.).

[2] τα εκ του ανθ. εκπορ. in ℵBDLΔ 33, and εκεινα omitted in ℵBLΔ.

[3] Omit whole verse ℵBDL. It is probably a gloss.

[4] την παραβολην for περι της. π. in ℵBDLΔ 33.

[5] καθαριζων in ℵABLΔ *al.*, Orig. (modern editions).

[6] πορνειαι, κλοπαι, φονοι, μοιχειαι in ℵBLΔ.

out of the *mouth*, but the things which come out of the *man*. But if He had meant the impure matters issuing from the body, would He not have said ἐκ τοῦ σώματος, so as to make His meaning unmistakable? On the whole, the most probable view is that even in ver. 15 the thought of Jesus moves in the moral sphere, and that the meaning is: the only defilement worth serious consideration is that caused by the evil which comes out of the *heart* (ver. 21).

Vv. 17-23. *Conversation with the disciples.*—εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου = alone, apart from the crowd, at home, wherever the home, *pro tem.*, might be. Whatever was said or done in public became habitually a subject of conversation between Jesus and the Twelve, and therefore of course this remarkable saying.—Ver. 18. Here, as in vi. 52, Mk. takes pains to make prominent the stupidity and consequent need of instruction of the Twelve.—οὕτω καὶ ὑ., etc.: are ye, too, so unintelligent as not to understand what I have said: that that which goeth into the man from without cannot defile?—Ver. 19. ὅτι οὐκ . . . εἰς τὴν καρδίαν: this negative statement is not in Mt. The contrast makes the point clearer. The idea throughout is that ethical defilement is alone of importance, all other defilement, whether the subject of Mosaic ceremonial legislation or of scribe tradition, a trivial affair. Jesus here is a critic of Moses as well as of the scribes, and introduces a religious revolution.—καθαρίζων (not -ον) is accepted generally as the true reading, but how is it to be construed? as the nominative absolute referring to ἀφεδρῶνα, giving the sense: evacuation purges the body from all matter it cannot assimilate? So most recent commentators. Or ought we not to terminate the words of Jesus at ἐκπορεύεται with a mark of interrogation, and take what follows as a comment of the evangelist? = ἐκπορεύεται;—καθαρίζων, etc.: this He said, purging all meats; making all meats clean, abolishing the ceremonial distinctions of the Levitical law. This view was adopted by Origen and Chrysostom, and is vigorously defended by Field, *Otium Nor.*, *ad loc.*, and favoured by the Spk., *Commentary*. Weizsäcker adopts it in his translation: "So sprach er alle Speisen rein".—Ver. 20. ἔλεγεν δὲ: the use of this phrase here favours the view that καθαρίζων, etc., is an interpolated remark of the evangelist (Field).—Ver.

i Lk. viii. 47. Acts xxvi. 26. 2 Pet. iii. 5, with part. Heb. xiii. 2.
j with προς and accus. here only.

24. Καὶ ἐκεῖθεν[1] ἀναστὰς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὰ μεθόρια[2] Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος.[3] καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν[4] οἰκίαν, οὐδένα ἤθελε γνῶναι, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθη[5] [i]λαθεῖν. 25. ἀκούσασα γὰρ[6] γυνὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἧς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, ἐλθοῦσα [j]προσέπεσε [j]πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ· 26. ἦν δὲ ἡ γυνὴ[7] Ἑλληνίς, Συροφοίνισσα[8] τῷ γένει· καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκβάλλῃ[9] ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῆς. 27. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν[10] αὐτῇ, "Ἄφες πρῶτον

[1] **εκειθεν δε** in ℵBLΔ.

[2] **μεθορια** is an interpretative harmonising (Mt. xv. 22) substitute for **ορια** in ℵBDLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] DLΔ omit **και Σ.** (Tisch.), found in ℵB (W.H. bracket).

[4] Omit **την** ℵABLΔ, etc.

[5] **ηδυνασθη** in ℵB (Tisch., W.H.). **-ηθη** DΔ (Trg., R.V.).

[6] **αλλ' ευθυς** before **ακουσασα** instead of **γαρ** in ℵBLΔ 33.

[7] **η δε γυνη ην** in ℵBDLΔ 33.

[8] **Συραφοινικισσα** in B and many other uncials = **Συρα Φοινικισσα.**

[9] **εκβαλη** in ℵABDLΔΣ *al.*

[10] For **ο δε Ι. ειπεν** ℵBLΔ 33 have **και ελεγεν.**

21. An enumeration of the things which come out of the man, from the heart; first six plurals, **πορνεῖαι**, etc.; then six singulars, **δόλος**, etc. (ver. 22).—Ver. 23. Concluding reflection: all these bad things come out from within and defile the man. Commonplace now, what a startling originality then!

Vv. 24-30. *The Syrophenician woman* (Mt. xi. 21-28).—**ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναστὰς** points to a change from the comparatively stationary life by the shores of the lake to a period of wandering in unwonted scenes. *Cf.* x. 1, where **ἀναστὰς** is used in reference to the final departure from Galilee to the south. The **δὲ**, instead of the more usual **καὶ**, emphasises this change.—**εἰς τὰ ὅρια Τ.**, not *towards* (Fritzsche), but *into* the borders of Tyre. There can be no doubt that in Mk.'s narrative Jesus crosses into heathen territory (*cf.* ver. 31). In view of the several unsuccessful attempts made by Jesus to escape from the crowd into quiet and leisure, so carefully indicated by Mk., this almost goes without saying. Failing within Jewish territory, He is forced to go without, in hope to get some uninterrupted leisure for confidential intercourse with the Twelve, rendered all the more urgent by scenes like that just considered, which too plainly show that His time will be short.—**εἰς οἰκίαν**, into a house, considering Christ's desire for privacy, more likely to be that of a heathen stranger (Weiss) than that of a friend (Meyer, Keil).—**οὐδένα ἤθελε γνῶναι**, He wished no one to know (He was there); to know no one (Fritzsche), comes to the same thing: desires to be private, not weary of well-doing, but anxious to do other work hitherto much hindered.—**οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη λαθεῖν**, He was not able to escape notice; not even here!—Ver. 25. **εὐθὺς**: does not imply that the woman heard of Christ's arrival as soon as it happened, but that, after hearing, she lost no time in coming = as soon as she heard. Yet sorrow, like the demoniacs, was quick to learn of His presence.—**θυγάτριον**: another of Mk.'s diminutives.—Ver. 26. **Ἑλληνίς, Σύρα, Φοινίκισσα**, a Greek in religion, a Syrian in tongue, a Phenician in race (Euthy. Zig.). The two last epithets combined into one (**Συροφ.**) would describe her as a Syrophenician as distinct from a Phenician of Carthage. Mk. is careful to define the nationality and religion of the woman to throw light on the sequel.—Ver. 27. **ἄφες πρῶτον**, etc.: a milder word than that in Mt. (ver. 26); it is here a mere question of order: first Jews, then Gentiles, St. Paul's programme, Rom. i. 16. In Mt. we read, **οὐκ ἔστι καλὸν**, it is not right, seemly, to take the children's bread and to throw it to the dogs. Mk. also has this word, but in a subordinate place, and simply as a reason for the prior claim of the children.

χορτασθῆναι τὰ τέκνα· οὐ γὰρ καλόν ἐστι[1] λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων, καὶ βαλεῖν τοῖς κυναρίοις."[1] 28. Ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ναί, κύριε· καὶ γὰρ[2] τὰ κυνάρια ὑποκάτω τῆς τραπέζης ἐσθίει[3] ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων." 29. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Διὰ τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, ὕπαγε· ἐξελήλυθε τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκ τῆς θυγατρός σου."[4] 30. Καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς, εὗρε τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθός, καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα βεβλημένην ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης.[5]

31. ΚΑΙ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὁρίων Τύρου καὶ[6] Σιδῶνος, ἦλθε πρὸς[6] τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως. 32. καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν μογιλάλον,[7] καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν

[1] **εστι καλον** in ℵBDLΔ and **βαλειν** after **τοις κυν.** in ℵB.

[2] **γαρ** omitted in ℵBD 33. It comes from Mt.

[3] **εσθιει** a grammatical correction for **εσθιουσιν** in ℵBDLΔ *al.*

[4] ℵBLΔ have **το δαιμ.** after **εκ της θυγ. σου.**

[5] ℵBLΔ invert the order of the facts, **το δαιμ. εξελ.** at the end. The order in T.R. is due to the feeling that it was more natural: cure first, quiet resting in bed following. For **τ. θυγ. βεβλημενην** ℵBLΔ 33 have **το παιδιον βεβλημενον** (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] **ηλθε δια Σιδωνος εις** in ℵBDLΔ.

[7] ℵBDΔ have **και** before **μογιλαλον.**

We note also that Mk., usually so full in his narratives compared with Mt., omits the intercession of the Twelve with Christ's reply (Mt. vv. 23, 24). Yet Mk.'s, "first the children," is really equivalent to "I am not sent," etc. The former implies: "your turn will come"; the latter: "to minister to you is not *my* vocation". This word, preserved in Mt., becomes less harsh when looked at in the light of Christ's desire for quiet, not mentioned in Mt. Jesus made the most of the fact that His commission was to Jews. It has been thought that, in comparison with Mt., Mk.'s report of Christ's words is secondary, adapted purposely to Gentile readers. Probably that is the case, but, on the other hand, he gives us a far clearer view of the extent and aim of the excursion to the North, concerning which Mt. has, and gives, no adequate conception.—Ver. 28. **ἀπεκρίθη**, aorist, hitherto imperfect. We come now to what Mk. deems the main point of the story, the woman's striking word.— **ὑποκάτω τ. τραπ.**, the dogs *under the table*, waiting for morsels, a realistic touch.—**τῶν ψιχίων τ. π.**, not merely the crumbs which by chance fall from the table, but morsels surreptitiously dropt by the children ("qui panem saepe prodigunt," Beng.) to their pets. Household dogs, part of the family, loved by the children; hard and fast line of separation impossible.—Ver. 29. **διὰ τ. τ. λόγον**, for this *word*, which showed the quick wit of the *faith*, which Mt. specifies as the reason of the exception made in her favour.—Ver. 30. **βεβλημένον**: the emphasis lies on this word rather than on **παιδίον** (Bengel), as expressing the condition in which the mother found her daughter: lying *quietly* ("in lecto molliter cubantem sine ullâ jactatione," Grotius).

It is probable that this interesting incident cannot be fully understood without taking into consideration circumstances not mentioned in the narratives, and which, therefore, it does not fall to the expositor to refer to. On this *vide* my book, *With Open Face*, chap. vii.

Vv. 31-37. *Cure of a deaf-mute*, peculiar to Mk. Mt. has, instead, a renewal of the healing ministry on an extensive scale, the thing Jesus desired to avoid (xv. 29-31).—Ver. 31. After the instructive episode Jesus continued His journey, going northwards through (**διὰ**, *vide* critical notes) Sidon, then making a circuit so as to arrive through Decapolis at the Sea of Galilee. The route is not more definitely indicated; perhaps it was along the highway over the Lebanon range to Damascus; it may conceivably have touched that ancient city, which, according to Pliny (*H. N.*, v., 16), was included in Decapolis (*vide* Holtz., H. C., and Schürer, Div., ii., vol. i., p. 95).—Ver. 32. **μογιλάλον**, speaking with difficulty; but here for

ἵνα ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα. 33. καὶ ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ' ἰδίαν, ἔβαλε τοὺς δακτύλους αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ, καὶ [k] πτύσας ἥψατο τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, 34. καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐστέναξε, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ἐφφαθά," ὅ ἐστι, "Διανοίχθητι." 35. Καὶ εὐθέως[1] διηνοίχθησαν[2] αὐτοῦ αἱ [l] ἀκοαί· καὶ ἐλύθη ὁ δεσμὸς τῆς γλώσσης αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς. 36. καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν[3]· ὅσον δὲ αὐτὸς[4] αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο, μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον· 37. καὶ [m] ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο, λέγοντες, "Καλῶς πάντα πεποίηκε· καὶ τοὺς κωφοὺς [n] ποιεῖ ἀκούειν, καὶ τοὺς[5] ἀλάλους λαλεῖν."

k Ch. viii. 23. John ix. 6.
l Lk. vii. 1. Acts xvii. 20. Heb. v. 11 (pl. = organs of hearing).
m cf. the verb in Rom. v. 20 and ὑπερεκ- in 1 Thess. v. 13.
n const. Ch. i. 17. Acts iii. 12.

[1] **ευθεως** is omitted here in ℵBDL 33 and inserted before **ελυθη** in ℵLΔ; wanting here also in BD *it.* (W.H. omit both).

[2] **ηνοιγησαν** in ℵBDL. T.R. assimilates to ver. 34. [3] **λεγωσιν** in ℵBL 33.

[4] ℵBLΔ omit **αυτος** and insert an **αυτοι** before **μαλλον** (Tisch., W.H.). The T.R. is an attempt at improving the style.

[5] **τους** omit ℵBLΔ 33.

dumb. *Cf.* **ἀλάλους**, ver. 37, used in Sept., Is. xxxv. 6, for אִלֵּם, dumb, here only in N.T.—Ver. 33. **ἀπολαβόμενος**, etc., withdrawing him from the crowd apart. Many reasons have been assigned for this procedure. The true reason, doubtless, is that Jesus did not wish to be drawn into a new ministry of healing on a large scale (Weiss, Schanz).—**ἔβαλε τοὺς δακτύλους**, etc.: one finger of the right hand into one ear, another of the left hand into the other, on account of the narrowness and depth of the hearing faculty, that He might touch it (**διὰ τὸ στενὸν καὶ βαθὺ τῆς ἀκοῆς ἵνα θίξῃ ταύτης**, Euthy. Zig.). Deafness is first dealt with; it was the primary evil. —**πτύσας**, spitting; on what, the tongue of the dumb man as on the eyes of the blind (viii. 23)? So Meyer. Or on His own finger, with which He then touched the tongue? So Weiss, Schanz, Kloster., Holtz. (H. C.), Keil. Mk. leaves us hear to our own conjectures, as also in reference to the import of these singular acts of Jesus. Probably they were meant to rouse interest and aid faith in the dull soul of the sufferer. (*Vide* Trench, *Notes on the Miracles*.)

Ver. 34. **ἀναβλέψας, ἐστέναξε**: Jesus looked up in prayer, and sighed or groaned in sympathy. In this case a number of acts, bodily and mental, are specified. Were these peculiar to it, or do we here get a glimpse into Christ's *modus operandi* in many unrecorded cases? On the latter view one can understand the exhausting nature of the healing ministry. It meant a great mental strain.—**ἐφφαθά**, an Aramaic word = as Mk. explains, **διανοίχθητι**; doubtless the word actually spoken = Be opened, in reference to the ears, though the loosing of the tongue was part of the result ensuing.—Ver. 35. **αἱ ἀκοαί**, literally, the hearings, here the instruments of hearing, the ears. So often in classics.—**ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς**, he began to speak in a proper or ordinary manner, implying that in his dumb condition he had been able only to make inarticulate sounds.—Ver. 36. **μᾶλλον περισσότερον**, a double comparative, forcibly rendered in A.V., "So much the more, a great deal". *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 13. This use of **μᾶλλον** to strengthen comparatives is found in classics, instances in Raphel, *Annon.*, *ad loc.*, and Hermann's *Viger*, p. 719.—Ver. 37. **ὑπερπερισσῶς**, superabundantly, a double superlative; here only.—**καλῶς π. πεποίηκε**, He hath done all things well. This looks like a reflection on past as well as present; the story of the demoniac, *e.g.* Observe the **ποιεῖ**, present, in next clause, referring to the cure just effected. It happened in *Decapolis*, and we seem to see the inhabitants of that region exhibiting a nobler mood than in chap. v. 17. Of course, there were no swine lost on this occasion. Their astonishment at the miracle may seem extravagant, but it must be remembered that they have had little experience of Christ's healing work; their own fault.

VIII. 1. ᾿ΕΝ ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, παμπόλλου[1] ὄχλου ὄντος, καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων τί φάγωσι, προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς[2] τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγει αὐτοῖς, 2. "Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον· ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέρας[3] τρεῖς προσμένουσί μοι, καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσι τί φάγωσι· 3. καὶ ἐὰν ἀπολύσω αὐτοὺς νήστεις εἰς οἶκον αὐτῶν, ἐκλυθήσονται ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ· τινὲς γὰρ αὐτῶν μακρόθεν ἥκασι."[4] 4. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, "Πόθεν[5] τούτους δυνήσεταί τις ὧδε χορτάσαι ἄρτων ἐπ' ἐρημίας;" 5. Καὶ ἐπηρώτα[6] αὐτούς, "Πόσους ἔχετε ἄρτους;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Ἑπτά." 6. Καὶ παρήγγειλε[7] τῷ ὄχλῳ ἀναπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους, εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραθῶσι[8] καὶ παρέθηκαν τῷ

[1] παλιν πολλου in ℵBDLΔΣ 33. παμπολλου is a conjectural emendation suggested by the fact of a great crowd, and perplexity caused by παλιν here as in vii. 14.

[2] ℵABDLΔΣ 33 it. vulg. cop. omit ο Ιησους, also ℵDLΔΣ omit αυτου after μαθητας.

[3] ημερας = a grammatical correction for ημεραι (ℵL, etc.), or ημεραις τρισιν in B.

[4] For τινες γαρ . . . ηκασι read και τινες (ℵBLΔ) αυτων απο μακροθεν (ℵBDLΔ), εισιν (BLΔ).

[5] οτι before ποθεν in BLΔ.

[6] ηρωτα in ℵBLΔ.

[7] παραγγελλει in ℵBDLΔ.

[8] παρατιθωσιν in ℵBCLΔ 33.

Chapter VIII. Second Feeding. Sign from Heaven. Cure at Bethsaida. Caesarea Philippi.—Vv. 1-10. *Second feeding* (Mt. xv. 32-39).—Ver. 1. ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις: a vague phrase, used only once again in this Gospel (i. 9, in reference to Jesus going from Nazareth to be baptised), indicating inability to assign to the following incident a precise historical place. *Cf.* Mt. iii. 1 for similar vague use of the expression.—πάλιν πολλοῦ ὄ. ὄ. This well-attested reading is another indication of the evangelist's helplessness as to historical connection: there being *again* a great crowd. Why? where? not indicated, and we are not entitled to assert that the scene of the event was Decapolis, and the occasion the healing of the deaf-mute. The story is in the air, and this is one of the facts that have to be reckoned with by defenders of the reality of the second feeding against those who maintain that it is only a literary duplicate of the first, due to the circumstance that the Petrine version of it differed in some particulars from that in the *Logia* of Matthew. On this subject I do not dogmatise, but I cannot pretend to be insensible to the difficulties connected with it.—ὄχλου, a great *crowd again*. How often the crowd figures in the evangelic story! It is the one monotonous feature in narratives of thrilling interest.—Ver. 2. *Vide* on Mt. xv. 32.—Ver. 3. ἐκλυθήσονται, they will faint. This verb is used in N. T. in middle or passive in the sense of being faint or weary in body or mind (Gal. vi. 9, Heb. xii. 3).—καί τινες . . . εἰσίν, and some of them are from a distance, peculiar to Mark. The meaning is that such, even if in vigour at starting, would be exhausted before reaching their destination. But could they not get food by the way?—Ver. 4. πόθεν, whence. This adverb was used by the Greeks, in speaking of food, in reference to the source of supply—πόθεν φάγητε = "unde cibum petituri sitis". Examples in Kypke, Raphel, Palairet.—ἐπ' ἐρημίας, in a desert. The scene of the first feeding is a desert place also (chap. vi. 32). But in that case food was purchasable within a reasonable distance; not so here.—Ver. 6. Compare the meagre statement here with the picturesque description in vi. 38-40. The evangelist seems to lack interest in the twice-told tale. Ver. 7. ἰχθύδια: another of Mark's diminutives, but Matthew has it also (xv. 34), copied

ὄχλῳ. 7. καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα· καὶ εὐλογήσας εἶπε παραθεῖναι καὶ αὐτά."[1] 8. ἔφαγον δέ,[2] καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν· καὶ ἦραν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, ἑπτὰ σπυρίδας. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ φαγόντες[3] ὡς τετρακισχίλιοι· 9. καὶ ἀπέλυσεν αὐτούς.

10. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά. 11. καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, καὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν αὐτῷ, ζητοῦντες παρ' αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πειράζοντες αὐτόν. 12. καὶ ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει, "Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ[4]; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,[5] εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον." 13. Καὶ ἀφεὶς αὐτούς, ἐμβὰς πάλιν[6] εἰς τὸ πλοῖον,[6] ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πέραν.

14. Καὶ ἐπελάθοντο λαβεῖν ἄρτους, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἕνα ἄρτον οὐκ εἶχον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ. 15. καὶ διεστέλλετο αὐτοῖς, λέγων,

[1] Read και ευλογησας αυτα ειπεν και ταυτα παρατιθεναι (ℵBLΔ).

[2] και εφαγον in ℵBCDLΔ.

[3] Omit οι φαγ. ℵBLΔ 33.

[4] ζητει σημειον in ℵBCDLΔ 33.

[5] BL omit υμιν (W.H. put in margin).

[6] Read παλιν εμβας, and omit εις το πλ. (ℵBCLΔ, Tisch., W.H.).

probably from Mark. In these two places only.—Ver. 8. περισσεύματα κλασμάτων, the remainders of the broken pieces. Matthew uses the singular neuter, τὸ περισσεῦον, in both feedings.—σπυρίδας: in both accounts of second feeding, κοφίνους in both accounts of first (κόφινοι in Luke). On the difference in meaning, *vide* notes on Mt. xiv. 20.—Ver. 10. Here as in case of first feeding there is a crossing of the lake immediately after (εὐθὺς, which has an obvious reason in first case). This time Jesus and the Twelve enter the boat together, at least in Mark's narrative (μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν).—Δαλμανουθά, in Matthew Μαγαδάν; both alike unknown: another of the features in this narrative which give a handle to critical doubt. Some place it on the western shore in the plain of Gennesaret (Furrer, "On the site of Khan Minyeh lay once Dalmanutha," *Wanderungen*, p. 369); others to the south-east of the lake near the junction of the Yarmuk with the Jordan (Delhemiyeh, Robinson, B. R., iii. 264). Weiss (in Meyer) adopts this view. Holtzmann (H. C.), while leaning to the former alternative, leaves the matter doubtful.

Vv. 11-12. *Pharisees seek a sign* (Mt. xii. 1-4).—Ver. 11. ἐξῆλθον οἱ Φ., the Pharisees went out, from their seat in the Holy Land into the heathen Decapolis, otherwise carefully shunned, in their zeal against Jesus. So Weiss (in Meyer).—Ver. 12. ἀναστενάξας, fetching a deep sigh, here only in N. T.; in Sept., Lament. i. 4, Sirach. xxv. 18, etc.—τῷ πνεύματι α., in His spirit. The sigh physical, its cause spiritual—a sense of irreconcilable enmity, invincible unbelief, and coming doom.—εἰ δοθήσεται, if there shall be given = there shall not (οὐ) be given a Hebraistic form of emphatic negative assertion. The suppressed apodosis is: may I die, or God punish me. Other instances in Heb. iii. 11, iv. 3, 5. In Mark there is an absolute refusal of a sign. In Matthew the refusal is qualified by offer of Jonah. But that was an absolute refusal of signs *in their sense*.

Vv. 13-21. *Warning against evil leavens* (Mt. xvi. 4b-12).—Ver. 13. εἰς τὸ πέραν, to the other side; which, east or west? Here again opinion is divided. The reference to Bethsaida, ver. 22, might be expected to decide, but then there is the dispute about the *two* Bethsaidas; Bethsaida Julias, and Bethsaida on the western shore. These points are among the obscurities of the Synoptical narratives which we are reluctantly compelled to leave in twilight.—Ver. 14. εἰ μὴ ἕνα ἄρτον: a curiously exact reminiscence where so much else that seems to us more important is left vague. But it shows that we have to do with reality, for the suggestion of the Tübingen critics that it is a mere bit o word painting is not credible. The one loaf seems to witness to a Christ-like

"Ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῆς ζύμης Ἡρώδου." 16. Καὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους, λέγοντες,[1] "Ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχομεν."[2] 17. Καὶ γνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς[3] λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Τί διαλογίζεσθε, ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὔπω νοεῖτε, οὐδὲ συνίετε; ἔτι[4] πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; 18. ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντες οὐ βλέπετε; καὶ ὦτα ἔχοντες οὐκ ἀκούετε; καὶ οὐ μνημονεύετε; 19. ὅτε τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς τοὺς πεντακισχιλίους, πόσους κοφίνους πλήρεις κλασμάτων[5] ἤρατε;" Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Δώδεκα." 20. "Ὅτε δὲ τοὺς ἑπτὰ εἰς τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους, πόσων σπυρίδων πληρώματα κλασμάτων ἤρατε;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον,[6] "Ἑπτά." 21. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Πῶς οὐ[7] συνίετε;"

22. ΚΑΙ ἔρχεται[8] εἰς Βηθσαϊδάν· καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ τυφλόν, καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα αὐτοῦ ἅψηται. 23. καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος τῆς

[1] Omit λεγοντες (an explanatory word used) ℵBD.

[2] B has εχουσιν, adopted by Trg. (text). W.H., Ws., Tisch., and R.V. retain εχομεν.

[3] Omit ο Ι. BΔ.

[4] ℵBCDLΔΣ omit ετι.

[5] κλασματων πληρεις in ℵBCLΔ 33.

[6] και λεγουσιν in ℵBCLΔ.

[7] B has πως ου νοειτε. πως ου is to be preferred to ουπω (ℵCLΔ) or πως ουπω (D), as expressive of vexation. Tisch. and W.H. adopt ουπω.

[8] ερχονται in BCDLΔ. The sing. (T.R.) is an adaptation to αυτω.

easymindedness as to food in the disciple-circle. Let to-morrow look after itself!—Ver. 15. ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης, etc.: *two* leavens, one of Pharisees, another of Herod, yet placed together because morally akin and coincident in practical outcome. *Vide* notes on Mt. xvi. 1-6.—Ver. 16. πρὸς ἀλλήλους. Mt. has ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. The mind of Jesus was profoundly preoccupied with the ominous demand of the sign-seekers, and the disciples might talk quietly to each other unnoticed by Him.—Ver. 17. γνοὺς: He does notice, however, and administers a sharp rebuke for *their* preoccupation with mere temporalities, as if there were nothing higher to be thought of than *bread*.—πεπωρωμένην, in a hardened state; the word stands in an emphatic position. For the time the Twelve are wayside hearers, with hearts like a beaten path, into which the higher truths cannot sink so as to germinate.—Ver. 18 repeats in reference to the Twelve the hard saying uttered concerning the multitude on the day of the parables (iv. 12). In vv. 19, 20 Jesus puts the Twelve through their catechism in reference to the recent feedings, and then in ver. 21 (according to reading in B) asks in the tone of a disappointed Master: How do you not understand? If we may emphasise the imperfect tense of ἔλεγεν, He said this over and over again, half speaking to them, half to Himself; another of Mk.'s realistic features. All this shows how much the Twelve needed special instruction, and it is obviously Mk.'s aim to make this prominent. Desire for leisure to attend to their instruction is in his narrative the key to the excursions in the direction of Tyre and Sidon and to Caesarea Philippi.

Vv. 22-26. *A blind man cured at Bethsaida*, peculiar to Mk.—Ver. 22. Βηθσαϊδάν. If there were two Bethsaidas, which of the two? If only one of course it was Bethsaida Julias. But against this has been cited the term κώμη twice applied to the town (vv. 23, 26), which, however, may be regarded as satisfactorily explained by the remark: it *had been* a village, and was first made a town by Philip, who enlarged and beautified it and called it Julias in honour of the daughter of Augustus (Joseph., B. J., ii., 9, 1, etc.). So Meyer and others.—Ver. 23. ἔξω τῆς κώμης, outside the village, for the same reason as in vii. 33, to avoid creating a run on Him for cures. Therefore Jesus becomes

χειρὸς τοῦ τυφλοῦ, ἐξήγαγεν[1] αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς κώμης· καὶ πτύσας εἰς τὰ ὄμματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ, ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν εἴ τι βλέπει.[2] 24. καὶ ἀναβλέψας ἔλεγε, "Βλέπω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅτι ὡς δένδρα ὁρῶ περιπατοῦντας." 25. Εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκε[3] τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἀναβλέψαι[4]· καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη,[5] καὶ ἐνέβλεψε[6] τηλαυγῶς[7] ἅπαντας.[8] 26. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν[9] οἶκον αὐτοῦ, λέγων, "Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς, μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινὶ ἐν τῇ κώμῃ."[10]

27. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου· καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγων αὐτοῖς, "Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;"

[1] **εξηνεγκεν** in ℵBCLΔ, replaced in T.R. by a more common word.
[2] **βλεπεις** in BCDΔ (W.H. text) more expressive than **βλεπει** (ℵL, Tisch.).
[3] **εθηκεν** in BL (W.H.).
[4] For the explanatory gloss **και επ. α. αναβλεψαι** ℵBCLΔ Cop. have **και διεβλεψεν**.
[5] **απεκατεστη** in ℵBCLΔ (B **αποκ.**).
[6] **ενεβλεπεν** (imp.) BLΔ.
[7] ℵCLΔ have **δηλαυγως** (Tisch.). **τηλ.** in BD (W.H. text, **δηλ.** margin).
[8] **απαντα** in ℵBCDLΔ.
[9] Omit **τον** many uncials.
[10] All after **εισελθης** omit ℵBL.

conductor of the blind man Himself, though he doubtless had one (Weiss-Meyer).—**πτύσας**, spitting, in this case certainly on the diseased parts. Spittle was regarded as a means of cure by the ancients. Holtzmann (H. C.) cites the story of Vespasian in Alexandria narrated by Tacitus (*Hist.*, iv., 81). The prince was asked to sprinkle the eyes of a blind man "oris excremento".—**εἴ τι βλέπεις**, do you, possibly, see anything? **εἰ** with a direct question, *vide* Winer, lvii., 2.—Ver. 24. **ἀναβλέψας**: the narrative contains three compounds of **βλέπω** (**ἀνὰ, διὰ, ἐν**); the first denotes looking up in the tentative manner of blind men, the second looking through (a mist as it were) so as to see clearly, the third looking into so as to see distinctly, as one sees the exact outlines of a near object (*cf.* Mk. xiv. 67).—**ὡς δένδρα**, as trees, so indistinct was vision as yet; yet not trees, but men because *moving* ("non arbores, quia ambulent," Bengel). He knew what a man is like, therefore he had once seen, not born blind. —Ver. 25. A second touch brings better vision, so that **διέβλεψεν**, and he was now restored to full use of his eyes; the result being permanent perfect vision—**ἐνέβλεπεν**, imperfect.—**διέβλεψεν** points to the first act of distinct seeing.—**τηλαυγῶς** (**τῆλε αὐγή** here only), shining from afar. He saw distant objects distinctly as if they were near; did not need to go near them to see them.—Ver. 26. **εἰς οἶκον**, home.—**μηδὲ**, etc., go not into the village; to avoid creating a sensation. It has been suggested that the gradual restoration of sight in this case was meant to symbolise the slowness of the Twelve in attaining spiritual insight. They got their eyes opened very gradually like the blind man of Bethsaida. So Klostermann.

Vv. 27-ix. 1. *At Caesarea Philippi* (Mt. xvi. 13-28, Lk. ix. 18-27).—Ver. 27. **καὶ ἐξῆλθεν**: the **καὶ** connects very loosely with what goes before, but presumably **ἐξῆλθεν** refers to Bethsaida. They leave it and go northwards towards Caesarea Philippi, up the Jordan valley, a distance of some twenty-five or thirty miles.—**ὁ Ἰησοῦς**: that Jesus is here expressly named is a hint that something very important is to be narrated, and the mention of the disciples along with Him indicates that it closely concerns them.—**εἰς τὰς κώμας Κ. τ. Φ.**, to the *villages* of Caesarea Philippi, not to Caesarea Philippi itself. Mt. has **τὰ μέρη**. Apparently they did not enter the city itself. Jesus seems to have avoided the towns in which the Herodian passion for ambitious architecture was displayed. Besides at this time He

28. Οἱ δὲ ἀπεκρίθησαν,[1] "Ἰωάννην[2] τὸν Βαπτιστήν· καὶ ἄλλοι Ἠλίαν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἕνα[3] τῶν προφητῶν." 29. Καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει αὐτοῖς,[4] "Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι;" Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ[5] ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός." 30. Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσι περὶ αὐτοῦ.

31. ΚΑΙ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτούς, ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ[6] τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι, καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι· 32. καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει. Καὶ

[1] ειπαν αυτω λεγοντες in ℵBCLD (D has απεκ. αυτω λεγ.).
[2] οτι before Ι. in ℵB.
[3] For ενα ℵBCL have οτι εις.
[4] επηρωτα αυτους in ℵBCDLΔ.
[5] Omit δε BL (Tisch., W.H.).
[6] υπο in ℵBCDL; with των before αρχ. (ℵBCD), and before γραμ. (ℵBCDL).

desired solitude.—ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, on the way, probably when the city of Caesarea Philippi came into view. *Vide* on Mt. xvi. 13. But conversation leading up to the critical subject might begin as soon as they had got clear of Bethsaida. No time to be lost now that the Master had got the Twelve by themselves. Or was the Master, very silent on that journey, preparing His own mind for what was coming?—ἐπηρώτα, imperfect, because subordinate to the reply of the disciples, the main thing.—τίνα με, etc.: on the form of the question *vide* on Mt. xvi. 13. —Ver. 28. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν α. λέγοντες, they said, saying, tautology, somewhat like the vulgar English idiom: He said, says he; fixing attention on what is said.—Ἰωάννην τ. Β.: the accusative depending on λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποί σε εἶναι understood. This infinitive construction passes into direct speech in the last clause: ὅτι εἷς (εἶ) τ. προφητῶν. The opinions reported are much the same as in vi. 14, 15.—Ver. 29. ὑμεῖς δὲ, etc.: a very pointed question given by all the Synoptists in the same terms. The reply, on the other hand, is different in each. *Vide* on Mt. xvi. 16.—ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει: we have here an aorist participle of identical action with a finite verb in the *present* tense. It usually goes with the aorist (*cf.* Mt. xvi. 17, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν).—Ver. 30. ἐπετίμησεν, He threatened them, spoke in a tone of menace, as if anticipating foolish talk—περὶ αὐτοῦ—about Him, *i.e.*, about His being the Christ, as in Mt. The prohibition might have a double reference: to the people, to prevent the spread of crude ideas as to the Messiahship of Jesus; to the disciples, that they might keep the new faith to themselves till it took deep root in their own souls. Recall Carlyle's counsel to young men: if thou hast an idea keep it to thyself, for as soon as thou hast spoken it it is dead to thee (*Stump Orator* in *Latter Day Pamphlets*).

Vv. 31-33. *First announcement of the Passion.*—Ver. 31. καὶ: Mt. has the more emphatic ἀπὸ τότε, indicating that then began an entirely new way of speaking as to the coming fate of Jesus. —διδάσκειν, to *teach*, more appropriate is Mt.'s word, δεικνύειν, to *show*. It was a solemn intimation rather than instruction that was given.—δεῖ, it must be; in all three evangelists. It points to the inevitableness of the event, not to the rationale of it. On that subject Jesus gave in the first place no instruction.—πολλὰ παθεῖν: where not indicated, as in Mt.—ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι: an expressive word taken from Ps. cxviii. 22, fitly indicating the precise share of the religious authorities in the coming tragedy. Their part was solemnly to disapprove of the claimant to Messiahship. All else was the natural sequel of their act of rejection.—τῶν πρ., τῶν ἀρ., τῶν γρ.: the article before each of the three classes named, saddling each with its separate responsibility.—Ver. 32. παρρησίᾳ: He spoke the word *plainly*, unmistakably. This remark was rendered almost necessary by the choice of the word διδάσκειν in ver. 31. Mt.'s δεικνύειν implies παρρησίᾳ. This word (from πᾶς, ῥῆσις) in ordinary Greek usage means frank, unreserved speech, as opposed to partial or total silence. Here,

προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος[1] ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾷν αὐτῷ. 33. ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς, καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, ἐπετίμησε τῷ[2] Πέτρῳ, λέγων,[3] "Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων."

34. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅστις[4] θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. 35. ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν. ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ[5] τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὗτος[6] σώσει αὐτήν. 36. τί γὰρ ὠφελήσει[7] ἄνθρωπον, ἐὰν κερδήσῃ[8] τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, καὶ ζημιωθῇ[8] τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; 37. ἢ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος[9] ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ; 38. ὃς γὰρ ἂν [o]ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται αὐτόν, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν ἁγίων."

o Lk. ix. 26. Rom. i. 16. 2 Tim. i. 8, 16.

[1] ο Π. αυτον in BL.
[2] Omit τω ℵBDL.
[3] και λεγει in ℵBCLΔ.
[4] ει τις in ℵBCDLΔ (W.H.).
[5] απολεσει in ℵBCΔ *al.*; a mechanical conformation to the preceding απολεσει, thinks Weiss.
[6] ουτος (from Lk.) omit ℵABCDLΔ verss.
[7] ωφελει in ℵBL.
[8] κηρδηση ζημιωθη come from Mt.; read κηρδησαι ζημιωθηναι with ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.), of course omitting εαν.
[9] η τι δωσει αν. is another conformation to Mt., read τι γαρ δοι α. with ℵB (Tisch., W.H.).

as in John xi. 14, xvi. 25, 29, it means plain speech as opposed to hints or veiled allusions, such as Jesus had previously given; as in Mk. ii. 20 (bridegroom taken away). In this sense St. Paul (2 Cor. iii. 12) claims παρρησία for the Christian ministry in contrast to the mystery connected with the legal dispensation as symbolised by the veil of Moses. The term was adopted into the Rabbinical vocabulary, and used to signify unveiled speech as opposed to metaphorical or parabolic speech (Wünsche, *Beiträge*, *ad loc.*).—προσλαβόμενος ὁ Π.: what Peter said is not given, Mk's aim being simply to show that Jesus had so spoken that misunderstanding of what He said was impossible. That the news should be unwelcome is regarded as a matter of course.—Ver. 33. ἐπιστραφεὶς: the compound instead of the simple verb in Mt., which Mk. does not use.—ἰδὼν τ. μαθ.: the rebuke is administered for the benefit of all, not merely to put down Peter. This resistance to the cross must be grappled with at once and decisively. What Peter said, all *felt*. In Mk.'s report of the rebuke the words σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ are omitted. On the saying *vide* in Mt.

Vv. 34-38. *First lesson on the cross.*—Ver. 34. τὸν ὄχλον, the crowd. Even here! A surprise; is it not a mistake? So appears to think Weiss, who (in Meyer) accounts for the reference to a crowd by supposing that the words of Mt. x. 38 are in his mind, which are given in Lk. xiv. 25 as spoken to a crowd, probably because they were so given in his source. Jesus certainly desired to be private at this time, and in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi ought to have succeeded.—Ver. 35. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου: for my sake and *the Gospel's*, an addition of Mk.'s, possibly a gloss.—σώσει, instead of the more enigmatical εὑρήσει of Mt.—Ver. 38 reproduces the *logion* in Mt. x. 33 concerning being ashamed of Jesus, which does not find a place here in Mt.'s version. In Mt.'s form it is the outward ostensible act of

IX. 1. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰσί τινες τῶν ὧδε[1] ἑστηκότων, οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει."

2. Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἓξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους· καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, 3. καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο[2] στίλβοντα, λευκὰ λίαν ὡς χιών,[3] οἷα γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται[4] λευκᾶναι. 4. καὶ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς Ἡλίας σὺν Μωσεῖ, καὶ ἦσαν συλλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 5. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ, "Ῥαββί, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι· καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνὰς τρεῖς,[5] σοὶ μίαν, καὶ Μωσεῖ μίαν, καὶ Ἡλίᾳ

[1] ωδε των in BD; των ωδε a correction of style.

[2] ℵBCΔ *al. pl.* have εγενετο as in T.R., which nevertheless is probably a correction of εγενοντο in DL to suit the neut. pl. nom.

[3] ως χιων is a gloss (Mt. xxviii. 3); not in ℵBCLΔ.

[4] ουτως follows in ℵBCLΔ, omitted as superfluous in T.R.

[5] τρεις σκηνας in ℵBCLΔ 33.

denial that is animadverted on; here the feeling of shame, which is its cause—ix. 1.—**καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς**: with this phrase Mk. makes a new start, and turns the close of the Caesarea Philippi conversation into an introduction to the following narrative concerning the transfiguration, apparently suggesting that in the latter event the words found their fulfilment. This impression, if it existed, does not bind the interpreter.—**ἀμὴν**, introducing a solemn statement.—**ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν**, etc.: the promised vision is differently described in the three accounts, as thus:—

Till they see: the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom (Mt.).

Till they see: the Kingdom of God come (**ἐληλυθυῖαν**) in power (Mk.).

Till they see: the Kingdom of God (Lk.).

CHAPTER IX. THE TRANSFIGURATION. THE EPILEPTIC. SECOND ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE PASSION. RETURN TO CAPERNAUM AND CONVERSATION THERE. —Vv. 2-13. *The transfiguration* (Mt. xvii. 1-13, Lk. ix. 28-36).—Ver. 2. **ἀναφέρει** with accusative of person = to lead, a usage unknown to the Greeks. So in Mt.; Lk. avoids the expression. —**κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους**, apart alone, a pleonasm, yet **μόνους**, in Mk. only, is not superfluous. It emphasises the **κατ' ἰδίαν**, and expresses the passion for solitude. Strictly, it refers only to the three disciples as opposed to the nine, but it really reflects the feeling of Jesus. His desire to be alone with three select companions for a season.—Ver. 3. **στίλβοντα**, glittering; here only in N. T., common in classics; in Sept. of bright brass (Ezra viii. 27); "flashing sword" (R. V., Nahum iii. 3); sunshine on shields (1 Macc. vi. 39).—**λευκὰ λίαν**, white *very*. All the evangelists become descriptive. Mk., as was to be expected, goes beyond the two others.—**ὡς χιών** (T.R.) is a tempting addition, especially if Hermon was the scene, but it so adequately expresses the highest degree of whiteness, that alongside of it **λίαν** and the following words, **οἷα**, etc., would have been superfluous.—**γναφεὺς**, a fuller, here only in N. T. (**ἀγνάφου** in ii. 21).—**ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς**, suggesting a contrast between what fullers on this earth can do in the way of whitening cloth, and the heaven-wrought brightness of Christ's garments (Schanz).—Ver. 4. **Ἡλίας συν Μ.**: Elijah first, not as the more important, but because of his special significance in connection with Messiah's advent, which was the subject of subsequent conversation (ver. 9 ff.).—Ver. 5. **Ῥαββί**, Rabbi: each evangelist has a different word here.—**καλόν**, etc. On this *vide* notes in Mt.—**ποιήσωμεν**: let *us* make, not let *me* make as in Mt. (*vide* notes there).—**σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωσεῖ**, etc.: Moses now comes before Elijah.—Ver. 6. **τί ἀποκριθῇ**, what he should answer—to the vision; he did not know

μίαν." 6. Οὐ γὰρ ᾔδει τί λαλήσῃ[1]· ἦσαν γὰρ ἔκφοβοι.[2] 7. καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη [a]ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἦλθε[3] φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης, λέγουσα,[4] "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε."[5] 8. Καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι, οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. 9. Καταβαινόντων δὲ[6] αὐτῶν ἀπὸ[7] τοῦ ὄρους, διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ διηγήσωνται ἃ εἶδον,[8] εἰ μὴ ὅταν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ. 10. καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτούς, συζητοῦντες τί ἐστι τό, ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι. 11. Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς, ὅτι Ἡλίαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον;" 12. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθείς,

a Lk. i. 35. Acts v. 15.

[1] αποκριθη in ℵBCLΔ 33.

[2] For ησαν γαρ εκ. ℵBCDLΔ have εκφοβοι γαρ εγενοντο.

[3] εγενετο again in ℵBCLΔ; ηλθε a correction of style.

[4] ℵBC *al.* omit λεγουσα (from parall.).

[5] ακουετε αυτου in ℵBCDL 33.

[6] και καταβ. in ℵBCDLΔ 33.

[7] BD 33 have εκ.

[8] α ειδον before διηγ. in ℵBCDLΔ.

what else to make of it than that Moses and Elijah had come to stay. This is probably an apologetic remark added by the evangelist to the original narrative. Lk. reproduces it in a somewhat altered form.—ἔκφοβοι: they were *frightened out of their wits* (again in Heb. xii. 21); explains the stupidity of Peter. The fear created by the sudden preternatural sight made him talk nonsense. Mt. makes the fear follow the Divine voice.—Ver. 7. καὶ ἐγένετο, before νεφέλη, and again before φωνὴ, in each place instead of Mt.'s ἰδοὺ; in both cases pointing to something remarkable: an overshadowing cloud, and a mysterious voice from the cloud.—Ver. 8. ἐξάπινα, suddenly, a form belonging to late Greek =ἐξαπίνης=ἐξαίφνης: here only in N. T.; several times in Sept. Kypke cites examples from the Psalms of Solomon and Jamblichus. The word here qualifies not περιβλεψάμενοι, but the change in the state of things which they discovered (εἶδον) on looking around.—οὐκέτι οὐδένα ἀλλὰ, etc.; no longer any one except (ἀλλὰ=εἰ μὴ after a negative).—τὸν Ἰησοῦν, etc.: Jesus alone with themselves: the whole celestial vision gone as quickly as it came.

Vv. 9-13. *Conversation during the descent*, not given in Lk.—Ver. 10. τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν, they kept the word; *i.e.*, if the verb be taken in the sense of vii. 3, 4, 8, gave heed to the Master's prohibition of speech concerning what had just happened, at least till after the resurrection—strictly complied with His wish. If we connect πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς with ἐκράτ., the meaning will be: they kept the saying to (with) themselves (A. V.), or rather, taking λόγον in the sense of "thing," they kept the *matter*—what had happened—to themselves: did not speak about it. The sense is the same in effect, but the latter is perhaps the better connection of words, as if πρὸς ἑ. were intended to go with συζητοῦντες it would more naturally have come after it.—τί ἐστι τὸ, etc.: the reference to the resurrection in the prohibition of the Master puzzled and troubled the three disciples: resurrection—His own, and soon, in our time; but that implies *death*; whereof, indeed, He lately spoke to us, but how hard to receive! Peter's resistance, sympathised with by his brethren, not yet overcome. They speak of it to one another, though not again to the Master.—Ver. 11. ὅτι λέγουσιν, etc.: this may be taken as an indirect or suggested rather than expressed question, ὅτι being recitative, as in ii. 16 = the Pharisees and scribes say, etc.,—how about that? (Weiss in Meyer), or, writing not ὅτι but ὅ, τι (neuter of ὅστις), as an instance of the use of this pronoun as an interrogative in a direct question (Meyer, Schanz, *vide* also Burton, M. and T., § 349). De Wette takes ὅτι =τί ὅτι after Beza and Grotius (who calls it one of Mk.'s Hebraisms).—Ver. 12. The construction of this sentence also is somewhat puzzling. After Ἡλίας

εἶπεν[1] αὐτοῖς, "Ἠλίας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον, ἀποκαθιστᾷ[2] πάντα· καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενωθῇ.[3] 13. ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι καὶ Ἠλίας ἐλήλυθε, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν,[4] καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν."

14. Καὶ ἐλθὼν[5] πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, εἶδεν[5] ὄχλον πολὺν περὶ αὐτούς, καὶ γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας αὐτοῖς.[6] 15. καὶ εὐθέως πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδὼν[7] αὐτόν, ἐξεθαμβήθη,[7] καὶ προστρέχοντες ἠσπάζοντο αὐτόν. 16. καὶ ἐπηρώτησε τοὺς γραμματεῖς,[8] "Τί συζητεῖτε πρὸς

[1] For **αποκ. ειπεν** ℵBCLΔ have simply **εφη**.

[2] **αποκαθιστανει** in ALΔ (**-τισ-** in B, W.H., **-τασ-** in D).

[3] *Vide* below.

[4] **ηθελον** in ℵBCDL.

[5] **ελθοντες, ειδον** in ℵBLΔ.

[6] **προς αυτους** in ℵBCLΔ.

[7] **ιδοντες, εξεθαμβηθησαν** in ℵBCLΔ (**εθαμβησαν** in D).

[8] ℵBDLΔ have **αυτους**.

comes **μὲν** in the best MSS., raising expectation of a **δὲ** in the apodosis, instead of which we have **καὶ** (**πῶς γέγραπται**). Examples of such substitution occur in classic authors; concerning which Klotz, *Devar.*, p. 659, remarks: when **καί, τέ**, or the like are put for **δὲ** after **μὲν**, it is not properly a case of construction, but rather: "quaedam quasi legitima orationis **ἀνακολουθία**". Perhaps we are at a loss from merely *reading* the words instead of hearing them spoken with a pause between first and second half of sentence, thus: Elias, indeed, coming first, restoreth all things (so teach the scribes) —and how stands it written about the Son of Man?—that He should suffer many things and be set at nought! The aim is to awaken thought in the mind of the disciples by putting together things incongruous. All things to be restored in preparation for Messiah; Messiah Himself to suffer and be set at nought: what then can the real function and fate of Elijah the restorer be? Who *is* Elijah? —**ἐξουδενηθῇ**: this form, found in BD and adopted by W.H., is rare. The verb occurs in three forms—**ἐξουδενέω, ἐξουδενόω** (T.R.), **ἐξουθενέω**; the latter two in more common use. The word in any form is late Greek. *Vide* Grimm's *Lexicon*, and Lobeck, Phryn., p. 181 (from **ἐξ, οὐδέν** or **οὐθέν** = to treat as nought).—Ver. 13 contains Christ's own view of Elijah's coming, which differs both from that of the scribes and from that of the disciples, who found it realised in the vision on the hill.—**καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν**: the reference is to the persecution of Elijah by Jezebel, the obvious intention being to suggest the identification of the expected prophet with the *Baptist*. All pointing to one conclusion —suffering the appointed lot of the faithful servants of God in this evil world: Elijah, John, Jesus. That, *the* lesson Jesus wished by all means to inculcate: the **δεῖ πολλὰ παθεῖν**, now, and henceforth, to the end.

Vv. 14-29. *The epileptic boy* (Mt. xvii. 14-21, Lk. ix. 37-43). The story is told in Mark with much greater fulness than in the parallels.—Ver. 14. **ὄχλον πολὺν**: the great crowd and the fact that the disciples at the foot of the hill, the nine, had been asked to heal the sufferer, are in favour of the view that the scene of the transfiguration was less remote than Hermon from the familiar theatre of the healing ministry of Jesus and His disciples.—**γραμματεῖς συζητοῦντας π. α.**, scribes wrangling with them, the nine. This is peculiar to Mark, but the situation is easily conceivable: the disciples have tried to heal the boy and failed (ver. 18); the scribes, delighted with the failure, taunt them with it, and suggest by way of explanation the waning power of the Master, whose name they had vainly attempted to conjure with. The baffled nine make the best defence they can, or perhaps listen in silence.—Ver. 15. **ἐξεθαμβήθησαν**, were utterly amazed, used by Mark only in N. T., here, and in xiv. 33 and xvi. 5 in connections which demand a very strong sense. What was there in common in the three situations: the returned Master, the agony in the garden, and the appearance of the angel at the resurrection? A surprise; which, whether sorrowful or joyful, always gives a certain emotional shock. The Master

αὐτούς;" 17. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς[1] εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου, εἶπε,[1] "Διδάσκαλε, ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου πρός σε, ἔχοντα πνεῦμα [b] ἄλαλον. 18. καὶ ὅπου ἂν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ, ῥήσσει αὐτόν· καὶ [c] ἀφρίζει, καὶ [d] τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας αὐτοῦ,[2] καὶ [e] ξηραίνεται· καὶ εἶπον τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσι, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν." 19. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ,[3] λέγει, "[f] Ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος, ἕως πότε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔσομαι; [f] ἕως πότε ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; φέρετε αὐτὸν πρός με." 20. Καὶ ἤνεγκαν αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτόν· καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν, εὐθέως τὸ πνεῦμα ἐσπάραξεν[4] αὐτόν· καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἐκυλίετο ἀφρίζων. 21. Καὶ ἐπηρώτησε τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, "Πόσος χρόνος ἐστίν, ὡς τοῦτο γέγονεν αὐτῷ;" Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Παιδιόθεν.[5] 22. καὶ πολλάκις αὐτὸν καὶ εἰς πῦρ[6] ἔβαλε καὶ εἰς ὕδατα, ἵνα ἀπολέσῃ αὐτόν· ἀλλ' εἴ τι δύνασαι,[7]

b Ch. vii. 37.
c here and ver. 20.
d here only.
e Ch. iii. 1.
f parall. John x. 24. Rev. vi. 10 (ἕως πότε).

[1] απεκριθη αυτω without ειπε in ℵBDLΔ 33.
[2] Omit αυτου ℵBCDLΔ 33.
[3] αυτοις in ℵABDLΔ 33.
[4] το πν. ευθυς συνεσπαραξεν in ℵBCLΔ 33.
[5] εκ παιδ. in ℵBCLΔ 33.
[6] αυτον after και εις πυρ in ℵBCLΔ.
[7] δυνη in ℵBDLΔ.

reappears, when He is not looked for, when He is needed, and when His name is being taken in vain, perhaps not without a certain sympathy on the part of the volatile crowd not accustomed hitherto to miscarriage of attempts at healing when the name of Jesus was invoked. In that case their feeling would be a compound of confusion and gladness—ashamed and yet delighted to see Him, both betrayed in their manner.—Ver. 16. **ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς**, He asked them, *i.e.*, the people who in numbers ran to meet Him. Jesus had noticed, as He drew near, that there was a dispute going on in which the disciples were concerned, and not knowing the composition of the crowd, He proceeds on the assumption that they had all a share in it = the crowd as a whole *versus* the nine.—Ver. 17. The father of the sick boy answers for the company, explaining the situation, laying the main stress of course on the deplorable condition of his child.—**πρὸς σέ**, to *thee*, not aware that Jesus was absent.—**πνεῦμα ἄλαλον**, a dumb spirit; the boy dumb, and therefore by inference the spirit.—Ver. 18. **ὅπου ἂν α. καταλάβῃ**, wherever it happens to seize him. The possession (**ἔχοντα**, ver. 17) is conceived of as intermittent; "the way of the spirit inferred from the characteristic phenomena of the disease" (*The Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, p. 181). Then follows a graphic description of the ensuing symptoms: spasms (**ῥήσσει**, a late form of **ῥήγνυμι**), foaming (**ἀφρίζει** from **ἀφρός**: he, the boy, foameth), grinding of the teeth (**τρίζει τ. ὀδ.**), then the final stage of motionless stupor graphically described as withering (**ξηραίνεται**), for which Euthy. gives as an equivalent **ἀναισθητεῖ**, and Weizsäcker "und wird *starr*".

Ver. 19. *The complaint of Jesus*, *vide* on Matthew.—Observe the **πρὸς ὑμᾶς** instead of Matthew's **μεθ' ὑμῶν**. = how long shall I be in relations with you, have to do with you?—Ver. 20. **ἰδὼν** may be taken as referring to the *boy* (Schanz), in which case we should have an anacolouthistic nominative for the accusative, the writer having in view to express his meaning in passives (**ἐκυλίετο**); or to the *spirit* (**πνεῦμα**) by a construction *ad sensum* = the spirit seeing Jesus made a last attack (Weiss in Meyer, *et al.*). This is most in keeping with the mode of conceiving the matter natural to the evangelist. The visible fact was a fresh fit, and the explanation, from the possession point of view, that the spirit, seeing Jesus, and knowing that his power was at an end, made a final assault.—Ver. 21. **ὡς**: a particle of time, here as frequently in Luke and John = since, or when.—**ἐκ παιδιόθεν**, **ἐκ** redundant, similar to **ἀπὸ μακρόθεν** (v. 6).—Ver. 22. **εἴ τι δύνῃ**, if Thou canst do anything (A. and R. Vv.), or better, if anyhow Thou canst help. The father speaks under the impression that the case, as he has just described it, is one of peculiar difficulty; therefore while the leper said

βοήθησον ἡμῖν, σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐφ' ἡμᾶς." 23. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Τό, εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῦσαι,[1] πάντα δυνατὰ τῷ πιστεύοντι." 24. Καὶ[2] εὐθέως κράξας ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ παιδίου, μετὰ δακρύων[3] ἔλεγε, "Πιστεύω, Κύριε,[4] βοήθει μου τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ." 25. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐπισυντρέχει ὄχλος, ἐπετίμησε τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ, λέγων αὐτῷ, "Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφόν,[5] ἐγώ σοι ἐπιτάσσω,[5] ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς εἰς αὐτόν." 26. Καὶ κράξαν, καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξαν αὐτόν,[6] ἐξῆλθε· καὶ ἐγένετο ὡσεὶ νεκρός, ὥστε πολλοὺς[7] λέγειν ὅτι ἀπέθανεν. 27. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς κρατήσας αὐτὸν τῆς χειρός,[8] ἤγειρεν αὐτόν· καὶ ἀνέστη.

28. Καὶ εἰσελθόντα αὐτὸν[9] εἰς οἶκον, οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν,[9] "Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθημεν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό;" 29. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τοῦτο τὸ γένος ἐν οὐδενὶ δύναται ἐξελθεῖν, εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ."[10]

[1] ει δυνῃ without πιστευσαι (a gloss) in ℵBDΔ (CL δυνασαι without πισ.).
[2] Omit και BLΔ.
[3] Omit μετα δακ. ℵBCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).
[4] Omit Κυριε ℵBCDL.
[5] το πνευμα after κωφον, and σοι after επιτασσω in ℵBCLΔ 33.
[6] ℵBCDL have κραξας, σπαραξας, and omit αυτον.
[7] τους πολ. in ℵABLΔ 33.
[8] της χειρος αυτου in ℵBDLΔ.
[9] εισελθοντος αυτου in ℵBCDLΔ, also κατ ιδιαν before επηρωτων.
[10] ℵB omit και νηστεια, which comes from Mt. (T.R.).

"if Thou *will*," he says "if Thou *canst*". With reference to the form δύνῃ, Phryn. says that it is right after ἐάν, but that at the beginning of a sentence δύνασαι must be used (p. 359).—Ver. 23. τὸ εἰ δύνῃ, nominative absolute: as to the "if Thou canst".—πάντα δυν., *all*, in antithesis to the τι of the father.—Ver. 24. κράξας: eager, fear-stricken cry; making the most of his little faith, to ensure the benefit, and adding a prayer for increase of faith (βοήθει, etc.) with the idea that it would help to make the cure complete. The father's *love* at least was above suspicion. Meyer and Weiss render "help me even if unbelieving," arguing that the other, more common rendering is at variance with the meaning of βοήθησον in ver. 22.

Vv. 25-29. *The cure.*—ἐπισυντρέχει (ἅπ. λεγ.) indicates that the crowd was constantly increasing, so becoming a new crowd (ὄχλος without art.); natural in the circumstances. Jesus seeing this proceeds to cure without further delay. The spirit is now described as unclean and, with reference to the boy's symptoms, both dumb and deaf.—μηκέτι εἰσέλθῃς, enter not *again*. This was the essential point in a case of intermittent possession. The spirit went out at the end of each attack, but returned again.—Ver. 26 describes a final fit, apparently worse than the preceding. It was evidently an aggravated type of epilepsy, fit following on fit and producing utter exhaustion. Mark's elaborate description seems to embody the recollections of one on whom the case had made a great impression.—Ver. 28. εἰς οἶκον: into a house, when or whose not indicated, the one point of interest to the evangelist is that Jesus is now alone with His disciples.—ὅτι, recitative, here as in ver. 11, introduces a suggested question: we were not able to cast it out—why?—Ver. 29. τοῦτο τὸ γένος, etc.: This is one of the texts which very soon became misunderstood, the ascetic addition, καὶ νηστείᾳ, being at once a proof and a cause of misunderstanding. The traditional idea has been that Jesus here prescribes a certain discipline by which the exorcist could gain power to cope successfully with the most obstinate cases of possession, a course of prayer and fasting. This idea continues to dominate the mind even when the ascetic addition to the text has come to be regarded as doubtful; witness this

30. ΚΑΙ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο[1] διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας· καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνῷ.[2] 31. ἐδίδασκε γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν· καὶ ἀποκτανθείς, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ[3] ἀναστήσεται." 32. Οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.

33. Καὶ ἦλθεν[4] εἰς Καπερναούμ· καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ γενόμενος, ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς, "Τί ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς[5] διελογίζεσθε;"

[1] BD have επορευοντο (W.H. text), παρεπ. in ℵCLΔ (Tisch.).

[2] γνοι in ℵBCDL.

[3] μετα τρεις ημερας in ℵBCDLΔ.

[4] So in CLΔ, ηλθον in ℵB (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] Omit προς εαυ. ℵBCDL.

remark: "The authorisation, however (for omitting καὶ νησ.), is not sufficient. But even if it were overwhelming, *fasting* would, *in its essence*, be implied" (Morison on Mark). What Jesus said doubtless was: "This kind can go out in (on the ground of) nothing except prayer," and His meaning that there was no hope of success except through a believing (of course faith is implied) appeal to the almighty power of God. It was a thought of the same kind as that in Mt. xix. 26 (Mk. x. 27): the impossible for man is possible for God. Of course in the view of Christ, prayer, faith (*vide* Mt. xvii. 20), both in healer and in healed, was needful in all cases, but He recognised that there were certain aggravated types of disease (the present, one of them) in which the sense of dependence and trust was very specially required. In the case of the epileptic boy this had been lacking both in the father and in the disciples. Neither he nor they were hopeful of cure.

Vv. 30-32. *Second announcement of the Passion* (Mt. xvii. 22, 23, Lk. ix. 43-45).—Ver. 30. καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξελθόντες, going forth from thence, *i.e.*, from the scene of the last cure, wherever that was: it might be north or south of their destination (Capernaum)—Caesarea Philippi or Tabor.—παρεπορεύοντο, they passed along without tarrying anywhere. Some take the παρὰ in the compound verb to mean, went along by-ways, to avoid publicity: "diverticulo ibant, non via regia," Grotius. It is certainly true that Jesus had become so well known in Galilee that it would be difficult for Him on the thoroughfares to escape recognition as He wished (οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνοῖ).—Ver. 31. ἐδίδασκε γὰρ, etc.: gives the reason for this wish. It was the reason for the whole of the recent wandering outside Galilee: the desire to instruct the Twelve, and especially to prepare them for the approaching crisis.—καὶ ἔλεγεν introduces the gist or main theme of these instructions. The words following: ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς, etc., are more than an announcement made in so many words once for all: they are rather the text of Christ's whole talk with His disciples as they went along. He was so saying (ἔλεγεν, imperfect) all the time, in effect.—παραδίδοται, is betrayed, present; it is as good as done. The betrayal is the new feature in the second announcement.—Ver. 32. ἠγνόουν: they had heard the statement before, and had not forgotten the fact, and their Master had spoken too explicitly for them to be in any doubt as to His meaning. What they were ignorant of was the why, the δεῖ. With all He had said, Jesus had not yet been able to make that plain. They will never know till the Passion has become a fact accomplished.—ῥῆμα, a solemn name for the utterance (*vide* Mt. iv. 4) = the oracular, prophetic, and withal weird, mysterious word of doom.—ἐφοβοῦντο, they feared to ask, they did not wish to understand, they would live on in hope that their Master was under a hallucination; true to human nature.

Vv. 33-50. *The Twelve at school* (Mt. xviii. 1-10, Lk. ix. 46-50, etc.).—Ver. 33. Καπερναούμ: home? This statement, more than anything else in Mk., gives the impression that Capernaum was a kind of home for Jesus.—ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, in the *house*, opposed to ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, but probably pointing to a particular house in which Jesus was wont to stay.—τί . . . διελογίζεσθε, what were ye discussing? Jesus did not always walk beside His disciples (*vide* x. 32). He went before,

34. Οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων· πρὸς ἀλλήλους γὰρ [g]διελέχθησαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, τίς μείζων. 35. καὶ καθίσας [h]ἐφώνησε τοὺς δώδεκα, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἔσχατος, καὶ πάντων διάκονος." 36. Καὶ λαβὼν παιδίον, ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν· καὶ [i]ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτό, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 37. "Ὃς ἐὰν [1] ἓν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέξηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἐὰν [1] ἐμὲ δέξηται,[2] οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με."

g here in Gospels. Several times in Acts and in Heb. xii. 5.
h vide at Mt. xx. 32.
i Ch. x. 16.

38. Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ [3] αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰωάννης, λέγων,[3] "Διδάσκαλε, εἴδομέν τινα τῷ ὀνόματί [4] σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια, ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ ἡμῖν [5]· καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν [6] αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ [6] ἡμῖν." 39 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε, "Μὴ κωλύετε αὐτόν· οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με. 40. ὃς γὰρ

[1] BDLΔ have αν in both places, ℵC in the first place.

[2] So in CDΔΣ *al.* ℵBL have δεχηται (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] For απεκ. δε ℵBΔ have εφη and omit λεγων.

[4] With εν prefixed in ℵBCDLΔΣ.

[5] This clause ος . . . ημιν is omitted in ℵBCLΔ, and treated as doubtful by modern editors. It may have been omitted to avoid redundancy (*vide* last clause, οτι ουκ, etc.). But such redundancy is characteristic of Mk.

[6] εκωλυομεν in ℵBDLΔ, and ηκολουθει in ℵBCLΔ.

thinking His deep thoughts, they followed thinking their vain thoughts The Master had noticed that something unusual was going on, divined what it was, and now asks.—Ver. 34. **ἐσιώπων**, they kept silent, ashamed to tell.—Ver. 35. **καὶ καθίσας**, etc.: every word here betokens a deliberate attempt to school the disciples in humility. The Master takes His seat (**καθίσας**), calls His scholars with a magisterial tone (**ἐφώνησεν**, for various sense in which used, *vide* references, Mt. xx. 32) –the *Twelve* (**τοὺς δ.**), called to an important vocation, and needing thorough discipline to be of service in it.—**εἴ τις θέλει**, etc. the direct answer to the question under discussion: who the greatest? = greatness comes by humility (**ἔσχατος**), and service (**διάκονος**).—Ver. 36. The child, produced at the outset in Mt., is now brought on the scene (**λαβών**), not, however, as a model (that in x. 15), but as an object of kind treatment.—**ἐναγκαλισάμενος**: in Mk. only = taking it into His arms, to symbolise how all that the child represents should be treated.—Ver. 37. **δέξηται** in the first member of the sentence, **δέχηται** in the second; the former (aorist, subjective with **ἂν**), the more regular in a clause expressing future possibility. Winer, xlii. 3b (a). The second member of the sentence is not in the corresponding place in Mt., but is given in Mt. x. 40.

Vv. 38-41. *A reminiscence* (Lk. ix. 49-50). Probably an incident of the Galilean mission, introduced without connecting particle, therefore (Weiss) connection purely topical; suggested (Holtz., H. C.) to the evangelist by the expression **ἐπὶ τ. ὀνόματί μου** in ver. 37, answering to **ἐν τ. ὀ. σ.** in ver. 38.—**ἐκβάλλοντα δ.**: exorcists usually conjured with some name, Abraham, Solomon; this one used the name of Jesus, implying some measure of faith in His worth and power.—**ἐκωλύομεν**, imperfect, taken by most as implying repeated interdicts, but it may be the conative imperfect = we tried to prevent him.—**οὐκ ἠκολούθει**, he did not follow us; the reason for the prohibition. The aloofness of the exorcist is represented as still continuing in the words **ὃς οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ** (T. R.).—Ver. 39. Jesus disallows the interdict for a reason that goes deeper than the purely external one of the disciples = not of our company? well, but with us at heart.—**δυνήσεται ταχὺ**: points to moral impossibility: use of Christ's name in exorcism incompatible with hostile or inappreciative thought and speech of Him.—**ταχὺ** softens the assertion: not *soon;* he may do it, but

οὐκ ἔστι καθ᾽ ὑμῶν,[1] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν[1] ἐστιν. 41. ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,[2] ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ[3] τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ. 42. Καὶ ὃς ἂν σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν[4] τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ,[5] καλόν ἐστιν αὐτῷ μᾶλλον, εἰ [j] περίκειται λίθος μυλικὸς[6] περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ βέβληται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. 43. Καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίζῃ[7] σε ἡ χείρ σου, ἀπόκοψον αὐτήν· καλόν σοι ἐστὶ[8] κυλλὸν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν εἰσελθεῖν,[9] ἢ τὰς δύο χεῖρας ἔχοντα ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον, 44. ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.[10] 45. καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πούς σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἀπόκοψον αὐτόν· καλόν ἐστί σοι[11] εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλόν, ἢ τοὺς δύο πόδας ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον,[12] 46. ὅπου ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται.[10] 47. καὶ ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου σκανδαλίζῃ σε, ἔκβαλε αὐτόν· καλόν σοι ἐστὶ[13] μονόφθαλμον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἢ δύο ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχοντα βληθῆναι εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός,[14] 48. ὅπου ὁ

j Lk. xvii. 2. Acts xxviii. 20. Heb. v. 2; xii. 1.

[1] ημων in both places in ℵBCD.

[2] εν ονοματι simply in BCLΣ (W.H.), εν ον. μου in ℵDΔ (Tisch.).

[3] οτι before ου μη in ℵBCDLΔ.

[4] τουτων after μικρων in ℵBCDLΔ.

[5] εις εμε may come from Mt., though it is in ℵBLΣ; wanting in ℵΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] μυλος ονικος in ℵBCDLΔ may be a conforming to Mt., but T.R. more probably conforms to Lk.

[7] σκανδαλιση in ℵBLΔ.

[8] εστιν σε in ℵBCLΔ.

[9] εισελθειν before εις in ℵBCDLΔ.

[10] Ver. 44 is wanting in ℵBCLΔ, some minusc. and verss., also ver. 46.

[11] σε in ℵABCLΔ.

[12] Omit εις το . . . ασβεστον ℵBCLΔ.

[13] σε εστιν in ℵB.

[14] του πυρος omit ℵBDLΔ (BL omit την before γεενναν).

it will mean a change of mind, and disuse of my name.—Ver. 40. The counterpart truth to that in Mt. x. 30. Both truths, and easily harmonised. It is in both cases a question of tendency; a little sympathy inclines to grow to more, so also with a lack of sympathy. *Vide* on Mt. x. 30.—Ver. 41 = Mt. x. 42, but a later secondary form of the saying: **ποτήριον ὕδατος** for **π. ψυχροῦ**, and **ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ** instead of **εἰς ὄν. μαθητοῦ**.

Vv. 42-48. After the episode of the exorcist the narrative returns to the discourse broken off at ver. 38. From receiving little children and all they represent, Jesus passes to speak of the sin of causing them to stumble.—Ver. 42. **καλόν**, etc.: well for him; rather = better. Each evangelist has his own word here: Mt. **συμφέρει**, Lk. (xvii. 2) **λυσιτελεῖ**; but Mk., according to the best attested reading, has the strong phrase **μύλος ὀνικὸς** in common with Mt. He is content, however, with the expression "in the sea," instead of Mt.'s "in the deep part of the sea," the faithful reproduction, probably, of what Jesus actually said.—Ver. 43. The offender of the little ones is still more an offender against himself, hence the discourse by an easy transition passes to counsels against such folly. In Mk.'s version these are given in a most particular way, hand, foot and eye being each used separately to illustrate the common admonition. In Mt. hand and foot are combined. In the third illustration **εἰς τὴν ζωὴν** is replaced by **εἰς τ. βασιλείαν τ. θ.** The refrain: "where the worm, etc.," is repeated in T. R. with solemn effect after each example, but the best MSS. have it only after the third, vv. 44, 46 being thus omitted (R. V.).

σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται. 49. Πᾶς γὰρ πυρὶ ἁλισθήσεται, καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται.[1] 50. καλὸν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἅλας ἄναλον γένηται, ἐν τίνι αὐτὸ [k] ἀρτύσετε; ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλας,[2] καὶ εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις."

k Lk. xiv. 34. Col. iv. 6.

[1] This last clause is omitted in ℵBLΔ, many minusc. (Tisch., W.H., *vide* below).

[2] αλα in ℵABDLΔ.

Vv. 49-50. *Salting inevitable and indispensable.* These verses appear only in Mk. as part of this discourse. The *logion* in ver. 50 corresponds to Mt. v. 13, Lk. xiv. 34-35.—Ver. 49 is a *crux interpretum*, and has given rise to great diversity of interpretation (*vide* Meyer, *ad loc.*). Three questions may be asked. (1) What is the correct form of the saying? (2) Was it spoken at this time by Jesus? (3) If it was, how is it to be connected with the previous context? As to (1) some important MSS. (ℵBLΔ and the new Syr. Sin.) omit the second half of the sentence, retaining only "every one shall be salted with fire". D and some copies of the old Lat. omit the first part and retain the second. W. and H. retain only part 1. Weiss and Schanz think that the text must be taken in its entirety, and that part 2 fell out by *homoeoteleuton*, or was omitted because of its difficulty. Holtzmann, H. C., is inclined to favour the reading of D. It is difficult to decide between these alternatives, though I personally lean to the first of the three, not only because of the weighty textual testimony, but, as against D, on account of the startling character of the thought, salted with *fire*, its very boldness witnessing for its authenticity. As to (2) I think it highly probable that such thoughts as vv. 49-50 contain were spoken at this time by Jesus. The two thoughts, salting inevitable and salting indispensable, were thoroughly apposite to the situation: a master teaching men in danger of moral shipwreck through evil passion, and unless reformed sure to prove unfit for the work to which they were destined. I cannot therefore agree with Holtzmann (H. C.) that Mk., misled by the word πῦρ in ver. 48, has brought in here a *logion* spoken at some other time. As to (3) I see no necessity to regard γάρ, ver. 49, as binding us down to a close exclusive connection with ver. 48, requiring us to interpret ver. 49a thus: every one that does not cut off the offending member shall be *salted* by the fire of hell; itself quenchless, and not destroying its victim, as it is the nature of ordinary fire to do, but rather preserving him for eternal torment, like salt. Thus viewed, ver. 49a is a mere comment on the words οὐ σβέννυται. The saying should rather be taken in connection with the whole course of thought in vv. 43-48, in which case it will bear this sense: "every one must be salted *somehow*, either with the unquenchable fire of gehenna, or with the fire of severe self-discipline. Wise is he who chooses the latter alternative." If we ignore the connection with ver. 48, and restrict πᾶς to the disciple-circle, this alternative rendering will be avoided, and the idea will be: every man who is to come to any good, will, must, be salted with fire. In that case, however, it is difficult to account for the unusual combination of salt and fire, whose functions are so opposed. 49b is of quite subordinate importance, merely at best a parabolic aid to thought. Grotius and others divide the sacrifices into two classes answering to the two forms of salting: burnt offerings typifying those consumed in hell, peace offerings those preserved by self-discipline.—Ver. 50 sets forth the other great truth: salting in the form of self-discipline *indispensable.*—καλὸν τὸ ἅλας, an excellent thing is salt; a most seasonable truth just then. What follows seems less so, as it stands in Mk.'s text. As spoken by Jesus, if we may assume that it was spoken on this occasion, it might come in quite naturally. The three thoughts in this verse: salt good, care must be taken that it lose not its virtue, have salt in yourselves, may be merely themes packed together in a single sentence, on which Jesus discoursed at length.—ἄναλον, ἅπ. λεγ. in N. T., used in later Greek; μωρανθῇ in Mt. and Lk.—ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἅλα: have salt in yourselves. In the two former clauses disciples are thought of, as in Mt. v. 13, as themselves salt for the world. Here they are viewed as the subject of the salting process. They must be salted in order to be salt to the world, their

X. 1. ΚΑΚΕΙΘΕΝ[1] ἀναστὰς ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ ὅρια τῆς Ἰουδαίας, διὰ τοῦ[2] πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου· καὶ συμπορεύονται πάλιν ὄχλοι πρὸς αὐτόν· καὶ ὡς εἰώθει, πάλιν ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. 2. Καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ[3] Φαρισαῖοι ἐπηρώτησαν[3] αὐτόν, εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα ἀπολῦσαι, πειράζοντες αὐτόν. 3. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί ὑμῖν ἐνετείλατο Μωσῆς;" 4. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Μωσῆς ἐπέτρεψε[4] βιβλίον ἀποστασίου γράψαι, καὶ ἀπολῦσαι." 5. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν[5] αὐτοῖς, "Πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν τὴν

[1] **και εκειθεν** in ℵBCDΔ.

[2] **και** instead of **δια του** in ℵBCL; **περαν** without **και** in DΔ. The **και** caused trouble to scribes, some omitted it after Mt., some substituted **δια του** as in T.R.

[3] BLΔ omit **οι** (added here as usual), and ℵBCDLΔ have the imperfect **επηρωτων** instead of the aorist so often substituted for it in T.R. (again in ver. 10).

[4] **επετρεψεν** M. in ℵBDLΔ.

[5] For **και . . . ειπεν** read with ℵBCLΔ **ο δε I. ειπεν**.

ulterior vocation. Meantime a more immediate effect of their being salted is pointed out in the closing words.—**εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις**: be at peace with one another; which they were not. The cause of dispeace was ambition. The salting would consist in getting rid of that evil spirit at whatever cost.—**εἰρηνεύετε**: a Pauline word, remarks Holtz. (H.C.). True, but why not also a word of Jesus? certainly very apposite to the occasion.

Note.—Salting of disciples imports suffering pain, but is not to be confounded with the cross-bearing of faithful disciples (viii. 34). The former is the discipline of self-denial necessary to make a man a follower of Christ worthy of the name. The latter is the tribulation that comes on all who follow closely in the footsteps of Christ. The one is needful to make us holy, the other overtakes us when and because we are holy.

CHAPTER X. MARRIAGE QUESTION. LITTLE CHILDREN. QUEST AFTER ETERNAL LIFE. TWO SONS OF ZEBEDEE. BARTIMAEUS.—Ver. 1. *The departure from Galilee* (Mt. xix. 1).—**ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστὰς**, as in vii. 24, *q.v.*; there, of a departure from Galilee which was followed by a return (ix. 33), here, of a final departure, so far as we know. Beza finds in the expression a Hebraism—to sit is to remain in a place, to rise is to depart from it. Kypke renders, *et inde discedens*, and gives classic examples of the usage.—**εἰς τὰ ὅρια τ. Ι. καὶ πέραν**, etc., into the borders of Judaea and of Peraea; how reached not indicated. The reading of T. R. **διὰ τοῦ πέραν τ. Ι.** gives the route. *Vide* on Mt., *ad loc.*, where the **καὶ** (of ℵBCL) is omitted.—**συμπορεύονται πάλιν**, crowds again gather.—**ὄχλοι**, plural; here only, with reference to the different places passed through.—**ὡς εἰώθει**, as He was wont; remarked on, because the habit had been suspended for a season during which the whole attention of Jesus had been devoted to the Twelve. That continues to be the case *mainly* still. In every incident the Master has an eye to the lesson for the disciples. And the evangelist takes pains to make the lesson prominent. Possibly his incidents are selected and grouped with that in view: marriage, children, money, etc. (so Weiss in Meyer).—**ἐδίδασκεν**, He continued *teaching*, so also in vi. 34. In both places Mt. (xiv. 14, xix. 2) speaks of *healing*. Yet Mk.'s Gospel is a gospel of *acts*, Mt.'s of *words*. Each is careful to make prominent, in general notices, what he comparatively neglects in detail.

Vv. 2-12. *The question of divorce* (Mt. xix. 3-12).—**ἀπολῦσαι**: the question is put absolutely, the qualifying clause **κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν** in Mt. being omitted. Thus put the question presupposes knowledge of Christ's high doctrine as to marriage, and is an attempt to bring Him into collision with the Mosaic law, as absolutely interdicting what it allowed.—Ver. 3. **τί ὑμῖν ἐνετείλατο Μ.**: here Jesus has in view not what Moses *allowed* in Deut. xxiv. 1, but what he in *Genesis* enjoined as the ideal state of things (Moses from the Jewish point of view author of the Pentateuch and all its legislation). They naturally supposed He had in view the former (ver. 4).—Ver. 5.

ἐντολὴν ταύτην· 6. ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός.[1] 7. 'ἕνεκεν τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα· καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,[2] 8. καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν.' ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶ δύο, ἀλλὰ μία σάρξ. 9. ὃ οὖν ὁ Θεὸς συνέζευξεν, ἄνθρωπος μὴ χωριζέτω." 10. Καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ[3] πάλιν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησαν[4] αὐτόν. 11. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν· 12. καὶ ἐὰν γυνὴ[5] ἀπολύσῃ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς καὶ[5] γαμηθῇ ἄλλῳ,[5] μοιχᾶται.

13. Καὶ προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἅψηται αὐτῶν· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμων τοῖς προσφέρουσιν.[6] 14. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἠγανάκτησε, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, καὶ[7] μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά· τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ

[1] Omit **ο θεος** ℵBCLΔ. D has **ο θ.**, and omits **αυτους** (W.H. omit **ο θ.** and bracket **αυτους**).

[2] **και προσκ. . . . αυτου**, omitted in ℵB, is probably an addition from Mt. or Sept.

[3] **εις την οικιαν** in ℵBDLΔ.

[4] **οι μαθ. περι τουτου επηρωτων** in ℵ (**τουτων**) BCLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] For **γυνη απ.** ℵBCLΔ have **αυτη απολυσασα** without **και**, and for **γαμηθη αλλω**, **γαμηση αλλον** (so also D: Tisch., W.H.).

[6] ℵBCLΔ have **αυτων** before **αψηται**, **επετιμησαν** for **επιτιμων**, and **αυτοις** for **τοις προσφερουσι** (W.H.).

[7] BΔΣ omit **και**, which comes from parall., and weakens the force of the words. *Vide* below.

Both evangelists, while varying considerably in their reports, carefully preserve this important *logion* as to legislation conditioned by the *sklerokardia*.—**ταύτην**: at the end, with emphasis; *this* particular command in contradiction to the great original one.—Ver. 6: "But from the beginning of the creation (it runs) 'male and female made He them,'" **ἄρσεν καὶ**, etc., being a quotation from Sept. (Gen. i. 27), vv. 7, 8 being another (*vide* Gen. ii. 24), with Christ's comment in the last clause of ver. 8 and in ver. 9 appended. On the import of the words *vide* in Mt., *ad loc.*—Vv. 10-12 report as spoken to the Twelve *in the house* (as opposed to the *way* in which the Pharisees are supposed to have encountered Jesus) what in Mt.'s version appears as the last word to the interrogants (ver. 9). Two variations are noticeable: (1) the absence of the qualifying clause **εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ**, and (2) the addition of a clause (ver. 12) stating the law in its bearing on the woman = if she put away her husband and marry another, she is an adulteress. In the former case Mk. probably reports correctly what Christ said, in the latter he has added a gloss so as to make Christ's teaching a guide for his Gentile readers. Jewish women could not divorce their husbands. The **ἐπ' αὐτήν** at the end of ver. 11 may mean either against, to the prejudice of, her (the first wife), or with her (the second). The former view is taken by the leading modern exegetes, the latter by Victor Ant., Euthy., Theophy., and, among moderns, Ewald and Bleek.

Vv. 13-16. *Suffer the children* (Mt. xix. 13-15, Lk. xviii. 15-17).—Ver. 13. **παιδία** as in Mt. Lk. has **βρέφη** = infants carried in arms. Note the use of the compound **προσέφερον**; elsewhere the simple verb. The word is commonly used of sacrifices, and suggests here the idea of *dedication*.—**ἅψηται**, *touch*, merely, as if that alone were enough to bless; prayer mentioned in Mt.—**τοῖς προσφέρουσιν** (T. R.), probably interprets the **αὐτοῖς** (W.H.) after **ἐπετίμησαν**.—Ver. 14. **ἠγανάκτησε**, "was moved with indignation" (R. V.) is too strong,

Θεοῦ· 15. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃς ἐὰν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν." 16. Καὶ ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτά, τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά, ηὐλόγει αὐτά.[1]

17. Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς ὁδόν, προσδραμὼν εἷς καὶ γονυπετήσας αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, "Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω ἵνα ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;" 18. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός. 19. τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας, Μὴ μοιχεύσῃς· μὴ φονεύσῃς[2]· μὴ κλέψῃς· μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς· μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς· τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα." 20. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν[3] αὐτῷ, "Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητός μου." 21. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς [a]ἐμβλέψας [a]αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἕν σοι[4] ὑστερεῖ· ὕπαγε, ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, καὶ δὸς τοῖς[5] πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν

a *cf.* Ch. xiv. 67. Lk. xx. 17; xxii. 61.

[1] Instead of τιθεις . . . ηυλογει αυτα ℵBCLΔ have κατευλογει τιθεις τας χειρας επ. αυτα (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] μη φονευσης before μη μοιχευσης in BCΔ (W.H. text).

[3] For ο δε αποκ. ειπεν ℵBCΔ have ο δε εφη.

[4] σε in ℵBCL. [5] BΔ *al.* omit τοις (W.H. in brackets).

"was much displeased" (A. V.) is better, "was annoyed" is better still ("ward unwillig," Weizsäcker).—μὴ κωλύετε, καὶ of T. R. before μὴ is much better left out: suffer them to come; do not hinder them; an expressive *asyndeton*. This saying is the main point in the story for the evangelist, hence the imperfects in ver. 13. It is another lesson for the still spiritually crude disciples.—Ver. 15 answers to Mt. xviii. 3. As Jesus gave several lessons on humility and kindred virtues, in Capernaum, here, and on the way to Jericho (x. 35 f.), it is not to be wondered at if the sayings spoken in the several lessons got somewhat mixed in the tradition. It does not greatly matter when they were uttered. The thing to be thankful for is their preservation.—Ver. 16. ἐναγκαλισάμενος, as in ix. 36. Jesus took each child in His arms, one by one, and blessed it: κατευλόγει, imperfect. The process would last a while, but Jesus would not soon weary in such work. The compound verb κατευλόγει (ℵBCL, etc.), here only, has intensive force like καταφιλέω in Mt. xxvi. 49 (*vide* notes there and Maclear in C. G. T.).

Vv. 17-27. *Quest after eternal life* (Mt. xix. 16-30, Lk. xviii. 18-30).—Ver. 17. ἐκπορευομένου α. εἰς ὁδὸν: the incident to be related happens as Jesus is coming out from some house into the highway, at what precise point on the journey Mk. neither knows nor cares. The didactic significance of the story alone concerns him.—διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ: that the epithet ἀγαθός was really used by the man is highly probable. *Vide* on Mt.—Ver. 18. τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν: on the import of this question *vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 19. The commandments of the second table enumerated are expressed by subjunctives with μὴ, instead of future indicatives with οὐ. While Mt. has the supernumerary, "love thy neighbour," Mk. has μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, which probably has in view the humane law in Deut. xxiv. 14, 15, against oppressing or withholding wages from a hired servant; a more specific form of the precept: love thy neighbour as thyself, and a most apposite reminder of duty as addressed to a wealthy man, doubtless an extensive employer of labour. It should be rung in the ears of all would-be Christians, in similar social position, in our time: defraud not, underpay not.—Ver. 21. ἠγάπησεν α.: on the import of the statement in reference to the man *vide* on Mt. Jesus loved this man. Grotius remarks: Jesus loved not virtues only, but *seeds* of virtues ("et semina virtutum"). Field (*Otium Nor.*) renders "caressed". Bengel takes ἐμβλέψας ἠγάπησεν as a ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, and renders, *amanter aspexit* = lovingly regarded him—ἕν σε ὑστερεῖ. In Mk. Jesus, not the inquirer, remarks on the

οὐρανῷ· καὶ δεῦρο, ἀκολούθει μοι, ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν."[1] 22. Ὁ δὲ στυγνάσας ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ἀπῆλθε λυπούμενος· ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά. 23. Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελεύσονται." 24. Οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Τέκνα, πῶς [b]δύσκολόν ἐστι τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν[2] εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν. 25. εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστι κάμηλον διὰ τῆς[3] τρυμαλιᾶς τῆς[3] ῥαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν,[4] ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν." 26. Οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο, λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς,[5] "Καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;" 27. Ἐμβλέψας δὲ[6] αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει, "Παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τῷ[7] Θεῷ· πάντα γὰρ δυνατά ἐστι[8] παρὰ

b here only.

[1] αρας τ. σ. is a gloss from Ch. viii. 34, omitted in ℵBCDΔ.

[2] τους πεπ. . . . χρημασιν is a gloss wanting in ℵBΔ; *vide* below. Omission by similar ending (Alford) is abstractly possible.

[3] της is found in B in both places (W.H. margin), but omitted in many uncials.

[4] διελθειν in some copies (W.H.).

[5] αυτον in ℵBCΔ.

[6] Omit δε ℵBCΔ.

[7] Omit τω ℵBCΔ. B omits the second τω at end of sentence (W.H. in brackets).

[8] εστι omitted in ℵBC *al.*; more expressive without.

lack; in Mt. the reverse is the fact: the man is conscious of his defect, an important point in his spiritual condition.—δεῦρο, etc.: from the invitation to join the disciple band Weiss (Meyer) infers that the incident must have happened before the circle of the Twelve was complete. The last clause in T. R. about the cross is an obvious gloss by a scribe whose mind was dominated by stereotyped religious commonplaces.—Ver. 22. στυγνάσας: in Mt. xvi. 3, of the sky, here, of the face, λυπούμενος, following, referring to the mind: with sad face and heavy heart.

Vv. 23-27. *The moral of the story given for the benefit of the disciples*, περιβλεψάμενος (iii. 5, 34), looking around, to see what impression the incident had made on the Twelve.—πῶς = ἀληθῶς, Euthy.—πῶς δυσ., with what difficulty!—τὰ χρήματα, wealth collectively held by the rich class (Meyer).—Ver. 4. ἐθαμβοῦντο, were confounded.—πάλιν ἀποκριθεὶς prepares us for repetition with unmitigated severity, rather than toning down, which is what we have in T. R., through the added words, τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τοῖς χρήμασιν, suggesting an idea more worthy of a scribe than of Jesus; for it is not merely difficult but impossible for one *trusting* in riches to enter the Kingdom. Yet this is one of the places where the Sin. Syriac agrees with the T. R.—Ver. 25. In this proverbial saying the evangelists vary in expression in reference to the needle and the needle-eye, though one might have looked for stereotyped phraseology in a proverb. The fact points to different Greek renderings of a saying originally given in a Semitic tongue.—τρυμαλιᾶς, from τρύω, to rub through, so as to make a hole. According to Furrer, proverbs about the camel and the needle-eye, to express the impossible, are still current among the Arabs. *E.g.*, "hypocrites go into paradise as easily as a camel through a needle-eye"; "He asks of people that they conduct a camel through a needle-eye" (*Wanderungen*, p. 339).—Ver. 26. The disciples, amazed, ask: καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; τίς ἄρα, etc., in Mt. The καὶ resumes what has been said, and draws from it an inference meant to call its truth in question (Holtz., H. C.) = who, in that case, can be saved?—Ver. 27. This saying is given diversely in the three parallels; most pithily in Mt., and perhaps nearest to the original. For the meaning *vide* on Mt.

Vv. 28-31. *Peter's question* (Mt. xix.

τῷ Θεῷ." 28. Καὶ ἤρξατο ὁ Πέτρος λέγειν[1] αὐτῷ, "Ἰδού, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμέν[2] σοι." 29. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν,[3] "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδείς ἐστιν, ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν, ἢ ἀδελφούς, ἢ ἀδελφάς, ἢ πατέρα, ἢ μητέρα,[4] ἢ γυναῖκα,[5] ἢ τέκνα, ἢ ἀγρούς, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ[6] τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, 30. ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ [e] καιρῷ τούτῳ, οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἀδελφὰς καὶ μητέρας[7] καὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀγρούς, μετὰ διωγμῶν, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 31. πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι, καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι."

e Rom. iii. 26; viii. 18.

32. ἮΣΑΝ δὲ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ ἦν προάγων αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐθαμβοῦντο, καὶ[8] ἀκολουθοῦντες ἐφοβοῦντο. καὶ παραλαβὼν πάλιν τοὺς δώδεκα, ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς λέγειν τὰ μέλλοντα αὐτῷ συμβαίνειν· 33. "Ὅτι, ἰδού, ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσι, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ,

[1] λεγειν before ο Π. and without και before ηρξ. in ℵBCΔ.
[2] ηκολουθηκαμεν in BCD.
[3] For αποκ. . . . ειπεν ℵBΔ Cop. have εφη ο Ι.
[4] μητερα η πατερα in BCΔ.
[5] ℵBDΔ omit η γυναικα, which probably comes from Lk.
[6] και ενεκεν in ℵCDΔ (W.H in brackets).
[7] So in BΔ, but ℵCD have μητερα, a correction (W.H. margin).
[8] οι δε in ℵBCLΔ; not understood, therefore και substituted in late uncials.

27-30, Lk. xviii. 28-30).—Ver. 28 introduces the episode without any connecting word such as τότε in Mt. ἰδού betrays self-consciousness, also the following ἡμεῖς. Yet, with all his self-consciousness, Peter, in Mk.'s account, has not courage to finish his question, stopping short with the statement of fact on which it is based = behold! *we* have left all and followed Thee?—ἀφήκαμεν, aorist, refers to an act done once for all, ἠκολουθήκαμεν, to an abiding condition. —Ver. 29. Jesus, seeing Peter's meaning, proceeds to give, first, a generous answer, then a word of warning. In the enumeration of persons and things forsaken, "wife" is omitted in important MSS. (W.H.). The omission is true to the delicate feeling of Jesus. It may have to be done, but He would rather not say it.—τοῦ εὐαγγελίου: a gloss to suit apostolic times and circumstances.—Ver. 30. νῦν: the present time the sphere of compensation; ἑκατονταπλασίονα (Lk. viii. 8): the measure characteristically liberal; μετὰ διωγμῶν: the natural qualification, seeing it is in this world that the moral compensation takes place, yet not diminishing the value of the compensation, rather enhancing it, as a relish; a foreshadowing this, perhaps a transcript, of apostolic experience.—Ver. 31. On this apothegm *vide* on Mt.

Vv. 32-34. *Third prediction of the Passion* (Mt. xx. 17-19, Lk. xviii. 31-34).—Ver. 32. εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, to Jerusalem! The fact that they were at last on the march for the Holy City is mentioned to explain the mood and manner of Jesus.—προάγων: Jesus in advance, all the rest following at a respectful distance.—ἐθαμβοῦντο: the astonishment of the Twelve and the fear of others (οἱ ἀκολ. ἐφοβοῦντο) were not due to the fact that Jesus had, against their wish, chosen to go to Jerusalem in spite of apprehended danger (Weiss). These feelings must have been awakened by the *manner* of Jesus, as of one labouring under strong emotion. Only so can we account for the fear of the crowd, who were not, like the Twelve, acquainted with Christ's forebodings of death. Memory and expectation were both active at that

καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσι, 34. καὶ ἐμπαίξουσιν αὐτῷ, καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐμπτύσουσιν αὐτῷ,[1] καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν· καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ[2] ἀναστήσεται."

35. Και [d] προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβεδαίου, λέγοντες,[3] "Διδάσκαλε, θέλομεν ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωμεν,[4] ποιήσῃς ἡμῖν." 36. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί θέλετε ποιῆσαί με[5] ὑμῖν;" 37. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Δὸς ἡμῖν, ἵνα εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν σου[6] καὶ εἷς ἐξ εὐωνύμων σου[7] καθίσωμεν ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου." 38. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε. δύνασθε πιεῖν τὸ ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω, καὶ[8] τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθῆναι;" 39. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Δυνάμεθα." Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τὸ μὲν[9] ποτήριον ὃ ἐγὼ πίνω, πίεσθε· καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι, βαπτισθήσεσθε· 40. τὸ δὲ καθίσαι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου καὶ ἐξ εὐωνύμων μου,[10] οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοίμασται." 41. Καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ δέκα ἤρξαντο ἀγανακτεῖν

d here only.

[1] εμπτυσουσιν in first place, μαστιγ. second, in ℵBCLΔ.

[2] μετα τρεις ημερας in ℵBCDLΔ.

[3] ℵBCDLΔ add αυτω.

[4] ℵABCLΔ add σε.

[5] For ποιησαι με B has με ποιησω. CD correct by omitting με, ALΔΣ by changing into infinitive with accusative as in T.R.

[6] σου εκ δεξιων in ℵBCLΔ.

[7] εξ αριστερων (without σου) in BLΔ.

[8] η in ℵBCDLΔ.

[9] μεν wanting in ℵBCLΔ. T.R. is a grammatical correction.

[10] η for και, and μου after ευων. omitted, in ℵBDLΔ. Besides these ACΣ *al.* omit second μου.

moment, producing together a high-strung state of mind: Peraea, John, baptism in the Jordan, at the beginning; Jerusalem, the priests, the cross, at the end! Filled with the varied feelings excited by these sacred recollections and tragic anticipations, He walks alone by preference, step and gesture revealing what is working within and inspiring awe — "muthig und entschlossen," Schanz; with "majesty and heroism," Morison; "tanto animo tantâque alacritate," Elsner; "more intrepidi ducis," Grotius. This picture of Jesus in advance on the way to Jerusalem is one of Mk.'s realisms.—Ver. 33. ὅτι ἰδού, etc.: the third prediction has for its specialties delivery to the Gentiles (τοῖς ἔθνεσι), and an exact specification of the indignities to be endured: mocking, spitting, scourging. Jesus had been thinking of these things before He spoke of them; hence the excitement of His manner.

Vv. 35-45. *The sons of Zebedee* (Mt. xx. 20-28), showing the comic side of the drama.—Ver. 35. In Mk., James and John speak for themselves: Διδάσκαλε θέλομεν, etc. In Mt. the mother speaks for them.—Ver. 36. τί θέλετέ με ποιήσω: this reading of B is accredited by its very grammatical peculiarity, two constructions being confused together; an accusative (με) followed, not as we expect by the infinitive, ποιῆσαι (T. R.), but by the subj. delib., ποιήσω.—Ver. 38. τὸ βάπτισμα: in Mk. there is a double symbolism for the Passion, a cup and a baptism; in Mt.'s true text only the former. The cup is an Old Testament emblem; the baptism not so obviously, yet it may rest on Ps. xlii. 7, lxix. 2, cxxiv. 4-5. The conception of Christian baptism as baptism into death is Pauline (Rom. vi.). — Ver. 40. ἡτοίμασται stands alone in Mk. without the reference to the Father, which is in Mt.—Ver. 42. οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν, those who pass for, are esteemed as, rulers: "quos gentes habent et agnoscunt" (Beza); "qui

περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου. 42. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς[1] λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. 43. οὐχ οὕτω δὲ ἔσται[2] ἐν ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ γενέσθαι μέγας[3] ἐν ὑμῖν, ἔσται διάκονος ὑμῶν[3]· 44. καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ὑμῶν γενέσθαι[4] πρῶτος, ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος· 45. καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν."

46. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεριχώ καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱεριχώ, καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ, υἱὸς[5] Τιμαίου Βαρτίμαιος ὁ τυφλὸς ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν προσαιτῶν.[5] 47. καὶ ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖός[6] ἐστιν, ἤρξατο κράζειν καὶ λέγειν, "Ὁ υἱὸς[7] Δαβίδ, Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με." 48. Καὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ πολλοί, ἵνα σιωπήσῃ· ὁ δὲ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν, "Υἱὲ Δαβίδ, ἐλέησόν με." 49. Καὶ στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι[8]· καὶ φωνοῦσι τὸν τυφλόν, λέγοντες αὐτῷ, "Θάρσει· ἔγειραι,[9] φωνεῖ σε." 50. Ὁ δὲ ἀποβαλὼν τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ ἀναστὰς[10] ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν·

[1] και προσκαλ. αυτους ο Ι. in ℵBCDLΔ. [2] εστιν in ℵBCDLΔ Lat. vet. Vulg.

[3] μεγας γεν. in ℵBCLΔ, also υμων διακ. [4] εν υμιν ειναι in ℵBCLΔ.

[5] For υιος . . . προσαιτων ℵBLΔ have ο υιος Τ. Β. τυφλος προσαιτης εκαθ. παρα την οδον (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] Ναζαρηνος in BLΔ. B places εστιν after Ιησους.

[7] υιε (for ο υ.) in ℵBCLΣ.

[8] φωνησατε αυτον in ℵBCLΔ changed in T.R. into the more commonplace αυτον φωνηθηναι.

[9] εγειρε in ℵABCDLΔΣ.

[10] A tame substitute for αναπηδησας in ℵBDLΔ, so characteristic of Mk.

honorem habent imperandi" (Grotius). Some, *e.g.*, Palairet, regard **δοκοῦντες** as redundant, and take the phrase in Mk. as = Mt.'s **οἱ ἄρχοντες**. Kypke resolves it into **οἱ ἐκ δόγματός τινος ἄρχοντες** = "qui constituti sunt ut imperent".—Ver. 43. **ἐστιν** (W.H.), *is;* the "is" not of actual fact, but of the ideal state of things.—Ver. 45. *Vide* on Mt.

Vv. 46-52. *Bartimaeus* (Mt. xx. 29-34, Lk. xviii. 35-43).—Ver. 46. **ἔρχονται**, historical present for effect. *Jericho* an important place, and of more interest to the narrator; the last stage on the journey before arriving at *Jerusalem* (Weiss in Meyer).—**ἐκπορευομένου α.**: Jesus mentioned apart as the principal person, or as still going before, the disciples and the crowd mentioned also, as they have their part to play in the sequel, **πορευομένων** understood.—**ὄχ. ἱκανοῦ**: not implying that the crowd was of very moderate dimensions, but = a large crowd, as we say colloquially "pretty good" when we mean "very good". This use of **ἱκανός** probably belonged to the colloquial Greek of the period. *Vide* Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 79.—**ὁ υἱὸς Τ. Β.** Mk. knows the name, and gives both name, Bartimaeus, and interpretation, son of Timaeus.—Ver. 47. **υἱὲ Δαβίδ**: this in all three narratives the popular name for Messiah.—Ver. 49. **φωνήσατε, φωνοῦσι, φωνεῖ**: no attempt to avoid monotony out of regard to style. It is the appropriate word all through, to call in a loud voice, audible at a distance, in the open air (*vide* ix. 35).—**θάρσει, ἔγειρε, φωνεῖ**, courage, rise, He calls you; pithy, no superfluous words, just how they would speak.—Ver. 50. Graphic description of the beggar's eager response—mantle thrown off, jumping to his feet, he

51. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[1] "Τί θέλεις ποιήσω σοί[2];" Ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ῥαββονί, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω." 52. Ὁ δὲ[3] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ὕπαγε· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε." καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέβλεψε, καὶ ἠκολούθει τῷ Ἰησοῦ[4] ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

XI. 1. ΚΑΙ ὅτε ἐγγίζουσιν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ,[5] εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανίαν[6] πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, 2. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν· καὶ εὐθέως εἰσπορευόμενοι εἰς αὐτὴν εὑρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς[7] ἀνθρώπων κεκάθικε[8]· λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.[9] 3. καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ, Τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἴπατε, Ὅτι[10] ὁ κύριος

[1] **αυτω ο Ι. ειπεν** in ℵBCDLΔ.

[2] **τι σοι θελεις ποιησω** in ℵBCLΔ, obviously preferable to the smooth reading in T.R.

[3] **και ο Ι.** in BLΔ Cop. (W.H.).

[4] **αυτω** for **τω Ι.** in ℵABCDLΔ *al.* Lat. vet. Vulg.

[5] **Ιερουσαλημ** is not used in Mk. The true form here is **Ιεροσολυμα** as in ℵBCDCΔΣ.

[6] D vet. Lat. Vulg. have simply **και εις Βηθανιαν**, which Tisch. adopts. The reading in T.R. is supported by ℵABCLΔΣ *al.*

[7] Add **ουπω**, following **ουδεις** in BLΔ; after **ανθρωπων** in ℵC, before **ουδεις** in ΚΠΣ (W.H. order 1, Tisch. 2).

[8] **εκαθισεν** in ℵBCLΔ.

[9] **λυσατε α. και φερετε** in ℵBCLΔ. The T.R. conforms to Lk.

[10] Omit **οτι** with BΔ vet. Lat.

comes, runs, to Jesus. Though blind he needs no guide (Lk. provides him with one); led by his ear.—Ver. 51. **τί σοι θέλεις**, etc.: what do you want: alms or sight?—**ῥαββονί**: more respectful than Rabbi (here and in John xx. 16).—**ἵνα ἀναβλέψω**: sight, of course, who would think of asking an alms of One who could open blind eyes!

CHAPTER XI. ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM. OTHER INCIDENTS. Vv. 1-11. *The solemn entry* (Mt. xxi. 1-11; Lk. xix. 29-44).—Ver. 1. It is first stated generally that they approach Jerusalem, then Bethphage and Bethany are named to define more exactly the whereabouts. Both villages named; partly because close together, partly because, while Bethphage was the larger and better known place, and therefore might have stood alone as an indication of locality, Bethany was the place where the colt was to be got.—Ver. 2. **κατέναντι ὑ.**, opposite you. This adverb (from **κατά ἔναντι**) is not found in Greek authors, but occurs frequently in Sept.—**ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς οὔπ. ἀν. ἐκάθισεν**: this point, that the colt had never been used, would seem of vital importance afterhand, from the Christian point of view, and one cannot wonder that it took a sure place in the tradition, as evinced by the narrative in Mk. followed by Lk. But it is permissible to regard this as an expansion of what Jesus actually said. The idea underlying is that for sacred purposes only unused animals may be employed (*vide* Numb. xix. 2, 1 Sam. vi. 7).—**λύσατε, φέρετε**: aorist and present; the former denoting a momentary act, the latter a process.—Ver. 3. **ὁ κύριος α. χ. ἔχει**: the Master hath need of him. *Vide* on this at Mt. xxi. 3.—**καὶ εὐθὺς**, etc.: and straightway He returneth him (the colt) again.—**πάλιν**, a well-attested reading, clearly implies this meaning, *i.e.*, that Jesus bids His disciples promise the owner that He will return the colt without delay, after He has had His use of it. So without hesitation Weiss (in Meyer) and Holtzmann (H. C.). Meyer thinks this a paltry thing for Christ to say, and rejects **πάλιν** as an addition due to misunderstanding. Biassed by

αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει· καὶ εὐθέως αὐτὸν ἀποστελεῖ[1] ὧδε." 4. Ἀπῆλθον δέ,[2] καὶ εὗρον τὸν[3] πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς τὴν[3] θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου, καὶ λύουσιν αὐτόν. 5. καί τινες τῶν ἐκεῖ ἑστηκότων ἔλεγον αὐτοῖς, "Τί ποιεῖτε λύοντες τὸν πῶλον;" 6. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτοῖς καθὼς ἐνετείλατο[4] ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτούς. 7. καὶ ἤγαγον[5] τὸν πῶλον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐπέβαλον[6] αὐτῷ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ.[7] 8. πολλοὶ δὲ[8] τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν· ἄλλοι δὲ στοιβάδας[9] ἔκοπτον[10] ἐκ τῶν δένδρων, καὶ ἐστρώννυον εἰς τὴν ὁδόν.[10] 9. καὶ οἱ προάγοντες καὶ οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες ἔκραζον, λέγοντες,[11] "Ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ

[1] **αποστελλει** in very many uncials. The most important various reading is **παλιν** after **αποστελλει** in ℵBC*DLΔ minusc. Orig.; doubtless a true reading, though omitted for harmonistic reasons in many copies. B places **αυτον** last, **αποσ. παλιν α.** (W.H. marg.).

[2] **και απηλθον** in ℵBLΔ.

[3] BDL omit **τον** before **πωλον** (ℵCΔ have it, Tisch.), and BLΔ omit **την** before **θυραν** (in ℵCD, Tisch.).

[4] **ειπεν** in ℵBCLΔ.

[5] **φερουσιν** instead of **ηγαγον** (from parall.) in ℵBLΔ.

[6] **επιβαλλουσι** in ℵBCDLΔ for **επεβαλον**, which conforms to **ηγαγον**.

[7] **επ αυτον** in ℵBCDLΔ.

[8] **και πολλοι** in ℵBCLΔ.

[9] **στιβαδας** in most uncials (ℵBDLΔ, etc.).

[10] For **εκοπτον . . . οδον** (*cf.* Mt.) ℵBLΔ have simply **κοψαντες εκ των αγρων**.

[11] Omit **λεγοντες** ℵBCLΔ.

the same sense of decorum—"below the dignity of the occasion and of the Speaker"—the Speaker's Comm. cherishes doubt as to πάλιν, sheltering itself behind the facts that, while the MSS. which insert "again" are generally more remarkable for omissions than additions, yet in this instance they lack the support of ancient versions and early Fathers. I do not feel the force of the argument from decorum. It judges Christ's action by a conventional standard. Why should not Jesus instruct His disciples to say "it will be returned without delay" as an inducement to lend it? Dignity! How much will have to go if that is to be the test of historicity! There was not only dignity but humiliation in the manner of entering Jerusalem: the *need* for the colt, the *use* of it, the fact that it had to be *borrowed* all enter as elements in the lowly state of the Son of Man. On the whole subject *vide* notes on Mt. This is another of Mk.'s realisms, which Mt.'s version obliterates. Field (*Otium Nor.*), often bold in his interpretations, here succumbs to the decorum argument, and is biassed by it against the reading πάλιν contained in so many important MSS. (*vide* above).—Ver. 4. ἀμφόδου (ἄμφοδον and -ος from ἀμφί and ὁδός, here only in N. T.), the road round the farmyard. In Jer. xvii. 27, Sept., it seems to denote some part of a town: "the palaces of Jerusalem" (R. V.).—Vv. 5-6. Mk. tells the story very circumstantially: how the people of the place challenged their action; how they repeated the message of Jesus; and the satisfactory result. Mt. (xxi. 6) is much more summary.—Ver. 8. στιβάδας (στιβάς from στείβω, to tread, hence anything trodden, such as straw, reeds, leaves, etc.; here only in N. T.); "layers of leaves," R. V., margin; or layers of branches (κλάδους, Mt.) obtained, as Mk. explains, by cutting from the fields (κόψαντες ἐκ τ. ἀγρῶν).—στοιβάς (στοιβάδας, T. R.) is probably a corrupt form of στιβάς. Hesychius defines στιβάς as a bed of rods and green grass and leaves (ἀπὸ ῥάβδων καὶ χλωρῶν χόρτων στρῶσις, καὶ φύλλων).—Ver. 9. οἱ προάγοντες, those going before; pro-

ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου. 10. εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου[1] τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβίδ· Ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις." 11. Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ[2] εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντα, ὀψίας[3] ἤδη οὔσης τῆς ὥρας, ἐξῆλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

12. Καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐπείνασε· 13. καὶ ἰδὼν συκῆν μακρόθεν,[4] ἔχουσαν φύλλα, ἦλθεν εἰ ἄρα εὑρήσει τι[5] ἐν αὐτῇ· καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐπ' αὐτήν, οὐδὲν εὗρεν εἰ μὴ φύλλα· οὐ[6] γὰρ ἦν καιρὸς[6] σύκων. 14. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς[7] εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα[8] μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι." Καὶ ἤκουον

[1] Omit this second εν ον. K. with ℵBCDLΔ. [2] Omit ο I. και with ℵBCDLΔ.

[3] ℵCLΔ, Orig., have οψε (Tisch., W.H., text, brackets), but BD and other uncials have οψιας. B omits της ωρας.

[4] απο μακ. in many uncials (ℵBD, etc.). [5] τι ευρησει in ℵBCLΔ.

[6] ο γαρ καιρος ουκ ην in ℵBCLΔ cop. syr.

[7] ο I. omit ℵBCDLΔ; also in ver. 15.

[8] εις τον αιωνα before εκ σου in ℵBCDLΔ.

bably people who had gone out from the city to meet the procession.—Ver. 11. εἰσῆλθεν, etc.: the procession now drops out of view and attention is fixed on the movements of Jesus. He enters Jerusalem, and especially the temple, and surveys all (περιβλεψάμενος πάντα) with keenly observant eye, on the outlook, like St. Paul at Athens, not for the picturesque, but for the moral and religious element. He noted the traffic going on within the sacred precincts, though He postponed action till the morrow. Holtzmann (H. C.) thinks that the περιβλεψάμενος πάντα implies that Jesus was a stranger to Jerusalem. But, as Weiss remarks (in Meyer), Mk. cannot have meant to suggest that, even if Jesus had never visited Jerusalem since the beginning of the public ministry.

Vv. 12-14. *The fig tree on the way* (Mt. xxi. 18-19).—Ver. 12 tells how Jesus coming from Bethany, where He had passed the night with the Twelve, felt hunger. This is surprising, considering that He probably spent the night in the house of hospitable friends. Had the sights in the temple killed sleep and appetite, so that He left Bethany without taking any food?—Ver. 13. εἰ ἄρα, if in the circumstances; leaves there, creating expectation.—εὑρήσει: future indicative; subjunctive, more regular.—ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς, etc., for it was not the season of figs. This in Mk. only. The proper season was June for the first-ripe figs. One may wonder, then, how Jesus could have any expectations. But had He? Victor Ant. and Euthy. viewed the *hunger* as feigned. It is more reasonable to suppose that the hope of finding figs on the tree was, if not feigned, at least extremely faint. He might have a shrewd guess how the fact was, and yet go up to the tree as one who had a right to expect figs where there was a rich foliage, with intent to utilise it for a parable, if He could not find fruit on it. In those last days the prophetic mood was on Jesus in a high degree, and His action would be only very partially understood by the Twelve.—Ver. 14. φάγοι: the optative of wishing with μὴ (μηκέτι), as in classic Greek (Burton, M. T., § 476). The optative is comparatively rare in the N. T.—ἤκουον: the disciples heard (what He said); they were not inobservant. His manner would arrest attention. The remark prepares for what is reported in ver. 20; hence the imperfect.

Vv. 15-19. *Cleansing of the temple* (Mt. xxi. 12-17, Lk. xix. 45-48). The state of things Jesus saw in the temple yesterday has been in His mind ever since: through the night watches in Bethany; in the morning, killing appetite; on the way, the key to His enigmatical behaviour towards the fig tree.—Ver. 15. εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, into the temple, that is, the forecourt, the court of the Gentiles.—τοὺς π. καὶ τοὺς ἀ., *the* sellers and *the*

οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. 15. Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας[1] ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν, καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστερὰς κατέστρεψε· 16. καὶ οὐκ ἤφιεν ἵνα τις διενέγκῃ σκεῦος διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. 17. καὶ ἐδίδασκε, λέγων[2] αὐτοῖς, "Οὐ γέγραπται, 'Ὅτι ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν'; ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐποιήσατε[3] αὐτὸν σπήλαιον λῃστῶν." 18. Καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς,[4] καὶ ἐζήτουν πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσουσιν[5]· ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν, ὅτι πᾶς[6] ὁ ὄχλος ἐξεπλήσσετο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ.

19. Καὶ ὅτε[7] ὀψὲ ἐγένετο, ἐξεπορεύετο[8] ἔξω τῆς πόλεως. 20. Καὶ πρωῒ παραπορευόμενοι,[9] εἶδον τὴν συκῆν ἐξηραμμένην ἐκ ῥιζῶν. 21. καὶ ἀναμνησθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ῥαββί, ἴδε, ἡ συκῆ ἣν

[1] τους before αγορ. in ℵBCL *al.*
[2] For λεγων ℵBCLΔ have και ελεγε. B omits αυτοις.
[3] πεποιηκατε in BLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).
[4] αρχ. before γραμ. in ℵBCDLΔ *al.*
[5] απολεσωσιν in ℵABCDL, etc.
[6] πας γαρ in ℵBCΔ.
[7] οταν in ℵBCLΔ.
[8] BΔ have εξεπορευοντο (W.H., text, brackets).
[9] παραπ. πρωι in ℵBCDLΔ.

buyers: article before both (not so in Mt.), both put in the pillory as alike evil in their practice.—Ver. 16. ἤφιεν: *vide* i. 34. The statement that Jesus did not allow any one to carry anything (σκεῦος, Lk. viii. 16) through the temple court is peculiar to Mk. It does not point to any attempt at violent prohibition, but simply to His feeling as to the sacredness of the place. He could not bear to see the temple court made a bypath or short cut, not to speak of the graver abominations of the mercenary traffic He had sternly interrupted. In this feeling Jesus was at one with the Rabbis, at least in their theory. "What reverence is due to the temple? That no one go into the mountain of the house (the court of the Gentiles) with his staff, shoes, purse, or dust on his feet. Let no one make a crossing through it, or degrade it into a place of spitting" (Babyl. Jevamoth, in Lightfoot, *ad loc.*).—Ver. 17. ἐδίδασκε covers more than what He said just then, pointing to a course of teaching (*cf.* ver. 18 and Lk. xix. 47). Here again we note that while Mt. speaks of a *healing* ministry in the temple (xxi. 14) Mk. gives prominence to teaching. Yet Mt. gives a far fuller report of the words spoken by Jesus during the last week.—πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, to all the Gentiles, as in Is. lvi. 7, omitted in the parallel; very suitable in view of the fact that the traffic went on in the court of the Gentiles. A foreshadowing of Christian universalism.—πεποιήκατε, ye have made it and it now is.—Ver. 18. πῶς, the purpose to get rid of Jesus fixed, but the *how* puzzling because of the esteem in which He was held.—Ver. 19. ὅταν (ὅτε, T.R.) implies repetition of the action. We have here ἄν with the indicative instead of the optative without ἄν as in the classics. Field (*Ot. Nor.*) regards ὅταν ὀψὲ ἐγένετο as a solecism due probably to Mk. himself (as in iii. 11, ὅταν ἐθεώρουν), and holds that the connection in Mk.'s narrative is decidedly in favour of a single action instead of, as in Lk., a daily practice.

Vv. 20-25. *The withered fig tree and relative conversation* (Mk. xxi. 20-22).—Ver. 20. παραπορευόμενοι, passing by the fig tree (on the way to Jerusalem next morning).—πρωῒ: the position of this word after παραπ., instead of before as in T.R., is important. It gives it emphasis as suggesting that it was in the *clear morning light* that they noticed the state of the tree. It might have been in the same condition the previous evening, but it would be dark when they passed the spot.—Ver. 21. ἀναμνησθεὶς, remembering (what the Master had said the previous morning).—ὁ Πέτρος:

κατηράσω ἐξήρανται." 22. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἔχετε πίστιν Θεοῦ. 23. ἀμὴν γὰρ[1] λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, Ἄρθητι, καὶ βλήθητι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύσῃ ὅτι ἃ λέγει[2] γίνεται· ἔσται αὐτῷ ὃ ἐὰν εἴπῃ.[3] 24. διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, Πάντα ὅσα ἂν προσευχόμενοι[4] αἰτεῖσθε, πιστεύετε ὅτι λαμβάνετε,[5] καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν. 25. Καὶ ὅταν στήκητε[6] προσευχόμενοι, ἀφίετε εἴ τι ἔχετε κατά τινος· ἵνα καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφῇ ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν. 26. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε, οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν." [7]

27. ΚΑΙ ἔρχονται πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ, ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, 28. καὶ λέγουσιν[8] αὐτῷ, "Ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; καὶ[9] τίς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἔδωκεν,[10] ἵνα ταῦτα

[1] γαρ omitted in ℵBD.

[2] For πιστευσῃ οτι α λεγει ℵBLΔ have πιστευῃ οτι ο λαλει (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] Omit ο εαν ειπῃ ℵBCDLΔ.

[4] For οσα αν προσευχομενοι ℵBCDLΔ have οσα προσευχεσθε και (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] ελαβετε in ℵBCLΔ. T.R. is a correction.

[6] στηκετε in CDL (Tisch., W.H.), but B has στηκητε.

[7] Ver. 26 is omitted in ℵBLΔ (Tisch., W.H.). Weiss thinks it has fallen out by similar ending.

[8] ℵBCLΔ have ελεγον. λεγουσι conforms to ερχονται in ver. 27.

[9] η in ℵBLΔ.

[10] εδωκεν before την εξ. τ. in ℵBCLΔ.

spokesman as usual; the disciples generally in Mt.—Ver. 22. ἔχετε πίστιν, have *faith*. The thoughts of Jesus here take a turn in a different direction to what we should have expected. We look for explanations as to the real meaning of an apparently unreasonable action, the cursing of a fig tree. Instead, He turns aside to the subject of the faith necessary to perform miraculous actions. Can it be that the tradition is at fault here, connecting genuine words of the Master about faith and prayer with a comparatively unsuitable occasion? Certainly much of what is given here is found in other connections—ver. 23 in Mt. xvii. 20, Lk. xvii. 6; ver. 24 in Mt. vii. 7, Lk. xi. 9; ver. 25 in Mt. xviii. 35; of course in somewhat altered form. Mk. seems here to make room for some important words of our Lord, as if to compensate for neglect of the *didache* which he knew to be an important feature in His ministry, doing this, however, as Meyer remarks, by way of thoughtful redaction, not by mere random insertion.—πίστιν Θεοῦ, faith *in* God, genitive objective as in Rom. iii. 22 and Heb. vi. 2 (βαπτισμῶν διδαχὴν).—Ver. 24. ἐλάβετε: this reading (ℵBCLΔ) Fritzsche pronounces absurd. But its very difficulty as compared with λαμβάνετε (T.R.) guarantees its genuineness. And it is not unintelligible if, with Meyer, we take the aorist as referring to the divine purpose, or even as the aorist of immediate consequence, as in John xv. 6 (ἐβλήθη). So De Wette, *vide* Winer, sec. xl. 5 b.

Vv. 27-33. *By what authority?* (Mt. xxi. 23-27, Lk. xx. 1-8).—Ver. 27. πάλιν, *again*, for the third time: on the day of arrival, on the day of the temple cleansing, and on this day, the event of which is the questioning as to authority.—περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ, while He is walking about, genitive absolute, instead of accusative governed by πρὸς; probably simply descriptive (Schanz) and not implying anything offensive in manner—walking as if He were Lord of the place (Kloster.); nor, on the other hand, meant

ποιῇς;" 29. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς[1] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ[2] ἕνα λόγον, καὶ ἀποκρίθητέ μοι, καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ. 30. Τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου[3] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν, ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; ἀποκρίθητέ μοι." 31. Καὶ ἐλογίζοντο[4] πρὸς ἑαυτούς, λέγοντες, "Ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ, Διατί οὖν οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; 32. ἀλλ' ἐὰν[5] εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων," ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν,[6] ἅπαντες γὰρ εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην, ὅτι ὄντως[7] προφήτης ἦν. 33. καὶ ἀποκριθέντες λέγουσι τῷ Ἰησοῦ,[8] "Οὐκ οἴδαμεν." Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς[9] λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ."

XII. 1. ΚΑΙ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λέγειν,[10] "Ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτευσεν ἄνθρωπος, καὶ περιέθηκε φραγμόν, καὶ ὤρυξεν ὑπολήνιον, καὶ ᾠκοδόμησε πύργον, καὶ ἐξέδοτο[11] αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησε. 2. καὶ ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς τῷ καιρῷ δοῦλον, ἵνα παρὰ

[1] Omit αποκριθεις ℵBCLΔ 33. [2] καγω (from parall.) omitted in BCLΔ.
[3] το before I. in ℵBCDLΔ 33. [4] διελογιζοντο in BCDLΔ.
[5] Omit εαν ℵABCLΔ. *Vide* below. [6] οχλον in ℵBC (W.H.).
[7] οντως οτι in BCL. [8] τω I. λεγουσι in ℵBCLΔ 33.
[9] Omit αποκριθεις ℵBCLΔ 33. [10] λαλειν in ℵBLΔ.
[11] εξεδετο in ℵABCL, changed into the more correct εξεδοτο (T.R.).

to convey the idea that Jesus was giving no fresh cause of offence, simply walking about (Weiss).—Ver. 28. **ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς**: **ἵνα** with subjunctive after **ἐξουσίαν** instead of infinitive found in ii. 10, iii. 15.—Ver. 29. The grammatical structure of this sentence, compared with that in Mt. xxi. 24, is crude—**καὶ ἀποκρίθητέ μοι** instead of **ὃν ἐὰν εἴπητέ μοι**. It is colloquial grammar, the easy-going grammar of popular conversation.—**ἕνα λόγον**, *vide* at Mt. xxi. 24.—Ver. 30. **ἀποκρίθητέ μοι**, answer me; spoken in the confident tone of one who knows they cannot and will not try. —Vv. 31-32 give their inward thoughts as divined by Jesus. Their spoken answer was a simple **οὐκ οἴδαμεν** (ver. 33).—Ver. 32. **ἀλλὰ εἴπωμεν, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;** = but suppose we say, from men? —**ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν ὄχλον**. Here Mk. thinks for them instead of letting them think for themselves as in Mt. (ver. 26, **φοβούμεθα**) = —they were afraid of the multitude.—**ἅπαντες γὰρ**, etc.: here again the construction is somewhat crude—**Ἰωάννην** by attraction, object of the verb **εἶχον** instead of the subject of **ἦν**, and **ὄντως** by trajection separated from the verb it qualifies, **ἦν**, giving this sense: for all held John truly that he was a prophet = for all held that John was indeed a prophet.

CHAPTER XII. A PARABLE AND SUNDRY CAPTIOUS QUESTIONS.—Vv. 1-12. *Parable of the wicked vinedressers* (Mt. xxi. 33-46, Lk. xx. 9-19).—Ver. 1. **ἐν παραβολαῖς**: the plural may be used simply because there are more parables than one even in Mk., the main one and that of the Rejected Stone (vv. 10, 11), but it is more probably generic = in parabolic style (Meyer, Schanz, Holtz., H. C.). Jesus resumed (**ἤρξατο**) this style because the circumstances called forth the parabolic mood, that of one "whose heart is chilled, and whose spirit is saddened by a sense of loneliness, and who, retiring within himself, by a process of reflection, frames for his thoughts forms which half conceal, half reveal them"—*The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 20.—**ἀμπελῶνα**: a vineyard, the theme suitably named first.—**ἄμπελος** is the usual word in Greek authors, but Kypke cites some instances of **ἀμπελὼν** in late authors.—**ὑπολήνιον** (here only), the under vat of a wine press, into which the juices trampled out in the **ληνὸς** flowed.—**ἐξέδετο** (W.H.), a defective form, as if from **δίδω**. *Cf.* **ἀπέδετο**, Heb. xii. 16.—Ver. 2. **τῷ καιρῷ**: at

τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ[1] τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· 3. οἱ δὲ[2] λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἔδειραν, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν κενόν. 4. καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἄλλον δοῦλον· κἀκεῖνον λιθοβολήσαντες[3] ἐκεφαλαίωσαν, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ἠτιμωμένον.[3] 5. καὶ πάλιν[4] ἄλλον ἀπέστειλε· κἀκεῖνον ἀπέκτειναν· καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους, τοὺς[5] μὲν δέροντες, τοὺς[5] δὲ ἀποκτείνοντες. 6. ἔτι[6] οὖν ἕνα υἱὸν ἔχων ἀγαπητὸν αὐτοῦ, ἀπέστειλε καὶ αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔσχατον,[6] λέγων, Ὅτι ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. 7. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ εἶπον πρὸς ἑαυτούς,[7] Ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε, ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία. 8. καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸν ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ ἐξέβαλον[8] ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος. 9. τί οὖν[9] ποιήσει ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργούς, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις. 10. Οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε; 'Λίθον, ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. 11. παρὰ Κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστι

[1] των καρπων in ℵBCLΔ 33. [2] και for οι δε in ℵBDLΔ 33.

[3] ℵBDLΔ 33 omit λιθοβολησαντες; ℵBL have εκεφαλιωσαν; and for και απεστειλαν ητιμωμενον, ℵBL have και ητιμασαν (so also DΔ, but with varying spelling of verb). λιθοβολησαντες comes from Mt.

[4] Omit παλιν ℵBCDLΔ 33.

[5] ους in both places ℵBLΔ. D has ους in first, αλλους in second place.

[6] For ετι ουν . . . εσχατον read ετι ενα ειχεν υιον αγαπ. απεστειλεν αυτον εσχατον προς αυτους with ℵBLΔ.

[7] προς εαυ. ειπαν in ℵBCLΔ 33.

[8] ℵBC place αυτον after απεκτειναν and insert another αυτον after εξεβαλον.

[9] Omit ουν BL cop.

the season of fruit, or at the time agreed on; the two practically coincident.—δοῦλον: a servant, one at a time, three in succession, then many grouped together, and finally the son. In Mt. first one set of servants are sent, then a larger number, then the son.—ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν: a part of the fruits, rent paid in kind, a share of the crop.—Ver. 4. ἐκεφαλί (αί, T.R.) ωσαν: ought to mean, summed up (κεφάλαιον, Heb. viii. 1 = the crown of what has been spoken), but generally taken to mean "smote on the head" ("in capite vulneraverunt," Vulg.). A "veritable solecism," Meyer ("Mk. confounded κεφαλαιόω with κεφαλίζω"). Field says: "We can only conjecture that the evangelist adopted ἐκεφαλαίωσαν, a known word in an unknown sense, in preference to ἐκεφάλωσαν, of which both sound and sense were unknown".—Ver. 5. πολλοὺς ἄλλους, many others. The construction is very loose. We naturally think of πολ. ἄλ. as depending on ἀπέστειλε = he sent many others, and possibly that was really what the evangelist had in his mind, though the following participles, δέροντες ἀποκτέννοντες, suggest a verb, having for its subject the agents these participles refer to = they maltreated many others, beating some and killing some. So most recent writers. *Vide* Buttmann, *N. T. G.*, p. 293. Elsner suggests ἀπεσταλμένους after πολλ. ἄλλ. = and many others, sent, they either beat or slew.—Ver. 8. Mk. says: the son and heir they killed and cast out of the vineyard. Mt. and Lk. more naturally, as it seems: they cast out and killed. We must understand Mk. to mean cast out *dead* (Meyer, Weiss, Schanz), or with Grotius we must take καὶ ἐξέβαλον as = ἐκβληθέντα.—Ver. 11. παρὰ κυρίου, etc., from or through the Lord it (the rejected stone) became this very thing (αὕτη), *viz.*, the head of the corner—κεφαλὴ γωνίας.—Ver. 12. καὶ ἐφοβή-

θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν.'" 12. Καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον· ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπε· καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον.

13. Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσι πρὸς αὐτόν τινας τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἡρωδιανῶν, ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσι λόγῳ. 14. οἱ δὲ[1] ἐλθόντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Διδάσκαλε, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ, καὶ οὐ μέλει σοι περὶ οὐδενός· οὐ γὰρ βλέπεις εἰς πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ διδάσκεις. ἔξεστι κῆνσον Καίσαρι δοῦναι[2] ἢ οὔ; δῶμεν, ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;" 15. Ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί με πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον, ἵνα ἴδω." 16. Οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφή;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Καίσαρος." 17. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[3] "Ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος[4] Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ." Καὶ ἐθαύμασαν[5] ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

18. Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν, οἵτινες λέγουσιν

[1] **και** for **οι δε** in ℵBCDLΔ 33.

[2] **δουναι** before **κηνσον** in ℵBCLΔ. For **κηνσον** D has **επικαιφαλαιον**.

[3] For **και αποκ. . . . αυτοις** B has simply **ο δε Ι. ειπεν**.

[4] **τα Κ. αποδοτε Κ.** in ℵBCLΔ. T.R. conforms to Mt.

[5] **εξεθαυμασαν** in ℵB. T.R. = Mt.

θησαν: **καὶ** is to all intents adversative here, though grammarians deny that it is ever so used (*vide* Winer, sec. liii. 3 b) = they sought to lay hold of Him, *but* they feared the people.—**ἔγνωσαν** refers to the Synedrists (Weiss, Holtz.), not to the **ὄχλος** (Meyer). It gives a reason at once for their desire to lay hold of Jesus, and for their fear of the people. They must be careful so to act as not to *appear* to take the parable to themselves, while they really did so.

Vv. 13-17. *Tribute to Caesar* (Mt. xxii. 15-22, Lk. xx. 20-26).—Ver. 13. **τινὰς**: according to Mt. the representatives of the Pharisees were *disciples*, not masters; a cunning device in itself. *Vide* on Mt. xxii. 16.—**ἀγρεύσωσι** (here only in N.T.), that they might *hunt* or catch Him, like a wild animal. Mt.'s expression, **παγιδεύσωσι**, equally graphic. Lk. avoids both.—**λόγῳ**: either, their question, or His reply; the one involves the other.—Ver. 14. The flattering speech is differently and more logically (Schanz) given in Mt. *Vide* notes there on the virtues specified.—**ἔξεστιν**, etc.: the question now put, and in two forms in Mk. First, as in Mt., is it lawful, etc.; second, in the added words, **δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;** These have been distinguished as the theoretical and the practical form of the question respectively (Meyer, Weiss, Schanz), but there is no real difference. Yet it is not idle repetition. The second question gives urgency to the matter. They speak as men who press for an answer for their guidance (Holtz., H. C.).—Ver. 15. **δηνάριον**: instead of Mt.'s **νόμισμα τοῦ κήνσου**; as a matter of fact the denarius was the coin of the tribute.—**ἵνα ἴδω**, that I may see: as if He needed to study the matter, a touch of humour. The question was already settled by the existence of a coin with Caesar's image on it. This verb and the next, **ἤνεγκαν**, are without object; laconic style.—Ver. 17. Christ's reply is given here very tersely = the things of Caesar render to Caesar, and those of God to God.—**ἐξεθαύμαζον**: the compound, in place of Mt.'s simple verb, suggests the idea of excessive astonishment, though we must always allow for the tendency in late Greek to use compounds. Here only in N. T., occasionally in Sept.

Vv. 18-27. *The resurrection question* (Mt. xxii. 23-33, Lk. xx. 27-29).—Ver. 19. The case is awkwardly stated here as compared with Mt., though Lk. retains the awkwardness = if the brother of any

ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι· καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν[1] αὐτόν, λέγοντες, 19. "Διδάσκαλε, Μωσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ, καὶ καταλίπῃ γυναῖκα, καὶ τέκνα μὴ ἀφῇ,[2] ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,[3] καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ· 20. ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ἔλαβε γυναῖκα, καὶ ἀποθνήσκων οὐκ ἀφῆκε σπέρμα· 21. καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἀπέθανε, καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφῆκε σπέρμα[4]· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως· 22. καὶ[5] ἔλαβον αὐτὴν οἱ ἑπτά, καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκαν σπέρμα.[5] ἐσχάτη[6] πάντων ἀπέθανε καὶ ἡ γυνή.[6] 23. ἐν τῇ οὖν[7] ἀναστάσει, ὅταν ἀναστῶσι,[8] τίνος αὐτῶν ἔσται γυνή; οἱ γὰρ ἑπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα." 24. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[9] "Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς, μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ; 25. ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν, οὔτε γαμίσκονται,[10] ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. 26. περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν, ὅτι ἐγείρονται, οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωσέως, ἐπὶ τῆς[11] βάτου, ὡς[12] εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός, λέγων, 'Ἐγὼ ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ

[1] επηρωτων in ℵBCDLΔ 33. T.R. = parall.

[2] μη αφη τεκνον in BLΔ.

[3] Omit αυτου ℵBCLΔ.

[4] For και ουδε . . . σπερμα ℵBCLΔ 33 have μη καταλιπων σ.

[5] For και ελαβον . . . σπερμα ℵBCLΔ 33 have και οι επτα ουκ αφηκαν σπερμα.

[6] For εσχατη . . . γυνη read with ℵBCLΔ 33 εσχατον και η γυνη απεθανεν.

[7] Omit ουν ℵBCLΔ.

[8] The oldest uncials omit οταν αναστωσι, which may, as Weiss suggests, have fallen out by similar ending (αναστασει) (Tisch. inserts, W.H. omit).

[9] For και . . . αυτοις read εφη αυτοις ο Ι. with ℵBCLΔ 33.

[10] γαμιζονται in ℵBCLΔ (γαμιζουσι D).

[11] του in ℵABCLΔ *al.* της in D (= Lk.).

[12] πως in ℵBCLΔ. ως in D, *al.*

one die, and leave a wife, and leave not children, let his (the brother's) brother take his wife and raise up seed to his brother. Mk. avoids the word ἐπιγαμβρεύσει (in Mt.).—Ver. 20: abrupt statement of the case, without connecting particle, and ἑπτὰ placed first for emphasis = *seven* brothers there were (in a case supposed, or pretendedly real, παρ' ἡμῖν, Mt.).—Ver. 23. τίνος αὐτῶν, etc., of which of them shall she be the wife? (γυνή, without the article, *vide* notes on Mt.).—Ver. 24. οὐ πλανᾶσθε, do ye not err? not weaker but stronger than a positive assertion: "pro vehementi affirmatione," Grotius.—διὰ τοῦτο usually refers to something going before, and it may do so here, pointing to their question as involving ignorant presuppositions regarding the future state, an ignorance due, in turn, to ignorance of Scripture teaching and the power of God. But it is more natural to connect it with the following clause, as in cases when the expression precedes ὅτι, ἵνα, ὅταν, etc., for μὴ εἰδότες is = ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε. So De Wette and others, *vide* Winer, sec. xxiii. 5.—Ver. 26. ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μ.: a general reference to the Pentateuch, the following phrase, ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου, supplying a more definite reference to the exact place in the book, the section relating to the bush. "At the bush," *i.e.*, Ex. iii., similarly reference might be made to Ex. xv., by the title: "at the song of Moses".—βάτος is masculine here according to the best reading; feminine in Lk. xx. 37. The feminine is Hellenistic, the masculine Attic. *Vide* Thayer's *Grimm*. The word occurs in Aristo-

ὁ[1] Θεὸς Ἰσαάκ, καὶ ὁ[1] Θεὸς Ἰακώβ'; 27. Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ[2] Θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ Θεὸς[3] ζώντων· ὑμεῖς οὖν[4] πολὺ πλανᾶσθε."

28. Καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς τῶν γραμματέων, ἀκούσας αὐτῶν συζητούντων, εἰδὼς ὅτι καλῶς αὐτοῖς ἀπεκρίθη,[5] ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, "Ποία ἐστὶ πρώτη πασῶν ἐντολή[6];" 29. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ,[7] "Ὅτι πρώτη πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν,[8] 'Ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ· Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν Κύριος εἷς ἐστί. 30. καὶ ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου.' αὕτη πρώτη ἐντολή.[9] 31. καὶ δευτέρα ὁμοία αὕτη,[10] 'Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.'

[1] BD omit the article in these two places.
[2] BDLΔ omit ο, which has been introduced through θεος being taken as subject.
[3] Omit θεος ℵABCDΔΣ.
[4] ℵBCLΔ K cop. omit υμεις ουν. *Vide* below.
[5] απεκριθη αυτοις in ℵBCLΔ 33.
[6] εντολη πρωτη παντων in ℵBCLΔ. T.R. is a grammatical correction.
[7] απεκριθη ο Ι. in ℵBLΔ 33.
[8] For οτι . . . εντολων read with ℵBLΔ οτι πρωτη εστι.
[9] Omit αυτη π. εν. (a gloss from ver. 28) with ℵBLΔ.
[10] For και . . . αυτη BLΔ have simply δευτερα αυτη (Tisch., W.H.).

phanes and in the N. T.; possibly colloquial (Kennedy, *Sources of N.T.G.*, p. 78).—Ver. 27. **πολὺ πλανᾶσθε**, much ye err. This new and final assertion of ignorance is very impressive; severe, but kindly; much weakened by adding **ὑμεῖς οὖν**.

Vv. 28-34. *The great commandment* (Mt. xxii. 34-40). The permanent value of this section lies in the answer of Jesus to the question put to Him, which is substantially the same in both Mt. and Mk. The accounts vary in regard to the motive of the questioner. In Mt. he comes to tempt, in Mk. in hope of getting confirmation in a new way of thinking on the subject, similar to that of the man in quest of eternal life—that which put the ethical above the ritual. No anxious attempt should be made to remove the discrepancy. — Ver. 28. **προσελθών, ἀκούσας, εἰδὼς**: the second and third of these three participles may be viewed as the ground of the first = one of the scribes, having heard them disputing, and being conscious that He (Jesus) answered them well, approached and asked Him, etc.—**ποία**, what sort of; it is a question, not of an individual commandment, but of characteristic quality. The questioner, as conceived by Mk., probably had in view the distinction between ritual and ethical, or positive and moral. The prevalent tendency was to attach special importance to the positive, and to find the great matters of the law in circumcision, Sabbath-keeping, the rules respecting phylacteries, etc. (Lightfoot). The opposite tendency, to emphasise the *ethical*, was not unrepresented, especially in the school of Hillel, which taught that the love of our neighbour is the kernel of the law. The questioner, as he appears in Mk., leant to this side.—Ver. 29. **ἄκουε, Ἰσραήλ**, etc.: this monotheistic preface to the great commandment is not given by Mt. Possibly Mk. has added it by way of making the quotation complete, but more probably Jesus Himself quoted it to suggest that duty, like God, was one, in opposition to the prevailing habit of viewing duty as consisting in isolated precepts. Mt. compensates for the omission by preserving the reflection: "On these two commandments hangeth the whole law and the prophets". In Mk. the bond of unity is *God;* in Mt. *love*.—Ver. 30. Heart, soul, mind, strength (**ἰσχύος**); in Mt.: heart, soul, mind; in Lk. (x. 27): heart, soul, strength, mind; in Deut. (vi. 4): heart, soul, strength (**δυνάμεως**); all varied ways of saying "to the uttermost degree" = "all that is within";

Μείζων τούτων ἄλλη ἐντολὴ οὐκ ἔστι." 32. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ γραμματεύς, "Καλῶς, διδάσκαλε, ἐπ' ἀληθείας εἶπας, ὅτι εἷς ἐστι Θεός,[1] καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν αὐτοῦ. 33. καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾷν αὐτὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς,[2] καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος, καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾷν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτόν, πλεῖόν[3] ἐστι πάντων τῶν ὁλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν." 34. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν αὐτόν, ὅτι νουνεχῶς ἀπεκρίθη, εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Οὐ μακρὰν εἶ ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ." Καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.

35. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγε, διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, "Πῶς λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς, ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς υἱός ἐστι Δαβίδ[4]; 36. αὐτὸς γὰρ[5] Δαβὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ, 'Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου[6] ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον[7] τῶν ποδῶν σου.' 37. Αὐτὸς οὖν[8] Δαβὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον· καὶ πόθεν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστι[9];" Καὶ ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως.

[1] ℵABLΔΣ *al.* omit θεος.
[2] Omit this clause imported from ver. 30, and found in ADΣ *al.*
[3] περισσοτερον in ℵBLΔ 33.
[4] Δαβιδ before εστιν in ℵBDL.
[5] ℵBLΔ omit γαρ.
[6] καθισον in B (Trg., W.H., marg.).
[7] υποκατω in BD sah. cop.
[8] ℵBLΔ omit ουν.
[9] αυτου εστιν υιος in BL.

and with the full potency of that "all".—Ver. 32. **καλῶς, ἐπ' ἀληθείας**: to be taken together = well indeed!—**εἷς ἐστιν**: He is one (God understood, supplied in T.R.).—Ver. 33: the manner of loving God is stated by the scribe in yet another form of language: heart, understanding (**συνέσεως**), might.—**περισσότερόν ἐστιν**, etc., is more, far, than all the burnt offerings and the sacrifices (meat offerings) = the whole Levitical ritual. There is a ring of conviction in the words. The varied expression of the law of love to God (**συνέσεως**) also bears witness to sincerity and independent thought. — **ὁλοκαυτωμάτων** (**ὁλοκαυτόω**, from **ὅλος, καίω**), here and in Heb. x. 6, from Sept., for עֹלָה.—Ver. 34. **νουνεχῶς**, intelligently, as one who had a mind (of his own), and really thought what he said, a refreshing thing to meet with at any time, and especially there and then. Here only in N.T. = **νουνεχόντως** in classics.—**οὐ μακρὰν**, not far; near by insight into its nature (the ethical supreme), and in spirit—a sincere thinker.—**οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι**, etc.: questioning given up because seen to be vain, always ending either in the confusion or in the acquiescence of questioners (*cf.* Lk. xx. 40).

Vv. 35-37. *David's Son and David's Lord* (Mt. xxii. 41-46, Lk. xx. 41-44). On the aim and import of this counter-question *vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 35. **ἀποκριθεὶς, διδάσκων ἐ. τ. ἱ.**: these two participles describe the circumstances under which the question was asked—addressed to silenced and disheartened opponents, and forming a part of the public instruction Jesus had been giving in the temple; a large body of people present.—Ver. 36. **αὐτὸς Δ.** Over against the dogma of the scribes, stated in ver. 35 as something well known (in Mt. Jesus asks for their opinion on the topic), is set the declaration of David himself, introduced without connecting particle. *David*, who ought to know better than the scribes.—**ἐν τῷ π. τ. ἁ.**: especially when speaking, as they would all admit, *by inspiration*.—**εἶπεν**, etc.: the quotation as given in T.R. exactly reproduces the Sept. The omission of **ὁ** before **Κύριος** in BD turns the latter into a proper name of God.—**κάθου** (**κάθισον** in B) is a late or "popular" form of the

38. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ,[1] "Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν, καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, 39. καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις· 40. οἱ κατεσθίοντες[2] τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν, καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι· οὗτοι λήψονται περισσότερον κρίμα."

41. Καὶ καθίσας ὁ Ἰησοῦς[3] κατέναντι[4] τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου ἐθεώρει πῶς ὁ ὄχλος βάλλει χαλκὸν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον. καὶ πολλοὶ

[1] εν τῃ διδ. αυτου ελεγεν in ℵBLΔ 33.

[2] B has κατεσθοντες.

[3] ℵBLΔ cop. omit ο Ι.

[4] So in ℵADΔΣ (Tisch., W.H., text, brackets). απεναντι in B (W.H. marg.).

present imperative of κάθημαι.—Ver. 37. καὶ ὁ πολὺς ὄχλος, etc.: this remark about the large crowd which had been witness to these encounters, as it stands in our N. T. at end of ver. 37, seems to refer merely to the closing scene of the conflict. Probably the evangelist meant the reflection to apply to the whole = the masses enjoyed Christ's victory over the classes, who one after the other measured their wits against His. The remark is true to the life. The people gladly hear one who speaks felicitously, refutes easily, and escapes dexterously from the hands of designing men. (ὡς ἡδέως διαλεγομένου, καὶ εὐχερῶς αὐτοὺς ἀνατρέποντος, καὶ ὡς αὐτὸς ἀπηλλαγμένος τῆς βασκανίας—Euthy. Zig.)

Vv. 38-40. *Warning against the influence of the scribes* (Lk. xx. 45-47). As if encouraged by the manifest sympathy of the crowd, Jesus proceeds to warn them against the baleful influence of their religious guides.—Ver. 38. ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ α.: this expression alone suffices to show that what Mk. here gives is but a fragment of a larger discourse of the same type—an anti-scribal manifesto. Here again the evangelist bears faithful witness to a great body of διδαχή he does not record. Mt. xxiii. shows how much he omits at this point.—ἔλεγεν: the imperfect here may be taken as suggesting that what follows is but a sample = He was saying things like this. —βλέπετε ἀπὸ as in viii. 15.—θελόντων, desiring, not so much claiming as their privilege (Meyer) as taking a childish pleasure in = φιλούντων, Lk. xx. 46.—ἐν στολαῖς, in long robes, worn by persons of rank and distinction ("gravitatis index," Grotius), possibly worn specially long by the scribes that the tassels attached might trail on the ground. So Wünsche, *ad loc.* *Vide* picture of Pharisee in his robes in Lund, *Heiligthümer*. — περιπατεῖν: infinitive, depending on θελόντων followed by accusatives, ἀσπασμούς, etc., depending on same word: *oratio variata*, *vide* Mt. xxiii. 6.—Ver. 40. οἱ κατεσθίοντες: this verse is probably still to be regarded as a continuation of the description ot the scribes commencing with τῶν θελόντων, only the writer has lost the sense of the original construction, and instead of the genitive puts the nominative, so giving to what follows the force of an independent sentence (so Weiss). Grotius, Meyer, and Schanz take ver. 40 as a really independent sentence. Lk. set the precedent for this; for, apparently having Mk.'s text before him, he turns οἱ κατεσθίοντες into οἱ κατεσθίουσι. Holtzmann, H. C., is undecided between the two views. As to the sense, two facts are stated about the scribes: they devoured the houses, the property of widows, and they made long (μακρά, *vide* on Lk. xx. 47) prayers in the homes of, and presumably for, these widows.—προφάσει: the real aim to get money, the long seemingly fervent prayers a blind to hide this aim. It is not necessary to suppose that the money-getting and the praying were connected by regular contract (so apparently Fritzsche, and Weiss in Meyer). For πρόφασις *cf.* Phil. i. 18 and especially 1 Thess. ii. 5.—οὗτοι λήψονται, etc.: this remark applies specially to the conduct just described: catching widows' substance with the bait of prayer, which Jesus characteristically pronounces exceptionally damnable in view of its sleek hypocrisy and low greed. The appending of this reflection favours the view that ver. 40 is after all an independent sentence. In it and the two preceding

πλούσιοι ἔβαλλον πολλά· 42. καὶ ἐλθοῦσα μία χήρα πτωχὴ ἔβαλε λεπτὰ δύο, ὅ ἐστι κοδράντης. 43. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγει[1] αὐτοῖς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ χήρα αὕτη ἡ πτωχὴ πλεῖον πάντων βέβληκε τῶν βαλόντων[2] εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον. 44. πάντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον· αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ἔβαλεν, ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς."

[1] ειπεν in ℵABDLΔΣ.

[2] For βεβληκε, ABDLΔΣ 33 have εβαλεν, and for βαλοντων ℵABDLΔΣ have βαλλοντων. Tisch. reads βεβληκεν τ. βαλλ., W.H. εβαλεν τ. βαλλ.

we have a very slight yet vivid picture of Pharisaic piety in its vanity, avarice, and hypocrisy.

Vv. 41-44. *The widow's offering* (Lk. xxi. 1-4). This charming story comes in with dramatic effect, after the repulsive picture of the greedy praying scribe. The reference to the widows victimised by the hypocrites may have suggested it to the evangelist's mind. It bears the unmistakable stamp of an authentic reminiscence, and one can imagine what comfort it would bring to the poor, who constituted the bulk of the early Gentile Church (Schanz).—Ver. 41. **καθίσας**: Jesus, a close and keen observer of all that went on (xi. 11), sits down at a spot convenient for noticing the people casting their contributions into the temple treasury.—**γαζοφυλακίου** (**γάζα**, Persian, **φυλακή** = **θησαυροφυλάκιον**, Hesychius). Commentators are agreed in thinking that the reference is to the treasury in the court of the women, consisting of thirteen brazen trumpet-shaped receptacles, each destined for its distinctive gifts, indicated by an inscription, so many for the temple tribute, and money gifts for sacrifice; others for incense, wood, etc.; all the gifts having reference to the service carried on. The gifts were people's offerings, generally moderate in amount: "the Peter's pence of the Jews" (Holtzmann, H. C.).—**χαλκὸν** may be meant for money in general, copper representing all sorts (Fritzsche, Grotius, etc.); but there seems to be no good reason why we should not take it strictly as denoting contributions in copper, the ordinary, if not exclusive, money gifts (Meyer; Holtzmann, H. C.).—**πολλοὶ πλούσιοι**, etc., many rich were casting in much: Jesus was near enough to see that, also to notice exactly what the widow gave. Among the rich givers might be some of the praying scribes who had imposed on widows by their show of piety, suggesting reflections on where wealthy givers get the money they bestow for pious purposes. That is not a matter of indifference to the Kingdom of God, whatever it may be to beneficiaries.—Ver. 42. **μία χ. π.**, *one* poverty-stricken widow. With what intense interest Jesus would watch her movements, after His eye fell on her! How much will *she* give?—**λεπτὰ δύο**, "two mites"; minute, of course, but *two*: she might have kept one of them (Bengel).—**λεπτόν**, so called from its smallness; smallest of brass coins—significant of deep poverty; two given, of a willing mind.—Ver. 43. **ἡ πτωχὴ**, emphatic—the poverty-stricken; manifest from her dress and wasted look.—Ver. 44.—**ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως**, from her state of want, *cf.* on Lk.—**ὑστέρησις**, here and in Phil. iv. 11.—**πάντα ὅσα**: this not visible to the eye; divined by the mind, but firmly believed to be true, as appears from the repetition of the statement in another form.—**ὅλον τὸν βίον**, her whole means of life. For the use of **βίος** in this sense *vide* Lk. viii. 43, xv. 12, 30; similarly in classics.

Though it has nothing to do with strict exegesis, I am tempted to give here a prayer by that felicitous interpreter and devout monk, Euthymius Zigabenus, based on this beautiful Gospel story: "May my soul become a widow casting out the devil to which it is joined and subject, and casting into the treasury of God two *lepta*, the body and the mind; the one made light (**λεπτυνθέντα**) by temperance, the other by humility".

CHAPTER XIII. THE APOCALYPTIC DISCOURSE. This is the solitary instance in which the second evangelist has given at length a discourse of Jesus. The fulness with which the apocalyptic discourse is recorded is all the more striking, when contrasted with the very meagre reproduction of the anti-pharisaic discourse (xii. 38-40). The exception made in its favour was doubtless due to

XIII. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, λέγει αὐτῷ εἷς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, "Διδάσκαλε, ἴδε, ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί." 2. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς[1] εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ[2] λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ,[3] ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ." 3. Καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ἐπηρώτων[4] αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας, 4. "Εἰπὲ[5] ἡμῖν, πότε ταῦτα ἔσται; καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον ὅταν μέλλῃ πάντα ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι[6];" 5. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτοῖς ἤρξατο λέγειν,[7] "Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ. 6. πολλοὶ γὰρ[8] ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου,

[1] Omit αποκριθεις with ℵBL 33.
[2] Add ωδε with ℵBDLΔΣ (W.H.).
[3] λιθον in ℵBLΔ 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
[4] επηρωτα in ℵBL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
[5] ειπον in ℵBDL 33.
[6] ταυτα συντελ. παντα in ℵBL.
[7] ℵBL 33 have ηρξατο λεγειν αυτοις without αποκριθεις (Tisch., W.H.).
[8] Omit γαρ ℵBL.

Mk.'s estimate of its interest and value for his first readers. Perhaps he was influenced in part by the fascinations of *prediction*. The real interest of the discourse and the key to its interpretation are to be found, as pointed out in the notes on the corresponding chapter in Mt., in its *ethical aim*—"to forewarn and forearm the representatives of a new faith, so that they might not lose their heads or their hearts in an evil perplexing time": notes on Mt. For a full exposition of the discourse in the light of this aim readers are referred to these notes.

Vv. 1-4. *The introduction* (Mt. xxiv. 1-3; Lk. xxi. 5-7).—Ver. 1. **εἷς τ. μαθητῶν**, *one* of the disciples; the disciples generally in Mt.; who, not said, nor for what motive; probably to divert the Master from gloomy thoughts.—**ποταποὶ λίθοι**, etc.: what stones and what buildings! the former remarkable for size, as described by Josephus (Antiq., xv., 11, 3); the latter for beauty. On **ποταπός** *vide* at Mt. viii. 27.—Ver. 2. **βλέπεις**: a question, do you see? to fix attention on an object concerning which a startling statement is to be made.—**μεγάλας**, *great* buildings, acknowledging the justness of the admiration and pointing to a feature which might seem incompatible with the statement following: that vast strong pile surely proof against destruction!—Ver. 3. **εἰς τὸ ὄρος**: implying previous motion towards, before sitting down *on* the Mount of Olives.—**κατέναντι τ. ἱ.**, opposite the temple, with the admired buildings in full view; this graphic touch in Mk. only. —**ἐπηρώτα** (ℵBL), singular: Peter in view as the chief speaker, though accompanied by other three; imperfect, as subordinate to **ἤρξατο** in ver. 5 explaining the occasion of the discourse Jesus then began to deliver.—**ὁ Πέτρος**, etc.: the well-known three, and a *fourth* —Andrew; a selection found only here. Were these all the disciples with Jesus, all who went with Him to Bethany in the evenings, the rest remaining in Jerusalem? The two pairs of brothers were the first called to discipleship (Mk. i. 16-20). This reminiscence points to internal relations in the disciple-circle imperfectly known to us.—**κατ' ἰδίαν**, apart, *i.e.*, from the rest of the disciples. Mt. has the same phrase, though he assumes all the disciples to be present, which is suggestive of literary dependence.—Ver. 4. The question of the four has exclusive reference to the predicted destruction of the sacred buildings. In Mt. three questions are mixed together: *vide* notes there.

Vv. 5-8. *Signs prelusive of the end* (Mt. xxiv. 4-8, Lk. xxi. 8-11). Jerusalem's judgment-day not to come till certain things have happened: advent of false Messiahs, rise of wars.—**βλέπετε**, take heed that no one *deceive* you; the ethical key-note struck at once; the aim of the whole discourse to help disciples to keep heads cool, and hearts brave in a perilous evil time (*vide* on Mt.).—Ver. 6. **ἐγώ εἰμι**, I am (He, the Christ). In what sense to be understood *vide* on Mt. The Messianic hope misconceived was the ruin of the Jewish people.—Ver. 7.

λέγοντες, Ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι· καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήσουσιν. 7. ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων, μὴ θροεῖσθε· δεῖ γὰρ[1] γενέσθαι· ἀλλ' οὔπω τὸ τέλος. 8. Ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος, καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν· καὶ[2] ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, καὶ[2] ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί.[3] ἀρχαὶ[4] ὠδίνων ταῦτα. 9. Βλέπετε δὲ ὑμεῖς ἑαυτούς. παραδώσουσι γὰρ[5] ὑμᾶς εἰς συνέδρια, καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε, καὶ ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνων καὶ βασιλέων σταθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς· 10. καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη δεῖ πρῶτον[6] κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. 11. ὅταν δὲ ἀγάγωσιν[7] ὑμᾶς παραδιδόντες, μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε, μηδὲ μελετᾶτε[8] ἀλλ' ὃ ἐὰν δοθῇ ὑμῖν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, τοῦτο λαλεῖτε· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον. 12. παραδώσει δὲ[9] ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφὸν εἰς θάνατον, καὶ πατὴρ τέκνον·

[1] אB sah. cop. omit γαρ. *Vide* below.

[2] אBDL omit the first και and BL the second. *Vide* below.

[3] אBDL vet. Lat. vulg. cop. omit και ταραχαι (so Trg., Tisch., W.H.), but these words may have fallen out by similar ending (αρχαι, so Weiss).

[4] αρχη in אBDLΔ (Trg., Tisch., W.H.), which may be an assimilation to Mt. αρχαι in AEFGXΓΣ *al.* (Weiss).

[5] Omit γαρ BL cop.

[6] πρωτον δει in אBD. LΔ = T.R.

[7] και οταν αγωσιν in אBDL.

[8] אBDL omit μηδε μελετατε.

[9] και παραδωσει in אBDL.

πολέμους: first pseudo-Messiahs preaching national independence; then, naturally, as a second **σημεῖον**, *wars*, actual or threatened (**ἀκοὰς πολ.**).—**μὴ θροεῖσθε**: good counsel, cheerful in tone, laconic in expression = be not scared; they must happen; but the end not yet. The disconnected style, no **γὰρ** after **δεῖ** (אB), suits thee motional prophetic mood.—**τὸ τέλος**, the crisis of Jerusalem. —Ver. 8. **ἔσονται σεισμοί**, etc., there will be earthquakes in places; there will be famines. Here again the briefest reading without connecting particles (**καί, καί**) is to be preferred, as suiting the abrupt style congenial to the prophetic mood. The **καὶ ταραχαί** after **λιμοὶ** may have fallen out of אBDL by homoeoteleuton (**ἀρχαὶ** following immediately after), but after earthquakes and famines *disturbances* seems an anticlimax.

Ver. 9-13. *Third sign, drawn from apostolic experiences* (Mt. xxiv. 9-13, Lk. xxi. 12-19). On the hypothesis that this is an interpolation into the discourse, having no organic connection with it, *vide* on Mt. The contents of this section, especially in Mk.'s version, correspond closely to Mt. x. 17-22. But the question, in which of the two discourses the logion has the more historical setting, is not thereby settled. Some utterance of the sort was certainly germane to the present situation.—Ver. 9. **βλέπετε**, etc.: not meant to strike a depressing note, but to suggest that the most interesting omens should be found in their own experiences as the Apostles of the faith, which, however full of tribulation, would yet be, on the whole, victorious.—**παραδώσουσι**, etc.: the tribulations are not disguised, but the blunt statement only lends emphasis to the declaration in ver. 10 that, notwithstanding, the Gospel must (**δεῖ**) and shall be proclaimed on a wide scale.—**εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε**: the **εἰς** here is pregnant = you, delivered to the synagogues, shall be maltreated. Bengel renders: "in synagogas inter verbera agemini" = ye shall be driven into the synagogues with clubs. So Nösgen.—Ver. 11 gives counsel for Apostles placed at the bar of kings and rulers. They are not to be anxious beforehand (**προμεριμνᾶτε**, here only in N.T.) even as to what they shall say, not to speak of what shall happen to them as the result of the trial. Their *apologia* will be given to them. They will not be the

καὶ ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς, καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς· 13. καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου· ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται.

14. "Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου,[1] ἑστὸς[2] ὅπου οὐ δεῖ· (ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω·) τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη· 15. ὁ δὲ[3] ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν,[4] μηδὲ εἰσελθέτω ἆραί τι[5] ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ· 16. καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν ὢν[6] μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, ἆραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ. 17. οὐαὶ δὲ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις. 18. προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα μὴ γένηται ἡ φυγὴ ὑμῶν[7] χειμῶνος. 19. ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι θλίψις, οἵα οὐ γέγονε τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἧς[8] ἔκτισεν ὁ Θεός, ἕως τοῦ νῦν, καὶ οὐ μὴ

[1] ℵBDL omit **το ρηθεν . . . προφητου**, which comes from Mt.

[2] **εστηκοτα** in ℵBL (*vide* below).

[3] B sah. cop. omit **δε**. More expressive without.

[4] ℵBL omit **εις την οικιαν**, a gloss.

[5] **τι αραι** in BL.

[6] ℵBDLΔ omit **ων**.

[7] ℵBL omit **η φυγη υμων**. More impressive without. What meant obvious. *Vide* below.

[8] **ην** in ℵBCL.

real speakers (**οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς οἱ λαλοῦντες**), but the Holy Spirit. Lk. has "I" here: Christ = the Holy Ghost. This comforting word is wanting in Mt., and whether it was really spoken at this time must remain uncertain. Mt. describes with more detail the internal troubles of the Christian community—mutual treachery, false prophets (within, not without, like the false Messiahs of ver. 5), lawlessness, chilling of early enthusiasm—all implying the lapse of a considerable time, and all to happen before the end of Jerusalem. (Vv. 10-12.) For all this Mk. gives only the brief statement in ver. 12.—Ver. 13 answers in its first part to Mt. xxiv. 9b, and in its second to Mt. xxiv. 13.

Vv. 14-23. *The Jewish catastrophe* (Mt. xxiv. 15-25, Lk. xxi. 20-24).—Ver. 14. **τὸ βδέλυγμα τ. ἐ.** The horror is the Roman army, and it is a horror because of the desolation it brings. *Vide* on Mt. The reference to Daniel in T.R. is imported from Mt.—**ἑστηκότα**, the reading in the best texts, masculine, though referring to **βδέλυγμα**, because the horror consists of soldiers (Schanz) or their general. (*Cf.* **ὁ κατέχων**, 2 Thess. ii. 7.)—**ὅπου οὐ δεῖ**, where it ought not, instead of **ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ** in Mt.—a graceful circumlocution betraying the Jewish Christian writing for heathen Christians, abstaining from making claims that might be misunderstood for his native country by calling it the "holy land" (Schanz).—**ὁ ἀναγινώσκων ν.** The reference here cannot be to Daniel, which is not mentioned in Mk., but either to the Gospel itself or to a separate document which it embodies—a Jewish or Jewish-Christian Apocalypse (*vide* on Mt.). The words may be taken as a direction to the reader in synagogue or church to explain further the meaning to hearers, it being a matter of vital practical concern. *Vide* Weizsäcker, *Das Apos. Zeit.*, p. 362.—Ver. 15. **δώματος**, he who is on the *roof*. *Vide* at Mt. x. 27. The main point to be noted in Mk.'s version of the directions for the crisis as compared with Mt.'s (*q.v.*) is the omission of the words **μηδὲ σαββάτῳ**, probably out of regard to Gentile readers.—Ver. 18. **ἵνα μὴ γένηται**, that *it* may not be; what not said, **φυγὴ** (T.R.) being omitted in best texts = the nameless horror which makes flight imperative, the awful crisis of Israel.—Ver. 19. **ἔσονται γὰρ αἱ ἡμέραι**, etc., for (not *in* those days, but) those days (themselves) shall be a tribulation. So we speak of

γένηται. 20. καὶ εἰ μὴ Κύριος ἐκολόβωσε[1] τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο, ἐκολόβωσε τὰς ἡμέρας. 21. Καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ, Ἰδού,[2] ὧδε ὁ Χριστός, ἤ ἰδού,[2] ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύσητε.[3] 22. ἐγερθήσονται γὰρ ψευδόχριστοι καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται, καὶ δώσουσι[4] σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾷν, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ[5] τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς. 23. ὑμεῖς δὲ βλέπετε· ἰδού,[6] προείρηκα ὑμῖν πάντα. 24. Ἀλλ' ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην, ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται, καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς, 25. καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται ἐκπίπτοντες,[7] καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται. 26. καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης. 27. καὶ τότε ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ,[8] καὶ ἐπισυνάξει τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ[8] ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς ἕως ἄκρου οὐρανοῦ.

[1] εκολ. Κ. in ℵBL.

[2] ℵBL have ιδε both times; for η before second ιδε B has και, which has been changed into η (as in Mt.) in DΔΣ *al.*; omitted in ℵL (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] πιστευετε in ℵABCDLΔ.

[4] δωσουσι in ℵABCLΣ *al.* ποιησουσι in D (Tisch.).

[5] Omit και ℵBD (from Mt.).

[6] Omit ιδου BL cop. aeth. (Tisch., W.H.).

[7] εσονται εκ τ. ουρ. πιπτοντες ℵBC (Tisch., W.H.).

[8] Omit first αυτου BDL (Tisch., W.H.), second DL, which is found in ℵBCΔ. Tisch. omits both. W.H. have second in brackets, omitting first.

"evil days," and in Scotland of the "killing times".—**οἵα οὐ γέγονεν**, etc.: a strong statement claiming for the crisis of Israel a unique place of tragic distinction in the whole calamitous experience of the human race, past and to come.—**οἵα τοιαύτη**, pleonastic, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 48, 2 Cor. x. 11.—Ver. 20. The merciful shortening of the days, out of regard to the elect, is here directly ascribed to God. Mt. uses the passive construction, where *vide* as to the idea of shortening and the reason.—**τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο**, the elect whom He elected, recalling "the creation which God created" in ver. 19; but more than a mere literary idiosyncrasy, emphasising the fact that the elect are God's elect, whom He loves and will care for, and whose intercessions for others He will hear.—Ver. 22. **ψευδόχριστοι, ψευδοπροφῆται**, false Christs, and false prophets; again, as in ver. 6, here as there without, not within, the Church; political Messiahs, in ver. 6 spoken of as the prime cause of all the calamities, here as at the last hour promising deliverance therefrom.—**πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾷν**, with a view to mislead; the compound verb occurs again in 1 Tim. vi. 10, in passive.—Ver. 23. **ὑμεῖς δὲ**, etc., now you look out! I have told you all things beforehand; forewarned, forearmed.

Vv. 24-32. *The coming of the Son of Man* (Mt. xxiv. 29-35, Lk. xxi. 25-33).—Ver. 24. **ἀλλὰ**, opposes to the false Christs who are not to be believed in, the coming of the true Christ.—**ἐν ἐκείναις τ. ἡμέραις**, in those days, for Mt.'s **εὐθέως**, a vaguer phrase, yet making the *parusia* synchronise with the *thlipsis*.—Ver. 25. **οἱ ἀστέρες**, etc., the stars shall be in process of falling (one after the other)—**ἔσονται** with **πίπτοντες** instead of **πεσοῦνται** in Mt.—**αἱ δυνάμεις**, etc.: the powers in heaven = the powers of heaven (Mt.) = the host of heaven (Is. xxxiv. 4), a synonym for the stars.—Ver. 26. **τὸν υἱὸν τ. ἀ.**: the Son of Man, not the sign of, etc., as in Mt.:

28. "Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν αὐτῆς ἤδη ὁ κλάδος[1] ἁπαλὸς γένηται, καὶ ἐκφυῇ τὰ φύλλα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν· 29. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ταῦτα ἴδητε[2] γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἐπὶ θύραις. 30. Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, μέχρις οὗ πάντα ταῦτα[3] γένηται. 31. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται[4]· οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι.[4]

32. "Περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ[5] τῆς ὥρας, οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ[6] ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ.

33. "Βλέπετε, ἀγρυπνεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε,[7] οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ καιρός ἐστιν. 34. ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος ἀφεὶς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ δοὺς τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, καὶ[8] ἑκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον

[1] The order of the words varies in MSS. ℵABCDL have **ηδη ο κλ. αυτης** (W.H., Tisch., as in T.R.).

[2] **ιδητε ταυτα** in ℵABCL. [3] **ταυτα παντα** in ℵBCLΔ.

[4] **παρελευσονται** in ℵBC; sing. in LΔΣ (from Mt.); for **ου μη παρελθωσι** (from Mt.) ℵBL have **παρελευσονται** a second time, and BL omit **μη**, which does not elsewhere occur in Mk. with **ου** and future indicative.

[5] **η** in ℵBCLΔΣ. ℵD have **και**.

[6] ℵDL omit **οι** after **αγ**. CΔ have it. B reads **αγγελος** (W.H. marg.).

[7] BD omit **και προσευχεσθε**; a gloss.

[8] ℵBCDL omit **και**, a connecting particle added by scribes.

Christ His own sign, *vide* on Mt.—Ver. 27. **ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς**, etc. (*cf.* expression in Mt.), from the extremity of the earth to the extremity of heaven. The earth is conceived as a flat surface, and the idea is—from one end of the earth to the other, where it touches the heavens. But they touch at both ends, so that Mt.'s expression is the more accurate. Either from one end of the *earth* to the other end of the *earth*, or from one end of the *heaven* to, etc.—Ver. 28. Parable of the fig tree, as in Mt.—**ἐκφύῃ**: this verb without accent might either be present subjunctive active of **ἐκφύω** = **ἐκφύῃ** = it putteth forth its leaves; or 2nd aorist subjunctive intransitive = **ἐκφυῇ**, from **ἐξεφύην**, later form of 2nd aorist indicative instead of **ἐξέφυν** = the leaves shoot out. The former is preferred by most commentators.

Vv. 32-37. *Concluding exhortation* (Mt. xxiv. 36).—Ver. 32. The words **ὁ υἱὸς** are an undoubted reading in Mk., and there can be little doubt they form a part of the true text in Mt. also. As to the import of the solemn declaration of nescience Jesus here makes, I need only refer to what has been said on the corresponding text in Mt. It is not a disclaimer of knowledge as to the precise day, month, or year of what it is certain will happen within the then present generation, but rather an intimation that all statements (that regarding the generation included) as to the time of the *parusia* must be taken in a qualified sense. Jesus had, I still feel, two ways of speaking on the subject, one for comfort (it will be soon), and one for caution (it may not be so soon as even I think or you expect).—Ver. 33. **ἀγρυπνεῖτε**: watch, be sleepless (**α** priv. and **ὕπνος**).—**οὐκ οἴδατε**, etc., ye know not the time or season (**καιρός**) *of the parusia*. If even the Son knows not, still less His disciples; therefore let them watch.—Ver. 34. Enforcement of the exhortation to watch by a brief parable. At this point each of the synoptical evangelists goes his own way. In Mt. Jesus presses home the lesson by historical and prophetical pictures of the surprises brought by unexpected crises; in Lk. by general statements; in Mk. by a comparison which seems to be the germ of the parable in Mt. xxv. 14-30.—**ἄνθρωπος ἀπόδημος** (here only), a travelling man, *cf.* **ἄνθ. ἔμπορος**, a merchant man, in Mt. xiii. 45.—**ἀφεὶς, δοὺς**: these participles

αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῷ θυρωρῷ ἐνετείλατο ἵνα γρηγορῇ. 35. γρηγορεῖτε οὖν· οὐκ οἴδατε γὰρ πότε ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἔρχεται, ὀψέ, ἢ μεσονυκτίου,[1] ἢ ἀλεκτοροφωνίας, ἢ πρωΐ· 36. μὴ ἐλθὼν ἐξαίφνης εὕρῃ ὑμᾶς καθεύδοντας. 37. ἃ[2] δὲ ὑμῖν λέγω, πᾶσι λέγω, Γρηγορεῖτε."

[1] μεσονυκτιον in ℵBCLΔ. T.R. (-ου) conforms to the following genitive.

[2] ο in ℵBCLΔ.

specify the circumstances under which the command to the porter, the main point, was given; it was when the master was leaving, and when he gave to all his servants his parting instructions.—τὴν ἐξουσίαν, his (the master's) authority, distributed among the servants when he could no longer exercise it himself.—τὸ ἔργον α., to each one *his work*, in apposition with ἐξουσίαν. In the master's absence each man became his own master; put upon his honour, the seat of the ἐξουσία, and prescribing careful performance of the ἔργον entrusted to each.—καὶ τ. θυρωρῷ, also, among the rest, and very specially, to the *porter* (he gave instructions). The καὶ here is emphatic, as if it had been καὶ δὴ καί.—ἵνα γρηγορῇ, that he should watch: note that in this parable the function of watching becomes the business of *one*—the porter. Each servant has his appropriate task; the porter's is to watch. Yet in the moral sphere watching is the common duty of all, the temper in which all are to discharge their functions. All have to be *porters*, waiting at the gate, ready to open it to the returning master. Hence the closing exhortation in ver. 37. What I say to you, the four disciples (ver. 3), I say to all: watch. This had to be added, because it was not said or suggested by the parable; a defect which makes it doubtful whether we have here a logion of Jesus in authentic form, and which may account for its omission by Lk.—Ver. 35. ὀψὲ ἤ, etc.: the night divided, Roman fashion, into *four* watches: 6-9, 9-12, 12-3, 3-6. Before the exile the Jews divided the night into three parts.—μεσονύκτιον: *vide* at Lk. xi. 5 on this word, found also in Acts xvi. 25, xx. 7.—ἀλεκτοροφωνία is a ἅπαξ λεγ. in N. T.—Ver. 36. ἐξαίφνης, suddenly, here in Lk. ii. 13, and four times in Acts.—καθεύδοντας: this applies to all the servants, not merely to the porter; therefore all must watch as well as work. In the case of a master absent on a journey, the servants cannot know even the *day*, not to speak of the *hour* or *watch* of the night, as they could in the cases supposed in Lk. xii. 36, Mt. xxv. 1. Therefore they must keep awake not merely one night, but many nights, an incongruity which again suggests that we have not here an original utterance of Jesus, but a composite logion with elements borrowed from several parables.

CHAPTER XIV. THE PASSION HISTORY.—Vv. 1-2. *Introduction* (Mt. xxvi. 1-5, Lk. xxii. 1-2).—Ver. 1. ἦν δὲ τὸ π.: the first hint that the visit of Jesus to Jerusalem took place at passover season.—τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα: full name of the feast, which consisted of the passover proper beginning on the 14th Nisan, and the seven days of unleavened bread. Mt. and Lk. give each only one of the designations; Mt. the former, Lk. the latter. Mk.'s dual designation a manifest combination of Mt. and Lk., say the followers of Griesbach.—μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας, indicates the point of time at which the Sanhedrists began seriously to consider how they could safely get rid of Jesus. Mt. turns this into an announcement by Jesus. Lk. generalises the precise note of time into a statement that the feast was approaching (ἤγγιζεν).—ἐν δόλῳ, in or with craft. ἐν = בְּ in Heb. Mt. has simply δόλῳ, the dative instr.—Ver. 2. ἔλεγον γάρ is a more difficult reading than ἔλ. δὲ of Mt., hence the correction in T.R. The γάρ presupposes that the murder of Jesus during the feast was from the first regarded as out of the question, and the clause following partly makes that fact explicit, partly assigns a reason for it. They wanted to compass His death, but they were in a difficulty, for they felt and said to one another: it may not be on the feast, lest there be a popular disturbance.—μήποτε ἔσται: the fut. ind. instead of the more usual subjunctive after μήποτε (*cf.* Col. ii. 8, Heb. iii. 12), implying the almost certain occurrence

XIV. 1. ῏ΗΝ δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἄζυμα μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας· καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, πῶς αὐτὸν ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν· 2. ἔλεγον δέ,[1] "Μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, μήποτε θόρυβος ἔσται[2] τοῦ λαοῦ." 3. Καὶ ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ, ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ, ἦλθε γυνὴ ἔχουσα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτελοῦς· καὶ[3] συντρίψασα τὸ[4] ἀλάβαστρον, κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ κατὰ[5] τῆς κεφαλῆς. 4. ἦσαν δέ τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς, καὶ λέγοντες,[6] "Εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια

[1] γαρ in ℵBCDL; δε in T.R. is from Mt.

[2] εσται θορυβος in ℵBCDL.

[3] Omit και ℵBL cop.

[4] The article is found in all the genders; το in GM cursives; τον in ℵADΣ and many other uncials (Tisch.); την in BCLΔ (Trg., W.H.).

[5] ℵBCLΔ omit κατα (introduced because usual).

[6] ℵBCL omit και λεγοντες, which may come from Mt.

of a θόρυβος if an attempt were made on the life of Jesus during the feast. This shows how highly the Sanhedrists estimated the influence of Jesus.

Vv. 3-9. *The anointing in Bethany* (Mt. xxvi. 6-13).—Ver. 3. **ὄντος αὐτοῦ, κατακειμένου αὐτοῦ**: two genitive absolute clauses whereof Weiss makes critical use (Marcus-Evang.); in which Schanz sees simply an instance of Mk.'s helplessness in style. The first indicates generally the time and place, the second the position of Jesus (at table) when the woman approached Him (ἦλθεν).—**ἀλάβαστρον.** *Vide* in Mt.—**πιστικῆς**: a puzzling word recurring in the fourth Gospel (xii. 3). It has been variously explained. (1) As one of Mk.'s Latinisms = *spicatus*, turned into **πιστικὸς** like Sextarius into **ξέστης** (Mk. vii. 4). In favour of this view is the Vulgate *nardi spicati* reproduced in "spikenard" (spiked-nard), A. V., and it has been adopted by Wetstein, Grotius, Rosenmüller, etc. (2) As meaning liquid, potable, from **πίω, πιπίσκω**, Fritzsche and others. (3) As derived from the name of a place whence the ointment was obtained, Augustine; also Bengel: "Pista urbs Indorum in regione Cabul; quâ ex regione pleraque aromata jam tum petebantur". But he adds: "Ex nomine proprio potius formaretur **πισταῖος**". (4) As = **πιστός**, trusty, genuine, to distinguish it from spurious imitations which abounded (Pliny, H. N., xii., 26). Instances of the use of the word in this sense are cited from Greek authors, *e.g.*, from Artemidorus, ii., 32: **πιστικὴ γυνὴ καὶ οἰκουρὸς** (*vide* Beza and Kypke). The choice lies between (1) and (4); most modern commentators (following Theophy. and Euthy.) adopt the latter. The following account of nard from Tristram's *Natural History of the Bible* is interesting: "An Indian product procured from the Nardostachys Jatamansi, growing on the Himalaya Mountains in Nepaul and Bhotan. It was well known to the Greeks and Romans, and is mentioned by classic authors as derived from the hills on the banks of the Ganges. One peculiarity of the plant which is mentioned by old writers aids in its identification, *viz.*, that it has many hairy spikes shooting from one root. These shaggy stems are caused by the root leaves shooting up from the ground and surrounding the stalk. It is from this part of the plant that the perfume is procured and prepared simply by drying it."—**πολυτελοῦς** (1 Tim. ii. 9, 1 Pet. iii. 4), dear, hence the temptation to produce cheap counterfeits.—**συντρίψασα**: she broke the *narrow-necked* vase that the contents might be poured out quickly, not drop by drop, and perhaps that the vessel used for so sacred a purpose might never be employed again (Kloster., Weiss, Schanz, etc.).—Ver. 4. **τινὲς**, certain persons; who, not indicated; Mt. says the disciples, John singles out Judas.—**τοῦ μύρου γέγονεν**: these words omitted in Mt. Observe the repetition in ver. 5, **τοῦτο τὸ μύρον** (BCL, etc.). Mt. simlpy has **τοῦτο** (so here in T.R.). Mt. more elegant in style, but Mk. truer to life = "To what purpose this waste of the myrrh? For this myrrh might, etc."—the style of men speaking under emotion.—Ver. 5. **ἐπάνω**, etc., for above three hundred pence. The cardinal

αὕτη τοῦ μύρου γέγονεν; 5. ἠδύνατο γὰρ τοῦτο[1] πραθῆναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων,[2] καὶ δοθῆναι τοῖς πτωχοῖς·" καὶ ἐνεβριμῶντο αὐτῇ. 6. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Ἄφετε αὐτήν· τί αὐτῇ κόπους παρέχετε; καλὸν ἔργον εἰργάσατο εἰς ἐμέ.[3] 7. πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, καὶ ὅταν θέλητε, δύνασθε αὐτοὺς[4] εὖ ποιῆσαι· ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε. 8. ὃ εἶχεν αὕτη,[5] ἐποίησε· προέλαβε μυρίσαι μου τὸ σῶμα[6] εἰς τὸν ἐνταφιασμόν. 9. ἀμὴν[7] λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅπου ἂν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο[8] εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὕτη λαληθήσεται εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς." 10. Καὶ ὁ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, εἷς[9] τῶν δώδεκα, ἀπῆλθε πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς, ἵνα παραδῷ αὐτὸν[10] αὐτοῖς. 11. Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐχάρησαν, καὶ ἐπηγγείλαντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι· καὶ ἐζήτει πῶς εὐκαίρως αὐτὸν παραδῷ.[11]

[1] τουτο το μυρον ABCLΔ *al.* *Vide* below.

[2] δην. τριακ. in ℵCDL (Tisch.). T.R. as in ABΔΣ *al.* (W.H. marg.).

[3] εν εμοι in ℵABCDLΔΣ *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] αυτοις with παντοτε following in BL sah. cop. (W.H. with παν. in brackets). ℵ omits both (Tisch.). αυτους in AΣ *al.*

[5] εσχεν in ℵABCDLΔΣ *al.*; omit αυτη BL cursives.

[6] το σωμα μου in ℵBDLΣ (W.H.).

[7] δε after αμην in ℵBDLΔ *al.*

[8] ℵBDL omit τουτο, inserted, as δε is omitted, after Mt.

[9] For ο Ι. ο Ισ. εις ℵBCD have Ι. Ισ., and ℵBCL ο εις.

[10] αυτον παραδοι in BD (προδοι). ℵCLΔ also place αυτον first.

[11] παραδοι in BD; αυτον before ευκαιρως in ℵABCLΔ.

number is here in the genitive of price after πραθῆναι. In 1 Cor. xv. 6 ἐπάνω is followed by a dative depending on ὤφθη.—Ver. 6. ἐν ἐμοί, in me (*cf.* Mt. xvii. 12), for the more usual εἰς ἐμέ (in Mt., and imported into Mk. in T.R.).—Ver. 7. καὶ ὅταν θέλητε, etc., and when ye wish ye can do them a kindness; a thought implied in the previous clause (the poor ye have always), and probably an expansion by Mk. (*cf.* Mt.), yet not superfluous: suggesting the thought that expenditure in one direction does not disqualify for beneficent acts in another. The willing-minded will always have enough for all purposes.—Ver. 8. ὃ ἔσχεν (suppl. ποιεῖν), what she had to do she did; the reference being not to the measure of her power (wealth) but to her opportunity: she did what lay to her hand, and could only be done *then*.—προέλαβε μυρίσαι, she anticipated the anointing; the latter verb here only, the former in 1 Cor. xi. 21, Gal. vi. 1.—ἐνταφιασμόν: the noun answering to the verb in Mt., here and in John and in one place in the classics. —Ver. 9. εἰς ὅλον τ. κ. for ἐν ο., etc., in Mt.; a *constr. praeg.*, the idea of going to all parts of the world with the gospel being understood.

Vv. 10-11. *Judas offers to betray his Master* (Mt. xxvi. 14-16, Lk. xxii. 3-6).—Ver. 11. ἐχάρησαν, they *rejoiced;* when one of the twelve companions of Jesus unexpectedly turned up ready to deliver his Master into their hands. A most vivid feature omitted by Mt. in his summarising way. Well might they rejoice, as but for this windfall they might have been totally at a loss how to compass their end.—ἐπηγγείλαντο, they *promised* to pay, did not actually pay on the spot, as Mt.'s statement implies (ἔστησαν, ver. 15).—ἐζήτει, *cf.* ἐζήτουν, ver. 1, in reference to the Sanhedrists. They were seeking means of getting rid of Jesus; Judas was now on the outlook for a chance of betraying Him into their hands.—εὐκαίρως here only in N. T., the

12. ΚΑΙ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθυον, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, "Ποῦ θέλεις ἀπελθόντες ἑτοιμάσωμεν ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα;" 13. Καὶ ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν πόλιν· καὶ ἀπαντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ, 14. καὶ ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃ, εἴπατε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ, Ὅτι ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει, Ποῦ ἐστι τὸ κατάλυμα,[1] ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; 15. καὶ αὐτὸς ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνώγεον[2] μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἕτοιμον· ἐκεῖ[3] ἑτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν." 16. Καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ,[4] καὶ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

17. Καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα· 18. καὶ ἀνακειμένων αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσθιόντων, εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[5] "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με, ὁ ἐσθίων[6] μετ' ἐμοῦ." 19. Οἱ δὲ[7] ἤρξαντο λυπεῖσθαι, καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ εἷς καθ' εἷς, "Μή τι ἐγώ;"

[1] **μου** after **καταλυμα** in ℵBCDLΔΣ. *Vide* below.
[2] **αναγαιον** in ℵABCDL *al.*
[3] **και** before **εκει** in ℵBCDL.
[4] Omit **αυτου** ℵBLΔ.
[5] **ο Ι. ειπεν** in ℵBCL.
[6] B has **των εσθιοντων** (W.H. marg.).
[7] **οι δε** omitted in ℵBL cop.

adjective and verb in Mk. vi. 21, 31, the noun in Mt. xxvi. 16.

Vv. 12-16. *Arrangements for paschal feast* (Mt. xxvi. 17-19, Lk. xxii. 7-13). Mk. is much more circumstantial in this section than Mt., his apparent aim being to explain how Judas did not find his opportunity at the paschal supper, the place of celebration being carefully concealed beforehand.—Ver. 12. **τῇ π. ἡμέρᾳ τ. ἀ. ὅτε τ. πάσχα ἔθυον**: again a double note of time, the second clause indicating precisely that by the first day is meant the 14th Nisan. Schanz, following the Greek Fathers, takes **πρώτῃ** in the first clause as = **προτέρᾳ**, yielding the same sense as **πρὸ τ. ἑορ. τ. πάσχα** in John xiii. 1.—**ποῦ θέλεις;**: the disciples would ask this question in good time, say in the forenoon of the 14th.—Ver. 13. **δύο**: more exact than Mt.; of course all the disciples would not be sent on such an errand. Lk. names the two.—**ὑπάγετε**, etc.: the instructions in Mk. are sufficient to guide the messengers. Mt.'s **πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα** is manifestly too vague, and could not have been spoken by Jesus.—**ἄνθρωπος**: water-carrying was generally the occupation of women; hence a man performing the office would be more noticeable.—**κεράμιον** (neuter of adjective **κεράμιος**, earthen), an earthen pitcher, here and in Lk. xxii. 10.—Ver. 14. **τὸ κατάλυμά μου**, *my* guest chamber. This **μου** of the best texts is interesting as suggesting a previous understanding between Jesus and the householder. It is not necessary to import the miraculous into the narrative.—Ver. 15. **ἀνάγαιον** (**ἀνά, γαῖα** = **γῆ**), a room above the earth, an upper room.—**μέγα**, large, enough for the company.—**ἐστρωμένον**, furnished with table-cushions. — **ἕτοιμον**, perhaps a synonym for **ἐστρωμένον** = furnished, all ready; possibly pointing to the removal of leaven (C.G.T.).

Vv. 17-21. *The presence of a traitor announced* (Mt. xxvi. 20-25, Lk. xxii. 21-23).—Ver. 17. **ἔρχεται**: after sunset *He cometh* to the place appointed for the feast, presumably after the two who had been sent to make arrangements had rejoined the company.—Ver. 18. **ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ**: this clause, omitted in Mt., is designed to indicate, not the culprit, but the gravity of his offence = one of you, *one who eats bread with me*, a *table companion*.—Ver. 19. **εἷς κατὰ εἷς**, one by one = **εἷς ἕκαστος** in Mt.; **κατὰ** is used adverbially, and hence is followed by **εἷς** instead of **ἕνα**. For other instances of this usage of late Greek *vide* John viii. 9, Rom. xii. 5, and *cf.* Winer, § xxxvii. 3.—Ver. 20. To the anxious questioning of the disciples Mk.

Καὶ ἄλλος, "Μή τι ἐγώ[1];" 20. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς[2] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Εἷς ἐκ[3] τῶν δώδεκα, ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρυβλίον.[4] 21. ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει, καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ[5]· οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται· καλὸν ἦν[6] αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος."

22. Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν, λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς[7] ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπε, "Λάβετε, φάγετε.[8] τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου." 23. Καὶ λαβὼν τὸ[9] ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες· 24. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης,[10] τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.[11] 25. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ."

[1] **και αλλος μη τι εγω** (ADΣ *al.*) omitted in BCLPΔ, possibly by similar ending (omit Tisch., W.H.).

[2] Omitted in ℵBCDL; a mere mechanical expletive.

[3] ℵBCL sah. cop. omit **εκ** (it comes from ver. 18).

[4] BC have **το εν τρυβ.** (W.H. brackets: **ἐν**).

[5] **οτι** introduces this clause (**ο μεν υιος**, etc.) in ℵBL sah. cop.

[6] BL sah. omit **ην**. [7] BD omit **ο Ι.** (from Mt.).

[8] **φαγετε** only in later uncials (Tisch., W.H., omit).

[9] ℵBCDLΔΣ omit **το** (from Lk.).

[10] For **το τ. καινης δ.** ℵBCL have **της διαθ.** (D omits **καινης**).

[11] ℵBCDLΔ have **εκχυννομενον υπερ πολλων**. T.R. from Mt.

makes Jesus reply: one of the *Twelve*; he *who dippeth with me in the dish*. A repetition of the original declaration with variations: the *Twelve* for *you*, and *dipping in the dish* for *eating*; the former bringing out the gravity of the fact, the Twelve chosen to be Apostles of the faith, one of them the traitor of its Author; the latter narrowing the circle within which the traitor is to be found. Twelve ate with Jesus, only three or four would dip with Him.—**ἐμβαπτόμενος**, middle, dipping with his own hand: "haec vis medii verbi," Bengel.—Ver. 21. **ὅτι**, assigns a reason for the fact just stated. To fulfil Scripture (Ps. xli. 9) the Son of Man must go from the earth through betrayal by an intimate. This verse contains an instance in Mk of the construction **μὲν δὲ** (again in v. 38 and in xvi. 19, 20).—**καλὸν αὐτῷ**, good for him, without the **ἦν** as in Mt. For the construction *vide* on Mt. and Burton, M. and T. in N. T., § 248.—**ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος**: this repetition (*vide* **τῷ ἀ. ἐκ.** above) gives a tragic solemnity to the utterance = good for him, if he had not been born, that man! *Cf.* Mk. ii. 20, "days will come, etc., and then shall they fast, in that day".

Vv. 22-25. *The Lord's Supper* (Mt. xxvi. 26-29, Lk. xxii. 19-20), *vide* notes on Mt.'s account, to which Mk.'s closely corresponds.—Ver. 22. **ἐσθιόντων α.**, while they were eating, as in ver. 18; a very general indication of time. This and the announcement of the betrayal are for Mt. and Mk. the two *memorabilia* of the paschal feast of Jesus with His disciples, and all they know is that they happened during feast-time.—**λάβετε**, take, without **φάγετε**, as in Mt.; the more laconic expression likely to be the original. "Take" implies "eat".—Ver. 23. **καὶ ἔπιον**, etc., and they drank of it, all. In Mt.'s account Jesus bids them drink, as He had previously bidden them eat. Mk.'s version strikes one as the more primitive; Mt.'s as influenced by liturgical usage.—Ver. 24. **καὶ εἶπεν**: while they drank the cup (not after they had drunk it, De Wette: nor before they began to drink, as Mt.'s narrative by itself would suggest), Jesus explained to them the symbolic import of

26. Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες ἐξῆλθον εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν. 27. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅτι πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ[1]· ὅτι γέγραπται, 'Πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα.[2] 28. Ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με, προάξω ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν." 29. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἔφη αὐτῷ, "Καὶ εἰ[3] πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ." 30. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτι[4] σήμερον ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ,[5] πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ με."[6] 31. Ὁ δὲ ἐκ περισσοῦ ἔλεγε μᾶλλον,[7] "Ἐάν με δέῃ συναποθανεῖν σοι, οὐ μή σε ἀπαρνήσομαι." Ὡσαύτως δὲ[8] καὶ πάντες ἔλεγον.

32. ΚΑΙ ἔρχονται εἰς χωρίον οὗ τὸ ὄνομα Γεθσημανῆ· καὶ λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Καθίσατε ὧδε, ἕως προσεύξωμαι." 33. Καὶ

[1] ℵBCDLΔ *al.* omit **εν εμοι . . . ταυτῃ**, which comes from Mt.

[2] **τα προβ. διασκορπ.** in ℵBCDL; **διασκορπισθησονται** in ℵBCDLΔΣ.

[3] **ει και** in ℵBCGL (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] Add **συ** ABLΣ *al.*, omitted in ℵCDΔ (Tisch., W.H., adopt; *vide* below).

[5] **ταυτῃ τ. ν.,** without **εν**, in ℵBCDL (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] **με** before **απαρ.** in ℵBCDΔ (T.R. = Mt.).

[7] **εκπερισσως** in ℵBCD; **ελαλει** in ℵBDL; omit **μαλλον** ℵBCDL.

[8] B omits **δε** (W.H. brackets).

the cup. The important point in Mk.'s account of the words, as compared with Mt.'s, is the omission of the expression, **εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν**.

Vv. 26-31. *On the way to Gethsemane* (Mt. xxvi. 30-35, Lk. xxii. 39).—Ver. 26, exactly as in Mt. xxvi. 30, states that after singing the paschal hymn the company went forth towards the Mount of Olives.—Ver. 27. **πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε**, ye all shall be made to stumble; absolutely, without the addition of **ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ** imported into the text from Mt. in T.R. It was a startling announcement in broad general terms that the disciple-circle was about to experience a moral breakdown. The announcement was made not by way of reproach, but rather as a preface to a more cheering prophecy of an early reunion.—Ver. 28. **ἀλλὰ μ.**: stronger than Mt.'s **μ. δὲ**=ye shall be offended, *but* (be of good cheer) after my resurrection I will go before you, as your Shepherd (**προάξω ὑμᾶς**) into Galilee.—Ver. 29. It is the former part of the Master's speech that lays hold of Peter's mind; hence he promptly proceeds to make protestations of fidelity.—**εἰ καὶ**, etc.: even if (as is likely) all the rest shall be offended (the future, because the case put is conceived to be probable), *yet certainly* (**ἀλλ'** strongly opposing what follows to what goes before; *vide* Klotz, p. 93, on the force of **ἀλλὰ** in the apodosis of a conditional proposition) *not I*.—Ver. 30. To this over-confident **ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ** of the disciple, the Master returns a very pointed and peremptory reply: I tell thee that *thou* (**σὺ** emphatic) *to-day* (**σήμερον**), *on this night* (more precise indication of time), *before the cock crow twice* (still more precise indication of time), shall deny me, not once, but again and again and again (**τρίς**).—Ver. 31. **ἐκπερισσῶς**, abundantly in matter and manner, with vehemence and iteration; a **ἅπαξ λεγ.**—**ἐλάλει**, kept saying: that he would not deny his Master even if he had to die for it.—**ὡσαύτως**, a stronger word than Mt.'s **ὁμοίως**=in the same way, and probably in the same words. But the words of the others were simply a faint echo of Peter's vehement and copious talk. They feebly said once (**ἔλεγον** = **εἶπον**) what he said strongly again and again (**ἐλάλει**).

Vv. 32-42. *In Gethsemane* (Mt. xxvi. 36-46, Lk. xxii. 40-46).—Ver. 33. **ἤρξατο**, introduces the description of our Lord's awful experience in the garden.—**ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι**, to be amazed; in Mk. only, first in ix. 15, where see remarks on its meaning. Though Jesus had long

παραλαμβάνει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην[1] μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ.[2] Καὶ ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν. 34. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου ἕως θανάτου· μείνατε ὧδε καὶ γρηγορεῖτε." 35. Καὶ προελθὼν[3] μικρόν, ἔπεσεν[4] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ προσηύχετο, ἵνα, εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι, παρέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα· 36. καὶ ἔλεγεν, "Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι. παρένεγκε τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τοῦτο[5]· ἀλλ' οὐ τί ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλὰ τί σύ." 37. Καὶ ἔρχεται καὶ εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας, καὶ λέγει τῷ Πέτρῳ, "Σίμων, καθεύδεις; οὐκ ἴσχυσας μίαν ὥραν γρηγορῆσαι; 38. γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε[6] εἰς πειρασμόν. τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής." 39. Καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών. 40. καὶ ὑποστρέψας εὗρεν αὐτοὺς πάλιν[7] καθεύδοντας· ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν βεβαρημένοι,[8] καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τί αὐτῷ ἀποκριθῶσι.[9]

[1] B has τον before each name (W.H.). Many MSS. have the article only with Πετρον.

[2] μετ αυτου in ℵBCD.

[3] CDLΔ have προσελθων, but προελθων, found in ℵB *al.*, seems to be the word needed. προσελθων is a frequent mistake of the scribes.

[4] επιπτεν in ℵBL (επεσεν from Mt.).

[5] τουτο απ. εμου in ℵABCLΔΣ *al.*

[6] ελθητε in ℵB (Tisch., W.H.). Weiss rejects the omission of εις before ελθ.; a very frequent mistake in the old MSS.

[7] For υποστρεψας . . . παλιν (ACΔ, Tisch.) ℵBL have παλιν ελθων ευρεν αυτους (W.H.). D the same, omitting παλιν.

[8] αυτων before οι οφ. in ℵBCLΔ, and καταβαρυνομενοι in ABLΔ; καταβαρουμενοι in D.

[9] αποκ. before αυτω ℵABCDL.

known, and had often with realistic plainness spoken of, what was to befall Him, yet the vivid sense of what it all meant came upon His soul at this hour, as a sudden appalling revelation. The other two words used by Mk. to describe Christ's state of mind (ἀδημονεῖν. περίλυπος) occur in Mt. also.—Ver. 35. ἔπιπτεν (ℵBL, ἔπεσεν T.R. as in Mt.), imperfect: He fell again and again on the ground. It was a protracted desperate struggle.—καὶ προσηύχετο ἵνα: Mk. first indicates the gist of Christ's prayers (=that if possible the *hour* might pass from Him), then reports what Jesus said (ver. 36). In the prayer of Jesus the experience dreaded is called the *cup*, as in Mt. The Hour and the Cup—both alike solemn, suggestive names.—Ver. 36. Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ: in the parallels simply πάτερ. In the Apostolic Church the use of the double appellation among Gentile Christians was common (*vide* Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6), Ἀββᾶ having become a proper name and πατὴρ being added as its interpretation = God our Father. Mk. imparts into the prayer of our Lord this apostolic usage. Jesus doubtless would use only one of the names, probably the Aramaic.—παρένεγκε τ. π. τ., remove this cup; equivalent to παρέλθῃ in ver. 35 (Lk. xxii. 42).—ἀλλ' οὐ, etc.; "*but* not what (τί for ὅ) I will, but what Thou"; elliptical but clear and expressive: γενήσεται or γενέσθαι δεῖ (not γενέσθω which would demand μὴ before θέλω) is understood (*vide* Holtzmann, H. C., and Weiss in Meyer).—Ver. 37. τῷ Πέτρῳ: to the disciple who had been so confident of his loyalty, but also from whom Jesus expected most in the way of sympathy.—Σίμων: the old, not the new, disciple, name; ominous.—Ver. 38. This exhortation to watch and pray is given in almost identical terms in Mt. and Mk. It looks like a second-ary version of what our Lord actually said.—Ver. 39. Mk., like Mt., divides

41. Καὶ ἔρχεται τὸ τρίτον, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Καθεύδετε τὸ[1] λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε. ἀπέχει· ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα· ἰδού, παραδίδοται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν. 42. ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν· ἰδού, ὁ παραδιδούς με ἤγγικε."

43. Καὶ εὐθέως, ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, παραγίνεται Ἰούδας, εἷς ὢν[2] τῶν δώδεκα, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς[3] μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων, παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. 44. [a]δεδώκει δὲ ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν σύσσημον αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Ὃν ἂν φιλήσω, αὐτός ἐστι· κρατήσατε αὐτόν, καὶ ἀπαγάγετε[4] ἀσφαλῶς," 45. Καὶ ἐλθών, εὐθέως προσελθὼν αὐτῷ λέγει, "Ῥαββί, ῥαββί[5]·"

a Ch. xv. 10, John xi. 57 (omission of argument: usual in N. T.).

[1] το is found in ℵBΔΣ; omitted in CDL (Tisch. retains, W.H. in brackets).

[2] Omit ων ℵABCDLΣ.

[3] ℵBL omit πολυς found in CDΔ (comes from Mt.).

[4] απαγετε in ℵBDL. [5] Ραββει once only in ℵBCDLΔ.

the agony into three acts, but he reports the words spoken by Jesus in prayer only in the first. Mt. gives the prayer of Jesus in the second act, as well as in the first, generalising in the third, where he repeats the formula here used by Mk.: τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών.—Ver. 40. καταβαρυνόμενοι, "their eyes were very heavy"; R. V., weighed down with irresistible sleep.—καταβαρύνω, here and occasionally in the Sept. = the more usual καταβαρέω (from the simple verb βαρέω comes βεβαρημένοι in T.R.).—καὶ οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, etc.: this remark recalls the experience of the same three on the hill of transfiguration (*cf.* ix. 6). But in the earlier instance the reference is to the stupidity produced by sleep, here probably to shame on account of unseasonable sleep. They felt that they ought to have kept awake during their Master's hour of trial, and knew not how to excuse themselves.—Ver. 41. ἀπέχει, "it is enough," A. V. = *sufficit* in Vulgate; one of the puzzling words in Mk.'s vocabulary to which many meanings have been given. Beza, in doubt as to Jerome's interpretation, was satisfied at last by a quotation from Anacreon coming into his mind, in which the poet, giving instructions to a painter for the portrait of his mistress, concludes: ἀπέχει. βλέπω γὰρ αὐτήν· τάχα, κηρέ, καὶ λαλήσεις = "Enough! the girl herself I view: so like, 'twill soon be speaking, too". Elsner and Raphel follow Beza. Kypke dissents and renders: ἀπέχει, ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα, as if it were ἦλθε καὶ ἀπ. ἡ ὥ. = the hour (of my passion) is come and calls you and me away from this scene. Most modern commentators accept the rendering, "It is enough". *Vide* an interesting note in Field's *Otium Nor.* The meaning is: I have conquered in the struggle; I need your sympathy no longer; you may sleep now if you will.

Vv. 43-52. *The apprehension* (Mt. xxvi. 47-56, Lk. xxii. 47-53).—Ver. 43. εὐθὺς, etc. (ἰδοὺ in Mt.), straightway, even while He is speaking, appears Judas, who is carefully defined by surname and position as one of the Twelve. At what point of time the traitor left the company on his nefarious errand is not indicated. According to Weiss (in Meyer) the evangelist conceives of Judas as going with the rest to Gethsemane and stealing away from the nine, after the three had been taken apart, having now satisfied himself as to the Master's whereabouts.—παρὰ τ. ἀρχ., etc.: παρὰ goes along with παραγίνεται, and implies that Judas and those with him had an official commission from the authorities, the three classes of whom are carefully specified.—Ver. 44. δεδώκει: the pluperfect, but without augment, *vide* Winer, § xii. 9.—σύσσημον (neuter of adjective σύσσημος: σύν, σῆμα): a sign previously agreed on (σημεῖον in Mt.), a late word severely condemned by Phrynichus, p. 418, here only in N. T. In Sept. for נֵס an "ensign" (Is. v. 26).—ἀσφαλῶς may mean either: lead Him away with an easy mind (He will not attempt escape), or: lead, etc., cautiously, carefully—He may slip out of your hands as He has done before (Lk. iv. 30). Judas was just the kind of man to have

καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. 46. Οἱ δὲ ἐπέβαλον ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν,[1] καὶ ἐκράτησαν αὐτόν.

47. Εἷς δέ τις[2] τῶν παρεστηκότων σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ἔπαισε τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, καὶ ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον.[3] 48. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξήλθετε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων, συλλαβεῖν με; 49. καθ' ἡμέραν ἤμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων, καὶ οὐκ ἐκρατήσατέ με· ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί." 50. Καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν πάντες ἔφυγον.[4] 51. Καὶ εἷς τις νεανίσκος[5] ἠκολούθει[6] αὐτῷ, περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ. καὶ κρατοῦσιν αὐτὸν οἱ νεανίσκοι[7]· 52. ὁ δὲ καταλιπὼν τὴν σινδόνα γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν.[8]

[1] For **επ αυτον τ. χ. αυτων** BDL have simply **τας χειρας αυτω**, the most probable reading.

[2] **εις δε** without **τις** in ℵAL (W.H. have **τις** bracketed); BCΔ have **τις**.

[3] **ωταριον** in ℵBD; **ωτιον** in CLΔ (probably from Mt.).

[4] **εφυγον παντες** in ℵBCLΔ, preferable reading. *Vide* below.

[5] Instead of **εις τις νεαν.** (AΔΣ *al.*) ℵBCL have **νεαν. τις.**

[6] **συνηκ.** in ℵBCL. D = T.R. Δ **συνηκολουθησεν.**

[7] ℵBCDLΔ omit **οι νεαν.**

[8] ℵBCL omit **απ αυτων** (a gloss found in ADΔΣ *al.*).

a superstitious dread of Christ's preternatural power.—Ver. 45. **ἐλθὼν εὐθὺς προσελθὼν** = arrived on the spot he without delay approaches Jesus; no hesitation, promptly and adroitly done.—**Ῥαββί**: without Mt.'s **χαῖρε**, and only once spoken (twice in T.R.), the fervour of false love finding expression in the kiss (**κατεφίλησεν**, *vide* notes on Mt.) rather than in words.

Vv. 47-52. *Attempt at rescue.*—Ver. 47. **εἷς τ. παρ.**, one of those standing by, *i.e.*, one of the three, Peter according to the fourth gospel (xviii. 10).—**τὴν μάχ.**, *the* sword = his sword, as if each disciple was armed; *vide* on Mt.—**ὠτάριον** = **ὠτίον**, T.R., diminutive of **οὖς**; the use of diminutives for the members of the body was common in popular speech. *Vide* Lobeck, Phryn., p. 211.—Ver. 48. On this and the following verse *vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 49. **ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γ.**: this may be a case of **ἵνα** with the subjunctive used as an imperative = let the Scriptures be fulfilled. *Cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 7, last clause, and consult Winer, § xliii. 5 d. — Ver. 50. **καὶ ἀφέντες**, etc., and deserting Him fled *all* (**πάντες** last, *vide* above): the nine with the three, the three not less than the nine—all alike panic-stricken.—Ver. 51 introduces a little anecdote peculiar to Mk., the story of an unknown friend, not one of the Twelve, who had joined the company, and did not fly with the rest.—**συνηκολούθει α.**, was following Jesus; when He was being led away, and after the disciples had fled.—**περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ**: this suggests that the youth, on hearing some sudden report, rose out of his bed and rushed out in his night-shirt, or, being absolutely naked, hurriedly threw about his body a loose cotton or linen sheet. The statement that on being laid hold of he cast off the garment favours the latter alternative.—Ver. 52. **γυμνὸς ἔφ.**, fled *naked*, in the literal sense, whereon Bengel remarks: "on a night not without a moon; fear conquers shame in great danger". (A few years ago a young wife chased a thief, who had been stealing her wedding presents, through the streets of Glasgow, in the early hours of the morning, in her night-gown; not without success. Her husband modestly stayed behind to put on his clothes.)—Who was this young man? Mk. the evangelist, say many, arguing: the story was of no interest to any one but the hero of it, therefore the hero was the teller of the tale. A good argument, unless a motive can be assigned for the insertion of the narrative other than

53. ΚΑΙ ἀπήγαγον τὸν Ἰησοῦν πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα· καὶ συνέρχονται αὐτῷ[1] πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς. 54. Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ ἕως ἔσω εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· καὶ ἦν συγκαθήμενος μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν, καὶ θερμαινόμενος πρὸς τὸ φῶς. 55. Οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον ἐζήτουν κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ μαρτυρίαν, εἰς τὸ θανατῶσαι αὐτόν· καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκον. 56. πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἴσαι αἱ μαρτυρίαι οὐκ ἦσαν. 57. καί τινες ἀναστάντες ἐψευδομαρτύρουν κατ' αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες, 58. "Ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, Ὅτι ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον, καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον οἰκοδομήσω." 59. Καὶ

[1] ℵDLΔ omit αυτω, found in BΣ *al. pler.* (W.H. marg.).

merely personal interest. Schanz suggests a desire to exhibit in a concrete instance the danger of the situation, and the ferocity of the enemies of Jesus. On the whole one feels inclined to acquiesce in the judgment of Hahn, quoted by Holtz., H. C., that in this curious incident we have "the monogram of the painter (Mk.) in a dark corner of the picture". Brandt, however (*Die Ev. Gesch.*, p. 28), dissents from this view.

Vv. 53-65. *Before Caiaphas* (Mt. xxvi. 57-68, Lk. xxii. 54, 66-71).—Ver. 53. **συνέρχονται α. πάντες**, etc.: again all the three orders of the Sanhedrists are named, who have been summoned to meet about the time the party sent to apprehend Jesus might be expected to arrive.—Ver. 54. **ὁ Πέτρος**: the story of Peter's denial begins here, and, after being suspended by the account of the trial, is resumed at ver. 66.—**ἀπὸ μακρόθεν**, from afar (**ἀπὸ** redundant here as elsewhere), fearful, yet drawn on by love and curiosity.—**ἕως ἔσω εἰς**: a redundant but expressive combination, suggesting the idea of one stealthily feeling his way into the court of the palace, venturing further and further in, and gaining courage with each step (*vide* Weiss, Mk.-Evan., p. 470).—**θερμαινόμενος**: nights cold even at Easter in Palestine; a fire in the court welcome in the early hours of morning, when something unusual was going on. "However hot it may be in the daytime, the nights in spring are almost always cold"—Furrer, *Wanderungen*, p. 241.—**πρὸς τὸ φῶς**, at the fire; here called light, because it was there to give light as well as heat. Elsner and Raphel cite instances of the use of **φῶς** for fire from Xenophon. Hesychius gives **πῦρ** as one of its meanings.

Vv. 55-65. *The trial and condemnation.*—Ver. 55. **μαρτυρίαν**: Mt. has **ψευδομαρτυρίαν**, justly so characterised, because the Sanhedrists wanted evidence for a foregone conclusion: evidence that would justify a sentence of death.—Ver. 56. **ἴσαι**, equal, to the same effect, as the testimonies of true witnesses would, of course, be. Grotius takes the word as meaning, not equal to one another, but equal to the demands of weighty evidence and justifying condemnation. Elsner agrees, arguing from the use of the word again, in reference to the evidence about the temple logion of Jesus. These witnesses, he holds, are not represented as making conflicting statements, but simply as making statements not sufficiently weighty—not equal to the occasion. There is some force in this.—Ver. 57. **τινες**, some, for which Mt. has the more definite **δύο**, the smallest number necessary to establish a matter.—Ver. 58. **ὅτι**, etc.: Mk.'s version of the testimony borne by the witnesses differs in important respects from that of Mt.; *viz.*, by the insertion of the words **τὸν χειροποίητον** and **ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον**. Mt.'s form doubtless comes nearest to what the witnesses actually said. Mk.'s puts into their mouths, to a certain extent, the sense in which he and his fellow-Christians understood Christ's saying, *viz.*, as a prophecy that the material temple would be superseded by a spiritual temple = the community of believers in Jesus. If they had really spoken, as here reported, the falsehood would have lain rather in the *animus* of their statement than in its meaning: the *animus* of men who regarded it as impious to speak of the temple of God being destroyed, as contemptuous to

οὐδὲ οὕτως ἴση ἦν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν. 60. Καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ[1] μέσον ἐπηρώτησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λέγων, "Οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν; τί οὗτοί σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν;" 61. Ὁ δὲ ἐσιώπα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο.[2] Πάλιν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;" 62. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Ἐγώ εἰμι. καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν[3] τῆς δυνάμεως, καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ." 63. Ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς διαρρήξας τοὺς χιτῶνας αὐτοῦ λέγει, "Τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; 64. ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας· τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται;" Οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν εἶναι ἔνοχον[4] θανάτου. 65. Καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ, καὶ περικαλύπτειν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ,[5] καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτόν, καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ, "Προφήτευσον·" καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔβαλλον.[6]

66. Καὶ ὄντος τοῦ Πέτρου ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ κάτω,[7] ἔρχεται μία τῶν

[1] ℵABCLΔΣ *al. pl.* omit το found in D.

[2] For ουδεν απεκ. (ADΔΣ *al.*) ℵBCL 33 sah. cop. have ουκ απεκ. ουδεν.

[3] εκ δεξ. καθ. in ℵBCDLΔΣ *al.*

[4] ενοχον ειναι in ℵBCLΔ 33.

[5] αυτου το προσ. in ℵBCLΔ 33.

[6] ελαβον in ℵABCLΔ. εβαλλον substituted in later MSS. for a word not understood.

[7] κατω εν τ. αυλ. in ℵBCL. D omits κατω.

characterise it as hand-made, and as blasphemous to suggest that another could take its place.—Ver. 60. **εἰς μέσον**: a graphic feature in Mk., suggesting that the high priest arose from his seat and advanced into the semi-circle of the council towards Jesus—the action of an irritated, baffled man.—**οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ**: on the high priest's question *vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 61. **ἐσιώπα καὶ**, etc.: one of Mk.'s dualisms, yet not idle repetition = He maintained the silence He had observed up to that point (imperfect), and He answered nothing to the high priest's pointed question (aorist).—**πάλιν**: the high priest makes another attempt to draw Jesus into some self-condemning utterance, this time successfully.—**τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ**, the Blessed One, here only, absolutely, as a name for God. Usually, an epithet attached to **Κύριος** (Wünsche, *Beiträge*).—Ver. 62. **Ἐγώ εἰμι**. On Christ's reply to the high priest affirming the Messianic claim, *vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 63. **τοὺς χιτῶνας**, his tunics, or undergarments, of which persons in good position wore two. —Ver. 64. **τί ὑμῖν φαίνεται**, what appears to you to be the appropriate penalty of such blasphemous speech? = **τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ** in Mt. Nösgen denies the equivalence, and renders Mk.'s peculiar phrase: what lies for you on the hand, what is now your duty? with appeal to Xenophon, Anab., v., 7, 3.—Ver. 65. **τινες**: presumably Sanhedrists.—**περικαλύπτειν**: Mt. says nothing of this, but he as well as Mk. represents them as asking Jesus to prophesy. Mt.'s version implies that Jesus was struck from behind, Mk.'s in front.—**οἱ ὑπηρέται**: following the example of their masters.—**ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον**, received Him with slaps of the open hand: a phrase recalling the Latin, *accipere aliquem verberibus*.

Vv. 66-72. *Peter's denial* (Mt. xxvi. 69-75, Lk. xxii. 56-62).—Ver. 66. **κάτω ἐ. τ. α.**, *below* in the court, implying that the trial of Jesus had taken place in a chamber on a higher level.—**ἔρχεται μία**, etc., cometh one of the maids of the high priest—a servant in his palace, on some errand that night when all things were out of their usual course. That a maid should be astir and on duty at that unseasonable hour was itself a sign that something extraordinary was going on.—Ver. 67. **ἰδοῦσα**: Peter, sitting at the fire, catches her eye, and she sees at once

παιδισκῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, 67. καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον θερμαινόμενον, ἐμβλέψασα αὐτῷ λέγει, "Καὶ σὺ μετὰ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἦσθα."[1] 68. Ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο, λέγων, "Οὐκ[2] οἶδα, οὐδὲ[2] ἐπίσταμαι τί σὺ[3] λέγεις." Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἔξω εἰς τὸ προαύλιον· καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε.[4] 69. Καὶ ἡ παιδίσκη ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν πάλιν ἤρξατο[5] λέγειν τοῖς παρεστηκόσιν,[6] "Ὅτι οὗτος ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστιν." 70. Ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἠρνεῖτο. Καὶ μετὰ μικρὸν πάλιν οἱ παρεστῶτες ἔλεγον τῷ Πέτρῳ, "Ἀληθῶς

[1] **ησθα** before **I.** with **του** prefixed in BCL. The readings vary much here, but that of BCL (Tisch., W.H., Weiss) is the most like Mk.'s graphic style. *Vide* below.

[2] **ουτε ουτε** in ℵBDL.

[3] **συ τι** in ℵBCLΔΣ 33, altered by the scribes into the smoother **τι συ**.

[4] **και αλεκτωρ εφωνησεν** omitted in ℵBL; found in CDΔ *al.* *Vide* below.

[5] **ηρξατο παλιν** in ℵCLΔ (Tisch., W.H., text). B omits, and for **λεγειν** following has **ειπεν** (W.H. marg.).

[6] **παρεστωσιν** in ℵBCLΔ.

that he is a stranger. Going closer to him, and looking sharply into his face in the dim fire-light (**ἐμβλέψασα**), she comes at once to her conclusion.—**καὶ σὺ**, etc., thou also wert with the Nazarene—that Jesus; spoken in a contemptuous manner, a faithful echo of the tone of her superiors. The girl had probably seen Peter in Christ's company in the streets of Jerusalem, or in the temple during the last few days, and doubtless she had heard disparaging remarks about the Galilean prophet in the palace.—Ver. 68. **οὔτε οἶδα**, etc., I neither know nor understand, *thou*, what thou sayest. —**οὔτε-οὔτε** connect closely the two verbs as expressing inability to comprehend what she means. The unusual emphatic position of **σὺ** (**σὺ τί λέγεις**, smoothed down into **τί σὺ λ.** in T.R.) admirably reflects affected astonishment. —**ἐξῆλθεν**: he slunk away from the fire into the forecourt—**προαύλιον**, here only in N. T.—**καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε**: these words, omitted in ℵBL, are of very dubious authenticity. Weiss and Holtzmann think they were inserted by copyists under the impression that the words of Jesus to Peter, ver. 30, meant that the cock was to crow twice in close succession, whereas the **δὶς** referred to the second time of cock-crowing, the beginning of the second watch after midnight. Schanz, while regarding this explanation of **δὶς** as unnatural, admits that it is difficult to understand how this first crow did not remind Peter of the Lord's warning word.—Ver. 69. **ἡ παιδίσκη**: the article naturally suggests that it is the same maid, and probably but for harmonistic interests there would have been no doubt on the subject. Yet the fact that Mt. makes it another obliges us to ask whether Mk.'s expression necessarily means the same person. Grotius, whom Rosenmüller follows, says **ἡ** may here, as occasionally elsewhere = **τις**. Of more weight is the suggestion that it means the maid on duty in that particular place, the forecourt (Schanz and Klostermann; the remarks of the latter specially worthy of notice). On first thoughts one might deem **πάλιν** decisive as to identity, but (1) it is wanting in B, and (2) its most probable position is just before **λέγειν**, and the meaning, that Peter was a second time spoken to (or at) on the subject of his connection with Jesus, not that the same person spoke in both cases. On the whole a certain element of doubt remains, which cannot be eliminated by exegetical considerations. In favour of one maid is the consideration that two able to recognise Peter is more unlikely than one. Yet the two might be together when they saw Peter previously, or the one might point him out to the other that night. In Mt.'s narrative the standers-by seem also to have independent knowledge of Peter. In Mk. the maid gives them information. On the whole, Mk., as was to be expected, gives the clearer picture of the scene.—**τοῖς παρεστῶσιν**, to those standing by; pointing to Peter, and speaking so that he could hear.—Ver. 70. Now, it is the bystanders who persecute Peter with the charge of being a disciple.—**ἀληθῶς**: they are quite sure of it, for two reasons:

ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ· καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖος εἶ, καὶ ἡ λαλιά σου ὁμοιάζει."[1] 71. Ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύειν,[2] "Ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον, ὃν λέγετε." 72. Καὶ[3] ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε. Καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος οὗ[4] εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δίς,[5] ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς."[5] καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν[6] ἔκλαιε.

[1] **και η λαλ. σ. ομοιαζει** is imported from Mt.; omitted in ℵBCDL (Tisch., W.H., Weiss).

[2] **ομνυναι** in BL *al.* (**ομνυειν** in Mt.).

[3] **και** followed by **ευθυς** in ℵBLD; omitted in ACINX, etc., which insert **και αλεκ. εφωνησε** in ver. 68.

[4] **το ρημα ως** in ℵABCLΔ, corrected into the more usual **του ρηματος** in some copies.

[5] B places **δις** before **φωνησαι**, and ℵBCLΔ have **τρις με απαρνηση** instead of the order in T.R.

[6] For **επιβαλων εκλαιε** D has **ηρξατο κλαιειν**, and is followed by Latin, Egyptian, and Syriac verss., including Syr. Sin.

(1) the maid's confidence not specified but implied in the **καὶ γὰρ**, which introduces an additional reason; (2) **Γαλιλαῖος εἶ** = you are (by your speech) a Galilean. The addition in some MSS., **καὶ ἡ λαλία σ.**, etc., explanatory of the term Galilean, would be quite in Mk.'s manner, but the best authorities omit it.—Ver. 71. **ἀναθεματίζειν**: used absolutely, to call down curses on himself in case he was telling lies. Mt. has **καταθ.**, which is probably a contraction from **καταναθ.** (in T.R.).—Ver. 72. **εὐθὺς**: omitted in the MSS. which insert a first cock-crow in ver. 68, as implying that this was the first crow at that hour, as in Mt.—**ἐκ δευτέρου** (omitted in ℵL because apparently implying a first cock-crow during the denial, which they omit) must be understood with Weiss as referring to the second time of cock-crowing (three in the morning), the first being at midnight.—**ἐπιβαλὼν**: another puzzle in Mk.'s vocabulary; very variously interpreted. Most modern interpreters adopt the rendering in the A. V. and R. V., "when he thought thereon" (**ἐπιβαλὼν τὸν νοῦν**). Weizsäcker: "er bedachte es und weinte". Theophylact took **ἐπιβ** = **ἐπικαλυψάμενος τὴν κεφαλήν**, having covered his head (that he might weep unrestrainedly), a rendering which Fritzsche and Field (*Otium Nor.*) decidedly support. Field remarks: "it may have been a *trivial* or *colloquial* word, such as would have stirred the bile of a Phrynichus or a Thomas Magister, who would have inserted it in their *Index Expurgatorius*, with a caution: **ἐπιβαλὼν μὴ λέγε ἀλλὰ ἐγκαλυψάμενος ἢ ἐπικαλυψάμενος**". Brandt (*Die Ev. Gesch.*, p. 31), adopting a suggestion by Holwerda, thinks the original word may have been **ἐκβαλὼν** = going out, or flinging himself out. Klostermann ingeniously suggests: "stopped suddenly in his course of denial, like a man, running headlong, knocking suddenly against an obstacle in his way". The choice seems to lie between the renderings: "thinking thereon" and "covering his head".

CHAPTER XV. THE PASSION HISTORY CONTINUED. — Vv. 1-5. *Before Pilate* (Mt. xxvii. 1-14, Lk. xxiii. 1-10).—Ver. 1. **εὐθὺς, πρωΐ**, without delay, *quam primum*, in the morning watch, which might mean any time between three and six, but probably signifies after sunrise. —**συμβούλιον** will mean either a consultation or the result, the resolution come to, according as we adopt the reading: **ποιήσαντες** (T.R. = BΔ) or **ἑτοιμάσαντες** (ℵCL).—**καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον**: the **καὶ** simply identifies = even the whole Sanhedrim, and does not imply that, besides the three classes previously mentioned, some others were present (*e.g.*, **στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ**: Lk. xxii. 52). This added clause signifies that it was a very important meeting, as, in view of its aim, to prepare the case for Pilate, it obviously was. The Sanhedrists had accomplished nothing till they had got the matter put in such a form that they might hope to prevail with the procurator, with whom lay the *jus gladii*, to do their wicked will, and

XV. 1. ΚΑΙ εὐθέως ἐπὶ τὸ πρωῒ[1] συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες[2] οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον, δήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήνεγκαν καὶ παρέδωκαν τῷ[3] Πιλάτῳ. 2. καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πιλάτος, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;" Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Σὺ λέγεις." 3. Καὶ κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς πολλά· 4. ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος πάλιν ἐπηρώτησεν[4] αὐτόν, λέγων,[5] "Οὐκ ἀποκρίνῃ οὐδέν; ἴδε, πόσα σου καταμαρτυροῦσιν[6]·" 5. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίθη, ὥστε θαυμάζειν τὸν Πιλάτον.

6. Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυεν αὐτοῖς ἕνα δέσμιον, ὅνπερ ᾐτοῦντο.[7] 7. ἦν δὲ ὁ λεγόμενος Βαραββᾶς μετὰ τῶν συστασιαστῶν[8] δεδεμένος,

[1] πρωι without επι το in ℵBCDL.

[2] So in BΔΣ *al.* ℵCL have ετοιμασαντες (Tisch., W.H., margin).

[3] Omit τω ℵBCDLΔ. [4] επηρωτα in B 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] ℵ omits λεγων (Tisch., W.H., in brackets).

[6] κατηγορουσιν in ℵBCD (Tisch., W.H.). καταμαρ. in T.R. is from Mt.

[7] ον παρητουντο in ℵAB (Tisch., Trg., marg., W.H.). ονπερ (T.R.) is found nowhere else in the N.T. *Vide* below.

[8] στασιαστων in ℵBCD. Weiss thinks the συσ- (T.R.) has been omitted *per incuriam* in these MSS.

of course that Jesus claimed to be the Christ would not serve that purpose. *Vide* notes on Mt.—Πιλάτῳ: without the article in best MSS. on this the first mention; with, in subsequent reference. Mk. does not think it necessary to say who or what Pilate was, not even mentioning, as Mt., that he was the governor.—Ver. 2. σὺ εἶ ὁ β. Pilate's question reveals the secret of the morning meeting. The crafty Sanhedrists put a political construction on the confession of Jesus. The *Christ*, therefore a pretender to the throne of Israel. *Vide* on Mt.—Ver. 3. πολλά: either an adverb = much, or the accusative after κατηγόρουν. As to the matter of these accusations *vide* on Mt. But to what end, when Jesus had confessed that He was King; giving Himself away, so to speak? The Sanhedrists must have seen from Pilate's manner, a smile on his face perhaps, that he did not take the confession seriously. For the reason of this *vide* on Mt.—Ver. 4. πόσα, answering to πολλά in ver. 3, might mean "how grave," Thayer's *Grimm*, but probably = how many, as in vi. 38, viii. 5, 19.—Ver. 5. ὥστε θαυμ. τ. Π. Mt. adds λίαν. The governor had never seen a prisoner like this before. He does not believe Him to be a political pretender, but he sees that He is a remarkable man, and feels that he must proceed cautiously, groping his way amid the parties and passions of this strange people.

Vv. 6-15. *Jesus or Barabbas?* (Mt. xxvii. 15-26, Lk. xxiii. 16-25).—Ver. 6. ἀπέλυεν, imperfect = Mt.'s εἰώθει ἀπολύειν, pointing to a practice of the governor at passover season; on which *vide* on Mt.—ὅνπερ ᾐτοῦντο, "whomsoever they desired," A. V. The R. V. adopts the reading preferred by W.H., ὃν παρῃτοῦντο, and translates "whom they asked of him". It is difficult to decide between the two readings, as the περ might easily be changed into παρ, and *vice versâ*. In favour of the T.R. is the fact that παρῃτοῦντο ordinarily in N. T., as in the classics, means to refuse, and also that ὅνπερ very strongly emphasises the finality of the popular choice—they might ask the release of any one, no matter whom—such is the force of περ; it would be granted. On these grounds Field (*Otium Nor.*) decides for the T. R.—Ver. 7. στασιαστῶν (συστασ., T.R.): this word (here only in N. T.) contains an interesting hint as to the nature of the offence committed by Barabbas and his associates. They were no mere band of brigands (λῃστής: John xviii. 40), but men engaged in an insurrection, probably of a political character, rising out

οἵτινες ἐν τῇ στάσει φόνον πεποιήκεισαν. 8. καὶ ἀναβοήσας[1] ὁ ὄχλος ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι, καθὼς ἀεὶ[2] ἐποίει αὐτοῖς. 9. ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Θέλετε ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;" 10. Ἐγίνωσκε γὰρ ὅτι διὰ φθόνον παραδεδώκεισαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς.[3] 11. οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς ἀνέσεισαν τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα μᾶλλον τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἀπολύσῃ αὐτοῖς· 12. ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἀποκριθεὶς πάλιν εἶπεν[4] αὐτοῖς, "Τί οὖν θέλετε[5] ποιήσω ὃν[6] λέγετε βασιλέα[7] τῶν Ἰουδαίων;" 13. Οἱ δὲ πάλιν ἔκραξαν, "Σταύρωσον αὐτόν."

[1] αναβας in ℵBD sah. cop. (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] αει wanting in ℵBΔ sah. cop. (Tisch. and W.H. omit).

[3] B omits οι αρχ. (W.H. in brackets).

[4] For αποκ. παλ. ειπεν ℵBC have παλ. αποκ. ελεγεν.

[5] θελετε, found in D, is omitted in ℵBCΔ 33. Tisch. retains, W.H. omit.

[6] B omits ον (W.H. in brackets). *Vide* below.

[7] τον before βασ. in ℵABCΔ.

of the restless desire of many for independence, and in connection with that guilty of murder (**φόνον**), at least some of them (**οἵτινες**), Barabbas included.—**τῇ στάσει**: the article refers back to **στασιαστῶν** = the insurrection implied in there being insurrectionists. Mk. therefore does not refer to the insurrection as known to his readers. Perhaps he knew nothing about it himself, nor do we.—Ver. 8. **ἀναβὰς**, etc.: Mk. assigns the initiative to the people. So Lk.; Mt. and John to Pilate. The difference is not important to the course of the history. The custom existing, this incident was bound to come about somehow. Nor does it greatly affect the question as to the attitude of Pilate. In either case he was simply feeling his way. The custom gave him a chance of feeling the popular pulse, a most important point for a ruler of his opportunist type.—**καθὼς**, here = that which.—Ver. 9. **θέλετε**, etc.: Pilate makes the tentative suggestion that the favoured person should be Jesus; whom he designates "King of the Jews," to see how the people would take a title which the Sanhedrists regarded as a mortal offence.—Ver. 10. **ἐγίνωσκεν**, it gradually dawned upon him. Pilate would see the *animus* of the Sanhedrists in their many accusations (ver. 3), from which it would appear that Christ's real offence was His great influence with the people. Hence the attempt to play off the one party against the other: the people against the priests.—Ver. 11. **ἀνέσεισαν**, the aorist implies that the priests stirred up the people *with success*, to the effect that their request to Pilate was in favour of Barabbas. One may wonder how they so easily gained their purpose. But Barabbas, as described by Mk., represented a popular passion, which was stronger than any sympathy they might have for so unworldly a character as Jesus—the passion for *political liberty*. The priests would know how to play on that feeling. What unprincipled characters they were! They accuse Jesus to Pilate of political ambition, and they recommend Barabbas to the people for the same reason. But a "holy" end sanctifies the means! On the contrast between Jesus and Barabbas *vide* Klostermann.—Ver. 12. It is presupposed that the people have intimated their preference for Barabbas perhaps by the cry: not Jesus, but Barabbas. Hence Pilate proceeds to ask: "what, then, am I to do with Him *whom ye call* (**λέγετε**) the King of the Jews?" That *whom ye call* was very astute. It ought to bring out the real feeling of the people, as from the next verse we learn that it did.—Ver. 13. **πάλιν**: they had intimated their will already by a popular shout = Barabbas, not Jesus; now they intimate their feeling about Jesus by a second shout with the unmistakable ring of reprobation in it: CRUCIFY HIM! That is what Pilate's **ὃν λέγετε** has brought out. It has been taken as an insult. The sense is the same if, with B, we omit **ὃν**. Pilate's question then = what then shall I do, tell me, to the King of the Jews? The sting lies in the

14. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν[1];" Οἱ δὲ περισσοτέρως[2] ἔκραξαν, "Σταύρωσον αὐτόν." 15. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος βουλόμενος τῷ ὄχλῳ τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι, ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Βαραββᾶν· καὶ παρέδωκε τὸν Ἰησοῦν, φραγελλώσας, ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.

16. Οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστι πραιτώριον, καὶ συγκαλοῦσιν ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν, 17. καὶ ἐνδύουσιν[3] αὐτὸν πορφύραν, καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον, 18. καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀσπάζεσθαι αὐτόν, "Χαῖρε, βασιλεῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων·" 19. καὶ ἔτυπτον αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν καλάμῳ, καὶ ἐνέπτυον αὐτῷ, καὶ τιθέντες τὰ γόνατα προσεκύνουν αὐτῷ. 20. Καὶ ὅτε ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὴν πορφύραν, καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια τὰ ἴδια[4]· καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτόν, ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτόν. 21. καὶ ἀγγαρεύουσι παράγοντά τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναῖον, ἐρχόμενον ἀπ᾿ ἀγροῦ, τὸν πατέρα Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Ῥούφου, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ.

22. ΚΑΙ φέρουσιν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ Γολγοθᾶ[5] τόπον, ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευό-

[1] εποι. κακον in BCΔ. [2] περισσως in ℵABCDΔ. *Vide* below.

[3] ενδιδυσκουσιν in ℵBCDΔ. *Vide* below.

[4] For τα ιδια BCΔ have αυτου (W.H.); ℵ reads τα ιδια ιματια αυτου (Tisch.).

[5] τον Γολγοθαν in ℵBLΔΣ.

title.—Ver. 14. This final speech of Pilate presents a subtle combination of honesty and craft. He says what he really thinks: that Jesus is innocent, and he makes sure that the people really mean to stand to what they have said. —περισσῶς, beyond measure: the positive here is stronger than the comparative περισσοτέρως (T.R.), and it is far better attested.—Ver. 15. Pilate was now quite sure what the people wished, and so, as an opportunist, he let them have their way.—τὸ ἱκανὸν ποιῆσαι: to satisfy (here only in N. T.) = *satisfacere* in Vulg., perhaps a Latinism (*vide* Grotius), but found in later Greek (*vide* Raphel and Elsner).—φραγελλώσας: certainly a Latinism, from *flagellare*.

Vv. 16-20. *Mocked by the soldiers* (Mt. xxvii. 27-31).—Ver. 16. The soldiers in charge of the prisoner conduct Him into the barracks (ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστιν πραιτώριον = into the court, that is, the praetorium—Weizsäcker), and call together their comrades to have some sport.—ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν: "a popular exaggeration" (Sevin.); at most 200 men.—Ver. 17. ἐνδιδύσκουσιν for ἐνδύουσιν, T.R.: a rare word, not in classics, found in Sept. and Joseph. (and in Lk. viii. 27, xvi. 19), and because rare, the more probable reading.—πορφύραν, a *purple* garment, for Mt.'s χλαμύδα κοκκίνην = "*scarlet* robe".—ἀκάνθινον σ.: here and in John xix. 5.

Vv. 21-26. *The crucifixion* (Mt. xxvii. 32-37, Lk. xxiii. 26, 33-38).—Ver. 21. ἀγγαρεύουσιν: on this word *vide* on Mt. v. 41.—ἀπ᾿ ἀγροῦ: this detail in Mk. and Lk. has been taken as an unintentional hint that the crucifixion took place a day earlier than the synoptical statements imply. Coming from the country, *i.e.*, from his work. But even Holtzmann, H. C., disallows the inference: "as if nine in the morning were evening after work time, and εἰς ἀγρὸν in Mk. xvi. 12 meant ploughing or reaping".—Ἀλεξ., Ῥούφ.: these names imply interest in the persons referred to within the circle of Mk.'s first readers, presumably well-known Christians. Rufus in Rom. xvi. 13? Alexander in Acts xix. 33?—Ver. 22. φέρουσιν α.: they carry Him: "ferunt, non modo ducunt," Bengel. It would appear that Jesus was so weak through the strain of the last few days, and the scourging,

μενον,[1] Κρανίου τόπος. 23. Καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ πιεῖν[2] ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον· ὁ δὲ[3] οὐκ ἔλαβε. 24. Καὶ σταυρώσαντες[4] αὐτόν, διεμέριζον[5] τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ' αὐτά, τίς τί ἄρῃ. 25. ἦν δὲ ὥρα τρίτη, καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. 26. Καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη, "Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων." 27. Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσι δύο λῃστάς, ἕνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἕνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων αὐτοῦ. 28. καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα, 'Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη.[6] 29. Καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτόν, κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγοντες, "Οὐά, ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν,[7] 30. σῶσον σεαυτόν, καὶ κατάβα[8] ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ." 31. Ὁμοίως δὲ[9] καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων ἔλεγον, "Ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι. 32. ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ[10] Ἰσραὴλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν."

[1] μεθερμηνευομενος in ℵBΣ. [2] ℵBCLΔ omit πιειν.

[3] ος δε in ℵB 33. [4] For the participle BL have σταυρουσιν αυτον και.

[5] For διεμεριζον (in minusc. only) read διαμεριζονται.

[6] ℵABCD sah. omit this verse, which is interpolated from Lk. xxii. 37.

[7] οικοδομων before τρι. ημ. in BDL. εν is wanting in D and other uncials (Tisch. omits, W.H. brackets).

[8] For και καταβα ℵBDLΔ have καταβας.

[9] δε omitted in ℵBCLΔ. [10] ℵBDLΔ omit του before Ισραηλ.

that He was unable to walk, not to speak of carrying His cross. He had to be borne as the sick were borne to Him (Mk. i. 32).—Ver. 23. **ἐδίδουν**: the conative imperfect = they tried to give, offered. — **ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον**, wine drugged with myrrh, here only in N. T. *Cf.* Mt.'s account.—**οὐκ ἔλαβεν**: Mt. says Jesus tasted the drink. He would not take it because He knew that it was meant to stupefy.—Ver. 24. **τίς τί ἄρῃ**, who should receive what; two questions pithily condensed into one, another example in Lk. xix. 15, *vide* Winer, § lxvi., 5, 3.—Ver. 25. **ὥρα τρίτη**, the third hour = nine o'clock as we reckon; raising a harmonistic problem when compared with John xix. 14. Grotius comments: "id est, jam audita erat tuba horae tertiae, quod dici solebat donec caneret tuba horae sextae" (they called it the third hour till the sixth was sounded).—**καὶ** = when, Hebraistic, but also not without example in classics in similar connections: the fact stated connected with its time by a simple **καὶ**; instances in Meyer.—Ver. 26. **ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπιγεγραμμένη**: awkwardly expressed; Mt. and Lk. have phrases which look like corrections of style.—**ὁ βασ. τῶν Ἰουδ.**: the simplest form of the inscription.

Vv. 29-32. *Taunts of spectators* (Mt. xxvii. 39-44, Lk. xxiii. 35, 37, 39).—Ver. 29. **οὐὰ** = Latin, *vah*, expressing here ironical admiration: "admirandi vim cum ironia habet," Bengel. Raphel remarks that this word was not given in the Greek Lexicons, but that it is not therefore to be regarded as a Latinism peculiar to Mk., but rather as a word which had been adopted and used by the later Greeks, *e.g.*, Arrian. Here only in N. T.—Ver. 30. **καταβὰς (καὶ κατάβα**, T.R.), etc., save Thyself, *having descended*, etc., or by descending = descend and so save Thyself.—Ver. 31. **οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς**: both in Mt. and in Mk. the priests lead in the unhallowed chuckling, scribes and elders (Mt.) being mentioned only subordinately (**μετὰ**, etc.).—**πρὸς ἀλλήλους**: a common fear gives place to a common sportiveness in this unholy brotherhood, now that the cause of their fear is removed.—Ver. 32. **ἵνα ἴδωμεν**[1] *that we may see* (in the descent from the cross) an unmistakable sign from heaven of Messiahship, and so believe in Thee.—

Καὶ οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι[1] αὐτῷ ὠνείδιζον αὐτόν. 33. Γενομένης δὲ[2] ὥρας ἕκτης, σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ᾽ ὅλην τὴν γῆν, ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης. 34. καὶ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῇ ἐννάτῃ[3] ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγων,[4] "Ἐλωΐ, Ἐλωΐ, λαμμᾶ σαβαχθανί[5];" ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, "Ὁ Θεός μου, ὁ Θεός μου, εἰς τί με ἐγκατέλιπες[6];" 35. Καί τινες τῶν παρεστηκότων[7] ἀκούσαντες ἔλεγον, "Ἰδού,[8] Ἡλίαν φωνεῖ." 36. Δραμὼν δὲ εἷς,[9] καὶ[10] γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξους, περιθείς τε[11] καλάμῳ, ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν, λέγων, "Ἄφετε, ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρχεται Ἡλίας καθελεῖν αὐτόν."

37. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀφεὶς φωνὴν μεγάλην ἐξέπνευσε. 38. καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη εἰς δύο, ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω.

[1] συν after συνεσταυρωμενοι in ℵBL. [2] και γεν. in ℵBDLΔ.
[3] τη ενατη ωρα in ℵBDL. [4] Omit λεγων ℵBDL.
[5] The spelling of the words λαμ. σαβ. varies much in the MSS.
[6] με after εγκατελ. in ℵBL. [7] B has εστηκοτων.
[8] ιδε in ℵBLΔ 33. [9] τις in ℵBLΔ. [10] BL omit και.
[11] ℵBDL 33 omit τε (W.H. read Δραμων δε τις γεμ. σ. ο. περιθεις καλ.).

οἱ συνεσταυρωμένοι, the co-crucified. Mk., like Mt., knows nothing of the conversion of one of the robbers reported by Lk. How different these fellow-sufferers in spirit from the co-crucified in St. Paul's sense (Rom. vi. 6, Gal. ii. 20)!

Vv. 33-36. *Darkness without and within* (Mt. xxvii. 45-49, Lk. xxiii. 44-46).—Ver. 33. γενομένης, ἐγένετο: another awkwardness of style variously amended in Mt. and Lk.—σκότος: on this darkness *vide* on Mt. Furrer (*Wanderungen*, pp. 175-6) suggests as its cause a storm of hot wind from the south-east, such as sometimes comes in the last weeks of spring. "The heavens are overcast with a deep gray, the sun loses his brightness, and at last disappears. Over the darkened land rages the storm, so that the country, in the morning like a flower-carpet, in the evening appears a waste. . . . On the saddest day in human history swept such a storm at noon over Jerusalem, adding to the terrors of the crucifixion."—Ver. 34. ἐλωΐ, ἐλωΐ: the Aramaic form of the words spoken by Jesus, Mt. giving the Hebrew equivalent. On this cry of desertion *vide* remarks on the parallel place in Mt.—ὁ Θεός μου. ὁ Θ. μ.: as in Sept. Mt. gives the vocative.—εἰς τί, for what end? ἵνα τί in Mt. and Sept.—Ver. 35. Ἡλίαν: the name of Elijah might be suggested by either form of the name of God—Eli or Eloi. Who the τινες were that made the poor pun is doubtful, most probably heartless fellow-countrymen who only affected to misunderstand.—Ver. 36. δραμὼν δὲ: if the wits were heartless mockers, then δὲ will imply that this person who offered the sufferer a sponge saturated with *posca* (*vide* Mt.) was a friendly person touched by compassion. For the credit of human nature one is very willing to be convinced of this.—ἐπότιζεν might, like ἐδίδουν (ver. 23), be viewed as a conative imperfect = offered Him a drink, but John's narrative indicates that Jesus accepted the drink (xix. 30).—λέγων refers to the man who brought the drink. In Mt. it is others who speak (xxvii. 49), and the sense of what was said varies accordingly—ἄφες in Mt. naturally, though not necessarily, means: stop, don't give Him the drink (*vide* on Mt.)—ἄφετε in Mk., spoken by the man to the bystanders, means naturally: allow me (to give Him the drink), the idea being that thereby the life of the sufferer would be prolonged, and so as it were give time for Elijah to come (ἴδωμεν εἰ ἔρ. Ἡ.) to work an effectual deliverance by taking Him down from the cross (καθελεῖν α.).—εἰ ἔρ.: εἰ with the present indicative instead of the more usual ἐὰν with subjunctive in a future supposition with probability (*vide* Burton, M. and T. in N. T., § 251).

Vv. 37-41. *Death and its accompaniments* (Mt. xxvii. 50-56, Lk. xxiii. 46-49).—

39. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐξ ἐναντίας αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὕτω κράξας[1] ἐξέπνευσεν, εἶπεν, "Ἀληθῶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος[2] υἱὸς ἦν Θεοῦ." 40. Ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, ἐν αἷς ἦν[3] καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή, καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ[4] Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσῆ[5] μήτηρ, καὶ Σαλώμη, 41. αἳ καί,[6] ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ, καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβᾶσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

42. Καὶ ἤδη ὀψίας γενομένης, ἐπεὶ ἦν παρασκευή, ὅ ἐστι προσάβ-

[1] ℵBL cop. omit κραξας, found in ACΔΣ *al. unc.*

[2] The order of the words varies: ουτος ο ανθ. in ℵBDLΔ 33 (Tisch., W.H.); υιος ην θ. in AC *al.* (Tisch.); υιος θ. ην in ℵBLΔ (W.H.).

[3] ην (from Mt.) omitted in ℵBL.

[4] ℵBCΔΣ omit του.

[5] Ιωσητος in BDLΔ.

[6] ℵB 33 omit και; ACLΔ omit αι. Perhaps both omissions are due to similar ending.

Ver. 37. φωνὴν μεγάλην: a *second* great voice uttered by Jesus (*vide* ver. 34), the fact indicated in Mt. by the word πάλιν. At this point would come in John's τετέλεσται (xix. 30). — ἐξέπνευσεν, breathed out His life, expired; aorist, the main fact, to which the incident of the drink (ἐπότιζεν, imperfect) is subordinate; used absolutely, here (and in Lk. xxiii. 46), as often in the classics. Bengel remarks: "spirare conducit corpori, exspirare spiritui".—Ver. 38. The fact of the rending of the veil stated as in Mt., with omission of Mt.'s favourite ἰδοὺ, and the introduction of another of Mk.'s characteristic pleonasms, ἀπ' ἄνωθεν.—Ver. 39. κεντυρίων, a Latinism = *centurio*, for which Mt. and Lk. give the Greek ἑκατόνταρχος.—ἐξ ἐναντίας (χώρας), right opposite Jesus, so that he could hear and see all distinctly. The thing that chiefly impressed him, according to Mk., was the manner of His death. —οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν = with a loud voice, as if life were still strong, and so much sooner than usual, as of one who, needing no Elijah to aid Him, could at will set Himself free from misery. This was a natural impression on the centurion's part, and patristic interpreters endorse it as true and important. Victor Ant. says that the loud voice showed that Jesus died κατ' ἐξουσίαν, and Theophylact applies to the ἐξέπνευσεν the epithet δεσποτικῶς. But it may be questioned whether this view is in accord either with fact or with sound theology. What of the φέρουσι in ver. 22? And is there not something docetic in self-rescue from the pangs of the cross, instead of leaving the tragic experience to run its natural course? Mt.'s explanation of the wonder of the centurion, by the external events—earthquake, etc.—is, by comparison, secondary. Schanz characterises Mk.'s account as "schöner psychologisch" (psychologically finer). —Ver. 40. On the faithful women who looked on from afar, *vide* on Mt. Mk. singles out for special mention the same three as Mt.: Mary of Magdala, Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children. Mk. distinguishes James, the brother of Joses, as τοῦ μικροῦ = either the little in stature (Meyer and Weiss), or the less in age, the younger (Schanz). Mk. refers to the mother of Zebedee's children by her own name, Salome. Neither evangelist mentions Mary, the mother of Jesus.—Ver. 41. This interesting reference to service rendered to Jesus in Galilee, given here by Mk. only, applies to the three named, hence the honourable mention of them. Mt. substitutes service on the way from Galilee to Jerusalem rendered by all—evidently a secondary account.—ἄλλαι πολλαί, others, many; also worthy of honour, but of an inferior order compared with the three. They made the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem with Jesus.

Vv. 42-47. *Burial* (Mt. xxvii. 57-66, Lk. xxiii. 50-56).—Ver. 42. ἤδη: omitted by Mt., but important, as indicating that the business Joseph had on hand—that of obtaining and using permission to take down and bury the body of Jesus—must

βατον, 43. ἦλθεν[1] Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, εὐσχήμων βουλευτής, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· τολμήσας εἰσῆλθε πρὸς[2] Πιλάτον, καὶ ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 44. ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐθαύμασεν[3] εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκε· καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν κεντυρίωνα, ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν εἰ πάλαι[4] ἀπέθανε· 45. καὶ γνοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος, ἐδωρήσατο τὸ σῶμα[5] τῷ Ἰωσήφ. 46. καὶ ἀγοράσας σινδόνα, καὶ[6] καθελὼν αὐτόν, ἐνείλησε τῇ σινδόνι, καὶ κατέθηκεν[7] αὐτὸν ἐν μνημείῳ,[8] ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας· καὶ προσεκύλισε λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου. 47. ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία Ἰωσῆ[9] ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τίθεται.[10]

[1] ελθων in ℵABCLΔ, etc., ηλθεν in D. [2] προς τον in ℵBLΔ 33.

[3] ℵD have εθαυμαζεν (Tisch.), aor. (T.R.) in BCLΔ (W.H.).

[4] παλαι in ℵCL (Tisch.), ηδη in BD (W.H. text, παλαι marg.).

[5] πτωμα in ℵBDL; changed into σωμα from a feeling of decorum.

[6] ℵBDL cop. omit και, added as a connecting particle.

[7] εθηκεν in ℵBDL (W.H.).

[8] ℵB have μνηματι, instead of μνημειω in CDLΔ. Tisch. and W.H. adopt reading of ℵB.

[9] η before Ιωσ. in BCΔ; Ιωσητος in BLΔ. [10] τεθειται in BCDLΔ.

be gone about without delay. It was *already* the afternoon of the day before the Sabbath, προσάββατον, called παρασκευή (here and in the parallels in this technical sense). It must, therefore, be done at once, or it could not be done till Sabbath was past.—Ver. 43. εὐσχήμων: Mt. has πλούσιος; *vide* there for remarks on the two epithets.—βουλευτής, a councillor, not in the provincial town, Arimathaea, which would have been mentioned, but in the grand council in Jerusalem.—καὶ αὐτὸς, not in contrast to the Sanhedrists generally (Weiss), but in company with the women previously named (Schanz); he, like them, was an expectant of the Kingdom of God.—τολμήσας: a graphic word, in Mk. only, giving a vivid idea of the situation. Objections to be feared on Pilate's part on score of time—dead so soon? possibly surly indifference to the decencies of burial in the case of a crucified person, risk of offence to the religious leaders in Jerusalem by sympathy shown to the obnoxious One, even in death. Therefore to be rendered: "*taking courage*, went in unto Pilate" (*vide* Field, *Ot. Nor.*, *ad loc.*).—Ver. 44. Omitted by Mt., whose narrative throughout is colourless compared with Mk.'s.—εἰ τέθνηκε: εἰ = ὅτι, after a verb of wonder (*vide* Burton, M. and T., § 277, and Winer, § lx., 6).—εἰ ἀπέθανε: τέθνηκε has reference to the present of the speaker, ἀπέθανε to the moment of death.—πάλαι: opposed to ἄρτι, and not implying a considerable time before, but only bare priority to the present. Pilate's question to the centurion was, did He die before now? = is He actually dead?—Ver. 45. Satisfied on the point Pilate freely gives (ἐδωρήσατο) the carcase (πτῶμα, ℵBDL, corrected from feelings of reverence into σῶμα in many MSS.).—Ver. 46. ἀγοράσας, *having purchased* linen; therefore purchases could be made. This word, and the reason given for Joseph's haste (ver. 42), have, not without a show of reason, been regarded as unintentional evidence in favour of the Johannine Chronology of the Passion. So Meyer, Weiss, and Holtzmann.—καθελὼν: καθαιρεῖν was the technical term for taking down from the cross. Proofs in Elsner, Raphel, Kypke, and Loesner.—ἐνείλησεν: here only in N. T.—ἐν μνημείῳ (μνήματι, ℵB): no indication in Mk. as in Mt. that it was *new*, and Joseph's own.—Ver. 47. τέθειται: from the *perfect* Meyer and Weiss infer that the women were not present at the burial, but simply approached and took note where Jesus lay after burial. Schanz dissents, and refers to the καὶ before ὅτε in ver. 41 in some MSS., as proving that they had come to render the last office to Jesus.

XVI. 1. **ΚΑΙ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου, Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Σαλώμη ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα, ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν. 2. καὶ λίαν πρωῒ τῆς μιᾶς[1] σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον,[2] ἀνατείλαντος[3] τοῦ ἡλίου. 3. καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς, "Τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου;" 4. Καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀποκεκύλισται[4] ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα. 5. καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι[5] εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκήν· καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν. 6. ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς, "Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε. Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον·**

[1] **τη μια** in ℵBLΔ 33 (B omits **τη**, W.H. brackets).

[2] So in BDLΔ (W.H.). ℵC have **μνημα** (Tisch.).

[3] **ανατελλοντος** in D (W.H. marg.).

[4] **ανακεκυλισται** in ℵBL. **αποκεκ.** conforms to ver. 3.

[5] **ελθουσαι** in B (W.H. marg.).

CHAPTER XVI. THE RESURRECTION. Vv. 1-8. *The open grave* (Mt. xxviii 1-10, Lk. xxiv. 1-12).—Ver. 1. **διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου**, the Sabbath being past; similar use of **διαγ-** in Acts xxv. 13, xxvii. 9, and in late Greek authors; examples in Elsner, Wetstein, Raphel, *e.g.*, **διαγενομένων πάλιν ἐτῶν δέκα**, Polyb., Hist., ii., 19.—**ἠγόρασαν ἀρ.**, purchased spices; wherewith, mingled with oil, more perfectly to anoint the body of the Lord Jesus. The aorist implies that this purchase was made on the first day of the week. Lk. (xxiii. 56) points to the previous Friday evening. Harmonists (Grotius, *e.g.*) reconcile by taking **ἠγόρ.** as a pluperfect. "After sunset there was a lively trade done among the Jews, because no purchase could be made on Sabbath" (Schanz).—Ver. 2. **λίαν πρωῒ**, very early in the morning, suggesting a time hardly consistent with the qualifying clause: **ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου** = when the sun was risen, which again does not harmonise with the "deep dawn" of Lk. and the "yet dark" of John. Mk.'s aim apparently is to emphasise the fact that what he is going to relate happened in broad daylight; Lk.'s to point out that the pious women were at their loving work as early on the Sunday morning as possible.—Ver. 3. **ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς**: as they went to the sepulchre, they kept saying to each other (*ad invicem*, Vulg., **πρὸς ἀλλήλας**, Euthy.). — **τίς ἀποκυλίσει**: their only solicitude was about the stone at the sepulchre's mouth: no thought of the guards in Mk.'s account. The pious women thought not of angelic help. Men had rolled the stone forward and could roll it back, but it was beyond woman's strength.—Ver. 4. **ἀναβλέψασαι**, *looking up*, as they approached the tomb; suggestive of heavy hearts and downcast eyes, on the way thither.—**ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα**: this clause seems out of place here, and it has been suggested that it should be inserted after **μνημείου** in ver. 3, as explaining the women's solicitude about the removal of the stone. As it stands, the clause explains how the women could see, even at a distance, that the stone had already been removed. It was a sufficiently large object. How the stone was rolled away is not said.

Vv. 5-8. *The women enter into the tomb through the open door, and experience a greater surprise.*—**νεανίσκον**, a young man. In Mt.'s account it is an angel, and his position is not within the tomb, as here, but sitting on the stone without. Lk. has *two* men in shining apparel.—**στολὴν λευκήν**, in a white long robe, implying what is not said, that the youth is an angel. No such robe worn by young men on earth.—Ver. 6. **μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε**, "be not affrighted" (as they had been by the unexpected sight of a *man*, and wearing *heavenly apparel*); no **ὑμεῖς** after the verb here, as in Mt. after **φοβεῖσθε**, where there is an implied contrast between the women and the *guards* (*vide* on Mt.).—**Ἰησοῦν**, etc., *Jesus* ye seek, the Nazarene, the crucified. Observe the objective, far-off style of description, befitting a visitor from

ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἴδε, ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν. 7. ἀλλ' ὑπάγετε, εἴπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὅτι προάγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε, καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν." 8. Καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ταχὺ[1] ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου· εἶχε δὲ[2] αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις· καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον, ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.[3]

[1] ℵABCDLΔΣ omit ταχυ (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] γαρ for δε in ℵBD vet. Lat. cop. syr. vers.

[3] On verses 9-20, in relation to the Gospel, *vide* below.

another world.—ἠγέρθη, etc.: note the abrupt disconnected style: risen, not here, see (ἴδε) the place (empty) where they laid Him. The empty grave, the visible fact; resurrection, the inference; when, how, a mystery (ἄδηλον, Euthy.).—Ver. 7. ἀλλὰ, but; change in tone and topic; gazing longer into the empty grave would serve no purpose: there is something to be done—go, spread the news! *Cf.* John xiv. 31: *But . . . arise, let us go hence!*—καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ, and to Peter in particular: why? to the disciple who denied his Master? so the older interpreters—to Peter, with all his faults, the most important man in the disciple band? so most recent interpreters: *ut dux Apostolici coetus*, Grotius.—ὅτι, recit., introducing the very message of the angel. The message recalls the words of Jesus before His death (chap. xiv. 28).—ἐκεῖ, there, pointing to Galilee as the main scene of the reappearing of Jesus to His disciples, creating expectation of a narrative by the evangelist of an appearance there, *which, however, is not forthcoming.*—Ver. 8. ἐξελθοῦσαι, *going out*—of the sepulchre into which they had entered (ver. 5).—ἔφυγον, they *fled*, from the scene of such surprises. The angel's words had failed to calm them; the event altogether too much for them.—τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις, trembling, caused by fear, and stupor, as of one out of his wits.—τρόμος = "tremor corporis": ἔκστασις = "stupor animi," Bengel.—οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπον: an unqualified statement as it stands here, no "on the way," such as harmonists supply: "obvio scilicet," Grotius.—ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ gives the reason of this reticence so unnatural in women; they were in a state of fear. When the fear went off, or events happened which made the disciples independent of their testimony, their mouths would doubtless be opened.

So ends the authentic Gospel of Mark, without any account of appearances of the risen Jesus in Galilee or anywhere else. The one thing it records is the empty grave, and an undelivered message sent through three women to the disciples, promising a reunion in Galilee. Strange that a story of such thrilling interest should terminate so abruptly and unsatisfactorily. Was there originally a continuation, unhappily lost, containing, *e.g.*, an account of a meeting of the Risen One in Galilee with His followers? Or was the evangelist prevented by some unknown circumstances from carrying into effect an intention to bring his story to a suitable close? We cannot tell. All we know (for the light thrown on the question by criticism, represented, *e.g.*, by Tischendorf, Nov. Test., G. Ed., viii., vol. i., pp. 403-407; Hahn, Gesch. des. N. Kanons, ii., p. 910 ff.; Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, Appendix, pp. 29-51, approaches certainty) is that vv. 9-20 of Mk. xvi. in our N. T. are not to be taken as the fulfilment of any such intention by the author of the second Gospel. The external evidence strongly points this way. The section is wanting in ℵB and in Syr. Sin. Jerome states (Ep. cxx., quaest. 3) that it was wanting in nearly all Greek copies ("omnibus Graecis libris pene"), and the testimony of Eusebius is to the same effect. The internal evidence of style confirms the impression made by the external: characteristic words of Mk. wanting, words not elsewhere found in the Gospel occurring (*e.g.*, ἐθεάθη, v. 11), the narrative a meagre, colourless summary, a composition based on the narratives of the other Gospels, signs ascribed to believers, some of which wear an apocryphal aspect (*vide* ver. 18). Some, in spite of such considerations, still regard these verses as an integral part of Mk.'s work, but for many the question of present interest is: what account is to be given of them, viewed as an indubitable *addendum* by another hand? Who wrote this conclusion, when, and with

9. Ἀναστὰς δὲ πρωῒ πρώτῃ σαββάτου ἐφάνη πρῶτον Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, ἀφ' ἧς[1] ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια. 10. ἐκείνη πορευθεῖσα ἀπήγγειλε τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις, πενθοῦσι καὶ κλαίουσι. 11. κἀκεῖνοι ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ζῇ καὶ ἐθεάθη ὑπ' αὐτῆς

[1] παρ ης in CDL 33 (W.H.).

what end in view? We wait for the final answers to these questions, but important contributions have recently been made towards a solution of the problem. In an Armenian codex of the Gospels, written in 986 A.D., the close of Mk. (vv. 9-20), separated by a space from what goes before to show that it is distinct, has written above it: "Of the Presbyter Aristion," as if to suggest that he is the author of what follows. (*Vide Expositor*, October, 1893. *Aristion, the Author of the last Twelve Verses of Mark*, by F. C. Conybeare, M.A.) More recently Dr. Rohrbach has taken up this fact into his interesting discussion on the subject already referred to (*vide* on Mt. xxviii. 9, 10), and appreciated its significance in connection with the preparation of a *four-gospel Canon* by certain Presbyters of Asia Minor in the early part of the second century. His hypothesis is that in preparing this Canon the Presbyters felt it necessary to bring the Gospels into accord, especially in reference to the resurrection, that in their preaching all might say the same thing on that vital topic. In performing this delicate task, the fourth Gospel was taken as the standard, and all the other Gospels were to a certain extent altered in their resurrection sections to bring them into line with its account. In Mt. and Lk. the change made was slight, simply the insertion in the former of two verses (xxviii. 9, 10), and in the latter of one (xxiv. 12). In Mk., on the other hand, it amounted to the removal of the original ending, and the substitution for it of a piece taken from a writing by Aristion the Presbyter, mentioned by Papias. The effect of the changes, if not their aim, was to take from Peter the honour of being the first to see the risen Lord, and from Galilee that of being the exclusive theatre of the Christophanies. It is supposed that the original ending of Mk. altogether ignored the Jerusalem appearances, and represented Jesus, in accordance with the statement of St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5), as showing Himself (in Galilee) first to Peter, then to the Twelve. The inference is based partly on Mk. xvi. 7, and partly on the relative section of the Gospel of Peter, which, following pretty closely Mk.'s account as far as ver. 8, goes on to tell how the Twelve found their way sad of heart to their old homes, and resumed their old occupations. In all this Rohrbach, a pupil of Harnack's, is simply working out a hint thrown out by his master in his *Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i., p. 346, 3 Ausg. It would be premature to accept the theory as proved, but it is certainly entitled to careful consideration, as tending to throw some light on an obscure chapter in the early history of the Gospels, and on the ending of the canonical Gospel of Mark in particular.

Vv. 9-20 may be divided into three parts corresponding more or less to sections in *John*, *Luke*, and *Matthew*, and not improbably based on these; vv. 9-11, answering to John xx. 14-18; vv. 12-14, answering to Lk. xxiv. 13-35; vv. 15-18, answering to Mt. xxviii. 19. Vv. 19, 20 wind up with a brief reference to the ascension and the subsequent apostolic activity of the disciples.

Vv. 9-11. **ἀναστὰς δὲ** refers to Jesus, who, however, is not once named in the whole section. This fact with the **δὲ** favours the hypothesis that the section is a fragment of a larger writing.—**πρωῒ πρώτῃ σαβ.**: whether these words are to be connected with **ἀναστὰς**, indicating the time of the resurrection, or with **ἐφάνη**, indicating the time of the first appearance, cannot be decided (*vide* Meyer).—**πρῶτον Μαρίᾳ τ. Μ.**, first to Mary of Magdala, as in John (xx. 14).—**παρ' ἧς**, etc.: this bit of information, taken from Lk. viii. 2, is added as if this woman were a stranger never mentioned before in this Gospel, a sure sign of another hand.—**ἐφάνη**, in this verse = appeared to, does not elsewhere occur in this sense.—Ver. 10. **ἐκείνη**, she, without emphasis, not elsewhere so used.—**πορευθεῖσα**: the simple verb **πορεύεσθαι**, three times used in this section (vv. 12, 15), does not occur anywhere else in this Gospel.—**τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ γενομένοις**: the reference is not to the disciples in the stricter sense who are called the Eleven (ver. 14), but to the friends of Jesus generally, an ex-

ἠπίστησαν. 12. Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν περιπατοῦσιν ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ, πορευομένοις εἰς ἀγρόν. 13. κἀκεῖνοι ἀπελθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τοῖς λοιποῖς· οὐδὲ ἐκείνοις ἐπίστευσαν. 14. Ὕστερον[1] ἀνακειμένοις αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἕνδεκα ἐφανερώθη, καὶ ὠνείδισε τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν, ὅτι τοῖς θεασαμένοις αὐτὸν ἐγηγερμένον[2] οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν. 15. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα, κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. 16. ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται· ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται. 17. σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύσασι ταῦτα παρακολουθήσει[3]· ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσι· γλώσσαις λαλήσουσι καιναῖς[4]· 18. ὄφεις ἀροῦσι· κἂν θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν, οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάψει[5]· ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσι, καὶ καλῶς ἕξουσιν."

[1] ΑΔΣ *al.* add δε after υστερον.

[2] ACΔ add εκ νεκρων after εγηγερμενον (W.H. brackets).

[3] ακολουθησει ταυτα in CL (W.H. text; as in T.R. margin).

[4] CLΔ omit καιναις, and have in this place και εν ταις χερσιν (W.H. text, brackets, with καιναις in margin).

[5] βλαψη in ACLΔ *al.* (Tisch., W.H. T.R. only in minusc.).

pression not elsewhere occurring in any of the Gospels.—Ver. 11. ἐθεάθη, was seen. This verb, used again in ver. 14, is foreign to Mk., as is also ἀπιστεῖν, also twice used here (ἠπίστησαν, ver. 11; ἀπιστήσας, ver. 16).

Vv. 12-14. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα, afterwards (only here in Mk.); vaguely introducing a second appearance in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.—δυσὶν ἐξ αὐτῶν, to two of the friends of Jesus previously referred to, not of the Eleven. *Cf.* with Lk. xxiv. 13. It is not only the same fact, but the narrative here seems borrowed from Lk.—ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ, in a different form. Serving no purpose here, because the fact it accounts for, the non-recognition of Jesus by the two disciples (Lk. xxiv. 16), is not mentioned. —εἰς ἀγρόν: for εἰς κώμην in Lk. The use of φανεροῦσθαι in the sense of being manifested to, in ver. 12, is peculiar to this section (again in ver. 14).—Ver. 14. ὕστερον, at a later time; vague indication, here only. It is difficult to identify this appearance with any one mentioned in the other Gospels. What follows in ver. 15, containing the final commission, seems to point to the farewell appearance in Galilee (Mt. xxviii. 16), but the ἀνακειμένοις (ver. 14) takes us to the scene related in Lk. xxiv. 36-43, though more than the Eleven were present on that occasion. The suggestion has been made (Meyer, Weiss, etc.) that the account here blends together features taken from various appearances. The main points for the narrator are that Jesus did appear to the *Eleven*, and that He found them in an unbelieving mood.

Vv. 15-18. *The Commission* (Mt. xxviii. 18-20).—εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα, added to Mt.'s πορευθέντες.—κηρύξατε τ. εὐ.: this more specific and evangelic phrase replaces Mt.'s μαθητεύσατε, and πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει gives more emphatic expression to the universal destination of the Gospel than Mt.'s πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.—Ver. 16 is a poor equivalent for Mt.'s reference to baptism, insisting as it does, in an ecclesiastical spirit, on the necessity of baptism rather than on its significance as an expression of the Christian faith in God the Father, Son, and Spirit. Jesus may not have spoken as Mt. reports, but the words put into His mouth by the first evangelist are far more worthy of the Lord than those here ascribed to Him. —Ver. 17. Here also we find a great lapse from the high level of Mt.'s version of the farewell words of Jesus: signs, physical charisms, and thaumaturgic powers, taking the place of the spiritual presence of the exalted Lord. Casting out devils represents the evangelic miracles; speaking with tongues those of the apostolic age; taking up venomous serpents and drinking deadly poison

19. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Κύριος,[1] μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς, ἀνελήφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ· 20. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἐξελθόντες ἐκήρυξαν πανταχοῦ, τοῦ Κυρίου συνεργοῦντος, καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιοῦντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων. Ἀμήν.[2]

[1] CLΔ have Ιησους after Κυριος (W.H. brackets).
[2] Αμην is found in CLΔ among other uncials (W.H. marg.).

seem to introduce us into the twilight of apocryphal story. Healing of the sick by laying on of hands brings us back to apostolic times. **θανάσιμον** is a ἅπ. λεγ.

Vv. 19, 20. The story ends with a brief notice of the ascension of the Lord Jesus on the one hand (μὲν), and of the apostolic activity of the Eleven on the other (δὲ). Lk., who means to tell the story of the acts of the Apostles at length, contents himself with reporting that the Eleven returned from Bethany, his scene of parting, to Jerusalem, not with sadness but with joy, there to worship and wait.

ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ

ΑΓΙΟΝ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

I. 1. ἘΠΕΙΔΗΠΕΡ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, 2. καθὼς παρέ-

Chapter I. The Early History. Vv. 1-4. *The preface.*—Ver. 1. **ἐπειδήπερ**: three particles, **ἐπεί, δή, περ**, blended into one word, implying that the fact to be stated is well known (**δή**), important (**περ**), and important as a reason for the undertaking on hand (**ἐπεί**) = *seeing*, as is *well known*. Hahn thinks the word before us is merely a temporal not a causal particle, and that Luke means only to say that he is not the first to take such a task on hand. But why mention this unless because it entered somehow into his motives for writing? It might do so in various ways: as revealing a widespread impulse to preserve in writing the evangelic *memorabilia*, stimulating him to do the same; as meeting an extensive demand for such writings on the part of Christians, which appealed to him also; as showing by the number of such writings that no one of them adequately met the demand, or performed the task in a final manner, and that therefore one more attempt was not superfluous. Ἐπειδήπερ, a good Greek word, occurs here only in N. T.—**πολλοί**: not an exaggeration, but to be taken strictly as implying extensive activity in the production of rudimentary "Gospels". The older exegetes understood the word as referring to heretical or apocryphal gospels, of course by way of censure. This view is abandoned by recent commentators, for whom the question of interest rather is: were Mt.'s *Logia* and Mk.'s Gospel among the earlier contributions which Lk. had in his eye? This question cannot be decided by exegesis, and answers vary according to the critical theories of those who discuss the topic. All that need be said here is that there is no apparent urgent reason for excluding Mt. and Mk. from the crowd of early essayists.—**ἐπεχείρησαν**, took in hand; here only in N. T. The word is a *vox ambigua*, and might or might not imply blame = attempted and did not succeed, or attempted and accomplished their task. It is not probable that emphatic blame is intended. On the other hand, it is not likely that **ἐπεχ.** is a mere expletive, and that **ἐπεχ. ἀνατάξασθαι** is simply = **ἀνετάξαντο**, as, after Casaubon, Palairet, Raphel, etc., maintained. The verb contains a gentle hint that in some respects finality had not yet been reached, which might be said with all due respect even of Mt.'s *Logia* and Mk.'s Gospel.—**ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν**, to set forth in order a narrative; the expression points to a connected series of narratives arranged in some order (**τάξις**), topical or chronological, rather than to isolated narratives, the meaning put on **διήγησις** by Schleiermacher. Both verb and noun occur here only in N. T.—**περὶ . . . πραγμάτων** indicates the subject of these narratives. The leading term in this phrase is **πεπληροφορημένων**, about the meaning of which interpreters are much divided. The radical idea of **πληροφορέω** (**πλήρης, φέρω**) is to bring or make full. The special sense will depend on the matter in reference to which the fulness takes place. It might be in the region of fact, in which case the word under consideration would mean "become a completed series," and the whole phrase "concerning events which now lie before us as a complete whole". This view is adopted by an increasing number of modern commentators (*vide* R. V.). Or the fulness may be in *conviction*, in which case the word would mean "most

δοσαν ἡμῖν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου, 3. ἔδοξε κἀμοί, [a] παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς,

a cf. in 1 Tim. iv. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 10.

surely believed" (A. V.). This sense of complete conviction occurs several times in N. T. (Rom. iv. 21, Heb. vi. 11, x. 22), but with reference to *persons* not to *things*. A very large number of interpreters, ancient and modern, take the word here in this sense ("bei uns beglaubigten," Weizsäcker). Holtz., H. C., gives both without deciding between them ("vollgeglaubten oder vollbrachten"). Neither meaning seems quite what is wanted. The first is too vague, and does not indicate what the subject-matter is. The second is explicit enough as to that = the matters which form the subject of Christian belief; but one hardly expects these matters to be represented as the subject of sure belief by one whose very aim in writing is to give further certainty concerning them (**ἀσφάλειαν**, ver. 4). What if the sphere of the fulness be *knowledge*, and the meaning of the clause: "concerning the things which have become widely known among us Christians"? Then it would be plain enough what was referred to. Then also the phrase would point out the natural effect of the many evangelic narratives—the universal diffusion of a fair acquaintance with the leading facts of Christ's life. But have we any instance of such use of the word?—**πληροφορία** is used in reference to understanding and knowledge in Col. ii. 2. Then in modern Greek **πληροφορῶ** means to *inform*, and as the word is mainly Hellenistic in usage, and may belong to the popular speech preserved throughout the centuries, **τῶν πεπλ.** may mean, "those things of which information has been given" (Geldart, *The Modern Greek Language*, p. 186), or those things generally known among Christians as such.

Ver. 2. **καθὼς** implies that the basis of these many *written* narratives was the **παράδοσις** of the Apostles, which, by contrast, and by the usual meaning of the word, would be mainly though not necessarily exclusively *oral* (might include, *e.g.*, the *Logia* of Mt.).—**οἱ . . . τοῦ λόγου** describes the Apostles, the ultimate source of information, as men "who had become, or been made, eye-witnesses and ministers of the word". Both **αὐτόπτ.** and **ὑπηρ.** may be connected with **τοῦ λόγου**, understood to mean the burden of apostolic preaching = the facts of Christ's earthly history. Eye-witnesses of the facts from the beginning (**ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**), therefore competent to state them with authority; servants of the word including the facts (= "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach"), whose very business it was to relate words and facts, and who therefore did it with some measure of fulness. Note that the **ἡμῖν** after **παρέδοσαν** implies that Lk. belonged to the second generation (Meyer, Schanz). Hahn infers from the **ἡμῖν** in ver. 1 that Lk. was himself an eye-witness of Christ's public ministry, at least in its later stage.

Ver. 3. **ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ**: modestly introducing the writer's purpose. He puts himself on a level with the **πολλοί**, and makes no pretensions to superiority, except in so far as coming after them, and more comprehensive inquiries give him naturally an advantage which makes his work not superfluous.—**παρηκολουθηκότι ἄν. π.**: having followed (in my inquiries) all things from the beginning, *i.e.*, not of the public life of Jesus (**ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**, ver. 2), but of His life in this world. The sequel shows that the starting point was the birth of John. This process of research was probably gone into antecedent to the formation of his plan, and one of the reasons for its adoption (Meyer, also Grimm, *Das Proömium des Lukasevangelium* in *Jahrbücher f. deutsche Theologie*, 1871, p. 48. Likewise Calvin: *omnibus exacte pervestigatis*), not merely undertaken after the plan had been formed (Hahn).—**ἀκριβῶς, καθεξῆς σ. γρ.** explain how he desired to carry out his plan: he wishes to be exact, and to write in an orderly manner (**καθεξῆς** here only in N. T., **ἐφεξῆς** in earlier Greek). *Chronological* order aimed at (whether successfully or not) according to many (Meyer, Godet, Weiss, Hahn). Schanz maintains that the chronological aim applies only to the great turning points of the history, and not to all details; a very reasonable view. These two adverbs, **ἀκρ., καθ.**, may imply a gentle criticism of the work of predecessors. Observe the *historical* spirit implied in all Lk. tells about his literary plan and methods: inquiry, accuracy, order, *aimed at* at least; vouchers desired for all statements. Lk. is no religious romancer, who will invent at will, and say anything that

καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, κράτιστε Θεόφιλε, 4. ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.

5. ʼΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου τοῦ[1] βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἱερεύς τις ὀνόματι Ζαχαρίας, ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιά· καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ[2]

[1] ℵBLΞ omit του.

[2] For η γυνη αυτου ℵBCDXΞ 33 have γυνη αυτω (Tisch., W.H.). L has η γ. αυτω.

suits his purpose. It is quite compatible with this historic spirit that Lk. should be influenced in his narrations by religious feelings of decorum and reverence, and by regard to the edification of his first readers. That his treatment of materials bearing on the characters of Jesus and the Apostles reveals many traces of such influence will become apparent in the course of the exposition.—**κράτιστε Θεόφιλε.** The work is to be written for an individual who may perhaps have played the part of *patronus libri*, and paid the expenses of its production. The epithet **κράτιστε** may imply high official position (Acts xxiii. 26, xxvi. 25). On this see Grotius. Grimm thinks it expresses only love and friendship.

Ver. 4. Indicates the practical aim: to give certainty in regard to matters of Christian belief.—**περὶ ὧν κ. λόγων**: an attraction, to be thus resolved: **περὶ τῶν λόγων οὓς κατηχήθης.** **λόγων** is best taken = matters (**πραγμάτων**, ver. 1), histories (Weizsäcker), not doctrines. Doubtless this is a Hebraistic sense, but that is no objection, for after all Lk. is a Hellenist and no pure Greek, and even in this preface, whose pure Greek has been so often praised, he is a Hellenist to a large extent. (So Hahn, *Einleitung*, p. 6.) The subject of instruction for young Christians in those early years was the teaching, the acts, and the experience of Jesus: their "catechism" historic not doctrinal.—**κατηχήθης**: is this word used here in a technical sense = formally and systematically instructed, or in the general sense of "have been informed more or less correctly"? (So Kypke.) The former is more probable. The verb (from **κατὰ, ἠχέω**) is mainly Hellenistic in usage, rare in profane authors, not found in O. T. The N. T. usage, confined to Lk. and Paul, points to regular instruction (*vide* Rom. ii. 18).

This preface gives a lively picture of the intense, universal interest felt by the early Church in the story of the Lord Jesus: Apostles constantly telling what they had seen and heard; many of their hearers taking notes of what they said for the benefit of themselves and others: through these gospelets acquaintance with the evangelic history circulating among believers, creating a thirst for more and yet more; imposing on such a man as Luke the task of preparing a Gospel as *full*, *correct*, and *well arranged* as possible through the use of all available means—previous writings or oral testimony of surviving eye-witnesses.

Vv. 5-25. *The birth of the Baptist announced.* From the long prefatory sentence, constructed according to the rules of Greek syntax, and with some pretensions to classic purity of style, we pass abruptly to the *Protevangelium*, the prelude to the birth of Christ, consisting of the remainder of this chapter, written in Greek which is Hebraistic in phrase and structure, and Jewish in its tone of piety. The evangelist here seems to have at command an Aramaic, Jewish-Christian source, which he, as a faithful collector of evangelic *memorabilia*, allows to speak for itself, with here and there an editorial touch.

Vv. 5-7. *The parents of John.*—**ἐγένετο**, there was, or there lived.—**ἐν ταῖς ἡ.**, etc.: in the days, the reign, of Herod, king of Judaea. Herod died 750 A.C., and *the Christian* era begins with 753 A.C. This date is too late by three or four years.—**ἐξ ἐφημερίας Ἀβιά**: **ἐφημερία** (a noun formed from **ἐφημέριος -ον**, daily, lasting for a day), not in profane authors, here and in ver. 8 in N. T., in Sept., in Chron. and Nehemiah, = (1) a service lasting for a day, or for days—a week; (2) a class of priests performing that service. The priests were divided into twenty-four classes, the organisation dating according to the tradition in Chronicles (1 Chron. xxiv.) from the time of David. The order of Abia was the eighth (1 Chron. xxiv. 10). Josephus (Ant., vii., 14, 7) uses **ἐφημερίς** and **πατρία** to denote a class. On the priesthood and the temple worship and the daily service, consult Schürer's *History*, Div. ii., vol. i., pp. 207-298.—**γυνὴ**: a daughter of Aaron; John descended

ἐκ τῶν θυγατέρων Ἀαρών, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Ἐλισάβετ. 6. ἦσαν δὲ δίκαιοι ἀμφότεροι ἐνώπιον[1] τοῦ Θεοῦ, πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι τοῦ Κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι. 7. καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τέκνον, καθότι ἡ Ἐλισάβετ ἦν[2] στεῖρα, καὶ ἀμφότεροι προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν ἦσαν. 8. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἱερατεύειν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ τάξει τῆς ἐφημερίας αὐτοῦ ἔναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ, 9. [b]κατὰ τὸ [b]ἔθος τῆς [c]ἱερατείας, [d]ἔλαχε τοῦ [e]θυμιάσαι εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Κυρίου· 10. καὶ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ ἦν[3] προσευχόμενον ἔξω τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ θυμιάματος. 11. ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος Κυρίου, ἑστὼς ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ θυμιάματος· 12. καὶ ἐταράχθη Ζαχαρίας ἰδών, καὶ φόβος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. 13. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ ἄγγελος, "Μὴ φοβοῦ, Ζαχαρία· διότι εἰσηκούσθη ἡ δέησίς σου, καὶ ἡ γυνή σου Ἐλισάβετ γεννήσει

b again in ii. 42; xxii. 39.
c Heb. vii. 5.
d John xix. 24. Acts i. 17. 2 Pet. i. 1.
e here only.

[1] ℵBC have **εναντιον**; **ενωπιον** in DLΔ.

[2] **ην** before **η Ελ.** in ℵBDLΔΞ (Tisch., W.H.). B 69 omit **η** (W.H. brackets).

[3] **ην του λαου** in ℵBLΔ (Tisch., W.H.).

from priestly parents on both sides.—Ver. 6. **δίκαιοι**: an O. T. term, and expressing an O. T. idea of piety and goodness, as unfolded in the following clause, which is Hebrew in speech as in sentiment: *walking* in all the *commandments* and *ordinances* (equivalent terms, not to be distinguished, with Calvin, Bengel, and Godet, as moral and ceremonial) *blameless* (relatively to human judgment).—Ver. 7. **καὶ οὐκ ἦν**, etc.: childless, a calamity from the Jewish point of view, and also a fact hard to reconcile with the character of the pair, for the Lord loveth the righteous, and, according to O. T. views, He showed His love by granting prosperity, and, among other blessings, children (Ps. cxxviii.).—**καθότι**: a good Attic word: in Lk.'s writings only in N. T. = seeing, inasmuch as.—**προβεβηκότες ἐν τ. ἡμ.**: "advanced in days," Hebraistic for the classic "advanced in age" (**τὴν ἡλικίαν**) or years (**τοῖς ἔτεσιν**): childless, and now no hope of children.

Vv. 8-10. *Hope preternaturally revived.*—**ἐν τῷ ἱερατεύειν**: Zechariah was serving his week in due course, and it fell to his lot on a certain day to perform the very special service of burning incense in the holy place. A great occasion in a priest's life, as it might never come to him but once (priests said to be as many as 20,000 in our Lord's time). "The most memorable day in the life of Zechariah" (Farrar, C. G. T.).—Ver. 9. **κατὰ τὸ ἔθος** is to be connected with **ἔλαχε**: casting lots, the customary manner of settling who was to have the honour.—**εἰσελθὼν** is to be connected with **θυμιᾶσαι**, not with **ἔλαχε**. The meaning is that entering the sanctuary was the necessary preliminary to offering incense: in one sense a superfluous remark (Hahn), yet worth making in view of the sacredness of the place. A great affair to get entrance into the **ναός**.—Ver. 10. **πλῆθος**: there might be a crowd within the temple precincts at the hour of prayer any day of the week, not merely on Sabbath or on a feast day ("dies solennis, et fortasse sabbatum," Bengel).

Vv. 11-17. *A celestial visitant.*—Ver. 11. **ὤφθη**: the appearance very particularly described, the very position of the angel indicated: on the *right* side of the altar of incense; the south side, the *propitious* side say some, the place of honour say others. The altar of incense is called, with reference to its function, **θυμιατήριον** in Heb. ix. 3.—Ver. 12. **ἐταράχθη** describes the state of mind generally = perturbed, **φόβος** specifically. Yet why afraid, seeing in this case, as always, the objective appearance answers to the inward state of mind? This fear of the divine belongs to O. T. piety.—Ver. 13. **δέησις**: all prayed at that hour, therefore of course the officiating priest. The prayer of Zechariah was very special—**δέησις** implies this as compared with **προσευχή**, *vide* Trench, *Synonyms*—and very realistic: for *offspring*. Beneath the dignity of the occasion say some

υἱόν σοι, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννην. 14. καὶ ἔσται χαρά σοι καὶ ἀγαλλίασις, καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπὶ τῇ γεννήσει[1] αὐτοῦ χαρήσονται. 15. ἔσται γὰρ μέγας ἐνώπιον τοῦ[2] Κυρίου· καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πίῃ, καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ. 16. καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν αὐτῶν· 17. καὶ αὐτὸς προελεύσεται[3] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἡλίου,[4] ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα, καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων, ἑτοιμάσαι Κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον." 18. Καὶ εἶπε Ζαχαρίας πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον, "Κατὰ τί γνώσομαι τοῦτο; ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι πρεσβύτης, καὶ ἡ γυνή μου προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῆς." 19. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἐγώ εἰμι Γαβριὴλ ὁ παρεστηκὼς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ἀπεστάλην λαλῆσαι πρός σε, καὶ εὐαγγελίσασθαί σοι ταῦτα. 20. καὶ ἰδού, ἔσῃ σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι, ἄχρι

[1] **γενεσει** in most uncials.

[2] ℵACL 33 omit **του** (Tisch.). BDΔ have it (W.H. in marg.).

[3] **προσελευσεται** in BCL (W.H. marg.), probably an unintentional error.

[4] **Ηλεια** in ℵBL.

interpreters; a very superficial criticism. True to human nature and to O. T. piety, and not unacceptable to God. That the prayer was for offspring appears from the angelic message, objective and subjective corresponding. —**γεννήσει**, shall bear; originally to beget.—**Ἰωάννην**: the name already mentioned to inspire faith in the reality of the promise: meaning, God is gracious.—Ver. 14. **χαρά, ἀγαλλίασις**, a joy, an exultation; joy in higher, highest degree: joy over a son late born, and such a son as he will turn out to be. —**πολλοὶ**: a joy not merely to parents as a child, but to many as a man.—Ver. 15. **μέγας**, a great man before the Lord; not merely in God's sight = true greatness, but indicating the sphere or type of greatness: in the region of ethics and religion.—**καὶ οἶνον**, etc., points to the external badge of the moral and religious greatness: abstinence as a mark of consecration and separation — a devotee.—**σίκερα** = שֵׁכָר (not Greek), strong drink, extracted from any kind of fruit but grapes (here only in N. T.).—**Πνεύματος Ἁγίου**: in opposition to wine and strong drink, as in Eph. v. 18. But the conception of the Holy Spirit, formed from the Johannine type of piety, is very different from that of St. Paul, or suggested by the life of our Lord.—Ver. 16 describes the function of the Baptist. —**ἐπιστρέψει**: repentance, conversion, his great aim and watchword.—Ver. 17. **προελεύσεται ἐν. α.**: not a reference to John's function as forerunner of Messiah, but simply a description of his prophetic character. He shall go before God (and men) = *be*, in his career, an Elijah in spirit and power, and function; described in terms recalling Malachi iv. 6.

Vv. 18-20. *Zechariah doubts.* The angel's dazzling promise of a son, and even of a son with such a career, might be but a reflection of Zechariah's own secret desire and hope; yet when his day-dream is objectified it seems too good and great to be true. This also is true to human nature, which alternates between high hope and deep despair, according as faith or sense has the upper hand.—Ver. 19. **ἀποκριθεὶς**: the very natural scepticism of Zechariah is treated as a fault.—**Γαβριὴλ**: the naming of angels is characteristic of the later stage of Judaism (*vide* Daniel viii. 16, x. 21).—Ver. 20. **σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δ. λ.**, silent and not able to speak; a temporary dumbness the sign asked, a slight penalty; not arbitrary, however, rather the almost natural effect of his state of mind—a kind of prolonged stupefaction resulting from a promise too great to be believed, yet pointing to a boon passionately desired.—**ἀνθ' ὧν**: a phrase of Lk. = תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר, *because*.

ἧς ἡμέρας γένηται ταῦτα· ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἐπίστευσας τοῖς λόγοις μου, οἵτινες πληρωθήσονται εἰς τὸν καιρὸν αὐτῶν." 21. Καὶ ἦν ὁ λαὸς προσδοκῶν τὸν Ζαχαρίαν· καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ναῷ.[1] 22. ἐξελθὼν δὲ οὐκ ἠδύνατο λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν ὅτι ὀπτασίαν ἑώρακεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ· καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διανεύων αὐτοῖς, καὶ διέμενε κωφός. 23. καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς [f]λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. 24. Μετὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας συνέλαβεν Ἐλισάβετ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιέκρυβεν ἑαυτὴν μῆνας πέντε, λέγουσα, 25. "Ὅτι οὕτω μοι πεποίηκεν ὁ[2] Κύριος ἐν ἡμέραις, αἷς ἐπεῖδεν ἀφελεῖν τὸ[2] ὄνειδός μου ἐν ἀνθρώποις."

f 2 Cor. ix. 12. Phil. ii. 17-30. Heb. viii. 6; ix. 21.

26. ἘΝ δὲ τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ ὑπὸ[3] τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ᾗ ὄνομα Ναζαρέτ, 27. πρὸς παρθένον μεμνηστευμένην[4] ἀνδρί, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωσήφ, ἐξ οἴκου Δαβίδ· καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ. 28. και εἰσελθὼν ὁ ἄγγελος[5] πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπε, "Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη· ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ,

[1] αυτον after εν τω ν. in BLΞ (W.H.). Order as in T.R. in ℵACDΔ *al.* (Tisch.).

[2] ℵCDL 33 omit ο (Tisch., W.H., text, ο in marg.). BΔ have it. ℵBDL 1 omit το before ονειδος.

[3] απο in ℵBL 1, 69.

[4] εμνηστ. in ℵABL.

[5] BLΞ 1, 131, cop. omit ο αγγελος (W.H.).

Vv. 21-22. *The people without.*—προσδοκῶν, waiting; they had to wait. The priest was an unusually long time within, something uncommon must have happened. The thought likely to occur was that God had slain the priest as unworthy. The Levitical religion a religion of distance from God and of fear. So viewed in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Illustrative quotations from Talmud in Wünsche, *Beiträge*, p. 413.—Ver. 22. ὀπτασίαν: from his dazed look they inferred that the priest had seen a vision (chap. xxiv. 23, 2 Cor. xii. 1).—διανεύων: making signs all he could do; he could not bless them, *e.g.*, if that was part of his duty for the day, or explain his absence (here only).

Vv. 23-25. *Returns home.* The week of service over, Zechariah went back to his own house.—λειτουργίας: in Biblical Greek used in reference to priestly service; elsewhere of public service rendered by a citizen at his own expense or of any sort of service.—Ver. 24. περιέκρυβεν: hid herself *entirely* (περὶ), here only; ἔκρυβον: a late form of 2nd aorist. Why, not said, nor whether her husband told her what had happened to him.—μῆνας πέντε, after which another remarkable event happened. Whether she appeared openly thereafter is not indicated. Possibly not (J. Weiss).—ἐπεῖδεν: here and in Acts iv. 29 = took care, the object being ἀφελεῖν τὸ ὄν. μ. = to remove my reproach: keenly felt by a Jewish woman. ἐν is understood before αἷς (Bornemann, *Scholia*).

Vv. 26-38. *The announcement to Mary.*—Ver. 26. Ναζαρέτ: the original home of Joseph and Mary, not merely the adopted home as we might infer from Mt. ii. 23.—Ver. 27. ἐξ οἴκου Δ.: Mary, Joseph, or both? Impossible to be sure, though the repetition of παρθένου in next clause (instead of αὐτῆς) favours the reference to Joseph.—Ver. 28. χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη: *ave plena gratiâ*, Vulg., on which Farrar (C. G. T.) comments: "not gratiâ *plena*, but gratiâ *cumulata*"; much graced or favoured by God.—χαριτόω is Hellenistic, and is found, besides here, only in Eph. i. 6 in N. T.—ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ, the Lord (Jehovah) *is* or *be* with thee, ἐστί or ἔστω understood; the two renderings come practically to the same thing.—Ver. 29. διεταράχθη: assuming that ἰδοῦσα (T.R.) is no part of the true text, Godet thinks that Mary *saw* nothing,

εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν."[1] 29. Ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα διεταράχθη ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ,[2] καὶ διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἴη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος. 30. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῇ, "Μὴ φοβοῦ, Μαριάμ· εὗρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. 31. καὶ ἰδού, συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρί, καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν. 32. οὗτός ἔσται μέγας, καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται· καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαβὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, 33. καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακὼβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος." 34. Εἶπε δὲ Μαριὰμ πρὸς τὸν ἄγγελον, "Πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω;" 35. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει

[1] **ευλογημ. . . . γυναιξιν** comes from ver. 42; wanting in ℵBL.

[2] For **ιδουσα . . . αυτου** ℵBDL have **επι τ. λ. διεταραχθη** (Tisch., W.H.).

and that it was only the *word* of the angel that disturbed her. It is certainly the latter that is specified as the cause of trouble. The salutation troubled her because she felt that it meant something important, the precise nature of which (**ποταπὸς**) did not appear. And yet on the principle that in supernatural experiences the subjective and the objective correspond, she must have had a guess.—Ver. 31. **Ἰησοῦν**: no interpretation of the name here as in Mt. i. 21; a common Jewish name, not necessarily implying Messianic functions. There may have been ordinary family reasons for its use.—Ver. 32 foreshadows the future of the child.—**μέγας**, applied also to John, ver. 15.—**κληθήσεται**, shall be called = shall be.—**τὸν θρόνον Δ. τ. πατρὸς α.**: the Messiah is here conceived in the spirit of Jewish expectation: a son of David, and destined to restore his kingdom.—Ver. 34: Mary's perplexity, how a mother and yet a virgin! J. Weiss points out that this perplexity on the part of a betrothed woman is surprising. Why not assume, as a matter of course, that the announcement had reference to a child to be born as the fruit of marriage with the man to whom she was betrothed? "These words betray the standpoint of Lk., who knows what is coming (ver. 35)." J. Weiss in Meyer.—Ver. 35. **Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον**: without the article because a proper name = the well-known Holy Spirit, say some (Meyer, Farrar), but more probably because the purpose is not to indicate the person by whom, etc., but the kind of influence: *spirit* as opposed to flesh, holy in the sense of separation from all fleshly defilement (Hofmann, J. Weiss, Hahn).—**δύναμις ὑψίστου**: the power of the Most High, also without article, an equivalent for **π. ἅ.**, and more definite indication of the cause, the power of God. Note the use of **ὕψιστος** as the name of God in ver. 32, here, and in ver. 16. Feine (*Vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, p. 17) includes **ὁ ὕψιστος, ὁ δυνατός** (i. 49), **ὁ δεσπότης** (ii. 29), **ὁ κύριος** (i. 6, 9, 11, etc.), all designations of God, among the instances of a Hebraistic vocabulary characteristic of chaps. i. and ii. The first epithet recurs in vi. 35 in the expression "sons of the Highest," applied to those who live heroically, where Mt. has "children of your Father in heaven".—**ἐπελεύσεται, ἐπισκιάσει**: two synonyms delicately selected to express the divine substitute for sexual intercourse. Observe the parallelism here: "sign of the exaltation of feeling. The language becomes a chant," Godet. Some find poetry throughout these two first chapters of Lk. "These songs . . . doubtless represent reflection upon these events by Christian poets, who put in the mouths of the angels, the mothers and the fathers, the poems which they composed" (Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 42. Even the address of Gabriel to Zechariah in the temple, i. 13-17, is, he thinks, such a poem).—**τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον**, the holy thing—holy product of a holy agency—which is being, or about to be, generated = the embryo, therefore appropriately neuter. —**υἱὸς Θεοῦ**, Son of God; not merely because holy, but because brought into

σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται Υἱὸς Θεοῦ. 36. καὶ ἰδού, Ἐλισάβετ ἡ συγγενής[1] σου, καὶ αὐτὴ συνειληφυῖα[2] υἱὸν ἐν γήρᾳ[3] αὐτῆς· καὶ οὗτος μὴν ἕκτος ἐστὶν αὐτῇ τῇ καλουμένῃ στείρᾳ· 37. ὅτι οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ[4] πᾶν ῥῆμα." 38. Εἶπε δὲ Μαριάμ, "Ἰδού, ἡ δούλη Κυρίου· γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου." Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτῆς ὁ ἄγγελος.

39. Ἀναστᾶσα δὲ Μαριὰμ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἐπορεύθη εἰς τὴν ὀρεινὴν μετὰ σπουδῆς, εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα, 40. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ζαχαρίου, καὶ ἠσπάσατο τὴν Ἐλισάβετ. 41. καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν ἡ Ἐλισάβετ τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας,[5] ἐσκίρτησε τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς· καὶ ἐπλήσθη Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἡ

[1] συγγενις in ℵBDLΔ *al.* (Tisch., W.H.). [2] συνειληφεν in ℵBLΞ (W.H.).
[3] γηρει in all uncials. [4] του Θεου in ℵBDLΞ.
[5] τον ασπ. της Μ. η Ελ. in ℵBLΔΞ and some cursives.

being by the power of the Highest.—Ver. 36. **καὶ ἰδού**, introducing a reference to Elizabeth's case to help Mary's faith.—**συγγενίς**, late form for **συγγενής** (T.R.), a blood relation, but of what degree not indicated, suggesting that Mary perhaps belonged to the tribe of *Levi*.—**γήρει**: Ionic form of dative for **γήρᾳ** (T.R.). Hellenistic Greek was an eclectic language, drawing from all dialects as from the poets, turning their poetic expressions to the uses of prose.—**καλουμένῃ**: Elizabeth is described as one who is still being called barren, though six months gone in pregnancy, because people have had no means of knowing her state.—Ver. 37. **ἀδυνατήσει**: the verb means, in classic Greek, to be weak, of persons. In Sept. and N. T. (here and in Mt. xvii. 20) it means to be impossible, of things. Commentators differ as to whether we should render: no *word* of God shall be weak, inoperative, or no *thing*, with, on the part of, God, shall be impossible.—**ῥῆμα** = דָּבָר may be rendered either *word* or *thing*. The reading **παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ** (BDL) seems to demand the former of the two translations. Field, *Otium Nor.*, discusses this passage. Adopting the above reading, and adhering to the sense of **ἀδυνατ.** in reference to things, he translates: "for from God no word (or no thing) shall be impossible".

Some recent critics find in this section two different views of the birth of Jesus, one implying natural paternity, the other supernatural causality, the former being the view in the original document, the other introduced by the evangelist, the former *Jewish* in its tendency of thought, the latter heathen-Christian. The subject is discussed by Hillmann in *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.*, 1891, and Usener, *Religionsgeschictliche Untersuchungen*, 1888. J. Weiss, in his ed. of Meyer, p. 303, note, seems inclined to favour this view, and to see in vv. 31-33 the one version, and in vv. 34, 35 the other, due to Lk. Against this view *vide* Feine, *Vork. Überlief.*

Vv. 39-45. *Mary visits Elizabeth.*—Ver. 39. **ἐν τ. ἡ. ταύταις** in these (not those = **ἐκείναις**, A. V.) days = at the time of the angelic visit.—**μετὰ σπουδῆς**: no time lost, a most natural visit from one woman with a high hope, to another, a friend, in a similar state of mind.—**εἰς τὴν ὀρεινὴν** (**χώραν**, again ver. 65): into the hill country, referring to the southern hill country of Judah, Benjamin and Ephraim. Galilee had a hill country too. The expression has been supposed to point to the origin of Lk.'s document in Judaea (Hillmann).—**εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα**, to a city of Judah, not particularly named. Reland (*Palaestina*) conjectures that we should read *Jutta*, the name of a priestly city mentioned twice in Joshua (xv. 55, xxi. 16).—Ver. 41. **ἐσκίρτησε**: commentators discuss the connection between the maternal excitement and the quickening of the child—which was cause and which effect. Let this and all other questions in reference to the movement denoted be passed over in respectful silence.—Ver. 42. **ἀνεφώνησεν**: here only in N. T. The verb, with the following words, **κραυγῇ**

Ἐλισάβετ, 42. καὶ ἀνεφώνησε φωνῇ[1] μεγάλῃ, καὶ εἶπεν, "Εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξί, καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου. 43. καὶ πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου μου πρός με[2]; 44. ἰδοὺ γάρ, ὡς ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἀσπασμοῦ σου εἰς τὰ ὦτά μου, ἐσκίρτησεν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ μου. 45. καὶ μακαρία ἡ πιστεύσασα, ὅτι ἔσται [g] τελείωσις τοῖς λελαλημένοις αὐτῇ παρὰ Κυρίου."

g cf. Heb. vii. 11.

46. Καὶ εἶπε Μαριάμ, "[h] Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν Κύριον, 47. καὶ ἠγαλλίασε τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου· 48. ὅτι ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ. ἰδοὺ γάρ, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσί με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί· 49. ὅτι ἐποίησέ μοι μεγαλεῖα[3] ὁ δυνατός, καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· 50. καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν[4] τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν. 51. ἐποίησε κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ· διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν. 52. καθεῖλε δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων, καὶ ὕψωσε ταπεινούς. 53. πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ πλουτοῦντας

h cf. use in Mt. xxiii. 5.

[1] κραυγῃ in BLΞ (Tisch., W.H.). [2] εμε in ℵB.
[3] μεγαλα in ℵBDL (Tisch., W.H.). μεγαλεια (CΔΞ) occurs in Acts ii. 11.
[4] εις γενεας και γενεας in BCLΞ (Tisch., W.H.).

μεγάλῃ, point to an unrestrained utterance under the influence of irrepressible feeling, thoroughly true to feminine nature: "blessed thou among women (a Hebrew superlative), and blessed the fruit of thy womb," poetic parallelism again, answering to the exalted state of feeling. The reference to the Holy Spirit (in ver. 41) implies that Elizabeth spoke by prophetic inspiration.—Ver. 43. ἵνα ἔλθῃ: subjunctive instead of infin. with art., the beginning of a tendency, which ended in the substitution of να with the subjunctive for the infinitive in modern Greek.—Ver. 44. γὰρ: implies that from the movement of her child Elizabeth inferred that the *mother of the Lord* stood before her.—Ver. 45. μακαρία, here, as elsewhere, points to rare and high felicity connected with heroic moods and achievements.—ὅτι, *because* or *that*, which? great conflict of opinion among commentators. The former sense would make ὅτι give the reason for calling Mary blessed = blessed because the things she hopes for will surely come to pass. The latter makes ὅτι indicate the object of faith = blessed she who believes that what God has said will come to pass, with possible allusion to her own husband's failure in faith.

Vv. 46-56. *Mary's song.*—μεγαλύνει: *magnificat*, Vulg., whence the ecclesiastical name for this hymn, which has close affinities with the song of Hanna in 1 Sam. ii. 1-10; variously regarded by critics: by some, *e.g.*, Godet and Hahn, as an extemporised utterance under inspiration by Mary, by others as a remnant of old Jewish-Christian Hymnology (J. Weiss, etc.), by others still as a purely Jewish Psalm, lacking distinctively Christian features (Hillmann). There are certainly difficulties connected with the first view, *e.g.*, the conventional phraseology and the presence of elements which do not seem to fit the special situation.—ψυχή, πνεῦμα: synonyms in parallel clauses.—Ver. 48. This verse and the two preceding form the first of four strophes, into which the song naturally divides. The first strophe expresses simply the singer's gladness. The second (vv. 49-50) states its cause. The third (vv. 51-53) describes in gnomic aorists the moral order of the world, for the establishment of which God ever works in His holy and wise Providence, overturning the conventional order, scattering the proud, upsetting thrones, and exalting them of low degree, filling the hungry, and sending the rich away empty. It is this third part of the hymn which on first view seems least in keeping with the occasion. And yet on a

ἐξαπέστειλε κενούς. 54. ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ, μνησθῆναι ἐλέους, 55. καθὼς ἐλάλησε πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα." 56. Ἔμεινε δὲ Μαριὰμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡσεὶ[1] μῆνας τρεῖς· καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς.

57. Τῇ δὲ Ἐλισάβετ ἐπλήσθη ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν, καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱόν· 58. καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ περίοικοι καὶ οἱ συγγενεῖς αὐτῆς, ὅτι ἐμεγάλυνε Κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτῆς, καὶ συνέχαιρον αὐτῇ. 59. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἡμέρᾳ,[2] ἦλθον περιτεμεῖν τὸ παιδίον· καὶ ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ζαχαρίαν. 60. καὶ ἀποκριθεῖσα ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ εἶπεν, "Οὐχί, ἀλλὰ κληθήσεται Ἰωάννης." 61. Καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτήν, "Ὅτι οὐδείς ἐστιν ἐν τῇ συγγενείᾳ[3] σου, ὃς καλεῖται τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ." 62. Ἐνένευον δὲ τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτόν.[4]

[1] ως in ℵBLΞ 1.

[2] τη ημερα τη ογδοη in ℵBCDLΞ 33.

[3] εκ της συγγενειας in ℵABCLΔΞ.

[4] αυτο in ℵBD 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

large view this strophe exactly describes the constant tendency of Christ's influence in the world: to turn things upside down, reverse judgments, and alter positions. The last strophe (vv. 54, 55) sets forth the birth about to happen as a deed of divine grace to Israel.—Ver. 54. **ἀντελάβετο**: laid hold of with a view to help, as in Isaiah xli. 8, 9, Acts xx. 35, 1 Tim. vi. 2. *Cf.* **ἐπιλαμβάνεται**, Heb. ii. 16.—**μνησθῆναι ἐλέους, καθὼς ἐλάλησεν**: what is about to happen is presented as fulfilling a promise made to the Fathers long, long ago, but not forgotten by God, to whom 1000 years, so far as remembering and being interested in promises are concerned, are as one day.—**τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τ. σ. α.** The construction is a little doubtful, and has been differently understood. It is perhaps simplest to take **Ἀβ.**, etc., as the dative of advantage = to remember mercy for the benefit of Abraham and his seed. The passage is an echo of Micah vii. 20.

Ver. 56. *Mary returns to her home.*—**ἔμεινε**: the time of Mary's sojourn with her kinswoman is given as "about three months". This would bring her departure near to the time of Elizabeth's confinement. Did she remain till the event was over? That is left doubtful.

Vv. 57-66. *Birth of John.*—Ver. 57. **ἐπλήσθη**, was fulfilled, the time for giving birth arrived in due course of nature.—Ver. 58. **περίοικοι** (**περί, οἶκος**), dwellers around, neighbours, here only in N. T., several times in Sept. Named first because nearest; some of the relatives would be farther away and would arrive later. This gathering of neighbours and kinsfolk (**συγγενεῖς**) presents a "gracious *tableau* of Israelite life," Godet.—**μετ' αὐτῆς**: a Hebraism = **πρὸς αὐτήν**.—**συνέχαιρον α.**, they congratulated her: *congratulabantur ei*, Vulg.; or, better, they rejoiced with her (ver. 14).—Ver. 59. **ἦλθον**, on the eighth, the legal day, *they came*, to circumcise the child; *i.e.*, those who were concerned in the function—the person who performed the operation, and the relatives of the family.—**ἐκάλουν** may be the imperfect of repeated action = they took for granted by repeated expressions that the name was to be Zechariah, or the conative imperfect indicating a wish which was frustrated.—Ver. 60. **Ἰωάννης**, *John;* presumably the mother had learned this from the father, by writing on a tablet as on the present occasion. The older commentators (Meyer also) supposed a Divine revelation.—Ver. 61. **συγγενείας**, kinsmanship. In Lk. only in N. T. *Cf.* Acts vii. 3, 14.—Ver. 62. **ἐνένευον** (here only in N. T.): they made signs, which seems to imply that Zechariah is supposed to be deaf as well as dumb. Various suggestions have been made to evade this conclusion; *e.g.*, that men are very apt to treat a dumb person as if he were also deaf (Bengel, De Wette, Godet); that they communicated by signs instead of by

63. καὶ αἰτήσας πινακίδιον ἔγραψε, λέγων, "Ἰωάννης ἐστὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ·" καὶ ἐθαύμασαν πάντες. 64. Ἀνεῴχθη δὲ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ παραχρῆμα καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλει εὐλογῶν τὸν Θεόν. 65. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος τοὺς περιοικοῦντας αὐτούς· καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ὀρεινῇ τῆς Ἰουδαίας διελαλεῖτο πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα· 66. καὶ ἔθεντο πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν, λέγοντες, "Τί ἄρα τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο ἔσται;" Καὶ[1] χεὶρ Κυρίου ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ. 67. Καὶ Ζαχαρίας ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐπλήσθη Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ προεφήτευσε,[2] λέγων, 68. "Εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησε [1]λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ· 69. καὶ ἤγειρε κέρας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν, ἐν τῷ[3] οἴκῳ Δαβὶδ τοῦ[3] παιδὸς αὐτοῦ· 70. (καθὼς ἐλάλησε διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων τῶν[3] ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφη-

1 Ch. ii. 38. Heb. ix. 12.

[1] και γαρ in ℵBCDL (Tisch., W.H.). [2] επροφ. in ℵABCL 1, 33.

[3] Omit τω ℵBCDL 33: also του before παιδος ℵBDL; also των after αγιων ℵBLΔ 33.

speech to spare the feelings of Elizabeth, whose judgment was being appealed from (Meyer); that a sign was all that was needed, Zechariah having heard all that was said (Bleek, J. Weiss, Hahn).—τὸ before the clause following—τί ἂν θέλοι, viewed as a substantive, is very appropriate in a case where the question was not spoken but signalled.—ἂν θέλοι: the optative with ἄν, implies diverse possibilities; found in Lk.'s writings only in N. T.—Ver. 63. πινακίδιον (dim. from πίναξ), here only in N. T.: a little tablet probably covered with wax, used like a slate; *pugillarem* in Vulg.—λέγων is used here, Hebrew fashion = to the effect.—ἔγραψε λέγων: *hypallage pro* γράφων ἔλεγε (Pricaeus) = he said by writing.—ἐθαύμασαν: they *wondered*, at this consent of the parents in giving a strange name, and felt there must be something under it—an *omen*.—Ver. 64. στόμα, γλῶσσα: both connected with ἀνεῴχθη, though the idea of opening is applicable only to the former—a case of *zeugma*. The return of speech a second marvel or rather a third: (1) a child of old parents; (2) the singular name; (3) the recovery of speech, much marked, and commented on among the denizens of the hill country of Judah (διελαλεῖτο).—φόβος, not terror, but religious awe in presence of the supernatural—characteristic of all simple people.—Ver. 66. τί ἄρα, etc.: what, in view of all these unusual circumstances, will this child come to? A most natural question. They felt sure all things portended an uncommon future for this child: "omina principiis inesse solent".—καὶ γάρ, etc.: a reflection of the evangelist justifying the wistful questioning of the hill folk = they might well ask, for indeed the hand of the Lord was with him.

Vv. 67-79. *The song of Zechariah*, called from the first word of it in the Vulgate the *Benedictus*. It is usually divided into five strophes, but it is more obviously divisible into two main parts, vv. 67-75, vv. 76-79. (Briggs, *The Messiah of the Gospels*, calls these divisions strophes, thus recognising only two.) Hillmann (*Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1891) regards the first part as a purely Jewish Psalm, having no reference to the birth of the Baptist; furnished with a preface, ver. 67, and an epilogue referring to the Baptist as the forerunner of Jesus by the evangelist. J. Weiss (in Meyer) seems to accept this conclusion, only suggesting that the second part (vv. 76-79) might be in the source used by Lk., appended to the Psalm by the Jewish-Christian redactor.

Ver. 67. ἐπροφήτευσεν, prophesied, when? At the circumcision, one naturally assumes. Hahn, however, connects the prophesying with the immediately preceding words concerning the hand of the Lord being with the boy. That is, Zechariah prophesied when it began to appear that his son was to have a remarkable career.—Ver. 68. ἐπεσκέψατο, visited graciously (*vide* on Mt. xxv. 36), occasionally used in Sept. in the sense of *judicial* visitation (Ps. lxxxix. 33). Note the use of the *aorist* here, which runs through vv. 68-75, in vv. 76-79

τῶν αὐτοῦ·) 71. σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς· 72. ποιῆσαι ἔλεος μετὰ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, καὶ μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ, 73. ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσε πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν, 74. τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν, ἀφόβως, ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν[1] ῥυσθέντας, λατρεύειν αὐτῷ 75. ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς[2] ἡμῶν. 76. Καὶ σύ,[3] παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ· [j] προπορεύσῃ γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου[4] Κυρίου, ἑτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ· 77. τοῦ δοῦναι γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν, 78. διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπεσκέψατο[5] ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους, 79. ἐπιφᾶναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις·

j here and in Acts vii. 40.

[1] εκ χειρος εχθρων in ℵBDL 33.

[2] πασαις ταις ημεραις in BL and της ζωης omitted in ℵBCDL *al.*

[3] και συ δε in ℵBCDL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] For προ προσωπου ℵB Orig. have ενωπιον (W.H.).

[5] ℵBL have επισκεψεται (W.H.).

futures occur. The object of **ἐπεσκέψατο** is latent in **τῷ λαῷ** (**τὸν λαὸν**, *cf.* vii. 16; **λαός** applied to Israel as the chosen people, **ἔθνος** to the other nations).—Ver. 69. **κέρας σ.** = **βασιλείαν**, because kings were anointed with a horn of oil, or = **δύναμιν**, because in their horn all horned animals have their power (Euthy. Zig.); a thoroughly Hebrew symbol.—**ἐν οἴκῳ Δ.**, pointing to a descendant of David, who has wrought signal deliverance for Israel.—Ver. 70. **ἁγίων**: a predicate applied in reverence to the prophets, as to the apostles in Eph. iii. 5.—Ver. 71. **σωτηρίαν**, in apposition with **κέρας σ.**, resuming and developing the thought interrupted by ver. 70, which is parenthetical.—**ἐχθρῶν, τῶν μισούντων**: not to be anxiously distinguished; poetic synonyms.—Ver. 72. **ποιῆσαι**: in effect epexegetical of salvation, though formally indicating the aim of the salvation.—**μετὰ τ. π.**, as in ver. 58, to make mercy with, for to show mercy to.—**ἁγίας**, holy, applied to another of Israel's sacred inheritances: the *covenant*.—Ver. 73. **ὅρκον** for **ὅρκου**, depending on **μνησθῆναι**, a case of inverse attraction, the noun by the relative (**ὃν**, object of **ὤμοσεν**) instead of the relative by the noun. *Cf.* Lk. xx. 17. Examples from Greek authors in Bornemann, *Scholia*.—Ver. 75. **ὁσιότητι**: the Godward, religious aspect of conduct (Eph. iv. 24).—**δικαιοσύνῃ**: the manward, ethical aspect.

Vv. 76-79. *From the general thanksgiving for Divine mercy the song turns to the special cause of gladness afforded by the birth of John.*—**σύ, παιδίον**: this address supposes the Baptist to be still a child, and all that is said of him is a prophetic forecast of the future, in literary form.—**ὑψίστου**: once more, for God. In the circle which produced this hymn, and these early records, the idea of Divine *transcendency* characteristic of later Judaism seems to have prevailed.—Ver. 77. **τοῦ δοῦναι**, the infinitive of purpose, to be connected with **προπορεύσῃ** in ver. 76 = John will go before the Lord (Jehovah), with the view of giving the knowledge of salvation in the forgiveness of sins. This is a very general description of John's ministry, hardly differentiating it from that of Christ. The knowledge of salvation in forgiveness *is* salvation = Christ's gift.—Ver. 78. **διὰ σπλάγχνα**, etc., on account of, etc., indicating the fountain-head of salvation—the mercy of God, described in Hebrew phrase as the *bowels of mercy of our God*.—**ἐπισκέψεται**: the future (aorist in T.R.), though in few MSS. (ℵBL), is doubtless the true reading. In the second great strophe the verbs are all future, and describe what is to be.—**ἀνατολὴ**: happily rendered "dayspring" in A. V. The reference is undoubtedly to a light, star, or sun, not to a branch from Jesse's stem, as it might be so far as usage in Sept. is concerned (*vide* Jer. xxiii. 5, Zechar. iii. 8, vi. 12), for its function is **ἐπιφᾶναι**, to appear as a light to those in darkness (**σκότει**).—**σκιᾷ θανάτου**: *vide* on Mt. iv. 16.

τοῦ κατευθῦναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης." 80. Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ηὔξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι· καὶ ἦν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις, ἕως ἡμέρας [k] ἀναδείξεως αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν Ἰσραήλ.

k here only.

II. 1. ΈΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, ἐξῆλθε δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου, ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην· 2. αὕτη

The *Benedictus* is steeped in O. T. language; "an anthology from Psalms and Prophets," Holtz., H. C.

Ver. 80. *Conclusion:* being a summary statement on John's history from childhood to manhood.—**πνεύματι**: the growing strength of John's spirit, the development of a remarkable moral individuality, the main point in the view of the evangelist.—**ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις**, in the desert places: not far to go from his home to find them; visits to them frequent in early boyhood; constant abode when youth had passed into manhood; love of solitude grown into a passion. Meet foster-mother for one who is to be the censor of his time. Essenes not far off, but no indication of contact, either outwardly or inwardly, with them.

Chapter II. The Birth and Boyhood of Jesus.—Vv. 1-5. *Joseph and Mary go up to Bethlehem.* In these verses Luke makes a historical statement, which one might have been inclined to regard as an illustration of the **ἀκρίβεια** (i. 1), at which he aimed, as well as of his desire, in the spirit of Pauline universalism, to connect the birth of Jesus with the general history of the world. In the former respect the experience of the exegete is very disappointing. The passage has given rise to a host of questions which have been discussed, with bewildering conflict of opinion, in an extensive critical and apologetic literature. The difficulty is not so much as to the meaning of the evangelist's words, but rather as to their truth. As, however, the apologetic and the exegetical interests have been very much mixed up in the discussions, it may be well at the outset to indicate briefly the chief objections that have been taken to the passage on the score of historicity. On the face of it, Lk.'s statement is that the Roman Emperor at the time of Christ's birth ordered a universal census, that this order was carried out by Quirinius, governor of Syria, and that the execution of it was the occasion of Joseph and Mary going to Bethlehem. To this it has been objected:—

1. Apart from the Gospel, history knows nothing of a general imperial census in the time of Augustus.

2. There could have been no Roman census in Palestine during the time of Herod the Great, a *rex socius*.

3. Such a census at such a time could not have been carried out by *Quirinius*, for he was not governor in Syria then, nor till ten years later, when he did make a census which gave rise to a revolt under Judas of Galilee.

4. Under a Roman census it would not have been necessary for Joseph to go to Bethlehem, or for Mary to accompany him.—With these objections in our view we proceed with the exposition, noting their influence, as we go along, on the details of interpretation.

Ver. 1. **ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις**: the days of Herod (i. 5), and of the events related in the previous chapter: the birth of John, etc.—**δόγμα** (**δοκέω**) = **δεδογμένον**, an opinion as of philosophers; here a decree, as in Acts xvii. 7.—**ἀπογράφεσθαι** (here and in Heb. xii. 23): the decree concerned enrolment or registration of the population (the verb might be either middle or passive—enrol itself, or be enrolled; the latter the more probable). For what purpose—taxation, or general statistical objects—not indicated, and not to be taken for granted as in the rendering "taxed" in A. V., but the former most probably intended. The hypothesis that the registration had reference to *statistics* meets objections 1 and 2, because Augustus did make or complete a *descriptio orbis* of that sort, and such a census would give no offence to the Jews or their king. *Vide* Hahn, *ad loc.* The Greek word for taxing is **ἀποτίμησις**.—**πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην**: the whole habitable world, *orbis terrarum* = the Roman empire, not merely the provinces (Italy excluded), or Palestine, as has been suggested in an apologetic interest to get rid of the difficulties connected with a universal census. The usual meaning of the phrase, and the reference to Augustus as the source of the order, favour the larger sense. Augustus reigned from 30 B.C. to 14 A.D.

Ver. 2. This verse looks like a paren-

ἡ[1] ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο[2] ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου. 3. καὶ ἐπορεύοντο πάντες ἀπογράφεσθαι, ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν[3] πόλιν. 4. Ἀνέβη δὲ καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ἐκ πόλεως Ναζαρέτ, εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, εἰς πόλιν Δαβίδ, ἥτις καλεῖται Βηθλεέμ, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαβίδ, 5. ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριὰμ τῇ μεμνηστευμένῃ[4] αὐτῷ γυναικί,[5] οὔσῃ ἐγκύῳ.

[1] η omitted in ℵBD 131; found in CLΔ (om. Tisch., W.H.).

[2] εγεν. before πρωτη in ℵD Orig. lat. (Tisch.). An exegetical device to meet a difficulty, thinks J. Weiss. As in T.R. ABCLΔ (W.H.).

[3] εαυτου in ℵcBDLΞ (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] εμνηστ. in ℵBCDLΞ.

[5] Omit γυναικι ℵBCDLΞ 1, 131 (Tisch., W.H.).

thetical explanation, and is actually bracketed in W.H. One could almost wish it had been omitted, or that there were reason to believe, as has been suggested by several writers, that it is a gloss that has found its way into the text, and that Lk. is not responsible for it—so much trouble has it given to commentators. Text and sense have alike been disputed.—αυτη has been taken as αὐτή = self, not αὕτη = *illa*, the same, to make room for a distinction between the decree and its execution or completion ten years after by Quirinius, so meeting difficulty No. 3. This device is now generally discarded. πρώτη has been taken as = προτέρα, meaning: this census took place *before* Quirinius was governor, a possible but very improbable rendering, not to say that one fails to see the object of such a statement. The true text is αὕτη ἀπογ. πρώτη ἐγέν., and the meaning: that census took place, as a first, when, etc. But why *as a first?* Because, reply many, there was a second, under the same Quirinius, ten years later, known to Lk. (Acts v. 37), disastrous in its consequence, and which he was anxious his readers should not confound with this one (so Hahn and others).—ἡγεμονεύοντος: this raises a question of fact. Was Quirinius governor then? He was, admittedly, governor of Syria ten years later, when he made the census referred to in Acts v. 37. Either there is a mistake here, or Quirinius was governor twice (so A. W. Zumpt, strenuously supported by Farrar, C. G. T., *ad loc.*), or at least present in Syria, at the time of Christ's birth, in some capacity, say as a commissioner in connection with the census.

Ver. 3. πάντες: not all throughout the world, but all in Palestine—the execution of the decree there being what the evangelist is interested in.—εἰς τὴν ἰδίαν πόλιν (or ἑαυτοῦ π., W.H.). Does this mean to the city of his people, or to the city of his abode? If the former, what a stir in Palestine, or in the world if πάντες be taken widely! A regular "Völkerwanderung" (Holtzmann in H. C.). Sensible of this, some (Hahn, *e.g.*) take the reference to be to the place of residence (Wohnort not Stammort), implying that Bethlehem was for Lk. as for Mt. Joseph's home, and that they merely happened to have been living in Nazareth just before. But ver. 7 implies that Joseph and Mary had no house in Bethlehem. Feine quotes, with a certain amount of approval, the view of Schneller (*Kennst du das Land*) that Joseph was not a carpenter but a mason, and that Bethlehem was therefore his natural home, being the headquarters of that craft then as now. On this view, Joseph had simply been in Nazareth building a house, not at home, but away from home for a time as an artisan.

Vv. 4, 5. Joseph and Mary and Nazareth are here referred to, as if they had not been mentioned before (i. 26, 27), implying that Lk. is here using an independent document (Holtz., H. C.).—ἀπὸ τ. Γαλ., ἐκ πόλ.: used with classical accuracy: ἀπὸ = direction from, ἐκ from within (C. G. T.).—ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς, "of the house and family," R. V.—οἶκοι, πατριαί, φυλαί represent a series of widening circles.—ἀπογράψασθαι, to be enrolled. If Bethlehem was Joseph's home, he would have gone to Bethlehem sooner or later in any case. Because of the census he went just then (Hahn).—σὺν Μαριὰμ, coming after ἀπογράψ., naturally suggests that she had to be enrolled too. Was this necessary? Even if not, reasons might be suggested for

6. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ, ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν. 7. καὶ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον, καὶ ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀνέκλινεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ[1] φάτνῃ· διότι οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος ἐν τῷ καταλύματι.

8. Καὶ ποιμένες ἦσαν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ ἀγραυλοῦντες καὶ φυλάσσοντες φυλακὰς τῆς νυκτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν ποίμνην αὐτῶν. 9. καὶ ἰδού,[2] ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς, καὶ δόξα Κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς· καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν. 10. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ ἄγγελος, "Μὴ φοβεῖσθε· ἰδοὺ γάρ, εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην, ἥτις ἔσται παντὶ τῷ λαῷ· 11. ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτήρ, ὅς ἐστι Χριστὸς Κύριος, ἐν πόλει Δαβίδ. 12. καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν τὸ[3] σημεῖον· εὑρήσετε βρέφος ἐσπαργανωμένον, κείμενον ἐν τῇ[4] φάτνῃ." 13. Καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἐγένετο σὺν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ πλῆθος

[1] Omit τη ℵABDLΞ.

[2] ℵBLΞ omit ιδου.

[3] το is omitted in BΞ 130 (W.H. relegate to margin).

[4] For κειμενον εν τη φατνη ℵD 68 read simply εν φατνη (Tisch.). BLΞ 1, 33 *al.* have και κειμενον (W.H.). Most MSS. omit τη before φατ.

her going with her husband: her condition, the intention to settle there as their real home, she an heiress, etc.—ἐγκύῳ (here only in N. T.), preparing for what follows.

With reference to the foregoing statement, it is generally agreed that a census of some kind must have taken place. Meyer and Weiss, following Schleiermacher and Olshausen, think that the event was something internal to Judaea, and concerned the revision of family genealogical registers, and that Lk. was misled into transforming this petty transaction into an affair of world-historical significance. This is not satisfactory. It would be much more satisfactory if it could be shown that Lk.'s historic framing of the birth of Jesus is strictly accurate. But most satisfactory of all is it to know that such a demonstration, however desirable, *is not vital to faith*.

Vv. 6, 7. *The birth.*—ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡ., as in i. 57. In this case, as in that of John, the natural course was run.—ἐσπαργάνωσεν (here and ver. 12), ἀνέκλινεν: the narrative runs as if Mary did these things herself, whence the patristic inference of painless birth.—φάτνῃ, in a manger (in a stall, Grotius, *et al.*).—καταλύματι, in the inn, not probably a πανδοχεῖον (x. 34), with a host, but simply a *khan*, an enclosure with open recesses. The meaning may be, not that there was absolutely no room for Joseph and Mary there, but that the place was too crowded for a *birth*, and that therefore they retired to a stall or cave, where there was room for the mother, and a crib for the babe (*vide* ch. xxii. 11).

Vv. 8-13. *The shepherds and the angels.*—Ver. 8. ποιμένες, shepherds, without article; no connection between them and the birthplace.—ἀγραυλοῦντες (ἀγρός, αὐλή, here only), bivouacking, passing the night in the open air; implying naturally a mild time of the year between March and November. In winter the flocks were in fold.—Ver. 9. ἐπέστη, used elsewhere by Lk. in reference to angelic appearances, eighteen times in his writings in all = stood beside; one more than their number, suddenly.—περιέλαμψεν: here and in Acts xxvi. 13, only, in N. T. = shone around.—ἐφοβήθησαν, they feared greatly; yet they were not utterly unprepared, their thoughts had been of a Divine gracious visitation—waiting for the consolation of Israel; subjective and objective corresponding.—Ver. 10. εὐαγγελίζομαι, etc., I bring good news in the form of a great joy (*cf.* i. 19).—παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, not merely to you, but to the whole people (of Israel, *vide* i. 68).—Ver. 11.—σωτήρ: a word occurring (with σωτηρία) often in Lk. and in St. Paul, not often elsewhere in N. T.—Κύριος: also often in Lk.'s Gospel, where the other evangelists use Jesus. The angel uses the dialect of the apostolic age.—Ver. 12. σημεῖον, the

στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου,[1] αἰνούντων τὸν Θεόν, καὶ λεγόντων, 14. "Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη· ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία."[2] 15. Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὡς ἀπῆλθον ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ποιμένες[3] εἶπον[4] πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "Διέλθωμεν δὴ ἕως Βηθλεέμ, καὶ ἴδωμεν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο τὸ γεγονός, ὃ ὁ Κύριος ἐγνώρισεν ἡμῖν." 16. Καὶ ἦλθον σπεύσαντες, καὶ ἀνεῦρον τήν τε Μαριὰμ καὶ τὸν Ἰωσήφ, καὶ τὸ βρέφος κείμενον ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ. 17. ἰδόντες δὲ διεγνώρισαν[5] περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ λαληθέντος αὐτοῖς περὶ τοῦ παιδίου τούτου. 18. καὶ πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες

[1] **ουρανου** in BD (Trg., W.H., margin).

[2] The documents are divided between **ευδοκια** and **ευδοκιας**. Most recent editors favour the latter, following ℵABD, vet. Lat. Vulg., Iren. [lat.], Orig. [lat.] W.H. place **ευδοκιας** in text and **ευδοκια** in margin.

[3] ℵBLΞ 1 omit **οι ανθρωποι** found in ADΔ *al. plur.* Tisch., W.H., om. J. Weiss suggests that **οι ποιμενες** is an ancient gloss which in one branch of the tradition crept into the text, in another displaced **οι ανθ.**

[4] **ελαλουν** in ℵB.

[5] **εγνωρισαν** in ℵBDLΞ.

sign just that which might, but for forewarning, have been a stumbling block; the Saviour and Lord lying in a crib, in a cattle stall, or cave! So Hahn, but Godet and Schanz take "sign" merely in the sense of means of identification.

Ver. 14. *The angels' song.*—If we regard the announcement of the angel to the shepherds (vv. 10-12) as a song, then we may view the *gloria in excelsis* as a refrain sung by a celestial choir (**πλῆθος στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου**, ver. 13). With the reading **εὐδοκίας**, the refrain is in two lines:—

1. "Glory to God in the highest."

2. "And on earth peace among men, in whom He is well pleased."

εἰρήνη in 2 answering to **δόξα** in 1; **ἐπὶ γῆς** to **ἐν ὑψίστοις**; **ἀνθρώποις** to **Θεῷ**. With the reading **εὐδοκία** (T.R.), it falls into three:—

1. Glory to God in the highest.

2. And on earth peace (between man and man).

3. Good will (of God) among men.

ἐν ὑψίστοις, in the highest places, proper abode of Him who is repeatedly in these early chapters called "the Highest". The thought in 1 echoes a sentiment in the Psalter of Solomon (18, 11), **μέγας ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ ἔνδοξος ἐν ὑψίστοις**.—**εὐδοκίας** is a gen. of quality, limiting **ἀνθρώποις** = those men who are the objects of the Divine **εὐδοκία**. They may or may not be all men, but the intention is not to assert that God's good pleasure rests on all. J. Weiss in Meyer says = **τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς**.

Vv. 15-20. *The shepherds go to Bethlehem.*—**διέλθωμεν δή**, come! let us go. The force of **δή**, a highly emotional particle (the second time we have met with it, *vide* at Mt. xiii. 23), can hardly be expressed in English. The rendering in A. V. (and R. V.), "Let us *now* go," based on the assumption that **δὴ** has affinity with **ἤδη**, is very tame, giving no idea of the mental excitement of the shepherds, and the demonstrative energy with which they communicated to each other, comrade-fashion, the idea which had seized their minds. "The **δὴ** gives a pressing character to the invitation," Godet. Similarly Hahn = "agedum, wohlan, doch". *Cf.* **δὴ** in Acts xiii. 2. The **διὰ** in **διέλθωμεν** suggests the idea of passing through the fields.—**ἕως** (conjunction used as a preposition) may imply that it was a considerable distance to Bethlehem (Schanz).—**ῥῆμα**, here = "thing" rather than "word".—Ver. 16. **σπεύσαντες**, hasting; movement answering to mood revealed by **δή**.—**τήν τε Μαριὰμ**, etc., mother, father, child, recognised in this order, all united together in one group by **τε**. The position of the babe, in the manger, noted as corresponding to the angelic announcement; hence in ver. 17 the statement that the shepherds recognised the correspondence.—Vv. 18, 19. The shepherds of course told what they had seen in Bethlehem, and how they had been led to go there, and these verses state the effect produced by their story.

ἐθαύμασαν περὶ τῶν λαληθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν ποιμένων πρὸς αὐτούς. 19. ἡ δὲ Μαριὰμ πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. 20. καὶ ἐπέστρεψαν[1] οἱ ποιμένες, δοξάζοντες καὶ αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἤκουσαν καὶ εἶδον, καθὼς ἐλαλήθη πρὸς αὐτούς.

21. ΚΑΙ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ τοῦ περιτεμεῖν τὸ παιδίον,[2] καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, τὸ κληθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου πρὸ τοῦ συλληφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ.

22. ΚΑΙ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν, κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, παραστῆσαι τῷ Κυρίῳ, 23. καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου, "Ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ Κυρίῳ κληθήσεται·" 24. καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν νόμῳ[3] Κυρίου, 'Ζεῦγος [a] τρυγόνων ἢ δύο [b] νεοσσοὺς[4] περιστερῶν.'

a here only in N. T.
b here only in N. T.

[1] υπεστρεψαν in all uncials.
[2] αυτον in ℵABLΔΞ *al.* (Tisch., W.H.). D has το παιδιον.
[3] τω before νομω in ℵBDL.
[4] νοσσους in ℵB; νεοσσους in ADL.

All *wondered*, but Mary *thought* on all the wonderful things that had happened to herself and to the shepherds; keeping them well in mind (**συνετήρει**), and putting them together (**συμβάλλουσα**, *conferens*, Vulg.), so as to see what they all meant. The wonder of the many was a transient emotion (aorist); this recollecting and brooding of Mary was an abiding habit (**συνετήρει**, imperfect).

Vv. 21-24. *Circumcision and presentation in the temple.*—Ver. 21. **ἐπλήσθησαν**, as in i. 57, ii. 6, and again in ii. 22; in the first two places the reference is to the course of nature, in the second two to the course prescribed by the law.—**τοῦ περιτεμεῖν**, the genitive not so much of purpose (Meyer, J. Weiss), but of more exact definition (Schanz; *vide* Burton, *M. and T.*, § 400, on the use of **τοῦ** with infinitive to limit nouns).—**καὶ ἐκλήθη**: the **καὶ** may be taken as "also" = He was circumcised (understood), and at the same time His name was called Jesus, or as introducing the apodosis: and = then (so Godet and Hahn). It might have been dispensed with (*superfluit*, Grotius).—Ver. 22. **κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μ.** The law relating to women after confinement is contained in Leviticus xii.—**ἀνήγαγον**: at the close of these forty days of purification His parents took Jesus up to Jerusalem from Bethlehem. The Greek form of the name for Jerusalem, **Ἱεροσόλυμα**, occurs here and in a few other places in Lk. **Ἱερουσαλήμ** is the more common form.—**παραστῆσαι**, a word used by Lk. and St. Paul (Rom. xii. 1), in the sense of dedication. This act was performed in accordance with the legal conception that the first-born belonged to God, His priestly servants before the institution of the Levitical order (Num. viii. 18, 19). J. Weiss suggests that the narrative is modelled on the story of the dedication of Samuel (1 Sam. i. 21-28).—Ver. 23. **γέγραπται**: the reference is to Ex. xiii. 2, and the statement implies that every first-born male child, as belonging to God, must be ransomed (Ex. xxxiv. 19, Num. xviii. 15, 16).—Ver. 24. **τοῦ δοῦναι**: parallel to **παραστῆσαι**, indicating another of the purposes connected with the visit to Jerusalem. The mother went to offer her gift of thanksgiving after the days of purification were ended.—**τὸ εἰρημένον**, in Lev. xii., where alternative offerings are specified: a lamb, and a turtle dove or a young pigeon; and in case of the poor two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, the one for a burnt offering, the other for a sin offering. Mary brought the poor woman's offering. The question has been asked, why any purification in this case? and the fact has been adduced in proof that the original docu-

25. Καὶ ἰδού, ἦν ἄνθρωπος[1] ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, ᾧ ὄνομα Συμεών, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ [c]εὐλαβής, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἦν[2] ἐπ' αὐτόν· 26. καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου, μὴ [d]ἰδεῖν [d]θάνατον πρὶν ἢ[3] ἴδῃ τὸν Χριστὸν Κυρίου. 27. Καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν, τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου περὶ αὐτοῦ, 28. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδέξατο αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας αὐτοῦ,[4] καὶ εὐλόγησε τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἶπε, 29. "Νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δοῦλόν σου, δέσποτα, κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου, ἐν εἰρήνῃ· 30. ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ

c Acts ii. 5; viii. 2; xxii. 12.
d Heb. xi. 5.

[1] ανθρωπος before ην in ℵB (Tisch., W.H.). ην αν. in ADLΔ (not to be summarily rejected, J. Weiss).

[2] ην before αγιον in ℵBLΔ *al.*, *e.* T.R. = D.

[3] πριν η in ADΔ; πριν αν in BF 36 (W.H. bracket η and read πριν αν); πριν η αν in L 33 (Tisch.).

[4] ℵBL omit αυτου (Tisch., W.H.).

ment used by Lk. knew nothing of the virgin birth.—γονεῖς, ver. 27, has been used for the same purpose (*vide* Hillmann, *Jahrb. f. pr. Theol.*, 1891).

Vv. 25-28. *Simeon.*—Συμεών, introduced as a stranger (ἄνθρωπος ἦν). The legendary spirit which loves definite particulars about celebrities of Scripture has tried to fill up the blank. The father of Gamaliel the son of Hillel, one of the seventy translators of the Hebrew Bible, are among the suggestions. A bracketed passage in Euthy. Zig. says, in reference to the latter suggestion, that Simeon alone of the company objected to the rendering of Isaiah vii. 14: "the *virgin* shall conceive," and that an angel told him he should live to take the virgin's son into his arms.—δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής. The evangelist is careful to make known *what* this man was, while giving no indication *who* he was ("who they were no man knows, what they were all men know," inscription on a tombstone in a soldiers' graveyard in Virginia), just and God-fearing, a saint of the O. T. type.—προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τ. Ἰ.: an earnest believer in the Messianic hope, and fervently desiring its early fulfilment. Its fulfilment would be Israel's consolation. The Messianic hope, the ideal of a good time coming, was the child of present sorrow—sin and misery prevalent, all things out of joint. The keynote of this view is struck in Is. xl. i.: "comfort ye".—παρακαλεῖτε. The Rabbis called Messiah the Comforter, *Menahem*. *Cf.* προσδεχ. λύτρωσιν in ver. 38.—Ver. 26. ἦν κεχρηματισμένον, it had been revealed (for the verb *vide* Mt. ii. 12), how long before not indicated.—μὴ ἰδεῖν: we have here an instance of the aorist infinitive referring to what is future in relation to the principal verb. In such a case the aorist is really timeless, as it can be in dependent moods, *vide* Burton, *M. and T.*, § 114.—πρὶν ἢ ἂν ἴδῃ: πρὶν here and in Acts xxv. 16 with a finite verb, usually with the infinitive, *vide* Mt. i. 18, xxvi. 34.—Ver. 27. ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι: observe the frequent reference to the Spirit in connection with Simeon, *vide* vv. 25 and 26.—εἰθισμένον (ἐθίζω), here only in N. T.: according to the *established custom* of the law.—Ver. 28. καί, as in ver. 21, before ἐκλήθη, introducing the apodosis "then" in A. V. and R. V.—αὐτός, not necessarily emphatic (Keil, Farrar), *vide* i. 22.

Vv. 29-32. *Nunc dimittis.*—Ver. 29. νῦν, now, at last, of a hope long cherished by one who is full of years, and content to die.—ἀπολύεις, Thou releasest me, present for the future, death near, and welcome.—δοῦλον, δέσποτα: slave, master; terms appropriate at all times to express the relation between God and men, yet savouring of legal piety.—ἐν εἰρήνῃ, in peace; he has had enough of life and its service, and the purpose of life has been fulfilled by the crowning mercy of a sight of the Christ: death will be as a sleep to a labouring man.—Ver. 30 gives the reason for this tranquil attitude towards death.—τὸ

σωτήριόν σου, 31. ὃ ἡτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν· 32. φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν, καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ." 33. Καὶ ἦν Ἰωσὴφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ[1] θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαλουμένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ. 34. καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς Συμεών, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς Μαριὰμ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, "Ἰδού, οὗτος [e] κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον· 35. (καὶ σοῦ δὲ[2] αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελεύσεται ῥομφαία·) ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί."

e Phil. i. 16. 1 Thess. iii. 3.

36. Καὶ ἦν Ἄννα [f] προφῆτις, θυγάτηρ Φανουήλ, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσήρ· αὕτη προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς, ζήσασα ἔτη μετὰ ἀνδρὸς[3]

f Rev. ii. 20.

[1] For ην . . . θαυμ. read ην ο πατηρ αυτου και η μητηρ θαυμ. with ℵBDL 1, 131. ℵL retain second αυτου. The substitution of Ιωσηφ for ο πατηρ explains itself.

[2] δε omitted in BLΞ.

[3] μετα ανδρος before ετη in ℵBLΔ 13, 33, 69, 131.

σωτήριον = τὴν σωτηρίαν, often in Sept. —Ver. 31. πάντων τῶν λαῶν: all peoples concerned in the salvation, at least as spectators.—Ver. 32. φῶς εἰς ἀ. ἐ.: the Gentiles are to be more than spectators, even sharers in the salvation, which is represented under the twofold aspect of a light and a glory.—φῶς and δόξαν may be taken in apposition with ὃ as objects of ἡτοίμασας: salvation prepared or provided in the form of a light for the Gentiles, and a glory for Israel. Universalism here, but not of the pronounced type of Lk. (Holtz., H. C.), rather such as is found even in O. T. prophets.—Ver. 33. ἦν: the construction is peculiar, the verb singular, and the participle, forming with it a periphrastic imperfect, plural = was the father, and was the mother, together wondering. *Vide* Winer, § 58, p. 651. The writer thinks of the two parents first as isolated and then as united in their wonder.—Ver. 34. εὐλόγησεν: "the less is blessed of the better". Age, however humble, may bless youth. Jacob blessed Pharaoh.—κεῖται, is appointed—εἰς πτῶσιν, etc.: generally, this child will influence His time in a decided manner, and to opposite effects, and with painful consequences to Himself; a forecast not necessarily beyond prophetic ken, based on insight into the career of epoch-making men. It is so more or less always. The blessing of being father or mother of such a child is great, but not unmixed with sorrow.—Ver. 35. καὶ σοῦ, singles out the mother for a special share in the sorrow connected with the tragic career of one destined to be much spoken against (ἀντιλεγόμενον); this inevitable because of a mother's intense love. Mary's sorrow is compared vividly to a sword (ῥομφαία here and in Rev. i. 16, and in Sept., Zech. xiii. 7) passing through her soul. It is a figure strong enough to cover the bitterest experiences of the *Mater Dolorosa*, but it does not necessarily imply prevision of the cross. There is therefore no reason, on this account at least, for the suggestion that ver. 35a is an editorial addition to his source by the evangelist (J. Weiss).—ὅπως introduces a final clause which can hardly refer to the immediately preceding statement about the sword piercing Mary's soul, but must rather indicate the purpose and result of the whole future career of the child, whereof the mother's sorrow is to be an incidental effect. The connection is: κεῖται εἰς πτ., etc. . . . ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλ. The general result, and one of the Divine aims, will be the revelation of men's inmost thoughts, showing, *e.g.*, that the reputedly godly were not really godly. Observe the ἂν in this pure final clause. It does not affect the meaning. Godet says that it indicates without doubt that the manifestation of hidden thoughts will take place every time occasion presents itself, in contact with the Saviour.

Vv. 36-38. *Anna.*—Another aged saint of the O. T. type comes on the stage speaking thankful prophetic words concerning the Holy Child.—Ver. 36. ἦν: either there was *there*, aderat (Meyer, Godet, Weizsäcker), or there *was*, there

ἑπτὰ ἀπὸ τῆς [g] παρθενίας αὐτῆς· 37. καὶ αὕτη χήρα ὡς[1] ἐτῶν ὀγδοηκοντατεσσάρων, ἣ οὐκ ἀφίστατο ἀπὸ[2] τοῦ ἱεροῦ, νηστείαις καὶ δεήσεσι [h] λατρεύουσα νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν· 38. καὶ αὕτη[3] αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπιστᾶσα ἀνθωμολογεῖτο τῷ Κυρίῳ,[4] καὶ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ πᾶσι τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν ἐν[5] Ἱερουσαλήμ. 39. Καὶ ὡς ἐτέλεσαν ἅπαντα τὰ[6] κατὰ τὸν νόμον Κυρίου, ὑπέστρεψαν[7] εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, εἰς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν[8] Ναζαρέτ. 40. Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ηὔξανε, καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι,[9] πληρούμενον σοφίας[10]· καὶ χάρις Θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό.

g here only in N. T.

h Acts xxvi. 7. Heb. ix. 9; x. 2 (absol.).

[1] εως in ℵABLΞ 33. [2] BDL omit απο (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] ℵABDLΞ 33 *al.* omit this αυτη (Tisch., W.H.). [4] θεω in ℵBDLΞ.

[5] ℵBΞ minusc. omit εν (Tisch., W.H.) found in BLΔ *al.*

[6] παντα and without τα in ℵL (Tisch.); παντα with τα in BΞ (W.H.); απαντα without τα in D.

[7] επεστρεψαν in ℵBΞ. υπεσ. conforms to the common usage in Lk.

[8] For εις τ. π. αυτων ℵBD have εις π. εαυτων. [9] ℵBDL omit πνευματι.

[10] σοφια in BL 33 (W.H.). T.R. = ℵDΔ (Tisch.).

lived (De Wette, J. Weiss, Schanz, Hahn).—Ἄννα = חַנָּה, 1 Sam. i. 20 (Ἄννα in Sept.) = grace. Of this woman some particulars are given, *e.g.*, her father and her tribe, which makes the absence of such details in Simeon's case more noteworthy. The two placed side by side give an aspect of historicity to the narrative.—αὕτη (or αὐτή, the sense much the same) introduces some further details in a loosely constructed sentence, which looks like biographic notes, with verbs left out = she advanced in years, having lived with a husband, seven years from virginity, the same a widow till eighty-four years—all which may be regarded, if we will, as a parenthesis, followed by a relative clause containing a statement of more importance, describing her way of life = who departed not from the temple, serving (God) by fasts and prayers, night and day.—Ver. 37. ἕως: either a widow for eighty-four years (Godet), or, as most think, a widow till the eighty-fourth year of her life. The former rendering would make her very old: married, say, at sixteen, seven years a wife, eighty-four years a widow = 107; not impossible, and borne out by the πολλαῖς after ἡμέραις (ver. 36, advanced in days—*many*).—νηστείαις: the fasting might be due to poverty, or on system, which would suggest a Judaistic type of piety.—νύκτα κ. ἡ.: did she sleep within the temple precincts?—Ver. 38. The T.R. has yet another αυτη here (the third), before αὐτῇ, which really seems wanted as nominative to the verb following, but which one can imagine scribes omitting to relieve the heaviness and monotony of the style.—ἀνθωμολογεῖτο (here only in N. T.): perhaps no stress should be laid on the preposition ἀντὶ, as the compound verb occurs in the sense of the simple verb in Sept. (Ps. lxxix. 13). The suggestion of an antiphony between Anna and Simeon (Godet; *vicissim*, Bengel) is tempting = began in turn to give thanks. The ἀντὶ may refer to spectators = began to praise God openly before all (Hahn). The subject of her praise of course was Jesus (περὶ αὐτοῦ), and its burden that He was the Saviour.—ἐλάλει points to an activity not confined to a single utterance; she spoke again and again on the theme to all receptive spirits. The omission of ἐν before Ἱερ. in ℵB, etc., gives us a peculiar designation for the circle to whom the prophetess addressed herself = those waiting for the redemption of *Jerusalem* (instead of *Israel* in ver. 25). Yet Isaiah xl. 2—"speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem"—makes such a turn of thought intelligible. And there might be discerning ones who knew that there was no place more needing redemption than that holy, unholy city.

Vv. 39, 40. *Return to Nazareth.*—πόλιν ἑαυτῶν, their own city, certainly

41. ΚΑΙ ἐπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατ' ἔτος εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα. 42. καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἀναβάντων [1] αὐτῶν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα [2] κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς, 43. καὶ τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν αὐτούς, ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰωσὴφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ [3] αὐτοῦ. 44. νομίσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ εἶναι,[4] ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὁδόν, καὶ ἀνεζήτουν αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι καὶ ἐν [5] τοῖς γνωστοῖς· 45. καὶ μὴ εὑρόντες αὐτόν,[6] ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ζητοῦντες [7] αὐτόν. 46. Καὶ ἐγένετο μεθ' ἡμέρας τρεῖς, εὗρον αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καθεζόμενον ἐν μέσῳ τῶν διδασκάλων, καὶ ἀκούοντα αὐτῶν, καὶ

[1] **αναβαινοντων** in ℵABL 33 *al.*

[2] ℵBDL omit **εις** Ι., an explanatory addition.

[3] For **εγνω** Ι. **και η μ.** ℵBDL 1, 33 *al.* have **εγνωσαν οι γονεις.**

[4] **ειναι** before **εν τη συν.** in ℵBDL 1, 33.

[5] B 33 omit this **εν** (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] Omit **αυτον** ℵBDL.

[7] **αναζ.** in BCDL.

suggesting that Nazareth, not Bethlehem, had been the true home of Joseph and Mary.—Ver. 40. **ηὔξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο**, grew, and waxed strong, both in reference to the physical nature.—**πνεύματι** in T.R. is borrowed from i. 80; a healthy, vigorous child, an important thing to note in reference to Jesus.—**πληρούμενον**: present participle, not = *plenus*, Vulg., full, but in course of being filled with wisdom—mind as well as body subject to the law of growth.—**χάρις**: a great word of St. Paul's, also more used by Lk. than by either of the other two synoptists (*vide* i. 52, iv. 22, vi. 32, 33, 34); here to be taken broadly = favour, good pleasure. The child Jesus dear to God, and the object of His paternal care.

Vv. 41-52. *When twelve years old.* Lk. here relates one solitary, significant incident from the early years of Jesus, as if to say: from this, learn all. The one story shows the wish to collect anecdotes of those silent years. There would have been more had the evangelist had more to tell. The paucity of information favours the historicity of the tradition.—Ver. 41. **κατ' ἔτος**: law-observing people, piously observant of the annual feasts, especially that of the passover.—Ver. 42. **ἐτῶν δώδεκα**: this mention of the age of Jesus is meant to suggest, though it is not directly stated, that this year He went up to Jerusalem with His parents; **ἀναβαινόντων** includes Him. At twelve a Jewish boy became a son of the law, with the responsibility of a man, putting on the phylacteries which reminded of the obligation to keep the law (*vide* Wünsche, *Beiträge, ad loc.*).—Ver. 43. **τελειωσάντων τ. ἡ.** This naturally means that they stayed all the time of the feast, seven days. This was not absolutely incumbent; some went home after the first two days, but such people as Joseph and Mary would do their duty thoroughly.—**ὑπέμεινεν**, tarried behind, not so much intentionally (Hahn) as by involuntary preoccupation—His nature rather than His will the cause (Acts xvii. 14).—Ver. 44. **ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ**, in the company journeying together (**σύν, ὁδός**, here only in N. T.), a journeying together, then those who so journey. A company would be made up of people from the same neighbourhood, well acquainted with one another.—**ἡμέρας ὁδὸν**, a day's journey. It is quite conceivable how they should have gone on so long without missing the boy, without much or any blame to the parents; not negligence, but human infirmity at worst.—**συγγενέσι, γνωστοῖς**: kinsfolk and acquaintances. Had there been less acquaintance and intimacy there had been less risk of losing the child. Friends take up each other's attention, and members of the same family do not stick so close together, and the absence of one excites no surprise.—Ver. 45. **ἀναζητοῦντες**: the present participle, expressing the purpose of the journey back to Jerusalem, where (not on the road) the search took place (*cf.* Acts xi. 25). The **ἀνά** here (as in **ἀνεζήτουν**, ver. 44) implies careful, anxious search.—Ver. 46. **ἡμέρας τρεῖς**, three days, measured from

ἐπερωτῶντα αὐτούς. 47. ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν αὐτοῦ. 48. Καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτόν, ἐξεπλάγησαν· καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ εἶπε,[1] "Τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ἡμῖν οὕτως; ἰδού, ὁ πατήρ σου κἀγὼ ὀδυνώμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν[2] σε." 49. Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με;" 50. Καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐ συνῆκαν τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς. 51. Καὶ κατέβη μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρέτ καὶ ἦν ὑποτασσόμενος αὐτοῖς. καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ διετήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα[3] ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς. 52. καὶ Ἰησοῦς [i]προέκοπτε σοφίᾳ[4] καὶ ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ χάριτι παρὰ Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

[i] Rom. xiii. 12. Gal. i. 14. 2 Tim. ii. 16; iii. 9.

[1] ειπεν before προς αυτον in ℵBCDL.

[2] B has ζητουμεν (W.H.).

[3] ℵBD omit ταυτα (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] εν τη σ. in ℵL (Tisch.); τη without εν in B (W.H.).

the time they had last seen Him, not implying three days' search in Jerusalem. The place where they had lodged and the temple would be among the first places visited in the search.—**ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ**: probably in a chamber in the temple court used for teaching and kindred purposes. Some think it was in a synagogue beside the temple.—Ver. 46. **καθεζόμενον**, sitting; therefore, it has been inferred, as a teacher, not as a scholar, among (**ἐν μέσῳ**) the doctors, for scholars stood, teachers only sitting. An unwelcome conclusion, to which, happily, we are not shut up by the evidence, the posture-rule on which it rests being more than doubtful (*vide* Vitringa, *Synag.*, p. 167). —**ἐπερωτῶντα**: nothing unusual, and nothing unbecoming a thoughtful boy.—Ver. 47. **ἐξίσταντο**, were amazed, not at His position among the *doctors*, or at His asking questions, but at the intelligence (**συνέσει**) shown in His answers to the questions of the teachers; something of the rare insight and felicity which astonished all in after years appearing in these boyish replies.—Ver. 48. **ἰδόντες** refers to the parents. This astonishment points to some contrast between a previous quiet, reserved manner of Jesus and His present bearing; sudden flashing out of the inner life.—**ἡ μήτηρ**: the *mother* spoke naturally; a *woman*, and the mother's heart more keenly touched. This apart from the peculiar relation referred to in Bengel's *major erat necessitudo matris.*—Ver. 49. **ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου**, in the things of my Father ("about my Father's business," A. V.); *therefore* in the place or *house* of my Father (R. V.); the former may be the verbal translation, but the latter is the real meaning Jesus wished to suggest. In this latter rendering patristic and modern interpreters in the main concur. Note the new name for *God* compared with the "Highest" and the "*Despotes*" in the foregoing narrative. The dawn of a new era is here.—Ver. 50. **οὐ συνῆκαν**, they did not understand; no wonder! Even we do not yet fully understand.—Ver. 51. **κατέβη**, He went down with them, gentle, affectionate, habitually obedient (**ὑποτασσόμενος**), yet far away in thought, and solitary.—**διετήρει**: she did not forget, though she did not understand.—Ver. 52. **προέκοπτε**, steadily grew, used intransitively in later Greek.—**ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ**, in wisdom and (also *as*, the one the measure of the other) in stature, both growths alike real. Real in body, apparent in the mind: growth in *manifestation* of the wisdom within, complete from the first—such is the docetic gloss of ecclesiastical interpreters, making the childhood of Jesus a *monstrum*, and His humanity a *phantom*.—**χάριτι π. Θ. καὶ ἀ.**, in favour with God and men: beloved of all; no division even among men while the new wisdom and the new religion lay a slumbering germ in the soul of the heaven-born boy.

CHAPTER III. THE MINISTRY OF THE NEW ERA OPENS. Having related the beginnings of the lives of the two prophets of the new time (chapters i. and ii.), the evangelist now introduces us to the beginnings of their prophetic ministries, or rather to the ministry of

a here only in N. T.
b Ch. ii. 2.

III. 1. ἘΝ ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς [a] ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, [b] ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ τετραρχοῦντος [1] τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρώδου, Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τετραρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας, καὶ

[1] The spelling of this word varies in MSS. B has it as in T.R. ℵC τετρααρχουντος (*ter*), which Tisch. and W.H. adopt.

John as the prelude to the evangelic drama. In regard to the ministry of Jesus he gives us merely the date of its beginning (iii. 23), attaching thereto a genealogy of Jesus. Bengel has well expressed the significance of this chapter by the words: *Hic quasi scena N. T. panditur*.

Vv. 1-2. *General historic setting of the beginnings*. For Mt.'s vague "in those days" (iii. 1), which leaves us entirely in the dark at what date and age Jesus entered on His prophetic career, Lk. gives a group of dates connecting his theme with the general history of the world and of Palestine; the universalistic spirit here, as in ii. 1, 2, apparent. This spirit constitutes the permanent ethical interest of what may seem otherwise dry details: for ordinary readers of the Gospel little more than a collection of names, personal and geographical. Worthy of note also, as against those who think Lk. was to a large extent a free *inventor*, is the indication here given of the *historical* spirit, the desire to know the real facts (i. 3). The historic data, six in all, define the date of John's ministry with reference to the reigning Roman emperor, and the civil and ecclesiastical rulers of Palestine.

Ver. 1. ἐν ἔτει, etc., in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius as Caesar. This seems a very definite date, rendering all the other particulars, so far as fixing time is concerned, comparatively superfluous. But uncertainty comes in in connection with the question: is the fifteenth year to be reckoned from the death of Augustus (19 Aug., 767 A.U.C.), when Tiberius became sole emperor, or from the beginning of the regency of Tiberius, two years earlier? The former mode of calculation would give us 28 or 29 A.D. as the date of John's ministry and Christ's baptism, making Jesus then thirty-two years old; the latter, 26 A.D., making Jesus then thirty years old, agreeing with iii. 23. The former mode of dating would be more in accordance with the practice of Roman historians and Josephus; the latter lends itself to apologetic and harmonistic interests, and therefore is preferred by many (*e.g.*, Farrar and Hahn).—Ποντίου Πιλάτου. Pilate was governor of the Roman province of Judaea from 26 A.D. to 36 A.D., the fifth in the series of governors. His proper title was ἐπίτροπος (hence the reading of D: ἐπιτροπεύοντος π. π.); usually ἡγεμὼν in Gospels. He owes his place here in the historic framework to the part he played in the last scenes of our Lord's life. Along with him are named next two joint rulers of other parts of Palestine, belonging to the Herod family; brought in, though of no great importance for dating purposes, because they, too, figure occasionally in the Gospel story.—τετραρχοῦντος, acting as tetrarch. The verb means primarily: ruling over a fourth part, then by an easy transition acting as a tributary prince.—Γαλιλαίας: about twenty-five miles long and broad, divided into lower (southern) Galilee and upper (northern). With Galilee was joined for purposes of government Peraea.—Ἡρώδου, Herod Antipas, murderer of the Baptist, and having secular authority over Jesus as his subject.—Φιλίππου, Herod Philip, brother of Antipas, whose name reappears in the new name of Paneas, rebuilt or adorned by him, Caesarea Philippi.—τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας: so Lk. designates the territory ruled over by Philip. The words might be rendered: the Ituraean and Trachonitic territory, implying the identity of Ituraea and Trachonitis (as in Eusebius. For a defence of this view, *vide* article by Professor Ramsay in *Expositor*, February, 1894); or, as in A. V., of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis. The former was a mountainous region to the south of Mount Hermon, inhabited by a hardy race, skilled in the use of the bow; the latter (the rough country) = the modern El-Lejah, the kingdom of Og in ancient times, was a basaltic region south of Damascus, and east of Golan. It is probable that only a fragment of Ituraea belonged to Philip, the region around

Λυσανίου τῆς Ἀβιληνῆς τετραρχοῦντος, 2. ἐπ' ἀρχιερέων[1] Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα, ἐγένετο ῥῆμα Θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν τοῦ[2] Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· 3. καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν[3] περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· 4. ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου, λέγοντος,[4] 'Φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου· εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς

[1] αρχιερεως in most uncials; pl. in minusc. only. [2] Omit του most uncials.
[3] την is in ℵCDΔ *al.* (Tisch.); wanting in ABL (W.H.).
[4] ℵBDLΔ 1, 118, it. vulg. omit λεγοντος.

Paneas. On the other hand, according to Josephus, his territories embraced more than the regions named by Lk.: Batanaea, Auranitis, Gaulonitis, and some parts about Jamnia (various places in Ant. and B. J.).—**Λυσανίου**, etc. This last item in Lk.'s dating apparatus is the most perplexing, whether regard be had to relevancy or to accuracy. To what end this reference to a non-Jewish prince, and this outlying territory between the Lebanon ranges? What concern has it with the evangelic history, or of what use is it for indicating the place of the latter in the world's history? By way of answer to this question, Farrar (C. G. T.) suggests that the district of Abilene (Abila the capital) is probably mentioned here "because it subsequently formed part of the Jewish territory, having been assigned by Caligula to his favourite, Herod Agrippa I., in A.D. 36". As to the accuracy: it so happens that there was a Lysanias, who ruled over Chalchis and Abilene sixty years before the time of which Lk. writes, who probably bore the title tetrarch. Does Lk., misled by the title, think of that Lysanias as a contemporary of Herod Antipas and Herod Philip, or was there another of the name really their contemporary, whom the evangelist has in his view? Certain inscriptions cited by historical experts make the latter hypothesis probable. Schürer (*The Jewish People*, Div. I., vol. ii., appendix 1, on the *History of Chalchis, Ituraea, and Abilene*, p. 338) has no doubt on the point, and says: "the evangelist, Lk., is thoroughly correct when he assumes that in the fifteenth year of Tiberias there was a Lysanias tetrarch of Abilene".

Ver. 2. **ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἄννα καὶ Καιάφα**, under the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas. The use of the singular **ἀρχιερέως** in connection with two names is peculiar, whence doubtless the correction into the easier **ἀρχιερέων** (T. R.); and the combination of two men as holding the office at the same time, is likewise somewhat puzzling. As Caiaphas was the actual high priest at the time, one would have expected his name to have stood, if not alone, at least first = under Caiaphas, the actual high priest, and the ex-high priest, Annas, still an influential senior. One can only suppose that among the *caste* of high priests past and present (there had been three between Annas and Caiaphas) Annas was so outstanding that it came natural to name him first. Annas had been deposed arbitrarily by the Roman governor, and this may have increased his influence among his own people. His period of office was A.D. 7-14, that of Caiaphas A.D. 17-35.—**ἐγένετο ῥῆμα**, etc., came the word of God to John; this the great spiritual event, so carefully dated, after the manner of the O. T. in narrating the beginning of the career of a Hebrew prophet (*vide*, *e.g.*, Jer. i. 1). But the date is common to the ministry of John and that of Jesus, who is supposed to have begun His work shortly after the Baptist.—**ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ**. From next verse it may be gathered that the desert here means the whole valley of the Jordan, El-Ghor.

Vv. 3-6. *John's ministry*.—Ver. 3. **ἦλθεν**. In Mt. and Mk. the people come from all quarters to John. Here John goes to the people in an itinerant ministry. The latter may apply to the early stage of his ministry. He might move about till he had attracted attention, then settle at a place convenient for baptism, and trust to the impression produced to draw the people to him.—**κηρύσσων**, etc.: here Lk. follows Mk. *verbatim*, and like him, as distinct from Mt., connects John's baptism with the forgiveness of sins, so making it in effect Christian.—Ver. 4. **βίβλῳ λόγων**: Lk. has his own way of

τρίβους αὐτοῦ. 5. πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται, καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθήσεται· καὶ ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθεῖαν,[1] καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας. 6. καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ.' 7. Ἔλεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, "Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; 8. ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀξίους[2] τῆς μετανοίας· καὶ μὴ ἄρξησθε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, Πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν Ἀβραάμ· λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι δύναται ὁ Θεὸς ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγεῖραι τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ. 9. ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται."

c Ch. xxiii. 30. (Is. xl. 4.)

10. Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι, λέγοντες, "Τί οὖν ποιήσομεν[3];" 11. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ λέγει[4] αὐτοῖς, "Ὁ ἔχων δύο χιτῶνας μεταδότω

[1] **ευθειας** in BDΞ. T.R. = ℵCLΔ many verss.

[2] **αξιους καρπους** in B. Orig. (W.H. marg.). **Most uncials as in T.R. (Tisch.).**

[3] **ποιησωμεν** in most uncials (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] **ελεγεν** in ℵBCL 1, 33, 69 *al.*

introducing the prophetic citation ("in the book of the words"), as he also follows his own course as to the words quoted. Whereas Mt. and Mk. are content to cite just so much as suffices to set forth the general idea of preparing the way of the Lord, Lk. quotes in continuation the words which describe pictorially the process of preparation (ver. 5), also those which describe the grand result: all mankind experiencing the saving grace of God (ver. 6). The universalistic bias appears here again.—Ver. 5. **φάραγξ**, a ravine, here only in N. T.—**εἰς εὐθείας**, the crooked places shall be (become) straight (ways, **ὁδοὺς**, understood)—**αἱ τραχεῖαι** (ὁδοί), the rough ways shall become smooth.

Vv. 7-9. *John's preaching* (*cf.* Mt. iii. 7-10).—Lk. gives no account of John's aspect and mode of life, leaving that to be inferred from i. 80. On the other hand he enters into more detail in regard to the drift of his preaching. These verses contain Lk.'s version of the Baptist's censure of his time.—Ver. 7. **ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις**: what Mt. represents as addressed specially to the Pharisees and Sadducees, Lk. less appropriately gives as spoken to the general crowd. Note that here, as in the other synoptists, the crowd comes to John, though in ver. 3 John goes to them.—**γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν**: on this figure *vide* Mt. Lk.'s report of the Baptist's severe words corresponds closely to Mt.'s, suggesting the use of a common source, if not of Mt. himself. The points of variation are unimportant.—Ver. 8. **καρποὺς**: instead of **καρπὸν**, perhaps to answer to the various types of reform specified in the sequel.—**ἄρξησθε** instead of **δόξητε** (*vide* on Mt.), on which Bengel's comment is: "omnem excusationis etiam conatum praecidit". While the words they are forbidden to say are the same in both accounts, perhaps the raising up children to Abraham has a wider range of meaning for the Pauline Lk. than for Mt.: sons from even the Pagan world.

Vv. 10-14. *Class counsels*, peculiar to Lk. Two samples of John's counsels to classes are here given, prefaced by a counsel applicable to all classes. The classes selected to illustrate the Baptist's social preaching are the much tempted ones: publicans and soldiers.—Ver. 10. **ἐπηρώτων**, imperfect. Such questions would be frequent, naturally suggested by the general exhortations to repentance. The preacher would probably give special illustrative counsels without being asked. Those here reported are meant to be characteristic.—**ποιήσωμεν**: subj. delib.—Ver. 11. **δύο χ.**: two, one to spare, not necessarily two on the person, one enough; severely simple ideas of life. The **χιτὼν** was the under garment, *vide* on Mt. v. 40.—**βρώματα**: the plural should perhaps not be emphasised as if implying variety and

τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι· καὶ ὁ ἔχων βρώματα ὁμοίως ποιείτω." 12. Ἦλθον δὲ καὶ τελῶναι βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν, "Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσομεν[1];" 13. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Μηδὲν πλέον παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον ὑμῖν [d] πράσσετε." 14. Ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ στρατευόμενοι, λέγοντες, "Καὶ ἡμεῖς τί ποιήσομεν[2];" Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς,[3] "Μηδένα διασείσητε, μηδὲ [e] συκοφαντήσητε· καὶ ἀρκεῖσθε τοῖς [f] ὀψωνίοις ὑμῶν."

15. Προσδοκῶντος δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ διαλογιζομένων πάντων ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, μήποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ Χριστός, 16. ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ Ἰωάννης ἅπασι λέγων,[4] "Ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν Πνεύματι

d Ch. xix. 23.
e Ch. xix. 8.
f Rom. vi. 23. 1 Cor. ix. 7. 2 Cor. xi. 8.

[1] Again ποιησωμεν in most uncials; also in ver. 14.

[2] τι ποι. και ημεις in ℵBCLΞ 1, 69.

[3] αυτοις for προς αυτους in BDLΞ 33 (W.H.).

[4] ℵBL have λεγων απασι ο I. (Tisch., W.H.).

abundance (τὰ περισσεύοντα, Grotius). The counsel is: let him that hath food give to him that hath none, so inculcating a generous, humane spirit. Here the teaching of John, as reported by Lk., touches that of Jesus, and is evangelical not legal in spirit.—Ver. 13. μηδὲν πλέον παρὰ: this mode of expressing comparison (usual in mod. Grk.) is common to Lk. and the Ep. to Heb. (i. 4, etc.), and has been used in support of the view that Lk. wrote Heb. "Non improbabilis videtur mihi eorum opinio qui Lucae eam Ep. adjudicant," Pricaeus. —πράσσετε, make in a sinister sense, exact, *exigite*, Beza. Kypke quotes Julius Pollux on the vices of the publicans, one being παρεισπράττων, *nimium exigens*, and remarks that this word could not be better explained than by the phrase in Lk., πράττων π. π. τὸ διατ.—Ver. 14. στρατευόμενοι, "soldiers on service". R. V. margin. So also Farrar. But Field disputes this rendering. "The advice seems rather to point to soldiers at home, mixing among their fellow-citizens, than to those who were on the march in an enemy's country" (*Ot. Nor.*). Schürer, whom J. Weiss follows, thinks they would be heathen.—διασείσητε: the verb (here only) means literally to shake much, here = to extort money by intimidation = *concertio* in law, Latin. This military vice would be practised on the poor.—συκοφαντήσητε: literally to inform on those who exported figs from Athens; here = to obtain money by acting as informers (against the rich).—ὀψωνίοις (ὄψον, ὠνέομαι): a late Greek word, primarily anything eaten with bread, specially fish, "kitchen"; salary paid in kind; then generally wages. *Vide* Rom. vi. 23, where the idea is the "kitchen," the best thing sin has to give is *death*.

Vv. 15-17. *Art thou the Christ?* (Mt. iii. 11, 12, Mk. i. 7, 8).—Ver. 15. προσδοκῶντος: in Mt. and Mk. John introduces the subject of the Messiah of his own accord: in Lk. in answer to popular expectation and conjecture; an intrinsically probable account, *vide* on Mt.—μήποτε, etc., whether perhaps he might not himself be the Christ; expresses very happily the popular state of mind.—Ver. 16. ἅπασι: might suggest frequent replies to various parties, uniform in tenor; but against this is the aorist ἀπεκρίνατο, which suggests a single answer given once for all, to a full assembly, a formal solemn public declaration. On the Baptist's statement in this and the following verse, *vide* on Mt.—ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί: against the idea of many commentators that the Holy Spirit and fire represent opposite effects on opposite classes—saving and punitive—Godet and Hahn press the omission of ἐν before πυρί, and take Πνεῦμα and πῦρ to be kindred = fire the emblem of the Spirit as a purifier. They are right as to the affinity but not as to the function. The function in both cases is judicial. John refers to the Holy Wind and Fire of Judgment.

Ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί· 17. οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ διακαθαριεῖ[1] τὴν ἅλωνα αὐτοῦ· καὶ συνάξει[1] τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ." 18. Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα παρακαλῶν εὐηγγελίζετο τὸν λαόν. 19. Ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης, ἐλεγχόμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ περὶ Ἡρωδιάδος τῆς γυναικὸς Φιλίππου[2] τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐποίησε πονηρῶν ὁ Ἡρώδης, 20. προσέθηκε καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσι, καὶ[3] [a] κατέκλεισε τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν τῇ[4] φυλακῇ.

[a] Acts xxvi. 10.

21. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαόν, καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου, ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν, 22. καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡσεὶ[5] περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι, λέγουσαν,[6] "Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ ηὐδόκησα." 23. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ[7] Ἰησοῦς

[1] For και διακ. (from Mt.) ℵB have διακαθαραι, also συναγαγειν for συναξει.

[2] Omit Φιλιππου ℵBDLΔΞ *al.*

[3] Omit this και ℵBDΞ b, e (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] Omit τη ℵBDLΞ.

[5] ως in ℵBDL 33.

[6] Omit λεγ. (expletive) with ℵBDL verss.

[7] ℵBL 33 omit ο.

It is, however, not impossible that Lk. read an evangelic sense into John's words.

Vv. 18-20. *Close of the Baptist's ministry and life.* Lk. gives here all he means to say about John, condensing into a single sentence the full narratives of Mt. and Mk. as to his end.—Ver. 18. **πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα**, "many things, too, different from these" (Farrar, who refers to John i. 29, 34, iii. 27-36, as illustrating the kind of utterances meant). The **εὐηγγελίζετο** following seems to justify emphasising **ἕτερα**, as pointing to a more evangelic type of utterance than those about the axe and the fan, and the wrath to come. But it may be questioned whether by such a representation the real John of history is not to a certain extent unconsciously idealised and Christianised.—**μὲν οὖν**: the **οὖν** may be taken as summarising and concluding the narrative about John and **μὲν** as answering to **δὲ** in ver. 19 = John was carrying on a useful evangelic ministry, but it was cut short; or **μενοῦν** may be taken as one word, emphasising **πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα**, and preparing for transition to what follows (Hahn).—Ver. 19. **Ἡρώδης**: the tetrarch named in ver. 1.—**περὶ πάντων**, implying that John's rebuke was not confined to the sin with Herodias. Probably not, but it was what John said on that score that cost him his head.—Ver. 20. **ἐπὶ πᾶσι**, added this also *to all* his misdeeds, and above all the crowning iniquity, and yet Lk. forbears to mention the damning sin of Herod, the beheading of the Baptist, contenting himself with noting the imprisonment. He either assumes knowledge of the horrid tale, or shrinks from it as too gruesome.—**κατέκλεισε**: instead of the infinitive; the paratactic style savours of Hebrew, and suggests a Hebrew source (Godet).

Vv. 21-22. *The baptism of Jesus* (Mt. iii. 13-17, Mk. i. 9-11).—**ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι**: the aorist ought to imply that the bulk of the people had already been baptised before Jesus appeared on the scene, *i.e.*, that John's ministry was drawing to its close (so De Wette; but *vide* Burton, *M. and T.*, p. 51, § 109, on the effect of **ἐν**).—**καὶ Ἰ. βαπτισθέντος**: so Lk. refers to the baptism of Jesus, in a participial clause, his aim not to report the fact, but what happened after it. On the different ways in which the synoptists deal with this incident, *vide* on Mt.—**προσευχομένου**: peculiar to Lk., who makes Jesus pray at all crises of His career; here specially noteworthy in connection with the theophany following: Jesus in a state of mind answering to the preternatural phenomena; subjective and objective corresponding.—**σωματικῷ εἴδει**, in bodily form, peculiar to Lk., and transforming a vision into an external event.—**Σὺ εἶ**: the voice, as in Mk., addressed to Jesus, and in the same terms.

ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος,[1] ὤν, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, υἱὸς[2] Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἡλί,[3] 24. τοῦ Ματθάτ, τοῦ Λευΐ, τοῦ Μελχί, τοῦ Ἰαννά, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, 25. τοῦ Ματταθίου, τοῦ Ἀμώς, τοῦ Ναούμ, τοῦ Ἐσλί, τοῦ Ναγγαί, 26. τοῦ Μαάθ, τοῦ Ματταθίου, τοῦ Σεμεΐ, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἰούδα, 27. τοῦ Ἰωαννᾶ, τοῦ Ῥησά, τοῦ Ζοροβάβελ, τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ, τοῦ Νηρί, 28. τοῦ Μελχί, τοῦ Ἀδδί, τοῦ Κωσάμ, τοῦ Ἐλμωδάμ, τοῦ Ἤρ, 29. τοῦ Ἰωσή, τοῦ Ἐλιέζερ, τοῦ Ἰωρείμ, τοῦ Ματθάτ, τοῦ Λευΐ,

[1] **αρχομενος** before **ωσει ε. τ.** in ℵBL 1, 33, 131, etc. The order of T.R. = that of ADΔ *al.*

[2] **υιος ως ενομ.** in ℵBL 1, 131 *al.*

[3] The spelling of many of the names in this genealogy varies in the MSS. As these variations are of little importance I let the names stand as in T.R. without remark, referring the curious to W.H. or Tisch.

Vv. 23-38. *The age of Jesus when He began His ministry, and His genealogy.*—Ver. 23. **καὶ αὐτὸς**, etc., and He, Jesus, was about thirty years of age when He *began*. The evangelist's aim obviously is to state the age at which Jesus commenced His public career.—**ἀρχόμενος** is used in a pregnant sense, *beginning* = making His beginning in that which is to be the theme of the history. There is a mental reference to **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς** in the preface, i. 1; *cf.* Acts i. 1; "all that Jesus began (ἤρξατο) both to do and to teach".—**ὡσεί**, about, nearly, implying that the date is only approximate. It cannot be used as a fixed datum for chronological purposes, nor should any importance be attached to the number thirty as the proper age at which such a career should begin. That at that age the Levites began full service, Joseph stood before Pharaoh, and David began to reign are facts, but of no significance (*vide* Farrar in C. G. T.). God's prophets appear when they get the inward call, and that may come at any time, at twenty, thirty, or forty. Inspiration is not bound by rule, custom, or tradition.

Vv. 24-38. *The genealogy.* One is surprised to find in Lk. a genealogy at all, until we reflect on his preface with its professed desire for accuracy and thoroughness, and observe the careful manner in which he dates the beginning of John's ministry. One is further surprised to find here a genealogy so utterly different from that of Mt. Did Lk. not know it, or was he dissatisfied with it? Leaving these questions on one side, we can only suppose that the evangelist in the course of his inquiries came upon this genealogy of the Saviour and resolved to give it as a contribution towards defining the fleshly relationships of Jesus, supplying here and there an editorial touch. Whether this genealogy be of Jewish-Christian, or of Pauline-Christian origin is a question on which opinion differs.

Ver. 24. **ὤν**, *being*, introducing the genealogical list, which ascends from son to father, instead of, as in Mt., descending from father to son, therefore beginning at the end and going backwards.—**ὡς ἐνομίζετο**: presumably an editorial note to guard the virgin birth. Some regard this expression with **Ἰωσήφ** following, as a parenthesis, making the genealogy in its original form run being son of Eli, etc., so that the sense, when the parenthesis is inserted, becomes: being son (as was *supposed* of Joseph but *really*) of Eli, etc., Eli being the father of *Mary*, and the genealogy being that of the mother of Jesus (Godet and others). This is ingenious but not satisfactory. As has been remarked by Hahn, if that had been Lk.'s meaning it would have been very easy for him to have made it clear by inserting **ὄντως δὲ** before **τοῦ Ἡλί**. We must therefore rest in the view that this genealogy, like that of Mt., is Joseph's, not Mary's, as it could not fail to be if Jews were concerned in its compilation.

Vv. 24-31. *From Joseph back to David.* Compared with the corresponding section of Mt.'s genealogy these differences are apparent: (1) in both sub-divisions of the section (David to captivity, captivity to Christ) there are considerably more names (20, 14), a fact intelligible enough in genealogies through different lines; (2) they start from different sons of David (Nathan,

30. τοῦ Συμεών, τοῦ Ἰούδα, τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, τοῦ Ἰωνάν, τοῦ Ἐλιακείμ, 31. τοῦ Μελεᾶ, τοῦ Μαϊνάν, τοῦ Ματταθά, τοῦ Ναθάν, τοῦ Δαβίδ, 32. τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, τοῦ Ὠβήδ, τοῦ Βοόζ, τοῦ Σαλμών, τοῦ Ναασσών, 33. τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ, τοῦ Ἀράμ, τοῦ Ἐσρώμ, τοῦ Φαρές, τοῦ Ἰούδα, 34. τοῦ Ἰακώβ, τοῦ Ἰσαάκ, τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, τοῦ Θάρα, τοῦ Ναχώρ, 35. τοῦ Σαρούχ, τοῦ Ῥαγαῦ, τοῦ Φαλέκ, τοῦ Ἔβερ, τοῦ Σαλά, 36. τοῦ Καϊνάν, τοῦ Ἀρφαξάδ, τοῦ Σήμ, τοῦ Νῶε, τοῦ Λάμεχ, 37. τοῦ Μαθουσάλα, τοῦ Ἐνώχ, τοῦ Ἰαρέδ, τοῦ Μαλελεήλ, τοῦ Καϊνάν, 38. τοῦ Ἐνώς, τοῦ Σήθ, τοῦ Ἀδάμ, τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Solomon); (3) they come together at the captivity in *Shealtiel* and *Zerubbabel;* (4) after running in separate streams from that point onwards they meet again in Joseph, who in the one is the son of Eli, in the other the son of Jacob. The puzzle is to understand how two genealogical streams so distinct in their entire course should meet at these two points. The earlier coincidence is accounted for by harmonists by the hypothesis of *adoption* (Jeconiah adopts Shealtiel, Shealtiel adopts Zerubbabel), the later by the hypothesis of a *Levirate marriage*. *Vide Excursus* ii. in Farrar's work on Luke (C. G. T.). These solutions satisfy some. Others maintain that they do not meet the difficulties, and that we must be content to see in the two catalogues genealogical attempts which cannot be harmonised, or at least have not yet been.

Vv. 32-34a. *From David back to Abraham.* The lists of Mt. and Lk. in this part correspond, both being taken, as far as Pharez, from Ruth iv. 18-22.

Vv. 34b-38. *From Abraham to Adam.* Peculiar to Lk., taken from Gen. xi. 12-26, v. 7-32, as given in the Sept., whence Canaan in ver. 36 (instead of שֶׁלַח in Gen. xi. 12, in Heb.). It is probable that this part of the genealogy has been added by Lk., and that his interest in it is twofold: (1) *universalistic:* revealed by running back the genealogy of Jesus to *Adam*, the father of the *human race;* (2) the desire to give emphasis to the Divine origin of Jesus, revealed by the final link in the chain: Adam (son) of God. Adam's sonship is conceived of as something unique, inasmuch as, like Jesus, he owed his being, not to a human parent, but to the immediate causality of God. By this extension of the genealogy beyond Abraham, and even beyond Adam up to God, the evangelist has deprived it of all vital significance for the original purpose of such tables: to vindicate the Messianic claims of Jesus by showing Him to be the son of David. The Davidic sonship, it is true, remains, but it cannot be vital to the Messiahship of One who is, in the sense of the Gospel, Son of God. It becomes like the moon when the sun is shining. Lk. was probably aware of this.

This genealogy contains none of those features (references to women, etc.) which lend ethical interest to Mt.'s.

CHAPTER IV. THE TEMPTATION AND BEGINNINGS OF THE MINISTRY.—Vv. 1-13. *The Temptation* (Mt. iv. 1-11, Mk. i. 12-13). Lk.'s account of the temptation resembles Mt.'s so closely as to suggest a common source. Yet there are points of difference of which a not improbable explanation is editorial solicitude to prevent wrong impressions, and ensure edification in connection with perusal of a narrative relating to a delicate subject: the temptation of the Holy Jesus by the unholy adversary. This solicitude might of course have stamped itself on the source Lk. uses, but it seems preferable to ascribe it to himself.

Ver. 1. **δέ**: introducing a new theme, closely connected, however, with the baptism, as appears from **ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου**, the genealogy being treated as a parenthesis.—**πλήρης Πνεύματος Ἁ.**, *full* of the Spirit, who descended upon Him at the Jordan, and conceived of as abiding on Him and in Him. This phrase is adopted by Lk. to exclude the possibility of evil thoughts in Jesus: no *room* for them; first example of such editorial solicitude.—**ὑπέστρεψεν ἀ. τ. Ἰ.** Hahn takes this as meaning that Jesus left the Jordan with the intention of returning immediately to Galilee, so that His retirement into the desert was the result of a change of purpose brought about by the influence of the Spirit.

IV. 1. ᾿ΙΗΣΟΥΣ δὲ Πνεύματος ῾Αγίου πλήρης[1] ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ᾿Ιορδάνου· καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι εἰς τὴν ἔρημον[2] 2. ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις· καὶ συντελεσθεισῶν αὐτῶν, ὕστερον[3] ἐπείνασε. 3. καὶ εἶπεν[4] αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος, "Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰπὲ τῷ λίθῳ τούτῳ ἵνα γένηται ἄρτος." 4. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ᾿Ιησοῦς πρὸς αὐτόν, λέγων,[5] "Γέγραπται, '῞Οτι οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι Θεοῦ.'"[6] 5. Καὶ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν[7] ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου· 6. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος, "Σοὶ δώσω τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν· ὅτι

[1] **πληρης** before Πν. Αγ. in ℵBDLΞ 1, 33 sah. cop. (Tisch., Trg., W.H.).
[2] **εν τη ερημω** in ℵBDL vet. Lat. (Tisch., W.H.).
[3] ℵBDL vet. Lat. omit. [4] **ειπεν δε** in ℵBDL 1, 33. [5] ℵBL omit **λεγων**.
[6] **αλλ . . . θεου** omitted in ℵBL sah. cop. (Tisch., W.H.).
[7] **ο διαβ. . . . υψηλον** omitted in ℵBDL 1 *al.* (from Mt.).

The words do not in themselves convey this sense, and the idea is intrinsically unlikely. Retirement for reflection after the baptism was likely to be the first impulse of Jesus. *Vide* on Mt.—**ἤγετο**: imperfect, implying a continuous process. —**ἐν τῷ Πν.**, *in* the spirit, suggesting voluntary movement, and excluding the idea of compulsory action of the Spirit on an unwilling subject that might be suggested by the phrases of Mt. and Mk. *Vide* notes there.—**ἐν τῇ ἐρ.**: this reading is more suitable to the continued movement implied in **ἤγετο** than **εἰς τὴν ἐ.** of T.R.—Ver. 2. **ἡμέρας τεσσ.**: this is to be taken along with **ἤγετο**. Jesus wandered about in the desert all that time; the wandering the external index of the absorbing meditation within (Godet).—**πειραζόμενος**: Lk. refers to the temptation participially, as a mere incident of that forty days' experience, in marked contrast to Mt., who represents temptation as the *aim* of the retirement (**πειρασθῆναι**); again guarding against wrong impressions, yet at the same time true to the fact. The present tense of the participle implies that temptation, though incidental, was continuous, going on with increasing intensity all the time.—**οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν** implies absolute abstinence, suggestive of intense preoccupation. There was nothing there to eat, but also no inclination on the part of Jesus.

Vv. 3-4. *First temptation.*—**τῷ λίθῳ τ.**: possibly the stone bore a certain resemblance to a loaf. *Vide* Farrar's note (C. G. T.), in which reference is made to Stanley's account (*Sinai and Palestine*, p. 154) of "Elijah's melons" found on Mount Carmel, as a sample of the crystallisations found in limestone formations.—Ver. 4. **καὶ ἀπεκρίθη**, etc.: the answer of Jesus as given by Lk., according to the reading of ℵBL, was limited to the first part of the oracle: man shall not live by bread only; naturally suggesting a contrast between physical bread and the higher food of the soul on which Jesus had been feeding (J. Weiss in Meyer).

Vv. 5-8. *Second temptation.* Mt.'s third.—**καὶ ἀναγαγὼν**, without the added **εἰς ὄρος ὑψ.** of T.R., is an expression Lk. might very well use to obviate the objection: where is the mountain so high that from its summit you could see the whole earth? He might prefer to leave the matter vague = taking Him up who knows how high!—**τῆς οἰκουμένης**: for Mt.'s **τοῦ κόσμου**, as in ii. 1.—**ἐν στιγμῇ χ.**, in a point or moment of time (**στιγμὴ** from **στίζω**, to prick, whence **στίγματα**, Gal. vi. 17, here only in N. T.).—Ver. 6. **ἐξουσίαν**, authority. *Vide* Acts i. 7, 8, where this word and **δύναμιν** occur, the one signifying authority, the other spiritual *power*. —**ὅτι ἐμοί**, etc.: this clause, not in Mt., is probably another instance of Lk.'s editorial solicitude; added to guard against the notion of a rival God with independent possessions and power.

ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν· 7. σὺ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιόν μου, ἔσται σου πάντα."[1] 8. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ[2] γέγραπται γάρ,[3] 'Προσκυνήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου,[4] καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.'" 9. Καὶ ἤγαγεν[5] αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Εἰ ὁ[6] υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω· 10. γέγραπται γάρ, 'Ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ, τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε· 11. καὶ ὅτι ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀροῦσί σε, μήποτε προσκόψῃς πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου.'" 12. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅτι εἴρηται, 'Οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου.'" 13. Καὶ συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμὸν ὁ διάβολος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἄχρι καιροῦ.

14. ΚΑΙ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ Πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθε καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ. 15. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδίδασκεν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, δοξαζό-

[1] **πασα** in ℵABDLΔΞ.

[2] **υπαγε . . . Σατ.** omitted in ℵBDLΞ 1, 33 *al.* (from Mt.).

[3] **γαρ** omitted by the same authorities.

[4] ℵBDL *al.* have **Κυρ. τον θ. σ. προσκ.** (W.H.).

[5] **ηγαγεν δε** in ℵBLΞ, which also omit **αυτον** after **εστησεν**.

[6] Omit **ο** ℵABDLΔΞ.

From the Jewish point of view, it is true, Satan might quite well say this (J. Weiss-Meyer).—Ver. 7. **σὺ**, emphatic; Satan hopes that Jesus has been dazzled by the splendid prospect and promise: Thou—all Thine (**ἔσται σοῦ πᾶσα**).—Ver. 8. **ὕπαγε Σατανᾶ** is no part of the true text, imported from Mt.; suitable there, not here, as there is another tempt. to follow.

Vv. 9-13. *Third temptation.* Mt.'s second.—**Ἱερουσαλήμ**, instead of Mt.'s **ἁγίαν πόλιν**.—**ἐντεῦθεν**, added by Lk., helping to bring out the situation, suggesting the plunge down from the giddy height.—Vv. 10 and 11 give Satan's quotation much as in Mt., with **τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε** added from the Psalm.—Ver. 12 gives Christ's reply exactly as in Mt. The nature of this reply probably explains the inversion of the order of the second and third temptations in Lk. The evangelist judged it fitting that this should be the last word, construing it as an interdict against tempting *Jesus* the *Lord*. Lk.'s version of the temptation is characterised throughout by careful restriction of the devil's power (*vide* vv. 1 and 6). The inversion of the last two temptations is due to the same cause. The old idea of Schleiermacher that the way to Jerusalem lay over the mountains is paltry. It is to be noted that Mt.'s connecting particles (**τότε, πάλιν**) imply sequence more than Lk.'s (**καὶ, δὲ**). On the general import of the temptation *vide* on Mt.—Ver. 13. **πάντα π.**, every kind of temptation.—**ἄχρι καιροῦ**: implying that the same sort of temptations recurred in the experience of Jesus.

Vv. 14-15. *Return to Galilee* (*cf.* Mk. i. 14, 28, 39).—Ver. 14. **ὑπέστρεψεν**, as in ver. 1, frequently used by Lk.—**ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τ. Π.**, in the power of the Spirit; still as full of the Spirit as at the baptism. Spiritual power not weakened by temptation, rather strengthened: *post victoriam corroboratus*, Bengel.—**φήμη** (here and in Mt. ix. 26), report, caused by the exercise of the **δύναμις**, implying a ministry of which no details are here given (so Schanz, Godet, J. Weiss, etc.). Meyer thinks of the fame of the Man who had been baptised with remarkable accompaniments; Hahn of the altered transfigured appearance of Jesus.—Ver. 15. **ἐδίδασκεν**: summary reference to Christ's preaching ministry in the Galilean synagogues.—**αὐτῶν** refers to **Γαλιλαίαν**, ver. 14, and means the

μενος ὑπὸ πάντων. 16. καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ναζαρέτ,[1] οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος[2]· καὶ εἰσῆλθε κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων, εἰς τὴν συναγωγήν, καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι. 17. καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου[3]· καὶ ἀναπτύξας[4] τὸ βιβλίον, εὗρε τὸν[5] τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον, 18. "Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ· οὗ ἕνεκεν ἔχρισέ με εὐαγγελίζεσθαι[6] πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέ με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν[7] κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν, καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν· ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει·

[1] εις Ναζαρ. without την ℵBDLΞ.

[2] ℵLΞ minusc. have ανατεθ. (Tisch., W.H., marg.).

[3] του προφ. Ησ. in ℵBLΞ 33, 69.

[4] So in ℵDΔ *al.* (Tisch.); ανοιξας in BLΞ 33 (W.H.).

[5] Omit τον ℵLΞ 33 (W.H. bracket).

[6] ευαγγελισασθαι in ℵBDLΔΞ *al.* T.R. in minusc.

[7] ιασασθαι . . . καρδιαν omit ℵBDLΞ 13, 33, 69 (Tisch., Trg., W.H.).

Galileans; construction *ad sensum*.—**δοξαζόμενος**: equally summary statement of the result—general admiration. Lk. is hurrying on to the following story, which, though not the first incident in the Galilean ministry (vv. 14 and 15 imply the contrary), is the first he wishes to narrate in detail. He wishes it to serve as the frontispiece of his Gospel, as if to say: *ex primo disce omnia*. The historic interest in exact sequence is here subordinated to the religious interest in impressive presentation; quite legitimate, due warning being given.

Vv. 16-30. *Jesus in Nazareth* (Mt. xiii. 53-58, Mk. vi. 1-6a). Though Lk. uses an editorial discretion in the *placing* of this beautiful story, there need be no suspicion as to the historicity of its main features. The visit of Jesus to His native town, which had a secure place in the common tradition, would be sure to interest Lk. and create desire for further information, which might readily be obtainable from surviving Nazareans, who had been present, even from the brethren of Jesus. We may therefore seek in this frontispiece (*Programmstück*, J. Weiss) authentic reminiscences of a synagogue address of Jesus.

Vv. 16-21. **κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς**: the reference most probably is, not to the custom of Jesus as a boy during His private life, but to what He had been doing since He began His ministry. He used the synagogue as one of His chief opportunities. (So J. Weiss and Hahn against Bengel, Meyer, Godet, etc.) That Jesus attended the synagogue as a boy and youth goes without saying.—**ἀνέστη**, stood up, the usual attitude in reading ("both sitting and standing were allowed at the reading of the Book of Esther," Schürer, Div. II., vol. ii., p. 79); either as requested by the president or of His own accord, as a now well-known teacher.—Ver. 17. **Ἡσαΐου**: the second lesson, *Haphtarah*, was from the prophets; the first, *Parashah*, from the Law, which was foremost in Rabbinical esteem. Not so in the mind of Jesus. The prophets had the first place in His thoughts, though without prejudice to the Law. No more congenial book than Isaiah (second part especially) could have been placed in His hand. Within the Law He seems to have specially loved Deuteronomy, prophetic in spirit (vide *the temptation*).—**εὗρε τόπον**: by choice, or in due course, uncertain which; does not greatly matter. The choice would be characteristic, the order of the day providential as giving Jesus just the text He would delight to speak from. The Law was read continuously, the prophets by free selection (Holtz., H. C.).—Vv. 18, 19 contain the text, Isaiah lxi. 1, 2, free reproduction of the Sept., which freely reproduces the Hebrew, which probably was first read, then turned into Aramaean, then preached on by Jesus, that day. It may have been read from an Aramaean version. Most notable in the quotation is the point at which it stops. In Isaiah after the "acceptable year" comes the "day of vengeance". The clause referring to

19. κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν Κυρίου δεκτόν.' 20. Καὶ πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον, ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ, ἐκάθισε· καὶ πάντων ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ[1] ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ. 21. Ἤρξατο δὲ λέγειν πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ὅτι σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν." 22. Καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος, τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον, "Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ[2];" 23. Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, Ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν· ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα ἐν τῇ Καπερναούμ,[3] ποίησον καὶ ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου."

24. Εἶπε δέ, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης δεκτός ἐστιν

[1] οι οφ. before εν τη συν. in ℵBL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] ουχι υιος εστιν l. ουτος in ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] εις την Κ. in ℵBDL.

the latter is omitted.—ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει (ver. 19) is imported (by Lk. probably) from Is. lviii. 6, the aim being to make the text in all respects a programme for the ministry of Jesus. Along with that, in the mind of the evangelist, goes the translation of all the categories named—poor, broken-hearted, captives, blind, bruised—from the political to the spiritual sphere. Legitimately, for that was involved in the declaration that the prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus.—Ver. 20. πτύξας, folding, ἀναπτύξας in ver. 17 (T.R.) = unfolding.—ὑπηρέτῃ, the officer of the synagogue; *cf.* the use of the word in Acts xiii. 5.—ἀτενίζοντες, looking attentively (ἀτενής, intent, from α and τείνω), often in Acts, *vide*, *e.g.*, xiii. 9.—Ver. 21. ἤρξατο: we may take what follows either as the gist of the discourse, the theme (De Wette, Godet, Hahn), or as the very words of the opening sentence (Grotius, Bengel, Meyer, Farrar). Such a direct arresting announcement would be true to the manner of Jesus.

Vv. 22-30. *The sequel.*—Ver. 22. ἐμαρτύρουν α., bore witness to Him, not = δοξαζόμενος in ver. 15; the confession was extorted from them by Christ's undeniable power.—ἐθαύμαζον, not, *admired*, but, were surprised at (Hahn).—λόγοις τῆς χάριτος, *words of grace*. Most take χάρις here not in the Pauline sense, but as denoting attractiveness in speech (German, *Anmuth*), *suavitas sermonis* (Kypke, with examples from Greek authors, while admitting that χάριτος may be an objective genitive, "sermo de rebus suavibus et laetis"). In view of the text on which Jesus preached, and the fact that the Nazareth incident occupies the place of a frontispiece in the Gospel, the religious Pauline sense of χάρις is probably the right one = words about the grace of God whereby the prophetic oracle read was fulfilled. J. Weiss (in Meyer), while taking χάρις = grace of manner, admits that Lk. may have meant it in the other sense, as in Acts xiv. 3, xx. 24. Words of grace, about grace: such was Christ's speech, then and always—that is Lk.'s idea.—οὐχὶ υἱός, etc.: this fact, familiarity, neutralised the effect of all, grace of manner and the gracious message. *Cf.* Mt. xiii. 55, Mk. vi. 3.—Ver. 23. πάντως, doubtless, of course—παραβολὴν = Hebrew *mashal*, including *proverbs* as well as what we call "parables". A proverb in this case.—Ἰατρέ, etc.: the verbal meaning is plain, the point of the parable not so plain, though what follows seems to indicate it distinctly enough = do here, *among us*, what you have, as we hear, done in Capernaum. This would not exactly amount to a physician healing himself. We must be content with the general idea: every sensible benefactor begins in his immediate surroundings. There is probably a touch of scepticism in the words = we will not believe the reports of your great deeds, unless you do such things here (Hahn). For similar proverbs in other tongues, *vide* Grotius and Wetstein. The reference to things done in Capernaum implies an antecedent ministry there.—Ver. 24. Ἀμὴν: solemnly in-

ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ. 25. ἐπ' ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, πολλαὶ χῆραι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἠλίου ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτε ἐκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ[1] ἔτη τρία καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν· 26. καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέμφθη Ἠλίας, εἰ μὴ εἰς Σάρεπτα τῆς Σιδῶνος[2] πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν. 27. καὶ πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐπὶ Ἐλισσαίου τοῦ προφήτου ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ[3]· καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη, εἰ μὴ Νεεμὰν ὁ Σύρος." 28. Καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ, ἀκούοντες ταῦτα, 29. καὶ ἀναστάντες ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἕως τῆς[4] ὀφρύος τοῦ ὄρους, ἐφ' οὗ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν ᾠκοδόμητο,[5] εἰς τὸ[6] [a] κατακρημνίσαι αὐτόν· 30. αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο.

[a] here only in N. T.

31. ΚΑΙ κατῆλθεν εἰς Καπερναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας· καὶ ἦν

[1] επι, found in ℵCLΔ *al.* (Tisch.), is wanting in BD (W.H. text, επι marg.).

[2] Σιδωνιας in ℵBCDL 1, 13, 69, 131 *al.*

[3] εν τω Ισ. before επι Ελ. in ℵBCDL 1, 13, 33, 69 *al.*

[4] Omit της ℵABCLΔ *al.*

[5] ῳκοδομητο αυτων in ℵBDL 33, altered into the more usual order in T.R.

[6] ωστε for εις το in ℵBDL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

troducing another proverb given in Mt. and Mk. (xiii. 57, vi. 4) in slightly varied form.—**δεκτός** (*vide* ver. 19, also Acts x. 35), acceptable, a Pauline word (2 Cor. vi. 2, Phil. iv. 18).—Ver. 25. This verse begins, like ver. 24, with a solemn asseveration. It contains the proper answer to ver. 23. It has been suggested (J. Weiss) that vv. 22 and 24 have been interpolated from Mk. vi. 1-6 in the source Lk. here used.—**ἔτη τρία κ. μ. ἕξ**, three years and six months. The reference is to 1 Kings xvii. 1, xviii. 1, where three years are mentioned. The recurrence of the same number, three and a half years, in James v. 17 seems to point to a traditional estimate of the period of drought, three and a half, the half of seven, the number symbolic of *misfortune* (Daniel xii. 7).—Ver. 26. **Σάρεπτα**, a village lying between Tyre and Sidon = modern *Surafend*.—Ver. 27. **ὁ Σύρος**. Naaman and the widow of Sarepta both Gentiles: these references savouring of universalism were welcome to Lk., but there is no reason to suspect that he put them into Christ's mouth. Jesus might have so spoken (*vide* Mt. viii. 11).—Vv. 28-29. Unsympathetic from the first, the Nazareans, stung by these O. T. references, become indignant. *Pagans*, not to speak of Capernaum people, better than we: away with Him! out of the synagogue, nay, out of the town (**ἔξω τῆς πόλεως**).—**ἕως ὀφρύος τ. ὄ.**, etc., to the eyebrow (*supercilium*, here only in N. T.) of the hill on which the city was built, implying an elevated point but not necessarily the highest ridge. Kypke remarks: "non summum montis cacumen, sed minor aliquis *tumulus* sive *clivus* intelligitur, qui cum monte cohaeret, metaphora a superciliis oculorum desumta, quae in fronte quidem eminent, ipso tamen vertice inferiora sunt". Nazareth now lies in a cup, built close up to the hill surrounding. Perhaps then it went further up.—**ὥστε** (**εἰς τὸ**, T.R.) with infinitive indicating intention and tendency, happily not result.—Ver. 30. **αὐτὸς δὲ**, but *He*, emphatic, suggesting a contrast: they infuriated, He calm and self-possessed. —**διελθὼν**: no miracle intended, but only the marvel of the power always exerted by a tranquil spirit and firm will over human passions.

Vv. 31-37. *In Capernaum; the demoniac* (Mk. i. 21-28).—**κατῆλθεν εἰς Κ.** He went down from *Nazareth*, not from *heaven*, as suggested in Marcion's Gospel, which began here: "Anno quintodecimo principatus Tiberiani Deum descendisse in civitatem Galilaeae Capharnaum," Tertull. c. Marc. iv. 7.—**πόλιν τ. Γ.**: circumstantially described

διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασι. 32. καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ. 33. Καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου, καὶ ἀνέκραξε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ. 34. λέγων.[1] "Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ." 35. Καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων, "Φιμώθητι, καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ[2] αὐτοῦ." Καὶ ῥίψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν. 36. καὶ ἐγένετο [b] θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας, καὶ συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, λέγοντες, "Τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασι, καὶ ἐξέρχονται;" 37. Καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο ἦχος περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου.

b Ch. v. 9. Acts iii. 10.

38. Ἀναστὰς δὲ ἐκ[3] τῆς συναγωγῆς, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος· ἡ[4] πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ· καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς. 39. καὶ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς, ἐπετίμησε τῷ πυρετῷ, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν· παραχρῆμα δὲ ἀναστᾶσα διηκόνει αὐτοῖς.

40. Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου, πάντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις

[1] Omit λεγων ℵBLΞ cop. Orig.
[2] απ in ℵBDLΞ minusc.
[3] απο in ℵBCDLΞ 33 *al.*
[4] Omit η ℵABDLΞ.

as it is the first mention in Lk.'s own narrative. Yet the description is vague, as if by one far off, for readers in the same position. No mention here of the lake (*vide* v. 1).—Ver. 32. **ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ**, no reference to the scribes by way of contrast, as in Mk., whereby the characterisation loses much of its point.—Ver. 33. **φωνῇ μεγάλῃ**, added by Lk.: in Lk.'s narratives of cures two tendencies appear—(1) to magnify the *power* displayed, and (2) to emphasise the *benevolence*. Neither of these is conspicuous in this narrative, though this phrase and **ῥίψαν**, and **μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν** in ver. 35, look in the direction of (1).—Ver. 34. **ἔα**: here only (not genuine in Mk., T.R.) in N. T. = ha! Vulg., *sine* as if from **ἐᾷν**; a cry of horror.—**Ναζαρηνέ**: Lk. usually writes **Ναζωραῖε**. The use of this form here suggests that he has Mk.'s account lying before him.—Ver. 35. **μηδὲν** before **βλάψαν** implies expectation of a contrary result.—Ver. 36. **ὁ λόγος οὗτος** refers either to the commanding *word* of Jesus, followed by such astounding results ("quid est hoc verbum?" Vulg.), or = what is this *thing?* what a surprising affair! ("quid hoc rei est?" Beza, and after him Grotius, De Wette, etc.). In either case Lk.'s version at this point is altogether secondary and colourless as compared with Mk.'s, *q.v.*—Ver. 37. **ἦχος** (**ἀκοή**, Mk.), a sound, report; again in xxi. 25, Acts ii. 2 = **ἠχώ** in classics.

Vv. 38, 39. *Peter's mother-in-law* (Mt. viii. 14, 15, Mk. i. 29-31).—**Σίμωνος**: another anticipation. In Mk. the call of Peter and others to discipleship has been previously narrated. One wonders that Lk. does not follow his example in view of his preface, where the apostles are called eye-witnesses, **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς**.—**ἦν συνεχομένη**, etc.: Lk'.s desire to magnify the *power* comes clearly out here. "The analytic imperfect implies that the fever was chronic, and the verb that it was severe," Farrar (C. G. T.). Then he calls it a *great* fever: whether using a *technical term* (fevers classed by physicians as great and small), as many think, or otherwise, as some incline to believe (Hahn, Godet, etc.), in either case taking pains to exclude the idea of a minor feverish attack.—Ver. 39. **παραχρῆμα**, immediately, another word having the same aim: cured at *once*, and perfectly; able to serve.

Vv. 40, 41. *Sabbath evening cures* (Mt. viii. 16, 17, Mk. i. 32-34).—**δύνοντος τ. ἡ.**: Lk. selects the more important part of Mk.'s dual definition of time.

ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθεὶς[1] ἐθεράπευσεν[2] αὐτούς. 41. ἐξήρχετο[3] δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν, κράζοντα[4] καὶ λέγοντα, "Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς[5] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ." Καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἴα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. 42. Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον τόπον, καὶ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐζήτουν[6] αὐτόν, καὶ ἦλθον ἕως αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν. 43. ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ὅτι καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὅτι εἰς[7] τοῦτο ἀπέσταλμαι."[8] 44. Καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς[9] τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

[1] επιτιθεις in BDΞ *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] εθεραπευεν in BD (Tisch., W.H., text).

[3] εξηρχοντο in ℵCX 1, 33 (Tisch., W.H., marg.). BD have the sing. (W.H. text).

[4] So in many MSS. (ℵBCL, etc.). D has κραυγαζοντα (Tisch.).

[5] Omit ο Χριστος ℵBCDLΞ 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] επεζητουν in very many uncials (ℵBCDL, etc.).

[7] επι in ℵBL.

[8] απεσταλην in ℵBCDL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[9] εις τας συναγωγας in ℵBD.

With sunset the Sabbath closed. **δύνοντος** is present participle of the late form **δύνω = δύω.—ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ**: laying His hands *on each one*, a touch peculiar to Lk., pointing, Godet thinks, to a separate source at Lk.'s command; much more certainly to Lk.'s desire to make prominent the *benevolent sympathy* of Jesus. Jesus did not heal *en masse*, but one by one, tender sympathy going out from Him in each case. Intrinsically probable, and worth noting. This trait in Lk. is in its own way as valuable as Mt.'s citation from Isaiah (viii. 17), and serves the same purpose.—Ver. 41. **λέγοντα ὅτι**, etc.: Lk. alone notes that the demons, in leaving their victims, bore witness in a despairing cry to the Divine Sonship of Jesus. God's power in this Man, our power doomed. Again a tribute to the miraculous might of Jesus.

Vv. 42-44. *Withdrawal from Capernaum* (Mk. i. 35-39).—**γενομένης ἡμέρας**, when it was day, *i.e.*, when people were up and could see Jesus' movements, and accordingly followed Him. In Mk. Jesus departed very early before dawn, when all would be in bed; a kind of *flight*.—**οἱ ὄχλοι**: in Mk. Simon and those with him, other disciples. But of disciples Lk. as yet knows nothing.—**ἕως αὐτοῦ**, to the place where He was. From the direction in which they had seen Him depart they had no difficulty in finding Him.—**κατεῖχον**, they held Him back, from doing what He seemed inclined to do, *i.e.*, from leaving them, with some of their sick still unhealed.—Ver. 43. **ὅτι καὶ**: the purpose of Jesus is the same in Lk. as in Mk., but differently expressed, in fuller, more developed terms, to preach the good news of the Kingdom of God. Of course all must hear the news; they could not gainsay that.—**ἀπεστάλην**, I was sent, referring to His Divine mission; in place of Mk.'s **ἐξῆλθον**, referring to the purpose of Jesus in leaving Capernaum. Lk.'s version, compared with Mk.'s, is secondary, and in a different tone. Mk.'s *realism* is replaced by *decorum*: what it is fitting to make Jesus do and say. Flight eliminated, and a reference to His Divine mission substituted for an apology for flight. *Vide* notes on Mk.

CHAPTER V. THE CALL OF PETER. THE LEPER. THE PALSIED MAN. THE CALL OF LEVI. FASTING.—Vv. 1-11. *The call of Peter*. This narrative, brought in later than the corresponding one in Mk., assumes larger dimensions and an altered character. Peter comes to the front, and the other three named

a here only in same sense in N. T.

V. 1. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον [a] ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ τοῦ[1] ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἑστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ· 2. καὶ εἶδε δύο πλοῖα[2] ἑστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην· οἱ δὲ ἁλιεῖς ἀποβάντες ἀπ' αὐτῶν[3] ἀπέπλυναν[4] τὰ δίκτυα. 3. ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων, ὃ ἦν τοῦ[5] Σίμωνος, ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπαναγαγεῖν ὀλίγον· καὶ καθίσας[6] ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου[7] τοὺς ὄχλους. 4. Ὡς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα, "Ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ [b] βάθος, καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν." 5. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ[8] Σίμων εἶπεν αὐτῷ,[9] "Ἐπιστάτα, δι' ὅλης τῆς[10] νυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματί

b here only in same sense in N. T.

[1] και for του in ℵABL 1, 131.

[2] B has πλοια δυο (W.H. text). ℵCL 33 *al.* min. have πλοιαρια (Tisch., W.H., marg.).

[3] απ αυτων αποβαντες in BCDL 33.

[4] επλυναν (-ον) in ℵBCDL.

[5] Omit του ℵBDL.

[6] καθισας δε in ℵBL.

[7] εκ τ. πλ. εδιδασκεν in B (W.H.). ℵD have εν τ. πλ. also before εδιδ. (Tisch.).

[8] Omit ο BLΔ.

[9] Omit αυτω ℵBC, e, cop.

[10] Omit της ℵABL 33.

in Mk., James, John and Andrew, retire into the shade; the last-named, indeed, does not appear in the picture at all. This, doubtless, reflects the relative positions of the four disciples in the public eye in the writer's time, and in the circle for which he wrote. The interest gathered mainly about Peter: Christian people wanted to be told about him, specially about how he became a disciple. That interest had been felt before Lk. wrote, hence the tradition about his call grew ever richer in contents, till it became a lengthy, edifying story. Lk. gives it as he found it. Some think he mixes up the call with the later story told in John xxi. 1-8, and not a few critics find in his account a symbolic representation of Peter's apostolic experience as narrated in the book of Acts. Such mixture and symbolism, if present, had probably found their way into the history before it came into Lk.'s hands. He gives it *bonâ fide* as the narrative of a real occurrence, which it may quite well be.

Vv. 1-7. **ἐπικεῖσθαι.** In Mt. and Mk. (iv. 18, i. 16) the call of the four disciples took place when Jesus was walking alone. Here Jesus is surrounded by a crowd who pressed upon Him.—**καὶ ἀκούειν**, etc., and were hearing the word of God. The crowd, and their eagerness to hear the word of God (phraseology here secondary), serve in the narrative to explain the need of disciples (so Schanz and Hahn).—**παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γ.** The position of Jesus in speaking to the crowd was on the margin of the lake; called by Lk. alone λίμνη.—Ver. 2. **ἑστῶτα**: two boats *standing* by the lake, not necessarily drawn up on shore, but close to land, so that one on shore could enter them. They had just come in from the fishing, and were without occupants, their owners having come on shore to clean their nets.—Ver. 3. **ἐμβὰς**: this action of Jesus would be noticed of course, and would bring the owner to His side. It was *Simon's* boat, the man whose mother-in-law, in Lk.'s narrative, had been healed of fever.—**ἐπαναγαγεῖν**, to put out to sea, here and in ver. 4 and Mt. xxi. 18 only.—**ὀλίγον**: just far enough to give command of the audience.—**ἐδίδασκεν**: this teaching from a boat took place again on the day of the parables (Mt. xiii. 2, Mk. iv. 1). But that feature does not appear in the corresponding narrative of Lk. (viii. 4). Did Peter's call attract that feature from the later occasion in the tradition which Lk. followed?—Ver. 4. **εἰς τὸ βάθος**, into the deep sea, naturally to be found in the centre, inside the shelving bottom stretching inwards from the shore.—**χαλάσατε**, plural, after **ἐπανάγαγε**, singular; the latter addressed to Peter as the master, the former denoting an act in which all in the boat would assist. Bornemann (*Scholia*) gives instances of similar usage in classics.—**ἄγραν**, here and in ver. 9 only, in N. T.; in the first place may be

σου χαλάσω τὸ δίκτυον." [1] 6. Καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσαντες, συνέκλεισαν ἰχθύων πλῆθος [2] πολύ· διερρήγνυτο δὲ τὸ δίκτυον [3] αὐτῶν, 7. καὶ κατένευσαν τοῖς [c] μετόχοις τοῖς [4] ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ, τοῦ ἐλθόντας συλλαβέσθαι αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἦλθον, καὶ ἔπλησαν ἀμφότερα τὰ πλοῖα, ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά. 8. ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος προσέπεσε τοῖς γόνασι τοῦ [5] Ἰησοῦ, λέγων, "Ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, Κύριε." 9. Θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ, ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων ᾗ [6] συνέλαβον· 10. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, οἳ ἦσαν κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι. Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα ὁ [7] Ἰησοῦς, "Μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν." 11. Καὶ καταγαγόντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἀφέντες ἅπαντα, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.

c here and several times in Heb. (i. 9, etc.).

[1] τα δικτυα in ℵBDL. [2] πληθος ιχθυων in ℵABCL. T.R. = D.

[3] ℵBL have διερησσετο, and ℵBDL τα δικτυα (Tisch., W.H., adopt both).

[4] Omit τοις ℵBDL. [5] ℵB *al.* omit του.

[6] ων in BD instead of η (in ℵCL). [7] Omit ο BL.

used actively = for taking, in the second, passively = for a take. But the latter sense might suit both places. If so used here the word implies a promise (Hahn).—Ver. 5. ἐπιστάτα: Lk.'s name for Jesus as Master, six times; a Greek term for Gentile readers instead of Rabbi = (1) *Master*, then (2) Teacher, "qui enim magistri doctrinae erant, ii magistri simul vitae esse solebant," Kypke.—ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί σου, at Thy word or bidding. Success was doubly improbable: it was *day*, and in *deep water;* fish were got at night, and near shore. The order, contrary to probability, tempts to symbolic interpretation: the deep sea the Gentile world; Peter's indirect objection symbol of his reluctance to enter on the Gentile mission, overcome by a special revelation (Acts x.). So Holtz., H. C.—Ver. 6. διερήσσετο, began to break, or were on the point of breaking; on the symbolic theory = the threatened rupture of unity though the success of the Gentile mission (Acts xv.).—Ver. 7. κατένευσαν, they made signs, beckoned, here only in N. T. (ἐνένευον, i. 62); too far to speak perhaps, but fishers would be accustomed to communicate by signs to preserve needful stillness (Schanz).—συλλαβέσθαι αὐτοῖς: this verb with dative occurs in Phil. iv. 3 = to help one.—ὥστε, with infinitive = tendency here, not result.—βυθίζεσθαι, to sink in the deep (βυθός), here only in O. or N. T. in reference to a ship; in 1 Tim. vi. 9 in reference to rich men.

Vv. 8-11. *Sequel of the miracle.*—Ver. 8. Πέτρος: here for first time introduced without explanation, presumably in connection with the great crisis in his history.—ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός: a natural exclamation especially for an impulsive nature in the circumstances. But the utterance, though real, might have been passed over in the tradition. Why so carefully recorded by Lk.? Perhaps because it was a fitting thing for any man to say on becoming a disciple of the Holy Jesus—the sin of the disciple a foil to the holiness of the Master. Also to supply a justification for the statement in ver. 32, "I came not to call," etc. In this connection sin is ascribed to all the apostles when called, in very exaggerated terms in Ep. Barnab., v. 9 (ὄντας ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν ἀνομωτέρους). — Ver. 10. Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην, dependent on περιέσχεν: fear encompassed them also, not less than Peter and the rest. This special mention of them is not explained, unless inferentially in what follows.—μὴ φοβοῦ, fear not, addressed to Peter alone. He alone, *so far as appears*, is to become a fisher of men, but the other two are named, presumably, because meant to be included, and in matter of fact they as well as Simon abandon all and follow Jesus (ver. 11).—ζωγρῶν: the verb means to take alive, then generally to take; here and in 2 Tim. ii. 26. The analytic form (ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν) implies permanent occupation = thou shall be a taker.—Ver. 11. καταγαγόντες τ. πλ.,

12. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων, καὶ ἰδού, ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας· καὶ ἰδὼν[1] τὸν Ἰησοῦν, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, ἐδεήθη αὐτοῦ, λέγων, "Κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασαί με καθαρίσαι." 13. Καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, ἥψατο αὐτοῦ, εἰπών,[2] "Θέλω, καθαρίσθητι." Καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 14. καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν· "ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου, καθὼς προσέταξε Μωσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς." 15. Διήρχετο δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ συνήρχοντο ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀκούειν, καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ[3] ἀπὸ τῶν ἀσθενειῶν αὐτῶν· 16. αὐτὸς δὲ ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις, καὶ προσευχόμενος.

17. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων· καὶ ἦσαν καθήμενοι Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι, οἳ ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες ἐκ πάσης κώμης τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς.[4] 18. καὶ ἰδού, ἄνδρες φέροντες ἐπὶ κλίνης ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος, καὶ ἐζήτουν

[1] **ιδων δε** in ℵBC cop. [2] **λεγων** in ℵBCDL 33 *al.*

[3] Omit **υπ αυτου** ℵBCDL minusc.

[4] **αυτον** in ℵBLΞ aeth. (Tisch., W.H.), not understood, hence corrected into **αυτους** (T.R.).

drawing up their ships on land; that work done for ever. Chiefly in Lk. and Acts.

Vv. 12-16. *The leper* (Mt. viii. 1-4, Mk. i. 40-45).—Ver. 12. **ἐν μιᾷ τ. π.** for **ἔν τινι**, one of the cities or towns of Galilee in which Jesus had been preaching (Mk. i. 39 Lk. iv. 44).—**καὶ ἰδού**, after **καὶ ἐγένετο**, very Hebraistic.—**πλήρης λέπρας**, *full* of leprosy (**λεπρὸς** in parallels). Note here again the desire to magnify the miracle.—**ἐὰν θέλῃς**, etc., the man's words the same in all three narratives. His doubt was as to the *will* not the *power* to heal.—Ver. 13. **ἥψατο**: this also in all three—a cardinal point; the touch the practical proof of the will and the sympathy. No shrinking from the loathsome disease.—**ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν**: Lk. takes one of Mk.'s two phrases, Mt. the other. Lk. takes the one which most clearly implies a cure; **ἐκαθερίσθη** (Mt.) might conceivably mean: became technically clean.—Ver. 14. **ἀλλὰ**, etc.: here the *oratio indirecta* passes into *or. directa* as in Acts i. 4, xiv. 22, etc.—**τῷ ἱερεῖ**, to the priest; not necessarily in Jerusalem, but to the priest in the province whose business it was to attend to such duties (Hahn).—Ver. 15. **ἀκούειν**, to hear, but not *the word* as in ver. 1, rather to hear about the wonderful Healer and to get healing for themselves (**θεραπεύεσθαι**).—Ver. 16. To retirement mentioned in Mk. Lk. adds *prayer* (**προσευχόμενος**); frequent reference to this in Lk.

Vv. 17-26. *The paralytic* (Mt. ix. 1-8, Mk. ii. 1-12).—Ver. 17. **ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν**, a phrase as vague as a note of time as that in ver. 12 as a note of place.—**καὶ αὐτὸς**, etc., *and* He was teaching; the Hebraistic paratactic construction so common in Lk. Note **καὶ ἦσαν** and **καὶ δύναμις Κ. ἦν** following.—**νομοδιδάσκαλοι**, teachers of the law, Lk.'s equivalent for **γραμματεῖς**. The Pharisees and lawyers appear here for the first time in Lk., and they appear in force—a large gathering from every village of Galilee, from Judaea, and from Jerusalem. Jesus had preached in the synagogues of Galilee where the scribes might have an opportunity of hearing Him. But this extensive gathering of these classes at this time is not accounted for fully in Lk. Not till later does such a gathering occur in Mk. (iii. 22).—**αὐτόν**, the reading in ℵBL gives quite a good sense; it is accusative before **ἰᾶσθαι** = the power of the Lord (God) was present to the effect or intent that He (Jesus) should heal.—Ver. 18. **παραλελυμένος**, instead of **παραλυτικός**

αὐτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν καὶ θεῖναι ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· 19. καὶ μὴ εὑρόντες διὰ[1] ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸν ὄχλον, ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα, διὰ τῶν κεράμων καθῆκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλινιδίῳ εἰς τὸ μέσον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 20. καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν, εἶπεν αὐτῷ,[2] "Ἄνθρωπε, ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου." 21. Καὶ ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, λέγοντες, "Τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας; τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας,[3] εἰ μὴ μόνος ὁ Θεός;" 22. Ἐπιγνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Τί διαλογίζεσθε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; 23. τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν, Ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, ἢ εἰπεῖν, Ἔγειραι[4] καὶ περιπάτει; 24. ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου[5] ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας," εἶπε τῷ παραλελυμένῳ, "Σοὶ λέγω, ἔγειραι,[6] καὶ ἄρας τὸ κλινίδιόν σου, πορεύου εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου." 25. Καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, ἄρας ἐφ᾽ ᾧ[7] κατέκειτο, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, δοξάζων τὸν Θεόν. 26. καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι εἴδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον."

[1] δια omitted in all uncials.
[2] ℵBLΞ 33 omit αυτω.
[3] αμαρ. αφιεναι in BDΞ.
[4] εγειρε in ℵABCDLΞ.
[5] ο υ. τ. αν. εξουσιαν εχει in BLΞ (Tisch., W.H.).
[6] εγειρε here again in many MSS.
[7] εφ ο in ℵABCLΔΞ *al.*

in the parallels, the former more in use among physicians, and the more classical.—**ἐζήτουν**. imperfect, implying difficulty in finding access, due, one might think, to the great numbers of Pharisees and lawyers present, no mention having as yet been made of any others. But the **ὄχλος** comes in in next verse.—Ver. 19. **ποίας** (**διὰ ποίας ὁδοῦ**), by what way.—**σ. τ. κλινιδίῳ**: dim. of **κλίνη** (ver. 18, here only in N. T.). Lk. avoids Mk.'s **κράββατος**, though apparently following him as to the substance of the story.—Ver. 20. **ἄνθρωπε**, *man*, instead of Mk.'s more kindly **τέκνον** and Mt.'s still more sympathetic **θάρσει τέκνον**; because (suggests J. Weiss) it was not deemed fitting that such a sinner should be addressed as son or child! This from Lk., the evangelist of grace! The substitution, from whatever reason proceeding, is certainly not an improvement. Possibly Lk. had a version of the story before him which used that word. Doubtless Jesus employed the kindlier expression.—Ver. 21. **διαλογίζεσθαι**: Lk. omits the qualifying phrases **ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις** of Mt. and Mk., leaving it doubtful whether they *spoke out* or merely *thought*.—**λέγοντες** does not settle the point, as it merely indicates to what effect they reasoned.—Ver. 22. The expression "in your hearts" coming in here suggests that Lk. may have omitted it in ver. 21 merely to avoid repetition.—Ver. 24. **ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας . . . πορεύου**: by introducing the participle **ἄρας** Lk. improves the style as compared with Mk., but weakens the force of the utterance, "arise, take up thy bed and go". The same remark applies to the words of the scribes, ver. 21, "who is this that speaketh blasphemies?" compared with, "why doth this person speak thus?" He blasphemes. Lk.'s is secondary, the style of an editor working over a rugged, graphic, realistic text.—Ver. 25. **παραχρῆμα** (**παρὰ τὸ χρῆμα**), on the spot, instantly; in Lk. only, magnifying the miracle.—Ver. 26. **ἔκστασις** might be taken out of Mk.'s **ἐξίστασθαι**.—**παράδοξα**. Each evangelist expresses the comments of the people in different terms. All three may be right, and not one of them may give the *ipsissima*

27. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξῆλθε, καὶ ἐθεάσατο τελώνην, ὀνόματι Λευΐν, καθήμενον ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἀκολούθει μοι." 28. Καὶ καταλιπὼν ἅπαντα, ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν[1] αὐτῷ. 29. Καὶ ἐποίησε δοχὴν μεγάλην ὁ[2] Λευῒς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἦν ὄχλος τελωνῶν πολύς,[3] καὶ ἄλλων οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι. 30. καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι[4] πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες, "Διατί μετὰ τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε;" 31. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες ἰατροῦ, ἀλλ' οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες. 32. οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς

[1] ηκολουθει in BDLΞ 69, a.
[2] Omit ο all uncials.
[3] πολυς before τελ. in ℵBCDLΞ 33 *al.*
[4] οι Φαρ. και οι γρ. αυτων in ABCLΔΞ *al.* T.R. = ℵD.

verba. Lk.'s version is: We have seen *unexpected things* to-day. Here only in N. T.

Vv. 27-32. *Call of Levi* (Mt. ix. 9-13, Mk. ii. 13-17).—Ver. 27. **ἐθεάσατο**, instead of **εἶδεν**. Hahn, appealing to John i. 14, iv. 35, xi. 45, assigns to it the meaning, to look with interest, to let the eye rest on with complacency. But it is doubtful whether in later usage it meant more than to look in order to observe. If the view stated in Mt. on the so-called Matthew's feast (*q.v.*) be correct, Jesus was on the outlook for a man to assist Him in the *Capernaum mission* to the publicans.—**ἐπὶ τὸ τελώνιον**, at "the tolbothe," Wyclif. The tolls collected by Levi may have been either on highway traffic, or on the traffic across the lake. Mk.'s **παράγων** (ver. 14) coming after the reference to the sea (ver. 13) points to the latter.—Ver. 28. **καταλιπὼν ἅπαντα**, leaving all behind, in Lk. only; a specialty of the ebionitically inclined evangelist, thinks J. Weiss (in Meyer). But it merely predicates of Levi what all three evangelists predicate of Peter and his comrades.—Ver. 29. **δοχὴν** (from **δέχομαι** here and in xiv. 13), a reception, a feast, in Sept. for מִשְׁתֶּה (Gen. xxvi. 30, Esther i. 3). That Mt. made a feast is directly stated only by Lk., perhaps as an inference from the phrases in Mk. which imply it: **κατακεῖσθαι, συνανέκειντο** (ver. 15), **ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει** (ver. 16). That it was a *great* feast is inferred from **πολλοὶ** in reference to the number present. The expressions of the evangelists force us to conceive of the gathering as exceeding the dimensions of a private entertainment—a congregation rather, in the court, to eat and to hear the gospel of the kingdom. Possibly none of the evangelists realised the full significance of the meeting, though Lk. by the expression **ὄχλος πολὺς** shows that he conceived of it as very large.—**ἄλλων** stands for **ἁμαρτωλῶν**, which Lk. does not care to use when speaking for himself of the class, preferring the vague word "others". They were probably a very nondescript class, the "submerged tenth" of Capernaum.—Ver. 30. **οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμ. αὐτῶν**, the Pharisees, and the scribes connected with them, the professional men of the party. They were not of course guests, but they might if they chose look in: no privacy on such occasions in the East; or they might watch the strange company as they dispersed.—**ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε**: addressed to the disciples. In the parallels the question refers to the conduct of Jesus though put to the disciples.—Ver. 31. Jesus replies, understanding that it is He who is put on His defence. His reply is given in identical terms in all three Synoptics; a remarkable *logion* carefully preserved in the tradition.—Ver. 32. **εἰς μετάνοιαν**: doubtless a gloss of Lk.'s or of a tradition he used, defining and guarding the saying, but also limiting its scope.—**καλέσαι** is to be understood in a festive sense = I came to call sinners *to the feast of the Kingdom*, as I have called to this feast the "sinners" of Capernaum.

Vv. 33-39. *Fasting* (Mt. ix. 14-17, Mk. ii. 18-22).—Ver. 33. **οἱ δὲ** connects what follows with what goes before as a continuation of the same story. Not so in Mk.; connection there simply topical.

μετάνοιαν." 33. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν, "Διατί[1] οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσι πυκνά, καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται, ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων· οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσι καὶ πίνουσιν;" 34. Ὁ δὲ[2] εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστι, ποιῆσαι νηστεύειν[3]; 35. ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι, καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις." 36. Ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἱματίου καινοῦ[4] ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίζει,[5] καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνεῖ[6]

[1] Omit **διατι** BLΞ 33 cop.
[2] Add **Ιησους** ℵBCDLΞ 33.
[3] **νηστευσαι** in BΞ 28 (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = ℵACDL.
[4] For **ιμ. καινου** ℵBDLΞ 33 *al.* have **απο ιμ. κ. σχισας** (Tisch., W.H.).
[5] **σχισει** in ℵBCDL 33.
[6] **συμφωνησει** in ℵABCDLX 33 and many other minusc.

The supposed speakers are the Pharisees and scribes (ver. 30). In Mk. Phar. and John's disciples. In Mt. the latter only. If the Pharisees and scribes were the spokesmen, their putting John's disciples first in stating the common practice would be a matter of policy = John held in respect by Jesus, why then differ even from him?—**πυκνὰ** (neuter plural, from **πυκνός**, dense), frequently.—**δεήσεις ποιοῦνται**, make prayers, on system; added to complete the picture of an ascetic life; *cf.* ii. 37; referred to again in xi. 1; probably the question really concerned only *fasting*, hence omitted in the description of the life of the Jesus-circle even in Lk.—**ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσι**, eat and drink; on the days when we fast, making no distinction of days.—Ver. 34. **μὴ δύνασθε . . . ποιῆσαι νησ.**, can ye make them fast? In Mt. and Mk., can they fast? Lk.'s form of the question points to the futility of prescriptions in the circumstances. The Master could not make His disciples fast even if He wished.—Ver. 35. **καὶ ὅταν**: Mt. and Mk. place the **καὶ** before **τότε** in the next clause. Lk.'s arrangement throws more emphasis on **ἡμέραι**: there will come *days*, and when, etc. The **καὶ** may be explicative (= *et quidem*, Bornemann), or it may introduce the apodosis.—**ὅταν ἀπαρθῇ**, the subjunctive with **ἂν** in a relative clause referring to a probable future event.

Vv. 36-39. *Relative parabolic Logia.*—**ἔλεγε . . . ὅτι**: an editorial introduction to the parabolic sayings. The first of these, as given by Lk., varies in form from the version in the parallels, suggests somewhat different ideas, and is in itself by no means clear. Much depends on whether we omit or retain **σχίσας** in the first clause. If, with ℵBDL, we retain it, the case put is: a piece cut out of a new garment to patch an old one, the evil results being: the new spoiled, and the old patched with the new piece presenting an incongruous appearance (**οὐ συμφωνήσει**). If, with AC, etc., we omit **σχίσας**, the case put may be: a new piece not cut out of a new garment, but a *remnant* (Hahn) used to patch an old, this new piece making a rent in the old garment; **τὸ καινὸν** in second clause not object of, but nominative to, **σχίσει**, and the contrast between the new patch and old garment presenting a grotesque appearance. The objection to this latter view is that there is no reason in the case supposed why the new patch should make a rent. In Mt. and Mk. the patch is made with unfulled cloth, which will contract. But the remnant of cloth with which a new garment is made would not be unfulled, and it would not contract. The sole evil in that case would be a piebald appearance. On the whole it seems best to retain **σχίσας**, and to render **τὸ καινὸν σχίσει**, he (the man who does so foolish a thing) will rend the new. Kypke suggests as an alternative rendering: the new is rent, taking **σχίζει** intransitively, of which use he cites an instance from the Testament of the twelve patriarchs. The sense on this rendering remains the same.—Ver. 37. The tradition of the second *logion* seems to have come down to Lk.'s time without variation; at all events he gives

ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ. 37. καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μήγε, ῥήξει ὁ νέος οἶνος[1] τοὺς ἀσκούς, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται· 38. ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.[2] 39. καὶ οὐδεὶς πιὼν παλαιὸν εὐθέως[3] θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ, Ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστότερός[4] ἐστιν."

[1] ο οινος ο νεος in BCDL *al.*

[2] και αμφ. συντηρ. omitted in ℵBL 1, 33 *al.* cop. (Tisch., W.H.); an addition from Mt.

[3] Omit ευθεως ℵBCL minusc. cop.

[4] χρηστος in ℵBL cop. D and some western codd. of vet. Lat. omit this verse.

it substantially as in parallels. The difficulty connected with this parabolic word is not critical or exegetical, but scientific. The question has been raised: could even new, tough skins stand the process of fermentation? and the suggestion made that Jesus was not thinking at all of fermented, intoxicating wine, but of "must," a non-intoxicating beverage, which could be kept safely in new leather bottles, but not in old skins, which had previously contained ordinary wine, because particles of albuminoid matter adhering to the skin would set up fermentation and develop gas with an enormous pressure. On this *vide* Farrar (C. G. T., *Excursus*, III.).—Ver. 38 gives the positive side of the truth answering to Mt. ix. 17b, only substituting the verbal adjective βλητέον for βάλλουσιν.—Ver. 39. The thought in this verse is peculiar to Lk. It seems to be a genial apology for conservatism in religion, with tacit reference to John and his disciples, whom Jesus would always treat with consideration. They loved the old wine of Jewish piety, and did not care for new ways. They found it good (χρηστός), so good that they did not wish even to taste any other, and could therefore make no comparisons. (Hence χρηστὸς preferable to χρηστότερος in T. R.) This saying is every way worthy of Christ, and it was probably one of Lk.'s finds in his pious quest for traditions of the Personal Ministry.

With reference to the foregoing parabolic words, drawn from vesture and wine, Hahn truly remarks that they would be naturally suggested through association of ideas by the figure of a wedding feast going before. Bengel hints at the same thought: "parabolam a veste, a vino; inprimis opportunam convivio".

CHAPTER VI. SABBATIC CONFLICTS. THE APOSTLES. THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.—Vv. 1-5. *The ears of corn* (Mt. xii. 1-8, Mk. ii. 23-28).—ἐν σαββάτῳ: Mk. makes no attempt to locate this incident in his history beyond indicating that it happened on *Sabbath*. Mt. uses a phrase which naturally suggests temporal sequence, but to which in view of what goes before one can attach no definite meaning. Lk. on the other hand would seem to be aiming at very great precision if the adjective qualifying σαββάτῳ—δευτεροπρώτῳ, were genuine. But it is omitted in the important group ℵBL, and in other good documents, and this fact, combined with the extreme unlikelihood of Lk.'s using a word to which it is now, and must always have been, impossible to attach any definite sense, makes it highly probable that this word is simply a marginal gloss, which found its way, like many others, into the text. How the gloss arose, and what it meant for its author or authors, it is really not worth while trying to conjecture, though such attempts have been made. *Vide* Tischendorf, N. T., ed. viii., for the critical history of the word.—ἤσθιον, ate, indicating the purpose of the plucking, with Mt. Mk. omits this, *vide* notes there.—ψώχοντες τ. χ., rubbing with their hands; peculiar to Lk., indicating his idea of the fault (or that of the tradition he followed); rubbing was threshing on a small scale, an offence against one of the many minor rules for Sabbath observance. This word occurs here only in N. T., and is not classical.—Ver. 2. τινὲς: more exact than Mt. and Mk., who say the Pharisees generally, but not necessary to make their meaning clear. Of course it was only some of the class.—Ver. 3. οὐδὲ, for Mk.'s οὐδέποτε and

VI. 1. ʼΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ[1] διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν[2] σπορίμων· καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τοὺς στάχυας, καὶ ἤσθιον,[3] ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσί. 2. τινὲς δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων εἶπον αὐτοῖς,[4] "Τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν ἐν[5] τοῖς σάββασι;" 3. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε, ὃ ἐποίησε Δαβίδ, ὁπότε[6] ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετʼ αὐτοῦ ὄντες[7]; 4. ὡς[8] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔλαβε, καὶ[9] ἔφαγε, καὶ ἔδωκε καὶ[9] τοῖς μετʼ αὐτοῦ, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστι φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς;" 5. Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι[10] κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου."[11]

[1] ℵBL 33 *al.* omit δευτεροπρωτω. *Vide* below.

[2] ℵBL *al.* omit των (from parall.).

[3] και ησθιον τους σταχυας in BCL (W.H.; Tisch. = T.R. with ℵ).

[4] Omit αυτοις ℵBCL minusc. a, c, e, cop.

[5] B omits ποιειν, and ℵBL omit εν (W.H. omit both).

[6] οτε in ℵBCDL minusc. (W.H.; Tisch. has οποτε with less weighty witnesses, *vide* below).

[7] Omit οντες with ℵBDL 33 *al.* (W.H.).

[8] B omits ως (W.H. in brackets), D also, reading εισελθων.

[9] For ελαβε και BCLX 33 have λαβων, and BL omit και after εδωκε.

[10] ℵB 1, 131 aeth. omit οτι (W.H.).

[11] του σαβ., without και, before ο υ. τ. αν. in ℵB cop. aeth. (W.H.). DL = T.R. (Tisch.).

Mt.'s οὐκ = not even; have ye so little understood the spirit of the O. T.? (De Wette). The word might be analysed into οὐ, δὲ, when it will mean: but have ye not then read this? So Hofmann, Nösgen, Hahn.—ὁπότε, here only in N. T., if even here, for many good MSS. have ὅτε (W.H.).—Ver. 4. Lk. contents himself with the essential fact: hunger, overruling a positive law concerning the shewbread. No reference to the high priest, as in Mk., and no additional instance of the Sabbath law superseded by higher interests, as in Mt. (xii. 5). The controversy no longer lives for him, and his accounts are apt to be colourless and secondary.—Ver. 5. καὶ ἔλεγεν: in Lk. this important *logion* about the Son of Man's Lordship over the Sabbath is simply an external annex to what goes before = and He said: instead of arising out of and crowning the argument, as in Mt., and partly in Mk., though the latter uses the same phrase in introducing the *logion* peculiar to him about the Sabbath being made for man. If Lk. had Mk. before him, how could he omit so important a word? Perhaps because it involved a *controversial antithesis* not easily intelligible to Gentiles, and because the Lordship of the Son of Man covered all in his view. How did he and his readers understand that Lordship?

Vv. 6-11. *The withered hand* (Mt. xii. 9-14, Mk. iii. 1-6).—Ver. 6. ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ: simply intended to indicate that the following incident, like the one going before, happened on a Sabbath. Observe Lk. uses here, as in vi. 1, 5, the *singular* for the Sabbath.—τὴν συν.: the article here might point to a particular synagogue, as in Mt., or be generic.—διδάσκειν, present, εἰσελθεῖν, aorist: the entering an act, the preaching continuous. He was preaching when the following happened.—καὶ ἡ χεὶρ: by comparison with Mt. and Mk. Lk. is here paratactic and Hebraistic in construction. But Palairet, against Grotius emphasising the Hebraism, cites from Aelian, *Hist. Anim.* (lib. xii., c. 24): ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ τῇ Ἐρυθρᾷ ἰχθὺς γίνεται, καὶ ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὑγρὸς φοῖνιξ.—ἡ δεξιά,

6. Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ[1] ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ διδάσκειν· καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος,[2] καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά. 7. παρετήρουν[3] δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύσει[4]· ἵνα εὕρωσι κατηγορίαν[5] αὐτοῦ. 8. αὐτὸς δὲ ᾔδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν, καὶ εἶπε τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ[6] τῷ ξηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα, "Ἔγειραι,[7] καὶ στῆθι εἰς τὸ μέσον." Ὁ δὲ[8] ἀναστὰς ἔστη. 9. Εἶπεν οὖν[9] ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ἐπερωτήσω[10] ὑμᾶς, τί ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασιν,[11] ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι; ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι;" 10. Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτούς, εἶπε τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ,[12] "Ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου." Ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν οὕτω.[13] καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη[14] ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὑγιὴς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.[15] 11. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπλήσθησαν ἀνοίας· καὶ διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τί ἂν ποιήσειαν[16] τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

[1] Omit **και** ℵBL min. [2] **ανθ. εκει** in ℵBL 33 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).
[3] **παρετηρουντο** in ABDL 33 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).
[4] **θεραπευει** in ℵADL (Tisch., W.H., text). T.R. = B (W.H. marg.).
[5] **κατηγορειν αυτου** in ℵB (D **-γορησαι**).
[6] **ειπεν δε τω ανδρι** in ℵBL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
[7] **εγειρε** in very many uncials. [8] For **ο δε** ℵBDL have **και**.
[9] For **ουν** ℵBDL 33 *al.* have **δε**. [10] **επερωτω** in ℵBL.
[11] ℵBDL have **ει** for **τι**, and **τω σαββατω** for **τοις σαββασιν**.
[12] **αυτω** in B and many other uncials. T.R. = ℵDL 33.
[13] Omit **ουτω** BLΔ 33.
[14] **απεκατεσταθη** in ADL *al. pl.*, but B has **αποκ.**
[15] Omit **υγιης . . . αλλη** (from Mt.) with ℵBL.
[16] **ποιησαιεν** in BLΛ 33 *al. pl.* (Tisch., W.H.).

the right hand. This particular peculiar to Lk., with the Hebrew style, proves, some think (Godet, Hahn), a source distinct from Mt. or Mk. Not necessarily. It may be an inference by Lk., added to magnify the beneficence of the miracle. The right hand the working hand, the privation great, the cure the more valuable.—Ver. 7. **παρετηροῦντο**, they kept watching, in a sly, furtive manner, *ex obliquo et occulto*, Bengel on Mk.—**εἰ θεραπεύει**, whether He is going to heal, if that is to be the way of it.—Ver. 8. **ᾔδει**: a participle might have been expected here = He knowing their thoughts said, etc.—**ἔγειρε καὶ στῆθι**, etc.: this command was necessary to bring the matter under the notice of the audience present, who as yet knew nothing of the thoughts of the Pharisees, and possibly were not aware that the man with the withered hand was present.—Ver. 9. **ἀγαθοποιῆσαι, κακοποιῆσαι**: on the meaning of these words and the issue raised *vide* on Mk.—Ver. 10. **περιβλεψάμενος**. Lk. borrows this word from Mk., but omits all reference to the emotions he ascribes to Jesus: anger mixed with pity. He looks round merely waiting for an answer to His pointed question. None being forthcoming, He proceeds to heal: "qui tacet, consentit," Bornemann.—Ver. 11. **ἀνοίας**: they were filled *with senseless anger*. They were "mad" at Jesus, because He had broken the Sabbath, as they conceived it, in a way that would make Him popular: humanity and preternatural power combined.—**τί ἂν ποιήσαιεν**: **ἂν** with the optative in an indirect question, in Lk. only, following classic usage. This combination of occasional classicism with frequent Hebraism is curious. It is noticeable that Lk. does not impute murderous intentions to the opponents of Jesus at this stage, nor combination with politicians to effect truculent designs (*vide* Mk. iii. 6).

12. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, ἐξῆλθεν[1] εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι· καὶ ἦν διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 13. καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσεφώνησε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε, 14. Σίμωνα ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασε Πέτρον, καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, Ἰάκωβον[2] καὶ Ἰωάννην, Φίλιππον καὶ Βαρθολομαῖον, 15. Ματθαῖον καὶ Θωμᾶν, Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ[3] Ἀλφαίου καὶ Σίμωνα τὸν καλούμενον Ζηλωτήν, 16. Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου, καὶ Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώτην, ὃς καὶ[4] ἐγένετο προδότης· 17. καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν, ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος[5] μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ

[1] εξελθειν αυτον in ℵBDL.

[2] ℵBDL have και before Ιακωβον, and there is MS. authority for και before every name (Tisch., W.H.: και in brackets before Ιακ. Αλφ., omitted there only in B, probably by oversight).

[3] Omit τον του ℵBL 33. [4] Omit και ℵBL. [5] οχλος πολυς in ℵBL.

Vv. 12-19. *On the hill* (Mt. iv. 24-25, x. 2-4; Mk. iii. 7-19).—Ver. 12. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις: a vague expression, but suggestive of some connection with foregoing encounters.—ἐξελθεῖν, went out; whence not indicated, probably from a town (Capernaum?) into the solitude of the mountains.—εἰς τὸ ὄρος: as in Mt. v. i. and Mk. iii. 13, to the hill near the place where He had been. —προσεύξασθαι, to pray, not in Mk.; might be taken for granted. But Lk. makes a point of exhibiting Jesus as a devotional Model, often praying, and especially at critical times in His life. The present is viewed as a very special crisis, hence what follows.—ἦν διανυκτερεύων, etc., He was spending the whole night in prayer to God; διανυκτερεύων occurs here only in N. T. —τοῦ θεοῦ is genitive objective: prayer of which God is the object; but if προσευχὴ were taken as = a place for prayer in the open air, as in Acts xvi. 13, we should get the poetic idea of the *proseucha* of God—the mountains!—Ver. 13. τοὺς μαθητὰς, the disciples, of whom a considerable number have gathered about Jesus, and who have followed Him to the hill.—ἀποστόλους, Apostles, used by Lk. in the later sense, here and elsewhere. The word is more frequent in his Gospel than in Mt. and Mk. (six times in Lk., once in Mt., twice in Mk.).—Ver. 14. Σίμωνα: here follows the list much the same as in Mt. and Mk. Lk., though he has already called Simon, Peter (v. 8), here mentions that Jesus gave him the name. In the third group of four Judas Jacobi takes the place of Thaddaeus in Mk. and Lebbaeus in Mt. and Simon the Kananite is called Simon the Zealot. Of Judas Iscariot it is noted that he became a traitor, "turned traitor" (Field, *Ot. Nor.*).—προδότης has no article, and therefore should not be rendered *the* traitor as in A. V. and R. V. When the verb is used it is always παραδιδόναι.—Ver. 17. καταβὰς, *descending*, with the Twelve, suggesting descent to the foot of the hills, the plain below. Yet the expression τόπου πεδινοῦ is peculiar; hardly what we should expect if the reference were to the plain beside the lake; rather suggestive of a flat space lower down the hill. —πεδινὸς, here only in N. T. The descent takes place in order to the delivery of a discourse which, with the choice of the Apostles, constitutes the occasion with reference to which Jesus had spent the night in prayer. The audience consists of three classes separately named (1) the Twelve, (2) the company of disciples described as an ὄχλος πολὺς, (3) a multitude (πλῆθος) gathered from a wide area. This is the same multitude from which in Mk.'s narrative Jesus *escaped* to the hill, taking His disciples with Him, to get rest, and presumably to devote some leisure time to their instruction. Of this desire to escape from the crowd, so apparent in Mk., there is no trace in Lk. In indicating the sources of this great human stream Lk. omits Galilee as superfluous, mentions Judaea and

πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος, οἳ ἦλθον ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰαθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νόσων αὐτῶν. 18. καὶ οἱ ὀχλούμενοι ὑπὸ[1] πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, καὶ[2] ἐθεραπεύοντο. 19. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτει[3] ἅπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ· ὅτι δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο, καὶ ἰᾶτο πάντας.

20. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγε, "Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. 21. μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν, ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε. μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν, ὅτι γελάσετε. 22. μακάριοί ἐστε,

[1] ενοχλουμενοι απο in ℵABL (D has απο).

[2] και omitted in ℵABDL 33. [3] εζητουν in ℵBL. T.R. a correction.

Jerusalem, passing over Idumaea and Peraea (Mk. iii. 8), and winds up with Tyre and Sidon, defining the territory there whence people came by the expression τῆς παραλίου (χώρας understood), the sea-coast. The people come from all these places to hear Jesus (ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ) in the first place, as if in expectation of a great discourse, and also to be healed. The eagerness to get healing even by touch, of which Mk. gives so graphic a picture (iii. 10), is faintly indicated by ἐζήτουν (ἐζήτει, T. R.).—Ver. 19. δύναμις may be nominative both to ἐξήρχετο and to ἰᾶτο (A. V. and R. V.), or we may render: "power went forth from Him and He healed all".

Vv. 20-49. *The Sermon* (Mt. v.-vii.). That it is the same sermon as Mt. reports in chapters v.-vii. may be regarded as beyond discussion. How, while the same, they came to be so different, is a question not quite easy to answer. There probably was addition to the original utterance in the case of Mt., and there was almost certainly selection involving omission in the case of Lk.'s version, either on his part or on the part of those who prepared the text he used. Retouching of expression in the parts common to both reports is, of course, also very conceivable. As it stands in Lk. the great utterance has much more the character of a *popular discourse* than the more lengthy, elaborate version of Mt. In Mt. it is *didache*, in Lk. *kerygma*—a discourse delivered to a great congregation gathered for the purpose, with the *Apostles* and *disciples* in the front benches so to speak, a discourse exemplifying the "words of grace" (iv. 22) Jesus was wont to speak, the controversial antithesis (Mt. v. 17-48) eliminated, and only the evangelic passages retained; a sermon serving at once as a model for "Apostles" and as a gospel for the million.

Vv. 20-26. *First part of the discourse: Beatitudes and Woes* (Mt. v. 1-12).—Ver. 20. ἐπάρας τ. ὀφ.: in Lk. the Preacher lifts up His eyes upon His audience (τ. μαθητὰς, who are themselves a crowd), in Mt. He opens His mouth; both expressions introducing a solemn set discourse. Lk.'s phrase suggests a benignant look, answering to the nature of the utterance.—μακάριοι: Lk. has only *four Beatitudes*, of which the *poor*, the *hungry*, the *weeping*, the *persecuted* are the objects; the sorrows not the activities of the children of the kingdom the theme.—πτωχοί, πεινῶντες, κλαίοντες are to be taken literally as describing the *social* condition of those addressed. They are characteristics of those who are supposed to be children of the kingdom, not (as in Mt.) conditions of entrance. The description corresponds to the state of the early Church. It is as if Jesus were addressing a church meeting and saying: Blessed are ye, my brethren, though poor, etc., for in the Kingdom of God, and its blessings, present and prospective, ye have ample compensation. Note the use of the second person. In Mt. Jesus speaks didactically in the third person. Christ's words are adapted to present circumstances, but it is not necessary to suppose that the adaptation proceeds from an ebionitic circle, ascetic in spirit and believing poverty to be in itself a passport to the kingdom, and riches the way to perdition.

Vv. 22, 23. In the corresponding passage in Mt. there is first an objective didactic statement about the persecuted,

ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὀνειδίσωσι, καὶ ἐκβάλωσι τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν, ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 23. χαίρετε[1] ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε· ἰδοὺ γάρ, ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· κατὰ ταῦτα[2] γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν. 24. Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν. 25. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι,[3] ὅτι πεινάσετε. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν,[4] οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε. 26. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν,[4] ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσι πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ ταῦτα[5] γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

27. "Ἀλλ' ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, 28. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρω-

[1] **χαρητε** in all uncials. [2] **τα αυτα** in BD (Tisch., W.H.).
[3] ℵBLΞ 33 *al.* add **νυν** to **εμπεπλ.**
[4] Omit **υμιν** in both places ℵBLΞ. Many more omit the second.
[5] **τα αυτα** again in ℵBDΞ 33.

then an expansion in the second person. Here all is in the second person, and the terms employed are such as suited the experience of the early Christians, especially those belonging to the Jewish Church, suffering, at the hands of their unbelieving countrymen, wrong in the various forms indicated—hatred, separation, calumny, ejection.—**ἀφορίσωσιν** may point either to separation in daily life (Keil, Hahn) or to excommunication from the synagogue (so most commentaries) = the Talmudic נִדָּה. In the former case one naturally finds the culminating evil of excommunication in the last clause—**ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄ. ὑ.** = erasing the name from the membership of the synagogue. In the latter case this clause will rather point to the vile calumnies afterwards heaped upon the excommunicated. "Absentium nomen, ut improborum hominum, differre rumoribus," Grotius.—Ver. 23. **σκιρτήσατε**, leap for joy; the word occurs in i. 41, 44, and this and other terms found in the sermon have led some to infer that Lk. uses as his source a version of the discourse emanating from a Jewish-Christian circle. *Vide* the list of words in J. Weiss, Meyer, note, p. 387. *Vide* also Feine, *Vork. Überlief.*

Vv. 24-26. **πλὴν**, but, used here adversatively, a favourite word with Lk., suggesting therefore the hypothesis that he is responsible for the "woes" following, peculiar to his version of the sermon. —**ἀπέχετε**, ye have in full; riches and nothing besides your reward (*cf.* Mt. vi. 2).—Ver. 25. **ἐμπεπλησμένοι**, the sated, a class as distinct in character as the **δεδιωγμένοι** of Mt. v. 10, on whom *vide* remarks there. Readers can picture the sated class for themselves.—Ver. 26. This woe is addressed, not to the rich and full without, but to the disciples within, and points out to them that to be free from the evils enumerated in ver. 22 is not a matter of congratulation, but rather a curse, as indicative of a disloyalty to the faith and the Master, which makes them rank with false prophets.

Vv. 27-35. *The law of love* (Mt. v. 38-48).—Ver. 27. **ὑμῖν λέγω**: Lk. here uses the phrase with which Mt. introduces each *dictum* of Jesus in opposition to the *dicta* of the scribes. But of the many *dicta* of the Lord reported in Mt. he has preserved only one, that relating to the duty of loving (Mt. v. 44). The injunction to love enemies is much weakened in force by omission of the antithesis: love neighbours and hate enemies. As if to compensate Lk. gives the precept *twice*, (1) as a general head under which to collect sayings culled from the section of the discourse omitted (Mt. v. 17-42), (2) as a protest against limiting love to those who love us (ver. 35, *cf.* ver. 32).—**τοῖς ἀκούουσιν**, to you who hear; a phrase by which the discourse is brought back to the actual audience from the rich and the false disciples apostrophised in the preceding verses. It is an editorial phrase.—

a 1 Pet. iii. 16.

μένους ὑμῖν,[1] καὶ[2] προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ[3] τῶν ᵃἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, 29. τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα, πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς. 30. παντὶ δὲ τῷ[4] αἰτοῦντί σε, δίδου· καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντος τὰ σά, μὴ ἀπαίτει. 31. καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως. 32. καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσι. 33. καὶ[5] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί; καὶ γὰρ[6] οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσι. 34. καὶ ἐὰν δανείζητε[7] παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν,[8] ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί; καὶ γὰρ οἱ[9] ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανείζουσιν, ἵνα ἀπολάβωσι τὰ ἴσα. 35. πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε, καὶ δανείζετε μηδὲν[10] ἀπελπίζοντες· καὶ

[1] **υμας** in ℵBDΞ vet. Lat. 6. **υμιν** is a correction to classical usage.
[2] Omit **και** ℵBDLΞ *al.*
[3] **περι** in ℵBLΞ.
[4] Omit **δε τω** ℵB.
[5] ℵB have **και γαρ εαν** (Tisch., W.H., in brackets).
[6] Omit **γαρ** ℵB.
[7] **δανισητε** in ℵBΞ (Tisch., W.H.).
[8] **λαβειν** in ℵBLΞ.
[9] ℵBLΞ omit **γαρ**, and many uncials omit **οι**.
[10] **μηδεν** is the best attested reading (ℵBLΔ *al.*, W.H. in brackets); **μηδενα** in ℵΞΠ (Tisch.).

καλῶς ποιεῖτε, etc.: Lk., in contrast with Mt. (true text), enlarges here, as if to say: you must love in every conceivable case, even in connection with the most aggravated evil treatment. In the clause enjoining prayer for such as have done wrong Lk. substitutes **ἐπηρεαζόντων** (ver. 28) for Mt.'s **διωκόντων** = those who *insult* you, the people it is hardest to pray for. Persecution may be very fierce, at the prompting of conscience, yet respectful.—Ver. 29 = Mt. v. 39, 40 with some changes: **τύπτειν** for **ῥαπίζειν**, **παρέχειν** for **στρέφειν**; **αἴροντος** suggests the idea of robbery instead of legal proceedings pointed at by Mt.'s **κριθῆναι**; **ἱμάτιον** and **χιτῶνα** change places, naturally, as the robber takes first the upper garment; for Mt.'s **ἄφες** Lk. puts **μὴ κωλύσῃς** = withhold not (for the construction **τινὰ ἀπό τινος κωλύειν**, which Bornemann thought unexampled, *vide* Gen. xxiii. 6, Sept.).—Ver. 30. Lk. passes over Mt.'s instance of compulsory service (v. 41), perhaps because it would require explanation, or was not a practical grievance for his readers, and goes on to the duty of generous giving, which is to be carried the length of cheerfully resigning what is taken from us by force.—Ver. 31. Lk. brings in here the law of reciprocity (Mt. vii. 12), hardly in its proper place, as the change from singular to plural shows, but in sympathy with what goes before, though not quite in line, and therefore inserted at this point as the best place to be found for the golden rule. It seems to be meant as a general heading for the particular hypothetical cases following = you would like men to love you, therefore love them whether they love you or not, etc.—Ver. 32. **χάρις**, here and in the following verses stands for Mt.'s **μισθὸς**, as if to avoid a word of legal sound and substitute an evangelical term instead. Yet Lk. retains **μισθὸς** in ver. 23.—**χάρις** probably means not "thanks" from men but *favour* from God. It is a Pauline word, and apparently as such in favour with Lk. *Vide* on iv. 22.—**ἁμαρτωλοὶ** here and in vv. 33, 34 for **τελῶναι** and **ἐθνικοὶ** in Mt., a natural alteration, but much weakening the point; manifestly secondary.—Ver. 33. For Mt.'s salutation Lk. substitutes doing good (**ἀγαθοποιῆτε**).—Ver. 34. This example is robbed of its point if it be supposed that Lk. had an ascetic bias. If a man despise money there is no merit in lending without expecting repayment.—Ver. 35. **πλὴν**, *but*, in

ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολύς, καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ τοῦ[1] ὑψίστου· ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς. 36. γίνεσθε οὖν[2] [b]οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς καὶ[3] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστί. 37. καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε. μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε. ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε· 38. δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλόν, [c]πεπιεσμένον καὶ[4] σεσαλευμένον καὶ[4] [d]ὑπερεκχυνόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν. τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ[5] μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν."

39. Εἶπε δὲ[6] παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς, "Μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν

b here and Jas. v. 11.

c here only in N. T. (Micah vi. 15).

d here and in Joel ii. 24.

[1] Omit του ℵABDLΔΞ *al. pl.*

[2] Omit ουν ℵBDLΞ 33 *al.*

[3] Omit και ℵBLΞ.

[4] ℵBL omit first και and ℵBDLΞ the second; more expressive without.

[5] For τω γαρ . . . ω ℵBDLΞ 33 *al.* have ω γαρ μετρω (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] δε και in ℵBCDLΞ 33.

opposition to all these hypothetical cases.—**μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες**, "hoping for nothing again," A. V., is the meaning the context requires, and accepted by most interpreters, though the verb in later Greek means to despair, hence the rendering "never despairing" in R. V. The reading **μηδένα ἀπ.** would mean: causing no one to despair by refusing aid.—**υἱοὶ Ὑψίστου**, sons of the *Highest*, a much inferior name to that in Mt. In Lk. to be sons of the Highest is the *reward* of noble, generous action; in Mt. to be like the Father in heaven is set before disciples as an object of ambition.—**χρηστός**, kind; by generalising Lk. misses the pathos of Mt.'s concrete statement (ver. 45), which is doubtless nearer the original.

Vv. 36-38. *Mercifulness inculcated. God the pattern.*—Ver. 36 corresponds to Mt. v. 48, which fitly closes the promulgation of the great law of love = be ye *therefore* perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect (*vide* notes there). Lk. alters the precept both in its *expression* (**οἰκτίρμονες** for **τέλειοι**), and in its *setting*, making it begin a new train of thought instead of winding up the previous one = be compassionate (**οὖν** omitted, ℵBDL, etc.) as, etc.—the precepts following being particulars under that general.—**γίνεσθε**, imperative, for the future in Mt.—**οἰκτίρμονες**: a legitimate substitution, as the perfection inculcated referred to loving enemies, and giving opportunity for setting forth the doctrine of God's free grace.—**καθὼς** for Mt.'s **ὡς**, common in Lk. (twenty-eight times), witnessing to editorial revision.—**ὁ πατὴρ ὑ.**: without **ὁ οὐράνιος**, which is implied in the epithet "the Highest" (ver. 35).—Ver. 37. In these special precepts it is implied throughout that God acts as we are exhorted to act. They give a picture of the gracious spirit of God.—**καὶ**, connecting the following precept as a special with a general. No **καὶ** in Mt. vii. 1, where begins a new division of the sermon. In Mt. the judging condemned is referred to as a characteristic Pharisaic vice. Here it is conceived of as internal to the disciple-circle, as in James iv. 12.—**ἀπολύετε**, set free, as a debtor (Mt. xviii. 27), a prisoner, or an offender (**τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπολυθῆναι**, 2 Macc. xii. 45).—Ver. 38. **δίδοτε**: this form of mercy is suggested by Mt. vii. 2, **ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε**, etc.: be giving, implying a constant habit, and therefore a generous nature.—**μέτρον καλὸν**, good, generous measure; these words and those which follow apply to man's giving as well as to the recompense with which the generous giver shall be rewarded.—**πεπιεσμένον**, etc., pressed down, shaken, and overflowing; graphic epexegesis of good measure, all the terms applicable to dry goods, *e.g.*, grain. Bengel takes the first as referring to dry (*in aridis*), the second to soft (*in mollibus*), the third to liquids (*in liquidis*).—**κόλπον**: probably the loose bosom of the upper robe gathered in at the waist, useful for carrying things (De Wette, Holtz., H. C., *al.*). It is implied that God gives so, *e.g.*, "plenteous redemption" (Ps. cxxx. 7).

Vv. 39-45. *Proverbial lore.*—Ver. 39. **εἶπε δὲ**: the Speaker is represented here as making a new beginning, the connection of thought not being apparent.

ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται[1]; 40. οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον αὐτοῦ[2]· κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ. 41. τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ κατανοεῖς; 42. ἢ[3] πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, Ἀδελφέ, ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου, αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν οὐ βλέπων; ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν[4] τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. 43. οὐ γάρ ἐστι δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρόν· οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν. 44. ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσι σῦκα, οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου τρυγῶσι σταφυλήν.[5] 45. ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν· καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος[6] ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ[6] προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ[7] περισσεύματος τῆς[7] καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

[1] εμπεσ. in BDL; πεσ. in ℵCΔΞ 33. [2] Omit αυτου ℵBDLΞ 33.
[3] B omits η. ℵ has πως δε. Most uncials = T.R.
[4] εκβαλειν at end of sentence in B 13, 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).
[5] σταφ. τρυγ. in ℵBCDLΞ 13, 33, 69.
[6] ℵBDL omit ανθρωπος and θησ. της καρδιας αυτου (explanatory additions).
[7] ℵABDΞ omit both articles.

Grotius says plainly that there is no connection, and that Lk. has deemed it fitting to introduce here a *logion* that must have been spoken at another time. Mt. has a similar thought to that in ver. 39, not in the sermon but in xv. 14.—**τυφλὸς τυφλὸν**: viewing the sermon as an ideal address to a church, this adage may apply to Christians trying to guide brethren in the true way (James v. 19), and mean that they themselves must know the truth.—Ver. 40. The connection here also is obscure; the adage might be taken as directed against the conceit of scholars presuming to criticise their teachers, which is checked by the reminder that the utmost height that can be reached by the fully equipped (**κατηρτισμένος**, a Pauline word, 1 Cor. i. 10, *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 17, **ἐξηρτισμένος**) scholar is to be on a level with his teacher.—Ver. 41 introduces a thought which in Mt. stands in immediate connection with that in ver. 37 (Mt. vii. 1, 2, 3). If the view of ver. 40, above suggested, be correct, then this and the next verses may also be understood as referring still to the relations between teacher and taught in the Church, rather than to the vices of the Pharisees, which in Lk.'s version of the sermon are very much left out of account. Censoriousness is apt to be a fault of young converts, and doubtless it was rife enough in the apostolic age. On the parable of the mote and the beam *vide* on Mt. vii. 3-5.—Ver. 40. **οὐ βλέπων**: this is one of the few instances in N. T. of participles negatived by **οὐ**. The **οὐ** in such cases may = **μὴ**, which in classical Greek has the force of a condition, **οὐ** being used only to state a fact (*vide* Burton, § 485).—Vv. 43-45. In Mt. these parabolic sayings are connected with a warning against false prophets (Mt. vii. 15-19). Here the connection is not obvious, though the thread is probably to be found in the word **ὑποκριτά**, applied to one who by his censoriousness claims to be saintly, yet in reality is a greater sinner than those he blames. This combination of saint and sinner is declared to be impossible by means of these adages.—Ver. 44. For **τριβόλοι** in Mt., Lk. puts **βάτος** = thorn bush, *rubus*, and for **συλλέγουσιν** applied to both thorns and thistles in Mt., Lk. uses in connection with **βάτου τρυγῶσιν** the

46. "Τί δέ με καλεῖτε, Κύριε, Κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω; 47. πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με καὶ ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων καὶ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι ἐστὶν ὅμοιος. 48. ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν, ὃς [e] ἔσκαψε καὶ [f] ἐβάθυνε, καὶ ἔθηκε θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· πλημμύρας[1] δὲ γενομένης, προσέρρηξεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσε σαλεῦσαι αὐτήν· τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.[2] 49. ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου· ᾗ προσέρρηξεν ὁ ποταμός, καὶ εὐθέως ἔπεσε,[3] καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα."

e Ch. xiii. 8; xvi. 3.
f here only in N. T.

VII. 1. 'ΕΠΕΙ δὲ[4] ἐπλήρωσε πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καπερναούμ. 2. Ἑκατοντάρχου δέ

[1] πλημμυρης in ℵBLΞ 33.

[2] For τεθ. γαρ . . . πετραν (from Mt.) ℵBLΞ 33 have δια το καλως οικοδομησ(-εισ-)θαι αυτην (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] συνεπεσεν in ℵBDLΞ 33 *al.*, a stronger word = collapsed (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] επειδη in ABC (Tisch., W.H., text); επει δε in ℵLΞ (W.H. marg.).

proper word for grape-gathering.—Ver. 45. θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας: either, the treasure which is in the heart, or the treasure which the heart is (Hahn). In either case the sense is: as is the heart, so is the utterance.

Ver. 46, introducing the epilogue, rather than winding up the previous train of thought, answers to Mt. vii. 21-23; here direct address (2nd person), there didactic (3rd person); here a pointed question, and paratactic structure as of an orator, in lively manner, applying his sermon, there a general statement as to what is necessary to admission into the Kingdom of Heaven—οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων, etc.

Vv. 47-48. *The epilogue* (Mt. vii. 24-27).—Ver. 47. πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος, etc.: the style of address here corresponds to the idea of the discourse suggested by Lk.'s presentation throughout, the historical Sermon on the Mount converted into an ideal sermon in a church = every one that cometh to me by becoming a Christian, and heareth my words generally, not these words in particular. — Ver. 48. ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε, dug, and kept deepening. A Hebraism, say Grotius and others = dug deeply. But Raphel produces an example from Xenophon of the same construction: σαφηνίζει τε καὶ ἀληθεύει for ἀληθῶς σαφηνίζει (*Oeconomici*, cap. xx.).—πλημμύρης (from πίμπλημι, ἅπ. λεγ in N. T.), a flood, "the sudden rush of a spate," Farrar (C. G. T.); "Hochwasser," Weizsäcker.—προσέρρηξεν, broke against, here and in ver. 49 only, in N. T.—Ver. 49. χωρὶς θεμελίου, without a foundation; an important editorial comment. The foolish builder did not make a mistake in choosing a foundation. His folly lay in not thinking of a foundation, but building at haphazard on the surface. *Vide* notes on Mt. for the characteristics of the two builders.—τὸ ῥῆγμα (πτῶσις in Mt.), the collapse, here only in N. T. This noun is used to answer to the verb προσέρρηξεν.

The impression produced by the foregoing study is that Lk's version of the Sermon on the Mount, while faithfully reproducing at least a part of our Lord's teaching on the hill, gives us that teaching, not in its original setting, but readapted so as to serve the practical purposes of Christian instruction, either by Lk. or by some one before him.

CHAPTER VII. THE CENTURION OF CAPERNAUM. THE WIDOW'S SON AT NAIN. THE BAPTIST. IN THE HOUSE OF SIMON.—Vv. 1-10. *The Centurion of Capernaum* (Mt. viii. 5-13).—Ver. 1. εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς, into the ears = εἰς τὰ ὦτα in Sept. (Gen. xx. 8, l. 4, Ex. x. 2). To show that it is not a Hebraism, Kypke cites from Dion. Hal.: εἰς τὴν ἁπάντων τῶν παρόντων ἀκοὴν.—εἰσῆλθεν, entered, not returned to, Capernaum.—Ver. 2. ὃς ἦν αὐτῷ ἔντιμος, who was dear to him; though a slave, indicating that he

a (Ch. xiv. 8.) Phil. ii. 29. 1 Pet. ii. 4, 6.

τινος δοῦλος κακῶς ἔχων ἤμελλε τελευτᾶν, ὃς ἦν αὐτῷ ᵃ ἔντιμος. 3. ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπέστειλε πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐρωτῶν αὐτόν, ὅπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ. 4. οἱ δὲ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν παρεκάλουν[1] αὐτὸν σπουδαίως, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι ἄξιός ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξει[2] τοῦτο· 5. ἀγαπᾷ γὰρ τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτὸς ᾠκοδόμησεν ἡμῖν." 6. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο σὺν αὐτοῖς. ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ[3] τῆς οἰκίας, ἔπεμψε πρὸς αὐτὸν[4] ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος φίλους,[5] λέγων αὐτῷ,[6] "Κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου· οὐ γάρ εἰμι ἱκανὸς[7] ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς· 7. διὸ οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἠξίωσα πρός σε ἐλθεῖν· ἀλλὰ εἰπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήσεται[8] ὁ παῖς μου. 8. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος, ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας, καὶ λέγω τούτῳ, Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται· καὶ ἄλλῳ, Ἔρχου, καὶ

[1] So in BC *al.* ηρωτων in ℵDLΞ minusc. (Tisch.). [2] παρεξη in ℵABCDLΔΞ *al.*
[3] ℵD min. omit απο (Tisch.). [4] Omit προς αυτον ℵB.
[5] φιλους before ο εκ. in ℵBCLΞ 33 *al.* [6] ℵ omits αυτω (Tisch.).
[7] ικ. ειμι in ℵB. [8] ιαθητω in BL. T.R. is from Mt.

was a humane master. Lk. has also in view, according to his wont, to enhance the value of the benefit conferred: the life of a valued servant saved.—Ver. 3. **ἀκούσας**: reports of previous acts of healing had reached him.—**ἀπέστειλε**: there is no mention of this fact or of the second deputation (in ver. 6) in Mt.'s version. Lk. is evidently drawing from another source, oral or written.—**πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων**, elders of the Jews; the reference is probably to elders of the city rather than to rulers of the synagogue. From the designation "of the Jews" it may be inferred that the centurion was a Pagan, probably in the service of Antipas.—**διασώσῃ**, bring safely through the disease which threatened life.—Ver. 4. **σπουδαίως**, earnestly; though he was a Pagan, they Jews, for reason given.—**ἄξιος ᾧ παρέξῃ**, for **ἄξιος ἵνα αὐτῷ π.** **παρέξῃ** is the 2nd person singular, future, middle, in a relative clause expressing purpose instead of the more usual subjunctive (*vide* Burton, § 318).—Ver. 5. **ἀγαπᾷ γὰρ**, etc., he loveth our race; a Philo-Jewish Pagan, whose affection for the people among whom he lived took the form of building a synagogue. Quite a credible fact, which could easily be ascertained. Herod built the temple. *Vide* Lightfoot on this.—Ver. 6. **ἐπορεύετο**: no hint of scruples on the part of Jesus, as in the case of the Syrophenician woman.—**οὐ μακρὰν**, not far, *i.e.*, quite near. Lk. often uses the negative with adjectives and adverbs to express strongly the positive. Hahn accumulates instances chiefly from Acts.—**φίλους**: these also would naturally be Jews.—**ἱκανός εἰμι ἵνα**: here we have **ἱκανὸς**, followed by **ἵνα** with subjunctive. In iii. 16 it is followed by the infinitive.—Ver. 7. **εἰπὲ λόγῳ**, speak, *i.e.*, command, with a word.—Ver. 8. **καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ**: here follows the great word of the centurion reported by Lk. much as in Mt. But it seems a word more suitable to be spoken *in propria persona* than by deputy. It certainly loses much of its force by being given second hand. Lk. seems here to forget for the moment that the centurion is not supposed to be present. Schanz conjectures that he did come after all, and speak this word himself. On its import *vide* at Mt. viii. 9—**τασσόμενος**: present, implying a constant state of subordination.

Comparing the two accounts of this incident, it may be noted that Lk.'s makes the action of the centurion consistent throughout, as inspired by diffident humility. In Mt. he has the courage to ask Jesus directly, yet he is too humble to let Jesus come to his house. In Lk. he uses intercessors, who show a geniality welcome to the irenic evangelist. Without suggesting intention, it may further be remarked that this story embodies the main features of the kindred incident of the

ἔρχεται· καὶ τῷ δούλῳ μου, Ποίησον τοῦτο, καὶ ποιεῖ." 9. Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν αὐτόν· καὶ στραφεὶς τῷ ἀκολουθοῦντι αὐτῷ ὄχλῳ εἶπε, "Λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον." 10. Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ πεμφθέντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον[1] εὗρον τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα[2] δοῦλον ὑγιαίνοντα.

11. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ[3] ἑξῆς, ἐπορεύετο[4] εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναΐν· καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἱκανοί,[5] καὶ ὄχλος πολύς. 12. ὡς δὲ ἤγγισε τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδού, ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκώς, υἱὸς μονογενὴς[6] τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὕτη ἦν χήρα· καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἱκανὸς[7] σὺν αὐτῇ. 13. καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν ὁ Κύριος

[1] **εις τ. ο.** before **οι πεμφ.** in ℵBDL *al.* vet. Lat. (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] Omit **ασθενουντα** ℵBL.

εν τω εξης in many MSS., including BL (W.H.). T.R. = ℵCD (Tisch.).

[4] **επορευθη** in ℵB 13, 69 (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] Omit **ικανοι** ℵBDLΞ (W.H.).

[6] **μον. υιος** in ℵBLΞ.

[7] Add **ην** after **ικ.** ℵBL 33.

Syrophenician woman, not reported by Lk. The excessive humility of the centurion = "we Gentile *dogs*". The intercession of the elders = that of the disciples. The friendliness of the elders s an admonition to Judaists = this is the attitude you ought to take up towards Gentiles. All the lessons of the "Syrophenician woman" are thus taught, while the one unwelcome feature of Christ's refusal or unwillingness to help, which might seem to justify the Judaist, is eliminated. How far such considerations had an influence in moulding the tradition followed by Lk. it is impossible to say. Suffice it to point out that the narrative, as it stands, does double duty, and shows us:—

1. Gentile humility and faith.
2. Jewish friendliness.
3. Christ's prompt succour, and admiration of great faith.

Vv. 11-17. *The son of the widow of Nain.* In Lk. only.—**ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς** (**καιρῷ**), in the following time, thereafter; vague. —**ἐν τῇ ἑ.** would mean: on the following *day* (**ἡμέρᾳ**, understood), *i.e.*, the day after the healing of the centurion's servant in Capernaum. Hofmann defends this reading on the negative ground that no usage of style on the part of Lk. is against it, and that it better suits the circumstances. "We see Jesus on the way towards the city of Nain on the north-western slope of the little Hermon, a day's journey from Capernaum. It is expressly noted that His disciples, and, as **ἱκανοί** is well attested, in considerbable numers, not merely the Twelve, were with Him, and many people besides; a surrounding the same as on the hill where He had addressed His disciples. Those of the audience who had come from Judaea are on their way home." The point must be left doubtful. W. and H. have **ἐν τῷ ἑ.**, and omit **ἱκανοί**.—**Ναΐν**: there is still a little hamlet of the same name (*vide* Robinson, *Palestine*, ii. 355, 361). Eusebius and Jerome speak of the town as not far from Endor. Some have thought the reference is to a Nain in Southern Palestine, mentioned by Josephus. But Lk. would hardly take his readers so far from the usual scene of Christ's ministry without warning.—Ver. 12. **καὶ ἰδού**, and lo! The **καὶ** introduces the apodosis, but is really superfluous; very Hebrew (Godet).—**ἐξεκομίζετο**, was being carried out (here only in N. T.); **ἐκφέρειν** used in the classics (Acts v. 6). Loesner cites examples of the use of this verb in the same sense, from Philo.—**μονογενής, χήρα**: these words supply the pathos of the situation, depict the woe of the widowed mother, and by implication emphasise the benevolence of the miracle, always a matter of interest for Lk.—Ver. 13. **ὁ Κύριος**, the Lord, first time this title has been used for Jesus in the narrative. Lk. frequently introduces it where the other synoptists have "Jesus". The heavenly Christ, Lord of the Church, is in his mind, and perhaps he employs the title here because it is a case of raising from the dead. The "Lord" is Himself the risen One.—**ἐσπλαγχνίσθη**: express mention of sympathy, pity, as the

ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτῇ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Μὴ κλαῖε." 14. Καὶ προσελθὼν ἥψατο τῆς σοροῦ· οἱ δὲ βαστάζοντες ἔστησαν· καὶ εἶπε, "Νεανίσκε, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγέρθητι." 15. Καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν[1] ὁ νεκρός, καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν· καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ. 16. ἔλαβε δὲ φόβος ἅπαντας, καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεόν, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι προφήτης μέγας ἐγήγερται[2] ἐν ἡμῖν," καὶ "Ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ." 17. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν[3] πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ.

18. ΚΑΙ ἀπήγγειλαν Ἰωάννῃ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ πάντων τούτων. 19. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος δύο τινὰς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἔπεμψε πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν,[4] λέγων, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον[5] προσδοκῶμεν;" 20. Παραγενόμενοι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες εἶπον, "Ἰωάννης ὁ Βαπτιστὴς ἀπέσταλκεν ἡμᾶς πρός σε, λέγων, Σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἄλλον[5] προσδοκῶμεν;" 21. Ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ[6] τῇ ὥρᾳ

[1] B has εκαθισεν (W.H. marg.). [2] ηγερθη in ℵABCLΞ 33.

[3] εν omitted by ℵBLΞ 33.

[4] κυριον in BLΞ 13, 33, 69, the most likely word for Lk.

[5] ετερον in ℵBLΞ 33 (W.H.), in second place ετερον in ℵDLΞ 33. B has αλλον (W.H. text).

[6] εν εκεινη τη ωρα in ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.).

motive of the miracle. *Cf.* Mk. i. 41.—**μὴ κλαῖε**, cease weeping, a hint of what was coming, but of course not understood by the widow.—Ver. 14. **σοροῦ**, the bier (here only in N. T.), probably an open coffin, originally an urn for keeping the bones of the dead.—**ἔστησαν**, those who carried the coffin stood, taking the touch of Jesus as a sign that He wished this.—Ver. 15. **ἀνεκάθισεν**, sat up: the **ἀνὰ** is implied even if the reading **ἐκάθισεν** be adopted; to sit was to sit up for one who had been previously lying; sitting up showed life returned, speaking, full possession of his senses; the reality and greatness of the miracle thus asserted.—Ver. 16. **φόβος**: the awe natural to all, and especially simple people, in presence of the preternatural.—**προφήτης μέγας**, a great prophet, like Elisha, who had wrought a similar miracle at Shunem, near by (2 Kings iv.).—**ἐπεσκέψατο**, visited graciously, as in i. 68, 78.—Ver. 17. **ὁ λόγος οὗτος**, this story. Lk. says it went out, it would spread like wildfire far and wide.—**ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ**, in all Judaea. Some (Meyer, Bleek, J. Weiss, Holtzmann) think Judaea means here not the province but the whole of Palestine. But Lk. is looking forward to the next incident (message from John); therefore, while the story would of course spread in all directions, north and south, he lays stress on the southward stream of rumour (carried by the Judaean part of Christ's audience, vi. 17) through which it would reach the Baptist at Machaerus.—**πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ**, the district surrounding Judaea, Peraea, *i.e.*, where John was in prison.

Vv. 18-35. *The Baptist's message* (Mt. xi. 2-19).—Ver. 18. **ἀπήγγειλαν**: John's disciples report to him. Lk. assumes that his readers will remember what he has stated in iii. 20, and does not repeat it. But the reporting of the disciples tacitly implies that the master is dependent on them for information, *i.e.*, is in prison.—**περὶ πάντων τούτων**: the works of Jesus as in Mt., but **τούτων** refers specially to the two last reported (centurion's servant, widow's son).—Ver. 19. **δύο**, two; more explicit than Mt., who has **διὰ τ. μαθητῶν**. The **δύο** may be an editorial change made on the document, from which both drew.—**πρὸς τὸν κύριον** (Ἰησοῦν, T. R.): a second instance of the use of the title "Lord" in Lk.'s narrative.—**σὺ εἶ**, etc.: question as in Mk., with the doubtful variation, **ἄλλον** for **ἕτερον**.—Ver. 20. On their arrival the men are made to repeat the question.—Ver. 21. Lk. makes Jesus reply not merely by word, as in Mt. (xi.

ἐθεράπευσε πολλοὺς ἀπὸ νόσων καὶ μαστίγων καὶ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν, καὶ τυφλοῖς πολλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο τὸ[1] βλέπειν. 22. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς[2] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ἃ εἴδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε· ὅτι[3] τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσι, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσι, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται, κωφοὶ ἀκούουσι, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται· 23. καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν, ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί." 24. Ἀπελθόντων δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων Ἰωάννου, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους περὶ Ἰωάννου, "Τί ἐξεληλύθατε[4] εἰς τὴν ἔρημον θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον; 25. ἀλλὰ τί ἐξεληλύθατε[4] ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσμένον; ἰδού, οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις εἰσίν. 26. ἀλλὰ τί ἐξεληλύθατε[4] ἰδεῖν; προφήτην; ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου. 27. οὗτός ἐστι περὶ οὗ γέγραπται, 'Ἰδού, ἐγὼ[5] ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.' 28. Λέγω γὰρ[6] ὑμῖν, μείζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν προφήτης[7] Ἰωάννου τοῦ Βαπτιστοῦ[7] οὐδείς ἐστιν. ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ

[1] Omit το most uncials. [2] Omit ο Ι. ℵBDΞ.
[3] Omit οτι ℵBL (W.H.).
[4] εξηλθατε in all three places in ℵABDLΞ 69 (W.H.).
[5] Omit εγω ℵBDLΞ minusc. verss. (Tisch., W.H.).
[6] Omit γαρ omitted in BΞ 33 (Tisch., W.H.).
[7] ℵBL omit προφ. and του Βαπ., which seem explanatory additions of scribes.

5), but first of all by deeds displaying His miraculous power. That Jesus wrought demonstrative cures there and then may be Lk.'s inference from the expression ἀκούετε καὶ βλέπετε, which seems to point to something going on before their eyes.—ἐχαρίσατο: a word welcome to Lk. as containing the idea of grace = He granted the boon (of sight).—Ver. 22 contains the verbal answer, pointing the moral = go and tell your master what ye saw and heard (aorist, past at the time of reporting), and leave him to draw his own conclusion.—νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται: this refers to the son of the widow of Nain; raisings from the dead are not included in the list of marvels given in the previous verse. Lk. omits throughout the connecting καὶ with which Mt. binds the marvels into couplets. On the motive of John's message, *vide* notes of Mt., *ad loc.*

Vv. 24-30. *Encomium on the Baptist.*—Ver. 24. τί: if we take τί = what, the question will be: what went ye out to see? and the answer: "a reed, etc."; if = why, it will be: why went ye out? and the answer: "to see a reed, etc."—ἐξεληλύθατε (T. R.): this reading, as different from Mt. (ἐξήλθατε), has a measure of probability and is adopted by Tischendorf, here and in vv. 25 and 26. But against this J. Weiss emphasises the fact that the "emendators" were fond of perfects. The aorists seem more appropriate to the connection as containing a reference to a past event, the visit of the persons addressed to the scene of John's ministry.—Ver. 25. ἰδοὺ οἱ: Lk. changes the expression here, substituting for οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες (Mt.), οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες = those living in (clothed with) splendid apparel and luxury.—Vv. 26 and 27 are = vv. 9 and 10 in Mt., with the exception that Lk. inverts the words προφήτην, ἰδεῖν, making it possible to render: why went ye out? to see a prophet? or, what went ye out to see? a prophet? In Mt., only the former rendering is possible.—Ver. 28. λέγω ὑμῖν: here as elsewhere Lk. omits the Hebrew ἀμὴν, and he other-

βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστι." 29. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸ ἀκούσας καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν Θεόν, βαπτισθέντες τ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου· 30. οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτούς, μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. 31. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος,[1] "Τίνι οὖν ὁμοιώσω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης; καὶ τίνι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι; 32. ὅμοιοί εἰσι παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις, καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις, καὶ λέγουσιν,[2] Ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε· ἐθρηνήσαμεν ὑμῖν,[3] καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύσατε. 33. ἐλήλυθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ Βαπτιστὴς μήτε ἄρτον

[1] **ειπε δε ο K.** omitted in uncials, found in minusc.; a marginal direction in Lectionaries.

[2] ℵB 1 have the peculiar reading **α λεγει**, which W.H. adopt.

[3] Omit this second **υμιν** (conforms to first) ℵBDLΞ 13, 346.

wise alters and tones down the remarkable statement about John, omitting the solemn **ἐγήγερται**, and inserting, according to an intrinsically probable reading, though omitted in the best MSS. (and in W.H.), **προφήτης**, so limiting the wide sweep of the statement. Lk.'s version is secondary. Mt.'s is more like what Jesus speaking strongly would say. Even if He *meant:* a greater *prophet* than John there is not among the sons of women, He would say it thus: among those born of women there hath not *arisen* a greater than John, as if he were the greatest *man* that ever lived.—**ὁ δὲ μικ.** On this *vide* at Mt.—Vv. 29, 30 are best taken as a historical reflection by the evangelist. Its prosaic character, as compared with what goes before and comes after, compels this conclusion, as even Hahn admits. Then its absence from Mt.'s account points in the same direction. It has for its aim to indicate to what extent the popular judgment had endorsed the estimate just offered by Jesus. The whole people, even the publicans, had, by submitting to be baptised by John, acknowledged his legitimacy and power as a prophet of God, and so "justified" (**ἐδικαίωσαν**) God in sending him as the herald of the coming Messianic Kingdom and King, *i.e.*, recognised him as the fit man for so high a vocation. To be strictly correct he is obliged, contrary to his wont, to refer to the Pharisees and lawyers as exceptions, describing them as making void, frustrating (**ἠθέτησαν**, *cf.* Gal. ii. 21) the counsel of God with reference to themselves. The two words **ἐδικ.** and **ἠθέτ.** are antithetic, and help to define each other. The latter meaning to treat with contempt and so set aside, the former must mean to approve God's counsel or ordinance in the mission of the Baptist. Kypke renders: *laudarunt Deum*, citing numerous instances of this sense from the *Psalt. Solom.*—**εἰς ἑαυτοὺς** after **ἠθέτησαν** has been variously rendered = "against themselves" (A. V.) and = "for themselves," *i.e.*, in so far as they were concerned (R. V.; "quantum ab eis pendebat," Bornemann). But the latter would require **τὸ εἰς ἑαυτούς**. The meaning is plain enough. God's counsel very specially concerned the Pharisees and lawyers, for none in Israel more needed to repent than they. Therefore the phrase = they frustrated God's counsel (in John's mission), which was for (concerned) the whole Jewish people, and its religious leaders very particularly.

Vv. 31-35. *The children in the market place.*—**τοὺς ἀν. τ. γενεᾶς ταύτης.** The pointed reference in the previous verse to the Pharisees and lawyers marks them out as, in the view of the evangelist, the "generation" Jesus has in His eye. This is not so clear in Mt.'s version, where we gather that they are the subject of animadversion from the characterisation corresponding to their character as otherwise known. Jesus spoke severely only of the religious leaders; of the people always pitifully.—Ver. 32. **ὅμοιοί εἰσιν**: referring to **ἀνθρώπους**, **ὁμοία** in Mt. referring to **γενεὰν**. The variations in Lk.'s version from Mt.'s are slight: both seem to be keeping close to a common source—**ἀλλήλοις** for **ἑτέροις**, **ἐκλαύσατε** for **ἐκόψασθε**; in ver. 33 **ἄρτον** is inserted after **ἐσθίων** and **οἶνον** after **πίνων**;

ἐσθίων μήτε οἶνον πίνων,[1] καὶ λέγετε, Δαιμόνιον ἔχει. 34. ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Ἰδού, ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος[2] καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. 35. καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς πάντων."[3]

36. Ἠρώτα δέ τις αὐτὸν τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἵνα φάγῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν[4] τοῦ Φαρισαίου ἀνεκλίθη.[5] 37. Καὶ ἰδού, γυνὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει, ἥτις ἦν[6] ἁμαρτωλός, ἐπιγνοῦσα[7] ὅτι ἀνάκειται[8]

[1] In μητε αρτον . . . πινων ℵBΞ have μη for first μητε, BD εσθων for εσθιων, ℵBLΞ αρτ. after εσθ. and οιν. after πινων. W.H. adopt all these changes.

[2] φιλος before τελων. in most uncials.

[3] παντων after απο in ℵB minusc. (W.H.).

[4] τον οικον in ℵBDLΞ 1, 33, 69 *al.*

[5] κατεκλιθη in BDLΞ 1, 33.

[6] ητις ην εν τη πολει in ℵBLΞ (Tisch., W.H.).

[7] και before επιγ. in ℵAB *al. pl.*

[8] κατακ. in ℵABDLΞ 33.

following a late tradition, think Meyer and Schanz. More probably they are explanatory editorial touches by Lk., as if to say: John did eat and drink, but not *bread* and *wine*.—For ἦλθεν Lk. substitutes in vv. 33 and 34 ἐλήλυθεν = is come. Thus the two prophets have taken their place once for all in the page of history: the one as an ascetic, the other as avoiding peculiarity—influencing men not by the method of isolation but by the method of *sympathy*. The malignant caricature of this genial character in ver. 34—glutton, drunkard, comrade of publicans and sinners—originated doubtless in the Capernaum mission.—Ver. 35. καὶ, etc., and wisdom is wont to be justified by all her children; by all who are themselves wise, not foolish and unreasonable like the "generation" described. On this adage *vide* notes on Mt. xi. 19. Bornemann thinks that this verse is part of what the adverse critics said, of course spoken in irony = their conduct shown to be folly by results; what converts they made: the refuse of the population!

Vv. 36-50. *The sinful woman.* This section, peculiar to Lk., one of the golden evangelic incidents we owe to him, is introduced here with much tact, as it serves to illustrate how Jesus came to be called the friend of publicans and sinners, and to be calumniated as such, and at the same time to show the true nature of the relations He sustained to these classes. It serves further to exhibit Jesus as One whose genial, gracious spirit could bridge gulfs of social cleavage, and make Him the friend, not of one class only, but of all classes, the friend of *man*, not merely of the degraded. Lk. would not have his readers imagine that Jesus dined only with such people as He met in Levi's house. In Lk.'s pages Jesus dines with Pharisees also, here and on two other occasions. This is a distinctive feature in his portraiture of Jesus, characteristic of his irenical cosmopolitan disposition. It has often been maintained that this narrative is simply the story of Mary of Bethany remodelled so as to teach new lessons. But, as will appear, there are original features in it which, even in the judgment of Holtzmann (H. C.), make it probable that two incidents of the kind occurred.

Vv. 36-39. *The situation.*—τις τῶν Φ.: when or who not indicated, probably not known, but of no consequence to the story; the point to be noted that one of the Pharisaic class was the inviter.—τοῦ Φαρισαίου: the class indicated a second time to make prominent the fact that Jesus did not hesitate to accept the invitation. Euthy. Zig. remarks: He did not refuse that He might not give excuse for saying that He ate with publicans and sinners and avoided the Pharisees (βδελυσσόμενος).—Ver. 37. γυνὴ, etc., a woman who was in the city, a sinner. This arrangement of the words (ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει, W.H.) represents her as a notorious character; how sinning indicated by expressive silence: a harlot. In what city? Various conjectures. Why not Capernaum? She a guest and hearer on occasion of the feast in Levi's house, and this what came of it! Place the two dinners side by side for an effective contrast.—ἐπιγνοῦσα,

b here only in sense of bearing or bringing to, in N. T.

ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ Φαρισαίου, [b] κομίσασα ἀλάβαστρον μύρου, 38. καὶ στᾶσα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω [1] κλαίουσα, ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοῖς δάκρυσι,[2] καὶ ταῖς θριξὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασσε, καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤλειφε τῷ μύρῳ. 39. ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγων, "Οὗτος, εἰ ἦν προφήτης,[3] ἐγίνωσκεν ἂν τίς καὶ ποταπὴ ἡ γυνή, ἥτις ἅπτεται αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἁμαρτωλός ἐστι."

40. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν, "Σίμων, ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν." Ὁ δέ φησι, "Διδάσκαλε, εἰπέ."[4] 41. "Δύο χρεωφειλέται ἦσαν δανειστῇ τινι· ὁ εἷς ὤφειλε δηνάρια πεντακόσια, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος πεντήκοντα. 42. μὴ ἐχόντων δὲ[5] αὐτῶν ἀποδοῦναι, ἀμφοτέροις ἐχαρίσατο. τίς οὖν αὐτῶν εἰπέ,[6] πλεῖον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσει[7]; "

[1] **οπισω** before **παρα τ. π.** in ℵBDLXΔ 1, 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] **τοις δακ.** before **ηρξατο** in ℵBDL 33, a very credible emphasis on the *tears*.

[3] BΞ have **ο προφ.** (W.H. in brackets).

[4] **διδασκ. ειπε φησιν** in ℵBLΞ 1 (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] Omit **δε** BDLΞ.

[6] Omit **ειπε** ℵBDLΞ.

[7] **αγαπ. αυτον** in ℵBLΞ 33.

having learned, either by accident, or by inquiry, or by both combined.—**ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τ. Φ.**: the *Pharisee* again, *nota bene!* A formidable place for one like her to go to, but what will love not dare?—Ver. 38. **στᾶσα ὀπίσω**, standing behind, at His feet. The guests reclined on couches with their feet turned outwards, a posture learned by the Jews from their various masters: Persians, Greeks, Romans. In delicacy Jesus would not look round or take any notice, but let her do what she would.—**κλαίουσα**: excitement, tumultuous emotions, would make a burst of weeping inevitable.—**ἤρξατο** applies formally to **βρέχειν**, but really to all the descriptive verbs following. She did not wet Christ's feet with tears of set purpose; the act was involuntary.—**βρέχειν**, to moisten, as rain moistens the ground: her tears fell like a thunder shower on Christ's feet. *Cf.* Mt. v. 45.—**ἐξέμασσε**, she continued wiping. Might have been infinitive depending on **ἤρξατο**, but more forcible as an imperfect. Of late use in this sense. To have her hair flowing would be deemed immodest. Extremes met in that act.—**κατεφίλει**, kissed fervently, again and again. *Judas* also kissed fervently. *Vide* Mt. xxvi. 49 and remarks there.—**ἤλειφε**: this was the one act she had come of set purpose to do; all the rest was done impulsively under the rush of feeling.—Ver. 39. **ὁ Φαρισαῖος**, for the fourth time; this time he is most appropriately so designated because he is to act in character.—**εἰ ἦν προφήτης**: not the worst thing he could have thought. This woman's presence implies previous relations, of what sort need not be asked: not a prophet, but no thought of impurity; simply ignorant like a common man.—**ἐγίνωσκεν ἄν**, indicative with **ἄν**, as usual in a supposition contrary to fact.—**τίς καὶ ποταπὴ**, who and what sort of a woman; known to everybody and known for evil.—**ἅπτεται**: touch of a man however slight by such a woman impossible without evil desire arising in her. So judged the Pharisee; any other theory of her action inconceivable to him.

Vv. 40-50. *Host and guest.*—**ἀποκριθεὶς**, answering, to his thought written on his face.—**Σίμων**: the Pharisee now is called by his own name as in friendly intercourse. The whole dialogue on Christ's part presents an exquisite combination of outspoken criticism with courtesy.—**ἔχω σοί τι εἰπεῖν**: *comis praefatio*, Bengel.—**Διδάσκαλε**: Simon's reply equally frank and pleasant.—Ver. 41. The parable of the two debtors, an original feature in the story.—**χρεωφειλέται**: here and in xvi. 5, only in N.T.—**δανειστῇ** (here only in N.T.): might mean a usurer, but his behaviour in the story makes it more suitable to think of him simply as a *creditor*.—**ὁ εἷς ὤφειλε**: even the larger sum was a petty debt,

43. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ[1] Σίμων εἶπεν, "ᶜὙπολαμβάνω ὅτι ᾧ τὸ πλεῖον ᶜ Acts ii. 13. ἐχαρίσατο." Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ὀρθῶς ἔκρινας." 44. Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη, "Βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα; εἰσῆλθόν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὕδωρ ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας μου[2] οὐκ ἔδωκας. αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέ μου τοὺς πόδας, καὶ ταῖς θριξὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς[3] αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξε. 45. φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δέ, ἀφ' ἧς εἰσῆλθον, οὐ διέλιπε[4] καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας. 46. ἐλαίῳ τὴν κεφαλήν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας· αὕτη δὲ μύρῳ ἤλειψέ μου τοὺς πόδας.[5] 47. οὗ χάριν, λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς[6] αἱ πολλαί, ὅτι ἠγάπησε πολύ· ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ὀλίγον ἀγαπᾷ." 48. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῇ, "Ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι." 49. Καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ συνανακείμενοι λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, "Τίς οὗτός ἐστιν ὃς καὶ ἁμαρτίας ἀφίησιν;" 50. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα, "Ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην."

[1] Omit δε BD, and ο ℵBLΞ.

[2] μου before επι τ. π. in ℵLΞ (Tisch., W.H., marg.). μοι επι ποδας in B (W.H. text).

[3] Omit της κεφ. ℵABDLΞ vet. Lat. vulg. cop. *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] διελιπε in BD (W.H. text); διελειπεν in ℵLΔΞ *al. mul.* (Tisch., W.H., marg.) —a correction of style.

[5] μου τ. π. in ℵ *al.*, 1, 13, 69 *al.* (Tisch. = T.R.). τ. π. μου in BLΞ (W.H.).

[6] αυτης before αι αμαρ. in ℵ, etc. (Tisch.). T.R. = BLΞ *al. mul.* (W.H.).

whereby Simon would be thrown off his guard: no suspicion of a personal reference.—Ver. 42. **ἐχαρίσατο**: a warmer word than **ἀφιέναι**, welcome to Lk. as containing the idea of grace. —**ὀρθῶς ἔκρινας**, like the **πάνυ ὀρθῶς** of Socrates, but without his irony.—Vv. 44-46. **στραφεὶς**: Jesus looks at the woman now for the first time, and asks His host to look at her, the despised one, that he may learn a lesson from her, by a contrast to be drawn between her behaviour and his own in application of the parable. A sharply marked antithesis runs through the description.—**ὕδωρ —δάκρυσιν**; **φίλημα — καταφιλοῦσα**; **ἐλαίῳ** (common oil), **μύρῳ** (precious ointment); **κεφαλήν—πόδας**. There is a kind of poetic rhythm in the words, as is apt to be the case when men speak under deep emotion.—Ver. 47. **οὗ χάριν**, wherefore, introducing Christ's theory of the woman's extraordinary behaviour as opposed to Simon's ungenerous suspicions.—**λέγω σοι**, I tell you, with emphasis; what Jesus firmly believes and what Simon very much needs to be told.—**ἀφέωνται** (Doric perf. pas.) **αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς**, forgiven are her sins; *i.e.*, it is a case, not of a courtesan acting in character, as you have been thinking, but of a penitent who has come through me to the knowledge that even such as she can be forgiven. That is the meaning of this extraordinary demonstration of passionate affection.—**αἱ πολλαί**, the many, a sort of afterthought: many sins, a great sinner, you think, and so I also can see from her behaviour in this chamber, which manifests intense love, whence I infer that she is conscious of much forgiveness and of much need to be forgiven.—**ὅτι ἠγάπησεν πολύ**: **ὅτι** introduces the ground of the assertion implied in **πολλαί**; *many* sins inferred from much love; the underlying principle: much forgiven, much love, which is here applied backwards, because Simon, while believing in the woman's great sin, did not believe in her penitence. The foregoing interpretation is now adopted by most commentators. The old dispute between Protestants and Catholics, based on this text, as to the ground of pardon is now pretty much out of date.—**ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον**, etc.: this is the other side of the truth, as it applied to Simon: little (conscious)

a Acts xvii. 1 (Gen. xiii. 17). VIII. 1. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς, καὶ αὐτὸς [a] διώδευε κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην, κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ οἱ δώδεκα σὺν αὐτῷ, 2. καὶ γυναῖκές τινες αἳ ἦσαν τεθεραπευμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν, Μαρία ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή, ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει, 3. καὶ Ἰωάννα γυνὴ Χουζᾶ ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρώδου, καὶ Σουσάννα, καὶ ἕτεραι

b const. (with dat.) Ch. xii. 15. Acts iv. 32. πολλαί, αἵτινες διηκόνουν αὐτῷ[1] ἀπὸ[2] τῶν [b] ὑπαρχόντων [b] αὐταῖς.

4. Συνιόντος δὲ ὄχλου πολλοῦ, καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιπορευομένων πρὸς αὐτόν, εἶπε διὰ παραβολῆς, 5. "Ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν, ὃ μὲν ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ κατεπατήθη, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατ-

[1] **αυτοις** for **αυτω** in BD *al. pl.*

[2] **εκ** for **απο** in ℵABDL 1, 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H., adopt both changes).

sin, little love. The doctrine here enunciated is another very original element in this story. It and the words in Lk. v. 31 and Lk. xv. 7 form together a complete apology for Christ's relations with the sinful.—Ver. 48. **ἀφέωνται**: direct assurance of forgiveness, for confirmation of her faith tried by an unsympathetic surrounding of frowning Pharisees.—Ver. 49. **τίς οὗτος**: again the stupid cavil about usurpation of the power to pardon (v. 21).—Ver. 50. Concerned only about the welfare of the heroine of the story, Jesus takes no notice of this, but bids her farewell with "thy faith hath saved thee, go into peace". J. Weiss (Meyer) thinks ver. 49 may be an addition by Lk. to the story as given in his source.

CHAPTER VIII. THE SOWER AND OTHER INCIDENTS.—Vv. 1-3. *Ministering women*; peculiar to Lk., and one of the interesting fruits of his industrious search for additional *memorabilia* of Jesus, giving us a glimpse into the way in which Jesus and His disciples were supported.—Ver. 1. **ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς**, "afterwards," A. V., not necessarily "*soon* afterwards," R. V. (= **ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς**, vii. 11). The temporal connection with the preceding narrative is loose, but the connection of thought and sentiment is close. Lk. would show how penitent, suffering, sorrowful women who had received benefit in body or soul from Jesus went into *peace* and blessedness. They followed Him and served Him with their substance, and so illustrated the law: much benefit, much love.—**διώδευε**: of this itinerant preaching ministry Lk. knows, or at least gives, no particulars. The one thing he knows or states is that on such tours Jesus had the benefit of female devotion. Probably such service began very early, and was not limited to one tour of late date.—Ver. 2. **Μαρία ἡ κ. Μαγδαληνή**, Mary called the Magdalene, the only one of the three named who is more than a name for readers of the Gospel; since the fourth century, identified with the sinful woman of the previous chapter, the seven demons from which she is said to have been delivered being supposed to refer to her wicked life; a mistaken identification, as in the Gospels demoniacal possession is something quite distinct from immorality. Koetsveld, speaking of the place assigned in tradition and popular opinion to Mary as the patroness of converted harlots, remarks: "All the water of the sea cannot wash off this stain from Mary Magdalene," *De Gelijkenissen*, p. 366. The epithet **Μαγδαληνή** is usually taken as meaning "of the town of Magdala". P. de Lagarde interprets it "the *hair-curler*," Haarkünstlerin (*Nachrichten der Gesell. der Wissens.*, Göttingen, 1889, pp. 371-375).

Vv. 4-8. *Parable of the sower* (Mt. xiii. 1-9, Mk. iv. 1-9).—Ver. 4. **ὄχλου**: Lk., like the two other evangelists, provides for the parable discourse a large audience, but he makes no mention of preaching from a boat, which has been forestalled in a previous incident (chap. v. 3).—**καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν**, etc.: this clause simply explains how the crowd was made up, by contingents from the various towns. This would have been clearer if the **καὶ** had been left out; yet it is not superfluous, as it gives an enhanced idea of the size of the crowd = *even*

ἔφαγεν αὐτό. 6. καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν[1] ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, καὶ φυὲν ἐξηράνθη, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἰκμάδα. 7. καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν, καὶ συμφυεῖσαι αἱ ἄκανθαι ἀπέπνιξαν αὐτό. 8. καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ[2] τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθήν, καὶ φυὲν ἐποίησε καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα." Ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει, "Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω." 9. Ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες,[3] "Τίς εἴη ἡ παραβολὴ αὕτη[4];" 10. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, "Ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ· τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσι, καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν. 11. Ἔστι δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή· ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ· 12. οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκούοντες,[5] εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἴρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες

[1] So in ℵD = parall. κατεπεσεν in BLRΞ (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] εις for επι in ℵABLΞ *al. pl.*

[3] Omit λεγοντες ℵBDLΞ verss., Orig.

[4] ℵB 33 have τις αυτη ειη η (B om.) παρ., changed into the smoother reading in T.R.

[5] ακουσαντες in ℵBLΞ.

people from every city gathering to Him. —**διὰ παραβολῆς**: Lk. gives only a single parable in this place.—Ver. 5. **τὸν σπόρον α.**: an editorial addition, that could be dispensed with.—**ὃ μὲν**, one part, ὃ neuter, replied to by **καὶ ἕτερον** = **ἕτερον δὲ** in ver. 6.—Ver. 6. **φυὲν**, 2nd aorist participle, neuter, from **ἐφύην** (Alex. form), the Attic 2nd aorist being **ἔφυν**.—**ἰκμάδα** (**ἰκμάς**), moisture, here only in N. T.—Ver. 7. **ἐν μέσῳ τ. ἀ.**: Mt. has **ἐπὶ**, Mk. **εἰς**. Lk.'s expression suggests that the thorns are already above ground.—Ver. 8. **ἑκατονταπλασίονα**, an hundredfold. Lk. has only one degree of fruitfulness, the highest, possibly because when 100 is possible 60 and 30 were deemed unsatisfactory, but an important lesson is missed by the omission. The version in Mt. and Mk. is doubtless the original. It was characteristic of Jesus, while demanding the undivided heart, to allow for diversity in the measure of fruitfulness. Therein appeared His "sweet reasonableness". This omission seems to justify the opinion of Meyer that Lk.'s version of the parable is secondary. Weiss on the contrary thinks it comes nearest to the original.

Vv. 9-10. *Conversation concerning the parable* (Mt. xiii. 10-17, Mk. iv. 10-12).—Ver. 9. **τίς εἴη**, what this parable might be. The question in Lk. refers not to the parabolic method, as if they had never heard a parable before, but to the sense or aim of this particular parable. It simply prepares for the interpretation following.—Ver. 10. The contrast between the disciples and others, as here put, is that in the case of the former the mysteries of the kingdom are given to be *known*, in that of the latter the mysteries are given, but only in *parables*, therefore so as to remain unknown. The sense is the same in Mt. and Mk., but the mode of expression is somewhat different.—**τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς**, a milder phrase than the **ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω** of Mk., *cf.* **ἄλλων** in chap. v. 29.—**ἵνα βλέποντες**, etc.: this sombre saying is also characteristically toned done by abbreviation as compared with Mt. and Mk., as if it contained an unwelcome idea. *Vide* notes on Mt.

Vv. 11-15. *Interpretation of the parable* (Mt. xiii. 18-23, Mk. iv. 13-20).—Ver. 12. **οἱ ἀκούσαντες**: this is not a sufficient definition of the wayside hearers; all the classes described heard. The next clause, beginning with **εἶτα**, must be included in the definition = the wayside men are persons in whose case, so soon as they have heard, cometh, etc.—**ὁ διάβολος**: each gospel has a different name for the evil one; **ὁ πονηρὸς**, Mt., **ὁ σατανᾶς**, Mk.—**ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν**, lest believing they should be saved; peculiar to Lk., and in expression an echo of St. Paul

σωθῶσιν. 13. οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας,[1] οἳ ὅταν ἀκούσωσι, μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον, καὶ οὗτοι[2] ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, οἳ πρὸς [e] καιρὸν πιστεύουσι, καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται. 14. τὸ δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας πεσόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ πλούτου καὶ ἡδονῶν τοῦ βίου πορευόμενοι συμπνίγονται, καὶ οὐ τελεσφοροῦσι. 15. τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ, ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσι, καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ.

e again in 1 Cor. vii. 5.

16. "Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἅψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει, ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας ἐπιτίθησιν,[3] ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι

[1] επι της π. in BLΔ *al. pl.* (W.H. text). επι την π. in ℵD *al.* (Tisch., W.H., marg.).

[2] B has αυτοι (W.H. marg.).

[3] ℵBLΞ have the simple τιθησιν (D has τιθι, apparently an incomplete word = τιθισιν).

and the apostolic age.—Ver. 13. μετὰ χαρᾶς: common to the three reports, a familiar and important feature of this type—emotional religion.—πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσι, believe for a season, instead of Mt.'s and Mk.'s, he (they) is (are) temporary.—ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ: a more comprehensive expression than that common to Mt. and Mk., which points only to outward trial, tribulation, or persecution. The season of temptation may include inward trial by deadness of feeling, doubt, etc. (Schanz).—Ver. 14. τὸ δὲ. There is a change here from the plural masculine to the neuter singular: from "those who" to "that which".—πορευόμενοι: the use of this word, which seems superfluous (Grotius), is probably due to Lk. having under his eye Mk.'s account, in which εἰσπορευόμεναι comes in at this point. Kypke renders: "illi a curis (ὑπὸ μεριμνῶν καὶ π. καὶ ἡ. τ. β.) occupati sive penetrati" = they being taken possession of by, etc., the passive form of Mk.'s "cares, etc., entering in and taking possession". This seems as good an explanation as can be thought of.—Bornemann takes ὑπὸ = μετά or σύν, and renders, they go or live amid cares, etc., and are checked.—οὐ τελεσφοροῦσι, they do not bring to maturity (here only in N. T.). Examples of this use in Wetstein and Kypke from Strabo, Philo, Josephus, etc. Hesychius explains τελεσφόρος thus: ὁ τελεσφορῶν καθ' ὥραν τοὺς καρποὺς, ἢ ὁ τελείους αὐτοὺς φέρων.—Ver. 15. ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ, in a noble and generous heart, an important contribution by Lk. to the explanation of the conditions of fruitfulness. The former epithet points to a lofty aim or ideal, the latter to enthusiastic whole-hearted devotion to the ideal, the two constituting a heroic character. The phrase was familiar to the Greeks, and Lk. may have been acquainted with their use of it to describe a man *comme il faut*, but he brings to the conception of the καλὸς κἀγαθὸς new moral elements.—ἐν ὑπομονῇ, in patience, as opposed to πρὸς καιρὸν; and, it might be added, ἐν εἰλικρινείᾳ as opposed to the thorny-ground hearers. ὑπομ., again in xxi. 19, often in Epistles.

Vv. 16-18. *Those who have light must let it shine* (Mt. v. 15, x. 26, Mk. iv. 21-25). Lk. here seems to follow Mk., who brings in at the same point the parable of the lamp, setting forth the duty of those who are initiated into the mysteries of the kingdom to diffuse their light. A most important complement to the doctrine set forth in ver. 10, that parables were meant to veil the mysteries of the kingdom.—Ver. 16. ἅψας: Mt. has καίουσιν. ἅπτειν is the more classical word.—σκεύει: any hollow vessel instead of the more definite but less familiar μόδιον in Mt. and Mk.—κλίνην, bed or couch, as in Mt. and Mk. Nobody puts the lamp under a vessel or a couch, *as a rule*; it may be done occasionally when the light, which burns night and day in an eastern cottage, for any reason needs to be obscured for a while.—ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι, etc., that those *entering in* may see the light. The light is rather for

βλέπωσι τὸ φῶς. 17. οὐ γάρ ἐστι κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται· οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται[1] καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθῃ 18. βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε· ὃς γὰρ ἂν[2] ἔχῃ, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν, ἀρθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ."

19. Παρεγένοντο[3] δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ[4] καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο [d] συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον. 20. καὶ ἀπηγγέλη αὐτῷ, λεγόντων,[5] "Ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἑστήκασιν ἔξω, ἰδεῖν σε θέλοντες."[6] 21. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν, οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες αὐτόν."[7]

22. Καὶ ἐγένετο[8] ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνέβη εἰς πλοῖον καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης·" καὶ ἀνήχθησαν. 23. πλεόντων δὲ αὐτῶν [e] ἀφύπνωσε. καὶ κατέβη λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου εἰς τὴν λίμνην,[9] καὶ

d here only in N. T.

e here only in N. T.

[1] For ο ου γνωσθησεται found in many texts ℵBLΞ 33 have ο ου μη γνωσθη (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] For γαρ αν in D *al.* ℵBLΞ have αν γαρ.

[3] παρεγενετο in BDX 50, 71 cop. T.R. a grammatical correction.

[4] αυτου after μητηρ in ℵD 69 (Tisch.).

[5] ℵBDLΞ have for και απ., απ. δε, and omit λεγοντων (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] σε after θελ. in BΞ (W.H.).

[7] Omit αυτον ℵABDLΔΞ *al.*

[8] εγεν. δε in ℵABDL 1, 33, 69 *al.*

[9] Ba have ανεμου after λιμνην (W.H. marg.). J. Weiss suggests that εις τ. λ. may be a gloss.

the benefit of those who are within (τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, Mt. v. 15), the inmates. Is Lk. thinking of the Gentiles coming into the church?—Ver. 17. γενήσεται: predictive = nothing hidden which shall not some day be revealed.——γνωσθῇ, ἔλθῃ (ℵBL), the fut. ind. passes into aor. subj., with οὐ μὴ for οὐ = nothing hidden which is not bound to become known (Meyer).—Ver. 18 enforces the duty thence arising, to be careful hearers; hearing so as really to know; shortcoming here will disqualify for giving light. Jesus has inculcated the duty of *placing* the light so that it may illuminate; He now inculcates the prior duty of *being* lights.—ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν: the δοκεῖ may be an editorial explanatory comment to remove the apparent contradiction between μὴ ἔχῃ and ὃ ἔχει (Weiss, Mk.-evang., p. 157).

Vv. 19-21. *Mother and brethren* (Mt. xii. 46-50, Mk. iii. 31-35). Given in a different connection from that in Mt. and Mk. The connection here seems purely topical: the visit of the friends of Jesus gives Him occasion to indicate who are they who represent the good, fruitful soil (ver. 21).—Ver. 19. διὰ τὸν ὄχλον: a crowd seems unsuitable here (though not in Mt. and Mk.), for just before, Jesus has been conversing with His disciples in private.—Ver. 21. Lk. omits the graphic touches—looking around, and stretching out His hands towards His disciples, concerned only to report the memorable word.—οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, those hearing and doing *the word of God*. The expression here is somewhat conventional and secondary as compared with Mt. and Mk. *Cf.* chap. vi. 47, and λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, viii. 11.

Vv. 22-25. *The tempest on the lake* (Mt. viii. 23-27, Mk. iv. 35-41). The voyage across the lake took place, according to Mk., on the day of the parables; it was an *escape* from the crowd, a very real and credible account. The whole situation in Lk. is different: no preaching from a boat, no escape when the preaching was over. It simply happened on one of the days (ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν).—Ver. 22. τῆς

f 1 Cor. xv. 30. συνεπληροῦντο, καὶ [f]ἐκινδύνευον. 24. προσελθόντες δὲ διήγειραν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, "Ἐπιστάτα, ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα." Ὁ δὲ

g Jas. i. 6. ἐγερθεὶς[1] ἐπετίμησε τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ [g]κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἐπαύσαντο, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη. 25. εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς, "Ποῦ ἐστιν[2] ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;" Φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "Τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;"

26. ΚΑΙ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν,[3] ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέραν[4] τῆς Γαλιλαίας. 27. ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἀνήρ τις[5] ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, ὃς εἶχε[6] δαιμόνια ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν, καὶ ἱμάτιον οὐκ ἐνεδιδύσκετο,[7] καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν. 28. ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ[8] ἀνακράξας, προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπε, "Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ[9] τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαί σου, μή με

[1] διεγερθεις in ℵBL 13, 33 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] ℵABLX 1 *al.* omit εστιν.

[3] So in ARΓΔΛΠ *al.* syr. verss. (including Sin.). Γεργεσηνων in ℵLXΞ minusc. 6 memph., etc. (Tisch.). Γερασηνων in BC*D vet. Lat. vulg.; the most probable reading (W.H.).

[4] αντιπερα in most uncials.

[5] Omit αυτω ℵBEΞ 33. B has τις ανηρ. D, while retaining αυτω, omits τις.

[6] For ος ειχε ℵB 157 cop. have εχων.

[7] For εκ χρονων . . . ενεδιδυσκετο ℵBLΞ 1, 33, 131, 157 cop. *al.* have και χρονω ικανω ουκ ενεδυσατο ιματιον (Tisch., W.H.). The true text is doubtful here, though I have assumed below that that adopted by Tisch. and W.H. is to be preferred.

[8] Omit και ℵBDLXΞ 33 *al.*

[9] Omit του θεου DΞ 1 (W.H. in brackets).

λίμνης: no need for this addition in Mk., or even in Mt., where Jesus is represented as in *Capernaum*. Lk. does not tell us where Jesus was at the time. —Ver. 23. **ἀφύπνωσε**, went off to sleep, fatigued with heat and speaking; the storm implies sultry conditions; **ἀφυπνοῦν** means both to awake = **ἀφυπνίζειν**, and to go to sleep = **καθυπνοῦν**; *vide* Lobeck, *ad Phryn.*, p. 224. —**κατέβη**, came down, from the hills.— **συνεπληροῦντο**, they (*i.e.*, the boat) were getting full and in danger. Seamen would naturally say, "we were getting full," when they meant the boat. Examples of such usage in Kypke.— Ver. 24. **ἐπιστάτα**: Lk.'s word for master, answering to **διδάσκαλε**, Mk., and **κύριε**, Mt.—**τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος**, the surge of the water.—Ver. 25. **ποῦ**, etc., where is your faith? a mild rebuke compared with Mt. and Mk. Note: *Lk. ever spares the Twelve.*

Vv. 26-39. *The demoniac of Gerasa* (Mt. viii. 28, 34, Mk. v. 1-20).—Ver. 26. **κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν**, "they sailed down from the deep sea to the land, put in," Grimm; *appulerunt ad regionem*, Raphel, who gives numerous examples of the use of this verb (here only in N. T.) in Greek authors.— **τ. Γερασηνῶν**, the Gerasenes, inhabitants of the town of Gerasa (Kersa, Thomson, *Land and Book*), near the eastern shore of the lake, a little south of the mouth of Wadi Semach (*Rob Roy on the Jordan*, chap. xxiii.).—**ἥτις ἐστὶν**, etc.: this clause answers to Mk.'s **εἰς τὸ πέραν τ. θ.** By the relative clause Lk. avoids the double **εἰς** (J. Weiss in Meyer).—**ἀντίπερα τ. Γαλ.**, opposite Galilee, a vague indication; an editorial note for the benefit of readers little acquainted with the country.— Ver. 27. **ἀνὴρ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως**, a man of, or from, the city; he did not come

βασανίσῃς." 29. Παρήγγελλε[1] γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν, καὶ ἐδεσμεῖτο[2] ἁλύσεσι καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος, καὶ διαρρήσσων τὰ δεσμὰ ἠλαύνετο ὑπὸ[3] τοῦ δαίμονος[4] εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους. 30. ἐπηρώτησε δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, λέγων,[5] "Τί σοι ἐστὶν ὄνομα[6]; " Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Λεγεών·" ὅτι δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰσῆλθεν[7] εἰς αὐτόν. 31. καὶ παρεκάλει[8] αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν. 32. ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν βοσκομένων[9] ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ παρεκάλουν[10] αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν. καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. 33. ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσῆλθεν[11] εἰς τοὺς χοίρους· καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην, καὶ ἀπεπνίγη. 34. ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες τὸ γεγενημένον[12] ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες[13] ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. 35. ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός· καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ εὗρον καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ'

[1] **παρηγγειλεν** in BΞ 69 (W.H. marg.).

[2] So in CD and other uncials. ℵBLXΞ 33 have **εδεσμευετο. δεσμεω** and **δεσμευω** are both rare (latter in Mt. xxiii. 4).

[3] So in most uncials. BΞ have **απο** (W.H. text).

[4] **δαιμονιου** in ℵBCDΞ (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] Omit **λεγων** ℵB 1 *al.* vet. Lat. (W.H.) against CDL (Tisch.).

[6] **ονομα εστιν** in ℵBDLΞ 1, 33 *al.*

[7] **εισηλθεν** before **δαιμ.** in ℵB.

[8] **παρεκαλουν** in ℵBCDL minusc. T.R. a correction.

[9] So in very many uncials, but ℵBD have **βοσκομενη** (W.H. text).

[10] **παρεκαλεσαν** in BCLΞ 1, 33 *al.*

[11] **εισηλθον** in most uncials.

[12] **γεγονος** in ℵABCDLΞ *al. pl.*

[13] Omit **απελθ.** all uncials.

out of the city to meet Jesus.—**ἔχων δαιμ.**, having demons, a *plurality* with reference to ver. 30.—**οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο**, etc.: the description begun here is completed in ver. 29. Mk. gives it all at once (v. 2-5). Lk. seems to follow Mk. but freely—unclothed, abode among the tombs, the two facts first mentioned.—Ver. 29. **παρήγγελλεν γὰρ**: the command caused the cry of fear, and the fear is explained in the clause following, introduced by a second **γὰρ**.—**πολλοῖς χρόνοις**, answers to **πολλάκις** in Mk. v. 4, therefore presumably used in the sense, oftentimes, frequently. So Erasmus and Grotius, and most recent commentators. Meyer and others take it = during a long time. Schanz combines the two senses. The disease was of an intermittent character, there were paroxysms of acute mania, and intervals of comparative quiet and rationality. When the paroxysms came on, the demon (one in ver. 29) was supposed to seize him (**συνηρπάκει**). Then he had to be bound in chains and fetters, and kept under guard (**φυλασσόμενος**, *cf.* A. V. and R. V. here), but all to no purpose, the demoniac force bursting the bonds and driving the poor victim into the deserts. The madman feared the return of an attack, hence his alarmed cry.—Ver. 30. **ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν**, etc.: Lk. gives this explanation of the name *Legion*; in Mk. the demoniac gives it.—Ver. 31. **εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον**, into the abyss (of Tartarus) instead of Mk.'s **ἔξω τῆς χώρας**, out of Decapolis.—Ver. 32. **χοίρ. ἱκανῶν**: for a large number, often in Lk.; his equivalent for Mk.'s 2000.

Vv. 34-39. *The sequel.* Lk. tells the second part of the story very much as it is given in Mk., with slight stylistic variations. In ver. 26 he substitutes the expression **πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς**, how the demoniac was saved, for Mk.'s "how it happened to the demoniac, and concerning the swine," suggesting the

οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξεληλύθει,[1] ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα, παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. 36. ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ[2] οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς. 37. καὶ ἠρώτησαν[3] αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν[4] ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς τὸ[5] πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν. 38. ἐδέετο δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ' οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια, εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ. ἀπέλυσε δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[6] λέγων, 39. "Ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα ἐποίησέ σοι[7] ὁ Θεός." Καὶ ἀπῆλθε, καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

40. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν[8] τῷ ὑποστρέψαι[9] τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν.

41. Καὶ ἰδού, ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰάειρος, καὶ αὐτὸς[10] ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχε, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, παρεκάλει

[1] **εξηλθεν** in ℵB (Tisch., W.H.). [2] Omit **και** ℵBCDL 33, 69 *al.*

[3] So in DL *al.*, and, as more difficult, preferable. ℵBC *al.* have the sing. (W.H.).

[4] *Vide* at ver. 26. [5] Omit **το** ℵBCL *al.*

[6] ℵBDL omit **ο Ι.**, an explanatory addition. [7] **σοι εποι.** in ℵBCDL minusc.

[8] **εγεν. δε εν** in ℵCD and many other uncials (Tisch.). BL 33 *al.* have **εν δε** (W.H.).

[9] ℵB have **υποστρεφειν** (Tisch., W.H.). [10] BD have **ουτος** (W.H. text).

idea that the destruction of the swine was a part of the cure. They had to be drowned that he might be restored to sanity.—Ver. 37. Lk. is very careful to involve the whole population in the request that Jesus would leave the country—the whole multitude of the district of Gerasa, town and country, citizens and farmers. And he gives as the reason, **ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο**, they were possessed with a great fear, panic-stricken.—Ver. 38. **ἐδέετο**, Ionic form of the imperfect of **δέομαι**. W. and H. prefer **ἐδεῖτο**, the reading of BL. The healed man's request, though not granted, would gratify Jesus, as a contrast to the unanimous petition of the Gerasenes that He would leave the place.—Ver. 39. **ὑπόστρεφε**: it was good for the man that he should return to his home and people, and tell them what had befallen him through the mercy of God (**ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός**). It was good for the people also. They needed a missionary greatly.—**καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν**, over the whole city. Mk. says in Decapolis.

Ver. 40. *On the western side* (Mk. v. 21). Lk. still follows Mk. closely, mentioning the cordial welcome given Jesus on His arrival on the Galilean shore, and proceeding to narrate the incidents of the woman with a flux, and Jairus' daughter.—**ὁ ὄχλος**, *the* crowd. This crowd is unexplained by Lk., who says nothing of a crowd when he introduces his narrative of the voyage to the eastern shore (ver. 22). In Mk. the presence of a crowd is easily accounted for: Jesus had suddenly left the great congregation to which He had spoken in parables, and as His stay on the eastern side was cut short, when He returned to the western shore the crowd had hardly dispersed, or at least could reassemble on short notice. Mk. does not say *the* crowd, but a great crowd.—**ἀπεδέξατο** implies a cordial reception. *Cf.* Acts xv. 4. Raphel gives examples of this sense from Greek authors. Euthy. took it in this sense, giving as the reason for the welcome: **ὡς εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτῆρα.**—**προσδοκῶντες**: the parables, not to speak of recent healings, account for the expectation.

Vv. 41-42. *The story of Jairus' daughter begins* (Mt. ix. 18, 19, Mk. v. 21-24).—**ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς** instead of **ἀρχισυνάγωγος** (Mk.), as more intelligible to Gentile readers. But after having explained its meaning by the use of this phrase he employs the other in ver. 49.

αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· 42. ὅτι θυγάτηρ μονογενὴς ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα, καὶ αὕτη ἀπέθνησκεν. Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι συνέπνιγον αὐτόν. 43. Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἥτις εἰς ἰατροὺς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον[1] οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ὑπ᾿[2] οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι, 44. προσελθοῦσα ὄπισθεν, ἥψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς. 45. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Τίς ὁ ἁψάμενός μου;" Ἀρνουμένων δὲ πάντων, εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ μετ᾿ αὐτοῦ,[3] "Ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσί σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσι, καὶ λέγεις, Τίς ὁ ἁψάμενός μου[4];" 46. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Ἥψατό μου τίς· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξελθοῦσαν[5] ἀπ᾿ ἐμοῦ." 47. Ἰδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαθε, τρέμουσα ἦλθε, καὶ προσπεσοῦσα αὐτῷ, δι᾿ ἣν αἰτίαν ἥψατο αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτῷ[6] ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ὡς ἰάθη παραχρῆμα. 48. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Θάρσει,[7] θύγατερ,[8] ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην."

[1] From εις ιατρους to βιον omitted in BD (W.H.); may be a gloss from Mk.
[2] απ in ℵBΞ.
[3] B some minusc. and verss. omit οι μετ. αυτου (W.H.).
[4] Omit και λεγεις . . . μου ℵBL minusc. verss. (Tisch., W.H.); comes from Mk.
[5] εξεληλυθυιαν in ℵBL 33.
[6] αυτω omitted in ℵABDLXΞ *al.*
[7] ℵBDLΞ minusc. verss. omit θαρσει, which may come from Mt.
[8] So in most uncials; BKL have θυγατηρ (W.H.).

—Ver. 42. **μονογενὴς** (as in vii. 12): peculiar to Lk. The name of the father, his rank, and the girl's age (all lacking in Mt.) Lk. has in common with Mk. This feature he adds after his wont to enhance the benevolence of Jesus.—**ἀπέθνησκεν**, was dying. Mk.'s phrase, **ἐσχάτως ἔχει**, is avoided as not good Greek. In Mt. she is already dead.—**συνέπνιγον**, were *suffocating* Him; a very strong expression. Mk.'s word is sufficiently strong (**συνέθλιβον**, thronged), and if there was to be exaggeration we should hardly have expected it from Lk. But he uses the word to make Christ's quick perception of the special touch from behind (ver. 45) the more marvellous.

Vv. 43-48. *The woman with an issue* (Mt. ix. 20-22, Mk. v. 25-34).—Ver. 43. **ἀπὸ**: indicating the *terminus a quo*. Mk. uses the accusative of duration.—**προσαναλώσασα** (here only in N. T.), having expended in addition: to loss of health was added loss of means in the effort to gain it back.—**βίον**, means of life, as in xv. 12, 30, xxi. 4.—**οὐκ ἴσχυσεν, etc.**, was not able to get healing from any (physician), a milder way of putting it than Mk.'s.—Ver. 44. **κρασπέδου**, the tassel hanging over the shoulder; this feature not in Mk., a curious omission in so graphic a writer.—**παραχρῆμα**: Lk.'s equivalent for **εὐθύς**.—**ἔστη**, the flow of blood (**ῥύσις**) stopped. **ἱστάναι**, the technical term for this experience.—Ver. 45. **ὁ Πέτρος**: Mk. says "the disciples," but one would speak for the rest, and Lk. naturally makes Peter the spokesman.—**συνέχουσί σε**, hem thee in.—**ἀποθλίβουσιν**, squeeze, *like grapes* (Joseph., *Ant.*, ii., v. 2).—Ver. 46. **ἐγὼ ἔγνων**: Lk. puts into the mouth of Jesus what in Mk. is a remark of the narrator. *Vide* notes on this incident in Mt. and Mk.

Vv. 49-56. *Previous narrative resumed* (Mt. ix. 23-26, Mk. v. 35-43).—Ver. 49. **τις**: one messenger, several in Mk.; one enough for the purpose.—**παρὰ τ. ἀρχ.**, from the ruler = belonging to his house. *Vide* Mk. iii. 21: **οἱ παρ᾿ αὐτοῦ**. Mk. has **ἀπὸ** here.—Ver. 50. **ἀκούσας**: Mk. has **παρακούσας**, the message being spoken not to Jesus but to Jairus: He overheard it.—**μόνον πίστευσον**, etc., only

49. Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἔρχεταί τις παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου, λέγων αὐτῷ,[1] "Ὅτι τέθνηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου· μὴ[2] σκύλλε τὸν διδάσκαλον." 50. Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀκούσας ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ, λέγων,[3] "Μὴ φοβοῦ· μόνον πίστευε,[4] καὶ σωθήσεται." 51. Εἰσελθὼν[5] δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, οὐκ ἀφῆκεν εἰσελθεῖν οὐδένα,[6] εἰ μὴ Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην,[7] καὶ τὸν πατέρα τῆς παιδὸς καὶ τὴν μητέρα. 52. ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες, καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν. ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Μὴ κλαίετε· οὐκ[8] ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει." 53. Καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ, εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν. 54. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντας, καὶ[9] κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, ἐφώνησε, λέγων, "Ἡ παῖς ἐγείρου."[10] 55. Καὶ ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα· καὶ διέταξεν αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. 56. καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

[1] Omit αυτω (expletive) ℵBLXΞ 1, 33.
[2] μηκετι in ℵBD.
[3] Omit λεγων with ℵBLXΔΞ 1, 33 *al.*
[4] πιστευσον in BLΞ.
[5] ελθων in most uncials and verss.
[6] For ουδενα BCDLX 33, 69 have τινα συν αυτω (Tisch., W.H.).
[7] Ιωαν. before Ιακ. in BCD and many other uncials. T.R. = ℵL 33.
[8] For ουκ ℵBCDL have ου γαρ (W.H.; Tisch. = T.R.).
[9] ℵBDLX minusc. omit εκβαλων . . . και; imported from Mk.
[10] εγειρε in ℵBCDX 1, 33 (W.H.).

believe and she shall be *saved*—Paulinism in the physical sphere.—Ver. 51. In B and other MSS. the usual order of the three disciples—Peter, James, John—is changed into Peter, John, James.—Ver. 53. εἰδότες ὅτι ἀπέθανεν: Lk. is careful to add this remark to exclude the idea that it was not a case of real death; his aim here, as always, to magnify the *power* as well as the benevolence of Jesus.—Ver. 55. τὸ πνεῦμα, her *spirit* returned = ψυχὴ in Acts xx. 10.—φαγεῖν: the order to give the resuscitated child food is not peculiar to Lk., but he places it in a more prominent position than Mk. to show that as she had been really dead she was now really alive and well; needing food and able to take it. Godet remarks on the calmness with which Jesus gave the order after such a stupendous event. "As simply as a physician feels the pulse of a patient He regulates her diet for the day."

CHAPTER IX. THE CLOSE OF THE GALILEAN MINISTRY. SETTING THE FACE TOWARDS JERUSALEM.—Vv. 1-50 contain sundry particulars which together form the closing scenes of the Galilean ministry: the mission of the Twelve, the feeding of the thousands, the conversation on the Christ and the cross, the transfiguration, the epileptic boy, the conversation on "who is the greatest". At ver. 51 begins the long division of the Gospel, extending to xviii. 14, which forms the chief peculiarity of Lk., sometimes called the Great Interpolation or Insertion, purporting to be the narrative of a journey southwards towards Jerusalem through *Samaria*, therefore sometimes designated the Samaritan ministry (Baur and the Tübingen school), but in reality consisting for the most part of a miscellaneous collection of didactic pieces. At xviii. 15 Lk. rejoins the company of his brother evangelists, not to leave them again till the tragic end.

Vv. 1-6. *The mission of the Twelve* (Mt. x. 1, 5-15, Mk. vi. 7-13).—Ver. 1. συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ: the δὲ turns attention to a new subject, and the part συγκαλ. implies that it is a matter of

IX. 1. ΣΥΓΚΑΛΕΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ,[1] ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια, καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν· 2. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἰᾶσθαι τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας.[2] 3. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν· μήτε ῥάβδους,[3] μήτε πήραν, μήτε ἄρτον, μήτε ἀργύριον, μήτε ἀνὰ[4] δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν. 4. καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθητε, ἐκεῖ μένετε, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε. 5. καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέξωνται[5] ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης καὶ[6] τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάξατε,[7] εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς." 6. Ἐξερχόμενοι δὲ διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι καὶ θεραπεύοντες πανταχοῦ.

[1] Many uncials (BD, etc.) omit **μαθ. αυτου**. Some texts (ℵCLΞ *al.*) have **αποστολους**.

[2] B syrr. cur. and sin. omit **τους ασθ.** (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] **ραβδον** in ℵBCDLΞ 1, 33, 69 *al.*

[4] Omit **ανα** ℵBCLΞ; found in D.

[5] **δεχωνται** in ℵABCLΞ. T.R. = D *al.*

[6] Omit **και** ℵBCDLXΞ 1, 33 verss.

[7] **αποτινασσετε** in ℵB 1, 131, 157 (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = parallels (aor.).

importance: calling together the *Twelve*, out of the larger company of disciples that usually followed Jesus, including the women mentioned in viii. 1-3.—**δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν**, power and right; power implies right. The man that *can* cast out devils and heal disease is entitled to do so, nay bound. This principle found an important application in St. Paul's claim to be an apostle, which really rested on fitness, insight. I *understand* Christianity, therefore I am entitled to be an apostle of it. Lk. alone has both words to express unlimited authority (Hahn). Mt. and Mk. have **ἐξουσίαν**.—**ἐπὶ πάντα**, etc., over all the demons, and (also power and authority) to heal diseases, the latter a subordinate function; thoroughly to quell the demons (**πάντα** emphatic) the main thing. Hence the Seventy on their return speak of that alone (x. 17).—Ver. 2. This might have been viewed as an incidental mention of preaching as another subordinate function, but for the reference to healing (**ἰᾶσθαι**), which suggests that this verse is another way of stating the objects of the mission, perhaps taken from another source.—Ver. 3. The instructions in this and the next two verses follow pretty closely the version in Mk.—**μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν**: as in Mk., but in direct speech, while Mk.'s is indirect (**ἵνα μ. αἴρωσιν**.)—**μήτε ῥάβδον**: Lk. interprets the prohibition more severely than Mk. Not a staff (Mk. except a staff only).—**ἀργύριον**, silver, for Mk.'s **χαλκόν**: silver the common metal for coinage among the Greeks, copper among the Romans.—**δύο χιτῶνας**, two tunics each, one on and one for change.—**ἔχειν**: infinitive, after **αἴρετε**, imperative. It may be a case of the infinitive used as an imperative, of which one certain instance is to be found in Phil. iii. 16 (**στοιχεῖν** = walk), or it may be viewed as a transition from direct to indirect speech (so most commentators). Bengel favours the first view.—Ver. 4. Thus far of material wants. We now pass to social relations. The general direction here is: stay in the same house all the time you are in a place; pithily put by Lk. = **ἐκεῖ μένετε, ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε**, *there* remain, *thence* depart, both adverbs referring to **οἰκίαν**.—Ver. 5. By omitting the **ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν** of Mk. Lk. gives the impression that non-receiving refers to the missionaries not as *preachers* but as *guests* = If they will not take you into the house you select, do not try another house, leave the place (so Hahn). This would be rather summary action, and contrary to the spirit of the incident (ix. 52-56).—Ver. 6. Brief statement, as in Mk., as

7. Ἤκουσε δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης τὰ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ[1] πάντα· καὶ διηπόρει, διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπό τινων, "Ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἐγήγερται[2] ἐκ νεκρῶν·" 8. ὑπό τινων δέ, "Ὅτι Ἡλίας ἐφάνη·" ἄλλων δέ, "Ὅτι προφήτης εἷς[3] τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη." 9. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ[4] Ἡρώδης, "Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα· τίς δέ ἐστιν οὗτος, περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ[5] ἀκούω τοιαῦτα;" Καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν.

10. Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐποίησαν· καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτούς, ὑπεχώρησε κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλουμένης[6] Βηθσαϊδά. 11. οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γνόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ· καὶ δεξάμενος[7] αὐτούς, ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τοὺς χρείαν ἔχοντας θεραπείας ἰᾶτο.

[1] Omit υπ αυτου ℵBCDLΞ 69 *al.*

[2] ηγερθη in ℵBCLΞ *al.*

[3] τις in ℵBCLXΔΞ 1, 13, 33.

[4] For και ειπεν ℵBCDLΞ 1, 33 *al.* have ειπεν δε, and ℵCD *al. pl.* omit ο found in BL.

[5] ℵBCLΞ omit εγω.

[6] For εις τ. καλουμενης ℵ^ca BLXΞ 33 sah. cop. have εις πολιν καλουμενην, which seems inconsistent with retirement; hence the introduction of την ερημον = the *desert* of the city (Tisch., W.H., follow BL, etc.).

[7] αποδεξ. in ℵBDLXΞ 33 *al.*

to the execution of the mission, but wanting his reference to the use of oil in healing.

Hahn states that this mission was purely pedagogic, for the benefit of the Twelve, not of the people. This is a mere unfounded assertion. The training of the Twelve by no means appears a prominent aim of Jesus in the pages of Lk.; much less so than in Mt. and Mk.

Vv. 7-9. *Herod's interest in Jesus* (Mt. xiv. 1-2, Mk. vi. 14-16).—ὁ τετράρχης as in Mt., βασιλεὺς in Mk.—τὰ γινόμενα πάντα, all the things which were happening, most naturally taken as referring to the mission of the Twelve, though it is difficult to believe that Herod had not heard of Jesus till then.—διηπόρει, was utterly perplexed, in Lk.'s writings only.—διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν. What Lk. represents as said by some, Mt. and Mk., doubtless truly, make Herod himself say. *Vide* notes on Mt. and Mk.—Ver. 8. ἐφάνη, appeared, the proper word to use of one who had not died, but been translated.—Ver. 9. Ἰ. ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα: the fact stated in the form of a confession by the criminal, but the grim story not told.—ἐγὼ, emphatic, the "I" of a guilty troubled conscience.—τις: he has no theory, but is simply puzzled, yet the question almost implies suspicion that Jesus is John returned to life. Could there be two such men at the same period?—καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν: this points forward to xxiii. 8.

Vv. 10-17. *Feeding of the multitude* (Mt. xiv. 13-21, Mk. vi. 30-44, John vi. 1-14).—Ver. 10. The Twelve return from their mission and report what they had *done;* Mk. adds and *taught.*—ὑπεχώρησε, withdrew, here and in v. 16, only, in N. T. The reason of this retirement does not appear in Lk.'s narrative, nor whether Jesus with His disciples went by land or by sea.—Ver. 11. οἱ ὄχλοι: no particular multitude is meant, but just the crowds that were wont to gather around Jesus. In Mt. and Mk. Jesus appears as endeavouring (in vain) to escape from the people. In Lk. this feature is not prominent. Even the expression τόπον ἔρημον in ver. 10 is probably not genuine. What Lk. appears to have written is that Jesus withdrew privately into a city called Bethsaida.—ἀποδεξάμενος, the more probable reading, implies a willing reception of the multitude. *Vide* viii. 40.—Ver. 12. κλίνειν, the day began to *decline;* the fact is alluded to here, not

12. Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν· προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες [1] εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ τοὺς ἀγροὺς καταλύσωσι, καὶ εὕρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν· ὅτι ὧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν." 13. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, "Δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν." [2] Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ πέντε ἄρτοι καὶ δύο ἰχθύες, εἰ μήτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρώματα." 14. Ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, "Κατακλίνατε αὐτοὺς κλισίας ἀνὰ [3] πεντήκοντα." 15. Καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτω, καὶ ἀνέκλιναν [4] ἅπαντας. 16. Λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς, καὶ κατέκλασε, καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παρατιθέναι [5] τῷ ὄχλῳ. 17. καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν πάντες· καὶ ἤρθη τὸ περισσεῦσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κόφινοι δώδεκα.

18. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον καταμόνας, συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί· καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτούς, λέγων, "Τίνα

[1] **πορευθεντες** in ℵABDΞ *al.*

[2] **φαγειν υμεις** in B (Tisch., W.H., text), also with other MSS. **αρτους** before **πεντε**, and **ιχθυες** before **δυο**.

[3] **ωσει** before **ανα** in ℵBCDLRΞ 33 (W.H.).

[4] **κατεκλιναν** in ℵBLΞ 1, 33, 69 *al.*

[5] **παραθειναι** in ℵBCX 1. T.R. = DL *al.*

in a participial clause, but in an independent sentence, as bringing an unwelcome close to the beneficent labours of Jesus. He went on teaching and healing, *but* (**δὲ**) the day, etc.—**καταλύσωσι**: the disciples in Lk. are solicitous about the *lodging* as well as the feeding of the people.—**ἐπισιτισμόν**, provisions, here only in N. T., but often in classics, *e.g.*, with reference to the provisioning of an army (commeatus).—Ver. 13. **πλεῖον ἢ**: on the construction, *vide* Winer, § 58, 4 obs. 1.—**εἰ μήτι . . . ἀγοράσωμεν**, unless perhaps we are to buy, etc.; **εἰ** with subjunctive is one of the forms of protasis in N. T. to express a future supposition with some probability, **εἰ** takes also present and future indicative. *Vide* Burton, M. and T., § 252. That Lk. did not regard this proposal as, if possible, very feasible, appears from his mentioning the number present at this stage—ver. 14. Hence also he does not think it worth while to mention the amount of money at their disposal (200 denarii, Mk. vi. 37).—**κλισίας**, dining parties, answering to Mk.'s **συμπόσια**. Mk.'s **πρασιαὶ**, describing the appearance to the eye, like flower beds, with their gay garments, red, blue, yellow. Lk. omits.—Ver. 16. **εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς**, He blessed them (the loaves), and by the blessing made them sufficient for the wants of all. In Mt. and Mk. **εὐλόγησεν** has no object. This is the only trait added by Lk. to enhance the greatness of the miracle, unless the position of **πάντες** after **ἐχορτάσθησαν** be another = they ate and were *filled, all;* not merely a matter of each getting a morsel.

Vv. 18-27. *The Christ and the cross* (Mt. xvi. 13-28, Mk. viii. 27-ix. 1). At this point occurs a great gap in Lk.'s narrative as compared with those of Mt. and Mk., all between Mt. xiv. 22 and xvi. 12 and between Mk. vi. 45 and viii. 27 being omitted. Various explanations of the omission have been suggested: accident (Meyer, Godet), not in the copy of Mk. used by Lk. (Reuss), mistake of the eye, passing from the second feeding as if it were the first (Beyschlag). These and other explanations imply that the omission was unintentional. But against this hypothesis is the fact that the edges of the opposite sides of the gap are brought together in Lk.'s

με λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι[1] εἶναι;" 19. Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον, "Ἰωάννην τὸν Βαπτιστήν· ἄλλοι δέ, Ἡλίαν. ἄλλοι δέ, ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη." 20. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς, "Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι;" Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος[2] εἶπε, "Τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ." 21. Ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλε μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν[3] τοῦτο, 22. εἰπών, "Ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων, καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι."[4]

23. Ἔλεγε δὲ πρὸς πάντας, "Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν,[5] ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν,

[1] **οι οχλοι λεγ.** in ℵBLΞ 1, 131 sah. cop.

[2] **Πετρος δε αποκ.** in ℵBCLΞ 1 sah. cop.

[3] **λεγειν** in ℵABCDLΞ *al. pl.*

[4] So in most uncials. ACD minusc. have **αναστηναι** (W.H. marg.).

[5] **ερχεσθαι** in ℵBCDLΞ *al.* The important authorities are divided between **απαρνησασθω** and the simple **αρνησ.** (W.H. former in margin, latter in text).

narrative at ix. 18: Jesus *alone praying*, as in Mt. xiv. 23, Mk. vi. 45-46, yet the disciples are with Him though alone (**κατὰ μόνας συνῆσαν α. οἱ μαθηταί**), and He proceeds to interrogate them. This raises the question as to the motives for intentional omission, which may have been such as these: avoidance of duplicates with no new lesson (second feeding), anti-Pharisaic matter much restricted throughout (ceremonial washing), Jewish particularism not suitable in a Gentile Gospel, not even the appearance of it (Syrophenician woman).—**κατὰ μόνας**, the scene remains unchanged in Lk.—that of the feeding of the 5000. No trace in this Gospel of Caesarea Philippi, or indeed of the great northerly journey (or journeys) so prominently recognised in Mk., the aim of which was to get away from crowds, and obtain leisure for intercourse with the Twelve in view of the approaching fatal crisis. This omission can hardly be without intention. Whether Lk. knew Mk.'s Gospel or not, so careful and interested an inquirer can hardly have been ignorant of that northern excursion. He may have omitted it because it was not rich in incident, in favour of the Samaritan journey about which he had much to tell. But the very *raison d'être* of the journey was the hope that it might be a quiet one, giving leisure for intercourse with the Twelve. But this private fellowship of Jesus with His disciples with a view to their instruction is just one of the things to which justice is not done in this Gospel. Their need of instruction is not emphasised. From Lk.'s narrative one would never guess the critical importance of the conversation at Caesarea Philippi, as regards either Peter's confession or the announcement by Jesus of the coming passion.—Ver. 20. **τὸν Χριστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ**: even the form of the confession, as here given, hides its significance. Peter speaks the language of the apostolic age, *the Christ of God*, a commonplace of the Christian faith. Mk.'s Thou art the *Christ*, laconic, emphatic, is original by comparison, and Mt.'s form still more sounds like the utterance of a fresh, strong conviction, a new revelation flashed into the soul of Peter.

Vv. 21-27. *The cross and cross-bearing.*—Ver. 22. **εἰπὼν** introduces reference to the coming sufferings of Jesus in a quite incidental way as a reason why the disciples should keep silence as to the Messiahship of their Master, just confessed. The truth is that the conversation as to the *Christ* was a mere prelude to a very formal, solemn, and plain-spoken announcement on a painful theme, to which hitherto Jesus had alluded only in veiled mystic language. *Cf.* the accounts in Mt. and Mk. (xvi. 21, viii. 31).—**ὅτι δεῖ**, etc., the announcement is given in much the same words as in Mk.—Ver. 23. **ἔλεγε δὲ πρὸς πάντας**: with this formula Lk. smoothly passes from Christ's statement concerning His own Passion to the kindred topic of cross-bearing as the law of

καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι. 24. ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ, οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν. 25. τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος, κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς; 26. ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, τοῦτον ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνθήσεται, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων. 27. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς, εἰσί τινες τῶν ὧδε[1] ἑστηκότων, οἳ οὐ μὴ γεύσονται[2] θανάτου, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ."

28. Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, καὶ[3] παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον[4] καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον, ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. 29. καὶ ἐγένετο, ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτόν, τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον, καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς

[1] For **ωδε** ℵBLΞ 1 have **αυτου**, doubtless the true reading. *Vide* below. The same authorities have **εστηκοτων**, while CD and many others have **εστωτων**.

[2] **γευσωνται** in most texts, including ℵBCDL.

[3] ℵB some verss. omit **και** (W.H. relegate to margin).

[4] Omit **τον** before **Π.** all uncials.

discipleship. The discourse on that theme is reproduced in much the same terms as in the parallel accounts. But it loses greatly in point by the omission of the Master's rebuke to Peter for his opposition to the Passion. That rebuke gives to the discourse this meaning: you object to my suffering? I tell you not only must I suffer; it is the inevitable lot of all who have due regard to the Divine interest in this world. Thus the first lesson Jesus taught the Twelve on the significance of His death was that it was the result of moral fidelity, and that as such it was but an instance of a universal law of the moral order of the world. This great doctrine, the ethical aspect of the Passion, is not made clear in Lk.—**καθ' ἡμέραν**, daily, in Lk. only, a true epexegetical addition, yet restricting the sense, directing attention to the commonplace trials of ordinary Christian life, rather than to the great tribulations at crises in a heroic career, in which the law of cross-bearing receives its signal illustration. This addition makes it probable that **πάντας** refers not only to the disciples, but to a larger audience: the law applies not to leaders only but to all followers of Jesus.—Ver. 25. **ἑαυτὸν ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς** = losing, or receiving damage in, his own self (Field, *Ot. Nor.*). The idea expressed by the second participle seems to be that even though it does not come to absolute loss, yet if gaining the world involve damage to the self, the moral personality—taint, lowering of the tone, vulgarising of the soul—we lose much more than we gain. —Ver. 26. **ἐν τῇ δόξῃ**, etc., in the glory of Father, Son, and holy angels, a sort of trinitarian formula.—Ver. 27. **ἀληθῶς** = **ἀμὴν** in parallels.—**αὐτοῦ**, here = **ὧδε** in parallels.—**τὴν βασ. τ. Θ.**, the Kingdom of God, a simplified expression compared with those in Mt. and Mk., perhaps due to the late period at which Lk. wrote, probably understood by him as referring to the origination of the church at Pentecost.

Vv. 28-36. *The transfiguration* (Mt. xvii. 1-13, Mk. ix. 2-13).—Ver. 28. **τοὺς λόγους τούτους**: the words about the Passion and cross-bearing.—**ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ**: no real discrepancy between Lk. and the other evangelists (after six days). —**Πέτρον**, etc., Peter, *John* and *James*, same order as in viii. 51 (BC, etc.).—**εἰς τὸ ὄρος**: the mountain contiguous to the scene of the feeding, according to the sequence of Lk.'s narrative.—**προσεύξασθαι**: prayer again (*cf.* ver. 18). In Lk.'s delineation of the character of Jesus prayer occupies a prominent place.—Ver. 29. **ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι**, while praying, and as the result of the exercise. —**ἕτερον**, different; a real objective change, not merely to the view of the three disciples. Lk. omits **ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν**.—**λευκὸς** may be viewed as an

ἐξαστράπτων. 30. Καὶ ἰδού, ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωσῆς καὶ Ἡλίας· 31. οἳ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἔμελλε πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. 32. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὕπνῳ· διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ. 33. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, "Ἐπιστάτα, καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι· καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνὰς τρεῖς, μίαν σοί, καὶ Μωσεῖ μίαν,[1] καὶ μίαν Ἡλίᾳ·" μὴ εἰδὼς ὃ λέγει. 34. ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπεσκίασεν[2] αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν[3] εἰς τὴν νεφέλην. 35. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης, λέγουσα, "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός,[4] αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε." 36. Καὶ ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνήν, εὑρέθη ὁ[5] Ἰησοῦς μόνος. Καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσίγησαν, καὶ οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις οὐδὲν ὧν ἑωράκασιν.[6]

[1] μιαν before M. in all uncials. [2] επεσκιαζεν in ℵBL; aorist (T.R.) from Mt.

[3] ℵBCL cop. have εισελθειν αυτους, which Tisch. and W.H. adopt. T.R. = ADXΔ *al.* sah.

[4] εκλελεγμενος in ℵBLΞ sah. cop. (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = CD *al. pl.*

[5] Omit ο very many uncials.

[6] εωρακαν in ℵABL *al. pl.* (Tisch., W.H.).

adverb in *function*, qualifying ἐξαστράπτων (De Wette), but there is no reason why it should not be co-ordinate with ἐξασ., καὶ being omitted = white, glistering.—ἐξαστράπτων: in N. T. here only, flashing like lightning.—Ver. 31. ἐν δόξῃ: this is peculiar to Lk.—ἔλεγον, were speaking about. Kypke thinks more is meant: speaking with praise (*cum laude aliquid commemorare*). One could have accepted this sense had Peter's opposition been reported.—τὴν ἔξοδον, decease, death; so in 2 Peter i. 15. Other words for death are ἔκβασις (Heb. xiii. 7), ἄφιξις (Acts xx. 29), ἀνάλυσις (2 Tim. iv. 6). Perhaps the exodus here spoken of should be taken comprehensively as including death, resurrection and ascension. (So Kypke, also Godet.) πληροῦν in that case will mean "pass through all the stages". But against this wide sense is ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.—Ver. 32. βεβαρ. ὕπνῳ: this particular, in Lk. only, implies that it was a night scene; so also the expression ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ, ver. 37. The celestial visitants are supposed to arrive while the disciples are asleep. They fell asleep while their Master prayed, as at Gethsemane. — διαγρηγορήσαντες, having thoroughly wakened up, so as to be able to see distinctly what passed (here only in N.T.).—Ver. 33. While the two celestials were departing Peter made his proposal, to prevent them from going.—μὴ εἰδώς, etc., not knowing what he said; an apology for a proposal to keep the two celestials from returning to heaven.—Ver. 34. It is not clear who were enveloped by the cloud. If the reading ἐκείνους before εἰσελθεῖν were retained it would imply that the three disciples were outside; αὐτούς, the reading of B, etc., implies that all were within.—Ver. 35. ἐκλελεγμένος, the reading of ℵBL, is to be preferred, because ἀγαπητός, T. R., is conformed to that in the parallels; here only in N. T.—Ver. 36. ἐσίγησαν, they were silent; "in those days," it is added, implying that afterwards (after the resurrection) they spoke of the experience. Lk. does not mention the injunction of Jesus to keep silence, nor the conversation on the way down the hill about Elijah and John the Baptist.

Vv. 37-43a. *The epileptic boy* (Mt. xvii. 14-21, Mk. ix. 14-29).—Ver. 38. ἐπιβλέψαι, to look with pity, as in i. 48.—μονογενής, only son, as in vii. 12, viii. 42, to bring out the benevolence of

37. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν[1] τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ, κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους, συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς. 38. Καὶ ἰδού, ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀνεβόησε,[2] λέγων, "Διδάσκαλε, δέομαί σου, ἐπίβλεψον[3] ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου, ὅτι μονογενής ἐστί μοι[4]· 39. καὶ ἰδού, πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξαίφνης κράζει, καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτὸν μετὰ ἀφροῦ, καὶ μόγις[5] ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, συντρῖβον αὐτόν. 40. καὶ ἐδεήθην τῶν μαθητῶν σου, ἵνα ἐκβάλλωσιν[6] αὐτό, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν." 41. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; προσάγαγε ὧδε τὸν υἱόν σου." 42. Ἔτι δὲ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ, ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ συνεσπάραξεν· ἐπετίμησε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ, καὶ ἰάσατο τὸν παῖδα, καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. 43. ἐξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ [a] μεγαλειότητι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πάντων δὲ θαυμαζόντων ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[7] εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, 44. "Θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τοὺς λόγους τούτους· ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων." 45. Οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ αἴσθωνται αὐτό· καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου. 46. Εἰσῆλθε δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τό, τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν.

[a] Acts xix. 27. 2 Pet. i. 16.

[1] ℵBL omit εν. [2] εβοησεν in ℵBCDL.
[3] επιβλεψαι in BCL. ℵD have -ον = T.R.
[4] μοι εστι in ℵABCDLX 33 verss.
[5] μολις in B (W.H.); μογις in ℵCD (Tisch.). Not found elsewhere in N.T.
[6] εκβαλωσιν in all uncials.
[7] For εποι. ο Ι. ℵBDLΞ have simply εποιει (Tisch., W.H.).

the miracle.—Ver. 39. **κράζει**, he (the boy) crieth.—**σπαράσσει**, he (the demon) teareth him.—Ver. 42. **προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ**, while the boy was approaching Jesus, in accordance with His request that he should be brought to Him, the demon made a final assault on his victim, rending and convulsing him.—Ver. 43. **ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι τ. Θεοῦ**, the people were astonished *at the majesty of God*, revealed in the power that could work such a cure. In Acts ii. 22 God is represented as working miracles through Jesus. So the matter is conceived here. But Lk. thinks of the majesty of God as immanent in Jesus.

Vv. 43b-45. *Second prediction of the Passion* (Mt. xvii. 22-23, Mk. ix. 30-32). —**πάντων θαυμαζόντων**, etc., while all were wondering at all the things which He did. The reference is to the cure of the epileptic, which led the multitude to see in Jesus the bearer of the majesty or greatness of the Almighty.—**εἶπε**. Jesus spoke a second time of His approaching death, in connection with this prevailing wonder, and His aim was to keep the disciples from being misled by it. The setting in Mt. and Mk. is different. There Jesus speaks of His passion, while He with the Twelve is wandering about in Galilee, endeavouring, according to Mk., to remain unnoticed, and He speaks of it simply because it is the engrossing theme with which His mind is constantly preoccupied. Here, on the other hand, the second announcement is elicited by an external occasion, the admiration of the people.—Ver. 44. **μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι**, is about to be betrayed. Lk. gives the specialty of the second prediction as in the parallels. Where he fails in comparison with Mt. and Mk. is in grasping the *psychological* situation,

47. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἰδὼν[1] τὸν διαλογισμὸν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενος παιδίου,[2] ἔστησεν αὐτὸ παρ' ἑαυτῷ, 48. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέξηται, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με. ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτος ἔσται[3] μέγας."

49. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰωάννης εἶπεν, "Ἐπιστάτα, εἴδομέν τινα ἐπὶ[4] τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα τὰ[5] δαιμόνια· καὶ ἐκωλύσαμεν[6]

[1] ειδως in ℵB *al.* (Tisch., W.H., text). ιδων in CDLΞ (W.H. margin).

[2] So in ℵ and very many MSS. (Tisch.). BCD have παιδιον (W.H.).

[3] εστιν in ℵBCLXΞ 1, 33 vet. Lat. vulg. D has εσται.

[4] εν in ℵBLXΔΞ 1, 33 *al.* (W.H.). επι in CD, etc.

[5] Omit τα most uncials.

[6] ℵBLΞ have εκωλυομεν, which may be conformed to Mk. (Tisch. aor. = T.R., W.H. imp.).

the emotional state of Christ's mind. *Cf.* remarks on Mk., *ad loc.* Lk.'s Christ is comparatively passionless.

Vv. 46-50. *Who might be the greatest* (Mt. xviii. 1-5, Mk. ix. 33-41).—Ver. 46. εἰσῆλθε διαλογισμὸς, now there entered in among them (the Twelve) a *thought.* Lk.'s way of introducing this subject seems to show a desire, by way of sparing the future Apostles, to make as little of it as possible. It is merely a thought of the heart (τῆς καρδίας, ver. 47), not a dispute as in Mk., and inferentially also in Mt. It came into their minds, how or why does not appear. Mk.'s narrative leads us to connect the dispute with Christ's foreboding references to His Passion. While they walked along the way (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ), the Master thinking always, and speaking often, of His death, they, realising that a crisis of some sort was approaching but not knowing its nature, discussed the question τίς μείζων; so supplying the comic side of the tragic drama.—τὸ τίς, etc., this, *viz.*, who might be the greater *of them*, or, who might be greater *than they.* αὐτῶν may be taken either partitively, or as a genitive of comparison. It is ordinarily taken in the former sense, whereby Lk.'s account is brought into line with the parallels; but Weiss (Mk.-Evang., and J. Weiss in Meyer) contends for the latter. His idea is that the Twelve, in Lk.'s view, were all conscious of their common importance as disciples of Jesus, and wondered if anybody could be greater than they all were. He connects the "thought" of the Twelve with the exorcist incident (ver. 49) as evincing a similar self-importance. This view cannot be negatived on purely exegetical grounds.—Ver. 47. παρ' ἑαυτῷ, beside Himself, not ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, as in Mt. and Mk., as if to say, here is the greater one.—Ver. 48. τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον, this particular child—not such a child, or what such a child represents, the little and insignificant—as in Mt. and Mk. Yet Lk.'s expression practically means that = this child, for example.—δέξηται: in Lk. the receiving of the little child is placed first in the discourse of Jesus, whereas in Mk. the general maxim that the man who is willing to be last is first, comes first. This position favours the view that not internal rivalry but a common self-exaltation in relation to those without is the vice in the view of Lk. Jesus says in effect: Be not high-minded; an appreciative attitude towards those you are prone to despise is what I and my Father value.—ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν: this phrase, on the other hand, seems to point to internal rivalries. There had been a question among them as to greater and less, to which the Master's answer was: the least one is the great one. Lk.'s version of this important discourse is, as De Wette remarks, inferior in point and clearness to Mt.'s.—Ver. 49. ἐκωλύσαμεν (T. R.), aorist, instead of Mk.'s imperfect; the former implies successful repression, the latter an attempt at it. *Vide* notes on Mk., *ad loc.*—μεθ' ἡμῶν: Phrynichus objects to this construction after ἀκολουθεῖν, and says it should be followed by the dative. But Lobeck gives examples of the former construction from good authors (*vide* p. 353).

αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν." 50. Καὶ εἶπε[1] πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Μὴ κωλύετε· ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι καθ' ἡμῶν,[2] ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν[2] ἐστιν."

51. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ[3] ἐστήριξε[4] τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς

[1] ειπε δε in ℵBCDLXΞ 33 *al.*

[2] υμων *bis* in BCDLΞ vet. Lat. vulg. cop. syrr. cur. sin. (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] BLΞ 1, 239 c omit αυτου after προσωπον (W.H.).

[4] εστηρισεν in BCLXΞ 33 (Tisch., W.H.). ℵD as in T.R.

Chapter ix., as Farrar remarks (C. G. T.), should have ended here, as with ver. 51 begins an entirely distinct, large, and very important division of Lk.'s Gospel.

Vv. 51-56. *Looking southward. Samaritan intolerance.*—Ver. 51 forms the introduction to the great division, ix. 51—xviii. 31. It makes all that follows up to the *terminus ad quem* stand under the solemn heading: *the beginning of the end.* From this time forth Jesus has the close of His earthly career in view. His face is fixedly set towards Jerusalem and—*heaven.* This conception of Jesus, as from this point onwards looking forward to the final crisis, suggests various reflections.

1. The reference to the last act of the drama comes in at a very early place in Lk.'s history.

2. The part of the story lying behind us does not adequately account for the mood of Jesus. We do not see why He should be thinking so earnestly of a final crisis of a tragic character, or even why there should be such a crisis at all. That the religious guides of Israel more or less disapproved of His ways has appeared, but it has not been shown that their hostility was of a deadly character. The dinner in Simon's house speaks to relations more or less friendly, and the omission of the sharp encounter in reference to hand-washing, and of the ominous demand for a sign from heaven, greatly tends to obscure the forces that were working towards a tragic end, and had the cross for their natural outcome. It does not seem to have entered into Lk.'s plan to exhibit Christ's death as the natural result of the opinions, practices, prejudices and passions prevalent in the religious world. He contemplated the event on the Godward, theological side, or perhaps it would be more correct to say on the side of fulfilment of O. T. prophecy. The necessity of Christ's death, the δεῖ (ix. 22) = the demand of O. T. Scripture for fulfilment, *vide* xxiv. 26.

3. In the long narrative contained in the next eight chapters, Jesus does not seem to be constantly thinking of the end. In Mk. and Mt. it is otherwise. From the period at which Jesus began to speak plainly of His death He appears constantly preoccupied with the subject. His whole manner and behaviour are those of one walking under the shadow of the cross. This representation is true to life. In Lk., on the other hand, while the *face* of Jesus is set towards Jerusalem, His *mind* seems often to be thinking of other things, and the reader of the story forgets about the cross as he peruses its deeply interesting pages.

συμπληροῦσθαι, etc., when the days of His assumption were in course of accomplishment, implying the approach of the closing scenes of Christ's earthly experience; here and in Acts ii. 1, only, of *time*; in viii. 23 in the literal sense.—**ἀναλήψεως α.** His assumption into heaven, as in Acts i. 2. The substantive in this sense is a ἅπ. λεγ. in N. T. It occurs in the *Test., xii. Patr.* The verb occurs in a similar sense in various places in the Sept. The assumption into heaven includes the crucifixion in Lk.'s conception, just as the glorification of Jesus includes the Passion in the Johannine conception. "Instabat adhuc passio, crux, mors, sepulchrum; sed per haec omnia ad metam prospexit Jesus, cujus sensum imitatur stylus evangelistae," Bengel. The ἀνάληψις was an act of God.—**ἐστήρισεν**, He made His face firm (from στήριγξ, akin to στερεός, Thayer's Grimm), as if to meet something formidable and unwelcome, the cross rather than what lay beyond, here in view. Hahn, who does not believe that Lk. is here referring to Christ's final journey to Jerusalem, tones down the force of this word so as to make it

Ἱερουσαλήμ. 52. καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ· καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσῆλθον εἰς κώμην[1] Σαμαρειτῶν, ὥστε[2] ἑτοιμάσαι αὐτῷ. 53. καὶ οὐκ ἐδέξαντο αὐτόν, ὅτι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. 54. ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ[3] Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης εἶπον, "Κύριε, θέλεις εἴπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ [b] ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς, ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησε[4];" 55. Στραφεὶς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπεν, "Οὐκ οἴδατε οἵου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς· 56. ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι, ἀλλὰ σῶσαι."[5] Καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην.

b Gal. v. 15 (2 Thess. ii. 8).

57. Ἐγένετο δὲ[6] πορευομένων αὐτῶν, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπέ τις πρὸς αὐτόν, "Ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχῃ, κύριε."[7] 58. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσι, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν

[1] **πολιν** in ℵ*ΓΛ some minusc. (Tisch.).

[2] So in CDL *al. pl.* (Tisch.). ℵB some vet. Lat. codd. have **ως** (W.H.).

[3] ℵB some minusc. omit **αυτου**.

[4] ℵBLΞ minusc. vulg. syrr. cur. sin. memph. omit **ως και Η. εποιησε**, which is probably a gloss.

[5] From **και ειπεν** (ver. 55) to **αλλα σωσαι** (ver. 56) is probably also a gloss (found in FKMΓΛ *al. pl.* D has **ουκ οιδ. οι. πν. εστε υμεις**; also in many verss.). ℵABCLΔΞ *al.* syr. sin., etc., omit the whole passage (Tisch., Trg., R.V., W.H.).

[6] For **εγεν. δε** ℵBCLXΞ 33 69 *al.* verss. have simply **και**.

[7] ℵBDLΞ minusc. verss. omit **κυριε** (Tisch., W.H.); found in CΔ *al.* Fewer MSS. omit **κυριε** in ver. 59 (BDV 57, Orig.). ℵCLΞ have it (Tisch. omits, W.H. put in margin).

express in Oriental fashion the idea of Jesus addressing Himself to a journey not specially momentous.

Vv. 52-56. *Samaritan intolerance.*—**εἰς κώμην Σαμαρειτῶν**: this indicates an intention to go southward through Samaritan territory. Not an unusual thing. Josephus (Antiq., xx., vi. 1) states that it was the custom for Galileans going to Jerusalem to the feasts to pass through Samaria.—**ἑτοιμάσαι α.**, to prepare for Him, *i.e.*, to find lodgings for the night.—**ὥστε** in view of the sequel can only express tendency or intention.—**οὐκ ἐδέξαντο α.**: the aorist, implying "that they at once rejected Him," Farrar (C. G. T.).—**ὅτι** introduces the reason: Christ's face was, looked like, going to Jerusalem. In view of what Josephus states, this hardly accounts for the inhospitable treatment. Perhaps the manner of the messengers had something to do with it. Had Jesus gone Himself the result might have been different. Perhaps He was making an experiment to see how His followers and the Samaritans would get on together. In that case the result would make Him change His plan, and turn aside from Samaria into Peraea. If so then Baur's idea of a Samaritan ministry is a misnomer.—Ver. 54. **Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης**: their outburst of temper, revealed in their truculent proposal, probably indicated the attitude of the whole company. In that case journeying through Samaria was hopeless.—**καταβῆναι**, infinitive, instead of **ἵνα** with subjunctive as often after **εἰπεῖν**.—Ver. 55. **στραφεὶς**: an imposing gesture, as in vii. 9, 44.—Ver. 56. **εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην**, to another village, probably in Galilee; both in the borderland.

Vv. 57-62. *New disciples.*—**ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ**: the indication of time is not precise. It does not mean, on the way to the other village, mentioned just before (Meyer), but on the way to Jerusalem (ver. 51).

κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ." 59. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον, "Ἀκολούθει μοι." Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον[1] θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου." 60. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[2] "Ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς· σὺ δὲ ἀπελθὼν διάγγελλε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ." 61. Εἶπε δὲ καὶ ἕτερος, "Ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε· πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου." 62. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν[3] ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ[4] ἐπ' [c]ἄροτρον, καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, εὔθετός ἐστιν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν[5] τοῦ Θεοῦ."

c here only in N.T.

[1] πρωτον απελθ. in ℵBD. [2] Omit ο Ι. ℵBDLΞ 33 a cop.

[3] B omits προς αυτον (W.H. in brackets).

[4] B minusc. and some codd. of vet. Lat. omit αυτου.

[5] For εις την β. ℵBLΞ 1, 33 vet. Lat. codd. have τη βασιλεια (Tisch., W.H.). D and some vet. Lat. codd. invert the order of the clauses = looking back and putting his hand to the plough.

Grotius thinks the connection is purely topical. "Visum est Lucae connectere τὰ ὁμογενία." The first two of the three cases are reported by Mt. (viii. 19-22).—τις: Mt. (viii. 19) designates this certain one a scribe.—ἀπέρχῃ implies a departure from a place. It would be a leaving of home for the disciple.—Ver. 58. This remarkable saying is given in identical terms by Mt. and Lk. *Vide* on Mt.

Vv. 59, 60. *The second case* (Mt. viii. 21-22).—ἀκολούθει μοι. Jesus takes the initiative in this case. That He should not have done so in the first is intelligible if the aspirant was a *scribe*. Jesus did not look for satisfactory discipleship from that quarter.—σὺ δὲ, but *thou*, emphatic, implying that the man addressed is not among the dead, but one who appreciates the claims of the kingdom.—διάγγελλε, keep proclaiming on every side the Kingdom of God; that thy sole business henceforth, to which everything else, even burying parents, must be sacrificed: seek first the kingdom.

Vv. 61, 62. *The third case*, peculiar to Lk., and setting forth a distinct type.—ἀκολουθήσω σοι, I will follow Thee, implying that he also has been asked to do so, and that he is ready, but on a condition.—ἐπίτρεψόν μοι: this is a type of man who always wants to do something, in which he is himself specially interested first (πρῶτον), before he addresses himself to the main duty to which he is called.—ἀποτάξασθαι: in this case it is to bid good-bye to friends, a sentimental business; that also characteristic.—τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου. The verb ἀπ. is used in later Greek both with the dative of a person to denote "to take leave of," and with the dative of a thing = to renounce (so in xiv. 33). Both senses are admissible here, as τοῖς may be either masculine or neuter, but the first sense is the only one suitable to the *character* (sentimental) and to the request, as property could be renounced on the spot; though this reason is not so conclusive, as some legal steps might be necessary to denude oneself of property.—Ver. 62. οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν, etc.: the necessity of self-concentration inculcated in proverbial language borrowed from agricultural life. Wetstein cites from Hesiod, Ἐργ., ver. 443, the well-known lines: ἰθεῖαν αὔλακ' ἐλαύνοι, Μηκέτι παπταίνων μεθ' ὁμήλικας, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ἔργῳ Θυμὸν ἔχων. The ambition to make a straight furrow has been common to ploughmen in all ages and countries, and it needs, like the highest calling, steady intention and a forward-cast eye. Furrer compliments the Palestine fellah on his skill in drawing a long straight furrow (*Wanderungen*, p. 149). His plough is a very inferior article to that used in this country.—εὔθετός, well fitted, apt; here and in chap. xiv. 35, Heb. vi. 7.—The *first* case is that of *inconsiderate impulse*, the *second* that of *conflicting duties*, the *third* that of a *divided mind*. The incidents are related by Lk., not so much possibly for their psychological interest as to show how Jesus came to have so many disciples as chap. x. 1-16 implies, and yet how particular He was.

X. 1. ΜΕΤΑ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ Κύριος καὶ[1] ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα,[2] καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον οὗ ἔμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι." 2. Ἔλεγεν οὖν[3] πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι· δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ, ὅπως ἐκβάλλῃ ἐργάτας[4] εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ. 3. Ὑπάγετε· ἰδού, ἐγὼ[5] ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς

[1] **και**, found in ℵCD *al. pl.* verss. (Tisch.), is omitted in BLΞ 33 (W.H.).

[2] So in ℵACLΔΞ *al.* b, f, q (Tisch.). BD a, c, e, l, g vulg. syrr. cur. sin. have **εβδ. δυο** (W.H. in brackets).

[3] For **ουν** ℵBCDLΞ 1, 33, 69 verss. have **δε**.

[4] **εργατας εκβ.**: this order in BD e. **εκβαλη** (aor.) in ℵABCDLΞ *al.*

[5] Omit **εγω** (from Mt.) ℵAB.

Chapter X. The Seventy. The Good Samaritan. Martha and Mary. —Vv. 1-12. *The Seventy sent forth*, peculiar to Lk. Many questions have been raised as to this narrative, *e.g.*, as to its historicity, as to the connection between the instructions to the new missionaries and those to the Twelve, and as to the time and place of their election, and the sphere of their mission. On these points only the briefest hints can be given here. As to the first, the saying about the paucity of labourers, found also in Mt. (ix. 38), implies that Jesus was constantly on the outlook for competent assistants, and that He would use such as were available. The cases mentioned in the closing section of last chapter confirm this inference. Whether He would send them out simultaneously in large numbers, twelve, or seventy, or piecemeal, one or more pairs now, and another small group then, is a matter on which it is precarious to dogmatise, as is done by W. Grimm when he says (*Das Proemium des Lucas-Evang.*) that Jesus did not send out twelve all at once, but two and two now and then, and besides the Twelve others of the second order, and that these piecemeal missions consolidated in the tradition into two large ones of twelve and seventy. As to the *instructions:* there would be such in every instance, and they would be substantially the same whether given once, twice, or twenty times, summed up in a few compact sentences, so racy and memorable as to be easily preservable even by oral tradition. It is, however, quite probable that versions of these instructions were to be found in documents, say in Mk. and in Mt.'s *Logia;* and Lk., as Weiss suggests, may have taken the instructions to the Twelve from the former, and those to the Seventy from the latter. Finally, as to time, place, and sphere, nothing certain can be determined, and there is room for various conjectures. Hahn, *e.g.*, suggests, as the *place* of the appointment, *Jerusalem;* the *time*, the feast of tabernacles, mentioned in John vii. 2; and the *sphere* of the mission, the towns and villages of *Judaea* or southern Palestine. There was certainly need for a mission there. The mission of the Twelve was in *Galilee*.

Ver. 1. **μετὰ ταῦτα**, after what has been narrated in ix. 51-62, but not necessarily implying close sequence.—**ἀνέδειξεν** (**ἀναδείκνυμι**). The verb means (1) to lift up so as to show, *cf.* the noun in Lk. i. 80; (2) to proclaim as elected, *cf.* Acts i. 24; (3) to elect, appoint, as here = *designavit*, Vulgate.—**ὁ Κύριος**, the Lord, Jesus, here, as often in Lk. applied to Him in narrative.—**ἑτέρους**, others, the reference being not to **ἀγγέλους**, ix. 52 (Meyer), but to **τοὺς δώδεκα**, ix. 1 = others besides the Twelve. —**ἑβδομήκοντα**, seventy (seventy-two in B), representing the nations of the earth, the number consciously fixed by the evangelist to symbolise Christian universalism—according to Dr. Baur and the Tübingen School; representing in the mind of Jesus the seventy Sanhedrists, as the Twelve were meant to represent the tribes of Israel, the seventy disciples having for their vocation to do what the Sanhedrists had failed to do—prepare the people for the appearance of the Christ—according to Hahn.

Vv. 2-12. *The instructions*.—Ver. 2. **ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς**: preliminary statement as to the need of men fit to take part in the work of preaching the kingdom, as in Mt. ix. 38, *vide* notes there; a true

ἄρνας ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. 4. μὴ βαστάζετε βαλάντιον, μὴ πήραν, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα· καὶ μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἀσπάσησθε. 5. Εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέρχησθε,[1] πρῶτον λέγετε, Εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ. 6. καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ᾖ ἐκεῖ[2] υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἐπαναπαύσεται[3] ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀνακάμψει. 7. ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε, ἐσθίοντες[4] καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν· ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐστι[5]· μὴ μεταβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν. 8. καὶ εἰς ἣν δ'[6] ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε, καὶ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ὑμῖν, 9. καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενεῖς, καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς, Ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. 10. εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε,[7] καὶ μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς, εἴπατε, 11. Καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν[8] [a] ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν· πλὴν τοῦτο γινώσ-

[a] here only in N.T.

[1] εισελθητε in ℵBCDLΞ 1, 13, 69.
[2] μεν is found only in minusc. B places εκει before η (W.H. text).
[3] ℵB have επαναπαησεται, to be preferred as the rarer form.
[4] BD have εσθοντες (Tisch., W.H.).
[5] εστι omitted in ℵBDLXΞ.
[6] δε is wanting in ℵBCDΞ *al.*
[7] εισελθητε in ℵBCDLΞ 1, 33 *al.*
[8] After υμων ℵBD have εις τους ποδας, adopted by modern editors.

logion of Jesus, whensoever spoken.—Ver. 3. **ὑπάγετε**, *go*, whither? Mt.'s version of the instructions to the Twelve says: not to Samaria, but to the lost sheep of Israel only; this omitted by Lk. with the one word, "go," retained. —**ὡς ἄρνας**, etc., as *lambs* among wolves; sheep (**πρόβατα**) in Mt. x. 16; pathetic hint as to the helplessness of the agents and the risks they run; not imaginary, as the recent experience at the Samaritan village shows.—Ver. 4. **βαλάντιον**, a purse, in Lk. only, in N. T.; often in classics, spelt there, as in MSS. of N. T., variously with one or two λs.—**μηδένα ἀσπάσησθε**: salute no one, to be taken in the spirit rather than in the letter; hyperbolical for: be exclusively intent on your business: "negotio quod imposui vobis incumbite, praeterhabitis vel brevissimis obstaculis et moramentis," Pricaeus. Weiss (Mt.-Evangel.) thinks the prohibition is directed against carrying on their mission on the way. It was to be exclusively a *house*-mission (*vide* Mt. x. 12, where **ἀσπάσασθε** occurs).—Ver. 5. **πρῶτον λέγετε**: the first word to be spoken, *peace*, speech on the things of the kingdom to be prepared for by courteous, kindly salutations. A sympathetic heart is the best guide in pastoral visitation. The first word should not be: how is it with your soul?—Ver. 6. **ἐπαναπαήσεται** (ℵB), a form of the 2nd fut. ind. passive, probably belonging to the spoken Greek of the period. Again in Rev. xiv. 13.—**ἀνακάμψει**: in any case the good wish will not be lost. If there be no "son of peace" in the house to receive it, it will come back with a blessing to the man who uttered it.—Ver. 7. **ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ οἰκίᾳ**: verbally distinct from **ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ**, etc., but really meaning the same thing = "in that same house," R. V.—**τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν**, eating and drinking *the meat and drink which belong to them*, as if they were your own: *libere et velut vestro jure*, Grotius.—**ἄξιος γὰρ** assigns the reason: your food is your hire; it belongs to you of right as wages for work done.—Ver. 8. **ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα**: not a repetition. It means, be contented with your fare: *contenti este quamvis frugali apparatu*, Bengel. Holtz. (H. C.) thinks Lk. has in view heathen houses, and that the meaning is: put aside Jewish scruples. —Ver. 9. The functions of the missionaries briefly indicated = heal the sick, and announce that the kingdom is at their doors (**ἤγγικεν**).—Vv. 10, 11. Direction how to act in case of churlish treatment.—**ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας α.** Lk. expresses the action so as to make it vivid for Gentile readers to

κετε, ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς[1] ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. 12. λέγω δὲ[2] ὑμῖν, ὅτι Σοδόμοις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ. 13. Οὐαί σοι, Χωραζίν, οὐαί σοι, Βηθσαϊδά· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγένοντο[3] αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν ὑμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ καθήμεναι[4] μετενόησαν. 14. πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει, ἢ ὑμῖν. 15. καὶ σύ, Καπερναούμ, ἡ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθεῖσα, ἕως ᾅδου καταβιβασθήσῃ.[5] 16. Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει· καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με." 17. Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα μετὰ χαρᾶς, λέγοντες, "Κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου." 18. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς, "Ἐθεώ-

[1] ℵBDLΞ 1, 13, 33 *al.* omit εφ υμας.

[2] δε in ℵDΞ (Tisch.) is omitted in BCL *al. pl.* verss. (W.H.).

[3] εγενηθησαν in ℵBDLΞ 13, 33, 69.

[4] καθημενοι in ℵABCLΞ *al.* -αι in D with many others.

[5] For η . . . υψωθεισα ℵBDLΞ vet. Lat. 5 syr. cur. have μη . . . υψωθηση; for καταβιβασθηση (ℵCLΞ *al. pl.* Tisch.) BD have καταβηση (W.H.).

whom the symbolic significance of the act was not familiar = go out of the inhospitable houses into the streets, and then solemnly wipe off the dust that has been taken up by your feet since you entered the town; wiping off (ἀπομασσόμεθα) is more expressive than shaking off (ἐκτινάξετε, Mt. x. 14, Lk. ix. 5), it means more thorough work, removing every speck of dust.—πλὴν, for the rest. The solemn symbolic act is to wind up with the equally solemn declaration that the Kingdom of God has come to them with its blessings, and that it is their own fault if it has come in vain.

Vv. 13-16. *Woe to thee, Chorazin* (Mt. xi. 21-24).—While the terms in which the woes on the cities of Galilee are reported are nearly identical in Mt. and Lk., the connections in which they are given are different. In Mt. the connection is very general. The woes simply find a place in a collection of moral criticisms by Jesus on His time: on John, on the Pharisees, and on the Galilean towns. Here they form part of Christ's address to the Seventy, when sending them forth on their mission. Whether they properly come in here has been disputed. Wendt (L. J., p. 89) thinks they do, inasmuch as they indicate that the punishment for rejecting the disciples will be the same as that of the cities which were unreceptive to the ministry of the Master. J. Weiss (in Meyer), on the other hand, thinks the woes have been inserted here from a purely external point of view, noting in proof the close connection between ver. 12 and ver. 16. It is impossible to be quite sure when the words were spoken, but also impossible to doubt that they *were* spoken by Jesus, probably towards or after the close of His Galilean ministry.—καθήμενοι, after σποδῷ, is an addition of Lk.'s, explanatory or pictorial.—Ver. 16 = Mt. x. 40, 41, only Mt. emphasises and expands the positive side, while Lk. with the positive presents, and with special emphasis, the negative (ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς, etc.).

Vv. 17-20. *Return of the Seventy*. No such report of the doings of the Twelve, and of their Master's congratulations, is given in any of the Gospels (*cf.* Mk. vi. 30, 31). It seems as if Lk. attached more importance to the later mission, as Baur accused him of doing under the influence of theological tendency (Pauline universalism). But probably this report was one of the fruits of his careful research for *memorabilia* of Jesus: "a highly valuable tradition arising on Jewish-Christian soil, and just on account of its strangeness trustworthy" (J. Weiss in Meyer). Similarly Feine, and Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 414, note.—Ver. 17. καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια, *even* the demons, subject to our power; more than they had expected or been promised, hence their exultation (μετὰ χαρᾶς).—Ver. 18. ἐθεώρουν: their report was no news to

ρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. 19. ἰδού, δίδωμι[1] ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ· καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ [b]ἀδικήσῃ[2]· 20. πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίρετε, ὅτι τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται· χαίρετε δὲ μᾶλλον[3] ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγράφη[4] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς." 21. Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[5] καὶ εἶπεν, "Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, Κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναί, ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως ἐγένετο εὐδοκία[6] ἔμπροσθέν σου." 22. Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶπε,[7] "Πάντα παρεδόθη μοι[8] ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου· καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ,

[b] in the sense of to hurt here and several times in Rev.

[1] δεδωκα in ℵBCLX 1, vet. Lat. vulg. (Tisch., W.H.). D has διδωμι.

[2] So in BCXΔ *al.* (W.H. margin). αδικησει in ℵDL 1, 13, 33 *al. mul.* (Tisch., W.H., text).

[3] Most uncials and verss. omit μαλλον.

[4] εγγεγραπται in ℵBLX 1, 33; most uncials as in T.R.

[5] ℵBDΞ omit ο I., and ℵBCDLXΞ 1, 33 *al.* add τω αγιω to πνευματι. Tisch. and W.H. adopt both changes.

[6] ευδ. εγεν. in BCLXΞ 33 some vet. Lat. codd.

[7] και στραφεις . . . ειπε omitted in ℵBDLΞ 1, 13, 22, 33 verss. (W.H., Tisch., retain with ACΔ *al. pl.*).

[8] μοι παρεδοθη in most uncials.

Jesus. While they were working He saw Satan falling. There has been much discussion as to what is meant by this fall, and why it is referred to. It has been identified with the fall of the angels at the beginning of the world, with the Incarnation, with the temptation of Jesus, in both of which Satan sustained defeat. The Fathers adopted the first of these alternatives, and found the motive of the reference in a desire to warn the disciples. The devil fell through pride; take care you fall not from the same cause (ver. 20).—ὡς ἀστραπὴν, like lightning; the precise point of the comparison has been variously conceived: momentary brightness, quick, sudden movement, inevitableness of the descent—down it must come to the earth, etc.—πεσόντα, aorist, after the imperfect (ἐθεώρουν), *fallen*, a fact accomplished. Pricaeus refers to Acts xix. 20 as a historical exemplification of the fall—Satan's kingdom destroyed by the rapid spread of Christianity.—Ver. 19 reminds one of Mk. xvi. 18.—τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, the enemy, Satan. —οὐδὲν, may be either nominative or accusative = either, "nothing shall in any wise hurt you," R. V., or "in no respect shall he (the enemy) hurt you".—Ver. 20. πλὴν has adversative force here = yet, nevertheless. The joy of the Seventy was in danger of becoming overjoy, running into self-importance; hence the warning word, which is best understood in the light of St. Paul's doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which laid much more stress on the *ethical* than on the *charismatical* results of His influence = rejoice not so much in possessing remarkable spiritual gifts as in being spiritual *men*. This text may be put beside Mt. vii. 21-23 as bearing on the separability of gifts and graces (χαρίσματα and χάρις).

Vv. 21-24. *The exultation of Jesus* (Mt. xi. 25-27).—The setting in Mt. gives to this great devotional utterance of Jesus a tone of resignation in connection with the apparent failure of His ministry. Here, connected with the fall of Satan, it has a tone of triumph (ἠγαλλιάσατο).—ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ: it was an inspired utterance, "a kind of glossolaly," J. Weiss (Meyer).—Ver. 21 is almost *verbatim*, as in Mt. xi. 25, only that Lk. has ἀπέκρυψας for Mt.'s ἔκρυψας.—Ver.

εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός, καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι." 23. Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπε, "Μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε. 24. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε, καὶ οὐκ εἶδον· καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν."

25. Καὶ ἰδού, νομικός τις ἀνέστη, ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν, καὶ[1] λέγων, "Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;" 26. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν, "Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις;" 27. Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, "Ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου, ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας[2] σου· καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν." 28. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ, "Ὀρθῶς ἀπεκρίθης· τοῦτο ποίει,

[1] **και**, found in ACD *al.*, is omitted in ℵBLΞ e syr. cur.

[2] Instead of **εξ** with genitive in this and preceding phrases ℵBDΞ minusc. have **εν** with dative (D has **εν** all through). ℵBLΞ have **εν** with dative for **εξ ο.τ. διανοιας**. D omits this clause.

22. This part of the devotional utterance, setting forth Christ's faith in the purpose of His Father and the intimate fellowship subsisting between Father and Son, appears in some texts of Lk. as a declaration made to the disciples (**στραφεὶς πρὸς τ. μ. α.**, T. R.). The gesture implies that a solemn statement is to be made.—**τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς, ὁ πατήρ**: to know who the Son or the Father is = knowing the Son and the Father. The idea in Lk. is the same as in Mt., though the expression is different.—Ver. 23. **στραφεὶς**: a second impressive gesture, if that in ver. 22 be retained, implying that Jesus now more directly addresses the disciples. But the first **στραφεὶς** is altogether doubtful.—**εἶπε**: the word, spoken **κατ' ἰδίαν** to the disciples, is substantially = Mt. xiii. 16, there referring to the happiness conferred on the disciples in being privileged to hear their Master's parabolic teaching.—**βασιλεῖς**: in place of Mt.'s **δίκαιοι**, which expresses an idea more intelligible to Jews than to Gentiles.

Vv. 25-37. *The lawyer's question, and the parable of the good Samaritan.* Many critics (even Weiss, Mk.-Evang., p. 400) think that Lk. or his source has got the theme of this section from Mt. xxii. 35 ff., Mk. xii. 28 ff., and simply enriched it with the parable of the good Samaritan, peculiar to him. Leaving this critical question on one side, it may be remarked that this story seems to be introduced on the principle of contrast, the **νομικός** representing the **σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοί**, to whom the things of the kingdom are hidden as opposed to the **νήπιοι**, to whom they are revealed, *i.e.*, the disciples whom Jesus had just congratulated on their felicity. Similarly in the case of the anecdote of the woman in Simon's house, vii. 26, *vide* notes there. J. Weiss remarks that this story and the following one about Martha and Mary form a pair, setting forth in the sense of the Epistle of James (ii. 8, 13, 14) the two main requirements of Christianity, love to one's neighbour and faith (*vide* in Meyer, *ad loc.*).—Ver. 25. **ἀνέστη**, stood up; from this expression and the present tense of **ἀναγινώσκεις**, how readest thou *now?* it has been conjectured that the scene may have been a synagogue.—**τί ποιήσας**: the **νομικός**, like the **ἄρχων** of xviii. 18, is professedly in quest of eternal life.—Ver. 26. **τί γέγραπ., πῶς ἀναγιν.**, how stands it written? how readest thou? double question with a certain *empressement*.—Ver. 27. Lk. here puts into the mouth of the lawyer an answer combining as co-ordinate the religious and the ethical, which in the later incident reported in Mt. xxii. 34-40, Mk. xii. 28-34, is ascribed to Jesus. The unity of these interests is, as Holtz. (H. C.) remarks, the achievement and characteristic of Christianity, and one may legitimately doubt whether a man belonging to the clerical class in our Lord's time had attained such insight. Divorce of religion from morality was a cardinal vice of the righteousness of the time, and we

καὶ ζήσῃ." 29. Ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιοῦν[1] ἑαυτὸν εἶπε πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, "Καὶ τίς ἐστί μου πλησίον;" 30. [c] Ὑπολαβὼν δὲ[2] ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Ἄνθρωπός τις κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Ἱεριχώ, καὶ λῃσταῖς [d] περιέπεσεν, οἳ καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτόν, καὶ πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες ἀπῆλθον, ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῆ τυγχάνοντα.[3] 31. κατὰ [e] συγκυρίαν δὲ ἱερεύς τις κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν [f] ἀντιπαρῆλθεν. 32. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Λευΐτης, γενόμενος[4] κατὰ τὸν τόπον, ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρῆλθε. 33. Σαμαρείτης δέ τις ὁδεύων ἦλθε κατ' αὐτόν, καὶ

c here only in N.T. in sense of replying.
d Acts xxvii. 41. Jas. i. 2.
e here only in N.T.
f here (*bis*) only in N.T.

[1] δικαιωσαι in ℵBCDLXΞ.
[2] Omit δε ℵBC.
[3] Omit τυγχ. ℵBDLΞ 1, 33 *al.*
[4] Omit γεν BLXΞ 1, 38, 118.

see it exemplified in the following parable: priest and Levite religious but inhuman. In Lk.'s time the conception of religion and morality as one and inseparable had become a Christian commonplace, and he might have been unable to realise that there was a time when men thought otherwise, and so without any sense of incongruity made the lawyer answer as he does. But, on the other hand, it has to be borne in mind that even in our Lord's time there were some in the legal schools who emphasised the ethical, and Mk. makes the scribe (xii. 32, 33) one of this type.—**ἀγαπήσεις**, etc.: Deut. vi. 5 is here given, as in Mk. xii. 31, with a fourfold analysis of the inner man: heart, soul, strength, mind.—Ver. 29. **δικαιῶσαι ἑ.**, to keep up his character as a righteous man, concerned in all things to do his duty. Hence his desire for a definition of "neighbour," which was an elastic term. Whether Lk. thinks of him as guilty of evasion and chicanery is doubtful. It was not his way to put the worst construction on the conduct even of scribes and Pharisees.—**πλησίον**, without article, is properly an adverb = who is near me? But the meaning is the same as if ὁ had been there.

Vv. 30-37. *The story of the good Samaritan*, commonly called a parable, but really not such in the strict sense of natural things used as vehicle of spiritual truth; an example rather than a symbol; the first of several "parables" of this sort in Lk.—**ἄνθρωπός τις**: probably a Jew, but intentionally not so called, simply a human being, so at once striking the keynote of universal ethics.—**κατέβαινεν**, was descending; it was a descent indeed.—**λ. περιέπεσεν**, "fell among" robbers, A. and R. VV.; better perhaps "fell in with," encountered, so Field (*Ot. Nor.*). The verb is often joined with a noun singular (**περιέπεσε χειμῶνι**). Raphel cites from Polybius an instance in which robbers "fall in with" the party robbed: **τούτους** (*legatos*) **λῃσταί τινες περιπεσόντες ἐν τῷ πελάγει διέφθειραν** (*Reliquiae*, lib. xxiv. 11).—**ἡμιθανῆ**, half dead, *semivivo relicto*, Vulgate, here only in N. T.; he will soon be whole dead unless some one come to his help: cannot help himself or move from the spot.—Ver. 31. **κατὰ συγκυρίαν** (**συγκυρία**, from **συγκυρέω**), rare, late Greek = **κατὰ συντυχίαν** (Hesychius, **συγκυρία, συντυχία**), by chance; the probabilities against succour being at hand just when sorely wanted; still more improbable that three possibilities of succour should meet just there and then. But the supposition, duly apologised for, is allowable, as the story must go on.—**ἱερεύς**: Schanz infers from **κατὰ συγ.** that Jericho was *not* a sacerdotal city, as, since Lightfoot, has been usually taken for granted. But the phrase has its full meaning independently of this inference, *vide* above.—**ἀντιπαρῆλθεν**, variously rendered either = passed by simply, or = passed the opposite way (going up), Grotius; or passed with the wounded man in full view, staring him in the face, a sight fit to awaken compassion in any one (Hahn); or passed by on the other side of the road.—Ver. 32. **ὁμοίως Λευΐτης ἀντιπ.**, likewise a Levite . . . passed by, the repetition of **ἀντιπαρῆλθεν** has a rhetorical monotony suggestive of the idea: such the way of the world—to pass by, "in nine cases out of ten that is what you may expect" (*The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, p. 348).—Ver. 33. **Σαμαρείτης**, a Samaritan: will he *a fortiori* pass by? No, he does not, that the surprise and the point of the story. The unexpected happens.—**ὁδεύων**, here only in N. T., making a journey, pre-

g here only in N.T.
h here only in N.T.
i Acts xxiii. 24. 1 Cor. xv. 39. Rev. xviii. 13.
j here only in N.T.

ἰδὼν αὐτὸν[1] ἐσπλαγχνίσθη· 34. καὶ προσελθὼν [g]κατέδησε τὰ [h]τραύματα αὐτοῦ, ἐπιχέων ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον· ἐπιβιβάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον [i]κτῆνος, ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς [j]πανδοχεῖον, καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ. 35. καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον ἐξελθών,[2] ἐκβαλὼν δύο δηνάρια ἔδωκε τῷ πανδοχεῖ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ,[3] Ἐπιμελήθητι αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὅ τι ἂν προσδαπανήσῃς, ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι. 36. Τίς οὖν[4] τούτων τῶν τριῶν δοκεῖ σοι πλησίον[5] γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς λῃστάς;" 37. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, "Ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ." Εἶπεν οὖν[6] αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Πορεύου, καὶ σὺ ποίει ὁμοίως."

k Ch. xix. 6. Acts xvii. 7. Jas. ii. 25.

38. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν[7] τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτούς, καὶ αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς κώμην τινά· γυνὴ δέ τις ὀνόματι Μάρθα [k]ὑπεδέξατο αὐτὸν εἰς

[1] Omit **αυτον** ℵBLΞ 1, 33 vet. Lat. codd.

[2] Omit **εξ.** ℵBDLXΞ 1, 33 *al.* B places **εδωκεν** before **δυο δην.** (W.H.).

[3] BDLΞ 1, 33, 80 *al.* vet. Lat. codd. omit **αυτω.**

[4] Omit **ουν** ℵBLΞ 1 verss.

[5] **πλησιον δοκει σοι** in ℵABCLΞ *al. pl.* D reads **τινα ουν δοκεις πλ. γεγονεναι.**

[6] **δε** for **ουν** in ℵBCDLXΔΞ *al.* verss.

[7] For **εγεν. δε εν.** ℵBLΞ 33 syrr. cur. sin. have simply **εν δε**, and omit **και** after **αυτους.**

sumably longer than from Jerusalem to Jericho, fully equipped for a long journey (Hahn), and so in possession of means for help, if he have the *will*.—**ἐσπλαγχνίσθη**, was touched with *pity*. That sacred feeling will keep *him* from passing by, though tempted by his own affairs to go on and avoid trouble and loss of time, as ships may pass by other ships in distress, so deserving ever after to have branded on them ΑΝΤΙΠΑΡΗΛΘΕΝ.—Ver. 34. **κατέδησε, ἐπιχέων**: both technical terms in medicine.—**ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον**: not separately, but mixed; in use among Greeks and Romans as well as Jews (Wetstein).—**κτῆνος = κτῆμα** from **κτάομαι**, generally a *property*, and specially a domestic animal: one's beast.—**πανδοχεῖον** (in classics **πανδοκ.**), a place for receiving all comers, an inn having a host, not merely a khan or caravanserai like **κατάλυμα** in ii. 7.—Ver. 35. **ἐκβαλὼν**, casting out (of his girdle or purse).—**δύο δην.**, two "pence," small sum, but enough for the present; will pay whatever more is needed; known in the inn, and known as a trusty man to the innkeeper (**τῷ πανδοκεῖ**).—**ὅτι ἂν**, etc.: the speech of a man who in turn trusts the host, and has no fear of being overcharged in the bill for the wounded man.—**ἐγὼ**: with a slight emphasis which means: you know me.—**ἐπανέρχεσθαι**: he expects to return to the place on his business, a regular customer at that inn. This verb, as well as **προσδαπανάω**, is used here only in N. T.—Ver. 36. Application of the story.—**γεγονέναι**: which of the three seems to you to have *become* neighbour by neighbourly action? neighbour is who neighbour does.—Ver. 37. **ὁ ποιήσας**, etc. If the lawyer was captious to begin with he is captious no longer. He might have been, for his question had not been directly (though very radically) answered. But the moral pathos of the "parable" has appealed to his better nature, and he quibbles no longer. But the prejudice of his class tacitly finds expression by avoidance of the word "Samaritan," and the use instead of the phrase **ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ.** Yet perhaps we do him injustice here, for the phrase really expresses the essence of neighbourhood, and so indicates not only *who* is neighbour but *why*. For the same phrase *vide* i. 58, 72. This story teaches the whole doctrine of neighbourhood: first and directly, what it is to be a neighbour, *viz.*, to give succour when and where needed; next, indirectly but by obvious consequence, who is a neighbour, *viz.*, any one who needs help and whom I

τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς.[1] 39. καὶ τῇδε ἦν ἀδελφὴ καλουμένη Μαρία, ἣ καὶ παρακαθίσασα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ[2] ἤκουε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ. 40. ἡ δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλὴν διακονίαν· ἐπιστᾶσα δὲ εἶπε, "Κύριε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἡ ἀδελφή μου μόνην με κατέλιπε[3] διακονεῖν; εἰπὲ[4] οὖν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται." 41. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[5] "Μάρθα, Μάρθα, μεριμνᾷς καὶ τυρβάζῃ[6] περὶ πολλά· 42. ἑνὸς δέ ἐστι χρεία[7]· Μαρία δὲ[8] τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο, ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ'[9] αὐτῆς."

[1] ℵCLΞ 33 have εις την οικιαν and without αυτης (Tisch.). B has nothing after υπεδεξατο αυτον (W.H. brackets).

[2] From η και to Ιησου sundry variants occur: omit η ℵLΞ; ℵABCLΞ have παρακαθεσθεισα; for παρα ℵBCLΞ have προς; and for Ιησου these with D have κυριου.

[3] κατελειπεν in ABCLΞ *al. pl.*

[4] ειπον in DLΞ 1, 33 (Tisch., W.H.); ειπε in ℵABC *al. pl.*

[5] For ο I. ℵBL have ο κυριος.

[6] θορυβαζη in ℵBCDL 1, 33.

[7] For ενος δε εστι χρεια (Tisch.) ℵBL 1, 33 have ολιγων δε εστι χρεια η ενος, which commends itself on reflection. *Vide* below. D omits the clause. Syr. sin. omits all between Μαρθα and Μαρια.

[8] γαρ in ℵBL.

[9] Omit απ ℵBDL.

have opportunity and power to help, no matter what his rank, race, or religion may be: neighbourhood coextensive with humanity.

Vv. 38-42. *Martha and Mary.*—Ver. 38. ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι, in continuation of the wandering whose beginning is noted at ix. 52; when, where, not indicated.—εἰς κώμην τινά: either not known, or the name deemed of no importance. When it is stated that He (αὐτὸς) (Jesus) came to this village it is not implied that He was alone, though no mention is made of disciples in the narrative.—Μάρθα = mistress, feminine of מָר.—Ver. 39. Μαρία, socially subordinate (inferrible from the manner of reference), though the spiritual heroine of the tale.—ἣ καὶ: the force of the καὶ is not clear, and has been variously explained. Grotius regards it as simply an otiose addition to the relative. Bornemann takes it = *adeo* = to such an extent did Mary disregard the customary duty of women, that of serving guests, "quem morem adeo non observat M. ut docenti Jesu auscultet". Perhaps it has something of the force of δή = who, observe! serving to counterbalance the social subordination of Mary; the less important person in the *house*, but the more important in the *Kingdom of God*.—παρακαθεσθεῖσα, first aorist passive participle, from παρακαθέζομαι, late Greek form = sitting at the feet of Jesus. Posture noted as significant of a receptive mind and devoted spirit.—τοῦ Κυρίου, the Lord, once more for *Jesus* in narrative (Ἰησοῦ in T. R.).—ἤκουε τὸν λόγον α., continued hearing His word, a conventional expression as in viii. 21.—Ver. 40. ἡ δὲ Μάρ., but Martha, δὲ as if μὲν had gone before where καὶ is = Mary on the one hand sat, etc., Martha on the other, etc.—περιεσπᾶτο, was distracted, over-occupied, as if the visit had been unexpected, and the guests numerous. In use from Xenophon down. In Polybius with τῇ διανοίᾳ added. Holtzmann (H. C.) points out the correspondence between the contrasted picture of the two sisters and the antithesis between the married and unmarried woman in 1 Cor. vii. 34, 35. The married woman caring for the world like Martha (μεριμνᾷς, ver. 41); the unmarried virgin: εὐπάρεδρον τ. κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως.—ἐπιστᾶσα, coming up to and placing herself beside Jesus and Mary: in no placid mood, looking on her sister as simply an idle woman. A bustled worthy housewife will speak her mind in such a case, even though a Jesus be present and come in for a share of the blame.—συναντιλάβηται, bid her *take a hand*

XI. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ προσευχόμενον, ὡς ἐπαύσατο, εἶπέ τις τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, "Κύριε, δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐδίδαξε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ." 2. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς, "Ὅταν προσεύχησθε, λέγετε, Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,[1] ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ

[1] ημων . . . ουρανοις omitted in ℵBL 1, 22 *al.* Orig. Tert. syr. sin.; comes in doubtless from Mt.

along with me in the work (*cf.* Rom. viii. 26).—Ver. 41. θορυβάζῃ (from θόρυβος, an uproar; τυρβάζῃ T. R., from τύρβη, similar in meaning, neither form again in N. T.), thou art bustled, gently spoken and with a touch of pity. —περὶ πολλά: a great day in that house. Every effort made to entertain Jesus worthily of Him and to the credit of the house.—Ver. 42. ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἑνός. With this reading the sense is: there is need of few things (material); then, with a pause—or rather of one thing (spiritual). Thus Jesus passes, as was His wont, easily and swiftly from the natural to the spiritual. The notion that it was beneath the dignity of Jesus to refer to *dishes*, even as a stepping stone to higher things, is the child of conventional reverence.—τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα, the good portion, conceived of as a share in a banquet (Gen. xliii. 34). Mary, having chosen this *good* portion, may not be blamed (γὰρ), and cannot be deprived of it, shall not with my sanction, in deference to the demands of a lower vocation.

CHAPTER XI. LESSON ON PRAYER. DISCOURSES IN SELF-DEFENCE.—Vv. 1-13 contain a lesson on prayer, consisting of two parts: *first*, a form of prayer suggesting the chief objects of desire (vv. 1-4); *second*, an argument enforcing perseverance in prayer (vv. 5-13). Whether the whole was spoken at one time or not cannot be ascertained; all one can say is that the instructions are thoroughly coherent and congruous, and might very well have formed a single lesson.

Vv. 1-4. *The Lord's Prayer with a historical introduction* (Mt. vi. 7-15).—ἐν τόπῳ τινὶ: neither the *place* nor the time of this incident is indicated with even approximate exactness. It is simply stated that it happened when Jesus was at a certain place, and when He was *praying* (προσευχόμενον). Why the narrative comes in here does not clearly appear. I have suggested elsewhere (*The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*, Preface to the Third Edition) that the parable of the *Good Samaritan*, the story of *Martha and Mary* and the *Lesson on Prayer* form together a group having for their common heading: "at school with Jesus," exhibiting under three types the scholar's burden, the Teacher's meekness, and the rest-bringing lesson, so giving us Lk.'s equivalent for Mt.'s *gracious invitation* (chap. xi. 28-30). I am now inclined to think that *Schola Christi* might be the heading not merely for these three sections but for the whole division from ix. 51 to xviii. 14, the contents being largely didactic.—τις τ. μαθ.: a *later* disciple, Meyer thinks, who had not heard the Teaching on the Hill, and who got for answer to his request a repetition of the Lord's Prayer, given by Mt. as part of the Sermon on the Mount. This conjecture must go for what it is worth.—καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης: the fact here stated is not otherwise known: no trace of a Johannine liturgy; but the statement in itself is very credible: prayer like fasting reduced to system in the Baptist's circle.—Ver. 2. λέγετε, say, but not implying obligation to repeat regularly the *ipsissima verba*. The divergence of Lk.'s form from that of Mt., as given in critical editions of the N. T., is sufficient evidence that the Apostolic Church did not so understand their Lord's will, and use the prayer bearing His name as a *formula*. Interpreters are not agreed as to which of the two forms is the more original. For my own part I have little doubt that Lk.'s is secondary and abbreviated from the fuller form of Mt. The very name for God—Father—without any added epithet is sufficient proof of this; for Jesus was wont to address God in fuller terms (*vide* x. 21), and was not likely to give His disciples a form beginning so abruptly. Lk.'s form as it stands in W.H. is as follows:

τῆς γῆς.[1] 3. τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν· 4. καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν[2] παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν· καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ."[3] 5. Καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἕξει φίλον, καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου, καὶ εἴπῃ αὐτῷ, Φίλε, χρῆσόν μοι τρεῖς ἄρτους, 6. ἐπειδὴ φίλος μου παρεγένετο ἐξ ὁδοῦ πρός με, καὶ οὐκ ἔχω ὃ παραθήσω αὐτῷ· 7. κἀκεῖνος ἔσωθεν ἀποκριθεὶς εἴπῃ, Μή μοι κόπους πάρεχε· ἤδη ἡ θύρα κέκλεισται, καὶ τὰ παιδία μου μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὴν κοίτην εἰσίν· οὐ δύναμαι ἀναστὰς δοῦναί σοι. 8. Λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ καὶ οὐ δώσει αὐτῷ ἀναστάς, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ φίλον,[4] διά γε τὴν ἀναίδειαν

[1] This petition, γενηθητω . . . επι της γης, omitted in BL 1, 22 vulg. syr. sin.

[2] αφιομεν in ℵcABCD. T.R. as in ℵ*L.

[3] αλλα . . . πονηρου omitted in ℵBL 1, 22 *al. pl.* vulg. syr. sin. These abbreviations in Lk.'s version of the Lord's Prayer are accepted by most modern editors and scholars.

[4] φιλον αυτου in ℵBCLX 33 *al.*

Father! Hallowed be Thy name.
Come Thy kingdom.
The bread of each day give us daily.
And forgive our sins, for we also forgive every one owing us.
And bring us not into temptation.

The third petition: Thy will be done, etc., and the second half of the sixth: but deliver us from evil, are wanting.—Ver. 3. τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, daily, for Mt.'s σήμερον, this day, is an alteration corresponding to the καθ' ἡμέραν in the *Logion* concerning cross-bearing (ix. 23).—δίδου, for δὸς, is a change necessitated by the other.—Ver. 4. ἁμαρτίας: for Mt.'s ὀφειλήματα, but it is noticeable that the idea of sins is not introduced into the second clause. Lk. avoids making our forgiving and God's parallel: we forgive debts, God *sins*. Whether the debts are viewed as moral or as material is not indicated, possibly both.—On the whole, *vide* Mt.

Vv. 5-8. *The selfish neighbour.* This parable and that of the unjust judge (xviii. 1-8) form a couplet teaching the same lesson with reference to distinct spheres of life or experience: that men ought always to pray, and not grow faint-hearted when the answer to prayer is long delayed. They *imply* that we have to wait for the fulfilment of spiritual desires, and they *teach* that it is worth our while to wait: fulfilments will come, God is good to them that wait upon Him.

Ver. 5. εἶπεν: the story is not *called* a parable, as the similar one in chap. xviii. is, but it *is* one. God's ways in the spiritual world are illustrated by men's ways in everyday life.—τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν, etc.: the whole parable, vv. 5-8, is really one long sentence in which accordingly the construction comes to grief, beginning interrogatively (as far as φίλον, ver. 5, or παραθήσω αὐτῷ, ver. 6) and continuing conditionally, the apodosis beginning with λέγω ὑμῖν, ver. 8, and taking the form of an independent sentence.—μεσονυκτίου, at midnight, a poetic word in classic Greek, a prose word in late Greek. Phryn. says: μεσονύκτιον ποιητικόν, οὐ πολιτικόν. In hot climates travelling was largely done during night, therefore the hour was seasonable from the traveller's point of view, while unseasonable from the point of view of people at home. This is a feature in the *felicity* of the parable.—χρῆσον, 1st aorist active imperative, from κίχρημι, here only in N. T., to lend.—Ver. 6. οὐκ ἔχω: this does not necessarily imply poverty: bread for the day was baked every morning. It is rather to be wondered at that a man with a family of children (ver. 7) had any over.—Ver. 7. μή μοι, etc.: similar phrase in xviii. 5. *Cf.* Mt. xxvi. 10, Mk. xiv. 6. Here = don't bother me!—κέκλεισται, has been barred for the night, a thing done and not to be undone for a trifling cause.—

αὐτοῦ, ἐγερθεὶς δώσει αὐτῷ ὅσων χρῄζει. 9. Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, Αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ζητεῖτε, καὶ εὑρήσετε· κρούετε, καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται[1] ὑμῖν. 10. πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει· καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει· καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.[1] 11. τίνα δὲ ὑμῶν[2] τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; εἰ καὶ[3] ἰχθύν, μὴ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ[4]; 12. ἢ καὶ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ[5] ᾠόν, μὴ ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον; 13. εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε ἀγαθὰ δόματα[6] διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν;"

14. Καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον, καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν[7] κωφόν· ἐγένετο δέ, τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος, ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός· καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ

[1] ανοιχθ. in many MSS. (Tisch.); ανοιγ. in ℵBCL *al. pl.* (W.H.) may have come from Mt. (so Tisch.). For the second ανοιγησεται (ver. 10) BD have ανοιγεται (W.H. marg.).

[2] εξ υμων in ℵABCDL.

[3] From αρτον to ει και is omitted in B verss. Orig. (W.H. text).

[4] αυτω before επιδ. in BDL.

[5] ℵBL 1, 13, 33 omit εαν, and with CD *al.* have αιτησει. BL also omit μη before επιδ.

[6] δομ. αγ. in ℵABCDL *al. pl.*

[7] και αυτο ην omit ℵBL *al.* verss.

εἰς τὴν κοίτην: they have gone to bed and are now sleeping in bed, and he does not want to risk waking them (ἵνα μὴ ἀφυπνίσῃ αὐτά, Euthym.).—οὐ δύναμαι: οὐ θέλω would have been nearer the truth.—Ver. 8. λέγω ὑμῖν: introducing a confident assertion.—διά γε τ. ἀν., yet *at least* on account of, etc. He may give or not give for friendship's sake, but he must give for his own sake.—ἀναίδειαν (here only in N.T.), the total disregard of domestic privacy and comfort shown by persistent knocking; very indecent from the point of view of the man in bed (ἀναίδειαν = τὴν ἐπιμονὴν τῆς αἰτήσεως, Euthym.).

Vv. 9-13. *The moral of the story* (*cf.* Mt. vii. 7-11).—κἀγὼ ὑμῖν, etc., and *I* (the same speaker as in ver. 8) say to *you*, with equal confidence. What Jesus says is in brief: you also will get what you want from God, as certainly as the man in my tale got what he wanted; therefore pray on, imitating his ἀναίδεια. The selfish neighbour represents God as He seems, and persistent prayer looks like a shameless disregard of His apparent indifference.—Vv. 9, 10 correspond almost exactly with Mt. vii. 7, 8. *Vide* notes there.—Ver. 11. τίνα δὲ: δὲ introduces a new parabolic saying: which of you, as a father, shall his son ask? etc. In the T.R. Lk. gives *three* examples of possible requests—Mt.'s two: a loaf, and a fish, and a third, an egg. Cod. B omits the first (W.H. put it on the margin).—ᾠόν, σκορπίον: in the two first instances there is resemblance between the thing asked and supposed to be given: loaf and stone, fish and serpent; in Lk.'s third instance also, the σκορπίος being a little round lobster-like animal, lurking in stone walls, with a sting in its tail. The gift of things similar but so different would be cruel mockery of which almost no father would be capable. Hens were not known in ancient Israel. Probably the Jews brought them from Babylon, after which eggs would form part of ordinary food (Benziger, *Heb. Arch.*, p. 94).—Ver. 13. ὁ π. ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, this epithet is attached to πατὴρ here though not in the Lord's Prayer.—Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον instead of Mt.'s ἀγαθά. The Holy Spirit is mentioned here as the *summum donum*, and the supreme object of desire for all true disciples. In some forms of the Lord's Prayer (Marcion, Greg. Nys.) a petition for the gift of the Holy Spirit took the place of the first or second petition.

Vv. 14-16. *Brief historical statement introducing certain defensive utterances of Jesus.*—Vv. 14, 15 answer to Mt. ix. 33, 34, xii. 22-24, and ver. 16 to Mt.

ὄχλοι. 15. τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον, "Ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἄρχοντι[1] τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια." 16. Ἕτεροι δὲ πειράζοντες σημεῖον παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐζήτουν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ[2]· 17. Αὐτὸς δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ [a] διανοήματα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Πᾶσα βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἐρημοῦται· καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον, πίπτει. 18. εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη, πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; ὅτι λέγετε, ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια. 19. εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσι; διὰ τοῦτο κριταὶ ὑμῶν αὐτοὶ[3] ἔσονται. 20. εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. 21. Ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος φυλάσσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αὐλήν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ· 22. ἐπὰν δὲ ὁ[4] ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ ἐπελθὼν νικήσῃ αὐτόν, τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἴρει, ἐφ' ᾗ ἐπεποίθει, καὶ τὰ [b] σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν. 23. ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστι· καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

a here only in N. T. (Is. iv. 9).

b here only in N. T.

[1] τω αρχ. in ℵABCL. [2] εξ ουρ. εζητουν παρ αυτου in ℵABCDL 1, 33 *al.*

[3] αυτοι before κρ. υμ. in BD (W.H.). [4] Omit ο ℵBDL.

xii. 38. The reproduction of these passages here is very summary: the reference to *Israel*, Mt. ix. 33, and the question "is not this the Son of David?" xii. 23, *e.g.*, being omitted. Then, further, it is noticeable that the references to the Pharisees and scribes, as the authors of the malignant theory as to Christ's cure of demoniacs and the persons who demanded a sign, are eliminated, the vague terms **τινὲς** (ver. 15) and **ἕτεροι** (ver. 16) being substituted. The historical situation in which Jesus spoke is wiped out, the writer caring only for *what* He said.

Vv. 17-23. *The Beelzebub theory* (Mt. xii. 25-30, Mk. iii. 23-27).—Ver. 17. **διαμερισθεῖσα.** Lk. has a preference for compounds; **μερισθεῖσα** in Mt.—**καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει**, and house falls against house, one tumbling house knocking down its neighbour, a graphic picture of what happens when a kingdom is divided against itself. In Mt. kingdom and city are two co-ordinate illustrations of the principle. In Mk. a house takes the place of Mt.'s city. In Lk. the house is simply a feature in the picture of a kingdom ruined by self-division. Some (*e.g.*, Bornemann and Hahn) render Lk.'s phrase: house upon house, one house after another falls. Others, in a harmonistic interest, interpret: a house being divided (**διαμερισθεὶς** understood) against itself (**ἐπὶ οἶκον = ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν**) falls.—Ver. 20. **ἐν δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ:** instead of Mt.'s **ἐν πνεύματι Θεοῦ**, which is doubtless the original expression, being more appropriate to the connection of thought. Lk.'s expression emphasises the immediateness of the Divine action through Jesus, in accordance with his habit of giving prominence to the miraculousness of Christ's healing acts. But the question was not as to the fact, but as to the moral quality of the miracle. The phrase recalls Ex. viii. 9.—**ἔφθασεν: φθάνω** in classics means to anticipate, in later Greek to *reach*, the idea of priority being dropped out.—Ver. 21. **ὅταν**: introducing the parable of the strong man subdued by a stronger, symbolising the true state of the case as between Beelzebub and Jesus, probably more original in Lk. than in Mt. (xii. 29).—**καθωπλισμένος**, fully armed, here only in N.T.—**αὐλήν**, *court*, whose entrance is guarded, according to some; house, castle, or palace according to others (**οἰκίαν** in Mt.).—Ver. 22. **πανοπλίαν**, panoply, a Pauline word (Eph. vi. 11, 13).—**διαδίδωσιν**, distributes the spoils among his friends with the generosity and the display of victory, referring probably to the extensive scale of Christ's healing ministry among demoniacs.—Ver. 23 = Mt. xii. 30.

Vv. 24-26. *The parable of the unclean spirit cast out and returning:* given by Mt. in connection with the demand for a

24. Ὅταν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων, ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν· καὶ μὴ εὑρίσκον λέγει,[1] Ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον· 25. καὶ ἐλθὸν εὑρίσκει[2] σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον. 26. τότε πορεύεται καὶ παραλαμβάνει ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ,[3] καὶ εἰσελθόντα κατοικεῖ ἐκεῖ· καὶ γίνεται τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρώτων."

27. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ λέγειν αὐτὸν ταῦτα, ἐπάρασά τις γυνὴ φωνὴν[4] ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Μακαρία ἡ κοιλία ἡ [c] βαστάσασά σε, καὶ μαστοὶ οὓς ἐθήλασας." 28. Αὐτὸς δὲ εἶπε, "Μενοῦνγε[5] μακάριοι οἱ ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ φυλάσσοντες αὐτόν."[6]

29. Τῶν δὲ ὄχλων [d] ἐπαθροιζομένων ἤρξατο λέγειν, "Ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη[7] πονηρά ἐστι· σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ,[8] καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ, εἰ

c here only in this sense.

d here only in N. T.

[1] BLXΞ 33 add τοτε, which implies that και μη ευρισκον is to be joined to αναπαυσιν (W.H. marg.).

[2] BCL *al.* verss. insert σχολαζοντα, which may come in from Mt. (W.H. brackets).

[3] επτα after εαυτου in ℵBLΞ 13, 69 *al.*; a most appropriate position of emphasis.

[4] φωνην before γυνη in ℵBL. A credible order, but apt to be altered by scribes into the smoother in T.R.

[5] μενουν in ℵABLΔΞ; μενουνγε in CDX *al.* There seems no reason why either should be changed into the other. The latter is found in Rom. ix. 20, x. 18.

[6] Omit αυτον ℵ*ABCDLΔΞ.

[7] γενεα follows as well as precedes αυτη in ℵABDLXΞ (Tisch., W.H.).

[8] ζητει in ℵABLΞ *al.* T.R. from Mt.

sign (xii. 43 ff.). Lk.'s version differs from Mt.'s chiefly in minute literary variations. Two omissions are noticeable: (1) the epithet σχολάζοντα in the description of the deserted house (a probable omission, the word bracketed in W. and H.), (2) the closing phrase of Mt.'s version: οὕτως ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ τ. τ. πονηρᾷ. On the import of the parable *vide* on Mt., *ad loc.*

Vv. 27-28. *The woman in the crowd.* In Lk. only, though reminding one of Mt. xii. 46-50, Mk. iii. 32-35. It reports an honest matron's blessing on the, to her probably unknown, mother of Jesus, who in this case, as in an earlier instance (viii. 19-21), treats the felicity of natural motherhood as entirely subordinate to that of discipleship.—Ver. 27. κοιλία, μαστοί: "Mulier bene sentit sed muliebriter loquitur" (Bengel).—Ver. 28. μενοῦν might be confirmatory (*utique*) or corrective (*imo vero*), or a little of both; the tone of voice would show which of the two the speaker meant to be the more prominent. Correction probably was uppermost in Christ's thoughts. Under the appearance of approval the woman was taught that she was mistaken in thinking that merely to be the mother of an illustrious son constituted felicity (Schanz). Viger, *Ed. Hermann*, p. 541, quotes this text as illustrating the use of μενοῦν in the sense of imo vero, rendering: "Quin imo, vel imo vero, beati qui audiunt verbum Dei". Its position at the beginning of the sentence is contrary to Attic use: "reperitur apud solos Scriptores Macedonicos," Sturz, *De Dial. Mac. et Alex.*, p. 203.—τὸν λόγον τ. Θ., those who hear and keep the *word of God*, the truly blessed. *Cf.* "His word" in x. 39; an established phrase.

Vv. 29-32. *The sign of Jonah* (Mt. xii. 38-42).—Τ. δ. ἐπαθροιζομένων, the crowds thronging to Him. The heading for the following discourse has been anticipated in ver. 16; ἕτεροι πειράζοντες, instead of Mt.'s scribes and Pharisees, asking a sign. In Lk.'s narrative Jesus answers their question in presence of a gathering crowd supposed to be referred to in the expression ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη.

μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου.[1] 30. καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς σημεῖον τοῖς Νινευΐταις,[2] οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ. 31. Βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς· ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶντος, καὶ ἰδού, πλεῖον Σολομῶντος ὧδε. 32. ἄνδρες Νινευΐ[3] ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδού, πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε.

33. "Οὐδεὶς δὲ[4] λύχνον ἅψας εἰς κρυπτὸν[5] τίθησιν, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φέγγος[6] βλέπωσιν. 34. ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός[7]· ὅταν οὖν[8] ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἁπλοῦς ᾖ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινόν ἐστιν· ἐπὰν δὲ πονηρὸς ᾖ, καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν. 35. σκόπει

[1] Omit τ. προφ. (from Mt.) with ℵBDLΞ codd. vet. Lat.

[2] σημ. after Νιν. in ℵBCLXΞ 33.

[3] Νινευιται in ℵBL. D omits ver. 32.

[4] Omit δε ℵBCD 33 verss.

[5] κρυπτην in all uncials.

[6] For φεγγος in ALΓΔ *al. pl.* (Tisch.). ℵBCDX *al.* have the more usual φως (W.H.).

[7] ℵBCD have σου after οφθ. here also.

[8] ℵBDLΔ verss. omit ουν.

ἐπαθροίζω occurs here only in N.T.—ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, etc., this generation is an evil generation; said in reference to the crowd supposed to sympathise with and share the religious characteristics of their leaders. The epithet μοιχαλὶς (Mt. xii. 39) is omitted as liable to be misunderstood by non-Hebrew readers.—Ver. 30. The sign of Jonah is not further explained as in Mt. (xii. 40), and it might seem that the meaning intended was that Jonah, as a prophet and through his preaching, was a sign to the Ninevites, and that in like manner so was Jesus to His generation. But in reference to Jesus Lk. does not say "is" but "shall be," ἔσται, as if something else than Christ's ministry, something future in His experience, was the sign. Something is obscurely hinted at which is not further explained, as if to say: wait and you will get your sign.—Vv. 31, 32 = Mt. xii. 41, 22, only that the men of Nineveh and the Queen of Sheba change places. Mt.'s order seems the more natural, the discourse so passing from the sign of Jonah to the Ninevites, who had the benefit of it.

Vv. 33-36 contain parabolic utterances concerning the placing of a light, and the conditions under which the eye sees the light.—Ver. 33 repeats viii. 16 in slightly varied language, and vv. 34-36 reproduce what Mt. gives in his version of the Sermon on the Mount (vi. 22, 23). The connection with what goes before is not apparent.—Ver. 33. κρύπτην, a hidden place: crypt, vault, cellar, or press, to put a lamp in which is to make it useless.—Ver. 34. ὁ λύχνος, etc., the lamp of the body is thine eye. This thought in connection with the foregoing one might lead us to expect some remark on the proper placing of the body's lamp, but the discourse proceeds to speak of the *single* (ἁπλοῦς) and the *evil* (πονηρὸς) eye. The connection lies in the *effects* of these qualities. The single eye, like a properly placed lamp, gives light; the evil eye, like a lamp under a bushel, leaves one in darkness. On these attributes of the eye *vide* remarks on Mt. vi. 22, 23.—Ver. 35. A counsel to take care lest the light in us become darkness, answering to that suggested in the parable: see that the lamp be properly placed.—Ver. 36. This verse is very puzzling both critically and exegetically. As it stands in T.R. (and in W.H.) it appears tautological (De Wette), a fault which some have tried to surmount by punctuation, and some by properly placed emphasis—on ὅλον in the protasis and on φωτεινόν in the apodosis, giving this sense: if thy body be *wholly* lighted, having no part dark,

οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν. 36. εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτεινόν, μὴ ἔχον τὶ μέρος σκοτεινόν, ἔσται φωτεινὸν ὅλον, ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστραπῇ φωτίζῃ σε."[1]

37. Ἐν δὲ τῷ λαλῆσαι, ἠρώτα[2] αὐτὸν Φαρισαῖός τις[3] ὅπως ἀριστήσῃ παρ' αὐτῷ· εἰσελθὼν δὲ ἀνέπεσεν. 38. ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου. 39. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν, "Νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε· τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει

[1] On ver. 36 *vide* below, and W.H. (appendix) on vv. 35, 36.

[2] **ερωτα** in ℵABM 69 *al.* [3] Omit **τις** ℵBL 1, 13, 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

then will it be lighted indeed, as when the lamp with its lightning illumines thee (so Meyer). Even thus the saying seems unsatisfactory, and hardly such as Lk., not to say our Lord, could have been responsible for. The critical question thus forces itself upon us: is this really what Lk. wrote? Westcott and Hort think the passage contains "a primitive corruption," an opinion which J. Weiss (in Meyer, p. 476, note) endorses, making at the same time an attempt to restore the true text. Such attempts are purely conjectural. The verse is omitted in D, some Latin codd., and in Syr. Cur. The new Syr. Sin. has it in a form which Mrs. Lewis thus renders: "Therefore also thy body, when there is in it no lamp that hath shone, is dark, thus while thy lamp is shining, it gives light to thee"—a sentence as dark as a lampless body.

Vv. 37-54. *In the house of a Pharisee; criticism of the religion of Pharisees and scribes* (Mt. xxiii.). This section contains a selection of the hard sayings of Jesus on the "righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees," given with much greater fulness in Mt.'s great anti-pharisaic discourse, the severity of the attack being further mitigated by the words being thrown into the form of table talk. This is the second time Jesus appears as a guest in a Pharisee's house in this gospel, speaking His mind with all due freedom but without breach of the courtesies of life. The effect and probable aim of these representations is to show that if it ultimately came to an open rupture between Jesus and the Pharisees it was their fault, not His.—Ver. 37. **ἐν τῷ λαλῆσαι**, while He was speaking, as if it had been **ἐ. τ. λαλεῖν. ἐν** goes most naturally with the present infinitive, but Lk., who uses **ἐν** with infinitive much more frequently than any other N.T. writer, has **ἐν** with the aorist nine times. *Vide* Burton (M. and T., § 109), who remarks in reference to such cases: "The preposition does not seem necessarily to denote exact coincidence (of time), but in no case expresses antecedence. In 1 Cor. xi. 21 and Heb. iii. 12 the action of the infinitive cannot be antecedent to that of the principal verb."—**ἀριστήσῃ**: the meal was breakfast rather than dinner.—Ver. 38. **ἐθαύμασεν**: the cause of wonder was that Jesus did not *wash* (**ἐβαπτίσθη**) before eating. We have here Lk.'s equivalent for the incident in Mt. xv. 1 ff., Mk. vii. 1 ff., omitted by him. But the secondary character of Lk.'s narrative appears from this, that the ensuing discourse does not, as in Mt. and Mk., keep to the point in hand—neglect of ritual ablutions, but expatiates on Pharisaic vices generally.—Ver. 39. **ὁ Κύριος**, once more this title in narrative.—**νῦν**: variously taken as = *igitur* or = *ecce*, or as a strictly temporal particle = now "a silent contrast with a better **πάλαι**" (Meyer). Hahn affirms that **νῦν** at the beginning of a sentence can mean nothing else than "now". But Raphel, in support of the second of the above senses ("admirationem quandam declarat"), quotes from Arrian **νῦν δύναταί τις ὠφελῆσαι καὶ ἄλλους, μὴ αὐτὸς ὠφελημένος** (*Epict.*, lib. iii., cap. 23, 1). Bengel cites 2 Kings vii. 6, Sept., where **νῦν** in the first position is the equivalent for הִנֵּה (*vide* Sweet's edition). Lo! ecce! seems best to suit the situation, which demands a lively emotional word. Godet happily renders: "Vous voilà bien! Je vous prends sur le fait."—**πίνακος** for Mt.'s **παροψίδος** (xxiii. 25).—**τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν**, *your* inside, instead of the inside of the dishes in Mt. The idea is that the food they take

ἁρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας. 40. ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησε; 41. πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην· καὶ ἰδού, πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστιν. 42. ἀλλ᾽ οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύσμον καὶ τὸ πήγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον, καὶ παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ· ταῦτα ἔδει ποιῆσαι, κἀκεῖνα μὴ ἀφιέναι.[1] 43. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς. 44. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί,[2] ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἴδασιν." 45. Ἀποκριθεὶς δέ τις τῶν νομικῶν λέγει αὐτῷ, "Διδάσκαλε, ταῦτα λέγων καὶ ἡμᾶς ὑβρίζεις." 46. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς οὐαί, ὅτι φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἑνὶ τῶν δακτύλων ὑμῶν οὐ προσψαύετε τοῖς φορτίοις. 47. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν

[1] παρειναι in BL 13 (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] γραμ. . . . υποκριται omitted in ℵBCL *al.* Probably imported from Mt.

into their bodies is the product of plunder and wickedness (πονηρίας = ἀκρασίας, Mt.).—Ver. 40. **ἄφρονες**, stupid men! not so strong a word as **μωροὶ** (Mt. xxiii. 17).—**οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας**, etc.: either a question or an assertion. As an assertion = he that makes the outside (as it should be) does not thereby also make the inside: it is one thing to cleanse the outside, another, etc. On this view **ποιήσας** has a pregnant sense = *purgare*, which Kypke and others (Bornemann dissenting) claim for it in this place. As a question the reference will be to God, and the sense: did not the Maker of the world make the inside of things as well as the outside? Why therefore lay so exclusive stress on the latter? The outside and inside are variously taken as body and spirit (Theophy., Euthy., etc.), vessel and contents (Wolf, Hofmann), vessel and human spirit (Bengel).—Ver. 41. **πλὴν**, rather (instead of devoting such attention to the outside).—**τὰ ἐνόντα**, etc., give, as alms, *the things within the dishes*. Others render as if the phrase were **κατὰ τ. ἐν.**: according to your ability (Pricaeus, Grotius, etc.).

Vv. 42-44. To this criticism of the externalism of the Pharisees, the only thing strictly relevant to the situation as described, are appended three of Mt.'s "woes" directed against their will-worship in tithing (Mt. xxiii. 23), their love of prominence (Mt. xxiii. 6, not formally put as a "woe"), and their hypocrisy (Mt. xxiii. 27).—**πήγανον**, rue, instead of Mt.'s **ἄνηθον**, anise, here only in N.T.—**πᾶν λάχανον**, every herb, general statement, instead of Mt.'s third sample, **κύμινον**.—**τὴν ἀγάπην τ. Θ.**, *the love of God*, instead of Mt.'s *mercy and faith*.—Ver. 43. Pharisaic ostentation is very gently dealt with here compared with the vivid picture in Mt. xxiii. 5-7, partly out of regard to the restraint imposed by the supposed situation, Jesus a guest, partly because some of the details (phylacteries, *e.g.*) lacked interest for Gentile readers. —Ver. 44. This "woe" is evidently adapted for Gentile use. In Mt. the sepulchres are made conspicuous by white-washing to warn passers-by, and the point is the contrast between the fair exterior and the inner foulness. Here the graves become invisible (**ἄδηλα**, in this sense here only in N.T.; *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 8) and the risk is that of being in the presence of what is offensive without knowing. Farrar (C. G. T.) suggests that the reference may be to Tiberias, which was built on the site of an old cemetery.

Vv. 45-52. *Castigation of the scribes present*; severe, but justified by having been invited.—Ver. 45. **τις τῶν νομικῶν**: a professional man, the Pharisees being laymen; the two classes kindred in spirit, hence the lawyer who speaks felt hit.—Ver. 46. Jesus fearlessly proceeds to say what He thinks of the class.—**καὶ ὑμῖν**, yes! to you lawyers also woes. Three are specified: *heavy burdens* (Mt.

προφητῶν, οἱ [1] πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς. 48. ἄρα μαρτυρεῖτε [2] καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν· ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε αὐτῶν τὰ μνημεῖα.[3] 49. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶπεν, Ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσι καὶ ἐκδιώξουσιν [4]· 50. ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον [5] ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, 51. ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ ἕως τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου· ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. 52. Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθετε, καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε." 53. Λέγοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτούς,[6] ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι δεινῶς ἐνέχειν, καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλειόνων, 54. ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτόν, καὶ ζητοῦντες [7] θηρεῦσαί τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.[8]

[1] For οι δε ℵC have και οι (Tisch.). *Vide* below.

[2] For μαρτυρειτε (ACDX *al. pl.*) ℵBL aeth. Orig. have μαρτυρες εστε.

[3] ℵBDL codd. vet. Lat. omit αυτων τα μνημεια. *Vide* below.

[4] διωξουσιν in ℵBCLX *al.* (W.H.). [5] εκκεχυμενον in B 33, 69 (W.H. text).

[6] For λεγοντος . . . προς αυτους, found in the Western type of text, ℵBCL 33 have κακειθεν εξελθοντος αυτου: two quite distinct prefaces to the new section. Tisch., W.H., prefer that of B (2) to that of D (1).

[7] ℵBL 1, 118, 131 *al.* omit και ζητουντες (Tisch., W.H.). ℵX omit also αυτον after ενεδρευοντες (Tisch.).

[8] ℵBL cop. aeth. omit ινα . . . αυτου (a gloss imitating Mt. xii. 10).

xxiii. 3), *tombs of the prophets* (Mt. xxiii. 29-31), *key of knowledge* (Mt. xxiii. 14).—**φορτίζετε** (with two accusatives only in N.T.), ye lade men with unbearable burdens.—**προσψαύετε**, ye touch, here only in N.T.—Ver. 47. **καὶ οἱ πατέρες ὑ.**, *and* your fathers. This reading of ℵC is to be preferred on internal grounds to **οἱ δὲ**, as implying that the two acts were not contrasted but kindred = they killed, you build, worthy sons of such fathers.—Ver. 48 points the moral.—**ἄρα**: perhaps with Schleiermacher we should write **ἆρα**, taking what follows as a question.—**οἰκοδομεῖτε**, ye *build*, absolutely (without object, *vide* note 3 above). Tomb-building in honour of dead prophets and killing of living prophets have one root: stupid superstitious reverence for the established order.—Ver. 49. **ἡ σοφία τ. Θ.**: *vide* notes on Mt. xxiii. 34.—**ἀποστόλους**, apostles, instead of wise men and scribes in Mt.—**ἐκδιώξουσιν**, they shall drive out (of the land), in place of Mt.'s **σταυρώσετε**.—Ver. 50. **ἐκζητηθῇ**, "a Hellenistic verb used in the sense of the Latin *exquiro*," Farrar (C. G. T.).—Ver. 51. **τοῦ ἀπολομένου** who perished, in place of the harsher whom ye slew of Mt.—**τοῦ οἴκου** = **τοῦ ναοῦ** in Mt., the temple.—Ver. 52. Final woe on the lawyers, a kind of anti-climax. *Cf.* Mt., where the pathetic apostrophe to Jerusalem follows and concludes the discourse.—**τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως**, the key which is knowledge (genitive of apposition) admitting to the Kingdom of God. Many take it = the key to knowledge.

Ver. 53. The foregoing discourse, though toned down as compared with Mt., was more than the hearers could stand. The result is a more hostile attitude towards the free-spoken Prophet than the classes concerned have yet shown, at least in the narrative of Lk. They began **δεινῶς ἐνέχειν**, to be sorely nettled at Him (*cf.* Mk. vi. 19). Euthy.

XII. 1. Ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ πρῶτον, "Προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις.[1] 2. οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστίν, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. 3. ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε, ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ἀκουσθήσεται· καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, κηρυχθήσεται ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων. 4. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου, Μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἐχόντων περισσότερόν τι ποιῆσαι.

[1] ητις . . . υποκ. before τ. Φαρ. in BL e (W.H.).

gives as equivalents ἐγκοτεῖν, ὀργίζεσθαι. The Vulgate has *graviter insistere*, to press hard, which A.V. and R.V. follow. Field (Ot. Nor.) decides for the former sense = the scribes and Pharisees began to be very angry.—ἀποστοματίζειν: Grimm gives three meanings—to speak from memory (ἀπὸ στόματος); to repeat to a pupil that he may commit to memory; to ply with questions so as to entice to offhand answers. In this third sense the word must be taken here as it is by Theophy. (and by Euthy.: ἀπαιτεῖν αὐτοσχεδίους καὶ ἀνεπισκέπτους ἀποκρίσεις ἐρωτημάτων δολερῶν = to seek offhand ill-considered answers to crafty questions).—Ver. 54 really gives the key to the meaning of ἀποστοματίζειν (here only in N.T.).

CHAPTER XII. MISCELLANEOUS DISCOURSES.—Vv. 1-12. *Exhortation to fearless utterance*, addressed to the disciples (*cf.* Mt. x. 17-33).—ἐν οἷς, in these circumstances, *i.e.*, while the assaults of the Pharisees and scribes on Jesus were going on (xi. 53).—μυριάδων: a hyperbolical expression for an "innumerable multitude," pointing, if the words are to be taken in earnest, to the largest crowd mentioned anywhere in the Gospels. Yet this immense gathering is not accounted for: it does not appear where or why it collected, but the ἐν οἷς suggests that the people had been drawn together by the encounter between Jesus and His foes.—πρῶτον from its position naturally qualifies προσέχετε, implying that hypocrisy was the first topic of discourse (Meyer). But it may also be taken with μαθητὰς, as implying that, while Jesus meant to speak to the crowd, He addressed Himself in the first place to His disciples (Schanz, J. Weiss, Holtzmann). Bornemann points out that while Mt. places πρῶτον after imperatives, Lk. places it also before, as in ix. 61, x. v.—ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τ. Φ.: this is the *logion* reported in Mt. xvi. 6 and Mk. viii. 15, connected there with the demand for a sign; here to be viewed in the light of the discourse in the Pharisee's house (xi. 37 f.). In the two first Gospels the warning expresses rather Christ's sense of the deadly character of the Pharisaic leaven; here it is a didactic utterance for the guidance of disciples as witnesses of the truth.—ἥτις ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις: not in Mt. and Mk.; might be taken as an explanatory gloss, but probably to be viewed as part of the *logion*. Hypocrisy, the leading Pharisaic vice = wearing a mask of sanctity to hide an evil heart; but from what follows apparently here to be taken in a wider sense so as to include dissimulation, hiding conviction from fear of man as in Gal. ii. 13 (so J. Weiss in Meyer). In Lk.'s reports our Lord's sayings assume a form adapted to the circumstances of the writer's time. Hypocrisy in the sense of Gal. ii. 13 was the temptation of the apostolic age, when truth could not be spoken and acted without risk.—Ver. 2 = Mt. x. 26, there connected with a counsel not to fear men addressed to persons whose vocation imposes the obligation to speak out. Here = dissimulation, concealment of your faith, is vain; the truth will out sooner or later.—Ver. 3. ἀνθ' ὧν, either = *quare*, inferring the particular case following from the general statement going before, or = because, assigning a reason for that statement. This verse = Mt. x. 27, but altered. In Mt. it is Christ who speaks in the darkness, and whispers in the ear; in Lk. it is His disciples. In the one representation the whispering stage has its place in the history of the kingdom; in the latter it is conceived as illegitimate and futile.

5. ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε· φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα[1] ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν· ναί, λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε. 6. Οὐχὶ πέντε στρουθία πωλεῖται[2] ἀσσαρίων δύο; καὶ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιλελησμένον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ· 7. ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν πᾶσαι ἠρίθμηνται. μὴ οὖν[3] φοβεῖσθε· πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε. 8. Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, Πᾶς ὃς ἂν [a] ὁμολογήσῃ[4] ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ· 9. ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ. 10. καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. 11. ὅταν δὲ προσφέρωσιν[5] ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε[6] πῶς ἢ τί ἀπολογήσησθε, ἢ τί εἴπητε· 12. τὸ γὰρ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα διδάξει ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἃ δεῖ εἰπεῖν."

[a] For ὁμολ. ἐν, vide Mt. x. 32, with notes.

[1] εχοντα εξουσιαν in ℵBDL, etc., verss.

[2] For πωλειται (a cor., as usual, neut. pl. nom.) ℵB 13, 69, 346 have πωλουνται.

[3] BLR 157 codd. vet. Lat. omit ουν.

[4] So in ℵL *al. pl.* (Tisch.). BDΔ *al.* have ομολογησει (W.H.).

[5] εισφερωσιν in ℵBLX 1, 33 *al.*

[6] μεριμνησητε in ℵBLQRX 1, 13, 33, 69. D and codd. vet. Lat. syr. cur., etc., omit η τι after πως (W.H. brackets).

What you whisper will become known to all, therefore whisper not but speak from the housetop.—Ver. 4. λέγω δέ, introducing a very important statement, not a mere phrase of Lk.'s to help out the connection of thought (Ws., Mt.-Evang., 279).—τοῖς φίλοις μου, not a mere conventional designation for an audience, but spoken with emphasis to distinguish disciples from hostile Pharisees = my comrades, companions in tribulation.—μὴ φοβηθῆτε, etc., down to end of ver. 5 = Mt. x. 28, with variations. For Mt.'s distinction between body and soul Lk. has one between now and hereafter (μετὰ ταῦτα). The positive side of the counsel is introduced not with a simple "fear," but with the more emphatic "I will show ye whom ye shall fear". Then at the end, to give still more emphasis, comes: "Yea, I say unto you, fear him". Who is the unnamed object of fear? Surely he who tempts to unfaithfulness, the god of this world!—Ver. 6. πέντε, five, for two farthings, two for one in Mt. (x. 29); one into the bargain when you buy a larger number. They hardly have a price at all!—ἐπιλελησμένον, forgotten, for Mt.'s "falls not to the ground without"; the former more general and secondary, but the meaning plainer.—Ver. 7. ἠρίθμηνται, they remain numbered, once for all; number never forgotten, one would be missed.

Vv. 8-12. Another solemn declaration introduced by a λέγω δὲ = Mt. x. 32, 33.—ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τ. Θ.: in place of Mt.'s "before my Father in heaven". In ver. 6 "God" takes the place of "your Father" in Mt. It seem as if the Christian circle to which Lk. belonged did not fully realise the significance of Christ's chosen designation for God.—Ver. 10. πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ, etc.: the true historical setting of the *logion* concerning blasphemy is doubtless that in Mt. (xii. 31), and Mk. (iii. 28), where it appears as a solemn warning to the men who broached the theory of Beelzebub-derived power to cast out devils. Here it is a word of encouragement to disciples (apostles) to this effect: blaspheming the Holy Spirit *speaking through you* will be in God's sight an unpardonable sin, far more heinous than that of prejudiced Pharisees speaking evil against me, the Son of Man, now.—

13. Εἶπε δέ τις αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου,[1] "Διδάσκαλε, εἰπὲ τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου μερίσασθαι μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν κληρονομίαν." 14. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἄνθρωπε, τίς με κατέστησε δικαστὴν[2] ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς;" 15. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ τῆς[3] πλεονεξίας· ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ."[4] 16. Εἶπε δὲ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτούς, λέγων, "Ἀνθρώπου τινὸς πλουσίου εὐφόρησεν ἡ χώρα· 17. καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῷ,[5] λέγων, Τί ποιήσω, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω τοὺς καρπούς μου; 18. καὶ εἶπε, Τοῦτο ποιήσω· καθελῶ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας, καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω, καὶ συνάξω ἐκεῖ πάντα τὰ γενήματά[6] μου, καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου, 19. καὶ ἐρῶ τῇ ψυχῇ μου, Ψυχή, ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά· ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε,[7] εὐφραίνου. 20. εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Θεός, Ἄφρων, ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν[8] ἀπὸ σοῦ· ἃ δὲ ἡτοίμασας, τίνι ἔσται; 21. οὕτως ὁ θησαυρίζων ἑαυτῷ, καὶ μὴ εἰς Θεὸν πλουτῶν."[9]

[1] εκ τ. οχ. αυτω in ℵBL 33. [2] κριτην in ℵBDL 1, 13, 33 *al.*

[3] For της πλ. ℵBDL *al.* verss. have πασης πλ. (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] αυτω in BD preferred by Tisch., W.H., to αυτου (T.R. = ℵLΔ *al. pl.* unc.).

[5] εν αυτω in BL.

[6] For τα γενηματα BL and some verss. have τον σιτον (W.H. text).

[7] κειμενα . . . πιε is wanting in D, codd. vet. Lat., and bracketed in W.H.

[8] So in ℵDΔ, etc. (Tisch.). BLQT 33 have αιτουσιν (W.H.).

[9] D a, b omit ver. 21, which is therefore bracketed in W.H.'s text.

Ver. 11. τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας: a general reference to heathen tribunals in place of Mt.'s συνέδρια (x. 17). "Synagogues," representing Jewish tribunals, retained.—Ver. 12. τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα: their utterances always inspired by the Holy Ghost (hence to contradict their word blasphemy), and specially when they are on their *defence*.

Vv. 13-21. *An interlude leading to a change of theme*, in Lk. only.—Ver. 13. τις ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου: the crowd now comes to the front, and becomes the audience for at least a few moments.—εἰπὲ here takes after it the infinitive, instead of ἵνα with subjunctive.—μερίσασθαι, to divide, presumably according to law, one-third to the younger, two-thirds to the elder (Deut. xxi. 17). The references to tribunals in ver. 11 may have suggested this application to Jesus.—Ver. 14. ἄνθρωπε, man! discouraging, no sympathy with the object (*cf.* Rom. ii. 1, ix. 20).—κριτὴν, a judge, deciding the right or equity of the case; μεριστὴν, an arbiter carrying out the judgment (here only in N.T.). The application was the less blameworthy that appeals to Rabbis for such purposes seem to have been not infrequent (Schanz).—Ver. 15: the moral pointed = beware of covetousness!—οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν, etc.: the expression here is peculiar and the meaning somewhat obscure, but apparently the idea is: not in the abundance enjoyed by any man is (consists) his life—not in (of) his possessions. Two ways of saying the same thing, the second a kind of afterthought. If life, true life, meant possessions, then the more the better, but it means something far higher.

Vv. 16-21. *Parable of the rich fool*, simply a story embodying in concrete form the principle just enunciated: teaching the lesson of Ps. xlix., and containing apparent echoes of Sirach xi. 17-19.—Ver. 16. εὐφόρησε, bore well; late and rare (here only in N.T.). Kypke gives examples from Josephus and Hippocrates.—χώρα, estate, farm = ἀγρός (ix. 12), so in John iv. 35.—Ver. 18. τὸν σῖτον (or τὰ γενήματα): may refer to the fruits (καρπούς, ver. 17) of the season, τὰ ἀγαθὰ to the accumulated

22. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, "Διὰ τοῦτο ὑμῖν λέγω, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν,[1] τί φάγητε· μηδὲ τῷ σώματι, τί ἐνδύσησθε. 23. ἡ[2] ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος. 24. Κατανοήσατε τοὺς κόρακας, ὅτι οὐ[3] σπείρουσιν, οὐδὲ[3] θερίζουσιν· οἷς οὐκ ἔστι ταμεῖον οὐδὲ ἀποθήκη, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τρέφει αὐτούς· πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑμεῖς διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν; 25. τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἕνα,[4] 26. εἰ οὖν οὔτε[5] ἐλάχιστον δύνασθε, τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε; 27. Κατανοήσατε τὰ κρίνα, πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπιᾷ, οὐδὲ νήθει·[6] λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ Σολομὼν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἓν τούτων. 28. εἰ δὲ τὸν χόρτον ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ σήμερον ὄντα,[7] καὶ αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον, ὁ Θεὸς οὕτως ἀμφιέννυσι,[8] πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι; 29. Καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε,

[1] Omit υμων ℵABDLQ *al*. [2] η γαρ in ℵBDLX (Trg., W.H.).

[3] ου, ουδε in B (W.H. text). ουτε, ουτε in ℵDLQ e (Tisch., W.H., marg.).

[4] ℵBD omit ενα (Tisch., W.H.). B places προσθειναι just before πηχυν (W.H. text).

[5] ουδε in ℵBLQ 1, 33 *al*.

[6] For πως αυξανει . . . νηθει D a syrr. cur. sin. have πως ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει (Tisch., W.H., marg.; "worth considering," J. Weiss).

[7] ℵBL have εν αγρω τον χορ. οντα σημερον (Tisch., W.H.).

[8] αμφιεζει (-αζει B) in BDL.

possessions of bygone years.—Ver. 19. ἀναπαύου, etc., rest, eat, drink, be jolly: an epicurean *asyndeton*.—Ver. 20. εἶπε δὲ α., but God said to him, through conscience at the death hour (Euthy.).—ἀπαιτοῦσι, they ask thy life = thy life is asked.—τίνι ἔσται, whose? Not *thine* at all events.—Ver. 21. εἰς Θεὸν πλουτῶν, rich with treasure laid up with God. Other interpretations are: rich in a way that pleases God, or rich *in honorem Dei*, for the advancement of God's glory. The last sense implies that the riches are literal, the first implies that they are spiritual.

Vv. 22-31. *Dissuasives against earthly care* (Mt. vi. 25-33). The disciples again become the audience.—Ver. 23. ψυχὴ and σῶμα are to be taken in the physical sense, the suggestion being that God has given us these the *greater* things, and therefore may be expected to give us *food* for the one and *raiment* for the other, the *smaller* things.—Ver. 24. κόρακας, the ravens, individualising, for Mt.'s πετεινά.—ὁ Θεὸς for ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν in Mt.—Ver. 26. ἐλάχιστον: the application of this epithet to the act of adding a cubit ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν at first appears conclusive evidence that for Lk. at least ἡλικία must mean length of life: as to add a cubit to one's *stature* is so great a thing that no one thinks of attempting it (Hahn, similarly Holtzmann, H. C.). But adding to one's stature a cubit or an inch is of minimum *importance* as compared with lengthening our days. Yet it must be owned that Lk.'s ἐλάχιστον puts us off the track of the idea intended, if we take ἡλικία = stature. The point is, *we* cannot do what God has done for all mature persons: added a cubit at least to the stature of their childhood, and this is the *greater* thing, not the least, greater than giving us the means of life now that we have reached maturity. *Vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 29. μετεωρίζεσθε: a ἅπ. λεγ. in N.T. and variously rendered. The meaning that best suits the connection of thought is that which finds in the word the figure of a boat tempest-tossed, but that which is best supported by usage points rather to high-mindedness, vain thoughts. The Vulgate renders *nolite in sublime tolli* = lift not yourselves up to lofty claims (Meyer); do not be ambitious, be content with humble things, a perfectly congruous counsel. Still the rendering: be not as

ἢ[1] τί πίητε· καὶ μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε. 30. ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητεῖ[2]· ὑμῶν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ οἶδεν ὅτι χρῄζετε τούτων· 31. πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,[3] καὶ ταῦτα πάντα[4] προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν. 32. μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον· ὅτι εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν. 33. Πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν, καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην. ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς βαλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα, θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου κλέπτης οὐκ ἐγγίζει, οὐδὲ σὴς διαφθείρει· 34. ὅπου γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν ἔσται. 35. Ἔστωσαν

[1] και in ℵBL.

[2] For επιζητει (a cor., neut. pl. nom.) ℵBLT 13, 33, 69 *al.* have επιζητουσιν.

[3] αυτου for τ. θ. in ℵBDL. [4] Omit παντα ℵBL *al.* verss. (from Mt.).

tempest-tossed vessels, vexed with care, is a finer thought and more what we expect. Hahn renders: do not gaze with strained vision heavenwards, anxiously looking for help. Pricaeus: "ex futuro suspendi". Theophylact gives a paraphrase which in a way combines the two senses. He defines *meteorismus* as *distraction* (περισπασμὸν), and a restless movement of the mind, thinking now of one thing now of another, leaping from this to that, and *always fancying higher things* (ἀεὶ τὰ ὑψηλότερα φανταζομένου).—Ver. 30. τ. ἔ. τοῦ κόσμου, the nations *of the world;* this addition is peculiar to Lk., the expression here only in N.T., but frequent with the Rabbis (Lightfoot, *ad loc.*); meaning with them the peoples of the outside world as distinct from the Jews; here probably all (Jews included) but Christians. On the thought *vide* on Mt.—Ver. 31. πλὴν, much rather (Schanz, Hahn).—ζητεῖτε, etc.: In his version of this great word of Jesus Lk. omits πρῶτον and τὴν δικαιοσύνην, so that it takes this simple and absolute form: *seek His* (the Father's) *kingdom:* very probably the original form. As temporal things are added (προστεθήσεται) they do not need to be sought. Mt.'s final word about not caring for to-morrow Lk. omits, either deeming it superfluous, or giving what follows as a substitute.

Vv. 32-34. *The little flock*, in Lk. only. —ποίμνιον (contracted from ποιμένιον), a flock (of sheep), a familiar designation of the body of believers in the apostolic age (Acts xx. 28, 1 Pet. v. 3); μικρὸν adds pathos. That Jesus applied this name to His disciples is very credible, though it may be that in the sense of the source from which Lk. drew, the little flock is the Jewish-Christian Church of Palestine subject to persecution from their unbelieving countrymen (J. Weiss in Meyer). The counsel "fear not" is Mt.'s "*take no thought for to-morrow*," but the "to-morrow" refers not to temporal but to spiritual things; hence the declaration following. Paraphrased = Fear not future want of food and raiment, still less loss of the kingdom, the object of your desire. Your Father will certainly give it.—Ver. 33 counsels a heroic mood for which apprehension as to future temporal want has become an impossibility, such want being now viewed as a means of ensuring the one object of desire, eternal riches.—πωλήσατε, etc.: the special counsel to the man in quest of eternal life *generalised* (*cf.* xviii. 22).—βαλάντια, purses: *continens pro contento* (De Wette).—παλαιούμενα: in Heb. viii. 13 applied to the Sinaitic covenant. Covenants, religions, wax old as well as *purses.*—ἀνέκλειπτον, unfailing. *Cf.* ἐκλίπῃ, xvi. 9, in reference to death: "vox rara, sed paris elegantiae cum altera ἀνεκλιπής, quam adhibet auctor libri Sapient., vii. 4, viii. 18, ubi habes θησαυρὸς ἀνεκλιπὴς et πλοῦτος ἀνεκλιπής," Wolf. There is poetry in this verse, but also some think *asceticism*, turning the poetry of Jesus into ecclesiastical prose. I prefer to believe that even Lk. sees in the words not a mechanical rule, but a law for the spirit.—Ver. 34 = Mt. vi. 21, with σου turned into ὑμῶν.

Vv. 35-38. *Loins girt, lamps burning.* Connection with what goes before is not apparent, but there is a latent affinity which makes the introduction of this *logion* here by Lk. or his source in-

ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι, καὶ οἱ λύχνοι καιόμενοι· 36. καὶ ὑμεῖς ὅμοιοι ἀνθρώποις προσδεχομένοις τὸν κύριον ἑαυτῶν, πότε ἀναλύσει[1] ἐκ τῶν γάμων, ἵνα, ἐλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος, εὐθέως ἀνοίξωσιν αὐτῷ. 37. μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὓς ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος εὑρήσει γρηγοροῦντας. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι περιζώσεται καὶ ἀνακλινεῖ αὐτούς, καὶ παρελθὼν διακονήσει αὐτοῖς. 38. καὶ ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ, καὶ εὕρῃ οὕτω,[2] μακάριοί εἰσιν οἱ δοῦλοι[3] ἐκεῖνοι. 39. τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε, ὅτι εἰ ᾔδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποίᾳ ὥρᾳ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἄν, καὶ οὐκ ἂν[4] ἀφῆκε διορυγῆναι[5] τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. 40. καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν[6] γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι· ὅτι ᾗ ὥρᾳ οὐ δοκεῖτε, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται." 41. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ[7] ὁ Πέτρος, "Κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγεις, ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας;"

[1] **αναλυση** in ℵABDL and many others (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] For the words **και εαν . . . ουτω** ℵBLT 33, 131 have **καν εν τη δευτ. καν εν τη τριτ. φυλ. ελθη και ευρη ουτως** (Tisch., Trg., W.H.).

[3] **οι δουλοι** omit ℵaBDL syrr. cur. sin., etc. (W.H.). ℵ* omits **εκεινοι** (Tisch.).

[4] For **εγρηγ. . . . ουκ αν** ℵD e, i syrr. cur. sin. have simply **ουκ αν** (Tisch., W.H., marg.).

[5] **διορυχθηναι** in ℵBL 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] Omit **ουν** ℵBL minusc. [7] Omit **αυτω** (in ℵ = Tisch.) BDL 33 (W.H.).

telligible. The kingdom the *summum bonum;* all to be sacrificed for it; its coming (or the King's) to be eagerly waited for.—Vv. 35, 36 contain the germ of the parable of the *Ten Virgins* (Mt. xxv. 1 f.). So De Wette, J. Weiss, Holtzmann, Schanz, etc. — **ὀσφύες περιεζωσμέναι**, loins girt, for service.—**λύχνοι καιόμενοι**, lamps burning, for reception of the master expected to return during the *night*. In the spiritual sphere the loins girt point to a noble purpose in life, and the burning lamp to the spirit of hope.—Ver. 36. **ἀναλύσῃ**, when (**πότε = ὁπότε**) he shall *return;* the figure is taken from sailors making the return voyage to the port whence they had sailed, Beza (*vide* Phil. i. 23, 2 Tim. iv. 6).—**ἐλθόντος καὶ κρούσαντος**: the participles in the genitive absolute, though the subject to which they refer, **αὐτῷ**, is in the dative.—Ver. 37. **μακάριοι**: here as always implying rare felicity the reward of heroic virtue.—**ἀμὴν**: the Hebrew word retained here contrary to custom, introducing a startling thought, the inversion of the relation of master and servants, lord and slaves, through joy over their fidelity. For the other side of the picture *vide* Lk. xvii. 7-10.—**διακονήσει αὐτοῖς**: the master, in genial mood, turns servant to his own slaves; makes them sit down, throws off his caftan, girds his under-garments, and *helps them to portions of the marriage feast he has brought home with him*, as a father might do for his children (De Wette, Koetsveld, p. 244). There is not necessarily an allusion either to the last supper (xxii. 27) or to the Roman Saturnalia (Grotius, Holtzmann, H. C.).—Ver. 38. **ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ**, etc., second and third watches named as the times at which men are most apt to be overtaken with sleep (Hahn), the night being probably supposed to consist of *four* watches, and the first omitted as too early, and the last as too late for the return.

Vv. 39-40. *The thief* (Mt. xxiv. 43, 44). A new figure is now employed to give pictorial embodiment to the counsel: be ever ready. The master returning from a wedding is replaced by a thief whose study it is to come to the house he means to plunder at an unexpected time. This *logion* is reproduced by Lk. substantially as in Mt. with only slight stylistic variations.

Vv. 41-46. *A question by Peter and a reply* (Mt. xxiv. 45-51). Some look on Peter's question as a literary device of

42. Εἶπε δὲ[1] ὁ Κύριος, "Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος καὶ[2] φρόνιμος, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ διδόναι ἐν καιρῷ τὸ[3] σιτομέτριον; 43. μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὑρήσει ποιοῦντα οὕτως. 44. ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτοῦ καταστήσει αὐτόν. 45. Ἐὰν δὲ εἴπῃ ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, Χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἔρχεσθαι· καὶ ἄρξηται τύπτειν τοὺς παῖδας καὶ τὰς παιδίσκας, ἐσθίειν τε καὶ πίνειν καὶ μεθύσκεσθαι· 46. ἥξει ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ οὐ προσδοκᾷ, καὶ ἐν ὥρᾳ ᾗ οὐ γινώσκει· καὶ διχοτομήσει αὐτόν, καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων θήσει. 47. Ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ,[4] καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας μηδὲ[5] ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα

[1] και ειπεν in ℵBDL 1, 13, 33, 69 *al.*

[2] For και (ℵL, etc.) read ο with BD, etc.

[3] BD 69 omit το (W.H. brackets).

[4] αυτου in ℵBDL. [5] For μηδε ℵB 33 have η.

the evangelist either to connect his material (Weiss in Meyer; x. 29, xi. 45 cited as similar instances), or to give what follows a special relation to the Apostles and to Peter as their head (Holtzmann, H. C., the passage thus becoming in his view a substitute for Mt. xvi. 18, 19).—Ver. 41. Peter's question reminds us of Mk. xiii. 37: "What I say unto you, I say unto all, watch".—Ver. 42. ὁ Κύριος, the Lord, in narrative.—τίς ἄρα, etc.: in Mt. this is connected immediately with the thought in ver. 40, so that Peter's interpellation appears as an interruption of a continuous discourse. Some variations from Mt.'s text are noticeable in Lk.'s version: οἰκονόμος for δοῦλος, καταστήσει (future) for κατέστησεν (aorist), θεραπείας for οἰκετείας, σιτομέτριον for τροφήν. These changes, according to Weiss and Holtzmann (H. C.), are due to the parable being connected with the Apostles, and one can see some plausibility in the hypothesis so far as the first two variations are concerned. The question: who then, etc., is supposed to answer itself: who but each of you apostles, who especially but you Peter?—Ver. 42. σιτομέτριον, the due portion of food; a word of late Greek. Phryn., p. 383, forbids the use of σιτομετρεῖσθαι, and enjoins separation of the compound into its elements: σῖτον, μετρεῖσθαι. The noun occurs here only; the verb in Gen. xlvii. 12 and occasionally in late Greek authors.—Ver. 44. ἀληθῶς here, as usual, for ἀμὴν (ver. 37 an exception).—Ver. 45. ἐὰν δὲ: introducing supposition of an abuse of power, conceived possible even in the case of an apostle, of a Peter. Let no proud ecclesiastic therefore say, Is thy servant a dog?—χρονίζει: a delayed παρουσία, a prominent thought in our Lord's later utterances. The delay may possibly be long enough to allow time for the utter demoralisation of even the higher officials. *Vide* on Mt.—τοὺς παῖδας, etc., the men- and maidservants, instead of συνδούλους in Mt.—διχοτομήσει: the retention of this strong word by Lk., who seems to have it for one of his aims to soften harsh expressions, is noticeable, especially when he understands it as referring to the Apostles, and even to Peter. It makes for the hypothesis that the word means not to cut into two as with a saw, but either to lash unmercifully, to cut to pieces in popular parlance, or to separate from the household establishment (Beza, Grotius, etc.).—μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων points to degradation from the confidential position of οἰκονόμος to a place among the *unfaithful;* dismissed, or imprisoned, or set to *drudging service.*

Vv. 47, 48. *Degrees of guilt and punishment,* in Lk. only, and serving as an apology for the severity of the punishment as described in ver. 46. That punishment presupposes anger. The statement now made is to the effect: penalty inflicted not as passion dictates

αὐτοῦ, δαρήσεται πολλάς· 48. ὁ δὲ μὴ γνούς, ποιήσας δὲ ἄξια πληγῶν, δαρήσεται ὀλίγας. παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολύ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ ᾧ παρέθεντο πολύ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν. 49. Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰς[1] τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη [b]ἀνήφθη; 50. βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως οὗ[2] τελεσθῇ; 51. δοκεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῇ; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἢ [c]διαμερισμόν. 52. ἔσονται γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν πέντε ἐν οἴκῳ ἑνὶ[3] διαμεμερισμένοι, τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυσί, καὶ δύο ἐπὶ τρισί. 53. διαμερισθήσεται[4] πατὴρ ἐφ' υἱῷ, καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί· μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατρί,[5] καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ μητρί[5]· πενθερά ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς, καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς."[6]

b Acts xxviii. 2. Jas. iii. 5.

c here only in N.T.

[1] επι in ℵABL (εις in D).
[2] εως οτου in ℵABDL.
[3] ενι οικω in ℵBDL.
[4] διαμερισθησονται in ℵBDL minusc.
[5] ℵBDL minusc. have θυγατερα, μητερα with or without the article.
[6] Omit αυτης ℵBDL.

but as principle demands.—ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς, etc.: describes the case of a servant who knows the master's will but does not do it (μηδὲ ποιήσας), nay, does not even intend or try to do it (μὴ ἑτοιμάσας), deliberately, audaciously negligent.—δαρήσεται πολλάς (πληγάς): many stripes justly his portion.—Ver. 48. ὁ δὲ μὴ γνοὺς: the opposite case is that of one who does not *know*. What he would do if he did know is another question; but it is not to be gratuitously supposed that he would neglect his duty utterly, like the other, though he does commit minor faults. He is a lower servant in the house to whom the master gave no particular instructions on leaving, therefore without special sense of responsibility during his absence, and apt like the average servant to take liberties when the master is away from home.—παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη, etc.: a general maxim further explaining the principle regulating penalty or responsibility (*cf.* Mt. xxv. 15 ff.).

Vv. 49-53. *Not peace but division* (Mt. x. 34-36). This section is introduced by no connecting particle. Yet there is a certain affinity of thought. Strict fidelity demanded under penalties, but fidelity not easy; times of fierce trial and conflict awaiting you. I forewarn you, that ye may be forearmed.—Ver. 49. πῦρ: the fire of a new faith, or religion, a burning enthusiasm in believers, creating fierce antagonism in unbelievers; deplorable but inevitable.—βαλεῖν, used by Mt. in reference to peace and war, where Lk. has δοῦναι.—τί θέλω εἰ, etc., how much I wish it were already kindled; τί = ὡς and εἰ after θέλω to express the object of the wish, as in Sirach xxiii. 14 (θελήσεις εἰ μὴ ἐγεννήθης, you will wish you had not been born).—Ver. 50. βάπτισμα: before the fire can be effectually kindled there must come for the kindler His own baptism of blood, of which therefore Jesus naturally speaks here with emotion.—πῶς συνέχομαι, how am I pressed on every side, either with fervent desire (Euthy., Theophy., De Wette, Schanz, etc.), or with fear, shrinking from the cup (Meyer, J. Weiss, Holtzmann, Hahn).—Ver. 51. διαμερισμόν: instead of Mt.'s μάχαιραν, an abstract prosaic term for a concrete pictorial one; exactly descriptive of the fact, however, and avoiding possible misapprehension as to Christ's aim = Jesus not a patron of *war*.—Ver. 52. τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυσίν, etc.: three against two and two against three; five in all, not six though three pairs are mentioned, mother and mother-in-law (μήτηρ and πενθερὰ) being the same person. This way of putting it is doubtless due to Lk.—ἐπὶ with dative = *contra*, only here in N.T.; κατὰ with genitive in Mt.

Vv. 54-59. *A final word to the crowd* (*cf.* Mt. xvi. 2 f., v. 25 f.).—τοῖς ὄχλοις: in Mt. Jesus speaks to the Pharisees and Sadducees, in reply to their demand for a sign, which gives a more definite occasion. But the words might quite appropriately have been addressed to the people at large. The weather-skill ascribed to the audience is such as any one might possess, and all Jews needed

54. Ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις, "Ὅταν ἴδητε τὴν[1] νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἀπὸ[2] δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε,[3] [d] Ὄμβρος ἔρχεται· καὶ γίνεται οὕτω. 55. καὶ ὅταν νότον πνέοντα, λέγετε, Ὅτι καύσων ἔσται· καὶ γίνεται. 56. ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν· τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τοῦτον πῶς οὐ δοκιμάζετε[4]; 57. τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον; 58. ὡς γὰρ ὑπάγεις μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου σου ἐπ' ἄρχοντα, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· μήποτε κατασύρῃ σε πρὸς τὸν κριτήν, καὶ ὁ κριτής σε παραδῷ[5] τῷ [e] πράκτορι, καὶ ὁ πράκτωρ σε βάλλῃ[5] εἰς φυλακήν. 59. λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως οὗ[6] καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτὸν ἀποδῷς."

d here only in N.T.

e here only in N.T.

[1] Omit την ℵABLXΔ 1, 33, 69 *al.*

[2] επι in ℵBL 64.

[3] οτι after λεγετε in ℵABL, etc.

[4] For δοκιμαζετε (ADΔ *al.*) ℵBL 33 verss. have ουκ οιδατε δοκιμαζειν (W.H.).

[5] παραδωσει in ℵBD minusc. (L = T.R.). The same authorities have βαλει for βαλλη.

[6] Omit ου ℵBL 1 Orig.

the warning. The precise circumstances in which this *logion* was spoken are uncertain.—**ἐπὶ δυσμῶν**, in the west, the region of the setting sun, and of the Mediterranean. A cloud rising up from that quarter meant, of course, rain (1 Kings xviii. 44, 45).—Ver. 55. **καύσων**, the sirocco, a hot wind from the desert, blighting vegetation (Jas. i. 11), equally a matter of course.—Ver. 56. **ὑποκριταί** seems too strong a term to apply to the people, and more appropriate to a Pharisaic or professional audience (Mt. xvi. 3). Raphel, after Erasmus Schmidt, translates *harioli*, weather prophets, citing a passage from Lucian in support of this sense. This is certainly one meaning of the word (*vide* Passow), but, as Hahn remarks, the usage of the N.T. does not support it here.—Ver. 57. **ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν**, from or of yourselves (*sua sponte*, Palairet); without needing any one to tell you the right; implying that the persons addressed were destitute of the average moral insight (*cf.* Lk. xxi. 30).—Ver. 58. **ὡς γὰρ**: introducing a legal scene from natural life to illustrate a similar situation in the moral world. It is implied that if they had the necessary moral discernment they would see that a judgment day was at hand, and understand that the duty of the hour was to come to terms with their adversary by timely repentance. That is how they would all act if it were an ordinary case of debtor and creditor.—**δὸς ἐργασίαν** (phrase here only): usually interpreted give diligence, give thine endeavour = *da operam*, a Latinism. Theophylact renders it: give *interest* (of the sum owed); Hofmann, offer work, labour, in place of money.—**κατασύρῃ** (here only in N.T.), lest he *drag* thee to the judge, stronger than Mt.'s **παραδῷ** (v. 25), realistic and not exaggerated.—**τῷ πράκτορι**, the man whose business it was to collect the debts after the judge had decreed payment, or to put the debtor in prison till the debt was paid. Kypke defines **πράκτορες**: "exactores qui mulctas violatorum legum a judice irrogatas exigunt," citing an instance of its use from Demosthenes.—Ver. 59. **λεπτὸν**, the half of a **κοδράντης** (Mt.'s word), making the necessity of full payment in order to release from prison still more emphatic.

CHAPTER XIII. JUDGMENT TO COME. This chapter continues the sombre judicial strain of xii. 54-59. Beginning with a general reference to the impending doom of Israel, as foreshadowed by a reported tragedy which had befallen certain individuals, it ends with a specific prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem similar to that which closes the great anti-Pharisaic discourse in Mt. xxiii. The dramatic effect of the prediction there is entirely lost in Lk.'s narrative, which in subsequent chapters continues

XIII. 1. ΠΑΡΗΣΑΝ δέ τινες ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ ἀπαγγέλλοντες αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν Γαλιλαίων, ὧν τὸ αἷμα Πιλάτος ἔμιξε μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν. 2. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς [1] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Δοκεῖτε, ὅτι οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι οὗτοι ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους ἐγένοντο, ὅτι τοιαῦτα [2] πεπόνθασιν; 3. οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὴ μετανοῆτε, πάντες ὡσαύτως [3] ἀπολεῖσθε. 4. ἢ ἐκεῖνοι οἱ δέκα καὶ [4] ὀκτώ, ἐφ' οὓς ἔπεσεν ὁ πύργος ἐν τῷ Σιλωάμ, καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτούς, δοκεῖτε, ὅτι οὗτοι [5] ὀφειλέται ἐγένοντο παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν [6] Ἱερουσαλήμ; 5. οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν·

[1] ℵBLT verss. omit ο Ι.
[2] ταυτα in ℵBDL.
[3] ομοιως in ℵBDLT 1, 13, 33, 69 *al.*
[4] Omit και ℵBDL.
[5] αυτοι in ℵABKLT 33, 69 *al.*
[6] BDLX *al.* omit εν.

its report of the teaching of Christ as if the end were still a great way off.

Vv. 1-5. *The Galilean tragedy*, peculiar to Lk., as is the greater part of what follows, on to xviii. 14.—Ver. 1. **παρῆσαν δέ**, etc.: The introduction to the gruesome story naturally implies a temporal connection between what follows and what goes before: *i.e.*, some present when Jesus spoke as reported in xii. 54-59 took occasion to tell Him this piece of recent news, recalled to their minds by what He had said about judgment and how to avert it. There is no good reason to suppose that the connection is merely topical, and that the preface is simply a literary device of Lk.—**τῶν Γαλ.**: the article implies that the story was current.—**ὧν τὸ αἷμα**, etc.: So the story was told among the horrified people: the blood of the poor Galilean victims ruthlessly shed by Pilate while they were in the very act of offering sacrifice. Perfectly credible in those times under such a ruler, and in reference to such victims, Galileans, free in spirit, restive under the Roman yoke. Similar incidents in Josephus, though not this precise occurrence.—Ver. 2. **ἀποκριθεὶς**: Jesus answered to an implied question. Those who told the story expected Him to make some remarks on it; not such doubtless as He did make.—**δοκεῖτε**, think ye; probably that was just what they did think. The fate of the Galileans awakened superstitious horror prone to impute to the victims special criminality.—**παρὰ πάντας τ. Γ.**, in comparison with all *Galileans*. To make the point more vivid the victims are compared with men of their own province, disposition, and temptations.—**ἐγένοντο**, became, were shown to be.—**πεπόνθασι**, have suffered, an irrevocable fact.—Ver. 3. **οὐχί**, an emphatic "no," followed by a solemn "I say to you". The prophetic mood is on the speaker. He reads in the fate of the few the coming doom of the whole nation.—**ὁμοίως**, in a similar way. **ὡσαύτως**, the reading in T.R., is stronger = in the *same* way. Jesus expresses Himself with greater intensity as He proceeds = ye shall perish likewise; nay, in the same way (ver. 5, **ὡσαύτως**), your towers and temples falling about your ears.—Ver. 4. Jesus refers to another tragic occurrence, suggesting that He was acquainted with both. His ears were open to all current news, and His mind prompt to point the moral. The fact stated, otherwise unknown to us.—**ὀφειλέται**, word changed, in meaning the same as **ἁμαρτωλοί**, moral debtors paying their debt in that dismal way.

The utterances of Jesus on this occasion do not bear on the general question: how far may lot be viewed as an index of character? which was not then before His mind. He assumed that the sufferers in the two catastrophes were sinners and even great sinners, so acquiescing in the popular view, because He wanted to point a lesson for the whole nation which He regarded as fast ripening for judgment. From the saying in the Teaching on the Hill concerning the Father in Heaven giving sunshine and rain to evil and good alike, it is evident that He had risen not only above popular current opinion, but even above the O.T. view as to the connection between physical and moral good and evil. That saying implies that there is a large sphere of Divine action within which moral distinctions among men are overlooked, that good may come to bad

ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὴ μετανοῆτε,[1] πάντες ὁμοίως[2] ἀπολεῖσθε." 6. Ἔλεγε δὲ ταύτην τὴν παραβολήν· "Συκῆν εἶχέ τις ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ πεφυτευμένην[3]· καὶ ἦλθε καρπὸν ζητῶν[4] ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ οὐχ εὗρεν. 7. εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀμπελουργόν, Ἰδού, τρία ἔτη[5] ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ, καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκω, ἔκκοψον αὐτήν· ἱνατί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ; 8. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἄφες αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος, ἕως ὅτου σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν, καὶ βάλω κοπρίαν[6]· 9. κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπόν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, εἰς τὸ μέλλον[7] ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν."

10. Ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι·

[1] **μετανοησητε** in ℵDLT. [2] **ωσαυτως** in ℵBLM 1, 33 *al.* (*vide* below).

[3] **πεφυτ.** before **εν τω αμπ.** in ℵBDLX. [4] **ζητων καρπον** in all uncials.

[5] After **ετη** ℵBDLT have **αφ ου** (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] **κοπρια** in ℵABLT *al. pl.* (Tisch., W.H.). D has **κοφινον κοπριων** (W.H. marg.).

[7] **εις το μελλον** before **ει δε μηγε** in ℵBLT 33, 69, a better arrangement.

men and evil to good men. To our Lord it would not have appeared impossible that some of the best men in Israel might be involved in the two calamities here mentioned.

Vv. 6-9. *Parable of the barren fig tree*, peculiar to Lk., probably extemporised to embody the moral of the preceding narratives; takes the place in Lk. of the cursing of the fig tree in Mt. and Mk.—Ver. 6. **Συκῆν εἶχέν τις**: a fig tree, quite appropriate and common in corners of a vineyard, yet not the main plant in such a place; selected rather than a vine to represent Israel, by way of protest against assumed inalienable privilege. "Perish," Jesus had said once and again (vv. 3 and 5). Some hearers might think: What! the Lord's elect people perish? Yes, replies Jesus in effect, like a barren fig tree cast out of a vineyard, where at best it has but a subordinate place.—Ver. 7. **ἀμπελουργόν**, the vine-dresser (**ἄμπελος, ἔργον**) here only in N.T.—**ἰδοὺ**, lo! as of one who has a right to complain.—**τρία ἔτη**, three years, reckoned not from the planting of the tree (it is three years after planting that it begins to bear fruit), but from the time that it might have been expected in ordinary course to yield a crop of figs. Three years is not a long period, but enough to determine whether it is going to be fruit-bearing, the one thing it is there for. In the spiritual sphere in national life that cannot be determined so soon. It may take as many *thousand* years.—**ἔρχομαι**, I keep coming, the progressive present. The master comes not merely once a year, but again and again within the year, at the seasons when fruit may be found on a fig tree (Hahn). *Cf.* **δουλεύω** in xv. 29.—**οὐχ εὑρίσκω**, I do not find it. I come and come and am always disappointed. Hence the impatient **ἔκκοψον**, cut it out (from the root).—**ἵνα τί καὶ**: **καὶ** points to a second ground of complaint. Besides bearing no fruit it occupies space which might be more profitably filled.—**καταργεῖ** (here and in Paul's epistles), renders useless; Vulgate, *occupat*, practically if not verbally the right rendering. A barren fig tree renders the land useless by occupying valuable space.—Ver. 8. **τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος**, one year more; he has not courage to propose a longer time to an impatient owner.—**κόπρια** (neuter plural from adjective **κόπριος**), dung stuffs. A natural proposal, but sometimes fertility is better promoted by starving, cutting roots, so preventing a tree from running to wood.—Ver. 9. **εἰς τὸ μέλλον**: if it bear *the coming year*—well (**εὖ ἔχει** understood).—**ἐκκόψεις**, if not, *thou shalt cut it down*—thou, not I. It depends on the master, though the vine-dresser tacitly recognises that the decision will be just. He sympathises with the master's desire for fruit. Of course when the barren tree is removed another will be planted in its place. The parable points to the truth taught in ver. 29.

11. καὶ ἰδού, γυνὴ ἦν[1] πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας ἔτη δέκα καὶ[2] ὀκτώ, καὶ ἦν συγκύπτουσα, καὶ μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές. 12. ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὴν ὁ Ἰησοῦς προσεφώνησε, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Γύναι, ἀπολέλυσαι τῆς ἀσθενείας σοῦ." 13. Καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας· καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀνωρθώθη, καὶ ἐδόξαζε τὸν Θεόν. 14. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ἀγανακτῶν ὅτι τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔλεγε τῷ ὄχλῳ,[3] "Ἓξ ἡμέραι εἰσίν, ἐν αἷς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι· ἐν ταύταις[4] οὖν ἐρχόμενοι θεραπεύεσθε, καὶ μὴ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου." 15. Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν[5] αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος, καὶ εἶπεν, "Ὑποκριτά,[6] ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης, καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν[7] ποτίζει; 16. ταύτην δέ, θυγατέρα Ἀβραὰμ οὖσαν, ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς, ἰδού, δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη, οὐκ ἔδει λυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ τούτου τῇ

[1] Omit ην ℵBLT 33 *al.* verss.
[2] Omit και ℵBT 1, 209.
[3] After οχλω ℵBL insert οτι.
[4] αυταις in ℵABLT.
[5] For ουν ℵBDL 1, 69 *al.* have δε.
[6] υποκριται in ℵBLT, etc.
[7] ℵB have απαγων (W.H. text).

Vv. 10-17. *Cure in a synagogue on a Sabbath day*, peculiar to Lk.—Ver. 10. **ἐν τοῖς σάββασι**: *may* mean on Sabbaths (Hahn, who refers to the discriminating use of singular and plural in Lk.) and imply a course of instruction in a particular synagogue for weeks.—Ver. 11. **πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας**: the Jews saw the action of a foreign power in every form of disease which presented the aspect of the sufferer's will being overmastered. In this case the woman was bent and could not straighten herself when she tried.—**συγκύπτουσα**, bent together, here only in N.T.—**εἰς τὸ παντελὲς** goes with **ἀνακύψαι**, and implies either that she could not erect her head, or body *at all*, or *entirely*. The former is more in keeping with the idea of bondage to a foreign spirit (Schanz). Similar use of the phrase in Heb. vii. 25.—Ver. 12. **προσεφώνησε**: Jesus, ever prompt to sympathise, called her to Him when His eye lit upon the bent figure.—**ἀπολέλυσαι**: perfect for future, the thing as good as done; spoken to cheer the downcast woman while she approaches. The cure was consummated by touch when she came up to Jesus (ver. 13), whereupon the eighteen years' sufferer burst into praise: **ἐδόξαζε τὸν Θεόν**. A lifelike moving scene.—Ver. 14. But religious propriety in the person of the ruler of the synagogue is once more shocked: it is a *Sabbath* cure.—**ἔλεγε τῷ ὄχλῳ**: He spoke *to* the audience *at* Jesus—plausibly enough; yet, as so often in cases of religious zeal, from mixed motives. Christ's power and the woman's praise annoyed him.—Ver. 15. **ὑποκριταί**: plural less personal than the singular (T.R.), yet severe enough, though directed against the class. The case put was doubtless according to the prevailing custom, and so stated as to make the *work* done prominent (**λύει**, looses, that one bit of work: **ἀπάγων**, leading the animal loosed to the water, that another, *vide* Bengel).—**ποτίζει**, gives him drink, at least to the extent of drawing water from the well, if not of carrying it to the animal's mouth (the former allowed, the latter disallowed in the Talmud, *vide* Lightfoot and Wünsche).—Ver. 16. The case of the woman described so as to suggest a parallel and contrast: a daughter of Abraham *versus* an ox or ass; bound by *Satan*, not merely by a chain round the neck; for eighteen years, not for a few hours. The contrast the basis of a strong *a fortiori* argument. The reply is thoroughly in the spirit of Jesus, and the whole incident, though peculiar to Lk., is a credible reminiscence of His ministry; whether placed in its true historical setting is a matter of minor moment.—Ver. 17. The religious leaders and the people behave according to their character; the former ashamed, not as

ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;" 17. Καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντος αὐτοῦ, κατῃσχύνοντο πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ· καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἔχαιρεν ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τοῖς γινομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

18. Ἔλεγε δέ,[1] "Τίνι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ; καὶ τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν; 19. Ὁμοία ἐστὶ κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ ηὔξησε, καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον μέγα,[2] καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ." 20. Καὶ πάλιν εἶπε, "Τίνι ὁμοιώσω τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ; 21. ὁμοία ἐστὶ ζύμῃ, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν[3] εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία, ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον."

22. ΚΑΙ διεπορεύετο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας διδάσκων, καὶ

[1] For δε ℵBL 1, 13, 69 *al.* have ουν.

[2] ℵBDLT codd. vet. Lat. syr. cur. omit μεγα, added by scribes in a spirit of exaggeration.

[3] εκρυψεν in BL minusc. (Tisch., W.H.).

convinced but as confounded, the latter delighted both by the works and by the words of Jesus.

Vv. 18-21. *The parables of the mustard seed and the leaven* (Mt. xiii. 31-33, Mk. iv. 30-32). Lk. may have introduced these parables here either because the joy of the people was in his view the occasion of their being spoken, Jesus taking it as a good omen for the future, or because he found in his source the two things, the cure and the parabolic speech, recorded together as incidents of the same meeting in the synagogue. In either case it is implied that the parables were spoken in a synagogue, in the latter case as a part of a regular synagogue address. This is the interesting feature in Lk.'s report of these parables. It is the only instance in which parables are connected with synagogue addresses as their occasion. The connection is every way credible, both from the nature of the two parables, and from the fact that Jesus was wont to speak to the people in parables. How many unrecorded parables He must have spoken in His synagogue addresses on His preaching tour through Galilee, *e.g.* (Mk. i. 39).—Ver. 19. κῆπον, garden, more exact indication of place than in Mt. and Mk.—δένδρον, a tree; an exaggeration, it remains an herb, though of unusually large size.—Ver. 20. The parable of the leaven is given as in Mt. The point of both is that the Kingdom of Heaven, insignificant to begin with, will become great. In the mind of the evangelist both have probably a reference to Gentile Christianity.

Vv. 22-30. *Are there few that be saved?* This section is a mosaic of words found dispersed in the pages of Mt.: the *strait gate* (ver. 24) in Mt. vii. 14; *the pleading for admission* (vv. 26, 27) recalls Mt. vii. 21-23; *the exclusion from the kingdom* (vv. 28, 29) reproduces Mt. viii. 11, 12; the *apothegm* in ver. 30 = Mt. xix. 30, xx. 16. The parabolic word concerning the master of the house (ver. 25) seems to be an echo from the parable of the *ten virgins*. The question as to the number of the saved introducing the group need not be an artificial heading furnished by Lk. or the compiler of his source.

Ver. 22 is a historical notice serving to recall the general situation indicated in ix. 51. So again in xvii. 11. "Luke gives us to understand that it is always the same journey which goes on with incidents analogous to those of the preceding cycle," Godet. Hahn, however, maintains that here begins a new division of the history and a new journey to Jerusalem, yet not the final one. This division extends from this point to xvii. 10, and contains (1) words of Jesus on the way to Jerusalem (xiii. 22-35), (2) words spoken probably in Jerusalem (xiv. 1-24), (3) words spoken after the return to Galilee.—διδάσκων, teaching; the main occupation of Jesus as He went from village to village. The long section from ix. 51 to xviii. 14 is chiefly didactic in contents, though an occasional healing is recorded.—καὶ πορ. ποι., the καὶ is epexegetic = and at the same time; His face set towards Jerusalem as He taught.

πορείαν ποιούμενος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.[1] 23. εἶπε δέ τις αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι;" Ὁ δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, 24. "Ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς πύλης[2]· ὅτι πολλοί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν. 25. Ἀφʼ οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης, καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν, καὶ ἄρξησθε ἔξω ἑστάναι καὶ κρούειν τὴν θύραν, λέγοντες, Κύριε, Κύριε,[3] ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν· καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ὑμῖν, Οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, πόθεν ἐστέ· 26. τότε ἄρξεσθε[4] λέγειν, Ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς

[1] ιεροσολυμα in ℵBL. [2] θυρας in ℵBDL 1, 131 Orig.

[3] Omit second κυρ. ℵBL 157 Lat. and Egypt. verss.

[4] B has αρξεσθε (Tisch., W.H., text), but ℵDLT and many more have αρξησθε (W.H. marg.).

Vv. 23-24. **εἰ ὀλ. οἱ σωζ.**: εἰ introduces a direct question as in Mt. xii. 10 and Lk. xxii. 49: are those who are being saved few?—**πρὸς αὐτούς**, to *them*, not to the questioner merely but to all present, as the reply was of general concern.—Ver. 24. **ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰς.**: stronger than Mt.'s **εἰσέλθετε**, suggesting the idea of a struggle or prize-fight (1 Cor. ix. 25) in which only a few can win, so virtually answering the question in the affirmative.—**διὰ τ. σ. θύρας**, through the narrow door (**πύλης**, gate, in Mt.): no interpretation of the door here any more than in Mt. But the connection suggests *repentance* (vv. 23, 25). The Kingdom of Heaven is here conceived of as a house.—**πολλοί**: the idea is that many shall desire admission and shall not obtain it. The reason in the parable is the narrowness of the door, making it impossible for so many to get in in a short time. All are in earnest; no stress is to be laid on **ζητήσουσιν**, shall *seek*, as if it meant something less than **ἀγωνίζεσθε** (Godet). All strive, but success is for the strongest who can push the weaker aside. So in the parable. In the interpretation the one point to be insisted on is: be in dead earnest.

Vv. 25-27. Here begins a new parable and a new sentence, though some (Beza, Lachmann, W. and H.) connect with what goes before, putting a comma after **ἰσχύσουσιν**. Against this is not only the change from the third person to the second (**ἄρξησθε**), but the fact that the cause of exclusion is different: not the narrowness of the door, but *coming too late*. The case put now is that of the master of a house who is giving an entertainment. He waits for a certain time to receive his guests. At length, deeming that all are, or ought to be, present, he rises and shuts the door, after which no one can be admitted. Some, however, come later, knock at the door, and are refused admission. The moral of this parable is distinct; of the former parable it was: be in earnest; of this it is: be not too late.—**ἑστάναι καὶ κρούειν**: both verbs depend on **ἄρξησθε**: ye begin to stand without and to knock. Some take **ἑστάναι** as = a participle, but it is better to take it as denoting a first stage in the action of those arriving late. At first they expect that the door will be opened soon as a matter of course, and that they have nothing to do but to step in. By-and-by they find it will be necessary to knock, and finally, being refused admission even when the door is opened, they are fain to plead (ver. 26).—**καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς**: the **καὶ** here has the force of *then*. The sense would have been clearer had it been omitted. Here properly begins the apodosis of the sentence and the close of the parable proper = then he answering will say: I do not know you.—**πόθεν ἐστέ**: these added words rather weaken than strengthen the laconic **οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς** of Mt. xxv. 12 = you must be strangers, not of those invited.—Ver. 26. This verse is viewed by many as the apodosis of a long sentence beginning with **ἀφʼ οὗ** (ver. 25), and the emotional character of the passage, in which parable and moral are blended, goes far to justify them. But it is better on the whole to find here a new start.—**ἐνώπιόν σου**, before thee, either, as thy guests or hosts (Capernaum feast, dinners in the houses of Pharisees), *i.e.*, *with* thee; or, under thine eye—in-

πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας. 27. καὶ ἐρεῖ, Λέγω[1] ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς,[2] πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες οἱ[3] ἐργάται τῆς[3] ἀδικίας. 28. ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, ὅταν ὄψησθε[4] Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφήτας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω· 29. καὶ ἥξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν, καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 30. καὶ ἰδού, εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἳ ἔσονται πρῶτοι, καί εἰσι πρῶτοι οἳ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι."

31. Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ[5] προσῆλθόν τινες Φαρισαῖοι, λέγοντες αὐτῷ, "Ἔξελθε καὶ πορεύου ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι Ἡρώδης θέλει σε ἀπο-

[1] For **λεγω** BT have **λεγων** (W.H.). [2] Omit **υμας** BLRT minusc.
[3] ℵBDL *al.* omit **οι**, and ℵBLR omit **της**. So D also, but with **ανομιας**.
[4] **οψεσθε** in BDX 69 *al.* [5] **ωρα** in ℵBDLX *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

volving a claim simply of neighbourhood. The former is the more likely, because it puts the case more strongly in their favour.—Ver. 27. **οὐκ οἶδα**, etc.: the same answer, iteration *cum emphasi* (Bengel).—**ἀπόστητε**, etc.: nearly as in Mt. vii. 23. This answer goes entirely out of the parable into the moral sphere. In the parable exclusion is due to arriving too late; in the spiritual sphere to character.—**ἀδικίας**, Mt. has **ἀνομίαν**, lawlessness. Against the tendency-criticism Schanz remarks: "**ἀνομία** in Mt. is Jewish-Christian but not anti-Pauline, **ἀδικία** Pauline but not anti-Jewish".

Vv. 28-30. *Concluding reflections.*—Ver. 28. **ἐκεῖ**, there; *then*, according to Euthy. Zig. (**τότε, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ**). Kuinoel also takes it as an adverb of time in accordance with Hebraistic usage, and Bornemann cites instances from Greek authors of the same use of adverbs of place as adverbs of time. But *there* is not only verbally correct, but graphic: there, outside the door of the house where patriarchs and prophets feast, shall the excluded weep and gnash their teeth, all the more because they think they have a right, as belonging to the chosen race, to be within.—Ver. 29 points to an aggravation of the misery of the outcasts: men coming from every quarter of the globe to join the festive company and finding admission. The shut door and the too late arrival are now out of view, and for the private house of the parable is substituted the Kingdom of God which it represents. It is needless to ask whether Mt. or Lk. has given this saying in its true place. Perhaps neither has. The important point is their joint testimony to the saying as a true utterance of Jesus.—Ver. 30. The same remark applies to this saying. As it stands here it refers to Jews as the first who become last, and to Gentiles as the last who become first, and the distinction between first and last is not one of degree, but absolute = within and without.

Vv. 31-33. *Warning against Herod by Pharisees*, peculiar to Lk., but Mk. (iii. 6, viii. 15) has prepared us for combined action of court and religious coteries against Jesus similar to that against Amos (vii. 10-13), both alike eager to be rid of Him as endangering their power.—Ver. 31. **ἔξελθε**: xvii. 11 shows that Lk. did not attach critical importance to this incident as a cause of Christ's final departure from Galilee.—**θέλει σε ἀποκτεῖναι**: was this a lie, an inference, a message sent by Herod in order to intimidate, or a fact which had somehow come to the knowledge of the reporters? It is impossible to ascertain. The answer of Jesus seems to imply that He regarded the Pharisees as messengers, and also innocent tools of the crafty king. But He answers according to the *ex facie* character of the message, that of friends warning against a foe, while probably having His own thoughts as to where the craft and the enmity lay. The one thing certain is that there was low cunning somewhere. The king was using the Pharisees, or the Pharisees the king, or perhaps they were both playing the same game. Possibly the evangelist viewed the Pharisees as friends.—Ver. 32. **τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ**, this fox; the fox revealed in this business, ostensibly the

κτεῖναι." 32. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Πορευθέντες εἴπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ, Ἰδού, ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἐπιτελῶ[1] σήμερον καὶ αὔριον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι. 33. πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι· ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἱερουσαλήμ. 34. Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιὰν ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε. 35. ἰδού, ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος[2]· ἀμὴν δὲ λέγω[3] ὑμῖν, ὅτι[4] οὐ μή με[5] ἴδητε ἕως ἂν ἥξῃ, ὅτε[5] εἴπητε, Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου."

[1] αποτελω in ℵBL 33, 124 (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] ℵABKL *al.* verss. omit ερημος, found in DXΔ 33 *al.*

[3] λεγω δε (for αμην δε λεγ. in minusc.) in BDX *al.* (W.H. with δε in brackets). Simply λεγω in ℵL (Tisch.).

[4] Omit οτι ℵBDL (W.H.).

[5] For με ιδητε ℵB have ιδητε με; for εως αν BDL have εως; ℵBL omit ηξη οτε, which may be conformed to Mt.

king, but in a roundabout way the would-be friends may be hit at (Euthy. Zig.). The quality denoted by the name is doubtless cunning, though there is no clear instance of the use of the fox as the type of cunning in the Scriptures elsewhere.—**σήμερον**, etc.: this note of time is not to be taken strictly. Jesus is in the prophetic mood and speaks in prophetic style: to-day, to-morrow, and the third day symbolise a short time.—**τελειοῦμαι** as to form may be either middle or passive. If middle it will mean: finish my healing (and teaching) ministry in Herod's territory (Galilee and Peraea). This meaning suits the connection, but against it is the fact that the verb is never used in a middle sense in N.T., and very rarely in classics. Taken passively it will mean: I am perfected by a martyr's death (Heb. xi. 40, xii. 23). Commentators are much divided between these meanings.—Ver. 33. **πλὴν**, for the rest, or, on the other hand, introducing the other side of the case = I must work still for a little space, yet I must keep moving on southwards, as the proper place for a prophet to die is Jerusalem, not Galilee. The second note of time (**σήμερον**) coincides with the first: work and moving southwards go hand in hand.—**οὐκ ἐνδέχεται**, it is not fitting (here only in N.T., *cf.* xvii. 1). John was murdered in Machaerus, but that was an offence against the fitness of things. The reply of Jesus is full of dignity and pathos. In effect He says: I am not to be driven out of Galilee by threats. I will work till the hour comes. Nevertheless keep your minds easy, princes and Pharisees! I must soon endure a prophet's fate, and not here. I go to meet it in the proper place, though not in fear of you.

Vv. 34, 35. *Apostrophe to Jerusalem* (Mt. xxiii. 37, 38), suitably introduced here as in sympathy with the preceding utterance, though not likely to have been spoken at this time and place, as indeed it is not alleged to have been. It is given nearly as in Mt.—**τὴν νοσσιὰν** (for **τὰ νοσσία** in Mt.) = a nest (*nidum suum*, Vulgate), hence the young in the nest. *Vide* remarks on Mt., *ad loc.*

CHAPTER XIV. TABLE TALK AND A CONCIO AD POPULUM.—Vv. 1-24 contain a digest of sayings of Jesus at the table of a Pharisee, this being the third instance in this Gospel of such friendly intercourse between Him and members of the Pharisaic party. The remaining part of the chapter consists of solemn words on self-sacrifice and on counting the cost represented as addressed to the people.

Vv. 1-6. *The dropsical man healed, with relative conversation*, in Lk. only (*cf.* Mt. xii. 9-14).—Ver. 1. **ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν**, etc.: the indication of place and time is very vague so as to lend plausibility to the suggestion that the introduction is

XIV. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκόν τινος τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν Φαρισαίων σαββάτῳ φαγεῖν ἄρτον, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν. 2. καὶ ἰδού, ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν ὑδρωπικὸς ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ· 3. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους, λέγων, "Εἰ[1] ἔξεστι τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύειν[2];" Οἱ δὲ ἡσύχασαν. 4. καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτόν, καὶ ἀπέλυσε. 5. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς[3] πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπε, "Τίνος ὑμῶν ὄνος[4] ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ ἐμπεσεῖται[5] καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ[6] ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;" 6. Καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἀνταποκριθῆναι αὐτῷ[7] πρὸς ταῦτα.

[1] ℵBDL 59 omit ει.

[2] ℵBDL 1, 13, 69 *al.* codd. Lat. vet. add η ου after θεραπευειν (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] BDL omit αποκριθεις.

[4] For ονος (ℵLX 1, 33) B *al.* have υιος. D has προβατον. Syr. cur. has all three: υιος η βους η ονος (Baethgen). *Vide* below.

[5] πεσειται in ℵABL 1, 13, 69 *al.*

[6] Omit τη ℵB.

[7] Omit αυτω ℵBDL minusc.

extracted from the parabolic speeches, vv. 7-24 (Holtzmann, H. C.).—ἀρχόντων τ. Φ., the house is described as that of one of the *rulers* of the Pharisees, an inexact expression, as the Pharisees as such had no rulers, being all on a level. Omitting the article before Φαρ. (as in B) we might take this word as in apposition and render: one of the rulers, Pharisees; rulers meaning the Sanhedrists, and Pharisees denoting their religious tendency (so Grotius, who therefore thinks the scene was in Jerusalem).—σαββάτῳ φαγεῖν ἄρτον: feasting on Sabbath was common among the Jews, *ex pietate et religione* (Lightfoot), but the dishes were cold, cooked the day before. —καὶ, introducing the apodosis, and the main fact the suspicious observation of Jesus by those present at the meal (αὐτοὶ). Altogether a strange situation: Jesus the guest of a great man among the Pharisees, as if held in honour, yet there to be watched rather than treated as a friend; simple-hearted geniality on one side, insincerity on the other.

Vv. 2-6. ὑδρωπικὸς (ὕδρωψ): here only in N.T., a solitary instance of this disease among the healing acts of Jesus. No conceivable reason for its being mentioned except that it was a fact.—ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, before Him, so that He could not fail to see him; how there—as guest, as brought by the Pharisees to tempt Jesus, come there of his own motion in hope to be cured, though not asking out of reverence for the Sabbath and in fear of its strict guardians (Euthy. Zig.)—not indicated.—Ver. 3. ἀποκριθεὶς: Jesus addresses Himself to the double situation; on the one hand a sick man dumbly appealing for help, on the other jealous religionists aware of His free habit and expecting eccentric speech and action open to censure.—ἔξεστιν, etc.: first He asks a question as to the legality of Sabbatic healing in a tone which amounts to an affirmative assertion, allowed to pass uncontradicted (ἡσύχασαν); then He proceeds to answer His own question by healing the man (ver. 4), and finally He offers an apology for the act.—Ver. 5. τίνος ὑμῶν, etc.: an awkward Hebraistic construction for τίς ὑμῶν οὗ, etc.—υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς, a son or (even) an ox, in either case, certainly in the former, natural instinct would be too strong for artificial Sabbatic rules.—φρέαρ, a well, or cistern, an illustration as apt to the nature of the malady as that of the ox loosed from the stall in xiii. 15 (Godet).—εὐθέως, at once, unhesitatingly, without thought of Sabbath rules. The emphasis lies on this word.—Ver. 6. οὐκ ἰσ. ἀνταποκριθῆναι (again in Rom. ix. 20): silenced but of course not convinced. The difference in the way of thinking too great to be overcome in a moment.

Luke has three Sabbath cures. The present one has no very distinctive features. The accumulation may point to a desire to help weak Christians to

a Acts iii. 5. 1 Tim. iv. 16.

7. Ἔλεγε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς κεκλημένους παραβολήν, ᵃἐπέχων πῶς τὰς πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο, λέγων πρὸς αὐτούς, 8. "Ὅταν κληθῇς ὑπό τινος εἰς γάμους, μὴ κατακλιθῇς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν· μήποτε ἐντιμότερός σου ᾖ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, 9. καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἐρεῖ σοι, Δὸς τούτῳ τόπον· καὶ τότε ἄρξῃ μετ' αἰσχύνης τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον κατέχειν. 10. ἀλλ' ὅταν κληθῇς, πορευθεὶς ἀνάπεσον[1] εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον· ἵνα, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κεκληκώς σε, εἴπῃ[2] σοι, Φίλε, ᵇπροσανάβηθι ἀνώτερον· τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον[3] τῶν συνανακειμένων σοί. 11. ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται· καὶ ὁ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται."

b here only in N.T.

12. Ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ τῷ κεκληκότι αὐτόν, "Ὅταν ποιῇς ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον, μὴ φώνει τοὺς φίλους σου, μηδὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου, μηδὲ τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου, μηδὲ γείτονας πλουσίους· μήποτε καὶ αὐτοί σε

[1] **αναπεσε** in ℵB *al.* [2] **ερει** in ℵBLX minusc.
[3] **παντων** after **ενωπιον** in ℵABLX verss.

get above their scruples by an appeal to the Master (Schanz). In the first and second cases the principle of Christ's defence is indicated: it is lawful to do good (vi. 9); you may do for a man, *a fortiori*, what it is lawful to do for a beast (xiii. 15). In the present case it is not indicated. It may be: you may do for another what you all do for your own, son or ox (Meyer, J. Weiss); or if need is a valid plea in *any* case, it is valid in *all* cases (Schanz).

Vv. 7-11. *Take the lowest seat.* Here begins the table talk of Jesus, consisting of three discourses. The first addressed to the guests in general is really a *parable* teaching the lesson of humility pointed in ver. 11. "Through the medium of a counsel of prudence relating to ordinary social life He communicates a lesson of true wisdom concerning the higher sphere of religion" (*The Parabolic Teaching of Christ*).—Ver. 7. **ἐπέχων**, observing. Euthy. renders: **μεμφόμενος**, blaming, in itself a legitimate meaning but not compatible with **πῶς**. The practice observed—choosing the chief places—was characteristic of Pharisees (Mt. xxiii. 6), but it is a vice to which all are prone.—Ver. 8. **γάμους**, a marriage feast, here representing all great social functions at which ambition for distinction is called into play.—**ἐντιμότερός σου**: this does not necessarily denote one of known superior social standing, but may mean simply one held in more honour by the host (Hahn).—Ver. 9. **ἐλθὼν ὁ, etc.**: the guests are supposed to have taken their places before the host comes in.—**ἄρξῃ**: the shame would be most acutely felt at the beginning of the movement from the highest to the lowest place (Meyer).—**τ. ἔσχατον τ.**, the lowest place just vacated by the honoured guest, who is humble in spirit though highly esteemed, who therefore in his own person exemplifies the honour and glory of being called up by the host from the lowest to the highest place.—Ver. 10. **προσανάβηθι ἀνώτερον**: "go up higher," A.V. and R.V.; better "come up higher," which gives effect to the **πρός**. The master invites the host to come towards himself. So Field (*Ot. Nor.*).—Ver. 11: the moral of the parable; a great law of the Kingdom of God dear to the heart of the Pauline evangelist, recurring in xviii. 14.

Vv. 12-14. *A word to the host*, also parabolic in character in so far as it gives general counsel under a concrete particular form (Hahn), but not parabolic in the strict sense of teaching spiritual truth by natural examples.—Ver. 12. **φωνεῖν** used for **καλεῖν** in Hellenistic Greek (Farrar, C. G. T.), denoting formal ceremonious invitation as on a great occasion (Hahn).—**τοὺς φίλους**, etc.: four classes likely to be asked on ordinary social grounds are named—personal intimates, brethren, relations (these two form one category), and rich neighbours. The epithet **πλουσίους** belongs to the last class alone. Friends and relatives are called because they are such. Mere neighbours are called

ἀντικαλέσωσι,[1] καὶ γένηταί σοι ᶜ ἀνταπόδομα.[1] 13. ἀλλ' ὅταν ποιῇς δοχήν,[2] κάλει πτωχούς, ἀναπήρους, χωλούς, τυφλούς· 14. καὶ μακάριος ἔσῃ· ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοῦναί σοι· ἀνταποδοθήσεται γάρ σοι ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν δικαίων."

c Rom. xi. 9.

15. Ἀκούσας δέ τις τῶν συνανακειμένων ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Μακάριος, ὃς[3] φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ." 16. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίησε[4] δεῖπνον μέγα, καὶ ἐκάλεσε πολλούς· 17. καὶ ἀπέστειλε τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δείπνου εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις, Ἔρχεσθε, ὅτι ἤδη ἕτοιμά ἐστι[5] πάντα.[6] 18. Καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀπὸ μιᾶς παραιτεῖσθαι πάντες.[7] ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα, καὶ ἔχω ἀνάγκην ἐξελθεῖν καὶ[8] ἰδεῖν αὐτόν· ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρῃτημένον. 19. καὶ ἕτερος εἶπε, Ζεύγη βοῶν ἠγόρασα πέντε, καὶ πορεύομαι δοκιμάσαι αὐτά· ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με

[1] σε after αντικαλ. in ℵBDLR 1, 69 *al.*, and σοι after ανταπ.

[2] ℵB have δοχην ποιης.

[3] οστις in ℵᵃBLPRX 1, 13, 69 *al.*

[4] εποιει in ℵBR 1.

[5] εισι in ℵLR (Tisch., W.H., marg.); εστι (T.R.) in BDX (W.H. text).

[6] Omit παντα ℵBLR.

[7] παντες παραι. in ℵBDLRX 1 verss.

[8] For εξελθειν και ℵBDL have simply εξελθων.

only because they are rich, or, more generally, socially important.—μήποτε, lest, presenting return invitations (ἀντικαλεῖν, here only in N.T.) as an object of dread, a fear unknown to the world. (*Hic metus mundo ignotus*, Bengel.)—Ver. 13. δοχὴν, the same word used by Lk. in reference to the feast in Levi's house, which was a gathering of the sort here recommended by Jesus.—μακάριος, here and always denoting rare virtue and felicity = the pleasure of doing a kindness not to be repaid, except at the resurrection of the just, or by the joy that every really beneficent action brings *now*.—τῶν δικαίων: in specifying the righteous as the subjects of the resurrection the Speaker has no intention of indicating an opinion as to the unrighteous: whether they rise at all, or when.

Vv. 15-24. *The great feast* (*cf.* Mt. xxii. 1-14), very naturally introduced by the pious reflection of a guest whose religious sentiment had been touched by the allusion to the resurrection-felicity of the just. Like many other pious observations of the conventional type it did not amount to much, and was no guarantee of genuine godliness in the speaker. The parable expresses this truth in concrete form, setting forth that many care less for the Kingdom of God and its blessings than they seem to care, and teaching that these will be offered to those who do care indeed.

Vv. 16-20. ἐκάλεσεν: it was a great feast and many were asked, with a long invitation.—Ver. 17. εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις: a second invitation according to Eastern custom still prevailing (Rosenmüller, *Morgenland*, v. 192; Thomson, *Land and Book*, vol. i. chap. ix.).—Ver. 18. ἀπὸ μιᾶς (supply γνώμης, ψυχῆς, ὥρας, or some such word implying with one mind, or at one time, or in the same manner, here only in Greek literature), with one consent.—παραιτεῖσθαι: not to refuse, but in courteous terms to excuse themselves.—ὁ πρῶτος, the first; of three, simply samples, by no means exhausting the list of possible excuses.—ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα: a respectable excuse, by no means justifying absence, but excellently exemplifying preoccupation, the state of mind common to all. A man who has purchased a farm is for a while very much taken up with it and makes himself very busy about it; everything else for the moment secondary.—ἔχω ἀνάγκην: no fewer than three Latinisms have been found in this sentence; this, the use of ἐρωτῶ in the sense of *rogo*, and ἔχε με παρῃτημένον (Grotius). But parallels can be found in Greek authors for the first. Kypke cites an instance of

παρῃτημένον. 20. καὶ ἕτερος εἶπε, Γυναῖκα ἔγημα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν. 21. καὶ παραγενόμενος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος[1] ἀπήγγειλε τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα. Τότε ὀργισθεὶς ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης εἶπε τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ, "Ἔξελθε ταχέως εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ ῥύμας τῆς πόλεως, καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ ἀναπήρους καὶ χωλοὺς καὶ τυφλοὺς[2] εἰσάγαγε ὧδε. 22. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ δοῦλος, Κύριε, γέγονεν ὡς[3] ἐπέταξας, καὶ ἔτι τόπος ἐστί. 23. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον, "Ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς, καὶ ἀνάγκασον εἰσελθεῖν, ἵνα γεμισθῇ ὁ οἶκός μου.[4] 24. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κεκλημένων γεύσεταί μου τοῦ δείπνου."

[1] Omit **εκεινος** ℵABDL *al.*

[2] **τυφ. και χωλ.** in ℵBDL, etc.

[3] For **ως** ℵBDLR i, e, etc., have **ο**.

[4] **μου ο οικος** in ℵABDLX 157 e cop.

the second from Josephus. The third, if not a Latinism (Meyer and J. Weiss say no, Schanz and Hahn yes), is at least exactly = *excusatum me habeto*.——Ver. 19. **ἕτερος**, another; his excuse is also highly respectable, though nothing more than a decent excuse; the preoccupation very real, though the apology lame. Five yoke of oxen a very important purchase in the owner's eyes.—Ver. 20. **γυναῖκα ἔγημα**: most presentable excuse of all, therefore offered *sans phrase;* preoccupation this time intense, and surely pardonable? In the natural sphere these are likely forms of preoccupation, but not necessarily either the only, or even the chief in the spiritual sphere, or those which kept the lawyers and Pharisees from accepting the teaching of Jesus. Their prepossessions were religious and theological.

Not only these three but *all* decline to come. In the natural sphere this is highly improbable and unexampled. Jesus, from no fault on His part as a parable artist, had to make improbable suppositions to exemplify the fact in the spiritual sphere, which in this instance was that the bulk of the Jewish people were indifferent to the Kingdom as He presented it. On the other hand, in the parables spoken in justification of His own conduct, the case put has the highest measure of probability. *Vide, e.g.*, those in next chapter.

Vv. 21-24. *The sequel.*—Ver. 21. The servant has done his duty and returns to make his strange report.—**ὀργισθεὶς**, enraged; no wonder.—**ἔξελθε ταχέως**, go out *quickly;* no time to be lost, as all things are ready; but the thing chiefly to be noted is how the word answers to the master's mood.—**πλατείας καὶ ῥύμας**, broad streets and narrow lanes (Mt. vi. 2, *q.v.*); all sorts of people to be met with there and many of them: invitation to be broadcast, no one to be shunned however poor or unsightly; the poor, maimed, blind, and halt rather to be preferred, therefore expressly named —such is the master's mood in his disgust at the behaviour of the well-to-do, propertied, happy classes—a violent but natural reaction.—Ver. 22. **ἔτι τόπος ἐστί**, yet there is room, places for more; many more, else the servant would hardly think it worth while to mention the fact, though he quite understands that the master wants the banqueting hall filled, were it only to show that he can do without those saucy recusants. Room after such a widespread miscellaneous invitation speaks to a feast on a grand scale, worthy emblem of the magnificence of Divine grace.—Ver. 23. **ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμοὺς**, "highways and hedges"; the main roads and the footpaths running between the fields, alongside of the hedges (Hahn); these, in the *country*, answering to the streets and lanes in the *town*. The people to be found there are not necessarily lower down socially than those called within the city, perhaps not so low, but they are without, representing in the interpretation the *Gentiles*.—**ἀνάγκασον**, compel; reflects in the first place the urgent desire of the master to have an absolutely full house, in the second the feeling that pressure will be needed to overcome the incredulity of country people as to the invitation to them being meant seriously. They would be apt to laugh in the servant's face.—**ἵνα γεμισθῇ**: the house must be full, no excuse to be taken; but for a curious reason.—Ver. 24. **ὅτι οὐδεὶς**, etc.: to keep out the

25. Συνεπορεύοντο δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί· καὶ στραφεὶς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, 26. "Εἴτις ἔρχεται πρός με, καὶ οὐ μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ,[1] καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ τὰ τέκνα, καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς, καὶ τὰς ἀδελφάς, ἔτι δὲ καὶ[2] τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν, οὐ δύναταί μου μαθητὴς εἶναι.[3] 27. καὶ ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ,[4] καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναταί μου εἶναι μαθητής. 28. τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θέλων πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι, οὐχὶ πρῶτον καθίσας [d] ψηφίζει

d Rev. xiii. 18 (to explain by counting).

[1] So in BL *al.* (W.H.). ℵDX, etc., 1, 13, 69 *al.* have **αυτου** (Tisch.).

[2] **ετι δε και** in ℵD (Tisch.); **ετι τε και** in BLRΔ (W.H.). *Vide* below.

[3] **ειναι μου μαθ.** in ℵBLMRX (Tisch., W.H.). In ver. 27 ℵBL have the same order.

[4] So in ℵDL (Tisch.). B has **εαυτου** (W.H.).

first invited in case they should change their minds. Of course this is spoken by the master, and is no comment of Jesus, though we read **ὑμῖν** where we expect **σοι**, the application to the hearers of the parable intruding itself at this one point. The reason of the master for wishing his house filled is not a high one. But the ethics of parables belong to this world. They must not be transferred into the spiritual sphere.

Vv. 25-35. *Concio ad populum.* Jesus now appears on the way, and followed by "many multitudes" (**ὄχλοι πολλοί**, ver. 25) to whom He speaks. Thus sayings which in Mt. and Mk. form part of disciple-instruction (**διδαχή**) assume the character of popular preaching, as in the case of the Sermon on the Mount (in Lk.), though the subject is the conditions of discipleship.

Vv. 26-27. *The requirements of true discipleship* (Mt. x. 37-39).—Ver. 26. **ἔρχεται πρός με**, cometh to me, with a view to close and permanent discipleship. —**μισεῖ**: a stronger word than that used in Mt., where it is a question of loving less; surprising in Lk., whose general habit is to soften hard sayings. But the *logion* is presented in different lights in the two Gospels. In Mt. it is a question of being a disciple *worthy* of the Master (**ἄξιος**); in Lk. of being an *effective* disciple (**οὐ δύναται**). Love of friends makes discipleship difficult or impossible; on the other hand, *hatred* makes it easy. It is easy to be devoted to a master or cause when you hate all rival masters or interests. Therefore "hates" is the appropriate *word* here, but the practical meaning is *love less*, which in experience signifies: hating other objects of affection in so far as they present themselves as hindrances to the supreme love of the Master.—**τὴν γυναῖκα**, (not in Mt.): to be most "hated" just because most loved, and excercising the most entangling influence.—**ἔτι τε καί**, and moreover. The **τε** (BL) binds all the particulars named into one bundle of *renuncianda*.—**ψυχήν**, life, oneself, most loved of all, therefore forming the climax, and also determining the sense of **μισεῖ**. The disciple is to hate friends as he can hate himself—"secundam eam partem, secundum quam *se ipsum* odisse debet, a Christo aversam" (Bengel). This last item in the list of things to be hated represents the idea contained in Mt. x. 39.—Ver. 27 = Mt. x. 38, with the idea of ability substituted for the idea of worth.

Vv. 28-33. *Parables illustrating the need of counting the cost*, peculiar to Lk., but intrinsically probable as sayings of Jesus, and thoroughly germane to the foregoing discourse. The connection is: It is a serious thing to be a disciple, therefore consider well before you begin —the renunciations required, the cross to be borne—as you would, if wise, consider before *building a tower* or *engaging in battle*.—Ver. 28. **θέλων**: conditional participle, "if he wish"; with the article it would = who wishes.—**πύργον**, a tower; need not be magnified into a grand house with a tower. Doubtless, as Bengel remarks, Christianity is a great and arduous affair, and is fitly compared *cum rebus magnis et arduis*. But the greatness of the undertaking is sufficiently represented by the second parable: the first emblem may be allowed to be less ambitious and more within the reach of ordinary mortals. A tower of observation in a vineyard (Mt. xxi. 33) or for refuge in danger, or for ornament in a garden may be thought of.—**καθίσας**:

τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ ἔχει τὰ πρὸς[1] ἀπαρτισμόν; 29. ἵνα μήποτε θέντος αὐτοῦ θεμέλιον, καὶ μὴ ἰσχύοντος [e] ἐκτελέσαι, πάντες οἱ θεωροῦντες ἄρξωνται ἐμπαίζειν αὐτῷ,[2] 30. λέγοντες, Ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἤρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἐκτελέσαι. 31. Ἢ τίς βασιλεὺς πορευόμενος [f] συμβαλεῖν ἑτέρῳ βασιλεῖ[3] εἰς πόλεμον οὐχὶ καθίσας πρῶτον βουλεύεται[4] εἰ δυνατός ἐστιν ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν ἀπαντῆσαι[5] τῷ μετὰ εἴκοσι χιλιάδων ἐρχομένῳ ἐπ' αὐτόν; 32. εἰ δὲ μήγε, ἔτι αὐτοῦ πόρρω ὄντος, πρεσβείαν ἀποστείλας ἐρωτᾷ τὰ[6] πρὸς εἰρήνην. 33. οὕτως οὖν πᾶς ἐξ ὑμῶν, ὃς οὐκ ἀποτάσσεται πᾶσι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ὑπάρχουσιν, οὐ δύναταί μου εἶναι[7] μαθητής. 34. Καλὸν[8] τὸ ἅλας[9]· ἐὰν δὲ[10] τὸ ἅλας[9] μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται; 35. οὔτε εἰς γῆν, οὔτε εἰς κοπρίαν εὔθετόν ἐστιν· ἔξω βάλλουσιν αὐτό. Ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω."

[e] here only in N.T. (*bis*).

[f] here only in N.T. in sense of fighting.

[1] For τα προς BDLR 225 have simply εις. [2] αυτω εμπ. in ℵABLX *al.*

[3] ετερω βασ. συμβ. in ℵABDLRX 33, 157 *al.*

[4] So in D; βουλευσεται in ℵB codd. vet. Lat. (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] So in L *al.* υπαντ. in ℵABDRXΔ 1, 33, 69, 346.

[6] B omits τα and reads εις. ℵ omits τα and reads προς (W.H. προς in text with εις for τα προς in marg.).

[7] ειναι μου in ℵBLR. [8] Add ουν to καλον ℵBLX 69 *al.*

[9] αλας in BLR unc. and minusc. *pl.* ℵD have αλα (Tisch.).

[10] εαν δε και in ℵBDLX *al.*

the attitude appropriate to deliberate, leisurely consideration.—**δαπάνην**, the cost, here only in N.T.—**εἰ ἔχει εἰς ἀ.**, if he has what is necessary for (**τὰ δέοντα** understood).—**ἀπαρτισμόν** = for *completion*, here only in N.T. and in Dion. Halic.; condemned by Phryn., p. 447. *Cf.* **ἐξηρτισμένος** in 2 Tim. iii. 17.—Ver. 29. **ἐμπαίζειν**, to mock; an unfinished tower is specially ridiculous: height is essential.—**οὗτος**, etc., this man, contemptuously; "this" stands for a proper name. "Vulgo ponunt N. N.," Bengel. Jesus here appeals with characteristic tact to one of the most sensitive feelings of human nature—shrinking from ridicule. Who would care to be spoken of all his days as the man who commenced a tower and could not finish it?

Vv. 31-33. *The king going to fight.* This is the affair of the few, a parable to be laid to heart by men aspiring to, or capable of, a grand career.—**συμβαλεῖν εἰς πόλεμον**, to encounter in war (R.V.). or perhaps better "to fight a *battle*" (Field, Ot. Nor.). **πόλεμον** is so rendered in 1 Cor. xiv. 8, Rev. ix. 9, in A.V. (altered in R.V. into "war"). In Homer the idea of battle prevails, but in later writers that of war.—**ἐν δέκα**, in, with, in the position of one who has only 10,000 soldiers at command.—**μετὰ εἴκοσι**: to beat 20,000 with 10,000 is possible, but it is an unlikely event: the chances are against the king with the smaller force, and the case manifestly calls for deliberation. The implied truth is that the disciple engages in a very unequal conflict. *Cf.* St. Paul, "we wrestle against principalities," etc., Eph. vi. 12. A reference in this parable to the relations between Herod Antipas (the "fox") and Aretas, his father-in-law, is possible (Holtzmann, H. C.).—Ver. 33 gives the application of the parable. Hofmann, Keil, and Hahn divide the sentence into two, putting a full stop after **ὑμῶν** and rendering: "So then every one of you! (do the same thing, *i.e.*, consider). He who does not renounce all he hath is not able to be a disciple of mine." This is very effective; it may have been what Jesus actually said; but it is hardly how Lk. reports His words. Had he meant the sentence to be read so he would have put **γὰρ** after **δς**. He runs the two supposed sentences into one, and so the counsel

XV. 1. ἮΣΑΝ δὲ ἐγγίζοντες αὐτῷ[1] πάντες οἱ τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ. 2. καὶ [a] διεγόγγυζον οἱ[2] Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι οὗτος ἁμαρτωλοὺς [b] προσδέχεται,

a Ch. xix. 7.
b Rom. xvi. 2. Phil. ii. 29.

[1] αυτω εγγ. in ℵAB. D has εγγ. α.

[2] οι τε Φ. in ℵBDL.

to deliberate is left out or latent in the requirement of renunciation, which is the reason for deliberation.

Vv. 34-35. *The saying concerning salt* (Mt. v. 13, Mk. ix. 50). This *logion* may have been repeatedly uttered by Jesus, but it does not seem to be so appropriate here as in its place in Mk. In this place the salt appears to denote disciples and the idea to be: genuine disciples are an excellent thing, valuable as salt to a corrupt world, but spurious disciples are as utterly worthless as salt which has lost its savour.—Ver. 35. **οὔτε εἰς γῆν οὔτε εἰς κοπρίαν**, neither for land nor for dung (is it fit, **εὔθετον** as in ix. 62). The idea seems to be that savourless salt is neither *earth* nor *manure*.—**ἔξω** is emphatic = *out* they cast it, as worthless, good for nothing, mere refuse, a waste substance.

CHAPTER XV. PARABLES TEACHING THE JOY OF FINDING THINGS LOST. Nothing is gained by insisting anxiously on historical connection here. The introduction of these beautiful parables of grace at this point is a matter of tact rather than of temporal sequence, so far as the conscious motive of the evangelist is concerned. They are brought in as a set-off to the severe discourse in the closing section of the previous chapter, in which Jesus seems to assume a repellent attitude towards those who desired to follow Him. Here, in happy contrast, He appears as One who graciously received the sinful, regardless of unfavourable comments. The parables of the *Lost Sheep*, the *Lost Coin*, and the *Lost Son* are here given as a self-defence of Jesus against Pharisaic fault-finding. Whether they were first spoken in that connection, or uttered in that connection alone, cannot be determined. So far as their main drift is concerned they might have been spoken to any audience; to critical Pharisees, to disciples (the first is given in Mt. xviii. 12-14 as spoken to the Twelve), to synagogue audiences, or to a gathering of publicans and sinners like that in Capernaum (Lk. v. 29-32); controversial, didactic, or evangelic, as the case might be. Quite possibly the original setting of these parables was a synagogue discourse, or better still the address to the Capernaum gathering. That they are all three authentic utterances of Jesus need not be doubted. The first has synoptical attestation, being found in Mt. also; the second has value only as a supplement to the first, and was hardly worth inventing as an independent parable; the third is too good to have been an invention by Lk. or any other person, and can only have proceeded from the great Master. Wendt (L. J.) accepts all three as authentic, and taken from the *Logia* of Mt.

Vv. 1, 2. *Historic introduction.*—**ἦσαν ἐγγίζοντες**: either were in the act of approaching Jesus at a given time (Meyer), or were in the habit of doing so. The position of **αὐτῷ** before **ἐγγίζοντες** in ℵB favours the latter (Schanz). On the other hand, it is not improbable that the reference is to the Capernaum gathering. We may have here, in fact, another version of that story taken from the *Logia*, the occasion slightly described, the words spoken carefully reported. In that case we may take **πάντες** following somewhat strictly, and not as a mere exaggeration of the evangelist's. There were *many* at the feast. The aim was to have all the outcasts of the town present (*vide* on Mt. ix. 9-13). True, they came to feast according to the other report, whereas here stress is laid on the *hearing* (**ἀκούειν**). The festive feature is referred to in the complaint of the Pharisees (**συνεσθίει**, ver. 2). Of course there would be hearing as well as eating, and probably what the guests heard was just these same parables in slightly different form. In that case they served first as a *gospel* and then as an *apologia*.—Ver. 2. **διεγόγγυζον**: the **διὰ** conveys the idea of a general pervasive murmuring. This is probably not an instance illustrating Hermann's remark (*ad Viger.*, p. 856) that this preposition in compound verbs often adds the notion of striving (**διαπίνειν**, *certare bibendo*).—**οἵ τε Φ.**: the **τε** (ℵBL) binds Pharisees and scribes together as one: as close a corporation as "publicans and sinners" (equivalent to "sinners" in their conception, **ἁμαρτωλοὺς**, ver. 2). Note the order:

c Acts x. 41; xi. 2. 1 Cor. v. 11. Gal. ii. 12.

καὶ ᶜσυνεσθίει αὐτοῖς." 3. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, λέγων, 4. "Τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων ἑκατὸν πρόβατα, καὶ ἀπολέσας ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν,[1] οὐ καταλείπει τὰ ἐννενηκονταεννέα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολωλός, ἕως εὕρῃ αὐτό; 5. καὶ εὑρὼν ἐπιτίθησιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὤμους ἑαυτοῦ[2] χαίρων, 6. καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον, συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς γείτονας, λέγων αὐτοῖς, Συγχάρητέ μοι, ὅτι εὗρον τὸ πρόβατόν μου τὸ ἀπολωλός. 7. λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὕτω χαρὰ ἔσται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ[3] ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι, ἢ ἐπὶ ἐννενηκονταεννέα δικαίοις, οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσι

[1] For εν εξ α. ℵBD 1, 69 *al.* have εξ αυτων εν.

[2] The texts are divided between εαυτου (AEMΔ, etc.) and αυτου (ℵBDL: Tisch., W.H.).

[3] εν τ. ουρανω εσται in ℵBL 33, 157.

Pharisees and scribes; usually the other way. Pharisees answers to sinners, scribes to publicans; the two extremes in character and calling: the holiest and unholiest; the most reputable and the most disreputable occupations. And Jesus preferred the baser group!—**προσδέχεται**, receives, admits to His presence; instead of repelling with involuntary loathing.—**καὶ συνεσθίει**: not only admits but *also eats with them*. That was the main surprise and offence, and therefore just the thing done, because the thing which, while offending the Pharisees, would certainly gain the "sinners". Jesus did what the reputedly good would not do, so winning their trust.

Vv. 3-7. *The first parable* (*cf.* Mt. xviii. 12-14).—Ver. 3. **τὴν παραβ. ταύτην**: the phrase covers the second parable (*Lost Coin*) as well as the first. The two are regarded as virtually one, the second a duplicate with slight variations.—Ver. 4. **ἐξ ὑμῶν**, what man *of you*. Even the Pharisees and scribes would so act in temporal affairs. Every human being knows the joy of finding things lost. It is only in religion that men lose the scent of simple universal truths.—**ἑκατὸν πρ.**: a *hundred* a considerable number, making *one* by comparison insignificant. The owner, one would say, can afford to lose a single erring sheep. Yet not so judges the owner himself, *any* owner. Losing only *one* (**ἐξ αὐτῶν ἓν**) he takes immediate steps to recover it.—**ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ**, in the untilled, unfenced pasture land; but of course not so as to run the risk of losing the whole flock: it is left under the care of an assistant, the master taking the more arduous task to himself.—**ἐπὶ** after **πορεύεται** indicates not only direction but aim: goeth after in order to find. (Schanz; Kypke remarks that **ἐπὶ** with verbs of going or sending often indicates "scopum itionis" and is usually prefixed to the thing sought. Similarly Pricaeus.)—**ἕως εὕρῃ**: the search not perfunctory, but thorough; goes on till the lost one be found, if that be possible. —Ver. 5. **ἐπιτίθησιν**, etc., he places the found one on his shoulders; not in affection merely or in the exuberance of his joy, but from necessity. He must carry the sheep. It cannot walk, can only "stand where it stands and lie where it lies" (Koetsveld). This feature, probable in natural life, is true to the spiritual. Such was the condition of the mass of Jews in Christ's time (Mt. ix. 36, *cf.* "when we were without strength," Rom. v. 6).—**χαίρων**: the carrying necessary, but not done with a grudge, rather gladly; not merely for love of the beast, but in joy that a thing lost has been *found*, making the burden, in spite of the long way, light. He is a very poor shepherd that does not bear the sheep that stands still, unable to walk (*vide* Zech. xi. 16, margin).—Ver. 6. **συγκαλεῖ**: the point here is not the formal invitation of neighbours to sympathise, but the confident expectation that they will. That they do is taken for granted. Sympathy from neighbours and friends of the same occupation, fellow-shepherds, a matter of course in such a case. This trait hit the Pharisees, and may have been added to the original parable for their special benefit.—Ver. 7. **ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ**, in heaven, that is, in the heart of God. Heaven is a synonym for God in vv. 18 and 21.—**ἢ** = more than, as if **πλέον** had preceded, so often in N.T. and in Sept. = Hebrew מִן. The comparison in the moral sphere is bold,

μετανοίας. 8. Ἢ τίς γυνὴ [d] δραχμὰς ἔχουσα δέκα, ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ δραχμὴν μίαν, οὐχὶ ἅπτει λύχνον, καὶ σαροῖ τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ ζητεῖ [e] ἐπιμελῶς, ἕως ὅτου [1] εὕρῃ; 9. καὶ εὑροῦσα συγκαλεῖται [2] τὰς φίλας καὶ τὰς [3] γείτονας, λέγουσα, Συγχάρητέ μοι, ὅτι εὗρον τὴν δραχμὴν ἣν ἀπώλεσα. 10. οὕτω, λέγω ὑμῖν, χαρὰ γίνεται [4] ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι."

d here only in N.T. (thrice).

e here only in N.T.

[1] For οτου ℵBLX *al.* have ου (W.H.).

[2] So in D. συνκαλει in ℵBKLXΔ *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] ℵBL omit this second τας.

[4] γινεται χαρα in ℵBLX 33.

but the principle holds true there as in the natural sphere, even if the ninety-nine be truly righteous men needing no repentance. It is rational to have peculiar joy over a sinner repenting, therefore God has it, therefore Christ *might* have it. This saying is the third great word of Christ's apology for loving the sinful. For the other two *vide* on Mt. ix. 9-13 and Lk. vii. 36-50.

Vv. 8-10. *The second parable*, a pendant to the first, spoken possibly to the Capernaum gathering to bring the experience of joy found in things lost home to the poorest present. As spoken to Pharisees it is intended to exemplify the principle by a lost object as insignificant in value as a publican or a sinner was in their esteem. A sheep, though one of a hundred, was a comparatively precious object. A drachma was a piece of money of inconsiderable value, yet of value to a poor woman who owned only ten drachmas in all; its finding therefore a source of keen joy to *her*.—Ver. 8. ἅπτει λ., lights a lamp. The verb used in this sense in N.T. only in Lk. No windows in the dwellings of the poor: a lamp must be lighted for the search, unless indeed there be one always burning on the stand.—σαροῖ: colloquial and vulgar for σαίρει, *vide* on Mt. xii. 44.—ζητεῖ ἐπιμελῶς: the emphasis in this parable lies on the seeking—ἅπτει, σαροῖ, ζητεῖ; in the *Lost Sheep* on the carrying home of the found object of quest.—Ver. 9. συγκαλεῖ: this calling together of friends and neighbours (feminine in this case, τὰς φ. καὶ τὰς γ.) peculiarly natural in the case of a woman; hence perhaps the reading of T.R., συγκαλεῖται, the middle being more subjective. The finding would appeal specially to feminine sympathies, if the lost drachma was not part of a hoard to meet some debt, but belonged to a string of coins worn as an ornament round the head, then as now, by married women in the East, as Tristram suggests (*Eastern Customs in Bible Lands*, p. 76). This view, favoured by Farrar, is ignored by most commentators.—Ver. 10 repeats the moral of ver. 7, but without comparison which, with a smaller number, would only weaken the effect.—ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τ. θ.: the angels may be referred to as the neighbours of God, whose joy they witness and share. Wendt (*L. J.*, i., 141) suggests that Luke uses the expression to avoid anthropopathism, and because God has no neighbours.

Vv. 11-32. *The third parable*, rather an example than a parable illustrating by an imaginary case the joy of recovering a *lost human being*. In this case care is taken to describe what loss means in the sphere of human life. The interest in the lost now appropriately takes the form of eager longing and patient waiting for the return of the erring one, that there may be room for describing the repentance referred to in vv. 7 and 10, which is the motive for the return. Also in the moral sphere the subject of the finding cannot be purely passive: there must be *self*-recovery to give ethical value to the event. A sinning man cannot be brought back to God like a straying sheep to the fold. Hence the beautiful picture of the sin, the misery, the penitent reflections, and the return of the prodigal peculiar to this parable. It is not mere scene-painting. It is meant to show how vastly higher is the significance of the terms "lost" and "found" in the human sphere, justifying increased interest in the finding, and so showing the utter unreasonableness of the fault-finding directed against Jesus for His efforts to win to goodness the publicans and sinners. Jesus thereby said in effect: You blame in me a joy which is universal, that of finding the lost, and which ought to be greater in the case of human beings just because it is a *man* that is found and not a *beast*. Does not the story as I tell it

11. Εἶπε δέ, "Ἄνθρωπός τις εἶχε δύο υἱούς· 12. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ νεώτερος αὐτῶν τῷ πατρί, Πάτερ, δός μοι τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας. καὶ[1] [f] διεῖλεν αὐτοῖς τὸν βίον. 13. καὶ μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συναγαγὼν ἅπαντα ὁ νεώτερος υἱὸς ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς χώραν μακράν, καὶ ἐκεῖ διεσκόρπισε τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ, ζῶν ἀσώτως. 14. δαπανήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα, ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἰσχυρὸς[2] κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤρξατο ὑστερεῖσθαι. 15. καὶ πορευθεὶς ἐκολλήθη ἑνὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τῆς χώρας ἐκείνης· καὶ ἔπεμψεν αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς αὐτοῦ βόσκειν χοίρους. 16. καὶ ἐπεθύμει γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ[3] ἀπὸ[4] τῶν [g] κερατίων ὧν ἤσθιον οἱ χοῖροι· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ. 17. Εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν εἶπε,[5] Πόσοι [h] μίσθιοι τοῦ πατρός

f 1 Cor. xii. 11.
g here only in N.T.
h here and in ver. 19.

[1] For και (ℵD, Tisch.) BL cop. have ο δε.

[2] ισχυρα in ℵABDL 1, 33, 131.

[3] γεμισαι . . . αυτου in APQXΓΔΛΠ, etc., codd. vet. Lat. vulg. syr. (Peshito) sin. (Tisch.). χορτασθηναι in ℵBDLR minusc. d e f syr. cur. (R.V., W.H., text).

[4] εκ in texts which have χορτασθηναι.

[5] ℵBL 13, 69 *al.* have εφη.

rebuke your cynicism and melt your hearts? Yet such things are happening among these publicans and sinners you despise, every day.

Vv. 11-13. *The case put.* **δύο υἱούς**: two sons of different dispositions here as in Mt. xxi. 28-31, but there is no further connection between the two parables. There is no reason for regarding Lk.'s parable as an allegorical expansion of Mt.'s *Two Sons* (Holtzmann in H. C.).—Ver. 12. **ὁ νεώτερος**, the younger, with a certain fitness made to play the foolish part. The position of an elder son presents more motives to steadiness.—**τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος**, the portion *falling* or *belonging to*, the verb occurs in this sense in late authors (here only in N.T.). The portion of the younger when there were two sons would be one third, the right of the first-born being two portions (Deut. xxi. 17).—**διεῖλεν**: the father complies, not as bound, but he must do it in the parable that the story may go on.—**βίον** = **οὐσίαν**, as in Mk. xii. 44, Lk. viii. 43.—Ver. 13. **μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας**: to be joined to **ἀπεδήμησεν**: he went away as soon as possible, when he had had time to realise his property, in haste to escape into wild liberty or licence.—**μακράν**: the farther away the better.—**ἀσώτως** (α pr. and **σώζω**, here only in N.T.), insalvably; the process of reckless waste, free rein given to every passion, must go on till nothing is left. This is what undisciplined freedom comes to.

Vv. 14-19. *The crisis:* recklessness leads to misery and misery prompts reflection.—Ver. 14. **λιμὸς**, a famine, an accident fitting into the moral history of the prodigal; not a violent supposition; such correspondences between the physical and moral worlds do occur, and there is a Providence in them.—**ἰσχυρὰ**: the most probable reading if only because **λιμὸς** is feminine only in Doric and late Greek usage.—**ὑστερεῖσθαι**: the result of wastefulness and prevalent dearth combined is dire want. What is to be done? Return home? Not yet; that the last shift.—Ver. 15. **ἐκολλήθη**, he attached himself (pass. with mid. sense). The citizen of the far country did not want him, it is no time for employing superfluous hands, but he suffered the wretch to have his way in good-natured pity.—**βόσκειν χοίρους**: the lowest occupation, a poor-paid pagan drudge; the position of the publicans glanced at.—Ver. 16. **ἐπεθύμει**, etc., he was fain to fill his belly with the horn-shaped pods of the carob-tree. The point is that he was so poorly fed by his new master (who felt the pinch of hard times, and on whom he had small claim) that to get a good meal of anything, even swine's food, was a treat. **γεμίσαι τ. κ.**, though realistic, is redeemed from vulgarity by the dire distress of the quondam voluptuary. Anything to fill the aching void within!—**οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου**, no one was giving him: this his experience from day to day and week

μου περισσεύουσιν[1] ἄρτων, ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ[2] ἀπόλλυμαι; 18. ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτῷ, Πάτερ, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου· 19. καὶ[3] οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱός σου· ποίησόν με ὡς ἕνα τῶν μισθίων σου. 20. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ. Ἔτι δὲ αὐτοῦ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος, εἶδεν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη, καὶ δραμὼν ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν. 21. εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ υἱός,[4] Πάτερ, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου, καὶ[5] οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱός σου.[6] 22. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ,[7] Ἐξενέγκατε[7] τὴν στολὴν τὴν πρώτην, καὶ ἐνδύσατε αὐτόν, καὶ δότε δακτύλιον εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑποδή-

[1] So in ℵDL, etc. (Tisch.). περισσευονται in ABP 1, 94 (W.H.).

[2] After λιμῳ ℵBL have ωδε.

[3] Omit και ℵABDL and many others.

[4] ο υιος before αυτῳ in BL 1, 131 *al.*

[5] και omitted here also in ℵABDL, etc.

[6] ℵBD add ποιησον με ως ενα των μισθιων σου (W.H. brackets). *Vide* below.

[7] ℵBLX prefix the expressive ταχυ (D ταχεως) and omit την before στολην.

to week. Giving what? Not the pods, as many think, these he would take without leave, but anything better. His master gave him little—famine rations, and no other kind soul made up for the lack. Neither food nor love abounded in that country. So there was nothing for it but swine's food or semi-starvation—or *home!*—Ver. 17. **εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐλθὼν** = either, realising the situation; or, coming to his true self, his sane mind (for the use of this phrase *vide* Kypke, *Observ.*). Perhaps both ideas are intended. He at last understood there was no hope for him there, and, reduced to despair, the human, the filial, the thought of home and father revived in the poor wretch.—**περισσεύονται**: passive, with gen. of the thing; here only in N.T. = are provided to excess, have more given them than they can use.—Ver. 18. **ἀναστὰς**: a bright hope gives energy to the starving man; home! Said, done, but the motive is not high. It is simply the last resource of a desperate man. He will go home and confess his fault, and so, he hopes, get at least a hireling's fare. Well to be brought out of that land, under home influences, by any motive. It is in the right direction. Yet though bread is as yet the supreme consideration, foretokens of true ethical repentance appear in the premeditated speech:—**Πάτερ**: some sense of the claims that long-disused word implies—**ἥμαρτον**, I erred; perception that the whole past has been a mistake and folly—**εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν**, against heaven, God—**ἐνώπιόν σου**, in thy sight, in thy *judgment* (Hahn)—he knows quite well what his father must think of his conduct; what a fool he must think him (Ps. lxxiii. 22)—**οὐκέτι εἰμὶ**, etc. (ver. 19), fully conscious that he has forfeited all filial claims. The omission of **καὶ** suits the emotional mood.

Vv. 20-24. *Return and reception.*—**ἦλθεν**, etc., he came to his father; no details about the journey, the fact simply stated, the interest now centring in the action of the father, exemplifying the joy of a parent in finding a lost son, which is carefully and exquisitely described in four graphic touches—**εἶδεν**: first recognition at a distance, implying, if not a habit of looking for the lost one (Göbel, Schanz, etc.), at least a vision sharpened by love—**ἐσπλαγχνίσθη**: instant pity awakened by the woful plight of the returning one manifest in feeble step, ragged raiment possibly also visible—**δραμὼν**, running, in the excitement and impatience of love, regardless of Eastern dignity and the pace safe for advancing years—**κατεφίλησεν**: kissing fervently and frequently the son folded in his arms (*cf.* Mt. xxvi. 49, Lk. vii. 38, 45). All signs these of a love ready to do anything to recover the lost, to search for him to the world's end, if that had been fitting or likely to gain the end.—Ver. 21. The son repeats his premeditated speech, with or without the last clause; probably with it, as part of a well-conned lesson, repeated half mechanically, yet not insin-

i here, three times. ματα εἰς τοὺς πόδας· 23. καὶ ἐνέγκαντες[1] τὸν μόσχον τὸν [i] σιτευτὸν θύσατε, καὶ φαγόντες εὐφρανθῶμεν· 24. ὅτι οὗτος ὁ υἱός μου νεκρὸς ἦν, καὶ ἀνέζησε· καὶ ἀπολωλὼς ἦν,[2] καὶ εὑρέθη. Καὶ ἤρξαντο εὐφραίνεσθαι. 25. Ἦν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐν ἀγρῷ· καὶ ὡς ἐρχόμενος ἤγγισε τῇ οἰκίᾳ, ἤκουσε [j] συμφωνίας καὶ [k] χορῶν· 26. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ἕνα τῶν παίδων αὐτοῦ,[3] ἐπυνθάνετο τί[4] εἴη ταῦτα. 27. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἥκει· καὶ ἔθυσεν ὁ πατήρ σου τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν, ὅτι ὑγιαίνοντα αὐτὸν ἀπέλαβεν. 28. Ὠργίσθη δέ, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν εἰσελθεῖν. ὁ οὖν[5]

j here only in N.T.
k here only in N.T.

[1] φερετε in ℵBLRX more suitable to emotional speech.

[2] For και απ. ην ℵBL have ην απ. without και.

[3] Omit αυτου all uncials.

[4] τι αν in B *al.* (W.H.).

[5] For ο ουν ℵABDLRX 1, 33 *al.* have ο δε.

cerely—as if to say: I don't deserve this, I came expecting at most a hireling's treatment in food and otherwise, I should be ashamed to be anything higher.—Ver. 22. **δούλους**: their presence conceivable, the father's running and the meeting noticed and reported by some one, so soon drawing a crowd to the spot, or to meet the two on the way to the house. To them the father gives directions which are his response to the son's proposed self-degradation. He shall not be their fellow, they shall serve him by acts symbolic of reinstatement in sonship.—**ταχὺ**, quick! a most probable reading (ℵBL), and a most natural exclamation; obliterate the traces of a wretched past as soon as possible; off with these rags! fetch robes worthy of my son, dressed in his best as on a gala day.—**ἐξενέγκατε**, bring from the house—**στολὴν τ. πρώτην**, the *first* robe, not in time, formerly worn (Theophy.), but in quality; *cf.* the second chariot, Gen. xli. 43 (*currus secundus*, Bengel).—**δακτύλιον** (here only in N.T.): no epithet attached, golden, *e.g.* (Wolff, *golden* ring for sons, *iron* ring for slaves); that it would be a ring of distinction goes without saying.—**ὑποδήματα**, shoes; *needed*—he is barefoot and footsore; and worn by *sons*, not by slaves. Robe, ring, shoes: all symbols of filial state.—Ver. 23. **τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν**: always one fattening for high-tides; could not be used on a better occasion.—Ver. 24: reason for making this a festive day.—**οὗτος**, etc.: the father formally calls him his son, partly by way of recognition, and partly to introduce him to the attendants in case they might not know him.—**νεκρὸς**, dead, ethically? or as good as dead? the latter more probable in a speech to slaves.—**ἀπολωλὼς**, lost; his whereabouts unknown, one reason among others why there was no search, as in the case of the sheep and the coin.

Vv. 25-32. *The elder son*, who plays the ignoble part of wet blanket on this glad day, and represents the Pharisees in their chilling attitude towards the mission in behalf of the publicans and sinners.—Ver. 25. **ἐν ἀγρῷ**, on the farm; of course there every day, doing his duty, a most correct, exemplary man, only in his wisdom and virtue so cold and merciless towards men of another sort. Being at his work he is ignorant of what has happened: the arrival and what followed.—**ἐρχόμενος**, coming home after the day's work is over, when the merriment is in full swing, with song and dance filling the air.—Ver. 26. **τί ἂν εἴη ταῦτα**, not contemptuous, "what all this was about" (Farrar, C. G. T.), but with the puzzled air of a man in the dark and surprised = what does this mean?—Ver. 27. In simple language the servant briefly explains the situation, showing in his words neither sympathy nor, still less, the reverse, as Hofmann thinks.—**ὑγιαίνοντα**, in good health; home again and well, that is the whole case as he knows it; no thought in his mind of a tragic career culminating in repentance, or if he has any suspicion he keeps it to himself; thoroughly true to nature this—Ver. 28. **ὠργίσθη**, he was angry, a very slight description of his state of mind into which various bad feelings would enter. disgust, chagrin that all this merriment had been going on for hours and they had not thought it worth while to let him know—an impolitic oversight; a sense of wrong and general unfair treat-

πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐξελθὼν παρεκάλει αὐτόν. 29. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε τῷ πατρί,[1] Ἰδού, τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι, καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐντολήν σου παρῆλθον, καὶ ἐμοὶ οὐδέποτε ἔδωκας ἔριφον,[2] ἵνα μετὰ τῶν φίλων μου εὐφρανθῶ. 30. ὅτε δὲ ὁ υἱός σου οὗτος ὁ καταφαγών σου τὸν βίον μετα πορνῶν[3] ἦλθεν, ἔθυσας αὐτῷ τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν.[4] 31. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Τέκνον, σὺ πάντοτε μετ' ἐμοῦ εἶ, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ σά ἐστιν. 32. εὐφρανθῆναι δὲ καὶ χαρῆναι ἔδει, ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου οὗτος νεκρὸς ἦν, καὶ ἀνέζησε[5]· καὶ ἀπολωλὼς ἦν,[6] καὶ εὑρέθη."

[1] BD add αυτου (W.H.), wanting in many copies (Tisch.).

[2] B has εριφιον (W.H. marg.).

[3] των πορ. in ADL (W.H. marg.). πορνων in ℵB (Tisch., W.H., text).

[4] τον σιτ. μοσχον for τ. μοσ τ. σιτ. in ℵBDLQR.

[5] εζησεν in ℵBLRΔ. T.R. = D, etc.

[6] For και απολ. ην ℵDX 1, 13, 69, etc., have simply απολωλως; with these BLR omit ην but retain και before απολ. (Tisch. has απολ., W.H., και απολ.).

ment of which this particular neglect was but a specimen.—ὁ δὲ πατὴρ, etc.: the father goes out and presses him to come in, very properly; but why not send for him at once that he might stop working on the farm and join in the feasting and dancing on that glad day? Did they all fear he would spoil the sport and act accordingly? The elder son has got a chance to complain, and he makes the most of it in his bitter speech to his father.—Ver. 29. ἔριφον, a kid, not to speak of the fatted calf.—μετὰ τῶν φίλων μου: he would have been content if there had been *any* room made for the festive element in his life, with a modest meeting with his own friends, not to speak of a grand family demonstration like this. But no, there was nothing but work and drudgery for him.—Ver. 30. οὗτος: contemptuous, this precious son of yours.—μετὰ πορνῶν: hard, merciless judgment; the worst said and in the coarsest way. How did he know? He did *not* know; had no information, jumped at conclusions. That the manner of his kind, who shirk work and go away to enjoy themselves.—Vv. 31, 32. The father answers meekly, apologetically, as if conscious that the elder son had some right to complain, and content to justify himself for celebrating the younger son's return with a feast; not a word of retaliation. This is natural in the story, and it also fits well into the aim of the parable, which is to illustrate the joy of finding the lost. It would serve no purpose in that connection to disparage the object of the lesser joy. There is peculiar joy over one sinner repenting even though the ninety-nine be truly righteous, and over a prodigal returned even though the elder brother be a most exemplary, blameless, dutiful son.

CHAPTER XVI. TWO ADDITIONAL PARABLES ON THE RIGHT USE OF WEALTH. These two parables, *the unjust steward* and *Dives*, bear such a foreign aspect when compared with the general body of Christ's teaching as to give rise to a doubt whether they have any claim to a place in an authentic record of His sayings. One at first wonders at finding them in such company, forming with the preceding three a group of five. Yet Luke had evidently no sense of their incongruity, for he passes from the three to the two as if they were of kindred import (ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ). Doubtless they appealed to his *social* bias by the sympathy they betray for the *poor* (*cf.* vi. 20, xi. 41), which has gained for them a place among the so-called *Ebionitic sections* of Luke's Gospel (*vide* Holtzmann in H. C.). In favour of the authenticity of the first of the two parables is its *apparently* low ethical tone which has been such a stumbling-block to commentators. Who but Jesus would have had the courage to extract a lesson of wisdom from conduct like that of the unrighteous steward? The literary grace of the second claims for it the same origin and author.

Vv. 1-7. *The parable of the unjust steward.*—Ver. 1. ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ: the same formula of transition as in xiv. 12. The καὶ connects with ἔλεγε, not with

XVI. 1. ἜΛΕΓΕ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ,[1] "Ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν πλούσιος, ὃς εἶχεν οἰκονόμον· καὶ οὗτος διεβλήθη αὐτῷ ὡς διασκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. 2. καὶ φωνήσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ; ἀπόδος τὸν λόγον τῆς οἰκονομίας σου· οὐ γὰρ δυνήσῃ[2] ἔτι οἰκονομεῖν. 3. Εἶπε δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ οἰκονόμος, Τί ποιήσω, ὅτι ὁ κύριός μου [a] ἀφαιρεῖται τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ; σκάπτειν οὐκ ἰσχύω, ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι. 4. ἔγνων τί ποιήσω, ἵνα, ὅταν μετασταθῶ[3] τῆς οἰκονομίας, δέξωνταί με εἰς τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν.[4] 5. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ἕνα ἕκαστον τῶν χρεωφειλετῶν τοῦ κυρίου ἑαυτοῦ, ἔλεγε τῷ πρώτῳ, Πόσον ὀφείλεις τῷ

a Rom. xi. 27 (mid.)

[1] Omit αυτου ℵBDLR.

[2] So in L and many others; ℵBDP have δυνῃ.

[3] ℵBD 1, 69 *al.* have εκ after μετασταθω.

[4] εαυτων in ℵBPRX. αυτων in DL.

πρὸς τ. μαθητὰς, and points not to change of audience (disciples now, Pharisees before) but to continued parabolic discourse.—**μαθητάς**, disciples, quite general; might mean the Twelve, or the larger crowd of followers (xiv. 25), or the publicans and sinners who came to Him (xv. 1, so Schleiermacher, etc.).—**διεβλήθη**, was accused, here only in N.T., often in classics and Sept.; construed with dative here; also with **εἰς** or **πρὸς**, with accusative. The verb implies always a hostile *animus*, often the accompaniment of *false* accusation, but not necessarily. Here the charge is assumed to be true.—**ὡς διασκορπίζων**, as squandering, that the charge; how, by fraud or by extravagant living, not indicated; the one apt to lead to the other.—Ver. 2. **τί τοῦτο**, etc. **τί** may be exclamatory = what! do I hear this of thee? or interrogatory: what is this that I hear of thee? the laconic phrase containing a combination of an interrogative with a relative clause.—**τὸν λόγον**: the reference may be either to a final account previous to dismissal, already resolved on (so usually taken), or to an investigation into the truth or falsehood of the accusation = produce your books that I may judge for myself (so Hahn). The latter would be the reasonable course, but not necessarily the one taken by an eastern magnate, who might rush from absolute confidence to utter distrust without taking the trouble to inquire further. As the story runs, this seems to be what happened.—Ver. 3. **εἶπε ἐν ἑ.**: a Hebraism, as in Mt. iii. 9, ix. 3. The steward deliberates on the situation. He sees that his master has decided against him, and considers what he is to do next, running rapidly over all possible schemes.—**σκάπτειν, ἐπαιτεῖν**: these two represent the alternatives for the dismissed: manual labour and begging; digging naturally chosen to represent the former as typical of agricultural labour, with which the steward's position brought him much into contact (Lightfoot). But why these two only mentioned? Why not try to get another situation of the same kind? Because he feels that dismissal in the circumstances means degradation. Who now would trust him? **ἐπαιτεῖν** = **προσαιτεῖν** (Mk. x. 46, John ix. 8).—Ver. 4. **ἔγνων**: too weak to dig, too proud to beg, he hits upon a feasible scheme at last: I have it, I know now what to do.—**ἔγνων** is the dramatic or tragic aorist used in classics, chiefly in poetry and in dialogue. It gives greater vividness than the use of the present would.—**δέξωνται**: his plan contemplates as its result reception of the degraded steward into their houses by people not named; probably the very people who accused him. We are not to suppose that permanent residence in other people's houses is in view. Something better may offer. The scheme provides for the near future, helps to turn the next corner.—Ver. 5. **ἕνα ἕκαστον**: he sees them one by one, not all together. These debtors might be farmers, who paid their rents in kind, or persons who had got supplies of goods from the master's stores; which of the two of no consequence to the point of the parable.—**τῷ πρώτῳ**, the first, in the

κυρίῳ μου; 6. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ἑκατὸν βάτους ἐλαίου. Καὶ[1] εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Δέξαι σου τὸ γράμμα,[2] καὶ καθίσας ταχέως γράψον πεντήκοντα. 7. Ἔπειτα ἑτέρῳ εἶπε, Σὺ δὲ πόσον ὀφείλεις; Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ἑκατὸν κόρους σίτου. Καὶ[3] λέγει αὐτῷ, Δέξαι σου τὸ γράμμα,[4] καὶ γράψον ὀγδοήκοντα. 8. Καὶ ἐπῄνεσεν ὁ κύριος τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας, ὅτι [b] φρονίμως ἐποίησεν· ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι

[b] here only in N.T.

[1] For και ℵABLR *al.* have ο δε.

[2] τα γραμματα in ℵBDLR 1 (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] Omit και BLR 13, 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] Again τα γραμματα in ℵBDLR.

parable = to one. Two cases mentioned, a first and a second (ἑτέρῳ), two, out of many; enough to exemplify the method. It is assumed that all would take advantage of the unprincipled concession; those who had accused him and those who had possibly been already favoured in a similar manner, bribed to speak well of him.—Ver. 6. τὰ γράμματα: literally, the letters, then a written document; here a bill showing the amount of indebtedness. The steward would have all the bills ready.—γράψον, write, *i.e.*, write out a new bill with fifty in place of a hundred; not merely change a hundred into fifty in the old bill.—ταχέως, no time left for reflection—"is this right?" Some think that the knavery had come in before, and that fifty was the true amount. That might be, but the steward would keep the fact to himself. The debtors were to take it that this was a *bonâ fide* reduction of their just debt.—Ver. 7. ὀγδοήκοντα, eighty, a small reduction as compared with the first. Was there not a risk of offence when the debtors began to compare notes? Not much; they would not look on it as mere arbitrariness or partiality, but as policy: variety would look more like a true account than uniformity. He had not merely to benefit them, but to put himself in as good a light as possible before his master.

Vv. 8-13. *Application of the parable.* There is room for doubt whether ver. 8 should form part of the parable (or at least as far as φρονίμως ἐποίησεν), or the beginning of the application. In the one case ὁ κύριος refers to the master of the steward, in the other to Jesus, who is often in narrative called Lord in Lk.'s Gospel. On the whole I now incline to the latter view (compare my *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*). It sins rather against natural probability to suppose the steward's master acquainted with his new misconduct. The steward in his final statement, of course, put as fair a face as possible on matters, presenting what looked like a true account, so as to make it appear he was being unjustly dismissed, or even to induce the master to cancel his purpose to dismiss. And those who had got the benefit of his sharp practice were not likely to tell upon him. The master therefore may be supposed to be in the dark; it is the speaker of the parable who is in the secret. *He* praises the steward of iniquity, not *for* his iniquity (so Schleiermacher), but for his prudence in spite of iniquity. His unrighteousness is not glozed over, on the contrary it is strongly asserted: hence the phrase τὸν ο. τῆς ἀδικίας, which is stronger than τ. ο. τὸν ἄδικον. Yet however bad he still acted wisely for himself in providing friends against the evil day. What follows—ὅτι οἱ υἱοί, etc.—applies the moral to the disciples = go ye and do likewise, with an implied hint that in this respect they are apt to come short. The counsel would be immoral if in the spiritual sphere it were impossible to imitate the steward's prudence while keeping clear of his iniquity. In other words, it must be possible to make friends against the evil day by unobjectionable actions. The mere fact that the lesson of prudence is drawn from the life of an unprincipled man is no difficulty to any one who understands the nature of parabolic instruction. The comparison between men of the world and the "sons of light" explains and apologises for the procedure. If you want to know what prudent attention to self-interest means it is to men of the world you must look. Of course they show their wisdom *suo more*, in relation to men of their own kind, and in reference to worldly matters

ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσι. 9. Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, Ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς[1] φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, ἵνα, ὅταν ἐκλίπητε,[2] δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς. 10. Ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστι, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος καὶ ἐν πολλῷ ἄδικός ἐστιν. 11. εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει; 12. καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον[3] τίς ὑμῖν δώσει[4]; 13. Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσει, καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει· ἢ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται, καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει. οὐ δύνασθε Θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ."

[1] εαυτοις before ποιησατε in ℵBLR.

[2] So in ℵ^{ca}FRUΓΔ, etc., latt. (vet. vulg.) several Fathers; ℵ*AB*DLRX syr. cur. sin. have εκλιπη (Tisch., W.H., and modern editors generally).

[3] So in ℵADΔ *al.* verss. Fathers. BL have ημετερον (W.H. text).

[4] δωσει υμιν in ℵDLR 33 a b c, etc. B as in T.R.

(this the sense of εἰς τ. γενεὰν, etc.). Show ye your wisdom in your way and in reference to your peculiar generation (εἰς τ. γενεὰν, etc., applicable to both parties) with equal zeal.

Ver. 9. ἐγὼ: the use of the emphatic pronoun seems to involve that here begins the comment of Jesus on the parable, ver. 8 being spoken by the master and a part of the parable. But J. Weiss (in Meyer) views this verse as a second application put into the mouth of Jesus, but not spoken by Him, having for its author the compiler from whom Lk. borrowed (Feine's *Vork. Lukas*). He finds in vv. 8-13 three distinct applications, one by Jesus, ver. 8; one by the compiler of precanonical Lk., ver. 9; and one by Lk. himself, vv. 10-13. This analysis is plausible, and tempting as superseding the difficult problem of finding a connection between these sentences, viewed as the utterance of one Speaker, the Author of the parable. Ver. 9 explicitly states what ver. 8 implies, that the prudence is to be shown in the way of making *friends*.—φίλους: the friends are not named, but the next parable throws light on that point. They are the *poor*, the Lazaruses whom Dives did *not* make friends of—to his loss. The counsel is to use wealth in doing kindness to the poor, and the implied doctrine that doing so will be to our eternal benefit. Both counsel and doctrine are held to apply even when wealth has been ill-gotten. Friends of value for the eternal world can be gained even by *the mammon of unrighteousness*. The more ill-gotten the more need to be redeemed by beneficent use; only care must be taken not to *continue* to get money by unrighteousness in order to have wherewith to do charitable deeds, a not uncommon form of counterfeit philanthropy, which will not count in the Kingdom of Heaven. The name for wealth here is very repulsive, seeming almost to imply that wealth *per se* is evil, though that Jesus did not teach.—ἐκλίπῃ, when it (wealth) fails, as it must at death. The other reading, ἐκλίπητε (T.R.), means "when ye die," so used in Gen. xxv. 8.—αἰωνίους σκηνάς, eternal tents, a poetic paradox = Paradise, the poor ye treated kindly there to welcome you! Believing it to be impossible that Jesus could give advice practically suggesting the doing of evil that good might come, Bornemann conjectures that an οὐ has fallen out before ποιήσετε (fut.), giving as the real counsel: do *not* make, etc.

Vv. 10-13. These verses contain not so much an application as a *corrective* of the parable. They may have been added by Lk. (so J. Weiss in Meyer, and Holtzmann, H. C.) to prevent misunderstanding, offence, or abuse, so serving the same purpose as the addition "unto repentance" to the saying, "I came not to call," etc. (v. 32); another instance of editorial solicitude on the part of an evangelist ever careful to guard the character and teaching of Jesus against misunderstanding. So viewed, their drift is: "the steward was dishonest in money matters; do not infer that it does not matter whether you

14. Ἤκουον δὲ ταῦτα πάντα καὶ[1] οἱ Φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες, καὶ ἐξεμυκτήριζον αὐτόν. 15. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς γινώσκει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν· ὅτι τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλὸν βδέλυγμα ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν[2]· 16. Ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἕως[3] Ἰωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται, καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται. 17. Εὐκοπώτερον δέ ἐστι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν, ἢ τοῦ νόμου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν. 18. Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει· καὶ πᾶς[4]

[1] Omit και ℵBDLR 157.
[2] Omit εστιν ℵABDL *al.*
[3] For εως (in D *al.*) ℵBLRX 1, 13, 69 *al.* have μεχρι (Tisch., W.H.).
[4] Omit πας here BDL 67, 69 *al.* verss.

be honest or not in that sphere. It is very necessary to be faithful even there. For faithful in little faithful in much, unfaithful in little unfaithful in much. He who is untrustworthy in connection with worldly goods is unworthy of being entrusted with the true riches; the unjust administrator of another's property will not deserve confidence as an administrator even of his own. In the parable the steward tried to serve two masters, his lord and his lord's creditors, and by so doing promoted his own interest. But the thing cannot be done, as even his case shows." This corrective, if not spoken by Jesus, is not contrary to His teaching. (Ver. 10 echoes Mt. xxv. 21, Lk. xix. 17; ver. 13 reproduces verbally the *logion* in Mt. vi. 24.) Yet as it stands here it waters down the parable, and weakens the point of its teaching. Note the epithets applied to money: the *little* or least, the *unjust*, and, by implication, the *fleeting*, *that which belongs to another* (τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ). Spiritual riches are the "much," the "true" τὸ ἀληθινὸν, in the Johannine sense = the ideal as opposed to the vulgar shadowy reality, "our own" (ἡμέτερον).

Vv. 14-18 form a "somewhat heavily built bridge" (H. C.) between the two parables, which set forth the right and the wrong use of riches.—Ver. 14. **φιλάργυροι**· an interesting and very credible bit of information concerning the Pharisees (2 Tim. iii. 2).—**ἐξεμυκτήριζον** (ἐκ and μύκτηρ, the nose), turned up the nose at, in contempt, again in xxiii. 35.—Ver. 15. **ἐνώπιον τ. ἀ.**: *cf.* the statements in Sermon on Mount (Mt. vi.) and in Mt. xxiii. 5.—**ὅτι**, etc.: a strong statement, but broadly true; conventional moral judgments are very often the reverse of the real truth: the conventionally high, estimable, really the low; the conventionally base the truly noble.—Ver. 16 = Mt. xi. 12 and 13, inverted, introduced here in view of ver. 31.—Ver. 17 = Mt. v. 18, substantially. Ver. 18 = Mt. v. 32. Its bearing here is very obscure, and its introduction in a connection to which it does not seem to belong is chiefly interesting as vouching for the genuineness of the *logion*. J. Weiss suggests that its relevancy and point would have been more apparent had it come in after ver. 13. On the critical question raised by this verse, *vide* J. Weiss in Meyer.

Vv. 19-31. *Parable of the rich man and Lazarus.* This story is hardly a parable in the sense of illustrating by an incident from natural life a truth in the spiritual sphere. Both story and moral belong to the same sphere. What is the moral? If Jesus spoke, or the evangelist reported, this story as the complement of the parable of the unfaithful steward, then for Speaker or reporter the moral is: see what comes of neglecting to make friends of the poor by a beneficent use of wealth. Looking to the end of this second "parable," ver. 31, and connecting that with ver. 17, we get as the lesson: the law and the prophets a sufficient guide to a godly life. Taking the first part of the story as the main thing (vv. 19-26), and connecting it with the reflection in ver. 15 about that which is lofty among men, the resulting aim will be to exemplify by an impressive imaginary example the reversal of positions in this and the next world: the happy here the damned there, and *vice versâ*. In that case the parable simply pictorially sets forth the *fact* of reversal, not its ground. If with

ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει. 19. Ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος, καὶ ἐνεδιδύσκετο πορφύραν καὶ [c] βύσσον, εὐφραινόμενος καθ᾽ ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς. 20. πτωχὸς δέ τις ἦν[1] ὀνόματι Λάζαρος, ὃς[2] ἐβέβλητο πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ [d] ἡλκωμένος[3] 21. καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων[4] τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου· ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἀπέλειχον[5] τὰ ἕλκη αὐτοῦ. 22. ἐγένετο δὲ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πτωχόν, καὶ ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ[6] Ἀβραάμ· ἀπέθανε δὲ καὶ ὁ

c here and in Rev. xviii. 12 (T.R.).
d here only in N.T.

[1] τις without ην in ℵBDLX 33, 157, etc.
[2] Omit ος ℵBDLX 33, 157.
[3] ειλκ. in ℵABDL and many more.
[4] Omit των ψιχιων ℵBL verss. (Tisch., W.H.).
[5] επελειχον in ℵABLX 33.
[6] Omit του all uncials.

some (Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, Feine, J. Weiss) we cut the story into two, an original part spoken by Jesus and an addition by a later hand, it will have two morals, the one just indicated, and another connecting eternal perdition with the neglect of the law and prophets by a worldly unbelieving Judaism, and eternal salvation with the pious observance of the law by the poor members of the Jewish-Christian Church. On this view *vide* J. Weiss in Meyer.

Ver. 19. **ἄνθρωπος δέ**, etc.: either there was a certain rich man, or a certain man was rich, or there was a certain man—*rich*, this the first fact about him.—**καὶ** introduces the second, instead of **ὃς**, after the Hebrew manner.—**πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον**: his clothing of the costliest: "purple without, Egyptian byssus underneath" (Farrar in C. G. T.).—**λαμπρῶς** (from **λάμπω**), splendidly, characterising his style of living; life a daily feast; here only in N.T.—Ver. 20. **Λάζαρος** gives the impression of a story from real life, but the name for the poor man is introduced for convenience in telling the tale. He has to be referred to in the sequel (ver. 24). No symbolic meaning should be attached to the name.—**πρὸς τὸν πυλῶνα αὐτοῦ**: Lazarus is brought into relation with the rich man. This favours the view that the moral is the folly of neglecting beneficence. If the story were meant to illustrate merely the reversals of lot, why not describe Lazarus' situation in this world without reference to the rich man? Is he placed at his door simply that he may know him in the next world?—**εἱλκωμένος**: covered with ulcers, therefore needing to be carried to the rich man's gate; supposed to be a leper, hence the words lazaretto, lazar, etc.—Ver. 21. **ἐπιθυμῶν**, desiring, perhaps not intended to suggest that his desire was not gratified. Suppose morsels did come to him from the rich man's table, not meant for him specially, but for the hungry without, *including the wild street dogs*, would that exhaust the duty of Dives to his poor brother? But the trait is introduced to depict the poor man's extreme misery rather than the rich man's sin.—**ἀλλὰ καὶ**: no ellipse implied such as that supplied by the Vulgate: *et nemo illi dabat*. Bornemann supplies: "not only was he filled with the crumbs," etc., but also, etc. (**οὐ μόνον ἐχορτάσθη ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων—πλουσίου, ἀλλὰ**, etc.).—**ἀλλὰ** simply introduces a new feature, and heightens the picture of misery (so Schanz) = he was dependent on casual scraps for his food, and moreover, etc.—**ἐπέλειχον**, licked (here only in N.T.); was this an aggravation or a mitigation? Opinion is much divided. Or is the point that *dogs* were his companions, now licking his sores (whether a benefit or otherwise), now scrambling with him for the morsels thrown out? The scramble was as much a fact as the licking. Furrer speaks of witnessing dogs and lepers waiting together for the refuse (*Wanderungen*, p. 40).—Ver. 22. The end comes to the two men.—**ἀπενεχθῆναι**: the poor man dies, and is carried by angels into the bosom of Abraham; the *man*, body and soul (so Meyer), but of course this is *poetry*. What really happened to the carcase is passed over in delicate reserve.—**ἐτάφη**: of course Dives was buried with all due pomp, his funeral worth mentioning. ("It is not said that the poor man was buried because of the meanness of poor men's burial, but it is

πλούσιος, καὶ ἐτάφη. 23. καὶ ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὑπάρχων ἐν βασάνοις, ὁρᾷ τὸν[1] Ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, καὶ Λάζαρον ἐν τοῖς κόλποις αὐτοῦ· 24. καὶ αὐτὸς φωνήσας εἶπε, Πάτερ Ἀβραάμ, ἐλέησόν με, καὶ πέμψον Λάζαρον, ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ καταψύξῃ τὴν γλῶσσάν μου· ὅτι ὀδυνῶμαι ἐν τῇ φλογὶ ταύτῃ. 25. Εἶπε δὲ Ἀβραάμ, Τέκνον, μνήσθητι ὅτι ἀπέλαβες σὺ[2] τὰ ἀγαθά σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου, καὶ Λάζαρος ὁμοίως τὰ κακά· νῦν δὲ ὅδε[3] παρακαλεῖται, σὺ δὲ ὀδυνᾶσαι. 26. καὶ ἐπὶ[4] πᾶσι τούτοις, μεταξὺ ἡμῶν καὶ ὑμῶν χάσμα μέγα ἐστήρικται, ὅπως οἱ θέλοντες διαβῆναι ἐντεῦθεν[5] πρὸς ὑμᾶς, μὴ δύνωνται, μηδὲ οἱ[6]

[1] Omit τον ℵBDLX.

[2] Omit συ ℵBDL, etc., verss.

[3] οδε only in minusc. ωδε is the approved reading.

[4] εν πασι τ. in ℵBL b c d f and vulg. cop. (Tisch., R.V., W.H.).

[5] ενθεν in ℵABLX *al.* D omits.

[6] Omit οι before εκειθεν ℵBD (W.H.).

said expressly of the rich man, διὰ τὸ πολυτελὲς τῆς τῶν πλουσίων ταφῆς." Euthy. Zig.)

Vv. 23-26. *In the other world.*—ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ: from the O.T. point of view Hades means simply the state of the dead. Thus both the dead men would be in Hades. But here Hades seems = hell, the place of torment, and of course Lazarus is not there, but in Paradise.—ἀπὸ μακρόθεν: Paradise dimly visible, yet within speaking distance; this is not dogmatic teaching but popular description; so throughout.—ἐν τοῖς κόλποις: plural here (*cf.* ver. 22); so often in classics.—Ver. 24. Πάτερ Ἀ.: the rich man, like Lazarus, is a Jew, and probably, as a son of Abraham, very much surprised that he should find himself in such a place (Mt. iii. 8, 9), and still hoping that the patriarch can do something for him.—καταψύξῃ (καταψύχω, here only in N.T.): surely that small service will not be refused! If the flames cannot be put out, may the pain they cause not be mitigated by a cooling drop of water on the tip of the tongue? —a pathetic request.—Ver. 25. τέκνον: answering to Πάτερ, introducing in a kindly paternal tone a speech holding out no hope, all the less that it is so softly and quietly spoken.—τὰ ἀγαθά σου, τὰ κακά: you got *your* good things —what you desired, and thought you had a right to—Lazarus got *the* ills, not what he desired or deserved, but the ills to be met with on earth, of which he had a very full share (no αὐτοῦ after κακά).—νῦν δὲ, but now, the now of time and of logic: the reversal of lot in the state after death a hard fact, and equitable. The ultimate ground of the reversal, character, is not referred to; it is a mere question of fairness or poetic justice.—Ver. 26. The additional reason in this verse is supplementary to the first, as if to buttress its weakness. For the tormented man might reply: surely it is pressing the principle of equity too far to refuse me the petty comfort I ask. Will cooling my tongue increase beyond what is equitable the sum of my good things? Abraham's reply to this anticipated objection is in effect: we might not grudge you this small solace if it were in our power to bring it to you, but unfortunately that is impossible.—ἐν (ἐπί, T.R.) πᾶσι τούτοις, in all those *regions:* the cleft runs from end to end, too wide to be crossed; you cannot outflank it and go round from Paradise to the place of torment. With ἐπί the phrase means, "in addition to what I have said".—χάσμα μέγα, a cleft or ravine (here only in N.T.), vast in depth, breadth, and length; an effectual barrier to intercommunication. The Rabbis conceived of the two divisions of Hades as separated only by a wall, a palm breadth or a finger breadth (*vide* Weber, *Lehre des Talmud*, p. 326 f.).—ὅπως implies that the cleft is there for the purpose of preventing transit either way; location fixed and final.

ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαπερῶσιν. 27. Εἶπε δέ, Ἐρωτῶ οὖν σε,[1] πάτερ, ἵνα πέμψῃς αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου, 28. ἔχω γὰρ πέντε ἀδελφούς· ὅπως διαμαρτύρηται αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλθωσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς βασάνου· 29. λέγει αὐτῷ[2] Ἀβραάμ, Ἔχουσι Μωσέα καὶ τοὺς προφήτας· ἀκουσάτωσαν αὐτῶν. 30. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Οὐχί, πάτερ Ἀβραάμ· ἀλλ' ἐάν τις ἀπὸ νεκρῶν πορευθῇ πρὸς αὐτούς, μετανοήσουσιν. 31. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ, Εἰ Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, οὐδέ, ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ, πεισθήσονται."

[1] For ουν σε (ℵLX, etc., Tisch.) ABD 69 *al.* have σε ουν (W.H.).

[2] Many authorities (ℵBDL, etc.) add δε after λεγει, and ℵBL omit αυτω. D has ειπεν.

Vv. 27-31. *Dives intercedes for his brethren.*—Ver. 27. οὖν = if no hope for *me*, there may be for those still dear to me. Possibility of transit from Paradise to *earth* is assumed. That this is desired reveals humane feeling. No attempt to show that Dives is utterly bad. Is such a man a proper subject for final damnation?—Ver. 28. ἀδελφούς, brothers, in the literal sense. Why force on it an allegorical sense by finding in it a reference to the Pharisees or to the Jewish people, brethren in the sense of fellow-countrymen? *Five* is a random number, true to natural probability; a large enough family to make interest in their eternal well-being on the part of a deceased member very intelligible.—διαμαρτύρηται, urgently testify to, telling them how it looks beyond, how it fares with their brother, with the solemn impressiveness of one who has seen.—Ver. 29. Μωσέα, etc.: *cf.* xviii. 20, where Jesus refers the ruler to the commandments. Moses, or the law, and the prophets = the O.T., the appointed, regular means of grace.—Ver. 30. οὐχί, a decided negative = nay! that is not enough; so he knew from his own experience; the Scriptures very good doubtless, but men are *accustomed* to them.—τις ἀπὸ νεκρῶν: something *unusual*, the preaching of a dead man returned to life, that might do.—Ver. 31. εἶπε δὲ: Abraham does not plead impossibility as in reference to the first request; he simply declares his unbelief in the utility of the plan for converting the five. The denizens of Paradise set little value on the unusual as a means of grace. Abraham does not say that a short-lived sensation could not be produced; he does say that they would not be persuaded (πεισθήσονται), *i.e.*, to repent (Hahn). By taking πεισθήσονται as meaning something less than μετανοήσουσιν, and emphasising the difference between ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ and ἀπὸ νεκρῶν πορευθῇ (ver. 30), Trench (*Notes on the Parables*) makes this point: "A far mightier miracle than you demand would be ineffectual for producing a far slighter effect". It is doubtful if the contrast be legitimate in either case; certainly not as between "repent" and "be persuaded". In the other case there may be the difference between an apparition and a resurrected man. It may be noted that the resurrection of Christ and of Christians is spoken of as ἐκ νεκρῶν (*vide* Lk. xx. 35), while the general resurrection is ἡ ἀνάσ. τῶν νεκρῶν (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. xv. 42).

CHAPTER XVII. A COLLECTION OF SAYINGS, INCLUDING THE PARABLE OF EXTRA SERVICE. This chapter gives the impression of being a group of fragments with little connection in place, time, or topic, and nothing is gained for exegesis by ingenious attempts at logical or topical concatenation. If we view the group of parables in chaps. xv., xvi. as a mass which has grown around the parable of the *Lost Sheep* as its nucleus, and reflect that that parable with the sayings in xvii. 1-4 is found in Mt. xviii., we may with some measure of confidence draw the inference that the discourse on humility at Capernaum was the original *locus* of at least these elements of Luke's narrative. That they are mixed up with so much matter foreign to Mt.'s record speaks to extensive transformation of the tradition of our Lord's words by the time it reached Lk.'s hands (*vide* Weizsäcker, *Untersuchungen*, p. 177).

XVII. 1. ΕΙΠΕ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς,[1] "Ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα[2]· οὐαὶ δὲ[3] δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. 2. λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ, εἰ μύλος ὀνικὸς[4] περίκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔρριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων.[5] 3. προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς. ἐὰν δὲ ἁμάρτῃ εἰς σὲ[6] ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ· 4. καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ, ἄφες αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐὰν ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἁμάρτῃ[7] εἰς σέ, καὶ ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας[8] ἐπιστρέψῃ ἐπὶ σέ,[9] λέγων, Μετανοῶ, ἀφήσεις αὐτῷ."

5. Καὶ εἶπον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῷ Κυρίῳ, "Πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν."

[1] ℵABDL *al.* verss. add **αυτου**.

[2] For **μη ελ. τα σκ.** (conformed to Mt.) ℵBLX c have **τα σκ. μη ελθ.** **του** is omitted in minusc.

[3] Omit **δε** ℵBDL *al.*

[4] For **μυλ. ονικος**, the true reading in Mt. and Mk., read **λιθος μυλικος** with ℵBDL *al.* verss. (Tisch., W.H.). *Vide* below.

[5] **των μικρ. τουτων ενα** in ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] **εαν αμαρτη** without **δε** and **εις σε** in ℵ BL(Tisch., W.H.). DX 33 omit **δε**, and A 1, 42, 131, etc., omit **εις σε**.

[7] **αμαρτηση** in ABDLXΔ *al.* (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = ℵ *al.*

[8] Omit **της ημερας** in ℵBDLX verss.

[9] **προς σε** in ℵABLX *al.* **επι σε** chiefly in minusc.

Vv. 1-4. *Concerning offences and forgiving of offences* (*cf.* Mt. xviii. 6, 7; 21, 22).—**ἀνένδεκτον**: here only in N.T. and hardly found in classics; with **ἐστι** = **οὐκ ἐνδέχεται** (xiii. 33), it is not possible.—**τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν**: the infinitive with the genitive article may depend on **ἀνένδεκτον** viewed as a substantive = an impossibility of offences not coming exists (Meyer, J. Weiss), or it may be the subject to **ἐστι, ἀνεν.** being the predicate = that offences should not come is impossible (Schanz; Burton, M. and T., inclines to the same view, *vide* § 405).—Ver. 2. **λυσιτελεῖ** (**λύω, τέλος**), it profits or pays; here only in N.T. = **συμφέρει** in Mt. xviii. 6.—**λίθος μυλικός**, a millstone, not a great millstone, one driven by an ass (**μύλος ὀνικός**, T.R.), as in Mt.: the vehement emphasis of Christ's words is toned down in Lk. here as often elsewhere. The realistic expression of Mt. is doubtless truer to the actual utterance of Jesus, who would speak of the offences created by ambition with passionate abhorrence.—**περίκειται** = perf. pass. of **περιτίθημι** in sense = has been placed; with **ἔρριπται**, another perfect, suggesting the idea of an action already complete—the miscreant with a stone round his neck thrown into the sea.—**εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν**: here again a subdued expression compared with Mt.—**ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ**, than to scandalise; the subj. with **ἵνα** = the infinitive. *Vide* Winer, § 44, 8.—Ver. 3. **προσέχετε ἑ.**, take heed to yourselves (lest ye offend), a reminiscence of the original occasion of the discourse: ambition revealing itself in the disciple-circle. —Ver. 4. **ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας**, seven times a day. The number recalls Peter's question (Mt. xviii. 21), and the phrase seven times *a day* states the duty of forgiving as broadly as Mt.'s seventy times seven, but not in so animated a style: more in the form of a didactic rule than of a vehement emotional utterance; obviously secondary as compared with Mt.

Vv. 5-6. *The power of faith* (*cf.* Mt. xvii. 20).—**οἱ ἀπόστολοι** instead of **μαθηταί**. Ver. 1. **τῷ κυρίῳ**: these titles for Jesus and the Twelve betray a narrative having no connection with what goes before and secondary in its character.—**πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν**, add faith to us. This sounds more like a stereotyped petition in church prayers than a request actually made by the Twelve. How much more life-like the occasion for the utterance supplied by Mt.; "Why could not we cast him out?"—Ver. 6. **εἰ ἔχετε**,

6. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος, "Εἰ εἴχετε[1] πίστιν, ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐλέγετε ἂν τῇ συκαμίνῳ ταύτῃ, Ἐκριζώθητι, καὶ φυτεύθητι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· καὶ ὑπήκουσεν ἂν ὑμῖν. 7. Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλον ἔχων [a] ἀροτριῶντα ἢ ποιμαίνοντα, ὃς εἰσελθόντι ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ ἐρεῖ,[2] Εὐθέως παρελθὼν ἀνάπεσαι[3]· 8. ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ Ἑτοίμασον τί [b] δειπνήσω, καὶ περιζωσάμενος διακόνει μοι, ἕως φάγω καὶ πίω· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα φάγεσαι καὶ πίεσαι σύ; 9. Μὴ χάριν ἔχει[4] τῷ δούλῳ ἐκείνῳ,[5] ὅτι ἐποίησε τὰ διαταχθέντα αὐτῷ,[5] οὐ δοκῶ.[6] 10. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ποιήσητε πάντα τὰ διαταχθέντα ὑμῖν, λέγετε, Ὅτι δοῦλοι ἀχρεῖοί ἐσμεν· ὅτι[7] ὃ ὠφείλομεν ποιῆσαι πεποιήκαμεν."

11. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν[8] εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ

a 1 Cor. ix. 10.
b Ch. xxii. 20. 1 Cor. xi. 25. Rev. iii. 20.

[1] εχετε in ℵABLXΔ *al. pl.* (Tisch., W.H.). ειχετε in D *al.*

[2] ℵBDLX *al.* verss. add αυτω.

[3] αναπεσε in ℵBD *al.* T.R. = L *al.*

[4] εχει χαριν in ℵBDL 124.

[5] Omit εκεινω ℵABDLX, and ℵABLΔ *al.* omit αυτω after διαταχθεντα.

[6] ℵBLX 1, 28, 118, 131 *al.* verss. omit ου δοκω (Tisch., Trg., text, R.V., W.H.).

[7] Omit οτι here ℵABDL *al.* verss.

[8] Omit αυτον ℵBL.

εἰ with pres. in protasis, the imperf. in apodosis with ἄν. Possession of faith already sufficient to work miracles is here admitted. In Mt. the emphasis lies on the want of such faith. Another instance of Lk.'s desire to spare the Twelve.—συκαμίνῳ, here only in N.T. = συκομορέα, xix. 4, the fig mulberry tree (*vide* there). A *tree* here, a mountain in Mt.; and the miraculous feat is not rooting it out of the earth but replanting it in the *sea* —a natural impossibility. Pricaeus cites a classic parallel: τὸ πέλαγος πρότερον οἴσει ἄμπελον.

Vv. 7-10. *The parable of extra service*, in Luke only. For this name and the view of the parable implied in it see my *Parabolic Teaching of Christ*. It is there placed among the theoretic parables as teaching a truth about the Kingdom of God, *viz.*, that it makes exacting demands on its servants which can only be met by a heroic temper. "Christ's purpose is not to teach in what spirit God deals with His servants, but to teach rather in what spirit we should serve God."—Ver. 7. εὐθέως: to be connected not with ἐρεῖ but with παρελθὼν ἀ. = he does not say: Go at once and get your supper.—Ver. 8. ἀλλ' οὐχὶ: ἀλλὰ implies the negation of the previous supposition.—ἕως φάγω, etc., "till I have eaten," etc., A.V.; or, *while* I eat and drink.—Ver. 9. μὴ ἔχει χάριν, he does not thank him, does he? the service taken as a matter of course, all in the day's work.—Ver. 10. οὕτως, so, in the Kingdom of God: extremes meet. The service of the Kingdom is as unlike that of a slave to his owner as possible in *spirit;* but it is like in the heavy demands it makes, which *we* have to take as a matter of course.—διαταχθέντα, commanded. In point of fact it is not commands but demands we have to deal with, arising out of special emergencies. — δοῦλοι ἀχρεῖοι: the words express the truth in terms of the parabolic representation which treats of a slave and his owner. But the idea is: the hardest demands of the Kingdom are to be met in a spirit of patience and humility, a thing possible only for men who are as remote as possible from a slavish spirit: heroic, generous, working in the spirit of free self-devotion. Such men are *not* unprofitable servants in God's sight; rather He accounts them "good and faithful," Mt. xxv. 21. Syr. Sin. reads simply "we are servants".

Vv. 11-19. *The ten lepers*.—Ver. 11. εἰς Ἱερ.: the note of time seems to take us back to ix. 51. No possibility of introducing historic sequence into the section of Lk. lying between ix. 51 and xviii. 15.—αὐτὸς, He without emphasis; not He, as opposed to other pilgrims taking another route, directly through Samaria (so Meyer and Godet).—διὰ μέσον = διὰ μέσου (T.R.), μέσον being used adverbially as in *Philip. ii.* 15 = through *between* the two provinces

αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσου[1] Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας. 12. καὶ εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ εἴς τινα κώμην, ἀπήντησαν[2] αὐτῷ[3] δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες, οἳ ἔστησαν[4] πόρρωθεν· 13. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦραν φωνήν, λέγοντες, "Ἰησοῦ, ἐπιστάτα, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς." 14. Καὶ ἰδὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεῦσι." Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτούς, ἐκαθαρίσθησαν. 15. εἷς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἰδὼν ὅτι ἰάθη, ὑπέστρεψε, μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης δοξάζων τὸν Θεόν· 16. καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, εὐχαριστῶν αὐτῷ· καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Σαμαρείτης· 17. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Οὐχὶ[5] οἱ δέκα ἐκαθαρίσθησαν; οἱ δὲ[6] ἐννέα ποῦ; 18. οὐχ εὑρέθησαν ὑποστρέψαντες δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος;" 19. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἀναστὰς πορεύου· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε."

[1] **δια μεσον** in ℵBL (D **μεσον** alone) 1, 13, 69 *al.* **ανα μεσον**.

[2] So in ABX *al.* (W.H. text). **υπηντ.** in ℵL 1, 13, 69, 131 *al.* (Tisch., W.H., marg.).

[3] BL omit **αυτω** (W.H.).

[4] BF 157 have **ανεστησαν** (W.H. text).

[5] **ουχ** in BLS 131.

[6] Omit **δε** AD (Tisch., W.H., brackets), found in ℵBLX, etc.

named, on the confines of both, which explains the mixture of Jews and Samaritans in the crowd of lepers.—Ver. 12. **δέκα λεπροὶ**: *ten*, a large number, the disease common. Rosenmüller (*das A. and N. Morgenland*) cites from Dampier a similar experience; lepers begging alms from voyagers on the river Camboga, when they approached their village, crying to them from afar. They could not heal them, but they gave them a little rice.—Ver. 13. **ἐπιστάτα**: this word is peculiar to Lk., which suggests editorial revision of the story.—**ἐλέησον**: a very indefinite request compared with that of the leper in v. 12 f., whose remarkable words are given in identical terms by all the synoptists. The interest wanes here.—Ver. 14. **ἐπιδείξατε ἑ.**: the same direction as in the first leper narrative, but without reason annexed.—**ἱερεῦσι**: plural, either to the priests of their respective nationalities (Kuinoel, J. Weiss, etc.) or to the priests of the respective districts to which they belonged (Hahn).—**ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν**, etc., on the way to the priests they were healed. Did they show themselves to the priests? That does not appear. The story is defective at this point ("negligently told," Schleier.), either because the narrator did not know or because he took no interest in that aspect of the case. The priests might not be far off.—Ver. 15. **δοξάζων τ. Θ.**: general statement, exact words not known, so also in report of thanksgiving to Jesus.—Ver. 16. **Σαμαρείτης**: this, with the comment of Jesus, *the* point of interest for Lk.—Ver. 17. **οὐχ** (**οὐχὶ**, T.R.): asking a question and implying an affirmative answer. Yet the fact of asking the question implies a certain measure of doubt. No direct information as to what happened had reached Jesus presumably, and He naturally desires explanation of the non-appearance of all but one. Were not all the ten (**οἱ δέκα**, now a familiar number) healed, that you come back alone?—**ποῦ**: emphatic position: the nine—*where?* expressing the suspicion that not lack of healing but lack of gratitude was the matter with the nine.—Ver. 18. **οὐχ εὑρέθησαν**, etc., best taken as another question (so R.V.).—**ἀλλογενὴς**, here only in N.T. and in Sept. = **ἀλλόφυλος** and **ἀλλοεθνής** in classics, an alien. Once more the Jew suffers by comparison with those without in respect of genuine religious feeling—faith, gratitude. It is not indeed said that all the rest were Jews. What is certain is that the one man who came back was *not* a Jew.—Ver. 19. **ἀναστὰς πορεύου**: that might be all that Jesus said (so in B), as it was the man's gratitude, natural feeling of thankfulness, not his faith, that was in evidence. But Lk., feeling that

20. Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων, πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, καὶ εἶπεν, "Οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ ᶜπαρατηρήσεως· 21. οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν, Ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἤ, ἰδοὺ[1] ἐκεῖ. ἰδοὺ γάρ, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν." 22. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, "Ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε μίαν

c here only in N.T.

[1] The second ἰδου in D and many other texts is omitted in ℵBL 157.

it was an abrupt conclusion, might add ἡ πίστις σ. σ. σ. to round off the sentence, which may therefore be the true reading.

Vv. 20-37. *Concerning the coming of the Kingdom and the advent of the Son of Man.* In this section the words of Jesus are distributed between Pharisees and disciples, possibly according to the evangelist's impression as to the audience they suited. Weiffenbach (*Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu*, p. 217) suggests that the words in vv. 20, 21 were originally addressed to disciples who did not yet fully understand the inward spiritual character of the Kingdom of God. I am inclined to attach some weight to this suggestion. I am sure at any rate that it is not helpful to a true understanding of Christ's sayings to lay much stress on Lk.'s historical introductions to them.

Vv. 20, 21. **μετὰ παρατηρήσεως**: there is considerable diversity of opinion in the interpretation of this important expression. The prevailing view is that Jesus meant thereby to deny a coming that could be observed with the eye ("not with observation"). The older interpretation "not with pomp" (**μετὰ περιφανείας ἀνθρωπίνης** is the gloss of Euthy. Zig.) is closely related to this view, because such pomp alone would make the kingdom visible to the vulgar eye. J. Weiss (Meyer) contends that it is not visibility but *predictability* that is negated. **Παρατήρησις**, he remarks, "is used of the observation of the heavenly bodies, from whose movements one can calculate when an expected phenomenon will appear. In a similar way the apocalyptists sought to determine by signs the moment when the kingdom should be set up. That was what the Pharisees expected of Jesus with their **πότε ἔρχεται**. And it is just this that Jesus declines. The Kingdom of God comes not so that one can fix its appearing by observation beforehand." The assumption is that when it does come the kingdom *will* be visible. It does not seem possible by mere verbal interpretation to decide between the two views. Each interpreter will be influenced by his idea of the general drift of Christ's teaching concerning the nature of the kingdom. My own sympathies are with those who find in Christ's words a denial of vulgar or physical visibility.—Ver. 21. **οὐδὲ ἐροῦσι**, nor will they say; there will be nothing to give occasion for saying: *non erit quod dicatur*, Grotius.—**ὧδε, ἐκεῖ**, here, there, implying a visible object that can be located.—**ἐντὸς ὑμῶν**, within you, in your spirit. This rendering best corresponds with the non-visibility of the kingdom. The thought would be a very appropriate one in discourse to *disciples*. Not so in discourse to Pharisees. To them it would be most natural to say "*among* you" = look around and see my works: devils cast out (Lk. xi. 20), and learn that the kingdom is already here (**ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς**). Kindred to this rendering is that of Tertullian (*c. Marcionem*, L. iv., 35): in your power, accessible to you: *in manu, in potestate vestra.* The idea "among you" would be more clearly expressed by **ἤδη ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν**. *Cf.* John i. 26. **μέσος ὑ. στήκει**, etc., one stands among you whom ye know not—cited by Euthy. to illustrate the meaning of our passage. Field (*Ot. Nor.*) contends that there is no clear instance of **ἐντὸς** in the sense of "among," and cites as an example of its use in the sense of "within" Ps. ciii. 1, **πάντα τὰ ἐντός μου**.

Vv. 22-25. *The coming of the Son of Man* (Mt. xxiv. 26-28).—**πρὸς τ. μαθητάς**: so in Mt., but at a later time and at Jerusalem; which connection is the more original cannot be decided.—**ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι**, there will come days (of tribulation), ominous hint like that in v. 35.—**μίαν τ. ἡ.**, etc., one of the days of the Son of Man; not past days in the time of discipleship, but days to come. Tribulation will make them long for the *advent*, which will put an end to their sorrows. *One* of the days; why not the first, the beginning of the Messianic period? Hahn actually takes **μίαν** as = first, Hebraistic fashion, as in

τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἰδεῖν, καὶ οὐκ ὄψεσθε. 23. καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν, Ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἤ, ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ[1]· μὴ ἀπέλθητε, μηδὲ[2] διώξητε. 24. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἡ[3] ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν[4] εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ[5] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ.[6] 25. πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ παθεῖν, καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. 26. καὶ καθὼς ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ[7] Νῶε, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 27. ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἐγάμουν, ἐξεγαμίζοντο,[8] ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθε Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν, καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμός, καὶ ἀπώλεσεν ἅπαντας. 28. ὁμοίως καὶ ὡς[9] ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Λώτ· ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἠγόραζον, ἐπώλουν, ἐφύτευον, ᾠκοδόμουν· 29. ᾗ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ἐξῆλθε Λὼτ ἀπὸ Σοδόμων, ἔβρεξε πῦρ καὶ θεῖον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἀπώλεσεν ἅπαντας· 30. κατὰ ταῦτα[10] ἔσται

[1] For **ιδου ωδε η ιδου εκει** some copies have **ιδου ωδε ιδου εκει** (DXΠ), some **ιδου εκει ιδου ωδε** (L). Some have this order of **εκει, ωδε**, but retaining **η** (B). ℵ has **και**.
[2] Omit **απελθητε μηδε** B 13, 69 (W.H. brackets).
[3] Omit this **η** ℵBLXΓ 169 *al.*
[4] **υπο τον ουρ.** in ℵBD *al.*
[5] Omit **και** ℵABLX *al.*
[6] BD 220 a b e i omit **εν τη ημ. α.** (W.H. text).
[7] Omit **του** all uncials.
[8] **εγαμ.** in ℵBDLX *al.*
[9] **και ως** in D *al.* **καθως** in ℵBLRX 13, 69 *al.*
[10] **κατα τα αυτα** in BDX *al.* T.R. = ℵLΔ *al.*

Mt. xxviii. 1, Mk. xvi. 2.—**οὐκ ὄψεσθε**, ye shall not see, not necessarily an absolute statement, but meaning: the vision will be deferred till your heart gets sick; so laying you open to temptation through false readers of the times encouraging delusive hope.—Ver. 23. **ἐκεῖ, ὧδε**: *cf.* the more graphic version in Mt. xxiv. 26, and notes thereon.—**μὴ διώξητε**, do not follow them, give no heed to them.—Ver. 24. **ἐκ τῆς, χώρας** understood, so also **χώραν** after **εἰς τὴν** = from this quarter under heaven to that. Here again Mt.'s version is the more graphic and original = from east to west.—Ver. 25. **πρῶτον δὲ δεῖ**, etc.; the Passion must come before the glorious lightning-like advent. What you have to do meantime is to prepare yourselves for *that*.

Vv. 26-30. *The advent will be a surprise* (Mt. xxiv. 37-41).—Ver. 27. **ἤσθιον**, etc.: note the four verbs without connecting particles, a graphic asyndeton; and note the imperfect tense: those things going on up to the very hour of the advent, as it was in the days of Noah, or in the fateful day of Pompeii.—Ver. 28. **ὁμοίως**: introducing a new comparison = similarly, as it was in the days, etc.—so shall it be in the day of, etc. (ver. 30). Bornemann ingeniously connects **ὁμοίως** with **ἅπαντας** going before, and, treating it as a Latinism, renders *perdidit omnes pariter*.—**ἤσθιον**, etc.: again a series of unconnected verbs, and a larger, *six*, and all in the imperfect tense. This second comparison, taken from Lot's history, is not given in Mt. The suddenness of the catastrophe makes it very apposite.—Ver. 29. **ἔβρεξε** (**βρέχω**): an old poetic word used in late Greek for **ὕειν**, to rain. **βροχή** is the modern Greek for rain (*vide* Mt. v. 45).—Ver. 30. **κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ**, etc., the apodosis of the long sentence beginning ver. 28.

Vv. 31-34. *Sauve qui peut* (Mt. xxiv. 17, 18; Mk. xiii. 15, 16). The saying in ver. 31 is connected in Mt. and Mk. with the crisis of Jerusalem, to which in this discourse in Lk. there is no allusion.

ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτεται. 31. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ὃς ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος, καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, μὴ καταβάτω ἆραι αὐτά· καὶ ὁ ἐν τῷ[1] ἀγρῷ ὁμοίως μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω. 32. μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ. 33. ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι,[2] ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· καὶ ὃς ἐὰν[3] ἀπολέσῃ αὐτήν,[4] ζωογονήσει αὐτήν. 34. λέγω ὑμῖν, ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς[5]· ὁ[6] εἷς παραληφθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται. 35. δύο ἔσονται[7] ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό· μία[8] παραληφθήσεται, καὶ ἡ[9] ἑτέρα ἀφεθήσεται." 37. Καὶ ἀποκριθέντες λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Ποῦ, κύριε;" Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅπου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί."[10]

[1] Omit τῳ ℵBL 13, 69, 346.

[2] For σωσαι (ℵ *al.*) BL vet. Lat. (4) have **περιποιησασθαι** (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] **ο δ αν** in ℵBL 69 *al.*

[4] **απολεση** in BD. **απολεσει** in ℵL (Tisch., W.H.). ℵBD 1, 33, 131 omit **αυτην** after **απολ.**

[5] BC omit **μιας** (W.H. brackets).

[6] B omits **ο**.

[7] **εσονται δυο** in ℵ^{a}BDL a cop. syr. cur.

[8] **η μια** in ℵ^{a}BDR 1, 69.

[9] For **και η** (D *al.*) ℵ^{a}BLR have **η δε**.

[10] For **συναχ. οι αετοι** ℵBL have **και οι αετοι επισυναχθησονται** (Tisch., W.H.).

The connection in Mt. and Mk. seems the more appropriate, as a literal flight was then necessary.—Ver. 32. **μνημονεύετε**, etc.: the allusion to Lot's wife is prepared for by the comparison in ver. 28. It is not in Mt. and Mk., being inappropriate to the flight they had in view. No fear of looking back when an invading army was at the gates. Lk. has in view the spiritual application, as is shown by the next ver., which reproduces in somewhat altered form the word spoken at Caesarea Philippi concerning losing and saving life (ix. 24).—**ζωογονήσει**, will preserve alive, used literally in this sense in Acts vii. 19.

Vv. 34-37. *The final separation* (Mt. xxiv. 40, 41).—Ver. 34. **τ. τ. νυκτὶ**, on that *night;* day hitherto, the Jewish day began with night (Hahn), and the reference to night suits the following illustration. No need to take night metaphorically = *imago miseriae* (Kuinoel).—**ἐπὶ κλίνης μ.**, in one bed; in the field in Mt.—Ver. 35. **ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό**, grinding at the same place; in the mill, Mt. Proximity the point emphasised in Lk.—near each other, yet how remote their destinies!—Ver. 37. **σῶμα**, the carcase = **πτῶμα**, Mt. xxiv. 28; so used in Homer, who employs **δέμας** for the living body.

CHAPTER XVIII. 1-14. THE PARABLES OF THE UNJUST JUDGE AND THE PHARISEE AND THE PUBLICAN.—Vv. 1-8. *The unjust judge*, in Lk. only.—Ver. 1. **παραβολὴν**: the story is a parable in so far as it teaches by an incident in natural life the power of perseverance with reference to the spiritual life.—**πρὸς**, in reference to, indicating the subject or aim of the parable—*de* (so Kypke, with examples).—**πάντοτε**: not continuously, but *persistently* in spite of temptation to cease praying through delayed answer = keep praying, notwithstanding delay. The whole *raison d'être* of the parable is the existence of such delay. Some fail to see this and think that the difference between God and the judge is that He does not delay. It is not so. God is like the judge in this, only His delay has not the same cause or motive. The judge represents God as He *appears* in Providence to tried faith—**ἐκκακεῖν**: a Pauline word (Gal. vi. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 13, etc.). This introduction to the parable is probably due to Lk., who, it will be observed, takes care to make the lesson of general

XVIII. 1. ἜΛΕΓΕ δὲ καὶ[1] παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι,[2] καὶ μὴ ἐκκακεῖν, 2. λέγων, "Κριτής τις ἦν ἔν τινι πόλει, τὸν Θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενος, καὶ ἄνθρωπον μὴ ἐντρεπόμενος. 3. χήρα δὲ ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ, καὶ ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν, λέγουσα, [a] Ἐκδίκησόν με ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου μου. 4. Καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν[3] ἐπὶ χρόνον· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα[4] εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, Εἰ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι, καὶ ἄνθρωπον οὐκ[5] ἐντρέπομαι· 5. διά γε τὸ παρέχειν μοι κόπον τὴν χήραν ταύτην, ἐκδικήσω αὐτήν, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τέλος ἐρχομένη [b] ὑπωπιάζῃ με." 6. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος, "Ἀκούσατε

a Rom. xii. 19. 2 Cor. x. 6. Rev. vi. 10; xix. 2.

b 1 Cor. ix. 27.

[1] Omit και ℵBLM 13, 69, 131 *al.* it. 4 cop.

[2] **αυτους** after **προσευχ.** in ℵBL *al.*

[3] **ηθελεν** in ℵABDLX *al.*

[4] **μετα ταυτα δε** in BLR (W.H.). T.R = ℵD *al.* (Tisch.).

[5] For **και ανθ. ουκ** (D *al. pl.*) ℵBLX 157 it. (8) vulg. have **ουδε ανθρωπον.**

application, though the **δὲ** after **ἔλεγε** and the concluding reflection in ver. 8 imply that the special subject of prayer contemplated both by Lk. and by our Lord was the advent referred to in the previous context.

Vv. 2-5. *The parable.*—**τὸν Θεόν**, etc.: a proverbial description for a thoroughly unprincipled man (examples from classics in Wetstein).—**ἐντρεπόμενος**, having respect for, with accusative, as in late Greek; in earlier writers with genitive.—Ver. 3. **χήρα**, a widow, such a suppliant tests a man's character. Her weakness appeals to a generous, noble nature, and is taken advantage of by an ignoble.—**ἤρχετο**, presumably used in a frequentative sense = *ventitabat* (Grotius), though not necessarily meaning more than "began to come," with possibility of recurrence.—**ἐκδίκησόν με**, give me redress or satisfaction. "Avenge me" is too strong.—Ver. 4. **ἐπὶ χρόνον**, for a considerable time. *Per multum tempus* (Vulgate) may be too strong, but it is in the right direction. The scope of the parable and the use of the word **χρόνος** in a pregnant sense implying **πολὺς** (*vide* examples in Kypke) demand a time sufficient to test the temper of the parties.—**ἐν ἑαυτῷ**, within himself. The characters in Lk.'s parables are given to talking to themselves (Prodigal, Unjust Steward).—Ver. 5. **διά γε**, etc.: similar expression in xi. 8. The parable before us is a companion to that of the *Selfish Neighbour.* The two should be studied together—*vide The Parabolic Teaching of Christ.*—**κόπον**: the power of the petitioner in both parables lies in their ability and determination to disturb the comfort of those they address. The neighbour and the judge are both selfish, care only for their own ease, and it is that very quality that gives the suppliants their opportunity. They can annoy the reluctant into granting their requests—success certain.—**εἰς τέλος**: interpreters differ as to the meaning of this phrase, and whether it should be connected with **ἐρχομένη** or with **ὑπωπιάζῃ**. The two ways of rendering the last clause of ver. 5 are: lest coming *continually*, she weary me to death, or lest coming and coming, she *at last* give me black eyes; of course meant in a humorous sense. The latter rendering does more justice to the humour of the situation, but the other seems more in harmony with the scope of the parable, which is to enforce *persistence* in prayer—continual coming. The present tense in participle and verb also seems to demand the first rendering: it points to a process in the coming and in its effect on the judge, the two keeping pace with each other. As she keeps coming, he gets more and more bored. If a final act, the use of fists (seriously or humorously meant) were pointed at by **ὑπωπ.**, the aorist would have been more suitable. (So Field in *Ot. Nor.*) The philological commentators differ in regard to the sense of **εἰς τέλος**, some taking it = *perpetuo, indesinenter* (Grotius, Kypke); others = *tandem* (Palairet); others = *omnino* (Raphel); all citing examples.

Vv. 6-8. *The moral.*—**κριτὴς τ. ἀδικίας**, *cf.* **οἰκονόμον τ. ἀ.**, xvi. 8.—Ver. 7. **οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ**, etc., will not God avenge, etc., the question implying strongly that

τί ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας λέγει· 7. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσει[1] τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοώντων πρὸς αὐτὸν[2] ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, καὶ μακροθυμῶν[3] ἐπ' αὐτοῖς; 8. λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν ἐν τάχει. πλὴν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐλθὼν ἆρα εὑρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;"

9. Εἶπε δὲ καὶ πρός τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσὶ δίκαιοι, καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντας τοὺς λοιπούς, τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· 10. "Ἄνθρωποι δύο ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσεύξασθαι· ὁ[4] εἷς Φαρισαῖος, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος τελώνης. 11. ὁ Φαρισαῖος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα[5] προσηύχετο, Ὁ Θεός, εὐχαριστῶ σοι, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ὥσπερ[6] οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἅρπαγες, ἄδικοι, μοιχοί, ἢ καὶ ὡς

[1] So in L *al.* ποιηση in ℵBDQXΔ *al. pl.*

[2] αυτω in ℵBLQ.

[3] μακροθυμει in ℵABDLQXΠ 1, 157, 209 (modern editors).

[4] ο εις in ℵALQ, etc. (Tisch.). εις in BDRX (W.H. text and in marg.).

[5] ταυτα before προς ε. in BL 1, 131 e vulg. (W.H. text). ℵ and codd. Lat. vet. omit προς εαυτον (Tisch.).

[6] So in ℵAB *al.* (Tisch., W.H., text). DLQ *al pauc.* have ως (W.H. marg.).

He will, but the emphasis is rendered necessary by appearances to the contrary, which strongly try men's faith in His good will—long delays in answering prayer which wear the aspect of indifference.—**τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν α.**, His elect: standing in a close relation, so named to support the previous assertion. But in the dark hour of trial it is difficult to extract comfort from the title. Then the doubt arises: is the idea of election not a delusion? What are we to the far-off Deity?—**τῶν βοώντων**: from these words down to the end of the sentence (**ἐπ' αὐτοῖς**) is a single clause meant to define the situation of "the elect". They are persons who keep crying to God day and night, while He seems to pay no heed to them, but delays action in their case, and in their interest. The words down to **νυκτός** describe the *need* of Divine interference; those which follow describe the experience which tempts to doubt whether succour will be forthcoming.—**μακροθυμεῖ**: this verb means to be slow, leisurely, unimpulsive in temper, whether in punishing or in succouring, or in any other form of action. Instances of the use of the verb in the first-mentioned occur in 2 Maccab. vi. 14 (cited by Pricaeus) and Sirach xxxv. 22 (οὐ μὴ βραδύνῃ οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήσει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, frequently quoted). In James v. 7 it is applied to the husbandman waiting for harvest. Here it is applied to God's leisureliness in coming to the help of tried saints. The construction **καὶ μακροθυμεῖ** is of the Hebraistic type.—Ver. 8. **ἐν τάχει**, quickly, quite compatible with delay; quickly when the hour comes = suddenly.—**πλὴν**, yet; in spite of the alleged speed, the time will seem so long that, etc.—**ἆρα**, so to be taken (not ἄρα), as bearing a major force of reasoning, and interrogative. The two words are one in essence, but ἆρα has more emphasis in utterance, and therefore the first syllable is lengthened, and it stands at the beginning of a sentence, here before **εὑρήσει**; *cf.* Gal. ii. 17. On the two particles *vide* Klotz in *Dev.*, p. 180.—**πίστιν**: not absolutely, but in reference to the second coming, hope deferred making the heart sick.

Vv. 9-14. *The Pharisee and the publican.*—Ver. 9. **πρός τινας**, with reference to certain persons; *who* not indicated, *of what sort* definitely described. This introduction is doubtless an editorial heading extracted from the story. It is true, but not necessarily the whole truth. The story may have been spoken to publicans to encourage them to hope in God's mercy—at the Capernaum gathering, *e.g.*—**παραβολὴν**: it is not really a parable, but simply an imaginary incident within the sphere to which its moral belongs.—Ver. 11. **σταθεὶς**, having taken his stand; *fidenter loco solito* (Bengel); "a sign less of confidence

οὗτος ὁ τελώνης. 12. νηστεύω δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου, ἀποδεκατῶ[1] πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι. 13. Καὶ ὁ[2] τελώνης μακρόθεν ἑστὼς οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπᾶραι[3] · ἀλλ' ἔτυπτεν εἰς[4] τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ, λέγων, Ὁ Θεός, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. 14. Λέγω ὑμῖν, κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἐκεῖνος.[5] ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται · ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται."

15. Προσέφερον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βρέφη, ἵνα αὐτῶν ἅπτηται ·

[1] αποδεκατευω in ℵB.

[2] For και ο (ADQX al.) ℵBGL 69 al. have ο δε.

[3] επαραι εις τ. ουρ. in ℵBLQX 33 verss.

[4] Omit this εις ℵBDLQX it. vulg.

[5] For η εκεινος (found in minusc.) APQXΔ al. have η γαρ εκ. (Tisch.). ℵBL 1 94 al. sah. cop. Orig. have παρ εκεινον (Alf., Trg., W.H.).

than of self-importance" (J. Weiss in Meyer). Probably both qualities are aimed at.—**πρὸς ἑαυτὸν**: whether these words should be taken with **σταθεὶς** or with **προσηύχετο** is disputed. If the position of **ταῦτα** before **πρὸς ἑ.** in BL be accepted, there is no room for doubt. Hahn contends that the proper meaning of **πρὸς ἑ. προσηύχετο** is "prayed *to* himself," and that there is no instance of the use of **πρὸς ἑ.** in the sense of "with himself". Godet takes the phrase as = to himself, and regards the so-called prayer as simply self-congratulation in God's presence.—**οἱ λοιποὶ τ. ἀ.**: not necessarily all mankind, rather all the Jewish world outside his coterie = *am haarez*.—**ἅρπαγες**, etc.. these hard words recall the elder brother's **μετὰ πορνῶν** (xv. 30).—**ἢ καὶ**, or even, the publican pointed at as the *ne plus ultra* of depravity: the best foil to Pharisaic exemplariness.—Ver. 12. **δὶς τ. σ.**, twice in the week: voluntary fasts on Mondays and Thursdays, ultra-legal in his zeal.—**ἀποδεκατ-ῶ** (-**εύω**, W. and H.) = **δεκατεύω** in Greek writers: tithing a typical instance of Pharisaic strictness.—**πάντα**, all, great and small, even garden herbs, again ultra-legal.—**κτῶμαι**, all *I get* (R.V.).—Ver. 13. **ὁ τελώνης**: the demeanour of the publican is drawn in vivid contrast to that of the Pharisee; he stands aloof, not in pride but in acute consciousness of demerit, does not dare to lift his eyes towards the object of prayer, beats upon his breast in pungent grief for sin.—**τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ**, the sinner; he thinks of himself only and of himself as *the* sinner, well known as such, the one fact worth mentioning about him, as one might speak about the drunkard of the village. Koetsveld remarks: "The publican might see his own picture in the prodigal son; no doubt many a son out of a good house took to a publican's trade as a last resort".—Ver. 14. **δεδικαιωμένος**, justified (here only in Gospels), a Pauline word, but not necessarily used in a Pauline sense = pardoned.—**παρ' ἐκεῖνον** (**ἢ ἐκεῖνος**, T.R.), in comparison with that one (the Pharisee). The reading **ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος** (QX) would have to be taken as a question—or was that one justified? The publican was the justified man; you would not say the other one was?—**ὅτι**, etc.: **ὅτι** introduces a moral maxim which we have met with already at xiv. 11. It stands here as the ethical basis of "justification". It is a universal law of the moral world, true both of God and of men, that self-exaltation provokes in others condemnation, and self-humiliation gentle judgment.

CHAPTER XVIII. 15-43. SOME SYNOPTICAL INCIDENTS OF THE LATER TIME. Lk., who has for some time followed his own way, now joins the company of his brother evangelists. Schleiermacher held that the document Lk. has been using did not stop at xviii. 14, but went on to the end of chapter xix.

Vv. 15-17. *The little ones brought to Jesus* (Mt. xix. 13-15, Mk. x. 13-16).—**τὰ βρέφη**: for **παιδία** in parallels = infants, sucklings, often in Lk.'s writings; the **καὶ** preceding naturally means "even," suggesting the notion of great popularity or great crowding, and perhaps hinting an apology for the Twelve. The article before **βρέφη** means the in-

ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμησαν[1] αὐτοῖς. 16. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτὰ εἶπεν,[2] "Ἄφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά. τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. 17. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃς ἐὰν μὴ δέξηται τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡς παιδίον, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτήν."

18. Καὶ ἐπηρώτησέ τις αὐτὸν ἄρχων, λέγων, "Διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;" 19. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ[3] Θεός. 20. τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας, Μὴ μοιχεύσῃς· μὴ φονεύσῃς· μὴ κλέψῃς· μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς· τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου."[4] 21. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην[5] ἐκ νεότητός μου."[6] 22. Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα[7] ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἔτι ἕν σοι λείπει· πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον, καὶ διάδος πτωχοῖς, καὶ ἕξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ[8]· καὶ δεῦρο, ἀκολούθει μοι." 23. Ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα περίλυπος ἐγένετο[9]· ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα. 24. Ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν

[1] επετιμων in ℵBDGL 1, 13, 69 *al.*
[2] ℵBL a have προσεκαλεσατο αυτα λεγων.
[3] Omit ο ℵB (Tisch., W.H., brackets).
[4] Omit this second σου BDLX *al.*
[5] εφυλαξα in ℵABL 1, 209.
[6] Omit μου BD.
[7] Omit ταυτα ℵBDL 1, 33, 69, 131 *al.*
[8] εν ουρανοις in ℵABDLR *al.* a e cop. BD have also τοις after εν.
[9] εγενηθη in ℵBL.

fants of those who brought them = their infants.—Ver. 16. προσεκαλέσατο, called, speaking to those who carried the infants. Lk. omits the annoyance of Jesus at the conduct of the Twelve, noted by Mk. Decorum controls his presentation not only of Jesus but of the Twelve. He always spares them (Schanz).—τῶν τοιούτων, of such; does this mean that children belong to the kingdom, or only that the childlike do so? Bengel, De Wette and Schanz take the former view, J. Weiss and Hahn the latter. Schanz says: "τοιοῦτοι with the article means not similarity but likeness with respect to something going before or following after. Therefore the children as such are recognised by Jesus as worthy of the kingdom."—Ver. 17, as in Mk. x. 15. With this reflection Lk. ends, his interest being mainly in the didactic element.

Vv. 18-23. *The young ruler* (Mt. xix. 16-22, Mk. x. 17-22). From a didactic point of view this narrative is closely connected with the two preceding. The three set forth conditions of entrance into the Kingdom of God—self-abasement, childlikeness, and single-mindedness.—Ver. 18. ἄρχων, a ruler; this definite statement in Lk. only.—τί ποιήσας instead of τί ποιήσω.—Ver. 20. μὴ μοιχεύσῃς: the Seventh Com., first in Lk., the Sixth in Mt. and Mk. (W. H.). Mk.'s μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς and Mt.'s ἀγαπήσεις τ. πλησίον σου, etc., are not found in Lk.—Ver. 21. ἕν σοι λείπει: ἕν σ. ὑστερεῖ in Mk. λείπει = fails, so in Tit. iii. 13.—Ver. 23. πλούσιος σφόδρα, very rich. Lk.'s expression differs from that of Mt. and Mk. (ἦν ἔχων κτήματα πολλά). Lk. follows Mk. in the most important points—the words first spoken by the ruler to Jesus: *good* Master, etc., and the reply of Jesus to him: why callest thou me good? but he agrees with Mt. in omitting some vivid traits found in Mk.: the placing of the incident ("going forth into the way"), the action of the man as he approached Jesus (προσδραμὼν, γονυπετήσας), the title διδάσκαλε (Mk. x. 20), and, most remarkable feature of all, the statement in Mk. x. 21: ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν, which so clearly excludes the notion entertained by many

ὁ Ἰησοῦς[1] περίλυπον γενόμενον[2] εἶπε, "Πῶς δυσκόλως οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες εἰσελεύσονται[3] εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 25. Εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστι, κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος[4] εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν." 26. Εἶπον δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες, "Καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;" 27. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατά ἐστι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ."[5] 28. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Πέτρος, "Ἰδού, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ[6] ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι." 29. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδείς ἐστιν ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν, ἢ γονεῖς, ἢ ἀδελφούς, ἢ γυναῖκα,[7] ἢ τέκνα, ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, 30. ὃς οὐ μὴ ἀπολάβῃ[8] πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον."

31. ΠΑΡΑΛΑΒΩΝ δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ἰδού, ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα,[9] καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμ-

[1] ο before Ι. is wanting in B (W.H. in brackets).

[2] ℵBL 1, 131 *al.* omit περιλ. γεν. (a gloss).

[3] εισπορευονται in BL and after του θεου. ℵDR 124 *al.* have εισελευσονται, but in the same position.

[4] τρηματος βελονης in ℵBD 49. L has τρυπηματος with βελονης. Assimilation to parall. has been at work in producing the T.R.

[5] εστι after θεω in ℵBDL 1, 28, 131 *al.*

[6] For αφηκαμεν παντα και ℵcBDL 1, 13, 69 *al.* have αφεντες τα ιδια.

[7] ℵBL have this order: γυν. αδελφ. γονεις.

[8] ουχι μη in ℵBL 1 *al.*, and λαβη in BD *al.* (Tisch. adopts former, W.H. both, but λαβη in text with απολ. in marg.).

[9] Ι . . . λημ in ℵBDLR.

that the man was a self-complacent Pharisee. I am glad to find Hahn decidedly repudiating this view (*vide* notes on Mt. and Mk.). *Vide* Mt.

Vv. 24-30. *Ensuing conversation* (Mt. xix. 23-30, Mk. x. 23-31).—Ver. 24. εἰσπορεύονται: present, not future, as in parallels, indicating not what will happen but what is apt to happen from the nature of riches.—Ver. 25. τρήματος βελόνης: each evangelist has his own expression here.—τρῆμα from τιτράω, τίτρημι (or τράω), to pierce, bore through; hence τρανής, penetrating, clear; βελόνη, the point of a spear.—Ver. 26. οἱ ἀκούσαντες, those hearing, a quite general reference to the company present. In Mt. and Mk. the words are addressed to the *disciples*.—καὶ τίς δ. σ.: as in Mk., *vide* notes there.—Ver. 27. τὰ ἀδύνατα, etc. Mk. and Mt. have first a particular then a general statement. Lk. gives the general truth only: the impossibles for men possible for God.—Ver. 28. Peter's remark about leaving all, as in Mk., without the question, what shall we have? appended to it in Mt.—Ver. 29. γυναῖκα: as in xiv. 26, not in parallels.—γονεῖς: parents, for father and mother in parallels; the latter more impressive.—Ver. 30. πολλαπλασίονα, as in Mt. Mk. has the more definite ἑκατονταπλασίονα. The reading ἑπταπλασίονα (D, W.H., margin), though little supported, has intrinsic probability as toning down an apparent exaggeration (hundred fold! say seven fold). *Cf.* ἑπτάκις in xvii. 4.

Vv. 31-34. *Third prediction of the Passion* (Mt. xx. 17-19, Mk. x. 32-34). *Vide* notes on the account in Mk., which is exceptionally realistic.—Ver. 31. τελεσθήσεται, shall be fulfilled. With this verb is to be connected τῷ υἱῷ τ. α. (not with γεγραμμένα). The sense is not "shall be fulfilled by the Son of Man". So Bornemann (*Scholia*), "a dei filio perficientur, *i.e.*, satisfiet pro-

μένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 32. παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσι, καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται, καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται, καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται, 33. καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν· καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεται." 34. Καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνῆκαν, καὶ ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα.

35. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ ἐγγίζειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεριχώ, τυφλός τις ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν προσαιτῶν.[1] 36. ἀκούσας δὲ ὄχλου διαπορευομένου, ἐπυνθάνετο τί[2] εἴη τοῦτο. 37. ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτῷ, "Ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος παρέρχεται." 38. Καὶ ἐβόησε, λέγων, "Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ Δαβίδ, ἐλέησόν με." 39. Καὶ οἱ προάγοντες ἐπετίμων αὐτῷ ἵνα σιωπήσῃ[3]· αὐτὸς δὲ πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν, "Υἱὲ Δαβίδ, ἐλέησόν

[1] επαιτων in ℵBDL Orig. [2] τι αν in DL (W.H. marg.).
[3] σιγηση in BDLPX 245 *al*. T.R. conforms to parall.

phetarum vaticiniis a dei filio". Nor is it necessary to insert ἐν before τ. υ. τ. ἀ. The meaning is: all things shall happen *to* the Son of Man as written in the prophets.—τελεῖσθαι stands for γίνεσθαι, being used because of the prophetic reference (in Lk. only). So Pricaeus: "τελεῖσθαι hic esse quod Marc. xi. 23, 24 εἶναι, quod 1 Cor. iv. 5 γίνεσθαι, quod 1 Pet. v. 9 ἐπιτελεῖσθαι". In all these places the verb is followed by the dative. —Vv. 32, 33. The details of the Passion are the same as in Mk., except that no mention is made of the Jewish rulers, and that other particulars are given in a somewhat different order.—Ver. 34. This is peculiar to Lk. A similar statement in ix. 45 with the same curious repetition. "An emphatic prolixity" is Meyer's comment. J. Weiss (Meyer) from the facts that this verse repeats ix. 45 and that Lk. avoids repetition infers that the words must have been in his source. I rather think that we have here an effort on Lk.'s part to compensate by a general statement about the ignorance of the Twelve for the instructive narrative about the two sons of Zebedee which comes in at this point in Mt. and Mk., and which Lk. omits, doubtless by way of sparing the disciples an exposure. The iteration (same thing said three times) is in Lk.'s manner (Acts xiv. 8), but it is significant here. The aim is by repetition of a general statement to convey the impression made by the concrete story—an utter impossibility. No wonder Lk. labours in expression, in view of that humiliating proof of ignorance and moral weakness! But the attempt to express the inexpressible is interesting as showing that Lk. must have had the sons of Zebedee incident in his mind though he does not choose to record it. The omission of this incident carries along with it the omission of the second and most important saying of our Lord concerning the significance of His death. Lk.'s gospel contains hardly any basis for a doctrine on that subject (*cf.* Mt. xx. 28, Mk. x. 45).

Vv. 35-43. *The blind man at Jericho* (Mt. xx. 29-34, Mk. x. 46-52).—τυφλός τις: the blind man is not named, from which J. Weiss (Meyer) infers that the name cannot have been in Lk.'s source. A very precarious inference. Lk. deviates from the tradition in the parallels as to the place of the incident: connecting it with the entrance into Jericho instead of the exit from the town.—ἐπαιτῶν as in xvi. 3.—Ver. 36. ἀκούσας: in Lk. what he hears is the multitude passing through, which he would have seen if he had not been blind. In the parallels what is heard is that it was Jesus around whom the multitude had gathered, which even a seeing man might have had to learn by the ear. Lk. is careful to bring out the fact of blindness.—διαπορευομένου is an instance of a participle serving as the object of a verb. What was heard was the *passing* of the crowd.—τί εἴη τ., the optative without ἄν in an indirect question makes the question definite (*cf.* iii. 15, viii. 9, xv. 26).—Ver. 37. Ναζωραῖος: the usual form in Lk., an exception in iv. 34.—Ver. 38. ἐβόησεν: aorist, he cried out once.—Ver. 39. οἱ προάγοντες, those in front, nearest him.

με." 40. Σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ[1] Ἰησοῦς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν· ἐγγίσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, 41. λέγων,[2] "Τί σοι θέλεις ποιήσω;" Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Κύριε, ἵνα ἀναβλέψω." 42. Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἀνάβλεψον· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε." 43. Καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀνέβλεψε, καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ δοξάζων τὸν Θεόν· καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἰδὼν ἔδωκεν αἶνον τῷ Θεῷ.

XIX. 1. ΚΑΙ εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο τὴν Ἱεριχώ· 2. καὶ ἰδού, ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι καλούμενος Ζακχαῖος, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν [a] ἀρχιτελώνης, καὶ οὗτος ἦν[3] πλούσιος· 3. καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, τίς ἐστι, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ὅτι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ μικρὸς ἦν. 4. καὶ προδραμὼν ἔμπροσθεν[4] ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομωραίαν, ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτόν·

[a] here only in N.T.

[1] Omit ο BD (W.H.), found in ℵL (Tisch.).

[2] Omit λεγων ℵBDLX 57 e.

[3] ℵL 245 omit ουτος (Tisch.). B reads και αυτος without ην (W.H. text, with και ην in marg.).

[4] εις το εμπρ. in ℵBL.

He would hear the sound of the crowd before it came up to him; when it was close to him he would make inquiry τί εἴη.—σιγήσῃ: only in Lk. and St. Paul, showing editorial overworking of the source.—ἔκραζεν: a stronger word than ἐβόησεν and imperfect, kept shouting louder than before.—Ver. 40. ἀχθῆναι, to be *led* to Him; Lk. again careful to bring out the fact of blindness, all the more noticeable when his narrative is compared with parallels. The omission of the interesting particulars in Mk., vv. 49, 50, has been remarked on (Hahn) as proving that Lk. did not know Mk. Again a precarious inference. It is Lk.'s habit to magnify the miracle, therefore he tells the story so as to bring out that it was a case of total blindness, which does not clearly appear in Mk., *vide* ver. 50.—Ver. 41. κύριε: in Mk. Ῥαββονί.—Ver. 43. αἶνον, praise, a poetical word in Greek writers = (1) a saying, (2) a word of praise, frequent in Sept. διδόναι αἶνον, instead of αἰνεῖν, is Hellenistic.

CHAPTER XIX. ZACCHAEUS. PARABLE OF THE POUNDS. ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.—Vv. 1-10. *The story of Zacchaeus*, in Lk. only, apparently derived from an Aramaic source—note the abundant use of καί to connect clauses—but bearing traces of editorial revision in the style (καθότι, ver. 9).—Ver. 1. διήρχετο: the incident occurred when Jesus was passing through Jericho, precisely where, not indicated.—ὀνόματι καλούμενος, called by name, as in i. 61; a Hebraism, ὀνόματι superfluous.—Ζακ., ἀρχιτ., πλούσιος: name, occupation, social standing. Zacchaeus = the pure one, but not so intended; chief publican; probably a head man or overseer over the local collectors of taxes, of whom there might be a goodly number in Jericho, with its balsam trade, and traffic from the eastern to the western side of Jordan.—Ver. 3. ἐζήτει: imperfect, implying continuous effort, for a while unsuccessful, because of (ἀπὸ) the crowd, too dense to penetrate, and not to be seen over by *him*, being short of stature (ἡλικίᾳ as in Mt. vi. 27).—ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰ. τίς ἐστι = ἰδεῖν τίς ἐστιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, to see who Jesus is = *de facie cognoscere* (Kuinoel); "*fama* notum *vultu* noscere cupiebat" (Grotius).—Ver. 4. εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν, in front of the crowd, to make sure; stationed at any point opposite the crowd he might miss his chance.—συκομοραίαν, a fig mulberry tree, as many think = συκάμινος in xvii. 6; but why then not use the same word in both places, the only two places in N.T. where they occur, both used by the same writer? To this it has been replied: "Although it may be admitted that the *sycamine* is properly and in Lk. xvii. 6 the mulberry, and the *sycamore* the fig mulberry, or sycamore fig, yet the latter is the tree generally referred to in the O.T. and called by the Sept. *sycamine*, as 1 Kings x. 27, 1 Chron. xxvii. 28, Ps. lxxviii. 47, Am. vii. 14.

ὅτι δι' ἐκείνης[1] ἤμελλε διέρχεσθαι. 5. καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἀναβλέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδεν αὐτόν, καὶ[2] εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν, "Ζακχαῖε, σπεύσας κατάβηθι· σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με μεῖναι." 6. Καὶ σπεύσας κατέβη, καὶ ὑπεδέξατο αὐτὸν χαίρων. 7. καὶ ἰδόντες ἅπαντες διεγόγγυζον, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι παρὰ ἁμαρτωλῷ ἀνδρὶ εἰσῆλθε καταλῦσαι." 8. Σταθεὶς δὲ Ζακχαῖος εἶπε πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, "Ἰδού, τὰ ἡμίση[3] τῶν ὑπαρχόντων μου,[4] κύριε, δίδωμι τοῖς πτωχοῖς[5]· καὶ εἴ τινός τι [b] ἐσυκοφάντησα, ἀποδίδωμι [c] τετραπλοῦν." 9. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅτι σήμερον σωτηρία τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ ἐγένετο, καθότι καὶ αὐτὸς υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ ἐστιν.[6] 10. ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός."

b Ch. iii. 14.
c here only in N.T.

[1] εκεινης without δι in ℵABLQR *al.*
[2] ειδεν αυτον και omitted in ℵBL 1, 131 *al.*
[3] This word variously spelt, ημισεια in ℵBLQ 382.
[4] μου before των υπ. in ℵBLQ 1, 209 *al.*
[5] τοις (B omits) πτωχοις διδωμι in ℵBDLQ 1, 33, 209.
[6] Omit εστιν ℵLR (Tisch.); found in BDQ *al.* (W.H. brackets).

Dioscorides expressly says **Συκόμορον, ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο συκάμινον λέγουσι,** lib. i., cap. 180" (Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. *Sycamore*). This is in effect to say that through the influence of the Sept. and following common usage Lk. used the two words indifferently as synonyms.—**ἐκείνης**: supply **ὁδοῦ**, *cf.* v. 19.—Ver. 5. **Ζακχαῖε**: Jesus knows his name, how not indicated.—**σπεύσας**, etc., uttered in cordial tone as if He were speaking to a familiar friend whom He is glad to see and with whom He means to stay that day. What a delightful surprise that salutation, and how irresistible its friendly frankness, ver. 6 shows. —Ver. 7. **ἅπαντες**: general muttered dissent (not even the Twelve excepted), which Jesus anticipated and disregarded. Note His courage, and how much prejudice the uncommon in conduct has to reckon with.—**ἁμαρτωλῷ**: no reason to think with some ancient and modern commentators that Zacchaeus was a Gentile, a son of Abraham only in a spiritual sense. They thought him unfit to be Christ's host because he was a "sinner" (Grotius). A sinner of *course* because a publican, a great sinner because a chief publican.—Ver. 8. **σταθεὶς**: like the Pharisees (xviii. 11) but in a different spirit—in self-defence, not self-laudation. J. Weiss thinks the word indicates the solemn attitude of a man about to make a vow (Meyer).—**μ. τ. ὑπαρχόντων**, the half of my *goods*, earnings, not of my income (**οἱ πρόσοδοι**) as Godet suggests. —**δίδωμι, ἀποδίδωμι**: presents, probably expressing not past habit but purpose for the future. This is the regenerating effect of that generous, brave word of Jesus. It has made a new man of him. Yet the desire to see Jesus, of whom he had heard as the publicans' friend, shows that the germ of the new man was there before. A "sinner" doubtless in the way indicated, as the **εἴ τι** mildly admits, but by no means, even in the past, a type of the hard, heartless, unscrupulous publican.—**τετραπλοῦν**, four fold, as in cases of theft (Exodus xxii. 1, four or five fold).—Ver. 9. **πρὸς αὐτὸν**, to him or with reference to him; probably both; the words meant for the ears of Zacchaeus and all who might be there to hear, or perhaps spoken half as a soliloquy.—**καθότι**, inasmuch as; a word of Lk.'s; in his writings only in N.T.—**υἱὸς Ἀ.**, a son of Abraham in the natural sense, a Jew; a protest against popular prejudice, for which a publican was as a heathen. The more radical reason, unexpressed, but present doubtless to the mind of Jesus, was: because he also is a son of *man*, a human being.—Ver. 10. A great key-word to Christ's idea of His own mission—a Saviour.—**τὸ ἀπολωλός**, the lost, a pathetic name for the objects of Christ's quest; its shades of meaning to be learned from the parables in Lk. xv.: lost as a sheep, a coin, a foolish son may be lost. Here the term points

11. ᾿ΑΚΟΥΟΝΤΩΝ δὲ αὐτῶν ταῦτα, προσθεὶς εἶπε παραβολήν, διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἱερουσαλήμ,[1] καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ὅτι παραχρῆμα μέλλει ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ [d] ἀναφαίνεσθαι· 12. εἶπεν οὖν, "Ἄνθρωπός τις [e] εὐγενὴς ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακράν, λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ βασιλείαν, καὶ ὑποστρέψαι. 13. καλέσας δὲ δέκα δούλους ἑαυτοῦ, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα [f] μνᾶς, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Πραγματεύσασθε

d Acts xxi. 3.
e Acts xvii. 11. 1 Cor i. 26.
f here (seven times) only in N.T.

[1] εγγυς ειναι l. αυτον in ℵBL 157.

to the social degradation and isolation of the publicans. They were social lepers. With reference to the conduct of Jesus in this case Euthy. Zig. remarks: "It is necessary to despise the little scandal when a great salvation comes to any one and not to lose the great on account of the little" (χρὴ γὰρ τοῦ μικροῦ σκανδάλου καταφρονεῖν, ἔνθα μεγάλη σωτηρία τινὶ προσγίνεται, καὶ μὴ διὰ τὸ μικρὸν ἀπόλλειν (*sic*) τὸ μέγα). The significance of Christ choosing a publican for His host in a town where many priests dwelt has been remarked on. Art. "Publican" in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Vv. 11-27. *Parable of the pounds, or of the nobleman who goes to find a kingdom* (*cf.* Mt. xxv. 14-30). Into the vexed question of the connection between this parable and that of the talents in Mt. I cannot here go. That there is a resemblance between them is obvious, and the hypothesis that the one has grown out of the other in the course of tradition cannot be treated as a mere impertinence. Yet that they are two distinct parables in their main features, both spoken by Jesus, is not improbable. They serve different purposes, and their respective details suit their respective purposes, and the kindred features may only show that Jesus did not solicitously avoid repeating Himself. The parable before us suits the situation as described by Luke, in so far as it corrects mistaken expectations with regard to the advent of the Kingdom. It is a prophetic sketch in parabolic form of the real future before them, the fortunes of the King and the various attitudes of men towards him. It is more allied to allegory than most of the parables, and on this ground, according to J. Weiss (in Meyer), it cannot have proceeded from Jesus. One fails to see why Jesus might not occasionally use allegory as a vehicle of truth as well as other teachers.

Ver. 11. *The introduction.*—**ταῦτα** naturally suggests the words spoken to Zacchaeus by Jesus about salvation, as what was heard.—**προσθεὶς εἶπε** imitates the Hebrew construction = He added and said, *cf.* Gen. xxxviii. 5, **προσθεῖσα ἔτεκεν.**—**ἐγγὺς**: about fifteen miles off.—**παραχρῆμα**: a natural expectation for friends of Jesus to entertain, and for all, friends and foes, to impute to Him, and a good occasion for uttering a parable to correct false impressions; comparable in this respect with the parable of *the Supper* in Lk. xiv.—saying in effect, "not so soon as you think, nor will all be as well affected to the king and his kingdom as you may suppose".

Vv. 12-27. *The parable.*—**εὐγενὴς**, well-born, noble; of such rank and social position that he might legitimately aspire to a kingdom. The Herod family might quite well be in view. Herod the Great and his son Archelaus had actually gone *from Jericho* on this errand, and Archelaus had had the experience described in ver. 14. Since the time of Clericus and Wolf, who first suggested it, the idea that the Herod family was in Christ's mind has been very generally accepted. Schanz thinks Jesus would not have selected so bad a man as Archelaus to represent Him. Yet He selected a selfish neighbour and an unjust judge to represent God as He *appears*, and an unjust steward to teach prudence!—**εἰς χώραν μακράν**: implying lapse of time; Rome, in the case of Archelaus.—**ὑποστρέψαι**: the desired kingdom is in the land of his birth; Palestine in case of Archelaus.—Ver. 13. **δέκα δ.**, ten, a considerable number, pointing to an extensive household establishment.—**δέκα μνᾶς**, ten pounds, not to each but among them (ver. 16). A Greek pound = about £3 or £4; a Hebrew = nearly double; in either case a small sum compared with the amounts in Mt. xxv. The purpose in the two parables is entirely different. In *the Talents* the master divides his whole means among his servants to be traded with, as the best way of disposing of them during his absence. In *the Pounds* he simply gives a moderate sum, the same to all, with a view to test *fidelity* and *capacity*, as he desires to

ἕως[1] ἔρχομαι. 14. Οἱ δὲ πολῖται αὐτοῦ ἐμίσουν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν [g] πρεσβείαν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες, Οὐ θέλομεν τοῦτον βασιλεῦσαι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. 15. Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ [h] ἐπανελθεῖν αὐτὸν λαβόντα τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ εἶπε φωνηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοὺς δούλους τούτους, οἷς ἔδωκε[2] τὸ ἀργύριον, ἵνα γνῷ[3] τίς τί διεπραγματεύσατο.[4] 16. παρεγένετο δὲ ὁ πρῶτος, λέγων, Κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ σου προσειργάσατο δέκα[5] μνᾶς. 17. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Εὖ,[6] ἀγαθὲ δοῦλε· ὅτι ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ πιστὸς ἐγένου, ἴσθι ἐξουσίαν ἔχων ἐπάνω δέκα πόλεων. 18. Καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ δεύτερος, λέγων, Κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ σου[7] ἐποίησε πέντε μνᾶς. 19. Εἶπε δὲ καὶ τούτῳ, Καὶ σὺ γίνου ἐπάνω[8] πέντε πόλεων. 20.

g Ch. xiv. 32.
h Ch. x. 35.

[1] For εως ℵABDL *al.* Orig. have εν ω. *Vide* below.

[2] δεδωκει in ℵBDL 1, 25, 131.

[3] γνοι in ℵBDL 33.

[4] For τις τι διεπραγματευσατο in ΑRΓΔΛΠ, etc. (Tisch.), ℵBDL 157 e have τι διεπραγματευσαντο (W.H.).

[5] δεκα προσειργασατο in ℵBL 1, 131, 209 a e.

[6] ευ in ℵALRΔ *al. pl.* (W.H. marg. = Mt.). ευγε in BD 56, 58, 61 Orig. (Tisch., W.H., text).

[7] κυριε after η μνα σου in ℵBL. T.R. = D, etc.

[8] επανω γινου in ℵBL 1, 131, 157, 209. D has γεινου και συ επ.

have tested men for higher service when the time comes. The amount may suit the master's finances, and though small it may just on that account the better test character and business talent.—**πραγματεύσασθε**, trade with, here only in the Scriptures, found in Plutarch.—**ἔρχομαι**: with **ἕως** (T.R.) = until I *come back*, with **ἐν ᾧ** (W.H.) = while I *go* (to the far country); perhaps it is used pregnantly to include going and returning.—Ver. 14. **πολῖται** = **συμπολῖται**, fellow-citizens of the aspirant to kingship while a private citizen (as in Gen. xxiii. 11, Sept., Heb. viii. 11, W.H.).—**ἐμίσουν**, hated habitually, showing something far wrong in him, or in *them*.—**πρεσβείαν**: this actually happened in the case of Archelaus, *on just grounds*; this, however, is no proof that he cannot have been in Christ's mind. The point is, hatred just or unjust, in the case both of Archelaus and of Jesus very real.—**οὐ θέλομεν**, we don't wish, an emphatic *nolumus*, stronger than **θέλομεν τοῦτον οὐ**, etc.

Vv. 15 ff. *After the return.*—**ἐν τῷ ἐπανελθεῖν**: **ἐν** with the aorist infinitive, usually with present, but frequently with aorist in Lk. = on his return, he takes action at once (*vide* Burton, *M. and T.*, § 109).—**εἶπε φωνηθῆναι** = commanded (*jussit*, Vulgate) to be called; **εἶπε** with infinitive, instead of **ἵνα** with subjunctive, as in some places, *e.g.*, Mt. iv. 3.—**τίς τί διεπρ.** (T.R.) is two questions in one: who had gained anything and what—**τί διεπραγματεύσαντο** (W.H.), what they had gained.—Ver. 16. **ἡ μνᾶ σου**, thy pound, modestly, as if he had no hand or merit in the gain (Grotius).—**δέκα**: a considerable increase, implying proportional length of time, the kingdom not *near*.—Ver. 17. **ἀγαθὲ** without **πιστέ**, as in Mt., but **πιστὸς** in next clause = noble, devoted.—**ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ**, in a very little. **ἐπὶ ὀλίγα** in Mt.—**ἐπάνω δέκα πόλεων**, over ten cities, or a *Decapolis* (Holtzmann, H. C.). This is what the king has had in view all along—to get capable and trusty governors. A new king needs to take special pains about this. The trial of character through *trade* is not unsuitable, as governors would have much to do with the provincial revenues.—Ver. 18. **πέντε**, five, half as much, implying less capacity, diligence, conscientiousness, or *luck* which, however, is not taken into account.—Ver. 19. **καὶ σὺ**: this man also deemed trustworthy, but of less capacity, therefore appointed to a governorship, but of less extent. Also, note, there is *no praise*. He was honest, but might have done better. The new king is thankful to have honesty even with respectable, though not admirable administrative qualities.

Καὶ ἕτερος[1] ἦλθε, λέγων, Κύριε, ἰδού, ἡ μνᾶ σου, ἣν εἶχον [i] ἀποκειμένην ἐν σουδαρίῳ· 21. ἐφοβούμην γάρ σε, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρὸς εἶ· αἴρεις ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκας, καὶ θερίζεις ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρας. 22. Λέγει δὲ[2] αὐτῷ, Ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου κρινῶ σε, πονηρὲ δοῦλε. ᾔδεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρός εἰμι, αἴρων ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκα, καὶ θερίζων ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρα· 23. καὶ διατί οὐκ ἔδωκας τὸ ἀργύριόν μου[3] ἐπὶ τὴν[4] τράπεζαν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν ἔπραξα αὐτό[5]; 24. Καὶ τοῖς παρεστῶσιν εἶπεν, Ἄρατε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν μνᾶν, καὶ δότε τῷ τὰς δέκα μνᾶς ἔχοντι. 25. (Καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, Κύριε, ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς.) 26. Λέγω γὰρ[6] ὑμῖν, ὅτι παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.[7] 27. Πλὴν τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου ἐκείνους,[8] τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεῦσαι ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἀγάγετε ὧδε, καὶ [j] κατασφάξατε[9] ἔμπροσθέν μου." 28. Καὶ εἰπὼν ταῦτα, ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν, ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

i Col. i. 5. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Heb. ix. 27.

j here only in N.T.

[1] ο ετερος in ℵcBDLR 69, 247.

[2] Omit δε ℵB *al.* 1, 28, 131 *al. pl.*

[3] μου το αργ. in ℵABL 33. T.R. = D.

[4] Omit την ℵABDLRΔ *al. pl.*

[5] αυτο επραξα in ℵBL.

[6] Omit γαρ ℵBL 1, 131, 209.

[7] Omit απ αυτου ℵ*BL 36, 53 *al.*

[8] For εκεινους (D, etc.) ℵBKLMΠ *al.* have τουτους.

[9] αυτους after κατασφ. in ℵBFLR 33.

Vv. 20-27. *The useless servant.* If in any part the parable has borrowed from the parable in Mt., it is here. The story might well have wound up with a statement as to what was to be done with the disaffected.—Ver. 27. Yet this feature is not inapposite, for there were likely to be three classes of people to be dealt with by the king: the honest and capable, the incapable and useless, and the disaffected. The chief objection to the part referring to the second class is that it gives the parable a too didactic aspect, aiming at theoretic exhaustiveness rather than insisting on the main points: how the king will deal with his friends and how with his foes.—Ver. 20. **ἐν σουδαρίῳ**, in a handkerchief; **ἐν τῇ γῇ** in Mt.—Ver. 21. **αὐστηρὸς** (here only in N.T.), harsh in flavour, then in disposition.—**αἴρεις**, etc., you lift what you did not deposit, and reap what you did not sow; accusing the master of an exorbitant demand for profit. He despaired of pleasing him in that respect, therefore did nothing—a pretext of course.—Ver. 23. **ἐπὶ τράπεζαν** = **τοῖς τραπεζίταις** in Mt.—**ἔπραξα** = **ἐκομισάμην** in Mt.—Ver. 24. **ἄρατε**, etc.: the pound given to him that had ten could only have the significance of a present, and a petty one, for he was no longer to be a trader but a ruler, therefore not an important illustration of the principle stated in ver. 26, a sign that in this section of the parable Lk. is secondary.—Ver. 25. Possibly an utterance from the crowd interested in the parable, the "Lord" being Jesus, or an addition by Lk., or not genuine (wanting in D).—Ver. 26. Deprivation the only penalty here, no casting out into outer darkness as in Mt.; merciless severity reserved for the enemies of the king.—Ver. 27. **πλὴν**, for the rest, winding up the transactions at the commencement of the king's reign.—**κατασφάξατε**: barbarous, but true to Eastern life; the new king cannot afford to let them live. In the spiritual sphere the slaying will be done by the moral order of the world (destruction of the Jewish state), King Jesus weeping over their fate. Motive must not be transferred from the parable to the application.

Ver. 28. *On the way to Jerusalem.* The Jericho incidents disposed of, the next centre of interest is the Holy City. Lk. connects the two parts of his narrative by a brief notice of the ascent from the smaller city at the foot of the pass to the larger and more famous at the top. —**εἰπὼν ταῦτα** refers naturally to the

29. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανίαν πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον ἐλαιῶν, ἀπέστειλε δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ,[1] 30. εἰπών,[2] "Ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην· ἐν ᾗ εἰσπορευόμενοι εὑρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισε· λύσαντες[3] αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε. 31. καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ, Διατί λύετε; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε αὐτῷ,[4] Ὅτι ὁ Κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει." 32. Ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· 33. λυόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον, εἶπον οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς, "Τί λύετε τὸν πῶλον;" 34. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Ὁ Κύριος[5] αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει." 35. Καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ ἐπιρρίψαντες ἑαυτῶν[6] τὰ ἱμάτια ἐπὶ τὸν πῶλον, ἐπεβίβασαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. 36. πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ [k] ὑπεστρώννυον τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν[7] ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. 37. Ἐγγίζοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν, ἤρξαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν Θεὸν

k here only in N.T. (Is. lviii. 5).

[1] Omit αυτου ℵBL minusc. (found in D *al.*).
[2] λεγων in ℵBDL 13, 69.
[3] BDL 157 prefix και.
[4] Omit αυτω ℵBDL minusc.
[5] οτι before ο κυρ. in ℵABDL *al. pl.*
[6] αυτων in ℵBDLΔ 1, 13, etc.
[7] So in ℵDL. B has here εαυτων.

parable. As a note of time the expression is sufficiently vague, for we do not know when or where the parable was spoken, nor how much time intervened between its utterance and the commencement of the ascent. It is simply one of Lk.'s formulæ of transition.—**ἔμπροσθεν** = **εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν**, not before them, but forwards: *iter suum continuabat*, Kypke.—**ἀναβαίνων**, going *up*. A constant ascent, steep and rugged.

Vv. 29-38. *The triumphal entry into Jerusalem* (Mt. xx. 1-11, Mk. xi. 1-11).—**Βηθφαγή**. Following Lightfoot and Renan, Godet regards this as the name not of a village but of a suburban district included for passover purposes in the holy city, pilgrims to the feast finding quarters in it. The reference to the two places Bethphage and Bethany is obscure and confusing.—**ἐλαιῶν**, commentators dispute whether the word should be accentuated thus, making it genitive plural of **ἐλαία**, or **ἐλαιών**, making it nominative singular of a name for the place = Olivetum, olive grove. W. and H. print it with the circumflex accent, and Field (*Ot. Nor.*) and Hahn take the same view.—Vv. 31-34. The sending of two disciples for the colt is related as in Mt. and Mk., but with a little more of Greek in the style. The remark about the owners sending it (Mt.) or Jesus returning it (Mk.) is omitted. On the other hand, Lk. alone states that the two disciples found matters as the Master had said (ver. 32). In ver. 33 **οἱ κύριοι** suggests a plurality of owners.—Ver. 35. **ἐπιρρίψαντες**: the participle is used to relieve the monotony of the paratactic construction (**καὶ, καὶ, καὶ** in Mt. and Mk.); the word occurs here only and in 1 Pet. v. 7, *q.v.*—**ἐπεβίβασαν**, helped to mount, as in Lk. x. 34, Acts xxiii. 24; a technical term, possibly used here to add pomp to the scene.—Ver. 36. **τὰ ἱμάτια**, their garments, but no mention of branches in Lk., possibly from a feeling that they would be an encumbrance.—Ver. 37. **ἐγγίζοντος**: Lk. is thinking of Jerusalem = when He was nearing the city. The next clause, **πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει**, is added to define more precisely the point reached = at the descent of the mount. They had got over the ridge to the western slope.—**καταβάσει**, here only in N.T.—**ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος**: Mt. and Mk. divide the crowd into those going before and those following.—**δυνάμεων**: this reference to miracles as the occasion of praise is peculiar to Lk. That Galilean pilgrims should remember gratefully the healing ministry at that moment was very natural. Yet Lk.'s explanation of the popular enthusiasm, while true, may be far from exhaustive.—Ver. 38. A free reproduction of the popular acclaim as reported by Mt. and Mk., not without

φωνῇ μεγάλῃ περὶ πασῶν[1] ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων, 38. λέγοντες, "Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου· εἰρήνη ἐν οὐρανῷ,[2] καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις." 39. Καί τινες τῶν Φαρισαίων ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν, "Διδάσκαλε, ἐπιτίμησον τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου." 40. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[3] "Λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι, ἐὰν οὗτοι σιωπήσωσιν,[4] οἱ λίθοι κεκράξονται."[5] 41. Καὶ ὡς ἤγγισεν, ἰδὼν τὴν πόλιν, ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' αὐτῇ,[6] λέγων, 42. "Ὅτι εἰ ἔγνως καὶ σύ, καί γε[7] ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτῃ, τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου· νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου· 43. ὅτι ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ περιβαλοῦσιν[8] οἱ ἐχθροί σου χάρακά σοι, καὶ περικυκλώσουσί

[1] **παντων** in BD, perhaps the true reading; **πασων** a correction to agree with **δυναμεων**.

[2] **εν ουρ. ειρ.** in ℵBL Orig. (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] ℵBL omit **αυτοις**.

[4] **σιωπησουσι** in ℵABLR *al.*

[5] For this form, common in Sept., ℵBL Orig. have **κραξουσι**.

[6] **επ αυτην** in ℵABDL, etc.

[7] **και συ και γε** is probably a conflate reading; some western texts have the one, some the other. ℵBL (with D) omit **και γε** and read **ει εγνως εν τη ημ. ταυτη** (**σου** omitted) **και συ**, and omit **σου** after **ειρηνην**.

[8] So in B (W.H. marg.). **παρεμβαλουσιν** in ℵCL 33 (Tisch., W.H., text).

variations even between them. The Hebrew Hosanna is omitted and translated into equivalents which recall the *gloria in excelsis* (Lk. ii. 14), "already become a church hymn" (Holtz., H. C.). Lk.'s version runs:

Blessed is He that cometh, the King, in the name of the Lord!
In heaven peace,
And glory in the highest.

In comparison with Mt. and Mk. this version seems secondary.

Vv. 39-44. *Pharisees murmur and Jesus weeps*, peculiar to Lk.—**ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου**, from within the crowd, or on account of the crowd and what they had been saying = *prae turba* as in ver. 3. Loesner cites from Philo instances of the use of **ἀπὸ** in this sense (but in reference to ver. 3).—Ver. 40. **ἐὰν σιωπήσουσιν**: **ἐὰν** with future indicative instead of subjunctive as in classic Greek, one of the divergent ways in which the N.T. expresses a future supposition with some probability (*vide* Burton, *M. and T.*, §§ 250-256).—**οἱ λίθοι κράξουσιν**, the stones will cry out; possibly there is a reference to Hab. ii. 11, but the expression is proverbial (instances in Pricaeus, Wetstein, etc.) = the impossible will happen rather than the Messianic kingdom fail of recognition. Some, *e.g.*, Stier and Nösgen, find in the words a reference to the destruction of the temple and the witness it bore to Jesus = if I receive not witness from the Jewish people the scattered stones of the ruined temple will witness for me. An attractive idea, not refuted by Hahn's objection that if it had been in view we should have had **ὅταν οὗτοι σιωπ.** instead of **ἐὰν**, etc. **ἐὰν** with future may express a future supposition with some probability.

Vv. 41-44. *Jesus weeps at sight of the city and laments its doom.*—**ὡς** = when, as in many places in Lk.—**ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' α.**, He wept aloud, like Peter (Mk. xiv. 72).—**δακρύειν** = to shed tears silently; for a group of synonyms with their distinctive meanings *vide* under **κλαίω** in Thayer's Grimm.—Ver. 42. **εἰ ἔγνως**: **εἰ** with the aorist indicative in a supposition contrary to fact, the apodosis being omitted by an impressive aposiopesis.—**ἐν τ. ἡμέρᾳ τ.**, in this (late) day, not too late yet.—**καὶ σὺ**, thou too, as well as my disciples: their insight will save *them*, but not you and the nation; you must know for yourselves.—**καί γε** (T.R.): the combination **καὶ σὺ καί γε** (*vide* critical notes) is suspicious. Coming before **ἐν τ. ἡμέρᾳ**, etc., as in T.R., it will mean: even at this late hour.—**τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην**, the things tending to thy peace = thy salvation.—**νῦν δὲ**, but now as things stand; the day of grace there-

σε, καὶ συνέξουσί σε πάντοθεν, 44. καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσί σε καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου ἐν σοί, καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν ἐν σοὶ λίθον ἐπὶ λίθῳ [1]· ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου."

45. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγοράζοντας,[2] 46. λέγων αὐτοῖς, "Γέγραπται, 'Ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς ἐστίν [3]· ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον λῃστῶν."

47. Καὶ ἦν διδάσκων τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι, καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ· 48. καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκον τὸ τί ποιήσωσιν, ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ἅπας [1] ἐξεκρέματο[4] αὐτοῦ ἀκούων.

1 here only.

[1] λιθον επι λιθον εν σοι in ℵBDL (D with other texts have εν ολη σοι: e, *in tota terra*).

[2] ℵBCL 1, 69, 209 *al.* omit εν αυτω, and ℵBL 1, 209 syr. sin. Orig. omit και αγοραζοντας, which, in view of Lk.'s editorial peculiarities, is to be rejected.

[3] ℵBLR 1, 13, 69 *al.* have και εσται ο οικ. μ. οικ. προσευχης (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] εξεκρεμετο in ℵB (W.H., also Tisch., who remarks: a vulgari usu haud aliena videtur fuisse).

fore is already past.—**ἐκρύβη**: judicial blindness has set in, the penalty of a long course of moral perversity.—Ver. 43. **ὅτι**, for, because, introducing a prophetic picture of coming ruin, either to explain the **εἰ ἔγνως** = what you would have escaped had you but known; or to substantiate the assertion of judicial blindness = no hope of your seeing now; your fate sealed; judgment days will surely come (**ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι**). Then follows an awful picture of these judgment days in a series of clauses connected by a fivefold **καὶ**, the first being = when. The description recalls Isaiah xxix. 3 so closely that the use of such definite phrases before the event is quite conceivable, although many critics think the prophecy so certainly *ex eventu* as to use it for fixing the date of the Gospel.—**χάρακα**, a palisade (here only in N.T.). Titus did erect a palisaded mound around Jerusalem, and, after it was destroyed by the Jews in a sortie, he built a wall.—Ver. 44. **ἐδαφιοῦσι**: this verb (here only in N.T., Sept. several times) has both **σε** and **τὰ τέκνα σ.** for its objects and must have a meaning assigned to it suitable to each: (1) to raze to the ground—in reference to the city, (2) to dash to the ground—in reference to the children or population of the city. Here only in N.T., frequent in Sept.—**τὸν καιρὸν τ. ἐπισκοπῆς σ.**, the season of thy gracious visitation.—**ἐπισκοπή** and its corresponding verb have this meaning in N.T. In Sept. it is a *vox media* and is used with reference to visitations both in mercy and in judgment.

Vv. 45-48. *Jesus in the temple* (Mt. xxi. 12-17, Mk. xi. 15-19). We have here two tableaux: Jesus reforming temple abuses (45-46), and Jesus teaching in the temple to the delight of the people and the chagrin of their religious and social superiors. Of the former we have but a slight and colourless presentation from Lk., whose editorial solicitudes, now well known to us, here come into play. The story as told by Mt. and Mk. shows passion (of the true Divine prophetic type) and action bordering on violence. This disappears from Lk.'s page in favour of a decorous but neutral picture. J. Weiss thinks it incredible that Lk. should have given us so inadequate a statement had he had such an account as that in Mk. before him (Meyer, eighth edition, note, p. 584). It is perfectly intelligible, once we understand Lk.'s method of handling his material. Equally groundless, for the same reason, is the inference of Hahn from the omissions of Lk. between vv. 44 and 45 (Mt. xxi. 10, 11, Mk. xi. 11-14) that he cannot have known either Mt. or Mk.

Ver. 45. **τοὺς πωλοῦντας**, the sellers, no mention of the buyers in the true text (W.H. after ℵBL).—Ver. 46. **καὶ ἔσται**: the **καὶ**, a well-attested reading, does not occur in the text quoted (Is. lvii. 7). The

XX. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων,[1] διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου, ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, 2. καὶ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν, λέγοντες,[2] "Εἰπὲ[3] ἡμῖν, ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, ἢ τίς ἐστιν ὁ δούς σοι τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην;" 3. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ ἕνα[4] λόγον, καὶ εἴπατέ μοι· 4. Τὸ βάπτισμα[5] Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν, ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;" 5. Οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο[6] πρὸς ἑαυτούς, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι ἐὰν εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ, Διατί οὖν[7] οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; 6. ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν, Ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, πᾶς ὁ λαὸς[8] καταλιθάσει ἡμᾶς· πεπεισμένος

[1] Omit εκεινων ℵBDLQ *al.*

[2] λεγοντες προς αυτον in ℵBL 1, 131, 209 verss.

[3] ειπον in ℵ^{a}BLR 1, 33.

[4] Omit ενα (from parall.) ℵBLR 1, 33, 69, etc.

[5] το before Ι. in ℵDLR (Tisch.), not in B (W.H.).

[6] συνελογιζοντο (imperfect in Mt. and Mk.) in ℵCD. Tisch. and W.H. retain -σαντο.

[7] ℵBL *al. pl.* omit ουν.

[8] ο λαος απας in ℵBDL 1, 33 *al.*

words πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, which do occur, are strangely omitted by Lk., the Gentile evangelist, perhaps to sharpen the contrast between the ideal—*a house of prayer*, and the reality—*a den of robbers*, *i.e.*, of dishonest traders, or it may be because the temple was now in ruins. The last part of the saying is from Jerem. vii. 11.

Vv. 47-48. τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, daily, as in xi. 3.—ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ γραμματεῖς, priests and scribes, Sadducees and Pharisees, lax and strict, united against the Man who had nothing in common with either.—καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι: added as a kind of afterthought = the socially important people who, though laymen, agreed with the professionals in their dislike of Jesus.—Ver. 48. τὸ τί ποιήσωσιν, "the what to do"; the will to kill there, but the way dark (*cf.* i. 62, xxii. 24).—ὁ λαὸς, the people, the common mass, with their inconvenient liking for a true, outspoken, brave, heroic man.—ἐξεκρέμετο α., hung upon Him (hearing), an expressive phrase, and classical; examples in Wetstein and Pricaeus and in Loesner from Philo. From the Latins they cite:

Pendentque iterum narrantis ab ore.—Virg., Aen., v. 79.

Narrantis conjux pendet ab ore viri.—Ovid., Her., 1, 30.

Pricaeus suggests that the metaphor is taken from iron and the magnet.

CHAPTER XX. IN THE TEMPLE. PREACHING, CONFLICTS, AND PARABLE OF THE VINEDRESSERS.—Vv. 1-8. *By what authority?* (Mt. xx. 23-27, Mk. xi. 27-33).—ἐν μιᾷ τ. ἡ., on one of the days, referred to in xix. 47; vague note of time.—εὐαγγελιζομένου: Lk. wishes his readers to understand that Jesus was not engaged in heated controversy all the time, that His main occupation during these last days was preaching the good news, speaking "words of grace" there as in Galilee and in Samaria.—ἐπέστησαν, came upon, with perhaps a suggestion of suddenness (examples in Loesner from Philo), and even of hostility (adorti sunt, Erasmus, *Annot.*). In xxi. 34 Lk. uses a separate word along with the verb to express the idea of suddenness.—Ver. 2. εἰπὸν ἡμῖν: peculiar to Lk., makes the question pointed.—ταῦτα ought to refer to the preaching, not to the cleansing of the temple, which in Lk. is very slightly noticed.—τίς ἐστιν, etc.: a direct question introduced by ἤ, not dependent on εἰπὸν, not altogether distinct from the first question; an alternative form putting it more specifically and more pointedly than in parallels = who is it that gives, who can it be? Authority everything for the interrogants. Every Rabbi had his diploma, every priest his ordination (Farrar).—Ver. 3. λόγον: without the ἕνα of the parallels. *Vide* notes there.—Ver. 5. συνελογίσαντο:

γάρ ἐστιν Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι." 7. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἰδέναι πόθεν. 8. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιῶ."

9. Ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· "Ἄνθρωπός τις ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα,[1] καὶ ἐξέδοτο[2] αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησε χρόνους ἱκανούς. 10. καὶ ἐν[3] καιρῷ ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς γεωργοὺς δοῦλον, ἵνα ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος δῶσιν[4] αὐτῷ· οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ δείραντες αὐτὸν ἐξαπέστειλαν[5] κενόν. 11. καὶ προσέθετο πέμψαι ἕτερον[6] δοῦλον· οἱ δὲ κἀκεῖνον δείραντες καὶ ἀτιμάσαντες ἐξαπέστειλαν κενόν. 12. καὶ προσέθετο πέμψαι τρίτον[7]· οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτον [a] τραυματίσαντες ἐξέβαλον. 13. εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, Τί ποιήσω; πέμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν·

[a] here and in Acts xix. 16.

[1] ℵBCDL omit τις, and ℵBL have εφυτ. αμπ. as in T.R. C has αμπ. ανθ. εφυτ. D αμπ. εφυτ. ανθ.

[2] εξεδετο in ℵBCL = parall. Tisch. and W.H. both adopt it, but Trg. retains εξεδοτο found in D.

[3] Omit εν ℵBDL 33.

[4] δωσουσιν in ℵABLMQ (Tisch., W.H.). CD have δωσιν.

[5] εξαπεστειλαν a. δειραντες in ℵBL.

[6] ετερον πεμψαι in ℵABLU.

[7] τριτον πεμψαι in ℵBL.

for the more usual διαλ.; here only in N.T.—πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς may be connected either with this verb or with λέγοντες.—Ver. 6. καταλιθάσει: in the parallels it is indicated generally that they feared the people; here it is explained why or what they feared: *viz.*, that the people would stone them; to be taken *cum grano*. The verb is a ἅπαξ λεγ.; synonyms are καταλιθοῦν (Joseph.), καταλιθοβολεῖν (Ex. xvii. 4).—πεπεισμένος points to a fixed permanent conviction, this the force of the perfect participle.—Ver. 7. μὴ εἰδέναι, the answer is given in dependent form = οὐκ οἴδαμεν in parallels.

Vv. 9-19. *The parable of the wicked vinedressers* (Mt. xx. 33-46, Mk. xii. 1-12). Between the last section and this comes, in Mt., the parable of the *Two Sons*.

Ver. 9. ἤρξατο: this word is less appropriate here than in Mk., where it means: made a beginning in teaching by parables by uttering this particular parable. Here it may signify turning to the people again after disposing of the question of the Pharisees concerning authority.—ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα: Lk. contents himself with this general statement, omitting the details given in parallels, which explain what planting a vineyard involves.—χρόνους ἱκανούς: literally, "for long times," peculiar to Lk. here; similar phrases are of frequent occurrence in his writings. The "long times" cover the whole period of Israel's history. The absenteeism of God during these long ages represents the free scope given in providence to the will of man in the exercise of his moral responsibility.—Ver. 10. καιρῷ means the fruit season each year; many such seasons at which God sent demanding fruit.—ἵνα δώσουσιν: ἵνα with the future in a pure final clause; similar constructions occur in classic Greek, but with ὅπως, not with ἵνα.—δείραντες: the gradation in indignities is well marked in Lk.—beating, beating with shameful handling (ἀτιμάσαντες), ejection with wounding (τραυματίσαντες ἐξέβαλον), culminating in murder in the case of the son. In the parallels killing comes in sooner, which is true to the historical fact.—Ver. 12. προσέθετο πέμψαι, he added to send, a Hebraism, as in xix. 11.—Ver. 13. τί ποιήσω; deliberative subjunctive, serving to make the step next taken appear something extraordinary. In Mt. it appears simply as the next (final) step in common course. In Mk. the son is the only person left to send. He had yet one, a beloved son, "beloved" added to bring out the significance of

ἴσως τοῦτον ἰδόντες[1] ἐντραπήσονται. 14. Ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ διελογίζοντο πρὸς ἑαυτούς,[2] λέγοντες, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος· δεῦτε,[3] ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα ἡμῶν γένηται ἡ κληρονομία. 15. Καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, ἀπέκτειναν. Τί οὖν ποιήσει αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος; 16. ἐλεύσεται καὶ ἀπολέσει τοὺς γεωργοὺς τούτους, καὶ δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις." Ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἶπον, "Μὴ γένοιτο." 17. Ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπε, "Τί οὖν ἐστι τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο, 'Λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας;' 18. Πᾶς ὁ πεσὼν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν λίθον συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτόν." 19. Καὶ ἐζήτησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς[4] ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαόν· ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην εἶπε.[5]

[1] Omit **ιδοντες** ℵBCDLQ 1, 33, 131 verss.

[2] **αλληλους** in ℵBDLR 1, 33 *al.*

[3] Omit **δευτε** B and other uncials (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] **οι γραμ. και οι αρχ.** in BL *al.* 1, 33 *al. pl.* verss. T.R. = ℵD.

[5] **ειπεν** before **την παρ.** in ℵB (D **ειρηκεν**) L 13, 69, etc.

sending him. In Lk. the reference to the son has a theological colour: **τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν**.—**ἴσως**: more than "perhaps" or "it may be" (A.V., R.V.), and less than "without doubt" ("sine dubio," Wolf). It expresses what may naturally and reasonably be expected = **τάχα** (Hesychius), or **οἶμαι** (Bornemann) = I *should think* (they will reverence him). Here only in N.T.—Ver. 15. **ἐκβαλόντες ἀπέκτειναν**, casting out they killed him, inverting the order of the actions in Mk.; perhaps with prospective reference (on Lk.'s part) to the crucifixion, when Jesus was led outside the city and crucified "without the gate".—Ver. 16. **μὴ γένοιτο**: here only in the Gospels, frequent in St. Paul's Epistles ("a Pauline phrase," Holtzmann, H. C.). Sturz (*De Dialecto Mac. et Alex.*) reckons it an Alexandrine usage, because found in the sense of deprecation only in Sept., N.T., and late Greek writers. Raphel cites an example from Herodotus. This **μὴ γένοιτο** is put by Lk. into the mouth of the people, as unable to contemplate the doom pronounced on the husbandmen as described by Jesus. In Mt. (xx. 41) the people themselves pronounce the doom. The sentiment thus strongly expressed prepares the way for the reference to the "rejected stone".

Vv. 17-19.—**ἐμβλέψας**, looking intently, to give impressiveness to what He is going to say in reply.—**τί οὖν**, etc., what then is (means) this Scripture? the **οὖν** implying that the words point to the very doom they deprecate. Yet the oracle does not directly indicate the fate of the builders, but rather the unexpected turn in the fortunes of the rejected and despised Stone. In Mt. and Mk. the citation is introduced, without any binding connection with what immediately goes before, to state a fact concerning the future of the "Son" lying outside the parable. They give the citation in full. Lk. omits the last clause: **παρὰ κυρίου**, etc.—Ver. 18 points out the bearing of the turn in the fortunes of the "Stone" on the fate of those who rejected Him. The thought is based on Daniel ii. 35. It is not in Mk., and it is a doubtful reading in Mt. It may have been a comment on the oracle from the Psalter suggested to believing minds by the tragic fate of the Jews. They first stumbled on the stone, then the stone fell on them with crushing judicial effect.—Ver. 19 states the effect of the parabolic discourse of Jesus on the men whom it satirised. They desired to apprehend the obnoxious Speaker on the spot.—**ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν**, etc.: the **καὶ** here, as in Mk., is in effect = but; *vide* notes on Mk.—**ἔγνωσαν**, they, that is the Pharisees, and scribes knew.—**πρὸς αὐτούς** = with reference to themselves.

20. Καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους, ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, εἰς τὸ[1] παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος. 21. καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν, λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ὀρθῶς λέγεις καὶ διδάσκεις, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ διδάσκεις. 22. ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν[2] Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι, ἢ οὔ;" 23. Κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Τί με πειράζετε[3]; 24. ἐπιδείξατέ[4] μοι δηνάριον· τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφήν;" Ἀποκριθέντες δὲ εἶπον,[5] "Καίσαρος." 25. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς,[6] "Ἀπόδοτε τοίνυν[7] τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῷ Θεῷ." 26. Καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ[8] ῥήματος ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ· καὶ θαυμάσαντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκρίσει αὐτοῦ, ἐσίγησαν.

b 1 Cor. iii. 19. 2 Cor. iv. 2; xi. 3. Eph. iv. 14.

[1] For εις το ℵBCDL have ωστε (Tisch., W.H.).
[2] ημας in ℵABL 13, 33, 69 *al.* CD have ημιν.
[3] Omit τι με πειρ. ℵBL minusc. e cop.
[4] δειξατε in ℵABDLMP *al.*
[5] For αποκρ. δε ειπον ℵBL 33 have οι δε ε.
[6] προς αυτους in ℵBL 1, 13, 69.
[7] τοινυν αποδοτε in ℵBL 69.
[8] του for αυτου in ℵBL 433 (W.H.).

Vv. 20-26. *The tribute question* (Mt. xxii. 15-22, Mk. xii. 13-17).—Ver. 20. **παρατηρήσαντες**: used absolutely = watching, not Him, but their opportunity; so Grotius and Field (*Ot. Nor.*); watching with close cunning observation (*accurate et insidiose observare*, Kypke).—**ἐγκαθέτους**: some derive from **ἐν** and **κάθημαι** = sitters down, lying in wait (*subsessores*, Grotius), others from **κατατίθημι**. The most probable derivation is from **καθίημι**, to place in ambush (so Kypke, Schanz, etc.). Pricaeus cites Sirach viii. 11: **ἵνα μὴ ἐγκαθίσῃ ὡς ἔνεδρον τῷ στόματί σου**, as probably in the mind of Lk. Here only in N.T. = "spies" (A.V., R.V.), "Aufpasser" (Weizsäcker).—**ὑποκρινομένους ἑ.**, passing themselves off as; that was the trick they had been put up to.—**δικαίους**, honest men, sincerely anxious to know and do their duty. They might pose as such with the better chance of success if they were as Mt. states "disciples"; scholars of the scribes = ingenuous young men.—**αὐτοῦ λόγου**: that they might lay hold either *of a word of His*, or *of Him by a word* (*eum in sermone*, Vulgate), or *of Him, i.e., of a word spoken by Him;* all three alternatives find support.—**ὥστε** (**εἰς τὸ** T.R.), indicating aim and tendency.—**τ. ἀρχῇ καὶ τ. ἐξουσίᾳ**: the repetition of the article raises a doubt whether both nouns refer to **τοῦ ἡγεμόνος**. So construed the clause will mean "to the rule and especially to the authority of the governor," rule being general, and authority a more special definition of it. Some take **ἀρχῇ** as referring to the Sanhedrim. The probability is that both refer to Pilate. On the aim thus said to be in view Grotius remarks: "When disputes about religion do not suffice to oppress the innocent, matters relating to the state are wont to be taken up".—Ver. 21. **ὀρθῶς**, rightly, as in vii. 43, pointing not to sincerity in speech (**λέγεις**) and teaching (**διδάσκεις**) but to sound judgment = you always say the right thing; the second clause points to impartiality = you say the same thing to all; the third to sincerity = you say what you think. They describe an ideal from which their own masters were as remote as possible.

Ver. 22 f. *The question.*—**φόρον** = **κῆνσον**, a Latinism, in the parallels.—Ver. 23. **πανουργίαν**, craft, cunning, as in 2 Cor. iv. 2, which possibly the evangelist had in his eye. Each synoptist has his own word here (**πονηρίαν** Mt., **ὑπόκρισιν** Mk.) as if trying to describe the indescribable.—Ver. 24. Lk. reports more briefly than Mt. and Mk., not thinking it necessary to state that the denarius asked for was handed to Jesus.—Ver. 25. **τοίνυν**, therefore, connecting

27. Προσελθόντες δέ τινες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες[1] ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτόν, 28. λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, Μωσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν, ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ ἔχων γυναῖκα, καὶ οὗτος ἄτεκνος ἀποθάνῃ,[2] ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ. 29. ἑπτὰ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν γυναῖκα ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκνος· 30. καὶ[3] ἔλαβεν ὁ δεύτερος τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ οὗτος ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκνος[3]· 31. καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα, καὶ ἀπέθανον· 32. ὕστερον δὲ πάντων[4] ἀπέθανε καὶ ἡ γυνή. 33. ἐν τῇ οὖν ἀναστάσει,[5] τίνος αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνή; οἱ γὰρ ἑπτὰ ἔσχον αὐτὴν γυναῖκα." 34. Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς[6] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γαμοῦσι καὶ ἐκγαμίσκονται[7]· 35. οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε ἐκγαμίσκονται[8]· 36. οὔτε γὰρ

[1] ℵBCDL 1, 33 *al.* verss. have **οι λεγοντες**, which may be a conformation to parall. Tisch. and W.H. adopt this reading.

[2] For **αποθανη** ℵaBLP 1, 33 *al.* have **η** (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] For **και ελαβεν . . . ατεκνος** ℵBDL have simply **και ο δευτερος** (Tisch., W.H.).

[4] Omit **δε παντων** and place **απεθανε** after **γυνη** ℵBDL minusc.

[5] For **εν τη ουν αναστασει** BL have **η γυνη ουν εν τη αναστ.**, **γυνη** thus occurring twice (Tisch., W.H.).

[6] Omit **αποκριθεις** ℵBDL.

[7] **γαμισκονται** in ℵBL 33.

[8] **γαμιζονται** in ℵDLQRΔ 1, 33 *al.* (Tisch., W.H., text). B has **γαμισκονται** (W.H. marg.).

the dictum following with the fact stated before that the denarius bore Caesar's image, and implying that by the dictum Jesus pronounced in favour of paying tribute to the Roman ruler.—Ver. 26. The reply of Jesus, baffling in itself, was doubly so, because it had made a favourable impression on the people. Therefore the questioners deemed it best to make no attempt at criticism in presence of the people (**ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ**).

Vv. 27-39. *The resurrection question. Sadducees speak* (Mt. xxii. 23-33, Mk. xii. 18-27).—**οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες** in strict grammar ought to refer to **τινες**, but doubtless it is meant to refer to the whole party. It is a case of a nominative in loose apposition with a genitive—"outside the construction of the sentence—interposed as a pendent word, so to speak," Winer, G. N. T., p. 668.—**μὴ εἶναι**: literally denying that there is *not* a resurrection, the meaning being really the reverse. After verbs of denying the Greeks repeat the negation. The reading **λέγοντες**, though well attested, looks like a grammatical correction.—Ver. 28. **ἄτεκνος**: here only in N.T. = **μὴ ἔχων τ.** in Mt. and **μὴ ἀφῇ τ.** in Mk.—Ver. 29. **οὖν**, therefore, carrying on the narrative (frequent in John) and implying that the law of Moses cited gave rise to the curious case stated and the difficulty connected with it.—Ver. 31. **οὐ κατέλιπον τ. κ. ἀπέθανον**, did not leave children and died, for died leaving no children. The emphasis is on the childlessness, therefore it is mentioned first. That the seven died in course of time was a matter of course, but that seven in succession should have no children was marvellous.—Ver. 34. In giving Christ's answer Lk. omits the charge of ignorance against the questioners found in Mt. and Mk.—**γαμίσκονται** = **γαμίζονται** in parallels, here only in N.T.—Ver. 35. **οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες**, etc., those deemed worthy to attain that world. The thought could have been expressed without **τυχεῖν**, for which accordingly there is no equivalent in the Vulgate: "qui digni habebuntur seculo illo," on which account Pricaeus thinks it should be left out of the Greek text. But the

ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται· ἰσάγγελοι γάρ εἰσι, καὶ υἱοί εἰσι τοῦ[1] Θεοῦ, τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες. 37. Ὅτι δὲ ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί, καὶ Μωσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὡς λέγει Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τὸν[2] Θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ τὸν[1] Θεὸν Ἰακώβ. 38. Θεὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστι νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζώντων. πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν." 39. Ἀποκριθέντες δέ τινες τῶν γραμματέων εἶπον, "Διδάσκαλε, καλῶς εἶπας." 40. Οὐκ ἔτι δὲ[3] ἐτόλμων ἐπερωτᾷν αὐτὸν οὐδέν.

41. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, "Πῶς λέγουσι τὸν Χριστὸν υἱὸν Δαβὶδ εἶναι; 42. καὶ αὐτὸς[4] Δαβὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν, 'Εἶπεν ὁ[5] Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, 43. ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.' 44. Δαβὶδ οὖν κύριον αὐτὸν[6]

[1] Omit **του** ℵABL. [2] Omit **τον** in second and third places ℵBDLR.
[3] **ουκετι γαρ** in ℵBL 33 *al.*
[4] **ειναι Δ. υιον** in ℵBL, and **αυτος γαρ** for **και αυτος**. [5] BD omit **ο**.
[6] **αυτον κυριον** in ABKL, etc. (W.H.). T.R. = ℵD (Tisch.).

use of this verb, even when it seems but an elegant superfluity, is common in Greek. Examples in Bornemann.—Ver. 36. **ἀποθανεῖν**: marriage, birth, death, go together, form one system of things, that of this world. In the next they have no place. Here Lk. expatiates as if the theme were congenial.—**ἰσάγγελοι**, angel-like, here only in N.T.—**καὶ υἱοί εἰσιν**, etc.: sons of God, being sons of the resurrection. This connection of ideas recalls St. Paul's statement in Rom. i. 4 that Christ was declared or constituted Son of God with power by the resurrection.—Ver. 37. **καὶ Μ.**: the same Moses who gave the Levirate law. It was important in speaking to Sadducees to show that even *Moses* was on the side of the resurrection.—**ἐμήνυσεν**, made known, used in reference to something previously hidden (John xi. 57).—**ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου**, as in Mk., *vide* notes there.—Ver. 38. **θεὸς** is predicate = Jehovah is not God of dead men.—**δὲ** has the force of the argumentative *nonne*.—**πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν**, "for all live unto Him" (A.V., R.V.), is probably an editorial explanatory gloss to make the deep thought of Jesus clearer (not in parallels). The gloss itself needs explanation. Is "all" to be taken without qualification?—**αὐτῷ** may be variously rendered "by Him," *i.e.*, by His power: *quoad Dei potentiam* (Grotius), "in Him" (Ewald), "for Him," *i.e.*, for His honour (Schanz), or for "His thought or judgment" = He accounts them as living (Hahn). The sentiment in some measure echoes Rom. xiv. 7, 8.—Ver. 39. **καλῶς εἶπας**, Thou hast spoken well; complimentary, but insincere, or only half sincere. They are glad to have the *Sadducees* put down, but not glad that *Jesus* triumphed.—Ver. 40. **οὐκέτι γὰρ**: the **γὰρ**, if the true reading, must mean: The scribes could do nothing but flatter (ver. 39), *for* they were so conscious of His power that they dared no longer ask captious questions.

Vv. 41-44. *The counter question* (Mt. xxii. 41-46, Mk. xii. 35-37). Lk., who had given something similar at an earlier stage (x. 25-37), omits the question of the scribe concerning the great commandment, which comes in at this point in Mt. (xxii. 34-40) and Mk. (xii. 28-34), retaining only its conclusion (in Mk.), which he appends to the previous narrative (ver. 40).—Ver. 41. **πρὸς αὐτούς**, to them, *i.e.*, the representatives of the scribes mentioned in ver. 39. In Mt. the Pharisees are addressed, in Mk. the audience is the people, and the question is about the scribes as interpreters.—**πῶς λέγουσι**, how do *they* say? (not **λέγετε**). The controversial character of the question is not made clear in Lk.—Ver. 42. **ἐν βίβλῳ ψ.**, in the book of Psalms, in place of **ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τ. ἁγ.** (in the Holy Spirit, Mk.), which one might have expected Lk. to retain if he found it in his source. But he probably names the place in O.T. whence the quotation is taken for the information of his readers. That what

καλεῖ, καὶ πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ[1] ἐστιν;" 45. Ἀκούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἶπε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ,[2] 46. "Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς, καὶ φιλούντων ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις· 47. οἳ κατεσθίουσι τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χηρῶν, καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσεύχονται. οὗτοι λήψονται περισσότερον κρίμα."

XXI. 1. ἈΝΑΒΛΕΨΑΣ δὲ εἶδε τοὺς βάλλοντας τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον[3] πλουσίους· 2. εἶδε δὲ καί[4] τινα χήραν πενιχρὰν βάλλουσαν ἐκεῖ δύο λεπτά,[5] 3. καὶ εἶπεν, "Ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ χήρα ἡ πτωχὴ αὕτη[6] πλεῖον[7] πάντων ἔβαλεν· 4. ἅπαντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ,[8] αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς ἅπαντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλε."

[1] **αυτου υιος** in ℵB, etc. (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = ℵDL.
[2] Omit **αυτου** BD.
[3] **εις το γαζ. τα δωρα α.** in ℵBDLX 1, 33, 69 *al. pl.*
[4] Omit **και** ℵBKLMQ 33.
[5] So in D (Tisch.). **λεπτα δυο** in ℵBLQX 33 (W.H.); conformed to **Mk.**?
[6] **αυτη** before **η πτωχη** in ℵBDLQ (W.H. = Mk.). T.R. = ΑΧΓΔ, etc. (Tisch.).
[7] **πλειω** in DQX minusc. (Tisch.). T.R. = B = Mk. (W.H.).
[8] Omit **του Θεου** ℵBLX minusc.

was written in the Psalms, was spoken by the Holy Spirit, was axiomatic for him.—**ὑποπόδιον**, as in the Psalms, for **ὑποκάτω** in Mt. and Mk. according to the approved readings. Lk. seems to have turned the passage up (Holtzmann, H. C.).

Vv. 45-47. *Warning against the scribes* (Mk. xii. 38-40).—Either a mere fragment of the larger whole in Mt. xxiii., or the original nucleus around which Mt. has gathered much kindred matter—the former more likely.—Ver. 46. **φιλούντων**: while following Mk. in the main, Lk. improves the construction here by introducing this participle before **ἀσπασμοὺς**, which in Mk. depends on **θελόντων**.—Ver. 47. Another improvement is the change of **οἱ κατεσθίοντες** (Mk. xii. 40) into **οἳ κατεσθίουσι**—*vide* notes on Mk.—**μακρὰ**, at length, an adverb. Bengel (in Mt.) suggests **μακρᾷ** to agree with **προφάσει** ("ex orationibus suis fecere magnam **πρόφασιν**, praetextum comedendi domos viduarum"). Elsner adopts the same view.

CHAPTER XXI. THE WIDOW'S OFFERING. THE APOCALYPTIC DISCOURSE.—Vv. 1-4. *The widow's offering* (Mk. xii. 41-44), unfortunately placed at the beginning of this chapter, which should have been devoted wholly to Christ's solemn discourse concerning the future. Yet this mal-arrangement corresponds to the manner in which Lk. introduces that discourse, by comparison with Mt. and Mk., markedly unemphatic.—Ver. 1. **ἀναβλέψας**, looking up, giving the impression of a casual, momentary glance taken by one who had been previously preoccupied with very different matters. Mk's narrative conveys the idea of deliberate, interested observation by one who took a position convenient for the purpose, and continued observing (**καθίσας κατέναντι, ἐθεώρει**).—**τὰ δῶρα**, instead of Mk's **χαλκὸν**. Lk. has in view only the rich; Mk., in the first place, the multitude.—**πλουσίους**: the whole clause from **τοὺς** may be taken as the object of **εἶδε**, saw the rich casting in, etc., or **πλ.** may be in apposition with **τοὺς βάλλοντας** = saw those casting in, etc., being rich men (so Hahn and Farrar). The former (A.V., Wzs.) is to be preferred.—Ver. 2. **πενιχρὰν**, needy, from **πένομαι** or **πένης**; a poetic word rarely used, here only in N.T. **πτωχὴ**, Mk.'s word, is stronger = reduced to beggary.—**δύο λέπτα**. Lk. does not think it necessary to explain

5. ΚΑΙ τινων λεγόντων περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ὅτι λίθοις καλοῖς καὶ ἀναθήμασι[1] κεκόσμηται, εἶπε, 6. "Ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ,[2] ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται." 7. Ἐπηρώτησαν δὲ αὐτόν, λέγοντες, "Διδάσκαλε, πότε οὖν ταῦτα ἔσται; καὶ τί τὸ σημεῖον, ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα γίνεσθαι;"

8. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Βλέπετε μὴ πλανηθῆτε· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, λέγοντες, Ὅτι[3] ἐγώ εἰμι· καί, Ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε.

[1] So in BLQ *al.* (W.H.). αναθεμασιν in ℵADX (Tisch.).
[2] ℵBL minusc. add ωδε (W.H.). [3] Omit οτι ℵBLX.

what the coin was or what the contribution amounted to. Mk. states its value in Roman coinage (κοδράντης).—Ver. 3. εἶπεν: to whom not indicated. The narrator is concerned alone about the saying—ἀληθῶς, for Mk.'s Hebrew ἀμὴν, as nearly always.—πτωχὴ: Lk. does not avoid this word: the use of the other term in his preliminary narrative is a matter of style. πτωχὴ implies that the widow might have been expected to beg rather than to be giving to the temple treasury.—Ver. 4. ἅπαντες οὗτοι, all these, referring to the rich and pointing to them.—ὑστερήματος: practically = Mk.'s ὑστερήσεως, preferred possibly because in use in St. Paul's epistles: not so good a word as ὑστέρησις to denote the *state* of poverty out of which she gave. Lk.'s expression strictly means that she gave out of a deficit, a minus quantity (" ex eo quod deest illi," Vulg.), a strong but intelligible way of putting it.—τ. βίον, her *living*, as in xv. 12, 30 = means of subsistence. Lk. combines Mk.'s two phrases into one.

THE APOCALYPTIC DISCOURSE (vv. 5-38).—Vv. 5-7. *Introduction to the discourse* (Mt. xxiv. 1-3, Mk. xiii. 1-4).—καί τινων λεγόντων, and some remarking. A most unemphatic transition, as if what follows were simply a continuation of discourse *in the temple* on one of many topics on which Jesus spoke. No indication that it was disciples (any of the Twelve) who asked the question, or that the conversation took place outside. *Cf.* the narrative in Mk. The inference that Lk. cannot have known Mk.'s narrative (Godet) is inadmissible. Lk. omits many things he knew. His interest is obviously in the didactic matter only, and perhaps we have here another instance of his "sparing the Twelve". He may not have cared to show them filled with thoughtless admiration for a building (and a system) which was doomed to judicial destruction. — λίθοις καλοῖς, beautiful stones: marble, huge; *vide* Joseph., B. J., v. 5, 2.—καὶ ἀναθήμασι, and votive or sacred gifts, in Lk. only; the reference implies that the spectators are within the building. These gifts were many and costly, from the great ones of the earth: a table from Ptolemy, a chain from Agrippa, a golden vine from Herod the Great. The temple was famous for its wealth. Tacitus writes: "illic immensae opulentiae templum," *Hist.*, vi. 8.—κεκόσμηται: perfect, expressing the permanent result of past acts of skilful men and beneficent patrons—a highly ornamented edifice, the admiration of the world, but marked for destruction by the moral order of the universe.—Ver. 6. ταῦτα ἃ θ. Some (Grotius, Pricaeus) take ταῦτα = τούτων: of these things which ye see a stone shall not be left. Most, however, take it as a nominative absolute = as for these things which ye see (*vide* Winer, § lxiii. 2 d). This suits better the emotional mood.—ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι: *cf.* v. 35, where a similar ominous allusion to coming evil days occurs.—Ver. 7. διδάσκαλε, Master, suggesting its correlate, disciples, but not necessarily implying that the question proceeded from the Twelve; rather the contrary, for they would not be so formal in their manner of speaking to Jesus (*cf.* Mt. and Mk.).—πότε οὖν ταῦτα, etc.: the question refers exclusively to the predicted destruction of the temple = when, and what the sign? So in Mk. *Cf.* Mt.

Vv. 8-11. *Signs prelusive of the end* (Mt. xxiv. 4-8, Mk. xiii. 5-11).—βλέπετε, etc., take heed that ye be not *deceived*. This the keynote—not to tell when, but to protect disciples from delusions and terrors.—ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, in my name, *i.e.*, calling themselves Christs. *Vide* at Mt. on these false Messiahs.—ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικε: the καιρὸς should naturally mean Jerusalem's fatal day.—Ver. 9.

μὴ οὖν[1] πορευθῆτε ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. 9. ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ [a] ἀκαταστασίας, μὴ πτοηθῆτε· δεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα γενέσθαι πρῶτον, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος." 10. Τότε ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἐγερθήσεται ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος, καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν· 11. σεισμοί τε μεγάλοι κατὰ τόπους καὶ[2] λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ[3] ἔσονται, φόβητρά τε καὶ σημεῖα ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μεγάλα ἔσται. 12. Πρὸ δὲ τούτων ἁπάντων ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν, καὶ διώξουσι, παραδιδόντες εἰς συναγωγὰς[4] καὶ φυλακάς, ἀγομένους[5] ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας, ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου. 13. ἀποβήσεται δὲ[6] ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον· 14. θέσθε οὖν εἰς τὰς καρδίας[7] ὑμῶν, μὴ προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι· 15. ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν, ᾗ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντειπεῖν

a 1 Cor. xiv. 33. 2 Cor. vi. 5; xii. 20. Jas. iii. 16.

[1] Omit ουν ℵBDLX. [2] και before κατα τ. in ℵBL 33.
[3] λιμ. και λοιμ. in ℵDL (Tisch.). λοιμ. και λιμ. in B (W.H. text).
[4] τας before συναγ. in ℵBD. [5] απαγομενους in ℵBDL minusc.
[6] Omit δε ℵBD. [7] θετε ουν εν ταις καρδιαις in ℵABDLX 33.

ἀκαταστασίας, unsettled conditions, for **ἀκοὰς πολέμων** in Mt. and Mk., and perhaps intended as an explanation of that vague phrase. Hahn refers to the French Revolution and the Socialist movement of the present day as illustrating the meaning.—**πτοηθῆτε** = **θροεῖσθε** in parallels; here and in xxiv. 37.—**δεῖ γάρ**, etc., *cf.* the laconic version in Mk. (W. and H.) and notes there.—**πρῶτον, οὐκ εὐθέως**: both emphasising the lesson that the crisis cannot come before certain things happen, and the latter hinting that it will not come even then.—Ver. 10. **τότε ἔλεγεν** points to a new beginning in discourse, which has the effect of dissociating the repeated mention of political disturbances from what goes before, and connecting it with apostolic tribulations referred to in the sequel. In Mt. and Mk. the verse corresponding is simply an expansion of the previous thought. —Ver. 11. **καὶ κατὰ τόπους**: the **καὶ** thus placed (ℵBL) dissociates **κ. τ.** from **σεισμοί** and connects it with **λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοί**: not earthquakes, but pestilences and famines here, there, everywhere. **λ. καὶ λ.**, a baleful conjunction common in speech and in fact.—**φόβητρα**, terrifying phenomena, here only in N.T. (in Is. xix. 17, Sept.). The **τε** connects the **φόβητρα** with the signs from heaven next mentioned. They are in fact the same thing (**ἓν διὰ δυοῖν**, Bengel).

Vv. 12-19. *Signs earlier still* (Mt. xxiv. 9-14, Mk. xiii. 9-13).—Ver. 12. **πρὸ δὲ τούτων ἁπάντων**: this phrase may be introduced here because Mk.'s account lying under Lk.'s eye mentions the signs in the heaven at a later stage, ver. 24. Or it may be Lk.'s equivalent for "these things are the beginning of *birth pangs*" (Mt. ver. 8, Mk. ver. 9), a Hebrew idea which he avoids.—**ἀπαγομένους**: a technical term in Athenian legal language.—Ver. 13. **ἀποβήσεται**, it will turn out; as in Phil. i. 19.—**ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον**, for a testimony to you = to your credit or honour; = **εἰς μαρτυρίου δόξαν**, Theophy. So also Bleek. J. Weiss (Meyer), following Baur and Hilgenfeld, renders: it will result in your *martyrdom*. This meaning is kindred to that of Theophy., but can hardly be intended here (Schanz). The idea belongs to a later time, and the sense is scarcely consistent with ver. 18.—Ver. 14. **θέτε οὖν**: not = consider, as in i. 66, but = resolve, as in Acts v. 4 ("settle it in your hearts," A.V.).—**μὴ προμελετᾶν** (here only in N.T.), not to study beforehand, with the inf.; not to be taken in the letter, as a rule, but in the spirit, therefore = Mk.'s **προμεριμνᾶτε** which counsels abstinence from anxious thought beforehand.—Ver. 15. **ἐγὼ**, I, emphatic, the exalted Lord, instead of "the Holy Spirit" in Mk. and "the Spirit of the Father" in Mt. x. 20. The substitution bears witness to the inspiring effect of the thought of the Lord Jesus ruling in heaven on the minds of Christians enduring tribulation, at the time when Lk. wrote.—**στόμα**, a mouth = utterance.—**σοφίαν**: the wisest thing to say in the actual situation.—**ἀντιστῆναι** refers to **στόμα**, and **ἀντειπεῖν** to **σοφίαν** = "They will not be able to

οὐδὲ ἀντιστῆναι[1] πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν. 16. παραδοθήσεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων, καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν· 17. καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου· 18. καὶ θρὶξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται. 19. ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε[2] τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν. 20. Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε κυκλουμένην ὑπὸ στρατοπέδων τὴν[3] Ἱερουσαλήμ, τότε γνῶτε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς. 21. τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη· καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχωρείτωσαν· καὶ οἱ ἐν ταῖς χώραις μὴ [b] εἰσερχέσθωσαν εἰς αὐτήν. 22. ὅτι ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως αὗταί εἰσι, τοῦ πληρωθῆναι[4] πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα. 23. οὐαὶ δὲ[5] ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις· ἔσται γὰρ ἀνάγκη μεγάλη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὀργὴ ἐν[6] τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. 24. καὶ πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαίρας, καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη[7] καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη

b here only in N.T.

[1] αντιστηναι η αντειπειν in ℵBL 13, 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] κτησεσθε in AB minusc. (W.H.). T.R. = ℵDLRX, etc. (Tisch.).

[3] Omit την ℵBD. [4] πλησθηναι in ℵABDLRΔ *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] BDL codd. vet. Lat. omit δε; unsuitable to the prophetic style, which makes abrupt transitions.

[6] Omit εν ℵABCDKL *al. pl.*

[7] τα εθνη παντα in ℵBLR 124 cop. (Tisch., W.H.).

gainsay your speech nor to *resist* your wisdom" (Farrar, C. G. T.).—Ver. 16. καὶ, even, by parents, etc.: *non modo alienis*, Beng.—ἐξ ὑμῶν, some of you, limiting the unqualified statement of Mk., and with the facts of apostolic history in view.—Ver. 17. μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων, *continually* hated (pres. part.) by *all;* dismal prospect! Yet—Ver. 18, θρὶξ, etc., a hair of your head shall not perish = Mt. x. 30, where it is said: "your hairs are all numbered". What! even in the case of those who die? Yes, Jesus would have His apostles live in this faith whatever betide; an optimistic creed, necessary to a heroic life.—Ver. 19. κτήσεσθε or κτήσασθε, ye shall win, or win ye; sense the same. Similar various readings in Rom. v. 1, ἔχωμεν or ἔχομεν.

Vv. 20-24. *Jerusalem's judgment day* (Mt. xxiv. 15-21, Mk. xiii. 14-19).—Ver. 20. κυκλουμένην, in course of being surrounded; pres. part., but not necessarily implying that for the author of this version of Christ's words the process is actually going on (J. Weiss—Meyer). Jesus might have so spoken conceiving Himself as present.—στρατοπέδων, camps, or armies, here only in N.T. This takes the place in Lk. of the βδέλυγμα in the parallels, avoided as at once foreign and mysterious.—ἡ ἐρήμωσις α., her desolation, including the ruin of the temple, the subject of inquiry: when besieging armies appear you know what to look for.—Ver. 21. τότε, then, momentous hour, time for prompt action.—φευγέτωσαν, flee! The counsel is for three classes: (1) those in Judaea at some distance from Jerusalem, (2) those who happen to be in Jerusalem (ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς) when the armies appear, (3) those in the fields or farms round about Jerusalem (ἐν ταῖς χώραις) who might be tempted to take refuge within the city from the invaders, thinking themselves safe within its walls, and who are therefore counselled not to enter. The corresponding counsel in the parallels, vv. 17, 18 in Mt., 15, 16 in Mk., vividly sets forth the necessity of *immediate* flight.—Ver. 22: peculiar to Lk., and setting forth Jerusalem's fate as the fulfilment (πλησθῆναι, for the more usual πληρωθῆναι, here only in N.T.) of prophecy.—Ver. 23. οὐαὶ, etc.: as in parallels as far as ἡμέραις; then follow words peculiar to Lk. concerning the ἀνάγκη and ὀργή. The use of the former word in the sense of distress is mainly Hellenistic; here and in St. Paul's epistles. The latter

ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, ἄχρι[1] πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. 25. Καὶ ἔσται[2] σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [c]συνοχὴ ἐθνῶν ἐν ἀπορίᾳ, ἠχούσης[3] θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου, 26. [d]ἀποψυχόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ· αἱ γὰρ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. 27. καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.

c 2 Cor. ii. 4.
d here only in N.T.

28. "Ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι, ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν· διότι ἐγγίζει ἡ [e]ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν."

e here only in Gospels.

[1] αχρι ου in ℵBCDLR *al. pl.* B inserts after πληρωθωσιν και εσονται (W.H. in brackets).

[2] The singular with a plural neuter nominative as usual in T.R.; εσονται in ℵBD.

[3] ηχους in ℵABCLMRX *al.* (Tisch., W.H.). ηχουσης (D, etc.) an exegetical change.

word expresses the same idea as that in 1 Thess. ii. 16.—Ver. 24: the description here becomes very definite (slaughter and captivity) and may be coloured by the event.—**πατουμένη**: usually taken as = **καταπατουμένη**: trodden under foot in a contemptuous way, but it may mean simply "trodden" in the sense of being occupied by (Hahn).—**καιροὶ ἐθνῶν**: the meaning of this suggestive phrase is not clear. The connection of thought seems to require that it be taken = the times of Gentile action in execution of Divine judgment on Israel, or more generally the times of Gentile supremacy. Yet I strongly incline to side with those who find in the phrase a reference to a Gentile *day of grace*. The Jews had had their day of grace (*vide* xix. 44, **τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς**) and the Gentiles were to have their turn. Such an idea would be congenial to Lk., the Pauline evangelist, and in sympathy with St. Paul's own thought in Rom. xi. 25. It would also be Lk.'s equivalent for the thought in Mt. xxiv. 14, Mk. xiii. 10. The expression may have become current and so be used here as a *vox signata*.

Vv. 25-28. *Signs of the advent* (Mt. xxiv. 29-31, Mk. xiii. 24-27).—Ver. 25. **σημεῖα**, etc.: the reference to the signs in heaven is very summary as compared with the graphic picture in the parallels. Lk. is more interested in the state of things on earth.—**συνοχὴ ἐ.**, distress of nations, *cf.* **συνέχομαι** in xii. 50.—**ἐν ἀπορίᾳ** may be connected with what follows or with **ἐθνῶν** = nations in perplexity, in which case the last clause—**ἠχοῦς**, etc.—will depend on **συνοχὴ** = distress from the noise and billows (**σάλος** = wave-movement: **ἡ τῆς θαλάσσης κλύδωνος κίνησις**, Hesych.) of the sea (so Hahn). The main difficulty lies in the vagueness of the reference to the sea. Is it meant literally, or is it a metaphor for the disturbed state of the world? If the latter the force of the genitives **ἠχοῦς, σάλου** will be best brought out by supposing **ὡς** to be understood = in perplexity like the state of the sea in a storm. So Heinsius (*Exer. Sac.*): "**ἀπορίαν** illam et calamitatem mari fore similem, quoties horrendum tonat atque commovetur," citing in support Tertullian's *veluti* a sonitu maris fluctuantis. The mode of expression is very loose: the sound of the sea and the waves, instead of "the sounding waves of the sea". Yet the crudeness of the construction suits the mood described. **ἠχους** may be accented either **ἦχους** or **ἠχοῦς** (W.H.) according as it is derived from **ἦχος** (neuter like **ἔλεος, νῖκος**, etc., in N.T.) or from **ἠχώ**.—Ver. 26. **ἀποψυχόντων**: literally, dying, probably meant tropically = **ὡς νεκροί**, Mt. xxviii. 4.—**ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας**, from fear and expectation, instead of fearful expectation as in Heb. x. 27 (**φοβερὰ ἐκδοχή**). **προσδοκία** here and in Acts xii. 11.—Ver. 27. **ἐν νεφέλῃ**, in a cloud, sing., instead of the plural in parallels, making the conception more literal.—Ver. 28: instead of the graphic picture of the angels gathering the elect in Mt. and Mk., Lk. has a general statement that when these signs, terrible to the world, begin to appear the hour of redemption for believers is at hand. They may look up and raise their heads. *Cf.* 1 Thess. i. 5-10, Jas. v. 7.

29. Και εἶπε παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς, "Ἴδετε τὴν συκῆν καὶ πάντα τὰ δένδρα. 30. ὅταν προβάλωσιν ἤδη, βλέποντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν γινώσκετε ὅτι ἤδη ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν. 31. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ὅταν ἴδητε ταῦτα γινόμενα, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγύς ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ. 32. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται. 33. ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ παρελεύσονται, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ μὴ παρέλθωσι.[1] 34. Προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς, μήποτε βαρυνθῶσιν[2] ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι[3] ἐν κραιπάλῃ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς, καὶ αἰφνίδιος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐπιστῇ[4] ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη· 35. ὡς παγὶς γὰρ ἐπελεύσεται[5] ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς καθημένους ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς. 36. ἀγρυπνεῖτε οὖν[6] ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ δεόμενοι, ἵνα καταξιωθῆτε[7] ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι, καὶ σταθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου."

[1] **παρελευσονται** in ℵBDL 13, 33. [2] **βαρηθωσι** in ℵABCL *al. pl.*

[3] **υμ. αι καρ.** in ℵCDL (Tisch.). **αι καρ. υμ.** in BX *al.* (W.H.).

[4] **επιστη εφ υμ. αιφνιδιος** in ℵBDLR (Tisch., W.H.).

[5] **επεισελευσεται γαρ** in ℵBDL. *Vide* below. [6] **δε** for **ουν** (CL) in ℵBD.

[7] **κατισχυσητε** in ℵBLX 1, 33 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = CD *al.*

Vv. 29-33. *Parabolic enforcement of the lesson* (Mt. xxiv. 32-35, Mk. xiii. 28-31).—Ver. 29. **καὶ πάντα τὰ δένδρα**: added by Lk., generalising as in ix. 23: "take up his cross *daily*". The lesson is taught by all the trees, but parabolic style demands special reference to one particular tree.—**προβάλωσιν**, put forth (their leaves, **τὰ φύλλα** understood). Similar phrases in Greek authors.—**βλέποντες**, etc., when ye look (as who does not when spring returns!) ye know of yourselves, need no one to tell you.—Ver. 31. **ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ**, explaining the elliptical but not obscure words in Mt. and Mk.: "(it) is near," *i.e.*, the coming of the Son of man. For Lk. that is one with the coming of the Kingdom, which again = redemption in ver. 28.—Vv. 32, 33: with slight change as in parallels, even to the retention of **ἀμὴν** usually replaced by **ἀληθῶς**. Presumably **ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη** means for Lk., as it must have done for the Twelve to whom the words were spoken, the generation to which Jesus Himself belonged. Hahn holds that **αὕτη** refers to the generation within whose time the events mentioned in vv. 25, 26 shall happen (so also Klostermann).

Vv. 34-36. *General exhortation to watchfulness*, peculiar to Lk.; each evangelist having his own epilogue.—**ἐν κραιπάλῃ καὶ μέθῃ**: this seems to be a phrase similar to **ἤχους καὶ σάλου**—sound and wave for sounding wave (ver. 25) = in headache (from yesterday's intoxication) and drunkenness, for: in drunkenness which causes headache and stupidity. Pricaeus denies that **κραιπάλη** (here only in N.T.) means yesterday's debauch (**χθεσινὴ μέθη**), and takes it = **ἀδηφαγία**, gluttony. That is what we expect certainly. The warning he understands figuratively. So also Bleek.—**μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς**, cares of life, "what shall we eat, drink?" etc. (xii. 22).—Ver. 35. **ὡς παγὶς**, as a snare, joined to the foregoing clause in R.V. ("and that day come upon you suddenly as a snare"). Field objects that the verb following (**ἐπεισελεύσεται**) does not seem sufficiently strong to stand alone, especially when the verb **ἐπιστῇ** is doubly emphasised by "suddenly" and "as a snare". He therefore prefers the T.R., which connects **ὡς παγὶς** with what follows, the arrangement adopted in all the ancient versions. The revisers, as if conscious of the force of the above objections, insert "so," "for *so* shall it come," etc., which virtually gives **ὡς παγὶς** a double connection. The figure of a snare, while expressive, is less apposite than that of a thief (xii. 39).—**καθημένους ε. π.**, etc., sitting on the face of the earth; the language here has a Hebrew colouring.—Ver. 36. **ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ**, in every season.—**κατισχύσητε**,

37. Ἦν δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων[1]· τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ηὐλίζετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν. 38. καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς [f] ὤρθριζε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ.

f here only in N.T.

XXII. 1. ἬΓΓΙΖΕ δὲ ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων, ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα· 2. καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, τό, πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν· ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν. 3. Εἰσῆλθε δὲ ὁ[2] Σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον[3] Ἰσκαριώτην, ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα· 4. καὶ ἀπελθὼν συνελάλησε τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι καὶ τοῖς[4]

[1] διδ. εν τω ιερ. in BK codd. vet. Lat. (W.H. marg.).

[2] Omit ο ℵABCDL, etc.

[3] καλουμενον in ℵBDLX 69.

[4] ℵABL, etc., omit this second τοις.

that ye may have power, "prevail" (R.V.).—καταξιωθῆτε (T.R.), "may be accounted worthy" (A.V.), also gives a very good meaning, even in some respects preferable.—σταθῆναι, to stand—in the judgment (so, many), or to be presented to, placed before. So most recent commentators. Either gives a good sense (Bleek).

Vv. 37-38. *Concluding notice as to how Jesus spent His last days.*—Ver. 37. ἐν τ. ἱερῷ διδάσκων, teaching in the temple. The statement covers all that is related in chapters xx., xxi., including the Apocalyptic discourse = Jesus made the most of His short time for the spiritual instruction of the people.—ηὐλίζετο, lodged, imperfect, because done night after night. Some (*e.g.*, Godet and Farrar) think Jesus with the Twelve slept in the open air. The word might mean this, though in Mt. xxi. 17 it appears to mean passed the night in a house in Bethany.—εἰς τ. ὄ.: the use of εἰς is probably due to the influence of ἐξερχόμενος. But Tobit xiv. 10 has a similar construction: μηκέτι αὐλισθῆτε εἰς Νινευῆ.—Ver. 38. ὤρθριζεν, came *early*, or sought Him *eagerly* (Meyer). ὀρθρεύω, the Greek form, always is used literally or temporarily.— ὀρθρίζω, its Hellenistic equivalent, seems sometimes to be used tropically, as in Ps. lxxviii. 34 ("early," R.V., "earnestly" in margin), Sirach iv. 12, vi. 36. The one meaning easily runs into the other: he who rises early to learn is in earnest. Earliness in the people implies earliness in Jesus, and corresponding devotion to the work.

CHAPTER XXII. THE PASSION HISTORY. The Passion history, as told by Lk., varies considerably from the narratives of Mt. and Mk. by omissions, additions, etc. J. Weiss (Meyer), following Feine, thinks that Lk. used as his main source for this part of his Gospel not Mk. but the precanonical Lk., whose existence Feine has endeavoured to prove. Lk.'s narrative at some points resembles that of the Fourth Gospel.

Vv. 1-2. *Introductory* (Mt. xxvi. 1-5, Mk. xiv. 1-2).—ἤγγιζεν, drew near, for the more definite note of time in parallels.—ἡ ἑορτή, etc.: the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the Passover are treated as one. Mk. distinguishes them. Lk. writes for Gentiles; hence his "*called*" the passover (ἡ λεγομένη). — Ver. 2. τὸ πῶς, the how, that was the puzzle, that Jesus should be put out of the way by death (ἀνέλωσιν α.); *somehow* was a settled matter. *Cf.* xix. 48 (τὸ τί, etc.).—ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ τ. λ.: their fear of the people explains why the *how* was so perplexing a matter. The popularity of Jesus was very embarrassing.

Vv. 3-6. *Judas* (Mt. xxvi. 14-16, Mk. xiv. 10, 11). At this point in Mt. (xxvi. 6-13) and Mk. (xiv. 3-9) comes in the anointing at Bethany omitted by Lk. —εἰσῆλθεν Σατανᾶς, Satan entered into Judas. Lk. alone of the synoptists thus explains the conduct of Judas. *Cf.* John xiii. 2. Lk.'s statement is stronger even than John's, suggesting a literal possession. Only so could he account for such behaviour on the part of a disciple towards such a Master. It was a natural view for a devout evangelist in the Apostolic Age, but, taken literally, it would be fatal to the moral significance of the act of the traitor, which, while presenting a difficult psychological problem, doubtless proceeded from conscious motives.—ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ, of the *number*, but how far from the spirit which became that privileged body!—Ver. 4. στρατηγοῖς: a military term which might suggest the captains of Roman soldiers, but doubtless pointing

στρατηγοῖς, τό, πῶς αὐτὸν παραδῷ αὐτοῖς.[1] 5. καὶ ἐχάρησαν, καὶ συνέθεντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι· 6. καὶ ἐξωμολόγησε, καὶ ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἄτερ ὄχλου.[2]

7. Ἦλθε δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, ἐν[3] ᾗ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα· 8. καὶ ἀπέστειλε Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, εἰπών, "Πορευθέντες ἑτοιμάσατε ἡμῖν τὸ πάσχα, ἵνα φάγωμεν." 9. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ποῦ θέλεις ἑτοιμάσωμεν; 10. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἰδού, εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, συναντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν οὗ[4] εἰσπορεύεται· 11. καὶ ἐρεῖτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας, Λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος, Ποῦ ἐστι τὸ κατάλυμα, ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; 12. Κἀκεῖνος ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνώγεον[5] μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ ἑτοιμάσατε." 13. Ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἴρηκεν[6] αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα.

[1] **αυτοις παραδω αυτον** in ℵBCL 116.
[2] **αυτοις** after **ατ. οχ.** in ℵABCL. D omits **αυτοις**.
[3] Omit **εν** BCDL, found in ℵ, etc. (Tisch.).
[4] For **ου** (in D and many uncials) ℵBC and codd. vet. Lat., etc., **have εις ην**.
[5] **αναγαιον** in ℵABDL, etc. (Tisch., W.H.).
[6] **ειρηκει** in ℵBCDL 69.

to the heads of the temple watches (Levites) who kept order during the feast. They would be necessary to the carrying out of Judas' plan. The Levites had to perform garrison duty for the temple (*vide* Numbers viii. 24, 25). In Acts iv. 2 we read of one **στρατηγὸς τ. ἱ.**, who was doubtless the head of the whole body of temple police.—**τὸ πῶς**: a second reference to the perplexing *how*.—Ver. 5. **ἐχάρησαν**, they were *glad*, emphatically; and how piously they would remark on the providential character of this unexpected means of getting out of the difficulty as to the **πῶς**!—Ver. 6. **ἐξωμολόγησε**, he agreed, *spopondit*, for which the Greeks used the simple verb. The active of **ἐξομ.** occurs here only in N.T.—**ἄτερ ὄχλου**, without a crowd, the thing above all to be avoided. **ἄτερ** is a poetic word in Greek authors; here and in ver. 35 only in N.T.

Vv. 7-13. *Preparation for the paschal feast* (Mt. xxvi. 17-19, Mk. xiv. 12-16).—Ver. 7. **ἦλθε**, arrived. A considerable number of commentators (Euthy. Zig., Godet, Schanz, J. Weiss (Meyer)) render, *approached* (**ἐπλησίασε**, Euthy.), holding that Lk. with John makes Jesus anticipate the feast by a day, so finding here one of the points in which the third Gospel is in touch with the fourth.—Ver. 8. **ἀπέστειλε**: in Lk. Jesus takes the initiative; in Mt. and Mk. the disciples introduce the subject. Various reasons have been suggested for this change. Lk. simply states the fact as it was (Schanz). He thought it unsuitable that Jesus should seem to need reminding (Meyer, seventh edition). The change of day, from 14th to 13th Nisan, required Jesus to take the initiative (J. Weiss, Meyer, eighth edition).—**Πέτρον καὶ Ἰ.**: the two disciples sent out not named in parallels.—Ver. 11. **οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας**: a pleonasm = the house-master of the house. Bornemann cites from Greek authors similar redundancies, **οἰκοφύλαξ δομῶν, αἰπόλια αἰγῶν, αἰπόλος αἰγῶν, συβόσια συῶν**, and from Sept., **τὰ βουκόλια τῶν βοῶν** (Deut. vii. 13). In the remainder of ver. 11 and in vv. 12, 13 Lk. follows Mk. closely.

Vv. 14-18. *Prelude to the Lord's Supper* (Mt. xxvi. 20, Mk. xiv. 17).—Ver. 14. **οἱ ἀπόστολοι**, the *apostles*, for disciples in parallels. This designation for the Twelve, the initiative ascribed to Jesus (ver. 8), and the desire of Jesus spoken of in next ver. all fit into each other and indicate a wish on the part of the evangelist to invest what he here

14. Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ δώδεκα[1] ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. 15. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν, πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· 16. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκέτι[2] οὐ μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ,[3] ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ." 17. Καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον, εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε, "Λάβετε τοῦτο, καὶ διαμερίσατε ἑαυτοῖς[4]· 18. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι[5] οὐ μὴ πίω[6] ἀπὸ τοῦ γεννήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, ἕως ὅτου[7] ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ." 19. Καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, λέγων, "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου,[8] τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν." 20. Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων, "Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.[8] 21. Πλὴν ἰδού, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.

[1] Omit **δωδεκα** ℵBD (Tisch., W.H.). LX omit **αποσ.** T.R. = C, etc.

[2] ℵABL omit **ουκετι** (W.H.), found in D *al.* (Tisch.).

[3] For **εξ αυτου** ℵBL minusc. have **αυτο**.

[4] **εις εαυτους** in ℵcBCLM 1, 13, 69 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.). D *al* have **εαυτοις** = T.R.

[5] Omit **οτι** BCDGL *al.* (W.H.), found in ℵXΓΔ *al.* (Tisch.).

[6] After **πιω** ℵBKLMΠ *al.* have **απο του νυν**. DG 1 have the phrase, but before **ου μη**.

[7] So in DX *al.* (Tisch.). ℵBL have **ου** (W.H.).

[8] From **το υπερ υ.**, ver. 19, to the end of ver. 20, found in nearly all Greek codd. and verss., is omitted in D a ff$_2$ i; b e syrr. cur. sin. more or less rearrange the matter referring to the Supper. Syr. cur. has ver. 19 before vv. 17, 18. Syr. sin. has this order: 19, 20 a, 17, 20 b, 18 ("And He took bread and gave thanks over it and brake, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which I give for you: thus do in remembrance of me. And after they had supped He took the cup and gave thanks over it, and said, Take this, share it among yourselves. This is my blood, the new Testament. For I say unto you that henceforth I will not drink of this fruit, until the Kingdom of God shall come," Mrs. Lewis).

narrates with great significance. He seems to write with the practice of the Apostolic Church in view in reference to the Holy Communion.—Ver. 15. **πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν**: the last passover He will eat with them is looked forward to with solemn, tender feeling.—Ver. 16. **λέγω γὰρ**: the words of Jesus here reported answer to words given in Mt. and Mk. at a later stage, *i.e.*, at the close of their narrative of the institution of the Supper. At this point Lk.'s narrative follows a divergent course.—Ver. 17. **δεξάμενος**, having received from the hand of another (different from **λαβὼν**, ver. 19), handed to Him that He might drink.—**εὐχαριστήσας**, this solemn act gives to the handing round of the cup here mentioned the character of a prelude to the Holy Supper: ("quaedam quasi prolusio S. Coenae," Beng. in reference to vv. 15-18). If the reading of D and some Old Latin codd. which makes ver. 19 stop at **σῶμά μου** and omits ver. 20 be the true text (*vide* critical notes above), then Lk.'s account of the institution really begins in ver. 17, and what happened according to it was this: Jesus *first* sent round the cup, saying: take this and divide it among yourselves, then took bread, broke it, and gave it to the disciples, saying: this is my body. In this version two things are to be noted: first, the inversion of the actions; second, the omission of all reference to the blood in connection with the wine. The existence of such a reading as that of D and the Old Latin version raises questions, not only as to Lk.'s text, but as to church practice in the Apostolic age and afterwards; or, assum-

22. καὶ ὁ μὲν υἱὸς[1] τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πορεύεται κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον[2]· πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ, δι' οὗ παραδίδοται." 23. Καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτούς, τό, τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων πράσσειν. 24. Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τό, τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων. 25. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν εὐεργέται καλοῦνται. 26. ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως· ἀλλ' ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γενέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος· καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. 27. τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος, ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δέ εἰμι ἐν

[1] For **και ο μ. υ.** ℵBDL have **οτι**, etc., and ℵcBL **ο υιος μεν.**

[2] **κατα τ. ω. πορευεται** in ℵBDGL 13, 69, etc.

ing as a possibility that Lk. wrote as D represents, have we here another instance of editorial discretion—shrinking from imputing to Jesus the idea of drinking His blood? If with D we omit all that follows **σῶμά μου**, then it results that Lk. has left out *all* the words of our Lord setting forth the significance of His death uttered (1) at Caesarea Philippi; (2) on the occasion of the request of Zebedee's sons; (3) the anointing at Bethany; (4) the institution of the Supper. (2) and (3) are omitted altogether, and (1) is so reported as to make the lesson non-apparent.

Vv. 19-20. *The Supper.*—Ver. 19. **τὸ σῶμά μου**, my body, broken like the bread, implying blood-shedding, though that is passed over in silence if the reading of D be accepted. Note that in Acts ii. 46 the communion of the faithful is called breaking bread.—**τὸ ὑ. ὑ. διδόμενον**: what follows from these words to the end of ver. 20 resembles closely St. Paul's account in 1 Cor. xi. 23-25. This resemblance is one of the arguments of W. and H. against the genuineness of the passage. On the whole subject consult J. Weiss (Meyer, eighth edition) and Wendt, *L. J.*, i., 173, both of whom adopt the reading of D.

Vv. 21-23. *The traitor* (Mt. xxvi. 21-25, Mk. xiv. 18-21), placed after the Supper, instead of before, as in parallels.—**πλὴν**: making a transition to an incident presenting a strong moral contrast to the preceding.—**ἡ χεὶρ**, the hand, graphic and tragic; the hand which is to perform such opposite acts, now touching the Master's on the table, ere long to be the instrument of betrayal.—Ver. 22. **πλὴν**, adversative, nevertheless; the Son of Man destined to go (to death), but that does not relieve the instrument of his responsibility.—Ver. 23. **πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς**, to one another, or among themselves, without speaking to the Master; otherwise in parallels.—**τοῦτο**: in an emphatic position = this horrible deed.

Vv. 24-30. *Strife among the disciples. Cf.* on chap. ix. 46.—Ver. 24. **φιλονεικία**, a contention, here only in N.T. The juxtaposition of this strife among the eleven with the announcement of the traitor gives to it by comparison the aspect of a pardonable infirmity in otherwise loyal men, and it is so treated by Jesus.—**τὸ τίς α.**, etc., as to the who of them, etc. The topic of the earlier dispute (ix. 46) *might* be: who outside their circle was greater than they all, but here it certainly is: which of them is greater than his fellow. It is usual to connect this incident with the feet-washing in John xiii.—**δοκεῖ**, seems, looks like, makes the impression of being (Bleek and Hahn).—Vv. 25, 26: borrowed from the incident of the two sons of Zebedee (Mt. xx. 25, 26, Mk. x. 42, 43), which Lk. omits and somewhat alters in expression.—Ver. 25. **εὐεργέται**: here only in N.T., either titular, like our "your highness," *e.g.*, Ptolemy Euergetes (so, many), or = benefactors.—Ver. 26. **ὑμεῖς δὲ**, etc., but ye not so, elliptical, **ἔσεσθε** or **ποιήσετε** understood.—**ὁ νεώτερος**, the younger, "who in Eastern families fulfils menial duties, Acts v. 6" (Farrar).—**ὁ ἡγούμενος**, the leader or chief, the name of those in office in the Church in Heb. xiii. 7, also in the epistle of Clement; therefore viewed by some as a note of a late date, but without sufficient reason.—Ver. 27 adduces the example of Jesus to enforce the principle stated in ver. 26. He, the admittedly greater, had assumed the position

μέσῳ ὑμῶν[1] ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. 28. Ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου· 29. κἀγὼ [a] διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν, καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου, βασιλείαν, 30. ἵνα ἐσθίητε[2] καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, καὶ καθίσησθε[3] ἐπὶ θρόνων, κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς[4] τοῦ Ἰσραήλ." 31. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος,[5] "Σίμων, Σίμων, ἰδού, ὁ Σατανᾶς [b] ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς, τοῦ

a here only in Gospels. Acts iii. 25 and several times in Heb.

b here only in N.T.

[1] ειμι after υμων in ℵBLT.

[2] εσθητε in BDT (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] καθησεσθε in ℵAB³L *al.* (Tisch., W.H., marg.). καθησθε in BTΔ (W.H. text).

[4] τας δωδ. φυλ. κρινοντες in BT (W.H.).

[5] Omit ειπε δε ο κ. BLT sah. cop. syr. sin. (Tisch., W.H.).

of the less by becoming the serving man, **ὁ διακονῶν**, instead of the guest at table (**ὁ ἀνακείμενος**). In what way Jesus had played the part of serving man Lk. does not indicate. The handing round of the cup might be viewed as service. By omitting the incident of the sons of Zebedee Lk. missed the supreme illustration of service through *death* (Mt. xx. 28, Mk. x. 45).—Ver. 28. **ὑμεῖς δέ**, but ye, the **δέ** making transition from words of correction to a more congenial style of address.—**οἱ διαμεμενηκότες**, who have continued all through; the perfect participle, pointing them out as in possession of a permanent character, a body of thoroughly tried, faithful men.—**πειρασμοῖς**, in my *temptations*, pointing to all past experiences fitted to try faith and patience, which were of daily occurrence: temptations even to the Master, but still more to the disciples (in view of their spiritual weakness) to lose confidence in, and attachment to, One so peculiar, so isolated, and so much disliked and opposed by the people of repute and influence.—Ver. 29. **διατίθεμαι** (**διατίθημι**, middle only in N.T.), "appoint," make a disposition of. The corresponding noun is **διαθήκη**. In Heb. ix. 17 we find **ὁ διαθέμενος**, a testator, and the verb may be used here in the sense of bequeathing, though that sense is inapplicable to God's gift of a kingdom to Jesus referred to in next clause.—Ver. 30. **καθήσεσθε**, ye shall sit, the judicial function the main thing, the feasting a subordinate feature; hence stated in an independent proposition (**καθήσεσθε** not dependent on **ἵνα**). — **δώδεκα**, *twelve* tribes, and *twelve* to rule over them, the defection of Judas not taken into account. The promise is given in that respect as if spoken on another occasion (Mt. xix. 28). This generous eulogy of the disciples for their fidelity has the effect of minimising the fault mentioned just before. Lk. was aware of the fact. It is another instance of his "sparing of the Twelve".

Vv. 31-34. *Peter's weakness foretold.* With John (xiii. 36-38) Lk. places this incident in the supper chamber. In Mt. and Mk. it occurs on the way to Gethsemane (Mt. xxvi. 31-35, Mk. xiv. 37-31). It is introduced more abruptly here than in any of the other accounts. The **εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος** of the T.R. is a natural attempt to mitigate the abruptness, but the passage is more effective without it. From generous praise and bright promises Jesus passes suddenly, with perhaps a slight pause and marked change of tone, to the moral weakness of His much-loved companions and of Peter in particular.—Ver. 31. **Σίμων, Σίμων**: one can imagine, though not easily describe, how this was said—with much affection and just enough of distress in the tone to make it solemn.—**ὁ Σατανᾶς**. The reference to Satan naturally reminds us of the trial of Job, and most commentators assume that the case of Job is in the view of Jesus or the evangelist. The coming fall of Peter could not be set in a more advantageous light than by being paralleled with the experience of the famous man of Uz, with a good record behind him and fame before him, the two connected by a dark but profitable time of trial.—**ἐξῃτήσατο**, not merely "desired to have" (A.V.) but, obtained by asking (R.V., margin). Careful Greek writers used **ἐξαιτεῖν** = to demand for punishment, and **ἐξαιτεῖσθαι** = to beg off, *deprecari*. Later writers somewhat disregarded this distinction. The aorist implies *success* in the demand. It is an instance of the "Resultative Aorist"

σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον· 32. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπῃ[1] ἡ πίστις σου· καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον[2] τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου." 33. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, μετὰ σοῦ ἕτοιμός εἰμι καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν καὶ εἰς θάνατον πορεύεσθαι." 34. Ὁ δὲ εἶπε, "Λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ μὴ[3] φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ, πρὶν ἢ[4] τρὶς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι με."[5] 35. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βαλαντίου καὶ πήρας καὶ ὑποδημάτων, μή τινος ὑστερήσατε;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Οὐδενός."[6] 36. Εἶπεν οὖν[7] αὐτοῖς, "Ἀλλὰ νῦν ὁ ἔχων βαλάντιον ἀράτω, ὁμοίως καὶ πήραν· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πωλησάτω τὸ

[1] εκλιπη in ℵBDLT *al.*
[2] στηρισον in ℵABKLT 1 (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = D, etc.
[3] ου without μη in ℵBLTX.
[4] For πριν η ℵBLT 69 *al.* have εως (D εως οτου).
[5] For απαρ . . . με ℵBLT 13, 131 *al.* have με απαρνησῃ ειδεναι (W.H.).
[6] ουθενος in ℵBT *al.* (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = ℵDL.
[7] For ουν ℵᶜBLT have δε. ℵ*D have ο δε ειπεν.

(*vide* on this and other senses of the aorist, Burton, *M. and T.*, § 35). Field (*Ot. Nor.*) cites from Wetstein instances of such use and renders ἐξητ. ὑ. periphrastically "Satan hath procured you to be given up to him".—ὑμᾶς, you, the whole of you (though not emphatic); therefore, Simon, look to yourself, and *to the whole brotherhood of which you are the leading man.* Bengel remarks: "Totus sane hic sermo Domini praesupponit P. esse primum apostolorum, quo stante aut cadente ceteri aut minus aut magis periclitarentur". — σινιάσαι: a ἅπ. λεγ., but of certain meaning. Hesychius gives as equivalent κοσκινεῦσαι, from κόσκινον, a sieve. Euthy. Zig. is copious in synonyms = θορυβῆσαι, κυκῆσαι, ταράξαι. He adds, "what we call κόσκινον is by some called σινίον," and he thus describes the function of the sieve: ἐν ᾧ ὁ σῖτος τῇδε κἀκεῖσε μεταφερόμενος ταράσσεται. Sifting points to the *result* of the process anticipated by Jesus. Satan aimed at ruin.—Ver. 32. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην, but *I* have prayed: *I* working against Satan, and successfully.—ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ π. σ., that thy faith may not (utterly) fail or die (xvi. 9), though it prove weak or inadequate for the moment. Job's faith underwent eclipse. He did not curse God, but for the time he lost faith in the reality of a Divine government in human affairs. So Peter never ceased to love Jesus, but he was overpowered by fear and the instinct of self-preservation.—ἐπιστρέψας, having returned (to thy true self). *Cf.* στραφῆτε in Mt. xviii. 3. The word "converted," as bearing a technical sense, should be allowed to fall into desuetude in this connection. Many regard ἐπιστρέψας as a Hebraism = *vicissim:* do thou *in turn* strengthen by prayer and otherwise thy brethren as I have strengthened thee. So, *e.g.*, Grotius: "Da operam ne in fide deficiant, nempe *pro ipsis orans*, sicut ego pro te oro". Ingenious but doubtful.—στήρισον: later form for στήριξον; for the sense *vide* Acts xiv. 22 and 1 Pet. v. 10.—Ver. 33. εἰς φυλακὴν καὶ εἰς θάνατον: more definite reference to the dangers ahead than in any of the parallels.—Ver. 34. σήμερον, to-day, as in Mk., but without the more definite ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ.—μὴ εἰδέναι: μὴ after a verb of denial as often in Greek authors, *e.g.*, τὸν τάμ' ἀπαρνηθέντα μὴ χρᾶναι λέχη, Eurip., *Hippol.*, l. 1256.

Vv. 35-38. *Coming danger*, peculiar to Lk. There is danger ahead physically as well as morally. Jesus turns now to the physical side. What He says about a sword is not to be taken literally. It is a vivid way of intimating that the supreme crisis is at hand = the enemy approaches, prepare!—Ver. 35. ὅτε ἀπέστειλα: the reference is to ix. 3, or rather, so far as language is concerned, to x. 4, which relates to the mission of the *seventy*.—ἄτερ as in ver. 6.—Ver. 36. ἀλλὰ νῦν, but *now*, suggesting an emphatic contrast between past and present,

ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν. 37. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἔτι[1] τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό, 'Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη'· καὶ γὰρ τὰ[2] περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει." 38. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Κύριε, ἰδού, μάχαιραι ὧδε δύο." Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἱκανόν ἐστι."

39. ΚΑΙ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν Ἐλαιῶν· ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.[3] 40. γενόμενος δὲ

[1] Omit **ετι** ℵABDLTX.

[2] For **τα** ℵBDLT 1 have **το** (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] Omit **αυτου** ℵABDLT 1, 13, etc. (Tisch., W.H.). B omits **και** before **οι μαθ.** (W.H. brackets).

or near future.—**ἀράτω**, lift it: if he has a purse let him carry it, it will be needed, either to buy a sword or, more generally, to provide for himself; he is going now not on a peaceful mission in connection with which he may expect friendly reception and hospitality, but on a campaign in an enemy's country.—**ὁ μὴ ἔχων**, he who has not; either purse and scrip, or, with reference to what follows, he who hath not already such a thing as a sword let him by all means get one.—**πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον**, let him sell his upper garment, however indispensable for clothing by day and by night. A *sword* the one thing needful. This is a realistic speech true to the manner of Jesus and, what is rare in Lk., given without toning down, a genuine *logion* without doubt.—Ver. 37. **τὸ γεγραμμένον**: the words quoted are from Is. liii. 12, and mean that Jesus was about to die the death of a criminal.—**δεῖ**, it is necessary, *in order that Scripture might be fulfilled*. No other or higher view than this of the rationale of Christ's sufferings is found in Luke's Gospel. *Cf.* xxiv. 26. A Paulinist in his universalism, he shows no acquaintance with St. Paul's theology of the atonement unless it be in ver. 20.—**τὸ** (**τὰ** T.R.) **περὶ ἐμοῦ**, that which concerns me, my life course.—**τέλος ἔχει** is coming to an end. Some think the reference is still to the prophecies concerning Messiah and take **τέλος ἔχει** in the sense of "is being fulfilled," a sense it sometimes bears: **τελειοῦται ἤδη**, Euthy. Kypke renders: *rata sunt*, the phrase being sometimes used in reference to things whose certainty and authority cannot be questioned = "my doom is fixed beyond recall"—Ver. 38. **μάχαιραι δύο**: how did such a peaceable company come to have even so much as one sword? Were the two weapons really swords, fighting instruments, or large knives? The latter suggestion, made by Chrysostom and adopted by Euthym., is called "curious" by Alford, but regarded by Field (*Ot. Nor.*) as "probable".—**ἱκανόν**, enough! *i.e.*, for One who did not mean to fight. It is a pregnant word = "for the end I have in view more than enough; but also enough of misunderstanding, disenchantment, speech, teaching, and life generally," Holtzmann, H. C.

Vv. 39-46. *Gethsemane* (Mt. xxvi. 36-46, Mk. xiv. 32-42). Lk.'s narrative here falls far short of the vivid realism of the parallels. Mt. and Mk. allow the infirmity of the great High Priest of humanity so graphically described in the Epistle to the Hebrews to appear in its appalling naked truth. Lk. throws a veil over it, so giving an account well adapted doubtless to the spiritual condition of first readers, but not so well serving the deepest permanent needs of the Church. This statement goes on the assumption that vv. 43, 44 are no part of the genuine text, for in these, especially in ver. 44, the language is even more realistic than that of Mk., and is thus out of harmony with the subdued nature of Lk.'s narrative in general. This want of keeping with the otherwise colourless picture of the scene, which is in accord with Lk.'s uniform mode of handling the emphatic words, acts and experiences of Jesus, is, in my view, one of the strongest arguments against the genuineness of vv. 43, 44.

Ver. 39. **ἐξελθὼν**: no mention of the hymn sung before going out (Mt. ver. 30, Mk. ver. 26). Lk. makes prominent the outgoing of *Jesus*. The parallels speak in the plural of the whole company.—**κατὰ τὸ ἔθος**: for the form *vide* ii. 42, and for the fact xxi. 37 and John xviii. 2. This is another point of contact between

ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Προσεύχεσθε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν." 41. Καὶ αὐτὸς [c] ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου [d] βολήν, καὶ θεὶς τὰ γόνατα προσηύχετο, 42. λέγων, "Πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν [1] τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο [2] ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου, ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γενέσθω." [3] 43. Ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. 44. καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, [e] ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο. ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ ἱδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.[4] 45. Καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς,

c Acts xxi. 1.
d here only in N.T.
e Acts xii. 5. 1 Pet. i. 22.

[1] For παρενεγκειν ℵL, etc., have παρενεγκαι (Tisch.). BDT *al.* have παρενεγκε (W.H.).

[2] τουτο το ποτηριον in ℵBDLT.

[3] γιν-(or γειν)-εσθω in ℵABL *al. pl.* D has γεν. = T.R.

[4] Verses 43, 44 are found in ℵ*DL and many other uncials, in codd. vet. Lat. vulg. Egypt. verss. Syr. (cur. Pesh. Hier., but not sin.) Eus. Canons, etc., etc. They are wanting in ℵaABRT, and Epiph., Hil. and Hier. mention that they were wanting in many codd. known to them. W.H. give them in double brackets, and regard them as no part of Lk.'s text, though a true element of the Christian tradition. *Vide* their appendix.

these two Gospels. The reference to the *habit* of Jesus deprives this visit of *special* significance.—ἠκολούθησαν: the disciples *followed*, no talk by the way of their coming breakdown, as in Mt. ver. 31, and Mk. ver. 27.

Vv. 40-46. ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου, at *the* place, of *usual resort*, not the place of *this memorable scene*, for it is not Lk.'s purpose to make it specially prominent. *Cf.* John xviii. 2, τὸν τόπον previously described as a κῆπος across the brook Kedron.—προσεύχεσθε: Jesus bids the disciples pray against temptation. In Mt. and Mk. He bids them sit down while He prays. Their concern is to be wholly for themselves.—Ver. 41. ἀπεσπάσθη, He withdrew, *secessit*. Some insist on the literal sense, and render, "tore Himself away" = "avulsus est," Vulg., implying that Jesus was acting under strong feeling. But did Lk. wish to make that prominent? The verb does not necessarily mean more than "withdrew," and many of the philological commentators (Wolf, Raphel, Pricaeus, Palairet, etc.) take it in that sense, citing late Greek authors in support.—ἀπ' αὐτῶν, from them (all); no mention of three taken along with Him, a very important feature as an index of the state of mind of Jesus. The Master in His hour of weakness looked to the three for sympathy and moral support; *vide* Mt. xxvi. 40. But it did not enter into Lk.'s plan to make that apparent.—λίθου βολήν, a stone's cast, not too distant to be overheard. βολήν is the accusative of measure.—θεὶς τὰ γόνατα: the usual attitude in prayer was standing; the kneeling posture implied special urgency ("in genibus orabant quoties res major urgebat," Grot.), but not so decidedly as falling at full length on the ground, the attitude pointed at in the parallels.—Ver. 42. πάτερ, Father! the keynote, a prayer of faith however dire the distress.—εἰ βούλει, etc.: with the reading παρένεγκε the sense is simple: if Thou wilt, take away. With παρενεγκεῖν or παρενέγκαι we have a sentence unfinished: "apodosis suppressed by sorrow" (Winer, p. 750), or an infinitive for an imperative (Bengel, etc.). The use of παρ. in the sense of "remove" is somewhat unusual. Hesychius gives as synonyms verbs of the opposite meaning· παραθεῖναι, παραβαλεῖν. The ἀπ' ἐμοῦ leaves no doubt what is meant. In Lk.'s narrative there is only a single act of prayer. The whole account is mitigated as compared with that in Mt. and Mk. Jesus goes to the *accustomed* place, craves no sympathy from the three, kneels, utters a single prayer, then returns to the Twelve. With this picture the statement in vv. 43, 44 is entirely out of harmony.—Ver. 44. ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, in an agony (of fear), or simply in "a great fear". So Field (*Ot. Nor.*), who has an important note on the word ἀγωνία, with examples to show that fear is the radical meaning of the word. Loesner supports the same view with examples from Philo. Here only in N.T.

ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, εὗρεν αὐτοὺς κοιμωμένους[1] ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, 46. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί καθεύδετε; ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν."

47. Ἔτι δὲ[2] αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδού, ὄχλος, καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας, εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, προήρχετο αὐτῶν,[3] καὶ ἤγγισε τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλῆσαι αὐτόν. 48. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς[4] εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως;" 49. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν τὸ ἐσόμενον εἶπον αὐτῷ,[5] "Κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ;" 50. Καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἷς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τὸν δοῦλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως,[6] καὶ ἀφεῖλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ οὖς[7] τὸ δεξιόν. 51. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου." Καὶ ἁψάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου αὐτοῦ,[8] ἰάσατο αὐτόν. 52. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ[9] Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ἐπ'[10] αὐτὸν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους, "Ὡς

[1] κοιμωμενους αυτους in ℵBDLT 69 *al.*
[2] Omit δε ℵABLT, etc.
[3] αυτους in uncials. αυτων in minusc.
[4] For ο δε Ι. ℵBLTX 157 have Ι. δε.
[5] Omit αυτω ℵBLTX.
[6] του αρχ. τον δουλον in ℵBLT 69, 346.
[7] το ους αυτου in ℵBLT 69, 346.
[8] Omit αυτου ℵBLRT 1, 131.
[9] Omit ο before Ι. ℵABT.
[10] προς in ℵ, etc. (Tisch.). επι (= T.R.) in ABDL (W.H.).

From this word comes the name "The Agony in the Garden".—θρόμβοι, clots (of blood), here only in N.T.

Vv. 45, 46. *Return of Jesus to His disciples.*—ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς: rising up *from the prayer*, seems to continue the narrative from ver. 41.—ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης, asleep *from grief*, apologetic; Hebraistic construction, therefore not added by Lk., but got from a Jewish-Christian document, says J. Weiss (in Meyer). Doubtless Lk.'s, added out of delicate feeling for the disciples, and with truth to nature, for grief does induce sleep ("moestitia somnum affert," Wolf).—Ver. 46. ἀναστάντες προσεύχεσθε: Jesus rose up *from* prayer. He bids His disciples rise up *to* prayer, as if suggesting an attitude that would help them against sleep.—ἵνα, etc.: again a warning against temptation, but no word of reproach to Peter or the rest, as in parallels.

Vv. 47-53. *The apprehension* (Mt. xxvi. 47-56, Mk. xiv. 43-52).—Ver. 47. φιλῆσαι α., to kiss Him; that the traitor's purpose, its execution left to be inferred, also that it was the preconcerted signal pointing out who was to be apprehended.—Ver. 48. φιλήματι, etc., the question of Jesus takes the place of, and explains, the enigmatical ἐφ' ὃ πάρει of Mt. The simple φίλημα, unlike καταφιλέω, implies no fervour.—Ver. 49. οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν, those about Him, *i.e.*, the *disciples*, though the word is avoided.—τὸ ἐσόμενον, what was about to happen, *i.e.*, the apprehension. The disciples, anticipating the action of the representatives of authority, ask directions, and one of them (ver. 50) not waiting for an answer, strikes out. In the parallels the apprehension takes place first.—Ver. 50. εἷς τις, etc., a certain one of them, thus vaguely referred to in all the synoptists. John names Peter.—τὸ δεξιόν, the *right* ear; so in Fourth Gospel. *Cf.* the *right* hand in vi. 6.—Ver. 51. ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου: an elliptical colloquial phrase, whose meaning might be made clear by intonation or gesture. It might be spoken either to the captors = leave me free until I have healed the wounded man, or to the disciples = let them apprehend me, or: no more use of weapons. For the various interpretations put upon the words, *vide* Hahn. Perhaps the most likely rendering is: "cease, it is enough," *desinite, satis est*, as if it had stood, ἐᾶτε, ἕως τούτου ἱκανόν ἐστι, the disciples being addressed.—Ver. 52. ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ, etc.: Lk. alone represents the authorities as present with the ὄχλος—priests, captains of the temple and elders—some of them might be, though it is

ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξεληλύθατε[1] μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων; 53. καθʼ ἡμέραν ὄντος μου μεθʼ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, οὐκ ἐξετείνατε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπʼ ἐμέ. ἀλλʼ αὕτη ὑμῶν ἐστιν[2] ἡ ὥρα, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους."

54. ΣΥΛΛΑΒΟΝΤΕΣ δὲ αὐτὸν ἤγαγον, καὶ εἰσήγαγον αὐτὸν[3] εἰς τὸν οἶκον[4] τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολούθει μακρόθεν. 55. ἀψάντων[5] δὲ πῦρ ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αὐλῆς, καὶ συγκαθισάντων αὐτῶν,[6] ἐκάθητο ὁ Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ[7] αὐτῶν. 56. ἰδοῦσα δὲ αὐτὸν παιδίσκη τις καθήμενον πρὸς τὸ φῶς, καὶ [f] ἀτενίσασα αὐτῷ, εἶπε, "Καὶ οὗτος σὺν αὐτῷ ἦν." 57. Ὁ δὲ ἠρνήσατο αὐτόν,[8] λέγων, "Γύναι, οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν."[9] 58. Καὶ μετὰ βραχὺ ἕτερος ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἔφη, "Καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ." Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπεν,[10] "Ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ εἰμί." 59. Καὶ διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μιᾶς, ἄλλος τις [g] διϊσχυρίζετο, λέγων, "Ἐπʼ ἀληθείας καὶ οὗτος μετʼ αὐτοῦ ἦν· καὶ γὰρ Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν."

f Acts i. 10; iii. 4; vi. 15, etc. 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13.

g Acts xii. 15.

[1] εξηλθατε in ℵBDLRT, etc. (W.H.).
[2] εστιν υμων in ℵcBDLT, etc.
[3] Omit this αυτον ℵABDLT *al.*
[4] εις την οικιαν in ℵBLT, etc., 1, 124 *al.*
[5] περιαψαντων in ℵBLT.
[6] Omit αυτων ℵBDLT.
[7] μεσος for εν μεσω (ℵ, etc.) in BLT 1, 209 (Tisch., W.H.).
[8] Omit αυτον ℵBD*LT (W.H.).
[9] ουκ οιδα αυτον γυναι in ℵBLTX. D omits γυναι.
[10] εφη in ℵBLT *al. pl.*

not likely. Farrar remarks: "these venerable persons had kept safely in the background till all possible danger was over".—ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστήν. Lk. gives the reproachful words of Jesus nearly as in the parallels.—Ver. 53. ἀλλʼ αὕτη ἐστίν, etc.: the leading words in this elliptical sentence are τοῦ σκότους, which qualify both ὥρα and ἐξουσία. Two things are said: your hour is an hour of darkness, and your power is a power of darkness. There is an allusion to the time they had chosen for the apprehension, night, not day, but the physical darkness is for Jesus only an emblem of moral darkness. He says in effect: why should I complain of being captured as a robber in the dark by men whose whole nature and ways are dark and false?

Vv. 54-62. *Peter's fall* (Mt. xxvi. 57, 58, 69-75, Mk. xiv. 53, 54, 66-72).—Lk. tells the sad story of Peter's fall without interruption, and in as gentle a manner as possible, the *cursing* omitted, and the three acts of denial forming an *anticlimax* instead of a climax, as in parallels.—Ver. 54. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολούθει, *Peter* followed. What the rest did is passed over in silence; *flight* left to be inferred.—Ver. 55. περιαψάντων, more strongly than ἀψάντων (T.R.) suggests the idea of a well-kindled fire giving a good blaze, supplying light as well as heat. Who kindled it did not need to be said. It was kindled in the open court of the high priest's house, and was large enough for the attendants to sit around it in the chilly spring night (συγκαθισάντων).—μέσος αὐτῶν. Peter sat *among* them. Was that an acted denial, or was he simply seeking warmth, and taking his risk?—Ver. 56. ἀτενίσασα (α intensive, and τείνω), fixing the eyes on, with dative here, sometimes with εἰς and accusative, frequently used by Lk., especially in Acts.—οὗτος, the maid makes the remark not *to* but *about* Peter in Lk. = this one also was with *Him*, of whom they were all talking.—Ver. 57. οὐκ οἶδα α. γ.: a direct denial = I do not *know* Him, woman, not to speak of being a *follower*.—Ver. 58. μετὰ βραχὺ, shortly after (here only in N.T.), while the mood of fear is still on him, no time to recover himself.—ἕτερος, another of the attendants, a man.—ἐξ αὐτῶν, of the notorious band, conceived possibly as a set of desperadoes.—ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ εἰμί, man, I am not, with more emphasis and some irritation = denial of *discipleship*. In one sense a stronger form of denial, but in another a weaker. Peter

60. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Πέτρος, "Ἄνθρωπε, οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις." Καὶ παραχρῆμα, ἔτι λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ, ἐφώνησεν ὁ[1] ἀλέκτωρ· 61. καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ Κύριος ἐνέβλεψε τῷ Πέτρῳ· καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ λόγου[2] τοῦ Κυρίου, ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ὅτι, πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι,[3] ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς." 62. Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ὁ Πέτρος[4] ἔκλαυσε πικρῶς.

63. Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν[5] ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ, δέροντες· 64. καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτόν, ἔτυπτον αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ[6] ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν,[7] λέγοντες, "Προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;" 65. Καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰς αὐτόν.

[1] Omit **ο** ℵABDL, etc.

[2] **ρηματος** in ℵBLTX 124 *al.* (W.H.). T.R. = AD (Tisch.).

[3] Add **σημερον** after **φωνησαι** in ℵBKLMT *al.*

[4] Omit **ο Π.** ℵBDLT, etc. Some codd. of vet. Lat. omit ver. 62 (W.H. in brackets).

[5] For **τον Ι.** ℵBDLT, etc., 157 *al.* have **αυτον**.

[6] **ετυπτον . . . και** omitted in ℵBKLT *al.* 1, 209.

[7] Omit this **αυτον** BKLMTX.

might have known Jesus without being a disciple. To deny all knowledge was the strongest form of denial. Besides it was less cowardly to deny to a man than to a woman.—Ver. 59. **διαστάσης ὥρας**, at the distance of an hour; the verb here used of time, in xxiv. 51 and Acts xxvii. 28 of place. This interval of an hour is peculiar to Lk. Peter in the course of that time would begin to think that no further annoyance was to be looked for.—**διϊσχυρίζετο, ἐπ' ἀληθείας**: these expressions imply that the previous denials had partly served their purpose for a time, and put the attendants off the idea that Peter was of the company of Jesus. After watching Peter, and listening to his speech, a third gains courage to reaffirm the position = I am sure he is after all one of them, for, etc. —Ver. 60. **ἄνθρωπε**, etc., man, I don't know what you are saying—under shelter of the epithet **Γαλιλαῖος**, pretending ignorance of what the man said—an *evasion* rather than a denial, with no cursing and protesting accompanying. A monstrous minimising of the offence, if Lk. had Mk.'s account before him, thinks J. Weiss; therefore he infers he had not, but drew from a Jewish-Christian source with a milder account. What if he had both before him, and preferred the milder?—**ἐφώνησεν ἀλεκ.**, immediately after the *cock crew*; but in Lk.'s account the reaction is not brought about thereby. In the parallels, in which Peter appears worked up to a paroxysm, a reaction might be looked for at any moment on the slightest occasion, the crowing of the cock recalling Christ's words abundantly sufficient. But in Lk. there is no paroxysm, therefore more is needed to bring about reaction, and more accordingly is mentioned.—Ver. 61. **στραφεὶς**, etc., the Lord, turning, looked at Peter; that look, not the cock crowing, recalled the prophetic word of Jesus, and brought about the penitent reaction.—**ὑπεμνήσθη**, remembered, was reminded, passive here only in N.T.—Ver. 62 exactly as in Mt.

Vv. 63-65. *Indignities* (Mt. xxvi. 67-68, Mk. xiv. 65). In Mt. and Mk. these come after the trial during the night which Lk. omits. In his narrative the hours of early morning spent by Jesus in the palace of the high priest are filled up by the denial of Peter and the outrages of the men who had taken Jesus into custody (**οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν**).—Ver. 63. **ἐνέπαιζον**, mocked, in place of the more brutal spitting in parallels.—**δέροντες**, smiting (the whole body), instead of the more special and insulting slapping in the face (**κολαφίζειν**).—Ver. 64. **περικαλύψαντες**, covering (the face understood, **τὸ πρόσωπον** in Mk.)—**προφήτευσον, τίς**, etc.: Lk. here follows Mt., not Mk., who has simply the verb

66. Καὶ ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀνήγαγον[1] αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον ἑαυτῶν,[2] λέγοντες, 67. "Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, εἰπὲ[3] ἡμῖν." Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς, "Ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε· 68. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ[4] ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι, ἢ ἀπολύσητε.[5] 69. ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν[6] ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ Θεοῦ." 70. Εἶπον δὲ πάντες, "Σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ;" Ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη, "Ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι." 71. Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Τί ἔτι χρείαν ἔχομεν μαρτυρίας[7]; αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἠκούσαμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ."

[1] απηγαγον in ℵBDKT (Tisch., W.H.). T.R. = ALX *al.*
[2] αυτων in ℵBDLT *al.* [3] ειπον in ℵBLT. [4] Omit και ℵBLT.
[5] ℵBLT omit μοι η απολυσητε (Tisch., W.H.).
[6] νυν δε in ℵABDLTX. [7] εχομεν μαρ. χρειαν in BLT (Tisch., W.H.).

προφ. without the question following.—Ver. 65. **ἕτερα πολλὰ**, many other shameful words, filling up the time, which Lk. would rather not report particularly, even if he knew them.

Vv. 66-71. *Morning trial*, the proceedings of which, as reported by Lk., correspond to those of the night meeting reported by Mt. and Mk. (Mt. xxvi. 59-66, Mk. xiv. 55-64), only much abridged. No mention of the attempt to get, through witnesses, matter for an accusation, or of the testimony concerning the word about destroying the temple. The Messiah question is alone noticed. Perhaps Lk. omitted the former because of their futility, though they were important as revealing the *animus* of the judges.—Ver. 66. **εἰς τὸ συνέδριον**, to the council chamber, in which the Sanhedrim met.—**λέγοντες**, introducing the proceedings, in a very generalising way. *Cf.* the graphic account of the high priest rising up to interrogate Jesus, after the first attempt to incriminate Him had failed, in parallels (Mt. xxvi. 62 f., Mk. xiv. 60 f.).—**εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χ. εἰπὸν ἡμῖν**: either, art Thou the Christ? tell us, or tell us whether Thou be the Christ. Christ *simpliciter* without any epithet as in parallels (Son of God, Son of the Blessed).—Vv. 67, 68. Jesus first answers evasively, saying in effect: it is vain to give an answer to such people. In parallels He replies with a direct "yes" ("thou sayst," Mt.; "I am," Mk.).—Ver. 69. What Jesus now says amounts to an affirmative answer.—**ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἔσται**, etc.: Jesus points to a speedy change of position from humiliation to exaltation, without reference to what they will see, or to a second coming.—Ver. 70. **πάντες**, all, eagerly grasping at the handle offered by Christ's words.—**ὁ υἱὸς τ. Θ.** This is supposed to be involved in the exalted place at the right hand.—**ἐγώ εἰμι**, the direct answer at last.—Ver. 71. **μαρτυρίας**: instead of **μαρτύρων**, no mention having been previously made of witnesses.

J. Weiss (in Meyer, eighth edition) finds in this section clear evidence of the use of a Jewish-Christian source from the correspondence between the account it gives of the questions put to Jesus and His replies and the Jewish-Christian ideas regarding the Messiahship. These he conceives to have been as follows: In His earthly state Jesus was not Messiah or Son of Man; only a claimant to these honours. He became both in the state of exaltation (*cf.* Acts ii. 36: "God hath made Him both Lord and Christ"). He *was God's Son* in the earthly state because He was conscious of God's peculiar love and of a Messianic commission. So here: Jesus is *to become* (ἔσται) Messianic Son of Man with glory and power (**δόξα** and **δύναμις**); He *is* Son of God (**ἐγώ εἰμι**). On this view Sonship is lower than Christhood. Was that Lk.'s idea? On the contrary, he evidently treats the Christ question as one of subordinate importance on which it was hardly worth debating. The wider, larger question was that as to Sonship, which, once settled, settled also the narrower question. If Son, then Christ and more: not only the Jewish Messiah, but Saviour of the world. The

XXIII. 1. ΚΑΙ ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν, ἤγαγεν[1] αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Πιλάτον. 2. ἤρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ, λέγοντες, "Τοῦτον εὕρομεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος,[2] καὶ κωλύοντα Καίσαρι φόρους[3] διδόναι, λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν[4] Χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι." 3. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος ἐπηρώτησεν[5] αὐτόν, λέγων, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;" Ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ ἔφη, "Σὺ λέγεις." 4. Ὁ δὲ Πιλάτος εἶπε πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ὄχλους, "Οὐδὲν εὑρίσκω αἴτιον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ."

5. Οἱ δὲ ἐπίσχυον, λέγοντες, "Ὅτι [a]ἀνασείει τὸν λαόν, διδάσκων καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας,[6] ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἕως ὧδε." 6. Πιλάτος δὲ ἀκούσας Γαλιλαίαν[7] ἐπηρώτησεν εἰ ὁ[8] ἄνθρωπος

[a] here only in N.T. (διασ. in Ch. iii. 14).

[1] ηγαγον in uncials, ηγαγεν in minusc.

[2] Add ημων to εθνος ℵBDLT, etc.

[3] φορους K. in ℵBLT, which also have και before λεγοντα.

[4] So in ℵADL (Tisch.). αυτον in BGT.

[5] ηρωτησεν in ℵBRT. T.R. = DL, etc.

[6] και before αρξαμενος in ℵBLT, not in D, etc., probably omitted because difficult.

[7] Omit Γαλ. ℵBLT.

[8] B and a few others omit ο (W.H. brackets).

account of the trial runs on the same lines as the genealogy, in which *Davidic* descent is dwarfed into insignificance by *Divine* descent (υἱὸς . . . τοῦ θεοῦ).

CHAPTER XXIII. THE PASSION HISTORY CONTINUED.—Vv. 1-5. *Before Pilate* (Mt. xxvii. 1, 2, 11-14, Mk. xv. 1-5). At the morning meeting of the Sanhedrim (in Mt. and Mk.) it had doubtless been resolved to put the confession of Jesus that He was the Christ into a shape fit to be laid before Pilate, *i.e.*, to give it a political character, and charge Him with aspiring to be a king. To this charge Lk. adds other two, meant to give this aspiration a sinister character.—Ver. 1. ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος, the whole number. The Jewish authorities go to Pilate in full strength to make as imposing an appearance as possible and create the impression that something serious was on hand.—ἤγαγεν: nothing is said about leading Jesus *bound*, as in Mt. and Mk.—Ver. 2. διαστρέφοντα, perverting, causing disaffection and disloyalty to Rome.—κωλύοντα, doing His best to prevent (people from paying tribute to Caesar); false, and they probably knew it to be so, but it was a serviceable lie.—βασιλέα: in apposition with Χριστὸν = saying that He was Christ—a *King!*—Ver. 3. σὺ εἶ, etc.: Pilate's question exactly as in Mt. and Mk.—σὺ λέγεις: this reply needs some such explanation as is given in John; *vide* notes on Mt.—Ver. 4. αἴτιον, blameworthy, punishable (neuter of αἴτιος) = αἰτία. Pilate arrived at his conclusion very swiftly. A glance sufficed to satisfy him that Jesus was no dangerous character. Probably he thought him a man with a fixed idea.—Ver. 5. ἐπίσχυον (here only in N.T.), they kept insisting, used absolutely = "invalescebant," Vulg. —ἀνασείει, stirs up, a stronger word than διαστρέφειν.—διδάσκων, teaching, the instrument of excitement. Jesus did, in fact, produce a great impression on the people by His teaching, and one not favourable to the Pharisees, but He did not set Himself to stir up the people even against them.—καθ' ὅλης τ. Ἰ.: κατὰ with the genitive of place as in iv. 14 = in the whole of Judaea. This, considering the purpose, should mean Judaea strictly, Pilate's province, and so taken it bears witness to more work done by Jesus in the south than is recorded in the Synoptists. But the testimony is of little value. The accusers said what suited their purpose, true or false.—καὶ ἀρξάμενος: the καὶ is a difficult reading, and just on that account probably correct. It gives the impression of an unfinished sentence, something left out = and beginning from Galilee He has spread His mischievous doctrine over the land even to this holy city. The

Γαλιλαῖός ἐστι· 7. καὶ ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας Ἡρώδου ἐστίν, [b] ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἡρώδην, ὄντα καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις. 8. ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν· ἦν γὰρ θέλων ἐξ ἱκανοῦ [1] ἰδεῖν αὐτόν, διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν πολλὰ [2] περὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἤλπιζέ τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινόμενον. 9. ἐπηρώτα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν λόγοις ἱκανοῖς· αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ. 10. εἱστήκεισαν δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς, εὐτόνως κατηγοροῦντες αὐτοῦ. 11. ἐξουθενήσας δὲ αὐτὸν [3] ὁ Ἡρώδης σὺν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐμπαίξας, περιβαλὼν αὐτὸν [4] ἐσθῆτα λαμπράν, ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν τῷ Πιλάτῳ. 12. ἐγένοντο δὲ φίλοι ὅ τε Πιλάτος καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης [5] ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετ' ἀλλήλων· προϋπῆρχον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς.[6] 13. Πιλάτος δὲ συγ-

b Acts xxv. 21. Phil. ii.

[1] εξ ικανων χρονων θελων in ℵBT. DL also have εξ ικανων χρ., but θελων in a different position.

[2] Omit πολλα ℵBDLT 1, 131 *al.*

[3] και before ο Η. in ℵLTX 13, 69 (Tisch., W.H., marg.). BD omit.

[4] Omit αυτον ℵBLT.

[5] Ηρ. and Πιλ. change places in ℵBLT.

[6] αυτους in ℵBLT.

words from καὶ to Γαλιλαίας are omitted in some MSS., and it is not inconceivable that they are an early gloss to explain ver. 6 (so Weiss in Meyer).

Vv. 6-12. *Before Herod*, peculiar to Lk.—Ver. 7. ἀνέπεμψεν, remitted Him = *remisit*, sent Him to, not the higher (Meyer), but the proper tribunal: a Galilean, to the tetrarch of Galilee; a technical term.—ἐν Ἱεροσ. Herod would be in Jerusalem to keep the Passover, though that is not stated.—Ver. 8. ἐχάρη λίαν, was much pleased, "exceeding glad" (A.V. and R.V.) is too grave a phrase to express the feeling of this worthless man, who simply expected from the meeting with Jesus a "new amusement" (Schanz), such as might be got from a conjurer who could perform some clever tricks (τι σημεῖον).—Ver. 9. ἐν λόγοις ἱκανοῖς: suggesting the idea of a desultory conversation, in which the king introduced topic after topic in a random, incoherent manner, showing no serious interest in any of his questions.—οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο, answered nothing, which would greatly astonish and pique this kingling, accustomed to courtier-servility. The fact that Jesus said nothing, and that nothing of importance came out of the appearance before Herod, may explain its omission by the other evangelists.—Ver. 10. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, etc., priests and scribes, there too, having followed Jesus, afraid that the case might take an unfavourable turn in their absence.—εὐτόνως, eagerly (Acts xviii. 28).—Ver. 11. ἐξουθενήσας: on this verb and kindred forms, *vide* at Mk. ix. 12. Herod, feeling slighted by Jesus, slights Him in turn, inciting his body-guards (τοῖς στρατεύμασιν, which cannot here mean armies) to mock Him, and having Him invested with a costly robe, probably a cast-off royal mantle of his own, and so sending Him back a mock king to Pilate, a man to be laughed at, not to be feared or punished.—ἐσθῆτα λαμπρὰν, a splendid robe; of what colour, purple or white, commentators vainly inquire.—ἀνέπεμψεν, "sent Him again" (A.V.), or "back" (R.V.). The verb may mean here, as in ver. 7, sent Him to Pilate as the proper person to try the case. The two magnates compliment each other, and shirk unpleasant work by sending Jesus hither and thither from tribunal to tribunal, the plaything and sport of unprincipled men.—Ver. 12. ἐγένοντο φίλοι: that the one positive result of the transaction—two rulers, previously on bad terms, reconciled, at least for the time. Sending Jesus to Herod was a politic act on Pilate's part. It might have ended the case so far as he was concerned; it pleased a jealous prince, and it gave him a free hand in dealing with the matter: nothing to fear in that quarter.—μετ' ἀλλήλων for ἀλλήλοις (Euthy. Zig., who also sub-

καλεσάμενος τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τὸν λαόν, 14. εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Προσηνέγκατέ μοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον, ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν· καὶ ἰδού, ἐγὼ ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἀνακρίνας οὐδὲν[1] εὗρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον, ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ' αὐτοῦ· 15. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης· ἀνέπεμψα γὰρ ὑμᾶς πρὸς αὐτόν,[2] καὶ ἰδού, οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶ πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ. 16. παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω." 17. Ἀνάγκην δὲ εἶχεν ἀπολύειν αὐτοῖς κατὰ ἑορτὴν ἕνα.[3] 18. ἀνέκραξαν[4] δὲ παμπληθεί, λέγοντες, "Αἶρε τοῦτον, ἀπόλυσον δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν Βαραββᾶν·" 19. ὅστις ἦν διὰ στάσιν τινὰ γενομένην ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ φόνον βεβλημένος εἰς φυλακήν.[5] 20. Πάλιν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος προσεφώνησε,[6] θέλων ἀπολῦσαι

[1] ουθεν in ℵBT 1.

[2] ανεπεμψε γαρ αυτον προς ημας in ℵBKLMT. T.R. = ADX is perhaps a correction by the scribes.

[3] Ver. 17 is omitted in ABKLTΠ (Tisch. W.H.).

[4] ανεκραγον in ℵBLT 124, 157. T.R. = ADX, etc.

[5] βληθεις εν τη φυλακη in BLT (Tisch., W.H.). ℵ has βεβλ. εν τ. φυλ.

[6] ℵBLT have παλιν δε ο Π. προσεφ. αυτοις.

stitutes πρὸς ἀλλήλους for πρὸς ἑαυτούς).—ὄντες after προϋπῆρχον might have been omitted, as in Acts viii. 9, but it serves to convey the idea of continued bad relations.

Vv. 13-16. *Pilate proposes to release Jesus.*—Ver. 14. ἀποστρέφοντα, turning away (the people from their allegiance). In Acts iii. 26, of turning men from their iniquities.—ἐνώπιον ὑ. ἀνακρίνας, having made an inquiry *in your presence*. In John, Pilate's inquiry is private. "He says this," remarks Pricaeus, "lest they should think he was setting Jesus free by favour or intrigue" (*gratiâ aut ambitu*). ἀνακρίνας is used absolutely here as in Acts xxiv. 8.—Ver. 15. αὐτῷ: some have taken this as referring to Herod = Herod did nothing in the case, implying that it was of a serious, capital nature. Most take it as referring to Jesus = behold, the result of sending to Herod is that in his judgment nothing has been done deserving death by the accused.—αὐτῷ instead of ὑπ' αὐτοῦ; *vide* on this construction Winer, § xxxi., 10.—Ver. 16. παιδεύσας: doubtless used here in the Hellenistic sense of chastise, scourge—a mild name for an ugly thing. The policy of the proposal Euthy. thus explains: "a moderate flagellation (μετρίαν μαστίγωσιν) to mitigate their wrath, that thinking they had gained their point they might cease from further madness". A weak, futile policy. "Hic coepit nimium concedere" (Bengel). Fanaticism grows by concession (Schanz).

Vv. 17-25. *Pilate finally succumbs* (Mt. xxvii. 15-26, Mk. xv. 6-14).—Ver. 17, which states that Pilate was under a necessity (why, not explained) to release one (prisoner) at feast time, is almost certainly imported from the parallels by a later hand, though it fills up an obvious hiatus in Lk.'s meagre narrative.—Ver. 18. παμπληθεί: adverb, from παμπληθής (here only in N.T.) = in the whole-mob style, giving a vivid idea of the overpowering shout raised.—αἶρε τοῦτον, take away this one, *i.e.*, to the cross.—ἀπόλυσον, release; if ye will release some one (ver. 16, ἀπολύσω) let it be Barabbas. Lk. makes this demand the voluntary act of the people. In the parallels (*vide* there) it is suggested to them by Pilate (Mt.), and urged on them by the priests. In Lk. s narrative the behaviour of the people is set in a dark light, while both Pilate and the priests are treated with comparative mildness. In view of Israel's awful doom, Lk. says in effect: the people have suffered for *their own sin*.—Ver. 19. ὅστις seems to be = ὃς here, following the growing usage of later Greek (Schanz, *vide* Buttmann, *Gram.*, p. 115).—διὰ στάσιν . . . καὶ φόνον = διὰ φόνον ἐν στάσει πεποιημένον, Pricaeus.—ἦν βληθείς: instead of ἐβλήθη, the analytic form is unusual

τὸν Ἰησοῦν. 21. οἱ δὲ ἐπεφώνουν, λέγοντες, "Σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον[1] αὐτόν." 22. Ὁ δὲ τρίτον εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν οὗτος; οὐδὲν αἴτιον θανάτου εὗρον ἐν αὐτῷ· παιδεύσας οὖν αὐτὸν ἀπολύσω." 23. Οἱ δὲ ἐπέκειντο φωναῖς μεγάλαις, αἰτούμενοι αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι· καὶ κατίσχυον αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων.[2] 24. Ὁ δὲ[3] Πιλάτος ἐπέκρινε γενέσθαι τὸ αἴτημα αὐτῶν· 25. ἀπέλυσε δὲ αὐτοῖς[4] τὸν διὰ στάσιν καὶ φόνον βεβλημένον εἰς τὴν[5] φυλακήν, ὃν ᾐτοῦντο· τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκε τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.

26. Καὶ ὡς ἀπήγαγον[6] αὐτόν, ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σίμωνός τινος Κυρηναίου τοῦ ἐρχομένου[7] ἀπ' ἀγροῦ, ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρόν, φέρειν ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 27. Ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ,

[1] σταυρου, σταυρου in ℵBD. T.R. = ALX, etc.
[2] Omit και των αρχ. ℵBL (Tisch., W.H.).
[3] For ο δε ℵBL have και.
[4] Omit αυτοις ℵABDX, etc
[5] Omit την ℵBD 69 *al.*
[6] απηγον in B (W.H. marg.).
[7] Σιμωνα τινα Κ—ον ερχ—ον in ℵBCDLX 13, 33 *al.* (Tisch., W.H.).

with the aorist (here only in N.T.), hence probably the reading of T.R., βεβλημένος.—Ver. 20. πάλιν, again, a second time. Lk. carefully enumerates the friendly attempts of Pilate, hence τρίτον in ver. 22. The first is in ver. 16.—Ver. 21. ἐπεφώνουν, shouted (βοᾷ κράζει, Hesych.), in Lk. only, and in reference to the people (Acts xii. 22).—σταύρου (active, not middle = σταυροῦ), "crucify," repeated, with passion; thoughtless, foolish, impulsive mob!—Ver. 22. τρίτον: third and final attempt, showing some measure of earnestness on Pilate's part.—τί γὰρ κακόν: the γὰρ answers to the hostile mood of the people = I cannot respond to your demand for, etc.; the "why, what evil," etc., of the R.V. is a happy rendering. In this final appeal, Pilate states most distinctly his opinion that Jesus is innocent.—Ver. 23. ἐπέκειντο, "they were instant," A.V. The verb is used absolutely.—κατίσχυον, were overpowering; "ecce gentis ingenium!" Pricaeus.—Ver. 24. ἐπέκρινεν, decided, gave judgment; here only in N.T. and in 2 Maccab. iv. 47, 3 Maccab. iv. 2. It was not a condemnation but simply a sentence to death under pressure.—αἴτημα, desire, here and in Phil. iv. 6 in this sense.—Ver. 25. τὸν διὰ σ.: the repetition of this description, instead of giving the name, is very expressive.—τῷ θελήματι α., to their will. Weak man and wicked people!

Vv. 26-32. *On the way to the cross* (Mt. xxvii. 31-34, Mk. xv. 21).—Ver. 26. ἀπήγαγον: who led Jesus away is not indicated. It might seem it was the mob, to whose will Jesus had just been delivered. But Lk. does not mean that. He simply continues the story, as in Mk., omitting the mockery of the soldiers (Mk. xv. 16-20), who, that brutal sport ended, led Him out (ἐξάγουσιν, Mk. xv. 20). Lk. omits also the scourging, which even Mt. and Mk. hurry over (φραγελλώσας).—ἐπιλαβόμενοι: a Greek word substituted for the foreign technical ἀγγαρεύειν in the parallels (usually takes the genitive in the Gospel, here also in T.R., accusative in W. and H.'s text, also in Acts xvii. 19, xviii. 17).—ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ does not mean that Simon *helped* Jesus to bear the cross, carrying the end behind Jesus. They laid the whole cross on him.

V. 27 f. This incident of the women following in the crowd is peculiar to Lk.—καὶ γυναικῶν, and of *women*; they are the part of the crowd in which the story is interested. They were mainly women of Jerusalem (ver. 28).—αἳ ἐκόπτοντο, etc.: they indulged in demonstrative grief by gesture and voice (ἐθρήνουν), contrary to rule it would appear ("non planxerunt eductum ad supplicium, sed interius luxerunt in corde," Lightfoot on Mt. xxvii. 31), but great grief heeds not rules.—Ver. 28. ἐπ' ἐμέ, ἐφ' ἑαυτὰς are brought close together to emphasise the

καὶ γυναικῶν, αἳ καὶ[1] ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουν αὐτόν. 28. στραφεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὰς ὁ[2] Ἰησοῦς εἶπε, "Θυγατέρες Ἱερουσαλήμ, μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ' ἐμέ, πλὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτὰς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν. 29. ὅτι ἰδού, ἔρχονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσι, Μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι, καὶ κοιλίαι[3] αἳ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν, καὶ μαστοὶ οἳ οὐκ ἐθήλασαν.[4] 30. τότε ἄρξονται λέγειν τοῖς ὄρεσι, Πέσετε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς· καὶ τοῖς [c] βουνοῖς, Καλύψατε ἡμᾶς. 31. ὅτι, εἰ ἐν τῷ[5] [d] ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται; 32. Ἤγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι, δύο [e] κακοῦργοι σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι.

c Lk. iii. 5 (late Gr.).
d here only in N.T.
e here, vv. 33, 39, and 2 Tim. ii. 9.

33. Καὶ ὅτε ἀπῆλθον[6] ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον Κρανίον, ἐκεῖ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, καὶ τοὺς κακούργους, ὃν μὲν ἐκ δεξιῶν, ὃν δὲ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν. 34. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγε, "Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσι."[7] Διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἔβαλον

[1] Omit και ABCDLX 28.
[2] Omit ο ℵBL.
[3] αι κοιλιαι in ℵBCX 1, 28, 69, etc.
[4] εθρεψαν in ℵBCL 131. D has εξεθρεψαν.
[5] Omit τω BC (W.H. text).
[6] ηλθον (-αν) in ℵBCL (W.H.).
[7] Ver. 34, from ο δε Ι. to ποιουσι, is omitted in ℵ[a]BD minusc. (3) a b d Egypt. verss. syr. sin. Tisch. retains, but W.H. only in double brackets, regarding this as one of D's non-interpolations, *i.e.*, where the interpolation is on the side of those who have the clause. *Vide* their appendix.

contrast = weep not for *me*, but for *yourselves* weep, hinting at the tragedies of Jerusalem's fatal day. At such times the greatest joy, that of motherhood, is turned into the greatest misery (Holtzmann, H. C.). The mothers ever have the worst of it (J. Weiss in Meyer).—Ver. 29. μακάρια, etc.: blessed the women that have no children, barren, or unmarried: nobody to care for but themselves. The reflection implies keen sympathy with human feeling.—Ver. 30. τοῖς ὄρεσι, τοῖς βουνοῖς: the reference is to Palestine, a land of mountains and hills, and the prayer of the miserable that a hill may fall on them and bury them under its ruins (quoted from Hosea x. 8).—Ver. 31. The sense of this proverbial phrase is obscure, but the connection demands this general idea: what is happening to me now is nothing to what is going to happen to this people. The green tree represents innocence, the dry tree guilt, ripe for the fire of judgment. *Vide* Ezekiel xx. 47, xxi. 3. Pricaeus cites as a parallel from Catullus: "quid facient crines quum ferro talia cedant?" The Rabbinical proverb, "si duo fuerint ligna arida et unum viride, arida illud lignum viride exurunt," does not seem to bear the same meaning.—ἐν ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ, in the *wet* tree, *in ligno humido*, Grotius. ξύλον χλωρὸν = *lignum viride*, in Ezekiel.—Ver. 32. ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι, other two malefactors, as if Jesus was one also. But this is not meant. "It is a negligent construction, common to all languages, and not liable to be misunderstood," remarks Field (*Ot. Nor.*), who gives an example from the Communion service. "If he require further comfort or counsel let him come to me, or to *some other discreet and learned minister of God's word*." If κακοῦργοι were meant to include Jesus it would be used in reference to what men thought, δοξαστικῶς (Kypke) = *pro tali habitus* in reference to Jesus (Kuinoel). On this use of ἕτερος and ἄλλος, *vide* Winer, p. 665.

Vv. 33-38. *Crucifixion* (Mt. xxvii. 35-38, Mk. xv. 24-27).—κρανίον, a skull, for the Hebrew Γολγοθά in Mt. and Mk.—Ver. 34. Πάτερ, etc.: a prayer altogether true to the spirit of Jesus, therefore, though reported by Lk. alone, intrinsically credible. It is with sincere regret that one is compelled, by its omission in important MSS., to regard its genuineness as subject to a certain amount of doubt. In favour of it is its

f here and in Ch. xvi. 14.

κλῆρον.[1] 35. καὶ εἱστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν. f Ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες σὺν αὐτοῖς,[2] λέγοντες, "Ἄλλους ἔσωσε, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός."[3] 36. Ἐνέπαιζον[4] δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται, προσερχόμενοι καὶ[5] ὄξος προσφέροντες αὐτῷ, 37. καὶ λέγοντες, "Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν." 38. Ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ γεγραμμένη[6] ἐπ' αὐτῷ γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς,[7] "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων."[8]

39. Εἷς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων ἐβλασφήμει αὐτόν, λέγων,[9] "Εἰ[10] σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, σῶσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς." 40. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἕτερος ἐπετίμα αὐτῷ, λέγων,[11] "Οὐδὲ φοβῇ σὺ τὸν

[1] κληρους in AX 1, 33 *al.* (Tisch., who thinks κληρον an assimilation to parall.).

[2] Omit συν αυτοις ℵBCDLQX 33, 69, etc. (Tisch., W.H.).

[3] In ℵBL 1, 118, 209 the last clause stands thus: ει ουτος εστιν ο Χ. του Θεου ο εκλεκτος.

[4] ενεπαιξαν in ℵBL. [5] Omit και ℵABCL. [6] Omit γεγρ. ℵBL.

[7] All after επ αυτω is omitted in BCL a sah. cop. syrr. cur. sin. It comes from John (Tisch., W.H. omit).

[8] ο βασ. των Ι. ουτος in ℵBL a. [9] Omit λεγων BL.

[10] ουχι in ℵBCL. [11] επιτιμων αυτω εφη in ℵBCLX.

conformity with the whole aim of Lk. in his Gospel, which is to exhibit the graciousness of Jesus.—διαμεριζόμενοι, etc., and parting His garments they cast lots = they divided His garments by casting lots.—Ver. 35. **θεωρῶν**: the people are now mere spectators. Have they begun to rue already when they see what their demand has come to? Observe the words **θεωρίαν** and **θεωρήσαντες** in ver. 48. When they had gazed long enough it came to decided poignant regret. Fickle mob!—**οἱ ἄρχοντες**: they alone, the rulers of the people, mock and sneer. The **σὺν αὐτοῖς** (T.R.) is a badly attested reading and clearly contrary to the spirit of the narrative.—**ὁ ἐκλεκτός**, the Elect One, and come to this? Incredible? No! thus all the truest sons and elect of God have fared in this evil world.—Ver. 36. **οἱ στρατιῶται**, the soldiers; first mention of them, whether there as executioners or as keeping order does not appear in Lk.'s narrative. They too mock in their own rough way, offering the sufferer vinegar by way of grim joke (Meyer). So Lk. understands the matter. Note how he hurries over these brutalities. *Cf.* Mt. and Mk.—Ver. 37. The taunt put into the mouth of the soldiers is a pointless echo of the sneers of the rulers. The crucified one might be a *King*, yet be unable to save Himself. The Christ, elect of God, might be conceived endowed with supernatural power.—Ver. 38. **ἐπ' αὐτῷ**, over Him, *i.e.*, above His head; or in reference to Him (Bleek). The **ἐπιγραφὴ** is viewed by Lk. as also an insult, crowning the others (**ἦν δὲ καὶ**), to which answers its form as in W. and H.: **ὁ βασιλεὺς τ. Ἰ. οὗτος** = the King of the Jews *this* (crucified person).

Vv. 39-43. *The penitent malefactor*, peculiar to Lk. and congenial to the spirit of the Gospel of the sinful.—Ver. 39. **ἐβλασφήμει**: the wretched man caught up the taunt of the rulers and, half in coarse contempt, half by way of petition, repeated it, with **καὶ ἡμᾶς** added, which redeemed the utterance from being a gratuitous insult.—Ver. 40. **οὐδὲ φοβῇ σὺ τ. θ.**: **οὐδὲ** may be connected with, and the emphasis may fall on, either **φοβῇ**, **σὺ**, or **θεόν** = (1) dost thou not even *fear* God, not to speak of any higher religious feeling? (2) dost not even *thou*, in contrast to these mockers of misery, fear, etc.? (3) dost thou not fear *God*, at least, if thou hast no regard for men? The position of **οὐδὲ** just before **φοβῇ**, casts the scale in favour of (1).—Ver. 41. **ἄτοπον** (α pr. and **τόπος**): primarily out of place, unfitting, absurd, often in Plato; in later usage bearing a moral sense—wrong, wicked (**ἄτοπα** =

Θεόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ; 41. καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως. ἄξια γὰρ ὧν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν· οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξε." 42. Καὶ ἔλεγε τῷ[1] Ἰησοῦ, "Μνήσθητί μου, Κύριε,[2] ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ[3] σου." 43. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[4] "Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι,[5] σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ."

44. Ἦν δὲ[6] ὡσεὶ ὥρα ἕκτη, καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν, ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης. 45. καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ ἐσχίσθη[7] τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον· 46. καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε, "Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι[8] τὸ πνεῦμά μου." Καὶ ταῦτα[9] εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν. 47. Ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος[10] τὸ γενόμενον ἐδόξασε[11] τὸν Θεόν, λέγων, "Ὄντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος

[1] ℵBCL omit τω; based on mistaken interpretation. *Vide* below.

[2] Omit κυριε ℵBCDLM.

[3] εις την β. in BL (W.H. text).

[4] Omit ο Ι. ℵBL.

[5] σοι λεγω in BCL.

[6] For ην δε ℵBC*DL 255 have και ην, to which BC*L add ηδη.

[7] For και εσκ. ο ηλ. και εσχ. ℵBC*L minusc. have του ηλιου εκλιποντος εσχισθη δε.

[8] παρατιθεμαι in ℵABC, etc.

[9] For και ταυτα ℵBC*D have τουτο δε.

[10] εκατονταρχης in ℵB 1, 131, 209.

[11] εδοξαζεν in ℵBDL.

πονηρὰ, αἰσχρὰ, Hesych.); of persons 2 Thess. iii. 2, in the sense of physically hurtful in Acts xxviii. 6.—Ver. 42. καὶ ἔλεγεν· Ἰησοῦ, and he said: Jesus! not *to* Jesus as T. R. signifies.—ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σ.: when Thou comest in Thy kingdom = when Thou comest as King to earth again, the petition meaning: may I be among those whom Thou shalt raise from the dead to share its joys! The reading of BL, εἰς τὴν β. σ., might point to an immediate entering into the Kingdom of Heaven, the prayer meaning: may I go there to be with Thee when I die!—Ver. 43. σήμερον: to be connected with what follows, not with λέγω = *to-day*, as opposed to a boon expected at some future time (which makes for the reading ἐν τῇ β. in ver. 42). Or the point may be: this very day, not to-morrow or the next day, as implying speedy release by death, instead of a slow lingering process of dying, as often in cases of crucifixion.—ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, in paradise; either the division of Hades in which the blessed dwell, which would make for the *descensus ad inferos*, or heaven; *vide* at xvi. 23, and *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 4, where it is a synonym for heaven, and Rev. ii. 7, where it denotes the perfected Kingdom of God, the ideal state of bliss realised. The use of "paradise" in this sense is analogous to the various representations in Hebrews of the perfect future drawn from the primeval condition of man: lordship in the world to come, deliverance from the fear of death, a Sabbatism (Heb. ii. 8, 14; iv. 9). The use of the term παράδεισος by St. Paul makes its use by our Lord credible.

Vv. 44-49. *After crucifixion* (Mt. xxvii. 45-56, Mk. xv. 33-41).—Ver. 44. ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν: though Lk. writes for Gentiles this phrase need not mean more than over the whole land of Israel. —Ver. 45. τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος: this phrase (a well-attested reading as against the T.R. ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥ.) ought to mean the sun being eclipsed, an impossibility when the moon is full. If all that was meant was the sun's light totally failing, darkened, *e.g.*, by a sand storm, the natural expression would be ἐσκοτίσθη. —Ver. 46. φωνῇ μεγάλῃ: this expression is used in Mt. and Mk. in connection with the "My God, My God," which Lk. omits. In its place comes the "Father, into Thy hands". Here as in the agony in the garden Lk.'s account fails to sound the depths of Christ's humiliation. It must not be inferred that he did not know of the "Eli, Eli". Either he personally, or his source, or his first readers, could not bear the thought of it.—παρατίθεμαι τ. π. μ.: an echo of Psalm xxxi. 6, and to be understood in a similar sense, as an expression

δίκαιος ἦν." 48. Καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαραγενόμενοι ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν ταύτην, θεωροῦντες[1] τὰ γενόμενα, τύπτοντες ἑαυτῶν[2] τὰ στήθη ὑπέστρεφον. 49. εἱστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτοῦ[3] μακρόθεν,[4] καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθήσασαι[5] αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὁρῶσαι ταῦτα.

50. Καὶ ἰδού, ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ, βουλευτὴς ὑπάρχων, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος, 51. (οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν,) ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὃς καὶ προσεδέχετο καὶ αὐτὸς[6] τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, 52. οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ᾐτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 53. καὶ καθελὼν αὐτὸ[7] ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ σινδόνι, καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ[8] ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ,

[1] **θεωρησαντες** in ℵBCDL 33.
[2] Omit **εαυτων** ℵABCDL minusc.
[3] **αυτω** in ℵBLP 33, 64.
[4] **απο μακ.** in ℵBDL *al.*
[5] **συνακολουθουσαι** in ℵBCLRX *al.* T.R. = AD, etc. B has **αι** before **γυναικες**.
[6] ℵBCDL 69 verss. have **ος προσεδεχετο** without **και** before **προσεδ.**, or **και αυτος** after it.
[7] **αυτο** omitted in ℵBCDL 13, 33, 69, etc.
[8] **αυτον** in ℵBCD.

of trust in God *in extremis*. Various shades of meaning have been put on the words, among which is that Jesus died by a free act of will, handing over His soul to God as a deposit to be kept safe (Grotius, Bengel, Hahn, etc.).—Ver. 47. **ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης**, the centurion, in command of the soldiers named in ver. 36.—**δίκαιος**, righteous, innocent; in the parallels he confesses that Jesus is a Son of God. Lk. is careful to accumulate testimonies to Christ's *innocence:* first the robber, then the centurion, then the multitude (ver. 48) bears witness.—Ver. 48. **θεωρίαν**, sight, here only (3 Macc. v. 24).—**τὰ γενόμενα**, the things that had happened; comprehensively, including the crucifixion and all its accompaniments. They had looked on and listened, and the result was regret that they had had anything to do with bringing such a fate on such a man.—**τύπτοντες τ. σ.**, beating their breasts. Lk. has in mind Zechariah's "they shall look on me whom they have pierced and mourn" (xii. 10).—**ὑπέστρεφον**, kept going away, in little groups, sad-hearted.—Ver. 49. **οἱ γνωστοὶ**, His acquaintances, Galileans mostly, who stood till the end, but far away. Mt. and Mk. do not mention this. No word of the eleven.—**καὶ γυναῖκες**: warm-hearted Galileans they too, and *women*, therefore bolder where the heart was concerned; nearer presumably, therefore "seeing" predicted of them specially (**ὁρῶσαι**). The men stood at a *safe* distance, the women cared more for *seeing* than for *safety*.

Vv. 50-56. *The burial* (Mt. xxvii. 57-61, Mk. xv. 42-47).—Ver. 50. **καὶ ἰδού**: introducing the bright side of the tragic picture, a welcome relief after the harrowing incidents previously related: the Victim of injustice honourably buried by a good man, who is described with greater fulness of detail than in Mt. and Mk.—**ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος**, a man generous or noble and just. Instead of the epithets **εὐσχήμων** (Mk. xv. 43) and **πλούσιος** (Mt. xxvii. 57), indicative of social position, Lk. employs words descriptive of moral character, leaving **βουλευτὴς** to serve the former purpose. **ἀγαθὸς** has reference to the generous act he is going to perform, **δίκαιος** to his past conduct in connection with the trial of Jesus; hence the statement following: **οὗτος οὐκ ἦν**, etc., which forms a kind of parenthesis in the long sentence.—Ver. 51. **οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος**, was not a consenting party, here only in N. T. Alford thinks the meaning is that he absented himself from the meeting. Let us hope it means more than that: present at the meeting, and dissenting from its proceedings.—**τ. βουλῇ καὶ τ. πράξει**, their counsel and their subsequent action in carrying that counsel into effect.—**ὃς προσεδέχετο**, etc.: this describes his *religious* character. Thus we have first *social* position, a counsellor; next *ethical* character, generous and just:

οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς[1] κείμενος. 54. καὶ ἡμέρα ἦν παρασκευή,[2] καὶ σάββατον ἐπέφωσκε.

55. Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ καὶ[3] γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθυῖαι αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας,[4] ἐθεάσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ. 56. ὑποστρέψασαι δὲ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα καὶ μύρα· καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἡσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν, XXIV. 1. τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων [a] ὄρθρου βαθέος,[5] ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμα,[6] φέρουσαι ἃ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα, καί τινες σὺν αὐταῖς.[7]

[a] Acts v. 21.

2. ΕΥΡΟΝ δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, 3. καὶ

[1] ουδεις ουδεπω in ℵC (Tisch.); ουδεις ουπω in ℵBL (W.H.).

[2] παρασκευης in ℵBC*L 13, 346.

[3] Omit και ℵAC *al.* (Tisch.). For δε και BLPX 33 *al.* have δε αι (W.H. text). D codd. Lat. vet. have δε δυο (W.H. marg.).

[4] αυτω after Γαλ. in ℵBL.

[5] βαθεως in ℵABCDL, etc.

[6] επι το μνημα ηλθαν in ℵBL.

[7] και τ. συν αυταις omitted in ℵBCL 33 Lat. vet. vulg. cop.

finally *religious* character, one who was waiting for the Kingdom of God.—Ver. 53. **λαξευτῷ**, cut out of stone, here only, and in Deut. iv. 49.—**οὐκ, οὐδέπω, οὐδεὶς**, an accumulation of negatives to emphasise the honour done to Jesus by depositing His body in a previously unused tomb.—Ver. 54. **ἐπέφωσκε**, was about to dawn, *illucescebat*, Vulgate. The evening is meant, and the word seems inappropriate. Lk. may have used it as if he had been speaking of a natural day (as in Mt. xxviii. 1) by a kind of inadvertence, or it may have been used with reference to the candles lit in honour of the day, or following the Jewish custom of calling the night *light* justified by the text, Ps. cxlviii. 3, "Praise Him, all ye stars of *light*" (*vide* Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*). Or it may be a touch of poetry, likening the rising of the *moon* to a dawn. So Casaubon, *Exercit. anti-Baronianae*, p. 416.—Ver. 55. **αἵτινες**: possibly = **αἵ**, but possibly meant to suggest the idea of distinction: Galilean women, and such in character as you would expect them to be: leal-hearted, passionately devoted to their dead Friend.—**ἀρώματα**, spices, dry.—**μύρα**, ointments, liquid.—Ver. 56. **κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν**: they respected the Sabbath law as commonly understood. The purchase of spices and ointments is viewed by some as a proof that the day of Christ's crucifixion was an ordinary working day.

CHAPTER XXIV. THE RESURRECTION. In this narrative Lk. diverges widely from Mt. and Mk. both as to the appearances of the Risen Christ he reports and as to the scene of these. Specially noticeable is the limitation of the Christophanies to the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, Galilee being left out of account.

Vv. 1-11. *The women at the tomb* (Mt. xxviii. 1-8, Mk. xvi. 1-8).—Ver. 1. **τῇ δὲ μ. τ. σ.**: the **δὲ** answers to the **μὲν** in the preceding clause (xxiii. 56) and carries the story on without any break. The T.R. properly prints the clause introduced by **τῇ δὲ** as part of the sentence beginning with **καὶ τὸ μὲν**, dividing the two clauses by a comma.—**ὄρθρου βαθέως** (**βαθέος**, T. R., a correction), at deep dawn = very early. **βαθέως** is either an adverb or an unusual form of the genitive of **βαθύς**. This adjective is frequently used in reference to time. Thus Philo says that the Israelites crossed the Red Sea **περὶ βαθὺν ὄρθρον**. The end of the dawn was called **ὄρθρος ἔσχατος**, as in the line of Theocritus: **ὄρνιχες τρίτον ἄρτι τὸν ἔσχατον ὄρθρον ἄειδον** (Idyll xxiv., v., 63).—**ἀρώματα**: the **μύρα** omitted for brevity.—Ver. 2. **τὸν λίθον**, the stone, not previously mentioned by Lk., as in Mt. and Mk.; nor does he (as in Mk.) ascribe to the women any solicitude as to its removal: enough for him that they found it rolled away.—Ver. 3. **εἰσελθοῦσαι δὲ**: this is obviously a better reading than **καὶ εἰσ.** (T.R.), which implies that they found what they expected, whereas the empty grave was a surprise.—Ver. 4. **ἄνδρες**, two *men* in appearance, but with

εἰσελθοῦσαι[1] οὐχ εὗρον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.[2] 4. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαπορεῖσθαι[3] αὐτὰς περὶ τούτου, καὶ ἰδού, δύο ἄνδρες[4] ἐπέστησαν αὐταῖς ἐν ἐσθήσεσιν ἀστραπτούσαις.[5] 5. [b] ἐμφόβων δὲ γενομένων αὐτῶν, καὶ κλινουσῶν τὸ πρόσωπον[6] εἰς τὴν γῆν, εἶπον πρὸς αὐτάς, "Τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; 6. οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλ' ἠγέρθη[7]· μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν, ἔτι ὢν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, 7. λέγων, Ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου[8] παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν, καὶ σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστῆναι." 8. Καὶ ἐμνήσθησαν τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ· 9. καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου,[9] ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα[10] τοῖς ἕνδεκα καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς λοιποῖς. 10. ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία Ἰακώβου,[11] καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς, αἳ[12] ἔλεγον

b Acts x. 4; xxiv. 25. Rev. xi. 13.

[1] εισελθ. δε in ℵBCDL 1, 33 *al.*

[2] του κυριου Ι. is found in ℵABCL *al. pl.* (Tisch.). D and some codd. vet. Lat. omit the whole; f. syrr. cur. sin. omit κυριου. W.H. count this one of the "Western non-interpolations," remarking that the combination ο κυριος Ιησους is not found in the genuine text of the Gospels.

[3] απορεισθαι in ℵBCDL.

[4] ανδρες δυο in ℵABCL. T.R. = D.

[5] εν εσθητι αστραπτουσῃ in ℵBD.

[6] τα προσωπα in ℵBCDL, 33, etc.

[7] ουκ εστιν ωδε αλλα ηγερθη wanting in D a b c ff$_2$, a "Western non-interpolation"; "comes from Mt. xxviii. 6 = Mk. xvi. 6 thrown into an antithetic form," W.H. App.

[8] οτι δει after ανθρωπου in ℵ*BC*L (Tisch., W.H.).

[9] D a b c e ff^2 l omit απο. τ. μν. (W.H. brackets).

[10] So in BL (W.H.). παντα ταυτα in ℵD (Tisch.).

[11] η Ιακ. in ℵABD *al. pl.*

[12] Omit αι ℵABDL, etc.

angelic raiment (ἐν ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ).—Ver. 5. ἐμφόβων, fear-stricken, from ἔμφοβος, chiefly in late writers, for ἐν φόβῳ εἶναι. *Vide* Hermann, *ad Viger.*, p. 607.—τὸν ζῶντα, the living one, simply pointing to the fact that Jesus was risen: no longer among the dead.—μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν, among the dead. The use of μετὰ in the sense of among, with the genitive, is common in Greek authors, as in Pindar's line (*Pythia*, v., 127): μάκαρ μὲν ἀνδρῶν μέτα ἔναιεν. Wolf mentions certain scholars who suggested that μετὰ τ. νεκρῶν should be rendered "with the things for the dead," *i.e.*, the spices and *mortuaria*. But of this sense no example has been cited.—Ver. 6. μνήσθητε, etc.: the reference is to what Jesus told the disciples in the neighbourhood of Caesarea Philippi (ix.). There is no indication elsewhere that women were present on that occasion.—ὡς: not merely "that," but "how," in what terms.—ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ: this reference to Galilee suggests that Lk. was aware of another reference to Galilee as the place of rendezvous for the meeting between the disciples and their risen Master (Mt. xxvi. 32, Mk. xiv. 28, to which there is nothing corresponding in Lk.).—Ver. 7. τὸν υἱὸν τ. ἀ.: standing before ὅτι δεῖ may be taken as an accusative of reference = saying as to the Son of Man that, etc.—ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν, sinful men, not necessarily Gentiles only (Meyer, J. Weiss, etc.), but men generally (Hahn). Jesus actually expressed Himself in much more definite terms.—Ver. 9. ἀπήγγειλαν, etc.: *cf.* the statement in Mk. xvi. 8, according to which the women said nothing to any person.—Ver. 10: here for the first time Lk. gives names, adding to two of those named by Mk. (xv. 47, xvi. 1) Joanna, mentioned in viii. 3. Mary Magdalene is here called the Magdalene Mary.—καὶ αἱ λοιπαί, etc., also the other women with them. The emphasis must lie on the persons named as those who took the chief hand in informing the Apostles.—σὺν αὐταῖς describes the other

πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ταῦτα. 11. Καὶ ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν,[1] καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς. 12. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ [c] παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ [d] ὀθόνια κείμενα μόνα· καὶ ἀπῆλθε πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.[2]

13. Καὶ ἰδού, δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἦσαν πορευόμενοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ[3] εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ᾗ ὄνομα Ἐμμαούς· 14. καὶ αὐτοὶ [e] ὡμίλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους περὶ πάντων τῶν συμβεβηκότων τούτων. 15. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὁμιλεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ

c John xx. 5, 11. Jas. i. 25.
d John xix. 40; xx. 5, 6, 7.
e Acts xx. 11; xxiv. 26.

[1] ταυτα for αυτων in ℵBDL codd. vet. Lat.

[2] Ver. 12 is another "Western non-interpolation," wanting in D a b e l (Tisch. omits, W.H. double brackets). ℵB omit κειμενα, and BL have προς αυτον for π. εαυτον.

[3] ησαν πορ. after εν α. τ. ημ. in ℵB.

women as, in a subordinate way, joint-informants. The αἱ before ἔλεγον in T. R. makes the construction easier, and just on that account may be regarded as a correction by the scribes.—Ver. 11. ἐφάνησαν: plural with a neuter pl. nom. (τὰ ῥήματα), denoting things without life, as in John xix. 31, because the "words," reports, are thought of in their separateness (*vide* Winer, § lviii., 3 a).—λῆρος: here only in N.T. = idle talk, not to be taken seriously.

Ver. 12. *Peter runs to the sepulchre.* This verse, omitted in D and some copies of the old Latin version, is regarded by some as an interpolation. For Rohrbach's theory *vide* notes on the appendix to Mark's Gospel (xvi. 9-20).—ἀναστὰς, rising up, suggesting prompt action, like the man; as if after all he at last thought there might be something in the women's story.—παρακύψας may mean: stooping down so as to look in, but in many passages in which the verb is used the idea of stooping is not suggested, but rather that of taking a stolen hasty glance with outstretched neck. Kypke gives as its meaning in profane writers *exserto capite prospicere* (examples there). Field (*Ot. Nor.*) quotes with approval these words of Casaubon against Baronius (p. 693): "Male etiam probat *humilitatem* sepulchri ex eo quod dicitur Joannes *se inclinasse;* nam Graeca veritas habet παρακύψαι, quod sive de fenestra sumatur sive de janua, nullam inclinationem corporis designat, qualem sibi finxit B., sed protensionem colli potius cum modica corporis incurvatione".—μόνα, alone, without the body.—πρὸς ἑαυτὸν (or αὐτὸν): most connect this with ἀπῆλθεν = went away to his home, as in John xx. 10 (πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διαγωγήν, Euthy. Zig.). The Vulgate connects with θαυμάζων = *secum mirans*, and is followed by not a few, including Theophyl. and Grotius; Wolf also, who lays stress on the fact that the ancient versions except the Coptic so render.—θαυμάζων, wondering; for, remarks Euthy., he knew that the body had not been carried off, for then the clothes would have been carried off also.

Vv. 13-35. *On the way to Emmaus:* in Lk. only, and one of the most beautiful and felicitous narratives in his Gospel, taken, according to J. Weiss (in Meyer), from Feine's precanonical Luke. Feine, after Holtzmann, remarks on the affinities in style and religious tone between it and Lk. i. and ii.

Vv. 13 ff. δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν, two of *them.* The reference ought naturally to be to the last-named subject, the Apostles (ver. 10); yet they were evidently not Apostles. Hence it is inferred that the reference is to τοῖς λοιποῖς in ver. 9. Feine (also J. Weiss) thinks the story had been originally given in a different connection.—Ἐμμαούς: now generally identified with Kalonieh, the Emmaus of Josephus, B. J., vii. 6, 6, lying to the north-west of Jerusalem (*vide* Schürer, Div. I., vol. ii., p. 253, note 138, and Furrer, *Wanderungen*, pp. 168-9).—Ver. 15. συζητεῖν. This word, added to ὁμιλεῖν to describe the converse of the two disciples, suggests lively discussion, perhaps accompanied by some heat. One might be sceptical, the other more inclined to believe the story of the resurrection.—Ver. 16. ἐκρατοῦντο, their eyes *were held*, from

συζητεῖν, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ[1] Ἰησοῦς ἐγγίσας συνεπορεύετο αὐτοῖς· 16. οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν. 17. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, "Τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι, οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους περιπατοῦντες, καί ἐστε σκυθρωποί[2];" 18. Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ εἷς,[3] ᾧ ὄνομα[4] Κλεόπας, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν, "Σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς ἐν[5] Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνως τὰ γενόμενα ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις;" 19. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ποῖα;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου,[6] ὃς ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης, δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ· 20. ὅπως τε παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν εἰς κρίμα θανάτου, καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν· 21. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ. ἀλλά γε[7] σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις

[1] ℵABL omit ο. D retains ο but omits αυτος.

[2] και εσταθησαν σκ. in ℵB e sah. cop. D has simply σκυθρωποι.

[3] For ο εις ℵBDL 1, 13 *al.* have εις.

[4] For ω ονομα (AD, etc., Tisch.) ℵBLNX have ονοματι (W.H.).

[5] Omit εν ℵABDL and many others.

[6] Ναζαρηνου in ℵBL.

[7] αλλα γε και in ℵBDL 1, 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

recognising Him (here only in this sense). Instances of the use of the verb in this sense in reference to the bodily organs are given by Kypke. It is not necessary, with Meyer, to suppose any special Divine action or purpose to prevent knowledge of Jesus.—Ver. 17. **ἀντιβάλλετε**: an expressive word (here only in N.T.), confirming the impression of animated and even heated conversation made by **συζητεῖν**. It points to an exchange of words, not simply, but with a certain measure of excitement. As Pricaeus expresses it: "fervidius aliquanto et commotius, ut fieri amat ubi de rebus novis mirisque disserentes nullamque expediendi nos viam invenientes, altercamur". The question of the stranger quietly put to the two wayfarers is not without a touch of kindly humour.—**καὶ ἐστάθησαν, σκυθρωποί**: this well-attested reading gives a good graphic sense = "they stood still, looking sad" (R.V.). A natural attitude during the first moments of surprise at the interruption of their talk by an unknown person, and in a puzzling tone.—Ver. 18. **ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ**: at last after recovering from surprise one of them, Cleopas, finds his tongue, and explains fully the subject of their conversation.—**Σὺ μόνος**, etc.: he begins by expressing his surprise that the stranger should need to be told. What could they be talking about but the one supreme topic of the hour? The verb **παροικεῖς** might mean: live near, and the point of the question be: dost thou live near Jerusalem (in the neighbourhood of Emmaus, a few miles distant), and not know, etc. So Grotius, Rosenmüller, Bleek, etc. The usual meaning of the verb in Sept. and N.T. (Heb. xi. 9) is to sojourn as a stranger, and most take it in that sense here = art thou a stranger sojourning in Jerusalem (at passover time), and therefore ignorant? The **μόνος** implies isolation over and above being a stranger. There were many strangers in Jerusalem at passover season; the two friends might be among them; but even visitors from Galilee and other places knew all about what had happened = do you live alone, having no communication with others—a stranger in Jerusalem so as to be the only man who does not know? (**μόνος** qualifies **ἔγνως** as well as **παροικεῖς**).—Ver. 19. **ποῖα**, what sort of things? with an affected indifference, the feigning of love—**οἱ δὲ εἶπον**: both speak now, distributing the story between them.—**ἀνὴρ προφήτης**, a prophetic man, a high estimate, but not the highest.—**ἀνὴρ** may be viewed as redundant—"eleganter abundat," Kypke.—Ver. 20. **ὅπως τε**, and how; **ὅπως** here = **πῶς**, used adverbially with the indicative, here

τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον,[1] ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο. 22. ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, γενόμεναι ὄρθριαι[2] ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον· 23. καὶ μὴ εὑροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, ἦλθον, λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι, οἳ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν. 24. καὶ ἀπῆλθόν τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ εὗρον οὕτω καθὼς καὶ[3] αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον· αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον." 25. Καὶ αὐτὸς εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, "Ὦ [f] ἀνόητοι καὶ [g] βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐλάλησαν οἱ προφῆται· 26. οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει

f here only in Gospels.
g Jas. i. 19.

[1] Omit σημερον ℵBL 1. [2] ορθριναι in ℵABDL. [3] Omit και BD (W.H.).

only in N.T. The τε connects what follows with what goes before as together constituting one complete tragic story: the best of men treated as the worst by the self-styled good.—καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν: this confirms the idea suggested in the previous narrative of the crucifixion that Lk. regarded that deed as the crime of the Jewish people, and even as executed by them.—Ver. 21. ἡμεῖς δὲ, but *we*, on the other hand, as opposed to the priests and rulers.—ἠλπίζομεν, were hoping; the hope dead or in abeyance now. But how wide asunder these disappointed ones from the rulers, ethically, in that they could regard such an one as Jesus as the Redeemer of Israel! λυτροῦσθαι is to be taken in the sense of i. 68, 74.—ἀλλά γε: these two particles stand together here contrary to the ordinary usage of Greek writers, who separate them by an intervening word. It is not easy to express the turn of feeling they represent. Does the ἐστιν in the previous clause mean that they think of Him as still living, hoping against hope on the ground of the women's report, mentioned in the following clause, and does the ἀλλά γε express a swing of feeling away in the opposite direction of hopelessness? = we hoped, we would like to hope still; yet how can we? He is dead three days, and yet again on the other hand (ἀλλὰ καί, ver. 22) there is a story going that looks like a resurrection. How true to life this alternation between hope and despair! σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις, in addition to all these things, *i.e.*, all that caused them to hope: prophetic gifts, marvellous power in word and work, favour with the people: there is the hard fact making hope impossible.—ἄγει: probably to be taken impersonally = *agitur*, one lives this third day since. So Grotius and many others. Other suggestions are that χρόνος or ὁ Ἰησοῦς is to be understood (*cf.* Acts xix. 38).—Ver. 22. ἀλλὰ καὶ γ. τ.: introducing another hope-inspiring phase of the story.—ἐξέστησαν ἡ., astonished us.—ὀρθριναί: ὀρθρινός is a late form for ὄρθριος, and condemned by Phryn.; the adjective instead of the adverb = early ones, a common classical usage.—Ver. 23. μὴ εὑροῦσαι, etc.: that part of the women's story—the body gone—is accepted as a fact; their explanation of the fact is regarded as doubtful, as appears from the cautious manner of expression.—λέγουσαι, etc., they came *saying* that they had also seen a *vision* of angels who *say*. Yet the use of the present indicative, λέγουσιν, in reporting what the angels said, shows a wish to believe the report.—Ver. 24. τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν: a general reference to the Apostles, though the phrase covers all the lovers of Jesus. The τινες were Peter and John (John xx. 3).—αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον, but Him they saw not, as surely, think the two friends, they ought to have done had He really been alive from the dead.

Ver. 25 f. *Jesus speaks.*—ἀνόητοι, "fools" (A.V.) is too strong, "foolish men" (R.V.) is better. Jesus speaks not so much to reproach as by way of encouragement. As used by Paul in Gal. iii. 1 the word is harder. "Stupid" might be a good colloquial equivalent for it here.—πιστεύειν ἐπὶ π.: ἐπὶ with dative of person after πιστεύειν is common, with dative of the thing only here.—Ver. 26. ἔδει: here as always in Lk. pointing to the necessity that O.T. prophecy should be fulfilled. Accordingly Jesus is represented in the next verse as going on to show that prophecy demanded the course of experience described: first the passion, then entrance into glory.—καὶ εἰσελθεῖν: the passion is past, the entering into glory is still to come, therefore it seems unfit to make εἰσελ. dependent with

παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; 27. Καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, διηρμήνευεν[1] αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ. 28. Καὶ ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο· καὶ αὐτὸς προσεποιεῖτο[2] πορρωτέρω πορεύεσθαι. 29. καὶ παρεβιάσαντο αὐτόν, λέγοντες, "Μεῖνον μεθ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἐστί, καὶ κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα."[3] Καὶ εἰσῆλθε τοῦ μεῖναι σὺν αὐτοῖς. 30. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακλιθῆναι αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν, λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησε, καὶ κλάσας ἐπεδίδου αὐτοῖς. 31. αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν· καὶ αὐτὸς ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν. 32. Καὶ εἶπον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "Οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν,[4] ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ

[1] διερμηνευσεν in BL (Tisch., W.H. text). D has ην before αρξαμενος with ερμηνευειν (W.H. marg.).

[2] προσεποιησατο in ℵABDL 1; for πορρωτερω (in ℵDL) AB 382 have πορρωτερον (W.H.).

[3] ηδη before η ημ. in ℵBL 1, 33 *al.*

[4] So in ℵALX *al. pl.* BD omit εν ημ. (W.H.). For καιομενη D has κεκαλυμμενη (W.H. marg.).

παθεῖν on ἔδει. Meyer supplies δεῖ, Bornemann ταῦτα παθόντα, the Vulgate οὕτω = *et ita intrare*.—Ver. 27. καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ, etc.: there is a grammatical difficulty here also. He might begin from Moses, but how could He begin from Moses and all the prophets? Hahn, after Hofmann, suggests that Moses and the prophets together are set in contrast to the rest of the O.T. But Lk. seems to have in mind not so much *where* Jesus began as *what* He began to do, *viz.*, teach = beginning (to instruct them) from Moses, etc.—Ver. 28. προσεποιήσατο, He assumed the air of one going farther. The verb in the active means to bring about that something shall be acquired by another, in middle, by oneself = "meum aliquid facio" (Alberti, *Observ. Phil.*, *ad loc.*). Jesus wished to be invited to stay.—Ver. 29. παρεβιάσαντο, they constrained by entreaty, again in Acts xvi. 15, found in Gen. xix. 9.—μεθ' ἡμῶν, with us, presumably in their home or lodgings. If they were but guests they could not well invite another.—πρὸς ἑσπέραν, κέκλικεν ἡ ἡ.: two phrases where one was enough, by way of pressing their fellow-traveller. They make the most of the late hour, which is not their real reason.—Ver. 30. λαβὼν τ. α., etc.: Jesus possibly by request assumes the position of host, prepared for by the previous exercise of the function of Master. By this time a suspicion of who He was had dawned upon the two disciples. While He spoke old impressions of His teaching were revived (Pricaeus).—Ver. 31. διηνοίχθησαν οἱ ὀφ., their eyes were at length opened, a Divine effect, but having its psychological causes. Euthy. suggests the use of the well-known blessing by Jesus as aiding recognition. The opening of the mind to the prophetic teaching concerning Messiah's suffering was the main preparation for the opening of the eyes The wonder is they did not recognise Jesus sooner.—ἄφαντος: an early poetical and late prose word = ἀφανής, not in Sept., here only in N.T. After being recognised Jesus became invisible, ἀπ' αὐτῶν, not to them (αὐτοῖς) but from them, implying departure from the house. Some take ἄφαντος adverbially as qualifying the departure = He departed from them in an invisible manner.

Vv. 32-35. *After Jesus' departure.*—Ver. 32. ἡ καρδία καιομένη, the heart burning, a beautiful expression for the emotional effect of new truth dawning on the mind; common to sacred writers (*vide* Ps. xxxix. 4, Jerem. xx. 9) with profane. Their heart began to burn while the stranger expounded Scripture, and kept burning, and burning up into ever clearer flame, as He went on—"valde et diu," Bengel. It is the heart that has been dried by tribulation that burns so. This burning of the heart experienced by the two disciples was

ὁδῷ, καὶ[1] ὡς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;" 33. Καὶ ἀναστάντες αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ εὗρον συνηθροισμένους[2] τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, 34. λέγοντας, "Ὅτι ἠγέρθη ὁ Κύριος ὄντως,[3] καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι." 35. Καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐξηγοῦντο τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, καὶ ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου.

36. Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων, αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰησοῦς[4] ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.[5] 37. Πτοηθέντες[6] δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν. 38. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τί τεταραγμένοι ἐστέ; καὶ διατί διαλογισμοὶ ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις[7] ὑμῶν; 39. ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγώ εἰμι[8]· [h] ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε· ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει, καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα." 40. Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας.[9] 41. ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ θαυμαζόντων, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἔχετέ τι βρώσιμον ἐνθάδε;" 42. Οἱ δὲ ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος

h Acts xvii. 27. Heb. xii. 18. 1 John i. 1.

[1] ℵBDL 33 omit και.

[2] ηθροισμενους in ℵBD 33. [3] οντως ηγερ. ο K. in ℵBDL 1, 131.

[4] Omit ο I. ℵBDL 61 *al.*

[5] και λεγει αυτοις ειρ. υμιν wanting in D a b e ff[2] l; a "Western non-interpolation," W.H. App. Omitted also by Tisch.

[6] B has θροηθεντες (W.H. marg.).

[7] τη καρδια in BD. [8] εγω ειμι αυτος in ℵBL 33.

[9] D a b e ff[2] syr. cur. omit ver. 40. A "Western non-interpolation," W.H.

typical of the experience of the whole early Church when it got the key to the sufferings of Jesus (Holtzmann, H. C.). Their doubt and its removal was common to them with many, and that is why the story is told so carefully by Lk.—ὡς ἐλάλει, ὡς διήνοιγεν (without καί), as He spoke, as He opened, etc.; first the general then the more specific form of the fact.—Ver. 33. αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ: no time lost, meal perhaps left half finished, no fear of a night journey; the eleven must be told at once what has happened. "They ran the whole way from overjoy" (ὑπὸ περιχαρείας), Euthy. Zig.—Ver. 34. λέγοντας: the apostolic company have their story to tell: a risen Lord seen by one of their number. The two from Emmaus would not be sorry that they had been forestalled. It would be a welcome confirmation of their own experience. On the other hand, the company in Jerusalem would be glad to hear their tale for the same reason. So they told it circumstantially (τὰ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ver. 35).

Vv. 36-43. *Jesus appears to the eleven* (*cf.* Mk. xvi. 14, John xx. 19-23).—Ver. 36. ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ α. suggests an appearance as sudden as the departure from the two brethren.—Ver. 37. πνεῦμα, a spirit, *i.e.*, a form recognisable as that of Jesus, but of Jesus not risen but come from the world of the dead disembodied or only with an apparent body; therefore they were terrified at the sight, notwithstanding what they had heard.—Ver. 38. τί τεταραγμένοι ἐστέ; why are ye disturbed? or *about what* are ye disturbed? taking τί as object of ταραρ. (Schanz).—Ver. 39. τὰς χεῖράς μου, etc.: Jesus shows His hands and feet with the wounds to satisfy them of His identity (ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός). Then He bids them touch Him (ψηλαφήσατέ με) to satisfy themselves of His substantiality.—ἴδετε, see with the mind; with the eye in case of the preceding ἴδετε.—ὅτι: either *that*, or *because*.—Ver. 40. Very nearly John xx. 20 and possibly an interpolation. It seems superfluous after ver. 39.—Ver. 41. ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς, a psychological touch quite in Lk.'s manner. *Cf.* xxii. 45: there asleep from grief, here unbelievers from joy. Hahn takes χαρά objectively.—τι βρώσιμον, anything eatable, here

ὀπτοῦ μέρος, καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου.[1] 43. καὶ λαβὼν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγεν. 44. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς,[2] "Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι,[3] οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωσέως καὶ προφήταις[4] καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ." 45. Τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν, τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς· 46. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι οὕτω γέγραπται, καὶ οὕτως ἔδει[5] παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, 47. καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν καὶ[6] ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἀρξάμενον[7] ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ. 48. ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε[8]

[1] **και απο μελ. κηρ.** omitted in ℵABDL (Tisch.; W.H., text, with the words in marg.). A Syrian and Western interpolation.

[2] **προς αυτους** in ℵBLX 33.

[3] Add **μου** ABDL 33.

[4] B has **τοις προφ.** (W.H.).

[5] **και ουτως εδει** omitted in ℵBCDL a b c e ff[2]; an explanatory addition.

[6] **εις** in ℵB (Tisch., W.H., text). CD have **και** (W.H. marg.).

[7] **αρξαμενοι** in ℵBCLNX 33 (Tisch., W.H.).

[8] ℵBCL have **υμεις** without **δε**, and BD omit **εστε**.

only in N.T.—Ver. 42. **ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου**, of a bee-comb. The adjective μελ. occurs nowhere else. **κηρίον** is the diminutive of **κηρός**. The words are probably a gloss.—Ver. 43. That Jesus ate is carefully stated. The materiality thus evinced seems inconsistent with the pneumatic nature of Christ's body as suggested by sudden appearing and departure, and with the immortal form of embodied life generally. Hahn suggests that the materiality was assumed by Jesus for the moment to satisfy the disciples that He had a body, and that He was risen. Euthy. Zig. expresses a similar view, stating that Jesus ate and digested supernaturally (**ὑπερφυῶς**), and that what He did to help the faith of the disciples was exceptional in reference to the immortal condition of the body, which can have nothing to do with wounds or food (**οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἕτερος μετὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν τοῦ σώματος ὠτειλὰς ἕξει, ἢ βρῶσιν προσήσεται**).

Vv. 44-49. *Parting words.*—**εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς**: it is at this point, if anywhere, that room must be made for an extended period of occasional intercourse between Jesus and His disciples such as Acts i. 3 speaks of. It is conceivable that what follows refers to another occasion. But Lk. takes no pains to point that out. His narrative reads as if he were still relating the incidents of the same meeting. In his Gospel the post-resurrection scenes seem all to fall within a single day, that of the resurrection.—**οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι**, etc., these are the words. With Euthy. Zig. we naturally ask: which? (**οὗτοι· ποῖοι**; and there he leaves it). Have we here the concluding fragment of a longer discourse not given by Lk., possibly the end of a document containing a report of the words of Jesus generally (so J. Weiss in Meyer)? As they stand in Lk.'s narrative the sense must be: these events (death and resurrection) fulfil the words I spoke to you before my death. If that be the meaning the mode of expression is peculiar.—**ἐν τ. ν. Μωσέως**, etc.: Moses, Prophets, Psalms, a unity (no article before **προφήταις** or **ψαλμοῖς**) = the whole O.T. canon. So most. Or, these three *parts* of the O.T. the main sources of the Messianic proof (Meyer, Hahn, etc.). The latter the more likely.—Ver. 45 points to detailed exposition of Messianic texts, generally referred to in ver. 44, as in the case of the two brethren.—Ver. 46 gives the conclusion of the expository discourse in Christ's own words (**καὶ εἶπεν, ὅτι**) = the gist of prophecy is: the suffering and resurrection of the Christ, and the preaching in the name of the Risen One, to all nations, of repentance unto the remission of sins.—Ver. 47. **ἀρξάμενοι**: this well-approved reading gives a satisfactory sense. We have to suppose a pause and then Jesus resuming says to the eleven—"beginning," the implied though not expressed thought being: this preaching of repentance to the nations is to be your work; or go ye

μάρτυρες τούτων. 49. καὶ ἰδού, ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω[1] τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἱερουσαλήμ,[2] ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε δύναμιν ἐξ ὕψους."[3]

50. Ἐξήγαγε δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξω[4] ἕως εἰς[5] Βηθανίαν· καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς. 51. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτούς, διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.[6] 52. καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν,[7] ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης· 53. καὶ ἦσαν διαπαντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες[8] τὸν Θεόν. Ἀμήν.[9]

[1] και ιδου εγω in ABC *al.* (W.H.); omit ιδου ℵDL (Tisch.). ℵ^cBLXΔ 33 have εξαποστελλω (Tisch., W.H.).

[2] Omit Ιερ. ℵBCDL codd. vet. Lat.

[3] εξ υψους δυναμιν in ℵBCL 33.

[4] Omit εξω ℵBCL 1, 33.

[5] For εις ℵBCDL 1, 33 have προς.

[6] και ανεφ. εις τ. ουρ. is wanting in ℵ*D a b c e l ff². A "Western non-interpolation," W.H. App.

[7] προσκυν. αυτον wanting in D a b e ff². A "Western non-interpolation," W.H. App.

[8] αινουντες only in D a b e ff² (Tisch.). ℵBC*L have ευλογουντες only (W.H. text).

[9] Αμην is wanting in ℵC*DL 1, 33 *al.*

and do this—beginning at Jerusalem.—Ver. 48. **μάρτυρες τ.**, the witnessing function refers mainly to the resurrection, not exclusively as i. 2 shows.—Ver. 49. **τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τ. π.**: the promise is the Spirit spoken of in prophetic oracles (Is. xliv. i., Joel ii. 28, etc.).—**καθίσατε**, sit still, patiently but with high hope.—**ἕως οὗ**: without ἄν, because the power is expected to come without fail.—**ἐνδύσησθε**: till ye be *invested*, a natural figure, and no mere Hebraism. *Cf.* Rom. xiii. 14, Gal. iii. 27. There may be a reference to warlike armour (δίκην πανοπλίας, Euthy. Zig.).

Vv. 50-53. *Farewell!* (*cf.* Mk. xvi. 19, 20, Acts i. 9-12).—Ver. 50. **ἐξήγαγε**: does this imply that Jesus walked through the streets of Jerusalem towards Bethany visible to all? Assuming that it does, some (*e.g.*, Holtz. in H. C.) find here a contradiction of the statement in Acts x. 41 that Jesus was manifested after His resurrection only to chosen witnesses.—**ἔξω**: the best MSS. leave this out, and it seems superfluous after ἐξήγ.; but such repetitions of the preposition are by no means uncommon in Greek (examples in Bornemann).—**ἕως πρὸς** (εἰς T.R.): this reading adopted by the revisers they render: "until they were over against," which brings the indication of place into harmony with that in Acts i. 12. Possibly harmonistic considerations influenced transcription, leading, *e.g.*, to the adoption of πρὸς instead of εἰς (in AC³X, etc.). Bethany lay on the eastern slope of Olivet, about a mile beyond the summit.—Ver. 51. **διέστη**, parted; taken by itself the verb might point merely to a temporary separation, but even apart from the next clause, referring to the ascension, it is evidently meant to denote a final leave-taking.—**καὶ ἀνεφέρετο**, etc.: the absence of this clause from ℵD and some old Latin codd. may justify suspicion of a gloss, meant to bring the Gospel statement into line with Acts. But on the other hand, that the author of both books should make a distinct statement concerning the final departure of Jesus from the world in the one as well as in the other was to be expected.—Ver. 52. **μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης**, with great joy, the joy of men convinced that their Lord was risen and gone up to glory, and that great events were impending in connection with the promise of the Spirit.—Ver. 53. **διὰ παντὸς** (χρόνου understood), continually, *i.e.*, at the hours of worship when the temple was open. By frequenting the temple the disciples remained faithful to the programme "beginning at Jerusalem". To the Jew first, and *with* the Jew as far and as long as possible: such was Lk.'s habitual attitude; manifest throughout in the Gospel and in Acts.

THE GOSPEL

ACCORDING TO

JOHN

INTRODUCTION.

Authorship. The importance of ascertaining the authorship of the Fourth Gospel can hardly be exaggerated. In no other Gospel have we the direct testimony of an eye-witness. Luke expressly informs us that his information, although carefully sifted, is at second hand. If in Mark we have the reminiscences of the Apostle Peter, these are related not by himself but by his companion and interpreter John Mark. In the first Gospel we probably have in a more or less original form the collection of our Lord's sayings which Papias tells us was made by Matthew; but certainly the original work of Matthew did not exactly coincide with our present Gospel, and to what extent alteration has been made upon it, it is not easy to say. But the Fourth Gospel professes to be the work of an eye-witness, and of an eye-witness who enjoyed an intimacy with our Lord allowed to none besides. If this claim be true, and if the Gospel be indeed the work of the Apostle John, then we have not only the narrative of one who saw and was a part of what he records, but we have a picture of our Lord by one who knew Him better than any one else did.

On examination the contents of this Gospel are found to be of such a character as to make it imperative that we should know whether we can trust its statements or not. The author of the Gospel not only expresses his own belief in our Lord's divinity, but he puts words into the mouth of Jesus which even on close scrutiny seem to many to form an explicit claim to pre-existence and thus to imply a claim to divinity. If these claims and statements merely reflect the belief and opinion of the third or fourth generation and not the very mind of Christ Himself, then they are important mainly as historical evidence of a growing tradition and not as giving us the firm basis on which the Church may build. But if an apostle was responsible for the Gospel, then the probability is that the utterances which are referred to Christ nearly, if not absolutely, represent His very words, and that the doctrinal position of the author himself is not one we can lightly set aside. For, although apostolic author-

ship does not guarantee absolute accuracy in detail, and although we cannot determine the relation of the record to the words actually spoken by Jesus until we have ascertained the object and point of view of the writer, yet apostolic authorship not only fixes the date within certain limits, but also determines to a considerable extent the probable spirit, attitude, means, and object of the writer.

Critics who find themselves unable to admit apostolic authorship lay stress upon the value of the Gospel as exhibiting the faith of the Church in the early part of the second century and the grounds on which that faith rested. Thus Weizsäcker declares that the debates regarding the divinity of Christ are a mere reflex of the time in which the evangelist lived—a time when, according to Pliny, Christians were accustomed to sing hymns to Christ as God and were creating a fuller dogma of His divinity. The Johannine Christ occupies no relation to the Law, because for the Church of the evangelist's day the Law was no longer of present interest as it had been in a former generation. The strife exhibited in the Gospel did not belong to the life of Christ, but is a strife of the Epigoni.

Holtzmann is of the same opinion. The Gospel has value as a mirror of the times in which the writer lived and of the experiences through which the Church had reached that period; but when we proceed to use the Gospel as a record of our Lord's life we must bear in mind that the author meant to portray the image of Christ as that image lived in his own soul and in the Church for which he wrote; and as, in his view, it should live in the Church of all times as the image of the Godhead. Oscar Holtzmann (*Das Johannes-evangelium*, 1887, p. 137) believes that the writer sought to write a life of Jesus which should be in keeping with the thought of his time; and with this object he used the material furnished by the Synoptists and by the oral tradition of his day, correcting and amplifying to suit his purpose.

Schürer (*Vorträge d. theol. Konferenz zu Giessen*, 1889, *Über d. gegenwärtigen Stand d. Johanneischen Frage*) maintains that the worth of the fourth Gospel lies, not in its historical narrative, but in its expression of the conviction that in Jesus Christ God revealed Himself. This is the essence of Christianity; and this is the fundamental thought of the Gospel. Nowhere in the New Testament is it presented with such clearness, with such ardent faith, with such victorious confidence. Accordingly, though this Gospel as a source of history must take a lower place than the synoptic Gospels, it must always have its worth as a witness of the Christian faith.

Doubtless the Gospel has a value, whoever is its author, and

whatever its date. But if it is not historically reliable and if the utterances attributed to our Lord were not really uttered by Him but are merely the creation of the writer and ascribed to the Founder of the Church to account for and justify some of its developments, plainly its value is widely different from that which attaches to a reliable record of the words and actions of Jesus. The faith and life of the Church of the second century is not normative; and if in this Gospel all that we have is a reflex of that life given in terms of the life of Christ, we have, no doubt, a very interesting document, but not a document on which we can build our knowledge of our Lord. Nay, professing, as this record does, to be historically reliable, the Church has been throughout its history gravely in error regarding the claims of its Founder, and this error lies at the door of the author of the Gospel. It is of the first importance, therefore, that we ascertain whether the writer had the means of being historically trustworthy, whether he was an eye-witness or was entirely dependent on others for his information.

1. *External evidence in favour of Johannine authorship.* In examining the Christian literature of the second century with a view to ascertain the belief of the Church regarding the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, it must be borne in mind that there are many instances in which the classical writers of antiquity were not quoted for some centuries after their works were published. The character and position of the New Testament writings, however, made it likely that they would at once and frequently be referred to. But although the second century was prolific of Christian writings, their extant remains are unfortunately scanty. We might have expected definite information from the exegetical writings of Papias and Basileides, and possibly some allusions in the histories of Hegesippus, but of these and other important documents only the names and a few extracts survive. It is also to be borne in mind that the mode of quotation in vogue at that time was different from our own. Books were not so plentiful, and they were more cumbrous. Accordingly there was more quotation from memory and little of the exactness which in our day is considered desirable. It was a common practice with early writers to weave Scriptural language into their own text without pausing to say whence these allusions were derived. The consequence is that while such allusions may seem to one reader to carry evidence that the writer is making use of such and such a book of Scripture, it is always open to a more sceptical reader to say that the inexactness of the allusion is rather a proof that the book of Scripture had not been seen, and that some traditional

saying was the source of the quotation. And even where explicit quotations occur, no light may be thrown on the authorship of the book quoted, except in so far as they indicate the date of its composition.

It is not questioned that in the last quarter of the second century the Fourth Gospel was accepted by the Church as the work of the Apostle John, and was recognised as canonical. This is a fact not questioned, but its importance may easily be underrated and its significance missed. Opponents of the Johannine authorship have declared it to be "totally unnecessary to account" for this remarkable consent of opinion. But the very fact that a Gospel so obviously different from the synoptic Gospels should have been unanimously received as Apostolic is a weighty testimony. Its significance has been admirably summarised by Archdeacon Watkins (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 47): "It is not that the Fourth Gospel was known and read as the work of St. John in the year A.D. 190 or 180 or 170; but that it was known and read through all the extent of Christendom, in churches varying in origin and language and history, in Lyons and Rome, in Carthage and Alexandria, in Athens and Corinth, in Ephesus and Sardis and Hierapolis, in Antioch and Edessa; that the witness is of Churches to a sacred book which was read in their services, and about which there could be no mistake, and of individuals who had sacrificed the greatest good of temporal life, and were ready to sacrifice life itself as a witness to its truth; that these individual witnesses were men of culture and rich mental endowment, with full access to materials for judgment, and full power to exercise that judgment; that their witness was given in the face of hostile heathenism and opposing heresy, which demanded caution in argument and reserve in statement; and that this witness is clear, definite, unquestioned".

To this universal consent the sole exceptions were Marcion and the Alogi, and possibly Gaius.[1] During the decade A.D. 160-170 there existed in Asia Minor some persons who discovered in the Gospel traces of Gnostic and Montanistic teaching. They held their place in the Christian Church, but discarded the Johannine writings and ascribed them to Cerinthus. Epiphanius gives them the name of Ἄλογοι [unreasonable, irrational] because they did not accept the Logos proclaimed by John.[2] Harnack justly maintains that this is

[1] See Rendel Harris' *Hermas in Arcadia and other Essays*, 1896.

[2] Epiphan., *Haeres.*, 51, 3, defines this heresy as ἀποβάλλουσαν Ἰωάννου τὰς βίβλους. Ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸν λόγον οὐ δέχονται τὸν παρὰ Ἰωάννου κεκηρυγμένον, Ἄλογοι κληθήσονται. See Harnack, *Das N. Test. um d. Jahr* 200, pp. 58-70;

"of the highest significance" for the history of the Canon; but it has little or no significance for the criticism of the Gospel, because the rejection of the Gospel proceeded wholly on dogmatic grounds. Its ascription to Cerinthus, an impossible author, betrays the recklessness of the judgment pronounced; while the naming of a contemporary and fellow-townsman of the Apostle may be accepted as an indication of the true date of the Gospel. Some of the scholars who are best informed regarding the second century, such as Hilgenfeld and Salmon, are inclined to believe that no such sect as the Alogi ever existed, although one or two individuals may have held the opinions identified with that nickname. If they existed, their rejection of the writings of John demonstrates that previous to their time these writings had been accepted as Apostolic and authoritative.[1] Marcion's neglect of the Johannine books is equally unimportant for the criticism of the Gospel.

In the writings of Irenaeus, who was born, according to Lipsius, about A.D. 130, and whose great work against Gnosticism may be dated between 180-185, the Fourth Gospel is referred to the Apostle John and is regarded as canonical. In a well-known passage (*Contra Haer.*, III., xi., 8) this representative writer even argues that in the nature of things there can be neither more nor fewer than four Gospels, as there are four zones of the world in which we live, and four principal winds. In accordance with this natural fourfoldness the Word who designs all things has given us the Gospel under four aspects but united and unified by one Spirit. Additional importance has been given to this statement by the suggestion of Dr. Taylor of Cambridge that Irenaeus borrowed this idea from Hermas. This writer, who belongs to a much earlier period than Irenaeus, in speaking of the Church says: "Whereas thou sawest her seated on a couch, the position is a firm one; for the couch has four feet and standeth firmly, for the world too is upheld by means

Watkins' *B. L.*, p. 123; Salmon's *Introd.*, p. 229; Sanday's *B. L.*, p. 64; and *cf.* Irenaeus, *Haer.*, III., xi., 9.

[1] Dr. Plummer, after discussing the rejection of the Gospel by Marcion and the Alogi, proceeds: "All this tends to show that if the Fourth Gospel was rejected in certain quarters for a time, this tells little or nothing against its genuineness. Indeed it may fairly be said to tell the other way; for it shows that the universal recognition of the Gospel, which we find existing from A.D. 170 onwards, was no mere blind enthusiasm, but a victory of truth over baseless, though not unnatural, suspicion. Moreover, the fact that these overwary Christians assigned the Gospel to Cerinthus is evidence that the Gospel was in their opinion written by a contemporary of St. John. To concede this is to concede the whole question" (*Cambridge Greek Test.; Gospel acc. to St. John*, p. 24).

of four elements".[1] If we could accept Dr. Taylor's view and believe that the four Gospels are here alluded to, we should have the earliest testimony to our four canonical Gospels; but it may so reasonably be doubted whether the reference is to four Gospels that the passage cannot be appealed to without hesitation.

But it is the connection of Irenaeus with Polycarp which has always been considered the significant element in his testimony. Eusebius (*H. E.*, v., 20) has preserved a letter written by Irenaeus to Florinus, in which he reminds him how they had together listened to Polycarp in their youth: "I distinctly remember the incidents of that time better than events of recent occurrence; for the lessons received in childhood, growing with the growth of the soul, become identified with it; so that I can describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, and his goings out and his comings in, and his manner of life and his personal appearance, and the discourses which he held before the people; and how he would describe his intercourse with John and with the rest who had seen the Lord, and how he would relate their words. And what were the accounts he had heard from them about the Lord, and about His miracles, and about His teaching, how Polycarp, as having received them from eye-witnesses of the life of the Word [τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ Λόγου], used to give an account harmonising on all points with the Scriptures."[2] The Scripture in which "the life of the Word" can be traced is the Fourth Gospel. Polycarp does not refer his hearers to that Gospel, because having himself been a pupil of John, he preferred to relate what he had heard from him. But Irenaeus recognised that Polycarp's oral tradition was in harmony with the Gospel. Besides, John lived to the times of Trajan, whose reign began in A.D. 98, while Polycarp was born not later than A.D. 70, and was put to death in 156, so that the first thirty years of his life coincided with the last years of John's, and the last thirty years with the youth of Irenaeus. This being so, can it fairly be said to be likely that after such intimacy with Polycarp as Irenaeus claims, he should not know whether John had written a Gospel or not? Is it conceivable that a young man of an intelligent and inquiring turn of mind should have been in daily communication with a pupil of the Apostle's, and should never have discovered the origin of the most remarkable document of primitive Christianity?

But Irenaeus is not the earliest writer who ascribes the Fourth

[1] See Taylor's *Hermas and the Four Gospels*. Cambridge, 1892.

[2] This argument is put in an interesting and conclusive form by Dr. Dale in his *Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, pp. 149-151, 281-284.

Gospel to the Apostle John. This distinction belongs to Theophilus of Antioch. His treatise, *Ad Autolycum*, was probably of an earlier date than Irenaeus' great work, and in this treatise, speaking of inspired men, he says: " one of whom, John, says, In the beginning was the Word".

The date of the Muratorian Canon is so much debated that it cannot be cited as a witness anterior to Irenaeus. But it records an interesting tradition of the origin of the Gospel. "The fourth of the Gospels is by the disciple John. He was urged by his fellow disciples and bishops and said, 'Fast with me this day and for three days and whatever shall be revealed to any of us let us relate it'. The same night it was revealed to the Apostle Andrew that John should write the whole in his own name, and that all the rest should revise it." Whatever may be thought of this tradition, it is at all events evidence that for some considerable time prior to the publication of the Muratorian Canon the Fourth Gospel had been accepted as the work of John.

The esteem in which the Fourth Gospel was held about the middle of the second century is evinced by the place it holds in the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. This harmony of the four Gospels opens with a portion of the Fourth Gospel. What may reasonably be gathered from the existence of such a work is fairly stated by Harnack in his article on Tatian in the *Encyc. Brit.*: "We learn from the *Diatessaron* that about A.D. 160 our four Gospels had already taken a place of prominence in the Church, and that no others had done so; that in particular the Fourth Gospel had already taken a fixed place alongside of the three synoptics". But this is too modest an inference. Prof. Sanday has shown that the text used in the composition of the *Diatessaron* does not represent the original autograph of the Gospel, nor a first copy of it, but that several copyings must have intervened between the original and Tatian's text; that in fact this text was derived "from a copy that is already very corrupt, a copy perhaps farther removed (if every aberration is taken into account) from the original text than the text which was committed to print in the sixteenth century. This is a fact of the very highest significance, and it is one that the negative critics in Germany have, to the best of my belief, entirely overlooked."[1] The date of the Gospel is thus pushed back considerably.

With the writings of Tatian's master, Justin, we pass from the second into the first half of the second century. Dr. Hort places his

[1] See also Harris' *Preliminary Study, etc.*, p. 56.

martyrdom in the year A.D. 149, and his writings may, with Lightfoot, be dated in the fifth decade of the century. That he made use of the Fourth Gospel, although hotly contested a few years ago, is now, since the investigations of Drummond and Abbot, scarcely denied.[1] And indeed several passages in Justin's writings are indisputable echoes of the Gospel. In the *Dialogue with Trypho* (c. 105) he expressly states that his knowledge of Jesus as the only begotten of the Father and as the Logos was derived from the Gospels, that is, from the Fourth Gospel, for none of the synoptics speak of the Logos. In his *First Apology* (c. 63) he says of the Jews: "They are justly upbraided by Christ Himself as knowing neither the Father nor the Son". In the same *Apology* (c. 61), in explaining baptism, he says: "For Christ also said, Except ye be born again ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven". Other passages have a similar bearing.

In the Apostolic Fathers we find no express references to the Fourth Gospel, but there are not wanting echoes which indicate a familiarity with its teaching. Thus in the epistles of Ignatius written in the year A.D. 110 while the writer was on his way to martyrdom, are found such expressions as "the Spirit . . . knoweth whence it cometh and whither it goeth," an obvious reminiscence of our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus. And when we find Ignatius speaking of Jesus as "the door of the Father," "the Shepherd," "the Son who is His Word," the probability is that these expressions were derived from the Gospel.

Polycarp's one epistle dates from the same year A.D. 110. It is a brief letter, and no reference to the Fourth Gospel occurs in it. But he quotes from the First Epistle of John, and as no one doubts that the Gospel and the Epistle are from the same hand, it can at any rate be concluded that the writer of the Gospel "flourished before Polycarp wrote".

Papias of Hierapolis, although not usually numbered among the Apostolic Fathers, was a contemporary of Polycarp, and his life overlapped that of the Apostle John by about twenty-five years. He wrote the earliest known commentary, entitled *An Exposition of our Lord's Oracles*. Most unfortunately this book is lost, and among the many rich discoveries which modern research is making none could be more valuable than the discovery of this work of Papias. The fact remains that he did write it, and therefore had some written material to proceed upon. And significant allusion is

[1] See Abbot's *Critical Essays*; Purves, *Test. of Justin*; Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*.

made to this work in an old Latin argument prefixed to the Gospel in a MS. of the ninth century, which says: "The Gospel of John was revealed and given to the churches by John while he still remained in the body, as one named Papias of Hierapolis, a beloved disciple of John, related in his five books of expositions".

The testimony of heretics is equally decisive. From the decade A.D. 160-170 we receive a significant witness in the commentary on the Gospel of John by Heracleon, a pupil or companion of Valentinus,[1] (γνώριμον is Origen's word). Mr. Brooke, who edited the extant portions of this commentary for Armitage Robinson's *Texts and Studies*, arrives at the conclusion that it must be dated shortly after the death of Valentinus, that is to say, not much later than A.D. 160. "The rise of commentaries shows an advanced stage in the history of the text of the Fourth Gospel" (Lightfoot, *Bibl. Essays*, p. 111). And the reason for Heracleon's choosing this Gospel as the subject of a commentary is that Valentinus and his school borrowed from it much of their phraseology, and hoped by putting their own interpretation on it to gain currency for their views. We have, then, this remarkable circumstance that shortly after the middle of the second century the Fourth Gospel occupied such a position of authority in the Church that the Gnostics considered it of importance to secure its voice in favour of their views. No wonder that even Volkmar should exclaim: "Ah! Great God! if between A.D. 125 and 155 a commentary was composed on John's Gospel such as that of which Origen has preserved considerable extracts, what yet remains to be discussed? It is very certain that it is all over with the critical thesis of the composition of the Fourth Gospel in the middle of the second century."[2]

But there is evidence that even an earlier Gnostic teacher made use of this Gospel. Hippolytus (*Philos.*, vii., 22), in giving an account of the opinions of Basileides, who flourished at Alexandria about the year A.D. 125, quotes him in the following terms: "This," says he (*i.e.*, Basileides), "is that which is said in the Gospels, 'That was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world'". The words are cited precisely as they stand in the Fourth Gospel, and as they are not words of Jesus, which might have been handed down through some other channel, but words of the evangelist himself, they prove that the Gospel existed before the year A.D 125. The attempt to evade this conclusion by the suggestion that

[1] Valentinus himself used "integro instrumento," the whole N.T. as Tertullian received it. Tert., *Praescr.*, 38.

[2] See Reynolds, *Pulpit Com.*, p. 29.

Hippolytus is quoting the followers of Basileides rather than himself has been finally disposed of by Matthew Arnold (*God and the Bible*, 268-9). But even Basileides was not the earliest Gnostic who used this Gospel. Hippolytus gives an account of the previously existing sects, the Naasseni and Peratae, which proves that they made large use of this Gospel. Already in the earliest years of the second century the Fourth Gospel was an authoritative document.

What must necessarily be inferred from this use of the Gospel by the Gnostics of the second century? The conclusion drawn by Ezra Abbot is as follows: "It was then generally received both by Gnostics and their opponents between the years A.D. 120 and 130. What follows? It follows that the Gnostics of that date received it because they could not help it. They would not have admitted the authority of a book, which could be reconciled with their doctrines only by the most forced interpretation, if they could have destroyed its authority by denying its genuineness. Its genuineness could then be easily ascertained. Ephesus was one of the principal cities of the Eastern world, the centre of extensive commerce, the metropolis of Asia Minor. Hundreds, if not thousands, of people were living who had known the Apostle John. The question whether he, the beloved disciple, had committed to writing his recollections of his Master's life and teaching, was one of the greatest interest. The fact of the reception of the Fourth Gospel as his work at so early a date, by parties so violently opposed to each other, proves that the evidence of its genuineness was decisive." [1]

The *Clementine Homilies* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which respectively represent the Ebionite and Nazarene branches of Judaistic Christianity, betray familiarity, if not with the Fourth Gospel, certainly with its teaching and phraseology.

In the face of this external evidence, it has been found impossible to maintain the late date which was ascribed to the Gospel by several eminent critics of the last generation. There can be no doubt that the Gospel existed in the earliest years of the second century, and that it was even then esteemed authoritative. That the Apostle John was its author, is nowhere explicitly stated before the middle of the century; but that this was from the first believed, may legitimately be inferred both from the esteem in which it was held, and from the fact that no other name was ever connected with the Gospel until the impossible Cerinthian authorship was suggested by the insignificant and biassed sect of the Alogi. Schürer, indeed, says

[1] *Critical Essays*, p. 91.

that "the utmost one can admit in an unprejudiced way, is that the external evidence is evenly balanced *pro* and *con*, and leads to no decision. Perhaps, however, it would be truer to say it is more unfavourable than favourable to the authenticity." Such a conclusion can only excite astonishment.

2. *Internal evidence of Johannine authorship.* The internal evidence has usually been grouped under four heads, showing respectively that the author was (1) a Jew, (2) a Palestinian, (3) an eye-witness, (4) the Apostle John.

(1) That the writer was a Jew is proved by his Hebraistic style, by his knowledge of Hebrew and Aramaic, and by his familiarity with Jewish traditions, ideas, modes of thought, expectations, customs. Although written in Greek which is neither awkward nor ungrammatical, the Gospel uses a small number of words and only such as are familiar in ordinary conversation. The vocabulary is much more limited than that of the well-educated Paul, and the style reveals none of the nicety found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. One chief distinction between Hebrew and Greek style is that the Greek writer by means of multitudinous particles exhibits with precision the course of thought by which each clause is connected with that which goes before it: the Hebrew writer contents himself with laying thought alongside of thought and leaving it to the reader to discover the connection. The most casual reader of the Fourth Gospel speedily finds that the difficulty of understanding it is the difficulty of perceiving the sequence of the clauses. Any one accustomed to a Greek style would on reading the Fourth Gospel conclude that its author was not familiar with Greek literature.[1]

It would also naturally be concluded that the writer was a Jew from his inserting translations of Aramaic names, as in i. 38, i. 41, i. 42, ix. 7, xix. 13, xix. 17, xx. 21; and especially from his familiarity with Jewish customs, ideas, and institutions. Thus he knows that it is a Jewish custom to sit under the fig tree, i. 49; to have water-pots for purposes of purification, ii. 6; to embalm the dead, xix. 40; to wash the feet before meals, xiii. 4. He is familiar with Jewish ideas, as that it is wrong for a Rabbi to speak with a woman, iv. 27; that disease is the result of sin, ix. 2; that Elias was to come before the Messiah, i. 21; that it defiles a Jew to enter a Gentile dwelling, xviii. 29. So intimate an acquaintance with the Jewish Messianic ideas as is shown in chap. vii. cannot easily be ascribed to any but a Jew. Jewish institutions are also well known: Levites and priests

[1] See further in Lightfoot's *Bibl. Essays*, p. 16 ff. Weiss, *Introd.*, ii., 359.

are distinguished, i. 19; the composition and action of the Sanhedrim is well understood; the less frequented feasts (ἐγκαίνια, x. 22) are known. He is also aware of the chief point in dispute between Jews and Samaritans, iv. 20; the length of time the Temple has been in building, ii. 21; that synagogue and temple are the favourite resort fo teachers, xviii. 20.[1]

Two objections, however, have been raised. 1st. It is said that the author throughout his Gospels betrays a marked antipathy to the Jews. He uses the name as a recognised designation of the enemies of Jesus; "the Jews" sought to kill Him; "no man spake openly of Him for fear of 'the Jews'". They are spoken of as "the children of the devil". This objection, however, is baseless. In the synoptic Gospels Jesus, Himself a Jew, is represented as pronouncing invectives against the leaders of the people quite as strong as any to be found in the Fourth Gospel. In John all the apostles are Jews, and it is in this Gospel the great saying is preserved that "salvation is of the Jews". 2nd. Matthew Arnold and the author of *Supernatural Religion* have maintained that the Jews and their usages are spoken of in this Gospel as if they belonged to a race different from the writer's. "The water-pots at Cana are set '*after the manner of purifying of the Jews*'; . . . 'now the *Jews'* passover was nigh at hand'. . . . It seems almost impossible to think that a Jew born and bred—a man like the Apostle John—could ever have come to speak so. . . . A *Jew* talking of the *Jews' passover* and of a dispute of some of John's disciples *with a Jew about purifying*. It is like an Englishman writing of the Derby as *the English people's Derby*, or talking of a dispute between some of Mr. Cobden's disciples and *an Englishman about free trade*. An Englishman would never speak so."[2] An Englishman who had for many years been resident abroad and who was writing for foreigners would use precisely such forms of expression.

(2) The author was a Palestinian. A Jew of the dispersion, a Hellenist, would probably betray himself, not only by writing a freer Greek style, but by showing a less intimate knowledge of the localities of the Holy Land, and by using the LXX., and not the original Hebrew, in quoting from the Old Testament. In regard to the evidence afforded by a knowledge of localities, Professor Ramsay lays down the following: "It is impossible for any one to invent a tale, whose scene lies in a foreign land, without betraying in slight

[1] The best statement of this part of the evidence will be found in Oscar Holtzmann's *Johan.*, pp. 188-191.

[2] *God and the Bible*, p. 251.

details his ignorance of the scenery and circumstances amid which the event is described as taking place. Unless the writer studiously avoids details, and confines himself to names and generalities, he is certain to commit numerous errors. Even the most laborious and minute study of the circumstances of the country, in which he is to lay his scene, will not preserve him from such errors. He must live long, and observe carefully in the country, if he wishes to invent a tale which will not betray his ignorance in numberless details. Allusions of French or German authors to English life supply the readiest illustration of this principle." Now the author of the Fourth Gospel betrays that intimate acquaintance with the localities of Palestine, which could only be possessed by a resident. He describes Bethany as "nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off". Who, but one who had often walked it, would be likely to let that exact indication drop from his pen? It is the unconscious gratuitousness of full knowledge. In chap. vi. he has before his mind's eye the movements round the Sea of Galilee, which he describes. He is familiar with the Temple, with its porches and cloisters, and he knows the side of the building which people chose in cold weather. He passes from Jerusalem to the villages around, crossing brooks, and visiting gardens without once stumbling in his topographical details. This sure sign of a resident he constantly betrays, he adds to the name of a town the additional specification by which it might be distinguished from others of the same name: "Bethany beyond Jordan," "Aenon near to Salim," "Bethsaida the city of Andrew and Peter," and so forth.

In a matter of this kind few are more qualified to judge than Bishop Lightfoot, who spent so much of his own life in archæological research. Here is his judgment: "Let us place ourselves in the position of one who wrote at the middle of the second century, after the later Roman invasion had swept off the scanty gleanings of the past which had been spared from the earlier. Let us ask how a romancer so situated is to make himself acquainted with the incidents, the localities, the buildings, the institutions, the modes of thought and feeling which belonged to this past age, and (as we may almost say) this bygone people. Let it be granted that here and there he must stumble upon a historical fact, that in one or two particulars he might reproduce a national characteristic. More than this would be beyond his reach. For, it will be borne in mind, he would be placed at a great disadvantage, compared with a modern writer; he would have to reconstruct history without these various appliances, maps and plates, chronological tables, books of travel,

by which the author of a historical novel is so largely assisted in the present day" (*Expositor*, Jan., 1890, p. 13).

A few years ago the writer's ignorance of the localities he mentioned was insisted upon. But since the Palestinian Survey the tables are turned. It is now admitted that competent knowledge of the localities is shown. Schürer, *e.g.*, says: "Among serious difficulties we need no longer reckon at the present day the supposed ignorance of Palestinian and Jewish matters from which Bretschneider and Baur inferred that the author was neither a Palestinian nor in any sense a Jew. The geographical errors and ignorance of things Jewish have more and more shrunk to a *minimum*." The argument now is, "admitting that the writer shows local knowledge, this does not prove that he was a native of Palestine. He may have derived his knowledge from books, or from occasional residence in the country." Professor Sanday has been at pains to show that any knowledge which could have been derived from such geographers as Pomponius Mela, Ptolemy, or Strabo, was of the scantiest possible description. Holtzmann, though strongly opposed to the Johannine authorship, admits that the topographical knowledge indicates that the author had visited the holy places, but not that he was a Palestinian. He had then been a resident in Palestine, knew the places he spoke about, and so far was not romancing.

One distinction of the Jew of the dispersion was his use of the LXX., instead of the Hebrew Bible. What Old Testament then does the writer of the Fourth Gospel use? He is found to depart from the LXX., and to use language more closely representing the Hebrew. Until a very few years ago, this was accepted as proof that he read the Hebrew, and used it. But recently there has been a growing conviction that during the Apostolic Age other versions of the Old Testament, or of some books and portions of it, were extant in Greek. And it is argued that John might have used some of these. But when it is found that in some of his quotations his language is closer to the original than that of the LXX., or than the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, it is certainly reasonable to conclude that he used the Hebrew, and translated for himself, and was, therefore, a native Palestinian.[1]

(3) There is reason to believe that the author was an eye-witness of the events he relates. In the first place, the writer claims to be an eye-witness. This is surely of some account. The expression

[1] See this handled with his usual fairness by Professor Sanday, *Expositor*, March, 1892.

"we beheld His glory" (i. 14) need not be pressed, although considering the analogous statement of 1 John i. 1, it may very well be maintained that the writer had with his bodily eyes seen the manifestation of his Lord's glory. But in xix. 35 we have an explicit claim: "He that saw it bare record, and his record is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe". The words "he knoweth that he saith true" could hardly have been inserted by any other hand than that of the eye-witness himself. In xxi. 24 we read: "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things". Whether this note was added by the writer himself, or by another hand, certainly the intention is to identify the writer with an eye-witness and participator of the events recorded. We are thus confronted with the alternative: either an eye-witness wrote this Gospel, or a forger whose genius for truth and for lying are alike inexplicable. As Renan says (*Vie*, xxvii.): "L'auteur y parle toujours comme témoin oculaire; il veut se faire passer pour l'Apôtre Jean. Si donc cet ouvrage n'est pas réellement de l'apôtre, il faut admettre une supercherie que l'auteur s'avouait à lui-même."

This claim is abundantly confirmed by the character of the Gospel. For we find in it such a multitude of detail as gratuitously invites the detection of error. Not only are individuals named, and so described that we seem to know them, but frequently there are added specifications of time and place which obviously are the involuntary superfluity of information which flows almost unconsciously from a full memory. Such details are: the hour at which Jesus sat on the well, the number and size of the water-pots at the marriage at Cana, the weight and value of the ointment, the number of fish at the last cast, the hour at which the nobleman's son began to amend, the hour at which Jesus took the two inquirers into His own lodging.

Circumstantiality can, no doubt, be given to a narrative by a Defoe or a Swift. But among the Jews the writing of fiction was not cultivated; and besides, the circumstantial detail of this Gospel does not belong to the world of imagination, but attaches to real objects and events, and can in many instances be verified. If in these instances the detail is found to be accurate, the presumption is that accuracy characterises those also which cannot so easily be checked; and that, therefore, the circumstantiality is due to the fact that the writer was an eye-witness of what he records.

(4) This Palestinian Jew who was himself an eye-witness of the ministry of Jesus was the Apostle John. In xxi. 24 the writer of the Gospel is identified with the disciple whom Jesus loved. This disciple

was certainly one of the seven named in xxi. 2, who appear as the actors in the scene there recorded. Of these seven there were three who frequently appear in the other Gospels as the intimates of Jesus. These are Peter, James, and John. But Peter cannot have been the disciple in question, for in this chapter Peter and that disciple are spoken of separately. Neither can James be the person meant, for his early death precludes the idea of his being the author of the Gospel. It remains that John was the disciple whom Jesus loved,[1] the author of the Fourth Gospel. And however we interpret the intention of John in using this circumlocution to designate himself, it must not be overlooked that its employment is evidence of the Johannine authorship. In the other Gospels John is frequently spoken of by name. In this Gospel John is not once named, although from no Gospel do we gather such vivid descriptions of the Apostles. Certainly it is a most natural and sufficient explanation of this fact to suppose that John was the author of the Gospel.

Objections. But to this conclusion many critics demur. Since Bretschneider it has been continually asserted that this does not exhaust the internal evidence, and that there is that in the Fourth Gospel which makes it impossible to refer it to the Apostle John. There are evidences of dependence on the synoptists, inconsistent with the hypothesis that it was written by an Apostle who himself had been an eye-witness; of a universalism inconsistent with the fact that the Apostle John was a pillar of the Jewish Christian Church; and of a philosophical colouring which does not favour the idea that the author was a Galilean fisherman.[2]

The two latter objections are not formidable. Schürer shows with considerable force that up to the time of the Apostolic convention in Jerusalem John was a Jewish Christian and an upholder of the law, whereas the author of this Gospel knows the law only as the law of the Jews. Is it likely, he asks, that one who during the first twenty years of his ministry maintained the law would in his latter years so entirely repudiate it? "If during this long period the influence of the preaching of Jesus had not made John a liberal, was such a transformation probable at a still later time?" That such a transformation was very probable will be the answer of those who consider that between the earlier and the later period the Jewish

[1] "There is no trace that in Christian antiquity this title ever suggested any one but John" (Ezra Abbot, *Critical Essays*, p. 73).

[2] For a brief but conclusive answer to these objections, see Dale's *Living Christ and the Four Gospels*, 149-152.

economy had come to an end and that John had become the successor of Paul in a thoroughly Greek city.

The traces of philosophical colouring have been exaggerated and misinterpreted. In the Platonic dialogues the circumstances, the speakers, and their utterances are all either created by the writer or employed to proclaim his own philosophy. To suppose that the Gospel was composed in some analogous manner is to misconceive it. No doubt in Ephesus John was brought into contact with forms of thought and with speculations which were little heard of in Palestine. And in so far as the ideas then prevalent were true, an intelligent Christian mind would necessarily bring them into relation with the manifestation of God in Christ. This process would bring to the surface much of the significance both of the life and teaching of Jesus which hitherto had been unnoticed and unused. The process is apparent in the epistles of Paul as well as in the Fourth Gospel. The idea of the Logos was a Jewish-Alexandrian idea, and that the author sought to attach his Gospel to this idea is unquestionable, but it is a very long and insecure step from this to conclude that he was himself trained in the Hellenistic philosophy of Alexandria. The Logos idea is not essential to the Fourth Gospel; it is rather the Sonship idea that is essential. But the term and the idea of the Logos are used by the author to introduce his subject to the Greek readers. As Harnack says: "The prologue is not the key to the understanding of the Gospel, but is rather intended to prepare the Hellenistic reader for its perusal".[1] After the introduction the Logos is never again referred to. The philosophy one finds in the Gospel is not the metaphysics of the schools, but the insight of the contemplative, brooding spirit which finds in Christ the solvent of all problems.

The originality of the author of the Fourth Gospel has recently been vigorously assailed.[2] It has been shown that, in certain passages, he is dependent for his phraseology on the Synoptic Gospels; and it has been urged that an Apostle and eye-witness would not thus derive from others an account of what he had himself seen. As a general rule it is of course true that an eye-witness would depend on his own reminiscences; but, presumably, no one denies that John knew and used the Synoptic Gospels; and that phrases which occur in them should have remained in his memory is not surprising. Even in the passages where these borrowings occur,

[1] *Zeitschrift f. T. und K.*, 2nd Jahrg., p. 230.

[2] See especially Oscar Holtzmann, *Johannesevang.*, p. 6 ff.

there are divergences so considerable as to indicate an original witness. For, to interpret these divergences, as Oscar Holtzmann does, as misunderstandings of his sources, is rather, if it may without offence be said, a misunderstanding of John. It may rather be said that, in several instances, we find additions and corrections which are requisite for the understanding of the Synoptists. From the first three Gospels the reader might gather that our Lord's ministry extended over only one year; the Fourth Gospel definitely mentions three Passovers (ii. 13; vi. 4; xiii. 1), with a possible fourth (v. 1). The probabilities here are certainly in favour of the representation of the Fourth Gospel, and it may be shown that even in the Synoptic narratives a longer ministry is implied than that which they expressly mention. Again, the ministry in Jerusalem, as recounted in the Fourth Gospel, alone enables us to understand the lament which finds a place in the Synoptics, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, *how often*," etc. The call of those who afterwards became Apostles, the arrival in Galilee of scribes from Jerusalem to watch Jesus, and other incidents recorded by the Synoptists, only become fully intelligible when read in the light of the narrative given in the Fourth Gospel. Evidently the author of this Gospel had, at least on some points, access to more accurate and complete information than that which was accessible to the other evangelists.

The independence of the Fourth Gospel is further shown by its omission of such remarkable scenes as the Temptation, the Transfiguration, the Agony in the Garden, and by its introduction of places and persons unnamed in the other Gospels; as, Aenon, Salim, Sychar, Bethany beyond Jordan, Nicodemus, Nathanael, the Samaritan woman, the man born blind, the dead Lazarus, Annas. The most natural way to account for this is to suppose that we have here the additional information which an Apostle would necessarily possess. The alternatives are that we must refer it to the creative imagination of the writer, or to the tradition of our Lord's life which had been handed down irrespective of the Synoptic Gospels, the "Johanneisches vor Johannes". But why deny this tradition to the Apostle John? In whom could it find a more suitable repository? Unquestionably there underlies this Gospel a full and significant tradition, but there seems no good reason for allotting the tradition to one source and the Gospel to another. Much more probable is the account of Eusebius,[1] who tells us "that John, having spent all

[1] *H. E.*, iii., 24: Ἰωάννην φασὶ τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἀγράφῳ κεχρημένον κηρύγματι τέλος καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἐλθεῖν.

his life in proclaiming the Gospel orally, at the last committed it to writing".

Suspicion has been cast on the historicity of the Fourth Gospel by the omission from the others of all reference to the raising of Lazarus. As related by John, this event was not only remarkable in itself, but materially contributed to the catastrophe. It is difficult to suppose that so surprising an event should not be known to the Synoptists. It is true John omits incidents as remarkable; but he knew that they were already related. It is possible that at the first, while the life of Lazarus was still in danger from the authorities, reference to the miracle may have been judged unadvisable, especially as similar raisings from the dead had been recorded. Probably, however, Professor Sanday's solution is right: "Considering that the Synoptists knew nothing of events in Jerusalem before the last Passover, we cannot be surprised that they should omit an event which is placed at Bethany".[1]

But that which has driven many open-minded critics to a disbelief in the Apostolic authorship of the Gospel is the character of the conversations and addresses which are here attributed to our Lord. Some pronounce these discourses to be entirely fictitious, ascribed to Jesus for the sake of illustrating and enforcing opinions of the author. Others suppose that a small modicum of historical truth is to be found in them; while critics who are branded as "Apologists" almost entirely eliminate from the discourses ascribed to our Lord any subjective element contributed by the Evangelist. Is there then any test we can apply to this record, any criterion by which these discourses may be judged? The reports in the Synoptic Gospels at once suggest themselves as the required criterion. Doubts there may be regarding the very words ascribed to our Lord in this or that passage of the Synoptists, doubts there must be, whether we are to follow Matthew or Luke, when these two differ; but practically there is no doubt at all, even among extreme critics, that we may gather from those Gospels a clear idea both of the form and of the substance of our Lord's teaching.

Now it is not to be denied that the comparison of the Fourth Gospel with the first three is a little disconcerting. For it is obvious that in the Fourth Gospel the discourses occupy a different position, and differ also both in style and in matter from those recorded in the Synoptical Gospels. They occupy a different position, bulking much more largely in proportion to the narrative. Indeed, the

[1] *Authorship of Fourth Gospel*, p. 185.

narrative portion of the Gospel of John may be said to exist for the sake of the verbal teaching. The miracles which in the first three Gospels appear as the beneficent acts of our Lord without ulterior motive, seem in the Fourth Gospel to exist for the sake of the teaching they embody, and the discussions they give rise to. Similarly, the persons introduced, such as Nicodemus, are viewed chiefly as instrumental in eliciting from Jesus certain sayings, and are themselves forgotten in the conversation they have suggested.

In form the teachings recorded in John conspicuously differ from those recorded by the other evangelists. They present our Lord as using three forms of teaching, brief, pregnant apophthegms, parables, and prolonged ethical addresses. In John, it is alleged, the parable has disappeared, the pointed sayings suitable to a popular teacher have also disappeared, and in their place we have prolonged discussions, self-defensive explanations, and stern invectives. As Renan says: "This fashion of preaching and demonstrating without ceasing, this everlasting argumentation, this artificial get-up, these long discussions following each miracle, these discourses, stiff and awkward, whose tone is so often false and unequal, are intolerable to a man of taste alongside the delicious sentences of the synoptists ".

Even more marked is the difference in the *substance* of the discourses. From the synoptists we receive the impression that Jesus was a genial ethical teacher who spent His days among the common people exhorting them to unworldliness, to a disregard of wealth, to the humble and patient service of God in love to their fellow-men, exposing the hollowness of much that passed for religion, and seeking to inspire all men with firmer trust in God as their Father. In the Gospel of John His own claims are the prominent subject. He is the subject matter taught as well as the teacher. The Kingdom of God no longer holds the place it held in the synoptists: it is the Messiah rather than the Messianic kingdom that is pressed upon the people.

Again it has been urged that the style ascribed to our Lord in this Gospel is so like the style of John himself as to be indistinguishable; so that it is not always possible to say where the words of Jesus end and the words of John begin (see chap. xii. 44, iii. 18-21). This difficulty may, however, be put aside, and that for more reasons than one. The words of Jesus are translated from the vernacular Aramaic in which He probably uttered them, and it was impossible they should not be coloured by the style of the translator. Besides, there are obvious differences between the style of John and that of Jesus. For example, the Epistle of John is singularly abstract and devoid of

illustration. James abounds in figure, and so does Paul; but in John's epistles not a single simile or metaphor occurs. Is it credible that their writer was the author of the richly figurative teachings in the tenth and fifteenth chapters of the Gospel [the sheepfold and the vine]?

But turning to the real differences which exist between the reports of the first three and the Fourth Gospel, several thoughts occur which at least take off the edge of the criticism and show us that on a point of this kind it is easy to be hasty and extreme. For, in the first place, it is to be considered that if John had had nothing new to tell, no fresh aspect of Christ or His teaching to present, he would not have written at all. No doubt each of the synoptists goes over ground already traversed by his fellow-synoptist, but it has yet to be proved that they knew one another's work. John did know of their Gospels, and the very fact that he added a fourth prepares us to expect that it will be different; not only in omitting scenes from the life of Christ with which already the previous Gospels had made men familiar, but by presenting some new aspect of Christ's person and teaching. That there was another aspect essential to the completeness of the figure was, as the present Bishop of Derry has pointed out, also to be surmised. The synoptists enable us to conceive how Jesus addressed the peasantry and how He dealt with the scribes of Capernaum; but, after all, was it not also of the utmost importance to know how He was received by the authorities of Jerusalem and how He met their difficulties about His claims? Had there been no record of those defences of His position, must we not still have supposed them and supplied them in imagination?

That we have here, then, a *different* aspect of Christ's teaching need not surprise us, but is it not even *inconsistent* with that already given by the synoptists? The universal Christian consciousness has long since answered that question. The faith which has found its resting-place in the Christ of the synoptists is not unsettled or perplexed by anything it finds in John. They are not two Christs but one which the four Gospels depict: diverse as the profile and front face, but one another's complement rather than contradiction. A critical examination of the Gospels reaches the same conclusion. For while the self-assertiveness of Christ is more apparent in the Fourth Gospel, it is implicit in them all. Can any claim be greater than that which our Lord urges in the Sermon on the Mount to be the supreme lawgiver and judge of men? Or than that which is implied in His assertion that He only knows the Father and that only through Him can others know Him; or can we conceive any

clearer confidence in His mission than that which He implies when He invites all men to come to Him and trust themselves with Him, or when He forgives sin, and proclaims Himself the Messiah, God's representative on earth?

Can we then claim that all that is reported in this Gospel as uttered by our Lord was actually spoken as it stands? This is not claimed. Even the most conservative critics allow that John must necessarily have condensed conversations and discourses. The truth probably is that we have the actual words of the most striking sayings, because these, once heard, could not be forgotten. And this plainly applies especially to the sayings regarding Himself which were most likely to astonish or even shock and startle the hearers. These at once and for ever fixed themselves in the mind. In the longer discussions and addresses we have the substance but cannot at each point be sure that the very words are given. No doubt in the last resort we must trust John. But whom could we more reasonably trust? He was the person of all others who entered most fully into sympathy with Christ and understood Him best, the person to whom our Lord could most freely open His mind. So that although, as Godet says, we have here "the extracted essence of a savoury fruit," we may be confident that this essence perfectly preserves the flavour and peculiarity of the fruit.

Neither ought it to be forgotten that there occur in the Gospel passages which strikingly illustrate the desire of the author to preserve the very words of our Lord. In chap. xii. 33, *e.g.*, we find an interpretation given of the saying recorded in verse 32. This is unintelligible on the hypothesis that the author was himself composing the discourses which he attributes to Christ. Any author who is expressing his own ideas, and writing freely out of his own mind, even although he is using another person as his mouthpiece, will at once deliver his meaning. To suppose that John first put his own words in the mouth of Jesus, and then interpreted them, is to suppose an elaborateness of contrivance which would reduce the Gospel to a common forgery. *Cf.* vii. 39.

While, then, it cannot be affirmed that the internal evidence uniformly points to the Johannine authorship, neither can it be said that it is decisively against it. There are difficulties on either alternative. But when to the internal evidence the weight of external attestation is added, by far the most probable conclusion is that the Fourth Gospel is the work of the Apostle John, and that it is historically trustworthy.

Between the affirmation and denial of the Johannine authorship

there has been interposed a third suggestion. The Gospel may have been (1) partly or (2) indirectly the work of the Apostle: parts of it may be from the hand of John, while the remainder is the work of an unknown editor; or, the whole may be from the school of John, but not directly from his own hand. The most distinguished advocate of the former of these two suggestions is Dr. Wendt, whose theory is that the Apostle John made a collection of our Lord's discourses, which was used by some unknown editor as the basis or nucleus of a Gospel. This theory ruthlessly sacrifices many of the most valuable and characteristic portions of the Gospel, such as the scene between the Baptist and the deputation, the examination before Annas (or Caiaphas), and many of those historical touches which lend life to the narrative. But the fatal objection to this theory is the solidarity of the Gospel. Holtzmann does not accept the Fourth Gospel as Johannine, but he says: "All attempts to draw a clearly distinguishable line of demarcation, whether it be between earlier and later strata, or between genuine and not genuine, historical and unhistorical elements, must always be wrecked against the solid and compact unity which the work presents, both in regard to language and in regard to matter. Apart from the interpolations indicated by the history of the text (v. 4, vii. 53, viii. 11), and from the last chapter added by way of supplement, the work is both in form and substance, both in arrangement and in range of ideas, an organic whole without omissions or interpolations, the 'seamless coat,' which cannot be parted or torn, but only by a happy cast allotted to its rightful owner." Certainly, if this Gospel is not from one hand, then there is no possibility of proving unity of authorship by unity of design and execution.

The second alternative, that the Gospel proceeded rather from the circle of John's disciples than from his own hand, has more in its favour and has enlisted great names in its support. Thus Renan says (*Vie de J.*, xxv.): "Can it indeed be John who has written in Greek these abstract metaphysical discourses, which find no analogy either in the Synoptists or in the Talmud? This is a heavy tax on faith, and for myself I dare not say I am convinced that the Fourth Gospel was entirely from the pen of an old Galilean fisherman; but that the Gospel as a whole proceeded, towards the close of the first century, from the great school of Asia Minor whose centre was John." "One is sometimes tempted to believe that some precious notes made by the Apostle were employed by his disciples."

The other great literary critic of our own day, Matthew Arnold, held the same opinion regarding the origin of the Gospel. In *God*

and the Bible, 256-7, he writes: "In his old age St. John at Ephesus has 'logia,' sayings of the Lord, and has incidents in the Lord's story which have not been published in any of the written accounts that were beginning at that time to be handed about. The elders of Ephesus, whom tradition afterwards makes into apostles, fellows of St. John, move him to bestow his treasure on the world. He gives his materials, and the presbytery of Ephesus provides a redaction for them and publishes them. The redaction with its unity of tone, its flowingness and connectedness, is by one single hand; the hand of a man of literary talent, a Greek Christian, whom the Church of Ephesus found proper for such a task. A man of literary talent, a man of soul also, a theologian. A theological lecturer perhaps, as in the Fourth Gospel he so often shows himself, a theological lecturer, an earlier and a nameless Origen, who in this one short composition produced a work outweighing all the folios of all the Fathers, but was content that his name should be written in the Book of Life." Schürer and Weizsäcker[1] are both advocates of this theory.

That this is an inviting theory is not to be denied. But, after all, little is gained by it; and there are grave objections to it. The Jew and the eye-witness appear on every page; so that the utmost that can be allowed is that some younger man may in quite a subordinate function have collaborated with the Apostle. That the Gospel was composed after the Apostle's death, mainly from reminiscences of his teaching, is a hypothesis which seems at once needless and inadequate.

Object of the Gospel. The object of the writer reflects some light on the nature of his work. In xx. 31 it is said: "these things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life in His name". The writer has no intention of composing a full biography of Jesus. He means to select from His life such material as will most readily convince men that He is the Christ, the Son of God. If not a dogmatic treatise [a "lehrschrift"], it is at any rate a history with a dogmatic purpose. This is always a dangerous form of literature, tempting the author to exaggeration, concealment, misrepresentation. But that this temptation invariably overcomes an author is of course not the case. A certain limitation, however, nay, a certain amount of distortion, do necessarily attach to a biography which aims at presenting only one aspect of its subject—distortion, not in what is actually presented, but in the implication that this is the whole. Where only a part of

[1] *Apost. Zeit.*, 531-538.

the life is given and certain aspects of the character are exclusively depicted, there is a want of perspective and so far a misleading element. But this gives us no ground for affirming that the actual statements of the book are erroneous or unhistorical.

The circumstance that John wrote a Gospel with the express purpose of proving that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, implies that he considered that this truth needed confirmation; that in the Christian circle in which he moved there was some more or less pronounced tendency towards a denial of the Messiahship or Divinity of Jesus. Whether the teaching of Cerinthus was or was not the immediate occasion of the publication of the Gospel, it is a happy circumstance that the author did not confine himself to what was controversial, or throw his work into a polemic and doctrinal form, but built up a positive exhibition of the Person and claims of our Lord as stated by Himself.

The object in view, therefore, reflects light on the historicity of the contents of the Gospel. The writer professes to produce certain facts which have powerfully influenced the minds of men and have produced faith. If these pretended facts were fictions, then the writer is dishonest and beneath contempt. He wishes to produce the conviction that Jesus is the Messiah, and to accomplish his purpose invents incidents and manipulates utterances of Jesus. A writer of romance who merely wishes to please, even a preacher whose aim is edification, might claim a certain latitude or negligence of accuracy, but a writer whose object it is to prove a certain proposition stands on a very different platform, and can only be pronounced fraudulent if he invents his evidence.

Method and Plan of the Gospel. The method adopted by the writer to convince men that Jesus is the Christ is the simplest possible. He does not expect that men will believe this on his mere word. He sets himself to reproduce those salient features in the life of Jesus which chiefly manifested His Messianic dignity and function. He believes that what convinced himself will convince others. One by one he cites his witnesses, never garbling their testimony nor concealing the adverse testimony, but showing with as exact truthfulness how unbelief grew and hardened into opposition, as he tells how faith grew till it culminated in the supreme confession of Thomas, "My Lord and my God". The plan of the Gospel is therefore also the simplest. Apart from the Prologue (i. 1-18), and the Epilogue (chap. xxi.), the work falls into two nearly equal parts, i. 19-xii. and xiii.-xx. In the former part the evangelist relates with a singular felicity of selection the scenes in which

Jesus made those self-revelations which it was essential the world should see. These culminate in the raising of Lazarus related in chap. xi. The twelfth chapter therefore holds a place by itself, and in it three incidents are related which are intended to show that the previously related manifestations of Jesus had sufficed to make Him known (1) to His intimates (xii. 1-11), (2) to the people generally (12-19), and (3) even to the Gentile world (20-36). Jesus may therefore now close His self-revelation. And the completeness of the work He has done is revealed not only in this widely extended impression and well-grounded faith, but also in the maturity of unbelief which now hardens into hatred and resolves to compass His death. Between the first and second part of the Gospel there is interposed a paragraph (xii. 37-50), in which it is pointed out that the rejection of Jesus by the Jews, who had been trained to receive the Messiah, had been predicted and reflects no suspicion on the sufficiency of the preceding manifestations. In the second part of the Gospel the glory of Christ is manifested (1) in His revealing Himself as the permanent source of life and joy to His disciples (xiii.-xvii.), and (2) in His triumph over death (xviii.-xx.).

The Gospel, therefore, falls into these parts:—

The Prologue, i. 1-18.

I. Part First. 1. Manifestation of Christ's glory as the Joy, Life, Light, Nourishment, Saviour of Men: or as the Son of God among men, i. 19-xi.

2. Summary of results, xii. 1-35.

Pause in the Gospel for review of Christ's teaching and its consequences, xii. 36-56.

II. Part Second. 1. Jesus declares Himself to be the permanent source of life and joy to His disciples, xiii.-xvii.

2. His victory over death, xviii.-xx.

The Epilogue, xxi.

LITERATURE.

A vast literature has grown up around the Fourth Gospel. A full list of critical treatises on the Authorship, published between 1792 and 1875, is given by Dr. Caspar Gregory in an appendix to the translation of Luthardt's *St. John, the Author of the Fourth Gospel*. To this list may now be added Thoma, *Die Genesis d. Joh. Evang.*, 1882; Jacobsen, *Untersuchungen über d. Joh. Evang.*, 1884; Oscar Holtzmann, *Das Joh. evangelium*, 1887. The Introductions of H. Holtzmann, Weiss, Salmon, and Gloag may also be consulted. The fullest history of the criticism of the Gospel is to be found in Watkins' *Bampton Lectures* for 1890.

Full lists of commentaries are given in the second volume of the translation of Meyer on John, and in Luthardt. The most valuable are the following:—

HERACLEON. *The Fragments of Heracleon* have been collected out of Origen's Commentary on John, and edited for Armitage Robinson's *Texts and Studies* by A. E. Brooke, M.A.

ORIGEN. *Commentary on St. John's Gospel;* originally only extending to the thirteenth chapter, and even of this original much has been lost. The best edition is that of A. E. Brooke, M.A., Cambridge University Press. 1896.
Portions of this Commentary are translated in the additional volume of Clark's Ante-Nicene Library

CHRYSOSTOM [347-407 A.D.]. *Homilies on the Gospel*, etc. The most convenient edition is Migne's. The Commentary on John is translated in the *Oxford Library*, and in the American *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.*

AUGUSTINE [354-430]. *Tractatus in Joan. Evan.* In third volume of Migne's edition; translated in Oxford series and Clark's translation.

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA [ob. 444]. *In D. Joannis Evangelium.* Best edition by P. E. Pusey, A.M., Clarendon Press. Three vols. 1872.

THEOPHYLACT and EUTHYMIUS (see p. 58) both wrote on this Gospel. The commentary of the latter is especially excellent.

Among post-reformation works, the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus, the *Commentary* of Calvin, and the *Annotationes Majores* of Beza are to be recommended. The *Annotationes* of Melanchthon are frequently irrelevant. Besides the collections of illustrative passages mentioned on pp. 58, 59, and the commentaries of Grotius, Bengel, and others which cover the whole New Testament, there may be named the following which deal especially with this Gospel: Lampe, *Com. Analytico-Exegeticus*, 3 vols., 4to, Amstel., 1724, an inexhaustible mine. More recent commentaries are those of Lücke, 1820-24; Tholuck, 1827 [translated in Clark's F. T. Lib., 1860]; Meyer, 1834 [translated 1875], edited by Weiss, 1893; Luthardt, 1852-3 [translated in Clark's F. T. Lib., 1876], Alford, 1849; 4th edition, 1859; Godet, 1864-5 [translated in Clark's F. T. L., 1876-7], Westcott, 1882; Reith, in Clark's *Hand-books for Bible-classes;* Whitelaw, 1888; Reynolds, in *Pulpit Com.*, 1888; Watkins, in Ellicott's *Com.*, n. d.; Holtzmann, in *Hand-commentar*, 1890; Plummer, in *Cambridge Greek Testament*, 1893. In Oscar Holtzmann's *Das Johannesevangelium untersucht und erklärt*, 1887, there are a hundred pages of commentary.

ΤΟ ΚΑΤΑ ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ

ΑΓΙΟΝ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.[1]

I. 1. [a] Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν [b] πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ [c] Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. 2. οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. 3. [d] Πάντα

a Gen. i. 1. 1 Jo. i. 1, 2. Ch. xvii. 5. b 1 Jo. i. 2. Prov. viii. 30. c xx. 28; x. 30. Phil. ii. 6. d v. 17. Col. i. 16. Heb. i. 2.

[1] κατα Ιωαννην in ℵ a b e q; κατα Ιωανην in B; ευαγγελιον κατα Ιωαννην in ACEFG; T.R. in minusc.

CHAPTER I.—Vv. 1-18. *The prologue.* The first eighteen verses contain a preface, or as it is usually called, the prologue to the Gospel. In this prologue the writer identifies the person, Jesus Christ, whom he is about to introduce on the field of history, with the Logos. He first describes the Logos in His relation to God and to the world, and then presents in abstract the history of His reception among men, which he is about to give in detail. That the Eternal Divine Word, in whom was the life of all things, became flesh and was manifested among men; that some ignored while others recognised Him; that some received while others rejected Him—that is what John means to exhibit in detail in his Gospel, and this is what he summarily states in this prologue.

The prologue may be divided thus: Vv. 1-5, The Logos described; vv. 6-13, The historic manifestation of the Logos and its results in evoking faith and unbelief; vv. 14-18, This manifestation more precisely defined as incarnation, with another aspect of its results. *Cf.* Westcott's suggestive division; and especially Falconer in *Expositor*, 1897.

Vv. 1-5. *The Logos described.* The first five verses describe the pre-existence, the nature, the creative power of the Logos, who in the succeeding verses is spoken of as entering the world, becoming man, and revealing the Father; and this description is given in order that we may at once grasp a continuous history which runs out of an unmeasured past, and the identity of the person who is the subject of that history.

Ver. 1. In the first verse three things are stated regarding the Logos, the subject ὁ λόγος being repeated for impressiveness. Westcott remarks that these three clauses answer to the three great moments of the Incarnation declared in ver. 14. He who was (ἦν) in the beginning, became (ἐγένετο) in time; He who was with God, tabernacled among men; He who was God, became flesh.

(1) ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος. ἐν ἀρχῇ is here used relatively to creation, as in Gen. i. 1 and Prov. viii. 23, ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸ τοῦ τὴν γῆν ποιῆσαι; *cf.* 1 John i. 1. Consequently even in the time of Theophylact it was argued that this clause only asserts that the Logos was older than Adam. But this is to overlook the ἦν. The Logos did not then begin to be, but at that point at which all else began to be He already *was.* In the beginning, place it where you may, the Word already existed. In other words, the Logos is before time, eternal. *Cf.* Col. i. 18 (the article is absent because ἐν ἀρχῇ is virtually an adverbial expression).—ὁ λόγος. The term Logos appears as early as Heraclitus to denote the principle which maintains order in the world (see passages in Ritter and Preller). Among the Stoics the word was similarly used, as the equivalent of the *anima mundi* (*cf.* Virgil, *Æn.*, vi., 724). Marcus Aurelius (iv. 14-21) uses

e v. 21; xi. 25. f xii. 36. 13 times in John. Elsewhere only in Mt. x. 27. Lk. xii. 3.

δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν, ὃ γέγονεν.[1] 4. ἐν αὐτῷ [e] ζωὴ ἦν,[2] καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 5. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ [f] σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

[1] Almost all ante-Nicene Fathers join **ο γεγονεν** to ver. 4 with AC*DG*L. Chrysostom declares this reading heretical and argues against it. T.R. is found in C³EG²HK vet. Lat. Brixianus.

[2] **ην** in ABCL, vulg.; **εστιν** in ℵD vet. Lat., arising out of above punctuation.

the term **σπερματικὸς λόγος** to express the generative principle or creative force in nature. The term was familiar to Greek philosophy. In Hebrew thought there was felt the need for some term to express God, not in His absolute being, but in His manifestation and active connection with the world. In the O. T. "the Angel of the Lord" and "the wisdom of God" are used for this purpose. In the Apocryphal books and the Targums "the word of Jehovah" is similarly used. These two streams of thought were combined by Philo, who has a fairly full and explicit doctrine of the Logos as the expression of God or God in expression (see Drummond's *Philo;* Siegfried's *Philo;* Reville, *Doctrine du Logos;* Bigg's *Bampton Lec.;* Hatch's *Hibbert Lec.*). The word being thus already in use and aiding thoughtful men in their efforts to conceive God's connection with the world, John takes it and uses it to denote the Revealer of the incomprehensible and invisible God. Irrespective of all speculations which had gathered around the term, John now proceeds to make known the true nature of the Logos. (*Cf.* The Primal Will, or Universal Reason of the Babis; Sell's *Faith of Islam*, 146.)

(2) If the Word was thus in the beginning, what relation did He hold to God? Was He identical or opposed? **ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. πρός** implies not merely existence alongside of but personal intercourse. It means more than **μετά** or **παρά**, and is regularly employed in expressing the presence of one person with another. Thus in classical Greek, **τὴν πρὸς Σωκράτην συνουσίαν**, and in N. T. Mk. vi. 3, Mt. xiii. 56, Mk. ix. 19, Gal. i. 18, 2 John 12. This preposition implies intercourse and therefore separate personality. As Chrysostom says: "Not in God but with God, as person with person, eternally".

(3) The Word is distinguishable from God and yet **Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος**, the Word was God, of Divine nature; not "a God," which to a Jewish ear would have been abominable; nor yet identical with all that can be called God, for then the article would have been inserted (*cf.* 1 John iii. 4). "The Christian doctrine of the Trinity was perhaps before anything else an effort to express how Jesus Christ was God (Θεός) and yet in another sense was not God (**ὁ θεός**), that is to say, was not the whole Godhead." Consult Du Bose's *Ecumenical Councils*, p. 70-73. Luther says "the Word was God" is against Arius: "the Word was with God" against Sabellius.

Ver. 2. **οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.** Not a mere repetition of what has been said in ver. 1. There John has said that the Word was in the beginning and also that He was with God: here he indicates that these two characteristics existed contemporaneously. "He was in the beginning with God." He wishes also to emphasise this in view of what he is about to tell. In the beginning He was with God, afterwards, in time, He came to be with man. His pristine condition must first be grasped, if the grace of what succeeds is to be understood.

Ver. 3. **Πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο.** The connection is obvious: the Word was with God in the beginning, but not as an idle, inefficacious existence, who only then for the first time put forth energy when He came into the world. On the contrary, He was the source of all activity and life. "All things were made by Him, and without Him was not even one thing made which was made."

The double sentence, positive and negative, is characteristic of John and lends emphasis to the statement.—**πάντα**, "grande verbum quo mundus, *i.e.*, universitas rerum factarum denotatur" (Bengel). The more accurate expression for "all things" taken as a whole and not severally is **τὰ πάντα** (Col. i. 16) or **τὸ πᾶν**; and, as the negative clause of this verse indicates,

6. Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ Θεοῦ, [g] ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἰωάννης.[1] 7. οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ [h] περὶ τοῦ

g Cp. Gen. xi. 29. Lk. i. 5.
h μαρτυρ. περὶ freq. in Jo., not elsewhere in N. T.

[1] Ιωανης in Tr.W.H., here and at every recurrence of the name.

created things are here looked at in their variety and multiplicity. *Cf.* Marcus Aurelius, iv. 23, ὦ φύσις, ἐκ σοῦ πάντα, ἐν σοὶ πάντα, εἰς σὲ πάντα.—δι' αὐτοῦ. The Word was the Agent in creation. But it is to be observed that the same preposition is used of God in the same connection in Rom. xi. 36, ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα; and in Col. i. 16 the same writer uses the same prepositions not of the Father but of the Son when he says: τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται. In 1 Cor. viii. 6 Paul distinguishes between the Father as the primal source of all things and the Son as the actual Creator. (In Greek philosophy the problem was to ascertain by whom, of what, and in view of what the world was made; ὑφ' οὗ, ἐξ οὗ, πρὸς ὅ. And Lücke quotes a significant sentence from Philo (*De Cherub.*, 35): εὑρήσεις αἴτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ (τοῦ κόσμου) τὸν θεόν, ὑφ' οὗ γέγονεν· ὕλην δὲ τὰ τέσσαρα στοιχεῖα, ἐξ ὧν συνεκράθη· ὄργανον δὲ λόγον θεοῦ δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη·)

Ver. 4. ἐν αυτῷ ζωὴ ἦν. "In Him was life"; that power which creates life and maintains all else in existence was in the Logos. To limit "life" here to any particular form of life is rendered impossible by ver. 3. In John ζωή is generally eternal or spiritual life, but here it is more comprehensive. In the Logos was life, and it is of this life all things have partaken and by it they exist. *Cf.* Philo's designation of the Logos as πηγὴ ζωῆς.—καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, "and the life was the light of men"; the life which was the fountain of existence to all things was especially the light of man (Lücke). It was not the Logos directly but the life which was in the Logos which was the light of men. O. Holtzmann thinks this only means that as men received life from the Logos they might be expected in the gift to recognise the Giver. Godet says: "The Logos is light; but it is through the mediation of life that He must become so always; this is precisely the relation which the Gospel restores. We recover through the new creation in Jesus Christ an inner light which springs up from the life." Stevens says: "The Word represents the self-manifesting quality of the Divine life. This heavenly light shines in the darkness of the world's ignorance and sin." The words seem to mean that the life which appears in the variety, harmony, and progress of inanimate nature, and in the wonderfully manifold yet related forms of animate existence, appears in man as "light," intellectual and moral light, reason and conscience. To the Logos men may address the words of Ps. xxxvi. 9, παρὰ σοὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς, ἐν τῷ φωτί σου ὀψόμεθα φῶς.—Ver. 5. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, "and the light shineth in the darkness". Three interpretations are possible. The words may refer to the incarnate, or to the pre-incarnate experience of the Logos, or to both. Holtzmann and Weiss both consider the clause refers to the incarnate condition (*cf.* 1 John ii. 8). De Wette refers it to the pre-incarnate operation of the Logos in the O. T. prophets. Meyer and others interpret φαίνει as meaning "present, *i.e.*, uninterruptedly from the beginning until now". The use of the aorist κατέλαβεν seems to make the first interpretation impossible; while the second is obviously too restricted. What "shining" is meant? This also must not be limited to O. T. prophecy or revelation but to the light of conscience and reason (*cf.* ver. 4).—ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, in the darkness which existed wherever the light of the Logos was not admitted. Darkness, σκότος or σκοτία, was the expression naturally used by secular Greek writers to describe the world's condition. Thus Lucian: ἐν σκότῳ πλανωμένοις πάντες ἐοίκαμεν. *Cf.* Lucretius:

"Qualibus in tenebris vitae, quantisque periclis,
Degitur hoc aevi quodcunque est".

καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν. The A. V. renders this "and the darkness comprehended it not"; the R. V. has "apprehended" and in the margin "overcame". The Greek interpreters understood the clause to mean that the darkness did not conquer the light. Thus Theophylact says: ἡ σκοτία . . . ἐδίωξε τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' εὗρεν ἀκαταμάχητον καὶ ἀήττητον. Some modern interpreters,

φωτός, ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσι δι' αὐτοῦ. 8. οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ φωτός. 9. ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὃ

and especially Westcott, adopt this rendering. "The whole phrase is indeed a startling paradox. The light does not banish the darkness: the darkness does not overpower the light." This rendering is supposed to find support in chap. xii. 35, where Christ says, "Walk while ye have the light," **ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ**; and **καταλαμβάνειν** is the word commonly used to denote day or night overtaking any one (see Wetstein). But the radical meaning is "to seize," "to take possession of," "to lay hold of"; so in Rom. ix. 30, 1 Cor. ix. 24, Phil. iii. 12. It is also used of mental perception, as in the *Phaedrus*, p. 250, D. See also Polybius, iii. 32, 4, and viii. 4, 6, **δυσχερὲς καταλαβεῖν**, difficult to understand. This sense is more congruous in this passage; especially when we compare ver. 10 (**ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω**) and ver. 11 (**οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον**).

Vv. 6-13. *The historic manifestation of the Logos and its results.*—Ver. 6. In this verse John passes to the historical; and like the other evangelists begins with the Baptist. So Theodore Mops: **μετεληλυθὼς ἐπὶ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ υἱοῦ, τίνα ἂν εὗρεν ἀρχὴν ἑτέραν ἢ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰωάννην;—ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος**, "not *there was* (chap. iii. 1), but denoting the *appearing*, the historical manifestation," Meyer. *Cf.* Lk. i. 5. The testimony of John is introduced not only as a historical note but in order to bring out the aggravated blindness of those who rejected Christ. This man was **ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ**. Holtzmann says "an historical appearance is characterised as Godsent". It might rather be said that an historical appearance sent to fulfil a definite Divine purpose is so characterised. There is no designation our Lord more frequently applies to Himself. In the prayer of chap. xvii. some equivalent occurs six times. And in the epistle to the Hebrews He is called "the Apostle of our confession". No distinguishing title is added to the common name "John". Westcott says: "If the writer of the Gospel were himself the other John of the Gospel history, it is perfectly natural that he should think of the Baptist, apart from himself, as John only". Watkins says: "The writer stood to him in the relation of disciple to teacher. To him he was *the* John." Afterwards the disciple became *the* John.—Ver. 7. **οὗτος ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν . . . δι' αὐτοῦ.** "The same (or, this man) came for witness," etc. "John's mission is first set forth under its generic aspect: he came for witness; and then its specific object (**ἵνα μαρτ. περὶ τ. φ.**) and its final object (**ἵνα παντ. πιστ.**) are defined co-ordinately," Westcott. John was not to do a great work of his own but to point to another. All his experience, zeal, and influence were to be spent in testifying to the true Light. This he was to do "that all might believe through him". The whole of this Gospel is a citing of witnesses, but John's comes first and is of most importance. At first sight it might seem that his mission had failed. All did not believe. No; but all who did believe, speaking generally, believed through him. The first disciples won by Jesus were of John's training; and through them belief has become general.—Ver. 8. **οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος . . . φωτός**, the thought of the previous verse is here put in a negative form for the sake of emphasis; and with the same object **οὐκ ἦν** is made prominent that it may contrast with the **ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ**. He (or, that man) *was* not the light, but he appeared that he might bear witness regarding the light. Why say this of John? Was there any danger that he should be mistaken for the light? Some did think he was the Christ. See vv. 19, 20.—Ver. 9. **ἦν τὸ φῶς . . . εἰς τὸν κόσμον. ἦν** stands first in contrast to the **οὐκ ἦν** of ver. 8. The light was not . . . : the light was . . . In this verse the light is also further contrasted with John. The Baptist was himself a light (ver. 35) but not **τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν.** This designation occurs nine times in John, never in the Synoptists. It means that which corresponds to the ideal; true not as opposed to false, but to symbolical or imperfect. The light is further characterised as **ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον.** This is the text on which the Quakers found for their doctrine that every man has a day of visitation and that to every man God gives sufficient grace. Barclay in his *Apology* says: "This place doth so clearly favour us that by some it is called 'the Quakers' text,' for it doth evidently demonstrate our assertion". It was also much used by the Greek Fathers, who believed that the Logos guided the heathen in their

φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. 10. ἐν τῷ [i] κόσμῳ ἦν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, [j] καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω. 11. εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε, καὶ [j] οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ [k] παρέλαβον.

i xvii. 25; 1 Cor. i. 21.
j Acts xxiv. 23.
k Col. ii. 6.

philosophical researches (see Justin's *Dial.*, ii., etc., and Clement, *passim*).—ἐρχόμενον has been variously construed, with ἄνθρωπον, with τὸ φῶς, or with ἦν. (1) The first construction is favoured by Chrysostom, Euthymius, the Vulgate, and A. V., "*that* was the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world"; or with Meyer, "the true light which lightens every man coming into the world was present" (ἦν = aderat). To the objection that ἐρχόμ. . . . κόσμον is thus redundant, Meyer replies that there is such a thing as a *solemn* redundance, and that we have here an "epic fulness of words". But the "epic fulness" is here out of place, emphasising πάντα ἄνθρωπον. Besides, in this Gospel, "coming into the world" is not used of human *birth*, but of appearance in one's place among men. And still further ἐρχόμενον of this verse is obviously in contrast with the ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν of the next, and the subject of both clauses must be the same. (2) The second construction, with τὸ φῶς, was advocated by Grotius ("valde mihi se probat expositio quae apud Cyrillum et Augustinum exstat, ut hoc ἐρχόμενον referatur ad τὸ φῶς," *cf.* iii. 19, xii. 46, xviii. 37), and has been adopted by Godet, who renders thus: "(That light) was the true light which lighteth every man, *by coming* (itself) into the world". If this were John's meaning, it is difficult to see why he did not insert οὗτος as in the second verse or τοῦτο. (3) The third construction, with ἦν, has much to recommend it, and has been adopted by Westcott, Holtzmann, and others. The R. V. margin renders as if ἦν ἐρχόμενον were the periphrastic imperfect commonly used in N. T., "the true light which enlighteneth every man was coming into the world," *i.e.*, at the time when the Baptist was witnessing, the true light was dawning on the world. Westcott, however, thinks it best to take it "more literally and yet more generally as describing a coming which was progressive, slowly accomplished, combined with a permanent being, so that both the verb (*was*) and the participle (*coming*) have their full force and do not form a periphrasis for an imperfect". And he translates: "There was the light, the true light which lighteth every man; that light was, and yet more, that light was coming into the world".—Ver. 10. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ . . . οὐκ ἔγνω. Vv. 10 and 11 briefly summarise what happened when the Logos, the Light, came into the world. John has said: "The Light was coming into the world"; take now a further step, ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἦν, and let us see what happened. Primarily rejection. The simplicity of the statement, the thrice repeated κόσμος, and the connecting of the clauses by a mere καί, deepens the pathos. The Logos is the subject, as is shown by both the second and the third clause.

Westcott thinks that the action of the Light which has been comprehensively viewed in ver. 9 is in vv. 10, 11 divided into two parts. "The first part (ver. 10) gathers up the facts and issues of the manifestation of the Light as immanent. The second part (ver. 11) contains an account of the special personal manifestation of the Light to a chosen race." That is possible; only the obvious advance from the ἐρχόμενον of ver. 9 to the ἦν of ver. 10 is thus obscured. Certainly Westcott goes too far when he says: "It is impossible to refer these words simply to the historical presence of the Word in Jesus as witnessed to by the Baptist".

Ver. 11. εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, "He came to His own". In the world of men was an inner circle which John calls τὰ ἴδια, His own home. (For the meaning of τὰ ἴδια *cf.* xix. 27, xvi. 32, Acts xxi. 6, 3 Macc. iv. 27-37, Esther v. 10, Polybius, *Hist.*, ii. 57, 5.) Perhaps in this place "His own property" might give the sense as accurately. Israel is certainly signified; the people and all their institutions existed only for Him. (See Exod. xix. 5, Deut. vii. 6, "The Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people, a *peculium*, unto Himself"; also Mt. xxi. 33.)—οἱ ἴδιοι, those of His own home (His intimates, *cf.* xiii. 1), those who belonged to Him, αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον "gave Him no reception". The word is used of welcoming to a home, as in xiv. 3, πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν. Even those whose whole history had been a training to know and receive Him rejected Him. It is not said of "His own" that they did not "know" Him, but that they did

12. ὅσοι δὲ [l] ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς [m] πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· 13. οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, οὐδὲ ἐκ [n] θελήματος ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ [o] ἐγεννήθησαν.

l v. 43.
m ii. 23; iii. 18.
n iii. 5. Jas. i. 18.
o With ἐκ Mt. i. 5, 6, 16. Ch. iii. 5, 6. 1 Jo. *passim*.

not receive Him. And in the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen our Lord represents them as killing the heir not in ignorance but because they knew him.—Ver. 12. But not all rejected Him. **ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον . . . ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. ὅσοι**, as many as, as if they were a countable number (Holtzmann), or, rather, suggesting the individuality of exceptional action on the part of those who received Him.—**ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς**, to them (resuming **ὅσοι** by a common construction) He gave **ἐξουσίαν**, not equivalent to **δύναμις**, the inward capacity, nor just equivalent to saying that He made them sons of God, but He gave them title, warrant, or authorisation, carrying with it all needed powers. *Cf.* v. 27, x. 18, xix. 10, Lk. ix. i., Mk. vi. 7, where **ἐξουσία** includes and implies **δύναμις**.—**τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι**, to become children of God. Weiss (*Bibl. Theol.*, § 150) says: "To those who accept Him by faith Christ has given not sonship itself, but the power to become sons of God; the last and highest realisation of this ideal, a realisation for the present fathomless, lies only in the future consummation". Rather, with Stevens, "to believe and to be begotten of God are two inseparable aspects of the same event or process" (*Johan. Theol.*, p. 251). John uses **τέκνα** rather than the Pauline **υἱοὺς τ. θ.**, because Paul's view of sonship was governed by the Roman legal process of adopting a son who was not one's own child: while John's view is mystical and physical, the begetting of a child by the communication of the very life of God (1 John, *passim*). This distinction underlies the characteristic use of **υἱός** by the one writer and **τέκνον** by the other (*cf.* Westcott, *Epistles of St. John*, p. 123). By the reception of Christ as the Incarnate Logos we are enabled to recognise God as our Father and to come into the closest possible relation to Him. Those who thus receive Him are further identified as **τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ**, "those who believe (believers, present participle) in His name".—**πιστεύειν εἴς τινα** is the favourite construction with John, and emphasises the object on which the faith rests. Here that object is **τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ**, the sum of all characteristic qualities which attach to the bearer of the name: "quippe qui credant esse eum id ipsum, quod nomen declarat" (Holtzmann). It is impossible to identify this "name" with the Logos, because Jesus never proclaimed Himself under this name. Other definite names, such as Son of God or Messiah, can here only be proleptic, and it is probably better to leave it indefinite, and understand it in a general sense of those who believed in the self-manifestation of Christ, and were characterised by that belief.—Ver. 13. **οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων . . . ἐγεννήθησαν.** This first mention of **τέκνα θεοῦ** suggests the need of further defining how these children of God are produced. The **ἐκ** denotes the source of the relationship. First he negatives certain ordinary causes of birth, not so much because they could be supposed in connection with children of God (although thoughts of hereditary rights might arise in Jewish minds) as for the sake of emphasising by contrast the true source.—**οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων**; that is, not by ordinary physical generation. **αἷμα** was commonly used to denote descent; Acts xvii. 26, Odys. iv. 611, **αἵματος εἰς ἀγάθοιο**. This is rather a Greek than a Hebrew expression. The plural **αἱμάτων** has given rise to many conjectural explanations; and the idea currently received is that it suggests the constituent parts of which the blood is composed (Godet, Meyer). Westcott says: "The use of the plural appears to emphasise the idea of the element out of which in various measures the body is formed". Both explanations are doubtful. The plural is used very commonly in the Sept., 2 Sam. xvi. 8, **ἀνὴρ αἱμάτων σύ**; Ps. xxv. 9, **μετὰ ἀνδρῶν αἱμάτων**; 2 Chron. xxiv. 25, etc.; and especially where much slaughter or grievous murder is spoken of. *Cf.* Eurip., *Iph. in Taur.*, 73. It occurs in connection with descent in Eurip., *Ion.*, 693, **ἄλλων τραφεὶς ἐξ αἱμάτων** (Lücke). The reason of John's preference for the plural in this place is not obvious; he may perhaps have wished to indicate that *all* family

14. **Καὶ ὁ λόγος [p] σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ [q] ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, (καὶ [r] ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν [s] ὡς μονογενοῦς [t] παρὰ πατρός), πλήρης χάριτος καὶ [u] ἀληθείας.**

p 1 Tim. iii. 16. Heb. ii. 14.
q Zech. ii. 10, 11. Rev. vii. 15; xxi. 3, etc.
r 1 Jo. i. 1.
s Mt. vii. 29.
t vi. 45; x. 18; xv. 26.
u iv. 24.

histories and pedigrees were here of no account, no matter how many illustrious ancestors a man could reckon, no matter what bloods united to produce him.—**οὐδὲ . . . ἀνδρος.** The combination of these clauses by **οὐδὲ . . . οὐδὲ** and not by **οὔτε . . . οὔτε** excludes all interpretations which understand these two clauses as subdivisions of the foregoing. **οὐδέ** adds negation to negation: **οὔτε** divides a single negation into parts (see Winer, p. 612). "Nor of the will of the flesh," *i.e.*, not as the result of sexual instinct; "nor of the will of a man," *i.e.*, not the product of human purpose ("Fortschritt von Stoff zum Naturtrieb und zum persönlichen Thun," Holtzmann). *Cf.* Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psych.*, p. 290, note E. Tr.—**ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.** The source of regeneration positively stated. Human will is repudiated as the source of the new birth, but as in physical birth the life of the child is at once manifested, so in spiritual birth the human will first manifests regeneration. In spiritual as in physical birth the origination is from without, not from ourselves; but just because our spiritual birth is spiritual the will must take its part in it. Nothing is spiritual into which the will does not enter.

Vv. 14-18. *The manifestation of the Logos defined as Incarnation.*—Ver. 14. **καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο,** "and the Word became flesh". This is not a mere repetition. John has told us that the Logos came into the world, but now he emphasises the actual mode of His coming and the character of the revelation thus made, **καί** "simply carrying forward the discourse" (Meyer) and now introducing the chief statement (Luthardt). It is this great statement to which the whole prologue has been directed; and accordingly he names again the great Being to whom he at first introduced us but whom he has not named since the first verse. As forcibly as possible does he put the contrast between the prior and the subsequent conditions, **ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο**; he does not even say **ἄνθρωπος** but **σάρξ.** He wishes both to emphasise the interval crossed, **λόγος, σάρξ**; and to direct attention to the visibility of the manifestation. *Cf.* 1 Tim. iii. 16, **ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί**; 1 John iv. 2, **ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθώς**; also Heb. ii. 14. "Flesh expresses here human nature as a whole regarded under the aspect of its present corporal embodiment, including of necessity the 'soul' (xii. 27) and the 'spirit' (xi. 33, xiii. 21) as belonging to the totality of man" (Westcott). The copula is **ἐγένετο**, and what precisely this word covers has been the problem of theology ever since the Gospel was written. The Logos did not become flesh in the sense that He was turned into flesh or ceased to be what He was before; as a boy who becomes a man ceases to be a boy. By his use of the word **ἐκένωσεν** in connection with the incarnation Paul intimates that something was left behind when human nature was assumed; but in any case this was not the Divine essence nor the personality. The virtue of the incarnation clearly consists in this, that the very Logos became man. The Logos, retaining His personal identity, "became" man so as to live as man.—**καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν,** "and tabernacled among us"; not only appeared in the flesh for a brief space, manifesting Himself as a Being apart from men and superior to human conditions, but dwelt among us ("non tantum momento uno apparuisse, sed versatum esse inter homines," Calvin). The "tent," **σκηνή**, suggests no doubt temporary occupation, but not more temporary than human life. *Cf.* 2 Cor. v. 1, 2 Pet. i. 13. And both in classical and N.T. Greek **σκηνοῦν** had taken the meaning "dwell," whether for a long or a short time. *Cf.* Rev. vii. 15, xii. 12, and Raphel, *Annot. in loc.* From the use of the word in Xenophon to denote living together and eating together Brentius would interpret in a fuller sense: "Filius ille Dei carne indutus, inter nos homines vixit, nobiscum locutus est, nobiscum convivatus est". But the association in John's mind was of course not military, but was rather with the Divine tabernacle in the wilderness, when Jehovah pitched His tent among the shifting tents of His people, and shared even in their thirty-eight years of punishment.

v ver. 7.
w Const viii. 55; x. 36.
x Col. i. 19.

15. Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ [v] περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ κέκραγε λέγων, "Οὗτος ἦν [w] ὃν εἶπον,[1] 'Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν· ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν'." 16. Καὶ[2] ἐκ τοῦ [x] πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς

[1] T.R. in ℵcbAB³DL, etc.; **ουτος ην ο ειπων**, as a parenthesis, in ℵaB*C*.
[2] T.R. in AC³EF; **οτι** in ℵBC*DL 33.

Whether there is an allusion to the שְׁכִינָה has been doubted, but it is probable. The Shekinah meant the token of God's presence and glory, and among the later Jews at all events it was supposed to be present not only in the temple but with individuals. See Schoettgen *in loc.* and Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, § 39. What the tabernacle had been, the dwelling of God in the midst of the people, the humanity of the Logos now was.—**καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ**, we, among whom He lived, beheld by our own personal observation the glory of the incarnate Logos. "Beheld," neither, on the one hand, only by spiritual contemplation (Baur), nor, on the other, merely with the bodily eye, by which the glory could not be seen. This "beholding" John treasured as the wealth and joy of his life. The "glory" they saw was not like the cloud or dazzling light in which God had manifested His glory in the ancient tabernacle. It was now a true ethical glory, a glory of personality and character, manifesting itself in human conditions. It is described as something unique, **δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός**, "a glory as of an only begotten from a father".—**ὡς** introduces an illustrative comparison, as is indicated by the anarthrous **μονογενοῦς**. Holtzmann expands thus: "The impression which the glory made was of so specific a character that it could be taken for nothing less than such a glory as an only son has from a father, that is, as the only one of its kind; for besides the **μονογενής** a father has no other sons". But the expression is no doubt suggested by the immediately preceding statement that as many as received Christ were born of God. The glory of the Incarnate Logos, however, is unique, that of an only begotten. In the connection, therefore, the application of the relation of Father and Son to God and Christ is close at hand and obvious, although not explicitly made. "The thought centres in the abstract relation of Father and Son, though in the actual connection this abstract relation passes necessarily into the relation of the Son to the Father." Westcott.—**παρὰ πατρός** more naturally follows **δόξαν** than **μονογενοῦς**. The glory proceeds from the Father and dwells in the only begotten *wholly*, as if there were no other children required to reflect some rays of the Divine glory. Accordingly He is **πλήρης**. With what is **πλήρης** to be construed? Erasmus thinks with **Ἰωάννης** following. Codex Bezae reads **πλήρη** and joins it to **δόξαν**. Many interpreters consider it to be one of those slight irregularities such as occur in Mk. xii. 40 and Phil. iii. 19 and in the Apoc., and would unite it either with **αὐτοῦ** or **μονογενοῦς**. But (*pace* Weiss) there is no good reason why we should not accept it as it stands and construe it in agreement with the nominative to **ἐσκήνωσε**.—**χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.** His glory consisted in the moral qualities that appeared in Him. What these qualities were will appear more readily from ver. 17.—Ver. 15. **Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ . . . πρῶτός μου ἦν.** At first sight this verse seems an irrelevant interpolation thrust in between the **πλήρης** of ver. 14 and the **πλήρωμα** of ver. 16. Euthymius gives the connection: **εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐγώ, φησι, δοκῶ τισιν ἴσως ἀξιόπιστος, ἀλλὰ πρὸ ἐμοῦ ὁ Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ· Ἰωάννης ἐκεῖνος οὗ τὸ ὄνομα μέγα καὶ περιβόητον παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.** "John witnesses and cries, saying **οὗτος ἦν ὃν εἶπον.** This was He of whom I said **ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος**," etc. This testimony was given to Andrew and John, ver. 30; but when the previous "saying" occurred we do not know, unless it be referred to the answer to the authorities, ver. 27. The meaning of the testimony will be considered in the next section of the Gospel, which is entitled "The Testimony of John".—Ver. 16. **ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος . . . χάριτος**, "because out of His fulness have we all received". The **ὅτι** does not continue the Baptist's testimony, but refers to **πλήρης** in ver 14. In Col. ii. 9 Paul says that in Christ dwelleth all the **πλήρωμα** of the Godhead, meaning to repudiate the

πάντες ἐλάβομεν καὶ χάριν [y] ἀντὶ χάριτος· 17. ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ [z] χάρις καὶ ἡ [a] ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο. 18. [b] Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς,[1] ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν

y Cp. Is. lvii. 19.
z Rom. iii 24.
a viii. 32; xiv. 6.
b Exod. xxxiii. 20. Ecclus. xliii. 31.

[1] Instead of the reading of the T.R., **ο μονογενης υιος**, several modern editors read **μονογενης θεος**. For the T.R. the authorities are AC[3]X and some other uncials; of versions the old Latin and the Vulgate, Curetonian Syriac, Armenian and Ethiopic; almost all the cursives and the great body of the Fathers—all the Latin Fathers after the fourth century. For **μονογενης θεος** the uncials ℵBC*L and cursive 33; the Peshito and Harklean Syriac in margin, and the Memphitic; and of the Greek Fathers Clement of Alexandria, Valentinus in Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Basil, etc. These authorities and the text they witness to have been discussed by the late Dr. Hort in his *Two Dissertations*, and by Ezra Abbot in his *Critical Essays*, pp. 241-285. The MS. authority favours the reading **θεος**; while the versions and the Fathers weigh rather in the opposite scale. Internal evidence is on the whole in favour of the T.R. The reading **θεος** is rejected by Scrivener, Wordsworth, McLellan, Tischendorf, Meyer, Godet, Lücke, Holtzmann, and Weizsäcker. It should be noted, as brought out by Ezra Abbot, that the Arians were quite willing to call the Son **ο μονογενης θεος**, because in their view this appellation happily distinguished Him from the Father who alone was God in the highest sense, unbegotten, uncaused, and without beginning.

Gnostic idea that this pleroma was distributed among many subordinate beings or æons. But what John has here in view is that the fulness of grace in Christ was communicable to men. By **ἡμεῖς πάντες** he indicates himself and all other Christians. He had himself experienced the reality of that grace with which Christ was filled and its inexhaustible character. For he adds **καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος**, "grace upon grace". Beza suggests the rendering: ("ut quidam vir eruditus explicat," he says): "Gratiam supra gratiam; pro quo eleganter dixeris, gratiam gratia cumulatam," but he does not himself adopt it. It is, however, adopted by almost all modern interpreters: so that ever and anon fresh grace appears over and above that already received. This rendering, as Meyer points out, is linguistically justified by Theognis, *Sent.*, 344, **ἀντ' ἀνιῶν ἀνίας**, sorrows upon sorrows; and it receives remarkable illustration from the passage quoted by Wetstein from Philo, *De Poster. Cain.*, where, speaking of grace, he says that God does not allow men to be sated with one grace, but gives **ἑτέρας ἀντ' ἐκείνων** (the first) **καὶ τρίτας ἀντι τῶν δευτέρων καὶ ἀεὶ νέας ἀντὶ παλαιοτέρων**. Harnack (*Hist. of Dogma*, i., 76, E. Tr.) asks: "Where in the history of mankind can we find anything resembling this, that men who had eaten and drunk with their Master should glorify Him, not only as the Revealer of God, but as the Prince of Life, as the Redeemer and Judge of the world, as the living power of its existence, and that a choir of Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and barbarians, wise and foolish, should along with them immediately confess that out of the fulness of this one man they have received grace for grace?" —Ver. 17. **ὅτι ὁ νόμος . . . ἐγένετο.** What is the connection? His statement that the Incarnate Logos was the inexhaustible supply of grace might seem to disparage Moses and the previous manifestations of God. He therefore explains. And he seems to have in view the same distinction between the old and the new that is so frequently emerging in the Pauline writings. Through Moses, here taken as representing the pre-Christian dispensation, was given the law, which made great demands but gave nothing, which was a true revelation of God's will, and so far was good, but brought men no ability to become liker God. But through Jesus Christ (here for the first time named in the Gospel, because we are now fully on the ground of history) came grace and truth. In contrast to the inexorable demands of a law that brought no spiritual life, Jesus Christ brought "grace," the unearned favour of God. The Law said: Do this and live; Christ says: God gives you life, accept it. "Truth" also was brought by Christ.—**ἀλήθεια** here means "reality" as opposed to the symbolism of the Law (*cf.* iv. 23). In the Law was a shadow of good things to come: in Christ we have the good things themselves. Several good critics

Lucian Pisc. 11

e Deut. xiii. 6. ᵉ κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο. 19. Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου, ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευΐτας, ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτὸν, "Σὺ τίς εἶ;" 20. Καὶ ὡμολόγησε, καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο· καὶ ὡμολόγησεν, "Ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ

find a contrast between ἐδόθη and ἐγένετο; the law being "given" for a special purpose, "grace and truth" "coming" in the natural course and as the issue of all that had gone before.—Ver. 18. **θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν . . . ἐξηγήσατο.** This statement, "God no one has ever seen," is probably suggested by the words διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The reality and the grace of God we have seen through Jesus Christ, but why not directly? Because God, the Divine essence, the Godhead, no one has ever seen. No man has had immediate knowledge of God: if we have knowledge of God it is through Christ.

A further description is given of the Only Begotten intended to disclose His qualification for revealing the Father in the words **ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός.** Meyer supposes that John is now expressing himself from his own present standing point, and is conceiving of Christ as in His state of exaltation, as having returned to the bosom of the Father. But in this case the description would not be relevant. John adds this designation to ground the revealing work which Christ accomplished while on earth (ἐξηγήσατο, aorist, referring to that work), to prove His qualification for it. It must therefore include His condition previous to incarnation. ὁ ὢν is therefore a timeless present and εἰς is used, as in Mk. xiii. 16, Acts viii. 40, etc., for ἐν. εἰς τὸν κόλπον, whether taken from friends reclining at a feast or from a father's embrace, denotes perfect intimacy. Thus qualified, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο "He" emphatic, He thus equipped, "has interpreted" what? See viii. 32; or simply, as implied in the preceding negative clause, "God". The Scholiast on Soph., *Ajax*, 320, says, ἐξήγησις ἐπὶ θείων, ἑρμηνεία ἐπὶ τῶν τυχόντων, Wetstein.

Ver. 19. With this verse begins the Gospel proper or historical narrative of the manifestation of the glory of the Incarnate Logos.

Vv. 19-42. *The witness of John and its result.*—Vv. 19-28. The witness of John to the deputation from Jerusalem, entitled αὕτη ἐστὶν . . . Λευΐτας. The witness or testimony of John is placed first, not only because it was that which influenced the evangelist himself, nor only because chronologically it came first, but because the Baptist was commissioned to be the herald of the Messiah. The Baptist's testimony was of supreme value because of (1) his appointment to this function of identifying the Messiah, (2) his knowledge of Jesus, (3) his own holiness, (4) his disinterestedness.—**αὕτη**, this which follows, is the testimony given on a special occasion **ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν . . . Λευΐτας,** "when the Jews sent to him from Jerusalem priests and Levites".—**Ἰουδαῖοι** [יְהוּדִים], originally designating the tribes of Judah and Benjamin which formed the separate kingdom of Judah, but after the exile denoting all Israelites. In this Gospel it is used with a hostile implication as the designation of the "entire theocratic community as summed up in its official heads and as historically fixed in an attitude of hostility to Christ" (Whitelaw). Here "the Jews" probably indicates the Sanhedrim, composed of priests, presbyters, and scribes.—**ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευΐτας**, the higher and lower order of temple officials (Holtzmann). Why were not scribes sent? Possibly because John's father was himself a priest. The priests were for the most part Sadducees, but John tells us this deputation was strong in Pharisees (ver. 24). Lampe says: "Custodibus Templi incumbebat, Dominum Templi, cujus adventum exspectabant, nosse". They were sent **ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν,** "that they might interrogate him," not captiously but for the sake of information. Lk. tells us (iii. 15) that the people were on the tiptoe of expectation, and were discussing whether John were not the Christ; so it was time the Sanhedrim should make the inquiry. "The judgment of the case of a false prophet is specially named in the Mishna as belonging to the council of the Seventy One" (Watkins). "This incident gives a deep insight into the extraordinary religious life of the Jews—their unusual combination of conservatism with progressive thought" (Reynolds' *John the Baptist*, p. 365).—**Σὺ τίς εἶ,** "Who art thou?" Not, what is your name, or birth, but, what personage do you claim to be,

ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός." 21. Καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν, "Τί οὖν, [d] Ἠλίας εἶ σύ;" Καὶ λέγει, "Οὐκ εἰμί." "[e] Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ;" Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη, "Οὔ." 22. Εἶπον [1] οὖν αὐτῷ, "Τίς εἶ; ἵνα [f] ἀπόκρισιν δῶμεν τοῖς πέμψασιν ἡμᾶς· τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ;" 23. Ἔφη, "[g] Ἐγὼ [g] φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου·"

d Mal. iv. 5.
e Deut. xviii. 18.
f xix. 9. Job xxxiii. 5.
g Is. xl. 3.

[1] T.R. in ℵAC³L; ειπαν in BC*D.

what place in the community do you aspire to?—with an implied reference to a possible claim on John's part to be the Christ. This appears from John's answer, ὡμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο καὶ ὡμολόγησεν. Schoettgen says the form of the sentence is "judaico more," citing "Jethro confessus, et non mentitus est". *Cf.* Rom. ix. 1 and 1 Tim. ii. 7. The iteration serves here to bring out the earnestness, almost horror, with which John disclaimed the ascription to him of such an honour. His high conception of the office emphasises his acknowledgment of Jesus.—ὅτι, here, as commonly, "recitative," serving the purpose of our inverted commas or marks of quotation.—ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός, the reading adopted by Tisch. and W.H., bringing the emphasis on the "I". "*I* am not the Christ," but another is. The T.R. οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός, by bringing the ἐγὼ and ὁ Χριστός together, accentuates the incongruity and the Baptist's surprise at being mistaken for the Christ. This straightforward denial evokes another question (ver. 21), τί οὖν; which Weiss renders, "What then art thou?" Better "what then?" "what then is the case?" *quid ergo, quid igitur?*—Ἡλείας εἶ σύ; If not the Christ Himself, the next possibility was that he was the forerunner of the Messiah, according to Mal. iv. 5, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord". [Among the Fathers there seems to have been a belief that Elias would appear before the second Advent. Thus Tertullian (*De anima*, 50) says: "Translatus est Enoch et Elias, nec mors eorum reperta est, dilata scilicet. Caeterum morituri reservantur, ut Antichristum sanguine suo exstinguant." Other references in Lampe.] But to this question also John answers οὐκ εἰμί, because the Jews expected Elias in person, so that although our Lord spoke of the Baptist as Elias (Mt. xvii. 10-13), John could not admit that identity without misleading them. If people need to question a great spiritual personality, replies in their own language will often mislead them. Another alternative presented itself: ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; "art thou the prophet?" *viz.*, the prophet promised in Deut. xviii. 15, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, like unto me". Allusion is made to this prophet in four places in this Gospel, the present verse and ver. 25 of this chapter; also in vi. 14 and vii. 40. That the Jews did not see in this prophet the Messiah would appear from the present verse, and also from vii. 40: "Some said, Of a truth this is the prophet; others said, This is the Christ". The Jews looked for "a faithful prophet" (1 Macc. xiv. 41) who was to terminate the prophetic period and usher in the Messianic reign. But after Peter, as recorded in Acts iii. 22, applied the prophecy of Deut. to Christ, the Christian Church adopted this interpretation. The use of the prophecy by Christ Himself justified this. But the different interpretations thus introduced gave rise to some confusion, and as Lightfoot points out, none but a Jew contemporary with Christ could so clearly have held the distinction between the two interpretations. (See Deane's *Pseudepig.*, p. 121; Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*, E. Tr., i., 67; and on the relation of "the prophet" to Jeremiah, see Weber, p. 339.) To this question also John answered "No"; "quia Prophetis omnibus erat praestantior" (Lampe). This negation is explained by the affirmation of ver. 23. Thus baffled in all their suggestions the deputies ask John to give them some positive account of himself, that they might not go back to those who sent them without having accomplished the object of their mission. To this second τίς εἶ; τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ; (ver. 23) he replies in words made familiar by the Synoptists, ἐγώ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ . . . ὁ προφήτης; John applies to himself the words of Is. xl. 3, blending the two clauses ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν Κυρίου and εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν into one: εὐθύνατε τὴν

καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης." 24. Καὶ οἱ[1] ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων· 25. καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Τί οὖν βαπτίζεις, εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, οὔτε Ἡλίας, οὔτε ὁ προφήτης;" 26. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων, "Ἐγὼ βαπτίζω [h] ἐν ὕδατι· [i] μέσος δὲ ὑμῶν ἕστηκεν,[2] ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε. 27. αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν· οὗ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος [j] ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος." 28. Ταῦτα ἐν Βηθαβαρᾷ[3] ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων.

h Mt. iii. 11. Lk. iii. 16.
i Mt. xiv. 24.
j A rare constr., usually infin. or gen.

[1] T.R. in ℵ^{cb}A²C³, etc.; without article in ℵ*A*BC*.
[2] T.R. in ACX, etc.; στηκει in BL, adopted by W.H.R.
[3] βηθανια in ℵ*ABC*EFG, etc., adopted by Tr.T.W.H.R.

ὁδὸν Κυρίου. By appropriating this prophetic description John identifies himself as the immediate precursor of the Messiah; and probably also hints that he himself is no personage worthy that inquiry should terminate on him, but only a voice. [Heracleon neatly graduates revelation, saying that the Saviour is **ὁ λόγος**, John is **φωνή**, the whole prophetic order **ἦχος**, a mere noise; for which he is with some justice rebuked by Origen.] "The desert," a pathless, fruitless waste fitly symbolises the spiritual condition of the Messiah's people. For the coming of their King preparation must be made, especially by such repentance as John preached. "If Israel repent but for one day, the Messiah will come." *Cf.* Weber, p. 334.—Ver. 24. **καὶ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων.** This gives us the meaning "And they had been sent from," which is not so congruous with the context as "And they who were sent were of the Pharisees"; because apparently this clause was inserted to explain the following question (ver. 25): **τί οὖν βαπτίζεις . . . ὁ προφήτης;** Founding on Zech. xiii. 1, "In that day there shall be a fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness," and on Ezek. xxxvi. 25, "then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," they expected a general purification before the coming of the Messiah. Hence their question. If John was not the Messiah, nor the prophet, nor Elias in close connection with the Messiah, why did he baptise? Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.*, p. 965) quotes from Kiddushin "Elias venit ad immundos distinguendum et ad purificandum". See also Ammonius and Beza quoted in Lampe. In reply to this objection of the Pharisees (ver. 26) John says: **ἐγὼ βαπτίζω . . . τοῦ ὑποδήματος**, "I for my part baptise with water"; the emphatic "I" leading us to expect mention of another with whom a contrast is drawn. This contrast is further signified by the mention of the element of the baptism, **ἐν ὕδατι**; a merely symbolic element, but also the element by baptism in which preparation for the Messiah was to be made. And John's administration of this precursory baptism is justified by the fact he immediately states, **μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε.** Had *they* been aware of this presence (**ὑμεῖς** emphatic) as John was aware of it, they could not have challenged the baptism of John, because it was the divinely appointed preparation for the Messiah's advent. This scarcely amounts to what Lampe calls it, "nova exprobratio ignorantiae Pharisaeorum" (Is. xlii. 19, xxix. 14), because as yet they had had no opportunity of knowing the Christ.—**μέσος ὑμῶν.** There is no reason why the words should not be taken strictly. So Euthymius, **ἦν γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς ἀναμεμιγμένος τότε τῷ λαῷ.**—**ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος**, denoting the *immediate* arrival of the Messiah and John's close connection with Him. He is further described relatively to John as inconceivably exalted above him, **οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ . . . ὑποδήματος.** The grammatical form admitting both the relative and pers. pronoun is Hebraistic. **ἄξιος ἵνα** also stands instead of the classical construction with the infinitive. Talmudists quote the saying: "Every service which a servant will perform for his master, a disciple will do for his Rabbi, except loosing his sandal thong".—Ver. 28. **ταῦτα ἐν Βηθανίᾳ . . . βαπτίζων.** The place is mentioned on account of the importance of the testimony thus borne to Jesus, and because the evangelist himself in all probability was present and it was natural to him to name it. But where was it? There is no doubt that

29. Τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει ὁ Ἰωάννης τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ λέγει, "Ἴδε ὁ [k] ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ [l] αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν

k Exod. xii. 3. 1 Cor. v. 7.
l Heb. i. 3. 1 Jo. ii. 2. 1 Pet. i. 19.

the reading Βηθανίᾳ is to be preferred. The addition πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου confirms this reading; as the existence of Bethany near Jerusalem rendered the distinguishing designation necessary. Bethany = בֵּית אֲנִיָּה meaning "boat-house," and Bethabara having the same meaning [עֲבָרָה a ferry boat] is it not possible that the same place may have been called by both names indifferently? Henderson (*Palestine*, p. 154) suggests that possibly the explanation of the doubtful reading is that the place referred to is Bethabara which led over into Bethania, that is, Bashan. Similarly Conder (*Handbook*, p. 320) says Bethania beyond Jordan is evidently the province of Batanea, and the ford Abârah now discovered leads into Batanea. At this place "John was, baptising," rather than "John was baptising".

Vv. 29-34. *The witness of John based on the sign at the baptism of Jesus.*—Ver. 29. τῇ ἐπαύριον, the first instance of John's accurate definition of time. *Cf.* 35, 43, ii. 1. The deputation had withdrawn, but the usual crowd attracted by John would be present. "The inquiries made from Jerusalem would naturally create fresh expectation among John's disciples. At this crisis," etc. (Westcott).—βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτόν. Jesus had quite recently returned from the retirement in the wilderness, and naturally sought John's company. Around John He is more likely to find receptive spirits than elsewhere. And it gave His herald an opportunity to proclaim Him, ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν αμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου. The article indicates that a person who could thus be designated had been expected; or it may merely be introductory to the further definition of the succeeding clause.—τοῦ θεοῦ, provided by God; *cf.* "bread of God," vi. 33; also Rom. viii. 32. It is impossible to suppose with the author of *Ecce Homo* that by this title "the lamb of God" the Baptist merely meant to designate Jesus as a man "full of gentleness who could patiently bear the ills to which He would be subjected" (*cf.* Aristoph., *Pax*, 935). The second clause forbids this interpretation. He is a lamb αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, and there is only one way in which a lamb can take away sin, and that is by sacrifice. The expression might suggest the picture of the suffering servant of the Lord in Is. liii., "led as a lamb to the slaughter," but unless the Baptist had previously been speaking of this part of Scripture, it is doubtful whether those who heard him speak would think of it. In Isaiah it is as a symbol of patient endurance the lamb is introduced; here it is as the symbol of sacrifice. It is needless to discuss whether the paschal lamb or the lamb of daily sacrifice was in the Baptist's thoughts. He used "the lamb" as the symbol of sacrifice in general. Here, he says, is the reality of which all animal sacrifice was the symbol.—ὁ αἴρων, the present participle, indicating the chief characteristic of the lamb. αἴρω has three meanings: (1) to raise or lift up, John viii. 59, ἦραν λίθους; (2) to bear or carry, Mt. xvi. 24, ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ; (3) to remove or take away, John xx. 1, of the stone ἠρμένον from the sepulchre; and 1 John iii. 5, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ, that He might take away sins. In the LXX φέρειν, not αἴρειν, is regularly used to express the "bearing" of sin (see Leviticus, *passim*). In 1 Sam. xv. 25 Saul beseeches Samuel in the words ἆρον τὸ ἁμάρτημά μου, which obviously means "remove" (not "bear") my sin. So in 1 Sam. xxv. 28. But a lamb can remove sin only by sacrificially bearing it, so that here αἴρειν includes and implies φέρειν.—τοῦ κόσμου, *cf.* 1 John ii. 2, αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι . . . περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, and especially Philo's assertion quoted by Wetstein that some sacrifices were ὑπὲρ ἅπαντος ἀνθρώπων γένους.

In this verse Holtzmann finds two marks of late date. (1) The Baptist was markedly a man of his own people, whose eye never ranged beyond a Jewish horizon; yet here he is represented as from the first perceiving that the work of Jesus was valid for all men. And (2) the allusion to the sacrificial efficacy of Christ's death could not have been made till after that event. Strauss stated this difficulty with his usual lucidity. "So foreign to the current opinion at least was this notion of the Messiah that the disciples of Jesus, during the whole

τοῦ κόσμου. 30. οὗτός ἐστι περὶ[1] οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον, Ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ, ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν. 31. κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν· ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ, διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι βαπτίζων." 32. Καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν Ἰωάννης λέγων, "m Ὅτι τεθέαμαι τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ

m Mk. i. 10. Mt. iii. 16. Lk. iii. 22.

[1] ὑπερ in ℵBC, Origen. Cp. 2 Thess. ii. 1, and 2 Cor. i. 8. This use common in late Greek prose. Cp. Holden's note in Plutarch, *Demosth.*, p. 181.

period of their intercourse with Him, could not reconcile themselves to it; and when His death had actually taken place their trust in Him as the Messiah was utterly confounded." Yet Strauss himself admits that "a penetrating mind like that of the Baptist might, even before the death of Jesus, gather from the O.T. phrases and types the notion of a suffering Messiah, and that his obscure hints on the subject might not be comprehended by his disciples and contemporaries". The solution is probably to be found in the intercourse of John with Jesus, and especially after His return from the Temptation. These men must have talked long and earnestly on the work of the Messiah; and even though after his imprisonment John seems to have had other thoughts about the Messiah, that is not inconsistent with his making this statement under the direct influence of Jesus. We must also consider that John's own relation to the Messianic King must have greatly stimulated his thought; and his desire to respond to the cravings he stirred in the people must have led him to consider what the Messiah must be and do.

Ver. 30. **οὗτος . . . πρῶτός μου ἦν.** Pointing to Jesus he identifies Him with the person of whom he had previously said ὀπίσω μοῦ, etc. *Cf.* ver. 15. "After me comes a man who is before me because He was before me." The A.V. "which is before me" is preferable though not so literal as the R.V. "which is become before me". The words mean: "Subsequent to me in point of time comes a man who has gained a place in advance of me, because He was eternally prior to me".—**ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται** refers rather to space than to time, "after me," but with the notion of immediacy, close behind, following upon. As certainly, **ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν** refers to position or dignity; He has come to be in front of me, or ahead of me. So used sometimes in classic writers; as ἔμπροσθ. τοῦ δικαίου, preferred before justice. Dem., 1297, 26. —**ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν**, assigning the ground of this advanced position of Jesus: He was before me. For **πρῶτός μου** see chap. xv. 18, "If the world hateth you, ye know ὅτι ἐμὲ πρῶτον ὑμῶν μεμίσηκεν," and Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.*, 12. It is difficult to escape the impression that something more is meant than **πρότερος** would have conveyed, some more absolute priority. As **οἱ πρῶτοι στρατοῦ** are the chief men or leaders, it might be supposed that John meant to say that Christ was his supreme, in virtue of whom he himself lived and worked. But it is more probable he meant to affirm the pre-existence of the Messiah, a thought which may have been derived from the Apocalyptic books (see Deane's *Pseud.* and Drummond's *Jewish Mess.*).—Ver. 31. **κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν**, *i.e.*, I did not know Him to be the Messiah. Mt. iii. 14 shows that John knew Jesus as a man. This meaning is also determined by the clause added: **ἀλλ' ἵνα . . . ἐν ὕδατι βαπτίζων.** The object of the Baptist's mission was the manifestation of the Christ. It was the Baptist's preaching and the religious movement it initiated which summoned Jesus into public life. He alone could satisfy the cravings quickened by the Baptist. And it was at the baptism of Jesus, undergone in sympathy with the sinful people and as one with them, that the Spirit of the Messiah was fully imparted to Him and He was recognised as the Messiah. How John himself became convinced that Jesus was the Messiah he explains to the people, vv. 32-4.—Ver. 32. **τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα . . . ἐπ' αὐτόν.** "I have seen the Spirit coming down like a dove out of heaven, and it remained upon Him." "I have seen, perfect, in reference to the sign divinely intimated to him, in the abiding fulfilment of which he now stood." Alford. **τεθέαμαι** is used (as in ver. 14) in its sense of seeing with intelligence, with mental or spiritual observation and inference (*cf.* Aristoph., *Clouds*, 363,

περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν. 33. κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν· ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν [n] ἐν ὕδατι, ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, Ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ Πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. 34. κἀγὼ ἑώρακα, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ."

[n] ver. 26.

"Have you ever seen it rain without clouds?"). In what sense did the Baptist "see" the Spirit descending? Origen distinctly declared that these words **οἰκονομίας τρόπῳ γέγραπται οὐχ ἱστορικὴν διήγησιν ἔχοντα ἀλλὰ θεωρίαν νοητήν**, ii. 239. The **ὡς περιστερὰν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ** does not necessarily involve that an actual dove was visible. It was not the dove which was to be the sign; but, as the Baptist affirms in ver. 33, the descent and abiding of the Spirit. John was scarcely the type of man who would be determined in an important course of action by the appearance of a bird. What he saw was the Spirit descending. This he can best have seen in the demeanour of Jesus, in His lowliness and sympathy and holiness, all of which came to their perfect bloom at and in His baptism. It was the possession of this spirit by Jesus that convinced John that He could baptise with the Holy Spirit. That this conviction came to him at the baptism of Christ with a clearness and firmness which authenticated it as divine is guaranteed by the words of this verse. It was as plain to him that Jesus was possessed by the Spirit as if he had seen the Spirit in a visible shape alighting upon Him. To a mind absorbed in this one idea it may have actually seemed as if he saw it with his bodily eyes. Ambrose, *De Sacram.*, i., 5, "Spiritus autem sanctus non in veritate columbae, sed in specie columbae descendit de coelo". The dove was in the East a sacred bird, and the brooding dove was symbolic of the quickening warmth of nature. In Jewish writings the Spirit hovering over the primeval waters is expressly compared to a dove: "Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas, sicut columba, quae fertur super pullos suos nec tangit illos". *Cf.* also Noah's dove as symbol of the new creation. (See Suicer, *s.v.*, **περιστερά**, and Strauss, i., 362.) Such a symbol of the Spirit would scarcely have been imagined by the Baptist, who was all for stern and violent methods.—Ver. 33. **κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν . . . ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν.** Because of the importance of the identification of the Messiah the Baptist reiterates that his proclamation of Jesus was not a private idea for which he alone was responsible. On the contrary, He who had sent him to baptise had given him this sign by which to recognise the Christ.—**ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς . . . πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.** Lk. (iii. 16) adds **καὶ πυρί**, which occasions the well-known utterance in *Ecce Homo*: "Baptism means cleansing, and fire means warmth. How can warmth cleanse? The answer is that moral warmth does cleanse. No heart is pure that is not passionate; no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic. And such an enthusiastic virtue Christ was to introduce." In affirming that the Christ baptises with the Holy Spirit, and that this is what distinguishes the Christ, the Baptist steps on to grouud where his affirmations can be tested by experience. This is the fundamental article of the Christian creed. Has Christ power to make men holy? History gives the answer. The essence of the Holy Spirit is communication: Jesus being the Christ, the anointed with the Spirit, must communicate it.—Ver. 34. **κἀγὼ ἑώρακα . . . ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.** "And I have seen and have testified that this is the Son of God." The Synoptists tell us that a voice was heard at the baptism declaring "this is my beloved Son"; and in the Temptation Satan uses the title. Nathanael at the very beginning of the ministry, and the demoniacs very little later, use the same designation. This was in a rigidly monotheistic community and in a community in which the same title had been applied to the king, to designate a certain alliance and close relation between the human representative and the Divine Sovereign. Whether the Baptist in his peculiar circumstances had begun to suspect that a fuller meaning attached to the title, we do not know. Unquestionably the Baptist must have found his ideas of the Messianic office expanding under the influence of intercourse with Jesus, and must more than ever have seen that this was a unique title setting Jesus apart from all other men. The basis of the application of the title to the Messiah is to be found in 2 Sam. vii. 14, "I will be to him a Father

35. Τῇ ἐπαύριον πάλιν[1] εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰωάννης, καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο. 36. καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι, λέγει, "Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ." 37. Καὶ ἤκουσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ λαλοῦντος, καὶ ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 38. στραφεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ° θεασάμενος αὐτοὺς ἀκολουθοῦντας, λέγει αὐτοῖς, 39. "Τί ζητεῖτε;"

o Ps. xxvii. 8. Lk. xi. 9.

[1] For the two forms εισηκει and ιστηκει see Veitch.

and he will be to me a Son". In the second and eighty-ninth Psalms the term is seen passing into a Messianic sense, and that it should appear in the N.T. as a title of the Messiah is inevitable.

Vv. 35-42. *Witness of John to two of his disciples and first self-manifestation of Jesus as the Christ.* Bengel entitles the section, vv. 35-52, "primae origines Ecclesiae Christianae"; but from the evangelist's point of view it is rather the blending of the witness of John with the self-manifestation of Jesus. His kingly lordship over men He reveals (1) by making Himself accessible to inquirers: Andrew and John; (2) by giving a new name, implying new character: Simon becomes Peter; (3) by summoning men to follow Him: Philip; (4) by interpreting and satisfying men's deepest desires and aspirations: Nathanael.—Ver. 35. τῇ ἐπαύριον . . . αὐτοῦ δύο. On the morrow John was again standing (ἱστήκει, pluperfect with force of imperfect) and two of his disciples. [Holtzmann uses this close riveting of day to day as an argument against the historicity of this part of the Gospel. He says that no room is left for the temptation between the baptism and the marriage in Cana. But these repeated "morrows" take us back, not to the baptism, which is nowhere in this Gospel directly narrated, but to the Baptist's conversation with the deputation from Jerusalem, in which it is implied that already the baptism of Jesus was past; how long past this Gospel does not state, but, quite as easily as not, six weeks may be inserted between the baptism of Jesus and the deputation.]—πάλιν looks back to ver. 29. Then no results followed John's testimony: now results follow. Two of his disciples stood with him, Andrew (ver. 41) and probably John.—Ver. 36. The Baptist, ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ, having gazed at, or contemplated (see Mt. vi. 26, ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινά, and especially Mk. xiv. 67, καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον . . . ἐμβλέψασα) Jesus as He walked, evidently not towards John as on the previous day, but away from him. —λέγει Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ without the added clause of ver. 29.—Ver. 37. καὶ ἤκουσαν . . . τῷ Ἰησοῦ. "And the two disciples heard him speaking"—possibly implying that the day before they had not heard him—"and they followed Jesus"; the Baptist does not bid them follow, but they feel that attraction which so often since has been felt.—Ver. 38. στραφεὶς δὲ . . . τί ζητεῖτε; Jesus, hearing their steps behind Him, turns. To all who follow He gives their opportunity. Having turned and perceived that they were following Him, He asks τί ζητεῖτε; the obvious first inquiry, but perhaps with a breath in it of that Fan which the Baptist had warned them to expect in the Messiah; as if, Are you seeking what I can give? They reply Ῥαββεί . . . μένεις; Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.*) tells us that "Rabbi" was a new title which had not been used long before the Christian era, and possibly arose during the rivalries of the schools of Hillel and Shammai. The word means "my greatness". *Cf.* His Majesty, etc., and for the absorption of the pronoun *cf.* monsieur or madame. See Lampe. As it occurs here for the first time John translates it, and renders by διδάσκαλε, Teacher; so that as yet they were scarcely prepared to give Him the greater title, Lord, or Messiah. Unready with an answer to His question they put another which may stand for an answer, ποῦ μένεις; where are you *staying*, where are you dwelling? So used in N.T., Lk. xix. 5, and in later Greek, Polybius, 30, 4, 10, and 34, 9, 9, of dwelling for a short time in a place; not so much implying, as Holtzmann suggests, that they wished to go to His lodging that they might have more uninterrupted talk with Him; for that scarcely fits Oriental habits; but rather implying that they were shy of prolonging intercourse and wished to know where they might find Him another time. From this unsatisfactory issue they are saved by His frank invitation (ver. 40) ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε. "Come and ye shall see." Use the opportunity you now have. Christ's door is ever on the latch: He is always accessible.—ἦλθαν οὖν . . . ὡς δεκάτη. The two men remained in con-

Οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ῥαββί," (ὃ λέγεται ἑρμηνευόμενον, Διδάσκαλε,) "ποῦ μένεις;" 40. Λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἔρχεσθε καὶ ἴδετε." Ἦλθον καὶ εἶδον [p] ποῦ μένει· καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην· ὥρα δὲ ἦν ὡς δεκάτη. 41. Ἦν [q] Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου, εἷς ἐκ τῶν δύο τῶν ἀκουσάντων [r] παρὰ Ἰωάννου, καὶ ἀκολουθησάντων αὐτῷ. 42. εὑρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτος[1] τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν," (ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, [s] ὁ Χριστός·) 43. καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. ἐμβλέψας δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε, "Σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωνᾶ[2]· σὺ κληθήσῃ [t] Κηφᾶς·" ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται Πέτρος.

p Constr. vide Burton, *M. and T.*, 341.
q Mk. i. 16.
r vi. 45.
s Acts x. 38.
t Mt. xvi. 18. Here only in John. 8 times in Paul.

[1] πρωτον in ℵ²ABM. [2] T.R. in AB³, etc.; Ιωανου in ℵB*L 33.

versation with Jesus during the remainder of the day [but Grotius gives the sense as "ibidem pernoctarunt, quia jam serum erat"], a day so memorable to John that he recalls the very hour when they first approached Jesus, four o'clock in the afternoon. It seems that at this time throughout the Græco-Roman world one system of reckoning the hours prevailed. There is indisputable evidence that while the Romans calculated their civil day, by which leases and contracts were dated, as extending from midnight to midnight, the hours of each day were reckoned from sunrise to sunset. Thus on the Roman sun-dials noon is marked VI. (see Becker's *Gallus*, p. 319). Martial's description of the manner in which each hour was spent (*Ep.*, iv., 8) leads to the same couclusion; and for proof that no different method was followed in the provinces, see Prof. Ramsay's paper "On the Sixth Hour" in the *Expositor*, 1893. *Cf.* also paper by Mr. Cross in *Classical Review*, June, 1891.—Ver. 41. **ἦν Ἀνδρέας . . . Σίμωνος.** One of the two who thus first followed Christ was Andrew, known not so much in his own name as being the brother of Simon—**Πέτρου** is here proleptic. We are left to infer that the other disciple was the evangelist.—Ver. 42. **εὑρίσκει οὗτος πρῶτος.** If with T. R. and Tischendorf we read **πρῶτος**, the meaning is that Andrew, *before John*, found his brother; if with W.H. we read **πρῶτον** the meaning is that before Andrew did anything else, and perhaps especially before the other men afterwards named were called, he *first of all* finds his own brother. Reading **πρῶτον**, we cannot gather that John went in search also of his brother, and as there is no mention of him at this time the probability is that he was not at hand. **πρῶτον** is the note of warning that this was but the beginning of a series of calls.—**εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν.** "We have found," perhaps, as Weiss suggests, with reference to the expectations produced by the Baptist's teaching. The result of their conversation with Jesus is summed up in these words. They were now convinced that He was the Christ. In Jewish lips "we have found the Messiah" was the most comprehensive of all Eurekas. That John gives the actual words, though he has immediately to translate one of them for his Greek readers, is not without significance in regard to his accuracy in reporting.—Ver. 43. **καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.** He was not content to allow his report to work in his brother's mind, but induced him there and then, though probably on the following day, as now it must have been late, to go to Jesus.—**ἐμβλέψας . . . Πέτρος.** Jesus may have known Simon previously, or may have been told his name by Andrew. "Thou art Simon, Jonah's son, or better, John's son. Thou shalt be called Kephas." This name, Kephas or Peter, stone or mass of rock, Simon did receive at Caesarea Philippi on his confession of Jesus as the Christ (Mt. xvi. 17, 18); a confession prompted not by "flesh and blood," that is, by his brother's experience, but by his own inwrought and home-grown conviction. The reason of this utterance to Simon is understood when it is considered that the name he as yet bore, Simon Barjona, was identified with a character full of impulsiveness; which might well lead him to suppose he would only bring mischief to the Messiah's kingdom. But, says Christ, thou shalt be called Rock. Those who enter Christ's kingdom believing in

44. Τῇ ἐπαύριον [u] ἠθέλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν· καὶ [v] εὑρίσκει Φίλιππον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ἀκολούθει μοι." 45. Ἦν δὲ ὁ [w] Φίλιππος ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδὰ, ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἀνδρέου καὶ Πέτρου. 46. Εὑρίσκει Φίλιππος τὸν [x] Ναθαναὴλ, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "[y] Ὃν ἔγραψε Μωσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφῆται, εὑρήκαμεν,

u Freq. in John.
v Is. lxv. 1.
w xii. 21.
x xxi. 2.
y Gen. xlix. 10. Deut. xviii. 18. Is. ix. 6. Mic. v. 2. Constr. *vide* Rom. x. 5.

Him receive a character fitting them to be of service.

Vv. 44-52. *Further manifestations of Jesus as Messiah.*—Vv. 44. **τῇ ἐπαύριον . . . Γαλιλαίαν.** "The day following He would go forth," that is, from the other side of Jordan, into Galilee, probably to His own home.—**καὶ εὑρίσκει Φίλιππον,** "and He finds," "lights upon," Philip (*cf.* vi. 5, xii. 21, xiv. 3). To him He utters the summons, **ἀκολούθει μοι,** which can hardly have the simple sense, "accompany me," but must be taken as the ordinary call to discipleship (Lk. ix. 59, Mt. xix. 21, etc.). —Ver. 45. **ἦν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος . . . Πέτρου.** This is inserted to explain how Jesus happened to meet Philip: he was going home also; and to explain how Philip's mind had been prepared by conversation with Andrew and Peter. The exact position of Bethsaida is doubtful. There was a town or village of this name (Fisher-Home) on the east bank of Jordan, slightly above its fall into the Sea of Galilee. This place was rebuilt by Philip and named Julias, in honour of the daughter of Augustus. Many good authorities think that this was the only Bethsaida (see Dr. G. A. Smith's *Hist. Geog. of Palestine*, p. 457). Others, however, are of opinion that the manner in which Bethsaida, here and in xii. 21, is named with an added note of distinction, "the city of Andrew," "of Galilee," requires us to postulate two Bethsaidas. This is further confirmed by the movements recorded in vi. 16-22. *Cf.* Mk. vi. 45. Those who accept two Bethsaidas locate the one which is here mentioned either opposite Bethsaida Julias and as a kind of suburb of it or farther south at Ain Tabigha (see *Rob Roy on the Jordan*, 342-392).—Ver. 46. **εὑρίσκει . . . Ναζαρέτ.** Philip in turn finds Nathanael, probably on the road from the Bethany ford homewards. Nathanael is probably the same person as is spoken of in the Synoptical Gospels as Bartholomew, *i.e.*, Bar Tolmai, son of Ptolemy. This is usually inferred from the following: (1) Both here and in chap. xxi. 2 he is classed with apostles; (2) in the lists of apostles given in the Synoptical Gospels Bartholomew is coupled with Philip; (3) while Nathanael is never mentioned by the Synoptists, Bartholomew is not mentioned by John. The two names might quite well belong to one man, Bartholomew being a patronymic. Nathanael means "God's gift," Theodore, or, like Augustine's son, Adeodatus. Philip announces the discovery in the words **ὃν ἔγραψεν . . . Ναζαρέτ.** On which Calvin remarks: "Quam tenuis fuerit modulus fidei in Philippo hinc patet, quod de Christo quatuor verba profari nequit, quin duos crassos errores permisceat. Facit illum filium Joseph, et patriam Nazareth falso illi assignat." This is too stringent. He draws the conclusion that where there is a sincere purpose to do good and to proclaim Christ, success will follow even where there is error. Nazareth lies due west from the south end of the Sea of Galilee, and about midway between it and the Mediterranean. — Ver. 47. Philip's announcement is received with incredulity.—**ἐκ Ναζαρὲτ δύναταί τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι;** "Can anything good be from Nazareth." *Cf.* viii. 52, "out of Galilee ariseth no prophet". Westcott, representing several modern interpreters, explains: "Can any blessing, much less such a blessing as the promised Messiah, arise out of a poor village like Nazareth, of which not even the name can be found in the O.T.?" But probably Nathanael was influenced by the circumstance that he himself was of Cana (xxi. 2), only a few miles from Nazareth, and with the jealousy which usually exists between neighbouring villages (inter accolas odium) found it hard to believe that Nazareth could produce the Messiah (*cf.* Is. liii. 2, "a root out of a dry ground"). From this remark of Nathanael's light is reflected on the obscurity and unobtrusiveness of the youth of Jesus. Though living a few miles off, Nathanael never heard of Him. To his incredulity Philip wisely replies, **ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε;** as

Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ." 47. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ναθαναὴλ, "Ἐκ Ναζαρὲτ δύναταί τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι;" Λέγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος, "Ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε." 48. Εἶδεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ναθαναὴλ ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ λέγει περὶ αὐτοῦ, "Ἴδε [z] ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης, ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστι." 49. Λέγει αὐτῷ Ναθαναὴλ, "Πόθεν με γινώσκεις;" Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι, ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν, εἶδόν σε." 50. Ἀπεκρίθη Ναθαναὴλ καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ῥαββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

z Gen. xxv. 26.

Bengel says, "optimum remedium contra opiniones praeconceptas". And Nathanael shows himself to be willing to have his preconceptions overcome. He goes with Philip.—Ver. 48. **εἶδεν . . . δόλος οὐκ ἔστιν.** The honesty shown in his coming to Jesus is indicated as his characteristic. He had given proof that he was guileless. In Gen. xxvii. 35 Isaac says to Esau, "Thy brother has come and **μετὰ δόλου ἔλαβε τὴν εὐλογίαν σου**". And it was by throwing off this guile and finding in God his dependence that Jacob became Israel. So that in declaring Nathanael to be a guileless Israelite, Jesus declares him to be one who does not seek to win blessing by earthly means but by prayer and trust in God.—Ver. 49. The significance of this utterance is further shown by what follows. Naturally Nathanael is surprised by this explicit testimony from one with whom he has had no acquaintance and who has notwithstanding truly described him, and he asks, **πόθεν με γινώσκεις;** "how do you know me?" perhaps imagining that some common friend had told Jesus about him. But Jesus ascribes it to another cause: **πρὸ τοῦ σε Φίλιππον φωνῆσαι ὄντα ὑπὸ τὴν συκῆν εἶδον σε,** I saw thee under the fig tree before Philip called thee (not, I saw thee somewhere else before Philip called thee when you were under the fig tree). "Under the fig tree" is obviously significant. Such trees were planted by the wayside (Mt. xxi. 19), and the large thick leaf afforded shade. It was the favourite garden tree of the Jews, so that "sitting under one's fig tree" meant being at home (Micah iv. 4, Zech. iii. 10). The tree formed a natural arbour affording shade and privacy. Thus Schoettgen quotes that it is related of Rabbi Jose and his disciples, "solebant summo mane surgere et sedere et studere sub ficu". And Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb., in loc.*) says that Nathanael was "aut orans, aut legens, aut meditans, aut aliquid religiosum praestans, in secessu sub aliquâ ficu et extra conspectum hominum". But evidently Nathanael understood that Jesus had not only seen him when he thought he was unobserved, but had penetrated his thought in retirement, and understood and sympathised with his prayer under the fig tree, for the impression made upon him by this knowledge of Jesus is profound.—Ver. 50. **Ῥαββεί,** he exclaims, **σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.** Nathanael had been praying for the manifestation of the Messiah: now he exclaims *Thou* art He. That Nathanael used both expressions, Son of God, and King of Israel, we may well believe, for he found both in the second Psalm. And it is probable that he used both as identifying Jesus with the Messiah (see chap. xi. 27, xii. 13-15). It is not likely that he would pass from a higher designation to a lower; more probable that by the second title he means more closely to define the former. Thou art *the* Son of God, fulfilling the ideal of sonship and actually realising all that prophecy has uttered regarding the Son of God: Thou art the ideal, long-expected King of Israel, in whom God's reign and kingdom are realised on earth. "The words are an echo of the testimony of the Baptist. Nothing can be more natural than to suppose that the language of John had created strange questionings in the hearts of some whom it had reached, and that it was with such thoughts Nathanael was busied when the Lord 'saw' him. If this were so, the confession of Nathanael may be an answer to his own doubts" (Westcott).—Ver. 51. **ἀπεκρίθη . . . ὄψῃ.** In accordance with the habit of this evangelist, who calls attention to the moving cause of faith in this or that individual, the source of Nathanael's faith is indicated with some surprise that it should have proved sufficient: and with the announcement that his nascent

Θεοῦ, σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ." 51. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ὅτι εἶπόν σοι, Εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, πιστεύεις; μείζω τούτων ὄψει." 52. Καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπ' ἄρτι[1] ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν [a] ἀνεῳγότα, καὶ [b] τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου."

II. 1. ΚΑΙ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ γάμος ἐγένετο ἐν [a] Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας· καὶ ἦν ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκεῖ. 2. [b] ἐκλήθη δὲ καὶ ὁ

a Rarely act. = stand open, *vide* Veitch.
b Gen. xxviii. 12.
a Josh. xix. 28.
b Esth. v. 12. 1 Cor. x. 27. Mt. xxii. 3.

[1] **απ αρτι** rejected by Tr.T.W.H.R. on authority of ℵBL vet. Lat. vulg., etc.

faith will find more to feed upon: **μείζω τούτων ὄψῃ**.—Ver. 52. What these things are is described in the words **ὄψεσθε . . . ἀνθρώπου**, introduced by the emphatic **ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν**, used in this double form twenty-five times in this Gospel (always single in Synop.) and well rendered "verily, verily". Christ as the Faithful and True Witness is Himself called the Amen in Rev. iii. 14. The words **ἀπ' ἄρτι** are omitted by recent editors. The announcement describes the result of the incarnation of Christ as a bringing together of heaven and earth, a true mediation between God and man, an opening of what is most divine for the satisfaction of human need. It is made in terms of Jacob's dream (Gen. xxviii. 10 ff.). In his dream Jacob saw a ladder fixed on earth with its top in heaven, **οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνέβαινον καὶ κατέβαινον ἐπ' αὐτῇ**. What Jacob had dreamt was in Christ realised. The Son of Man, the Messiah or actual representative of God on earth, brings God to man and makes earth a Bethel, and the gate of heaven. What Nathanael under his fig tree had been longing for and unconsciously preparing, an open communication with heaven, a ladder reaching from the deepest abyss of an earth submerged in sin to the highest heaven of purity, Jesus tells him is actually accomplished in His person. "The Son of Man" is the designation by which Jesus commonly indicates that He is the Messiah, while at the same time He suggests that His kingdom is not founded by earthly power or force, but by what is especially human, sympathy, reason, self-sacrifice.

CHAPTER II.—Vv. 1-11. *The marriage at Cana. The first manifestation of Christ's glory to His disciples.*—Ver. 1. As usual John specifies time and place and circumstance. The time was **τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ**. The Greeks reckoned **σήμερον, αὔριον, τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ**. So Lk. xiii. 32, **ἰάσεις επιτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι**. The "third day" was therefore what we call "the day after to-morrow". From what point is this third day calculated? From i. 41 or i. 44? Probably the latter. Naturally one refers this exact specification of time to the circumstance that the writer was present. The place was **ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας**, "of Galilee" to distinguish it from another Cana, as in all countries the same name is borne by more than one place (Newcastle; Tarbet; Cleveland, Ohio, and Cleveland, N.Y.; Freiburg). This other Cana, however, was not the Cana of Josh. xix. 28 in the tribe of Asher (Weiss, Holtzmann); but more probably Cana in Judaea (*cf.* Henderson's *Palestine*, p. 152; Josephus, *Antiq.*, xiii., 15, 1; and Lightfoot's *Disq. Chorog. Johan. praemissa*). Opinion is now in favour of identifying "Cana" with Kefr Kenna, five miles north-east of Nazareth on the road to the Sea of Galilee. Robinson (*Researches*, iii., 108 and ii., 346) identified it with Khurbet Kâna, three hours north of Nazareth, because ruins there were pointed out to him as bearing the name Kâna el Jelil, Cana of Galilee. Dr. Zeller, however, who resided at Nazareth, declares that Khurbet Kâna is not known to the natives as Kâna el Jelil. Major Conder (*Tent Work*, i., 153), although not decided in favour of Kefr Kenna, shows that the alteration in the form of the name can be accounted for, and that its position is in its favour (Henderson's *Palestine*, 151-3).—**γάμος ἐγένετο**, a marriage took place. Jewish marriage customs are fully described in Trumbull's *Studies in Oriental Social Life*.—**καὶ ἦν ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκεῖ.** This is noticed to account for the invitation given to Jesus and His disciples. Joseph is not mentioned, probably because already dead. Certainly he was dead before the crucifixion.—Ver. 2. **ἐκλήθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν**

Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν γάμον. 3. καὶ ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου,[1] λέγει ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, "Οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι." 4. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[c] Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, [d] γύναι; [e] οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου." 5. Λέγει ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ τοῖς διακόνοις, "Ὅ τι ἂν

c Jud. xi. 12. 2 Sam. xvi. 10.
d xix. 26.
e vii. 6.

[1] T.R. in ℵ[a]ABL vulg. cop. syr.; but ℵ* and some vet. Lat. read οινον ουκ ειχον οτι συνετελεσθη ο οινος του γαμου, ειτα, "they had no wine because the wine of the marriage was finished; then . . . ".

γάμον. "And both Jesus was invited and His disciples to the marriage." To translate ἐκλήθη as a pluperfect "had been invited" is grammatically possible, but it is impossible that the disciples should have been previously invited, because their existence as disciples was not known. They were invited when they appeared. The collective title οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ is anticipatory: as yet it could not be in use. The singular verb (ἐκλήθη) with a plural nominative is too common to justify Holtzmann's inference that it indicates, what of course was the fact, that the disciples were asked only in consequence of Jesus being asked. *Cf.* Lk. ii. 33. In this instance Jesus "came unto His own" and His own received Him, at any rate as a friend.—Ver. 3. Through this unexpected addition to the number of guests the wine began to fail, ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου. ὑστερέω, from ὕστερος, signifies "to be late," and hence "to come short of," "to lack," and also "to be awanting". *Cf.* Mt. xix. 20, τί ἔτι ὑστερῶ; and Mk. x. 21, ἕν σοι ὑστερεῖ. Here the meaning is "the wine having failed," or "given out". Consequently λέγει ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν, Οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσι. Bengel supposes she wished him to leave "velim discedas, ut ceteri item discedant, antequam penuria patefiat". Calvin suggests "fieri potest, ut [mater] tale remedium [miraculum] non expectans eum admonuerit, ut pia aliqua exhortatione convivis taedium eximeret, ac simul levaret pudorem sponsi". Lampe says: "Obscurum est". Lücke thinks Jesus had given proof of His miracle-working previously. The Greek commentators and Godet suppose that when she saw Him recognised as Messiah the time for extraordinary manifestation of power had arrived. The words show that she was on terms of intimacy with the family of the bridegroom, that she knew of the failure of the wine and wished to relieve the embarrassment. She naturally turns to her oldest son, who had always in past emergencies proved helpful in counsel and practical aid. But from the words of Jesus in reply, "Mine hour is not yet come," it certainly would seem as if she had suggested that He should use Messianic powers for the relief of the wedding guests.—Ver. 4. His complete reply is, τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, γύναι; οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου. γύναι is a term of respect, not equivalent to our "woman". See chap. xix. 26, xx. 13, Lk. xiii. 12. In the Greek tragedians it is constantly used in addressing queens and persons of distinction. Augustus addresses Cleopatra as γύναι (Dio, quoted by Wetstein). Calvin goes too far when he says that this term of address was used to correct the superstitious adoration of the Virgin which was to arise. But while there is neither harshness nor disrespect, there is distance in the expression. Wetstein hits the point when he says: "Non poterat dicere: quid mihi tecum est, mater?"—τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί represents the Hebrew מַה־לִּי וָלָךְ (Judges xi. 12), and means: What have we in common? Trench gives the sense: "Let me alone; what is there common to thee and me; we stand in this matter on altogether different grounds". Or, as Holtzmann gives it, Our point of view and interests are wholly diverse; why do you mingle them?—οὔπω ἥκει ἡ ὥρα μου, not as Bengel, "discedendi hora," but, mine hour for bringing relief. This implies that He too had observed the failure of the wine and was waiting a fitting opportunity to interfere. That the same formula is more than once used by Jesus of His death (see chap. vii. 30, viii. 20) merely indicates that it could be used of any critical time. Euthymius says it here means "the hour of miracle working". Wetstein quotes from R. Sira "non quavis hora fit miraculum". Especially true is this of the first miracle of the Messiah, which would commit Him to a life of publicity ending in an ignominious death. That Mary found hope in the οὔπω is obvious from ver. 5. She did not find His reply wholly refusal.

λέγῃ ὑμῖν, ποιήσατε." 6. [f]Ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ [f] ὑδρίαι [g] λίθιναι ἓξ [h] κείμεναι κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, [i] χωροῦσαι [j] ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς. 7. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος." Καὶ ἐγέμισαν αὐτὰς [k] ἕως ἄνω. 8. Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἀντλήσατε

f iv. 28. 1 Kings xviii. 23.
g 2 Cor. iii. 3.
h Mk. vii. 3.
i 2 Chron. iv. 5.
j Rev. iv. 8. Winer, p. 496.
k 2 Chron. xxvi. 8.

She therefore says to the servants (ver. 5), ὅ τι ἂν λέγῃ ὑμῖν ποιήσατε. The διακόνοι, or servants waiting at table, might not otherwise have obeyed an unimportant guest. His orders might perhaps be of an unusual kind.—Ver. 6. There were there, hard by or in the feast-room, there were ὑδρίαι λίθιναι ἓξ κείμεναι, "six stone water jars standing". Stone was believed to preserve the purity and coolness of the water. [According to Plutarch, *Tib. Gracchus*, these jars were sometimes used for drawing lots, wooden tablets being put in the jars and shaken.] Similar stone jars are still used in Cana and elsewhere. They were κείμεναι, set; "in purely classical Greek κεῖμαι is the recognised passive perfect of τίθεμαι" (Holden, Plutarch's *Themist.*, p. 121).—κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων. For the washing of hands and vessels. *Cf.* Mk. vii. "Abluendi quidem ritum habebant ex Lege Dei, sed ut mundus semper nimius est in rebus externis, Judaei praescriptâ a Deo simplicitate non contenti continuis aspersionibus ludebant: atque ut ambitiosa est superstitio, non dubium est quin hoc etiam pompae serviret, quemadmodum hodie in Papatu videmus, quaecunque ad Dei cultum pertinere dicuntur, ad meram ostentationem esse composita," Calvin. The number and size are given that the dimensions of the miracle may appear. There were six χωροῦσαι ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς, "holding two or three firkins each".—ἀνὰ is here distributive, a classical use; *cf.* also Mt. xx. 9, 10, Mk. vi. 40. Accordingly the Vulgate translates "capientes singulae metretas binas". The Attic μετρητής held about nine gallons, so that averaging the jars at twenty gallons the six would together contain 120 gallons. The English translation has *firkin*, that is, *vierkin*, the fourth of a barrel, a barrel being thirty imperial gallons. It is difficult to assign any reason for giving the number and capacity of these jars, except that the writer wished to convey the idea that their entire contents were changed into wine. This prodigality would bring the miracle into closer resemblance to the gifts of nature. Also it would furnish proof, after the marriage was over, that the transformation had been actual. The wedding guests had not dreamt it. There was the wine. It was no mesmeric trick. Holtzmann, in a superior manner, smiles at the prosaic interpreters who strive to reduce the statement to matter of fact.—Ver. 7. The first order Jesus gives to the διακόνοις is one they may unhesitatingly obey.—Γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος, "Fill the water jars with water," the water being specified in view of what was to follow.—καὶ ἐγέμισαν αὐτὰς ἕως ἄνω, "and they filled them up to the brim". The corresponding expression, ἕως κάτω, is found in Mt. xxvii. 51. ἕως ἔσω and ἕως ἔξω are also found in N.T. to indicate more precisely the *terminus ad quem*. In this usage ἕως is not perceptibly different from a preposition. "Up to the brim" is specified not so much to indicate the abundant supply as to suggest that no room was left for adding anything to the water. The servants did all their part thoroughly, and left no apparent room for Jesus to work. Thus they became instrumental to the working of a miracle.—Ver. 8. The second order might stagger them more, Ἀντλήσατε νῦν, καὶ φέρετε τῷ ἀρχιτρικλίνῳ. The ἀρχιτρίκλινος was originally the person who had charge of the triclinium or triple couch set round a dining table: "praefectus cui instruendi ornandique triclinii cura incumbit"; a butler or head waiter whose duty it was to arrange the table and taste the food and wine. Petron. Arb. 22, "Jam et Tricliniarches experrectus lucernis occidentibus oleum infuderat". But apparently the person indicated in this verse is rather the συμποσιάρχης or συμποσίαρχος, the chairman elected by the company from among the guests, sometimes by lot. *Cf.* Horace's "Arbiter bibendi," Od., ii., 7. The requirements in such an official are described in Ecclus. xxxii. 1; Plato, *Laws*, p. 640; see also Reid's edition of Cicero, *De Senect.*, p. 131. In general he regulated the course of the feast and the conduct of the guests. [Holtzmann and Weiss both retain the proper meaning of

νῦν, καὶ φέρετε τῷ ἀρχιτρικλίνῳ." Καὶ ἤνεγκαν. 9. ὡς δὲ ἐγεύσατο ὁ ἀρχιτρίκλινος τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγενημένον, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει [l] πόθεν ἐστίν· (οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ᾔδεισαν οἱ ἠντληκότες τὸ ὕδωρ·) [m] φωνεῖ τὸν νυμφίον ὁ ἀρχιτρίκλινος, 10. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, "Πᾶς ἄνθρωπος πρῶτον τὸν καλὸν οἶνον [n] τίθησι, καὶ ὅταν μεθυσθῶσι, τότε τὸν [o] ἐλάσσω· σὺ

l Constr. see i. 40.
m i. 49.
n Here only, but cp. *Bel and the Dragon*, ver. 14.
o Inferior, cp. Wisd. ix. 5.

ἀρχιτρίκλινος.] Westcott suggests that the **ἀντλήσατε νῦν** may refer to drawing from the well, and that "the change in the water was determined by its destination for use at the feast". "That which remained water when kept for a ceremonial use became wine when borne in faith to minister to the needs, even to the superfluous requirements of life," a suggestive interpretation, but it evacuates of all significance the clause "they filled them up to the brim". The servants obeyed, possibly encouraged by seeing that what they had poured in as water flowed out as wine; although if the words in the end of the ninth verse are to be taken strictly, it was still water when drawn from the water jars. But some refer the **οἱ ἠντληκότες** to drawing from the well. It is, however, more natural to refer it to the **ἀντλήσατε νῦν** of the eighth verse. Besides, drawing water from the well would be the business rather of the women than of the **διάκονοι**.—Ver. 9. The architriklinos, then, when he had tasted the water which had now become wine, and did not know whence it had been procured, and was therefore impartially judging it merely as wine among wines, **φωνεῖ τὸν νυμφίον**, "calls the bridegroom," or simply "addresses the bridegroom," and says to him **πᾶς ἄνθρωπος** . . . The usage referred to was natural: and is illustrated by the **ἐωλοκρασία**, the mixture of all the heeltaps with which the harder heads dosed the drunken at the end of a debauch.—**ὅταν μεθυσθῶσι**, "when men have drunk freely," R.V. The Vulgate more accurately has "cum inebriati fuerint". And if the word does not definitely mean "when men are intoxicated," it at least must indicate a condition in which they are unfit to discriminate between good wine and bad. The company then present was not in that condition, because they were able to appreciate the good wine; but the words of the architriklinos unquestionably imply that a good deal had already been drunk. The **ἕως ἄρτι** involves this. The significance of the remark consists in the certificate thus given to the quality of the wine. Bengel felicitously says: "Ignorantia architriclini comprobat bonitatem vini: scientia ministrorum veritatem miraculi". Judging it by his natural taste and comparing it with the wine supplied by the host, the architriklinos pronounces this fresh supply better. What Christ introduces into the world will stand comparison with what is already in it. Christian grace must manifest itself not in sanctimonious and unpractical displays, but must stand comparison with the rough natural virtues, the courage, generosity, and force which are called for in the practical affairs of life.—Ver. 11. No answer of the bridegroom is recorded, nor any detail of the impression made, but John notes the incident as "the beginning of signs".—**ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχήν**, deleting the article with Tisch. and W.H., and rendering "This as a beginning of signs did Jesus," from which it can scarcely be gathered that no insight mentioned in the first chapter was considered by John to be supernatural. It is characteristic of this Gospel that the miracles are viewed as signs, or object lessons. The feeding of the five thousand presents Jesus as the bread of God; the strengthening of the impotent man exhibits Him as the giver of spiritual life; and so forth. So that when John here says that by this miracle Jesus **ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ**, we are prompted to ask what particular aspect of His glory was manifested here. What was there in it to elicit the faith and reverence of the disciples? (1) He appears as King in physical nature. He can use it for the furtherance of His purposes and man's good. He is, as declared in the Prologue, that One in whom is life. (2) A hint is given of the ends for which this creative power is to be used. It is, that human joy may be full. These disciples of the Baptist perceive a new kind of power in their new Master, whose goodness irradiates the natural joys and domestic incidents of human life. (3) When John recorded this miracle he saw how fitly it stood as the first, rehearsing as it did the entire

τετήρηκας τὸν καλὸν οἶνον ἕως ἄρτι." 11. Ταύτην ἐποίησε τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν [p] σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

p John *passim*, and freq. in Synopt.

12. ΜΕΤΑ τοῦτο κατέβη εἰς Καπερναοὺμ,[1] αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ [q] ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν

q Mt. xii. 46.

[1] Καφαρναουμ in ℵBX, adopted by T.Tr.W.H.

work of Christ, who came that human happiness might not untimely close in shame. Wine had become the symbol of that blood which brought reconcilement and renewal. Seeing this sign and the glory manifested in it **ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.** "Testimony (i. 36) directs those who were ready to welcome Christ to Him. Personal intercourse converts followers into disciples (ii. 2). A manifestation of power, as a sign of divine grace, converts discipleship into personal faith" (Westcott). "Crediderunt amplius" (Bengel). The different grades, kinds, and types of faith alluded to in this Gospel are a study. Sanday remarks on the unlikelihood of a forger making such constant allusion to the disciples. That *they* believed would seem a truism. If they had not, they would not have been disciples. It would have been more to the point to tell us the effect on the guests, and a forger would hardly have failed to do so. But John writes from the disciples' point of view. Not happy are the attempts to interpret this seeming miracle as a cleverly prepared wedding jest and gift (Paulus); or as a parable (Weisse), or as a hastened natural process (Augustine, Olshausen). Holtzmann finds here an artistic *Lehrdichtung*, an allegory rich in suggestion. Water represents all that is mere symbol as contrasted with spirit and reality. The period of symbolism is epresented by the water baptism of Iohn: this was to find its realisation in Jesus. The jars which had served for the outward washings of Judaism were by Jesus filled with heart-strengthening wine. The O.T. gift of water from the rock is superseded by the gift of wine. Wine becomes the symbol of the spiritual life and joy of the new kingdom. With this central idea the details of the incident agree: the helplessness of the old oeconomy, "they have no wine"; the mother of the Messiah is the O.T. community; and so forth. The historical truth consists simply in the joyful character ascribed to the beginning of Christ's ministry. (1) Against all these attempts it is the obvious intention of John to relate a miracle, a surprising and extraordinary manifestation of power. (2) Where allegory exists he directs attention to it; as in this chapter, ver. 21; also in chapters x., xv., etc. (3) That the incident can be allegorised is no proof that it is only allegory and not history. All incidents and histories may be allegorised. The life and death of Caesar have been interpreted as a sun myth.

Few, if any, incidents in the life of Jesus give us an equal impression of the width of His nature and its imperturbable serenity. He was at this juncture fresh from the most disturbing personal conflict, His work awaited Him, a work full of intense strife, hazard, and pain; yet in a mind occupied with these things the marriage joy of a country couple finds a fit place.

Ver. 12. *From Nazareth to Capernaum and thence to Jerusalem.* At ver. 12, as Calvin says, "transit Evangelista ad novam historiam". This new section runs to the end of the fourth chapter, and gives an account of the first great series of public manifestations on the part of Christ (1) in Jerusalem, (2) in Judaea, (3) in Samaria, (4) in Galilee. These are introduced by the note of time, **μετὰ τοῦτο**, commonly used by John when he wishes merely to denote sequence without definitely marking the length of the interval. The interval in the present case was probably long enough at any rate to allow of the Nazareth family returning home, although this is not in the text. The motive for a fresh movement was probably the desire of the fishermen to return home. Accordingly **κατέβη εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ**, down from the higher lands about Nazareth to the lake side, 680 feet below sea level. His destination was **Καφαρναούμ**, the site of which is probably to be found at Khan Minyeh (Minia), at the north end of the plain of Gennesareth, where the great road to Damascus leaves the lake side and strikes north. [The most valuable comparison of the two competing sites,

οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας. 13. Καὶ ἐγγὺς ἦν [r] τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 14. καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοὺς πωλοῦντας βόας καὶ πρόβατα καὶ περιστερὰς, καὶ τοὺς κερματιστὰς καθημένους. 15. καὶ ποιήσας φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων, πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας. καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεε τὸ κέρμα, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέστρεψε·

r Exod. xii. 14. Ch. v. 1; vi. 4; xi. 55.

Tell Hum and *Khan Minyeh*, will be found in the *Rob Roy on the Jordan*. Mr. Macgregor spent several days sounding along the shore, measuring distances, comparing notes, and making careful examination, and concluded in favour of Khan Minyeh. Tell Hum was thought to represent Kefr Nahum (Nahumston); which, when it ceased to be a town and became a heap of ruins, might have been called Tell Nahum, and hence Tell Hum. Authoritative opinion is, however, decidedly in favour of Khan Minyeh.] With Jesus there went to Capernaum ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ . . . αὐτοῦ. From the manner in which His brothers are here mentioned along with His mother the natural inference is that they were of the same father and probably of the same mother. At Capernaum no long stay was made, the reason being given in ver. 13, ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, the Passover was approaching, here called "of the Jews," either for the sake of Gentile readers or because the Christian Easter was sometimes called πάσχα, and John wished to distinguish it.—καὶ ἀνέβη . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς, the disciples also went, as appears from ver. 17. "Went *up*" because Jerusalem was the capital, and because of its height (2500 feet) above sea level. On these movements Prof. Sanday (*Fourth Gospel*, p. 53) makes the remark: "If it is all an artificial composition with a dogmatic object, why should the author carry his readers thus to Capernaum—for nothing? The apparent aimlessness of this statement seems to show that it came directly from a fresh and vivid recollection and not from any floating tradition."—Ver. 14. On reaching Jerusalem Jesus as a devout Jew visited the Temple καὶ εὗρεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, that is, in the outer court of the Temple, the court of the Gentiles.—τοὺς πωλοῦντας βόας καὶ πρόβατα καὶ περιστεράς, cattle and sheep and doves, the sacrificial animals. It was of course a great convenience to the worshippers to be able to procure on the spot all requisites for sacrifice. Some of them might not know what sacrifice was required for their particular offence, and though the priest at their own home might inform them, still the officiating examiner in the Temple might reject the animal they brought as unfit; and probably would, if it was his interest to have the worshippers buying on the spot. That enormous overcharges were sometimes made is shown by Edersheim, who relates that on one occasion Simeon, the grandson of Hillel, interfered and brought down the price of a pair of doves from a gold denar, 15s. 3d., to half a silver denar, or 4d. This Temple tyranny and monopoly and these exorbitant charges naturally tended to make the Temple worship hateful to the people; and besides, the old charm of sacrifice, the free offering by a penitent of what he knew and cherished, the animal that he valued because he had watched it from its birth, and had tested its value in the farm work—all this was abolished by this "convenient" abuse. That the abuse was habitual is shown by John Lightfoot, who quotes: "Veniens quadam die Bava Ben Buta in atrium, vacuum pecoribus illud reperit," as an extraordinary thing. It was not the presence of oxen and sheep which was offensive, for such animals must pass into the Temple with their usual accompaniments. But it was an aggravation to have these standing all day in the Temple, and to have the haggling and chaffering of a cattle market mingling with the sounds of prayer. But especially was it offensive to make the Temple service a hardship and an offence to the people of God. Not only were there those who provided sacrificial animals but also τοὺς κερματιστὰς καθημένους, money changers *seated*, at their tables, for a regular day's business—not a mere accidental or occasional furnishing with change of some poor man who had hitherto not been able to procure it.—κέρμα is a small coin, from κείρω, to cut short.—τὸ κέρμα used collectively in the next verse would be in Attic τὰ κέρματα.—κερματιστής is one who gives small change, a money changer (such as may be seen sitting on the open street at a table in Naples or elsewhere). In the

a With obj. in gen., Rom. x. 2. b Cp. Ps. lxix. 9.

16. καὶ τοῖς τὰς περιστερὰς πωλοῦσιν εἶπεν, "Ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν· μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου." 17. Ἐμνήσθησαν δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν, "Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ

fifteenth verse they are called κολλυβισταί, from κόλλυβος, a small coin, this again from κολοβός, docked, snipped short. Maimonides, quoted by Lücke, says the κόλλυβος was the small coin given to the money changer for exchanging a shekel into two half-shekels. The receiver of the change "dat ipsi aliquid superabundans," gives the changer something over and above, and this aliquid superabundans vocatur collybus. In fact the word was transliterated, and in the Hebrew characters was read "kolbon". This kolbon was about 2d., which was pretty high for providing the sacred half-shekel, which could alone be received into the Temple treasury and which every Jew had to pay. It was not only on the exchange of foreign money brought up to Palestine by Jews of the dispersion these money changers must have made a good percentage; but especially by exchanging the ordinary currency of Galilee and Judaea into the sacred half-shekel, which was the poll-tax or Temple tribute exacted from every Jew. This tax was either paid a week or two before Passover in the provinces or at the Passover in the Temple itself. To Jesus the usage seemed an intolerable abuse. καὶ ποιήσας φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων. φραγέλλιον is the Latin *flagellum*. Many commentators represent the matter as if Jesus made a whip of the *litter;* but John does not say ἐκ σχοίνων, "of rushes," but ἐκ σχοινίων, of ropes made of rushes. In the account of Paul's shipwreck (Acts xxvii. 32) σχοίνια are the ropes which held the boat to the ship; so that it is impossible on this ground to say with Dr. Whitelaw that "the whip could only have been designed as an emblem of authority". It is quite probable it was not used; as Bengel says: "neque dicitur hominibus ictum inflixisse; terrore rem perfecit".—πάντας ἐξέβαλεν. Holtzmann and Weiss consider that the following clause is epexegetical of the πάντας, as, grammatically, it is; and that πάντας therefore refers to the sheep and oxen, not to the men. In the Synoptical Gospels πάντας ἐξέβαλεν certainly refers to the men, and as the masculine is here retained it is difficult to refer it to the πρόβατα. After driving out the oxen and their owners, ἐξέχεε τὸ κέρμα καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέστρεψεν, or as W.H. read ἀνέτρεψεν.—τραπέζας were specifically "bankers' tables," hence τραπεζῖται, bankers, so that we might translate "counters". These He overturned, and poured the coin on the ground. We cannot evacuate of forcible meaning these plain terms. It was a scene of violence: the traders trying to protect their property, cattle rushing hither and thither, men shouting and cursing, the money changers trying to hold their tables as Jesus went from one to another upsetting them. It was indeed so violent a scene that the disciples felt somewhat scandalised until they remembered, then and there, not afterwards, that it was written: Ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεταί με, words which are found in the sixty-ninth Psalm, the aorist of the LXX being changed into the future. In ordinary Greek ἐσθίω has for its future ἔδομαι, but in Hellenistic Greek it has φάγομαι for its future. See Gen. iii. 3, Lk. xvii. 8. The disciples saw in their Master's act a consuming zeal for God's house. It was this zeal which always governed Christ. He could not stand by and wash His hands of other men's sins. It was this which brought Him to this world and to the cross. He had to interfere. It might have been expected that the words of Malachi would rather have been suggested to them, "The Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple: but who may abide the day of His coming? for He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver". Their interpretation of His act was suggested by His words: μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου. At His first visit to the Temple He had called it His Father's house. There is, no doubt, in the μου an appropriation from which others are excluded. He does not say "your Father's house" nor "our Father's," but "my Father's". In this word and in His action His Messiahship was implied, but *directly* the act and even the word were no more than a reforming prophet might have felt to be suitable. Weiss (*Life of Jesus*, ii., 6) says: "He felt Himself to be the Son of Him who in a unique way had consecrated this place for His temple, and He exercised the authority of a Son against the turmoil which defiled His Father's house. Those

οἴκου σου κατέφαγέ[1] με.' 18. Ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "[t]Τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς;" 19. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον,

t vi. 30. Mt. xii. 38 and xvi. 1. 1 Cor. i. 22.

[1] **καταφαγεται** in all uncials.

who looked deeper must ultimately have seen that the Messiah alone had a right to feel Himself in this sense the Chosen of Jehovah. As yet, however, there were no such observers. The followers by whom He was already surrounded did not require to deduce His Messiahship from this: they knew He was the Messiah." Make not my Father's house **οἶκον ἐμπορίου**. In Mk. xi. 17 the words are given as running, "Is it not written, My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer? but ye have made it a den of thieves"; which seems to be a combination of Is. lvi. 7, "Mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people," and Jer. vii. 11, "Is this house which is called by my name become a den of robbers in your eyes?" In the **οἶκος ἐμπορίου** there may be a reminiscence of Zech. xiv. 21.

At ver. 18 the cleft begins to open between faith and unbelief. In the act in which the disciples had seen the fulfilment of a Messianic Psalm, the Jews see only an unauthorised interference and assumption of authority. Characteristically they ask for a sign.—**οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι**, as frequent in John, means "the Jewish authorities"; and **ἀπεκρίθησαν** is used as elsewhere of a reply to what has been suggested or affirmed not by word but by deed.—**τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς; ὅτι** is used similarly in ix. 17 = **εἰς ἐκεῖνο ὅτι**. The blindness of the Jews is enough to put external evidence for ever out of repute. They never will see the sign in the thing itself. The fact that Jesus by one blow accomplished a much needed reform of an abuse over which devout men must often have sighed and which perhaps ingenuous Levites had striven to keep within limits, the fact that this unknown youth had done what none of the constituted authorities had been able to do, was surely itself the greatest **σημεῖον**. Might they not rather have said: Here is one who treats things radically, who does not leave grievances to mend themselves but effectively puts His hand to the work? But this blindness is characteristic. They never see that Jesus Himself is the great sign, but are always craving for some extraneous testimony. This Gospel throughout is an exhibition of the comparative value of external and internal evidence. To their request Jesus could not answer, "I am the Messiah". He wished that to be the people's discovery from their knowledge of Him. He therefore answers (ver. 19), **Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν**. The saying was meant to be enigmatical. Jesus spoke in parables when He wished to be understood by the spiritual and to baffle the hostile. Those who cross-question Him and treat Him as a subject to be investigated find no satisfaction. John tells us (ver. 21) that here He spoke of the "temple of His body". Bengel suggests that He may have indicated this, "adhibito nutu gestuve"; others suggest that He may have given such an emphasis to **τοῦτον** as to suggest what He intended; but this is excluded by ver. 22, which informs us that it was only after the resurrection that the disciples themselves understood what was meant. Those who heard considered it an idle challenge which He knew could not be put to the proof. He knew they would not destroy their unfinished Temple. His words then had one meaning for Himself; another for those who heard. For Himself they meant: 'Destroy this body of mine in which dwells the Father and I will raise it in three days". He said this, knowing they would not now understand Him, but that this would be the great sign of His authority. Paul refers the resurrection of Christ to the Father or to the Spirit; John here, as in x. 17, 18, refers it directly to Christ Himself.

Holtzmann suggests, as had previously been suggested by others, that "to do anything in three days" merely meant to do it quickly. Reference is made to Hos. vi. 2, Mt. xiii. 40. This may be. Holtzmann further maintains that such an announcement as Jesus is here represented as making was impossible at so early a period of the ministry, that it must have been uttered on some other occasion and have been inserted here to suit John's purpose. The origin of the expression he finds in the Pauline-Alexandrian conception of the body as the temple of God. If this was believed

u Of building; see Kypke, *in loc.*
v Col. ii. 9. 1 Cor. iii. 16.
w i. 12.

καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ᵘ ἐγερῶ αὐτόν." 20. Εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, "Τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν ᾠκοδομήθη ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, καὶ σὺ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερεῖς αὐτόν;" 21. Ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἔλεγε περὶ ᵛ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. 22. ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς[1]· καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 23. ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχα, ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν ʷ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα

[1] Omit αυτοις with ℵABL it. vulg.

of ordinary men much more must that body be the temple in which dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (Col. ii. 9).

That the saying itself was historical is put beyond doubt by its quotation at the trial of Jesus, Mk. xiv. 58; *cf.* xv. 29. There were those who had heard Him say that He would destroy the Temple; which gives this saying with just the kind of misunderstanding and perversion one would expect. But if the saying itself is historical, can Jesus have meant anything else by it than John tells us He meant? That He considered His body the Temple of God goes without saying.

It is indeed extremely unlikely that Jesus should at the very beginning of His ministry have spoken of His death and resurrection *openly*. Hence even Weiss seems to think that the words meant: Destroy this Temple, as you are doing by allowing such abuses in it, prohibit me from those reforms on the Temple which can alone save it, and eventually this Temple must be completely destroyed, its purpose gone, and its services extinct. But I will in its place raise a spiritual temple, the living Church. But if already Jesus had thought out the Messianic career, then He already was sure both that He would die and that He would rise again. Being in perfect fellowship with the living God He knew that He must be hated of men, and He knew that He could never fall from that fellowship but must conquer death. At no time then after His baptism and temptation could it be impossible to Him to speak covertly as here of His death and resurrection. On this point see Schwartzkopff, *Die Weissagungen Christi*.

Ver. 20. The Jews naturally saw no reference to His own body or to its resurrection, and replied to the letter of His words, τεσσεράκοντα. . . . The Temple was begun to be rebuilt in the eighteenth year of Herod's reign, that is the autumn of 734-735. In Jewish reckoning the beginning of a year was reckoned one year. Thus forty-six years might bring us to the autumn of 779 and the Passover of 780, *i.e.*, 27 A.D. would be regarded as forty-six years from the rebuilding; and this is Edersheim's calculation. But several accurate chronologists think the following year is meant.

The Synoptical Gospels insert a similar incident at the close of Christ's ministry, and there alone. Harmonists accordingly understand that the Temple was twice cleansed by Him. "Bis ergo Christus templum . . . purgavit" (Calvin). It is easy to find reasons for such action either at the beginning or at the close of the ministry. On the whole it seems more appropriate at the beginning. The Messiah might be expected to manifest Himself at the Temple.

The next paragraph extends from ii. 23 to iii. 21, and contains (1) a brief description of the general result of Christ's manifestation in Jerusalem (ii. 23-25), and (2) a longer description of an instance of the kind of faith and inquiry which were produced by this manifestation and of the manner in which Christ met it.—Ver. 23. Time, place, and circumstance are again given, ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ. The last clause is added with a reference to ver. 13. Then the feast was near, now it had arrived. We are to hear what happened while Jesus resided in Jerusalem *during the feast*.—πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, which can scarcely mean less than that they believed He was the Messiah. Nicodemus, however, seems willing only to admit He is "a teacher come from God". Their belief was founded on the miracles they saw.—θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει, seeing day by day the signs He was doing, and of which John relates none. This faith, resting on miracles, is in this Gospel never commended as the highest kind of faith,

αὐτοῦ, θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει. 24. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ [x] ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας· 25. καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν [y] ἵνα τὶς μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ [z] ἐγίνωσκε τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

III. 1. ἮΝ δὲ [a] ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδημος [b] ὄνομα αὐτῷ, ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 2. οὗτος ἦλθε πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν [1] [c] νυκτὸς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ῥαββὶ, οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος· [d] οὐδεὶς γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα δύναται ποιεῖν ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς,

x Lk. xvi. 11, etc. y xvi. 30; see Burton, 216. z 1 Sam. xvi. 7. 2 Sam. xiv. 17. Mt. ix. 4. a = τις, Mt. xvii. 14, etc.; with τις, Mt. xviii. 12. Jo. v. 5; cp. Thayer. b Job i. 1; cp. Ch. i. 6. c vii. 50; xix. 39. d vii. 31; ix. 31.

[1] T.R. in EFGH. **αυτον** in ℵABKL, etc.

although it is by no means despised. It is what Luther calls "milk faith" and may grow into something more trustworthy. Accordingly, although Jesus had at once committed Himself to the men who were attracted without miracle by His personality and the testimony of the Baptist, to these **αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν**, "Jesus on His part did not commit Himself". It is necessary to consider not only whether we have faith in Christ but whether Christ has faith in us. Thoroughgoing confidence must always be reciprocal. Christ will commit Himself to the man who thoroughly commits himself to Him. The reason of this reserve is given in a twofold expression: positive, **διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας**, "because He Himself knew all men"; negative, **καὶ ὅτι οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν ἵνα τὶς μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου**, "and because He had no need that any one should witness concerning man". Holtzmann, following Winer, thinks that the article is inserted because reference is made to the individual with whom Jesus had on each occasion to do. This seems quite unnecessary. **ὁ ἄνθρωπος** is here, as in A.V., "man," the ordinary generic use of the article. The reason for this again is given in the closing words, **αὐτὸς γὰρ** . . . "For He Himself knew what was in man," knew human nature, the motives, governing ideas, and ways of man. This knowledge was not supernatural. Westcott has an important note on this point, in which he points out that John describes the knowledge of Jesus "both as relative, acquired (**γινώσκειν**) and absolute, possessed (**εἰδέναι**)". Each constitutes a higher degree of the kind of knowledge found among men. Reynolds says: "There are many other indications of this thought mastery, which the evangelists appear to regard as proofs of divine power; so that I think the real significance of the passage is an ascription to Jesus of Divine power. The supernatural in mind, the superhuman mental processes of Jesus, are part of the proof we have that though He was man He created the irresistible impression that He was more than man."

CHAPTER III. Vv. 1-21. *A specimen is given of the kind of belief produced in the Jews of Jerusalem and of the manner in which Jesus dealt with it.*—**ἦν δὲ ἄνθρωπος**, the Syriac adds "there," *i.e.*, at Jerusalem. **ἄνθρωπος** is simply equivalent to **τις**, and does not point back to the **ἄνθρωπος** of the preceding verse. He is described as **ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων** that we may the better understand what follows. He belonged to that party which with all its bigotry contained a salt of true patriotism and could rear such cultured and high-toned men as Gamaliel and Paul. It is a mistake to suppose that all who belong to a mischievous party in a Church are themselves mischievous: it is also a mistake to ascribe without inquiry the goodness of individuals to the influence of their party.—**Νικόδημος ὄνομα αὐτῷ**. Many Jews had now Greek names. Lightfoot quotes from the Talmud passages which show that a certain Bonai surnamed Nicodemus was a disciple of Jesus, and that he lived through the destruction of Jerusalem, but lost in it all his wealth. He is, however, very doubtful whether this is the Nicodemus of this passage. He is further described as **ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων**, a member of the Sanhedrim. See vii. 50, where he appears in the Sanhedrim. Lk. xiv. 1 speaks of one **τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν Φαρισαίων**. See also Lk. xviii. 18, viii. 41; Mt. ix. 18.—Ver. 2. **οὗτος ἦλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν**. The pronoun instead of the name Jesus, as Holtzmann remarks, shows the close connection with the closing verses of the last chapter. Nicodemus came to the fountain head, dissatisfied with the way in which his colleagues were dealing with Jesus, and

[e] Acts vii. 9; x. 38. 1 Kings x. 10. [f] Gal. vi. 15. 1 Pet. i. 23.

ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ὁ Θεὸς [e] μετ' αὐτοῦ." 3. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, [f] ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ

resolved to judge for himself. Nothing could be more hopeful than such a state of mind. When a man says, I will see for myself what Jesus is, not influenced by what other men say; before I sleep I will settle this matter, the result is fairly certain to be good. See chap. vii. 50, xix. 39. He came νυκτὸς, certainly with the purpose of secrecy, and yet for a man in his position to come at all was much. No timidity is shown in vii. 50. In xix. 39 John still identifies him as "he that came to Jesus by night," but adds "at the first" in contrast to the courage he afterwards showed. Similarly, as Grotius tells us, Euclid of Megara visited Socrates by night when Athens was closed by edict against the Megarians. Modestly and as if not presuming to speak as an individual but as representing a party however small (ii. 32), he says, Ῥαββεί οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας διδάσκαλος, "Rabbi, we know that Thou art come from God as a teacher". We need not see in the words anything either patronising or flattering, but merely the natural first utterance of a man wishing to show the state of his mind. He was convinced that Jesus was a divinely commissioned teacher. He came to hear what He had to teach. His teaching, in the judgment of Nicodemus, was divinely authenticated by the miracles; but to Nicodemus at any rate the teaching was that for which the miracles existed. They were σημεῖα, and though not recorded, they must have been of a kind to strike a thoughtful mind ταῦτα τὰ σημεῖα ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς, the emphatic pronoun, as if other miracles might not have been so convincing. At the same time the reply of Jesus shows that behind this cautious designation of "teacher" there lay in the mind of Nicodemus a suspicion that this might be the Messiah. Nicodemus may have taken to heart the Baptist's proclamation. Grotius supposes the conversation is abridged, and that Nicodemus had intimated that he wished to learn something about the kingdom which formed the subject of our Lord's teaching. "Responsio tacite innuit, quod adjectum a Nicodemo fuerat, nempe, velle se scire, quandoquidem Jesus *Regni coelestis* inter docendum mentionem saepe faceret, quae ratio esset eo perveniendi." But with the introduction to this incident (ii. 23-25) in our mind, it seems gratuitous to suppose that part of the conversation is here omitted. Jesus speaks to the intention and mental attitude of His interlocutor rather than to his words. He saw that Nicodemus was conceiving it as a possible thing that these miracles might be the signs of the kingdom; and in this visit of Nicodemus He sees what may be construed into an overture from the Pharisaic party. And so He cuts Nicodemus remorselessly short. As when the Pharisees (Lk. xvii. 20) demand of Him when the Kingdom of God should come, He replied: The Kingdom of God cometh *not with observation*, not with signs which the natural man can measure, it comes within you; so here in strikingly similar language He says, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. This allusion to the kingdom, which is not a favourite idea of John's, is one of the incidental marks of his historical trustworthiness.—ἄνωθεν is sometimes local = ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, from above; sometimes temporal = ἐξ ἀρχῆς, *de novo*. The former meaning is advocated here by Baur, Lücke, Meyer, and others. But the use of παλιγγενεσία and the difficulty stated by Nicodemus in ver. 4 rather indicate that the Syriac and Vulgate [nisi quis renatus fuerit], Augustine, Calvin, and among many others Weiss are right in adopting the temporal meaning and rendering with R.V. "anew". [Wetstein, in proof of this meaning, quotes from Artemidorus, who tells of a father who dreamt that there was born to him a child exactly like himself; "he seemed," he says, "to be born a second time," ἄνωθεν. And in the touching story which gave rise to the *Domine quo vadis* Church at Rome where Peter met Christ, the words of the Lord, as given in the Acta Pauli, are ἄνωθεν μέλλω σταυρωθῆναι.] The answer of Nicodemus might seem to indicate that he had understood ἄνωθεν as equivalent to his own δεύτερον. But it is impossible to determine with certainty which is the correct meaning. A man must be born again, says our Lord, because otherwise οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Is ἰδεῖν here to be taken in the sense of "seeing" or of "enjoying," "partaking"? Meyer and Weiss, resting on

δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν [g] βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ." 4. Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Νικόδημος, "Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὤν; μὴ δύναται εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ δεύτερον εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γεννηθῆναι;" 5. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ [h] ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς

g Only here and ver. 5 in John. ἡ β. ἡ ἐμή in xviii. 36.
h Mk. i. 8. Ezek. xxxvi. 25.

such expressions as ἰδεῖν θάνατον (Lk. ii. 26, Heb. xi. 5), διαφθοράν (Acts ii. 27), ἡμέρας ἀγαθάς (1 Pet. iii. 10), understand that "participation" is meant. So Calvin, "*videre* regnum Dei idem valet ac ingredi in regnum Dei," and Grotius, "participem fieri". Confirmation of this view is at first sight given by the εἰσελθεῖν of ver. 5. But it is of "signs" Nicodemus has been speaking, of observing the kingdom coming; and Christ says: To see the kingdom you must be spiritual, born anew, for the signs are spiritual. In this *language* there should have been nothing to stumble Nicodemus. All Jerusalem was ringing with the echoes of the Baptist's preaching, the essence of which was "ye must be born again". To be children of Abraham is nothing. There is nothing moral, nothing spiritual, nothing of the will, nothing related to the Kingdom of God in being children of Abraham. As regards your fleshly birth you are as passive as stones and as truly outside the kingdom. In fact John had excommunicated the whole nation, and expressly told them that they must submit to baptism, like Gentile proselytes, if they were to be prepared for the Messiah's reign. The language may not have puzzled Nicodemus. Had our Lord said: "Every Gentile must be born again," he would have understood. It is the idea that staggers him. His bewilderment he utters in the words:—Ver. 4. πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος γεννηθῆναι γέρων ὤν; μὴ δύναται, etc. In this reply there is no attempt to fence with Jesus, but merely an expression of the bewilderment created by His statement. The emphasis is on πῶς, which asks for further explanation. The μὴ of the second clause shows that Nicodemus understood that Jesus could not mean a second physical birth (see Lücke). On γέρων ὤν Grotius remarks: "Exemplum in se ponit, qui senex jam erat". That our Lord understood Nicodemus' words as a request for further explanation appears from His at once proceeding to give it.—Ver. 5. Ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν β. To remove as far as possible the difficulty of Nicodemus as to the πῶς of the second birth our Lord declares that the two great factors in it are "water" and "spirit". Calvin thinks this is a ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, and that the two names cover one reality. "Spiritum et aquam pro eodem posuit." "*Aqua* nihil aliud est quam interior Spiritus sancti purgatio et vegetatio." And he defends this by a reference to the Baptist's announcement that the Messiah would baptise with the spirit and fire. Grotius takes the same line, but cautiously adds: "Si quis tamen malit ista decernere, ut *aqua* significet mali fugam, *spiritus* vero impetum ad optima quaeque agenda, inveniet quo hanc sententiam fulciet". Lk. (vii. 30) tells us that the Pharisees, to whom belonged Nicodemus, were not baptised of John; their reason being that to submit to the same rite as Gentiles and acknowledge the insufficiency of their Jewish birth was a humiliation they could not suffer. To receive the Spirit from the Messiah was no humiliation; on the contrary, it was a glorious privilege. But to go down into Jordan before a wondering crowd and own their need of cleansing and new birth was too much. Therefore to this Pharisee our Lord declares that an honest dying to the past is as needrul as new life for the future. To be born of the Spirit involves a dying to the past, and therefore it is only the Spirit that is spoken of in the subsequent verses; but it is essential that our past be recognised as needing cleansing and forgiveness. These two factors, water and spirit, are not strictly co-ordinate. Water is not an actual spiritual agency in the second birth; it is only a symbol. But in every true second birth there is a negative as well as a positive side, a renunciation of the past as well as a new life created. The same idea is found in Titus iii. 3-5, "We were [of the flesh] but He saved us by the bath of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Ghost". The same combination is found in Ezek. xxxvi. 25-27, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols

τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 6. [i] τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς, σάρξ ἐστι· καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος, πνεῦμά ἐστι. 7. μὴ θαυμάσῃς [j] ὅτι εἶπόν σοι, Δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν. 8. τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ, καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν [k] ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶ πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος." 9. Ἀπεκρίθη Νικόδημος καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Πῶς δύναται

i 1 Cor. ii. 12. Gal. v. 16.
j iv. 27. Lk. xi. 38. Gal. i. 6; with εἰ Mk. xv. 44 and 1 Jo. iii. 13.
k pres. indic. Burton, 313.

will I cleanse you. A new heart *also* will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." The water, then, is considered as that which cleanses from sin: the Spirit as the principle of the new life.—Ver. 6. The necessity of the new birth is further exhibited by a comparison of the first and second birth: **τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς, σάρξ ἐστι· καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος, πνεῦμά ἐστι.** The neuter is used because the speaker "wishes to make His statement altogether general" (Winer, 27, 5), whatever is born. The law is laid down in Aristotle (Eth. Maj., i., 10), "Every nature generates its own substance," flesh, flesh; spirit, spirit.—Ver. 7. Therefore it was no cause for wonder that a new birth was required for entrance into the spiritual kingdom. The argument implies that natural birth produces only **σάρξ**, not spirit. By his natural birth man is an animal, with a nature fitting him to live in the material world in which he finds himself and with capacities for spiritual life in a spiritual world. These capacities may or may not be developed. If they are developed, the Spirit of God is the Agent, and the change wrought by their development may fitly be called a new birth, because it gives a man entrance into a new world and imparts new life to live in it. (*Cf.* the second birth and second life of many insects.)—Ver. 8. **τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ.** Two renderings of these words are possible: "The wind bloweth where it listeth," as in A.V.; "The Spirit breatheth where He will," as in margin of R.V. By the one rendering a comparison is instituted between the unseen but powerful operation of the Spirit in regeneration and the invisible but mighty power of the wind. You hear the voice of the wind but cannot see where it comes from nor where it goes to. So in the new birth the Spirit moves and works unseen. Similarly Socrates (Xen., *Mem.*, iv., 3) says: The thunder as it comes and goes is not seen: the winds also are invisible though their effects are manifest; the soul of man is itself unseen, therefore despise not the unseen but honour God. In favour of the other rendering it may be urged that there is nothing to warn us that we are now to understand that by the word **πνεῦμα** "wind" is meant. It occurs about 370 times in the N.T., and never means "wind" except once in a quotation from the O.T. The Vulgate renders "Spiritus ubi vult spirat," and if we could not only say "expire," "inspire," but also "spire," the best translation might be "the Spirit spires". As this cannot be, we may render: "The Spirit breathes where He will," that is to say, there is no limitation of His power to certain individuals, classes, races. *Cf.* v. 21, **ὁ υἱὸς οὓς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ.** The thought here is similar: there need be no despair regarding the second birth: the Spirit breathes where He will. So Bengel, "*Spiritus*, proprie, nam huic, non vento voluntas et vox est".—**καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις**, the Spirit makes Himself audible in articulate and intelligible sounds. The breathing of the Spirit is like man's breath, not mere air, but articulated and significant voice. The Spirit works intelligible results. He does not roar like the wind and toss men in unavailing contortions as the wind tosses the trees. It is a voice and the result is full of reason, in harmony with human nature and vivifying it to higher life. But for all this, **οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει**, you cannot observe and regulate the Spirit's approach and departure.—**οὕτως ἐστὶ πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος**, thus it is in the case of every one who is born of the Spirit. You cannot see the process of regeneration; the process is secret and invisible, the results are apparent.—Ver. 9. This explanation did not satisfy Nicodemus. He falls back upon his bewilderment, **πῶς δύναται ταῦτα γενέσθαι;** This question stirs Jesus to a fuller explanation, which is reported in vv. 10-15.—Ver. 10. He opens with an exclamation of surprise, **Σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις;** perhaps there is more of

ταῦτα γενέσθαι;" 10. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ [l] διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις; 11. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτι ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν, καὶ ὃ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν· καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε. 12. εἰ τὰ [m] ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς, ἐὰν εἴπω ὑμῖν τὰ [n] ἐπουράνια, πιστεύσετε; 13. καὶ [o] οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [p] καταβὰς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ [1]·

l Rom. ii. 20.
m 1 Cor. xv. 40. 2 Cor. v. 1. Phil. iii. 19.
n 1 Cor. xv. 48. Phil. ii. 10.
o Deut. xxx. 12. Baruch iii. 29. Prov. xxx. 4.
p vi. 33, 38.

[1] **ο ων εν τω ουρανω** is found in ΑΓΔ vet. Lat. vulg. syr., but is omitted in ℵBL 33 memph. Cyr.-Alex.

sadness than either of indignation or irony in the words. Is this the state of matters I have to confront? If the teacher is so obtuse what must the taught be? The presence of the article is usually taken as indicating that Nicodemus was recognised as a great teacher, perhaps held the official position of Chakam in the Sanhedrim. But Westcott is right: "the definite article marks the official relation of Nicodemus to the people generally". It is used to bring out sharply, not the relation he held to other teachers, but the relation he held to the people. "Art thou the *teacher* of Israel and knowest not these things?" Bad enough for an Israelite to be blind to such things, but how much worse for one who teaches! But should a teacher of Israel have known these things? Westcott overleaps the difficulty by saying that **γινώσκεις** refers to the knowledge of perception, and that Jesus is surprised that Nicodemus should not have been able during this conversation to apprehend what was said.—Ver. 11. **ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν . . . οὐ λαμβάνετε.** From this point dialogue ceases, and we have now an unbroken utterance of Jesus. It starts with a certification of the truth of what Nicodemus had professed himself unable to understand.—**ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν.** Why plural? Were the disciples present and are they included? Or does it mean Jesus and the prophets, or Jesus and the Baptist, or Jesus and the Father, or is it the rhetorical "we"? Possibly it is merely an unconscious transition to the plural, as in this same verse the **σοι** of the first clause becomes a plural in **λαμβάνετε** in the last clause. Or there may be an indefinite identification of Himself with all who had apprehended the nature of the new birth—the Baptist and the best of his disciples. Jesus does not wish to represent Himself as alone able to testify of such matters. Weiss' view is peculiar. He thinks that the contents of the **μαρτυροῦμεν** consist of what John and Jesus saw at the Baptism, when the Spirit's descent indicated Jesus as the Baptiser with the Spirit.—Ver. 12. **εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια . . . πιστεύσετε;** The reference of **τὰ ἐπίγεια** is fixed by the **εἶπον ὑμῖν.** They are such things as Jesus had been speaking of: things verified in human, earthly experience, the necessity of a spiritual birth and the results of it. Regeneration was a change made in this earthly life. The kingdom of regenerate men was to be established on earth, as apprehensible in certain of its aspects as the kingdom Nicodemus was proposing to found. The **ἐπουράνια** are matters not open to human observation, matters wholly in the unseen, the nature and purposes of God. *Cf.* the remarkable parallel in Wisd. ix. 16. —Ver. 13. **καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν . . . καταβάς.** The connection is: You have not believed earthly things, much less will you believe those which are heavenly; for not only are they in their own nature more difficult to understand, but there is none to testify of them save only that One who came down out of heaven. The sentence may be paraphrased thus: No one has gone up to heaven and by dwelling there gained a knowledge of the heavenly things: One only has dwelt there and is able to communicate that knowledge—He, *viz.*, who has come down from heaven. "Presence in heaven" is considered to be the ground and qualification for communicating trustworthy information regarding "heavenly things". Direct knowledge and personal experience of heavenly things alone justify authoritative declarations about them; as in earthly things one may expect to be believed if he can say, "we speak that we do know and testify that we have seen". But this "presence in heaven" Jesus declares to be the qualification exclusively of one

q Num. xxi. 9. r viii. 28; xii. 32.

14. καὶ q καθὼς Μωσῆς ὕψωσε τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, r οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου· 15. ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ'[1] ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 16. οὕτω γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν

[1] μη απολητai αλλ omitted in ℵBL 1, 33 vet. Lat.

person. This person He describes as "He that came down out of heaven," adding as a further description "the Son of Man" [who is in heaven]. This description identifies this person as Jesus Himself. He claims therefore to have a unique qualification for the declaration of truth about heavenly things, and this qualification consists in this, that He and He alone has had direct perception of heavenly things. He has been in heaven. By "heaven" it is not a locality that is indicated, but that condition which is described in the prologue as πρὸς τὸν Θεόν. And when He speaks of coming down out of heaven He can only mean manifesting Himself to those who are on that lower level from which they had not been able to ascend to the knowledge of heavenly things. In short, we have here the basis in Christ's own words of the statement in the prologue that the Word was in the beginning with God, and became flesh to be a light to men. Why is ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου introduced? It identifies the person spoken of, and it suggests that He who alone had the knowledge of heavenly things now wore human nature, was accessible, and was there for the purpose of communicating this knowledge. The words added in the T.R., ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, affirm that although He had come out of heaven He was still in it, and they show that a condition of being, not a locality, was meant by "heaven".—Ver. 14. If the Son of Man alone has this knowledge, how is it to be disseminated and become a light to all men? This is answered in the words, καὶ καθὼς Μωσῆς . . . τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [modern editors read Μωυσῆς; so also in LXX]. The emphatic word is ὕψωσε. When Moses made the brazen serpent, he did not secrete it in his tent and admit a few selected persons to view it, but ὕψωσε τὸν ὄφιν, gave it an elevation at which all might see it. So must the Son of Man, the bearer of heavenly light and healing, ὑψωθῆναι, that all may see Him. The "lifting up" of the Son of Man is interpreted in xii. 33 to mean His lifting up on the cross. It was this which drew human observation and human homage. The cross is the throne of Christ. In the phrase δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι the aorist is used in accordance with Greek usage by which an aorist infinitive is employed to express the action of the verb even though future after verbs signifying to hope, to expect, to promise, and such like. Thus *Iph. in Aul.*, 462, οἶμαι γάρ νιν ἱκετεύσαι, where Markland needlessly changes the aorist into the future. Nicodemus could not see the significance with which these words were filled by the crucifixion. What would be suggested to him by the comparison of the Messiah with the brazen serpent might be something like this: The Son of Man is to be lifted up. Yes, but not on a throne in Herod's palace. He was to be conspicuous, but as the brazen serpent had been conspicuous, hanging on a pole for the healing of the people. His elevation was certain, but it was an elevation by no mere official appointment, or popular recognition, or hereditary right, but by plumbing the depths of human degradation in truest self-sacrifice. There is no royal road to human excellence, and Jesus reached the height He attained by no blare of heralds' trumpets or flaunting of banners or popular acclaim, but by being subjected to the keenest tests by which character can be searched, by passing through the ordeal of human life in this world, and by being found the best, the one only perfectly faithful servant of God and man.—Ver. 15. The words μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' of the T.R. are omitted by Tisch., W.H., and R.V. Further, the same editors replace the words εἰς αὐτὸν by ἐν αὐτῷ, and the R.V. translates "that whosoever believeth may in Him have eternal life," in accordance with Johannine usage, which does not support the rendering "believeth in Him". This is the object to be accomplished by the "elevation" of the Son of Man, *viz.*, that whoever, Jew or Gentile, believes that there is life in Him that is thus exalted, may have life eternal.—Ver. 16. Several conservative theologians,

αἰώνιον. 17. οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ. 18. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται· ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι [s] μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 19. [t] αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος, ἢ τὸ φῶς·

[s] Exceptional constr.; see Burton, 474; Winer, 594, 602.
[t] 1 Jo. v. 11.

Neander, Tholuck, Westcott, are of opinion that the words of Jesus end with ver. 15, and that from vv. 16-21 we have an addition by the evangelist. There is much to be said in favour of this idea. The thoughts of these verses are explanatory rather than progressive. Vv. 16 and 17 repeat the object of Christ's mission, which has already been stated. Vv. 18 and 19 declare the historic results in faith and unbelief, results which at the date of the conversation were not conspicuous. Vv. 20 and 21 exhibit the causes of faith and unbelief. The tenses also forbid us to refer the passage directly to Jesus. In His lips the present would have been more natural. To John looking back on the finished story aorists and perfects are natural. Also, the designation "only begotten son" is not one of the names by which Jesus designates Himself, but it is used by the evangelist, i. 18 and 1 John iv. 9.—**οὕτω γὰρ ἠγάπησεν . . . ζωὴν αἰώνιον.** The love of God for the world of men is the source of Christ's mission with all its blessings. It was this which prompted Him to "give," that is, to give not solely to the death of the cross alluded to in ver. 14, but to all that the world required for salvation, His only begotten Son. "The change from the aorist (**ἀπόληται**) to the present (**ἔχῃ**) is to be noted, the utter ruin being spoken of as an act, the possession of life eternal as an enduring experience" (Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann).—Ver. 17. **οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν . . . δι' αὐτοῦ.** For whatever the result of Christ's coming has been, in revealing a love of sin and bringing heavier judgment on men, this was not God's purpose in sending His Son. The Jewish idea was that the Messiah would come "to judge," *i.e.*, to condemn the world.—**κρίνω** and **κατακρίνω**, though originally distinct, are in the N.T. sometimes identical in meaning, the result of judgment so commonly being condemnation; *cf. crime.* But although the result is judgment, the bringing to light a distinction among men and the resulting condemnation of many, yet the object was **ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος**. John repeats his favourite word **κόσμος** three times in this verse that there may be no possibility of missing his point, that so far as God's purpose was concerned, it was one of unmixed love, that all men might be saved. The emphasis was probably due to the ordinary Messianic expectation which limited and misrepresented the love of God. Westcott remarks on this verse: "The sad realities of present experience cannot change the truth thus made known, however little we may be able to understand in what way it will be accomplished". It might on similar grounds be argued that because God wills that all men be holy in this life, all men are holy.—Ver. 18. **ὁ πιστεύων . . . τοῦ θεοῦ.** Expansion of previous verse. God sent His Son not to judge but to save; and whoso accepts the Son and His revelation is not judged. It is no longer "every Jew," nor "every one chosen by God," but every one that believeth. All here is spiritual. Although judgment was not the object it is the necessary result of Christ's presence in the world. But it is a judgment very different from that which the Jews expected. It is determined by the attitude towards Christ, and this again, as afterwards shown, is determined by the moral condition of the individual.—**ὁ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται,** "he that believeth not is already judged": not only is left under the curse of his own evil actions; but, as the next clause shows, lies under the condemnation of not believing.—**ἤδη κέκριται,** he is already judged: it is not some future assize he doubtfully awaits and which may or may not convict. He *is* judged, and on a ground which to John seems to indicate monstrous depravity, **ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν . . . τοῦ θεοῦ.** Not to perceive the glory of this august Being whom John so adored, not to receive the revelation made by the Only Begotten, is proof not merely of human infirmity and passion, but of wickedness chosen and preferred in presence of revealed goodness.—Ver. 19. This is further explained in the following, **αὕτη . . . τὸ φῶς.** The ground of the con-

u Prov. xxii. 8. Eph. v. 13.
v Tobit xiii. 6.

ἦν γὰρ πονηρὰ αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα. 20. πᾶς γὰρ ὁ [u] φαῦλα πράσσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς, καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· 21. ὁ δὲ [v] ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι ἐν Θεῷ ἐστιν εἰργασμένα."

demnation lies precisely in this, that since the coming of Christ and His exhibition of human life in the light of the holiness and love of the Father, human sin is no longer the result of ignorance, but of deliberate choice and preference. Nothing can be done for a man who says, "Evil, be thou my good". The reason of this preference of darkness and rejection of Christ is that the life is evil, ἦν γὰρ κ. τ. λ.—Ver. 20. The principle is explained in this verse. Underlying the action of men towards Christ during His historical manifestation was a general law: a law which operates wherever men are similarly invited to walk in the light. The law which governs the acceptance or refusal of light is given in the words πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα . . . ἔργα αὐτοῦ. φαῦλος, originally "poor," "paltry," "ugly"; οἱ φαῦλοι, "the vulgar," "the common sort". In Polybius, φαῦλα πλοία, πολιτεία φαῦλα, badly constructed; φαῦλος ἡγεμών, a foolish general, and in xvii. 15, 15 it is opposed to deliberate wickedness. Dull, senseless viciousness seems to be denoted. Here and in ver. 29 πράσσειν is used with φαῦλα, and ποιεῖν in the next verse with ἀλήθειαν, on which Bengel remarks: "Malitia est irrequieta; est quiddam operosius quam veritas. Hinc verbis diversis notantur". Where a distinction is intended, πράσσειν expresses the reiterative putting forth of activities to bring something to pass, ποιεῖν the actual production of what is aimed at. Hence there is a slight hint of the busy fruitlessness of vice. Paul, as well as John, uses πράσσειν, in certain passages, of evil actions. The person thus defined μισεῖ τὸ φῶς, "hates the light," instead of delighting in it, καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, and does not bring himself within its radiance, does not seek to use it for his own enlightenment; ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, "lest his works be convicted" and so put to shame. According to John there is moral obliquity at the root of all refusal of Christ. Obviously there is, if Christ be considered simply as "light". To refuse the ideal he presents is to prefer darkness.—Ver. 21. ὁ δὲ ποιῶν . . . "On the other hand, he who does the truth" . . . This is one of John's comprehensive phrases which perhaps lose by definition. "To do the truth" is at any rate to live up to what one knows; to live an honest, conscientious life. John implies that men of this type are to be found where the light of Christ has not dawned: but when it dawns they hail it with joy. He that doeth the truth comes to the light that his deeds may be manifested, ὅτι ἐν Θεῷ ἐστιν εἰργασμένα. Is ὅτι expressive of a fact or declarative of a reason? Must we translate "manifested, that they are," etc., or "manifested, because they are," etc.? The R.V. has "that" in the text, and "because" in the margin. Godet and Westcott prefer the former; Lücke, Meyer, Weiss and Weizsäcker the latter. It is not easy to decide between the two. On the whole, the latter interpretation is to be preferred. This clause gives the reason of the willingness shown by the man to have his deeds made manifest: and thus it balances the clause ἦν γὰρ πονηρὰ αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα, which gives the reason for evil doers shunning the light. He who does the truth is not afraid of the light, but rather seeks increased light because his deeds have been done ἐν Θεῷ; that is, he has not been separated from God by them, but has done what he has done because he conceived that to be the will of God. Where such light as exists has been conscientiously used, more is sought, and welcomed when it comes. "Plato was like a man shut into a vault, running hither and thither, with his poor flickering Taper, agonizing to get forthe, and holding himself in readinesse to make a spring forward the moment a door should open. But it never did. 'Not manie wise are called.' He had clomb a Hill in the Darke, and stood calling to his companions below, 'Come on, come on, this way lies the East: I am avised we shall see the sun rise anon'. But they never did. What a Christian he would have made. Ah! he is one now. He and Socrates, the veil long removed from their eyes, are sitting at Jesus' feet. Sancte Socrates, ora pro nobis" (Erasmus to More in *Sir T. More's Household*). Holtzmann quotes from Hausrath: "As a magnet attracts the metal while the dead stone lies unmoved: so are the children of God drawn

22. Μετὰ ταῦτα ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν [w] Ἰουδαίαν γῆν. καὶ ἐκεῖ διέτριβε μετ᾽ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐβάπτιζεν. 23. ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνὼν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλεὶμ, ὅτι [x] ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ· καὶ παρεγίνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο. 24. [y] οὔπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν ὁ Ἰωάννης. 25. Ἐγένετο οὖν ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετὰ Ἰουδαίων[1] περὶ καθαρισμοῦ· 26. καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ῥαββὶ, ὃς ἦν μετὰ σοῦ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, ἴδε οὗτος

w Adj. with γῇ here and in Mk. i. 5 only. Cp. Acts xvi. 1; xxiv. 24.

x Ps. xxxii. 6. Nah. i. 12. Rev. i. 15.

y Mt. iv. 12; xiv. 3.

[1] Ιουδαιου in ℵcABL, adopted by T.Tr.W.H.R.

by the Logos and come to the Light". *Cf.* chap. xviii. 37.

Vv. 22-36. *The ministry of Jesus in Judaea after He left Jerusalem.* This falls into three parts: (1) a brief account of the movements and success of Jesus and the Baptist which provoked a comparison between them, 22-26; (2) the Baptist's acceptance of the contrast and final testimony to Jesus, 27-30; (3) the expansion by the evangelist of the Baptist's words, 31-36.—Ver. 22. **μετὰ ταῦτα**, subsequent to the ministry in Jerusalem Jesus and His disciples came **εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν**, "into the Judaean country," the rural parts in contradistinction to the metropolis. "Nam quum ex Judaeae metropoli exiret Jesus, non poterat simpliciter dici proficisci in Judaeam; . . . maluimus ergo territorium convertere quam terram," Beza. So in Josh. viii. 1 (Codex Ambrosianus), "I have given into thy hand the King of Gai **καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ**". *Cf.* also John xi. 54.—**καὶ ἐκεῖ διέτριβεν**, "and there He spent some time with them"; whether weeks or months depends on the interpretation of iv. 35.—**καὶ ἐβάπτιζεν**, that is, His disciples baptised, iv. 2.—Ver. 23. **ἦν δὲ καὶ . . . ἐκεῖ.** And John also was baptising, although he had said that he was sent to baptise in order that the Messiah might be identified; which had already been done. But John saw that men might still be prepared for the reception of the Messiah by his preaching and baptism. Hence, however, the questioning which arose, ver. 25. The locality is described as **Αἰνὼν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ.** "The Salim of this place is no doubt the Shalem of Genesis xxxiii. 18, and some seven miles north is 'Ainûn [= Springs], at the head of the Wâdy Fâr'ah, which is the great highway up from the Damieh ford for those coming from the east by the way of Peniel and Succoth" (Henderson's *Palestine*, p. 154). The reason for choosing this locality was **ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ**, "because many waters were there," or much water; and therefore even in summer baptism by immersion could be continued. It is not "the people's refreshment" that is in view. Why mention this any more than where they got their food?—**καὶ παρεγίνοντο**, the indefinite third plural, as frequently in N.T. and regularly in English, "they continued coming".—Ver. 24. **οὔπω γὰρ . . . ὁ Ἰωάννης**, "for not yet had John been cast into prison": a clause inserted for the sake of those who might have gathered from the synoptic narrative that John was cast into prison immediately after the temptation of Jesus, Mk. i. 14, Mt. iv. 12. John having been present with Jesus through all this period can give the sequence of the events with chronological precision.—Ver. 25. **ἐγένετο οὖν ζήτησις . . .** There arose therefore—that is, in consequence of the proximity of these two baptisms—on the part of John's disciples [**ἐκ**, *cf.* Herod. v. 21 and Dionys. Hal. viii. p. 556] a questioning, or discussion, with a Jew about purifying, that is, generally, including the relation of those two baptisms to one another, and to the Jewish washings, and the significance of each. The trend of the discussion may be gathered from the complaint to the Baptist, ver. 26. As the discussion was begun by the disciples of John, it would seem as if they had challenged the Jew for seeking baptism from Jesus. For their complaint is (ver. 26) **Ῥαββί . . . πρὸς αὐτόν.** That Jesus should baptise as well as John they could not understand. Really, the difficulty is that Jesus should have allowed John to go on baptising, and that John should not himself have professed discipleship of Jesus. But so long as John saw that men were

βαπτίζει, καὶ πάντες ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτόν." 27. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰωάννης καὶ εἶπεν, "Οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμβάνειν οὐδὲν, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 28. αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον, Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου. 29. ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην, [z] νυμφίος ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου, ὁ ἑστηκὼς καὶ ἀκούων αὐτοῦ, χαρᾷ χαίρει διὰ τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ νυμφίου. 30. αὕτη οὖν ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ πεπλήρωται.

z ii. 9. Is. liv. 5. Eph. v. 25.

led by his preaching to accept the Messiah he might well believe that he served Christ better thus than by following in His train.—Ver. 27. His answer sufficiently shows that it was not rivalry that prompted him to continue his baptism.—**οὐ δύναται . . . οὐρανοῦ.** The general sense is obvious (*cf.* Ps. lxxv. 6, 7, cxxvii. 1; Jas. i. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 7), but did John mean to apply the principle directly to himself or to Jesus? Wetstein prefers the former: "non possum mihi arrogare et rapere, quae Deus non dedit". So Calvin, Beza ["quid conamini meae conditioni aliquid adjicere?"], Bengel ["quomodo audeam ego, inquit, homines ad me adstringere?"], and Lücke. But, as Weiss points out, it is a justification of Jesus which the question of the disciples demands, and this is given in John's statement that His popularity is God's gift. But John avails himself of the opportunity to explain the relation he himself holds to Jesus.—Ver. 28. **αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς . . . ἐκείνου.** John's disciples should have been prepared for what they now see happening. He had emphatically declared that he was not the Christ, but only His forerunner (i. 19-27, 30).—Ver. 29. **ὁ ἔχων τὴν νύμφην . . .** The bride is the familiar O.T. figure expressive of the people in their close relation to God (Is. liv. 5, Hos. ii. 18, Ps. xlv.). This figure passes into N.T. *Cf.* Mt. xxii. 2, Eph. v. 32, Jas. iv. 4.—**ὁ ἔχων**, he that has and holds *as a wife*. *Cf.* Mk. vi. 18, Is. liv. 1. lxii. 5.—**νυμφίος ἐστίν**, it is the bridegroom, and no one else, who marries the bride and to whom she belongs. There is only one in whom the people of God can find their permanent joy and rest; one who is the perennial spring of their happiness and life.—**ὁ δὲ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου**, *the* friend, *par excellence*, the groomsman, **παρανύμφιος, νυμφάγωγος**, or in Hebrew Shoshben, who was employed to ask the hand of the bride and to arrange the marriage. For the standing and duties of the Shadchan and Shoshben see Abraham's *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, pp. 170, 180. The similar function of the Hindu go-between or *ghatak* is fully described in *The City of Sunshine*. The peculiar and intense gratification [**χαρᾷ χαίρει**, intensely rejoices, see especially Lücke, who renders "durch und durch"; Weizsäcker, "freut sich hoch"; R.V., "rejoiceth greatly"] of this functionary was to see that his delicate task was crowned with success; and of this he was assured when he stood and heard the bridegroom directly welcoming his bride ["voice of bridegroom" as symbol of joy, Jer. vii. 34, xvi. 9].—**αὕτη οὖν ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ πεπλήρωται.** This is the joy which John claims for himself, the joy of the bridegroom's friend, who arranges the marriage, and this joy is attained in Christ's welcoming to Himself the people whom John has prepared for Him and directed to Him. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 2, where Paul uses similar language. It is not John's regret that men are attracted to Jesus: rather it is the fulfilment of his work and hope. This was the God-appointed order.—Ver. 30. **ἐκεῖνον δεῖ αὐξάνειν, ἐμὲ δὲ ἐλαττοῦσθαι.** Paley translates, "it is for Him to go on growing and for me to be ever getting less," and adds, "the language seems to be solar". In the Church Calendar, no doubt, John the Baptist's day is Midsummer Day, while our Lord's "natalitia" is midwinter, but scarcely founded on solar considerations of the day's increase after Christmas and decrease after 24th June. Rather John is the morning star "fidelis Lucifer" whose light is eclipsed in that of the rising sun (*cf.* Bernard's "Lucet ergo Johannes, tanto verius quanto minus appetit lucere," and Euthymius, **ἐλαττοῦσθαι ὡς ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος ἑωσφόρον**). If the style of the following verses is any clue to their authorship we must ascribe them to the evangelist. Besides, some of the expressions are out of place in the Baptist's lips: *e.g.*, **τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς λαμβάνει** could scarcely have been said at the very time when crowds were

ἐκεῖνον δεῖ [a] αὐξάνειν, ἐμὲ δὲ ἐλαττοῦσθαι. 31. [b] ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος, [c] ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν. ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστι, καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ· ὁ [d] ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος, ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστί,[1] 32. καὶ ὃ ἑώρακε καὶ ἤκουσε, τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ· καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ [e] οὐδεὶς λαμβάνει. 33. ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν, ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι [f] ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής ἐστιν. 34. ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Θεὸς, τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ λαλεῖ· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ Θεὸς[2]

a Intrans. in Mt. vi. 28; xiii. 32, etc.; trans. in 1 Cor. iii, 6, 7.
b viii. 23. 1 Cor. xv. 47. Phil. ii. 6.
c Lk. xix. 17, 19; in local sense freq. in Gospp.
d xvi. 28.
e i. 11. Is. liii. 1.
f vii. 18. Rom. iii. 3.

[1] επανω παντων εστι omitted in ℵD vet. Lat., etc., but found in ℵcABL. The words are omitted by W.H., but are almost necessary as a balance to εκ της γης εστι.

[2] ο θεος omitted in ℵBC*L 1, 33, and therefore by Tisch., W.H. and Weiss; T.R. in AC²D vet. Lat.

flocking to Him. The precise point in the Baptist's language to which the evangelist attaches this commentary or expansion [" theils erklärende, theils erweiternde Reflexion," Lücke] is his affirmation of the Messiah's superiority to himself. To this John adds (ver. 31): He is superior not only to the Baptist but to all, ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν, the reason being that He comes from above, ἄνωθεν; which is the equivalent of ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in the latter part of the verse. These expressions are contrasted with ἐκ τῆς γῆς, the ordinary earthly origin of men, and they refer Christ's origin to a higher and unique source: unique because the result of this origin is that He is supreme over *all*, ἐπάνω πάντων. His origin is superior to that of all, therefore His supremacy is universal (*cf.* ver. 13). The results of origin, whether earthly or heavenly, are traced out in a twofold direction: in the kind of life lived and in the words spoken. On the one hand ὁ ἐκ τῆς γῆς . . . ἐστι. The first ἐκ expresses origin: the second moral connection, as in xviii. 37, xv. 19: he whose origin is earthly is an earthly person, his life rises no higher than its source, his interests and associations are of earth. Another result is given in the words ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ, from the earth his ideas and his utterance of them spring. A man's talk and teaching cannot rise above their source. So far as experimental knowledge goes he is circumscribed by his origin. In contrast to persons of earthly origin stands ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος; ἐρχ. is added that not only his origin but his transition to his present condition may be indicated. His origin in like manner determines both his moral relationships and his teaching. The one is given in ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστί. He lives in a higher region than all others and is not limited by earthly conditions.—Ver. 32. The result is ὃ ἑώρακε . . . μαρτυρεῖ. Seeing and hearing are equivalent to having direct knowledge. The man who is of earth may be trusted when he speaks of earth: he who is from heaven testifies to that of which he has had experimental knowledge (*cf.* ver. 13), and might therefore expect to be listened to, but τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς λαμβάνει. The καὶ which connects the clauses implies the meaning "and yet". This statement could not have been made when crowds were thronging to Jesus' baptism. They are the reflection of the evangelist, who sees how sporadically the testimony of Christ has been received. Yet it has not been universally rejected: ὁ λαβὼν . . . ἀληθής ἐστιν. He who received His testimony sealed that God is true. σφραγ. means to stamp with approval, to endorse, to give confirmation. Wetstein quotes from Aristides, *Platonic.*, i., p. 18: Αἰσχίνης μαρτυρεῖ Πλάτωνι . . . καὶ τὴν τοῦδε μαρτυρίαν ὥσπερ ἐπισφραγίζεται. But he who believes Christ not only confirms or approves Christ's truthfulness, but God's. ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν . . . λαλεῖ. For Christ is God's ambassador and speaks God's words. This is a thought which pervades this Gospel, see viii. 26, 28; xv. 5, etc. "He that sent me," or "the Father that sent me," is a phrase occurring over twenty times in the Gospel and is characteristic of the aspect of Christ presented in it, as revealing the Father.—Ver. 34. The reason assigned for the truth and trustworthiness of Christ's words is scarcely the reason we expect: οὐ γὰρ . . . Πνεῦμα. John has told us that Christ is to be believed because He

τὸ Πνεῦμα. 35. [g] ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν [h] ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ. 36. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ οὐκ [i] ὄψεται ζωὴν, ἀλλ' ἡ [j] ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν."

g v. 20; xiii. 3.
h Jud. iii. 28.
i Ps. xlix. 19; lxxxix. 48.
j Rom. i. 18.

testifies of what He hath seen and heard: now, because the Spirit is given without measure to Him. The meaning of the clause is contested. The omission of **ὁ θεός** does not materially affect the sense, for **ὁ θεός** would naturally be supplied as the nominative to **δίδωσι** from **τοῦ θεοῦ** of the preceding clause. There are four interpretations. (1) Augustine, Calvin, Lücke, Alford, suppose the clause means that God, instead of giving occasional and limited supplies of the Spirit as had been given to the prophets, gives to Christ the fulness of the Spirit. (2) Meyer thinks that the primary reference is not to Christ but that the statement is general, that God gives the Spirit freely and abundantly, and does thus dispense it to Christ. (3) Westcott, following Cyril, makes Christ the subject and understands the clause as meaning that He proves His Messiahship by giving the Spirit without measure. (4) Godet makes **τὸ πνεῦμα** the subject, not the object, and supposes the meaning to be that the Spirit gives to Christ the words of God without measure. The words of ver. 35 seem to weigh in favour of the rendering of A.V.: "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him". The R.V. is ambiguous. **ἐκ μέτρου**, out of a measure, or, by measure, that is, sparingly. So **ἐν μέτρῳ** in Ezek. iv. 11. Wetstein quotes: "R. Achan dixit: etiam Spiritus S. non habitavit super Prophetas nisi mensura quadam: quidam enim librum unum, quidam duos vaticiniorum ediderunt". The Spirit was given to Jesus not in the restricted and occasional manner in which it had been given to the O.T. prophets, but wholly, fully, constantly. It was by this Spirit His human nature was enlightened and guided to speak things divine; and this Spirit, interposed as it were between the Logos and the human nature of Christ, was as little cumbrous in its operation or perceptible in consciousness as our breath which is interposed between the thinking mind and the words which utter it.—Ver. 35. **ὁ πατὴρ . . . αὐτοῦ.** These absolute expressions, "the Father," "the Son," are more naturally referred to the evangelist than to the Baptist. This absolute use of "the Son" as a designation of Christ certainly suggests, if it does not prove, the proper Divinity of Christ. It is the favourite designation in this Gospel. The love of the Father for the Son is the reason for His giving to Him the Spirit: nay, it accounts for His committing all things to His hand; **πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ**, that is, to possess and to rule. "Facit hic amor, quo Filium amplexus nos quoque in eo amplectitur, ut per illius manum nobis bona sua omnia communicet"—Calvin. But Calvin does not make the mistake of supposing that the words signify "by means of His hand"; *cf.* Beza. God has made Christ His plenipotentiary for this world and has done so because of His love. It was a boon then to Christ to come into this world and win it to Himself. There is no history, movement, or life of God so glorious as the history of God incarnate.—Ver. 36. **ὁ πιστεύων . . . ἐπ' αὐτόν.** Christ has been represented as Sovereign, commissioned with supreme powers, especially for the purpose of saving men and restoring them to God. Hence "he that believeth on the Son hath eternal life". He who through the Son finds and accepts the Father has life in this very vision and fellowship of the Supreme; *cf.* xvii. 3. But "he that refuses to be persuaded," lit. "he that disobeyeth". Beza points out that in N.T. there is a twofold **ἀπείθεια**, one of the intellect, dissenting from truth presented, as here and in Acts xiv. 2; the other of the will and life, see Rom. xi. 30. But will enters into the former as well as the latter. **ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ**, the wrath of God denotes "the fixed and necessary hostility of the Divine nature to sin"; what appears in a righteous man as indignation; and also the manifestation of that hostility in acts of retributive justice. This is the only place in the Gospel where it occurs; but in Rev. vi. 16, we have "the wrath of the Lamb"; also xvi. 19, "the wine of the fury of His wrath"; also xiv. 10, xi. 18, xix. 15. In Paul "the coming wrath" is frequently alluded to; as also "the day of wrath," "the children" or "vessels" of wrath. On the refuser of Christ the wrath of God, instead of removing from him, abides, **μένει**; not, as Theophylact reads, **μενεῖ**, "will abide".

IV. 1. ῼΣ οὖν ἔγνω [a] ὁ Κύριος, ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας [b] μαθητὰς [b] ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης· 2. ([c] καίτοιγε Ἰησοῦς [d] αὐτὸς οὐκ ἐβάπτιζεν, ἀλλʼ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·) 3. [e] ἀφῆκε τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, καὶ ἀπῆλθε πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 4. ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας.[1] 5. ἔρχεται οὖν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην Συχὰρ, [f] πλησίον τοῦ

a vi. 23; xi. 2, etc., freq. in Lk.
b Cp. Acts ii. 36. Constr. cp. i. 40.
c Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 27 only.
d 1 Cor. i. 13.
e Mk. i. 14.
f Num. xxxiii. 37. Josh. xii. 9.

[1] Σαμαριας Tisch. and W.H.

CHAPTER IV. Vv. 1-42. *Jesus leaves Salim and the south for Galilee, and is received by the Samaritans on His way.*—Vv. 1-4 account for His being in Samaria; 5-26 relate His conversation with a Samaritan woman; 27-38 His consequent conversation with His own disciples; 39-42 the impression He made upon the Samaritans. The circumstances which brought our Lord into Samaria seem to be related as much for the sake of maintaining the continuity of the history and of exhibiting the motives which guided His movements as for the sake of introducing the incident at Sychar.—Ver. 1. The first verse gives the cause of His leaving Judaea, to wit, a threatened or possible collision with the Pharisees, who resented His baptising.—**Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω . . . ἢ Ἰωάννης. οὖν** continues the narrative with logical sequence, connecting what follows with what goes before; here it connects what is now related with the popularity of Jesus' baptism, iii. 22, 26.—**ὁ κύριος**, so unusual in this Gospel that some editors read **Ἰησοῦς**, for which there is scant authority. But where the evangelist is not reporting contemporary speech but speaking for his own person **κύριος** is natural.—**ἔγνω** rightly rendered in the modern Greek translation by **ἔμαθεν**; the knowledge that comes by information is meant.—**ὅτι ἤκουσαν**, that the Pharisees had heard, the aorist here, as frequently elsewhere, representing the English pluperfect. What they had heard is given in direct narration under an introductory **ὅτι**, and hence not the pronoun but **Ἰησοῦς** appears as subject: "Jesus is making and baptising more disciples than John".—**μαθητὰς ποιεῖ** (*cf.* **μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες**, Mt. xxviii. 19), "disciples" being here used in the wider sense and not involving permanent separation from their employments. The Pharisees had resented John's baptising, much more that of Jesus, because more popular.—Ver. 2. Here John inserts a clause corrective of one impression which this statement would make: **καίτοιγε . . . αὐτοῦ. καίτοιγε** is slightly stronger than "although," rather "although indeed". Hoogeveen (*De Particulis*, p. 322) renders "quanquam re vera"; see also Paley, *Greek Particles*, pp. 67-8. **τοι** is the old form of **τῷ**, "hereby," "truly," "in fact". The clause is inserted to remind us, as Bengel says, that "baptizare actio ministralis (*cf.* Paul's refusal to baptise). Johannes minister suâ manu baptizavit, discipuli ejus, ut videtur, neminem; at Christus baptizat spiritu sancto." So too Nonnus, who says that the king did not baptise with water. "By leaving the baptism of water to the apostles, He rendered the rite independent of His personal presence, and so provided for the maintenance of it in His Church after His departure," Godet.—Ver. 3. On this coming to the ears of Jesus **ἀφῆκε τὴν Ἰουδαίαν**, He forsook or abandoned Judaea. The verb is used of neglecting or dismissing from thought, hence of forgiving sin; but there is here no ethical sense in the word, and it may be translated "left".—**καὶ ἀπῆλθε πάλιν**, "again" in reference to the visit to Galilee already narrated, i. 44, ii. 1. Jesus feared a collision with the Pharisees at this early stage, because it could only mar His work. He refuses to be hurried, and remains master of the situation throughout. He therefore retired to Galilee, where He thought He would be hidden. *Cf.* ver. 44.—Ver. 4. **ἔδει . . . Σαμαρείας**. The **ἔδει** is explained by the position of Samaria interposed between Judaea and Galilee. Only the very sensitive Jews went round by Peraea. The Galileans were accustomed to go through Samaria on their way to the feasts at Jerusalem (Josephus, *Antiq.*, xx. 6, 1). Samaria took its name from the city Samaria or Shomron, built by Omri as the capital of the kingdom of Israel (1 Kings xvi. 24). After being destroyed by Hyrcanus, the city was rebuilt by Herod and called Sebaste in honour

χωρίου [g] ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακὼβ Ἰωσὴφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ. 6. ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ. ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς [h] κεκοπιακὼς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας [i] ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ. ὥρα ἦν ὡσεὶ ἕκτη. 7. [j] Ἔρχεται γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας [k] ἀντλῆσαι ὕδωρ. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

g Gen. xxxiii. 19; xlviii. 22. h Is. xl. 31. i 1 Mac. vi. 41. 2 Cor. xi. 26. Heb. ii. 17. j Exod. ii. 15. k Gen. xxiv. 20. Exod. ii. 16.

of Augustus. The territory of Samaria in the time of Christ was included in the tetrarchy of Archelaus and was under the procurator Pontius Pilate. Herod Antipas' domain marched with it north and east.—Ver. 5. **ἔρχεται οὖν . . . τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ.** "So He comes to a city of Samaria called Sychar." **λεγομένην**, *cf.* xi. 16, xi. 54, xix. 13, etc. In the *Itinerary of Jerusalem* (A.D. 333) Sychar is identified with 'Askar, west of Salim and near Shechem, the modern Nablûs. The strength of the case for 'Askar, according to Prof. G. A. Smith (*Hist. Geog.*, p. 371), is this: "That in the fourth century two authorities independently describe a Sychar distinct from Shechem; that in the twelfth century at least three travellers, and in the thirteenth at least one, do the same, the latter also quoting a corrupt but still possible variation of the name; that in the fourteenth the Samaritan Chronicle mentions another form of the name; and that modern travellers find a third possible variation of it not only applied to a village suiting the site described by the authorities in the fourth century, but important enough to cover all the plain about the village". The difficulty regarding the initial Ayin in the name 'Askar is also removed by Prof. Smith. See further Conder's *Tent-work*, i. 71. Sychar is described as **πλησίον . . . αὐτοῦ**, near the "parcel of ground" (particella, little part; the Vulgate has "praedium," estate) which Jacob gave to Joseph his son; according to Gen. xlviii. 22, where Jacob says, "I have given thee one portion (Shechem) above thy brethren"; *cf.* Gen. xxxiii. 19. Shechem in Hebrew means "the shoulder," and some have fancied that the shoulder being the priest's portion, the word came to denote any allotment. Gesenius, however, is of opinion that the word was transferred to a portion of land, on account of the shape resembling the back across the shoulders.—Ver. 6. **ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ πηγὴ τοῦ Ἰακώβ.** Both **πηγή** and **φρέαρ** are used in this context; the former meaning the spring or well of water, the latter the dug and built pit or well. In ver. 11 **φρέαρ** is necessarily used. Whether in this verse 6 **ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ** is to be rendered "at," keeping **πηγῇ** in its strict sense, or "on" as if for **φρέατι** is doubted; but the former is certainly the more natural rendering; *cf.* Aristoph., *Frogs*, 191, where **ἐπί** with accus. gives rise to misunderstanding of sitting "*on*" an oar instead of "at" it. Jacob's well lies ten minutes south of the present village 'Askar, and a good spring exists in 'Askar. This has given rise to the difficulty: Why should a woman have come so far, passing good sources of water supply? Most probably the reason is that this well was Jacob's, and special virtue was supposed to attach to it; or because in the heat of summer other wells and streams were dry. The real difficulty is: Why was there a well there at all, in the neighbourhood of streams? Possibly Jacob may have dug it that he might have no quarrelling with his neighbours about water-rights. As a stranger with a precarious tenure he might find this necessary. Travellers agree in accepting as Jacob's well here mentioned the Ain-Jakub, or Bir-et-Jakub, some twenty minutes east of Nablûs.—**ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς . . . ἕκτη.** It was "about," **ὡς** (Theophylact calls attention to this as a mark of accuracy), the sixth hour, that is, midday (the Jews dined on Sabbath at the sixth hour, see Josephus, *Vita*) (see on c. i. 40); and they had probably been walking for several hours, and accordingly Jesus was tired, **κεκοπιακὼς** (**κόπος**, excessive toil), fatigued (Wetstein quotes **οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ὁδοιπορίας τὰς φλέβας κοπιᾷ ἀλλὰ τὰ νεῦρα**), and was sitting thus, tired as He was (**οὕτως**, *in the condition in which He was*, that is, tired as He was. Elsner thinks it only indicates consequence [nihil aliud quam consequentiam significat] and should be omitted in translating. So Kypke, who cites instructive instances, concludes: "solemne est Graecis, praecedente participio, voculam **οὕτως** *pleonastice* ponere". But in all his instances **οὕτως** precedes the verb), at the well (*cf.* Josephus, *Ant.*, v. 1: **στρατοπεδευσαμένους ἐπί τινι πηγῇ**). As to the hour, two circumstances confirm the opinion that it was midday

"Δός μοι πιεῖν."[1] 8. οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπεληλύθεισαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἵνα [m] τροφὰς ἀγοράσωσι. 9. Λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρεῖτις, "[n] Πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν [o] παρ' ἐμοῦ πιεῖν αἰτεῖς, οὔσης γυναικὸς Σαμαρείτιδος;" οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρείταις.[2] 10. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν [p] δωρεὰν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγων σοι, Δός μοι πιεῖν, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτὸν,

l Gen. xxiv. 43.
m Pl. here only; cp. 2 Chron. xi. 23.
n viii. 48. Ezra iv. 9. 2 Kings xvii. 24.
o Only in Acts iii. 2; ix. 2. Jas. i. 5. [1 Jo. v. 15. Mt. xx. 20.]
p Here only in Gospp.

[1] πειν in Tisch., W.H.; πιν in Lachmann.

[2] This clause, a supposed gloss, omitted in ℵ*D, found in ℵ[a]ABCL.

First, that apparently there was no intention of halting here for the night, as there would have been had it been evening. And, second, while it is truly urged that evening is the common time for drawing water, it is obvious that only one woman had come at this time, and accordingly the probability is it was not evening. See also Josephus, *Ant.*, ii. 11, 1, where he describes Moses sitting at the well *at midday* wearied with his journey, and the women coming to water their flocks.—Ver. 7. **ἔρχεται . . . ὕδωρ**, apparently this clause is prepared for by the preceding, "There comes a woman of Samaria," that is, a Samaritan woman, not, of course, "from the city Samaria," which is two hours distant from the well, **ἀντλῆσαι ὕδωρ**, infinitive and aorist, both classical; *cf.* Rebecca in Gen. xxiv. 11, etc., having her **ὑδρία** on her shoulder or on her head, **ἄγγος ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ ἔχουσα**, Herod., v. 12; and Ovid's "Ponitur e summa fictilis urna coma". [Elsner] **ἄντλος** is the hold of a ship where the bilge settles: **ἀντλέω**, to bale a ship; hence, to draw water. To her Jesus says, **Δός μοι πιεῖν**, the usual formula; *cf.* **δώσω πιεῖν**, Pherecrates, *Frag.*, 67, and Aristoph., *Pax*, 49.—Ver. 8. **οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ . . . ἀγοράσωσι.** This gives the reason for the request. Had the disciples been present they would have made the request: an indication of the relations already subsisting between the disciples and the Lord. Probably the five first called were still with Him. That the disciples had gone to buy in Sychar, shows either that the law allowed trading with Samaritans, or that Jesus and His disciples ignored the law. But the woman is surprised at the request of Jesus.—Ver. 9. **πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὤν.** How did she know He was a Jew? Probably there were slight differences in dress, feature and accent. Edersheim says "the fringes on the Tallith of the Samaritans are blue, while those worn by the Jews are white". He also exposes the mistake of some commentators regarding the words uttered by Jesus: "Teni li lishtoth". The reason of the woman's surprise is given by the Evangelist in the words **οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρείταις.** "For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans." **Συγχρᾶσθαι** literally signifies "to use together with," so that the sense here might be that the woman was surprised that Jesus should use the same vessel she used; rather it has the secondary meaning "to have intercourse" or "dealings with"; similarly to the Latin *utor*, see Hor., *Ep.*, i. xii. 22, "utere Pompeio Grospho," and xvii. 13, "regibus uti," to make a friend of, or "be on terms of intimacy with". The classical phrase is **οἷσιν οὐκ ἐπιστροφαί**, Eurip., *Helena*, 440. The later tradition said: "Samaritanis panem comedere aut vinum bibere prohibitum est". Of course the hostile feeling ran back to the days of Nehemiah. And see Ecclus. l. 25, 26. "With two nations is my soul vexed, and the third is no nation: they that sit upon Mount Seir and the Philistines, and that foolish people that dwelleth in Sichem." For the origin of the Samaritans see 2 Kings xvii., and *cf.* Farrar's *Life of Christ* in loc. Tristram, *Land of Israel*, 134.—Ver. 10. **Ἀπεκρίθη . . . ὕδωρ ζῶν.** "If thou knewest;" the pathos of the situation strikes Jesus. The woman stands on the brink of the greatest possibilities, but is utterly unconscious of them. Two things she did not know: (1) **τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ**, the free gift of God. This is explained in the last words of the verse to be "living water"; but in its first occurrence it is indefinite: "If thou knewest the freeness of God's giving, and that to each of His children He has a purpose of good". But in God's direction the woman cherished no hope. (2) She did not know **τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγων σοι, Δός μοι πιεῖν.** So long as she thought Him an ordinary Jew she could expect nothing from Him. Had she known that Jesus

καὶ ἔδωκεν ἄν σοι [q] ὕδωρ ζῶν." 11. Λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, "Κύριε, οὔτε ἄντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ· πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν; 12. μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ, ὃς ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ, καὶ αὐτὸς [r] ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔπιε, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ θρέμματα αὐτοῦ;" 13. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Πᾶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου, διψήσει πάλιν· 14. ὃς δ' ἂν πίῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ [1] εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ, γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον." 15. Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή, "Κύριε, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ, μηδὲ ἔρχωμαι [2] [s] ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν." 16. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὕπαγε, φώνησον τὸν ἄνδρα σου, καὶ

q Gen. xxvi. 19.

r vv. 13, 14. Mt. xxvi. 27.

s Ver. 16. Six times in Lk. and Acts, and nowhere else.

[1] διψησει in ℵABDL.

[2] διερχωμαι in Tisch., W.H., R.V.

was the bearer of God's free gift to men, she would have asked of Him. **σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτόν, σὺ** is emphatic. You would have anticipated my request by a request on your own behalf. And instead of creating difficulties I would have given thee living water.—**ὕδωρ ζῶν**, by which the woman understood that He meant spring water. What He did mean appears immediately. Ver. 11. **λέγει αὐτῷ . . . τὸ ζῶν**; She addresses Him with **κύριε**, perhaps fancying from His saying, "If you had known who it is that says to you," that He was some great person in disguise. But her answer breathes incredulity: **οὔτε ἄντλημα ἔχεις**. She began her sentence meaning to say, "You neither have a bucket, nor is the well shallow enough for you to reach the water without one," but she alters its construction and puts the second statement in a positive form. The depth of the well is variously given. Conder found it 75 feet.—**πόθεν . . .** She is mystified. **μὴ σὺ μείζων . . . θρέμματα αὐτοῦ.** Jesus had spoken as if independently of the well He could procure living water: but even Jacob (claimed by the Samaritans as their father, and whose bones lay in their midst), great as he was, used this well.—**θρέμματα.** "What is nourished." Kypke adduces several instances in which it is used of "domestics". Plato, *Laws*, 953 E, uses it of "nurslings of the Nile," the Egyptians. But Wetstein adduces many instances of its use in the sense of "cattle". Theophylact thinks this points to the abundant supply of water.—Vv. 13, 14. Jesus in reply, though He does not quite break through the veil of figure, leads her on to think of a more satisfying gift than even Jacob had given in this well. —**πᾶς ὁ πίνων . . . ζωὴν αἰώνιον.** He contrasts the water of the well with the water He can give; and the two characteristic qualities of His living water are suggested by this contrast. The water of Jacob's well had two defects: it quenched thirst only for a time, and it lay outside the town a weary distance, and subject to various accidents. Christ offers water which will quench thirst lastingly, and which will be "in" the person drinking, **ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.** For this figure put to another though similar use, see Marcus Aurelius, vii. 59, and viii. 51, with Gataker's notes. The living water lastingly quenches human cravings and is within the man, inseparable from him, and always energetically and afresh shooting up.—Ver. 15. The woman, with her mind still running on actual water, says **Κύριε . . . ἀντλεῖν.** She is attracted by the two qualities of the water, and asks it (1) **ἵνα μὴ διψῶ,** (2) **μηδὲ ἔρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν.**—Ver. 16. To this request Jesus replies **Ὕπαγε, φώνησον . . . ἐνθάδε.** His purpose in this has been much debated. Calvin thinks He meant to rebuke her scurrility in mockingly asking for the water. This does not show Calvin's usual penetration. Westcott says that in the woman's request "she confessed by implication that even the greatest gift was not complete unless it was shared by those to whom she was bound. If they thirsted, though she might not thirst, her toilsome labour must be con-

ἐλθὲ ἐνθάδε." 17. Ἀπεκρίθη ἡ γυνὴ καὶ εἶπεν, "Οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα." Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Καλῶς εἶπας, Ὅτι ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχω· 18. πέντε γὰρ ἄνδρας ἔσχες· καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις, οὐκ ἔστι σου ἀνήρ· τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας." 19. Λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, "Κύριε, [t] θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ. 20. οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ὄρει προσεκύνησαν· καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος, ὅπου δεῖ προσκυνεῖν." 21. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Γύναι, πίστευσόν μοι,[1] ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα, ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις

t Mt. xii. 19; xvi. 13, etc.; i. 49.

[1] T.R. in AC[3], but πιστευε μοι γυναι in ℵBC*DL.

tinued still." Jesus, reading this thought, bids her bring the man for whom she draws water. The gift is for him also. But this meaning is too obscure. Meyer thinks the request was not seriously intended: but this detracts from the simplicity of Christ. The natural interpretation is that in response to her request Jesus gives her now the first draught of the living water by causing her to face her guilty life and bring it to Him. He cannot give the water before thirst for it is awakened. The sure method of awaking the thirst is to make her acknowledge herself a sinful woman (*cf.* Alford).—Ver. 17. The woman shrinks from exposure and replies **οὐκ ἔχω ἄνδρα**, "I have no husband". A literal truth, but scarcely honest in intention. Jesus at once veils her deceit, **καλῶς εἶπας**, etc., and disposes of her equivocation by emphasising the **ἄνδρα**. Thou hast well said, I have no *husband*.—**πέντε γὰρ . . . εἴρηκας**. "He whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in this [so far] you said what is true." In Malachi's time facility for divorce was producing disastrous consequences, and probably many women, not only in Samaria but among the poorer Jews, had a similar history to relate. The stringency with which our Lord speaks on this subject suggests that matters were fast approaching the condition in which they now are in Mohammedan countries. Lane tells us that "there are certainly not many persons in Cairo who have not divorced one wife if they have been long married," and that there are many who have in the course of ten years married twenty or thirty or more wives (*cf.* Lecky's *European Morals* for the state of matters in the Roman world). Jerome, *Ep. ad Ageruch*, 123, mentions a Roman woman who had had twenty-two husbands. Serious attention need scarcely be given to the fancy of "the critical school" that the woman with her five husbands is intended as an allegorical representation of Samaria with the [seven] gods of the five nations who peopled the country. See 2 Kings xvii. 24-31. Consistently the man with whom the woman now lived would represent Jehovah. Holtzmann, shrinking from this, suggests Simon Magus. Heracleon discovered in the husband that was not a husband the woman's guardian angel or Pleroma (Bigg's *Neoplatonism*, 150).—Ver. 19. The woman at once recognises this knowledge of her life as evidence of a supernatural endowment.—**Κύριε θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ**. *Cf.* ver. 29 and ii. 24. **θεωρῶ** is used in its post-classical sense. It is not unnatural that the woman finding herself in the presence of a prophet should seek His solution of the standing problem of Samaritan religion. His answer would shed further light on his prophetic endowment, and would also determine whether He had any light and hope to give to a Samaritan. Josephus (*Antiq.*, xiii. 3, 4) narrates that a disputation on this point before Ptolemy Philometor resulted in the death according to contract of the two Samaritan advocates, they not being able to prove their position.—Ver. 20. **οἱ πατέρες . . . δεῖ προσκυνεῖν**. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, Gerizim, at whose base we are standing, etc. On Gerizim were proclaimed the blessings recorded Deut. xxviii. Sanballat erected on it a rival temple (but see the *Bible Dict.* and Josephus) which was rased by John Hyrcanus, B.C. 129. A broad flat surface of rock on the top of Gerizim is still held sacred by the few Samaritans who now represent the old race and customs. Especially consult G. A. Smith's *Hist. Geog.*, p. 334, who shows that Shechem is the natural centre of Palestine, and adds: "It was

[u] προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί. 22. [v] ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἴδαμεν· ὅτι ἡ [w] σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν. 23. ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσι τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ τοιούτους ζητεῖ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτόν. 24. Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός· καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν, ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, δεῖ προσκυνεῖν." 25. Λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ, "Οἶδα ὅτι [x] Μεσσίας ἔρχεται·" (ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός·) "ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ

u With acc. ver. 23, etc., and in older writers; see Thayer.
v 2 Kings xvii. 27.
w Here only in John. Lk. i. 69, 71, 77; xix. 9, only in Gospp.
x Here and i. 42 only.

by this natural capital of the Holy Land, from which the outgoings to the world are so many and so open, that the religion of Israel rose once for all above every geographical limit, and the charter of a universal worship was given". **ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις** may either mean that the place of worship, the temple, is in Jerusalem, or that Jerusalem is itself the place—more probably the latter.—Ver. 21. **Γύναι, πίστευσόν μοι . . . τῷ πατρί.** One of the greatest announcements ever made by our Lord; and made to one sinful woman, *cf.* xx. 16.—**ἔρχεται ὥρα** a time is coming; in ver. 23 **καὶ νῦν ἐστίν** is added. A great religious revolution has arrived. Localism in worship is abolished, **οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ**, etc., "neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem," exclusively or preferentially, "shall ye worship the Father". What determines this "hour"? The manifestation of God in Christ, and the principle announced in ver. 24 and implied in **τῷ πατρί**; for God being absolutely "the Father" all men in all places must have access to Him, and being of a like nature to man's He can only receive a spiritual worship. *Cf.* Acts xvii. 29.—Ver. 22. **ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε.** The distinction between Jewish and Samaritan worship lies not in the difference of place, but of the object of worship. The neuter refers abstractly to the object of worship. "You do not know the object of your worship;" suggested by the **τῷ πατρί** of the preceding clause. *Cf.* Acts xvii. 23. **ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἴδαμεν.** The Jews worshipped a God who had made Himself known to them in their history by His gracious and saving dealings with them. That it is this knowledge which is meant appears in the following clause: **ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν**, that is to say, God has manifested Himself as Saviour to the Jews, and through them to all. "A powerful repudiation of the theory which makes the author of this Gospel a Gentile of the second century with a Gnostic antipathy to Judaism and Jews," Reynolds.—Ver. 23. There is this great distinction between Jew and Samaritan, **ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα . . . καὶ ἀληθείᾳ**, but notwithstanding that it is to the Jews God has especially revealed Himself as Saviour, the hour has now come when the ideal worshippers, whether Jew or Samaritan, shall worship the one universal Father in *spirit*, not in either Gerizim or Jerusalem, and in *truth*, not in the symbols of Samaritan or Jewish worship, **ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ**. Two defects of all previous worship are aimed at; all that was local and all that was symbolic is to be left behind. Worship is to be (1) **ἐν πνεύματι** [on **ἐν** here, see Winer, 528], in the heart, not in this place or that. The essential thing is, not that the right place be approached, but that the right spirit enter into worship. And (2) it is to be **ἐν ἀληθείᾳ**, in correspondence with reality, both as regards the object and the manner of worship. The Samaritans had not known the object of their worship: the Jews had employed symbolism in worship. Both these defects were now to be removed. **καὶ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ . . . αὐτόν. καὶ γάρ** is not merely equivalent to **γάρ**, but must be rendered, "For of a truth". The characteristics of the ideal worshippers have been declared; and now, in confirmation, Jesus adds, "For of a truth the Father seeks such for His worshippers".—Ver. 24. The reason of all this is found in the determining statement **πνεῦμα ὁ θεός**, God is Spirit. *Cf.* God is Light; God is Love. The predication involves much; that God is personal, and much else. But primarily it here indicates that God is not corporeal, and therefore needs no temple. Rarely is the fundamental fact of God's spirituality carried to *all* its conclusions. *Cf.* James i. 27; Rom. xii. 1.—Ver. 25. This

ἡμῖν πάντα." 26. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι." 27. Καὶ [y] ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθαύμασαν [1] ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει· οὐδεὶς μέντοι εἶπε, "[z] Τί ζητεῖς;" ἤ, "Τί λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς;"

28. Ἀφῆκεν οὖν τὴν ὑδρίαν αὐτῆς ἡ γυνή, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, 29. "Δεῦτε, ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον, ὃς

y Cp. Phil. i. 3; ii. 17, etc. Thayer, p. 233.

z Gen. xxxvii. 15.

[1] εθαυμαζον in ℵABCDGKL; T.R. in ESU.

great statement rather overwhelms and bewilders the woman. Ἰλιγγίασε πρὸς τὸ τῶν ῥηθέντων ὕψος, Euthymius, after Chrysostom. Somewhat helplessly she appeals to the final authority, οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας . . . πάντα. The Samaritan expectation of a Messiah was based on their knowledge of Deut. xviii., and other allusions in the Pentateuch, and on their familiarity with Jewish ideas. He was known as Hashab or Hathab, the Converter, or as El Muhdy, the Guide. For the sources of information, see Westcott's *Introd. to Gospels*, chap. ii., note 2. "It appears from Josephus (*Ant.*, xviii. 4, 1) that in the later years of the procuratorship of Pilate, there was an actual rising of the Samaritans, who assembled on Mount Gerizim, under the influence of these Messianic expectations. Who can say that they may not have been originally set in motion by the event recorded in the Fourth Gospel?" Sanday. It was His prophetic endowment which this woman especially believed in, "He will tell us all"; and for Him she was willing to wait.—Ver. 26. The woman's despairing bewilderment is at once dissipated by the announcement ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι. "I that speak to thee am He." This declaration He was free to make among a people with whom He could not be used for political ends. "I think, too, there will be felt to be something not only very beautiful, but very characteristic of our Lord, in His declaring Himself with greater plainness of speech than He had Himself hitherto done even to the Twelve, to this dark-minded and sin-stained woman, whose spiritual nature was just awakening to life under His presence and His words" (Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 275).—Ver. 27. But just at this critical juncture, ἐπὶ τούτῳ, "on this," came His disciples καὶ ἐθαύμασαν. The imperfect better suits the sense; "they were wondering": the cause of wonder being ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει, "that He was speaking with a woman"; this being forbidden to Rabbis. "Samuel dicit: non salutant feminam omnino." "The wise have said, Each time that the man prolongs converse with the woman [that is, his own wife] he causes evil to himself, and desists from words of Thorah and in the end inherits Gehinnom" (Taylor, *Pirke Aboth*, p. 29; see also Schoettgen *in loc.*). But although the disciples wondered οὐδεὶς μέντοι εἶπε, "no one, however, said" τί ζητεῖς, "what are you seeking?" nor even the more general question τί λαλεῖς μετ' αὐτῆς, "why are you talking with her?" Their silence was due to reverence. They had already learned that He had reasons for His actions which might not lie on the surface.—Ver. 28. ἀφῆκεν οὖν . . . ἡ γυνή. "The woman accordingly," that is, because of the interruption, "left her pitcher," forgetting the object of her coming, in the greater discovery she had made; and also unconsciously showing that she meant to return.—καὶ ἀπῆλθεν . . . ὁ Χριστός; and went to the city and says to the men, easily accessible because lounging in groups at the hottest hour of the day, "Come, see a man who told me all I ever did". The woman's absorption in the thought of the prophet's endowment causes her to forget the shame of the declaration which had convinced her. She does not positively affirm that He is the Christ, but says μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός; This is what grammarians call the "tentative" use of μήτι. The A.V. "Is not this the Christ?" is not so correct as R.V. "Can this be the Christ?" The Syriac has "Is not this perhaps the Christ?" The Vulgate has "Numquid ipse est Christus?" In some passages of the N.T. (Mt. vii. 16, Acts x. 47) μήτι is used in questions which expect a more decided and exclusive negative than the simple μή, "certainly not," "not at all". But here and in Mt. xii. 23 mere doubt expresses itself, doubt with rather a leaning to an affirmative answer (*cf.* Hoogeveen, *Doctrina Partic.*, under μήτι; and Pape's *Lexicon*, where it is rendered "ob etwa"). The Greek commentators unite in lauding the skill with which the woman excites the curiosity of the men and leads without seeming to

εἰπέ μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα· [a]μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χρίστός;" 30. Ἐξῆλθον οὖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν.

31. Ἐν δὲ [b]τῷ μεταξὺ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ, λέγοντες, "Ῥαββὶ, φάγε." 32. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἐγὼ βρῶσιν ἔχω φαγεῖν, ἣν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε." 33. Ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "Μήτις [c]ἤνεγκεν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν;" 34. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν, [d]ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με, καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον. 35. οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι [e]ἔτι τετράμηνόν ἐστι, καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται; ἰδοὺ, λέγω ὑμῖν, [f]Ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν, καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας, ὅτι

a xviii. 35.
b Only here with ἐν; cp. Acts xiii. 42.
c Constr. ver. 7.
d Constr. xv. 12. Lk. i. 43, etc., Burton, 213.
e ἔτι . . . καὶ, Gen. vii. 4.
f vi. 5.

lead. [Euthymius says: τὸ δὲ μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός; ἀντὶ τοῦ, μήποτε οὗτός ἐστιν; ὑποκρίνεται γὰρ, οἷον ἐπιδιστάζειν, ὥστε παρ' αὐτῶν γενέσθαι τὴν κρίσιν.]—Ver. 30. ἐξῆλθον οὖν . . . πρὸς αὐτόν. The men, moved by the woman's question, left the city and were coming to Jesus.—Ver. 31. But meanwhile ἐν τῷ μεταξύ, between the woman's leaving the well and the men's return to it, the disciples, having brought the purchased food, and observing that notwithstanding His previous fatigue Jesus does not share with them, say Ῥαββὶ φάγε. But in His conversation with the woman His fatigue and hunger had disappeared, and He replies (ver. 32) ἐγὼ βρῶσιν . . . οὐκ οἴδατε. John does not distinguish between βρῶσις and βρῶμα, eating and the thing eaten, *cf.* ver. 34; Paul uses both words in their proper sense, 1 Cor. viii. 4, vi. 13. Weiss and others, strangely enough, maintain that βρῶσις has here its proper meaning "an eating". The pronouns are emphatic: *I* am refreshed by nourishment hidden from *you*. The proof of which they at once gave by asking one another Μήτις ἤνεγκεν αὐτῷ φαγεῖν; "Surely no one can have brought Him anything to eat?" Winer, p. 642, adds "especially here in Samaria". Perhaps evidence that Jesus had such an appearance as would not forbid any one offering Him food. But we must keep in view the easier manners of Oriental life.—Ver. 34. Jesus answers their question though not put to Him: Ἐμὸν βρῶμα . . . τὸ ἔργον. Westcott thinks the telic use of ἵνα can be discerned here; "the exact form of the expression emphasises the *end* and not the *process*, not the doing and finishing, but that I may do and finish". Lücke acknowledges that it is not always easy to distinguish between the construction of αὕτη or τοῦτο with ἵνα and with ὅτι, but that here it is possible to discriminate; and translates "Meine Speise besteht in dem *Bestreben*," etc. It is much better to take it as the Greek commentators and Holtzmann and Weiss take it, as equivalent to τὸ ποιῆσαι. See especially 3 John 4. ["Sometimes, beyond doubt, ἵνα is used where the final element in the sense is very much weakened—sometimes where it is hard to deny that it has altogether vanished." Simcox, *Grammar*, 177.] The idea that mental or spiritual excitement acts as a physical stimulant is common. *Cf.* Plato's λόγων ἑστίασις, *Tim.*, 27 B; Thucydides, i. 70, represents the Corinthian ambassadors as saying of the Athenians μήτε ἑορτὴν ἄλλο τι ἡγεῖσθαι ἢ τὸ τὰ δέοντα πρᾶξαι. See also Soph., *Electra*, 363, and the quotations in Wetstein; also Browning's *Fra Lippo Lippi*, "to find its [the world's] meaning is my meat and drink". Jesus does not say that His meat is to bring living water to parched souls, but "to do the will of Him that sent me, and to accomplish His work". First, because throughout it is His aim to make Himself a transparency through which the Father may be seen; and second, because the will of God is the ultimate stability by fellowship with which all human charity and active compassion are continually renewed.—Ver. 35. οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε, etc. These words may either mean "Are you not saying?" or "Do you not say?" that is, they may either refer to an expression just used by the disciples, or to a common proverb. If the former, then the disciples had probably been speaking of the dearness of the provisions they had bought, and congratulating themselves that harvest would lower them. Or sitting by the well and looking round, some of them

λευκαί εἰσι [g] πρὸς θερισμὸν ἤδη. 36. Καὶ [h] ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει, καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ἵνα καὶ ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων. 37. ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ [i] ἀληθινὸς, ὅτι ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων, καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων. 38. ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν [k] ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιάκατε· ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασι, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε." 39. Ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν, διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης, "Ὅτι εἶπέ μοι πάντα ὅσα

g Acts iii. 10. Col. ii. 23.
h Lk. x. 7. 1 Cor. ix. 18. 2 Tim. ii. 6.
i Mic. vi. 15.
j xix. 35. 2 Chron. ix. 5.
k ἐπί in Josh. xxiv. 13.

may have casually remarked that they were four months from harvest. In this case the time of year would be determined. Harvest beginning in April, it would now be December. But the phrase **οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε** is not the natural introduction to a reference to some present remark of the disciples; whereas it is the natural introduction to the citation of a proverb (Matt. xvi. 2). That it is a proverb is also favoured by the metrical form **ἔτι τετράμηνόν ἐστι καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται.** No trace of such a proverb has been found, but that some such saying should be current was inevitable, the waiting of the husbandman being typical of so much of human life. (Wetstein quotes from Ovid (*Heroid.*, xvii. 263), "adhuc tua messis in herba est," and many other parallels.) If this was a proverbial expression to give encouragement to the sower, we cannot infer from its use here that the time was December. Our Lord quotes it for the sake of the contrast between the ordinary relation of harvest to seed-time, and that which they can recognise by lifting their eyes.—**ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν.** . . . Your harvest is already here. What the disciples see when they lift their eyes from their food is the crowd of Samaritans ripe for the kingdom and now approaching them. In Samaria a long time might have been expected to elapse between sowing and reaping; but no!—**λευκαί εἰσι** . . . the fields are already ripe for cutting. [**λευκαί** Wetstein illustrates from Ovid, "maturis *albescit* messis aristis".]—Ver. 36. **καὶ ὁ θερίζων** . . . W.H. close ver. 35 with **θερισμόν** and begin 36 **ἤδη ὁ θερίζων.** Already, and not after four months waiting, the harvester has his reward and gathers fruit to life eternal. The reaper has not to wait, but even now and in one and the same action finds his reward (*cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 17) and gathers the great product of this world which nourishes not merely through one winter till next year's crop is gathered but to life eternal.—**ἵνα ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων,** "that sower and reaper may rejoice at one and the same time". Here among the Samaritans this extraordinary spectacle was seen, Jesus the Sower and the disciples the reapers working almost simultaneously. So quickly had the crop sprung that the reapers trod on the heels of the Sower.—Ver. 37. **ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ.** For in this, *i.e.*, in the circumstances explained in the following verse, namely, that I have sent you to reap what others sowed, is the saying verified, "one soweth and another reapeth".—**ὁ λόγος,** "the saying"; *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, etc.—**ἀληθινός** without the article is the predicate and scarcely expresses that the saying receives in the present circumstances its ideal fulfilment, rather that the saying is shown to be genuine; the saying is **ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων,** various forms of which are given by Wetstein; as, **ἄλλοι μὲν σπείρουσιν, ἄλλοι δ' αὖ ἀμήσονται,** "sic vos non vobis"; *cf.* Job xxxi. 8; Micah vi. 15; Deut. vi. 11. ["It was objected to Pompey that he came upon the victories of Lucullus and gathered those laurels which were due to the fortune and valour of another," Plutarch.]—Ver. 38. The exemplification in our Lord's mind is given in ver. 38, where the pronouns **ἐγὼ** and **ὑμᾶς** are emphatic. "I sent you to reap." When? Holtzmann thinks the past tenses can only be explained as spoken by the glorified Lord looking back on His call of the twelve as Apostles. That is, the words were not spoken as John relates. But may not the reference be to the baptising of many by the disciples in the preceding months? This would be quite a natural and obvious reference. The work in Judaea which justifies the preterites was now alluded to, because now again the same division of labour is apparent. The Samaritans come not because of anything the disciples had said while making purchases in the town, but because of their Master's

l Lk. v. 3. m i. 40. n 1 Mac. xi. 40.

ἐποίησα." 40. Ὡς οὖν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ Σαμαρεῖται, l ἠρώτων αὐτὸν m μεῖναι παρ' αὐτοῖς· καὶ n ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας. 41. καὶ πολλῷ πλείους ἐπίστευσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, 42. τῇ τε γυναικὶ ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλιὰν πιστεύομεν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν, καὶ οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ Χριστός." [1]

o Mk. i. 14. Mt. iv. 12.

43. Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν, καὶ o ἀπῆλθεν [2] εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 44. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν, ὅτι προφήτης

[1] ο Χριστος omitted in ℵBC vulg. and Memph.; found in AC³DL.

[2] Omit και απηλθεν with ℵBCD, T., Ti., W.H.

talk with the woman.—Vv. 39-42 briefly sum up the results of the Lord's visit.—Ver. 39. Out of Sychar many of the Samaritans believed on Him. This faith was the result of the woman's testimony, διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης; her testimony being, εἶπέ μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα.—Ver. 40. Their faith showed itself in an invitation to Him to remain with them; in compliance with which invitation, impressive as coming from Samaritans, He remained two days.—Ver. 41. The result was that πολλῷ πλείους, a far larger number than had believed owing to the woman's report now believed διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ, on account of what they heard from Jesus Himself. This is a faith approved by John, because based not on miracles but on the word of Christ.—οὐκέτι . . . καὶ οἴδαμεν. No longer do we believe on account of your talk [λαλιάν, not λόγον], for we ourselves have heard and know. This could only be said by those who went out first from the city, not by those many more who afterwards believed. They felt that their faith was now firmer and stronger, more worthy to be called faith. This mature belief expressed itself in the confession οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου ὁ Χριστός. The title "Saviour of the World" was of course prompted by the teaching of Jesus Himself during His two days' residence. To suppose, with several interpreters, that it is put into the mouth of the Samaritans by the evangelist is to suppose that during these two days Jesus did not disclose to them that He was the Saviour of the World. ["It probably belongs not to the Samaritans but to the evangelist. At the same time it is possible that such an epithet might be employed by them merely as synonymous with 'Messiah'" —Sanday.]

Doubt has been cast on the historicity of this narrative by Baur, who thinks the woman is a type of susceptible heathendom; and by Strauss, who thinks it was invented for the purpose of showing that Jesus personally taught not only in Galilee, Judaea, and Perea, but also in Samaria. "How natural the tendency to perfect the agency of Jesus, by representing Him to have sown the heavenly seed in Samaria, thus extending His Ministry through all parts of Palestine; to limit the glory of the apostles and other teachers to that of being the mere reapers of the harvest in Samaria; and to put this distinction, on a suitable occasion, into the mouth of Jesus!" Holtzmann's idea of this section of the Gospel is similar. The fictitious character of the narrative seems to be mainly based on its great significance for the life of Christ. As if the actual events of His life were not significant. Stress too is laid on the circumstance that among simple peoples all striking incidents, conversations, recognitions, take place at wells. In other words, wells are common meeting-places, therefore this meeting at a well cannot have taken place.

Vv. 43-54. *Jesus passes into Galilee and there heals the son of a nobleman.*—Ver. 43. Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας. "And after *the* two days," see ver. 40.—ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν, "He departed thence," *i.e.*, from Sychar.—εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, "into Galilee," carrying out the intention which had brought Him to Sychar, iv. 3.—Ver. 44. The reason for His proceeding to Galilee is given in ver. 44.—αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν, "for Jesus Himself testified". The evangelist would not have presumed to apply to Jesus the proverbial expression, προφήτης . . . οὐκ ἔχει, but Jesus Himself used it. The saying embodies a common observation. Montaigne complained that

ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει. 45. [p] Ὅτε οὖν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, [q] ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι, πάντα ἑωρακότες ἃ ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ· καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν.

46. Ἦλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [r] πάλιν εἰς τὴν Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὅπου ἐποίησε τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον. καὶ ἦν τις [s] βασιλικὸς, οὗ ὁ υἱὸς ἠσθένει ἐν

p Lk. iv. 24.
q i. 11.
r ii. 1.
s Here only as subst.

in his own country he had to purchase publishers: while elsewhere publishers purchased him. The difficulty lies in the present application of the saying. If Galilee was His "fatherland," how can He use this proverb as a reason for His going there? To escape the difficulty Cyril, followed by Calvin, Grotius, and many more, says Nazareth was His πατρίς, and here [ἀναγκαίαν ποιεῖται τὴν ἀπολογίαν τῆς παραδρομῆς] he assigns the reason for His passing by Nazareth. πατρίς can be used of a town as in Philo's *Leg. ad Caium*, Agrippa says ἔστι δέ μοι Ἱεροσόλυμα πατρίς (Kypke). See also Achilles Tat., 22; Lk. iv. 23. But the objection is that Lk. tells us He did go to Nazareth. Origen says Judaea was the πατρὶς τῶν προφητῶν; and Lücke, Westcott, Reith, and others believe that Judaea is here meant; and that Jesus, by citing the proverb, gives the reason for His rejection in Jerusalem. But this is out of place, as He had long since left Jerusalem. Meyer thinks the meaning is that Jesus left Galilee in order to substantiate His Messianic claim in Jerusalem, and this having been accomplished, He returns with His credentials to His own country. This agrees with ver. 45, "having seen the miracles which He had done in Jerusalem". Weiss interprets the words as meaning that Jesus leaves Samaria, where honour had come unbidden, in order to evoke faith and honour where as yet He had none: thus continuing the hard work of sowing and leaving to the disciples the glad harvesting. This is ingenious; but the obvious interpretation is that which finds in the statement (vv. 43, 44) a resumption of the narrative of vv. 1-3, which had been interrupted by the account of the Lord's experience in Samaria. That narrative had assigned as the reason for our Lord's leaving Judaea and making for Galilee, His own over-popularity, which threatened a collision with the Pharisees. To avoid this He goes to Galilee, where, as He Himself said, there was little risk of His being too highly honoured.—Ver. 45. Neither is οὖν of ver. 45 inconsistent with this interpretation. It merely continues the narration: "when, then, He came into Galilee". The immediate result of His coming was not what He anticipated, and therefore ἐδέξαντο is thrust into the emphatic place, "a welcome was accorded to Him by the Galileans". And this unexpected result is accounted for by the fact stated, πάντα ἑωρακότες . . . εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν; they had been at the Passover at Jerusalem, and had seen all He had done there. "They received Him . . . on account of His fame in Jerusalem, the metropolis, which set them the fashion in their estimate of men and things" (Alford). According to John's usual method of distinguishing various kinds of faith, this note is inserted to warn the reader that the reception was after all not deeply grounded, and to prepare for the statement of ver. 48. [ἦλθον, and even ἐποίησεν, may be rendered by pluperfects.]—Ver. 46. ἦλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. May we conclude from the circumstance that no mention is made of the disciples until vi. 3, "that they had remained in Samaria, and had gone home"? πάλιν ἐλθεῖν means "to return"; here with a reference to ii. 1. The further definition of Κανᾶ, ὅπου ἐποίησε τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον, is to identify the place, to prepare for ver. 54, and to remind us He had friends there. Weiss and Holtzmann suppose the family of Jesus was now resident at Cana. That we have no reason to suppose. From the period of the ministry in Galilee now beginning, the Synoptists give many details: John gives but one. ἦν τις βασιλικός. Euthymius gives the meanings of βασιλικός thus: βασιλικὸς ἐλέγετο, ἢ ὡς ἐκ γένους βασιλικοῦ, ἢ ὡς ἀξίωμά τι κεκτημένος, ἀφ' οὗπερ ἐκαλεῖτο βασιλικός, ἢ ὡς ὑπηρέτης βασιλικός. Kypke gives examples of its use by writers of the period to denote soldiers or servants of a king, or persons of royal blood, or of rank and dignity, and thinks it here means "vir nobilis, clarus, in dignitate quadam constitutus". Lampe thinks it may imply that this man was both in the royal service and of royal blood. Lightfoot suggests that this may

Καπερναούμ. 47. οὗτος ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἥκει ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἀπῆλθε πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα καταβῇ καὶ ἰάσηται αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱόν· [t] ἤμελλε γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν. 48. εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτὸν, "[u] Ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδητε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε." 49. Λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ βασιλικὸς, "Κύριε, κατάβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου." 50. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Πορεύου· ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ." Καὶ ἐπίστευσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐπορεύετο. 51. ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος, οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ ἀπήντησαν[1] αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν λέγοντες, "Ὅτι ὁ παῖς σου ζῇ." 52. [v] Ἐπύθετο οὖν παρ' αὐτῶν τὴν ὥραν ἐν ᾗ κομψότερον ἔσχε· καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ὅτι χθὲς ὥραν

t 2 Mac. vii. 18.
u vi. 30. 1 Cor. i. 22.
v With acc. here and Acts xxiii. 20 only.

[1] υπηντησαν (always used in John, xi. 20, 30; xii. 18) found in ℵBCDKL.

have been Chuza, Herod's chamberlain. Most probably he was an officer of Herod's court, civil or military. His prominent characteristic at this time is given in the words, οὗ ὁ υἱὸς ἠσθένει ἐν Καφαρναούμ. The place is named because essential to the understanding of what follows.—Ver. 47. Having heard ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἥκει, "that Jesus has come into Galilee," he traces Him to Kana, and begs Him not simply to heal his son, but pointedly ἵνα καταβῇ, to go to Capernaum for the purpose. He considered the presence of Jesus to be necessary [" non putat verbo curare posse," Melanchthon] (contrast the centurion of Matt. viii.); and, being a person of standing, did not scruple to trouble Jesus. Jesus neither refuses nor grants the request at once, but utters the reflection: Ver. 48. ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα . . . πιστεύσητε. Not as a prophet uttering truth, but as a miracle worker He is sought in His own country: Samaria had received Him without miracle, as a Prophet. To seek for a sign, says Melanchthon, "est velle certificari alio modo quam per verbum". τέρατα here only in John, though frequent in Acts. Faith rooted in "marvels" Jesus put in an inferior place. But the father in his urgent anxiety can only repeat his request (ver. 49) κατάβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου. "Duplex imbecillitas rogantis, quasi Dominus necesse haberet adesse, nec posset aeque resuscitare mortuum" (Bengel). But Jesus, unable to prolong his misery, says πορεύου· ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ. He did not go with him. His cures are independent of material media and even of His presence.—Ver. 50. And now the man believed τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ [or ὃν] εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. His first immature faith has grown into something better. The evident sincerity of Jesus quickens a higher faith. On Christ's word he departs home, believing he will find his son healed.—Ver. 51. And while already on his way down [ἤδη showing that he did not remain with Christ until from some other source he heard that his son was healed], his servants met him and gave him the reward of his faith.—ὁ παῖς σου ζῇ, an echo, as Weiss remarks, of the words of Jesus, ver. 50. The servants seeing the improvement in the boy and not ascribing it to miracle, set out to save their master from bringing Jesus to Capernaum.—Ver. 52. ἐπύθετο οὖν . . . κομψότερον ἔσχε. "Amoenum verbum, de convalescente, puero praesertim"—Bengel. Theophylact explains by ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον καὶ εὐρωστότερον μετῆλθεν ὁ παῖς: Euthymius by τὸ ῥᾳότερον, τὸ κουφότερον, as we speak of a sick person being "easier," "lighter". The best illustration is Raphel's from Epictetus (*Diss.*, 3, 10), who bids a patient not be too much uplifted if the physician says to him κομψῶς ἔχεις, you are doing well. The servants name the seventh hour, *i.e.*, 1 p.m. of the previous day, as the time when the fever left him. [Accus. of time when, rare; Winer explains as if it meant the approximate time with a περί or ὡσεί understood; Acts x. 3; Rev. iii. 3.] And this the father recognised as the time at which Jesus had said "Thy son liveth". The distance between Cana and Capernaum is about twenty-five miles, so that it would appear as if the father had needlessly delayed on the road. But he may have had business for Herod or for himself on the road, or the beast he rode may have been unequal to the double

ἑβδόμην ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός." 53. Ἔγνω οὖν ὁ πατὴρ, ὅτι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἐν ᾗ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅτι ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ." Καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη. 54. τοῦτο πάλιν δεύτερον σημεῖον ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐλθὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. w ii. 1-11.

V. 1. ΜΕΤΑ ταῦτα ἦν ἑορτὴ[1] τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς

[1] η εορτη ℵCEFHL Memph. Theb. Cyr.-Alex. Tisch. εορτη without article ABDGK Orig. Chrys. Tr.W.H.R.

journey. At any rate it seems illegitimate to say with Weiss that "yesterday" means before sundown; or to ascribe the father's delay to the confidence he had in Jesus' word. The discovery of the coincidence in point of time produces a higher degree of faith, ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη. The cure brings into prominence this distinctive peculiarity of a miracle that it consists of a marvel which is coincident with an express announcement of it.—Ver. 54. τοῦτο πάλιν . . . τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. πάλιν δεύτερον a common pleonasm, "again a second"; *cf.* xxi. 16. In Mt. xxvi. 42, πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου; and Acts x. 15. By this note John connects this miracle with that at the wedding, ii. 1-10, of which he said (ii. 11) ταύτην ἐποίησε ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς. It does not mean that this was the second miracle after this return to Galilee, although the words might bear that interpretation. Why this note? Bengel thinks that attention is called to the fact that John relates three miracles wrought in Galilee and three in Judaea. Alford supposes that John wishes to note that as the former miracle had called forth the faith of the disciples, so this elicited faith from a wider circle.

Not only Strauss, Baur, and Keim but also Weiss and Sanday suppose that this is the same healing as is recorded in Mt. viii. 5-13. But the differences are too great. In the one it is a Gentile centurion whose servant is paralysed; in the other it is the son of a (probably Jewish) court official who is at the point of death from fever. In the one the centurion insists that Jesus shall not come under his roof; in the other the supplicant beseeches Him to do so. The half-faith of the father is blamed; the extraordinary faith of the centurion is lauded.

Chapters v.-xi. depict the growth of the unbelief of the Jews. In this part of the Gospel three Judaean miracles and one in Galilee are related in full, and the impulse given by each to the hatred of the Jews is pointed out. These miracles are the healing of the impotent man (chap. v.), the miraculous feeding (chap. vi.), the cure of the man born blind (chap. ix.), and the raising of Lazarus (chap. xi.). This section of the Gospel may be divided thus:—

1. Chaps. v. and vi., Christ manifests Himself as the Life first in Judaea, then in Galilee, but is rejected in both places.

2. Chaps. vii. to x. 21, He attends the Feast of Tabernacles and manifests Himself by word and deed but is threatened both by the mob and by the authorities.

3. Chaps. x. 22 to xi., Jesus withdraws from Jerusalem but returns to raise Lazarus, in consequence of which the authorities finally determine to slay Him.

CHAPTER V. *Jesus in Jerusalem manifests Himself as the Life by communicating strength to an impotent man.* —Ver. 1. μετὰ ταῦτα, "after this"; how long after does not concern the narrative.—ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. See critical note. Even if the article were the true reading, this would not, as Lücke has shown, determine the feast to be the Passover. Rather it would be Tabernacles, see W.H. ii. 76. We are thrown upon general considerations ;and that these yield a very uncertain result is shown by the variety of opinion expressed by commentators. The feasts we have to choose from are: Purim in March, Passover in April, Pentecost in May, Tabernacles in October, Dedication in December. It is chiefly between Purim and Passover that opinion is divided, because some feast in spring is supposed to be indicated by iv. 35. Against Passover it is urged that in chap. vi. another Passover is mentioned; but this is by no means decisive, as John elsewhere passes over equally long intervals of time. Lampe, Lightfoot, Grotius, Whitelaw, and Wordsworth argue for Passover: Tischendorf, Meyer,

a Neh. iii. 1. εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. 2. Ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ [a] προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα, ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθεσδά,[1] πέντε στοὰς ἔχουσα. 3. ἐν ταύταις [b] κατέκειτο πλῆθος πολὺ τῶν ἀσθενούντων, τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ξηρῶν, ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν.[2] 4. ἄγγελος γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, καὶ ἐτάρασσε τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος, ὑγιὴς ἐγίνετο, ᾧ δήποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι.[3] 5. Ἦν δέ [c] τις ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ τριακονταοκτὼ ἔτη [d] ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ. 6. τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς κατακείμενον, καὶ γνοὺς ὅτι πολὺν ἤδη

b Mk. i. 30. Acts ix. 33.
c iii. 1.
d viii. 57; xi. 17.

[1] Βηθεσδα ACI Syr. Cur. Pesh. Orig. Chrys. Βηθζαθα (or Βηζαθα) ℵL 33. Βηθσαιδα B vulg. Memph. Theb. Syr. Harcl.

[2] εκδεχομενον την του υδατος κινησιν in A²C³DI vet. Lat. codd. plur. syrr. (Pesh. Harcl. Hier.); omitted from ℵA*BC*L and by recent editors.

[3] Ver. 4 found in AC³EFGHIKL vet. Lat., etc., but omitted from ℵBC*D vulg. Memph. Theb. Arm. and by recent editors. But Oscar Holtzmann pronounces it necessary for the understanding of the narrative; and it is quite in keeping with the Jewish conception of the ministry of angels.

Godet, Farrar, Weiss, and others strongly favour Purim; while Lücke seems to prove that no sure conclusion can be reached. [For a full and fair presentation of opinions and data see Andrew's *Life of our Lord*, p. 189 *sqq.*] The feast, whatever it was, is mentioned here to account for Jesus being again in Jerusalem.—Ver. 2. **ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις.** From the use of the present tense Bengel concludes that this was written before the destruction of Jerusalem ["Scripsit Johannes ante vastationem urbis"]. But quite probably John considered the pool one of the permanent features of the city. Its position is more precisely defined in the words **ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ**, rendered in A.V. "by the sheep market" and in R.V. "by the sheep gate". Others read **κολυμβήθρᾳ**, and render "by the sheep-*pool a pool*"; Weiss, adopting this reading, supplies **οἰκία** or some such word: "there is by the sheep-pool a building". But this does some violence to the sentence; and as the "sheep gate" is mentioned in Neh. iii. 32, xii. 39, the reading, construction, and rendering of R.V. are to be preferred.—**ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθεσδά.** The pool has recently been identified. M. Clermont Ganneau pointed out that its site should not be far from the church of St. Anne, and in 1888 Herr Shick found in that locality two sister pools, one fifty-five and the other sixty feet long. The former was arched in by five arches, while five corresponding porches ran alongside the pool. By the crusaders a church had been built over this pool, with a crypt framed in imitation of the five porches and with an opening in the floor to get down to the water. That they regarded this pool as that mentioned here is shown by their having represented on the wall of the crypt the angel troubling the water. [Herr Shick's papers are contained in the *Palestine Quarterly*, 1888, pp. 115-134, and 1890, p. 19. See also St. Clair's *Buried Cities*, Henderson's *Palestine*, p. 180.] The pool had five porches. Bovet describes the bath of Ibrahim near Tiberias: "The hall in which the spring is found is surrounded by several porticoes in which we see a multitude of people crowded one upon another, laid on couches or rolled in blankets, with lamentable expressions of misery and suffering". Here lay **πλῆθος τῶν ἀσθενούντων**, and these were of three kinds, **τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ξηρῶν.**—Ver. 3. **ἐκδεχομένων . . . νοσήματι.** See critical note.—Ver. 5. **ἦν δέ τις ἄνθρωπος . . . ἀσθενείᾳ.** "And there was a certain man there who had spent thirty-eight years in his infirmity:" **ἔτη ἔχων**, *cf.* v. 6 and viii. 57; and Achil. Tat., 24. How long he had lain by the water is not said. To find in the man's thirty-eight years' imbecility a symbol of Israel's thirty-eight years in the wilderness is itself an imbecility.—Ver. 6. Jesus when He saw the man lying and had ascertained (**γνούς**, having learned from the man or his friends) that already he had passed a long time (in that infirmity) says: **θέλεις ὑγιὴς γενέσθαι;** "Do you wish to become whole

χρόνον ἔχει, λέγει αὐτῷ, "Θέλεις ὑγιὴς γενέσθαι;" 7. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ ἀσθενῶν, "Κύριε, ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω, ἵνα ὅταν [e] ταραχθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ, βάλλῃ με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν· [f] ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγὼ, ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει." 8. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[g] Ἔγειραι,[1] ἆρον τὸν [h] κράββατόν σου, καὶ περιπάτει." 9. Καὶ εὐθέως ἐγένετο ὑγιὴς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἦρε τὸν κράββατον αὐτοῦ, καὶ περιεπάτει. [i] ἦν δὲ σάββατον [j] ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. 10. Ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ τεθεραπευμένῳ, "Σάββατόν ἐστιν· οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι ἆραι τὸν κράββατον." 11. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, "Ὁ [k] ποιήσας με [k] ὑγιῆ, ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν, Ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν σου, καὶ περιπάτει." 12. Ἠρώτησαν οὖν αὐτὸν, "Τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ εἰπών σοι, Ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν σου, καὶ περιπάτει;" 13. Ὁ δὲ ἰαθεὶς οὐκ ᾔδει τίς [l] ἐστιν· ὁ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς [m] ἐξένευσεν, ὄχλου ὄντος ἐν τῷ τόπῳ.

e Ezek. xxxii. 2.
f Mk. ii. 19, etc.
g Mk. ii. 11.
h Mk. ii. 4, 9.
i Mk. iii. 1.
j Josh. vi. 26.
k ver. 15; vii. 23.
l i. 40.
m viii. 59. 2 Kings ii. 24.

[1] **εγειρε** as in ℵABCD; restored by modern editors in all places of its occurrence. Intrans. in Eph. v. 14, etc.; *vide* Thayer, cp. ver. 21.

(healthy)?" This question was put to attract the man's attention and awaken hope. But the man is hopeless: it is not a question of will, he says, but of opportunity. His very weakness enabled others to anticipate him; **ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι ἐγὼ**, "while I am coming," he could, then, move a little, but not quickly enough. At each bubbling up of the water, apparently only one could be healed. The **ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει** was a great aggravation of his case.—Ver. 8. The impotent man having declared his helplessness, Jesus says to him, **Ἔγειρε**, a command to be obeyed on the moment by faith in Him who gave it. *Cf.* vi. 63, and Augustine's "Da quod jubes, et jube quod vis". **ἆρον τὸν κράββατόν σου**, "take up your pallet". **κράββατος** is the Latin *grabatus*, and is late Greek; see Rutherford's *New Phryn.*, 137; and McLellan's *Greek Test.*, p. 106, for references and anecdote. He was commanded to take up his bed that he might recognise that the cure was permanent. No doubt many of the cures at the pool were merely temporary. **περιπάτει** "walk," ability was given not merely to rise, but to walk. The cures wrought by Christ are perfect, and do not only give some relief.—Ver. 9. **καὶ εὐθέως** . . . Immediately on Christ's word he became strong, and took up his bed and walked: **ἦρε** aorist of one act, **περιεπάτει** imperfect of continued action. Ver. 10 should begin with the words **ἦν δὲ σάββατον**, as this is the starting-point for what follows.—Ver. 10. "It was a Sabbath on that day," the Jews therefore said to him that had been healed, **Σάββατόν ἐστιν**, "It is Sabbath". **οὐκ ἔξεστί σοι ἆραι τὸν κράββατον**. The law is laid down in Exod. xxiii. 12; Jer. xvii. 21. "Take heed to yourselves and bear no burden on the Sabbath day;" *cf.* Neh. xiii. 15. The rabbinical law ran: "Whosoever on the Sabbath bringeth anything in, or taketh anything out from a public place to a private one, if he hath done this inadvertently, he shall sacrifice for his sin; but if wilfully, he shall be cut off and shall be stoned" (Lightfoot *in loc.*).—Ver. 11. The man's reply reveals a higher law than that of the Sabbath, the fundamental principle of all Christian obedience: **Ὁ ποιήσας . . . περιπάτει.** He that gives life is the proper authority for its use.—Ver. 12. As the healed man transferred the blame to another, **ἠρώτησαν . . . περιπάτει**. "Who is the man," rather, "the fellow?" **ὁ ἄνθρωπος** used contemptuously. As Grotius says: "Quaerunt non quod mirentur, sed quod calumnietur".—Ver. 13. But the man could give them no information. He did not know the name of his healer. **ὁ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐξένευσεν**, "for Jesus had withdrawn" or "turned aside". **ἐκνεύω**, from **νεύω**, to bend the head, rather than **ἐκνέω**, to swim out. *Cf.* Judges iv. 18 (where, however, Dr. Swete reads **ἔκκλινον**), xviii. 26. See also Thayer and Wetstein. The reason why Jesus took Himself away, and the explanation of His doing so without observation, are both given in **ὄχλου ὄντος ἐν τῷ τόπῳ.** He did not wish observation and it was easy to escape in the crowd.—Ver. 14.

14. Μετὰ ταῦτα εὑρίσκει αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἴδε ὑγιὴς γέγονας· μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε, ἵνα μὴ χεῖρόν τί σοι γένηται." 15. Ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἀνήγγειλε τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς [l] ἐστιν ὁ [k] ποιήσας αὐτὸν ὑγιῆ.

16. Καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδίωκον τὸν Ἰησοῦν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι,[1] ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ. 17. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς, "Ὁ πατήρ μου [n] ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι." 18. Διὰ τοῦτο οὖν μᾶλλον ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι οὐ μόνον [o] ἔλυε τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα

l i. 40.
k ver. 15; vii. 13.
n ii. 10.
o vii. 23; x. 35. Mt. v. 19.

[1] The clause και . . . αποκτειναι is found in A, but not in ℵBCDL, and is supposed to have been derived from ver. 18. But μαλλον in ver. 18 is pointless unless this clause be read.

Though the healed man had failed to keep hold of Jesus, Jesus does not lose hold of him, but **εὑρίσκει αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ**, "finds him," as if He had been looking out for him, *cf.* i. 44, 46, "in the temple," where he may have gone to give God thanks. Jesus says to him **Ἴδε ὑγιὴς γέγονας . . . γένηται. μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε**, present imperative, "continue no longer in sin". **χεῖρον**. There is then some worse consequence of sin than thirty-eight years' misery and uselessness. Apparently Jesus feared that health of body might only lead the man to further sin. His physical weakness was seemingly the result of sin, *cf.* Mark ii. 5-10. Jesus is not satisfied with giving him physical health. Oscar Holtzmann observes that we have here the two leading Pauline ideas, that the Saviour frees from many O.T. precepts, and yet that His emancipation is a call to strive against sin (*Johan.*, p. 60).—Ver. 15. **ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος**. "The man went off and reported to the Jews that the person who healed him was Jesus. He had asked His name, and perhaps did not consider that in proclaiming it he was endangering his benefactor.—Ver. 16. The consequence however was that "the Jews persecuted Jesus," **ἐδίωκον**, not in the technical sense; but, as the imperfect also suggests, they began from this point to meditate hostile action; *cf.* Mark iii. 6. **καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι**, on the ground that He was a Sabbath-breaker, and therefore worthy of death; **ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ**. The plural and the imperfect show that the cure of the impotent man was not the only case they had in view. Their allies in the provinces had made them acquainted with similar cases. It would almost seem as if He was in the habit of thus signalising the Sabbath.—Ver. 17. In some informal way these accusations were brought to the ears of Jesus, and His defence was: **Ὁ πατήρ μου . . . ἐργάζομαι**. "My Father until now works, and I work"; as if the work of the Father had not come to an end on the seventh day, but continued until the present hour. Nay, as if the characteristic of the Father were just this, that He works. Philo perceived the same truth; **παύεται οὐδέποτε ποιῶν ὁ θεὸς ἀλλ᾽ ὥσπερ ἴδιον τὸ καίειν πυρὸς καὶ χίονος τὸ ψύχειν, οὕτω καὶ Θεοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν**. God never stops working, for as it is the property of fire to burn and of snow to be cold so of God to work (*De allegor.*, ii. See Schoettgen *in loc.*). Jesus means them to apprehend that there is no Sabbath, such as they suppose, with God, and that this healing of the impotent was God's work. The Father does not rest from doing good on the Sabbath day, and I as the Father's hand also do good on the Sabbath. In charging Him with breaking the Sabbath (ver. 18), it was God they charged with breaking it. But this exasperated them the more "because He not only was annulling (**ἔλυε**, 'laws, as having binding force, are likened to bonds, hence **λύειν** is *to annul*, *subvert*, *deprive of authority*,' Thayer) the Sabbath, but also said that God was His own Father, making Himself equal to God". The Jews found in **ὁ πατήρ μου** (ver. 17) and the implication in **κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι** a claim to some peculiar and exclusive (**ἴδιον**) sonship on the part of Jesus; that He claimed to be Son of God not in the sense in which other men are, but in a sense which involved equality with God. Starting from this, Jesus took occasion to unfold His relation to the Father so far as it concerned men to know it.

[p] ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεὸν, ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ Θεῷ. 19. ἀπεκρίνατο οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν [q] ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν, ἐὰν μή τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα· ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ, ταῦτα καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ὁμοίως ποιεῖ. 20. [r] ὁ γὰρ πατὴρ φιλεῖ τὸν υἱὸν, καὶ πάντα δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ· καὶ [s] μείζονα τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαυμάζητε. 21. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἐγείρει τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ ζωοποιεῖ, [t] οὕτω καὶ ὁ υἱὸς οὓς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ. 22. [u] οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει

p Rom. viii 32. 1 Cor. vii. 2.
q viii. 28; ix. 4; x. 18.
r xv. 9.
s xiv. 12.
t xi. 25.
u Mt. xi. 27; xxv. 31.

The passage 19-30 divides itself thus: vv. 19, 20 exhibit the ground of the Son's activity in the Father's activity and love for the Son; vv. 21-23, the works given by the Father to the Son are, generally, life-giving and judging; vv. 24-27, these works in the spiritual sphere; vv. 28-29, in the physical sphere; and ver. 30, reaffirmation of unity with the Father.—Ver. 19. The fundamental proposition is **οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν**. "The Son can do nothing of Himself." This is not, as sometimes has been supposed, a general statement true of all sons, but is spoken directly of Jesus. **δύναται** is moral not physical ability—though here the one implies the other; but *cf.* ver. 26. So perfect is the Son's sympathy with the Father that He can only do what He sees the Father doing. He does nothing at His own instance. That is to say, in healing the impotent man He felt sure He was doing what the Father wished done and gave Him power to do.—**ἃ γὰρ . . . ποιεῖ**, as Holtzmann observes, the force of the repetition lies in **ὁμοίως**, *pariter*, "in like manner".—Ver. 20. And the Son is enabled to see what the Father does, because He loves the Son and shows Him all that He Himself does. The Father is not passive in the matter, merely allowing Jesus to discover what He can of the Father's will; but the Father **δείκνυσιν**, shows Him, inwardly and in response to His own readiness to perceive, not mechanically but spiritually, all that He does; **πάντα** apparently without limitation, for **ποιεῖ** is habitual present as **φιλεῖ** in previous clause, and cannot be restricted to the things God was *then* doing in the case of the impotent man. Besides, a merely human sonship scarcely satisfies the absolute **ὁ πατήρ** and **ὁ υἱός** of this passage.—**καὶ μείζονα . . . θαυμάζητε**, the Father through the Son will do greater works than the healing of the impotent man; *cf.* xiv. 12; "that ye may marvel"; this seems an inadequate motive, but ver. 23 explains it. In the following passage, spiritual quickening is meant in vv. 21-27, while in vv. 28, 29, it is the bodily resurrection that is in view.—Ver. 21. **ὥσπερ γὰρ . . . ζωοποιεῖ**. This is one of the "greater works" which the Father shows to the Son. The Jews believed in the power of God to give life and to raise the dead; see Deut. xxxii. 39; 1 Sam. ii. 6; Is. xxvi. 19. In our Lord's time there was in use the following prayer: "Thou, O Lord, art mighty for ever; Thou quickenest the dead; Thou art strong to save; Thou sustainest the living by Thy mercy; Thou quickenest the dead by Thy great compassion; Thou makest good Thy faithfulness to them that sleep in the dust; Thou art faithful to quicken the dead. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who quickenest the dead." There is therefore no need to ask, what quickening of the dead is here meant? What was meant was that the power which they all believed to be in God was likewise in the Son. He quickens **οὓς θέλει**, *i.e.*, no matter how dead the person is; even though he has lain as long useless as the impotent man. The question of the human will is not touched here, but it may be remarked that the will of the impotent man was consulted as the prime requisite of the cure.—Ver. 22. But not only does the Son quicken whom He will, but He also judges; **οὐδὲ γὰρ . . . υἱῷ**. "For not even does the Father judge any one, but has given all judgment to the Son." "For since He knows Himself to be the sole mediator of true life for men, He can also declare that all those who will not partake through Him of this blissful life, just therein experience judgment whereby they sink into death." Wendt, ii. 211; and *cf.* ver. 27. **οὐδὲ γὰρ** introduces the fresh statement, that He judges, not only as the reason for what goes before, but on its own account also, as an additional fact to be noticed. It would seem an astonishing thing that

οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ· 23. ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι τὸν υἱόν, καθὼς τιμῶσι τὸν πατέρα. ὁ μὴ τιμῶν τὸν υἱόν, οὐ τιμᾷ τὸν πατέρα τὸν πέμψαντα αὐτόν. 24. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων, καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον· καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ [v] μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν. 25. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι [w] ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν, ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσονται[1] τῆς φωνῆς

v 1 Jo. iii. 14.
w iv. 23.

[1] ακουσονται in ADΓ; ακουσουσιν in B, adopted by T.Tr.W.H.R. So in ver. 28.

even "judgment," the allotting of men to their eternal destinies, should be handed over to the Son. But so it is: and without exception, τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν, "all judgment," of all men and without appeal.—Ver. 23. This extreme prerogative is given to the Son ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι τὸν υἱὸν . . . This is one purpose, though not the sole purpose, of committing judgment to the Son; that even those supremely and inalienably Divine prerogatives of giving life and judging may be seen to be in Him, and that thus Deity may be honoured in and through Him. The great peril threatening the Jews was that they should deny honour to the Son, and hereby incur the guilt of refusing honour to the Father. In denouncing Him for breaking the Sabbath they were really dishonouring the Father. ὁ μὴ τιμῶν . . . αὐτόν. μὴ τιμῶν a supposed case, therefore μή: οὐ τιμᾷ actual negation. To dishonour the Father's messenger is to dishonour the Father. Having explained the relation of His work to the Father's, and having declared that life-giving and judging are His prerogatives, Jesus now, in vv. 24-30, more definitely shows how these powers are to be exercised in the spiritual regeneration, and in the resurrection and final judgment of men. Vv. 24-26. The voice of Jesus gives life eternal. ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν, however incredible what I now say may seem.—Ver. 24. ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων; it was through His word Jesus conveyed life to the impotent man, because that brought Him into spiritual connection with the man. And it is through His claims, His teaching, His offers, He brings Himself into connection with all. It is a general truth not confined to the impotent man. But to hear is not enough: καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με, belief on Him that sent Jesus must accompany hearing. Not simply belief on Jesus but on God. The word of Jesus must be recognised as a Divine message, a word with power to fulfil it. In this case, by the very hearing and believing, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. As the impotent man had, in his believing, physical life, so whoever believes in Christ's word as God's message receives the life of God into his spirit. Faith has also a negative result; εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται [*cf.* οὐκ ἐθελόντων ὑμῶν ἐλθεῖν εἰς κρίσιν, quoted from Demosthenes by Wetstein. Herodotus also uses the expression]. Literally this means "he does not come to trial"; but has it not the fuller meaning "come under condemnation"? Meyer says "yes": Godet says "no". Meyer is right. This clause is the direct negative of the former: to come to judgment is to come under condemnation, *cf.* iii. 19, αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις, etc. ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν. The perfect shows (1) that the previous ἔχει is an actual present, and does not merely mean "has in prospect" or "has a right to"; and (2) that the result of the transition continues. Had the impotent man not believed and obeyed, he would have remained in his living death, in now a self-chosen and self-fixed condemnation: but accepting the life that was in Christ's command, he passed there and then from death to life.—Ver. 25. Ἀμὴν . . . introducing a confirmation of the preceding statement, in the form of an announcement of one characteristic of the new dispensation; ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν, *cf.* iv. 3. In this already arrived "hour" or epoch, the message of God is uttered by the voice of Jesus, τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ and οἱ νεκροί, they who have not made the transition spoken of in the preceding verse, ἀκούσονται, shall hear it; καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται [or ζήσουσιν], not "and having heard shall live," nor "and when they hear shall live"; but "and those who have heard [or hear] shall live". The insertion of the article indicates that not all, but only a certain class of the νεκροί are meant; all the

τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται.[1] **26. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ** [x] **πατὴρ ἔχει ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως ἔδωκε καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ· 27. καὶ** [z] **ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ** [y] **κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς**

x i. 12. Wisd. xvii. 2.
y Gen. xviii. 25.

[1] Modern editors read ζησουσι with ℵBDL 1, 22, 33.

dead hear but not all give ear (Weiss). **ἀκουσούσιν** in the former clause means hearing with the outward ear, **ἀκούσαντες** hearing with faith. The question, how can the spiritually dead hear and believe? is the question, how could the impotent man rise in response to Christ's word? Perhaps psychologically inexplicable, it is, happily, soluble in practice.—Ver. 26. The 26th verse partly explains the apparent impossibility.—**ὥσπερ γὰρ . . . ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.** "The particles mark the *fact* of the gift and not the *degrees* of it" (Westcott). As the Father has in Himself, and therefore at His own command, life which He can impart as He will: so by His gift the Son has in Himself life which He can communicate directly to whom He will.—**ἐν ἑαυτῷ** [similarly used Mk. iv. 17, John iv. 14, etc.] excludes dependence for life on anything external to self. From this it follows that what is so possessed is possessed with uninter rupted fulness, and can at will be imparted.—**ἔδωκε,** "the tense carries us back beyond time," says Westcott. This is more than doubtful; although several interpreters suppose the eternal generation of the Son is in view. That is precluded both by the word "gave"[which "denotat id quod non per naturalem generationem, sed per benevolam Patris voluntatem est concessum," Mt. xxviii. 18 Lk. i. 32; John iii. 34, vi. 37, Lampe] and by the context, especially by the last clause of ver. 27. The opinions of the Fathers and Reformers are cited in Lampe. See further Stevens, *Johan. Theol.*, p. 60.—Ver. 27. Not only has the Father given to the Son this great prerogative, but **καὶ ἐξουσίαν . . . ἀνθρώπου ἐστί. κρίσιν ποιεῖν,** like *judicium facere*, and our *do judgment*, is used by Demosthenes, Xenophon, Polybius, etc., in the sense "to judge," "to act as judge". This climax of authority [although **καὶ** is omitted before **κρίσιν** by recent editors on good authority] is based upon the fact **ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί.** [Strangely enough, Chrysostom ascribes this punctuation to Paul of Samosata, and declares it to be an inconsequence. He himself begins ver. 28 with this clause, and reads "marvel not at this, that He is the Son of Man".] The absence of the article condemns all interpretations which render these words "the Son of Man" and understands that Jesus claims the prerogative of judgment as the Messiah. Where "the Son of Man" means the Messiah the articles regularly appear. Besides, direct allusion to the Messianic functions would here be out of place. The words must be rendered "because He is a son of man," that is, a man. How is this a reason for His being Judge of men? Various explanations are given: the Judge must be visible since the judgment is to take place with human publicity (Luther, Maldonatus, Witsius), because as man the Son carries out the whole work of redemption (Meyer, etc.), because men should be judged by the lowliest and most loving of men (Stier), because the Judge must share the nature of those who are brought before Him (Westcott), because only as man could Jesus enter into the sphere in which the judicial office moves or have the compassion which a judge of men should possess (Baur), because the judgment of humanity is to be a homage rendered to the holiness of God, a true act of adoration, a worship; and therefore the act must go forth from the bosom of humanity itself (Godet). But undoubtedly Beyschlag is right when he says: "The eternal love condemns no one because he is a sinner; as such it does not at all condemn; it leaves it to men to judge themselves, through rejection of the Saviour who is presented to them. The Son of Man is the judge of the world, just because He presents the eternal life, the kingdom of heaven to all, and urges all to the eternal decision, and thus urges those who continue unbelieving to a continuing self-judgment" (*Neutest. Theol.*, i. 290). By His appearing in human form as God's messenger, and by His offer of life eternal, He necessarily judges men. As His offer of life to the impotent man tested him and showed whether he would abide in death or pass into life: so are all men judged precisely by that appearance among them in human form which stumbles them and tempts them to think His claims absurd, and which yet as the em-

ἀνθρώπου ἐστί. 28. μὴ [z]θαυμάζετε τοῦτο· ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα, ἐν ᾗ πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις ἀκούσονται τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ, 29. καὶ ἐκπορεύσονται, οἱ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες, εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς· οἱ δὲ τὰ [a]φαῦλα πράξαντες, [b]εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως. 30. οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν [c]ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν. καθὼς ἀκούω, κρίνω· καὶ ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν· ὅτι οὐ [d]ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός.[1] 31. Ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ

z Acc. of obj. in Lk. vii. 9; xxiv. 12. Jude 16. Acts vii. 31. Commonly with ἐπί.
a iii. 20.
b Dan. xii. 2.
c ver. 19.
d vii. 18; viii. 50.

[1] Modern editors omit πατρος in accordance with ℵABDK.

bodied love and life of God necessarily judges men. Therefore μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο.—Ver. 28. And another reason for restraining surprise is ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα, etc. It has been proposed to render this as if ὅτι were explanatory of τοῦτο, do not wonder at this, that an hour is coming. But (1) τοῦτο usually, though not invariably, refers to what precedes; and (2) when John says "Do not wonder that" so and so, he uses μὴ θαυμάσῃς ὅτι without τοῦτο; and (3) the ordinary rendering suits the passage better: Marvel not at this [that my voice gives life] because a time is coming when there will result from my voice that which if not really greater will strike you more sensibly. The bodily resurrection may be said to be greater than the spiritual as its consummation, completion, and exhibition in results. Besides, the Jews of our Lord's time looked upon the resurrection as the grand demonstration of God's power. But here the οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις shows that the surprise is to be occasioned by the fact that even the physically dead shall hear.—πάντες . . . κρίσεως. That the resurrection is alluded to is shown by the change from οἱ νεκροί of ver. 25 to οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις. Some rise to life, some to κρίσιν, which from its opposition to ζωήν must here be equivalent to κατακρίσιν. If it is asked with regard to the righteous, With what body do they come? much more may it be asked of the condemned. The entrance into life and into condemnation are determined by conduct; how the conduct is determined is not here stated. For the expressions defining the two types of conduct see on chap. iii. 20, 21. That the present reception of life is the assurance of resurrection is put strikingly by Paul in 2 Cor. v. 5. The fact that some shall rise to condemnation discloses that even those who have not the Spirit of God in them have some kind of continuous life which maintains them in existence with their personal identity intact from the time of death to the time of resurrection. Also, that the long period spent by some between these two points has not been utilised for bringing them into fellowship with Christ is apparent. In what state they rise or to what condition they go, we are not here told. Beyond the fact of their condemnation their future is left in darkness, and was therefore probably meant to be left in darkness.—Ver. 30. This judgment claimed by Jesus is, however, engaged in, not in any spirit of self-exaltation or human arbitrariness, nor can it err, because it is merely as the executor of the Father's will He judges.—οὐ δύναμαι . . . οὐδέν. The first statement of the verse is a return upon ver. 19, "The Son can do nothing of Himself"; but now it is specially applied to the work of judgment.—καθὼς ἀκούω κρίνω. As He said of His giving life, that He was merely the Agent of God, doing what He saw the Father do: so now He speaks what He hears from the Father. His judgment He knows to be just, because He is conscious that He has no personal bias, but seeks only to carry out the will of the Father. In vv. 31-40 Jesus substantiates these great claims which He has made in the foregoing verses. He refers to the μαρτυρία borne by John the Baptist, by the works given Him by the Father, and by the Father in Scripture.—Ver. 31. Ἐὰν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ . . . ἀληθής. Jesus anticipates the objection, that these great claims were made solely on His own authority [ἔγνω τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐνθυμουμένους ἀντιθεῖναι, Euthym.]. The Jewish law is given by Wetstein, "Testibus de se ipsis non credunt," or "Homo non est fide dignus de se ipso," and *cf.* Deut. xix. 15. The same law prevailed among the Greeks, μαρτυρεῖν γὰρ οἱ νόμοι οὐκ ἐῶσιν αὐτὸν ἑαυτῷ (Demosth., *De Cor.*, 2), and among the Romans, "more majorum comparatum est, ut in minimis

ἐμαυτοῦ, ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής. 32. [e] ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.

33. "Ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκε [f] τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· 34. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω, [g] ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λέγω ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε. 35. ἐκεῖνος ἦν [g] ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ [h] φαίνων, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠθελήσατε ἀγαλλιασθῆναι [1] πρὸς

e viii. 18.
f xviii. 37. 3 Jo. 6.
g Ps. cxxxii. 17. Mk. vi. 20.
h Phil. ii. 15. Mt. ii. 7.

[1] αγαλλιαθηναι in ℵAD; T.R. in BL.

rebus homines amplissimi testimonium de sua re non dicerent" (Cicero, *pro Roscio*, 36, Wetstein). Grotius says: "Romani dicunt neminem idoneum testem esse in re sua". But how can Jesus say that if His witness stands alone it is not true? Chrysostom says He speaks not absolutely but with reference to their suspicion [πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνων ὑπόνοιαν]. And on occasion He can maintain that His testimony of Himself is true, chap. viii. 13, where He says "Though I witness of myself my witness is true," and demands that He be considered one of the two witnesses required. Here the point of view is different, and He means: Were I standing alone, unauthenticated by the Father, my claims would not be worthy of credit. But ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ (on the definite predicate with indefinite subject *vide* Winer, p. 136). "It is another that beareth witness of me," namely, the Father [σημαίνει τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ὄντα Θεὸν καὶ Πατέρα, Cyril, Melanchthon, and the best modern interpreters, Holtzmann, Weiss, Westcott]. Grotius, following Chrysostom and Euthymius, says "facillimum est ut de Johanne sumamus, quia de eo sunt quae proxime sequuntur". Against this is (1) the disclaimer of John's testimony, ver. 34; (2) and especially the accentuated opposition of ὑμεῖς, ver. 33, and ἐγώ, ver. 34. For other reasons, see Lücke. Of this witness Jesus says οἶδα ὅτι . . . ἐμοῦ. Why this addition? Is it an overflow of satisfaction in the unassailable position this testimony gives Him? Rather it is the offset to the supposition made in ver. 31, "my witness is not true". [Cyril's interpretation is inexact, but suggestive: μονονουχὶ τοῦτο διδάσκων, ὅτι Θεὸς ὢν ἀληθινός, οἶδα, φησίν, ἐμαυτόν, κεχαρισμένον δὲ οὐδὲν ὁ Πατὴρ ἐρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.]—Ver. 33. Before exhibiting the Father's testimony Jesus meets them on their own ground: ὑμεῖς, ye yourselves, ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, sent, by the deputation mentioned chap. i., to John; which they would not have done had they not thought him trustworthy (Euthymius). The perfect is used, indicating that the result continued; as the perfect μεμαρτύρηκε indicates that "the testimony preserves its value notwithstanding the disappearance of the witness".—τῇ ἀληθείᾳ to the truth, especially of the Messianic dignity of Jesus.—Ver. 34. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ . . . but for my part I do not depend upon a man's testimony. In what sense is this to be taken? In iii. 11 λαμβάνειν τὴν μαρτυρίαν means "to credit testimony," but this sense does not satisfy the present use. Grotius says, "Hic λαμβάνω est *requiro*, ut infra 41, 44, ubi in opposito membro ponitur ζητεῖν ut idem valens". So too Lücke. Godet and Westcott prefer to emphasise the article, "*the* testimony," "the only real, infallible, unexceptionable testimony," I do not accept from man. The sense is: You sent to John and he testified to the truth; but the testimony which I for my part accept and rely upon is not that of a man. The testimony which confirms Him in the consciousness that He is God's messenger is not a human but a Divine testimony.—ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λέγω but this I say, that is, this regarding the truth of John's testimony I now mention ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε, for your sakes, not for my own, that even on a man's testimony you may be induced to believe.—Ver. 35. ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων, "He was (suggesting that now the Baptist was dead) the lamp that burneth and shineth".—ὁ λύχνος; for the difference between λύχνος a lamp and λαμπάς a torch, see Trench, *Synonyms*, p. 154, and *cf.* λαμπαδηδρομία the Athenian *torch*-race. The article "simply marks the familiar piece of household furniture" (Westcott). "The article simply converts the image into a definition" (Godet). "The article points him out as the definite light which

i Constr. cp. Mt. v. 20. ὥραν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ. 36. ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου· τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ ἔδωκέ[1] μοι ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτά, αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκε· 37. καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ, αὐτὸς[2] μεμαρτύρηκε περὶ j Exod. xxvii. 17. ἐμοῦ. οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκηκόατε πώποτε, οὔτε [j] εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε. 38. καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε μένοντα ἐν ὑμῖν, k Ps. cxix. 2. ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε. 39. [k] Ἐρευ- l Mt. iii. 9. νᾶτε[3] τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς [l] δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν,

[1] δεδωκεν in ℵBL 1, 33. [2] εκεινος in ℵBL. The difference here is slight.
[3] εραυνατε in ℵB*; Tr.Ti.W.H.

could have shown them the way to salvation, ver. 34" (Weiss). Others find a reference to Ps. cxxxii. 17, ἡτοίμασα λύχνον τῷ Χριστῷ σου. Grotius and Lücke think the reference is to Ecclus. xlviii. 1, καὶ ἀνέστη Ἐλίας προφήτης ὡς πῦρ καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπὰς ἐκαίετο. In the mediæval Latin Hymns the Baptist is "non Lux iste, sed lucerna". [Cicero, *pro Milone*, 21, and elsewhere, calls certain illustrious citizens "lumina," but with a somewhat different significance.] — ὁ καιόμενος, "burning and shining are not two different properties," Meyer; a lamp must burn if it is to shine.—ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠθελήσατε ἀγαλλιασθῆναι πρὸς ὥραν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ; the expression seems intended to suggest the thoughtless and brief play of insects in the sunshine or round a lamp. ["Wie die Mücken im Sonnenschein spielen," Hausrath in Holtzmann.] Like children following in a bridal procession, dancing in the torchlight: the type of sentimental religionists revelling in their own emotions.—Ver. 36. ἐγὼ δὲ "But I" in contrast to the ὑμεῖς of ver. 33, ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω, "have the witness which is greater," *i.e.*, of greater weight as evidence than that of John.—τὰ γὰρ ἔργα . . . ἀπέσταλκε, "the works which the Father ἔδωκε [or as modern editors read δέδωκεν] to Him" comprise *all* that He was commissioned to do, but with a more special reference to His miracles. Lücke well says, "He who looked at the miracles as separate and individual displays of supernatural power and did not view the entire manifestation of Christ in its solidarity, was bound to find the miracles without significance and the latter incomprehensible". The ἔργα are cited as evidence, chaps. x. 25, 38, and xiv. 11; evidence as here to the fact that the Father had sent Him.—Ver. 37. But over and above the evidence of the works καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ, αὐτὸς μεμαρτύρηκε, "And the Father who sent me has Himself also testified". Where and how this testimony of the Father's separate from the works has been given, is explained, vv. 38 and 40 But, first, Jesus states how it has no been given: οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ . . ἑωράκατε. It is not by coming into your midst in a visible form and speaking as I speak that the Father has testified. "His voice you have never heard: His form you have never seen." It is not by sensible sights and sounds the Father has given His testimony. [This interpretation is however ignored by most: by Meyer, who thinks the reference is to their insensibility to the revelation of God in Scripture; by Westcott, who says "the Jews by their disbelief of Christ failed to hear and see Him"; by Godet, who finds "a declaration of man's natural impotence to rise to the immediate and personal knowledge of God". Reference to the baptism is put out of the question by πώποτε. The reference to the two chief forms of prophetic revelation (Weiss) is too remote.]—Ver. 38. καὶ τὸν λόγον . . . you have not heard His *voice*—as you have heard mine (ver. 25)—and His *word* which you have heard, and which has been coming to you through all these centuries, you do not admit to an abiding and influential place within you.—τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ is God's revelation, which the Jews were conscious they had received; but though the word of God had come to them, they did not have it "abiding in" them; *cf.* 1 John iii. 15; a phrase which in John denotes permanent possession and abiding influence. God's message does no good until it inwardly possesses those to whom it comes. The proof that the Jews had not thus received it is: ὅτι ὃν ἀπέστειλεν . . . "whom God

καὶ [m] ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ· 40. καὶ οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε. 41. [n] Δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρώπων οὐ λαμβάνω· 42. ἀλλ' ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς, ὅτι [o] τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. 43. ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετέ με· ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκεῖνον λήψεσθε.[1] 44. πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι, δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ [p] μόνου Θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε; 45. μὴ δοκεῖτε ὅτι ἐγὼ κατηγορήσω ὑμῶν [q] πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν, Μωσῆς, εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε. 46. εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωσῇ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ [q] ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν. 47. εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου [r] γράμμασιν οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασι πιστεύσετε;"

m 1 Pet. i. 10, 12.
n 1 Thess. ii. 6. Ch. vi. 15.
o xii. 13, 41.
p xvii. 2. 1 Tim. ii. 17. Jude 25. 1 Cor. viii. 6.
q πρὸς, 2 Macc. x. 13.
r 2 Tim. iii. 15. Esth. vi. 1.

[1] λημψεσθε in ℵABDL, adopted in modern editions.

hath sent, Him ye believe not". Had the revelation or word of God in law and prophets possessed them, they would inevitably have recognised Jesus as from the same source, and as the consummation of the message, the fulfilment of the promise. Not that the Jews held their Scriptures in no esteem, no, (ver. 39), **ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς**; the indicative is to be preferred, "Ye search the Scriptures"; the reason being **ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν**, "because *you* suppose that in *them* you have life eternal"—already it is hinted, by the emphatic **ὑμεῖς** implicitly opposed to a contrasted **ἐγώ**, and by the emphatic **ἐν αὐταῖς** suggesting another source, that eternal life was not to be had in the Scriptures, but in something else. But it is of me these Scriptures themselves into which you search testify. **καὶ ἐκεῖναι . . . ἐμοῦ.** "They testify that in me is life eternal; and yet you will not come to me that you may have life."—Ver. 40. **καὶ οὐ . . . ἔχητε.** The true function of Scripture is expressed in the words, **ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ**: they do not give life, as the Jews thought; they lead to the life-giver. God speaks in Scripture with a definite purpose in view, to testify to Christ; if Scripture does that, it does all. But to set it on a level with Christ is to do both it, Him, and ourselves grave injustice.

This closes the description of the threefold witness to Christ, and in vv. 41-47, He exposes the source of their unbelief. This exposure is introduced by a disclaimer on His part of any chagrin at the want of homage and acceptance He received.—Ver. 41. **Δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρώπων οὐ λαμβάνω**, not "glory from men I am not receiving," not quite "glory from men I do not seek," but rather, that which is in my judgment glory, I do not receive from men: not what men yield me is my glory. Ambition is not my motive in making these claims.—Ver. 42. **ἀλλ' ἔγνωκα . . .** but I know you, etc.; that is, I know why you do not receive me; the reason is that you have not the love of God in yourselves, and therefore cannot appreciate or understand one who acts in concert with God; if therefore they did offer Him homage, it could not be God in Him they worshipped (Holtzmann). [The motive of Jesus in making His claims is a subject inviting inquiry and full of significance.]—Ver. 43. **ἐγὼ ἐλήλυθα . . .** It is just because I have come in the Father's name that you do not receive me. Not really loving God, they could not appreciate and accept Jesus who came in God's name, that is, who truly represented God. But **ἐὰν ἄλλος ἔλθῃ . . . λήψεσθε**, "if another come in his own name," and therefore seeking only such glory as the Jews could give, him ye will receive; *cf.* Matt. xxiv. 5, 23, 24. "He did not say, 'If I had come in my own name,' because the thing was so inconceivable." Mason, *Conditions of our Lord's Life*, etc., p. 90. Possibly Jesus had here in view Antichrist (see Bousset's *Antichrist*, 133); but neither Bar Cochba nor any other definite Pseudo-Christ. Schudt mentions sixty-four.—Ver. 44. The Jewish inability to believe arose from their earthly ambition: **πῶς δύνασθε . . . οὐ ζητεῖτε.** The root of their unbelief was their earthly idea of

a Deut. xxx. 13; cp. Pera and see Sophocles' Lex. b Here only.

VI. 1. ΜΕΤΑ ταῦτα ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [a] πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος· 2. καὶ ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς, ὅτι ἑώρων [1] αὐτοῦ [2] τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει [b] ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων. 3. ἀνῆλθε δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν

[1] εωρων in ℵΓΔ Chrys.; εθεωρουν in BDL.

[2] αυτου omitted in ℵABD it. vulg. syr.

glory, what they could win or bestow. This incapacitated them from seeing the glory of Christ, which was divine and heavenly, which men could not give or remove. The glory παρὰ ἀλλήλων is contrasted with that παρὰ τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ from the only God, the only source, arbiter, and dispenser of praise. Seeking credit as religious men from one another, they necessarily habituated themselves to current ideas, and blotted out Divine glory from their mind.—Ver. 45. μὴ δοκεῖτε . . . These words bear in them the mark of truth. They spring from Jesus' own consciousness of His intimacy with the Father. To suppose that the Jews feared He would accuse them, is to suppose that they believed Him to have influence with God. Chiefly in view is the fact that Moses will accuse them. They thought they were defending Moses' law in accusing Christ for Sabbath-breaking: but, on the contrary, they were themselves open to the accusation of Moses; εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε, in Vulgate "Moyses in quo vos speratis".—Ver. 46. They will be accused by Moses because their unbelief in Christ convicts them of unbelief in Moses, εἰ γὰρ . . . ἐμοί. Had they believed the revelation made by Moses and understood it, they would necessarily have believed in Christ. "Disbelief in me is disbelief in him, in the record of the promises to the patriarchs, in the types of the deliverance from Egypt, in the symbolic institutions of the Law, in the promise of a prophet like to himself; for *it was of me* (the order is emphatic) he wrote," Westcott. —Ver. 47. The converse is true, and true with an *a fortiori* conveyed by the contrast between γράμμασιν and ῥήμασι. If the writings you have had before you for your study all your life, and which you have heard read in the Synagogues Sabbath after Sabbath, have not produced faith in you, and enabled you to see God and appreciate His glory, how shall ye believe the once heard words of one whose coming was prepared for, and His identification made easy by all that Moses wrote?

CHAPTER VI. *Jesus miraculously furnishes a meal for 5000 men with women and children, and thus manifests Himself as the Bread from heaven. This provokes the crisis in Galilee.*—Vv. 1-13. *The miracle narrated.*—Ver. 1. μετὰ ταῦτα, John's indefinite note of time. The interval between chap. v. and chap. vi. depends on the feast alluded to, v. 1. If it was Purim, only a month had elapsed; if it was Passover, a year. In any case Jesus had left Jerusalem, the reason being that the Jews sought to slay Him (vii. 1).—ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Jesus departed," but whence? Evidently from Capernaum and the neighbourhood; *cf.* Mt. xiv. 13, Mk. vi. 30, Lk. ix. 10.—πέραν . . . Τιβεριάδος, "to the other side of the Sea of Galilee, of Tiberias". In xxi. 1 it is called simply τῆς Τιβεριάδος. The second title may here be a gloss, either by the evangelist himself or by a later hand, to distinguish the lake from Merom, or possibly because the latter name was more familiar to some of John's readers than the former. [Pausanias, v. 7, 3, calls it λίμνη Τιβερίς.] Grotius, followed by Meyer, says: "Proprius denotat lacus partem quae ab adsito oppido, ut fieri solet, nomen habet proprium". Consequently he thinks of Jesus as crossing the Jordan below the lake. This is groundless. The town Tiberias was only built by Herod about the year 20 A.D. (Smith's *Hist. Geog.*, 448). The exact locality where the following scene is laid seems to have been at the north-east corner of the lake, not far from Bethsaida Julias.—καὶ ἠκολούθει . . . ἀσθενούντων. "A great crowd followed Him," out of Galilee into Gaulanitis, the reason being ὅτι ἑώρων [plural although ἠκολούθει is singular], "because they had seen the miracles which He was doing [imperfect of continuous action] on the sick".—ἐπί with genitive denotes the object towards which action is directed, ἐπ' οἶκον, homewards, etc. Meyer, Weiss (and Holtzmann) take it as meaning "among".—ἀνῆλθε δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "and Jesus went up," from the

μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. 4. ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς [c]το πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 5. [d]ἐπάρας οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς, καὶ θεασάμενος ὅτι πολὺς ὄχλος [e]ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν, λέγει πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον, "[f]Πόθεν ἀγοράσομεν[1] ἄρτους, ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι;" 6. Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε πειράζων αὐτόν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ᾔδει τί ἔμελλε ποιεῖν. 7. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Φίλιππος, "Διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ἕκαστος αὐτῶν[2] [g]βραχύ τι λάβῃ." 8. Λέγει αὐτῷ εἷς ἐκ τῶν

c ii. 13.
d xvii. 1. Gen. xiii. 10.
e Tense cp. i. 40.
f Num. xi. 21. Mk. vi. 37.
g 1 Sam. xiv. 29.

[1] **αγορασομεν** feebly authenticated; **αγορασωμεν** in ℵABDEFG, etc.

[2] ℵABL 33 omit **αυτων**.

level of the Jordan and the lake, to the higher ground on the hill; **καὶ ἐκεῖ . . . αὐτοῦ**, "and there sat down with His disciples," having apparently left the crowd behind, for the sitting down with the disciples indicated that rest and peace were expected.—Ver. 4. But another crowd was to be accounted for, as ver. 4 intimates, **ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς . . . Ἰουδαίων**, "now the Passover, the Jewish feast, was at hand". [Grotius says: "Hoc ideo interjicit, ut intelligatur tempus fuisse opportunum ad eliciendam multitudinem, et quo melius cohaereat quod de herba sequitur". Godet's account of the insertion of this clause, that it was meant to show that the nearness of the Passover suggested to Jesus the idea "we will keep a Passover here," is plainly out of the question.]—**ἐπάρας οὖν . . .** Jesus *therefore* (or better, "accordingly"; **οὖν** connects what He saw with the foregoing statement).—Ver. 5. **πολὺς ὄχλος ἔρχεται**, not the same crowd as was mentioned in ver. 2, else the article would have been inserted, but a Passover caravan coming from some other direction, and probably guided to Jesus' retirement by some of those who had followed in the first crowd. Seeing the crowd approaching, He initiates the idea of giving them a meal. The synoptic account is different.—**λέγει πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον.** Why to Philip? The question was put to Philip not because he happened at the moment to be nearest to Jesus (Alford); nor, as Bengel suggests, because he had charge of the commissariat, "fortasse Philippus rem alimentariam curabat inter discipulos"; nor "because he knew the country best"; nor only, as Euthymius says, **ἵνα τὴν ἀπορίαν ὁμολογήσας, ἀκριβέστερον καταμάθῃ τοῦ μέλλοντος γενέσθαι θαύματος τὸ μέγεθος**; but Cyril is right who finds the explanation in the character of Philip and in the word **πειράζων** of ver. 6 [**γυμνάζων εἰς πίστιν τὸν μαθήτην**]. Philip was apparently a matter-of-fact person (xiv. 8), a quick reckoner and good man of business, and therefore perhaps more ready to rely on his own shrewd calculations than on unseen resources. This weakness Jesus gives him an opportunity of conquering, by putting the question **πόθεν ἀγοράσωμεν ἄρτους;** "Whence are we to buy bread?" [lit. loaves]. **πόθεν** may either mean "from what village," or "from what pecuniary resources". *Cf.* **πόθεν γὰρ ἔσται βιοτά**; Soph., *Philoct.*, 1159.—Ver. 7. Philip swiftly calculating declares it impossible to provide bread for so vast a multitude, **Διακοσίων . . . λάβῃ.** "Two hundred denarii worth of loaves are not enough for them that each should receive a little." "Denarius" means containing ten; and originally the denarius contained ten asses. The *as* was originally an ingot of copper, *aes*, weighing one lb.; but long before imperial times it had been reduced to one ounce, and the denarius was reckoned as equal to sixteen asses or four sesterces, and taking the Roman gold piece like our sovereign as the standard, the denarius was equivalent to about 9½d., which at that time was the ordinary wage of a working man; sufficient therefore to support a family for a day. If half was spent in food, then, reckoning the family at five persons, one denarius would feed ten persons, and 200 would provide a day's rations for 2000; but as Philip's calculation is on the basis not of food for a whole day, but only for one meagre meal, a short ration (**βραχύ τι**), it is approximately accurate. There were between five and ten thousand mouths. See *Expositor*, Jan., 1890.—Ver. 8. With the same matter-of-factness as Philip **εἷς . . . Πέτρου**, "one of His disciples, Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter," a description apparently inserted in forget-

μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου, 9. "Ἔστι [h] παιδάριον ἓν ὧδε, ὃ ἔχει πέντε ἄρτους κριθίνους καὶ δύο ὀψάρια· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα τί ἐστιν εἰς τοσούτους;" 10. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους [i] ἀναπεσεῖν." ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ. ἀνέπεσον[1] οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡσεὶ[2] πεντακισχίλιοι. 11. ἔλαβε δὲ τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ [j] εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ[3] τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις· ὁμοίως

h 2 Kings iv. 43. 1 Sam. xxi. 7. Tob. vi. 2.
i Tob. ii. 1. Judith xii. 15.
j Mt. xv. 36; xxvi. 27. Rom. xiv. 6, etc.

[1] ανεπεσαν in all good MSS. [2] ωσει in ΑΓΔ Cyr.; ως in ℵBDL.

[3] T.R. in ℵcD, but τοις μαθηταις, οι δε μαθηται omitted in ℵ*ABL 1, 33. The words apparently were added from the Synoptical Gospels.

fulness that it has already been given, i. 41, supplementing Philip's judgment, *cf.* xii. 22, λέγει αὐτῷ, "says to Him" [the dative still holds its place after λέγει, and has not quite given way, as in modern Greek, to πρός with accusative, *cf.* ver. 5]. Ἔστι παιδάριον ἓν ὧδε. "There is here one little boy." [ἓν is rejected by modern editors. May it not have been rejected because unnecessary? At the same time it must be borne in mind that although in Mt. (viii. 19 and xxvi. 69) εἷς is used as an indefinite article—as in German, French, etc.—it is not so used in John. The Vulgate has "est puer unus hic". Meyer thinks it is inserted to bring out the meagreness of the resources, "but one small boy".]—Ver. 9. ὃ ἔχει . . . ὀψάρια. The Synoptic account speaks of these provisions as already belonging to the disciples.—κριθίνους, the cheapest kind of bread; see Ezek. xiii. 19, and the extraordinary profusion of illustrations in Wetstein, among which occurs one from the Talmud: "Jochanan dixit, hordeum factum est pulchrum. Dixerunt ei: nuncia equis et asinis"; and from Livy, "Cohortibus, quae signa amiserant, hordeum dari jussit".—καὶ δύο ὀψάρια, in Mt. xiv. 17, ἰχθύας, see also John xxi. 10.—ὀψάριον is whatever is eaten with bread as seasoning or "kitchen," hence, pre-eminently, fish. So Athenaeus, cited by Wetstein. In Numbers xi. 22 we have τὸ ὄψος τῆς θαλάσσης.—ἀλλὰ ταῦτα τί ἐστιν εἰς τοσούτους; exhibiting the helplessness of the disciples and inadequacy of the means, as the background on which the greatness of the miracle may be seen.—Ver. 10. The moral ground for the miracle being thus prepared Jesus at once says, ποιήσατε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀναπεσεῖν. [For the form of speech *cf.* Soph., *Philoct.*, 925, κλύειν . . . με . . . ποιεῖ.] This order was given for two reasons: (1) that there might be no unseemly crowding round Him and crushing out of the weaker; and (2) that they might understand they were to have a full meal, not a mere bite they could take in their hand in passing. Obedience to this request tested the faith of the crowd. They trusted Jesus.—ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, "now there was much grass in the place," contrasting with the corn-lands and olive-yards of the opposite shore, where the large crowd could not easily have found a place to lie down. Mark rather brings out the contrast between the colours of the dresses and the green grass (vi. 39): ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ. καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαί, like beds of flowers.—ἀνέπεσον [better ἀνέπεσαν] οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες . . . the men reclined, not counting women and children (χωρὶς γυναικῶν καὶ παιδίων, Mt. xiv. 21), in number about five thousand; the women, though not specified, would take their places with the men. Some of the children might steal up to Jesus to receive from His own hand.—Ver. 11. Facing the vast and hungry crowd Jesus took up and gave thanks for the slender provision, ἔλαβε δὲ [better ἔλαβεν οὖν] τοὺς ἄρτους, the loaves already mentioned, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας [Phrynichus says εὐχαριστεῖν οὐδεὶς τῶν δοκίμων εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ χάριν εἰδέναι; and Rutherford says Polybius is the first writer who uses the word in the sense of "give thanks"]. Pagans, by libation, or by throwing a handful on the household altar, gave thanks before a meal; Jews pronounced a blessing, ἁγιασμός or εὐλογία. (Luke xxiv. 30, Mt. xiv. 19, and especially 1 Tim. iv. 4. See also Grotius' note on Mt. xxvi. 27.) Having given thanks Jesus διέδωκε . . . τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις. The words added from the Synoptists give a fuller account

καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὅσον ἤθελον. 12. ὡς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν, λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, "Συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα [k] κλάσματα, ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται." 13. Συνήγαγον οὖν, καὶ ἐγέμισαν δώδεκα κοφίνους κλασμάτων ἐκ τῶν πέντε [l] ἄρτων τῶν κριθίνων, ἃ [m] ἐπερίσσευσε τοῖς βεβρωκόσιν. 14. οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἰδόντες ὃ ἐποίησε σημεῖον ὁ Ἰησοῦς,[1] ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον." 15. Ἰησοῦς οὖν γνοὺς ὅτι [n] μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι καὶ [o] ἁρπάζειν αὐτὸν, ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλέα, [p] ἀνεχώρησε πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος.

16. Ὡς δὲ [q] ὀψία ἐγένετο, κατέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, 17. καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς τὸ[2] πλοῖον, ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καπερναούμ. καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει, καὶ οὐκ[3] ἐληλύθει

k Ezek. xiii. 19.
l 2 Kings iv. 42.
m Tob. iv. 22.
n i. 40, etc.
o Acts viii. 39.
p Exod. ii. 15. Hos. xii. 12. Mk. vi. 46.
q Only in Gospp. in N.T. Judith xiii. 1.

[1] ο Ιησους omitted in ℵBD. [2] το omitted in ℵBL 33.
[3] ουπω in modern editions as in ℵBDL 33.

of what actually happened. But curiosity as to the precise stage at which the multiplication occurred, or whether it could distinctly be seen, is not satisfied. They all received **ὅσον ἤθελον**, not the **βραχύ τι** of Philip; and even this did not exhaust the supply; for (ver. 12) **ὡς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν**, when no one could eat any more, there were seen to be **κλάσματα περισσεύσαντα**, pieces broken off but not used. These Jesus directs the disciples to gather **ἵνα μή τι ἀπόληται**, "that nothing be lost". The Father's bounty must not be wasted. Infinite resource does not justify waste. Euthymius ingeniously supposes the order to have been given **ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ φαντασία τις τὸ γενόμενον**; but of course those who had eaten already knew that the provision was substantial and real.—Ver. 13. **Συνήγαγον οὖν . . . βεβρωκόσιν**, the superabundance, the broken pieces of the five loaves which were in excess of the requirements, **ἃ ἐπερίσσευσε**, filled **δώδεκα κοφίνους**, that is to say, far exceeded the original five loaves.—**κόφινος** [French, *Coffin*, petit panier d'osier; *cf.* our "coffin" and "coffer"], a large wicker basket or hamper used in many countries by gardeners for carrying fruit, vegetables, manure, soil; and identified with the Jew by Juvenal (iii. 14), "Judaeis quorum cophinus foenumque supellex". (See further Mayor's note on the line, and *Sat.*, vi. 541.) This gives colour to the idea that each of the apostles may have carried such a basket, which would account for the twelve. But why they should have had the baskets with nothing to carry in them does not appear.

Vv. 14-25. *The immediate impression made by the miracle and the consequent movements of Jesus and the crowd.*—Ver. 14. The conclusion drawn from the miracle by those who had witnessed it, was that this was "the beginning of that reign of earthly abundance, which the prophets were thought to have foretold". See Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, 552. This at once found expression in the words **οὗτός ἐστιν . . . κόσμον**. "This is indeed," or "of a truth," as if the subject had been previously debated by them, or as if some had told them He was "the prophet who should come into the world," **ὁ ἐρχόμενος**, used of the Messiah by the Baptist (Matt. xi. 3) without further specification; but John adds his favourite expression **εἰς τὸν κόσμον**. That the people meant the Messiah (*cf.* Deut. xviii. 14-19) is shown by the action they were prepared to take.—Ver. 15. For Jesus perceived that they were on the point of coming and carrying Him off to make Him king. **ἁρπάζειν**, to snatch suddenly and forcibly (derived from the swoop of the falcon, the **ἅρπη**; hence, the Harpies). This scene throws light on the use of **ἁρπάζουσιν** in Matt. xi. 12. Their purpose was to make Him king. Their own numbers and their knowledge of the general discontent would encourage them. But Jesus **ἀνεχώρησε πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος**, "withdrew again (*cf.* ver. 3) to the mountain," from which He may have come down some distance to meet the

πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, 18. ἥ τε θάλασσα ἀνέμου μεγάλου πνέοντος [r] διηγείρετο. 19. [s] ἐληλακότες οὖν ὡς σταδίους εἰκοσιπέντε ἢ τριάκοντα [t] θεωροῦσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιπατοῦντα [u] ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ [v] ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου γινόμενον καὶ [w] ἐφοβήθησαν. 20. ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε." 21. [x] Ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ εὐθέως τὸ πλοῖον ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ὑπῆγον.

22. Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἑστηκὼς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, ἰδὼν[1] ὅτι πλοιάριον ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ εἰ μὴ ἓν ἐκεῖνο εἰς ὃ ἐνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ,[2] καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς

r Cp. Jon. i. 13.
s Mk. vi. 48. Lk. viii. 29. Jas. iii. 4.
t Mk. vi. 49.
u Job ix. 8.
v With gen. iii. 23; xi. 18; cp. iv. 5.
w Lk. xxiv. 37.

[1] ειδον read by T.Tr.W.H.R. as in ABL vet. Lat., etc.

[2] The clause εκεινο . . . αυτου is deleted by modern editors with ℵcABL.

crowd. Now He detached Himself even from His disciples. [μὴ παρέχων μηδὲ τούτοις ἀφορμήν, Origen.] The Synoptic account is supplementary. The disciples remained behind with fragments of the crowd, but, when it became late, they went down to the sea, and having got on board a (not "the") boat, they were coming across to Capernaum [Mark says Jesus told them to go to Bethsaida, but that is quite consistent, as they may have meant to land at the one place and walk to the other] on the other side, and it had already become dark, and Jesus had not, or "not yet," come to them, and the sea was rising owing to a strong wind blowing.—Ver. 19. ἐληλακότες οὖν ὡς σταδίους εἰκοσιπέντε ἢ τριάκοντα. The Vulgate renders "cum remigassent ergo," and modern Greek ἐκωπηλάτησαν, rightly; see Aristoph., *Frogs*, 195; and other passages in Elsner. The stadium was about 194 (Rich gives 202) yards, so that nine rather than eight would go to a mile. The disciples had rowed about three miles. [The best discussion of the direction they were taking is in the *Rob Roy on the Jordan*, p. 374.] θεωροῦσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης "they see Jesus walking on the sea". It has been suggested that this may only mean that Jesus was walking "by" the sea, ἐπί being used in this sense in xxi. 1. But that ἐπί can mean "on" the sea is of course not questioned (see Lucian's *Vera Historia*, where this incident is burlesqued; also Job ix. 8, where, to signalise the power of God, He is spoken of as ὁ περιπατῶν ὡς ἐπ' ἐδάφους ἐπὶ θαλάσσης). Besides, why should the disciples have been afraid had they merely seen Jesus walking on the shore? They manifested their fear in some way, and He says to them, Ἐγώ εἰμι, I am He, or It is I.—Ver. 20. Hearing this, ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, by which Lücke, Holtzmann, Weiss, Thayer, and others suppose it is meant, that they merely wished to take Him into the boat, but did not actually do so. The imperfect tense favours this sense; and so do the expressions ἤθελον πιάσαι αὐτόν, vii. 44; and ἤθελον αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾷν, xvi. 19; whereas two of the passages cited against this meaning by Alford are in the aorist, a tense which denotes accomplished purpose. On the other hand, the imperfect may here be used to express a continuous state of feeling, and accordingly the A.V., following the Geneva Bible, against Wiclif and Tindale, rendered "they willingly received Him". So Grotius "non quod non receperint, sed quod cupide admodum". So, too, Sanday: "The stress is really on the willingness of the disciples, 'Before they shrank back through fear, but now they were glad to receive Him'". And this seems right. The R.V. has "they were willing therefore to receive Him into the boat". The καί with which the next clause is introduced is slightly against the supposition that Jesus was not actually taken into the boat (but see Weiss *in loc.*); and the Synoptic account represents Jesus as getting into the boat with Peter. The immediate arrival at the shore was evidently a surprise to those on board. Sanday thinks that the Apostle was so occupied with his devout conclusions that he did not notice the motion of the boat.

Vv. 22, 23, and 24 form one sentence, in which John describes the observations made by the crowd the following morning and their consequent

εἰς τὸ πλοιάριον, ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον, 23. ἄλλα δὲ[1] ἦλθε πλοιάρια ἐκ Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ Κυρίου· 24. ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ [x] ἔστιν ἐκεῖ οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐνέβησαν καὶ αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοῖα, καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καπερναοὺμ, ζητοῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν. 25. καὶ εὑρόντες αὐτὸν πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ῥαββὶ, πότε ὧδε [y] γέγονας;" 26. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, [z] ζητεῖτέ με, οὐχ ὅτι εἴδετε σημεῖα, ἀλλ'

x L. 42, etc.
y Lk. x. 32.
z iv. 48.

[1] δὲ omitted in BL 33.

action. The observations they made are described under ἰδών, which never finds its verb, but is resumed in ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν of ver. 24; and their consequent action is described in the main verbs of the sentence ἐνέβησαν (ver. 24) καὶ ἦλθον. With the unconscious but accurate observation of a fishing population in such matters, the crowd had noticed that there was only one boat lying on the beach at that point, and further that the disciples had gone away in it and had not taken Jesus with them. But in the morning, having presumably passed the night in the open air, and having gathered at the lake-side below the scene of the miracle, they found that neither Jesus nor His disciples were there. Apparently they expected that the disciples would have returned for Jesus, and that they might find both Him and them on the shore. Disappointed in this expectation, and concluding that Jesus had returned by land as He had come, or had left in one of the Tiberias boats, they themselves entered the boats from Tiberias, which had been driven ashore by the gale of the previous night, and crossed to Capernaum. This account of the movements and motives of the crowd seems to give each expression its proper force. The fact parenthetically introduced, ver. 23, that boats from Tiberias had put in on the east shore, is an incidental confirmation of the truth that a gale had been blowing the night before. What portion of the belated crowd went back to Capernaum in these Tiberias boats we do not know.—εὑρόντες αὐτὸν πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης, having found Him on the other side of the lake, that is, on the Capernaum side, εἶπον . . . γέγονας, "they said to Him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither?" "Quaestio de tempore includit quaestionem de modo" (Bengel). For this use of γέγονας *cf.* ver. 19; and Cebes, *Tabula*, πρὸς τὸν ἰατρὸν γινόμενος, and Lucian, *Asinus*, ἐπεὶ δὲ πλησίον τῆς πόλεως ἐγεγόνειμεν (Kypke). They came seeking Him, but were surprised to find Him. To their question Jesus makes no direct reply. He does not tell them of His walking on the water.

In vv. 26-65 we have the conversation arising out of the miracle. The first break in it is at ver. 41. From ver. 26-40 *Jesus explains that He is the Bread of Life.*—Ver. 26. Ἀμὴν . . . ἐχορτάσθητε. In this pursuing crowd Jesus sees no evidence of faith or spiritual hunger, but only of carnality and misunderstanding. Ye follow me οὐχ ὅτι εἴδετε σημεῖα, "not because you saw signs," not because in the feeding of the 5000 and other miracles you saw the Kingdom of God and glimpses of a spiritual world, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐφάγετε ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ ἐχορτάσθητε, but because you received a physical satisfaction. This gave the measure of their Messianic expectation. He was the true Messiah who could maintain them in life without toil. Sense clamours and spirit has no hunger.—χορτάζειν, from χόρτος, means "to give fodder to animals," and was used of men only "as a depreciatory term". In later Greek it is used freely of satisfying men; see Kennedy's *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 80; Lightfoot on Phil. iv. 12.—Ver. 27. ἐργάζεσθε . . . ὑμῖν δώσει. "Work not for the meat which perisheth." ἐργάζομαι means "I earn by working," "I acquire," see passages cited by Thayer *in voc.* The food which He had given them the evening before He called βρῶσιν ἀπολλυμένην: they were already hungry again, and had toiled after Him for miles to get another meal. Rather must they seek τὴν βρῶσιν . . . αἰώνιον, the food which abides εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, that is, which is not consumed in the eating but rather grows as it is enjoyed. *Cf.* iv. 14. This food ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει. He does not call Himself "the Prophet,"

a Mt. v. 6; xiv. 20. Jas. ii. 16. Rev. xix. 21.
b 2 Jo. 8 only; cp. Wetstein on Mt. xxv. 16.
c iii. 33. Exod. xxxvi. 39.
d Num. viii. 11.
e iv. 34; xv. 12. Burton, *M. and T.*, 213.
f Exod. xvi. 15. Heb. ix. 4.
g Ps. lxxviii. 24.

ὅτι ἐφάγετε ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ [a] ἐχορτάσθητε. 27. [b] ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑμῖν δώσει· τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ [c] ἐσφράγισεν ὁ Θεός." 28. Εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτόν, "Τί ποιοῦμεν,[1] ἵνα [d] ἐργαζώμεθα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ;" 29. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ, [e] ἵνα πιστεύσητε[2] εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος." 30. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, "Τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν σοι; τί ἐργάζῃ; 31. οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ [f] μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθώς ἐστι γεγραμμένον, [g] Ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν." 32. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, Οὐ Μωσῆς δέδωκεν[3] ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν

[1] ποιωμεν in all modern editions as in ℵABL.

[2] T.Tr.W.H.R. read πιστευητε following ℵABL 1, 33.

[3] εδωκεν in BDL; δεδ. in ℵAT.

as they had called Him yesterday, because this would have excited false expectations; but in calling Himself the Son of Man He suggests His sympathy with all human wants and at the same time indicates to the initiated that He claims the Messiahship. The guarantee is given in the words τοῦτον γὰρ . . . ὁ θεός, "For Him hath the Father, God, sealed". By giving the Son the miracle of the previous day and other signs to do, the Father has sealed or authenticated Him as the Giver of that which nourishes life everlasting. [For the idea, approved by Delitzsch, that the seal refers to the stamping of loaves with the name of the maker, see *O. T. Student*, Sept., 1883, and *Expositor*, 1885. Elsner with more reason cites passages showing that a person ordering a banquet gave his seal to the slave or steward commissioned to provide it: and thus that Christ here declares "se a Patre constitutum esse ad suppeditandum Ecclesiae salutarem cibum". The various meanings of the word are given by Suicer.] Some at least of the crowd are impressed; and conscious that their toil was, as Jesus said, commonly misdirected, they ask Him (ver. 28) τί ποιοῦμεν [better, ποιῶμεν] ἵνα ἐργαζώμεθα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ; that is, how can we so labour as to satisfy God? What precisely is it that God waits for us to do, and will be satisfied with our doing? To which Jesus, always ready to meet the sincere inquirer, gives the explicit answer (ver. 29) τοῦτό ἐστι . . . ἐκεῖνος. If God has sent a messenger it is because there is need of such interposition, and the first duty must be to listen believingly to this messenger. To this demand that they should accept Him as God's ambassador they reply (ver. 30) τί οὖν ποιεῖς . . . "Judaeis proprium erat signa quaerere," 1 Cor. i. 22, Lampe. Grotius and Lücke think this asking for a sign could not have proceeded from those who saw the miracle of the previous day. But Lampe rightly argues that they were the same people, and that they did not consider either the miracle of the previous day or the ordinary cures wrought by Jesus to be sufficient evidence of His present claim.—Ver. 31. This is proved by the suggestion added in ver. 31. οἱ πατέρες . . . φαγεῖν; they demanded that He as Messiah should make good His claim by outdoing Moses. Schoettgen and Lightfoot quote from Rabbinical literature a relevant and significant saying: "Qualis fuit redemptor primus (Moses) talis erit redemptor ultimus (Messias). Redemptor prior descendere fecit pro iis Manna, sic et Redemptor posterior descendere faciet Manna, sicut scriptum est," Ps. lxxiii. 16. See other instructive passages in Lightfoot. According to this expectation that the Messiah would feed His people supernaturally the crowd now insinuate that though Jesus had given them bread He had not fulfilled the expectation and given them bread from heaven. (For the expression "bread of

ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν [h] ἀληθινόν. 33. ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν [i] ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ." 34. Εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν, "Κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον." 35. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς· ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ· καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ [j] οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ [1] πώποτε. 36. ἀλλ' εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ ἑωράκατέ με, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε. 37. [k] πᾶν ὃ δίδωσί μοι ὁ πατὴρ, πρὸς ἐμὲ

h i. 9, etc.
i iii. 13.
j iv. 14.
k ver. 39; xvii. 2.

[1] διψησει in T.Tr.W.H.R. following ℵAB*D.

heaven" see Exod. xiv. 4 and Ps. lxxviii. 23, 24.) To this challenge to fulfil Messianic expectation by showing Himself greater than Moses Jesus replies (ver. 32), οὐ Μωσῆς . . . ἀληθινόν. A double denial; not Moses, but "my Father" s the giver, and although the manna was in a sense "bread from heaven" it was not "the true bread from heaven," τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν. This my Father is now giving to you; ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος . . . τῷ κόσμῳ.—Ver. 33. Moses therefore could not give this bread, since it comes down out of heaven. It is characterised by two attributes: (1) it is ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, that which cometh down out of heaven—not, as Godet renders, "He who cometh down from heaven"; at least the request of ver. 34 shows that those who heard the words did not take them in this sense; (2) the other characteristic of the bread of God is that it giveth life to the world; a fuller life-giving power than that of the manna is implied; and it is of universal application and not merely to their fathers. Hearing this description of "the bread of God" the crowd exclaim (ver. 34) Κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον, precisely as the woman of Samaria had exclaimed Κύριε δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, when Jesus had disclosed to her the properties of the living water. And as in her case the direct request brought the conversation to a crisis, so here it elicits the central declaration of all His exposition of the bearing of the miracle: Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς. [It is not impossible that some of them may have had a glimmering of what He meant and uttered their request with some tincture of spiritual desire; for among the Rabbis there was a saying, "In seculo venturo neque edunt neque bibunt, sed justi sedent cum coronis suis in capitibus et aluntur splendore majestatis divinae".] "I am the bread of life," "I am the living bread" (ver. 51, in a somewhat different sense), "I am the bread which came down from heaven" (ver. 41), or, "the true bread from heaven"—all these designations our Lord uses, and that the people may quite understand what is meant, He adds ὁ ἐρχόμενος . . . πώποτε. The repetition of the required action ὁ ἐρχόμενος, and ὁ πιστεύων, and of the result οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ, and οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ, is for clearness and emphasis, not for addition to the meaning. The "believing" explains the "coming"; and the "quenching of thirst" more explicitly conveys the meaning of "never hungering," that all innocent and righteous cravings and aspirations shall be gratified. The "coming" was not that physical approach which they had adopted in pursuing Him to Capernaum, but such a coming as might equally well be called "believing," a spiritual approach, implying the conviction that He was what He claimed to be, the medium through which God comes to man, and man to God.—Ver. 36. But although God and this perfect satisfaction were brought so near them, they did not believe: ἀλλ' εἶπον . . . πιστεύετε. Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Godet, Weiss, etc., understand that εἶπον refers to ver. 26. Euthymius, preferably, says εἰκὸς τοῦτο ῥηθῆναι μὲν, μὴ γραφῆναι δέ. Lampe gives the alternatives without determining. Undoubtedly, although the reference may not be directly to ver. 26, the ἑωράκατε means seeing Jesus in the exercise of His Messianic functions, doing the works given Him by the Father to do. But seeing is not in this case believing. It was found very possible to be in His company and to eat the provision He miraculously provided, and yet disbelieve. If so, what could produce belief? Might not His entire manifestation fail to accomplish its purpose?—Ver. 37. No; for πᾶν ὃ δίδωσι . . . ἥξει. "Everything which the Father gives"; the neuter is used as being more universal than the masculine and including everything

ἥξει· καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρός με οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω· 38. ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, [l] οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με. 39. τοῦτο δέ ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός,[1] [m] ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέ μοι, μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ ἐν [n] τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. 40. τοῦτο δέ[2] ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με,[3] [o] ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν, ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ [n] τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. 41. Ἐγόγγυζον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι

l iv. 34.
m Constr. ver. 29, reff.
n vv. 40, 44, 54; vii. 37, etc.
o ver. 29.

[1] πατρος omitted in ℵ*ABCD, etc.
[2] All authorities read γαρ.
[3] του πεμψαντος με in AEGH; του πατρος μου in ℵBCD.

which the Father determines to save from the world's wreck, viewed as a totality. *Cf.* ver. 39, ἀναστήσω αὐτό: and the collective neuter, as in Thucyd., iii. 16, τὸ ἐπιόν for τοὺς ἐπιόντας. Lampe thinks the neuter is used, "quia hae personae spectantur ut reale peculium, haereditas, merces, genus, semen, sacerdotium, sanctuarium Domini". What is meant by δίδωσι? It is an act on God's part prior to the "coming" on man's part; the coming is the result of the giving. Calvinistic interpreters have therefore identified the giving with election. "*Donandi* verbum perinde valet ac si dixisset Christus, quos elegit Pater, eos regenerat"—Calvin. "Patrem dare filio est eligere"—Melanchthon; and similarly Beza and Lampe. On the other hand, Reynolds represents a number of interpreters when he says, "It is the present activity of the Father's grace that is meant, not a foregone conclusion". This identifies the Father's "giving" with His "drawing," ver. 44. It would rather seem to be that which determines the drawing, the assigning to Jesus of certain persons who shall form His kingdom. This perhaps involves election but is not identical with it. *Cf.* xvii. 6. Euthymius replies, from a Semi-Pelagian point of view, to the objections which arise from an Augustinian interpretation of the words. The purpose of the verse is to impart assurance that Christ's work will not fail. καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον . . . ἔξω. Grotius thinks the "casting out" refers to the School of Christ; Lücke thinks the kingdom is referred to. It is scarcely necessary to think of anything more than Christ's presence or fellowship. This strong asseveration οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω, and concentrated Gospel which has brought hope to so many, is here grounded on the will of the Father.—Vv. 38, 39. ὅτι καταβέβηκα . . . ἡμέρᾳ. Everywhere Jesus forestalls the idea that He is speaking for Himself, and is uttering merely human judgments, or is in any way regulated in His action by what is arbitrary: it is the Supreme Will He represents. And this will requires Him to protect and provide for all that is committed to Him. ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέ μοι, on this nominative absolute, see Lücke or Raphel, who justify it by many instances. The positive and negative aspects of the Redeemer's work, and the permanence of its results, are indicated. On ἀναστήσω . . . ἡμέρᾳ, Bengel says: "Hic finis est ultra quem periculum nullum," and Calvin finely: "Sit ergo hoc animis nostris infixum porrectam esse nobis manum a Christo, ut nos minime in medio cursu deserat, sed quo ejus ductu freti secure ad diem ultimum oculos attollere audeamus". It is a perfect and enduring salvation the Father has designed to give us in Christ.—Ver. 40. In ver. 40 Jesus describes the recipients of salvation from the human side, πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν, the latter, "believing," being necessary, as already shown, to complete the former. The neuter πᾶν necessarily gives place to the masculine. καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. This promise recurs like a refrain, vv. 39, 40, 44, 54; each time the ἐγώ is expressed and emphatic, "I, this same person who here stands before you, I and no other". Christ gives His hearers the assurance that in this respect He is superior to Moses, that the life He gives is not confined to this present time. In itself it is a stupendous declaration.

Vv. 41-51. In this paragraph we are first told how the Jews were staggered by our Lord's affirming that He had come down from heaven; second, how Jesus explains that in order to understand and receive Him they must be

εἶπεν, "Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ." 42. καὶ ἔλεγον, "Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, οὗ ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα; πῶς οὖν λέγει οὗτος, Ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα;" 43. Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Μὴ γογγύζετε μετ' ἀλλήλων. 44. οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με [p] ἑλκύσῃ αὐτόν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν [n] τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. 45. ἔστι γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, 'Καὶ ἔσονται πάντες [q] διδακτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ.' Πᾶς οὖν ὁ

p xii. 32; in phys. sense, xviii. 10; xxi. 6, 11. Acts xvi. 19.
n vv. 40, 44, 54; vii. 37, etc.
q 1 Cor. ii. 13.

taught of God; and third, how He reiterates His claim to be the Bread of Life, adding now the explanation that it is His flesh which He will give for the life of the world.—Ver. 41. **Ἐγόγγυζον . . . οὐρανοῦ.** "The Jews," not as we might expect, "the Galileans," probably because John identifies this unbelieving crowd with the characteristically unbelieving Jews. **ἐγόγγυζον** in Exod. xvi. 7-9, 1 Cor. x. 10, etc., has a note of malevolence, but in John vii. 32 no such note. "Murmur" thus corresponds to it, as carrying both meanings. The ground of their murmuring was His asserting **Ἐγώ εἰμι . . . οὐρανοῦ.** *Cf.* ver. 33, **ὁ καταβαίνων**, and ver. 38, **καταβέβηκα.** Lücke says: "When John makes the descent from heaven the essential, inherent predicate of the bread, he uses the present: when the descent from heaven is regarded as a definite fact in the manifestation of Christ, the aorist". They not merely could not understand how this could be true, but they considered that they had evidence to the contrary (ver. 42), **καὶ ἔλεγον, Οὐχ . . . καταβέβηκα**; the emphatic **ἡμεῖς** more clearly discloses their thought. We ourselves know where He comes from. The road from heaven, they argued, could not be through human birth. This was one of the real difficulties of the contemporaries of Jesus. The Messiah was to come "in the clouds," suddenly to appear; but Jesus had quietly grown up among them. From this passage an argument against the miraculous birth of our Lord has been drawn. The murmurers represent the current belief that He had a father and mother, and in His reply Jesus does not repudiate His father. But He could not be expected to enter into explanations before a promiscuous crowd. As Euthymius says: He passes by His miraculous birth, "lest in removing one stumbling block He interpose another". To explain is hopeless.—Ver. 43. Therefore He merely says **Μὴ γογγύζετε μετ' ἀλλήλων.** That was not the way to light. Nor could He expect to convince all of them, for **οὐδεὶς . . . ἑλκύσῃ αὐτόν,** "no one can come to me unless the Father who hath sent me draw him". **ἑλκύειν** has the same latitude of meaning as "draw". It is used of towing a ship, dragging a cart, or pulling on a rope to set sails. But it is also used, xii. 32, of a gentle but powerful moral attraction; "I, if I be lifted up, **ἑλκύσω,** will draw, etc.". Here, however, it is an inward disposing of the soul to come to Christ, and is the equivalent of the Divine teaching of ver. 45. And what is affirmed is that without this action of God on the individual no one can come to Christ. In order to apprehend the significance of Christ and to give ourselves to Him we must be individually and inwardly aided by God. [Augustine says: "Si trahitur, ait aliquis, invitus venit. Si invitus venit, non credit, si non credit, nec venit. Non enim ad Christum ambulando currimus, sed credendo, nec motu corporis, sed voluntate cordis accedimus. Noli te cogitare invitum trahi: trahitur animus et amore." And Calvin says: "Quantum ad trahendi modum spectat, non est ille quidem violentus qui hominem cogat externo impulsu, sed tamen efficax est motus Spiritus Sancti, qui homines ex nolentibus et invitis reddit voluntarios". All that Calvin objects to is that men should be said "proprio motu" to yield themselves to the Divine drawing. *Cf.* a powerful passage from Luther's *De libero Arbitrio* quoted in Lampe; or as Beza concisely puts it: "Verum quidem est, neminem credere invitum, quum Fides sit assensus. Sed volumus quia datum est nobis ut velimus."]—Ver. 45. In confirmation of His assertion in ver. 44, Jesus, as is His wont, cites Scripture: **ἔστι γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις,** that is, it is written in that part of Scripture known as "the Prophets". The passage cited is Is. liv. 13, where, in describing Messianic times, the prophet says, "Thy

r i. 18. ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν, ἔρχεται πρός με· 46. [r] οὐχ
s vii. 29; ix. 16. ὅτι τὸν πατέρα τις ἑώρακεν· εἰ μὴ [s] ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗτος
ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα. 47. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ,
t 1 Cor. x. 5. ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 48. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς. 49. οἱ
πατέρες ὑμῶν ἔφαγον τὸ μάννα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καὶ ἀπέθανον·
u vv. 26, 51. 50. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνων, ἵνα τις [u] ἐξ
αὐτοῦ φάγῃ καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ. 51. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ
v viii. 16, 17. Mt. x. 18. Acts iii. 24. οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου, ζήσεται[1] εἰς
τὸν αἰῶνα. [v] καὶ ὁ ἄρτος [v] δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστιν, ἣν

[1] Here and in v. 58 ζήσει is read in ℵDL 33.

children shall all be taught of God," ἔσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, and what this being taught of God means He more fully explains in the words πᾶς οὖν . . . μαθὼν, "every one who has heard from the Father and has learned comes to me". Both the hearing and the learning refer to an inward spiritual process. The outward teaching of Scripture and of Christ Himself was enjoyed by all the people He was addressing; but they did not come to Him. It is therefore an inward and individual illumination by the special operation of God that enables men to come to Christ. Whether these verses teach "irresistible grace" may be doubted. That they teach the doctrine which Augustine asserted against Pelagius, *viz.*, that power to use grace must itself be given by God, is undeniable. That is affirmed in the statement that no one can come to Christ unless the Father draw him. But whether it is also true that every one whom God teaches comes is not here stated; the καὶ μαθὼν introduces a doubtful element. [Wetstein quotes from Polybius διαφέρει τὸ μαθεῖν τοῦ μόνον ἀκοῦσαι.]—Ver. 46. Lest His hearers should suppose that in Messianic times direct knowledge of God was to be communicated, He adds, οὐχ ὅτι τὸν πατέρα τις ἑώρακεν, it is not by direct vision men are to learn of God. One alone has direct perception of the Father, ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, He whose origin is Divine; not ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ Θεοῦ, a designation which belonged to all prophets, but He whose Being is directly derived from God. Similarly, in vii. 29, we find Jesus saying ἐγὼ οἶδα αὐτόν ὅτι παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμί καὶ ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν, where the source of the mission and the source of the being are separately mentioned. To refer this exclusive vision of the Father to any earthly experience seems out of the question. No one who was not more than man could thus separate himself from all men. See i. 18. Having thus explained that they could not believe in Him without having first been taught of God, He returns (ver. 47) to the affirmation of ver. 40, ἀμὴν . . . ζωῆς. Their unbelief does not alter the fact, nor weaken His assurance of the fact. This consciousness of Messiahship was so identified with His spiritual experience and existence that nothing could shake it. But now He adds a significant confirmation of His claim.—Vv. 49, 50. οἱ πατέρες . . . μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, "Your fathers ate the manna in the desert and died: this is the bread which comes down out of heaven, that a man may eat of it and not die". In other words: The manna which was given to your fathers to maintain them in physical, earthly life, could not assert its power against death, and maintain them continually in life. Your fathers died physically. The bread which comes down from heaven does not give physical life; it is not sent for that purpose, but the life which it is given to maintain, it maintains in continuance and precludes death. Taken in connection with the context, the words interpret themselves. Godet however says: "Jesus, both here and elsewhere, certainly denies even physical death in the case of the believer. *Cf.* viii. 51. That which properly constitutes death, in what we call by this name, is the total cessation of moral and physical existence. Now this fact does not take place in the case of the believer at the moment when his friends see him die." This seems to misrepresent the fact of death for the sake of misrepresenting the present passage.—Ver. 51. In ver. 51 Jesus adds two fresh terms in explanation of the living bread, which, however, through

ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς."[1] 52. Ἐμάχοντο οὖν [w] πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες, "Πῶς δύναται οὗτος ἡμῖν δοῦναι τὴν σάρκα φαγεῖν;" 53. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ πίητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς. 54. [x] ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἐγὼ

w πρὸς in *Il.* xvii. 98, etc., ἐπὶ also used; commonly the simple dative.

x xiii. 18 and Mt. xxiv. 38 only.

[1] Instead of η σαρξ μου . . . ζωης BCDL 33 read η σαρξ μου εστιν υπερ τ. του κοσμου ζωης, adopted by W.H.R. Tisch. adopts the reading of ℵ, υπερ της του κοσμου ζωης, η σαρξ μου εστιν. Weiss is too positive in saying, "Die Worte sind unbedingt und zu streichen". T.R. gives the most intelligible sentence.

their want of apprehension, increased their difficulty. The first is ἐγώ εἰμι . . . ζωῆς. In giving this explanation He slightly alters the designation of Himself as the Bread: He now claims to be not "the bread of life," but ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, "the living bread". Godet says: "The manna, as not itself living, could never impart life. But Jesus, because He Himself lives, can give life." That is correct, but is not the full meaning. ὁ ζῶν contrasts the bread with the βρῶσις ἀπολλυμένη; and as "living water" is water running from a fountain in perpetual stream, and not a measured quantity in a tank, so "living bread" is bread which renews itself in proportion to all needs like the bread of the miracle. The second fresh intimation now made is ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σάρξ μου ἐστίν . . . This intimation is linked to the foregoing by a double conjunction καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δέ, "and besides" indicating, according to classical usage, a new aspect or expansion of what has been said. The new intimation is at first sight an apparent limitation: instead of "I am the bread," He now says "My flesh is the bread". Accordingly some interpreters suppose that by "flesh" the whole manifestation of Christ in human nature is meant. *Cf.* ὁ λόγος σάρξ ἐγένετο. Thus Westcott says: "The life of the world in the highest sense springs from the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ. By His Incarnation and Resurrection the ruin and death which sin brought in are overcome. The thought here is of support and growth, and not of Atonement." To this there are two objections. (1) If σάρξ is equivalent to the whole manifestation of Christ in the flesh, this is not a new statement, but a repetition of what has already been said. And (2) the δώσω compels us to think of a giving yet future. Besides, the turn taken by the conversation, vv. 53-57, seems to point rather to the atoning sacrifice of Christ. [So Euthymius: τὴν σταύρωσιν αὐτοῦ προσημαίνει. τὸ δέ, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω, τὸ ἑκούσιον ἐμφαίνει τοῦ τοιούτου πάθους. So too Cyril: Ἀποθνήσκω, φησίν, ὑπὲρ πάντων, ἵνα πάντας ζωοποιήσω δι' ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ ἀντίλυτρον τῆς ἁπάντων σαρκὸς τὴν ἐμὴν ἐποιησάμην. Bengel says: "Tota haec de carne et sanguine Jesu Christi oratio passionem spectat". Beza even finds in δώσω the sense "offeram Patri in ara crucis".] The giving of His flesh, a still future giving which is spoken of as a definite act, is, then, most naturally referred to the death on the cross. This was to be ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, "for the sake of the life of the world". ὑπέρ when used in connection with sacrifice tends to glide into ἀντί; see the *Alcestis* of Eurip. *passim* and Lampe's note on this verse. Here, however, the idea of substitution is not present. It is only hinted that somehow the death of Christ is needed for the world's life. This statement, however, only bewilders the crowd; and the next paragraph, vv. 52-59, gives expression to and deals with this bewilderment.—Ver. 52. Ἐμάχοντο . . . The further explanations sprang from a fresh question put not directly to Jesus, but to one or other of the crowd. They differed in their judgment of Him. Some impatiently denounced Him as insane: others suggesting that there was truth in His words. The discussion all tended to the question πῶς δύναται . . . φαγεῖν. He had only spoken of "giving" His flesh for the life of the world: but they not unreasonably concluded that if so, it must be eaten. Their mistake lay in thinking of a physical eating.—Vv. 53, 54. εἶπεν οὖν . . . ἡμέρᾳ. Instead of explaining the mode Jesus merely reiterates the statement. The reason of this is that

a vv. 40, 44, 54; vii. 37, etc.
y Dan. i. 10.
z Freq. in John.
a Heb. iii. 12. 1 Thess. i. 10. Rom. ix. 26.
b Gen. xxi. 11. Deut. i. 17. Jer. vi. 10.

ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν [a] τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. 55. ἡ γὰρ σάρξ μου ἀληθῶς[1] ἐστι [y] βρῶσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθῶς ἐστι πόσις. 56. ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα, [z] ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ. 57. καθὼς ἀπέστειλέ με [a] ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ, κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα· καὶ ὁ τρώγων με, κἀκεῖνος ζήσεται δι' ἐμέ. 58. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· οὐ καθὼς ἔφαγον οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν τὸ μάννα, καὶ ἀπέθανον· ὁ τρώγων τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα." 59. Ταῦτα εἶπεν ἐν συναγωγῇ διδάσκων ἐν Καπερναούμ.

60. Πολλοὶ οὖν ἀκούσαντες ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπον, " [b] Σκλη-

[1] For αληθως in both occurrences αληθης is read in ℵ[c]BC.

their attention was thus more likely to be fixed on the necessity of using Him as the living bread. The difficulty of the statement disappears when it is perceived that the figure of speech is not to be found in the words "flesh" and "blood," but in the words "eating" and "drinking". The actual flesh and blood, the human life of Christ, was given for men; and men eat His flesh and drink His blood, when they use for their own advantage His sacrifice, when they assimilate to their own being all the virtue that was in Him, and that was manifested for their sakes. As Lücke points out, the σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα form together one conception and are equivalent to the με of ver. 57. If αἷμα stood alone it might refer especially to the death of Christ, but taken along with σάρξ it is more natural to refer the double expression to the whole manifestation of Christ; and the "eating and drinking" can only mean the complete acceptance of Him and union with Him as thus manifested. [τρώγω, originally the munching of herbivorous animals, was latterly applied to ordinary human eating.]—Vv. 55, 56. This is further shown in vv. 55, 56. ἡ γὰρ σάρξ μου ἀληθῶς [better ἀληθής] ἐστι βρῶσις, "For my flesh is a genuine food and my blood is a genuine drink"; with an implied contrast to those things with which men ordinarily endeavour to satisfy themselves. The satisfying, genuine character of Christ as the bread consists especially in this, that ὁ τρώγων . . . ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ. He becomes as truly assimilated to the life of the individual as the nourishing elements in food enter into the substance of the body. The believer abides in Christ as finding his life in Him (Gal. ii. 20); and Christ abides in the believer, continually imparting to him what constitutes spiritual life. For in Christ man reaches the source of all life in the Father (ver. 57), καθὼς ἀπέστειλέ με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ . . . δι' ἐμέ. The living Father has sent Christ forth as the bearer of life. He lives διὰ τὸν πατέρα, not equivalent to διὰ τοῦ πατρός, through or by means of the Father, but "because of," or "by reason of the Father". The Father is the cause of my life; I live because the Father lives. [Beza quotes from the *Plutus* of Aristoph., 470, the declaration of Penia that μόνην Ἀγαθῶν ἁπάντων οὖσαν αἰτίαν ἐμὲ Ὑμῖν, δι' ἐμέ τε ζῶντας ὑμᾶς.] The Father is the absolute source of life; the Son is the bearer of that life to the world; *cf.* v. 26, where the same dependence of the Son on the Father for life is expressed. The second member of the comparison, introduced by καί (see Winer, p. 548; and the *Nic. Ethics*, *passim*), is not, as Chrys. and Euthymius suggest, κἀγὼ ζῶ, but καὶ ὁ τρώγων με, κἀκεῖνος ζήσεται (better ζήσει) δι' ἐμέ. (For the form of the sentence *cf.* x. 14.) Every one that eateth Christ will by that connection participate in the life of God.—Ver. 58. οὗτός ἐστιν . . . αἰῶνα. These characteristics, now mentioned, identify this bread from heaven as something of a different and superior nature to the manna.—Ver. 59. With his usual exact specification of time and place John adds ταῦτα . . . ἐν Καφαρναούμ. Lampe says: "Colligi etiam inde potest, quod haec acciderint in Sabbato"; but the synagogue was available for teaching on other days, and it is not likely that on a Sabbath so many persons would have followed Him across the lake.

Vv. 60-71. *The crisis in Galilee.*—Ver. 60. Πολλοὶ οὖν . . . ἀκούειν; many of His disciples [*i.e.*, of the larger and more loosely attached circle of His followers, as distinct from the Twelve, ver.

ρός ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ λόγος· τίς δύναται αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν;" 61. [c] Εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν [c] ἑαυτῷ, ὅτι γογγύζουσι περὶ τούτου οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς "Τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει; 62. ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον; 63. τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν· τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λαλῶ[1] ὑμῖν, πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωή ἐστιν. 64. ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες οἳ οὐ πιστεύουσιν." Ἤιδει γὰρ [d] ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες, καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν.

c xiii. i. Lk. xi. 17. Mk. v. 30. Gen. xviii. 12.

d xvi. 4 only. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς freq.

[1] λελαληκα in ℵBCD it. vulg., etc.

67] having heard the foregoing utterances, said **Σκληρός ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ λόγος. Σκληρός** is rather "hard to receive" than "hard to understand". Abraham found the command to cast out Hagar **σκληρός**, Gen. xxi. 11. Euripides opposes **σκληρ' ἀληθῆ**, distasteful, uncompromising truths to **μαλθακὰ ψευδῆ**, flattering falsehoods (*Frag.*, 75, Wetstein). The **λόγος** referred to was especially, ver. 58, **οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς** as is proved by vv. 61, 62. But this must be taken together with His statement in ver. 51, that He would give His flesh, and the development of this idea in vv. 53, 54, **τίς δύναται αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν**; "who can listen to Him?"—Ver. 61. This apparently was said out of the hearing of Jesus, for ver. 61 says **εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἑαυτῷ**, "Jesus knowing in Himself," that is, perceiving that they were murmuring, He intuitively understood what it was they were stumbling at, and said **τοῦτο ὑμᾶς . . . πρότερον**; "Does this saying stumble you? If then ye see the Son of Man ascending where He was before ——" What are we to supply? Either, Will you not be much more scandalised? Or, Will you not then be convinced? According to the former, the sense would be: If now you say, how can this Man give us His flesh to eat? much more will you then say so when His flesh wholly disappears. But the second interpretation gives the better sense: You will find it easier to believe I came down from heaven, when you see me returning thither. *Cf.* iii. 13; xiii. 3. You will then recognise also in what sense I said that you must eat my flesh. **τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστι τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν**. It was therefore the spirit animating the flesh in His giving of it which profited; not the external sacrifice of His body, but the spirit which prompted it was efficacious. The acceptance of God's judgment of sin, the devotedness to man and perfect harmony with God, shown in the cross, is what brings life to the world; and it is this Spirit men are invited to partake of. It is therefore not a fleshly but a spiritual transaction of which I have been speaking to you. [Bengel excellently: "Non sola Deitas Christi, nec solus Spiritus sanctus significatur, sed universe *Spiritus*, cui contradistinguitur *caro*".] **τὰ ῥήματα . . . ἐστιν**, His entire discourse at Capernaum, and whatever other sayings He had uttered, were spirit and life. It was through what He said that He made Himself known and offered Himself to them. To those who believed His words, spirit and life came in their believing. By believing they were brought into contact with the life in Him.—Ver. 64. But **τινὲς οὐ πιστεύουσιν**, and therefore do not receive the life. This Jesus said **ᾔδει γὰρ . . . αὐτόν**, for Jesus knew from the first who they were that believed not, and who it was who should betray Him. "Hoc ideo addidit Evangelista, ne quis putet temere judicasse Christum de suis auditoribus," Calvin. Euthymius says it illustrates His forbearance. **ἐξ ἀρχῆς**, from the beginning of His connection with individuals. Weiss supposes it means from the beginning of their not believing. He gave utterance to this knowledge in ver. 26. He even knew who it was who should betray Him. This is said in anticipation of vv. 70, 71. This declaration raises the question, Why then did Jesus call Judas to the Apostolate? Holtzmann indeed supposes that this intimation is purely apologetic and intended to show that Jesus was not deceived in appointing Judas. It is unnecessary to increase the difficulty by supposing the **ἐξ ἀρχῆς** to refer to the time previous to his call. Jesus saw in Judas qualities fitting him to be an Apostle; but seeing him among the others He recognised that he was an

65. Καὶ ἔλεγε, "Διὰ τοῦτο εἴρηκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με, ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ [e] ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου." 66. [f] Ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ ἀπῆλθον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ [g] εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ οὐκέτι μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ περιεπάτουν. 67. εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς δώδεκα, "Μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν;" 68. Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος, "Κύριε, πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα; [h] ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις· 69. καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν, καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος."[1] 70. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[i] Οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην, καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολός

e Cp. iii. 27.
f xix. 12; viii. 31. Heb. x. 38.
g xviii. 6; xx. 14. Mk. xiii. 16. Gen. xix. 17.
h Acts v. 20.
i xv. 16; xiii. 18.

[1] ο Χριστος . . . ζωντος only in inferior authorities; ο αγιος του Θεου (without τ. ζωντος) in ℵBC*DL. Cp. Mk. i. 24; Acts iii. 14.

unfaithful man. To suppose that He called him in the clear knowledge that he would betray Him is to introduce an unintelligible or artificial element into the action of Christ. [Neither Calvin nor Beza makes any remark on the clause. Bruce, *Training of the Twelve;* and Reith, *in loc.*, should be consulted.] Jesus already recognised in what manner His death would be compassed: by treachery. The fact stated in ver. 64, that some of His own disciples could yet not believe in Him, illustrates the truth of what He had said, ver. 44, that no one can come to Him except the Father draw him.—Ver. 65. He therefore points this out, **διὰ τοῦτο . . . πατρός μου.** All that brings men to Christ is the Father's gift.—Ver. 66. **ἐκ τούτου,** "on this"; neither exclusively "from this time" **ἔκτοτε** (Euthymius), "from this moment onwards" (Lücke), nor exclusively "on this account," but a combination of both. *Cf.* xix. 12. Here the time is in the foreground, as is shown by the **οὐκ ἔτι** following. Lampe has: "Qui ab illo tempore Iesum deserebant, clare indicabant, quod propter hunc sermonem istud fecerint". **πολλοὶ ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω . . . περιεπάτουν.** Many of those who had up to this time been following Him and listening to His teaching, returned now to their former ways and no longer accompanied Jesus. [**ὀπίσω δὲ νόει μοι, καὶ τὸν πρότερον βίον αὐτῶν, εἰς ὃν πάλιν ὑπέστρεψαν,** Euthymius.] **εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω** occurs xviii. 6, xx. 14; also Mk. xiii. 16. But the most instructive occurrence is in Ps. xliv. 18, **οὐκ ἀπέστη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν,** where the literal sense passes into the spiritual meaning, apostasy, abandonment of God.—Ver. 67. This giving up of their adherence to Christ was probably manifested in an immediate and physical withdrawal from His presence. For He turned to the Twelve with the words: **μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν;** "Sciebat id non facturos," Lampe, who adds six reasons for the question, of which the most important are: "ut confessionem illam egregiam eliceret, qua se genuinos discipulos Jesu esse mox probaturi erant"; and "ut edoceret, se nonnisi voluntarios discipulos quaerere". Probably also that they might be confirmed in their faith by the expression of it, and that He might be gladdened.—Ver. 68. Simon Peter answered in name of all, **Κύριε . . . ζῶντος.** He gives a threefold reason why they remained faithful while others left. (1) **πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα;** "To whom shall we go away?" implying that they must attach themselves to some one as a teacher and mediator in divine things. They cannot imagine that any one should be to them what already Jesus had been. (2) Especially are they bound to Him, because He has words of eternal life, **ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχεις.** They had experienced that His words were spirit and life, ver. 63. In themselves a new life had been quickened by His words, a life they recognised as the true, highest, eternal life. To have received eternal life from Christ makes it impossible to abandon Him. (3) **καὶ ἡμεῖς** (ver. 69), "we for our part," whatever others think, **πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν** "have believed and know," *cf.* 1 John iv. 16, **ἡμεῖς ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν,** which shows we cannot press the order [*cf.* Augustine's "credimus ut intelligamus"] but must accept the double expression as a strong asseveration of conviction: we have believed and we know by experience **ὅτι σὺ εἶ . . .**

ἐστιν;" 71. Ἔλεγε δὲ τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτην· οὗτος γὰρ ἤμελλεν αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι, εἷς ὢν ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα.

VII. 1. ΚΑΙ [a] περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ· οὐ γὰρ ἤθελεν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περιπατεῖν, ὅτι [b] ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι. 2. Ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ [c] σκηνοπηγία. 3. εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, "Μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ ὕπαγε εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου

a xi. 54. Mk. xi. 27.
b v. 16. Exod. ii. 15. Jer. xxxiii. 21.
c Deut. xvi. 16. Lev. xxiii. 34. 1 Macc. x. 21.

ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ occurs in Mk. i. 24, Lk. vi. 34; *cf.* Acts iii. 14, iv. 27, 30; Rev. iii. 7. The expression is not Johannine; but the idea of the Messiah as consecrated or set apart is found in x. 36, ὃν ὁ Πατὴρ ἡγίασε. Peter's confession here is equivalent to his confession at Caesarea Philippi, recorded in the Synoptic Gospels.—Ver. 70. ἀπεκρίθη . . . ἐστιν; this reply of Jesus to Peter's warm-hearted confession at first sight seems chilling. Peter had claimed for himself and the rest a perfect loyalty; but this confidence of Peter's carried in it a danger, and must be abated. Also it was well that the conscience of Judas should be pricked. Therefore Jesus says: Even in this carefully selected circle of men, individually chosen by myself from the mass, there is not the perfect loyalty you boast.—ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολός ἐστιν. Even of you one is a devil. Lücke, referring to Esth. vii. 4 and viii. 1, where Haman is called ὁ διάβολος, as being "the slanderer," or "the enemy," suggests that a similar meaning may be appropriate here. But Jesus calls Peter "Satan" and may much more call Judas "a devil". Besides in the present connection "traitor" is quite as startling a word as "devil".—Ver. 71. Using the knowledge brought by subsequent events John explains that Judas was meant, ἔλεγε δὲ τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτην [better Ἰσκαριώτου, which shows that the father of Judas was also known as Iscariot], ἔλεγε with the accusative, meaning "He spoke of," is classical, and see Mk. xiv. 71. The word "Iscariot" is generally supposed to be equivalent to אִישׁ קְרִיּוֹת, Ish Keriyoth, a man of Kerioth in the tribe of Judah (Josh. xv. 25). *Cf.* Ishtob, a man of Tob (Joseph., *Ant.*, vii. 6, 1, quoted in Smith's *Dict.*). The name Judas now needs no added surname.

CHAPTERS VII.-X. 21. *Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles, and subsequently in Jerusalem.*

CHAPTER VII. *At the Feast.*—Vv. 1-13. *The circumstances of His visit to Jerusalem.*—Vv. 14-36. *He teaches, and discussions regarding Him are evoked.*—V. 37-end. *His manifestation on the last day of the Feast, and the consequent action of the Sanhedrim.*—Ver. 1. Having described the crisis in Galilee the evangelist proceeds to describe the various opinions and discussions held regarding Jesus in Jerusalem. See Sanday, p. 144. In chap. vi., a Passover was said to be at hand; but Jesus did not go to it, but continued to go about teaching in Galilee, περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ. Although appropriate to a single school, περιπάτειν denoted generally the going about of a teacher with his disciples; hence, "to dispute," or "to discourse". περίπατος in Aristoph., *Frogs*, 907 and 918, means "a philosophical discussion or argumentation". John assigns a reason for Jesus remaining in Galilee; this, according to Holtzmann and Weiss, proves that he considered the Judaean ministry the rule, the Galilean the exception. But the assigning of a reason may be accounted for by the unlikelihood of Jesus remaining in Galilee after what was recorded in chap. vi. His reason for remaining in Galilee, even after His rejection there, was the active hostility of the Jews, ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι. See ver. 18. Things were not yet ripe for His exposing Himself to the hostility of the authorities.—Ver. 2. But occasion arose for His abandoning His purpose to remain in Galilee. ἦν δὲ . . . σκηνοπηγία. In Hebrew חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת (Lev. xxiii. 34), the Feast of Succoth, or Booths, in Greek σκηνοπηγία, the fixing of tents; so called because in this Feast the Jews commemorated how their fathers had dwelt in tents, and been fed and cared for as if in a settled condition. It was one of the great Feasts, and as it fell in October and Jesus had not attended the previous Passover, it might seem desirable that He should go up to Jerusalem now.—Ver. 3. The desirableness of doing so is urged by His brothers, εἶπον . . . τῷ κόσμῳ. The reason they

[d] θεωρήσωσι [1] τὰ ἔργα σου ἃ ποιεῖς· 4. οὐδεὶς γὰρ [e] ἐν κρυπτῷ τι ποιεῖ, καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι. εἰ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, φανέρωσον σεαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ." 5. Οὐδὲ γὰρ [f] οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν. 6. Λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[h] Ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὔπω πάρεστιν· ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος πάντοτέ ἐστιν [i] ἕτοιμος. 7. [j] οὐ δύναται ὁ κόσμος μισεῖν ὑμᾶς· ἐμὲ δὲ μισεῖ, ὅτι ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρά ἐστιν. 8. ὑμεῖς [k] ἀνάβητε εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην [2]· ἐγὼ οὔπω [3] ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην, ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὔπω [l] πεπλήρωται." 9. Ταῦτα δὲ εἰπὼν αὐτοῖς, ἔμεινεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.

10. Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβησαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη εἰς

d Fut. indic. never in classics after ἵνα; freq. in N. T., Burton, 199.
e xviii. 20; commonly ἐν τῷ κ.
f xi. 54. Col. ii. 15.
g Mk. iii. 21.
h ii. 4; viii. 20.
i 1 Pet. i. 5.
j iii. 19; xv. 19.
k Zech. xiv. 18. Ch. xii. 20. Mk. x. 32.
l Mk. i. 15.

[1] θεωρησουσι in ℵcB*DL.

[2] ταυτην deleted in modern editions on authority of ℵcaBDKL.

[3] ουκ is read in ℵDKM vet. Lat. vulg. Memph. Arm. Tr. Ti. Meyer, Weiss; ουπω in BLT syr. Theb. Goth. vulg. codd. aliq. W.H. R.V.

advanced was "that Thy disciples also may see Thy works which Thou doest". καὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου seems to imply that since the Feeding of the Five Thousand in April, Jesus had been living in comparative retirement, perhaps at Nazareth. At Jerusalem, all who were attached to Him would be found at the Feast; and the brothers recognise that He would then have an opportunity of putting His claims to the proof. "No one," they say, "who seeks public recognition confines his activities to a hidden and private corner." ἐν παρρησίᾳ, as in xi. 54, means "openly" or "in public," and is in direct contrast to ἐν κρυπτῷ. Having laid down the general law, they then apply it to Him, "if (or 'since,' not expressing doubt) Thou doest these things, show Thyself to the world". Lücke, following Euthymius, thinks doubt is implied in εἰ; but this implies an ignorance on the part of the brothers which is inconceivable.—Ver. 5. It is indeed added οὐδὲ γὰρ . . . αὐτόν, "For not even did His brothers believe in Him"; but this does not mean that they did not believe He wrought miracles, but that they had not submitted to His claim to be Messiah. They required to see Him publicly acknowledged before they could believe. Therefore this clause is introduced to explain why they urged Him to go to Jerusalem.—Ver. 6. His answer was ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὔπω πάρεστιν . . . ἕτοιμος. The time for my manifestation to the authorities as Messiah is not yet come; but no time is inappropriate or unsafe for you to show yourselves.—Ver. 7. The reason of the different procedure lies in the different relation to the world held by Jesus and His brothers. οὐ δύναται . . . ἐστιν. There is no danger of your incurring the world's hatred by anything you do or say; because your wishes and actions are in the world's own spirit. But me the world hates, and I cannot at random or on every occasion utter to it my claims and purpose, because the very utterance of these claims causes it to be conscious that its desires are earthly (see chap. vi. *passim*). This hatred of the world compelled Him to choose His time for manifesting Himself.—Ver. 8. ὑμεῖς . . . πεπλήρωται "Go ye up to the feast. I go not up yet to this Feast, for my time is not yet fulfilled." His time for manifesting Himself publicly was not yet come, and therefore He did not wish to go up to the feast *with His brothers*, who were eager for some public display. Had He gone in their company He would have been proclaimed, and would have appeared to be the nominee of His own family. It was impossible He should go on any such terms.—Ver. 9. He therefore remained where He was.—Ver. 10. Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβησαν . . . κρυπτῷ. "But when His brothers had gone up, then He also went up to the Feast, not openly, but, as it were, in secret." That is to say, He went up, but not at His brothers' instigation, nor with the publicity they had recommended. [Of course if we read in ver. 8 ἐγω οὐκ ἀναβαίνω a change

τὴν ἑορτήν, οὐ φανερῶς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ. 11. Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, καὶ ἔλεγον, "Ποῦ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος;" 12. Καὶ [m] γογγυσμὸς πολὺς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις. οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι ἀγαθός ἐστιν·" ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον, "Οὔ· ἀλλὰ πλανᾷ τὸν ὄχλον." 13. [n] Οὐδεὶς μέντοι παρρησίᾳ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

14. Ἤδη δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς [o] μεσούσης, ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκε. 15. καὶ ἐθαύμαζον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες, "Πῶς οὗτος [p] γράμματα οἶδε, μὴ μεμαθηκώς;" 16. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν, "Ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμή, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με·

m ix. 16.
n ix. 22.
o Exod. xii. 29; xxxiv. 22.
p Dan. i. 4. Is. xxix. 12. 2 Tim. iii. 15.

of mind must be supposed, although not the "inconstantia" alleged by Porphyry.]

Vv. 11-13. *Disappointment at Jesus' non-appearance.*—Ver. 11. **Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι . . . ἐκεῖνος**; "the Jews," possibly, as usual in John, the authorities (so Meyer, Weiss, etc.), and thus in contrast to the **ὄχλοι** of ver. 12; but ver. 15 rather indicates that the term is used more generally. They looked for Him, expecting that He would appear at least at this third feast. They asked **ποῦ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος**; which Luther, Meyer, etc., think contemptuous; but **ἐκεῖνος** cannot thus be pressed. *Cf.* 1 John *passim.*—Ver. 12. Among the masses (**ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις**) there was **γογγυσμὸς πολύς** regarding Him; not "murmuring," as R.V., but rather "whispering," suppressed discussion in low tones, in corners, and among friends; "halblaute Mittheilung entgegengesetzter Ansichten" (Holtzmann), "viel im Volke über ihn herumgeredet" (Weizsäcker). Specimens of this talk are given: **οἱ μὲν . . . ὄχλον**. "Some said, He is a good man," **ἀγαθός**, pure in motive and seeking to do good. "But others said, No: but He misleads the multitude" (Mt. xxvii. 63, Lk. xxiii. 5), that is, seeks to ingratiate Himself with the people to serve His own ends.—**Οὐδεὶς . . . Ἰουδαίων**. "No one, however, talked openly about Him, for fear of the Jews." Until the Jews, the authorities, gave their decision, neither party dared to utter its opinion openly.

Vv. 14-36. *The teaching of Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles.* [Spitta supposes that the original place of paragraph vv. 15-24 was at the end of chap. v.] So far as reported this teaching is found in three short statements: (1) in justification of His authority as a teacher; (2) in assertion of His Divine origin; and (3) of His approaching departure. This threefold teaching elicited expressions of opinion from three parties: (1) from "the Jews" (15-24); (2) from inhabitants of Jerusalem (25-31); (3) from the officers sent to apprehend Him (32-36).—Ver. 14. **Ἤδη δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσούσης**. "But when it was now mid-feast," *i.e.*, the fourth day. **μεσοῦν** is commonly used in this sense: **ἡμέρα μεσοῦσα**, midday; **θέρος μεσοῦν**, midsummer.—**ἀνέβη . . . ἐδίδασκε**. "Jesus went up to the temple and taught"; see xviii. 20; He did not go to Jerusalem to seclude Himself and worship in private, nor did He go to proclaim Himself explicitly as Messiah. He went and taught. His teaching astonished the Jews, and they asked **Πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδε μὴ μεμαθηκώς**; It is not His wisdom that astonishes them, for even uneducated men are often wise; but His learning or knowledge. **γράμματα** (Acts xxvi. 24) "included the whole circle of rabbinical training, the sacred Scriptures, and the comments and traditions which were afterwards elaborated into the Mishna and Gemara" (Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom*). But it cannot be supposed that Jesus made Himself acquainted with these comments. His skill in interpreting Scripture and His knowledge of it is what is referred to. What the scribes considered their prerogative, He, without their teaching, excelled them in.—Ver. 16. But though not received from them, it was a derived teaching. He is not self-taught. **Ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχὴ . . . με**. The teaching which I give has not its source in my knowledge but in Him that sent me. "Der Autodidakt in Wahrheit ein Theodidakt ist," Holtzmann. The truest self-renunciation is the highest claim. That this claim was true He proceeds to show (1) from the conviction of every one who desired to do God's will, ver. 17; and (2) from His own character, ver. 18.—Ver. 17. **ἐάν τις . . . λαλῶ**. "If any

q Mt. vii. 21. Wisd. i. 25.
r Here only in N.T., freq. in Job.
s Rom. ii. 14, etc.
t viii. 48.

17. ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ [q]θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, [r]πότερον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν, ἢ ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ λαλῶ. 18. ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν, τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ· ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτὸν, οὗτος ἀληθής ἐστι, καὶ ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. 19. οὐ Μωσῆς δέδωκεν[1] ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν [s]ποιεῖ τὸν νόμον; τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι;" 20. [t]Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ὄχλος καὶ εἶπε, "Δαιμόνιον ἔχεις· τίς σε ζητεῖ ἀποκτεῖναι;" 21. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἓν ἔργον ἐποίησα, καὶ

[1] εδωκεν in BD; δεδωκεν in ℵLT.

man willeth to do His will, he shall know concerning the teaching, whether it is of God (or from God) or I speak from myself." As Jesus everywhere asserts (v. 46, xviii. 37), he who thirsts for God will recognise Him as God's messenger; he who hungers for righteousness is filled in Jesus; he who is of the truth hears His voice. The teaching of Jesus is recognised as Divine by those whose purpose and desire it is to be in harmony with God.—Ver. 18. There are also two different kinds of teachers: the one **ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν**, speaks his own mind, teaches his own ideas, does not represent God and reveal His mind; because he **τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ**, "seeks his own glory," which of course cannot be reached by representing himself to be merely the herald of another's glory. The other style of teacher is described in the words **ὁ δὲ ζητῶν . . . ἔστιν**. Plainly He who seeks the glory of Him whose ambassador He is, has no interest in falsifying matters to advance His own interests. If His aim is to advance the glory of Him who has sent Him, He will truthfully deliver His message; **ἀληθής ἐστι, καὶ ἀδικία . . .** and injustice, dishonesty, is not in Him. The application of this general principle to Jesus was obvious.—Ver. 19. **οὐ Μωσῆς . . . ἀποκτεῖναι.** The connection is not obvious, but seems to be this: You reject my teaching, but that is not surprising, for you reject Moses' also (*cf.* v. 39, 45-47). "Did not Moses give you the law?" or, "Hath not Moses given you the law?" [the point of interrogation should be after the first **νόμον**; none after the second]. "Yet none of you keeps it. If you did you would not seek to kill me." Was there not a former revelation of God which should have prevented you from thus violently rejecting my teaching?—Ver. 20. This, some of the crowd think mere raving. He is a monomaniac labouring under a hallucination that people wish to kill Him.—**Δαιμόνιον . . . ἀποκτεῖναι;** This question, repudiating the idea that any one seeks to slay Him, needs no answer and gets none.—Ver. 21. Jesus prefers to expose the unjustifiable character of the hostility which pursued Him (ver. 16). Referring to the miracle wrought at Bethesda, and which gave occasion to this hostility, He says **ἓν ἔργον . . . σαββάτῳ.** One single work I did and ye all marvel [are horrified or scandalised]; for this same object, of imparting health, Moses gave you circumcision, an ordinance that continues through all the generations and regularly sets aside the Sabbath law. If circumcision is performed, lest the law of Moses be broken, are ye angry at me for making a man every whit whole [or rather, for making an entire or whole man healthy] on the Sabbath day? The argument is obvious; and its force is brought out by the antithetical form of the sentence: the **ἓν ἔργον** of the healing of the impotent man is contrasted with the continuous ordinance of circumcision, and so the aorist is used of the one, the perfect of the other. In ver. 23 **περιτομὴν λαμβάνει** is contrasted with **ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ**, the partial and symbolic with the complete and actual soundness. The argument is all the more telling because a "vis medicatrix," as well as a ceremonial purity (but *vide* Meyer), was ascribed to circumcision ["praeputium est vitium in corpore"]. Wetstein quotes from a Rabbi a singularly analogous argument: "Si circumcisio, quae fit in uno membrorum 248 hominis, pellit Sabbatum, quanto magis verum est, conservationem vitae Sabbatum pellere?" The parenthesis in ver. 22, **οὐχ ὅτι . . . πατέρων**, is apparently thrown in for accuracy's sake, lest some captious persons should divert

πάντες θαυμάζετε. 22. [u] διὰ τοῦτο Μωσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὴν περιτομὴν, οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Μωσέως ἐστὶν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ τῶν πατέρων· καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ περιτέμνετε ἄνθρωπον. 23. εἰ περιτομὴν λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῳ, ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωσέως, ἐμοὶ [v] χολᾶτε ὅτι ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ ἐποίησα ἐν σαββάτῳ; 24. [w] μὴ κρίνετε κατ᾽ ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε."[1] 25. Ἔλεγον οὖν τινες ἐκ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν, "Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὃν ζητοῦσιν ἀποκτεῖναι; 26. καὶ ἴδε παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖ, καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ λέγουσι. [x] μήποτε ἀληθῶς ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς[2] ὁ Χριστός; 27. ἀλλὰ τοῦτον οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται,

u Lev. xii. 3. Gen. xvii. 10.
v 3 Macc. iii. 1.
w Deut. i. 16. Zech. vii. 9.
x Gen. xlvii. 18. Jud. iii. 24.

[1] κρινετε in BDL; κρινατε ℵXΓ.

[2] αληθως deleted by modern editors as in ℵBDKL.

attention from the argument by objecting to the statement that Moses had "given" them circumcision. The reference of διὰ τοῦτο in the same verse is obscure. Some editors join these words with θαυμάζετε; but although in Mk. vi. 6 διά follows θαυμάζειν, this construction does not occur in John. Besides, John frequently begins his sentences with διὰ τοῦτο; and if ver. 22 begins with Μωσῆς, such a commencement is certainly abrupt. Retaining διὰ τοῦτο as part of ver. 22, the words might be understood thus: "I have done one work and ye all marvel: therefore (be it known unto you) Moses has given you," etc., *i.e.*, "I will remove your astonishment: you yourselves perform circumcision," etc. See Winer, p. 68. So Holtzmann, and Weizsäcker, who renders: "Darum: Moses hat euch," etc. This gives a good sense, but surely the ellipsis is too severe. Holtzmann's reference to vi. 65 tells rather against it, for there εἴρηκα is added. May διὰ τοῦτο not mean, "on this account," *i.e.*, for the same reason as I had in healing the impotent man, did Moses give you circumcision? I did one work of healing and ye marvel. But with a similar object Moses gave you circumcision. This seems best to suit the words and the context. He adds to His argument the comprehensive advice of ver. 24. μὴ κρίνετε κατ᾽ ὄψιν . . . κρίνατε. "Judge not according to appearance:" κατ᾽ ὄψιν, according to what presents itself to the eye; the Pharisaic vice. In appearance the healing of the impotent man was a breach of the Sabbath-law. No righteous judgment can be come to if appearances decide. For κρίσιν κρίνειν, *cf.* Plato *Rep.*, 360 E; and *cf.* οἰκίαν οἰκεῖν, βαδίζειν ὁδόν, πεσεῖν πτώματα, etc.

Vv. 25-31. *Opinion of inhabitants of Jerusalem regarding Jesus.* Knowing the hostility of the authorities, they express surprise that Jesus should be allowed to teach openly; and wonder whether the authorities themselves can have changed their opinion about Him. This they find it difficult to believe, because on the point of origin Jesus does not satisfy Messianic requirements.—Ver. 25. Ἔλεγον οὖν, in consequence of the bold denunciation which they had heard from the lips of Jesus. τινὲς ἐκ τῶν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν [or Ἱεροσολυμειτῶν, or Ἰεροσολυμειτῶν], distinct from the ὄχλος of ver. 20, which was unaware of any intention to kill Him; but themselves not so familiar as the Galileans with the appearance of Jesus, and therefore they asked: Οὐχ οὗτος . . . λέγουσι. Or the words may only be a strong way of expressing their astonishment at the inactivity of the authorities. μήποτε ἀληθῶς . . . ὁ Χριστός; "Can it be that the rulers indeed know that this man is the Christ?" But this idea, again, is at once dismissed, ἀλλὰ τοῦτον . . . ἐστίν. "Howbeit we know this man whence He is: but when the Christ comes, no one knows whence He is." There was a general belief that the Christ would spring from David's line and be born in Bethlehem; see ver. 42. The words "no one knows whence He is" must refer to the belief encouraged by the Apocalyptic literature that He would appear suddenly "in the clouds" or "from the sea". *Cf.* 4 Ezra vii. 28, xiii. 32, Apoc. Baruch xiii. 32; with Mr. Charles' note; and other passages cited in Drummond's

y xii. 44. Exod. xxii. 23.
z v. 19.
a Heb. x. 22. Rev. iii. 14.
b vi. 46, etc.
c Freq. in John; also Acts iii. 7; xii. 4. 2 Cor. xi. 32.
d ii. 4; viii. 20, etc.
e Attrac. cp. Zeph. iii. 11.
f ver. 30.
g Is. liv. 7.

οὐδεὶς γινώσκει πόθεν ἐστίν." 28. [y] Ἔκραξεν οὖν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ λέγων, "Κἀμὲ οἴδατε, καὶ οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί· καὶ [z] ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν [a] ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε· 29. ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν, ὅτι [b] παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰμι, κἀκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλεν." 30. Ἐζήτουν οὖν αὐτὸν [c] πιάσαι· καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπέβαλεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὴν χεῖρα, ὅτι [d] οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ. 31. Πολλοὶ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔλθῃ, μήτι [1] πλείονα σημεῖα τούτων [2] ποιήσει [e] ὧν οὗτος ἐποίησεν;" 32. Ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τοῦ ὄχλου γογγύζοντος περὶ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα· καὶ ἀπέστειλαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ὑπηρέτας, ἵνα [f] πιάσωσιν αὐτόν. 33. εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἔτι [g] μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν

[1] μη in ℵBDL. [2] τουτων omitted in ℵBDL.

Messiah, 279 ff. Different sections of the community may have had different expectations. The surmises of the Jerusalemites came to the ears of Jesus, and stirred Him to further and more emphatic statements, **Ἔκραξεν οὖν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ**. From the repetition of the words "in the Temple," Westcott gathers that a break occurred between this scene and the last; but this idea seems to be precluded by the continuity of the conversation. Jesus takes up the words of the doubters, **Κἀμὲ οἴδατε** . . . Some interpreters think there is a touch of irony in the first clauses; thus Weizsäcker translates: "So? mich kennet ihr und wisset wo ich her bin? Und doch bin ich," etc. Similarly Lücke and Godet. But this is unnecessary. Jesus concedes their ability to identify Him as the carpenter of Nazareth. This knowledge they had; but the knowledge which they had not was of far greater importance. To know my native place and to be able to recognise me as Jesus is not enough; for I am not come at my own prompting. To deduce from your knowledge of my origin that I am a self-constituted prophet and therefore not the Messiah, is to mistake; for I am not come of myself. To know me apart from Him that sent me is empty knowledge. He that sent me has a real existence, and is not a fancy of mine. You indeed do not know Him; but I know Him because from Him I have my being and He has sent me. Weiss rightly observes that **ὅτι** (ver. 29) does not include **κἀκεῖνος με ἀπέστειλεν** under its government. Jesus knew the Father because He was from Him; but His being sent was the result, not the cause, of His knowledge. These statements exasperated the Jews, (ver. 30) **Ἐζήτουν οὖν αὐτὸν πιάσαι.** They sought to seize or apprehend Him. **πιάζω**, Doric and Hellenistic for **πιέζω**, "I press"; in later Greek "I catch" (xxi. 3), "I arrest," ver. 32, etc. But **οὐδεὶς ἐπέβαλεν** "no one laid hands [or, 'his hand,' R.V.] upon Him, for His hour was not yet come"; the immediate cause being that they were not all of one mind, and feared resistance on the part of some of the people.—Ver. 31. For, **πολλοὶ** . . . Here as usual alongside of the hostility evoked by the deeds and words of Jesus faith also was evoked; faith which suggested covertly that He might be the Messiah. **ὁ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔλθῃ**, "When the Christ comes will He do more signs than this man has done?"

Vv. 32-36. *The Sanhedrim takes action regarding Jesus.*—Ver. 32. **Ἤκουσαν . . . αὐτόν.** The Pharisees, perceiving that many of the people were coming under the influence of Jesus, determined to put a stop to His teaching, and persuaded the Sanhedrim [**οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι**] to send officers to apprehend Him.—Ver. 33. **εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς** [**αὐτοῖς** omitted by modern editors] **ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον . . . πέμψαντά με.** Seeing the servants of the Sanhedrim [**οὖν**], Jesus said to the crowd: "Yet a little while am I with you, and then I go to Him that sent me". The "little while" is prompted by the actively hostile step taken by the Sanhedrim. The utterance was a word of warning. **ὑπάγω** does not convey any sense of secrecy, as has been alleged. [It has been supposed that **τὸν πέμψαντά**

πέμψαντά με. 34. [h] Ζητήσετέ με, καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετε· καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν." 35. Εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, "Ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι, ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐχ εὑρήσομεν αὐτόν; μὴ εἰς τὴν [i] διασπορὰν τῶν [j] Ἑλλήνων μέλλει πορεύεσθαι, καὶ διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας; 36. τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπε, Ζητήσετέ με, καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετε· καί, Ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν;"

37. Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ [k] τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἔκραξε λέγων, "Ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ

h Hos. v. 6.
i Jas. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 1. Deut. xxxii. 26.
j xii. 20. Is. ix. 12.
k xix. 31. Exod. xii. 16.

με is a Johannine addition; chiefly because of ver. 35. But this misunderstanding proves nothing; for the people never apprehended who was meant by "Him that sent Him".]—Ver. 34. In ver. 34 He views with pity (*cf.* "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc.) their too late awakening to a sense of their need: **ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐκ εὑρήσετε.** "The tragic history of the Jewish people since their rejection of Jesus as Christ is condensed into these words," Reith. *Cf.* Lk. xvii. 22, "The days will come when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and ye shall not see it"; also Lk. xix. 43, 44; and Is. lv. 6. **εἰκὸς γὰρ πολλοὺς . . . ζητεῖν αὐτὸν βοηθὸν καὶ μᾶλλον ἁλισκομένων Ἱεροσολύμων**, Euthymius. Even though they may then know where He has gone, they cannot follow Him, **ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν**, "where I am" [not εἶμι, "I will go"], *i.e.*, in the presence of Him that sent me, "ye cannot," as ye now are and by your own strength, "come". For the full meaning see chap. viii. 21-24.—Ver. 35. This was quite unintelligible to the Jews, **εἶπον οὖν . . . ἐλθεῖν.** The only meaning they could put upon His words was that, finding no reception among the Jews of Judaea and Galilee, He intended to go to the Jews of the Dispersion and teach them and the Greeks among whom they lived. The **διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων** does not mean, as Chrysostom and Euthymius suppose, the Gentiles **διὰ τὸ διεσπάρθαι πανταχοῦ**, but the Jews dispersed among the Gentiles, see Deut. xxviii. 25, Jer. xxxiv. 17, 1 Pet. i. 1, Jas. i. 1 (*cf.* Schürer, Div. II., vol. ii., and Morrison, *Jews under Roman Rule*). But the following clause, **καὶ διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας**, indicates that they supposed He might teach the Greeks themselves; thus ignorantly anticipating the course Christianity took; what seemed unlikely and impossible to them became actual.—**τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ λόγος . . .** The saying has impressed itself on their memory, though they find it unintelligible. How they could not go where He could, they could not fathom. *Cf.* Peter's "Lord, why can I not follow Thee now?" and the whole conversation, chap. xiii. 33-xiv. 6, "No one comes to the Father but through me".

Vv. 37-44. *Jesus proclaims His ability to quench human thirst with living water.* —Ver. 37. **ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ . . .** This exact specification of time is given that we may understand the significance of the words uttered by Jesus. The Feast of Tabernacles lasted for seven days (Lev. xxiii. 34, Neh. viii. 18), and on the eighth day was "an holy convocation," on which the people celebrated their entrance into the holy land, abandoning their booths, and returning to their ordinary dwellings. On each of the seven feast days water was drawn in a golden pitcher from the pool of Siloam, and carried in procession to the Temple, in commemoration of the water from the rock with which their fathers in the desert had been provided. On the eighth day, which commemorated their entrance into "a land of springs of water," this ceremony was discontinued. But the deeper spirits must have viewed with some misgiving all this ritual, feeling still in themselves a thirst which none of these symbolic forms quenched, and wondering when the vision of Ezekiel would be realised, and a river broad and deep would issue from the Lord's house. Filled with these misgivings they suddenly hear a voice, clear and assured, **Ἐάν τις διψᾷ, ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ πινέτω**: that is, whatever natural wants and innocent cravings and spiritual aspirations men have, Christ undertakes to satisfy them every one. To this general invitation are added words so enigmatical that John finds it necessary

πινέτω· 38. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ [l]ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος." 39. Τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος οὗ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὔπω γὰρ ἦν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον,[1] ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω [m]ἐδοξάσθη. 40. πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον,[2] ἔλεγον, "Οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης." 41. Ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός." Ἄλλοι δὲ ἔλεγον, "Μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; 42. οὐχὶ ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν, ὅτι [n]ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαβίδ, καὶ [o]ἀπὸ Βηθλεέμ, τῆς κώμης ὅπου ἦν Δαβίδ, ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται;"

l Ezek. iii. 3. Zech. xiv. 3. Prov. xviii. 4.
m xii. 16; xiii. 31; xvii. 1.
n Ps. cxxxii. 11.
o Heb. xiii. 24.

1 πνευμα αγιον δεδομενον in B Syr. (Harcl.-Hier). πνευμα without addition in ℵKTΠ Memph. Arm. Aeth. Cyr.-Alex. adopted by T.Tr.W.H.

2 των λογων in all modern editions with ℵBDL it. vulg.

to explain their reference.—Ver. 38. ὁ πιστεύων . . . ζῶντος. [The nominative absolute is common.] No Scripture gives the words *verbatim*. Is. lviii. 11 has: "The Lord shall satisfy thy soul in drought: and thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water whose waters fail not". *Cf.* John iv. 14. The words seem to intimate that the believer shall not only have his own thirst quenched, but shall be a source of new streams for the good of others (O. Holtzmann). A remarkably analogous saying is quoted by Schoettgen from the Talmud: "Quando homo se convertit ad Dominum suum, tanquam fons aquis vivis impletur, et fluenta ejus egrediuntur ad omnis generis homines et ad omnes tribus". At the same time it is not easy to see the relevancy of the saying if this meaning be attached to it, and the saying of John iv. 14 is so similar that it seems preferable to understand it in the same sense, of the inseparableness and inwardness of the living water. Those who advocate the other meaning can certainly find confirmation for their view in the explanation added by John.—Ver. 39. τοῦτο . . . ἐδοξάσθη, for these words apparently refer to Pentecost, the initial outpouring of the Spirit, when it once for all became manifest that the Spirit's presence did not turn men's thoughts in upon themselves, and their own spiritual anxieties and prospects, but prompted them to communicate to all men the blessings they had received. From the little group in the upper room "rivers" did flow to all. But the appended clause, οὔπω γὰρ ἦν Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, is difficult. The best attested reading (see critical note) gives the meaning: "The Spirit was not yet, because Jesus was not yet [οὔπω, not οὐδέπω] glorified". ἐδοξάσθη with John signifies the entire process of glorification, beginning with and including His death (see chap. xii. 23, 32, 33); but especially indicating His recognition by the Father as exalted Messiah (see chap. xvii. 1, 5, xiii. 31). Until He thus became Lord the Spirit was not given: and the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost was recognised as the grand proof and sign that He had reached the position of supremacy in the moral universe. (See especially Acts ii. 32, 33.) The Spirit could not be given before in His fulness, because until Christ no man could receive Him in His fulness. Christ was the lens in whom all the scattered rays were gathered. And it is always and only by accepting Christ as perfect humanity, and by finding in Him our norm and ideal, that we receive the Spirit. It is by the work of the Spirit on the human nature of Christ that we are made aware of the fulness and beauty of that work. It is there we see what the Spirit of God can make of man, and apprehend His grace and power and intimate affinity to man.—Ver. 40. The immediate results of this declaration were twofold. In some faith was elicited: many of the crowd said: "This is of a truth the prophet"; others, going a step further, said: "This is the Christ". On the relation of "the prophet" to "the Christ," see on i. 21.—Ver. 41. But others, either honestly perplexed, or hostile to Christ, and glad to find Scripture on their side, objected, μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; "But does the Christ come out of Galilee?" [Hoogeveen explains the γάρ by resolving the sentence into a double statement: "Others said this is not the Christ: *for* Christ will not come out of Galilee". The γάρ assigns the reason for the denial

43. Σχίσμα οὖν ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἐγένετο δι' αὐτόν. 44. τινὲς δὲ ἤθελον ἐξ αὐτῶν [p]πιάσαι αὐτόν, ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς [q]ἐπέβαλεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας. 45. ἦλθον οὖν οἱ ὑπηρέται πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίους· καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνοι, "Διατί οὐκ [r]ἠγάγετε αὐτόν;" 46. Ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ὑπηρέται, "Οὐδέποτε οὕτως ἐλάλησεν ἄνθρωπος, ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος." 47. Ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν αὐτοῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, "Μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς πεπλάνησθε; 48. μή τις ἐκ τῶν [s]ἀρχόντων ἐπίστευσεν εἰς αὐτόν, ἢ ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων; 49. ἀλλ' ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ

p ver. 30.
q Gen. xxii. 12.
r xviii. 28. Jer. xlvi. 7.
s ver. 26; iii. 1.

already hinted in the ἄλλοι δὲ introducing a contrary opinion to that already expressed.] They knew that Jesus was a Galilean, and this clashed with their idea that the Christ was to be born of the seed of David and in Bethlehem; an idea founded on Micah v. 2; Is. xi. 1; Jer. xxiii. 5. Bethlehem is here called the κώμη ὅπου ἦν Δαβίδ [or Δαυείδ, which gives the same pronunciation], because there David spent his youth; 1 Sam. xvi. 1, 4, etc.—Vv. 43, 44. Σχίσμα . . . χεῖρας. On this verse Calvin has the following pertinent remark: "quaecunque dissidia emergunt quum praedicatur Evangelium, eorum causa et semen prius in hominibus latebant; sed tunc demum quasi ex somno expergefacti se movere incipiunt, qualiter vapores aliunde quam a sole procreantur, quamvis nonnisi exoriente sole emergant". To this divided state of opinion He owed His immunity on this occasion.

Vv. 45-52. *Anger of the Sanhedrim on receiving the report of their officers.*—Ver. 45. ἦλθον οὖν . . . αὐτόν. It now appears that the οὐδεὶς of the preceding clause applies even to the officers sent by the Sanhedrim. They returned empty-handed πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ Φαρισαίους, that is, as the single article shows, to the Sanhedrim, or at any rate to these parties acting together and officially. What follows indicates rather that they were met as a court. They [ἐκεῖνοι regularly refers to the more remote noun; but here, although in the order of the sentence the ὑπηρέται are more remote, they are nearer in the writer's mind, and he uses ἐκεῖνοι of the priests and Pharisees] at once demand the reason of the failure, Διατί οὐκ ἠγάγετε αὐτόν; "Why have ye not brought Him?" Apparently they were sitting in expectation of immediately questioning Him. —Ver. 46. The servants frankly reply: οὐδέποτε . . . ἄνθρωπος. The testimony is notable, because the officers of a court are apt to be entirely mechanical and leave all responsibility for their actions with their superiors. Also it is remarkable that the same result should have found place with them all; for in view of the divided state of public feeling, probably five or six at least would be sent.—Ver. 47. But their apology only rouses the indignation of those who had sent them, μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς πεπλάνησθε; Are ye also, of whom better things might have been expected, deluded?—μή τις . . . Φαρισαίων; What right have subordinates to have a mind of their own? Wait till some of the constituted authorities or of the recognised leaders of religious opinion give you the cue. Here the secret of their hostility is out. Jesus appealed to the people and did not depend for recognition on the influential classes. Power was slipping through their fingers.—ἀλλ' ὁ ὄχλος . . . εἰσι. "But this mob [these masses] that knows not the law are cursed." This Pharisaic scorn of the mob [or "am-haarets," which is here represented by ὄχλος] appears in Rabbinic literature. Dr. Taylor [*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 44] quotes Hillel as saying: "No boor is a sin-fearer; nor is the vulgar pious". To the Am-haarets are opposed the disciples of the learned in the law; and Schoettgen defines the Am-haarets as "omnes illi qui studio sacrarum literarum operam non dederunt". The designation, therefore, ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, was usual. That it was prompted here by the popular recognition as Messiah of one who came out of Galilee, in apparent contradiction of the law and of the opinion of the Pharisees, is also probable. People so ignorant as thus to blunder ἐπικατάρατοί εἰσι.—Ver. 50. To this strong expression one of their own number (and therefore to their great surprise), Nicodemus, the same person who had visited Jesus under cover of night, takes exception and makes a protest. [Tisch. deletes

γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, ἐπικατάρατοί[1] εἰσι." 50. Λέγει Νικόδημος πρὸς αὐτούς, ὁ ἐλθὼν νυκτὸς[2] πρὸς αὐτόν, εἷς ὢν ἐξ αὐτῶν, 51. "Μὴ ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν κρίνει ᵗτὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ παρ' αὐτοῦ πρότερον,[3] καὶ γνῷ τί ποιεῖ;" 52. Ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶ; ᵘἐρεύνησον καὶ ἴδε, ὅτι προφήτης ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας οὐκ ἐγήγερται."[4] 53. Καὶ[5] ἐπορεύθη ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

t Mt. xv. 11.

u 2 Kings x. 23.

[1] επαρατοι adopted by T.Tr.W.H.R. as in ℵB 1, 33, and as the word appears in the classics; but T.R. gives the word as used by the Sept. and in Gal. iii. 14.

[2] νυκτος omitted by Tr.W.H.R.; W.H. read ο ελθων προς αυτον προτερον; Tisch. omits the clause altogether; MS. authority is divided.

[3] πρωτον in ℵBDKL 1, 33.

[4] εγειρεται read by T.Tr.W.H.R. after ℵBDK it. vulg. Pesh. syr. Aegypt. Goth. Arm. Aeth.

[5] The closing words of the chapter, και επορευθη εκαστος εις τον οικον αυτου, belong to the next paragraph, which is rejected by recent editors, and ends with ver. 11 of chap. viii. at the words μηκετι αμαρτανε. The entire paragraph is awanting in ℵABCL (A and C are imperfect at this part, but a calculation of space required shows they cannot have contained the passage); about seventy cursives; a, f, q, Theb. Goth., best Pesh. MSS., Memph., Arm.; Chrys., Cyr.-Alex. The paragraph is first found in Codex Bezae, after which it appears in several uncials and more than 300 cursives, in b*, c, e; Vulg., Syr.-Hier., Aeth., etc. The Greek commentators, Origen, Theodor. Mops., Chrysostom, Cyril, Theophylact, pass it by, and Euthymius, although he comments on it, expressly says that in accurate MSS. η ουχ ευρηται η ωβελισται. It rather interrupts the narrative at this point, and besides contains several words not elsewhere found in John: ορθρου, ο λαος, οι γραμματεις, αναμαρτητος. At the same time the incident may well be a genuine tradition, and, as Calvin says, "nihil apostolico spiritu indignum continet," and therefore "non est cur eam in usum nostrum accommodare recusemus". See further in Spitta, *Zur Gesch. d. Urchristentums*, i. 194; Conybeare's article in *Expositor*, 5th series, ii. 405.

the clause ὁ ἐλθὼν νυκτὸς πρὸς αὐτόν, and no doubt it has quite the appearance of a gloss. At the same time it is John's manner thus to identify persons named. And at xix. 39 the similar clause is not deleted.] This was a bold step. For he must have known it was useless; and he might have persuaded himself to evade all risk by silence. His remonstrance is based on their implied claim to know the law: μὴ ὁ νόμος . . . ποιεῖ; their own action is suspiciously like a violation of the law. "Does our law pass judgment on the suspected person before it first hears him and knows what he is guilty of doing?" For the law regarding trials see Deut. i. 16 and Stapfer's *Palestine*, p. 108, on the administration of justice. The construction is simple; "the law" which the Sanhedrim administered is the nominative throughout.—Ver. 52. This remonstrance is exasperatingly true, and turns the bitterness of the Pharisaic party on Nicodemus, μὴ καὶ . . . ἐγήγερται. "Art thou also, as well as Jesus, from Galilee, and thus disposed to befriend your countryman?" *Cf.* Mk. xiv. 70. By this they betray that their own hostility was a merely personal matter, and not founded on careful examination. "Search and see, because [or 'that'] out of Galilee there arises no prophet." That is, as Westcott interprets, "Galilee is not the true country of the prophets: we cannot look for Messiah to come from thence". They overlooked the circumstance that one or two exceptions to this rule existed.

CHAPTER VIII.—Ver. 1. καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἕκαστος . . . The position of these words almost necessitates the understanding that the members of the Sanhedrim are referred to. But in this case the contrast conveyed in the next clause, Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη, is pointless.—εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, to the Mount of Olives. *Cf.* Mt. xxiv. 3, xxvi. 30; Mk. xiii. 3. Lodging probably in the house of

VIII. 1. ᾿ΙΗΣΟΥΣ δὲ ἐπορεύθη εἰς [a] τὸ ὄρος τῶν ᾿Ελαιῶν· 2. [b] ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν [c] παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν· καὶ [d] καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς. 3. ἄγουσι δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πρὸς αὐτὸν γυναῖκα ἐν μοιχείᾳ [e] κατειλημμένην, καὶ στήσαντες αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ, 4. λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Διδάσκαλε, αὕτη ἡ γυνὴ κατελήφθη [1] [f] ἐπαυτοφώρῳ μοιχευομένη. 5. ἐν δὲ τῷ νόμῳ Μωσῆς ἡμῖν ἐνετείλατο τὰς τοιαύτας [g] λιθοβολεῖσθαι [2]· σὺ οὖν τί λέγεις;" 6. Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγον πειράζοντες αὐτὸν, ἵνα [h] ἔχωσι κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ ᾿Ιησοῦς κάτω κύψας, τῷ

a Zech. xiv. 4.
b Esther v. 14. Lk. xxiv. 1. Acts v. 21.
c With εἰς in Mt. ii. 1. Acts ix. 26 (?). Acts xiii. 14; xv. 4; commonly πρός or ἐπί.
d Mt. v. 1.
e Exod. xxii. 4.
f Num. v. 13.
g 1 Sam. xxx. 6. Deut. xxii. 24.
h xvi. 12. 2 Jo. 12.

[1] **κατειληπται** is read by W.H.R., **κατειληφθη** by early editors. In the classics both forms occur; see Kypke and Veitch.

[2] **λιθαζειν** in Tr. W.H.R.

Lazarus, He returned to the city before dawn (ver. 2) **ὄρθρου δὲ πάλιν παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν**. Plato, *Protag.*, 310 A, reckons **ὄρθρος** a part of the night.—**καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο**, *i.e.*, those designated **ὁ ὄχλος** in the preceding chapter.—**καὶ καθίσας**, and He sat down and began to teach them. But this quiet and profitable hour was broken in upon.—Ver. 3. **ἄγουσι δὲ οἱ γραμματεῖς . . . κατειλημμένην**. The scribes and the Pharisees, who in the synoptics regularly appear as the enemies of Jesus, bring to Him a woman taken in adultery. In itself an unlawful thing to do, for they had a court in which the woman might have been tried. Obviously it was to find occasion against Him that they brought her; see ver. 6. They knew He was prone to forgive sinners.—**καὶ στήσαντες . . . τί λέγεις;** "And having set her in the midst," where she could be well seen by all; a needless and shameless preliminary, "they say to Him, Teacher," appealing to Him with an appearance of deference, "this woman here has been apprehended in adultery in the very act". **ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ** is the better reading. Originally meaning "caught in the act of *theft*" (**φώρ**), it came to mean generally "caught in the act," red-hand. But also, as the instances cited by Kypke show, it frequently meant "on incontrovertible evidence," "manifestly". Thus in Xen., *Symp.*, iii. 13, **ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ εἴλημμαι πλουσιώτατος ὤν**, I am evidently convicted of being the richest. See also Wetstein and Elsner.—Ver. 5. **ἐν δὲ τῷ νομῷ . . . λιθοβολεῖσθαι.** In Lev. xx. 10 and Deut. xxii. 22 death is fixed as the penalty of adultery; but "stoning" as the form of death is only specified when a betrothed virgin is violated, Deut. xxii. 23, 24. And the Rabbis held that where death simply was spoken of, strangling was meant ["omnis mors dicta in Lege simpliciter non est nisi strangulatio"]. It is supposed therefore that by **τὰς τοιαύτας** the accusers refer to the special class to which this woman belonged. The words themselves do not suggest that; and it is better to suppose that these lawyers who had brought the woman understood "stoning" when "death" without further specification was mentioned. See further in Lightfoot and Holtzmann.—**σὺ οὖν τί λέγεις;** "What then sayest Thou?" as if it were possible He might give a decision differing from that of the law.—Ver. 6. **τοῦτο δὲ . . . αὐτοῦ.** "And this they said tempting Him," hoping that His habitual pity would lead Him to exonerate the woman. ["Si Legi subscriberet, videri poterat sibi quodammodo dissimilis," Calvin. **προσεδόκων ὅτι φείσεται αὐτῆς, καὶ λοιπὸν ἕξουσι κατηγορίαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ὡς παρανόμως φειδομένου τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου λιθαζομένης**, Euthymius.] The dilemma supposed by Meyer is not to be thought of. See Holtzmann. Their plot was unsuccessful; Jesus as He sat (ver. 2), **κάτω κύψας . . . γῆν**, "bent down and began to write with His finger on the ground," intimating that their question would not be answered; perhaps also some measure of that embarrassment on account of "shame of the deed itself and the brazen hardness of the prosecutors" which is overstated in *Ecce Homo*, p. 104. The scraping or drawing figures on the ground with a stick or the finger has been in many countries a common

δακτύλῳ ἔγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν· 7. ὡς δὲ ἐπέμενον ἐρωτῶντες αὐτὸν, [i] ἀνακύψας εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς, "Ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν, [j] πρῶτος τὸν λίθον ἐπ' αὐτῇ βαλέτω." 8. καὶ πάλιν κάτω κύψας ἔγραφεν εἰς τὴν γῆν. 9. οἱ δέ, ἀκούσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς [k] συνειδήσεως [l] ἐλεγχόμενοι, ἐξήρχοντο [m] εἷς καθεῖς, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτων· καὶ κατελείφθη μόνος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἐν μέσῳ ἑστῶσα. 10. ἀνακύψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ μηδένα θεασάμενος πλὴν τῆς γυναικὸς, εἶπεν αὐτῇ, "Ἡ γυνή,[1] ποῦ εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι οἱ κατήγοροί σου[2]; οὐδείς σε κατέκρινεν;" 11. Ἡ δὲ εἶπεν, "Οὐδείς, κύριε." Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐδὲ ἐγώ σε κατακρίνω· πορεύου καὶ [n] μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε."

i Lk. xiii. 11; xxi. 28. Job x. 15.
j Deut. xvii. 7.
k Wisd. xvii. 11. Rom. ii. 15.
l xvi. 8
m Mk. xiv. 19. Cp. Rev. iv. 8.
n v. 14.

[1] **γυναι** Tr.W.H. [2] **εκεινοι οι κατηγοροι σου** omitted by W.H.R.

expression of deliberate silence or embarrassment. [**ὅπερ εἰώθασι πολλάκις ποιεῖν οἱ μὴ θέλοντες ἀποκρίνεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐρωτῶντας ἄκαιρα καὶ ἀνάξια**, Euthymius.] Interesting passages are cited by Wetstein and Kypke, in one of which Euripides is cited as saying: **τὴν σιωπὴν τοῖς σοφοῖς ἀπόκρισιν εἶναι.**—Ver. 7. The scribes, however, did not accept the silence of Jesus as an answer, but "went on asking Him". For this use of **ἐπιμένω** with a participle *cf.* Acts xii. 16, **ἐπέμενεν κρούων**; and see Buttmann's *N.T. Gram.*, 257, 14. And at length Jesus lifting His head, straightening Himself, said to them: **Ὁ ἀναμάρτητος . . . βαλέτω**, "let the faultless one among you first cast the stone at her". **ἀναμάρτητος** only here in N.T. In Sept. Deut. xxix. 19, **ἵνα μὴ συναπολέσῃ ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς τὸν ἀναμάρτητον.** It can scarcely have been used on this occasion generally of all sin, but with reference to the sin regarding which there was present question, or at any rate to sins of the same kind, sins of unchastity. They are summoned to judge themselves rather than the woman.—Ver. 8. Having shot this arrow Jesus again stooped and continued writing on the ground, intimating that so far as He was concerned the matter was closed.—Ver. 9. **οἱ δὲ . . . ἐσχάτων.** "And they when they heard it went out one by one, beginning from the elders until the last." [The words which truly describe the motive of this departure, **καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι**, are deleted by Tr.W.H.R.] **πρεσβυτέρων** refers not to the elders by office but by age. They naturally took the lead, and the younger men deferentially allowed them to pass and then followed. Thus **κατελείφθη μόνος . . . ἑστῶσα.** Jesus was left sitting and the woman standing before Him. But only those would retire who had been concerned in the accusation: the disciples and those who had previously been listening to Him would remain.—Ver. 10. **ἀνακύψας . . .** Jesus, lifting His head and seeing that the woman was left alone, says to her: **Ἡ γυνή . . . κατέκρινεν;** "Woman," nominative for vocative, as frequently, but see critical note, "where are they? Did no man condemn thee?" That is, has no one shown himself ready to begin the stoning?—Ver. 11. And she said: "No one, Lord".—**Εἶπε . . . ἁμάρτανε.** "Neither do I condemn thee," that is, do not adjudge thee to stoning. That He did condemn her sin was shown in His words **μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε.** Therefore Augustine says: "Ergo et Dominus damnavit, sed peccatum, non hominem".

Vv. 12-20. *Jesus proclaims Himself the Light of the World.*—Ver. 12. **Πάλιν οὖν.** "Again therefore Jesus spake to them"; "again" refers us back to vii. 37. Lücke and others suppose that the conversation now reported took place on some day after the feast: but there is no reason why it should not have been on the same day as that recorded in chap. vii. The place, as we read in ver. 20, was **ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ**, "in the Treasury," which probably was identical with the colonnade round the "Court of the Women," or **γυναικωνίς**, "in which the receptacles for charitable contributions, the so-called *Shopharoth* or 'trumpets,' were placed" (Edersheim, *Life of Christ*, ii. 165). Edersheim supposes that here the Pharisees would alone venture to speak. This seems

12. Πάλιν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησε λέγων, "Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοί, οὐ μὴ περιπατήσει[1] ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἕξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς." 13. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, "Σὺ περὶ σεαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖς· ἡ μαρτυρία σου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής." 14. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Κἂν ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία μου· ὅτι οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω· ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε πόθεν ἔρχομαι, καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω· 15. ὑμεῖς [o]κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε· ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα. 16. καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ, ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ ἀληθής[2] ἐστιν· ὅτι μόνος οὐκ

o 2 Cor. xi. 18.

[1] περιπατηση in ℵBFGKL; T.R. in DEHM.
[2] αληθινη in BDL 33; αληθης in ℵ.

scarcely consistent with the narrative. The announcement made by Jesus was, Ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου. Notwithstanding Meyer and Holtzmann it seems not unlikely that this utterance was prompted by the symbolism of the feast. According to the Talmud, on *every* night of the feast the Court of the Women was brilliantly illuminated, and the night, according to Wetstein and others, was spent in dancing and festivity. This brilliant lighting was perhaps a memorial of the Pillar of Fire which led the Israelites while dwelling in tents. This idea is favoured by the words which follow and which describe how the individual is to enjoy the light inherent in Jesus: ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοί, "he that follows me". Like the basket of fire hung from a pole at the tent of the chief, the pillar of fire marked the camping ground and every movement of the host. And those who believe in Christ have not a chart but a guide; not a map in which they can pick out their own route, but a light going on before, which they must implicitly follow. Thus οὐ μὴ περιπατήσει ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, "shall not walk in the dark"; *cf.* Mt. iv. 16. The Messiah was expected to scatter the darkness of the Gentiles, "Lux est nomen Messiae" (Lightfoot), ἀλλ' ἕξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς, but shall have light sufficient for the highest form of life. The analogous ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, τὸ ὕδωρ τ. ζ. show that the light of life means the light which is needful to maintain spiritual life.—Ver. 13. To this the Pharisees, seeing only self-assertion, reply: Σὺ . . . ἀληθής. A formal objection; *cf.* v. 31. But the attempt to apply it here only shows how far the Pharisees were from even conceiving the conditions of a true revelation. They were still in the region of pedantic rules and external tests.—Ver. 14. Jesus replies: κἂν . . . ὑπάγω, "even if I witness of Myself, My witness is true". The difference between καὶ εἰ and εἰ καί is clearly stated by Hermann on Viger, 822; Klotz on Devarius, 519; and is for the most part observed in N.T. On the law regulating testimony, which was meant merely for courts of law, see ver. 31. The expressed ἐγώ indicates that He is an exception to the rule; the reason being because He knows whence He comes and whither He goes, ὅτι οἶδα . . . ὑπάγω. He knows His origin and His destiny. He knows Himself, and therefore the rule mentioned has no application to Him.—πόθεν ἦλθον cannot of course be restricted to His earthly origin. He knows He is from God, so ὑπάγω refers to His going to God. *Cf.* xiii. 3. Moreover, He is compelled to witness to Himself, because ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε . . . ὑπάγω. He alone knew the nature of His mission, yet it behoves to be known by all men; therefore He must declare Himself. They would no doubt have replied, as formerly, vii. 27, Mk. vi. 3, that they did know whence He was. Therefore He reminds them that they judge by appearances only: ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε. They had constituted themselves His judges, and they decided against Him, because "according to the flesh" He was born in Galilee, vii. 52. "For my part," He says, "I judge (condemn) no one"; ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα. As if He said, "I confine myself (ver. 16) to witnessing, and do not sit in judgment," *cf.* iii. 17. "But even if I do judge (as my very appearance among you results in judgment, iii. 18-19, v. 22), my judgment is true; there is no fear of its being merely superficial

εἰμί, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ. 17. καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ γέγραπται, ὅτι δύο ἀνθρώπων ἡ μαρτυρία ἀληθής ἐστιν. 18. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ." 19. Ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, "Ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ πατήρ σου;" Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[p] Οὔτε ἐμὲ οἴδατε, οὔτε τὸν πατέρα μου· εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ᾔδειτε ἄν." 20. Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ [q] γαζοφυλακίῳ, διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ· καὶ οὐδεὶς [r] ἐπίασεν αὐτόν, ὅτι [s] οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ. 21. Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, καὶ ζητήσετέ με, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε· [t] ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν." 22. Ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, "[u] Μήτι ἀποκτενεῖ ἑαυτόν, ὅτι λέγει, "Ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν;"

p vii. 28. q Mk. xii. 41. Neh. xiii. 5. r vii. 30. s ii. 4; vii. 6, 30. t xiii. 33. u iv. 29.

or prejudiced, because I am not alone, but I am inseparably united to the Father who sent me." *Cf.* v. 30, "as I hear I judge". In *Pirqe Aboth*, iv. 12, R. Ishmael is cited: "He used to say, judge not alone, for none may judge alone save One".—Ver. 17. **καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ . . . πατήρ.** He returns from "judging" to "witnessing," and He maintains that His witness (ver. 18) satisfies the Mosaic law (Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15) because what He witnesses of Himself is confirmed by the Father that sent Him. The nature of this witness was given fully at v. 37-47.—**ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν . . .** Field maintains the A.V. "I am one that beareth witness," against the R.V. "I am He that beareth witness"; **ἐγώ εἰμι** being equivalent to "There is I" or "It is I". Misled perhaps by the Lord's use of **ἀνθρώπων** (ver. 17), the Pharisees ask (ver. 19): **Ποῦ ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ σου;** "Patrem Christi carnaliter acceperunt" (Augustine), therefore they ask where He is that they may ascertain what He has to say regarding Jesus; as if they said: "It is all very well alleging that you have a second witness in your Father; but where is He?" The idea of Cyril that it was a coarse allusion to His birth is out of the question, and Cyril himself does not press it. Jesus replies: **Οὔτε . . . ᾔδειτε ἄν** [or **ἂν ᾔδειτε**]. They ought to have known who He meant by His Father and where He was; and their hopeless ignorance Jesus can only deplore. They professed to know Jesus, but had they known Him they would necessarily have known the Father in whom He lived and whom He represented. Their ignorance of the Father proves their ignorance of Jesus.—**Ταῦτα . . . ἱερῷ.** On **γαζοφ.**, see ver. 12. Euthymius, as usual, hits the nail on the head: "**Ταῦτα**" **τὰ παῤῥησιαστικά. ἐπεσημήνατο γὰρ τὸν τόπον, δεικνύων τὴν παῤῥησίαν τοῦ διδασκάλου.** "But no one apprehended Him, because not yet was His hour come." His immunity was all the more remarkable on account of the proximity to the chamber where the Sanhedrim held its sittings, in the south-east corner of the Court of the Priests. See Edersheim's *Life of Christ*, ii. 165, note.

Vv. 21-30. *Further conversation with the Jews, in which Jesus warns them that He will not be long with them, and that unless they believe they will die in their sins. They will know that His witness is true after they have crucified Him.*—Ver. 21. **Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν.** On another occasion, but whether the same day (Origen) or not we do not know, although, as Lücke points out, the **αὐτοῖς** favours Origen's view, Jesus said: **Ἐγὼ ὑπάγω . . . ἐλθεῖν.** This repeats vii. 34, with the addition "and ye shall die in your sin"; *i.e.*, undelivered by the Messiah, in the bondage of sin and reaping its fruit. He adds the reason why they should not find Him (*cf.* vii. 34): **ὅπου . . . ἐλθεῖν.** He goes to His Father and thither they cannot come, if they do not believe in Him.—Ver. 22. As before, so now, the Jews fail to understand Him, and ask: **Μήτι . . . ἐλθεῖν;** "Will He kill Himself, etc.?" They gathered from the **ὑπάγω** that the departure He spoke of was His own action, and thought that perhaps He meant to put Himself by death beyond their reach. Many interpreters, even Westcott and Holtzmann, suppose that the hell of suicides is meant by the place where they could not come. This is refuted by Edersheim (ii. 170, note); and, besides, the meaning obviously is,

23. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστὲ, ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί· ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐστὲ, ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. 24. εἶπον οὖν ὑμῖν ὅτι ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν· ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν." 25. Ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, "Σὺ τίς εἶ;" Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[v] Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι[1] καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν. 26. [w] πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν καὶ κρίνειν· ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με ἀληθής ἐστι, κἀγὼ ἃ

v Gen. xliii. 20. Dan. viii. 1.
w xvi. 12.

[1] W.H. read οτι as one word and place point of interrogation at the end of the clause.

that as they had no intention of dying, His supposed death would put Him beyond their reach.—Ver. 23. But disregarding the interruption, and wishing more clearly to show why they could not follow Him, and what constituted the real separation in destiny between Him and them, He says: Ὑμεῖς . . . τούτου, "You belong to the things below, I to the things above: you are of this world, I am not of this world". The two clauses balance and interpret one another: "things below" being equivalent to "this world". It was because this gulf naturally separated them from Him and His destiny and because their destiny was that of the world that He had warned them.—Ver. 24. εἶπον οὖν . . . ὑμῶν. "Therefore said I unto you, ye shall die in your sins." The emphatic word is now ἀποθανεῖσθε (*cf.* ver. 12); the destruction is itself put in the foreground (Meyer, Holtzmann). "For unless ye believe that I am He, ye shall, etc." What they were required to believe is not explicitly stated (see their question, ver. 15), it is ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι "that I am," which Westcott supposes has the pregnant meaning "that I am, that in me is the spring of life and light and strength"; but this scarcely suits the context. Meyer supposes that He means "that I am the Messiah". But surely it must refer directly to what He has just declared Himself to be, "I am not of this world but of the things above" ["nämlich der ἄνωθεν Stammende; die allentscheidende Persönlichkeit," Holtzmann]. This belief was necessary because only by attaching themselves to His teaching and person could they be delivered from their identification with this world.—Ver. 25. This only adds bewilderment to their mind, and they, not "pertly and contemptuously" (Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann), but with some shade of impatience, ask: Σὺ τίς εἶ; "Who art Thou?" To this Jesus replies: τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν. These words are rendered in A.V. "Even *the same* that I said unto you from the beginning"; and in R.V. "Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning". The Greek Fathers understood τὴν ἀρχὴν as equivalent to ὅλως, a meaning it frequently bears; and they interpret the clause as an exclamation, "That I should even speak to you at all!" [ὅλως, ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, περιττόν ἐστιν. ἀνάξιοι γάρ ἐστε παντὸς λόγου, ὡς πειρασταί, Euthymius.] With this Field compares Achilles Tatius, vi. 20, οὐκ ἀγαπᾷς ὅτι σοι καὶ λαλῶ; Art thou not content that I even condescend to speak to thee? In support of this rendering Holtzmann quotes from Clem., Hom. vi. 11, εἰ μὴ παρακολουθεῖς οἷς λέγω, τί καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διαλέγομαι; He even supposes that this is an echo of John, so that we have here an indication of the earliest interpretation of the words. This meaning does no violence to the words, but it is slightly at discord with the spirit of the next clause and of Jesus generally (although *cf.* Mk. ix. 19). Another rendering, advocated at great length by Raphel (*Annot.*, i. 637), puts a comma after τὴν ἀρχὴν and another after ὑμῖν, and connects τὴν ἀρχὴν with πολλὰ ἔχω; "omnino, quia et loquor vobis, multa habeo de vobis loqui". Raphel's note is chiefly valuable for the collection of instances of the use of τὴν ἀρχήν. A third interpretation is that suggested by the A.V., and which finds a remarkable analogue in Plautus, *Captivi*, III. iv. 91, "Quis igitur ille est? Quem dudum dixi a principio tibi" (Elsner). But this would require λέγω, not λαλῶ. There remains a fourth possible interpretation, that of Melanchthon, who renders "plane illud ipsum verbum sum quod loquor vobiscum". So Luther (see Meyer); and Winer translates "(I am)

ἤκουσα παρ' αὐτοῦ, ταῦτα λέγω εἰς τὸν κόσμον." 27. Οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν. 28. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅταν [x] ὑψώσητε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τότε γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι· καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐδίδαξέ με ὁ πατήρ μου, ταῦτα λαλῶ. 29. καὶ ὁ πέμψας με, μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστιν· οὐκ ἀφῆκέ με μόνον ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι ἐγὼ τὰ [y] ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ πάντοτε." 30. Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πολλοὶ [z] ἐπίστευσαι εἰς αὐτόν.

31. Ἔλεγε οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους, "Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς [a] μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, ἀληθῶς μαθηταί μου ἐστέ· 32. καὶ γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια [b] ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς."

x iii. 14.
y Exod. xv. 26. Gen. xvi. 6.
z Acts vi. 2. ii. 11.
a xv. 9, 10.
b 2 Mac. i. 27. Rom. vi. 18.

altogether that which in my words I represent myself as being". To this Meyer and Moulton (see his note on Winer) object that τὴν ἀρχὴν only means "omnino" "prorsus" when the sentence is negative. Elsner, however, admitting that the use is rare, gives several examples where it is used "sine addita negativa". The words, then, may be taken as meaning "I am nothing else than what I am saying to you: I am a Voice; my Person is my teaching".—Ver. 26. πολλὰ ἔχω . . . "many things have I to speak and to judge about you," some of which are uttered in the latter part of this chapter.—ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας . . . But—however hard for you to receive—these things are what are given me to say by Him that sent me, and therefore I must speak them; and not to you only but to the world εἰς τὸν κόσμον.—Ver. 27. His hearers did not identify "Him that sent me" with "the Father": Οὐκ ἔγνωσαν . . . ἔλεγεν.—Ver. 28. Therefore (οὖν) Jesus said to them, Ὅταν . . . εἰμι, "when ye have lifted up the Son of Man, then shall ye know that I am He". ὑψώσητε has the double reference of elevation on the cross and elevation to the Messianic throne, *cf.* iii. 14. The people were thus to elevate Him and then they would recognise Him, Acts ii. 37, etc. —ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι "that I am He," *i.e.*, "the Son of Man". What follows is not dependent on ὅτι (against Meyer, Holtzmann, Westcott); the καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ begins a new statement, as the present, ποιῶ, shows. The sequence of thought is: ye shall know that I am Messiah: and indeed I now act as such, for of myself I do nothing, but as my Father has taught me, so I speak. This is the present proof that He was Messiah.—Ver. 29. καὶ ὁ πέμψας . . . πάντοτε. His fidelity to the purpose of the Father that sent Him secured His perpetual presence with Him. By His entire self-abnegation and freedom from self-will He gave room to the Spirit of the Father. Or, as Westcott supposes, the ὅτι clause may give the evidence or sign of the preceding rather than its cause; and the meaning may be that the result of the Father's presence is seen in the perfect correspondence of the conduct of the Son with the will of the Father.—Ver. 30. ταῦτα . . . αὐτόν. "As He spake these things many believed on Him," not only believed what He said, but accepted Him as the Messenger of God. The statement closes one paragraph and prepares for the next, in which it is shown what this faith amounted to (Holtzmann).

Vv. 31-59. *Discussion between Jesus and the Jews regarding their paternity.* —Ver. 31. To those who have just been described as believing on Him Jesus went on to say, Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς . . . ὑμᾶς. "If you"—ὑμεῖς emphasised in distinction from those who had not believed—"abide in my word"—not content with making this first step towards faith and obedience—"then"—but not till then—"are ye really my disciples."—Ver. 32. καὶ γνώσεσθε . . . ὑμᾶς. By abiding in Christ's word, making it the rule of their life and accepting Him as their Guide and Teacher, they would come to that knowledge of the truth which only experimental testing of it can bring; and the truth regarding their relation to Him and to God would turn all service and all life into liberty. Freedom, a condition of absolute liberty from all outward constraint, is only attained when man attains fellowship with God (who is absolutely free) in the truth: when that prompts man to action which prompts God. [*Cf.* the striking parallel in Epictetus, iv. 7. εἰς ἐμὲ οὐδεὶς ἐξουσίαν ἔχει· ἠλευθέρωμαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἔγνωκα αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς, οὐκέτι οὐδεὶς δουλα-

33. Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, "[c] Σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐσμεν, καὶ οὐδενὶ [d] δεδουλεύκαμεν πώποτε· πῶς σὺ λέγεις, Ὅτι ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε;" 34. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι [e] πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, δοῦλός ἐστι τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 35. ὁ δὲ δοῦλος [f] οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ὁ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. 36. ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε. 37. οἶδα ὅτι σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ ἐστε· ἀλλὰ [g] ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. 38. [h] ἐγὼ ὃ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρί μου,[1] λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ὃ ἑωράκατε[2] παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ[3] ὑμῶν,[3] ποιεῖτε." 39. Ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Ὁ πατὴρ

c vv. 37, 39. Gal. iii. 16.
d Gen. xv. 14.
e 2 Pet. ii. 19. Jas. v. 15.
f Gen. xxi. 10. Gal. iv. 22.
g v. 44.
h v. 19; xii. 49.

[1] μου omitted in BCL. [2] α ηκουσατε with ℵcBCKL 1, 33.
[3] του πατρος without υμων in T.Tr.W.H.R.

γωγῆσαί με δύναται.]—Ver. 33. But this announcement, instead of seeming to the Jews the culmination of all bliss, provokes even in the πεπιστευκότες (ver. 31) a blind, carping criticism: Σπέρμα . . . γενήσεσθε; we are the seed of Abraham, called by God to rule all peoples, and to none have we ever been slaves. "The episodes of Egyptian, Babylonian, Syrian, and Roman conquests were treated as mere transitory accidents, not touching the real life of the people, who had never accepted the dominion of their conquerors or coalesced with them," Westcott. Sayings such as "All Israel are the children of kings" were current among the people. How then could emancipation be spoken of as yet to be given them?—Ver. 34. The answer is: ἀμὴν . . . ἁμαρτίας [τῆς ἁμαρτίας is bracketed by W.H.]. The liberty meant is inward, radical, and individual. "Every one who lives a life of sin is a slave." *Cf.* Rom. vi. 16, 20; 2 Pet. ii. 19; Xen., *Mem.*, iv. 5, 3; Philo's tract "Quod omnis probus sit liber," and the Stoic saying "solus sapiens est liber". The relations subsisting ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ in the house of God, the Theocracy to which they boasted to belong, must be determined by what is spiritual, by likeness to the Head of the house; "this servitude would lead to national rejection," Edersheim. It behoves them therefore to remember this result of the generally recognised principle that sin masters the sinner and makes him a slave (ver. 35), *viz.*, "that the slave does not abide in the house," does not permanently inherit the promises to Abraham, and the blessedness of fellowship with God; it is the Son who abides for ever. *Cf.* Heb. iii. 6. The slave has no permanent footing in the house: he may be dismissed or sold. The transition which Paul himself had made from the servile to the filial position coloured his view of the Gospel, Gal. iv. 1-7; but here it is not the servile attitude towards God but slavery to sin that is in view. From this slavery only the Son emancipates, ἐὰν οὖν . . . ἔσεσθε. This implies that they were all born slaves and needed emancipation, and that only One, Himself the Son, could give them true liberty.—ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι in contrast to the liberty they boasted of in ver. 33. How the Son emancipates is shown in Gal. iv. 1-7. The superficial character of the liberty they enjoyed by their birth as Jews is further emphasised in ver. 37.—Ver. 37. οἶδα . . . ὑμῖν. "I know that you are Abraham's seed; it is your moral descent which is in question, and your conduct shows that my word, which gives true liberty (vv. 31, 32), does not find place in you."—οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. The Greek Fathers all understand these words in the sense of A.V., "hath no place in you". Cyril has διὰ τὴν ἐνοικήσασαν ἐν ὑμῖν ἁμαρτίαν δηλαδὴ, καὶ τόπον ὥσπερ οὐκ ἐῶσαν, etc. So Euthymius and Theophylact. Beza renders "non habet locum," citing a passage from Aristotle, which Meyer disallows, because in it the verb is used impersonally. But Field has found another instance in Alciphron, *Epist.*, iii. 7, in which χωρεῖν is used in the sense of "locum habere" (*Otium Norvic.*, p. 67). The common meaning of χωρεῖν, "to advance," is also quite relevant and indeed not materially different. It is frequently used for prosperous, successful progress. See Aristoph., *Pax*, 694, and other passages

ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ἐστι." Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἦτε,[1] τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐποιεῖτε ἄν. 40. νῦν δὲ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι, ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα, ἣν ἤκουσα [i]παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ· τοῦτο Ἀβραὰμ οὐκ ἐποίησεν. 41. ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν." Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, "Ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας οὐ γεγεννήμεθα[2]· ἕνα πατέρα ἔχομεν, τὸν Θεόν." 42. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἦν, ἠγαπᾶτε ἂν ἐμέ· ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἥκω· οὐδὲ γὰρ [j]ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνός με ἀπέστειλε. 43. διατί τὴν [k]λαλιὰν τὴν ἐμὴν οὐ γινώσκετε; ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμόν.

i I. 40.
j Num. xvi. 28.
k iv. 42. Mt. xxvi. 73.

[1] Instead of ητε . . . εποιειτε αν W.H. read εστε . . . ποιειτε. εστε is found in ℵBDL; εποιειτε without αν in ℵ*BDEFG, with αν in ℵcCKL. Certainly the intrinsically probable reading is that of T.R., especially when the νυν δε of ver. 40 is considered.

[2] T.R. in CΔ, but ουκ εγεννηθημεν in BD, adopted by Tr.W.H.R.

in Kypke; and *cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 1, ἵνα ὁ λόγος τρέχῃ. "My word meets with obstacles and is not allowed its full influence in you."—Ver. 38. "And yet the word of Christ justly claimed acceptance, for it was derived from immediate knowledge of God," Westcott.—ἐγὼ ὃ [or ἃ ἐγὼ, as recent editors read] . . . ποιεῖτε. "What I have seen with my Father I speak; and what ye have seen with your father ye do." He makes the statement almost as if it were a necessary principle that sons should adopt their fathers' thoughts. The οὖν might be rendered "and so"; it was because Jesus uttered what He had learned by direct intercourse with His Father that the Jews sought to slay Him. See vv. 16-19. The ἑώρακα (cp. iii. 31, 32) might seem to indicate the knowledge He had in His pre-existent state, but the next clause forbids this.—ποιεῖτε, if it is to balance λαλῶ, must be indicative.—Ver. 39. To this ambiguous but ominous utterance the Jews reply: Ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ἐστι, thereby meaning to clear themselves of the suspicion of having learned anything evil from their father. To which Jesus retorts: Εἰ τέκνα . . . ἐποιεῖτε ἄν. "If ye were Abraham's children ye would do the works of Abraham"; according to the law of ver. 38. If their origin could be wholly traced to Abraham, then their conduct would resemble his.—νῦν δὲ . . . ἐποίησεν. "But now—as the fact really is—you seek to kill me; and this has not only the guilt of an ordinary murder, but your hostility is roused against me because I have spoken to you the truth I heard from God. It is murder based upon hostility to God. This is very different from the conduct of Abraham."—ἄνθρωπον seems to be used simply as we might use "person"—a person who: certainly, as Lampe says, it is used "sine praejudicio deitatis". Bengel thinks it anticipates ἀνθρωποκτόνος in ver. 44, and Westcott says it "stands in contrast with *of God* . . . and at the same time suggests the idea of human sympathy, which He might claim from them (*a man*), as opposed to the murderous spirit of the power of evil".—Ver. 41. ὑμεῖς . . . ὑμῶν. You do not the works of Abraham: you do the works of your father. And yet (ver. 37) He had acknowledged them to be the children of Abraham. The only possible conclusion was that besides Abraham some other father had been concerned in producing them. This idea they repudiate with indignation: Ἡμεῖς . . . Θεόν. "We were not born of fornication: we have one father, God"; not "Abraham," as might have been expected, but "God": *i.e.*, they claim to be the children of the promise, within the Theocracy, children of God's house (ver. 35).—Ver. 42. But this claim Jesus explodes by the same argument: Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς . . . ἀπέστειλε. Were God your Father you would love me, for I am from God.—ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ expresses "the proceeding forth from that essential pre-human fellowship with God, which was His as the Son of God, and which took place through the incarnation," Meyer. The meaning of the expression is fixed by that with which it is contrasted in xiii. 3, xvi. 28. ἥκω is

44. ὑμεῖς [l] ἐκ [m] πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστέ, καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν. ἐκεῖνος [n] ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐχ ἕστηκεν· ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ. ὅταν λαλῇ τὸ ψεῦδος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ· ὅτι [o] ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ. 45. ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι.

l iii. 5, 6, 31
m Gen. iv. 20.
n 1 Jo. iii. 15. Gen. iii. 3.
o Prov. xix. 22. 1 Jo. i. 10, etc. Gen. iii. 5.

added, as ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον in xvi. 28, almost in the sense in which it is used in the Dramatists, announcing the arrival of one of the "personae" on the stage, "I am come from such and such a place and here I am". The coming itself was the result of God's action rather than of His own: οὐδὲ . . . ἀπέστειλε. This is His constant argument, that as He came forth from God and was sent by Him, they must have welcomed Him had they been God's children. Their misunderstanding had a moral root.—διατί . . . ἐμόν. They did not recognise His speech as Divine, because they were unable to receive the message He brought. "In λαλεῖν (= loqui) the fact of uttering human language is the prominent notion; in λέγειν (= dicere) it is the words uttered, and that these are correlative to reasonable thoughts within the breast of the utterer" (Trench, *Synonyms*, 271). All His individual expressions and the very language He used were misunderstood, because there was in them a moral incapacity to receive the truth He delivered. —Ver. 44. This was the result and evidence of their paternity: ὑμεῖς . . . [τοῦ πατρὸς is read by all recent editors]. "Ye are of the father who is the devil." The translation, "of the father of the devil," *i.e.*, the (Gnostic) God of the Jews, is, as Meyer says, thoroughly un-Johannine. Perhaps a slight pause before the culminating words τοῦ διαβόλου would emphasise them and show that this had been in His mind throughout the conversation. Being of this parentage they deliberately purpose [θέλετε] and not merely unintentionally are betrayed into the fulfilment of his desires. Their origin is determined by the fact that "from the first the devil was a manslayer". To what does ἀπ' ἀρχῆς refer? Since the beginning of the human race, or since men first were killed; not since the devil's beginning. Cyril and some others think it is the first murder, that of Abel, that is in view (*cf.* 1 John iii. 15), but far more probably it is the introduction of death through the first sin (Wisd. ii. 23, 24). So almost all recent commentators. Some think both references are admissible (see Lücke).—καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐχ ἕστηκεν, "and stands not in the truth". R.V. has "and stood not"; so the Vulgate "et in veritate non stetit". W.H. adopt the same translation, reading οὐκ ἔστηκεν, the imperfect of στήκω, I stand; but good reasons against this reading are given by Thayer s.v. ἕστηκεν is the usual perfect of ἵστημι with the sense of a present. The reference therefore is not to the fall of the angels, but to the constant attitude of the devil; οὐκ ἐμμένει, Euthymius. "The truth is not the domain in which he has his footing." Meyer, Weiss. He does not adhere to the truth and live in it. The reason being, ὅτι . . . αὐτῷ, "because truth is not in him". There is not in him any craving for the truth. He is not true to what he knows. His nature is so false that ὅταν λαλῇ τὸ ψεῦδος ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ, "whenever he speaks what is false, he speaks of his own". "But the article may mean 'the lie that is natural to him,' '*his* lie'" (Plummer).—ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων means that he speaks out of that which is characteristically and peculiarly his (*cf.* Mt. xii. 34); "because he is"—this is his character and description—"a liar and his father," *i.e.*, he is himself a liar and the father of all liars. This is added to reflect light on the first statement of this verse. So Holtzmann and most recent interpreters. But Weiss rightly defends the reference of αὐτοῦ to ψεῦδος as in A.V. Westcott proposes to translate: "Whenever a man speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for his father also is a liar". Paley renders: "When (one) utters . . . he is speaking from his own, because he is a liar, and (so is) his father". Westcott's translation makes excellent sense and suits the context and gives a good meaning to the ἰδίων, but, as he himself owns, the omission of the subject (ὅταν λαλῇ) is certainly harsh; it may be said, impossible.—Ver. 45. ἐγὼ δέ. "But I"—in contrast to the devil—"because I speak the truth you do not believe me." Had I spoken falsehood you would have believed me, because it is your nature to live in what is false (*cf.* Euthymius).—Ver. 46. τίς

p xvi. 8-11. 46. τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ᵖἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας; εἰ δὲ ἀλήθειαν λέγω, διατί ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι; 47. ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀκούει· διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ." 48. Ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς, ὅτι Σαμαρείτης εἶ σύ, καὶ ᑫδαιμόνιον ἔχεις;" 49. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐγὼ δαιμόνιον οὐκ ἔχω, ἀλλὰ τιμῶ τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ʳἀτιμάζετέ με. 50. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ ζητῶ τὴν δόξαν μου· ἔστιν ὁ ζητῶν καὶ κρίνων. 51. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ ˢθεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα." 52. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, "Νῦν ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι δαιμόνιον ἔχεις. Ἀβραὰμ ἀπέθανε καὶ οἱ προφῆται, καὶ σὺ λέγεις, Ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου ᵗτηρήσῃ, οὐ μὴ ᵘγεύσεται[1] θανάτου εἰς τὸν

q vii. 20. r Deut. xxvii. 16. Prov. xxviii. 7. etc. Rom. ii. 23. Lk. xx. 11. s Here only: cp. ver. 52 and Ps. lxxxix. 48. t 1 Sam. xv. 11. u Heb. ii. 9.

[1] γευσηται in ℵACDL.

. . . ἁμαρτίας; Alford, who represents a number of interpreters, says: "The question is an appeal to His *sinlessness of life*, as evident to them all, as a pledge for His truthfulness of word". Calvin is better: "Haec defensio ad circumstantiam loci restringi debet, ac si quicquam sibi posse obiici negaret, quominus fidus esset Dei minister". Similarly Bengel.—εἰ δὲ . . . μοι; "If I speak truth, why do you not believe me?" It follows from their inability to convict Him of sin, that He speaks what is true: if so, why do they not believe Him?—Ver. 47. He is believed by those who have another moral parentage, ὁ ὢν . . . ἐστέ. "He that is of God listens to the words of God," implying that the words He spoke were God's words. Their not listening proved that they were not of God. At this point the Jews break in: Οὐ . . . ἔχεις; "Say we not well that Thou art a Samaritan and hast a demon?" "In the language in which they spoke, what is rendered into Greek by 'Samaritan' would have been either *Cuthi*, which, while literally meaning a Samaritan, is almost as often used in the sense of 'heretic,' or else *Shomroni*. The latter word deserves special attention. Literally, it also means 'Samaritan'; but the name *Shomron* is also sometimes used as the equivalent of Ashmedai, the prince of the demons. According to the Kabbalists, *Shomron* was the father of Ashmedai, and hence the same as *Sammael* or Satan. That this was a widespread Jewish belief appears from the circumstance that in the Koran Israel is said to have been seduced into idolatry by Shomron, while in Jewish tradition this is attributed to Sammael. If therefore the term applied by the Jews to Jesus was *Shomroni*—and not *Cuthi*, 'heretic'—it would literally mean 'Child of the Devil.'" Edersheim. The ordinary interpretation of "Samaritan" yields, however, quite a relevant meaning. To His refusal to own their true Abrahamic ancestry they retort that He is no pure Jew, a Samaritan.—Ver. 49. δαιμόνιον ἔχεις, possessed, or crazed. *Cf.* x. 20. To this Jesus replies: Ἐγὼ . . . αἰῶνα. The ἐγώ is emphatic in contrast to the expressed ὑμεῖς of the last clause; "I am not out of my mind, but all I do and say springs from my desire to honour my Father, while you for your part and on this very account dishonour me". This dishonour does not stir His resentment, because (ver. 50) ἐγὼ . . . μου, "I am not seeking my own glory". *Cf.* v. 41. Nevertheless His glory is not to be carelessly slighted and turned into reproach (Ps. iv. 2) for ἔστιν ὁ ζητῶν καὶ κρίνων, "there is who seeketh it and judgeth" (vv. 22, 23).—Ver. 51. Therefore the emphasis in the next verse, precisely as in ver. 24 of chap. v., is on "*my* word".—ἐάν τις . . . αἰῶνα, "if any one keeps my word, he shall never see death". For τηρεῖν see xiv. 15-23, xv. 10-20, xvii. 6, 1 John and Rev. *passim;* it is exactly equivalent to "keep". θεωρεῖν θάνατον occurs only here. It is probably stronger than the commoner ἰδεῖν θάνατον (Lk. ii. 26, Heb. xi. 5), "expressing fixed contemplation and full acquaintance" (Plummer); although in John this fuller meaning is sometimes not apparent.—Ver. 52. This

αἰῶνα. 53. [v] μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ὅστις ἀπέθανε; καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον· τίνα σεαυτὸν σὺ ποιεῖς;" 54. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐὰν ἐγὼ δοξάζω[1] ἐμαυτόν, ἡ δόξα μου [w] οὐδέν ἐστιν· ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δοξάζων με, [x] ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε, ὅτι Θεὸς ὑμῶν[2] ἐστι, 55. καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν, ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν· καὶ ἐὰν[3] εἴπω ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν, ἔσομαι [y] ὅμοιος ὑμῶν, ψεύστης· ἀλλ' οἶδα αὐτὸν καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ τηρῶ. 56. [z] Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο [a] ἵνα ἴδῃ [a] τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν· καὶ εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη." 57. Εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν, "Πεντήκοντα ἔτη

v iv. 12.
w Eccles. iii. 19. 1 Cor. vii. 19.
x ix. 19.
y With gen. here only; cp. Herod. iii. 37.
z Burton. 217.
a Ps. xxxiv. 12. Lam. ii. 16. Gen. xxii 18.

[1] δοξασω in ℵ*cbBC*D. [2] T.R. in ℵBD, ημων in ACL. [3] καν Tr. Ti. W.H.

confirms the Jews in their opinion that He is not in His right mind, **Νῦν ἐγνώκαμεν** . . . they seem to have now got proof of what they had suspected; "antea cum dubitatione aliqua locuti erant," Bengel. Their proof is that whereas Jesus says that those who keep His word shall never die, Abraham died and the prophets; therefore Jesus would seem to be making Himself greater than those most highly revered personages.—Ver. 53. What did He expect them to take Him for?—**τίνα σεαυτὸν σὺ ποιεῖς;** For the **μὴ σὺ μείζων** *cf.* iv. 12.—Ver. 54. To their question Jesus, as usual, gives no categorical answer, but replies first by repelling the insinuation contained in their question and then by showing that He was greater than Abraham (see Plummer).—**Ἐὰν ἐγὼ δοξάζω.** "If I shall have glorified myself, my glory is nothing; my Father is He who glorifieth me." He cannot get them to understand that it is not self-assertion on His part which prompts His claims, but fulfilment of His Father's commission. This "Father" of whom He speaks and who thus glorifies Him is the same **ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι** . . . "of whom you say that He is your God". His witness therefore you ought to receive; and the reason why you do not is this, **οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτόν, ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν**, "you have not learned to know Him, but I know Him". The former verb denotes knowledge acquired, by teaching or by observation; in contrast to the latter, which denotes direct and essential knowledge.—**καὶ ἐὰν εἴπω** . . . **τηρῶ.** So far from the affirmations of Jesus regarding His connection with the Father being false, He would be false, a liar and like them, were He to deny that He enjoyed direct knowledge of God. "But, on the contrary, I know Him and all I do, even that which offends you, is the fulfilment of His commission, the keeping of His word."—Ver. 56. And as regards the connection they claim with Abraham, this reflects discredit on their present attitude towards Jesus; for **Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν**, "Abraham in whose parentage you glory," **ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν**, "rejoiced to see my day". The day of Christ is the time of His earthly manifestation; **τῆς ἐπιδημίας αὐτοῦ τῆς μετὰ σαρκός**, Cyril. See Lk. xvii. 22-26; where the plural expresses the same as the singular here. "To see" the day is "to be present" at it, "to experience" it; *cf.* Eurip., *Hecuba*, 56, **δούλειον ἦμαρ εἶδες**, and the Homeric **νόστιμον ἦμαρ ἰδέσθαι. ἵνα ἴδῃ** cannot here have its usual Johannine force and be epexegetical (Burton, *Moods, etc.*), nor as Holtzmann says = **ὅτι ὄψοιτο**, because in this case the **εἶδε καὶ ἐχάρη** would be tautological. Euthymius gives the right interpretation: **ἠγαλλ., ἤγουν, ἐπεθύμησεν** (similarly Theophylact), and the meaning is "Abraham exulted in the prospect of seeing," or "that he should see". This he was able to do by means of the promises given to him.—**καὶ εἶδε**, "and he saw it," not merely while he was on earth (although this seems to have been the idea the Jews took up from the words, see ver. 57); for this kind of anticipation Jesus uses different language, Mt. xiii. 17, and at the utmost the O.T. saints could be described as **πόρρωθεν ἰδόντες**, Heb. xi. 13; but he has seen it in its actuality. This involves that Abraham has not died so as to be unconscious, ver. 52, and *cf.* Mk. xii. 26.—Ver. 57. This, however, the Jews completely misunderstand. They think that by asserting that Abraham saw His day, Jesus means to say that His day and the life of Abraham on earth were contemporaneous.—**Πεντήκοντα** . . . **ἑώρακας;**

b v. 5. οὔπω [b] ἔχεις, καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακας;" 58. Εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι." 59. c v. 9. Rev. xviii. 21. [c] Ἦραν οὖν λίθους ἵνα βάλωσιν ἐπ' αὐτόν· Ἰησοῦς δὲ [d] ἐκρύβη, d xii. 36. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν· καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως.[1]

a Mk. i. 16; ii. 14. Mt. ix. 9. b Lev. xxv. 47. IX. 1. Καὶ [a] παράγων εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν [b] ἐκ γενετῆς. 2. καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες, "Ῥαββί, τίς

[1] Omit διελθων . . . ουτω as in ℵBD vet. Lat. vulg. T.R. is found in ℵcACL.

"Fifty years" may be used as a round number, sufficiently exact for their purpose and with no intention to determine the age of Jesus. But Lightfoot (*Hor. Heb.*, 1046) thinks the saying is ruled by the age when Levites retired, see Num. iv. 3, 39: "Tu non adhuc pervenisti ad vulgarem annum superannuationis, et tunc vidisti Abrahamum?" Irenaeus (ii. 22, 5) records that the Gospel (presumably this passage) and the Presbyters of Asia Minor who had known John, testified that Jesus taught till He was forty or fifty. This idea is upheld by E. v. Bunsen (*Hidden Wisdom of Christ*), and even Keim is of opinion that Jesus may have lived to His fortieth year.—Ver. 58. The misunderstanding of His words elicits from Jesus the statement: **πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι, ἐγώ εἰμι.** "Before Abraham was born I am." "Antequam Abraham fieret, Ego sum," Vulgate. Plummer aptly compares Ps. xc. 2, **πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι . . . σὺ εἶ.** Before Abraham came into existence I am, eternally existent. No stronger affirmation of pre-existence occurs, and Beyschlag's subtle attempt to evade the meaning is unsuccessful.—Ver. 59. What the Jews thought of the assertion appeared in their action: **ἦραν . . . αὐτόν.** Believing that He was speaking sheer blasphemy and claiming equality with the great "I Am," they sought to stone Him. For this purpose there was material ready to hand even in the Temple court, for, as Lightfoot reminds us, the building was still going on. "A stoning in the temple is mentioned by Josephus, *Ant.*, xvii. 9, 3," Meyer.—**Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν.** "But Jesus went out unperceived"; on this usage *vide* Winer, and *cf.* Thayer. Why it should be supposed that there is anything miraculous or doketic in this (Holtzmann and others) does not appear. Many in the crowd would favour the escape of Jesus. The remaining words of the chapter are omitted by recent editors.

CHAPTER IX. 1—X. 22. *The healing of a man born blind and the discussions arising out of this miracle.*

Vv. 1-7. *The cure narrated.*—Ver 1. **Καὶ παράγων.** "And as He passed by," possibly, as Meyer and Holtzmann suppose, on the occasion just mentioned (viii. 59), and as He passed the gate of the Temple where beggars congregated; but the definite mention that it was a Sabbath (ver. 14) rather indicates that it was not the same day. See on x. 22.—**εἶδεν . . . γενετῆς.** "He saw a man blind from birth," an aggravation which plays a prominent part in what follows. And first of all it so impresses the disciples that they ask **τίς . . . γεννηθῇ;** Their question implies a belief, repudiated by Jesus here and in Lk. xiii. 1-5, that each particular sickness or sorrow was traceable to some particular sin; see Job *passim* and Weber's *Lehren d. Talmud*, p. 235. Their question seems also to imply that they supposed even a natal defect might be the punishment of the individual's own sin. This has received five different explanations: (1) that the pre-existence of souls had been deduced from Wisd. viii. 20, "being good, I came into a body undefiled"; (2) that metempsychosis was held by some Jews (so Calvin, Beza, and see Lightfoot, p. 1048); or (3) that the unborn babe might sin, see Gen. xxv. 26, Lk. i. 41-44; or (4) that the punishment was anticipatory of the sin; or (5) that the question was one of sheer bewilderment, putting all conceivable possibilities, but without attaching any very definite meaning to the one branch of the alternative. A combination of the two last seems to fit the mental attitude of the disciples. The alternative that the man suffered for his parents' sin was an idea which would naturally suggest itself. See Exod. xx. 5, etc.—**ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ;** **ἵνα** expresses result, not purpose; and the form of expression is "the product of false analogy, arising from

ἥμαρτεν, οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, [c] ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ;" 3. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὔτε οὗτος ἥμαρτεν οὔτε οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ἵνα [d] φανερωθῇ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Θεοῦ [d] ἐν αὐτῷ. 4. ἐμὲ[1] δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με [e] ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νύξ, ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι. 5. [f] ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὦ, φῶς εἰμι τοῦ κόσμου." 6. Ταῦτα εἰπών, ἔπτυσε [g] χαμαί, καὶ ἐποίησε πηλὸν ἐκ τοῦ πτύσματος, καὶ ἐπέχρισε[2] τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ, 7. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ὕπαγε νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ," ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται, ἀπεσταλμένος. ἀπῆλθεν οὖν καὶ ἐνίψατο, καὶ ἦλθε βλέπων.

c Burton, 218.
d 1 Jo. iv. 9. Ps. xlvi. 8.
e Burton, 328.
f Lk. xi. 34.
g xviii. 6.

[1] ημας in ℵBD, adopted by recent editors.

[2] επεθηκεν in BC. W.H.R. add αυτου with ℵABL and delete του τυφλου, which may have been introduced to make the sense clearer.

imitation of a construction which really expresses purpose" (Burton, *Moods*, 218, 219).—Ver. 3. Both alternatives are rejected by Jesus, **Οὔτε . . . αὐτοῦ**. And another solution is suggested, **ἵνα . . . αυτῷ**. Evil furthers the work of God in the world. It is in conquering and abolishing evil He is manifested. The question for us is not where suffering has come from, but what we are to do with it. Ver. 4. The law which is binding on all men Jesus enounces.—**ἐμὲ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι** . . . Work, active measures to remove suffering, are more incumbent on men than resentful speculation as to the source of suffering. As to God's connection with evil, the practical man need only concern himself with this, that God seeks to abolish it. The time for doing so is limited, it is **ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν**, "so long as it is day," that is, as the next clause shows, so long as life lasts. [On **ἕως** in N.T. see Burton, *Moods*, 321-330.]—**ἔρχεται νύξ**, suggested by the threats (vii. 59, etc.) and by the presence of the blind man.—Ver. 5. **ὅταν . . . κόσμου**. We should have expected **ἕως** and not **ὅταν**, and the Vulgate renders "quamdiu". But the "when" seems to be used to suggest a time when He should not be in the world: "when I am in the world, I am the Light of the World," as He immediately illustrated by the cure of the blind man.—Ver. 6. **Ταῦτα εἰπών**, *i.e.*, "in this connection," **ἔπτυσε χαμαί** . . . "He spat on the ground and made clay of the spittle," "quia aqua ad manum non erat," says Grotius; but that spittle was considered efficacious Lightfoot proves by an amusing anecdote and Wetstein by several citations. Tacitus (*Hist.*, iv. 81) relates that the blind man who sought a cure from Vespasian begged "ut . . . oculorum orbes dignaretur respergere oris excremento". Probably the idea was that the saliva was of the very substance of the person. Tylor (*Prim. Culture*, ii. 400) is of opinion the Roman Catholic priest's touching with his spittle the ears and nostrils of the infant at baptism is a survival of the custom in Pagan Rome in accordance with which the nurse touched with spittle the lips and forehead of the week-old child. Virtue was also attributed to clay in diseases of the eye. A physician of the time of Caracalla prescribes "turgentes oculos vili circumline coeno". That Jesus supposed some virtue lay in the application of the clay is contradicted by the fact that in other cases of blindness He did not use it. See Mk. x. 46. But if He applied the clay to encourage the man to believe, as is the likely solution, the question of accommodation arises (see Lücke). The whole process of which the man was the subject was apparently intended to deepen his faith. —Ver. 7. The application of the clay was not enough. Jesus further said: **Ὕπαγε . . . ἀπεσταλμένος**. Elsner shows that "wash into," **νίψαι εἰς**, is not an uncommon construction. But ver. 11, which gives the same command in a different form, shows that the man understood that **εἰς** followed **ὕπαγε** and not **νίψαι**. The pool of Siloam, supplied from the Virgin's fountain (Is. viii. 6), lay at the south-east corner of Jerusalem in the Kidron Valley. On the opposite side of the valley lies a village *Silwan*

8. Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον ὅτι τυφλὸς ἦν, ἔλεγον, "Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος καὶ προσαιτῶν;" 9. Ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν·" ἄλλοι δέ, "Ὅτι[1] ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστιν." Ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγεν, "Ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι." 10. Ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, "Πῶς [h] ἀνεῴχθησάν[2] σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί;" 11. Ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν, "Ἄνθρωπος λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς πηλὸν ἐποίησε, καὶ ἐπέχρισέ μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ εἶπέ μοι, Ὕπαγε εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ, καὶ νίψαι. ἀπελθὼν δὲ καὶ νιψάμενος, ἀνέβλεψα." 12. Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, "Ποῦ ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος;" Λέγει, "Οὐκ οἶδα."

h Mt. ix. 30.

13. Ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους, τόν ποτε τυφλόν. 14. ἦν δὲ σάββατον, ὅτε τὸν πηλὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἀνέῳξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. 15. πάλιν οὖν ἠρώτων αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, πῶς ἀνέβλεψεν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Πηλὸν ἐπέθηκεν

[1] Considerable variety of reading occurs in this clause; W.H.R. adopt **αλλοι ελεγον Ουχι, αλλα ομοιος αυτω εστιν.**

[2] **ηνεωχθησαν** read by Tr.Ti.W.H.R. with אBCDEF.

representing the old name. The name is here interpreted as meaning "Sent" [שָׁלוּחַ, *missus;* not שִׁילוֹחַ, *missio* sc. *aquarum*, Meyer]. The word **ἀπεσταλμένος** is so frequently used by Jesus of Himself that, notwithstanding what Meyer says, we naturally apply it here also to Himself, as if the noiseless Stream which their fathers had despised (Is. vii. 6) and which they could trace to its source, was a fit type of Him whom the Jews rejected because they knew His origin and because he had no external force. His influence consisted in this, that He was **ἀπεσταλμένος**. The blind man obeyed and received his sight. *Cf.* Elisha and Naaman. From the succeeding **γείτονες** several interpreters conclude that **ἦλθε** means "came" home. Needlessly.

Vv. 8-12. *The people discuss the man's identity.*—Ver. 8. **Οἱ οὖν γείτονες . . . προσαιτῶν;** "The neighbours, then," who might or might not be at that time near the man's home, "and those who formerly used to see him, that he was blind" [but **προσαίτης** is read instead of **τυφλὸς** by recent editors], "said, Is not this he that sits and begs?"—Ver. 9. "Others" but evidently of the same description "said, This is he". Besides those who were doubtful and those who were certain of his identity there was a third opinion uttered: "He is like him". Naturally the opened eyes would alter his appearance. The doubts as to his identity were scattered by the man's decisive **ἐγώ εἰμι.**—Ver. 10. This being ascertained the next question was, **Πῶς ἀνεῴχθησάν σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί;** In reply the cured man relates his experience. He had ascertained Jesus' name from some bystander; and it is noticeable that he speaks of Him as one not widely known: **ἄνθρωπος λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς. ἀνέβλεψα**, "I recovered sight". The man, who now saw for the first time, "uses the ordinary language of men, though in strictness it was not applicable to his own case," Watkins.

Vv. 13-34. *The man is examined by the Pharisees, who eventually excommunicate him.*—Ver. 13. **Ἄγουσιν . . . τυφλόν.** "They," some of the neighbours and others already mentioned, "bring him who had formerly been blind to the Pharisees," not to the Sanhedrim, but to an informal but apparently authoritative (ver. 34) group of Pharisees, who were members of the court.—Ver. 14. The reason of this action was that the cure had been wrought on a Sabbath. [" Prohibitum erat sputum oculo illinere Sabbato, sub notione aliquâ medicinali," Lightfoot.]—Ver. 15. **πάλιν . . . ἀνέβλεψεν. πάλιν** looks back to the same question put by the people, ver. 10; the **καὶ** serving the same purpose. Their first question admits the man's original blindness. The man's reply is simple and straightforward.—Ver. 16. And then the Pharisees introduce their charge and its implication, **Οὗτος . . .**

ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, καὶ ἐνιψάμην, καὶ βλέπω." 16. Ἔλεγον οὖν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων τινές, "[i] Οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι τὸ σάββατον οὐ [j] τηρεῖ." Ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, "Πῶς δύναται ἄνθρωπος ἁμαρτωλὸς τοιαῦτα σημεῖα ποιεῖν;" Καὶ σχίσμα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς. 17. Λέγουσι τῷ τυφλῷ πάλιν, "Σὺ τί λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἤνοιξέ σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;" Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, "Ὅτι προφήτης ἐστίν." 18. Οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τυφλὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν, ἕως ὅτου ἐφώνησαν τοὺς γονεῖς αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος, 19. καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτοὺς λέγοντες, "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμῶν, [k] ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη; πῶς οὖν ἄρτι βλέπει;" 20. Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπον, "Οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ ὅτι τυφλὸς ἐγεννήθη· 21. πῶς δὲ νῦν βλέπει, οὐκ οἴδαμεν· ἢ τίς ἤνοιξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, ἡμεῖς οὐκ οἴδαμεν· αὐτὸς [l] ἡλικίαν [m] ἔχει· αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, αὐτὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ λαλήσει." 22. Ταῦτα εἶπον οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐφοβοῦντο τοὺς Ἰουδαίους· ἤδη γὰρ [n] συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἵνα ἐάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστὸν, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται. 23. διὰ τοῦτο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπον, "Ὅτι ἡλικίαν ἔχει,

i v. 16.
j Cp. Lev xxvi. 2
k viii. 54.
l Eph. iv. 13
m viii. 57; cp. Job xxix. 18.
n Dan. ii. 9. Lk. xxii. 5. Acts xxiii. 20; xxiv. 9.

τηρεῖ. The miracle is not denied, rather affirmed, but it cannot be a work of God, for it has been done on Sabbath. *Cf.* iii. 2 and v. 16. Some of their party, however, inclined to a different conclusion, **Πῶς . . . ποιεῖν;** How can such a work be done at all, whether on Sabbath or any other day, by a sinner? This breach of the Sabbath law must admit of explanation. It cannot arise from opposition to God.—**καὶ σχίσμα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς**, as before among the people, vii. 43, so now among the authorities a pronounced and permanent cleft was apparent.—Ver. 17. Differing among themselves, they refer the question to the man, **Σὺ τί λέγεις . . .** "You, what do you say about Him, on account of His opening your eyes?" The question is not one of fact, but of inference from the fact; the **ὅτι** means "in that," "inasmuch as," and the Vulgate simply renders "Tu quid dicis de illo, qui aperuit oculos tuos?" Promptly the man replies, **προφήτης ἐστίν.**—Ver. 18. It now appears that their previous admission of the fact of the miracle was disingenuous and that they suspected fraudulent collusion between Jesus and the man; **Οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν,** "they did not believe" his account (ver. 19), **ἕως ὅτου . . . βλέπει;** "until they summoned his parents".—Ver. 20. To them they put virtually three questions: Is this your son? Was he born blind? (for though *you* say this of him, **ὑμεῖς** emphatic, we do not believe it). How does he now see? The first two questions they unhesitatingly answer: This is our son who was born blind. This answer explodes the idea of collusion.—Ver. 21. The third question they have not the means of answering, or as ver. 22 indicates, they shammed ignorance to save themselves; and refer the examiners to the man himself.—**ἡλικίαν ἔχει,** his parents are no longer responsible for him. Examples of the Greek phrase are given by Kypke and Wetstein from Plato, Aristophanes, and Demosthenes. **αὐτὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ** [better **ἑαυτοῦ**] **λαλήσει.**—Ver. 22. **Ταῦτα . . . ἐρωτήσατε.** The reluctance of the parents to answer brings out the circumstance that already the members of the Sanhedrim had come to an understanding with one another that any one who acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah should be excommunicated, **ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται.** Of excommunication there were three degrees: the first lasted for thirty days; then followed "a second admonition," and if impenitent the culprit was punished for thirty days more; and if still impenitent he was laid under the *Cherem* or ban, which was of indefinite duration, and which entirely cut him off from intercourse with others. He was treated

o ver. 18. p Zech. iv. 12; six times in N.T.

αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε." 24. Ἐφώνησαν οὖν ᵖ ἐκ δευτέρου τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν τυφλὸς, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Δὸς δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ· ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν." 25. Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν, "Εἰ ἁμαρτωλός ἐστιν, οὐκ οἶδα· ἓν οἶδα, ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν, ἄρτι βλέπω." 26. Εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ πάλιν, "Τί ἐποίησέ σοι; πῶς ἤνοιξέ σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;" 27. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς, "Εἶπον ὑμῖν ἤδη, καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσατε· τί πάλιν θέλετε ἀκούειν; μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ γενέσθαι;" 28. Ἐλοιδόρησαν οὖν αὐτὸν, καὶ εἶπον, "Σὺ εἶ μαθητὴς ἐκείνου· ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ Μωσέως ἐσμὲν μαθηταί. 29. ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν ὅτι Μωσῇ λελάληκεν ὁ Θεός· τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν." 30. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν, ὅτι ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε πόθεν ἐστὶ, καὶ ἀνέῳξέ μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. 31. ᵍ οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ Θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει· ἀλλ' ἐάν τις θεοσεβὴς ᾖ, καὶ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῇ, τούτου ἀκούει. 32. ʳ ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσθη, ὅτι ἤνοιξέ τις ὀφθαλμοὺς τυφλοῦ γεγεννημένου. 33. εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ

q Jas. iv. 3; v. 16.

r Here only; cp. Lk. i. 70, etc.

as if he were a leper. This, to persons so poor as the parents of this beggar, would mean ruin and death (see Edersheim, *Life of Christ*, ii. 183-4).—Ver. 24. Baffled by the parents the Pharisees turn again, **ἐκ δευτέρου**, a second time to the man and say: **Δὸς δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ . . . ἐστιν.** They no longer deny the miracle, but bid the man ascribe the glory of it to the right quarter; to God: not to Jesus, because they can assure him on knowledge of their own, **ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν**, that He is a sinner.—Ver. 25. But they find in the man a kind of independence and obstinacy they are not used to. **Εἰ ἁμαρτωλὸς . . . βλέπω.** He does not question their knowledge, and he draws no express inferences from what has happened, but of one thing he is sure, that he was blind and that now he sees.—Ver. 26. Thwarted by the man's boldness and perceiving that it was hopeless to deny the fact, they return to the question of the means used. **Τί ἐποίησέ σοι;** At this the man loses patience. Their crafty and silly attempt to lead him into some inconsistent statement seems to him despicable, and he breaks out (ver. 27): **Εἶπον . . . γενέσθαι.** No more galling gibe could have been hurled at them than this man's "Are you also wishing to become His disciples?"—Ver. 28. It serves its purpose of exasperating them and bringing them to the direct expression of their feelings. **Ἐλοιδόρησαν . . . ἐστίν.** "They reviled him." On **ἐκείνου** Bengel has: "Hoc vocabulo *removent* Jesum a sese".—Ver. 29. We know that Moses was a prophet, commissioned by God to speak for Him (for **λελάληκεν** see Heb. i. 1); and if this man is commissioned He must show proof of His being sent from God, and not leave us in ignorance of His origin.—Ver. 30. This, in the face of the miracle, seems to the man a surprising statement: **Ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ**, "why, herein is that which is marvellous". **τὸ θαυμαστόν** is the true reading. For the use of **γάρ** in rejoinders see Winer, p. 559, and Klotz, p. 242. It seems to imply an entire repudiation of what has just been said: "You utter an absurdity, *for* . . . " The marvel was that they should hesitate about the origin of one who had such power as was manifest in the cure wrought on him.—Ver. 31. This is elaborated in ver. 31: **οἴδαμεν . . . ἀκούει.** They themselves had owned it a work of God, ver. 24; but God is not persuaded or induced to give such power to sinners, but only to those who do His will. This man therefore, were He a sinner, would have been unable to do anything, not to speak of such a work as has never before been done. Watkins expresses it as a syllogism. (1) God heareth not sinners but only those who worship Him and do His will; (2) That God heareth this man is certain, for such a miracle could be performed only by divine power; (3) This man, therefore, is not a sinner but is from God.—Ver. 32. **ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος**, rather "from of old" than "since the world began". *Cf.* Lk. i. 70, **τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν**, and Acts. iii. 21, xv. 18. To

Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν." 34. Ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "ˢ Ἐν ἁμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ᵗ ὅλος, καὶ σὺ διδάσκεις ἡμᾶς;" Καὶ ᵘ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω. 35. Ἤκουσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω· καὶ ᵛ εὑρὼν αὐτὸν, εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ[1];" 36. Ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπε, "Τίς ἐστι, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν;" 37. Εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Καὶ ἑώρακας αὐτὸν, καὶ ʷ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σοῦ, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν." 38. Ὁ δὲ ἔφη, "Πιστεύω, κύριε·" 39. καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον, ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσι, καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται." 40. Καὶ ἤκουσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ταῦτα οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοί ἐσμεν;" 41. Εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, οὐκ ἂν ˣ εἴχετε ἁμαρτίαν· νῦν δὲ λέγετε, Ὅτι βλέπομεν· ἡ οὖν ἁμαρτία ὑμῶν μένει.

s Ps. li. 5.
t vii. 23.
u 2 Chron. xxix. 16. Lk. xx. 12. Ch. vi. 37.
v i. 42, 44.
w iv. 26.
x xv. 22, 24.

[1] **Θεου** in ALXΓΔ Lat. (vet. vulg.) Syrr. (Pesh. Harcl. Hier.) Memph. Goth. Arm. Aeth., but **ανθρωπου** in ℵAB Theb., adopted by Ti.W.H.

this there is no reply but abuse and dismissal.—Ver. 34. **Ἐν ἁμαρτίαις . . . ἔξω.** "In sins thou wast wholly born, and dost thou teach us?" They refer his blindness to sin, and reproach him with his calamity. Sin, they say, was branded on the whole man; he was manifestly a reprobate. Yet we, the pure and godly, are to be taught by such a man!—**ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω**, "they cast him out," not merely from the chamber, but from communion. This is implied both in ver. 35 and all that Jesus says of the shepherds in the following paragraph.

Ver. 35-X. 21. *The good and the hireling shepherds.*—Ver. 35. **Ἤκουσεν . . .** The action of the Pharisees threw the man on the compassion of Jesus: "He heard that they had cast him out," and He knew the reason; therefore, **εὑρὼν αὐτὸν**, "when He found him," as He wished and sought to do, His first question was: **Σὺ . . . Θεοῦ;** Perhaps a slight emphasis lies in the **Σὺ**. "Dost thou believe in the Messiah?"—Ver. 36. The man's answer shows that he was willing to believe in the Messiah if he could identify Him; and having already declared Jesus to be a prophet, he believed that He could tell him who the Messiah was. It may be taken for granted that although he had not seen Jesus since recovering his sight, he knew somehow that he was speaking to the person who had healed him; and was perhaps almost prepared for the great announcement (ver. 37): **Καὶ ἑώρακας αὐτὸν**, "Thou hast both seen Him," no doubt with a reference to the blessing of restored eyesight; **καὶ . . . ἐστιν.** This direct revelation, similar to that given to the Samaritan woman (iv. 26), was elicited by the pitiable condition of the man as an outcast from the Jewish community, and by the perception that the man was ripe for faith.—Ver. 38. **Ὁ δὲ . . . αὐτῷ.** He promptly uttered his belief and "worshipped" Jesus. In this Gospel **προσκυνεῖν** is used of the worship of God: the word is, however, susceptible of a somewhat lower degree of adoration (Mt. xviii. 26); but it includes the acknowledgment of supremacy and a complete submission.—Ver. 39. Summing up the spiritual significance of the miracle Jesus said: **Εἰς κρίμα . . . γένωνται.** "For judgment," for bringing to light and exhibiting in its consequences the actual inward state of men; "that those who see not may see," that is, that those who are conscious of their blindness and grieved on account of it may be relieved; while those who are content with the light they have lose even that. With a kind of sad humour He points out how easily felt blindness is removed, but how obstinately blind is presumed knowledge. The blind man now saw, because he knew he was blind and used the means Jesus told him to use: the Pharisees were stone-blind to the world Jesus opened to them, because they thought that already they knew much more than He did.—Ver. 40. Some of the Pharisees overheard His words, and unconsciously

X. 1. "'ΑΜΗΝ ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τῶν προβάτων, ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνων [a] ἀλλαχόθεν, ἐκεῖνος [b] κλέπτης ἐστὶ καὶ λῃστής· 2. ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας, [c] ποιμήν ἐστι τῶν προβάτων. 3. τούτῳ ὁ [d] θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα καλεῖ [e] κατ' ὄνομα, καὶ [f] ἐξάγει αὐτά. 4. καὶ ὅταν τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα [1] [g] ἐκβάλῃ, ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται· καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι οἴδασι τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. 5. [h] ἀλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσωσιν, ἀλλὰ φεύξονται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασι τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τὴν φωνήν."

a 4 Mac. i. 7.
b Obad. 5.
c Gen. iv. 2. 1 Pet. ii. 25.
d xviii. 16, 17.
e 3 Jo. 15.
f Ezek. xx. 6. *Cf.* Zech. ix. 16.
g Mk. i. 12.
h Job xix. 13; 1 Kings viii. 41, etc.

[1] T.R. in ΑΓΔ, but **παντα** in ℵ[ca]BDLX 1, 33.

proved their truth by saying with indignant contempt: **μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοί ἐσμεν;** To which Jesus, taking them on their own ground, replies: **Εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, οὐκ ἂν εἴχετε ἁμαρτίαν.** If ye were ignorant, as this blind man was, aware of your darkness and anxious to be rid of it, your ignorance would excuse you: but now by all your words and actions you proclaim that you are satisfied with the light you have, therefore you cannot receive that fuller light which I bring and in which is deliverance from sin, and must therefore remain under its bondage. *Cf.* viii. 21.

CHAPTER X.—Vv. 1-21. *The Good Shepherd and the hirelings.* This paragraph is a continuation of the conversation which arose out of the healing of the blind man. Instead of being introduced by any fresh note of time, it is ushered in by **ἀμὴν ἀμὴν**, which is never found in this Gospel at the commencement of a discourse. The subject also is directly connected with the miracle and its consequences. Jesus explains to the excommunicated man who it is that has power to give entrance to the true fold or to exclude from it. As usual, the terms and tenor of the teaching are interpreted by the incident which gave rise to it.—Ver. 1. **'Αμὴν . . . λῃστής.** The **αὐλή**, or sheepfold, into which the sheep were gathered for safety every night, is described as being very similar to folds in some parts of our own country; a walled, unroofed enclosure. The **θύρα**, however, is not as with us a hurdle or gate, but a solid door heavily barred and capable of resisting attack. This door is watched by a **θυρωρός** [door-guard, for root "or" *vide* Spratt's *Thucyd.*, iii. p. 132], who in the morning opened to the shepherd. He who does not appeal to the **θυρωρός** but climbs up over the wall by some other way (lit. from some other direction: **ἀλλαχόθεν**, which is used in later Greek for the Attic **ἄλλοθεν**) is **κλέπτης καὶ λῃστής**, a "thief" who uses fraud and a "robber" who is prepared to use violence. That is to say, his method of entrance, being illegitimate, declares that he has no right to the sheep.—Ver. 2. On the other hand, **ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος . . . προβάτων**, "but he that entereth by the door is shepherd of the sheep". The shepherd is known by his using the legitimate mode of entrance. What that is, He does not here explicitly state. The shepherd is further recognised by his treatment of the sheep, **τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα καλεῖ** [better **φωνεῖ**] **κατ' ὄνομα**, "his own sheep he calls by name". **ἴδια** perhaps as distinguished from others in the same fold; perhaps merely a strong possessive. As we have names for horses, dogs, cows, so the Eastern shepherds for their sheep. ["Many of the sheep have particular names," Van Lennep, *Bible Lands*, i. 189. It was also a Greek custom to name sheep, and Wetstein quotes from Longus, **ὁ δὲ Δάφνις ἐκάλεσέ τινας αὐτῶν ὀνομαστί.**]—**ὅταν . . . αὐτοῦ.** When he has put all his own out of the fold, they follow him, because they know his voice: the shepherd walking in front as is still the custom in the East. This method cannot be adopted by strangers "because the sheep know not the voice of strangers". "There is a story of a Scotch traveller who changed clothes with a Jerusalem shepherd and tried to lead the sheep; but the sheep followed the shepherd's voice and not his clothes." Plummer. So that the shepherd's claim is justified not only by his method of entrance but by his knowledge of the names of the individual sheep and by their knowledge of him and confidence in him. The different methods are illustrated in Andrewes and Laud, the former saying;

6. Ταύτην τὴν [i] παροιμίαν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τίνα ἦν ἃ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς.

7. Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων. 8. πάντες ὅσοι πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἦλθον, κλέπται εἰσὶ καὶ λῃσταί· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα. 9. ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα· δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ, σωθήσεται, [j] καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται, καὶ νομὴν εὑρήσει. 10. ὁ κλέπτης οὐκ ἔρχεται εἰ μὴ ἵνα κλέψῃ καὶ [k] θύσῃ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ· ἐγὼ ἦλθον

i xvi. 25. 2 Pet. ii. 22
j Num. xxvii. 17.
k Acts x. 13; xi. 7. Lk. xv. 23. 1 Mac. vii. 19.

"Our guiding must be mild and gentle, else it is not *duxisti*, but *traxisti*, drawing and driving and no leading"; the latter, of whom it was said that he "would never convince an opponent if he could suppress him". See Ottley's *Andrewes*, 159.—Ver. 6. The application of the parable was sufficiently obvious; but **ταύτην . . . αὐτοῖς. παροιμία** [**παρά, οἶμος**, out of the way or wayside] seems more properly to denote "a proverb"; and the Book of Proverbs is named in the Sept. **αἱ παροιμίαι** or **παροιμίαι Σαλωμῶντος**; and Aristotle, *Rhetor.*, 3, 11, defines **παροιμίαι** as **μεταφοραὶ απ' εἴδους επ' εἶδος.** But **παροιμία** and **παραβολή** came to be convertible terms, both meaning a longer or shorter utterance whose meaning did not lie on the surface or proverbial sayings: the former term is never found in the Synoptic Gospels, the latter never found in John. [Further see Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, p. 64; and Abbot's *Essays*, p. 82.] This parable the Pharisees did not understand. They might have understood it, for the terms used were familiar O.T. terms; see Ezek. xxxiv., Ps. lxxx. But as it had been spoken for their instruction as well as for the encouragement of the man whom they had cast out of the fold, (ver. 7) **εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν**, Jesus therefore began afresh and explained it to them.—**ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν πρόβατων** I, and no other, am the door of the sheep. [*Cf.* the Persian reformer who proclaimed himself the "Bâb," the gate of life.] Through me alone can the sheep find access to the fold. Primarily uttered for the excommunicated man, these words conveyed the assurance that instead of being outcast by his attachment to Jesus he had gained admittance to the fellowship of God and all good men. Not the Pharisees but Jesus could admit to or reject from the fold of God.—Ver. 8. In contrast to Jesus, **πάντες . . . λῃσταί**, "all who came before me," *i.e.*, all who came before me, claiming to be what I am and to give to the sheep what I give. The prophets pointed forward to Him and did not arrogate to themselves His functions. Only those could be called "thieves and robbers" who had come before the Shepherd came, as if in the night and without His authority. It must have been evident that the hierarchical party was meant. [The inexactness of contrasting the "door" rather than the Shepherd with the "thieves and robbers" who came before Jesus, only emphasises the fact that the reality was more prominent than the figure in the mind of the speaker.] Those, however, who had tried to assume the functions of the Shepherd had failed; because **οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα**, the people of God had not listened to them. They no doubt assumed authority over the people of God and compelled obedience, but the true children of God did not find in their voice that which attracted and led them to pasture. — Ver. 9. **ἐγώ . . . εὑρήσει.** With emphasis He reiterates: "I am the door: through me, and none else, if a man enter he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture". Meyer and others supply "any shepherd" as the nominative to **εἰσέλθῃ**, which may agree better with the form of the parabolic saying, but not so well with the substance. Jesus is the Door of the sheep, not of the shepherd; and the blessings promised, **σωθήσεται, κ. τ. λ.**, are proper to the sheep. These blessings are three: deliverance from peril, liberty, and sustenance. For the phraseology see the remarkable passage Num. xxvii. 15-21, which Holtzmann misapplies, neglecting the twenty-first verse. To "go out and in" is the common O.T. expression to denote the free activity of daily life, Jer. xxxvii. 4, Ps. cxxi. 8, Deut. xxviii. 6.—Ver. 10. The tenth verse introduces a new contrast, between the good

l vv. 15, 17, 18; xiii. 37; xv. 13.
m Gen. xlix. 27. Ecclus. xiii. 17.
n Jer. x. 21. 1 Mac. vi. 54. Jer. xxiii. 1. Mt. xii. 30; and see Thayer.
o Exod. xii. 45. Lev. xxii. 10, etc. Mk. i. 20.
p Wisd. xii. 13. Tob. x. 5.

ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσι, καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν. 11. Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός· ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν [l] ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων. 12. ὁ μισθωτὸς δὲ, καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμὴν, οὗ οὐκ εἰσὶ τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια, θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐρχόμενον, καὶ ἀφίησι τὰ πρόβατα, καὶ φεύγει· καὶ ὁ [m] λύκος ἁρπάζει αὐτὰ, καὶ [n] σκορπίζει τὰ πρόβατα. 13. ὁ δὲ [o] μισθωτὸς φεύγει,[1] ὅτι μισθωτός ἐστι, καὶ οὐ [p] μέλει αὐτῷ

[1] The verse closes at σκορπιζει, the following six words being deleted in ℵBDL, 1, 33, but the clause must at any rate be mentally supplied.

shepherd and the thieves and hirelings.—ὁ κλέπτης . . . ἀπολέσῃ. The thief has but one reason for his coming to the fold: he comes to steal and kill and destroy; to aggrandise himself at the expense of the sheep. θύσῃ has probably the simple meaning of "kill," as in Acts x. 13, Mt. xxii. 4; *cf.* Deut. xxii. 1. With quite other intent has Christ come: ἐγὼ ἦλθον . . . ἔχωσιν, that instead of being killed and perishing the sheep "may have life and may have abundance". This may mean abundance of life, but more probably abundance of all that sustains life. περιττὸν ἔχειν in Xen., *Anab.*, vii. 6, 31, means "to have a surplus". "The repetition of ἔχωσιν gives the second point a more independent position than it would have had if καί alone had been used. *Cf.* ver. 18; Xen., *Anab.*, i. 10, 3, καὶ ταύτην ἔσωσαν καὶ ἄλλα . . . ἔσωσαν," Meyer. *Cf.* Ps. xxiii. 1.—Vv. 11-18. In these verses Jesus designates Himself "the Good Shepherd" and emphasises two features by which a good shepherd can be known: (1) his giving his life for the sheep, and (2) the reciprocal knowledge of the sheep and the shepherd. These two features are both introduced by the statement (ver. 11) ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός, "the good shepherd"; "good" probably in the sense in which we speak of a "good" painter or a "good" architect; one who excels at his business. The definite article claims this as a description applicable to Himself alone. *Cf.* Ps. xxiii., Is. xl. 11, Ezek. xxxiv., etc. For other descriptions of the ideal shepherd, see Plato's *Repub.*, p. 345, and the remarkable passage in the *Politicus*, 271-275, and Columella (in Wetstein), "Magister autem pecoris acer, durus, strenuus, laboris patientissimus, alacer atque audax esse debet; et qui per rupes, per solitudines atque vepres facile vadat".—ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς, the good shepherd, whoever he is, τὴν ψυχὴν . . . προβάτων, "lays down his life for the sheep". τιθέναι τὴν ψυχήν is not a classical phrase, but in Hippocrates occurs a similar expression, Μαχάων γέ τοι ψυχὴν κατέθετο ἐν τῇ Τρωάδι, Kypke. *Ponere spiritum* occurs in Latin. Of the meaning there is no doubt. *Cf.* xiii. 37.—ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων, "for the good of the sheep," that is, when the welfare of the sheep demands the sacrifice of life, that is freely made. Here it is evident Jesus describes "the good shepherd" as revealed in Himself.—Ver. 12. ὁ μισθωτὸς δὲ [δὲ is omitted by recent editors] . . . πρόβατα. In contrast to the good shepherd stands now not the robber but a man in some respects better, a hireling or hired hand (Mark i. 20), not a shepherd whose instincts would prompt him to defend the sheep, and not the owner to whom the sheep belong. So long as there is no danger he does his duty by the sheep for the sake of his wages, but when he sees the wolf coming he abandons the sheep and flees. "The wolf" includes all that threatens the sheep. In Xen., *Mem.*, ii. 7, 14, the dog says to the sheep: ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτὰς σώζων, ὥστε μήτε ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων κλέπτεσθαι, μήτε ὑπὸ λύκων ἁρπάζεσθαι.—καὶ ὁ λύκος . . . σκορπίζει, "and the wolf carries them off and scatters them"; *cf.* Mt. ix. 36; a general description careless of detail. Bengel says "lacerat quas potest, ceteras dispergit".—Ver. 13. ὁ δὲ μισθωτὸς φεύγει, not, as in ver. 12, ὁ μισθ. δὲ, "because the antithesis of the hireling was there first brought forward and greater emphasis was secured by that position". Meyer. Klotz, p. 378, says that δέ is placed after more words than one "ubi quae praeposita particulae verba sunt aut aptius inter se conjuncta sunt aut ita comparata, ut summum pondus in ea sententia obtineant". He flees ὅτι μισθωτός ἐστι, his nature is

περὶ τῶν προβάτων. 14. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός· καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμά, καὶ γινώσκομαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν,[1] 15. καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατήρ, κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα· καὶ τὴν ψυχήν μου τίθημι ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων. 16. καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω, ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης· κἀκεῖνά με δεῖ [q] ἀγαγεῖν, καὶ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσι· καὶ γενήσεται μία ποίμνη, [r] εἷς ποιμήν. 17. διὰ τοῦτο ὁ πατήρ με ἀγαπᾷ, ὅτι ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν μου, ἵνα πάλιν λάβω

q Is. lx. 9.
r Ezek. xxxvii. 24.

[1] T.R. is authenticated by AXΓΔ 33, syr., etc.; the active γινωσκουσιν με τα εμα is the reading of ℵBL, it. vulg. "cognoscunt me meae". This gives a better balanced sentence, though the sense is the same.

betrayed by his conduct. He does not care for the sheep but for himself. He took the position of guardian of the sheep for his own sake, not for theirs; and the presence of the wolf brings out that it is himself, not the sheep, he cares for.—Ver. 14. The second mark of the good shepherd is introduced by a repetition of the announcement: **ἐγώ . . . καλός**. And this second mark is not stated in general terms applicable to all good shepherds, but directly of Himself: **ἐγώ εἰμι . . . καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμά, καὶ γινώσκομαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν**. There is a mutually reciprocal knowledge between Jesus and His sheep. And the existence of this knowledge is the proof that He is the Shepherd. The shepherd's claim is authenticated by his knowledge of the marks and ways of the sheep, and by its knowledge of him as shown in its coming to his voice and submission to his hand. Augustine says: "They sometimes do not know themselves, but the shepherd knows them".—Ver. 15. This reciprocal knowledge is so sure and profound that it can only be compared to the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son: **καθὼς . . . πατέρα**. He then applies to Himself what had been stated in general of all good shepherds in ver. 11; and ver. 16 might suitably have begun with the words "And my life I lay down for the sheep". This statement is, however, prompted by His reference to His knowledge of the Father. He knows it is the Father's will that He should lay down His life. See vv. 17 and 18.—Ver. 16. But the mention of His death suggests to Him the wide extent of its consequences. **ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω**, "other sheep I have"; not that they are already believers in Him, but "His" by the Father's design and gift. *Cf.* xvii. 7 and Acts xviii. 10. They are only negatively described: **ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης**; "this fold" is evidently that which contained the Jews who already had received Him as their Shepherd; and the other sheep which are not "of" (**ἐκ**, as frequently in John, "belonging to"; not as Meyer renders) this fold are the Gentiles.—**κἀκεῖνα . . . ποιμήν** "those also I must bring and they shall listen to my voice, and they shall so amalgamate with the Jewish disciples that there shall be one flock, one shepherd". The listening to Christ's voice brings the sheep to Him, and this being what constitutes the flock, the flock must be one as He is one. But nothing is said of unity of organisation. There may be various folds, though one flock.—**μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν**, the alliteration cannot be quite reproduced in English. For the emphasis gained by omitting **καί** *cf.* Eurip., *Orestes*, 1244, **τρισσοῖς φίλοις γὰρ εἷς ἀγών, δίκη μία**. The A.V. wrongly translated "one fold," following the Vulgate, which renders both **αὐλή** and **ποίμνη** by "ovile" ["qua voce non grex ipse sed ovium stabulum declaratur; quod unum vix unquam fuit, et non modo falso, sed etiam stulte impudenter Romae collocatur". Beza]. This is corrected in R.V. The old Latin versions had "unus grex"; see Wordsworth's and White's *Vulg.*—Ver. 17. At this point the exposition of the functions of the good shepherd terminates; but as a note or appendix Jesus adds **διὰ τοῦτο**, "on this account," *i.e.*, because I lay down my life for the sheep (ver. 15 and following clause) does my Father love me. The expressed **ἐγώ** serves to bring out the spontaneity of the surrender. And this free sacrifice or death is justified by the object, **ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν**. He dies, not to remain in death and so leave the sheep defenceless, but to live again, to resume life in pursuance of the object for which He had given it. The freedom of the sacrifice is proved by His taking

s v. 19. Num. xvi. 29. t i. 12. Wisd. xvi. 13. u ix. 16. v vii. 20; viii. 48. Wisd. v. 4. w Mk. iii. 21. Acts xxvi. 24. Wisd. xiv. 28. x Mt. iv. 24. y Acts iii. 11; v. 12. z Lk. xxi. 20. Acts xiv. 20. a Mt. xvii. 17. Rev. vi. 10, only in N.T. b Ezek. xxiv. 25.

αὐτήν. 18. οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν [s] ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ. [t] ἐξουσίαν ἔχω θεῖναι αὐτήν, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν. ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου." 19. [u] Σχίσμα οὖν πάλιν ἐγένετο ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους. 20. ἔλεγον δὲ πολλοὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν, "[v] Δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ [w] μαίνεται· τί αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε;" 21. Ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, "Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα οὐκ ἔστι [x] δαιμονιζομένου· μὴ δαιμόνιον δύναται τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοίγειν;"

22. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ [1] τὰ ἐγκαίνια ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις, καὶ χειμὼν ἦν· 23. καὶ περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν τῇ [y] στοᾷ τοῦ Σολομῶντος. 24. [z] ἐκύκλωσαν οὖν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ, "[a] Ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν [b] αἴρεις; εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός, εἰπὲ

[1] τοτε is read instead of δε by W.H. on the authority of BL 33 and some versions. This reading would connect this paragraph with the foregoing, and the interval of two months between the Feast of Tabernacles and Dedication would be placed between chs. viii. and ix. It has been suggested that τα εγκαινια may here mean the Dedication of *Solomon's* Temple, which coincided with the Feast of Tabernacles. This is not likely. The reading of T.R. is strongly authenticated, being found in ℵAD and most other uncials, vulg. goth. syr., etc.

His life again. He was not compelled to die.—Ver. 18. **οὐδεὶς . . . ἐμαυτοῦ.** He did not succumb to the machinations of His foes. To the last He was free to choose another exit from life; Mt. xxvi. 53. He gave His life freely, perceiving that this was the Father's will: **ἐξουσίαν . . . μου.** Others have only power to choose the time or method of their death, and not always that: Jesus had power absolutely to lay down His life or to retain it. Others have no power at all to resume their life after they had laid it down. He has. This freedom, as Weiss remarks, does not clash with the instrumentality of the Jews in taking His life, nor with the power of God in raising Him again.—**ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν.** "This commandment" thus to dispose of His life and to resume it He has received from the Father. In this as in all else He is fulfilling the will and purpose of God.

Vv. 19-21. *The result of this discourse briefly described.*—Ver. 19. As usual, diverse judgments were elicited, and once more a division of opinion appeared, **Σχίσμα οὖν πάλιν ἐγένετο . . .** Many thought Him possessed and mad, as in Mk. iii. 21; *cf.* **οὐ μαίνομαι** of Paul, Acts xxvi. 24. Others took the more sensible view. These words they had heard were not the wild exclamations and ravings they usually heard from demoniacs; and His acts, such as opening the blind man's eyes, were not within the compass of a demon.

Vv. 22-39. *Sayings of Jesus at the Feast of Dedication.*—Ver. 22. **Ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ ἐγκαίνια.** The **ἐγκαίνια** (Ezra vi. 16) was the annual celebration of the reconsecration of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus after its defilement by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. i. 20-60, iv. 36-57).—**ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις.** The feast might be celebrated elsewhere, and the place may be specified because Jesus had been absent from Jerusalem and now returned.—**χειμὼν ἦν,** not "it was stormy weather" (Plummer) but "it was winter"; inserted for the sake of Gentile readers and to explain why Jesus was teaching under cover. The feast was held in December, the 25th, Chisleu. See Edersheim, *Life of Jesus*, ii. 226.—**καὶ περιεπάτει . . . Σολομῶντος** [better· **Σολομῶνος**].—Ver. 23. For the sake of shelter Jesus was walking with His disciples [**περιεπάτει**] in Solomon's Porch, a cloister on the east side of the Temple area (Joseph., *Antiq.*, xx. 9, 7) apparently reared on some remaining portions of Solomon's building.—Ver. 24. Here the Jews **ἐκύκλωσαν αὐτόν,** "ringed Him round," preventing His escape and with hostile purpose; *cf.* Plutarch's *Them.*, xii. 3. Their attitude corresponded to the peremptory

ἡμῖν [c]παρρησίᾳ." 25. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Εἶπον ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε. τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρός μου, ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ· 26. ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν, καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν. 27. τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει, κἀγὼ γινώσκω αὐτά· καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσί μοι, 28. κἀγὼ ζωὴν αἰώνιον δίδωμι αὐτοῖς· καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ οὐχ [d]ἁρπάσει τις αὐτὰ ἐκ τῆς χειρός μου. 29. ὁ πατήρ μου ὃς δέδωκέ μοι, μείζων[1] πάντων ἐστί· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἁρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρός μου. 30. ἐγὼ

c xi. 14; xvi. 25.

d Ps. vii. 2. 2 Sam. xxiii. 21. Jo. vi. 15.

[1] Instead of ος and μειζων of T.R. ο and μειζον are read by Tr.Ti.W.H. following [for ο] ℵBL and [for μειζον] AB and versions. This reading seems exegetically impossible. See Weiss. It gives a sense irrelevant to the passage. "That which my Father has given me is greater than all." Very possibly μειζον was originally read, cp. Mt. xii. 6, and ος may have been changed into ο through a misunderstanding of μειζον.

character of their demand: Ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἴρεις; Beza renders αἴρεις by "suspendis, *i.e.*, anxiam et suspensam tenes?" For which Elsner blames him and prefers "why do you kill us with delay?" But αἴρω occurs not infrequently in the sense of "disturb". Soph., *Oed. Tyr.*, 914, αἴρει θυμὸν Οἰδίπους, Oedipus excites his soul; Eurip., *Hecuba*, 69, τί ποτ' αἴρομαι ἔννυχος οὕτω δείμασι; *cf.* Virgil, *Aeneid*, iv. 9, "quae me suspensam insomnia terrent?" "Why do you keep us in suspense?" is a legitimate translation. "If Thou art the Christ tell us plainly."—παρρησίᾳ, in so many words, devoid of all ambiguity; *cf.* xvi. 29. This request has a show of reasonableness and honesty, as if they only needed to hear from Himself that He was the Christ. But it is never honest to ask for further explanation after enough has been given. Nothing more surely evinces unwillingness to believe. Besides, there was always the difficulty that, if He categorically said He was the Christ, they would understand Him to mean the Christ of their expectation.—Ver. 25. Therefore He replies: "I told you and ye believe not. The works which I do in my Father's name, these witness concerning me." These works tell you what I am. They are works done in my Father's name, that is, wholly as His representative. These show what kind of Christ He sends you and that I am He.—Ver. 26. "But you on your part do not believe"—the reason being that you are not of the number of my sheep. Had you been of my sheep you must have believed; because my sheep have these two characteristics, (ver. 27) they hear my voice and they follow me: (ver. 28) and these characteristics meet a twofold response in me, "I know them" and "I give them life eternal". κἀγὼ in each case emphatically exhibits the response of Christ to believers. They acknowledge Him by hearing His voice; He acknowledges them, "knows them". *Cf.* ver. 14. They follow Him, and He leads them into life eternal. "*Sequela* et *vita* arcte connectuntur," Bengel. This mention of the gift of life leads Him to enlarge on its perpetuity and its security.—οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, "they shall never perish" (*cf.* ver. 10), but shall enjoy the abundant life I am come to bestow.—καὶ οὐχ ἁρπάσει τις αὐτὰ ἐκ τῆς χειρός μου, "and no one shall carry them off (ver. 12) out of my hand" or keeping. Throughout He uses the phraseology of the "Shepherd" parable.—Ver. 29. These strong assertions He bases, as always, on the Father's will and power. ὁ πατήρ μου . . . ἐσμεν. "My Father who has given me these sheep is greater than all: and therefore no one can snatch them out of my Father's hand. But this is equivalent to my saying no one can snatch them out of my hand, for I and the Father are one."—ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν. *Cf.* xvii. 21, 22, 23, ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσι. Bengel says: "*Unum*, non solum voluntatis consensu, sed unitate potentiae, adeoque naturae. Nam omnipotentia est attributum naturale; et sermo est de unitate Patris et Filii. In his verbis Jesu plus viderunt caeci Judaei, quam hodie vident Antitrinitarii." But Calvin is right when

e xvii. 21. f viii. 59; xi. 8. g Mt. v. 16. h vide Thayer. i viii. 53; v. 18. j Ps. lxxxii. 6. k vi. 25. Jonah i. 1. l Mt. v. 19. m Wisd. xlix. 7. Ch. xvii. 17. Mk. i. 24.

καὶ ὁ πατὴρ [e]ἕν ἐσμεν." 31. [f]Ἐβάστασαν οὖν πάλιν λίθους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἵνα λιθάσωσιν αὐτόν. 32. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Πολλὰ [g]καλὰ ἔργα ἔδειξα ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου· διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον λιθάζετέ με;" 33. Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες, "[h]Περὶ καλοῦ ἔργου οὐ λιθάζομέν σε, ἀλλὰ [h]περὶ βλασφημίας, καὶ ὅτι σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν [i]ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν Θεόν." 34. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐκ ἔστι [j]γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν, 'Ἐγὼ εἶπα, θεοί ἐστε;' 35. Εἰ ἐκείνους εἶπε θεοὺς, πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ [k]ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐ δύναται [l]λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή· 36. ὃν ὁ πατὴρ [m]ἡγίασε καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὑμεῖς λέγετε,

he denies that the words carry this sense: "Abusi sunt hoc loco veteres ut probarent Christum esse Patri ὁμοούσιον. Neque enim Christus de unitate substantiae disputat, sed de consensu quem cum Patre habet: quicquid scilicet geritur a Christo Patris virtute confirmatum iri." An ambassador whose demands were contested might quite naturally say: "I and my sovereign are one"; not meaning thereby to claim royal dignity, but only to assert that what he did his sovereign did, that his signature carried his sovereign's guarantee, and that his pledges would be fulfilled by all the resources of his sovereign. So here, as God's representative, Jesus introduces the Father's power as the final guarantee, and claims that in this respect He and the Father are one. Whether this does not involve metaphysical unity is another question. *Cf.* Tertullian, *adv. Praxeam*, 22; Hippolytus, *c. Noetum*, 7, **δύο πρόσωπα ἔδειξεν, δύναμιν δὲ μίαν**.—Ver. 31. **Ἐβάστασαν οὖν . . . αὐτόν.** In chap. viii. 59, **ἦραν λίθους**, so now once more, **πάλιν**, they lifted stones to stone Him.—Ver. 32. Jesus anticipating them says: **Πολλὰ . . . με**; "Many excellent works ['praeclara opera,' Meyer] have I shown you from my Father; for what work among these do ye stone me?" Which of them deserves stoning? (Holtzmann). As it could only be a work differing in character from the **καλὰ ἔργα** which deserved stoning, **ποῖον** is used, although in later Greek its distinctive meaning was vanishing. Wetstein quotes from Dionys. Halicar., viii. 29, an apposite passage in which Coriolanus says: **οἵ με ἀντὶ πολλῶν καὶ καλῶν ἔργων, ἐφ' οἷς τιμᾶσθαι προσῆκεν . . . αἰσχρῶς ἐξήλασαν ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος.**—Ver. 33. The irony is as much in the situation as in the words. The answer is honest enough, blind as it is: **Περὶ . . . Θεόν.** "For a praiseworthy work we do not stone Thee, but for blasphemy, and because Thou being a man makest Thyself God." For **περί** in this sense *cf.* Acts xxvi. 7. The **καὶ ὅτι** does not introduce a second charge, but more specifically defines the blasphemy. On the question whether it was blasphemy to claim to be the Christ see Deut. xviii. 20, Lev. xxiv. 10-17, and Treffry's *Eternal Sonship*. It was blasphemy for a man to claim to be God. And it is noteworthy that Jesus never manifests indignation when charged with making Himself God; yet were He a mere man no one could view this sin with stronger abhorrence.—Ver. 34. On this occasion He merely shows that even a man could without blasphemy call himself "Son of God"; because their own judges had been called "gods".—**Οὐκ ἔστι γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν**, "Is it not written in your law, I said 'ye are Gods'?" In Ps. lxxxii. the judges of Israel are rebuked for abusing their office; and God is represented as saying: "I said, Ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High". "The law" is here used of the whole O.T. as in xii. 34, xv. 25, Rom. iii. 19, 1 Cor. xiv. 21.—**Εἰ ἐκείνους . . .** "If it [that **ὁ νόμος** is the nominative to **εἶπε** is proved by the two following clauses, although at first sight it might be more natural to suppose the nearer and more emphatic **ἐγώ** supplied the nominative] called them gods, to whom the word of God came," that is, who were thus addressed by God at their consecration to their office and *by this word* lifted up to a new dignity—"and that they were so called is certain because Scripture cannot be denied or put aside—then do you, shutting your eyes to your own Scriptures, declare Him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world to be a blasphemer because He said, I am God's Son?"

Ὅτι βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον, Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰμι; 37. εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρός μου, μὴ πιστεύετέ μοι· 38. εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε· ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε,[1] ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ." 39. Ἐζήτουν οὖν πάλιν αὐτὸν [n] πιάσαι· καὶ [o] ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν.

40. ΚΑΙ ἀπῆλθε πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου [p] ἦν Ἰωάννης [q] τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων· καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ. 41. καὶ πολλοὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ ἔλεγον, "Ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδέν· πάντα δὲ ὅσα εἶπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου, ἀληθῆ ἦν." 42. Καὶ ἐπίστευσαν πολλοὶ ἐκεῖ εἰς αὐτόν.

n vii. 30.
o "escaped" *vide* Thayer, 223.
p iii. 23.
q xii. 16; xix. 39.

[1] For πιστευσητε BLX, cursives and versions read γινωσκητε, "that ye may attain to knowledge and *permanently know*". The T.R. is read in ℵA.

The *a fortiori* element in the argument lies in this, that the judges were made "gods" by the coming to them of God's commission, which found them engaged otherwise and itself raised them to their new rank, whereas Jesus was set apart by the Father and sent into the world for the sole object of representing the Father. If the former might be legitimately called "gods," the latter may well claim to be God's Son. The idea of the purpose for which Christ was sent into the world is indicated in the emphatic use of ὁ πατήρ; and this is still further accentuated in ver. 37.—Vv. 37, 38. εἰ οὐ ποιῶ . . . πιστεύσατε. "If I do not the works of my Father, do not believe me: but if I do them, even though you do not believe me, believe the works." That is, if you do not credit my statements, accept the testimony of the deeds I do. And this, not to give me the glory but "that ye may know and believe [*cf.* vi. 69] that the Father is in me, and I in the Father" [for αὐτῷ read τῷ πατρί].—Ver. 39. Ἐζήτουν . . . αὐτῶν. His words so far convinced them that they dropped the stones, but they sought to arrest Him. The πάλιν refers to vii. 30, 44. But He escaped out of their hand, and departed again beyond Jordan to the place where John at first was baptising, *i.e.*, Bethany. *Cf.* i. 28, also iv. 1. Holtzmann considers that the πρῶτον is intended to differentiate the earlier from the later ministry of the Baptist. It might rather seem to point to the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, especially as following πάλιν.—καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ, "and He remained there" until xi. 7, that is, for a little more than three months.—Ver. 41. There He was still busy; for πολλοὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν, "many came to Him and said," that is, giving this as their reason for coming, that "although John himself had done no miracle, all he had said of Jesus was found to be true". The reference to John is evidently suggested by the locality, and probably means that the "many" alluded to as coming to Jesus belonged to the district and had been impressed by John. The correspondence between what they had heard from the Baptist and what they saw in Jesus, as well as the intrinsic evidence of the works He did, engendered belief in Him (ver. 42) Καὶ ἐπίστευσαν πολλοὶ ἐκεῖ εἰς αὐτόν.

CHAPTER XI.—Vv. 1-16. *Lazarus' death recalls Jesus to Judaea.*—Ver. 1. Ἦν δέ τις ἀσθενῶν. "Now a certain man was ill;" δέ connects this narrative with the preceding, and introduces the cause of our Lord's leaving His retirement in Peraea. "Lazarus," the Greek form of Eleazar = God is my Help (*cf.* Lk. xvi. 20), "of Bethany". ἀπό is commonly used to designate residence or birthplace, see i. 45, Heb. xiii. 24, etc.; ἐκ is used similarly, see Acts xxiii. 34. Bethany lay on the south-east slope of Olivet, nearly two miles from Jerusalem, ver. 18; it is now named El-'Azirîyeh, after Lazarus; "from the village of Mary and Martha her sister," a description of Bethany added not so much to distinguish it from the Bethany of i. 28 (*cf.* x. 40) as to connect it with persons already named in the evangelic tradition, Lk. x. 38.—Ver. 2. In order further to identify Lazarus it is added: "Now it was (that) Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was ill". This act of Mary's has not yet

a Lk. x. 38.
b xii. 3.
c Lk. vii. 38. Ch. xiii. 5. Wisd. xii. 11.
d iv. 35. Cp. 2 Kings xx. 1.
e ix. 3.
f i. 40.
g ver. 15. Mk. i. 38. Mt. xxvi. 46.
h With imperf. here only.

XI. 1. Ἦν δέ τις ἀσθενῶν [a] Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας καὶ Μάρθας τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς. 2. ἦν δὲ Μαρία [1] [b] ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν Κύριον μύρῳ, καὶ [c] ἐκμάξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς, ἧς ὁ ἀδελφὸς Λάζαρος ἠσθένει. 3. ἀπέστειλαν οὖν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγουσαι, "Κύριε, ἴδε ὃν φιλεῖς ἀσθενεῖ." 4. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, "Αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστι [d] πρὸς θάνατον, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, [e] ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' αὐτῆς." 5. Ἠγάπα δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον. 6. ὡς οὖν ἤκουσεν ὅτι [f] ἀσθενεῖ, τότε μὲν ἔμεινεν ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπῳ δύο ἡμέρας. 7. Ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς, "[g] Ἄγωμεν εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν πάλιν." 8. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί, "Ῥαββί, [h] νῦν ἐζήτουν σε λιθάσαι οἱ

[1] Recent editors read **Μαριαμ** instead of **Μαρια**, but, as Meyer remarks, the genitive presupposes the form **Μαρια**, and while in some versions **Μαριαμ** is well supported, in others it is poorly authenticated. Generally T.R. is supported by ℵAD, **Μαριαμ** by BC.

been narrated by John (see xii. 3), but it was this which distinguished her at the time John was writing; *cf.* Mt. xxvi. 13.—Ver. 3. The sisters were so intimate with Jesus that they naturally turn to Him in their anxiety, and send Him a notice of the illness, which is only a slightly veiled request that He would come to their relief: "Lord, behold, he whom Thou lovest is ill". "Sufficit ut noveris. Non enim amas et deseris." Augustine.—Ver. 4. **Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν.** "And Jesus when He heard said," *i.e.*, to His disciples. It was not the reply sent to the sisters. "This illness is not to death," **πρὸς θάνατον**, death is not the end towards which it is making. But that Jesus knew that death had already taken place (ver. 6 and ver. 17) or was imminent is evident from the following clause, but He knew what He would do (vi. 6) and that death was not to be the final result of this illness. The illness and death were **ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ**, for the sake of glorifying God (*cf.* ix. 3), "gloriae divinae illustrandae causa," Winer, p. 479. This is further explained in the clause "that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it," *i.e.*, by means of this illness; *cf.* xiii. 31. "In two ways; because the miracle (1) would lead many to believe that He was the Messiah; (2) would bring about His death. **Δοξάζεσθαι** is a frequent expression of this Gospel for Christ's death regarded as the mode of His return to glory (vii. 39, xii. 16, xiii. 31), and this glorification of the Son involves the glory of the Father (v. 23, x. 30-38)." Plummer, Bengel.—Ver. 5. **Ἠγάπα δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς** . . . It is quite true that **φιλεῖν** denotes the more passionate love, and **ἀγαπᾶν** the more reasoning; but it is doubtful whether this distinction is observed in this Gospel. Passages proving the distinction are given by Wetstein.—Ver. 6. Jesus loved the family, **ὡς οὖν ἤκουσεν . . . τότε μὲν ἔμεινεν.** We expect another consequence: "Jesus loved them, therefore He immediately went to Bethany". But the consequence indicated in **οὖν** is found in **λέγει**, ver. 7, and the whole sentence should read: "When, therefore, He had heard that he was ill, for the present indeed [**τότε μὲν** = tum quidem], He remained for two days where He was; then after this He says to His disciples, Let us go into Judaea again". The **μέν** after **τότε** suggests a **δέ** after **ἔπειτα** and unites the two clauses. For the dropping of **δέ** after **ἔπειτα** or its absorption see Winer, 720; and for the pleonastic **ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο** and for **ἄγωμεν** in the sense "let us go" see Kypke, who gives instances of both from post-Macedonian authors. Jesus remained two days inactive, not to test the faith of the sisters, which Holtzmann justly characterises as "grausam"; but, as Godet, Holtzmann, and Weiss agree, because He awaited the prompting of the Father, *cf.* ii. 4, vii. 1-10.—Ver. 8. The announcement of His intention is received with astonishment: **Ῥαββὶ . . . ἐκεῖ.** "Rabbi, the men of Judaea were but now seeking to stone

Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ πάλιν ὑπάγεις ἐκεῖ;" 9. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐχὶ δώδεκά εἰσιν ὧραι τῆς ἡμέρας; [i] ἐάν τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, οὐ προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου βλέπει· 10. ἐὰν δέ τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ, προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ." 11. Ταῦτα εἶπε, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν [j] κεκοίμηται· ἀλλὰ πορεύομαι ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν." 12. Εἶπον οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, "Κύριε, εἰ κεκοίμηται, σωθήσεται." 13. Εἰρήκει δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς περὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἔδοξαν ὅτι περὶ τῆς [k] κοιμήσεως τοῦ ὕπνου λέγει. 14. τότε οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς [l] παρρησίᾳ, "Λάζαρος ἀπέθανε· 15. καὶ χαίρω δι' ὑμᾶς, ἵνα πιστεύσητε, ὅτι οὐκ ἤμην ἐκεῖ· ἀλλ' ἄγωμεν πρὸς αὐτόν." 16. Εἶπεν οὖν Θωμᾶς, [m] ὁ λεγόμενος [n] Δίδυμος, τοῖς συμμαθηταῖς, "Ἄγωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ."

i Burton, 240, 260.
j 1 Kings xv. 8. 1 Thess. iv. 13.
k Wisd. xvii. 14.
l xvi. 29.
m iv. 25; xix. 13. Mt. xxvii. 17.
n xx. 24; xxi. 2.

Thee, and goest Thou thither again?" "They think of the danger to Him, and are not without thought of the danger to themselves (ver. 16)." Watkins. The νῦν shows that they had not been long in Peraea. To this remonstrance Jesus replies, as in ix. 4, that while His day, appointed to Him by the Father, continued, He must work, and nothing could hinder Him.—Ver. 9. **Οὐχὶ . . . ἡμέρας**, *i.e.*, each man's day, or term of work, is a defined quantity. [**τὰ δυώδεκα μέρεα τῆς ἡμέρης παρὰ Βαβυλωνίων ἔμαθον Ἕλληνες**, Herod., ii. 109; and see Rawlinson's *Appendix* to his *Translation*.]—**ἐάν τις . . . βλέπει.** So long as this day lasts, a man may go confidently forward to the duties that call him; **οὐ προσκόπτει** "he does not stumble," he can walk erect and straight on amid dangers, *cf.* Mt. iv. 6, "because he sees the light of the world"; as the sun makes all causes of stumbling manifest and saves the walker from them, so the knowledge of God's will, which is man's moral light, guides him; and to follow it is his only safety.—Ver. 10. On the other hand, **ἐὰν δέ τις . . . ἐν αὐτῷ**, if a man prolongs his day beyond God's appointment, he stumbles about in darkness, having lost his sole guide, the will of God. His prolonged life is no longer a day but mere night.—Ver. 11. **Ταῦτα εἶπε . . . αὐτόν.** "These things spake He, and after this," how long after we do not know; but ver. 15, "let us go to him," indicates that the two days here intervened. There is, however, difficulty introduced by this supposition. He now makes the definite announcement: "Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep, but I go to awake him".—**κεκοίμηται** *cf.* Mt. ix. 24, xxvii. 52, Acts. vii. 60, 1 Thess. iv. 13, 1 Cor. xv. 6. "Mortuos dormientes appellat Scripturae veracissima consuetudo, ut cum dormientes audimus, evigilaturos minime desperemus." Augustine. The heathen idea of the sleep of death is very different, *cf.* Catullus, "Nox est perpetua una dormienda". **ἐξυπνίσω** is later Greek: **ἐξυπνισθῆναι οὐ χρὴ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἀφυπνισθῆναι**, Phrynichus (Rutherford, p. 305). The disciples misunderstood Him, and said: **Κύριε . . . σωθήσεται.** "Lord, if he sleep, he will recover," implying that in this case they need not take the dangerous step of returning to Judaea [*cf.* Achilles Tatius, iv., **ὕπνος γὰρ πάντων νοσημάτων φάρμακον**]. How He knows that Lazarus sleeps they do not inquire, accustomed as they are to His exercise of gifts they do not understand. **σωθήσεται**, *cf.* Mk. v. 28, 34, vi. 56, etc. Their misunderstanding was favoured by His having said (ver. 4) that the illness was "not to death"; naturally when Jesus spoke of Lazarus sleeping they understood Him to speak (ver. 13) **περὶ τῆς κοιμήσεως τοῦ ὕπνου**, "of the **κοίμησις** of sleep". —Ver. 14. **τότε οὖν.** "At this point, accordingly, Jesus told them plainly," **παρρησίᾳ** "without figure or ambiguity," "expressly in so many words," *cf.* x. 24, removing all possibility of misunderstanding, "Lazarus is dead," but instead of grieving (ver. 15) **καὶ χαίρω δι' ὑμᾶς**, "I am glad for your sakes," although grudging the pain to Lazarus and his sisters, **ὅτι οὐκ ἤμην ἐκεῖ**, "that I was not there," implying that had He been there Lazarus would not have died. This gives us a glimpse into the habitual and absolute confidence of Jesus in the

o v. 5; viii. 57; ix. 21.
p iii. 23; vi. 23.
q xxi. 8. Rev. xiv. 20.
r i. 40.
s Gen. xxxviii. 11. 2 Sam. vii. 1.

17. Ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὗρεν αὐτὸν τέσσαρας ἡμέρας ἤδη ° ἔχοντα ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ. 18. ἦν δὲ ἡ Βηθανία ᵖ ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, ὡς ᵍ ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε· 19. καὶ πολλοὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐληλύθεισαν πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν,[1] ἵνα παραμυθήσωνται αὐτὰς περὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῶν. 20. ἡ οὖν Μάρθα ὡς ἤκουσεν ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ʳ ἔρχεται, ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ· Μαρία δὲ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ˢ ἐκαθέζετο. 21. εἶπεν οὖν ἡ Μάρθα πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, "Κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε, ὁ

[1] T.R. is supported by AC³ΓΔ; but ℵBC*LX 33, it. vulg., read προς την Μαρθαν κ. τ. λ. Tisch. retains T.R. W.H.R. adopt the other and better authenticated reading, although it is the easier, while the T.R. might naturally present difficulty. Wetstein's examples show that τας περι κ. τ. λ. would in classical Greek mean "Martha and Mary and those with them"; in later Greek it might mean "Martha and Mary". In Acts xiii. 13 the older usage obtains: here αδελφου αυτων seems to point to the later usage.

presence with Him of an almighty power, ἵνα πιστεύσητε "that ye may believe," go on to firmer faith. "Faith can neither be stationary nor complete. 'He who *is* a Christian is no Christian,' Luther," Westcott.—Ver. 16. Εἶπεν οὖν Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος Θωμᾶς is the transliteration and Δίδυμος the translation of תְּאוֹם, a twin. He is the pessimist among the disciples, and now takes the gloomy, and, as it proved, the correct view of the result of this return to Judaea, but his affectionate loyalty forbids the thought of their allowing Jesus to go alone. "To his mind there is nothing left for Jesus but to die. But now comes the remarkable thing. He is willing to take Jesus at the lowest, uncrowned, unseated, disrobed, he loves Him still." Matheson. If Thomas is stiff and obstinate in his incredulity, he is also stiff and obstinate in his affection and allegiance. "In him the twins, unbelief and faith, were contending with one another for mastery, as Esau and Jacob in Rebecca's womb." Trench. συμμαθηταῖς occurs only here.—ἵνα ἀποθάνωμεν μετ' αὐτοῦ, *i.e.*, with Jesus. The expression is well illustrated by Wetstein.

Vv. 17-44. *The raising of Lazarus.*—Ver. 17. Ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὗρεν. "When, then, Jesus came, He found," implying that He did not know before, but learned from some in Bethany, αὐτὸν τέσσαρας ἡμέρας ἤδη ἔχοντα ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ "that he had been four days already in the tomb". Raphel and Wetstein give instances of this construction, and see v. 5. According to Jewish custom burial took place on the day of death, so that, allowing somewhat more than one day for the journey from the one Bethany to the other, it seems probable that Lazarus died about the time the messenger reached Jesus. At ver. 39 the time which had elapsed since death is mentioned for a different reason. Here it seems to be introduced to account for ver. 19; as also is the statement ἦν δὲ Βηθανία [ἡ deleted by Tisch. and W.H.] ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε, within easy walking distance of Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off. The form is a Latinism, used in later Greek instead of ὡς σταδίους δεκαπέντε ἀπὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων; *cf.* xii. 1, xxi. 8, Rev. xiv. 20. The nearness of Bethany accounts for the fact that πολλοὶ . . . αὐτῶν, "many of the Jews had come out to Martha and Mary". Of visits of condolence we have a specimen in Job. "Deep mourning was to last for seven days, of which the first three were those of 'weeping'. During these seven days it was, among other things, forbidden to wash, to anoint oneself, to put on shoes, to study, or to engage in any business. After that followed a lighter mourning of thirty days." Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, an interesting chapter on *In Death and after Death*. *Cf.* Gen. l. 3; Num. xx. 29; 1 Sam. xxviii. 13. Specimens of the manifestations of grief in various heathen countries and of the things said ὑπὸ τῶν παραμυθουμένων are given by Lucian in his tract *Concerning Grief.*—Ver. 20. ἡ οὖν Μάρθα . . . ἐκαθέζετο. Martha as the elder sister and mistress of the house (Lk. x. 38-40) goes out to meet Jesus, while Mary remained seated in the house. "After the body is carried out of the house all chairs and couches are reversed, and the mourners sit on the ground on a low stool." Edersheim, *loc. cit.* On

ἀδελφός μου οὐκ ἂν ἐτεθνήκει.[1] 22. ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν Θεὸν, δώσει σοι ὁ Θεός." 23. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "ᵗἈναστήσεται ὁ ἀδελφός σου." 24. Λέγει αὐτῷ Μάρθα, "Οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται, ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει ἐν ᵘτῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ." 25. Εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, κἂν ἀποθάνῃ, ζήσεται· 26. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. πιστεύεις τοῦτο;" 27. Λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ναὶ, κύριε· ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ᵛἐρχόμενος." 28. Καὶ ταῦτα[2] εἰποῦσα ἀπῆλθε, καὶ ἐφώνησε Μαρίαν τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς λάθρα,

t Is. xxvi. 19. 2 Mac. vii. 9, 14.
u vi. 39 reff.
v Mt. xi. 3

[1] **ουκ αν απεθανεν ο αδελφος μου** is the reading of ℵBCDKL 33.

[2] Instead of **ταυτα** ℵBCL read **τουτο**.

sitting as an attitude of grief see Doughty, *Analecta Sacra*, on Ezek. viii. 14.—Ver. 21. Martha's first words to Jesus, **Κύριε . . . ἐτεθνήκει**, "hadst Thou been here my brother had not died," are "not a reproach but a lament," Meyer. Mary uses the same words (ver. 32), suggesting that this had been the burden of their talk with one another; and even, as Bengel says, *before* the death "utinam adesset Dominus Jesus".—Ver. 22. But Martha not only believed that Jesus could have prevented her brother's death but also that even now He could recall him from the grave: **καὶ νῦν οἶδα . . .** "Even now I know that what thing soever you ask of God, God will give you." *Cf.* ix. 31. Jesus referred all His works to the Father, and spoke as if only faith were required for the working of the greatest miracles. See Mt. xiv. 31, xvii. 20. On the use of **αἰτεῖν** and **ἐρωτᾶν** see Ezra Abbot's *Critical Essays*, in which Trench's misleading account of their difference is exposed.—Ver. 23. **λέγει . . . σου.** "Thy brother shall rise again." "The whole history of the raising of Lazarus is a parable of life through death. . . . Here, then, at the beginning the key-note is struck." Westcott. Whether the words were meant or not to convey only the general truth of resurrection, and that death is not the final state, Martha did not find in them any assurance of the speedy restoration of Lazarus.—Ver. 24. "I know," she says, "that he will rise again, in the resurrection at the last day." On the terms used see v. 28, vi. 39, 40, 54. Belief in the resurrection had been promoted through Dan. xii. 2, and, as Holtzmann remarks, Martha must have heard more than enough about it during the last four days, and fears perhaps that even Jesus is offering the merely conventional consolation. To one who yearns for immediate re-union the "last day" seems invisible. It was small consolation for Martha to know that her brother would lie for ages in the tomb, no more to exchange one word or look till the last day.—Ver. 25. Nor does this faith satisfy Jesus, who at once replaces it by another in the words, **Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή.** Resurrection and life are not future only, but present in His person; she is to trust not in a vague remote event but in His living person whom she knew, loved, and trusted. Apart from Him there was neither resurrection nor life. He carried with Him and possessed there and then as He spoke with her all the force that went to produce life and resurrection. Therefore **ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ . . . αἰῶνα** (ver. 26), "He that believeth on me, even though he die, shall live; and every one who liveth and believeth on me shall never die". Belief in Him or acceptance of Him as the source of true spiritual life, brings the man into vital union with Him, so that he lives with the life of Christ and possesses a life over which death has no power.—Ver. 27. Martha believed this, as implicitly included in her belief in Jesus as the Messiah, **Ναὶ, Κύριε . . . ἐρχόμενος.** Resurrection and life were both Messianic gifts, but it is doubtful whether Martha fully understood what our Lord had said. Rather she falls back on what she did understand and believe. She will not claim to believe more than she is sure of; but if His statement is only an elaboration of His Messianic function, then she can truly say: **Ναὶ, Κύριε.**—

w i. 49; ii. 10.
x ver. 1.
y ver. 20.
z Mk. xii. 34.
a Here only. Gen. πρός or ἐπί.
b ver. 38. Mk. i. 43. Lam. ii. 6.

εἰποῦσα, "Ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστι καὶ [w] φωνεῖ σε." 29. Ἐκείνη ὡς ἤκουσεν, ἐγείρεται ταχὺ καὶ ἔρχεται[1] πρὸς αὐτόν. 30. οὔπω δὲ ἐληλύθει ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν [x] κώμην, ἀλλ' ἦν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ ὅπου [y] ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἡ Μάρθα. 31. οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ παραμυθούμενοι αὐτήν, ἰδόντες τὴν Μαρίαν [z] ὅτι ταχέως ἀνέστη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῇ, λέγοντες,[2] "Ὅτι ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, ἵνα κλαύσῃ ἐκεῖ." 32. Ἡ οὖν Μαρία ὡς ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἰδοῦσα αὐτόν, ἔπεσεν [a] εἰς[3] τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, λέγουσα αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε, οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανέ μου ὁ ἀδελφός." 33. Ἰησοῦς οὖν ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν, καὶ τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰουδαίους κλαίοντας [b] ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ

[1] ℵBCLX 33 read ηγερθη ταχυ και ηρχετο, "rose quickly and went," aorist and imperfect.

[2] For λεγοντες W.H. read δοξαντες, "having supposed," with ℵBC*DL 1, 33.

[3] προς is read in ℵBCDLX.

ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα, I have come to believe, I have reached the belief.—Ver. 28. **καὶ ταῦτα εἰποῦσα ἀπῆλθε**, "and when she had said this," and when some further conversation had taken place (*cf.* **φωνεῖ σε**), "she went and called Mary her sister, secretly saying to her: The Teacher is here and asks for you". The secrecy was due not so much to the presence of Jesus' enemies as to Martha's desire that Mary should meet Jesus alone, unaccompanied even by friends. For the same purpose Jesus remained in the place where He had met Martha.—Ver. 29. On the delivery of His message Mary springs up from her attitude of broken-hearted grief and comes to meet Him.—Ver. 31. But she was not allowed to go alone: **οἱ οὖν . . . ἐκεῖ**. The Jews who were with her in the house comforting her interpreted her sudden movement as one of those urgent demands of grief which already, no doubt, they had seen her yield to, and in sincere sympathy (ver. 33) followed her. —Ver. 32. Consequently when she reaches Jesus she has only time to fall at His feet and exclaim, in Martha's words, **Κύριε . . . ἀδελφός**. The sight of Jesus, **ἰδοῦσα αὐτόν**, produced a more vehement demonstration of grief than in Martha. *Cf.* Cicero, *in Verrem*, v. 39. "Mihi obviam venit et . . . mihi ad pedes misera jacuit, quasi ego excitare filium ejus ab inferis possem." Wetstein. —Ver. 33. **Ἰησοῦς οὖν . . . αὐτόν.** "Jesus, then, when He saw her weeping [**κλαίειν** is stronger than **δακρύειν** and might be rendered 'wailing'. It is joined with **ἀλαλάζειν**, Mk. v. 38; **ὀλολύζειν**, Jas. v. 1; **θορυβεῖν**, Mk. v. 39; **πενθεῖν**, Mk. xvi. 10. *Cf.* Webster's *Synonyms*] and the Jews who accompanied her wailing," **ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι**, "was indignant in spirit". The word **ἐμβριμᾶσθαι** occurs again in ver. 38 and in three other passages of the N.T., Mt. ix. 30, Mk. i. 43, and xiv. 5. In those passages it is used in its original sense of the *expression* of feeling, and might be rendered "sternly charged"; and it is in each case followed by an object in the dative. In Mt. ix. 30 Jesus sternly charged or with strong feeling charged the healed blind man not to make Him known. In Mk. i. 43 the leper is similarly charged. In Mk. xiv. 5 the bystanders express strong feeling [of indignation, **ἀγανακτοῦντες**] against Mary for her apparent extravagance. In all three passages it is used of the expression of strong feeling; but no indignation enters into its meaning in the former two passages. Here in John it is not feeling expressed, but **τῷ πνεύματι**, inwardly felt; and with only such expression as betrayed to observers that He was moved (*cf.* Mk. viii. 12, **ἀναστενάξας τῷ πνεύματι**), for **τῷ πνεύματι** cannot be the object, for this does not give a good sense and it is contradicted by **πάλιν ἐμβριμ. ἐν ἑαυτῷ** of ver. 38. It would seem, then, to mean "strongly moved in spirit". This meaning quite agrees with the accompanying clause, **καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν**, "and disturbed Himself"; precisely as we speak of a man "distressing himself," or "troubling

πνεύματι, καὶ [c] ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν, 34. καὶ εἶπε, "Ποῦ [d] τεθείκατε αὐτόν;" 35. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, [e] ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε." Ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 36. ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, "Ἴδε πῶς ἐφίλει αὐτόν." 37. Τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον, "Οὐκ ἠδύνατο [1] οὗτος [f] ὁ ἀνοίξας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ, ποιῆσαι [g] ἵνα καὶ οὗτος μὴ ἀποθάνῃ;" 38. Ἰησοῦς οὖν [h] πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. ἦν δὲ σπήλαιον, καὶ λίθος [i] ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ. 39. λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἄρατε τὸν λίθον." Λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ τεθνηκότος [2] Μάρθα, "Κύριε, ἤδη [j] ὄζει· τεταρταῖος γάρ ἐστι."

c xii. 27.
d xx. 15.
e i. 40.
f ix. 10.
g Not μὴ simply; see Burton, 206.
h ver. 33.
i xxi. 9.
j Exod. viii. 14. Ps. xxxviii. 5.

[1] εδυνατο in BCDK. [2] τετελευτηκοτος in ℵABC*DKLΠ 33.

himself," or "making himself anxious". To say that the active with the reflexive pronoun indicates that this was a voluntary act on Christ's part is to introduce a jarring note of Doketism. His sympathy with the weeping sister and the wailing crowd caused this deep emotion. To refer His strong feeling to His indignation at the "hypocritical" lamentations of the crowd is a groundless and unjust fancy contradicted by His own "weeping" (ver. 34) and by the remark of the Jews (ver. 35).—Ver. 34. His intense feeling prompts Him to end the scene, and He asks, Ποῦ τεθείκατε αὐτόν; He asks because He did not know. They reply, but probably with no expectation of what was to happen, ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε. As He went ἐδάκρυσεν, "He shed tears". To assert that such tears could only be theatrical because He knew that shortly Lazarus would live, is to show profound ignorance of human nature. And it also shows ignorance of the true sympathy requisite for miracle. "It is not with a heart of stone that the dead are raised."—Ver. 36. These tears evoked a very natural exclamation, Ἴδε πῶς ἐφίλει αὐτόν, "see how He loved him".—Ver. 37. But this again suggested to the more thoughtful and wary the question, Οὐκ . . . ἀποθάνῃ; The tears of Jesus, which manifest His love for Lazarus, puzzle them. For if He opened the eyes of a blind man, He was able to prevent the death of His friend. The question with οὐκ expects an affirmative answer. Euthymius and the Greek interpreters in general think the question was ironical and scoffing. Thus Cyril, Ποῦ ἡ ἰσχύς σου ὦ θαυματουργέ; But there is nothing in the words to justify this.—Ver. 38. Ἰησοῦς οὖν πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος. "Jesus, then, being again deeply moved." "Quia non accedit Christus ad sepulcrum tanquam otiosus spectator, sed athleta qui se ad certamen instruit, non mirum est si iterum fremat." Calvin. To refer the renewed emotion to the sayings of the Jews just reported is to take for granted that Jesus heard them, which is most unlikely. The tomb ἦν σπήλαιον . . . αὐτῷ, "was a cave," either natural, as that which Abraham bought, Gen. xxiii. 9, or artificial, hewn out of the rock, as our Lord's, Mt. xxvii. 60.—λίθος ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ, "a stone lay upon it," *i.e.*, on its mouth to prevent wild animals from entering. The supposed tomb of Lazarus is still shown and is described by several travellers.—Ver. 39. The detail, that Jesus said, Ἄρατε τὸν λίθον, is mentioned because it was an unexpected step and quickened inquiry as to what was to follow, but also because it gave rise to practical Martha's quick objection, ἤδη ὄζει. ["He employed natural means to remove natural obstructions, that His Divine power might come face to face with the supernatural element. He puts forth supernatural power to do just that which no less power could accomplish, but all the rest He bids men do in the ordinary way." Laidlaw, *Miracles*, p. 360.]—ἤδη ὄζει shows that Lazarus had not been embalmed or even wrapped in spiced grave-clothes; which, some suppose, sheds light on xii. 3. The fact is mentioned, however, to show how little Martha expected what Jesus was going to do: evidently she supposed He wished to take a last look at His friend, and she [ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος] the sister of the deceased, and therefore jealous of any exposure, interposes, knowing what He would see.—τεταρταῖος γάρ ἐστι, "for he is four days [dead]". Herodotus, ii. 89, tells us that the wives of men of rank were not at death given to the embalmers at once, ἀλλ' ἐπεὰν τριταῖαι ἢ τεταρταῖαι γένωνται. Lightfoot quotes a remarkable tradition of Ben Kaphra:

40. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐκ εἶπόν σοι, ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς, ὄψει τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ;" 41. Ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον, οὗ ἦν ὁ τεθνηκὼς κείμενος.[1] Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς [k] ἦρε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω, καὶ εἶπε, "Πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου. 42. ἐγὼ δὲ ᾔδειν ὅτι πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστῶτα εἶπον, ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας." 43. Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν, φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκραύγασε, "Λάζαρε, [l] δεῦρο ἔξω." 44. Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκὼς, δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας [m] κειρίαις, καὶ ἡ [n] ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Λύσατε αὐτὸν, καὶ ἄφετε ὑπάγειν."

45. Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὴν Μαρίαν, καὶ θεασάμενοι ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν. 46. τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους, καὶ εἶπον αὐτοῖς ἃ

k iv. 35. Ps. cxxi. 1.
l Dan. xii. 9. Acts vii. 34.
m Prov. vii. 16 only.
n Jer. iii. 3. Song ii. 14. Rev. i. 16.

[1] The clause **ου . . . κειμενος** is obviously a gloss and is not found in ℵBC*DL 33.

"Grief reaches its height on the third day. For three days the spirit hovers about the tomb, if perchance it may return to the body. But when it sees the fashion of the countenance changed, it retires and abandons the body."—Ver. 40. But Martha's incredulity is mildly rebuked, **Οὐκ εἶπόν σοι . . . Θεοῦ;** "Did I not say to you, that if you believed, you would see the glory of God?" recalling rather what He had said (ver. 4) to the disciples than what He had said to Martha (vv. 23-26); but the conversation is, as already noted, abridged.—Ver. 41. Accordingly, notwithstanding her remonstrance, and because it was now perceived that Jesus had some end in view that was hidden from them, they lifted the stone, **ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον.**—**Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς . . . ἀπέστειλας.** "But Jesus lifted His eyes upwards and said, Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard me." No pomp of incantation, no wrestling in prayer even; but simple words of thanksgiving, as if already Lazarus was restored. [Origen thinks that the spirit of Lazarus had already returned. **Ἀντὶ εὐχῆς ηὐχαρίστησε, κατανοήσας τὴν Λαζάρου ψυχὴν εἰσελθοῦσαν εἰς τὸ σῶμα.**] The prayer which He thanks the Father for hearing had been offered during the two days in Peraea. And the thanksgiving was more likely to impress the crowd now than in the excitement following the resurrection of Lazarus. Therefore He thanks the Father because it was essential that the miracle should be referred to its real source, and that all should recognise that it was the Father who had sent this power among men.—Ver. 43. Having thus turned the faith of the bystanders to the Father, **φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκραύγασε,** "He cried with a great voice," "that all might hear its authoritativeness" (Euthymius). "Talis vox opposita est omni magico murmuri, quale incantatores in suis praestigiis adhibere solent." Lampe. More probably, as Lampe also suggests, it was the natural utterance of His confidence, and of the authority He felt. **κραυγάζω** is an old word, see Plato, *Rep.*, 607 B, but is principally used in late Greek (Rutherford's *New Phryn.*, 425).—**Λάζαρε δεῦρο ἔξω.** "Lazarus, come forth," or as Weiss renders, "hier heraus," "huc foras," "hither, out"; but on the whole the E.V. is best. Sometimes an imperative is added to **δεῦρο**, as **χώρει σὺ δεῦρο** (Paley's *Com. Frag.*, p. 16).—Ver. 44. **Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκώς,** "And out came the dead man," **δεδεμένος . . . περιεδέδετο,** "bound feet and hands with grave-bands," **κειρίαις,** apparently the linen bandages with which the corpse was swathed. Opinions are fully given in Lampe. "And his face was bound about with a napkin." *Cf.* xx. 7. "The trait marks an eye-witness," Westcott.—**λέγει . . . ὑπάγειν.** "Jesus says to them, 'Loose him and let him go away'." He did not require support, and he could not relish the gaze of the throng in his present condition.

Vv. 45-54. *The consequences of the miracle.*—Ver. 45. **Πολλοὶ οὖν . . . αὐτόν.** "Many therefore of the Jews, *viz.*, those who had come to Mary and seen what Jesus did, believed on Him." That is to say, all the Jews who thus

ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 47. συνήγαγον οὖν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι [o] συνέδριον, καὶ ἔλεγον, "Τί ποιοῦμεν; ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος πολλὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖ. 48. ἐὰν [p] ἀφῶμεν αὐτὸν οὕτω, πάντες πιστεύσουσιν εἰς αὐτόν· καὶ ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ ἀροῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος." 49. Εἷς δέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καϊάφας, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν· 50. οὐδὲ διαλογίζεσθε,[1] ὅτι συμφέρει ἡμῖν,[2] [q] ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος

o Jer. xv. 17. See Thayer.
p Mt. xv. 14; xxvii. 49.
q xvi. 7. Mt. v. 29. Lk. xvii. 2. 1 Cor. iv. 3.

[1] λογιζεσθε in ℵABDL 1, 22. T.R. poorly authenticated.
[2] υμιν in BDLM. ημιν in AEGHΠ.

came and saw believed.—Ver. 46. But of this number [it may be "of the Jews" generally, and not of those who had been at Bethany] some went away to the Pharisees and told them, His recognised enemies, what He had done. Whether they did this in good faith or not does not appear.—Ver. 47. The Pharisees at once acted on the information, **συνήγαγον . . . συνέδριον**. The chief priests, who were Sadducees, and the Pharisees, their natural foes, but who together composed the supreme authority, "called together a meeting of the Sanhedrim". The key-note of the meeting was struck in the words **τί ποιοῦμεν;** "What are we doing?" *i.e.*, why are we doing nothing? The indicative, not the deliberative subjunctive. The reason for shaking off this inertia is **ὅτι . . . ποιεῖ**. The miracles are not denied, but their probable consequence is indicated.—Ver. 48. **ἐὰν ἀφῶμεν . . . ἔθνος**. "If we let Him thus alone," *i.e.*, if we do no more to put an end to His miracles than we are doing, "all will believe on Him; and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation". **ἡμῶν** emphatic. The raising of Lazarus and the consequent accession of adherents to Jesus made it probable that the people as a whole would attach themselves to Him as Messiah; and the consequence of the Jews choosing a king of their own would certainly be that the Romans would come and exterminate them.—**τὸν τόπον** one would naturally render "our land" as co-ordinate with **τὸ ἔθνος** ["Land und Leute," Luther], and probably this is the meaning; although in 2 Macc. v. 19 in a very similar connection **ὁ τόπος** means the Temple: **οὐ διὰ τὸν τόπον τὸ ἔθνος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἔθνος τὸν τόπον ὁ Κύριος ἐξελέξατο**. Others, with less warrant, think the holy city is meant. —Ver. 49. **Εἷς δέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καϊάφας.** "But a certain one of them, Caiaphas." Winer (p. 146) says that **τὶς** does not destroy the arithmetical force of **εἷς**. This may be so: but the use of **εἷς** in similar forms is a peculiarity of later Greek. Caiaphas (Mt. xxvi. 3) is a surname = Kephas, added to the original name of this High Priest, Joseph. He held office from A.D. 18 to 36, when he was deposed by Vitellius.—**ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου**, "being High Priest that year," not as if the writer supposed the high priesthood was an office held for a year only, but desiring to emphasise that during that marked and fatal year of our Lord's crucifixion Caiaphas held the position of highest authority: as if he said "during the year of which we speak Caiaphas was High Priest". "Non vocat anni illius pontificem, quod annuum duntaxat esset munus, sed quum venale esset transferretur ad varios homines praeter Legis praescriptum." Calvin. And Josephus (*Ant.*, xx. 10) reminds us that there were twenty-eight high priests in 107 years.—**Ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν.** "Ye [contemptuous] know nothing at all," **οὐδὲ λογίζεσθε**, "nor do ye take account that it is expedient for you that one man die for the people, and the whole nation perish not". The **ἵνα** clause is the subject of the sentence, "that one man die for the people is expedient"; as frequently, *cf.* Mt. x. 25, xviii. 6, John xvi. 7, 1 Cor. iv. 3. On the use of **ἵνα** in this Gospel see Burton's *Moods and Tenses*, 211-219. Caiaphas enounced an unquestionably sound principle (see Wetstein's examples); but nothing could surpass the cold-blooded craft of his application of it. He saw that an opportunity was given them of at once getting rid of an awkward factor in their community, a person dangerous to their influence, and of currying favour with Rome, by putting to death one who was claiming to be king of the Jews. "Why!" he says, "do you not see that

ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται." 51. Τοῦτο δὲ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, προεφήτευσεν[1] ὅτι ἔμελλεν[2] ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους, 52. καὶ [r] οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ [s] διεσκορπισμένα [t] συναγάγῃ [u] εἰς ἕν. 53. ἀπ' ἐκείνης οὖν τῆς ἡμέρας συνεβουλεύσαντο[3] ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν. 54. Ἰησοῦς οὖν οὐκ ἔτι παρρησίᾳ [v] περιεπάτει ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν χώραν [w] ἐγγὺς τῆς ἐρήμου, εἰς Ἐφραῒμ λεγομένην πόλιν, κἀκεῖ διέτριβε[4] μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. 55. ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ ἀνέβησαν πολλοὶ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἐκ τῆς χώρας πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα, ἵνα [x] ἁγνίσωσιν ἑαυτούς.

r Not μὴ μόνον. See Acts xxi. 13. 2 Cor. viii. 10. Burton, 481.
s Mt. xxvi. 31.
t Is. lvi. 8.
u xvii. 23.
v vii. 1.
w ver. 18.
x Acts xxi. 24; xxiv. 18.

[1] επροφητευσεν in ℵBDLX 33. The usage is given in Winer, p. 84.

[2] ημελλεν in ABDL 1, 33. See Winer, p. 82.

[3] εβουλευσαντο in ℵBD 13, 69.

[4] εμεινεν in ℵBL; cp. iii. 22.

this man with His *eclát* and popular following, instead of endangering us and bringing suspicion on our loyalty, is exactly the person we may use to exhibit our fidelity to the empire? Sacrifice Jesus, and you will not only rid yourselves of a troublesome person, but will show a watchful zeal for the supremacy of Rome, which will ingratiate you with the imperial authorities."—Ver. 51. **Τοῦτο δὲ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ εἶπεν . . . προεφήτευσεν.** **ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ**, "at his own instigation," is contrasted with "at the instigation of God" implied in **ἐπροφήτευσεν** [Kypke gives interesting examples of the use of **ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ** in classical writers]. "None but a Jew would be likely to know of the old Jewish belief that the high priest by means of the Urim and Thummim was the mouthpiece of the Divine oracle." Plummer. Calvin calls him "bilingual," and compares his unconscious service to that of Balaam. John sees that this unscrupulous diplomatist, who supposed that he was moving Jesus and the council and the Romans as so many pieces in his own game, was himself used as God's mouthpiece to predict the event which brought to a close his own and all other priesthood. In the irony of events he unconsciously used his high-priestly office to lead forward that one sacrifice which was for ever to take away sin and so make all further priestly office superfluous. He prophesied "that Jesus was to die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but that also the children of God who were scattered in various places should be gathered into one". **ὅτι** is rendered "because" by Weiss and others. Jesus was to die **ὑπὲρ τὸ ἔθνος**, although not in Caiaphas' sense; and His death had the wider object of bringing into one whole, of truer solidarity than the nation, all God's children wherever at present scattered. *Cf.* x. 16, Eph. ii. 14. The expression **τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ** is used proleptically of the Gentiles who were destined to become God's children. So Euthymius. For the phrase **συνάγειν εἰς ἓν** Meyer refers to Plato, *Phileb.*, 378, C, and Eurip., *Orestes*, 1640.—Ver. 53. This utterance of Caiaphas brought sudden light to the members of the Sanhedrim, and so influenced their perplexed mind that **ἀπ' ἐκείνης ἡμέρας συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν.** This was the crisis: what hitherto they had desired (v. 16, 18, vii. 32, x. 39) they now determined in council. —Ver. 54. Jesus accordingly, **Ἰησοῦς οὖν**, not to precipitate matters, **οὐκ ἔτι . . . αὐτοῦ**, "no longer went about openly among the Jews, but departed thence (*i.e.*, from Bethany or Jerusalem and its neighbourhood) to the country near the desert (**χώραν** in contrast to the city; the particular part being the wilderness of Bethaven, a few miles north-east of Jerusalem) to a city called Ephraim (now Et-Taiyibeh, anciently Ophrah, see Smith's *Hist. Geog.*, 256, 352; 'perched on a conspicuous eminence and with an extensive view, thirteen miles north of Jerusalem,' Henderson's *Palestine*, p. 161), and there He spent some time with His disciples".

Vv. 55-57. *Approach of the Passover.* —Ver. 55. **ἦν δὲ . . . ἑαυτούς.** "Now

56. ἐζήτουν οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἔλεγον μετ' ἀλλήλων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἑστηκότες, "Τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν;" 57. Δεδώκεισαν δὲ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐντολήν,[1] ἵνα ἐάν τις γνῷ ποῦ ἐστι, μηνύσῃ, ὅπως πιάσωσιν αὐτόν.

XII. 1. Ὁ ΟΥΝ Ἰησοῦς [a] πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν, ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος ὁ τεθνηκώς,[2] ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν. 2. [b] ἐποίησαν οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἡ Μάρθα διηκόνει· ὁ δὲ Λάζαρος εἷς ἦν τῶν συνανακειμένων[3] αὐτῷ. 3. Ἡ οὖν Μαρία λαβοῦσα [c] λίτραν μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου, [d] ἤλειψε τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ [d] ἐξέμαξε ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ·

a Amos i. 1. 2 Mac. xv. 36.
b Dan. v. 1. Mk. vi. 21.
c xix. 39.
d xi. 2.

[1] εντολην in ADL, it. vulg., etc.; εντολας in ℵB 1.

[2] ο τεθνηκως omitted by Ti.W.H.R. with ℵBLX. T.R. in ADIΓΔ. The words have some appearance of a gloss for greater perspicuity.

[3] ανακειμενων συν in ℵABDILΠ.

the Passover of the Jews was at hand, and many went up to Jerusalem out of the country before the Passover to purify themselves." *Cf.* xviii. 28, Num. ix. 10, 2 Chron. xxx. 17. Some purifications required a week, others consisted only of shaving the head and washing the clothes. See Lightfoot *in loc.*—Ver. 56. **ἐζήτουν . . . ἑορτήν;** Jesus was one main topic of conversation among those who stood about in groups in the Temple when their purifications had been got through; and the chief point discussed was whether He would appear at this feast. *Cf.* vii. 10-13.—Ver. 57. There was room for difference of opinion, for **Δεδώκεισαν . . . αὐτόν**, "the Sanhedrim had issued instructions that if any knew where He was he should intimate this, that they might arrest Him".

CHAPTER XII.—Vv. 1-11. *Jesus embalmed in the love of His intimates.*—Ver. 1. **Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς . . . Βηθανίαν.** **οὖν** takes us back to xi. 55; the Passover being at hand, Jesus therefore came to Bethany.—**πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα**, not, as Vulgate, "ante sex dies Paschae," but with Beza "sex ante Pascha diebus". So Amos i. 1, **πρὸ δύο ἐτῶν τοῦ σεισμοῦ.** Josephus, *Antiq.*, xv. 14, **πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῆς ἑορτῆς.** Other examples in Kypke; *cf.* x. 18, xxi. 8, and see Viereck's *Sermo Graecus*, p. 81. Six days before the Passover probably means the Sabbath before His death. According to John Jesus died on Friday, and six days before that would be a Sabbath. But it is difficult to ascertain with exactness what day is intended. Bethany is now described as the place **ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος ὁ τεθνηκώς.** This description is given to explain what follows.—Ver. 2. **ἐποίησαν . . . αὐτῷ. ἐποίησαν** is the indefinite plural: "they made Him" a supper; **δεῖπνον**, originally any meal, came to be used invariably of the evening meal.—**καὶ ἡ Μάρθα διηκόνει**, "and Martha waited at table," which was her peculiar province (Lk. x. 40).—**ὁ δὲ Λάζαρος . . . αὐτῷ.** This is mentioned, not to show that Lazarus was still alive and well, but because the feast was not in his house but in that of Simon the leper (Mk. xiv. 3, Mt. xxvi. 6). That this was the same feast as that mentioned by the Synoptists is apparent; the only discrepancy of any consequence being that the Synoptists seem to place the feast only two days before the Passover. But they introduce the feast parenthetically to present the immediate motive of Judas' action, and accordingly disregard strict chronology.—Ver. 3. **Ἡ οὖν Μαρία . . .** The third member of the Bethany family appears also in character, **λαβοῦσα λίτραν μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου. λίτρα** (Lat. libra), the unit of weight in the Roman empire, slightly over eleven ounces avoirdupois. **μύρον** (from **μύρω**, to trickle, or from **μύρρα**, myrrh, the juice of the Arabian myrtle) is any unguent, more costly and luxurious than the ordinary **ἔλαιον**. *Cf.* Lk. vii. 46, and Trench, *Synonyms.* **νάρδος**, "the head or spike of a fragrant East Indian plant belonging to the genus *Valeriana*, which yields a juice of delicious odour which the ancients used in the preparation of a most precious ointment". Thayer. **πιστικῆς** is sometimes derived from

e With ἐκ here only. f Mk. xiv. 5. g x. 13. h xiii. 29. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 10.

ἡ δὲ οἰκία ᵉἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου. 4. λέγει οὖν εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Ἰούδας Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτης, ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι, 5. "Διατί τοῦτο τὸ μύρον οὐκ ἐπράθη ᶠτριακοσίων δηναρίων, καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς;" 6. Εἶπε δὲ τοῦτο, οὐχ ὅτι ᵍπερὶ τῶν πτωχῶν ᵍἔμελεν αὐτῷ, ἀλλ' ὅτι κλέπτης ἦν, καὶ τὸ ʰγλωσσόκομον

πίστις, and rendered "genuine," γνήσιος, δόκιμος. Thus Euthymius, ἀκράτου καὶ καταπεπιστευμένης εἰς καθαρότητα, unadulterated and guaranteed pure. But πιστός is the common form; *cf.* Θηρικλέους πιστὸν τέκνον, Theopomp. in *Com. Frag.* Some suppose it indicates the name of the place where the nard was obtained. Thus Augustine: "Quod ait 'pistici,' locum aliquem credere debemus, unde hoc erat unguentum pretiosum". Similarly some modern scholars derive it from Opis (sc. Opistike), a Babylonian town. In the *Classical Review* (July, 1890) Mr. Bennett suggests that it should be written πιστακῆς, and that it refers to the *Pistacia Terebinthus*, which grows in Cyprus, Chios, and Palestine, and yields a turpentine in such inconsiderable quantities as to be very costly. The word is most fully discussed by Fritzsche on Mk. xiv. 3, who argues at great length and with much learning for the meaning "drinkable". He quotes Athenaeus in proof that some ointments were drunk, mixed with wine. πιστός is the word commonly used for "potable," as in Aesch., *Prom. Vinct.*, 480, where Prometheus says man had no defence against disease οὔτε βρώσιμον, οὐ χριστὸν, οὔτε πιστόν. And Fritzsche holds that while πιστός means "qui bibi potest," πιστικός means "qui facile bibi potest". The weight and nature of the ointment are specified to give force to the added πολυτίμου; see ver. 5.—ἤλειψε τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Mt. and Mk. say "the head," which was the more natural but less significant, and in the circumstances less convenient, mode of disposing of the ointment.—καὶ ἐξέμαξε . . . αὐτοῦ, "and wiped His feet with her hair". Holtzmann thinks this an infelicitous combination of Mk. xiv. 3 and Lk. vii. 38; infelicitous because the anointing of the feet which was appropriate in the humbled penitent was not so in Mary's case; and the drying with her hair which was suitable where tears had fallen was unsuitable where anointing had taken place, for the unguent should have been allowed to remain. This, however, is infelicitous criticism. In Aristoph., *Wasps*, 607, the *daughter* anoints her father's feet: ἡ θυγάτηρ . . . τὼ πόδ' ἀλείφῃ; and if, as Fritzsche supposes, the ointment was liquid, there is nothing inappropriate but the reverse in the wiping with the hair.—ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μυροῦ, at once attracting attention and betraying the costliness of the offering.—Ver. 4. Hence the οὖν in ver. 4, λέγει οὖν εἷς . . . πτωχοῖς; "one" of His disciples. Matthew (xxvi. 8) leaves all the disciples under the reproach, which John transfers to Judas alone. On the designation of Judas see vi. 71. Westcott, however, with a harmonising tendency, says "Judas expressed what others felt". But this is contradicted by the motive which John ascribes to Judas, ver. 6.—Διατί . . . δηναρίων. Three hundred denarii would equal a day labourer's wage for one year.—Ver. 6. Εἶπε δὲ τοῦτο . . . ἐβάσταζεν. "This he said, not because he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief." Before John could make this accusation, he must have had proof; how or when we do not know. But the next clauses, being in the imperfect, imply that his pilfering was habitual.—τὸ γλωσσόκομον, "the bag," better "the purse," or "box," "loculos habens," Vulgate. In the form γλωσσοκομεῖον (which Phrynichus declares to be the proper form, see Rutherford, p. 181) the word occurs in the *Bacchae* of Lysippus to denote a case for holding the tongue pieces of musical instruments (γλῶσσαι, κομέω). Hence it came to be used of any box, chest, or coffer. In Sept. it occurs in 2 Sam. vi. 11 (Codd. A, 247, and Aquila) of the Ark of the Lord; in 2 Chron. xxiv. 8 of the chest for collections in the Temple. This chest had a hole in the lid, and the people cast in (ἐνέβαλον, *cf.* τὰ βαλλόμενα here) their contributions. (Further see Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 42, and Field's *Otium Norvic.*, 68.)—τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν. The R.V. renders "took away what was put therein". Certainly, to say that Judas had the money box and carried what was put therein is flat and tautological. And that ἐβάσταζεν can bear the sense of "take

εἶχε, καὶ[1] τὰ βαλλόμενα [i] ἐβάσταζεν. 7. εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[j] Ἄφες αὐτήν· εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τετήρηκεν[2] αὐτό. 8. τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' [k] ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε."

9. Ἔγνω οὖν ὄχλος[3] πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὅτι ἐκεῖ [l] ἐστι· καὶ ἦλθον [m] οὐ διὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἴδωσιν, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν. 10 ἐβουλεύσαντο δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, [n] ἵνα καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον ἀποκτείνωσιν· 11. ὅτι πολλοὶ δι' αὐτὸν ὑπῆγον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ ἐπίστευον εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

i xx. 15.
j x. 48. Mt. xxvii. 49.
k See Simcox, *Gram.* p. 63.
l i. 40.
m xi. 52.
n Burton, 205.

[1] For ειχε, και ℵBD 33 read εχων.

[2] T.R. in AΓΔ; ινα (inserted after αυτην) . . . τηρηση in ℵBDKL 33, it. vulg. Aegypt. Arm. Goth. So Ti.W H.R. T.R. gives the better meaning; the difficulty invited alteration.

[3] ℵB*L insert ο; adopted by Ti.W.H.R.

away" or "make away with" is beyond dispute. The passages cited by Kypke and Field (Soph., *Philoct.*, 1105; Josephus, *Antiq.*, ix. 2; Diog., *Laert.*, iv. 59) prove that it was used of "taking away by stealth" or "purloining"; and *cf.* the use of φέρειν in Eur., *Hec.*, 792. Liddell and Scott aptly compare the Scots use of "lift" in "cattle-lifting" and so forth. Mary found a prompt champion in Jesus: Ἄφες αὐτήν, "let her alone". R.V. renders: "Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying"; and in margin: "Let her alone: *it was* that she might keep it". This Westcott understands as meaning "suffer her to keep it—this was her purpose, and let it not be disturbed—for my preparation for burial". But, however we understand it, there is a palpable absurdity in our Lord's requesting that which had already been poured out to be kept for His burial. On the other hand, if the reading of A adopted in T.R. τετήρηκεν was the original reading, it might naturally be altered owing to the scribe's inability to perceive how this day of anointing could be called the day of His ἐνταφιασμός, and how the ointment could be said to have been kept till that day (*cf.* Field, *Otium Norvic.*, p. 69). τετήρηκεν is opposed to ἐπράθη (ver. 5); she had not sold, but kept it; and she kept it, perhaps unconsciously, against the day of His entombment or preparation for burial. ἐνταφιασμός is rather the preparation for burial than the actual interment. *Vide* especially Kypke on Mk. xiv. 8. This anointing was His true embalming. Mary's love was representative of the love of His intimate friends in whose loyal affection He was embalmed so that His memory could never die. The significance of the incident lies precisely in this, that Mary's action is the evidence that Jesus may now die, having already found an enduring place for Himself in the regard of His friends. It is possible that Mary herself, enlightened by her love, had a presentiment that this was the last tribute she could ever pay her Lord.—Ver. 8. As for Judas' suggestion, He disposes of it, τοὺς πτωχοὺς . . . ἔχετε. "For the poor ye have always with you," and every day, therefore, have opportunities of considering and relieving them, "but me ye have not always," and therefore this apparent extravagance, being occasional only, finds justification. Occasional lavish expenditure on friends is justified by continuous expenditure on the real necessities of the poor.—Ver. 9. Ἔγνω οὖν ὄχλος πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. "A great crowd of the Jews"; ὄχλος is generally used by John in contrast to the Jewish authorities, and R.V. renders "the common people". When they knew that Jesus was in Bethany they went out from Jerusalem to see Him and Lazarus: an easily accessible and undoubted sensation. The result was that many of the Jews, on identifying Lazarus, believed on Jesus. Accordingly ἐβουλεύσαντο . . . ἀποκτείνωσιν. The high priests, being Sadducees, could not bear to have in their neighbourhood a living witness to the possibility of living through death, and a powerful testimony to the power of Jesus. And so, to prevent the people believing on Jesus, they made the monstrous proposal to put Lazarus,

12. Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὄχλος πολὺς ὁ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, 13. ἔλαβον τὰ βαΐα τῶν φοινίκων, καὶ ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἔκραζον,[1] "[o] Ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ." 14. Εὑρὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὀνάριον, ἐκάθισεν ἐπ' αὐτὸ, καθώς ἐστι [p] γεγραμμένον, 15. 'Μὴ φοβοῦ, θύγατερ Σιών· ἰδοὺ, ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεται, καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου.' 16. ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ [q] τὸ πρῶτον· ἀλλ' ὅτε [r] ἐδοξάσθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τότε ἐμνήσθησαν ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα, καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ. 17. ἐμαρτύρει οὖν ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ὢν μετ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτε τὸν Λάζαρον ἐφώνησεν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου, καὶ [s] ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν·

o Ps. cxviii. 25, 26.
p Zech. ix. 9.
q x. 40.
r vii. 39 reff.
s ver. 1.

[1] εκραυγαζον in ℵB[3]DL.

an entirely innocent person, to death. In Mary John has shown faith and devotion at their ripest: in this devilish proposal the obduracy of unbelief is exhibited in its extreme form.

Vv. 12-19. *The triumphal entry into Jerusalem.*—Ver. 12. **Τῇ ἐπαύριον**, *i.e.*, probably on Sunday, called Palm Sunday in the Church year [**κυριακὴ τῶν βαΐων**, dominica palmarum, or, in ramis palmarum]. Four days before the Passover the Jews were required to select a lamb for the feast.—**ὄχλος πολὺς ὁ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν**, and therefore not Jerusalemites, **ἀκούσαντες . . . ἔλαβον τὰ βαΐα τῶν φοινίκων** "took the fronds of the palms," *the* palms which every one knew as growing on the road from Jerusalem to Bethany. The **βαΐα** (from Coptic **βαι**) were recognised as symbols of victory or rejoicing. *Cf.* 1 Macc. xiii. 51, **μετὰ αἰνέσεως καὶ βαΐων**. So Pausanias (viii. 48), **ἐς δὲ τὴν δεξιάν ἐστι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἐστιθέμενος φοῖνιξ**. *Cf.* Hor., *Odes*, I. i. 5, "palma nobilis". This demonstration was evidently the result of recent events, especially, as stated in ver. 18, of the raising of Lazarus.—Ver. 13. **εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ**. "Substantives derived from verbs which govern a dative are sometimes followed by this case, instead of the ordinary genitive." Winer, 264. They left no doubt as to the meaning of the demonstration, **ἔκραζον Ὡσαννά . . . Ἰσραήλ**. These words are taken from Ps. cxviii. 25, 26; written as the Dedication Psalm of the second Temple. **Ὡσαννά** is the Hebrew הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא, "save now". The words were originally addressed to approaching worshippers; here they designate the Messiah; but that no mistake might be possible as to the present reference, the people add, **ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ**.—Ver. 14. Jesus being thus hailed as king by the people, **εὑρὼν ὀνάριον . . . ὄνου**, *i.e.*, He accepted the homage and declared Himself king by adopting the prediction of Zech. ix. 9 (ver. 15), "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion (**χαῖρε σφόδρα** instead of **μὴ φοβοῦ**), proclaim it aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold the king is coming to thee, just and saving, He is meek and riding on a beast of burden and a young foal". The significance of the "ass" is shown in what follows: "He shall destroy the chariots out of Ephraim and the horse out of Jerusalem, and the war-bow shall be utterly destroyed: and there shall be abundance and peace". By riding into Jerusalem as king but on an ass, not on a war horse, He continued to claim to be Messiah but ruling by spiritual force for spiritual ends.—Ver. 16. The significance of His action was not at that time perceived by the disciples: **ταῦτα . . . πρῶτον**, but when Jesus had been glorified, then they remembered that this had been written concerning Him and that the people had made this demonstration in His favour, **καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ**.—Ver. 17. In verses 17 and 18 this demonstration is carefully traced to the raising of Lazarus: "the crowd which was with Him when He summoned Lazarus from the tomb, and raised him from the dead, testified [that He had done so], and on this account the crowd went out to meet Him, because they had heard this testimony". The demonstration is thus rendered intelligible. In the Synoptists it is not accounted for. He is represented as

18. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος, ὅτι ἤκουσε τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον. 19. οἱ οὖν Φαρισαῖοι εἶπον πρὸς ἑαυτούς, "[t] Θεωρεῖτε ὅτι οὐκ ὠφελεῖτε οὐδέν; ἴδε ὁ κόσμος [u] ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν."

20. Ἦσαν δέ τινες Ἕλληνες ἐκ τῶν [v] ἀναβαινόντων, ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ· 21. οὗτοι οὖν προσῆλθον Φιλίππῳ τῷ ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες, "Κύριε, θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν." 22. Ἔρχεται Φίλιππος καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἀνδρέᾳ· καὶ πάλιν Ἀνδρέας καὶ Φίλιππος λέγουσι τῷ Ἰησοῦ. 23. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίνατο[1] αὐτοῖς λέγων, "Ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα [w] ἵνα [x] δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. 24. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ [y] κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἀποθάνῃ, αὐτὸς μόνος μένει· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ, πολὺν καρπὸν φέρει. 25. ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει[2] αὐτήν· καὶ ὁ μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν

t iv. 19.
u Mk. i. 20.
v Zech. xiv. 16.
w i. 27; ii. 25, etc. See Burton, 216.
x ver. 16.
y Mt. xiii. 31. 1 Cor. xv. 37.

[1] αποκρινεται in ℵBLX 33. [2] T.R. in ADX, it. vulg.; απολλυει in ℵBL 33.

entering the city with the pilgrims, and no reason is assigned for the sudden outburst of feeling. See Mk. xi. 1, etc. —Ver. 19. The effect on the Pharisees is, as usual, recorded by John; they said one to another, **Θεωρεῖτε . . . ἀπῆλθεν.** "Do you see how helpless you are? The world is gone after Him." For **ὁ κόσμος** see 4 Macc. xvii. 14 and French "tout le monde". For **ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ** see 2 Sam. xv. 13.

Vv. 20-36. *The Greeks inquire for Jesus.*—Ver. 20. **Ἦσαν δέ τινες Ἕλληνες ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων** . . . Among the crowds who came up to worship in the feast were some Greeks; not Hellenists, but men of pure Greek extraction; proselytes belonging to Decapolis, Galilee, or some country more remote.—Ver. 21. **οὗτοι οὖν προσῆλθον Φιλίππῳ,** "these came therefore to Philip," probably because they had learned that he knew their language; or, as indicated in the addition, **τῷ . . . Γαλιλαίας,** because they had seen him in Galilee. Their request to Philip was, **Κύριε . . . ἰδεῖν.** "Sir, we would see Jesus"; not merely to see Him, for this they could have managed without the aid of a disciple, but to interview the person regarding whom they found all Jerusalem ringing. Philip does not take the sole responsibility of this introduction on himself, because, since they, as Apostles, had been forbidden to go to the Gentiles, Philip might suppose that Jesus would decline to see these Greeks. He therefore tells Andrew (*cf.* i. 44; vi. 7, 8), his fellow-townsman, and together they venture to make known to Jesus the request.—Ver. 23. **ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς,** "Jesus answers them," *i.e.*, the two disciples, but probably the Greeks had come with them and heard the words: **Ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ἔρχεται ὥρα** is followed by **ὅτε** in iv. 21, v. 25, and by **ἐν ᾗ** in v. 28. Burton calls it "the complementary" use of **ἵνα.** "The hour is come that the Son of Man should be glorified." Directly the glorification of the Son of Man or Messiah consisted in His being acknowledged by men; and this earnest inquiry of the Greeks was the evidence that His claims were being considered beyond the circle of the Jewish people.—Ver. 24. But second to the thought of His enthronement as Messiah comes the thought of the way to it: **ἀμὴν . . . φέρει,** "except the grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abides itself alone; but if it die, it bears much fruit". The seed reaches its full and proper development by being sown in the ground and dying. It is this process, apparently destructive, and which calls for faith in the sower, which disengages the forces of the seed and allows it to multiply itself. To preserve the seed from this burial in the ground is to prevent it from attaining its best development and use. The law of the seed is the law of human life.—Ver. 25. **ὁ φιλῶν . . . αὐτήν,** he that so prizes his life [**φιλοψυχεῖν** is used in the classics of excessive love of life. See Kypke] that he cannot let it out of his own hand or give it up to good ends checks its growth, and it withers and dies: whereas he who treats his life as if he hated it, giving it up freely to the needs of other men, shall

τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν. 26. ἐὰν ἐμοὶ [z] διακονῇ τις, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθείτω· καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται· καὶ ἐάν τις ἐμοὶ διακονῇ, τιμήσει αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ.

27. "Νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου [a] τετάρακται· καὶ τί εἴπω; πάτερ, σῶσόν με [b] ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης. ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ὥραν ταύτην. 28. πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα." Ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, "Καὶ ἐδόξασα, καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω." 29. Ὁ οὖν ὄχλος ὁ ἑστὼς καὶ ἀκούσας ἔλεγε βροντὴν γεγονέναι. ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, "Ἄγγελος αὐτῷ λελάληκεν." 30. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν, "Οὐ δι' ἐμὲ αὕτη ἡ φωνὴ γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ δι' ὑμᾶς. 31. νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου

z Mt. xxv. 44.
a Gen. xli. 8.
b Heb. v. 7. Jas. v. 20.

keep it to life eternal. **φυλάξει**, "shall guard," suggested by the apparent lack of guarding and preserving in the **μισῶν**. He has not guarded it from the claims made upon it in this world, but thus has guarded it to life eternal.—Ver. 26. This law is applicable not to Jesus only, but to all: **ἐὰν ἐμοὶ . . . ἀκολουθείτω**. The badge of His servants is that they adopt His method and aim and truly follow Him. The result of following necessarily is that **ὅπου . . . ἔσται**, "where I am, as my eternal state, there shall also my servant be". **διάκονος** is especially a servant *in attendance*, at table or elsewhere; a **δοῦλος** may serve at a distance: hence the appropriateness of **διάκονος** in this verse. The office of **διάκονος** may seem a humble and painful one, but **ἐάν τις** [omit **καὶ**] . . . **πατήρ**, to be valued or honoured by the Father crowns life.—Ver. 27. The distinct and near prospect of the cross as the path to glory which these Greeks called up in His thoughts prompts Him to exclaim: **Νῦν ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται**, "Now is my soul troubled". **ψυχή** is, as Weiss remarks, synonymous with **πνεῦμα**, see xiii. 21. A conflict of emotions disturbs His serenity. "Concurrebat horror mortis et ardor obedientiae." Bengel. **καὶ τί εἴπω;** "And what shall I say?" This clause certainly suggests that the next should also be interrogative, "Shall I say, Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause (or, with this object) came I to this hour." That is, if He should now pray to be delivered from death this would be to stultify all He had up to this time been doing; for without His death His life would be fruitless. He would still be a seed preserved and not sown.—Ver. 28. Therefore He prays: **Πάτερ δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα**. "Father, glorify Thy name." Complete that manifestation of Thy holiness and love which through me Thou art making; complete it even at the cost of my agony.—**Ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ . . . δοξάσω.** "There came, therefore, a voice out of heaven: I have both glorified it and will again glorify it." However Jesus might seem in the coming days to be tossed on the sea of human passions, the Father was steadily guiding all to the highest end. The assurance that His death would glorify God was, of course, that which nerved Jesus for its endurance. He was not throwing His life away.—Ver. 29. **Ὁ οὖν ὄχλος . . . λελάληκεν.** The mass of the people which was standing by and heard the voice did not recognise it as a voice, but said it thundered. Others caught, if not the words, yet enough to perceive it was articulate speech, and said that an angel had spoken to Him.—Ver. 30. **Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς.** Jesus, hearing these conjectures, explained to them that not on His account but on theirs this voice had been uttered. It was of immense importance that the disciples, and the people generally, should understand that the sudden transition from the throne offered by the triumphal acclamation of the previous day to the cross, was not a defeat but a fulfilment of the Divine purpose. The voice furnished them against the coming trial.—Ver. 31. It was a trial not so much of Him as of the world: **νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου**. In the events of the next few days the world was to be judged by its treatment of Jesus. *Cf.* iii. 18, v. 27. Calvin, adopting the fuller meaning given to the Hebrew word "judge," thinks that the restoration of the world to its legitimate rule and order is signified. A fuller explanation follows in the clauses, **νῦν ὁ ἄρχων . . . ἐμαυτόν.**

τούτου· νῦν [c] ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω· 32. κἀγὼ ἐὰν [d] ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας [e] ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν." 33. Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε, [f] σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν. 34. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος, "Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου, ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς [g] μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· καὶ πῶς σὺ λέγεις, Ὅτι δεῖ ὑψωθῆναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;" 35. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον τὸ φῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν [1] ἐστι. περιπατεῖτε ἕως [2] τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς [h] καταλάβῃ· καὶ ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἶδε ποῦ ὑπάγει. 36. ἕως τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, πιστεύετε εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα [i] υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε." Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἀπελθὼν [j] ἐκρύβη ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

c xiv. 30; xvi. 11.
d iii. 14; viii. 28.
e vi. 44.
f xviii. 32; xxi. 19.
g viii. 35. Ps. x. 16.
h 1 Thess. v. 4.
i 1 Thess. v. 5.
j viii. 59.

[1] **εν υμιν** in ℵBDKL.

[2] For **εως** ABDKLΠ 33 read **ως**, translating "walk as ye have the light". So in ver. 36. **εως** is supported by ℵ and several versions, and gives the better sense.

Two rulers are represented here as contending for supremacy, the ruler who is spoken of as in possession and Jesus. The ruler in possession, Satan, shall be ejected from his dominion by the cross, but Jesus by the cross shall acquire an irresistibly attractive power. "Si quis roget, quomodo dejectus in morte Christi fuerit Satan, qui assidue bellare non desinit, respondeo ejectionem hanc non restringi ad exiguum aliquod tempus, sed describi insignem illum mortis Christi effectum qui quotidie apparet." Calvin. The **πάντας** is a general expression looking to the ultimate issue of the contention between the rival rulers. **ἑλκύσω** Hellenistic for Attic **ἕλξω**.—Ver. 32. **ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς** is explained as indicating or hinting, **σημαίνων**, "by what death He was to die," *i.e.*, that He was to be raised on the cross. *Cf.* iii. 14. It was the cross which was to become His throne and by which He was to draw men to Him as His subjects. In **ὑψωθῶ** therefore, although the direct reference is to His elevation on the cross, there is a sub-suggestion of being elevated to a throne. "**σημαίνειν** notat aliquid futurum vaticinando cum ambiguitate quadam atque obscuritate innuere." Kypke. So Plutarch says of the Oracle, **οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει.**—Ver. 34. The crowd apparently understood the allusion to His death, for they objected: **Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν . . . ἀνθρώπου**; "we have heard out of the law," *i.e.*, out of Scripture (*cf.* x. 34, xv. 25, and Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, p. 15: "under the word Torah were comprised not only the Law, but also the contributions of later times expressing either the thoughts or the emotions of holy and sincere men"), "that the Christ abides for ever"; this impression was derived from Ps. cx. 4, Is. ix. 7, Ezek. xxxvii. 25, Dan. vii. 14. A different belief was also current. Their belief regarding the Messiah seemed so to contradict His allusion to death that it occurred to them that after all "the Son of Man" might not be identical with "the Messiah" as they had been supposing. So they ask, **τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;** This among other passages shows that the "Son of Man" was a title suggestive of Messiahship, but not quite definite in its meaning and not quite identical with "Messiah".—Ver. 35. **Εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.** In replying Jesus vouchsafes no direct solution of their difficulty. It is as if He said: Do not entangle yourselves in sophistries. Do not seek such logical proofs of Messiahship. Allow the light of truth and righteousness to enter your conscience and your life. "Yet a little while is the light with you." "Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness overtake you" (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 4), that is, lest Jesus, the light of the world, be withdrawn.—**καὶ ὁ περιπατῶν . . . ὑπάγει**, *cf.* xi. 10.—Ver. 36. In ver. 36 it becomes evident that under **τὸ φῶς** He refers to Himself. He urges them to yield to that light in Him which penetrates the conscience. Thus they will become **υἱοὶ φωτός**, see 1 Thess. v. 5, "children of light," not "of the Light". The expression is the ordinary form used by the Hebrews to indicate

k Cp. xx. 30. Mt. v. 16.
l Is. liii. 1.

37. Τοσαῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ σημεῖα πεποιηκότος [k] ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν· 38. ἵνα ὁ λόγος [l] Ἠσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ, ὃν εἶπε, 'Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων Κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;' 39. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεύειν, ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἠσαΐας, 40. 'Τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ πεπώρωκεν[1] αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ νοήσωσι τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐπιστραφῶσι, καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς.' 41. Ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἠσαΐας, ὅτε[2] εἶδε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησε περὶ αὐτοῦ· 42. [m] ὅμως [m] μέντοι καὶ ἐκ τῶν [n] ἀρχόντων πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς Φαρισαίους οὐχ ὡμολό-

m Here only.
n iii. 1; vii. 48.

[1] For πεπωρωκεν recent editors read επωρωσεν with ABKL 33; στραφωσιν with ℵBD* 33, although επιστραφωσι is well supported; and ιασομαι with ℵABDΠ.

[2] οτι in ℵABL 33. The words of Isaiah were uttered not only "when," but "because he saw the glory".

close connection; see Mt. viii. 12, ix. 15, Mk. iii. 17, Lk. xvi. 8, etc. To be **υἱοὶ φωτός** is to be such as find their truest life in the truth, recognising and delighting in all that Christ reveals. "These words Jesus spoke and departed and was hidden from them." His warning that the Light would not always be available for them was at once followed by its removal. Where He was hidden is not said.

Vv. 37-43. In the verses which follow, 37-43, *John accounts for the unbelief of the Jews.* This fact that the very people who had been appointed to accept the Messiah had rejected Jesus needed explanation. This explanation is suitably given at the close of that part of the Gospel which has described His manifestation.—Ver. 37. **Τοσαῦτα . . . αὐτόν.** The difficulty to be solved is first stated. "Although He had done so many signs before them, yet they did not believe on Him." A larger number of miracles is implied than is narrated, vii. 31, xi. 47, xxi. 25. The quality of the miracles is also alluded to once and again, iii. 2, ix. 32. They had not been done "in a corner," but **ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν**, *cf.* **ἐνώπιον** xx. 30. Yet belief had not resulted. The cause of this unbelief was that the prediction of Is. liii. 1 had to be fulfilled. Certainly this mode of statement conveys the impression that it was not the future event which caused the prediction but the prediction which caused the event. The form of expression might in some cases be retained although the natural order was perceived. The purpose of God was always in the foreground of the Jewish mind. The prophecy of Isaiah was relevant; the "arm of the Lord" signifying the power manifested in the miracles, and **τῇ ἀκοῇ** referring to the teaching of Jesus. In the time of Jesus as in that of Isaiah the significance of Divine teaching and Divine action was hidden from the multitude.—Ver. 39. **Διὰ τοῦτο** seems to have a double reference, first to what precedes, second to the **ὅτι** following, *cf.* viii. 47.—**οὐκ ἠδύναντο**, "they were not able," irrespective of will; their inability arose from the fulfilment in them of Isaiah's words, vi. 10 (ver. 40), **Τετύφλωκεν . . . αὐτούς. τετύφλωκεν** refers to the blinding of the organ for perceiving spiritual truth, **ἐπώρωσεν** (from **πῶρος**, a callus) to the hardening of the sensibility to religious and moral impressions. This process prevented them from seeing the significance of the miracles and understanding with the heart the teaching of Jesus. By abuse of light, nature produces callousness; and what nature does God does.—Ver. 41. John's view of prophecy is given in the words **Ταῦτα . . . αὐτοῦ.** "The Targum renders the original words of Isaiah 'I saw the Lord' by 'I saw the Lord's glory'. St. John states the truth to which this expression points, and identifies the Divine Person seen by Isaiah with Christ." Westcott. This involves that the Theophanies of the O.T. were mediated by the pre-existent Logos.—Ver. 42. Although unbelief was so commonly the result of Christ's manifestation, **ὅμως μέντοι**, *cf.* Herodot., i. 189, "nevertheless, however, even of the rulers many believed on Him, but on account of the Pharisees they did not confess Him

γουν, ἵνα μὴ [a] ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται. 43. ἠγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν [o] δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον [p] ἤπερ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

44. Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἔκραξε καὶ εἶπεν, "Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, οὐ πιστεύει εἰς ἐμέ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με· 45. καὶ [q] ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμέ, θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με. 46. ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ. 47. καὶ ἐάν τις μου ἀκούσῃ τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ μὴ πιστεύσῃ,[1] ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω αὐτόν· [r] οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον. 48. ὁ [s] ἀθετῶν ἐμὲ καὶ μὴ λαμβάνων τὰ ῥήματά μου, ἔχει τὸν κρίνοντα αὐτόν· ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα, ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν [t] ἐν τῇ [t] ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. 49. ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλάλησα· ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ, αὐτός μοι ἐντολὴν ἔδωκε, τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω· 50. καὶ οἶδα ὅτι ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιός ἐστιν. ἃ οὖν λαλῶ ἐγώ, καθὼς εἴρηκέ μοι ὁ πατήρ, οὕτω λαλῶ."

o ix. 22.
p 2 Mac. xiv. 42.
q xiv. 9.
r iii. 17.
s 1 Thess. iv. 8. Is. i. 2; xxi. 2, etc.
t vi. 39 reff.

[1] φυλαξῃ in ℵABDKLΠ 33 and most versions. See Mt. xix. 20, Lk. xi. 28.

(ὡμολόγουν, imperfect, their fear to confess Him was continued) lest they should be put out of the synagogue". The inherent truth of the teaching of Jesus compelled response even in those least likely to be influenced. Westcott says: "This complete intellectual faith (so to speak) is really the climax of unbelief. The conviction found no expression in life." This is true of the bulk of those referred to (see ver. 43), but cannot apply to all (see vii. 50, xix. 38, 39). For ἀποσυνάγωγοι see ix. 22, xvi. 2.—ἠγάπησαν . . . Θεοῦ. As in v. 44 an excessive craving for the glory which men can bestow is noted as the cause of unbelief.

Vv. 44-50. *A summary of the teaching of Jesus regarding the nature and consequences of faith and unbelief.*—Ver. 44. Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἔκραξε, "but Jesus cried aloud". δὲ suggests that this summary is intended to reflect light on the unbelief and the imperfect faith which have just been mentioned. ἔκραξε would of itself lead us to suppose that Jesus made the following statement at some particular time, but as ver. 36 has informed us, He had already withdrawn from public teaching. It is therefore natural to suppose that we have here the evangelist's reminiscences of what Jesus had publicly uttered at a previous time.—Ὁ πιστεύων . . . με. This sums up the constant teaching of Jesus that He appeared solely as the ambassador of the Father (see v. 23, 30, 43, vii. 16, viii. 42); and that therefore to believe on Him was to believe on the Father.—Ver. 45. Here He adds καὶ ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμὲ θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με: "he who beholds me, beholds Him that sent me"; so xiv. 9; *cf.* vi. 40. Jesus was the perfect transparency through whom the Father was seen: the image in whom all the Father was represented.—Ver. 46. ἐγὼ φῶς . . . μείνῃ. "I am come into the world as light," and in the connection, especially as light upon God and His relation to men. The purpose of His coming was to deliver men from their native darkness: ἵνα . . . ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ, "should not abide in the darkness"; *cf.* i. 9, viii. 12; iii. 18, 19, ix. 41; also 1 John ii. 9, 11.—Ver. 47. But "if any one should hear my words and not keep them I do not judge him, for I came not to judge," etc. See iii. 17.—Ver. 48. Not on that account, however, is the unbeliever scatheless: ὁ ἀθετῶν . . . ἡμέρᾳ, "he that rejecteth me"; ἀθετεῖν here only in John but used in a similar connection and in the same sense in Lk. x. 16; *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 8. For the sense *cf.* i. 11. The rejecter of Christ "has one to judge him; the word which I spake, it will judge him in the last day". Nothing personal enters into the judgment: the man will be judged by what he has heard, by his opportunities and light.—Ver. 49. This word will judge him, "because" though spoken here on earth it is divine: "I have not spoken at my own instance nor out of my own resources"; ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ, not as in v. 30, vii. 16-18, ἀπ'

a ii. 13, 23; vi. 4; xi. 55.
b xii. 23.
c vii. 3.
d i. 11.
e Mt. x. 22.
f Job i. 6. Zech. iii. 1. Mt. iv. 1.
g Philo, *de Abrahamo*, p. 377.

XIII. 1. ΠΡΟ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ [a] πάσχα, εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐλήλυθεν[1] αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα, [b] ἵνα [c] μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ἀγαπήσας τοὺς [d] ἰδίους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, [e] εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς. 2. καὶ δείπνου γενομένου,[2] τοῦ [f] διαβόλου ἤδη [g] βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Ἰούδα Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου, ἵνα αὐτὸν

[1] ηλθεν in ℵABKLΠ.

[2] γενομενου in ℵ^c ADΠ, vet. Lat. vulg. (coena facta) Pesh.; γινομενου in BLX, four times in Origen. ℵ* has γεινομ. The present participle is adopted by Tr.Ti.W.H., but the reasons assigned by Holtzmann and Weiss are insufficient. T.R. gives the better sense.

ἐμαυτοῦ, but indicating somewhat more strictly the origin of the utterances. He did not create His teaching, ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας . . . λαλήσω, "but the Father who sent me Himself gave me commandment what I should say and what I should speak". The former designates the doctrine according to its *contents*, the latter the varying manner of its delivery. Meyer and Westcott.—Ver. 50. καὶ οἶδα . . . ἐστιν. "And I know that His commandment is life eternal," that is, the commandment which Jesus had received (ver. 49) was to proclaim life eternal. This was His commission; this was what He was to speak. He was to announce to men that the Father offered through Him life eternal. "Therefore whatever I speak, as the Father hath said to me, so I speak."

CHAPTER XIII. Here commences the closing part of the gospel. It exhibits the manifestation of Christ's glory in suffering and death. The first division embraces xiii.-xvii., in which the faith of the believing is confirmed and unbelief [Judas] cast out.

Vv. 1-20. *Jesus washes the disciples' feet and explains His action.*—Ver. 1. Πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, "before the feast of the Passover," and therefore it was not the Paschal supper which is now described. According to John, though not in agreement with the Synoptists, Jesus suffered as the Paschal Lamb on the day of the Passover, which in all Jewish households was terminated by the Paschal supper. How long before the Feast the supper here mentioned occurred is not explicitly stated, but the narrative shows it was the eve of the Passover. The note of time has an ethical rather than an historical intention. It is meant to mark that this was the last night of Jesus' life. Therefore it is followed up by a full description of the entire situation and motives. The main action is expressed in ἐγείρεται of the fourth verse; but to set his reader in the right point of view for perceiving the significance of this action the Evangelist points out three particulars regarding the mind and feeling of Jesus, and two external circumstances. (1) εἰδὼς . . . αὐτούς, "Jesus, knowing that the hour had come that He should pass [for the construction ὥρα ἵνα see xii. 23; μεταβῇ emphasises the change in condition implied] out of this world to the Father, having loved His own who were in the world [τοὺς ἰδίους, a more restricted and more sympathetic class than the οἱ ἴδιοι of i. 11. His especial and peculiar friends. The designation τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ is added in contrast to ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου which described His future condition, and it suggests the difficulties they are left to cope with and the duties they must do. They are to represent Him in the world: and this appeals to Him], He loved them" εἰς τέλος, which is translated "in the highest degree" by Chrys., Euthymius [σφόδρα], Cyr.-Alex. [τελειοτάτην ἀγάπησιν], Godet, Weiss; but Godet is wrong in saying that εἰς τέλος never means "unto the end," see Mt. x. 22. Melanchthon renders "perduravit donec pateretur". He loved them through all the sufferings and to all the issues to which His love brought Him. The statement is the suitable introduction to all that now looms in view. His love remained steadfast, and was now the ruling motive. The statement is further illustrated by the disappointing state of the disciples. [Wetstein quotes from Eurip., *Troad.*, 1051, οὐδεὶς ἐράστης ὅστις οὐκ ἀεὶ φιλεῖ; and from the *Anthol.*, τούτους ἐξ ἀρχῆς μέχρι τέλους ἀγαπῶ, and *cf.* Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, cxvi., "Love . . . bears it out even to the edge of doom".] (2) καὶ δείπνου γενομένου,

παραδῷ, 3. εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι πάντα δέδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπάγει, 4. [h] ἐγείρεται ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου, καὶ τίθησι τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ λαβὼν λέντιον [i] διέζωσεν ἑαυτόν· 5. εἶτα βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα, καὶ ἤρξατο [j] νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν, καὶ [k] ἐκμάσσειν τῷ λεντίῳ ᾧ ἦν διεζωσμένος. 6. ἔρχεται οὖν πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον· καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ

h xi. 29.
i Cp. xxi. 7.
j Gen. xliii. 24.
k xii. 3.

"supper having arrived," "supper having been served," *cf.* **γενομένου σαββάτου**, the Sabbath having come, **πρωΐας γενομένης**, Mt. xxvii. 1, morning having dawned. In x. 22 the phrase **ἐγένετο τὰ ἐγκαίνια** means "the Dedication had arrived". So here the meaning is "supper having come," and not "supper being ended," or "while supper was proceeding". If we read **γινομένου** the meaning is substantially the same, "supper arriving," "at supper time". This also is essential to the understanding of the incident. Feet-washing, pleasant and customary before a meal, would have been disagreeable and out of place in the course of it. [The custom is abundantly illustrated by Wetstein, Doughty and others. See especially Becker's *Charicles.*] The feet, either bare, or sandalled, or with shoes, were liable to be heated by the fine dust of the roads, and it was expected that the host would furnish means of washing them, see Lk. vii. 44. When our Lord and His disciples supped together, this office would be discharged by the youngest, or by the disciples in turn; but this evening the disciples had been disputing which of them was the greatest, Lk. xxii. 24, and consequently no one could stoop to do this menial office for the rest. (3) **τοῦ διαβόλου . . . παραδῷ** [or **παραδοῖ**], "the devil having now put into the heart," etc. For the expression **βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν** see especially Pindar, *Olymp.*, xiii. 16, **πολλὰ δ' ἐν καρδίαις ἀνδρῶν ἔβαλον Ὧραι κ. τ. λ.** Similar expressions are frequent in Homer. It is perhaps rather stronger than "suggest," "the devil having already put in the heart"; the idea had been entertained, if we cannot say that the purpose was already formed. His presence was another disturbing element in the feast. But had Jesus unmasked him before such fiery spirits as John and Peter, Judas would never have left that room alive. Peter's sword would have made surer work than with Malchus. Judas therefore is included in the feet-washing. "Jesus at the feet of the traitor, what a picture, what lessons for us" (Astié).—Ver. 3. (4) **εἰδὼς . . . χεῖρας**, this consciousness on the part of Jesus is mentioned to bring out the condescension of the action to be related. (5) So too is the accompanying consciousness, **ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ . . . ὑπάγει.** It was not in forgetfulness of His true dignity but because conscious that He was supreme and God's ambassador that He did what He did. ["All things," says Melanchthon, "condere testamentum promissum in Scripturis": "omnia, adeoque peccatum et mortem".]—Ver. 4. This person, and in this mood and in these circumstances, on the brink of His own passion, is free to attend to the wants of unworthy men, and **ἐγείρεται . . . διεζωσμένος.** "He rises," having reclined at the table in expectation that one or other of the disciples would do the feet-washing.—**καὶ τίθησι τὰ ἱμάτια**, "and lays aside His garments," *i.e.*, His Tallith, appearing in His **χιτών**, similar to our "in His shirt sleeves". **τίθημι** is similarly used in **τίθημι τὴν ψυχήν**, x. 11, etc. [See also Kypke on Lk. xix. 21.]—**καὶ λαβὼν λέντιον διέζωσεν ἑαυτόν**, "and having taken a *linteum*," a towel or long linen cloth, "He girt Himself," tying the towel round Him. *Cf.* **ἐγκομβώσασθε**, 1 Pet. v. 5. The middle **διεζώσατο** is used in xxi. 7; the expression here more emphatically indicates that He was the sole Agent. The condescension is understood in the light of what Suetonius tells of Caligula (Cal. 26), that he was fond of making some of the senators wait at his table "succinctos linteo," that is, in the guise of waiters.—Ver. 5. **εἶτα . . . νιπτῆρα.** Each step in the whole astounding scene is imprinted on the mind of John. "Next He pours water into the basin," *the* basin which the landlord had furnished as part of the necessary arrangements. [**νιπτῆρα** is only found here; but **ποδανιπτήρ** is not so rare; see Plut., *Phocion*, 20, where **ποδονιπτῆρες** filled with wine were provided for the guests.]—**καὶ ἤρξατο νίπτειν . . .** "nihil ministerii omittit" (Grotius). [Plutarch says of Favonius that he did for Pompey **ὅσα δεσπότας δοῦλοι μεχρὶ νίψεως ποδῶν.**] He "began" to wash the feet of the disciples; "began,"

ἐκεῖνος, "Κύριε, σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας;" 7. Ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ὃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, σὺ οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι, γνώσῃ δὲ [l] μετὰ ταῦτα." 8. Λέγει αὐτῷ Πέτρος, "Οὐ μὴ νίψῃς τοὺς πόδας μου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα." Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε, οὐκ [m] ἔχεις [m] μέρος μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ." 9. Λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος, "Κύριε, μὴ τοὺς πόδας μου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν κεφαλήν." 10. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὁ [n] λελουμένος οὐ χρείαν ἔχει [o] ἢ τοὺς πόδας [1] νίψασθαι, ἀλλ᾽ ἔστι [p] καθαρὸς ὅλος· καὶ ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχὶ πάντες." 11. Ἤιδει γὰρ τὸν παραδιδόντα αὐτόν· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπεν, "Οὐχὶ πάντες καθαροί ἐστε."

l ver. 12.
m Deut. xiv. 27. Rev. xx. 6.
n Lev. xvi. 4. Acts ix. 37.
o Cp. Winer p. 638.
p Ps. li. 7.

[1] ℵ omits **η τους ποδας**, but these words are found in ABCEGKL.

perhaps because, as Meyer suggests, the washing was interrupted, but this is not certain.—Ver. 6. **ἔρχεται οὖν**, *apparently* in the order in which they happened to be sitting, and having first washed some of the other disciples, He comes to Simon Peter, who draws up his feet out of reach and exclaims, **Κύριε, σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας;** The **σύ μου** are brought together for the sake of the contrast.—Ver. 7. This was a right impulse and honourable to Peter; and therefore Jesus treats it tenderly. **ὃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ . . . μετὰ ταῦτα,** "what I am doing thou dost not at present comprehend, but thou shalt learn as soon as I am finished". The pronouns are emphatic, that Peter may understand that Jesus may have much to do which the disciple cannot comprehend. The first requisite in a disciple or follower is absolute trust in the wisdom of his Master. **μετὰ ταῦτα** refers to the immediate future; see ver. 12, where the explanation of the action is given. [**οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ἐρεῖ**, Euthymius.]—Ver. 8. Peter, however, cannot accept the disciple's attitude, but persists, **Οὐ μὴ νίψῃς μου τοὺς πόδας εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,** "never shalt Thou wash my feet". The **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα** was prompted by the **μετὰ ταῦτα.** No future explanation can make this possible. Peter's humility is true enough to allow him to see the incongruity of Jesus washing his feet: not deep enough to make him conscious of the incongruity of his thus opposing and dictating to his Master. To this characteristic utterance Jesus, waiting with the basin, replies, **ἐὰν μὴ νίψω σε . . . ἐμοῦ.** Superficially these words might mean that unless Peter allowed Jesus to wash him, he could not sit at table with Him. But evidently Peter found in them a deeper significance, and understood them as meaning: Unless I wash you, you are outcast from my fellowship and cease to share in my kingdom and destiny. Here the symbolic significance of the eating together and of the washing begins dimly to appear. That Peter saw that this deeper meaning was intended appears from the eagerness of his answer.—Ver. 9. **Κύριε . . . κεφαλήν.** A moment ago he told his Master He was doing too much: now he tells Him He is doing too little. Self-will gives place slowly. Yet this was the unmistakable expression of devotion. If washing is any requirement for fellowship with Thee, wash me wholly. ["Non pedes solum, quos soli ministri vident; sed manus et caput, quod convivae adspiciunt." Wetstein.] He is still in error.—Ver. 10. **Ὁ λελουμένος . . . ὅλος.** "He that has been in the bath has no need to wash save his feet, but is all clean." His feet may be soiled by walking from the public bath to the supper chamber, and it is enough that they be washed. "Ad convivium vocati solebant prius in balneo lavari; in domo vero convivatoris nonnisi pedes, quibus in via pulvis aut sordes adhaeserant, a servis abluebantur, ne lecti, super quibus accumbebant, macularentur." Wetstein. He supports the statement by many references. The added clause discloses that a spiritual sense underlies the symbol: **ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε, ἀλλ᾽ οὐχὶ πάντες,** "ye are clean, but not all". All had been washed: the feet of Judas were as clean as those of Peter. But Judas was not clean.—Ver. 11. That Judas was meant is at once said in ver. 11. **Ἤιδει . . . ἐστε.** Jesus thus shows that He distinguishes between the offence of the rest and the sin of Judas. All that they required was to have the soil of

12. Ὅτε οὖν ἔνιψε τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν, καὶ [q] ἔλαβε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, [r] ἀναπεσὼν[1] πάλιν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Γινώσκετε τί πεποίηκα ὑμῖν; 13. ὑμεῖς φωνεῖτέ με, Ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὁ κύριος· καὶ καλῶς [s] λέγετε, εἰμὶ γάρ. 14. εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ ἔνιψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας· 15. [t] ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ ἔδωκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ [u] ἐποίησα ὑμῖν, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιῆτε. 16. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος [v] μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν. 17. εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά. 18. οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω· ἐγὼ οἶδα οὓς[2] [w] ἐξελεξάμην· [x] ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ, ''Ὁ [y] τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ[3] τὸν ἄρτον, ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν

q x. 17, 18.
r Lk. xi. 37. Tob. ii. 1.
s iv. 17; viii. 48.
t Jas. v. 10. 2 Pet. ii. 6.
u Exod. xiv. 11.
v xv. 20. Mt. x. 24. Lk. vi. 40.
w vi. 70.
x Constr. i. 8.
y Ps. xli. 9.

[1] και ανεπεσεν in ℵ*BC*.

[2] Better τινας with ℵBCL 33.

[3] μετ' εμου in ℵAD vet. Lat. vulg.; μου in BCL adopted by W.H. The clause is thus closer to the Hebrew.

their present evil temper and jealousy removed: they were true in heart, they had been in the bath and had only contracted a slight stain. But Judas had not been in the bath: he had no genuine and habitual loyalty to Christ.—Ver. 12. **Ὅτε . . . ὑμῖν**: "when, then, He had washed their feet and taken His garments [*cf.* **τίθησι τὰ ἱμάτια** of ver. 4] and reclined again He said to them: Know ye what I have done to you?" Do you perceive the meaning of this action? By washing their feet He had washed their heart. By stooping to this menial service He had made them all ashamed of declining it. By this simple action He had turned a company of wrangling, angry, jealous men into a company of humbled and united disciples.—Ver. 13. **ὑμεῖς φωνεῖτέ με**, "ye call me," in addressing me (**φωνεῖν**, not **καλεῖν**), **ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ Κύριος**, "Teacher" and "Lord"; the *nominativus tituli*, see Winer, 226. Perhaps "Rabbi" would convey better the respect involved in **διδάσκαλος**. **καὶ καλῶς λέγετε, εἰμὶ γάρ.** Jesus, humble and self-suppressing as He was, clearly recognised His own dignity and on occasion asserted it. Here the point of the lesson lay in His consciousness of being their Lord.—Ver. 14. Hence the *a fortiori* argument: **εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ ἔνιψα . . . πόδας**, "if I then, Lord and Teacher, washed your feet, ye also ought (**ὀφείλετε** denoting moral obligation) to wash one another's feet". "It is not the act itself, but its moral essence, which after His example He enjoins upon them to exercise." Meyer. This has sometimes been considered a command enjoining the literal washing of the feet of poor saints: and was practised in England until 1731 by the Lord High Almoner, and is still practised by the Pope on Maundy Thursday (*Dies Mandati*), the day before Good Friday. See also Church's *Anselm*, p. 49. The ancient practice is discussed in Augustine's *Letters*, 55, to Januarius, c. 33. It at once took its place as symbolic of all kindly care of fellow-Christians, see 1 Tim. v. 10.—Ver. 15. **ὑπόδειγμα . . . ποιῆτε.** **ὑπόδειγμα** is condemned by Phrynichus, who recommends the Attic **παράδειγμα**. See Rutherford's interesting note, *New Phryn.*, p. 62. The purpose, **ἵνα**, of His action was that they might act in the same humble, loving spirit, in *all* their conduct to one another.—Ver. 16. And as confirmatory of this example and in rebuke of their pride, He adds: **οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος . . . αὐτόν.** In Mt. x. 24 a similar saying occurs; *cf.* also Lk. vi. 40, and Lk. xxii. 27. The slave whose function it is to serve is not "greater," **μείζων**, than his lord, who may expect to receive service, and therefore the slave may well stoop to the offices which the lord himself discharges and count on no exemptions the lord does not claim.—Ver. 17. These are obvious first principles in Christian discipleship, but the mere knowledge of them is not enough: **εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά.** **ταῦτα** refers to what Jesus had just declared to be the significance of His action. **εἰ οἴδατε**, "if ye know," as you do know; **ἐὰν ποιῆτε**, a supposition. "The knowing is objectively granted,

πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.' 19. [z] ἀπ' ἄρτι λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἵνα ὅταν γένηται, πιστεύσητε ὅτι [a] ἐγώ εἰμι. 20. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, Ὁ [b] λαμβάνων ἐάν τινα πέμψω, ἐμὲ λαμβάνει· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ λαμβάνων, λαμβάνει τὸν πέμψαντά με."

21. Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς [c] ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ ἐμαρτύρησε καὶ εἶπεν, "Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι [d] εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με."

22. Ἔβλεπον οὖν εἰς ἀλλήλους οἱ μαθηταί, ἀπορούμενοι περὶ τίνος λέγει. 23. ἦν δὲ ἀνακείμενος εἷς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ [e] κόλπῳ

z xiv. 7. Rev. xiv. 13. Cp. Mt. xxvi. 64.
a iv. 26; viii. 24; xviii. 5, 8.
b i. 12.
c xii. 27.
d Acts i. 17.
e Lk. xvi. 22.

the doing subjectively conditioned." Meyer. On the double protasis see Burton, 268. **μακάριοι** is usually translated "blessed," Mt. v. 3, John xx. 29, and should be so here.—Ver. 18. This blessedness, He knew, could not attach to all of them: **οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω**, "I speak not of you all," I do not expect all of you to fulfil the condition of blessedness. **ἐγὼ οἶδα οὓς ἐξελεξάμην**, "I for my part (in contrast to the disciples who were in ignorance) know the men whom I have chosen as Apostles," and am therefore not taken by surprise by the treachery of one of them. For the choice of Judas see vi. 70, where the same word **ἐξελεξάμην** is used. **ἀλλ' ἵνα . . .** The simplest construction is: "but I chose Judas in order that," etc. This may not, however, involve that Jesus *consciously* chose Judas for this purpose. That is not said, and can scarcely be conceived. The Scripture which waited for fulfilment is Ps. xl. 9, **ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν.** Eating bread together is in all countries a sign, and in some a covenant or pledge of friendship. *Cf.* Kypke on **ὁμοτράπεζος** and Trumbull's *Blood Covenant*, p. 313, and *Oriental Life*, p. 361. Here the fact of Judas' eating bread with Jesus is introduced as aggravating his crime. "To lift the heel" is to kick, whether originally used of a horse or not; and expresses violence and contempt.—Ver. 19. This grave announcement was made at this point and not previously, **ἀπ' ἄρτι**, "from henceforth" (as if the knowledge resulting from the announcement rather than the announcement itself were dictating the expression) "I tell you before it happens, that when it has happened you may know that I am He," *i.e.*, the Messiah in whom these predictions were destined to be fulfilled.—Ver. 20. But lest this announcement should weaken their confidence in one another and in their own call to the Apostolate ("probabile est voluisse Christum offendiculo mederi". Calvin) He hastens to add: **ἀμὴν . . . πέμψαντά με** [**ἄν τινα** better than **ἐάν τινα**]. He gives the assurance that those whom He sends as His apostles will be identified with Himself and with God.

Vv. 21-30. *Judas is eliminated from the company.*—Ver. 21. **Ταῦτα εἰπὼν . . . παραδώσει με.** Two elements in the company had prevented Jesus from freely uttering His last counsels to the Twelve. (1) They had manifested dissension which would prevent them from acting together when He was gone, and a temper which would prevent them from receiving His words. And (2) there was among them a traitor. The first element of discord had been removed by the feet-washing. He now proceeds to eliminate the second. But to have at once named the traitor would have been fatal. Peter and the rest would have taken steps to defeat, if not to put an end to Judas. Therefore He merely says, **εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με.** This it was which troubled His spirit, that one of the Twelve whom He had so cherished should turn traitor, using the familiarity and knowledge of intimacy to betray Him.—Ver. 22. The disciples had no idea who was meant. **Ἔβλεπον . . . λέγει**, Judas could scarcely be "at a loss to know of whom He spoke".—Ver. 23. **ἦν . . . Ἰησοῦς**, the disciple whom Jesus loved lay next Him, **ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ.** Two arrangements of guests at a table were in vogue. They either lay at right angles to the table and parallel to one another, each resting on his left elbow and having his right hand free (see Rich's *Dict.*, s. v. *Triclinium*, *Lectus*, *Accubo*); or they lay obliquely, the second reaching with his head to "the sinus of the girdle (**κόλπος**)" of the first, and with the feet of the first at his back; while the third occupied the same posture relatively to the second (see the engraving in Becker's *Charicles*, 327, and Lightfoot, p. 1095, who says that this second arrangement prevailed in Palestine in the time of Christ). John

τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, [f] ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς· 24. [g] νεύει οὖν τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει. 25. ἐπιπεσὼν[1] δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, λέγει αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, τίς ἐστιν;" 26. Ἀποκρίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ [h] βάψας τὸ ψωμίον ἐπιδώσω."[2] Καὶ [h] ἐμβάψας τὸ ψωμίον, δίδωσιν Ἰούδᾳ Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτῃ. 27. καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον, τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σατανᾶς. λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὃ ποιεῖς, ποίησον τάχιον." 28. Τοῦτο δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τῶν ἀνακειμένων πρὸς τί εἶπεν αὐτῷ. 29. τινὲς γὰρ ἐδόκουν, ἐπεὶ τὸ [i] γλωσσόκομον εἶχεν ὁ Ἰούδας, ὅτι λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἀγόρασον ὧν χρείαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν·" ἢ τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἵνα τι δῷ. 30. λαβὼν οὖν τὸ ψωμίον ἐκεῖνος, εὐθέως ἐξῆλθεν[3]· ἦν δὲ νύξ,[4] ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθε.

f xix. 26; xx. 2; xxi. 7.
g Acts xxiv. 10.
h Ruth ii. 14.
i xii. 6.

[1] αναπεσων in ℵ^cBC*KL. ουτως added after εκεινος in BCEF 33, "as he was".

[2] T.R. in ℵAD, it. vulg.; βαψω και δωσω αυτω in BCL copt. arm. aeth. adopted by Tr.Ti.W.H.R.

[3] εξηλθεν ευθυς in ℵBCD.

[4] ℵBCD 1, 33, it. vulg. place full stop after νυξ, and commence next paragraph with οτε ουν εξηλθεν λεγει. So Tisch. and W.H.

was lying, then, next to Jesus, his position being inside that of Jesus. To him Peter νεύει, "beckons" (*cf.* νεύσω μέν τοι ἐγὼ κεφαλῇ, Od., xvi. 283), taking the initiative as usual, but not himself asking, perhaps because he had made so many mistakes that evening already, perhaps because a private matter might better be transacted in a whisper from John.—Ver. 25. That disciple, ἐκεῖνος, when thus appealed to, ἀναπεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, "having leant back towards the breast of Jesus" so as to speak more directly to Him and to be heard only by Him. On the difference between ἀνακείμενος and ἀναπεσών see Origen in *Evang. Jo.*, ii. 191, Brooke.—Ver. 26. But even in answer to John's question, τίς ἐστιν; Jesus does not name Judas, but merely gives a sign by which John may recognise the traitor: Ἐκεῖνος . . . ἐπιδώσω, "he it is for whom I shall dip the sop and give it him". Some argue from the insertion of the article τὸ ψωμίον that this was the sop made up of a morsel of lamb, a small piece of unleavened bread, and dipped in the bitter sauce, which was given by the head of the house to each guest as a regular part of the Passover; and that therefore John as well as the Synoptists considered this to be the Paschal Supper. But not only is the article doubtful, see W.H., but it is an ordinary Oriental custom for the host to offer such a tid-bit to any favoured guest; and we are rather entitled to see in the act the last appeal to Judas' better feeling. The very mark Jesus chooses to single him out is one which on ordinary occasions was a mark of distinctive favour. At any rate he is thus all the more effectually screened from the others.—Ver. 27. But instead of moving Judas to compunction μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον, τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σατανᾶς. μετὰ "after," not "with," "non cum offula," Bengel and Cyril, who also says, οὐ γὰρ ἔτι σύμβουλον ἔχει τὸν σατανᾶν, ἀλλ' ὅλης ἤδη τῆς καρδίας δεσπότην. On ἐκεῖνον Bengel also has: "Jam *remote* notat Judam". Morally he is already far removed from that company. But what was it that thus finally determined Judas? Perhaps the very revulsion of feeling caused by taking the sop from Jesus: perhaps the accompanying words, Ὃ ποιεῖς, ποίησον τάχιον, "what thou doest, do quickly". τάχιον: "to Attic writers θάσσων (θάττων) was the only comparative, and τάχιστος the only superlative". Rutherford, *New Phryn.*, p. 150. The idea in the comparative is "with augmented speed," see Donaldson's *Greek Gram.*, p. 390.—Ver. 28. Τοῦτο . . . αὐτῷ. All heard the command given to Judas, but none of them knew its object, not even John; for although he was now aware that Judas was the traitor he did not connect the command "Do it quickly" with the actual work of betrayal.—Ver. 29. τινὲς

31. Λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Νῦν [j] ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς [j] ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ. 32. εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ,[1] καὶ ὁ Θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν. 33. [k] Τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι. ζητήσετέ με, καὶ καθὼς εἶπον τοῖς [l] Ἰουδαίοις, Ὅτι ὅπου ὑπάγω ἐγὼ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν, καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω ἄρτι. 34. [m] ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους· καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους. 35. [n] ἐν τούτῳ γνώσονται πάντες ὅτι ἐμοὶ μαθηταί ἐστε, ἐὰν ἀγάπην

j vii. 39: xii. 16.
k Freq. in 1 John; also in Gal. iv. 19.
l vii. 34; viii. 21.
m xv. 12. 1 Jo. ii. 7, 8. Mt. v. 43, 44.
n 1 Jo. iii. 10.

[1] This clause omitted in ℵ*BC*DL (and by W.H.R.); found in ℵcAC²Γ and many versions.

γὰρ ἐδόκουν. Some supposed that Judas being treasurer of the company had been sent to buy what they needed for the feast, or to give something to the poor. That it was possible at so late an hour to make purchases appears from Mt. xxv. 9-11 (Holtzmann).—Ver. 30. Judas on his part, having accepted the sop, **ἐξῆλθεν εὐθύς**, the **εὐθύς** answering to **τάχιον**, ver. 27; he went out immediately, taking the purse with him no doubt. **ἦν δὲ νύξ**, "and it was night". The sudden darkness succeeding sunset in the East suddenly fell on the room, impressing John's sensitive spirit and adding to the perturbation of the company. The note of time may however only result from John's desire to keep his narrative exact.

Ver. 31—XIV. 31 comprise one continuous conversation, introduced by Jesus' announcement (vv. 31-35) of His speedy departure.—Ver. 31. **Ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθεν.** As soon as Judas had gone out, the spirit of Jesus rose, and with a note of triumph He explains the situation to the disciples. Two points He emphasises: His work is done, and He must leave them. The former He announces in the words **Νῦν ἐδοξάσθη . . . αὐτῷ.** "This 'now' with which the Lord turns to the faithful eleven, expresses at once the feeling of deliverance from the traitor's presence and His free acceptance of the issues of the traitor's work." Westcott. **ἐδοξάσθη** the aorist is used because the traitor is considered to have "as it were already completed his deed". Winer, p. 346. The Son of Man is "glorified" by accomplishing the work of His life by being accepted as the manifestation of God, and by being acknowledged by the Father as having revealed Him; see xvii. 1, 4, 5, xii. 23, xi. 4. *Cf.* Milligan's *Ascension of our Lord*, p. 79.—Ver. 32. Necessarily therefore when He is glorified **ὁ Θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ. καὶ ὁ Θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ.** God is more definitely named as the source of the glorification of the Son of Man; and as God was glorified "in" Jesus, so shall Jesus be glorified "in" God. It is not only **παρὰ σεαυτῷ**, as in xvii., 5, but **ἐν ἑαυτῷ**, which does not merely mean that He will be taken up into the eternal blessedness of God, but that His glory will be the Divine glory itself.—Ver. 33. This result was to be forthwith achieved: **εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν**, which at once is interpreted to the disciples in the explicit statement **Τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι. Τεκνία** is frequent in 1 John; here only in the Gospel. Lightfoot (p. 1098) says: "Discipulus cujusvis vocatur ejus filius"; but here there is a tenderness in the expression not so accounted for. **ἔτι μικρὸν**, "yet a little," *i.e.*, it is only for a little longer; *cf.* vii. 33. This announcement, formerly made to the Jews (vii. 33, viii. 21, 24), He now, **ἄρτι**, makes to the disciples; arousing their attention to what follows, as His last injunctions. In view of the temper they had that evening displayed and the necessity for united action and unanimous testimony He first lays upon them the commandment to love one another.—Ver. 34. **ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους**: "one another," not "all men," which is a different commandment. So, rightly, Grotius: "*Novum* autem dicit quia non agit de dilectione communi omnium . . . sed de speciali Christianorum inter se qua tales sunt," and Holtzmann: "Es ist die **φιλαδελφία** im Unterschied von der allgemeinen **ἀγάπη**". The necessity of love among those who were to carry on Christ's work had that night become apparent. It was "new," because the love of Christ's friends for Christ's sake was a new thing in the world. There-

ἔχητε [o] ἐν ἀλλήλοις." 36. Λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος, "Κύριε, ποῦ ὑπάγεις;" ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅπου ὑπάγω, οὐ δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι· ὕστερον δὲ ἀκολουθήσεις μοι." 37. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος, "Κύριε, διατί οὐ δύναμαί σοι ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι; τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ [p] θήσω." 38. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Τὴν ψυχήν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ [q] φωνήσει [1] ἕως οὗ ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς.

XIV. 1. "Μὴ [a] ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία· πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε. 2. ἐν τῇ [b] οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου [c] μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν· [d] εἰ δὲ μή, εἶπον ἂν ὑμῖν· πορεύομαι [2] ἑτοιμάσαι

o Rom. i. 12 and xv. 5.
p x. 11, 17.
q Mk. xiv. 30. Zeph. ii. 14.
a xi. 33. Ps. lv. 4.
b Cp. ii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 1.
c Cp. 1 Mac. vii. 38.
d Gen. xxx. 1.

[1] φωνηση in ℵABG. [2] οτι is inserted before πορευομαι in ℵABC*DKL.

fore the *kind* rather than the *degree* of love is indicated in the clause **καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς κ. τ. λ.**—Ver. 35. And this Christian love is to be the sole sufficing evidence of the individual's Christianity: **ἐν τούτῳ** (emphatic) **γνώσονται . . . ἀλλήλοις**. *Cf.* Acts iv. 32, 1 John iii. 10; also Tertull., *Apol.*, 39, "vide, inquiunt, ut invicem se diligant"; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, ii. 9; Min. Felix, *Octavius*, 9.—Ver. 36. On this announcement of Jesus that He was shortly to leave them follow four characteristic utterances of the disciples. First as usual, **λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος, Κύριε ποῦ ὑπάγεις;** "Lord, where are you going?" referring to ver. 33. The Vulgate renders "Domine, quo vadis?" the words which the legend ascribes to Peter when withdrawing from persecution in Rome he met Jesus entering the city. Jesus does not needlessly excite them by plainly telling them of His death, for He has much to say to them which He wishes them to listen to undisturbed. He assures Peter that though he cannot now accompany his Master, he will afterwards follow, and so rejoin Him; *cf.* xxi. 19.—Ver. 37. This does not satisfy Peter. He sees it is some dangerous enterprise Jesus is undertaking, and he feels his courage discredited by the refusal to be allowed to accompany Him. **Κύριε διατί . . . θήσω.** "Putasne ulla itineris molestia me terreri?" Grotius. "In the zeal of love he mistakes the measure of his moral strength." Meyer. Mt. and Mk. represent all the disciples as making the same declaration (Mt. xxvi. 35, Mk. xiv. 31); which made it all the more necessary to expose its unconscious hollowness, painful as it must have been to Jesus to do so. **Τὴν ψυχήν σου . . . τρίς.** "Wilt thou lay down . . . ? So far from that, you will deny me thrice before the morning." **οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσει.** "Cock-crow" was used among the Jews as a designation of time (Lightfoot on Mt. xxvi. 34); *cf.* Mk. xiii. 35, where the night is divided into **ὀψέ, μεσονύκτιον, ἀλεκτοροφωνία, πρωΐ.** At the equinox cock-crow would be between 2 and 4 A.M. See Greswell's *Dissert.*, iii. 216. This was incomprehensible; how the night could bring circumstances so appalling as to tempt any of them, and compel the hardiest to deny Jesus, they could not conceive.—CHAPTER XIV. Ver. 1. But as they sat astounded and perplexed, He continues, **Μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία.** Let not your heart be tossed and agitated like water driven by winds; *cf.* Liddell and S. and Thayer. He not only commands them to dismiss their agitation, but gives them reason: **πιστεύετε . . . πιστεύετε.** "Trust God, yea, trust me." Trust Him who overrules all events, He will bring you through this crisis for which you feel yourselves incompetent; or if in your present circumstances that faith is too difficult, trust me whom you see and know and whose word you cannot doubt. It is legitimate to construe the first **πιστεύετε** as an indicative, and the second as imperative: but this gives scarcely so appropriate a sense.—Ver. 2. As an encouragement to this trust, He adds, **ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ . . . ὑμῖν.** He is going home to His Father's house, but had there been room in it only for Himself He would necessarily have told them that this was the case, because the very reason of His going was to prepare a place for them. **ὅτι** assigns the reason for the necessity of explanation: the reason being that His purpose or plan

τόπον ὑμῖν. 3. καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ καὶ ἑτοιμάσω ὑμῖν τόπον, πάλιν [e]ἔρχομαι καὶ [f]παραλήψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν· ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. 4. καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε, καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν οἴδατε."[1] 5. Λέγει αὐτῷ Θωμᾶς, "Κύριε, οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις· καὶ πῶς δυνάμεθα[2] τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι;" 6. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή· οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς

e Mt. xvii. 11. Acts i. 11.
f Song viii. 2. Mt. xvii 1.

[1] Omit και before and οιδατε after την οδον with ℵBLX. The words occur in AD, probably inserted for clearness.

[2] Instead of δυναμεθα ειδεναι Tr.Ti.W.H.R. read οιδαμεν with BC*D.

for His future would require to be entirely altered had there been no room for them in His Father's house. "My Father's house" is used in ii. 16 of the Temple: here of the immediate presence of the Father and of that condition in which His love and protection are uninterruptedly and directly experienced. This is most naturally thought of as a place, but with the corrective that "it is not in heaven one finds God, but in God one finds heaven". *Cf.* Godet. In this house, as in a great palace, *cf. Iliad*, vi. 242, μοναὶ πολλαί εἰσιν. μονή (μένειν), only here and in ver. 23, means a place to abide in, and was used of a station on a journey, a resting place, quarters for the night, and in later ecclesiastical Greek a monastery. See Soph., *Lexicon*. "Mansions" reproduces the Vulgate "mansiones". See further Wright's *Bible Word-Book*. εἰ δὲ μή . . . "were it not so, I would have told you," "ademissem vobis spem inanem," Grotius. Had there been no such place and no possibility of preparing it, He necessarily would have told them, because the very purpose of His leaving them was to prepare a place for them. ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον, a figure derived from the custom of sending forward one of a party to secure quarters and provide all requisites. *Cf.* the *Alcestis*, line 363: ἀλλ' οὖν ἐκεῖσε προσδόκα μ', ὅταν θάνω, καὶ δῶμ' ἑτοίμαζ', ὡς συνοικήσουσά μοι. What was involved in the preparation here spoken of is detailed in Hebrews. *Cf.* Selby's *Ministry of the Lord*, 275. —Ver. 3. Neither will He prepare a place and leave them to find their own way to it.—καὶ ἐὰν πορευθῶ . . . ἦτε. "*If* I go"; that is, the commencement of this work as their forerunner was the pledge of its completion. And its completion is effected by His coming again and receiving them to Himself, or "to His own home," πρὸς ἐμαυτόν. *Cf.* xx. 10.— πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήμψομαι, "I come again and will receive". The present is used in ἔρχομαι as if the coming were so certain as to be already begun, *cf.* v. 25. For παραλήμψομαι see Cant. viii. 2. The promise is fulfilled in the death of the Christian, and it has changed the aspect of death. The personal second coming of Christ is not a frequent theme in this Gospel. The ultimate object of His departure and return is ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἦτε. *Cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 17, 2 Cor. v. 8, Phil. i. 23. The object of Christ's departure is permanent reunion and the blessedness of the Christian.

Vv. 4-7. *A second interruption occasioned by Thomas.*—Ver. 4. καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν. The ἐγώ is emphatic: the disciples knew the direction in which He was going.—Ver. 5. But this statement bewilders the despondent Thomas, who gloomily interjects: Κύριε . . . εἰδέναι; Thomas' difficulty is that not knowing the goal they cannot know the way. In the reply of Jesus both the goal and the way are disclosed.—Ver. 6. ἐγώ εἰμι . . . ἐμοῦ. "I am the way and the truth and the life: no one comes to the Father save through me." I do not merely point out the way and teach the truth and bestow life, but I am the way and the truth and the life, so that by attachment to me one necessarily is in the way and possesses the truth and the life. "The way" here referred to is the way to the Father. He is the goal of all human aspiration: and there is but one way to the Father, "no one comes," etc.—καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, "and the truth," primarily about God and the way to Him, but also as furnishing us with all knowledge which we now require for life. Thomas craved knowledge sufficient to guide him in the present crisis. Jesus says: You have it in me.—καὶ ἡ ζωή, "and the life"; the death which casts its shadow over the eleven and Himself is itself to be swallowed up in life. Those who

τὸν πατέρα, εἰ μὴ δι᾽ ἐμοῦ. 7. εἰ ἐγνώκειτέ με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἐγνώκειτε ἄν [1]· καὶ [g] ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι γινώσκετε αὐτὸν, καὶ ἑωράκατε αὐτόν." 8. Λέγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος, "Κύριε, δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα, καὶ [h] ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν." 9. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Τοσοῦτον χρόνον μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με Φίλιππε; ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ, ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα· καὶ πῶς σὺ λέγεις, Δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα; 10. οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί ἐστι; τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, [i] ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ· ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ὁ [j] ἐν ἐμοὶ [j] μένων, αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα. 11. πιστεύετέ μοι ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί· εἰ δὲ μὴ, διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστεύετέ μοι. 12. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, κἀκεῖνος ποιήσει, καὶ [k] μείζονα τούτων ποιήσει· ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν

g xiii. 19 reff.
h Prov. xxx. 16.
i v. 19 reff.
j vi. 56, etc.
k Mt. xxi. 21.

[1] Instead of εγνωκειτε αν W.H. read αν ηδειτε with BCL 33.

are one with Jesus cannot die. They are possessed of the source of life. Further see Hort's *The Way*, etc., and Bernard's *Central Teaching*.—**οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται**, "no one comes to the Father save through me" as the way, the truth, the life. It is not "through believing certain propositions regarding me" nor "through some special kind of faith," but "through me".—Ver. 7. He is the essential knowledge, **εἰ ἐγνώκειτέ με . . .** Some press the distinction between **ἐγνώκειτε** and **ᾔδειτε**, "the first representing a knowledge acquired and progressive; the second a knowledge perceptive and immediate". But this discrimination is here inappropriate. The clause explains the foregoing. The Father is in Jesus, and to know Him is to know the Father. They had unconsciously been coming to the Father and living in Him. Now they were to do so consciously: **ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι γινώσκετε . . . αὐτόν**. The repeated **αὐτόν** brings out the point, that it was the Father that was henceforth to be recognised by them when they saw and thought of Jesus: "ye know *Him* and have seen *Him*".

Vv. 8-14. *A third interruption by Philip; to which Jesus replies, appending to His answer a promise which springs out of what He had said to Philip.*—Ver. 8. **Λέγει . . . ἡμῖν.** Philip, seizing upon the **ἑωράκατε αὐτόν** of ver. 7, utters the universal human craving to see God, to have the same indubitable direct knowledge of Him as we have of one another. Perhaps Philip supposed some appearance visible to the eye would be granted. Always there persists the feeling that more might be done to make God known than has been done.—Ver. 9. Jesus corrects the error, and guides the craving to its true satisfaction. **Τοσοῦτον χρόνον . . . πατέρα** [**τοσοῦτον χρόνον** may be a gloss for the dative which is found in ℵDL]. The manifestation which Philip craves had been made, and made continuously for some considerable time; for so long that it was matter of surprise and regret to Jesus that Philip needed still to be taught that he who saw Jesus saw the Father. It is implied that not to see the Father in Jesus was not to know Him.—Ver. 10. **οὐ πιστεύεις . . . ἐστι;** This unbelief was involved in Philip's question, but when the question of the mutual indwelling of the Father and Jesus was thus directly put to him, he would have no doubt as to the answer. *Cf.* x. 38. The *fact* of the union is indisputable; the *mode* is inexplicable; some of the *results* are indicated in the words: **τὰ ῥήματα . . . τὰ ἔργα.** See vii. 16-18 and v. 19. The mutual indwelling is such that everything Jesus says or does is the Father's saying or doing. This was so obvious that Jesus could appeal to the works He did in case His assertion was disbelieved.—Ver. 11. **πιστεύετέ μοι . . . πιστεύετε.** "Believe me," *i.e.*, my assertion, not my manifestation, "or if you find that difficult, believe on account of the works themselves". The mention of His works and the evidence they afford that He is in the Father suggests to Him a ground of comfort for His disciples in view of His departure. And from this point onwards in this chapter it is to the comforting of the disciples our Lord addresses Him-

l xv. 16. πατέρα μου πορεύομαι. 13. καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε [1]ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, τοῦτο ποιήσω· ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ. 14. ἐάν τι αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐγὼ ποιήσω.

m Burton, 250. n ver. 26; xv. 26; xvi. 7. 1 Jo. ii. 1. o xv. 26; xvi. 13. 1 Jo. iv. 6.

15. "Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς [m]τηρήσατε.[1] 16. καὶ ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον [n]παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μένῃ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 17. [o]τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτό, οὐδὲ γινώσκει αὐτό· ὑμεῖς δὲ γινώσκετε αὐτό, ὅτι παρ' ὑμῖν μένει,[2] καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται.[3]

[1] τηρησετε is read in BL 54, 73, "ye will keep". This is adopted by Tr.Ti.W.H.R. τηρησατε, "keep," is found in ADQ, it. vulg. and other versions.

[2] The vulg. has "manebit," having read μενεῖ. So Arm. and Aeth. versions.

[3] T.R. supported by ℵAD[2]LΠ 33. εστιν by BD* 1, 22, and is adopted by Tr. and W.H.

self. First, in vv. 12-14; second, in vv. 15-17; third, in vv. 18-21. The mention of the Paraclete in connection with this third item of encouragement gives rise to a fourth interruption, this time by Judas, vv. 22-24; and at ver. 25 Jesus resumes His explanation of the Paraclete's function, and closes with several considerations calculated to remove their fears.—Ver. 12. ἀμὴν . . . ποιήσει. The first encouragement is the assurance that through Christ's absence the disciples would be enabled to do greater works than Jesus Himself had done. These "greater" works were the spiritual effects accomplished by the disciples, especially the great novel fact of conversion. See this developed in Parker's *The Paraclete.* Such works were to be possible ὅτι . . . πορεύομαι. It was by founding a spiritual religion and altering men's views of the spiritual world Christ enabled His followers to do these greater works. Here this is explained on the plane of the disciples' thoughts and in this form: "I go to my Father, the source of all power, and whatever you ask in my name I will do it".—Ver. 13. τοῦτο ποιήσω, so what they do is still His doing; one condition being attached to their prayers, that they ask ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου. The name of a person can only be used when we seek to enforce his will and further his interests. This gives the condition of successful prayer: it must be for the furtherance of Christ's kingdom. For the end of all is ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ, that is, that the fulfilment of God's purpose in sending forth His Son may be manifest in Christ's people and in their beneficent work in the world.—Ver. 14. In ver. 14 the promise is repeated, as Euthymius says, for confirmation: τὸ αὐτὸ λέγει βεβαιῶν μάλιστα τὸν λόγον. Perhaps, too, additional significance is given to His agency by introducing ἐγώ. *Cf.* Bengel and Meyer.

Vv. 15-17. *The second encouragement: the promise of another Paraclete.*—Ver. 15. ἐὰν . . . τηρήσατε. The fulfilment of the promise He is about to give depends upon their condition of heart and life. This therefore He announces as the preamble to the promise. On their side there would be a constant endeavour to carry out His instructions: on His side κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω . . . During His ministry Jesus has said little of the Spirit. Now on the eve of His departure He directs attention to this "alter ego". He designates Him ἄλλον παράκλητον, implying that Jesus Himself was a Paraclete. See 1 John ii. 1. παράκλητος is literally *advocatus*, called to one's aid, especially in a court of justice. [*Cf.* παραστάτης in Arist., *Thesm.*, 369; *Eccl.*, 9.] See especially Hatch, *Essays in Bibl. Greek*, p. 82, and Westcott's "Additional Note". "Comforter" in A.V. is used in its original sense of "strengthener" (con, fortis); as in Wiclift's version of Phil. iv. 13, "I may all thingis in him that comfortith me" (see Wright's *Bible Word-Book*). This Paraclete should remain with them for ever, and He is specifically designated (ver. 17) τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, *cf.* xvi. 13, 14; He would enable them to understand the new truths which were battling with their old conceptions, and to readjust their beliefs round a new centre. He would explain the departure of Christ, and the principles of the new economy under which they were henceforth to live. This spirit was to be peculiarly

18. οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς [p] ὀρφανούς· [q] ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 19. ἔτι μικρὸν καὶ ὁ κόσμος με οὐκ ἔτι θεωρεῖ, ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτέ με· ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσεσθε. 20. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ γνώσεσθε ὑμεῖς ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. 21. ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτάς, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με· ὁ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με, ἀγαπηθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου· καὶ ἐγὼ

p Jas. i. 27.
q ver. 3.

theirs, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, the characteristically worldly cannot receive that which can only be apprehended by spiritually prepared persons. It has been proposed to render λαβεῖν, "seize" or "apprehend," as if a contrast to the world's apprehension and dismissal of Jesus were intended. But λαμβάνειν τὸ πνεῦμα is regularly used in N.T. to express "receiving the Spirit," Gal. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 12. The world cannot receive the Spirit ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ, . . . Outward sense cannot apprehend the invisible Spirit; and the world has no personal experience of His presence and power; but ye, ὑμεῖς, have this experimental knowledge, "because He is even now abiding with you (has already begun His ministry; or, rather, has this for His characteristic that He remains with you, making you the object of His work), and shall be within you". With the entire statement *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 8-14.

Vv. 18-21. *The third encouragement: that Jesus Himself will come to them and make Himself known to them.*—Ver. 18. Great as was the promise of this other helper, this spirit of truth, it did not seem to compensate for the departure of Jesus. "Another," any other, was unable to fill the blank; it was Himself they craved. Therefore He goes on, οὐκ ἀφήσω ὑμᾶς ὀρφανούς· ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, "I will not abandon you as orphans," ὀρφανός (orbus) "bereaved," used of fathers bereft of children (1 Thess. ii. 17, Dionys. Hal., i.); as well as of children bereft of parents. See Elsner. πατρικῆς εὐσπλαγχνίας τὸ ῥῆμα, Euthymius. *Cf.* Ps. ix. 14, ὀρφανῷ σὺ ἦσθα βοηθός. Wetstein quotes Rabbi Akiba as lamenting the death of Rabbi Eleazar, "Vae mihi . . . quia totam hanc generationem reliquisti orphanam". The utter helplessness of the disciples without their Master is indicated. ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. From the absence of ἐγώ it may be gathered that Jesus means to point out not so much that it is He who is coming through the spirit to them, as that His apparent departure is really a nearer approach.—Ver. 19. In a short time, ἔτι μικρόν, the world would no longer see Him, but His disciples would be conscious of His presence, ὑμεῖς δὲ θεωρεῖτέ με, present for immediate future. His presence would be manifested in their new life which they would trace to Him, ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ, καὶ ὑμεῖς ζήσεσθε. This is confirmed by Paul's "No longer I, but Christ liveth in me". Gal. ii. 20. The grand evidence of Christ's continued life and presence is the Christian life of the disciple.—Ver. 20. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, "in that day," which does not mean Pentecost, but the new Christian era which was to be characterised by these experiences. *Cf.* Holtzmann. The sense of a new life produced by Christ would compel the conviction ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί . . . "that I am in the Father" in vital union with the source of all life, "and that you are in me," vitally connected with me so as to receive that life that I live, "and I in you," filling you with all the fulness that is in myself, living out my own life in and through you, and finding in you room for the output of all I am.—Ver. 21. The conditions on which depended the manifestation of the departed Christ are then exhibited, ὁ ἔχων . . . ἐμαυτόν. The love to which Christ promises a manifestation of Himself is not an idle sentiment or shallow fancy, but a principle prompting obedience, ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου, *cf.* 1 John ii. 7, iv. 21, 2 John 5; it means more than "hearing," and is yet not equivalent to τηρῶν; it seems to point to the permanent possession of the commandments in consciousness. This finds its appropriate expression in τηρῶν αὐτάς—"keeping them," observing them in the life. This is the expression and proof of love, and this love finds its response and reward in the love of the Father and of the Son, and in the manifestation of the Son to the individual. The appropriateness of introducing the Father and His love appears in ver. 24. The love of Christ is that which prompts the manifestation. ἐμφανίσω, the word is used by Moses in Exodus xxxiii. 13. Reynolds says: "This remarkable word implies that the scene or place of the higher manifestation

ἀγαπήσω αὐτὸν, καὶ ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν." 22. Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης, "Κύριε, τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις [r] ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν, καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ;" 23. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με, τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτὸν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα, καὶ [s] μονὴν παρ' αὐτῷ ποιήσομεν.[1] 24. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με, τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ· καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούετε, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός.

25. "Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν παρ' ὑμῖν μένων· 26. ὁ δὲ [t] παράκλητος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα, καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν.

r Exod. xxxiii. 13. Mt. xxvii. 53. Heb. ix. 24.
s ver. 2.
t ver. 16.

[1] ποιησομεθα has the stronger attestation, being read in ℵBLX 33.

will be in (ἐν) the consciousness of the soul". The word however is currently used for outward manifestation; although here the manifestation alluded to is inward. *Cf.* Judas' words. The nature of the manifestation has already been explained, ver. 19.

Vv. 22-24. *A fourth interruption, by Judas.*—Ver. 22. All that Jesus has said has borne more and more clearly in upon the mind of the disciples the disappointing conviction that the manifestation referred to is not to be on the expected Messianic lines. Accordingly Judas, not Iscariot, but Thaddaeus or Lebbaeus (Mt. x. 3; Lk. vi. 16), says: τί γέγονεν κ. τ. λ. "What has happened that," etc.? or, "What has occurred to determine you," etc.? Kypke quotes from Arrian apposite instances of the use of this expression. Judas expresses, no doubt, the thought of the rest. Was there to be no such public manifestation of Jesus as Messiah, as would convince the world?—Ver. 23. To this Jesus replies ἐάν τις . . . ποιήσομεν. The answer explains that the manifestation, being spiritual, must be individual and to those spiritually prepared. "It contemplates not a public discovery of power, but a sort of domestic visitation of love." Bernard. πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα, "to him we will come"; Jesus without scruple unites Himself with the Father. μονὴν . . . ποιησόμεθα, a classical expression, see Thuc., i. 131, μονὴν . . . ποιούμενος. "We will make our abode with him, will be daily his guests, yea, house and table companions." Luther in Meyer. μονή is here used in a sense different from that of ver. 2, where it means a place to abide in.—Ver. 24. The necessity of love as a condition of this manifested presence is further emphasised by stating the converse, ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με . . . πατρός. The κόσμος of ver. 22 is here more closely defined by ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με. See Holtzmann.

Vv. 25-31. *The conversation closed by bequest of peace.* The genuineness of this report of the last words of Jesus is guaranteed by the frequency with which He seems to be on the point of breaking off. The constant resumption, the adding of things that occur on the moment, these are the inimitable touch of nature. At this point the close seems imminent.—Ver. 25. Ταῦτα λελάληκα . . . μένων, implying that this abiding and teaching were now at an end.—Ver. 26. But His teaching would be continued and completed by the Paraclete: ὁ δὲ παράκλητος . . . ὑμῖν. The Paraclete is now identified with τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, and His connection with Christ is further guaranteed by the clause ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, "which the Father will send in my name," that is, as representing me and promoting my interests. And this He will accomplish by teaching: ἐκεῖνος "He," and no longer the visible Christ, "will teach you all things," πάντα in contrast to the ταῦτα (ver. 25) with which Christ had to be satisfied; but πάντα must itself be limited by the needs and capacities of the disciples.—καὶ ὑπομνήσει . . . "and will bring to your remembrance all that I said to you," that is, the teaching of the Spirit should so connect itself with the teaching of Christ as to revive the memory of forgotten words of His, and give them a new meaning. *Cf.* especially xvi. 12-14.—Ver. 27. εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, "peace I bequeath to you". The usual farewell was given with the word

27. εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν· οὐ καθὼς ὁ κόσμος δίδωσιν, ἐγὼ δίδωμι ὑμῖν. [u] μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία, μηδὲ [v] δειλιάτω. 28. ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν, Ὑπάγω καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. εἰ ἠγαπᾶτέ με, ἐχάρητε ἂν ὅτι εἶπον, Πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστί. 29. καὶ νῦν εἴρηκα ὑμῖν [w] πρὶν γενέσθαι· ἵνα ὅταν γένηται, πιστεύσητε.

30. "Οὐκ ἔτι πολλὰ λαλήσω μεθ' ὑμῶν· ἔρχεται γὰρ [x] ὁ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἄρχων, καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν· 31. ἀλλ' ἵνα γνῷ ὁ κόσμος, ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ καθὼς ἐνετείλατό μοι ὁ πατήρ, οὕτω ποιῶ. ἐγείρεσθε, [y] ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν.

u ver. 1.
v Deut. i. 21. Is. xiii. 7.
w Is. xlvi. 10. Ecclus. xlviii. 25.
x xii. 31 reff.
y xi. 7.

"peace". And Jesus uses the familiar word, but instead of uttering a mere wish He turns it into a bequest, intimating His power not only to wish but to give peace in the further description **εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν**, "my peace I give unto you"; the peace which He had attained by means of all the disturbance and opposition He had encountered. Leaving them His work, His view of life, His Spirit, He necessarily left them His peace.—**οὐ καθὼς ὁ κόσμος δίδωσιν, ἐγὼ δίδωμι ὑμῖν**, "not as the world gives give I to you". This is referred by Grotius to the difference between the empty form of salutation and Christ's gift of peace. ("*Mundus*, *i.e.*, major pars hominum, salute alios impertit sono vocis, nihil saepe de re cogitans; et si cogitet, tamen id alteri nihil prodest.") So too Holtzmann and Bernard. Meyer considers this "quite out of relation to the profound seriousness of the moment," and understands the allusion to be to the treasures, honours, pleasures which the world gives. There is no reason why the primary reference should not be to the salutation, with a secondary reference to the wider contrast. This gift of peace, if accepted, would secure them against perturbation, and so Jesus returns to the exhortation of ver. 1, **μὴ ταρασσέσθω** . . . "Observing that the opening sentence of the discourse is here repeated and fortified, we understand that all enclosed within these limits is to be taken as a whole in itself, and that the intervening words compose a divine antidote to that troubling and desolation of heart which the Lord's departure would suggest." Bernard. He now adds a word, **μηδὲ δειλιάτω**, which carries some reproach in it. Theophrastus (*Char.*, xxvii.) defines **δειλία** as **ὕπειξίς τις ψυχῆς ἔμφοβος**, a shrinking of the soul through fear. With this must be taken Aristotle's description, *Nic. Eth.*, iii. 6, 7, **ὁ δὲ τῷ φοβεῖσθαι ὑπερβάλλων δειλός**. It may be rendered "neither let your heart timidly shrink".—Ver. 28. On the contrary quite other feelings should possess them: joy in sympathy with Him in His glorification and in expectation of the results of His going to the Father: **ἠκούσατε . . . πατέρα**. "If ye loved me," an almost playful way of reproaching their sadness. There was no doubt of their love, but it was an unintelligent love. They failed to consider the great joy that awaited Him in His going to the Father. This going to the Father was cause for rejoicing, **ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου** [**μου** is not well authenticated and should be deleted] **μείζων μου ἐστί**, "because the Father is greater than I"; and can therefore fulfil all the loving purposes of Christ to His disciples. "The life which He has begun with them and for them will be raised to a higher level." They had seen the life He had lived and were disturbed because it was coming to an end: but it was coming to an end because absorbed in the greater life He would have with the Father. The theological import of the words is discussed by Westcott, who cites patristic opinions and refers to Bull and Pearson. In all that Jesus did, it was the Father's will He carried out, and with powers communicated by the Father: the Father is the Originator and End of all His work in the world. Throughout the ministry of Jesus the Father is represented as "greater" than the Son. That it should require to be explicitly affirmed, as here, is the strongest evidence that He was Divine.—Ver. 29. **καὶ νῦν . . . πιστεύσητε**. "I have told you now before it came to pass," *i.e.*, He has told them of His departure, that they might not be terrified or depressed by its occurrence, but might recognise it as foretold by Him as the consummation of His work and so might have their faith increased.

a Ps. lxxx. 8. Jer. ii. 21.
b Rom. xi. 17.

XV. 1. "ΕΓΩ εἰμι ἡ [a] ἄμπελος ἡ [a] ἀληθινή, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός ἐστι. 2. πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπόν, [b] αἴρει αὐτό· καὶ πᾶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρον, καθαίρει αὐτό, ἵνα πλείονα καρπὸν φέρῃ.

Cf. xiii. 19.—Ver. 30. **οὐκ ἔτι . . . ὑμῶν.** "I will no longer speak much with you"; "temporis angustiae abripiunt verba," Grotius.—**ἔρχεται . . . οὐδέν.** "The ruler of this world" is Satan, see xii. 31. He "comes" in the treachery of Judas (xiii. 27) and all that followed. But this coming was without avail, because **ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν,** "in me he hath nothing," nothing he can call his own, nothing he can claim as his, and which he can use for his purposes. He is ruler of the world, but in Christ has no possessions or rule. A notable assertion of sinlessness.—Ver. 31. Jesus goes to death not crushed by the machinations of Satan, "but that the world may know that I love the Father and as the Father has commanded me," **οὕτω ποιῶ,** "thus I do," applies to His whole life, which was throughout ruled by regard to the Father's commandment, but in the foreground of His thought at present is His departure from the disciples, His death.—**ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν,** "arise, let us go hence," similar to the summons in Mt. xxvi. 46, but the idea of referring so common an expression to a reminiscence of the Synoptic passage is absurd. On the movement made in consequence of the summons, see on xv. 1.

In chapters xv. and xvi. Jesus (1) explains the relation He holds to those who continue His work, xv. 1-17; (2) the attitude the world will assume to His followers, xv. 18-25; (3) the conquest of the world by the Spirit, 26-xvi. 11; and (4) adds some last words, encouragements and warnings, xvi. 12-33. In this last conversation, which extends from chap. xiii. to chap. xvi. inclusive, the closing words of chap. xiv., **ἐγείρεσθε ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν,** form the best marked division. At this point Jesus and His disciples rose from table. Whether the conversation was continued in the house or after they left it may be doubtful; but probabilities are certainly much in favour of the former alternative. A party of twelve could not conveniently talk together on the street. In xviii. 1 we read that when Jesus had uttered the prayer recorded in xvii. **ἐξῆλθε σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τῶν Κέδρων.** This, however, may refer to their leaving the city, not the house. Bengel thinks they may have paused in the courtyard of the house.

Chapter XV.—Vv. 1-17. *The relation between Jesus and His disciples represented by the relation of the vine and its branches.*—Ver. 1. **Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή,** "I am the true vine." **ἡ ἀληθινή** suggests a contrast to other vines to which this title could not be applied: but not to a vine trailing across the window of the room where they were, nor to the golden vine on the Temple gate, nor to the vines on the slopes of Olivet; but to Israel, the stock which God had planted to bring forth fruit to Him, see Ps. lxxx., Is. v., Jer. ii. 21. **ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφύτευσά σε ἄμπελον καρποφόρον πᾶσαν ἀληθινήν.** The vine was a recognised symbol also of the Messiah, see Delitzsch in *Expositor*, third series, iii., p. 68, and in his *Iris*, pp. 180-190, E. Tr. On the Maccabean coinage Israel was represented by a vine. It was the present situation which here suggested the figure. As Jesus rose to depart the disciples crowd round Him with anxiety on every face. Their helplessness and trouble appeal to Him, and He encourages them by reminding them that, although left to do His work in the world, they would still be united to Him as truly as the branches to the vine. He and His together are the true Vine of God. **καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός ἐστι,** "and my Father is the vine-dresser". What is now happening is the Father's doing, and, therefore, tends to the well-being and fruitfulness of the vine. ["Pater qui cum diligit me, certe servabit totum fruticem." Melanchthon.]—Ver. 2. The function of the vine-dresser is at once described: **πᾶν κλῆμα . . . φέρῃ. κλῆμα,** or more fully as in Xen., *Oecon.*, xix. 8, **κλῆμα ἀμπέλου,** is the shoot of the vine which is annually put forth. It is from **κλάω,** "I break," as also is **κλάδος,** but Wetstein quotes Pollux to show that **κλάδος** was appropriated to the shoots of the olive, while **κλῆμα** signified a vine-shoot. Of these shoots there are two kinds, the fruitless, which the vine-dresser **αἴρει:** "Inutilesque falce ramos amputans," Hor. *Epod.*, ii. 13; the fruitful, which He **καθαίρει** ["suavis rhythmus," Bengel]. The full meaning of **αἴρει** is described in ver. 6: **καθαίρει** here denotes

3. ἤδη ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε, διὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν λελάληκα ὑμῖν. c 4. μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. καθὼς τὸ κλῆμα οὐ δύναται καρπὸν φέρειν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ, ἐὰν μὴ μείνῃ ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς, ἐὰν μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ μείνητε. 5. ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα. ὁ μένων ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος φέρει καρπὸν πολύν· ὅτι χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν. 6. ἐὰν μή τις μείνῃ[1] ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα, καὶ ἐξηράνθη, καὶ d e συνάγουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλουσι, καὶ καίεται. 7. ἐὰν e μείνητε ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ, ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε

c xiii. 10, 11. xvii. 17.
d Mt. iii. 10 and vii. 19.
e iv. 36. Mt. xiii. 47.

[1] μενη is better authenticated, being found in ℵ*ABD.

especially the pruning requisite for concentrating the vigour of the tree on the one object, ἵνα πλείονα καρπὸν φέρῃ, that it may continually surpass itself, and yield richer and richer results. The vine-dresser spares no pains and no material on his plants, but all for the sake of fruit. [*Cf.* Cicero, *De Senec.*, xv. 53.] The use of καθαίρει was probably determined by the καθαροί of ver. 3.—Ver. 3. ἤδη ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε: "Already ye are clean". καθαροί here means "in a condition fit to bear fruit"; in xiii. 10, 11, it is suggested by the feet-washing, and means "free from inward stain". It is similarly used even in classical writers. διὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν λελάληκα ὑμῖν, "on account of the word which I have spoken unto you". For διά in this sense as indicating the source, see vi. 67. The word which Jesus had spoken to them, *i.e.*, the whole revelation He had made, had brought spiritual life, and, therefore, cleansing. But this condition they must strive to maintain, μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγω ἐν ὑμῖν. μενῶ must be understood after κἀγω. Maintain your belief in me, your attachment to me, your derivation of hope, aim, and motive from me: and I will abide in you, filling you with all the life you need to represent me on earth. All the divine energy you know to be in me will now pass through you.—Ver. 4. It is in and through you I live henceforth. καθὼς τὸ κλῆμα . . . μείνητε [or μένητε]; illustrating by the figure the necessity of the foregoing injunction. A branch that falls to the ground, and no longer abides in the vine as a living part of it, cannot bear fruit, so neither can ye except ye abide in me. That is, ye cannot bear the fruit my Father, the vine-dresser, looks for, and by which He will be glorified, ver. 8.—Ver. 5. ἐγὼ . . . κλήματα—"I am the Vine, ye are the branches," together forming one tree and possessed by one common life. The stock does not bear fruit, but only the branches; the branches cannot live without the stock. Therefore it follows ὁ μένων . . . οὐδέν. The one thing needful for fruit-bearing is that we abide in Christ, and He in us; that the branch adhere to the vine, and the life of the vine flow into the branch. χωρὶς ἐμοῦ, "in separation from me". See Eph. ii. 12. Grotius gives the equivalents "seorsim," "separatim," κατὰ μονάς, κατ᾽ αὐτό. οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν, "ye cannot do anything," absolutely nothing according to i. 3, 4; but here the meaning is, "ye cannot do anything which is glorifying to God, anything which can be called fruit-bearing," ver. 8.—Ver. 6. ἐὰν μή τις μείνῃ, "if any one shall not have abided in me". ἐβλήθη . . . ἐξηράνθη, the gnomic aorist, *cf.* 1 Peter i. 24; and see Burton, *M. and T.*, 43, and Grotius: "Hi aoristi sine designatione temporis significant quid fieri soleat, pro quo et praesens saepe usurpatur". The whole process undergone by the fruitless branch is described in these six verbs, αἴρει ver. 2, ἐβλήθη, ἐξηράνθη, συνάγουσιν, βάλλουσι, καίεται, and each detail is thus given for the sake of emphasising the inevitableness and the completeness of the destruction. ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα, "is cast out," *i.e.*, from the vineyard, as the next words show; here this means hopeless rejection. The result is ἐξηράνθη, the natural capacity for fruit-bearing is destroyed. The figure derived from the treatment of the fruitless branch is continued in συνάγουσιν . . . καίεται, *cf.* Mt. xiii. 49, 50; and 41, 42. On καίεται, Euthymius remarks οὐ μὴν κατακαίονται "but are not consumed". And in Exod. iii. 2, the bush καίεται, but οὐ κατεκαίετο "burns, but was not consumed". But this only shows that without the

αἰτήσεσθε,[1] καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν. 8. ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, [f]ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε· καὶ γενήσεσθε[2] ἐμοὶ μαθηταί. 9. Καθὼς ἠγάπησέ με ὁ πατὴρ, κἀγὼ ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς· [g]μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ. 10. ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ μου· καθὼς ἐγὼ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ πατρός μου τετήρηκα, καὶ μένω αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. 11. ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ,[3] καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ. 12. αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ ἐμὴ, [h]ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα

f iv. 34; xv. 12, etc. See Burton, 213.
g viii. 31.
h ver. 8 reff.

[1] αιτησεσθε, although supported by ℵ and Π, must give place to the imperative αιτησασθε found in ABDL.

[2] T.R. in ℵA. γενησθε in BDLM adopted by Tr.W.H., "and that ye be my disciples".

[3] η in ABD 33: μεινη in ℵLXΠ.

miraculous interposition it would have been consumed.—Ver. 7. From the fate of those who do not abide in Him, Jesus turns to the results of faithful adherence—ἐὰν μείνητε . . . ὑμῖν. The expression is altered from that of vv. 3 and 5, instead of "and I in you," we now have "and my words abide in you"; it is by means of His teaching and His commandments that Christ abides in His people, and by His word they are fitted for fruit-bearing, ver. 3. Not that His words are a substitute for His personal presence, but its medium. But His presence is not to energise in them as if they were machines; they are to consider the exigencies that arise, and, giving play to judgment and conscience, are to ask for appropriate manifestations of grace: ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε, "ask what ye will". Petitions thus prompted by the indwelling word of Christ will necessarily be answered: καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν.—Ver. 8. Further assurance of an answer is given in the fact that the γεωργός is glorified in the fruit-bearing branches: ἐν τούτῳ, "in this pre-eminently," *i.e.*, in your bearing much fruit, *cf.* vi. 29, 30, 40. So, rightly, Weiss and Holtzmann. For construction with ἵνα see Burton on Subject, Predicate and Appositive clauses introduced by ἵνα.—ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα, etc. ἐδοξάσθη, proleptic; *cf.* xiii. 31. The Father is glorified in everything which demonstrates that through Christ His grace reaches and governs men.—καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί, "and ye shall become my disciples". The ἐμοὶ μαθηταί seems to mean: This is the relation you will hold to me, *viz.*, that of discipleship. "A Christian never 'is,' but always 'is becoming' a Christian. And it is by his fruitfulness that he indicates his claim to the name." Westcott.

Vv. 9-17. *The disciples are urged to fulfil Christ's purposes in the world, and are assured that if they abide in the love of Christ they will receive all they need for fruit-bearing.*—Ver. 9. Καθὼς ἠγάπησε . . . ἐμῇ. Love is the true bond which gives unity to the moral world, and inspires discipleship. All that Christ experiences is the result of the Father's love: all that the disciples are called to be and to do is the outcome of Christ's love. This love of Christ was to be retained as their possession by their conforming themselves to it: μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ, "abide in my love," no longer "abide in me," but specifically "in my love". Abide in it, for there is a possibility of your falling away from its enjoyment and possession.—Ver. 10. That possibility is defeated, ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε. To encourage them in keeping His commandments He reminds them that He also has been subject to the same conditions, and by keeping the Father's commandments has remained in His love.—Ver. 11. The great joy of His life had been found in the consciousness of the Father's love and in the keeping of His commandments: this joy He desires that they may inherit, ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ, "my joy," *i.e.*, the joy I have enjoyed, the joy which I habitually feel in accomplishing the Father's will. This joy is not an incommunicable monopoly.—καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ, "and your joy be full," which it could not be until they, like Him, had the spring of full joy in the consciousness of His love, and perfect obedience to Him; standing in

ὑμᾶς. 13. μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ [i] θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ. 14. ὑμεῖς [j] φίλοι μου ἐστέ, ἐὰν ποιῆτε ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν. 15. οὐκέτι ὑμᾶς λέγω δούλους, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδε τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα φίλους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα [k] παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου, ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν. 16. οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς, καὶ [l] ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε καὶ καρπὸν φέρητε, καὶ ὁ καρπὸς ὑμῶν μένῃ· ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα [m] ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, δῷ ὑμῖν. 17. ταῦτα ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.

i x. 11 reff.
j Mt. xii. 50.
k viii. 26, etc.
l Acts xx. 28. 1 Cor. xii. 28. 1 Tim. i. 12.
m xiv. 14.

the same relation to Him as He to the Father.—Ver. 12. And that they might know definitely what His commandment (ver. 10) is, He says, **αὕτη . . . ὑμᾶς.** "This is my commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." Perhaps they expected minute, detailed instructions such as they had received when first sent out (Matt. x.). Instead of this, love was to be their sufficient guide. **καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς.**—His love was at once the source and the measure of theirs. In His love for them they were to find the spring of love to one another, and were to become transparencies through which His love would shine.—Ver. 13. And that they might not underrate the measure of this exemplary love, He says, **μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην . . . αὐτοῦ. Ταύτης** is explained by **ἵνα . . . αὐτοῦ** as in ver. 8; and does not directly mean "than this which I have shown and still show," as understood by Westcott and Whitelaw. It is a general statement, the application of which is suggested in ver. 14. Self-sacrifice is the high water mark of love. Friends can demand nothing more: there is no more that love can do to exhibit devotedness to friends, *cf.* Rom. v. 6, 8, 10.—Ver. 14. Then comes the application: **ὑμεῖς . . . ὑμῖν.** "Ye are my friends, if ye do what I command you." You may expect of me this greatest demonstration of love, and therefore every minor demonstration of it which your circumstances may require, "if ye do," etc. This condition was added not to chill and daunt, but to encourage: when you find how much suffering the completion of my work entails upon you, assure yourselves of my love. It is copartnery in work that will give you assurance that you are my friends.—Ver. 15. "Friends" who may expect all the good offices of their Friend, not "slaves," is the character in which alone you can carry on my work: **οὐκέτι ὑμᾶς λέγω δούλους . . . ὑμῖν.** The designation "slave" is no longer (**οὐκέτι**) appropriate, *cf.* xiii. 16 and Jas. i. 1, Phil. i. 1, etc. It is not appropriate, because **ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδε τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος** "the slave knows not what his lord is doing," he receives his allotted task but is not made acquainted with the ends his master wishes to serve by his toil ("servus tractatur ut **ὄργανον**". Bengel). He is animated by no sympathy with his master's purpose nor by any personal interest in what he is doing. Therefore "friends" is the appropriate designation, **ὑμᾶς δὲ εἴρηκα φίλους,** "but I have called you friends". Schoettgen quotes from Jalkut Rubeni, 164, "Deus Israelitas prae nimio amore primo vocat servos, deinde filios, Deut. xiv. 1". Other remarkable passages on God's calling the Israelites "friends" are also cited by him *in loc.* For the peculiar use of **εἴρηκα,** *cf.* x. 35 and 1 Cor. xii. 3; and for parallels in the classics, see Rose's *Parkhurst's Lexicon.* **ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου, ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν.** Jesus had opened to them the mind of the Father in sending Him to the world, and as this purpose of the Father had commended itself to Jesus, and fired Him with the desire to fulfil it, so does He expect that the disciples will intelligently enter into His purposes, make them their own, and spend themselves on their fulfilment.—Ver. 16. **οὐχ ὑμεῖς . . . ὑμῖν.** This is added to encourage them in taking up and prosecuting the work of Jesus. Euthymius says it is **ἄλλο τεκμήριον τοῦ ἔχειν αὐτοὺς φίλους ἑαυτοῦ;** but it is more. They are invited to depend on His will, not on their own. They had not discovered Him, and attached themselves to Him, as likely to suit their purposes. "It is not ye who chose me." But "I chose you," as a king selects his officers, to fulfil my purposes. **καὶ ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς,** "and I set (or, appointed) you," *cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 28, Acts xx. 28, etc., see Con-

18. "Εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ, γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐμὲ [n] πρῶτον ὑμῶν μεμίσηκεν. 19. [o] εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει· ὅτι δὲ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστὲ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, διὰ τοῦτο μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος. 20. μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν, Οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν· εἰ τὸν λόγον μου ἐτήρησαν, καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον τηρήσουσιν. 21. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πάντα ποιήσουσιν ὑμῖν [p] διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασι τὸν πέμψαντά με. 22. εἰ μὴ ἦλθον καὶ ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς, [q] ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ [q] εἶχον [6]· νῦν δὲ [r] πρόφασιν οὐκ

n i. 15.
o 1 Jo. iv. 5. Jas. iv. 4.
p ὑπὲρ Acts v. 41; ix. 16; xxi. 13, etc.; ἕνεκεν Mt. xix. 29. Lk. xxi. 12, etc.
q ix. 41; xix. 11. 1 Jo. i. 8.
r Phil. i. 18. Mt. xxiii. 13.

cordance. The purpose of the appointment is ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑπάγητε, "that you may go away" from me on your various missions, and thus (resuming the original figure of the vine and branches) καρπὸν φέρητε, may bear fruit in my stead, and supplied by my life. Or to express this purpose in a manner which reveals the source of their power to bear fruit, ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε . . . δῷ ὑμῖν, see ver. 7, and xiv. 13.—Ver. 17. ταῦτα ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν. "These things" which I have now spoken "I enjoin upon you," ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, "in order that ye may love one another".

Vv. 18-25. *The relation of the disciples to the world.*—Ver. 18. Εἰ ὁ κόσμος . . . μεμίσηκεν, "If the world hates you," as it does (indicative); "the world" is contrasted with "one another" of ver. 17, with the disciples who were to love. γινώσκετε, "ye know," or, if it be taken as an imperative, "know ye," that it has hated me, πρῶτον ὑμῶν, "before you," and, as in i. 15 where also the superlative is found, not only "before" in point of time, but as the norm or prototype.—Ver. 19. εἰ ἐκ . . . ἐφίλει, "If ye were of the world, the world would love [that which is] its own"; not always the case, but generally. ὅτι δὲ . . . ὁ κόσμος, "but because ye are not of the world," do not belong to it, and are not morally identified with it, "but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hates you". So that the hatred of the world, instead of being depressing, should be exhilarating, as being an evidence and guarantee that they have been chosen by Christ.—Ver. 20. μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου . . . αὐτοῦ. μνημονεύετε (from μνήμων, mindful), "be mindful of," sometimes used pregnantly, as in 1 Thess. i. 3; Gal. ii. 10; "the words which I said to you," *viz.*, in xiii. 16, and Mt. x. 24, 25. The outcome of the principle is seen in 2 Tim. ii. 11, and 1 Peter iv. 13. That He should speak of them as "servants" so shortly after calling them "friends," shows how natural and appropriate both designations are, how truly service characterises His friends, and how He must at all times be looked upon as Supreme Lord. εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν . . . τηρήσουσιν. "If they persecuted me, you also will they persecute; if they kept my word, yours too will they keep." In so far as they are identified with Him, their experience will be identical with His. The attitude of the world does not alter. Bengel takes ἐτήρησαν in a hostile sense, "infensis modis observare," referring to Mt. xxvii. 36, but in John τὸν λόγον τηρεῖν is regularly used of "observing" in the sense of "keeping," practising, see viii. 51, ix. 16, xiv. 23; 1 John ii. 3, 4, 5, etc.; Apoc. i. 3, iii. 8, etc.—Ver. 21. ἀλλά. "But" be not dismayed at persecution, for "all these things they will do to you *for my name's sake*". ταῦτα πάντα seems to involve that details had been given (*cf.* Mt. x. 16 ff.) which were omitted by the reporter; or that xvi. 2 had been already uttered; or that John, writing when the persecutions of the Christians were well known, uses "all these things" from his own point of view. διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. The efficacy of this consolation appears everywhere in the Apostolic age; Acts v. 41; Phil. i. 29, and *cf.* Ramsay's *Church in the Roman Empire*. The "name" of Christ was hateful to the world, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασι τὸν πέμψαντά με. They did not believe He was sent, because they did not know the sender. Had they known God, they would have recognised Christ as sent by Him. *Cf.* vii. 28, v. 38, εἰ μὴ ἦλθον . . . αὐτῶν.—Ver. 22. "If I had not come and spoken to them," as the revealer of the Father, "they would not have sin," they would still be ignorant of the Father, but would not have incurred the guilt which attaches to ignorance maintained in the presence of light. ἔχειν ἁμαρτίαν is Johannine, see ver. 24;

ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. 23. ὁ ἐμὲ μισῶν, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου μισεῖ. 24. εἰ τὰ ἔργα μὴ ἐποίησα ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἃ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος πεποίηκεν, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον[1]· νῦν δὲ καὶ [s] ἑωράκασι, καὶ μεμισήκασι καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου· 25. ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν, '[t] Ὅτι ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν.' 26. Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ [u] παράκλητος, ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ [v] παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς [v] ἐκπορεύεται, ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ· 27. καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, ὅτι ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐστε.

s xiv. 9.
t Ps. xxxv. 19; lxix. 4.
u xiv. 16.
v More freq. with ἐκ; cp. xvi. 28.

[1] ειχοσαν in ℵB; ειχον in AD[2].

xix. 11; 1 John i. 8. νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. "But now," as I have come, "they have no excuse for," etc., πρόφασιν, *cf.* Ps. cxl. 4: "Incline not my heart προφασίζεσθαι προφάσεις ἐν ἁμαρτίαις".—Ver. 23. In hating me, they hate my Father whom I represent, ὁ ἐμὲ μισῶν . . . μισεῖ. In hating and persecuting me, it is God they hate.—Ver. 24. εἰ τὰ ἔργα . . . οὐκ εἶχον. This repeats in a slightly varied form the statement of ver. 22. He had not only come and spoken, but had done works which none other had done, *cf.* iii. 2; ix. 32; vii. 31. The miracles wrought by Christ were themselves of a kind fitted to produce faith. In them men were meant to see God, v. 17, 19, 20. So that He could say, νῦν δὲ καὶ ἑωράκασι . . . μου. This is their guilt, that they have both seen and hated both me and my Father. This does not imply that they had been conscious of seeing the Father in Christ, but only that in point of fact they had done so. *Cf.* xiv. 9; i. 18.—Ver. 25. This almost incredible blindness and obduracy is accounted for, as in xii. 37, by the purpose of God disclosed in O.T. Scripture. "Their law" is here, as in x. 34, etc., used of O.T. Scripture as a whole. αὐτῶν is inserted, as ὑμετέρῳ in viii. 17, to suggest that the very Scripture in which they had prided themselves would condemn them; see also v. 45, v. 39. The words ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν do not occur in O.T.; but similar expressions are found in Ps. xxxiv. 19, οἱ μισοῦντές με δωρεάν, and cviii. 3, ἐπολέμησάν με δωρεάν. Entirely gratuitous was their hatred and rejection of Christ, so that they were inexcusable.

Ver. 26—xvi. 11. *The conquest of the world by the Spirit.*—Ver. 26. But the work of the Apostles was not to be wholly fruitless, nor was their experience to be wholly comprised in fruitless persecution. Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ . . . περὶ ἐμοῦ. The Spirit of Truth will witness concerning me. The Spirit is here designated, as in xiv. 16, "the Paraclete," and the Spirit of Truth. There, and in xiv. 26, it is the Father who is to give and send Him in Christ's name: here it is ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, as if the Spirit were not only dwelling with the Father, but could only be sent out from the Father as the source of the sending. This is still further emphasised in the added clause, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται. To define the mode of being of the Spirit, or His essential relation to the Father, would have been quite out of place in the circumstances. These words must be understood of the *mission* of the Spirit. What the disciples needed to know was that He came out from the Father, and of this they are here assured. ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ, "He," that person thus elaborately described, who is truth and who comes out from Him who sent me, "will witness concerning me".—Ver. 27. καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε, "and do ye also witness," or, if indicative, "and ye also witness". Most prefer the indicative. "The disciples were already the witnesses which they were to be in the future." Meyer. This agrees with the ἐστε following. They were able to act as witnesses ὅτι ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐστε, "because from the beginning," of the Messianic activity, "ye are with me". The present, ἐστε, is natural as Jesus is looking at their entire fellowship with Him, and that was still continuing. *Cf.* Mk. iii. 14, ἐποίησε δώδεκα, ἵνα ὦσι μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ; also Acts i. 21, iv. 13.—CHAPTER XVI. ver. 1. Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, I have warned you of persecution, and have told you of the encouragements you will have, ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλισθῆτε, "that ye be not

a Mt. xi. 6.
b ix. 22; xii. 42.
c xii. 23; cp. v. 25.
d vi. 64 only; cp. xv. 27.
e xiii. 36.
f xi. 50; xviii. 14.

XVI. 1. "Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα μὴ [a] σκανδαλισθῆτε. 2. [b] ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα, [c] ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς, δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ Θεῷ. 3. καὶ ταῦτα ποιήσουσιν ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν πατέρα οὐδὲ ἐμέ. 4. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα, μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν· ταῦτα δὲ ὑμῖν [d] ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ εἶπον, ὅτι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην. 5. νῦν δὲ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πέμψαντά με, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐρωτᾷ με, [e] Ποῦ ὑπάγεις; 6. ἀλλ' ὅτι ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἡ λύπη πεπλήρωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν καρδίαν. 7. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ὑμῖν, [f] συμφέρει ὑμῖν [f] ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω. ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἀπέλθω, ὁ παράκλητος οὐκ ἐλεύσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ, πέμψω

staggered," or stumbled, *i.e.*, that the troubles that fall upon you may not induce you to apostatise. See Thayer and Parkhurst, and Wetstein on Mt. v. 29. *Cf.* also Mt. xi. 6.—Ver. 2. **ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς.** For the word **ἀποσυν.** see ix. 22, xii. 42; "they will put you out of their synagogues," they will make you outcasts from their synagogues. **ἀλλ'**, "yea," or "yea more"; used in this sense Rom. vii. 7, 2 Cor. vii. 11, where it occurs six times. *Cf.* Acts xix. 2.—**ἔρχεται . . . Θεῷ. ἔρχεται ὥρα ἵνα**, *cf.* xii. 23, **ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα . . .** and Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 216, on the complementary limitation by **ἵνα** of nouns signifying set time, etc. And for **πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας**, the aorist indicating those "who once do the act the single doing of which is the mark of the class," see Burton, 124, *cf.* 148.—**δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν**, "may think that he offers sacrificial service". **λατρεία** is used in Exod. xii. 25, etc., of the Passover; apparently used in a more general sense in 1 Macc. ii. 19, 22; and defined by Suicer "quicquid fit in honorem et cultum Dei," and by Theophylact as **θεάρεστον ἔργον**, a work well pleasing to God. *Cf.* Rom. xii. 1. Meyer and others quote the maxim of Jewish fanaticism, "Omnis effundens sanguinem improborum aequalis est illi qui sacrificium facit".—Ver. 3. This fanatical blindness is traced to its source, as in xv. 21, to their ignorance of God and of Christ: **καὶ ταῦτα . . . ἐμέ.** And He forewarns them that they might not be taken unawares.—Ver. 4. **ἀλλὰ ταῦτα . . . ὑμῖν.** This repeats ver. 1, but He now adds an explanation of His silence up to this time regarding their future: **ταῦτα δὲ ὑμῖν . . . ἤμην. ἐξ ἀρχῆς = ἀπ' ἀρχῆς** of xv. 27, Holtzmann. If there is a difference, **ἐξ ἀρχῆς** indicates rather the point of time (*cf.* its only other occurrence, vi. 64) while **ἀπ' ἀρχῆς** indicates continuity. The fact of the silence has been disputed: but no definite and full intimations have hitherto been given of the future experience of the Apostles, as representing an absent Lord. The reason of His silence was **ὅτι μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην**, "because I was with you". While He was with them they leant upon Him and could not apprehend a time of weakness and of persecution. See Mt. ix. 15.—Ver. 5. **νῦν δὲ**, "but now," in contrast to **ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ὑπάγω**, "I go away," in contrast to **μεθ' ὑμῶν ἤμην, πρὸς . . . με**, "to Him that sent me," as one who has discharged the duty committed to Him. **καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν . . . ὑπάγεις**, "and no one of you asks me, Where are you going?" They were so absorbed in the thought of His departure and its consequences of bereavement to themselves that they had failed to ascertain clearly where He was going. **ἀλλ' ὅτι . . . καρδίαν.** The consequence of their absorption in one aspect of the crisis which He had been explaining to them was that grief had filled their heart to the exclusion of every other feeling. *Cf.* xiv. 28.—Ver. 7. **ἀλλ' ἐγὼ . . . ἀπέλθω.** "But," or "nevertheless I tell you the truth," I who see the whole event tell you "it is to your advantage" and not to your loss "that I go away". This statement, incredible as it seemed to the disciples, He justifies: **ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἀπέλθω . . . ὑμᾶς.** The withdrawal of the bodily presence of Christ was the essential condition of His universal spiritual presence.—Ver. 8. **καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖνος . . .** "and when He" (with some emphasis, "that person") "has come, He will reprove," or as in R.V., "convict the world". "Reprove," reprobare, to rebut or refute, as in Henry VI., iii., l. 40, "Reprove my

αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· 8. καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖνος [g] ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως. 9. περὶ ἁμαρτίας μέν, ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ· 10. περὶ δικαιοσύνης δέ, ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου ὑπάγω, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι θεωρεῖτέ με. 11. περὶ δὲ κρίσεως, ὅτι [h] ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κέκριται.

12. "[i] Ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε [i] βαστάζειν ἄρτι· 13. ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, [j] ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν[1]· οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ'

g viii. 46. 1 Cor. xiv. 24.
h xii. 31.
i Rev. ii. 2. Mt. xx. 12. 1 Cor. iii. 2.
j xiv. 26. Acts viii. 31. Mt. xv. 14.

[1] εν τη αληθεια παση in ℵDL, possibly originating in the common occurrence of οδηγειν with dative in Sept., see Ps. xxv. 5.

allegation if you can," is no longer used in this sense. The verb ἐλέγξει expresses the idea of pressing home a conviction. The object of this work of the Spirit is "the world" as opposed to Christ; and the subjects regarding which (περὶ) the convictions are to be wrought are "sin, righteousness and judgment". Regarding these three great spiritual facts, new ideas are to be borne in upon the human mind by the spirit.—Ver. 9. In detail, new convictions περὶ ἁμαρτίας are to be wrought, ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ. Each of the three clauses introduced by ὅτι is in apposition with the foregoing substantive, and is explanatory of the ground of the conviction, "Concerning sin, because they do not believe on me". Unbelief will be apprehended to be sin. The world sins "because" it does not believe in Christ, *i.e.*, the world sins inasmuch as it is unbelieving, *cf.* iii. 18, 19, 36; xv. 22. περὶ δικαιοσύνης δὲ . . . "And concerning righteousness, because I go to my Father and ye see me no longer." The world will see in the exaltation of Christ proof of His righteousness [δικαίου γὰρ γνώρισμα τὸ πορεύεσθαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ συνεῖναι αὐτῷ, Euthymius] and will accordingly cherish new convictions regarding righteousness. The clause καὶ οὐκ ἔτι θεωρεῖτέ με is added to exhibit more clearly that it was a spiritual and heavenly life He entered upon in going to the Father; and possibly to remind them that the invisibility which they lamented was the evidence of His victory.—Ver. 11. περὶ δὲ κρίσεως, "and concerning judgment (between sin and righteousness, and between Christ and the prince of this world, xii. 31, xiv. 30), because the ruler of this world has been judged," or "is judged". The distinction between sin and righteousness was, under the Spirit's teaching, to become absolute. In the crucifixion of Christ the influences which move worldly men—ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου—were finally condemned. The fact that worldliness, blindness to the spiritually excellent, led to that treatment of Christ, is its condemnation. The world, the prince of it, is "judged". To adhere to it rather than to Christ is to cling to a doomed cause, a sinking ship.

Vv. 12-15. *The Spirit will complete the teaching of Jesus.*—Ver. 12. Ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν, "I have yet many things to say to you"; after all I have said much remains unsaid. There is, then, much truth which it is desirable that Christians know and which yet was not uttered by Christ Himself. His words are not the sole embodiment of truth, though they may be its sole criterion. ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι, "but you cannot bear them now," therefore they are deferred; truth can be received only by those who have already been prepared for its reception. "'Tis the taught already that profit by teaching" (Ecclus. iii. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 1; Heb. v. 11-14). The Resurrection and Pentecost gave them new strength and new perceptions. βαστάζειν, similarly used in 2 Kings xvii. 14, ὃ ἐὰν ἐπιθῇς ἐπ' ἐμέ, βαστάσω. To those who wish to become philosophers Epictetus gives the advice, Ἄνθρωπε, σκέψαι τί δύνασαι βαστάσαι (Diss. iii. 15, Kypke).—Ver. 13. What was now withheld would afterwards be disclosed, ὅταν . . . ἀλήθειαν. The Spirit would complete the teaching of Christ and lead them "into *all* the truth". ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς "shall lead you," "as a guide leads in the way, by steady advance, rather than by sudden revelation". Bernard. This function of the Spirit He still exercises. It is the Church at large He finally leads into all truth through centuries of error. οὐ γὰρ

ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ λαλήσει, καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. 14. ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει, ὅτι [k] ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. 15. πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ, ἐμά ἐστι· διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον, ὅτι [k] ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται,[1] καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν. 16. [l] Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ[2] θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με, ὅτι ἐγὼ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα."[3] 17. Εἶπον οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "Τί ἐστι τοῦτο ὃ λέγει ἡμῖν, Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ

k i. 16.

l vii. 33; xiii. 33.

[1] λαμβανει in BDEG adopted by Tr.Ti.W.H.R.

[2] ουκετι in ℵBD 33.

[3] This clause οτι . . . πατερα is not found in ℵBDL, and is deleted by Tr.Ti.W.H.R. It seems to have been inserted because of ver. 17, last clause; but this may be a reminiscence of ver. 10.

λαλήσει . . . ὑμῖν, "for He shall not speak from Himself, but whatever He shall have heard He will speak, and the things that are coming He will announce to you". This is the guarantee of the truth of the Spirit's teaching, as of Christ's, vii. 17, xiv. 10. What the Father tells Him, He will utter. Particularly, τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν, "the things that are coming He will declare to you". τὰ ἐρχόμενα means "the things that are now coming," not "the things which *at any future stage of the Church's history* may come". It might include the events of the succeeding day, but in this case ἀναγγελεῖ could not be used; for although these events might require to be explained, they did not need to be "announced". The promise must therefore refer to the main features of the new Christian dispensation. The Spirit would guide them in that new economy in which they would no longer have the visible example and help and counsel of their Master. It is not a promise that they should be able to predict the future. ["Maxime huc spectat apocalypsis, scripta per Johannem." Bengel.] In enabling them to adapt themselves to the new economy the centre and norm would be Christ.—Ver. 14. ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δόξασει, "He will glorify me". The fulfilment of this promise is found in every action and word of the Apostles. Under the Spirit's guidance they lived wholly for Christ: the dispensation of the Spirit was the Christian dispensation. This is further explained in ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται . . . "because He shall take of that which is mine, and declare it unto you". The Spirit draws from no other source of information or inspiration. It is always "out of that which is Christ's" He furnishes the Church. So only could He glorify Christ. Not by taking the Church beyond Christ, but by more fully exhibiting the fulness of Christ, does He fulfil His mission.—Ver. 15. There is no need that the Spirit go beyond Christ and no possibility He should do so, because πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ Πατὴρ ἐμά ἐστι, "all things whatsoever the Father has are mine," *cf.* xvii. 10 and xiii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 24-28; Heb. ii. 8. The Messianic reign involved that Christ should be truly supreme and have all things at His disposal. So that when He said that the Spirit would take of what was His, that was equivalent to saying that the Spirit had the unlimited fulness of the Godhead to draw upon.

Vv. 16-22. *The sorrow occasioned by Christ's departure turned into joy at His return.*—Ver. 16. Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με. The first "little while" is the time till the following day; the second "little while," the time till the resurrection, when they would see Him again. The similar expression of xiv. 19 has induced several interpreters to understand our Lord as meaning, "Ye shall see me spiritually"; thus Bernard says: "The discrimination in the verbs employed affords sufficient guidance, and leads us to interpret as follows. A little while (it was but a few hours), and then 'ye behold me no longer' (οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με); I shall have passed from the visible scene, and from the observation of spectators (that is the kind of seeing which the verb intends). 'Again, a little while' (of but little longer duration), and 'ye shall see me' (ὄψεσθέ με), with another kind of seeing, one in which the natural sight becomes spiritual vision." This distinction, however, is not maintained in xiv. 19.—Ver. 17. Εἶπον οὖν ἐκ τῶν

ὄψεσθέ με; καί, Ὅτι ἐγὼ ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα;" 18. Ἔλεγον οὖν, "Τοῦτο τί ἐστιν ὃ λέγει, τὸ μικρόν; οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί λαλεῖ." 19. Ἔγνω οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤθελον αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾷν, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Περὶ τούτου ζητεῖτε μετ᾽ ἀλλήλων, ὅτι εἶπον, Μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με; 20. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι [m] κλαύσετε καὶ θρηνήσετε ὑμεῖς, ὁ δὲ κόσμος χαρήσεται· ὑμεῖς δὲ λυπηθήσεσθε, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν [n] εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται. 21. ἡ γυνὴ ὅταν τίκτῃ, λύπην ἔχει, ὅτι [o] ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς· ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον, οὐκ ἔτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως, διὰ τὴν χαράν, ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. 22. καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν λύπην μὲν νῦν ἔχετε· πάλιν δὲ ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ χαρήσεται ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία, καὶ τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς αἴρει[1] ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν. 23. καὶ ἐν

m Mk. xvi. 10.
n Acts v. 36. Rev. viii. 11.
o ii. 4.

[1] αρει, future, in BD*Γ, vulg. "tollet". αιρει in ℵACD²LΠ.

μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ. A pause is implied; during which some of the disciples (τινές understood, as in vii. 40; see Simcox, *Gram. of N.T.*, p. 84) expressed to one another their bewilderment. They were alarmed, but could not attach their alarm to any definite object of dread.—Ver. 19. Jesus, perceiving their embarrassment, and that they wished to interrogate Him—ὅτι ἤθελον αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾷν—said to them: Περὶ τούτου . . . "Are you inquiring among yourselves?"—μετ᾽ ἀλλήλων, not as in ver. 17, πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "about this that I said," etc.?—Ver. 20. ἀμὴν . . . ὅτι κλαύσετε καὶ θρηνήσετε ὑμεῖς, "ye shall weep and lament"; θρηνέω is commonly used of lamentation for the dead, as in Jer. xxi. 10, μὴ κλαίετε τὸν τεθνηκότα, μηδὲ θρηνεῖτε αὐτόν; 2 Sam. i. 17; Mt. xi. 17; Lk. vii. 32. Here it is weeping and lamentation for the dead that is meant. ὁ δὲ κόσμος χαρήσεται, but while you mourn, the world shall rejoice, as achieving a triumph over a threatening enemy. ὑμεῖς δὲ λυπηθήσεσθε, "and ye shall be sorrow-stricken, but your sorrow shall become joy". *Cf.* ἀπὸ πένθους εἰς χαράν, Esth. ix. 22, and especially xx. 20, ἐχάρησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν Κύριον.—Ver. 21. He adds an illustration of the manner in which anxiety and dread pass into joy: ἡ γυνή "the woman," the article is generic, *cf.* ὁ δοῦλος, xv. 15, Meyer, ὅταν τίκτῃ, "when she brings forth," λύπην . . . αὐτῆς, "hath sorrow because her hour"—the critical or appointed time of her delivery—"is come". The woman in travail is the common figure for terror-stricken anguish in O.T.: Ps. xlviii. 6; Jer. iv. 31; vi. 24, etc. ὅταν δὲ γεννήσῃ τὸ παιδίον . . . "but when the child is born, she no longer remembers the distress, for the joy that a man is born into the world". The comparison, so far as explicitly used by our Lord in ver. 22, extends only to the sudden replacement of sorrow with joy in both cases. But a comparison of Is. lxvi. 7-9, Hos. xiii. 13, and other O.T. passages, in which the resurrection of a new Israel is likened to a difficult and painful birth, warrants the extension of the metaphor to the actual birth of the N.T. church in the resurrection of Christ. *Cf.* Holtzmann.—Ver. 22. καὶ ὑμεῖς . . . ὑμῶν, "and you accordingly," in keeping with this natural arrangement conspicuous in the woman's case, "have at present sorrow". This is the time when the results are hidden and only the pain felt: "but I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice and your joy no one takes from you". This joy was felt in the renewed vision of their Lord at the Resurrection. "All turns on the Resurrection; and without the experiences of that time there would have been no beholding Christ in the Spirit." Bernard.

Vv. 23-28. *Future accessibility of the Father.*—Ver. 23. καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, "and in that day" of the Resurrection and the dispensation it introduces, see xiv. 20, in contrast to this present time when you wish to ask me questions, ver. 19, "ye shall not put any questions to me". *Cf.* xxi. 12. He was no longer the familiar friend and visible teacher to whom at any moment they might turn. But though this accustomed intercourse terminated, it was only that they might learn a more direct communion with the

ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, δώσει ὑμῖν.[1] 24. [p] ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ᾐτήσατε οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου· [q] αἰτεῖτε, καὶ λήψεσθε, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ [r] πεπληρωμένη. 25. ταῦτα ἐν [s] παροιμίαις λελάληκα ὑμῖν· ἀλλ' ἔρχεται ὥρα [t] ὅτε οὐκ ἔτι ἐν παροιμίαις λαλήσω ὑμῖν, ἀλλὰ [u] παρρησίᾳ περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀναγγελῶ[2] ὑμῖν. 26. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου αἰτήσεσθε· καὶ οὐ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν· 27. αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε, καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι

p ii. 10. Mt. xi. 12.
q Mt. vii. 7.
r ii. 7-10.
s ver. 29. Prov. i. 1. Ecclus. xlvii. 17. Cp. Hatch, *Essays*, p. 64.
t v. 25.
u x. 24.

[1] δωσει υμιν before εν τω ονοματι μου in ℵBC*LX. T.R. in AC³D, it. vulg. Cp. xiv. 13, 14.

[2] For the αναγγελω of EGH απαγγελω is read in ABC*D, while ℵ reads απαγγελλω.

Father: ἀμὴν . . . δώσει ὑμῖν. The connection is somewhat obscure. The words may either be taken in connection with those immediately preceding, in which case they intimate that the information they can no longer get from a present Christ they will receive from the Father: or they may begin a distinct paragraph and introduce a fresh subject, the certainty of prayer being heard.—Ver. 24. ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ᾐτήσατε οὐδὲν ἐν τ. . . . "Until now ye have asked nothing in my name." They had not yet realised that it was through Christ and on the lines of His work all God's activity towards man and all man's prayer to God were to proceed.—αἰτεῖτε . . . πεπληρωμένη, "ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full," or "fulfilled," or "completed". The joy they were to experience on seeing their Lord again, ver. 22, was to be completed by their continued experience of the efficacy of His name in prayer. Prayer must have been rather hindered by the visible presence of a sufficient helper, but henceforth it was to be the medium of communication between the disciples and the source of spiritual power.—Ver. 25. Another great change would characterise the economy into which they were passing. Instead of dark figurative utterances which only dimly revealed things spiritual, direct and intelligible disclosures regarding the Father would be made to the disciples: ταῦτα ἐν παροιμίαις . . . ὑμῖν. παροιμία. See x. 6; "dark sayings" or "riddles" expresses what is here meant. It is opposed to παρρησίᾳ, open, plain, easily intelligible, meant to be understood. He does not refer to particular utterances, such as xv. 1, xvi. 21, etc., but to the reserved character of the whole evening's conversation, and of all His previous teaching. "The promise is that the reserve imposed by a yet unfinished history, by a manifestation in the flesh, by the incapacity of the hearers, and by their gradual education, will then be succeeded by clear, full, unrestricted information, fitted to create in those who receive it that 'full assurance of understanding' which contributes so largely to the 'full assurance of faith'." Bernard. περὶ τοῦ πατρός, the Father is the central theme of Christ's teaching, both while on earth and above.—Ver. 26. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. "In that day," in which I shall tell you plainly of the Father (ver. 25, ἔρχεται ὥρα), "ye shall ask in my name"; this is the natural consequence of their increased knowledge of the Father. καὶ οὐ λέγω . . . ἐξῆλθον. "And I do not say to you that I will ask the Father concerning you"—περί, almost equivalent to ὑπέρ, here and in Matt. xxvi. 28; 1 John iv. 10, "in relation to," almost "in behalf of"—(ver. 27) "for the Father Himself loves you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came forth from God". The intention of the statement is to convey fuller assurance that their prayers will be answered. The Father's love needs no prompting. Yet the intercession of Christ, so emphatically presented in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in Rom. viii. 34, is not ignored. Jesus says: "I do not base the expectation of answer *solely* on my intercession, but on the Father's love, a love which itself is quickened and evoked by your love for me". "I do not say that I will ask" means "I do not press this," "I do not bring this forward as the sole reason why you

ἐγὼ [v] παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ [1] ἐξῆλθον. 28. ἐξῆλθον [v] παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς,[2] καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν [w] ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον, καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα."

29. Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, "[w] Ἴδε νῦν[3] παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖς, καὶ [x] παροιμίαν οὐδεμίαν λέγεις. 30. νῦν οἴδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα, καὶ οὐ χρείαν ἔχεις [y] ἵνα τίς σε ἐρωτᾷ. [z] ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες." 31. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[w] Ἄρτι πιστεύετε; 32. ἰδοὺ, ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν[4] ἐλήλυθεν, [a] ἵνα [b] σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ [c] ἴδια, καὶ ἐμὲ μόνον ἀφῆτε· καὶ [d] οὐκ εἰμὶ μόνος, ὅτι ὁ πατὴρ μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστι. 33. ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰρήνην ἔχητε. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θλίψιν ἕξετε[5]· ἀλλὰ θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ [e] νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον."

v See crit. note. w iv. 3. x ver. 25. y ii. 25. 1 Jo. ii. 27. Cp. Heb. v. 12. z 1 Jo. iii. 19; iv. 2. a ver. 2. b x. 12. c xix. 27. d viii. 16, 29. e 1 Jo. v. 4, 5. Rev. iii. 21.

[1] πατρος is read by W.H.R. following ℵ^{ca}BC*D. θεου is found in ℵ*AC², it. vulg.

[2] T.R. in ℵAC², εκ in BC*L 33. εκ follows εξηλθον in viii. 42; απο in ver. 30, xiii. 3, xvi. 30; παρα in ver. 27 and in xvii. 8. εκ conveys the idea of origin, παρα of starting point, απο of the agency of the sender.

[3] εν with ℵBCD nowhere else in John with λαλειν, but in Ep. μετα is used in Acts.

[4] νυν deleted by Tr. Ti. W.H.R. following ℵABC*D*L 33.

[5] εχετε in ℵABCL, etc.

may expect to be heard". The mediation of Christ has here its incidence at an earlier stage than in the Apostolic statements. The love of God is represented as intensified towards those who have accepted Christ as the revealer of the Father.—Ver. 28. ἐξῆλθον . . . πατέρα. "I came forth from the Father and am come into the world; again (reversing the process) I leave the world and go to the Father." There is a sense in which any man can use these words, but it is a loose not an exact sense. The latter member of the sentence —"I leave the world and go to the Father"—gives us the interpretation of the former—"I came forth," etc. For to say "I leave the world" is not the same as to say "I go to the Father"; this second expression describes a state of existence which is entered upon when existence in this world is done. And to say "I came forth from the Father" is not the same as to say "I am come into the world": it describes a state of existence antecedent to that which began by coming into the world.

Vv. 29-33. *Last words.*—Ver. 29. The Lord's last utterance, vv. 25-28, the disciples find much more explicit than His previous words: Ἴδε νῦν παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖς, "Behold, now (at length) Thou speakest plainly," explicitly, καὶ παροιμίαν οὐδεμίαν λέγεις, "and utterest no obscure saying," ver. 25. Almost universally νῦν, in vv. 29, 30, is understood to denote the present time *in contrast to the future* promised in ver. 25. As if the disciples meant: "Already Thou speakest plainly; we do not need to wait for that future time". It seems simpler to take it as signifying a contrast to the past time in which He had spoken in dark sayings. — Ver. 30. νῦν οἴδαμεν . . . ἐρωτᾷ. The reference is to ver. 19, where they manifested dissatisfaction with the obscurity of His utterances. Here in ver. 30 two things are stated, that Jesus has perfect knowledge, οἶδας πάντα, and that He knows how to communicate it, οὐ χρείαν ἔχεις ἵνα τίς σε ἐρωτᾷ. Convinced that He possessed these qualifications, they felt constrained to accept Him as a teacher come from God, ἐν τούτῳ ("herein," or "by this," ἐκ τούτου in modern Greek version) πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες, *cf.* iii. 2.—Ver. 31. To this enthusiastic confession Jesus makes the sobering and pathetic reply: Ἄρτι πιστεύετε; Do ye now believe that I am God's Representative? Is this your present attitude? ἰδοὺ, ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐλήλυθεν, "Behold, the hour is coming and is come," so imminent is it that the perfect may be used.—ἵνα σκορπισθῆτε . . . ἀφῆτε. *Cf.* 1 Macc. vi. 54,

XVII. 1. ΤΑΥΤΑ ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ [a] ἐπῆρε[1] τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ εἶπε, "Πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα· δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱὸν, ἵνα καὶ[2] ὁ υἱός σου δοξάσῃ σε· 2. καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ [b] ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκὸς, ἵνα [c] πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ,

a xi. 41. 1 Chron. xxi. 16. Is. xiv. 14.
b With gen. of obj. here and Mt. x. 1, Mk. vi. 7: usually with infin. or ἐπί with gen. or acc.
c vi. 39.

[1] T.R. in AC[3] and most versions, except vulg. επαρας, without και before ειπε, in ℵBC*DL 33. Lücke says this is "offenbar eine stylistische correctur".

[2] Omit και with ℵABC*D.

ἐσκορπίσθησαν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ. In x. 12 the wolf σκορπίζει τὰ πρόβατα. *Cf.* especially Mk. xiv. 27. εἰς τὰ ἴδια frequently of one's own house, *cf.* xix. 27; Acts xxi. 6; Esth. v. 10, vi. 12. Here perhaps it is somewhat less definite, "to his own" is better than "to his own house". It includes "to his own interests," or "pursuits," or "familiar surroundings," or "private affairs," or all these together. Those whom He had gathered round Him and who believed in Him were yet destined to fail Him in the critical hour, and were to scatter each to his own, for the time abandoning the cause and Person who had held them together, leaving their loved Master (ver. 27) alone.—καὶ οὐκ εἰμὶ μόνος . . . ἐστι, "and (yet) I am not alone, because the Father is with me". This presence supplies the lack of all other company. He was destined to lose for a time the consciousness even of this presence, Mt. xxvii. 46.—Ver. 33. ταῦτα . . . κόσμον. ταῦτα embraces the whole of the consolatory utterances from xiv. 1 onwards. His aim in uttering them was "that in me" (*cf.* Paul's use of "in Christ") "ye may have peace". ἐν ἐμοί and ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ are the two spheres in which at one and the same time the disciples live, xvii. 15, Col. iii. 1 and 5. So long as they "abode in Christ" and His words abode in them, xv. 7, they would have peace, xiv. 27. So long as they were in the world they would have tribulation, θλίψιν ἔχετε, "in the world ye have tribulation".—ἀλλὰ θαρσεῖτε, "but be of good courage". *Cf.* θάρσει τέκνον, Mt. ix. 2, xiv. 27.—ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον. νικᾷν occurs only here in the Gospel, but twenty-two times in the Johannine Epistles and Apocalypse; only four times in the other N.T. writings; *cf.* especially 1 John v. 4, 5. "I (emphatic) have overcome the world," have proved that its most dangerous assaults can be successfully resisted; and in me you are sharers in my victory; in me you also overcome.

CHAPTER XVII.—Vv. 1-26. *The closing prayer of Jesus* ["*precatio summi sacerdotis*," *Chytraeus*]. Vv. 1-5, *with reference to Himself; vv.* 6-19, *for His disciples; vv.* 20-26, *for all who should afterwards believe on Him.*—Ver. 1. Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν . . . καὶ ἐπῆρε. The connection of ἐλάλησεν with ἐπῆρε by καί shows that the prayer followed immediately upon the discourse, and was, therefore, uttered in the hearing of the disciples. ἐπῆρε . . . οὐρανόν, so 1 Chron. xxi. 16. ἦρα τ. ὀφθ., Ps. cxxi. 1, and cxxiii 1. From οὐρανόν it cannot be argued that they were in the open air. "Für das Auge des Geistes is der freie Himmel überall." Lücke. "The eye of one who prays is *on all occasions* raised toward heaven." Meyer. Πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα, "Father," the simplest and most intimate form of address, *cf.* xi. 41, xii. 27. "The hour is come," *i.e.*, the hour appointed for the glorification of the Son; *cf.* ii. 4, xii. 23. That this hour is meant is shown by the petition which follows: δόξασόν σου τὸν υἱόν, "glorify Thy Son". σου, in position of emphasis. This glorification embraced His death, resurrection, and session at God's right hand, as accredited Mediator, *cf.* vii. 39, xii. 16, 23. But this glorification itself had an object, ἵνα ὁ υἱὸς δοξάσῃ σε, "that the Son may glorify Thee". The Father is glorified by being known in His love and holiness.—Ver. 2. This is the object of Christ's manifestation and reign. This glorification of the Son, which is now imminent, is in accordance with the purpose of the Father in giving the Son power over men: καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν . . . αἰώνιον. Only by His being glorified could the Son give this eternal life, and so fulfil the commission with which He was entrusted. ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκας is explained in ver. 27, and the verses preceding: Mt. xi. 27; Heb. i. 2. πάσης σαρκὸς represents כָּל־בָּשָׂר, Gen. vi. 12, Is. xl. 6, etc., and denotes the human race as possessed

δώσῃ[1] αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 3. αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, [d] ἵνα γινώσκωσί σε τὸν μόνον [e] ἀληθινὸν Θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. 4. ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· τὸ ἔργον [f] ἐτελείωσα[2] ὃ δέδωκάς μοι [g] ἵνα ποιήσω· 5. καὶ νῦν [h] δόξασόν με σύ, πάτερ, [i] παρὰ σεαυτῷ, τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον [j] πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι παρὰ σοί.

d vi. 29 reff.
e 1 Thess. i. 9. Heb. ix. 14 (A) cp. 1 Jo. v. 20. Rev. iii. 7.
f Neh. vi. 16.
g v. 36.
h xiii. 33. Ps. lxxi. 5
i Prov. ii. 1; iii. 13.
j Prov. viii. 24.

[1] For δωση and γινωσκωσι some read δωσει and γινωσκουσι, but *vide* Simcox, *Gram.*, p. 109, and W.H., Appendix, p. 171.

[2] τελειωσας in ℵABCLΠ 33 adopted by Tr.Ti.W.H.R.

of a frail, terrestrial existence, lacking **ζωὴν αἰώνιον. ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ**, the neuter, as in vi. 39, resolved into the individuals in **αὐτοῖς**; and on the nominative absolute, see Buttmann's *N.T. Gram.*, 379; and Kypke *in loc.*—Ver. 3. **αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή ἵνα . . .** On **ἵνα** in this construction, see Burton, 213, and *cf.* xv. 8; **ὅτι** in iii. 19 is not quite equivalent. In Is. xxxvii. 20 God is designated **ὁ Θεὸς μόνος**, and in Exod. xxxiv. 6 **ἀληθινός**; *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 10. He is the only true God in contrast to many that are "called gods," 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. But *cf.* especially 1 John v. 20. It was by making known to them this God, and thus glorifying the Father, that Christ "gave men eternal life". The life He gave consisted in and was maintained by this knowledge. But to the knowledge of the Father, the knowledge of "Him whom Thou didst send, Jesus Christ," was necessary, i. 18, xiv. 6. As in i. 17, so here, **Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν** is the double name which became common in Apostolic times, and not (as Meyer and others) "an appellative predicate," "Jesus as the Messiah". Whether Jesus' naming of Himself as a third person can be accounted for by the solemnity of the occasion ("der feierliche Gebetstyl," Lücke), or is to be ascribed to John, is much debated. Westcott seems justified in saying that "the use of the name 'Jesus Christ' by the Lord Himself at this time is in the highest degree unlikely. . . . It is no derogation from the truthfulness of the record that St. John has thus given parenthetically, and in conventional language (so to speak), the substance of what the Lord said at greater length."—Ver. 4. **ἐγώ σε . . . ποιήσω.** This is a fresh ground for the petition of ver. 1 renewed in ver. 5: "glorify Thou me". The ground is "I have glorified Thee on the earth; having finished [perfectly accomplished, *cf.* **τετέλεσται** of the cross] the work which Thou gavest me to do". But it is not the idea of reward that is prominent here, although that idea is found in Phil. ii. 6-11; Heb. ii. 9-11; v. 4-10; the immediate thought here is of the necessary progress which the hour demanded. There remained no longer any reason for His continuance on earth. He did not desire, and did not need, any prolongation of life below. Beyschlag's objection (*N.T. Theol.*, i. 254) is therefore baseless, as also is Grotius' "ostendit, non iniquum se petere".—Ver. 5. **καὶ νῦν δόξασον . . . σοί.** The precise character of the glorification He looks for is here presented. It is **παρὰ σεαυτῷ**, and it is a restoration to the glory He had enjoyed **πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι.** By **παρὰ σεαυτῷ** it is rendered impossible to understand **παρὰ σοί** of an "ideal" pre-existence; because these two expressions are here equivalents, and Christ cannot be supposed to have prayed for an "ideal" glory when He asked that God would glorify Him **παρὰ σεαυτῷ.** "There is, consequently, here, as in vi. 62, viii. 58, a continuity of the consciousness of the historical Christ with the Logos." Tholuck. On this verse Beyschlag remarks (i. 254): "The possibility of such a position was first won by Jesus through His life and death on earth, so that, in point of fact, it forms the divine reward of that life and death; how then could He have possessed it *realiter* before the world was?" But the representation given by Paul in Phil. ii. is open to the same objection. Christ is represented as leaving a glory He originally enjoyed and returning to it when His work on earth was done and as the result of that work. The humanity was now to share in and to be in some way the organ of that divine glory; and this it could not be until it had been perfected by the experience of a human life. Wendt (*Teaching of Jesus*, ii. 169) says: "Ac-

6. Ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς δέδωκάς[1] μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου· σοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτοὺς δέδωκας· καὶ τὸν λόγον σου [k] τετηρήκασι. 7. νῦν ἔγνωκαν ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι, παρὰ σοῦ ἐστιν[2]· 8. ὅτι τὰ [l] ῥήματα ἃ δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς· καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον, καὶ ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς, ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας. 9. ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ· οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ, ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι, ὅτι σοί εἰσι. 10. καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ [m] πάντα σά ἐστι, καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά· καὶ δεδόξασμαι ἐν

k viii. 51. 1 Kings xv. 11.
l Acts vii. 38.
m 1 Chron. xxix. 14.

[1] For **δεδωκας** in both occurrences in ver. 6 **εδωκας** is read in ℵABDK. In ver. 7 **δεδωκας** is found in ℵCDL, **εδωκας** in AB. In ver. 8 **δεδωκας** in ℵL, **εδωκας** in ABCD.

[2] **εισιν** in ℵBCL 33.

cording to the mode of speech and conception prevalent in the N.T., a heavenly good, and so also a heavenly glory, can be conceived and spoken of as existing with God, and belonging to a person, not because this person already exists, and is invested with glory, but because the glory of God is in some way deposited and preserved for this person in heaven". The passages, however, on which he depends for this principle do not sustain it. Such expressions as i. 14, ii. 11, which indicate that already while on earth a divine glory was manifest in Christ, in no degree contradict but rather confirm such statements as the present.

Vv. 6-19. *Prayer for the disciples.*—Ver. 6. **Ἐφανέρωσά σου . . . κόσμου.** Ver. 4 is resumed and explained. "I have glorified Thee and finished my work by *manifesting*," etc. To manifest the name here means to make God known as the holy and loving Father. This had been accomplished by Christ not in the case of all, but of those whom the Father had given Him; *cf.* vi. 37-44. Out of the world some were separated by the Father and allotted to Christ as His disciples. **σοὶ ἦσαν,** "Thine they were," before they attached themselves to Jesus they already belonged to God in a special sense; as, *e.g.*, Nath. i. 48.—Holtzmann. **καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετηρήκασι,** "and they have kept Thy word," the revelation of God which has come to them through various channels; in contrast to those mentioned in v. 38.—Ver. 7. As the result of this keeping of God's truth, **νῦν ἔγνωκαν . . . ἐστιν,** "they have now"—in presence of this final revelation—"known that all things whatsoever Thou hast given me are from Thee". The object of the manifestation in Christ has been attained: the Father has been seen in and through Him. All the wisdom and power of Christ have been recognised as from God.—Ver. 8. **ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα . . . ἀπέστειλας.** The result achieved, ver. 7, was due to the fidelity of the messenger, **τὰ ῥήματα . . . δέδωκα αὐτοῖς,** and to the receptiveness of those prepared by God, **αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον,** etc. *cf.* xvi. 30. **ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ.** He desires solemnly to commit to the Father's keeping those who have believed. He prays for them in distinction from the world, and for the present sets the world aside, **οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου.** The petitions now presented are only applicable to disciples, not to the world. Melanchthon says: "Vide horrendum judicium Christi de mundo, cum negat se orare pro mundo, damnatque quicquid est mundi, quantumvis speciosum". But Luther more justly says: "To pray for the world, and not to pray for the world, must both be right and good. For soon after He says Himself: 'Neither pray I for those alone, but for them also who shall believe on me'." He prayed too for His crucifiers, Lk. xxiii. 34. His reason for praying for those who have received Him is **ὅτι σοί εἰσι,** "because they are Thine". God's interest in them and work upon them have already been manifested, and are the promise of His further operation.—Ver. 10. **καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σά ἐστι, καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά,** the community of property and therefore of interest is unlimited, absolute; extending not only to the persons of the disciples, but to all that Christ has spoken and done on earth. **καὶ δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς,** "and I have been glorified in them," *i.e.*, in the dis-

αὐτοῖς. 11. καὶ οὐκ ἔτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ οὗτοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσὶ, καὶ ἐγὼ πρός σε ἔρχομαι. πάτερ [n] ἅγιε, [o] τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, οὓς[1] δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὦσιν [p] ἓν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς. 12. ὅτε ἤμην μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,[2] ἐγὼ [q] ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου· οὓς[3] δέδωκάς μοι [q] ἐφύλαξα, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο, εἰ μὴ ὁ [r] υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ. 13. νῦν δὲ πρός σε ἔρχομαι, καὶ ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἵνα ἔχωσι [s] τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν αὐτοῖς. 14. ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. 15. οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς [t] ἐκ

n Josh. xxiv. 19.
o 1 Thess. v. 23.
p x. 30.
q Prov. xix. 16. Wisd. x. 5; xix. 6. 1 Pet. i. 5.
r 2 Kings xii. 5. Is. lvii. 4. 2 Thess. ii. 3.
s xv. 11.
t Rev. iii. 10; ἀπό common.

[1] **ους** D[2] and a few cursives; **ο** in D*XU and a few cursives; **ω** in ℵABCL, etc., Syrr. Theb. Arm. Tr.Ti.W.H.R.

[2] Omit **εν τω κοσμω** with ℵBC*DL.

[3] **ω** read here also by BC*L, and **και** inserted before **εφυλαξα**.

ciples. In them it had been manifested that Christ was the messenger of God and had the words of eternal life.—Ver. 11. **καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.** The circumstances necessitating the prayer are now stated. Jesus is no longer in the world, already He has bid farewell to it, but the disciples remain in it, exposed without His accustomed counsel and defence. **πάτερ ἅγιε,** "Holy Father"; this unique designation is suggested by the Divine attribute which would naturally assert itself in defending from the world's corruptions those who were exposed to them. **τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι,** "preserve them in [the knowledge of] Thy name, which Thou gavest me". **ᾧ** is attracted into dative by **ὀνόματι.** This was the fundamental petition. The retention of the knowledge which Christ had imparted to them of the Father would effect **ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς.** Without harmony among themselves, so that they should exist as a manifest unity differentiated from the world, their witness would fail; xv. 8, 12. **καθὼς ἡμεῖς** is explained by xv. 9, 10.—Ver. 12. The protection now asked had been afforded by Christ so long as He was with the disciples. **ὅτε ἤμην μετ᾽ αὐτῶν, ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν . . .** "when I was with them, I kept them in Thy name which Thou hast given me: and I guarded them, and not one of them perished, but the son of perdition, that the Scripture might be fulfilled". On the detail of educative care spent on the disciples, and covered by **ἐτήρουν,** see Bernard, *Central Teaching*, p. 370. **ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας,** *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 3, in accordance with the usual Hebrew usage, the person identified with perdition, closely associated with it. *Cf.* Is. lvii. 4; xxxiii. 2; Mt. xxiii. 15. Raphel quotes from Herodotus, viii., **ὕβριος υἱόν,** with the remark, "nec Graecis plane ignotus est hic loquendi modus". The Scripture referred to is Ps. xli. 10, as in xiii. 18.—Ver. 13. As He Himself goes to the Father, He utters this petition aloud, and while yet with the disciples—**ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ**—that they might recognise that the power of God was engaged for their protection, and might thus have repeated and perfected in themselves the same joy with which Christ had overcome all the trials and fears of life. *Cf.* xv. 11, xvi. 24.—Ver. 14. **ἐγὼ δέδωκα . . . κόσμου.** Additional reason for soliciting in behalf of the disciples the protection of the Father consists in this, that the world hates them because they have received the revelation of God in Christ, and are thereby separated from the world as their Teacher was not of the world. *Cf.* ver. 6.—Ver. 15. The simplest escape from the anger of the world was removal from it, but for this He would not ask: **οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.** They had a work to do which involved that they should be in the world. It also involved the fulfilment of the petition, **ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.** Luther, Calvin, etc., take **πονηροῦ** as neuter; recent interpreters in general consider it to be masculine, "from the evil one," as in 1 John ii. 13, iv. 4, v. 18; *cf.* Mt. vi.

τοῦ πονηροῦ. 16. ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσὶ, καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰμί. 17. [u] ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου[1]· ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστι. 18. καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, κἀγὼ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον· 19. καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ [v] ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτὸν, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ὦσιν ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. 20. Οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευσόντων[2]

u x. 36. Exod. xiii. 2. ἐν Ecclus. xlv. 4.

v 1 Esdr. i. 3.

[1] σου omitted in ℵ*ABC*D, it. vulg.

[2] πιστευοντων in ℵABCD.

13. "The evil one" as the prince of this world and "a murderer from the beginning" (viii. 44) was the instigator of persecution.—Ver. 16. For τηρεῖν ἐκ see Rev. iii. 10. The reason of the world's hatred and persecution is given here, as in xv. 19, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου . . . "They do not belong to the world, as I am out of the world."—Ver. 17. But besides this negative qualification for representing Christ, they must possess also a positive equipment, ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου. "Consecrate them by thy truth." ἁγιάζω is to render sacred, to set apart from profane uses; as in Exod. xiii 1, ἁγίασόν μοι πᾶν πρωτότοκον; Exod. xx. 8, ἁγ. ἡμέραν; Exod. xxviii. 37, ἁγιάσεις αὐτοὺς ἵνα ἱερατεύωσί μοι; Mt. xxiii. 17; Heb. ix. 13. In x. 36 it is used of the Father's setting apart of Christ to His mission. Here it is similarly used of the setting apart or consecration of the disciples as Christ's representatives. Meyer includes their "equipment with Divine illumination, power, courage, joyfulness, love, inspiration, etc., for their official activity". Wetstein's definition is good; "Sanctificare est aliquem eligere ad certum munus obeundum, eumque praeparare atque idoneum reddere". "The truth," as the element in which they now lived, was to be the efficient instrument of their consecration, *cf.* xiv. 16, xvi. 7-13; the truth specifically which became theirs through the revelation of the Father, ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστι, "the word which is Thine," ver. 14, but here emphatically distinguished as being the Word of the Father and no other. The article is absent before ἀλήθεια, as in iv. 24, because ἀλήθ. is abstract. "Thy word is" not only "true" but "truth".—Ver. 18. καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας . . . "As Thou didst send me into the world, I also sent them into the world." καθὼς seems to imply "in prosecution of the same purpose and therefore with similar equipment". εἰς τὸν κόσμον is not otiose, but suggests that as Christ's presence in the world was necessary for the fulfilment of God's purpose, so the sphere of the disciples' work is also "the world," *cf.* v. 15. ἀπέστειλα, aorist, because already they had served as apostles, see iv. 38 and Mark iii. 14.—Ver. 19. The crowning plea is that it was for this end, their consecration, Jesus consecrated Himself: καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, "and in their behalf, that they may be consecrated in truth, do I consecrate myself". "Ἁγιάζω in the present with ὑπέρ can only be understood of Christ's self-consecration to His sacrificial death." Tholuck. ἐγὼ ἑκουσίως θυσιάζω ἐμαυτόν, Euthymius; so Meyer, Reynolds and others. This however is needlessly to limit the reference and to introduce an idea somewhat alien to this context and to x. 36. Calvin is right: "Porro sanctificatio haec quamvis ad totam Christi vitam pertineat, in sacrificio tamen mortis ejus maxime illustris fuit". ἵνα . . . The object of Christ's consecration to His work was the severance of His disciples from the world and their inspiration with the same spirit of self-sacrifice and devotedness to sacred uses. ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, understood by the Greek commentators as "real" in contrast to what is symbolic, *cf.* iv. 23. Thus Euthymius, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ὦσι τεθυμένοι ἐν ἀληθινῇ θυσίᾳ, ἡ γὰρ νομικὴ θυσία τύπος ἦν, οὐκ ἀλήθεια. "Discernit a sanctificationibus legis." Melanchthon. Similarly Godet. Meyer renders "truly" and remarks: "As contrasted with every other ἁγιότης in human relations, that wrought through the Paraclete is the *true* consecration". But is it possible to neglect the reference to ἀληθείᾳ, ver. 17? As Lücke points out, John (3 John 3, 4) does not always distinguish between ἀλήθεια and ἡ ἀλήθεια. The object of Christ's consecration was to bring the truth by and in which the disciples might be consecrated.

Vv. 20-26. *Prayer for future believers.*—Ver. 20. Οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον . . . The consecration of the disciples and His sending them forth natu-

διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ· 21. ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσι· καθὼς σὺ, πάτερ,[1] ἐν ἐμοὶ, κἀγὼ ἐν σοὶ, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν[2] ὦσιν· ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας. 22. καὶ ἐγὼ [w] τὴν δόξαν ἣν, δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς [x] ἓν ἐσμεν· 23. ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοὶ, ἵνα ὦσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν, καὶ ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, καὶ ἠγάπησας αὐτοὺς, καθὼς ἐμὲ ἠγάπησας. 24. Πάτερ,[3] οὓς[4] δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, κἀκεῖνοι ὦσι μετ' ἐμοῦ· ἵνα θεωρῶσι τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν, ἣν ἔδωκάς μοι, ὅτι ἠγάπησάς με [y] πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. 25. Πάτερ [z] δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνων, καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας· 26. καὶ ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου, καὶ γνωρίσω· ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη, ἣν ἠγάπησάς με, ἐν αὐτοῖς ᾖ, κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς."

w i. 14. Num. xxii. 20.
x x. 30. Zech. xiv 1.
y πρὸ only here and Eph. i. 4. 1 Pet. i. 20; ἀπὸ seven times.
z Here only with πάτερ, but cp. 1 Jo. i. 9; ii. 29. Rev. xvi. 5.

[1] πατερ in ℵACL; πατηρ in BD. [2] εν omitted in BC*D, read in ℵAC³L.
[3] πατηρ in AB, πατερ ℵCDL. So in ver. 25. [4] ους in ACL, it.; ο in ℵBD.

rally suggests the enlargement of the Church and of His care.—Ver. 21. For those who through their preaching believe on Him He prays that they may be one. Naturally the extension of the Church imperils its unity, the ἑνότης τοῦ πνεύματος, Eph. iv. 3. "This unity is infinitely more than mere unanimity, since it rests upon unity of spirit and life." Tholuck. This unity of all believers finds its ideal in the unity of the Father and the Son: καθὼς σὺ, πάτερ κ. τ. λ., and not only its ideal but its unifying principle and element, ἐν ἡμῖν. This unity of all believers is to result in the universal belief in Christ's mission, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος . . . ἀπέστειλας.—Ver. 22. That the unity of believers in the Father and the Son might be perfect, it was needful that even the glory which Christ possessed by the Father's gift (ver. 5) should be given to His people. The perfect tense is used, because the gift had already been determined. The nature of the glory spoken of is interpreted both by ver. 5 and by ver. 24. It could not be completely and actually bestowed until the point indicated in ver. 24 was reached.—Ver. 23. ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν of ver. 22 becomes in ver. 23 ἵνα ὦσι τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν, "that they may be perfected into one". They are perfected by being wrought to a Divine unity. The work of Christ is accomplished when men are one by Christ dwelling in them. God is in Him, He is in each believer, and thus a true and final unity is formed. One result is the conviction wrought in the world, ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας . . . ἠγάπησας. The mission of Christ and its results prove not only the Father's love of the Son but His love for men.—Ver. 24. Πάτερ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, "that which Thou hast given me," *i.e.*, the community of believers; θέλω, "I will," no longer, ἐρωτῶ, "that where I am, there they may be also"; ὃ resolved into individuals. To share in the destiny of Christ has already been promised to His followers, x. 26; *cf.* xiv. 3. This is the consummation of Christian blessedness. They are not only in the same condition as their Lord, but enjoy it in fellowship with Him, μετ' ἐμοῦ.—ἵνα θεωρῶσι τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν. To see Christ honoured and supreme must ever be the Christian's joy. But this glory of Christ resulting from the eternal love of the Father is not only seen but shared in by the disciples in the measure of their capacity, v. 22, 2 Tim. ii. 12, Rev. iii. 21.—Ver. 25. Πάτερ δίκαιε, "Righteous Father". The appeal is now to God's justice; "ut tua bonitas me miserat servandsn si qua fieri potuisset, omnibus; ita tui, justitia non patietur ob quorundam iacredulitatem frustrari vota credentium". Erasmus. The Father's justice is appealed to, that the believing may not share the fate of the unbelieving world καὶ ὁ κόσμος Elsner translates "quamvis," and Lampe says all difficulty thus disappears. But Elsner's examples are irrelevant. Meyer renders "Righteous Father—(yea, such Thou art!) and (and yet) the world knew Thee not". Simcox suggests that the first καί is correlative not to the immediately follow-

XVIII. 1. ΤΑΥΤΑ εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθε σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ [a]πέραν τοῦ [b]χειμάρρου τῶν Κέδρων,[1] ὅπου ἦν κῆπος, εἰς ὃν εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. 2. ᾔδει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας, ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν, τὸν τόπον· ὅτι πολλάκις [c]συνήχθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ· 3. ὁ οὖν Ἰούδας λαβὼν τὴν σπεῖραν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ Φαρισαίων [d]ὑπηρέτας, ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ μετὰ

a vi. 1.
b 2 Kings xxiii. 6.
c Mt. xxviii. 12.
d vii. 32.

[1] των Κεδρων in ℵ[c]BCLXΓ, Orig. Chrys. Cyr.-Alex. Tr.W.H.R. [cp. 2 Sam. xv. 23]. του Κεδρου in ℵ*D, Ti.; του Κεδρων in A(S)Δ, vet. lat. vulg. Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann, who understand it as = קִדְרוֹן *black*, a name frequently given to streams. "If the original reading was του Κεδρων it is easy to understand how each of the two corruptions came to be substituted for it by copyists knowing only Greek." Sanday.

ing δέ, but to the second καί, the effect being something like: "While the world knew Thee not, though I knew Thee, these on their part knew". . . . Similarly Westcott; "it serves to co-ordinate the two main clauses. . . . The force of it is as if we were to say: Two facts are equally true; it is true that the world knew Thee not; it is true that these knew that Thou didst send me." May the καί not be intended to connect this clause with the preceding ὅτι . . . κόσμου, and to mark the contrast between the love that was in God before the foundation of the world and the world's ignorance of Him, and especially of His love? But "I knew Thee and these knew," etc. They did not know God directly as Christ did, but they knew they could accept Him as the Revealer of God. And to them who were willing to receive my message, because they knew I was sent by Thee, I made known Thy name and will make it known by my death (Weiss) and by sending the Spirit of truth (Westcott). The end in view in this manifestation by Christ was that the love with which the Father had loved the Son might rest on the disciples. ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με. The construction is found in Eph. ii. 4, and is frequent in the classics; ἡ κρίσις ἣν ἐκρίθη, Lysias; τῇ νίκῃ ἣν ἐνίκησε, Arrian.—See Kypke. κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς. This is the end and crown of all. That He should desire this intimate communion with men, and should seek above all else to live in and through His disciples, is surprising proof of His love.

CHAPTER XVIII. — Friedrich Spitta (*Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, i. 157 ff.) believes that the second section of this chapter has been accidentally dislocated, and that its original order was as follows: (1) 12, 13, Jesus is brought to Annas; (2) 19-23, He is examined before the high priest; (3) 24, 14, He is passed on to Caiaphas; (4) 15-18, 25*b*-27, the triple denial of Peter; (5) 28, Jesus is sent to the Praetorium.

But this arrangement also has its difficulties. It requires us to suppose that Caiaphas had come to the house of Annas and conducted the examination recorded in 19-23, and that when it is said that Annas sent the prisoner to Caiaphas, after this examination, it is only meant that he sent Him to the house or palace of Caiaphas where the Sanhedrim sat.

Vv. 1-12. *The arrest of Jesus.*—Ver. 1. Having finished His prayer and His discourse, Jesus ἐξῆλθε, "went out" from the city, as is suggested by πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου, "to the other side of the torrent," *cf.* vi. 1. χείμαρρος sc. χειμάρροος ποταμός, a stream that flows in winter, a torrent; of Jabbok, Gen. xxxii. 35; of Kidron, 2 Sam. xv. 23. τῶν Κέδρων, "the Kidron," described in Henderson's *Palestine*, 90. ὅπου ἦν κῆπος "where was a garden," in Mark xiv. 32, described as χωρίον (a country place, or estate), and called Γεθσημανῆ. The owner was probably a friend of Jesus. Into this garden He went with His disciples.—Ver. 2. ᾔδει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας. "And Judas also knew the place, because Jesus and His disciples had frequently assembled there" on previous visits to Jerusalem, Lk. xxi. 37. This is inserted to account for what follows, and to remind the reader of the voluntariness of the surrender. There was no attempt to escape or hide.—Ver. 3. ὁ οὖν Ἰούδας λαβὼν τὴν σπεῖραν καὶ . . . ὑπηρέτας. σπεῖρα (Spira, anything rolled up or folded together), a Roman cohort (Polyb., xi. 23, 1) or tenth

φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων καὶ ὅπλων. 4. Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἰδὼς πάντα τὰ [e] ἐρχόμενα ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν, ἐξελθὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Τίνα ζητεῖτε;" 5. Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, "Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον." Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[f] Ἐγώ εἰμι." Εἱστήκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν. 6. Ὡς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι [f] ἐγώ εἰμι," ἀπῆλθον [g] εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ ἔπεσον [1] [h] χαμαί. 7. πάλιν οὖν αὐτοὺς ἐπηρώτησε, "Τίνα ζητεῖτε;" Οἱ δὲ εἶπον, "Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον." 8. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Εἶπον ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε, [i] ἄφετε τούτους ὑπάγειν·" 9. ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν, 'Ὅτι οὓς δέδωκάς μοι, οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα.' 10. Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος ἔχων μάχαιραν, εἵλκυσεν αὐτὴν, καὶ ἔπαισε τὸν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως δοῦλον, καὶ ἀπέκοψεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον [2] τὸ δεξιόν,

e xvi. 13. Cp. Is. xliv. 7.
f iv. 26; viii. 24.
g vi. 66; xx. 14. 2 Pet. ii. 21. 2 Kings xx. 11.
h ix. 6. Job i. 20.
i xi. 44; xii. 7. Acts v. 38, etc.

[1] απηλθαν, επεσαν in ℵBD. [2] ωταριον in ℵBC*L, vulg. "auriculam".

part of a legion, and therefore containing about 600 men. *The* cohort denotes the garrison of the castle Antonia, which, during the Passover, was available to assist the Sanhedrim in maintaining order. Part of it was now used in case "the servants of the Sanhedrim," **ἐκ τῶν . . . ὑπηρέτας**, should not prove sufficient. A considerable body of troops would obviate the risk of a popular rising, vii. 32-49, xii. 42; especially Mk. xiv. 2. They were furnished with **φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων καὶ ὅπλων. φανός** was a link or torch, consisting of strips of resinous wood tied together, and in late Greek was used for **λυχνοῦχος**, a lantern; **λαμπάς** was the open torch. See Rutherford's *New Phryn.*, p. 131, and Wetstein. Both open lights and lanterns were in use in the Roman army, and would be at hand. "The soldiers rushed out of their tents with lanterns and torches." Dion. Hal., xi. 5. It was new moon, but it might be cloudy, and it would certainly be shady in the garden.—Ver. 4. Jesus, then, not with the boldness of ignorance, but knowing **πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν**, "all that was coming upon Him," *cf.* Lk. xiv. 31, **ἐρχομένῳ ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν**, "went out" from the garden, or more probably, ver. 26, from the group of disciples, "and says, Whom seek ye?" to concentrate attention on Himself and prevent a general attack.—Ver. 5. **Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον** "Jesus the Nazarene," *cf.* Acts xxiv. 5, **Ναζαρηνός** occurs Mk. xiv. 67, etc. **ἐγώ εἰμι**, "I am He". He had already been identified by Judas' kiss, Mt. xxvi. 47, but Jesus wished to declare Himself as one who did not fear identification. That the kiss was superfluous is, however, no proof that it was not given. **Εἱστήκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας . . .** This remark is inserted not to bring out that Judas fell to the ground with the rest (Holtzmann), but to point out that Judas had not only given directions, but had actually come, and now confronted his Lord and companions.—Ver. 6. The immediate effect of His calm declaration was: **ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἔπεσον χαμαί**, "they went backwards and fell to the ground". Job i. 20, **πεσὼν χαμαί**; similarly used by Homer, etc., as = **χαμᾶζε**. This might have been considered a fulfilment of Ps. xxvii. 2, **οἱ θλίβοντές με . . . ἔπεσαν**. The recoil, which necessarily causes stumbling and falling in a crowd, was natural, especially if the servants here employed were the same as those who had been sent to take Him on a former occasion, vii. 46. No one wished to be the first to lay hands on Him. Similar effects were produced by Mohammed (when Durthur stood over him with drawn sword), Mark Antony, Marius, Coligny. But the object in narrating the circumstance may have been to illustrate the voluntariness of Christ's surrender.—Ver. 7. Declaring His identity a second time, Jesus explicitly reminds the officials that by their own acknowledgment they are instructed to arrest none but Himself. **εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε . . . οὐδένα.** In thus protecting His companions, Jesus, according to John, fulfils xvii. 12; although here the fulfilment is more superficial than that which was intended. (*Cf.* 2 Sam. xxiv. 17.)—Ver. 10. Peter did not wish to be thus dissociated from the fate of his Master, xiii. 38, and thinks a rescue

ἦν δὲ ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος. 11. εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ, "Βάλε τὴν μάχαιράν σου[1] εἰς τὴν θήκην. τὸ [j] ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέ μοι ὁ πατὴρ, οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό;"

[j] Ezek. xxiii. 31. Ps. xvi. 5. Mt. xx. 23, etc.

12. Ἡ οὖν σπεῖρα καὶ ὁ χιλίαρχος καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται τῶν Ἰουδαίων [k] συνέλαβον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτὸν, 13. καὶ ἀπήγαγον[2] αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἄνναν πρῶτον· ἦν γὰρ [l] πενθερὸς τοῦ Καϊάφα, ὃς ἦν ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου. 14. ἦν δὲ Καϊάφας ὁ [m] συμβουλεύσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ὅτι συμφέρει ἕνα ἄνθρωπον ἀπολέσθαι[3] ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ.

[k] Acts i. 16. 2 Kings x. 14. [l] Gen. xxxviii. 13. [m] xi. 49.

15. Ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ ὁ[4] ἄλλος μαθητής. ὁ δὲ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος ἦν [n] γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ συνεισῆλθε τῷ

[n] Ps. lxxxviii. 8. Acts i. 19.

[1] σου omitted in ℵABCDLΠ.

[2] ηγαγον without αυτον in ℵ*BD. So in Tr.Ti.W.H.R.

[3] αποθανειν in ℵBC*D 33.

[4] ο omitted in ℵ*ABD, inserted in ℵcbCLΠ. The article is out of place here, though appropriate in xx. 3, 4.

possible, as only the Sanhedrim officials would enter the garden, leaving the soldiers outside. ἔχων μάχαιραν, "having a sword," "pro more peregrinantium in iis locis," Grotius, and *cf.* Thucyd., i. 6; Luke xxii. 36. He struck τὸν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως δοῦλον, "the high priest's servant". The δοῦλοι are distinguished from the ὑπηρέται, ver. 18. John, being acquainted with the high priest's household, both identified the man and knew his name, which was a common one, see Wetstein, and *cf.* Neh. x. 4; also, Porphyry, *Life of Plotinus*, 17. "In my native dialect I (Porphyry) was called Malchus, which is interpreted, king." ἀπέκοψεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον τὸ δεξιόν. In Mark xiv. 47 ἀφεῖλεν τὸ ὠτάριον. τὸ δεξιόν indicates eye-witness or subsequent intimate knowledge. Peter meant, no doubt, to cleave the head.—Ver. 11. Peter's action, however, was not commended. βάλε . . . θήκην. "Res evangelica non agitur ejusmodi praesidiis." Erasmus. θήκη, a receptacle; sometimes ξιφοθήκη; usually κολεός. τὸ ποτήριον . . . αὐτό. For the figure of the cup, see Ezek. xxiii. 31-34; Mt. xx. 22, and xxvi. 39. Shall I refuse the lot appointed me by the Father?—Ver. 12. Ἡ οὖν σπεῖρα . . . αὐτόν. The Roman soldiers, ἡ σπεῖρα, under the orders of their Chiliarch (Tribune, Colonel), abetted the officers of the Sanhedrim, ὑπηρέται τῶν Ἰουδαίων, in the apprehension of Jesus. As a matter of course and following the universal practice ἔδησαν αὐτόν, "they bound Him," with His hands shackled behind His back.

Vv. 13-24. *Examination before Annas.*—Ver. 13. καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν, "and they led Him to Annas first". πρῶτον refers to the subsequent examinations, vv. 24, 28. The reason for taking Him to Annas first was that he was father-in-law of the actual high priest, Caiaphas, and was a man of commanding influence. He had himself been high priest from A.D. 7-14, while five of his sons occupied the office in succession. Caiaphas held office till 37 A.D. On ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου see xi. 49.—Ver. 14. The attitude Caiaphas was likely to assume towards the prisoner is indicated by his identification with the person who uttered the principle, xi. 50, ὅτι συμφέρει . . . ἀπολέσθαι.—Ver. 15. Ἠκολούθει . . . μαθητής. "There followed Jesus Simon Peter"—with whom the narrative is now concerned—"and another disciple," in all probability John. He is mentioned to explain how Peter found access to the high priest's residence. "That disciple was known to the high priest," *i.e.*, probably to Caiaphas, and accordingly went in with Jesus εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, "into the palace (or court) of the high priest". αὐλή, originally the court or quadrangle round which the house was built, was used of the residence itself. Apparently, and very naturally, Annas had apartments in this official residence now occupied by Caiaphas.—Ver. 16. Peter, not being known to the household, was excluded and stood outside at the door, πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ ἔξω, *cf.* xx. 11. John, missing him, spoke to the doorkeeper and introduced

Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· 16. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἱστήκει πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ ἔξω. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος ὃς ἦν γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, καὶ εἶπε τῇ θυρωρῷ, καὶ εἰσήγαγε τὸν Πέτρον. 17. λέγει οὖν ἡ [o] παιδίσκη ἡ θυρωρὸς τῷ Πέτρῳ, "Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν εἶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;" Λέγει ἐκεῖνος, "Οὐκ εἰμί." 18. Εἱστήκεισαν δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται [p] ἀνθρακιὰν πεποιηκότες, ὅτι ψύχος ἦν, καὶ ἐθερμαίνοντο· ἦν δὲ μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Πέτρος ἑστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος. 19. Ὁ οὖν ἀρχιερεὺς ἠρώτησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν περὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς αὐτοῦ. 20. ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐγὼ [q] παρρησίᾳ ἐλάλησα [1] τῷ κόσμῳ· ἐγὼ πάντοτε ἐδίδαξα ἐν τῇ [2] συναγωγῇ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, ὅπου πάντοτε [3] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συνέρχονται, καὶ [r] ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν. 21. Τί με ἐπερωτᾷς; ἐπερώτησον τοὺς ἀκηκοότας, τί ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς· ἴδε οὗτοι οἴδασιν ἃ εἶπον ἐγώ." 22. Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος, εἷς τῶν ὑπηρετῶν παρεστηκὼς [s] ἔδωκε [s] ῥάπισμα τῷ Ἰησοῦ, εἰπών, "Οὕτως ἀποκρίνῃ τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ;" 23. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα,

o Gal. iv. 22. Gen. xx. 17.
p xxi. 9. Ecclus. xi. 32. 4 Macc. ix. 20.
q vii. 4 reff.
r vii. 4.
s xix. 3. Is. l. 6.

[1] λελαληκα in ℵABC*L. [2] Omit τη with ℵABCD.
[3] παντες in ℵABC*L and most versions.

him. τῇ θυρωρῷ, female doorkeepers appear 2 Sam. iv. 6, Acts. xii. 13, and see Wetstein.—Ver. 17. Naturally she concluded from John's introducing him that Peter was also a disciple, and as a mere innocent and purposeless remark says: Μὴ καὶ σὺ . . . τούτου; "Are you also one of this man's disciples?" He says, οὐκ εἰμί, "I am not".—Ver. 18. Εἱστήκεισαν . . . θερμαινόμενος. The household servants and the Sanhedrim servitors had made a fire in the open court of the house and were standing round it warming themselves. Peter, unabashed by his lie, joined himself to this group and stood in the light of the fire. *Cf.* Lk. xxii. 56, πρὸς τὸ φῶς. Jerusalem, lying 2500 feet above sea-level, is cold at night in spring.—Ver. 19. Ὁ οὖν ἀρχιερεὺς ἠρώτησε . . . "The high priest then interrogated Jesus about His disciples and about His teaching," apparently wishing to bring out on what terms He made disciples, whether as a simple Rabbi or as Messiah. But Jesus answered: Ἐγὼ παρρησίᾳ ἐλάλησα . . . οὐδέν. The high priest's question was useless. Jesus had nothing to tell which He had not publicly and frequently proclaimed. Similarly Socrates replied to his judges (Plato, *Apol.*, 33), "If any one says that he has ever learned or heard anything from me in private which the world has not heard, be assured he says what is not true". παρρησίᾳ "without reserve," *rückhaltslos*, Holtzmann. τῷ κόσμῳ, "to everybody," to all who cared to hear; *cf.* Socrates' δημοσίᾳ. "I always taught in synagogue and in the temple"; the article dropped as we drop it in the phrase "in church"; "where," *i.e.*, in both synagogue and temple, πάντες "all the Jews assemble".—Ver. 21. "Why do you interrogate me? Ask those who have heard, what I said to them." Similarly Socrates appeals to his disciples. The οὗτοι might be construed as if Jesus looked towards some who were present.—Ver. 22. Ταῦτα . . . ἀρχιερεῖ; ῥάπισμα. The older meaning of ῥαπίζειν was "to strike with a rod" sc. ῥαβδίζειν; but in later Greek it meant "to give a blow on the cheek with the open hand". This is put beyond doubt by Field, *Otium Norv.*, p. 71; *cf.* Rutherford's *New Phryn.*, p. 257. R.V. marg. "with a rod" is not an improvement on R.V. text.—Ver. 23. The calmness and reasonableness of Jesus' retort to this blow impressed it on the memory of John, whose own blood would boil when he saw his Master struck by a servant.—Ver. 24. As nothing was to be gained by continuing the examination, Jesus is handed on to Caiaphas, Ἀπέστειλεν . . . ἀρχιερέα.

Ver. 25 resumes the narrative inter-

t Heb. v. 14. Ch. iv. 17. Exod. xxii. 28. μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ ᵗκακοῦ· εἰ δὲ ᵗκαλῶς, τί με δέρεις;" 24. Ἀπέστειλεν[1] αὐτὸν ὁ Ἄννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα.

25. Ἦν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος ἑστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος· εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ, "Μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶ;" Ἠρνήσατο ἐκεῖνος, καὶ εἶπεν, "Οὐκ εἰμί." 26. Λέγει εἷς ἐκ τῶν δούλων τοῦ ἀρχιερέως, ᵘσυγγενὴς ὢν οὗ ἀπέκοψε Πέτρος τὸ ὠτίον, "Οὐκ ἐγώ σε εἶδον ἐν τῷ κήπῳ μετ' αὐτοῦ;" 27. Πάλιν οὖν ἠρνήσατο ὁ Πέτρος, καὶ εὐθέως ἀλέκτωρ ᵛἐφώνησεν.

u Lk. i. 36. Rom. xvi. 7, etc.
v xiii. 38.

28. ʷΑΓΟΥΣΙΝ οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα εἰς τὸ ʷπραιτώριον. ἦν δὲ πρωΐα[2]· καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον, ἵνα μὴ ˣμιανθῶσιν, ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα. 29. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος[3] πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ εἶπε, "Τίνα κατηγορίαν ʸφέρετε κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;" 30. Ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ, "Εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος κακοποιός,[4] οὐκ ἄν σοι παρεδώκαμεν αὐτόν." 31. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος, "Λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς, καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν κρίνατε αὐτόν." Εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, "Ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι

w xix. 9. Acts xxiii. 35. Phil. i. 13.
x Lev. v. 3. Heb. xii. 15. Tit. i. 15. Jude 8.
y Acts xxv. 18. 2 Pet. ii. 11.

[1] ουν inserted in BC*L 33, which compels the translation "Annas therefore sent Him," and forbids the meaning "Annas had sent Him".

[2] Better πρωι as in ℵABCD.

[3] Πειλατος in ABC, Πιλατος in ℵD. It represents the Latin *pilatus*, "armed with a javelin". εξω is added in ℵBC*L 33.

[4] κακον ποιων read by Tr.Ti.W.H. on the authority of ℵᶜBL 33. The Vulgate has "malefactor".

rupted at vv. 18-19, and resumes by repeating the statement that Simon Peter was standing and warming himself. While he did so the servants and officers, ver. 18, who were round the fire said, **Μὴ καὶ σὺ** . . . "Are you also of His disciples?"—Ver. 26. **Λέγει εἷς ἐκ τῶν δούλων . . . ὠτίον,** "one of the servants of the high priest, who was a kinsman of him," etc., "a detail which marks an exact knowledge of the household (ver. 15)," Westcott.—Ver. 27. **Πάλιν οὖν . . . ἐφώνησεν** . . . A cock crew, the dawn approaching, and the warning of xiii. 38 was fulfilled. See on xiii. 38.

Vv. 28—xix. 16. *Jesus before Pilate.*—Ver. 28. **Ἄγουσιν,** "They lead," *i.e.*, the Sanhedrists who had assembled lead: in Luke xxiii. 1, **ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν. ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα.** Field prefers translating "from the house of Caiaphas," *cf.* Mark v. 35; Acts xvi. 40. **πραιτώριον,** *praetorium*, lit. "the general's tent"; here probably the governor's quarters in Antonia, but possibly the magnificent palace of Herod used by the Roman governor while in Jerusalem; see especially Keim, *Jesus of Nazareth*, vi. 79 E. Tr. **ἦν δὲ πρωΐα καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθον** . . . "It was early morning (the fourth watch, from 3 to 6 A.M., see Mark xiii. 35; see on xiii. 38) and they themselves entered not into the palace that they might not be defiled but might eat the passover." The dawning of the day seems to have reminded them of its sacred character. To enter a house from which all leaven had not been removed was pollution. Probably too the mere entrance into the house of a Gentile was the gnat these men strained at. The plain inference from the word is that the Paschal Supper was yet to be eaten. But see Edersheim's *Life of Jesus*, ii. 566.—Ver. 29. **ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλάτος** . . . The examination began therefore in the open air in front of the building; *cf.* xix. 13. Pilate opened the case with the formal inquiry, **Τίνα κατηγορίαν κ. τ. λ.;** To this reasonable demand the Sanhedrists evasively and insolently reply (ver. 30): "Had He not been a **κακοποιός** we should not have delivered Him to you". It appears therefore that having already condemned Him to death (see Mt. xxvi. 66, **ἔνοχος**

οὐδένα·" 32. ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πληρωθῇ, ὃν εἶπε [z] σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν. 33. Εἰσῆλθεν οὖν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον πάλιν ὁ Πιλάτος, καὶ [a] ἐφώνησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;" 34. Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[b] Ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις, ἢ ἄλλοι σοι εἶπον περὶ ἐμοῦ;" 35. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πιλάτος, "[c] Μήτι ἐγὼ Ἰουδαῖός εἰμι; τὸ ἔθνος τὸ σὸν καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς παρέδωκάν σε ἐμοί· [d] τί ἐποίησας;" 36. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν [e] ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἦν ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμή, οἱ ὑπηρέται ἂν οἱ ἐμοὶ ἠγωνίζοντο, ἵνα μὴ παραδοθῶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις·

z xii. 33.
a i. 49; ii. 10.
b v. 19.
c iv. 29.
d 1 Sam. xx. 32.
e iii. 31.

θανάτου ἐστί. Mk. xiv. 64) they handed Him over—**παρεδώκαμεν**—to Pilate, not to have their judgment revised, but to have their decision confirmed and the punishment executed. **κακοποιός** is found in Arist., *Eth.*, iv. 9, Polybius, and frequently in 1 Peter.—Ver. 31. This does not suit Roman ideas of justice; and therefore Pilate, ascribing their reluctance to lay a definite charge against the prisoner and to have the case reopened to the difficulty of explaining to a Roman the actual law and transgression, bids them finish the case for themselves, **λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς** . . . *cf.* Acts xviii. 14.—Ver. 32. This, however, they decline to do, because it is the death penalty they desire, and this they have no right to inflict: **ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα.** In the Roman provinces the power of life and death, the *jus gladii*, was reserved to the governor. See Arnold's *Roman Prov. Administration*, pp. 55, 57; and Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 8, 1, who states that when the territory of Archelaus passed to the provincial governor, Coponius, the power of inflicting capital punishment was given to him, **μέχρι τοῦ κτείνειν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐξουσίαν.** See also Stapfer's *Palestine*, p. 100. By being thus handed over to the Roman magistrate it came about that Jesus was *crucified*, a form of capital punishment which the Jews never inflicted even when they had power; and thus the word of Jesus was fulfilled which He spake intimating that He would die by crucifixion, xii. 32, 33.

Vv. 33-37. *Jesus examined by Pilate in private.*—Ver. 33. Pilate, being thus compelled to undertake the case, withdraws within the Praetorium to conduct it apart from their prejudices and clamours. He calls Jesus and says to Him, **Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;** How did Pilate know that this was the **κατηγορία** against Jesus? John omits the information given in Lk. xxiii. 2 that the Sanhedrists definitely laid this accusation. And the answer of Jesus implies that He had not heard this accusation made in Pilate's presence. The probability therefore is that Pilate had privately obtained information regarding the prisoner. There is some contempt as well as surprise in Pilate's **Σύ.** "Art Thou," whose appearance so belies it, "the king of the Jews?"—Ver. 34. Jesus answers by asking: **Ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις . . .;** Pilate's reply, "Am I a Jew?" precludes all interpretations, however inviting (see especially Alford and Oscar Holtzmann), but the simple one: "Do you make this inquiry from any serious personal interest and with any keen apprehension of the blessings attached to the Kingdom of God, or are you merely echoing a formal charge brought against me by others?"—Ver. 35. To this Pilate with some heat and contempt replies: **Μήτι ἐγὼ Ἰουδαῖός εἰμι;** "Am I a Jew?" How can you suppose that I have any personal interest in such a matter?—**τὸ ἔθνος τὸ σὸν . . . ἐμοί.** "Your own nation and the chief priests handed you over to me." It is their charge I repeat. **τί ἐποίησας;** "what hast Thou done?" He scouts the idea that he should take any interest in the Jewish Messiah, and returns to the practical point, "what have you done?"—Ver. 36. But Jesus accepts the allegation of the Jews and proceeds to explain in what sense He is king: **Ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ κ. τ. λ.** My kingdom is not of a worldly nature, nor is it established by worldly means. Had it been so, my servants would have striven to prevent my being surrendered to the Jews. But as things are, **νῦν**, since it is indisputable that no armed resistance or rescue has been attempted, it is put beyond question that my kingdom is not from hence. "The substitution of 'hence' for 'of this world' in the last

νῦν δὲ ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐντεῦθεν." 37. Εἶπεν οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος, "Οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ;" Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεύς εἰμι ἐγώ. ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι, καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. πᾶς ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας [f] ἀκούει μου τῆς φωνῆς." 38. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος, "Τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια;" Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν, πάλιν ἐξῆλθε πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἐγὼ οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὑρίσκω [g] ἐν αὐτῷ. 39. ἔστι δὲ συνήθεια ὑμῖν, [h] ἵνα ἕνα ὑμῖν ἀπολύσω ἐν τῷ πάσχα· βούλεσθε οὖν ὑμῖν ἀπολύσω τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;" 40. Ἐκραύγασαν οὖν πάλιν πάντες, λέγοντες, "Μὴ τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Βαραββᾶν·" ἦν δὲ ὁ Βαραββᾶς λῃστής.

f x. 3.
g Dan. ix. 26.
h Cp. xii. 23; xvi. 2. Burton, 216.

clause appears to define the idea of the world by an immediate reference to the representatives of it close at hand." Westcott. Perhaps this rather limits the reference. Jesus uses **ἐντεῦθεν** as one who has other worlds than this in view. —Ver. 37. Pilate understands only so far as to interrupt with **Οὐκοῦν . . . σύ;** "So then you are a king?" On **οὐκοῦν** see Klotz's *Devarius*, p. 173. To which Jesus replies with the explicit statement: **Σὺ λέγεις . . . ἐγώ.** "Thou sayest." This, says Schoettgen (Mt. xxvi. 25), is "solennis adfirmantium apud Judaeos formula"; so that **ὅτι** must be rendered with R.V. marg. "because" I am a king. Erasmus, Westcott, Plummer, and others render, "Thou sayest that I am a king," neither definitely accepting nor rejecting the title. But this interpretation seems impossible in the face of the simple **σὺ λέγεις** of the synoptists, Mt. xxvii. 11, Mark xv. 2, Luke xxiii. 3. We must then render, "Thou art right, for a king I am". In what sense a king, He explains: **ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι κ. τ. λ.** "For this end have I been born, and for this end am I come into the world;" the latter expression, by being added to the former, certainly seems to suggest a prior state. *Cf.* i. 9. The end is expressed in **ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ**, "that I might witness to the truth," especially regarding God and His relation to men. The consequence is that every one who belongs to the truth (moral affinity expressed by **ἐκ**) obeys Him, **ἀκούει** in a pregnant sense, *cf.* x. 8-16. They become His subjects, and form His kingdom, a kingdom of truth. For which Pilate has only impatient scorn: **τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια;**—"Tush, what is Aletheia?" It was a kingdom which could not injure the empire. What have I to do with provinces that can yield no tribute, and threaten no armed rebellion?

Vv. 38-40. *Pilate declares the result of his examination.*—Ver. 38. Pilate waited for no reply to his question, but **τοῦτο εἰπὼν, πάλιν ἐξῆλθε.** The noting of each movement of Pilate suggests the eye-witness, and brings out his vacillation. **Ἐγὼ οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν . . .** "I for my part find no fault, or ground of accusation in Him." Naturally, therefore, Pilate will acquit and dismiss Him; but no. He attempts a compromise: **ἔστι δὲ συνήθεια ὑμῖν** "You have a custom," of which we have no information elsewhere; although Josephus (*Antiq.*, xx. 9, 3) relates that at a passover Albinus released some robbers. Analogies in other countries have been produced. This custom Pilate fancies they will allow him to follow in favour of Jesus: **βούλεσθε . . . Ἰουδαίων; ἀπολύσω**, aorist subjunctive; *cf.* Mt. xiii. 28, **θέλεις συλλέξωμεν**; Lk. ix. 54, **θέλεις εἴπωμεν**; **βούλεσθε καλῶμεν**; **βούλεσθε εἴπω**, etc., commonly occur in Aristophanes and other classical writers. **Ἐκραύγασαν . . . Μὴ τοῦτον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Βαραββᾶν,** "They shouted," showing their excitement: **πάλιν**, previous shoutings have not been mentioned by John, but this word reflects light on the manner in which the accusations had been made. **ἦν δὲ ὁ Βαραββᾶς λῃστής.** Bar-Abbas, son of a father, or of a Rabbi, **διδασκάλου υἱός.** In Mt. xxvii. 16, Origen read **Ἰησοῦν τὸν Βαρ.**, but added "in multis exemplaribus non continetur". He found a mystery in the circumstance that both prisoners were called "Jesus, the Son of the Father". Barabbas is designated **λῃστής**, or, as Luke (xxiii. 19) more definitely says, he had been imprisoned for sedition in the city and for murder. John does not bring out the irony of the Jews' choice, which freed

XIX. 1. Τότε οὖν [a] ἔλαβεν ὁ Πιλάτος τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ [b] ἐμαστίγωσε. 2. καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται [c] πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν [d] περιέβαλον αὐτὸν,[1] 3. καὶ ἔλεγον, "Χαῖρε, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων·" καὶ [e] ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ [e] ῥαπίσματα. 4. Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν πάλιν ἔξω ὁ Πιλάτος, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἴδε ἄγω ὑμῖν αὐτὸν ἔξω, ἵνα γνῶτε ὅτι [f] ἐν αὐτῷ οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὑρίσκω." 5. Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω, [g] φορῶν τὸν ἀκάνθινον στέφανον, καὶ τὸ πορφυροῦν ἱμάτιον. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ἴδε[2] ὁ ἄνθρωπος." 6. Ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται, ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες, "Σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον." Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος, "Λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς καὶ σταυρώσατε· ἐγὼ γὰρ [f] οὐχ

a Mt. xiii. 31.
b Is. l. 6.
c Is. xxviii. 5.
d Mt. xv. 51.
e xviii. 22.
f xviii. 38.
g Ecclus. xl. 4.

[1] Insert και ηρχοντο προς αυτον with ℵBL 33, omitted in AD by homoioteleuton.

[2] ἰδου in ℵBL 33.

the real and crucified the pretended mover of sedition.

CHAPTER XIX.—Vv. 1-6. *Pilate, after scourging Jesus, again pronounces Him guiltless.*—Ver. 1. **Τότε οὖν . . . ἐμαστίγωσε.** Keim (vi. 99) thinks that Pilate at this point pronounced his "condemno" and "ibis in crucem," and that the scourging was preparatory to the crucifixion. This might seem to be warranted by Mark's very condensed account, xv. 15. **φραγελλώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῇ** (according to the Roman law by which, according to Jerome, it was decreed "ut qui crucifigeretur, prius flagellis verberaretur"; so Josephus, *B. J.*, v. 11, and Philo, ii. 528). But according to John the scourging was meant as a compromise by Pilate; as in Lk. xxiii. 22: "what evil hath He done? I found in Him nothing worthy of death; I will therefore scourge Him and let Him go." Neither, then, as part of the capital punishment, nor in order to elicit the truth (quaestio per tormenta); but in the ill-judged hope that this minor punishment might satisfy the Jews, Pilate ordered the scourging. The victim of this severe punishment was bound in a stooping attitude to a low column (column of the Flagellation, now shown in Church of Holy Sepulchre) and beaten with rods or scourged with whips, the thongs of which were weighted with lead, and studded with sharp-pointed pieces of bone, so that frightful laceration followed each stroke. Death frequently resulted. **καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται . . . ῥαπίσματα,** "and the soldiers plaited a crown of thorns" in mockery of the claim to royalty (for a similar instance, see Keim, vi. 121). Of the suggestions regarding the particular species of thorn, it may be said with Bynaeus (*De Morte Christi*, iii. 145) "nemo attulit aliquid certi". **ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν,** "a purple robe," probably a small scarlet military cloak, or some cast-off *sagum*, or *paludamentum*, worn by officers and subject kings.—Ver. 3. **καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτόν,** "and they went on, coming to Him," imperfect of continued action; "and hailing Him king," **χαῖρε κ. τ. λ.,** as they were accustomed to shout "Ave, Caesar". At the same moment they struck Him on the face with their hands.—Ver. 4. Pilate, judging that this will content the Jews, brings Jesus out that they may see Him and **ἵνα γνῶτε . . . εὑρίσκω,** that Pilate may have another opportunity of pronouncing Him guiltless.—Ver. 5. Still wearing (**φορῶν**) the mocking symbols of royalty, an object of derision and pity, Jesus is led out, and the judge pointing to Him says, **Ἴδε ὁ ἄνθρωπος,** Ecce Homo, "Lo! the man," as if inviting inspection of the pitiable figure, and convincing them how ridiculous it was to try to fix a charge of treason on so contemptible a person. **ὁ ἄνθρωπος** is used contemptuously, as in Plutarch, *Them.*, xvi. 2, "the fellow," "the creature". Other instances in Holden's note in Plut., *Them.* The result is unexpected.—Ver. 6. Instead of allowing him to release the prisoner, "the chief priests and their officers," not "the people," who were perhaps moved with pity (Lücke), "roared" (**ἐκραύγασαν**) "Crucify, crucify"; "To the cross". To this demand Pilate, "in angry sarcasm" (Reynolds), but perhaps rather merely wishing strongly to assert, for the third time, that he

εὑρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτίαν." 7. Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι,
h xiii. 14. "Ἡμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν, καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἡμῶν [h] ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν,
i v. 18. ὅτι [i] ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐποίησεν."

8. Ὅτε οὖν ἤκουσεν ὁ Πιλάτος τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη,
j xviii. 28. 9. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ [j] πραιτώριον πάλιν, καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ,
k vii. 27; ix. 29. "[k] Πόθεν εἶ σύ;" Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς [l] ἀπόκρισιν οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ.
l i. 22. 10. λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλάτος, "Ἐμοὶ οὐ λαλεῖς; οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι
m xviii. 39. ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρῶσαί σε, καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω [m] ἀπολῦσαί σε;"

11. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν οὐδεμίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ,
n iii. 27. [n] εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν. διὰ τοῦτο ὁ παραδιδούς [1] μέ σοι

[1] παραδους in ℵBE, it. vulg.

for his part would not condemn Jesus to death, "If He is to be crucified, it is you who must do it," retorts, **Λάβετε . . . αἰτίαν**, "Take ye Him and crucify Him, for I find no fault in Him".

Vv. 7-12*a*. *Second private examination by Pilate.*—Ver. 7. The Jews are as determined that Pilate shall condemn Jesus as he is resolved not to condemn Him, and to his declaration of the prisoner's innocence they reply, **Ἡμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν . . . ἐποίησεν.** He may have committed no wrong of which your Roman law takes cognisance, but "we have a law (Lev. xxiv. 16), and according to our law He ought to die, because He made Himself God's Son". For the construction see v. 18. The occasion they refer to is His profession to the Sanhedrim recorded in Mk. xiv. 62. **υἱὸν Θεοῦ** here means more than "Messiah," for the claim to be Messiah was not apparently punishable with death (see Treffry's *Eternal Sonship*), and, moreover, such a claim would not have produced in Pilate the state of mind suggested by (ver. 8) **μᾶλλον ἐφοβήθη**, words which imply that already mingling with the governor's hesitation to condemn an innocent man there was an element of awe inspired by the prisoner's bearing and words. The words also imply that this awe was now deepened, and found utterance in the blunt interrogation (ver. 9), **Πόθεν εἶ σύ;** "Whence art Thou?" What is meant by your claim to be of Divine origin? To this question Jesus **ἀπόκρισιν οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ**, "did not give him an answer". Pilate had no right to prolong the case; because already he had three times over pronounced Jesus innocent. He needed no new material, but only to act on what he had. Jesus recognises this and declines to be a party to his vacillation. Besides, the charge on which He was being tried was, that He had claimed to be King of the Jews. This charge had been answered. Legal procedure was degenerating into an unregulated wrangle. Jesus therefore declines to answer.—Ver. 10. At this silence Pilate is indignant; **Ἐμοὶ οὐ λαλεῖς;** "To me do you not speak?" It is intelligible that you should not count it worth your while to answer the charges of that yelling mob; but do you not know that I have power to crucify you and have power to release you?—Ver. 11. Jesus answered, **Οὐκ εἶχες . . . ἔχει. ἄνωθεν**, "from above," *i.e.*, from God. Pilate must be reminded that the power he vaunts is not inherently his, but is given to him for God's purposes. From this it follows, **διὰ τοῦτο**, that **ὁ παραδιδούς μέ σοι**, "he that delivered me unto thee," to wit, Caiaphas (although the designation being that which is constantly used of Judas it has not unnaturally been referred to him), **μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει**, "hath greater sin," not than you, Pilate (as understood by most interpreters), but greater than in other circumstances it would have been. Had Pilate been a mere irresponsible executioner their sin would have been sufficiently heinous; but in using the official representative of God's truth and justice to fulfil their own wicked and unjust designs, they involve themselves in a darker criminality. So Wetstein: "Comparatur ergo, nisi fallor, peccatum Judaeorum cum suis circumstantiis, cum eodem peccato sine istis circumstantiis: hoc Judaeos aggravat, eosque atrocioris delicti reos agit, quod non per tumultum sed per Praesidem, idque specie juris, me quaerunt de medio tollere".—Ver. 12. In consequence of

μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν [o] ἔχει." 12. [p] Ἐκ τούτου [q] ἐζήτει ὁ Πιλάτος [k] ἀπολῦσαι αὐτόν. οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι ἔκραζον [1] λέγοντες, "Ἐὰν τοῦτον ἀπολύσῃς, οὐκ εἶ φίλος τοῦ Καίσαρος. πᾶς ὁ βασιλέα [r] αὐτὸν ποιῶν, [s] ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι." 13. Ὁ οὖν Πιλάτος ἀκούσας τοῦτον τὸν λόγον, ἤγαγεν ἔξω τὸν Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Λιθόστρωτον, [t] Ἑβραϊστὶ δὲ Γαββαθᾶ· 14. ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὥρα δὲ ὡσεὶ ἕκτη.[2] καὶ λέγει τοῖς

o ix. 41.
p vi. 66 reff.
q v. 16.
r ver. 7.
s Is. xxii. 22; l. 5. Hos. iv. 4. Lk. ii. 34.
t v. 2; vv. 17, 20. Rev. ix. 11; xvi. 16.

[1] εκραυγαζον is adopted by Tisch. after AIL; εκραυγασαν by W.H. after BD 33.

[2] Ti.W.H. read ωρα ην ως with ℵAB. τριτη is found ℵcDsuppLX and some cursives.

this and from this point, ἐκ τούτου, as in vi. 66, "upon this," with a causal as well as a temporal reference, ἐζήτει ὁ Πιλάτος ἀπολῦσαι αὐτόν, Pilate sought (ineffectually, imperfect) to set Him free.

Vv. 12*b*-16. *Fresh assault upon Pilate and his final surrender.*—Ver. 12. οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι, "but the Jews," a new turn was at this point given to the case by the cunning of the Sanhedrists, who cried out, ἔκραζον λέγοντες Ἐὰν . . . Καίσαρι. φίλος τοῦ Καίσαρος. Wetstein says: "Legati, praesides, praefecti, consiliarii, amici Caesaris dicebantur," but it is not in this titular sense the expression is here used. The meaning is: Thou dost not show thyself friendly to Caesar. The reason being that every one who makes himself a king, ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι, "speaks against Caesar". Euthymius, Field, Thayer, etc., prefer "setteth himself against Caesar," "resisteth his authority". And as Jesus made Himself a king, Pilate would aid and abet Him by pronouncing Him innocent. This was a threat Pilate could not despise. Tiberius was suspicious and jealous. ["Judicia majestatis . . . atrocissime exercuit." Suetonius, *Tib.*, 58. Treason was the makeweight in all accusations. Tacitus, *Annals*, iii. 38.]—Ver. 13. Pilate therefore, when he heard this, brought Jesus out, καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος. In the *Gospel according to Peter*, ἐκάθισεν is understood transitively: καὶ ἐκάθισαν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ καθέδραν κρίσεως λέγοντες Δικαίως κρῖνε, βασιλεῦ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Similarly in Justin, *I. Apol.*, i. 35. This rendering presents a strikingly dramatic scene, and admirably suits the "behold your king" of ver. 14. (See *Expositor* for 1893, p. 296 ff., and Robinson and James' *Gospel according to Peter*, p. 18.) But it is extremely unlikely that Pilate should thus have degraded his seat of justice, and much more natural to suppose that ἐκάθισεν is used intransitively, as in xii. 14, etc. (Joseph., *Bell. Jud.*, ii. 9, 3, ὁ Πιλάτος καθίσας ἐπὶ βήματος), and that Pilate's taking his seat is mentioned to indicate that his mind was now made up and that he was now to pronounce his final judgment. The βῆμα was the *suggestum* or *tribunal*, the raised platform (Livy, xxxi. 29; Tac., *Hist.*, iv. 25) or seat (Suet., *Aug.*, 44) on which the magistrate sat to administer justice. See 2 Macc. xiii. 26.—εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Λιθόστρωτον, "at a place called Lithostroton," *i.e.*, lit. Stone pavement, or Tesselated pavement (of which see reproductions in Rich's *Antiq.*). *Cf.* 2 Chron. vii. 3, Joseph., *Bell. Jud.*, vi. 1, 1. Pliny (xxxvi. 15) defines Lithostrota as mosaics, "parvulis certe crustis," and says they were a luxury introduced in the time of Sulla and found in the provinces rather than in Rome (see Krebs *in loc.*). The space in front of the praetorium where the βῆμα stood was thus paved and therefore currently known as "Lithostroton": Ἑβραϊστὶ δὲ Γαββαθᾶ, "but in Hebrew," *i.e.*, in the popular Aramaic "Gabbatha," which is not a translation of Lithostroton, but a name given to the same place from its being *raised*, from גַּב, a ridge or elevation. The tribunal was raised as a symbol of authority and in order that the judge might see and be seen (see Lücke).—Ver. 14. ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, "now it was the preparation of the Passover". παρασκευή was the usual appellation of Friday, the day of preparation for the weekly Sabbath. Here the addition τοῦ πάσχα shows that it is used of the day preceding the Passover. This day was, as it happened, a Friday, but it is the relation to the feast, not to the ordinary Sabbath, that is here indicated. *Cf.* ver. 42. ὥρα δὲ ὡσεὶ ἕκτη. "It was about the sixth hour," *i.e.*, about 12 o'clock. But Mark

u i. 29, etc. Ἰουδαίοις, "u Ἴδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν." 15. Οἱ δὲ ἐκραύγασαν, "Ἆρον, ἆρον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν." Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος, "Τὸν βασιλέα ὑμῶν σταυρώσω;" Ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, "Οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα εἰ μὴ Καίσαρα." 16. Τότε οὖν παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.

v 2 Kings xviii. 14. Mt. iii. 11. Mk. xiv. 13. Acts xv. 10. w Dan. xii. 5. Rev. xxii. 2.

Παρέλαβον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἀπήγαγον[1]· 17. καὶ v βαστάζων τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ[2] ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου τόπον, ὃς λέγεται Ἑβραϊστὶ Γολγοθᾶ· 18. ὅπου αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἄλλους δύο w ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν, μέσον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

[1] Tr.Ti.W.H.R. omit **και απηγαγον** following BLX 33.

[2] Instead of the genitive ℵL read **εαυτω**, BX 33 **αυτω**.

(xv. 25) says: "It was the third hour and they crucified Him". The various methods of reconciling the statements are given in Andrew's *Life of Our Lord*, p. 545 ff. Meyer leaves it unsolved "and the preference must be given to the disciple who stood under the cross". But if the crucifixion took place midway between nine and twelve o'clock, it was quite natural that one observer should refer it to the former, while another referred it to the latter hour. The height of the sun in the sky was the index of the time of day; and while it was easy to know whether it was before or after midday, or whether the sun was more or less than half-way between the zenith and the horizon, finer distinctions of time were not recognisable without consulting the sun-dials, which were not everywhere at hand. *Cf.* the interesting passages from rabbinical literature in Wetstein, and Professor Ramsay's article in the *Expositor*, 1893, vol. vii., p. 216. The latter writer found the same conditions in Turkish villages, and "cannot feel anything serious" in the discrepancy between John and Mark. "The Apostles had no means of avoiding the difficulty as to whether it was the third or the sixth hour when the sun was near mid-heaven, and they cared very little about the point." **καὶ λέγει . . . ὑμῶν**, "and he says to the Jews: Behold your king!" words uttered apparently in sarcasm and rage. If he still wished to free Jesus, his bitterness was impolitic.—Ver. 15. They at once shouted, **Ἆρον, ἆρον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν.** To this Pilate could offer only the feeble opposition of more sarcasm, **Τὸν βασιλέα ὑμῶν σταυρώσω**; where, of course, the emphasis is on the first words, John with his artistic perception exhibits their final rejection of Christ in the form in which it appeared as a reckless renunciation of all their national liberties and hopes: **Οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα εἰ μὴ Καίσαρα.** Even yet Pilate will take no active part, but hands Jesus over to the Sanhedrists with the requisite authorisation; **παρέδωκεν**, used in a semi-technical sense, *cf.* Plut., *Dem.*, xiv. 4, and the passages cited in Holden's note.

Vv. 17-30. *The crucifixion.*—Ver. 17. The Jewish authorities on their part "received" Jesus, **καὶ ἀπήγαγον. καὶ βαστάζων . . . Γολγοθᾶ.** "And carrying the cross for Himself, He went out to the place called Kraniou (of a skull), which in Hebrew is called Golgotha." The condemned man carried at least part of the cross, and sometimes the whole. **ὁ μέλλων σταυρῷ προσηλοῦσθαι πρότερον αὐτὸν βαστάζει**, Artemid., *Oneir.*, ii. 56. Other passages in Keim, vi. 124. Since Tertullian (*adv. Jud.*, 10) a type of this has been found in Isaac's carrying the wood for the sacrifice. **ἐξῆλθεν**, it was usual both in Jewish and Roman communities to execute criminals outside the city. In Athens the gate through which they passed to the place of punishment was called **χαρώνεια θύρα**. *Cf.* Bynaeus, *De Morte Christi*, 220; Pearson, *On the Creed* (Art. iv.); Heb. xiii. 12; Lev. xxiv. 14. The place of execution at Jerusalem was a small knoll just beyond the northern wall, which, from its bare top and two hollow caves in its face, bears a rough resemblance to a skull, and was therefore called **κρανίον**, Calvaria, Skull. "Golgotha" is the Aramaic form of Gulgoleth, which is found in 2 Kings ix. 35. It is described in Conder's *Handbook*, p. 355; Henderson's *Palestine*, pp. 163, 164.—Ver. 18. **ὅπου . . . Ἰησοῦν.** All information regarding the cross has been collected by Lipsius in his treatise

19. Ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος, καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ· ἦν δὲ γεγραμμένον, "Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων." 20. Τοῦτον οὖν τὸν τίτλον πολλοὶ ἀνέγνωσαν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι [x] ἐγγὺς ἦν τῆς πόλεως ὁ τόπος, ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστὶ, Ἑλληνιστὶ, Ῥωμαϊστί. 21. ἔλεγον οὖν τῷ Πιλάτῳ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, "Μὴ γράφε, Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνος εἶπε, Βασιλεύς εἰμι τῶν Ἰουδαίων." 22. Ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πιλάτος, "[y] Ὃ γέγραφα, γέγραφα." 23. Οἱ οὖν στρατιῶται, ὅτε ἐσταύρωσαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἔλαβον τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐποίησαν τέσσαρα μέρη, ἑκάστῳ στρατιώτῃ μέρος, καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα. ἦν δὲ ὁ χιτὼν ἄρραφος, ἐκ τῶν [z] ἄνωθεν [a] ὑφαντὸς δι' ὅλου. 24. εἶπον οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, "Μὴ [b] σχίσωμεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ [c] λάχωμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ, τίνος ἔσται·" ἵνα [d] ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ ἡ λέγουσα, 'Διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον.'

Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιῶται ταῦτα ἐποίησαν· 25. εἱστήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς

x vi. 19 reff.
y Gen. xliii. 14.
z Mk. xv. 38.
a Exod. xxviii. 28.
b xxi. 11. Is. xxxvii. 1. Lk. v. 36. Mk. xv. 38.
c Here only in this sense, see Thayer.
d Ps. xxii. 18.

De Cruce, Antwerp, 1595; Amstel., 1670; and in vol. ii. of his collected works, published at Lugduni, 1613. With Jesus were crucified "other two," in Mt. xxvii. 38, called "robbers," probably of the same class as Barabbas. Jesus was crucified between them; possibly, to identify Him with the worst criminals. "The whole of humanity was represented there: the sinless Saviour, the saved penitent, the condemned impenitent." Plummer.—Ver. 19. **Ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος.** "And Pilate wrote a 'title,' also, and set it on the cross." The "title," **αἰτία**, was a board whitened with gypsum (**σανίς, λεύκωμα**) such as were commonly used for public notices. Pilate himself, meaning to insult the Jews, ordered the precise terms of the inscription. **καὶ τίτλον**, "a title *also*," in addition to all the other insults he had heaped on them during the trial.—Ver. 20. This title was read by "many of the Jews," because the place of crucifixion was close to the city, and lay in the road of any coming in from the north; also it was written in three languages so that every one could read it, whether Jew or Gentile.—Ver. 21. Naturally the chief priests remonstrated and begged Pilate so to alter the inscription as to remove the impression that the claim of Jesus was admitted.—Ver. 22. But Pilate, "by nature obstinate and stubborn" (Philo, ii. 589), peremptorily refused to make any alteration. **ὃ γέγραφα γέγραφα.**—Ver. 23. "The soldiers, then, when they had crucified Jesus, took His garments"—the executioner's perquisite (Apuleius has the comparison "naked as a new-born babe or as the crucified")—and as there were four soldiers, **τετράδιον**, Acts xii. 4, they divided the clothes into four parts. This was the more easily done because the usual dress of a Jew consisted of five parts, the head-dress, the shoes, the chiton, the outer garment, and the girdle. The **χιτών** remained after the four other articles were distributed. They could not divide it into four without spoiling it, and so they cast lots for it. It was seamless, **ἄρραφος**, unsewed, and woven in one piece from top to bottom.—Ver. 24. The soldiers therefore said, **Μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτόν ἀλλὰ λάχωμεν**, "let us not rend it but cast lots". **λαγχάνειν** is, properly, not "to cast lots," but "to obtain by lot". See Field, *Otium Norv.*, 72. In this John sees a fulfilment of Ps. xxii. 18, the LXX. version of which is here quoted verbatim.—Ver. 25. This part of the scene is closed (that another may be introduced) with the common formula, **οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιῶται ταῦτα ἐποίησαν.** ("Graeci . . . saepissime hujusmodi conclusiunculis utuntur." Raphel *in loc.*) **οἱ μὲν . . . εἱστήκεισαν δὲ** . . . The soldiers for their part acted as has been related, but there were others beside the cross who were very differently

αὐτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή. 26. Ἰησοῦς οὖν ἰδὼν τὴν μητέρα, καὶ τὸν μαθητὴν παρεστῶτα ὃν ἠγάπα, λέγει τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, "Γύναι, ἰδοὺ ὁ υἱός σου." 27. Εἶτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ, "Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου." Καὶ [e] ἀπ' ἐκείνης τῆς ὥρας ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν ὁ μαθητὴς εἰς τὰ [f] ἴδια. 28. Μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι πάντα ἤδη τετέλεσται, ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, λέγει, "Διψῶ." 29. Σκεῦος οὖν [g] ἔκειτο [h] ὄξους μεστόν· οἱ δὲ, πλήσαντες σπόγγον [h] ὄξους, καὶ ὑσσώπῳ [i] περιθέντες, προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι.

e xi. 53.
f xvi. 32. Acts xxi. 6.
g ii. 6; xx. 5; xxi. 9.
h Ps. lxix. 21.
i Prov. vii. 3.

affected. **ἡ μήτηρ . . . Μαγδαληνή.** It is doubtful whether it is meant that three or that four women were standing by the cross; for **Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ** may either be a further designation of **ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ**, or it may name the first member of a second pair of women. That four women are intended may be argued from the extreme improbability that in one family two sisters should bear the same name, Mary. The Synoptists do not name the mother of Jesus among those who were present, but Matthew (xxvii. 56) and Mark (xv. 40) name Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and Salome the mother of John. Two of these three are mentioned by John here, and it is natural to infer that the unnamed woman (**ἡ ἀδελφὴ κ. τ. λ.**) is the third, Salome; unnamed possibly because of this writer's shyness in naming himself or those connected with him. But the fact that Luke (xxiv. 10) names Joanna as the third woman reflects some uncertainty on this argument. If Salome was Mary's sister, then Jesus and John were cousins, and the commendation of Mary to John's care is in part explained. **ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ** may mean the mother, daughter, sister, or wife of Klopas; probably the last. According to Mt. xxvii. 56, Mk. xv. 40, Lk. xxiv. 10, the Mary here mentioned was the mother of James and Joses. But in Mt. x. 3 we learn that James was the son of Alphaeus. Hence it is inferred that Klopas and Alphaeus are two slightly varying forms of the same name חַלְפַי.—Ver. 26. John's interest in naming the women is not obvious except in the case of the first. **Ἰησοῦς . . . ἡ μήτηρ σου.** Jesus when He saw His mother, and the disciple whom He loved standing beside her (the relevancy of the designation, **τὸν μαθητὴν ὃν ἠγάπα**, is here obvious, and the most convincing proof of its truth and significance is now given), says to His mother, "Woman, behold thy son"; *i.e.*, turning His eyes towards John, There is your son. Me you are losing, so far as the filial relation goes, but John will in this respect take my place.—Ver. 27. And this trust He commits to John in the simple words, **Ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου,** although his natural mother, Salome, was also standing there. [*Cf.* the bequest of Eudamidas: "I leave to Aretaeus the care of nourishing and providing for my mother in her old age". Lucian's *Toxaris.*] John at once accepted the charge, "from that hour (which cannot be taken so stringently as to imply that they did not wait at the cross to see the end) the disciple took her to his own home"; **εἰς τὰ ἴδια**, see i. 11, xvi. 32. The circumstances of the Nazareth home which made this a possible and desirable arrangement are not known. That Mary should find a home with her sister and her son is in itself intelligible, and this close intimacy of the two persons whose hearts had been most truly the home of Jesus must have helped to cherish and vivify all reminiscences of His character and words.—Ver. 28. **Μετὰ τοῦτο . . . Διψῶ.** "After this, Jesus knowing that all things are now finished, that the scripture might be completely fulfilled, saith, I thirst." Jesus did not feel thirsty and proclaim it with the intention of fulfilling scripture—which would be a spurious fulfilment—but in His complaint and the response to it, John sees a fulfilment of Ps. lxix. 22, **εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν με ὄξος.** Only when all else had been attended to (**εἰδὼς κ. τ. λ.**) was He free to attend to His own physical sensations.—Ver. 29. **Σκεῦος . . . μεστόν**—"There was set a vessel full of vinegar"; the mention of the vessel betrays the eye-witness. "The Synoptists do not mention the **σκεῦος**, but John had stood beside it." Plummer. **ὄξος**, the vinegar used by soldiers. [Ulpian says: "vinum atque *acetum* milites nostri solent percipere, uno die vinum, alio die acetum". Keim, vi. 162.] Here it seems to have been provided for the crucified, for as Weiss and Plummer

30. ὅτε οὖν ἔλαβε τὸ ὄξος ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπε, "Τετέλεσται·" καὶ κλίνας τὴν κεφαλὴν, παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα.

31. Οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι, ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ, ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν· ἦν γὰρ [j] μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνου τοῦ σαββάτου· ἠρώτησαν τὸν Πιλάτον, ἵνα [k] κατεαγῶσιν αὐτῶν τὰ σκέλη, καὶ ἀρθῶσιν. 32. ἦλθον οὖν οἱ στρατιῶται, καὶ τοῦ μὲν πρώτου κατέαξαν τὰ σκέλη καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου τοῦ συσταυρωθέντος αὐτῷ· 33. ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐλθόντες, ὡς εἶδον αὐτὸν ἤδη τεθνηκότα, οὐ κατέαξαν αὐτοῦ τὰ σκέλη· 34. ἀλλ' εἷς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ

j vii. 37. Is. i. 13.
k Jer. xxxi. 25.

observe, there were a sponge and a hyssop-reed also at hand. **οἱ δὲ**, *i.e.*, the soldiers, but *cf.* Mk. xv. 36; **πλήσαντες . . .** They filled a sponge, because a cup was impracticable, and put it round a stalk of hyssop, and thus applied the restorative to His mouth. The plant called "hyssop" has not been identified. All that was requisite was a reed (*cf.* **περιθεὶς καλάμῳ**, Mt. xxvii. 48, Mk. xv, 36) of two or three feet long, as the crucified was only slightly elevated.—Ver. 30. **ὅτε οὖν . . . πνεῦμα.** The cry, **τετέλεσται**, "it is finished," was not the gasp of a worn-out life, but the deliberate utterance of a clear consciousness that His work was finished, and all God's purpose accomplished (xvii. 4), that all had now been done that could be done to make God known to men, and to identify Him with men. **παρέδωκε τὸ πνεῦμα**, "gave up His spirit," according to Luke xxiii. 46, with an audible commendation of His spirit to the Father. **ἀφῆκε πνεῦμα** in Eurip., *Hecuba*, 569; **ἀφῆκε τὴν ψυχήν** Plut., *Dem.*, xxix. 5.

Vv. 31-37. *The piercing of Jesus' side.*—Ver. 31. "The Jews, therefore, since it was the preparation," *i.e.*, Friday, the day before the Sabbath, "and as the day of that Sabbath was great," being not only an ordinary Sabbath but the Passover, "that the bodies might not hang on the cross on the Sabbath" and so defile it, "they asked Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be removed". The law of Deut. xxi. 23 was that the body of a criminal should "not remain all night upon the tree". This law seems not to have been in view; but rather the fear of polluting their great feast. The Roman custom was to leave the body to birds and beasts of prey. To secure speedy death the *crurifragium*, breaking of the legs with a heavy mallet or bar, was sometimes resorted to: as without such means the crucified might in some cases linger for thirty-six hours. Neander (*Life of Christ*, p. 473) has an interesting note on *crurifragium*; and *cf.* the *Gospel according to Peter* on **σκελοκοπία**, with the note by the Author of *Supernat. Religion*.—Ver. 32. The two robbers were thus despatched. **ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐλθόντες**, but when the soldiers who were carrying out Pilate's orders came to Jesus and saw that He was already dead, they refrained from breaking His legs.—Ver. 34. But one of the soldiers **λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἔνυξε**, "pierced His side with a spear". But Field prefers "pricked His side" to keep up the distinction between **ἔνυξε** (the *milder* word) and **ἐξεκέντησε** (ver. 37). He favours the idea of Loesner that the soldier's intention was to ascertain whether Jesus was really dead, and he cites a very apt parallel from Plutarch's *Cleomenes*, 37. But **ἔγχεϊ νύξε** occurs in Homer (*Il.*, v. 579), where death followed, and as the wound inflicted by this spear thrust seems to have been a hand-breadth wide (xx. 25) it may be presumed the soldier meant to make sure that Jesus was dead by giving Him a thrust which itself would have been fatal. The weapon with which the blow was inflicted was a **λόγχη**, the ordinary Roman *hasta*, which had an iron head, egg-shaped, and about a hand-breadth at the broadest part. Following upon the blow **εὐθὺς ἐξῆλθεν αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ.** Dr. Stroud (*Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*) advocates the view that our Lord died from rupture of the heart, and thus accounts both for the speedy cessation of life and for the effusion of blood and water. Previous literature on the subject will be found in the *Critici Sacri* and select passages in Burton's *Bampton Lec.*, 468-9. Without physiological knowledge John records simply what he saw, and if he had an eye to the Docetae, as Waterland (v. 190) supposes, yet his main purpose was to certify the real death of Jesus. The symbolic signifi-

l Rev. xiv. 20. 1 Jo. v. 6.
m iv. 37.
n Exod. xii. 46. Ps. xxxiv. 20.
o Zech. xii. 10.

αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἔνυξε, καὶ εὐθὺς [l] ἐξῆλθεν αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ. 35. καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκε, καὶ [m] ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία, κἀκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει, ἵνα ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε. 36. ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα, ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ, '[n] Ὀστοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ.' 37. Καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει, '[o] Ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.'

p Here only.
q 1 Kings xiii. 29.
r x. 40; xii. 16.
s Here only in N.T. Ecclus. xxxviii. 8.

38. ΜΕΤΑ δὲ ταῦτα ἠρώτησε τὸν Πιλάτον ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, ὢν μαθητὴς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, [p] κεκρυμμένος δὲ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἵνα [q] ἄρῃ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν ὁ Πιλάτος. ἦλθεν οὖν καὶ [q] ἦρε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 39. ἦλθε δὲ καὶ Νικόδημος ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν νυκτὸς [r] τὸ πρῶτον, φέρων [s] μίγμα σμύρνης

cance of the blood and water so abundantly insisted on by the Fathers (see Burton, *B. L.*, 167-72, and Westcott's additional note) is not within John's horizon.—Ver. 35. When he goes on to testify, **ὁ ἑωρακὼς** . . . it is not the phenomenon of the blood and water he so emphatically certifies, but the veritable death of Christ. To one who was about to relate a resurrection it was a necessary preliminary to establish the *bona-fide* death. That John here speaks of himself in the third person is quite in his manner. Here, as in chap. xx., he shows that he understood the value of an eye-witness's testimony. It is that which constitutes his **μαρτυρία** as **ἀληθινή**, it is adequate. Besides being adequate, its contents are true, **ἀληθῆ**. "Testimony may be sufficient (*e.g.*, of a competent eye-witness) but false; or it may be insufficient (*e.g.*, of half-witted child) but true. St. John declares that his testimony is both sufficient and true." Plummer. The reason of his utterance, or record of these facts, is **ἵνα ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε**, "that ye might believe," first, this record, and through it in Jesus and His revelation.—Ver. 36. **ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα**. He records these things, contained in this short paragraph, because they further identify Jesus as the promised Messiah. **Ὀστοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ.** The law regarding the Paschal lamb ran thus (Exod. xii. 46): **ὀστοῦν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ**, *cf.* Ps. xxxiv. 20. Evidently John identified Jesus as the Paschal Lamb, *cf.* 1 Cor. v. 7. **καὶ πάλιν . . . ἐξεκέντησαν.** Another Scripture also here found its fulfilment, Zech. xii. 10. The original is: "They shall look upon me whom they pierced". The Sept. renders: **ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο**: "They shall look towards me because they insulted me". John gives a more accurate translation: **Ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν**: "They shall look on Him whom (**ἐκεῖνον ὃν**) they pierced". The same rendering is adopted in the Greek versions of Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus, and is also found in Ignatius, *Ep. Trall.*, 10; Justin, *I. Apol.*, i. 77; and *cf.* Rev. i. 7, and Barnabas, *Ep.*, 7. In the lance thrust John sees a suggestive connection with the martyr-hero of Zechariah's prophecy.

Vv. 38-42. *The entombment.*—Ver. 38. **Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα**, "But after these things". In ver. 31 the Jews asked that the bodies might be removed. Had this request been fulfilled by the soldiers, they would have cast the three bodies together into some pit of refuse, *cf.* Josh. viii. 29; but before this was done Joseph of Arimathaea—a place not yet certainly identified—who was a rich man (*cf.* Is. liii. 9) and a member of the Sanhedrim (Mt. xxvii. 57; Mk. xv. 43; Lk. xxiii. 50), but also "a disciple of Jesus," though "a hidden one, **κεκρυμμένος**, through fear of the Jews, asked Pilate that he might remove the body of Jesus". This required some courage on Joseph's part, and Mark therefore uses the word **τολμήσας**. Reynolds says that **ἠρώτησεν** "implies something of claim and confidence on his part. The Synoptists all three use **ᾐτήσατο**, which rather denotes the position of a supplicant for a favour." The reason, however, why **ᾐτήσατο** is used in the Synoptists is that it is followed by an accusative of the object asked for; while **ἠρώτησε** is used in John because it introduces a request that something may be done. With Joseph's request Pilate complied. **ἦλθεν . . . Ἰησοῦ.** For **ἦρε τὸ σῶμα**, *cf.* 1 Kings xiii. 29. Another member of Sanhedrim countenanced and aided Joseph.—Ver. 39. **ἦλθε δὲ καὶ Νικό-**

καὶ [t] ἀλόης ὡσεὶ [u] λίτρας ἑκατόν. 40. ἔλαβον οὖν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔδησαν αὐτὸ [v] ὀθονίοις μετὰ τῶν [w] ἀρωμάτων, [x] καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις [y] ἐνταφιάζειν. 41. ἦν δὲ τῷ τόπῳ, ὅπου ἐσταυρώθη, κῆπος, καὶ ἐν τῷ [z] κήπῳ μνημεῖον καινὸν, ἐν ᾧ οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἐτέθη. 42. ἐκεῖ οὖν διὰ τὴν [a] παρασκευὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον, ἔθηκαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

XX. 1. ΤΗι δὲ [a] μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται [b] πρωῒ, σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης, εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον· καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου. 2. τρέχει οὖν καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "[d] Ἦραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου, καὶ οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν." 3. Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής,

t Here only.
u xii. 3.
v xx. 5, 6, 7.
w Mk. xvi. 1, etc.
x 1 Mac. x. 89. 2 Chron. xvi. 14.
y Mat. xxvi. 12.
z 2 Kings xxi. 26.
a ver. 14.
a Acts xx. 7. Mk. xvi. 2.
b Gen. i. 5. Mk. i. 35.
c Cp. Mk. xiv. 46.
d ver. 1; xix. 38.

δημος. "Thus Jesus by being lifted up is already drawing men unto Him. These Jewish aristocrats first confess Him in the hour of His deepest degradation." Plummer. Nicodemus is identified as **ὁ ἐλθὼν . . . τὸ πρῶτον**, "he who came to Jesus by night at the first"; iii. 1, in contrast to the boldness of his coming now. **φέρων μίγμα . . . ἑκατόν. μίγμα**, a "confection" or "compound," *cf.* Ecclus. xxxviii. 8. **σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης**, "of myrrh and aloes". Myrrh was similarly used by the Egyptians, see Herod., ii. 83. *Cf.* Ps. xlv. 9. **ὡσεὶ λίτρας ἑκατόν.** The **λίτρα** (libra) was rather over eleven ounces avoirdupois. The enormous quantity has been accounted for as a rich man's expression of devotion, or as required if the entire body and all the wrappings were to be smeared with it, and if the grave itself was to be filled with unguents as in 2 Chron. xvi. 14.—Ver. 40. **ἔλαβον . . . ἐνταφιάζειν.** They wrapped the body in strips of linen along with the aromatic preparations (2 Chron. xvi. 14, **ἀρωμάτων**), as is the custom (**ὡς ἔθος ἐστί**, 1 Macc. x. 89) with the Jews (other peoples having other customs) to prepare for burial.—Ver. 41. **ἐνταφιάζειν**, see Gen. l. 1-3. **ἦν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ**, "There was in the place," *i.e.*, in that neighbourhood, **κῆπος**, a garden, which, according to Mt. xxvii. 60, must have belonged to Joseph. **μνημεῖον καινόν**, a tomb, rock-hewn according to Synoptists, which had hitherto been unused, and which was therefore fresh and clean.—Ver. 42. "There, accordingly, on account of the preparation of the Jews, because the tomb was at hand, they laid Jesus." The Friday was so nearly at an end that they had not time to go to any distance, and therefore availed themselves of the neighbouring tomb as a provisional, if not permanent, resting-place.

CHAPTER XX.—*The resurrection and subsequent manifestations.*—Vv. 1-10. *The empty tomb.*—Ver. 1. **ΤΗι δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων**: "And on the first day of the week". Mk. (xvi. 2) and Lk. (xxiv. 1) have the same expression. Mt. (xxviii. 1) has **ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων, τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων.** [In the suspected ninth verse of Mk. xvi. **πρώτῃ** appears instead of **μιᾷ**.]—**Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται**, Mary of Magdala, now Mejdel, a fishing village north of Tiberias; she is further described in Mk. xvi. 9 as **παρ' ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια** (*cf.* Lk. viii. 2), which lends significance both to her being at the tomb and to her being the first to see the Lord. She alone of the three women present is here named, because she alone is required in John's account. The time is more exactly described as **πρωΐ, σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης.** Mk. (xvi. 2) has **λίαν πρωΐ**, but adds **ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου**, apparently having chiefly in view, not the first arrival of the women, but the appearance of Jesus to Mary. Luke's **ὄρθρου βαθέος** agrees with John's expression. Phrynichus defines **ὄρθρος** as the time before the day began while a lamp was still needed. [*Cf.* Plato's *Crito* at the beginning, and Roger's note on Aristoph., *Wasps*, 215.] The darkness is noticed by John to account for her seeing nothing of what Peter and John afterwards saw. She could not, however, fail to see **τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου**; the slab closing the sepulchre had been removed. Seeing this she naturally concluded that the tomb had been violated, possibly that

e iv. 36; xxi. 2. καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. 4. ἔτρεχον δὲ οἱ δύο ᵉὁμοῦ· καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς προέδραμε τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου, καὶ ἦλθε πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, 5. καὶ ᶠπαρακύψας βλέπει ᵍκείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια, οὐ μέντοι εἰσῆλθεν. 6. ἔρχεται οὖν Σίμων Πέτρος ἀκολουθῶν αὐτῷ, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ὀθόνια ᵍκείμενα, 7. καὶ τὸ σουδάριον ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, οὐ μετὰ τῶν ὀθονίων κείμενον, ἀλλὰ ʰχωρὶς ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἕνα τόπον. 8. τότε οὖν εἰσῆλθε καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς ὁ ἐλθὼν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ εἶδε, καὶ ἐπίστευσεν· 9. οὐδέπω γὰρ ᾔδεισαν τὴν γραφήν, ὅτι ⁱδεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ

f ver. 11. Jas. i. 25.
g xix. 28.
h Adv. here only.
i Lk. xxiv. 7.

the authorities for purposes of their own had removed the body.—Ver. 2. **τρέχει οὖν . . . αὐτόν.** She therefore runs, disregarding unseemliness, and comes to those who would be most interested, and without preface, breathless and anxious, exclaims: **ἦραν** . . . "they have removed the Lord from the tomb, and we know not where they have laid Him". Evidently she had no idea that a resurrection had taken place. The plural **οἴδαμεν** may naturally be accepted as confirming Mark's account that she was not alone.—Ver. 3. At once the two men **ἐξῆλθεν . . . καὶ ἤρχοντο**, singular and plural as frequently, aorist and imperfect, the one referring to the passing beyond the city wall, the other to the whole course from the house to the tomb.—Ver. 4. **ἔτρεχον δὲ οἱ δύο ὁμοῦ**, "and the two ran together": equally eager; but **ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς προέδραμε ταχίον τοῦ Πέτρου**, "the other disciple ran on before more quickly than Peter"; probably John was the younger man. [Lampe suggests two other reasons: either Peter's steps were slower "ob conscientiam culpae," or "forte via Joanni magis nota erat".] Consequently John **ἦλθε πρῶτος . . .** "came first to the tomb". —Ver. 5. **καὶ παρακύψας** . . . The R.V. renders **παρακύψας** by "stooping and looking in," A.V. has merely "stooping down"; the Vulgate "cum se inclinasset," Weizsäcker "beugte sich vor". Field (*Otium Norvic.* on Luke xxiv. 12) prefers "looking in," although, he says, "peep in" would more accurately define the word **παρακύπτειν**. He quotes Casaubon's opinion that the word implies "protensionem colli cum modica corporis incurvatione". See also Kypke on Luke xxiv. 12, and Lid. and Scott Lex. **ὀθόνια** are the strips of linen used for swathing the dead; the cerecloths. **ὀθόνη** is frequent in Homer (*Il.*, 3, 141; 18, 595) to denote the fine material of women's dress; in Lucian and Herodian of sails; in Acts x. 11 of a sheet. **σινδών** is the word used by Luke (xxiii. 53); so Herodotus, ii. 86. **οὐ μέντοι εἰσῆλθεν**, "he did not however enter," withheld by dread of pollution, according to Wetstein; by terror, according to Meyer. It is enough to suppose that it did not occur to John to enter the tomb, or that he was withheld by a feeling of reverence or delicacy. —Ver. 6. Peter is not so withheld. He enters **καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ὀθόνια . . . τόπον. θεωρεῖ** is probably used here in its stricter sense of seeing so as to draw conclusions. —Ver. 7. What he saw was significant; the linen wrappings lying, and the napkin which had been on His head not lying with the linen cloths, but separately folded up in a place by itself. The first circumstance was evidence that the body had not been hastily snatched away for burial elsewhere. Had the authorities or any one else taken the body, they would have taken it as it was. The second circumstance gave them even stronger proof that there had been no hurry. The napkin was neatly folded and laid "into one place," the linens being in another. They felt in the tomb as if they were in a chamber where one had divested himself of one set of garments to assume another. [Euthymius is here interesting and realistic.] **σουδάριον**, sudarium, from sudo, I sweat.—Ver. 8. On Peter reporting what he saw **τότε οὖν . . . ἐπίστευσεν**, "then entered accordingly the other disciple also, who had first arrived at the tomb, and he saw and believed". Standing and gazing at the folded napkin, John saw the truth. Jesus has Himself risen, and disencumbered Himself of these wrappings. *Cf.* xi. 44. It was enough for John; **ἐπίστευσεν.** He visited no other tomb; he questioned no one. — Ver. 9. The emptied and orderly grave convinced him, **οὐδέπω γὰρ ᾔδεισαν . . . ἀναστῆναι**; it was not an expectation founded on

νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι. 10. ἀπῆλθον οὖν πάλιν [j] πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς οἱ μαθηταί. 11. Μαρία δὲ εἱστήκει πρὸς τὸ μνημεῖον κλαίουσα ἔξω. ὡς οὖν ἔκλαιε, [k] παρέκυψεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, 12. καὶ θεωρεῖ δύο ἀγγέλους ἐν [l] λευκοῖς καθεζομένους, ἕνα πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ἕνα πρὸς τοῖς ποσίν, ὅπου ἔκειτο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 13. καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῇ ἐκεῖνοι, "Γύναι, τί κλαίεις;" Λέγει αὐτοῖς, "Ὅτι [m] ἦραν τὸν κύριόν μου, καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ [n] ἔθηκαν αὐτόν." 14. Καὶ ταῦτα εἰποῦσα ἐστράφη [o] εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἑστῶτα· καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς [p] ἐστι. 15. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Γύναι, τί κλαίεις; [q] τίνα ζητεῖς;" Ἐκείνη δοκοῦσα ὅτι ὁ [r] κηπουρός ἐστι, λέγει αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, εἰ σὺ [s] ἐβάστασας αὐτὸν, εἰπέ μοι ποῦ αὐτὸν [n] ἔθηκας· κἀγὼ αὐτὸν [t] ἀρῶ." 16. Λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Μαρία." Στραφεῖσα ἐκείνη λέγει αὐτῷ,[1] "[u] Ῥαββουνί·" ὃ λέγεται, διδάσκαλε.

j 1 Sam. xxvi. 11. Num. xxiv. 25. Lk. xxiv. 12.
k ver. 5.
l Pl. Exod. xxxiii. 4.
m xix. 38; and ver. 2.
n xix. 41.
o xviii. 6 reff.
p i. 40.
q Gen. xxxvii. 15. cp. xviii. 7.
r Here only.
s Cp. xii. 6.
t ver. 13.
u Mk. x. 51 only.

[1] Insert Εβραιστι with ℵBDLOX 33 Syrr. Aegypt. Arm. Aeth., omitted in AEGK vulg. Cyr.-Alex.

scripture which prompted belief in the resurrection; but only those matter-of-fact observations, the empty grave and the folded napkin.—Ver. 10. Satisfied in their own minds **ἀπῆλθον οὖν . . . οἱ μαθηταί. πρὸς ἑαυτούς** or **αὐτούς** or **αὑτούς** = home; "chez eux," Segond's French version; **εἰς τὰ ἴδια**, modern Greek. Kypke gives examples of a phrase which he says is "trita profanis".

Vv. 11-18.—*Jesus reveals Himself to Mary*.—Ver. 11. **Μαρία δὲ εἱστήκει . . . ἔξω.** Hitherto John has told us simply what he himself saw: now he reports what Mary told him, see ver. 18. She had come to the tomb after the men, but could not share in their belief. She remained *outside the tomb* helplessly and hopelessly weeping. She herself had told the disciples that the tomb was empty, and she had seen them come out of it; but again **παρέκυψεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον** "she peered into the tomb"; an inimitably natural touch. She could not believe her Lord was gone. **καὶ θεωρεῖ . . . Ἰησοῦ.** This, says Holtzmann, is a mere reminiscence of Luke xxiv. 4. But even the description of the angels differs. They were "seated one at the head and one at the feet where the body of Jesus lay"; sitting, says Bengel, "quasi opera quapiam perfunctos, et exspectantes aliquem, quem docerent". Lampe has little help to give here; and Lücke is justified in saying that neither the believing nor the critical inquirer can lift the veil that hangs over this appearance of angels. In Mary's case it was wholly without result; for no sooner does she answer the angels' question than she turns away, probably hearing a footstep behind her.—Ver. 14. **ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω . . .** "And she sees Jesus standing and did not know that it was Jesus"; not merely because her eyes were dim with tears, but because He was altered in appearance; as Mark (xvi. 12) says, **ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ**. So little was her ultimate recognition of Jesus the result of her expectation or her own fancy embodied.—Ver. 15. **λέγει . . . ζητεῖς;** That she was searching for some one she had lost was obvious from her tears and demeanour. But not even the voice of Jesus sounds familiar. **Ἐκείνη . . . ἀρῶ.** She supposed Him to be the gardener (or garden-keeper) not because He had on the gardener's clothes—for probably He wore merely the short drawers in which He had been crucified (see Hug and Lücke)—nor because He held the spade as represented in some pictures, but because no one else was likely to be there at that early hour and to question her as to her reason for being there. Her answer shows that she thought it possible that it had been found inconvenient to have the body of Jesus in that tomb and that it had been removed to some other place of sepulture. In this case she will gladly relieve them of the encumbrance. It is none to her.—Ver. 16. **λέγει . . . Διδάσκαλε.** His uttering her name, **Μαριάμ**, revealed that He was a friend who knew her; and there was also that in the tone which made her instantly turn fully round to search Him with her gaze. Surprise, recognition,

v iii. 13; vi. 62.
w ver. 1.
x xviii. 2. Esth. ix. 15.
y ver. 26.
z Jud. vi. 23. Dan. x. 19.
a xix. 34.
b Esth. ix. 15.

17. λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Μή μου ἅπτου, οὔπω γὰρ [v] ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου, καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς, [v] Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν, καὶ Θεόν μου καὶ Θεὸν ὑμῶν." 18. Ἔρχεται Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἀπαγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ὅτι ἑώρακε τὸν κύριον, καὶ ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῇ.

19. Οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ [w] μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ [x] συνηγμένοι, διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἔστη [y] εἰς τὸ μέσον, καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "[z] Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν." 20. Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν [a] πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ. [b] ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ

relief, joy, utter themselves in her exclamation, Ῥαββουνί, which Buxtorf renders "Domine mi"; but probably the pronominal suffix had ceased to have significance, as in "Monsieur," etc. Lampe quotes the saying; "Majus est Rabbi quam Rabh, et majus est Rabban quam Rabbi," *cf.* Mk. x. 51. With the exclamation Mary made a forward movement as if to embrace Him. But this is forbidden.—Ver. 17. **Μή μου ἅπτου**, "noli me tangere," not because it was indecorous (Lk. vii. 38); nor because she wished to assure herself by touch that the appearance was real, a test which He did not prevent His disciples from applying; nor because her embrace would disturb the process of glorification through which His body was passing; nor, following Kypke's note, can we suppose that Jesus forbids Mary to *worship* Him [although K. proves that **ἅπτεσθαι** is used of that clinging to the knees or feet which was adopted by suppliants], because He accepts Thomas' worship even before His ascension; but, as He Himself says, **οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου**, "for I have not yet ascended to my Father," implying that this was not His permanent return to visible fellowship with His disciples. Mary, by her eagerness to seize and hold Him, showed that she considered that the **μικρόν**, the "little time," of xvi. 16, was past, and that now He had returned to be for ever with them. Jesus checks her with the assurance that much had yet to happen before that. His disciples must at once be disabused of that misapprehension. Therefore, **πορεύου . . . ὑμῶν**, "Go to my brothers [**ἀδελφούς μου**, here for the first time; in anticipation of the latter part of the sentence, *cf.* Mk. iii. 35] and tell them, I ascend to my Father and your Father, and my God and your God". He thus forms a relationship which bound Him to them more closely than His bodily presence. His place by right is with God. But His love binds Him as certainly to His people on earth as His rights carry Him to God. The form of the expression is dictated by His desire to give them assurance. They had no doubt God was His God and Father. He teaches them that, if so, He is their God and Father. **ἔρχεται . . . αὐτῇ**, Mary carries forthwith the Lord's message to the disciples, *cf.* Mk. xvi. 10; Mt. xxviii. 10; Lk. xxiv. 10.

Vv. 19-29. *Manifestations of the risen Lord to the disciples, first without Thomas, then with Thomas.*—Ver. 19. The time of the manifestation is defined, it was **τῇ ἡμέρᾳ . . . σαββάτων** "on that day, the first of the week," and during the evening, **οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας**, which agrees with Luke's account, from which we learn that when Jesus and the two disciples reached Emmaus, two hours from Jerusalem, the day was declining. The evening was chosen, probably because then the disciples could be found together. The circumstance that the doors were shut seemed to John significant regarding the properties of the risen body of Jesus. **τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων**, "the doors having been shut," *i.e.*, securely fastened so that no one could enter, because the precaution was taken **διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων**. So soon had the disciples begun to experience the risks they ran by being associated with Jesus. Calvin supposes Jesus opened the doors miraculously; but that is not suggested in the words. Rather it is indicated that His glorified body was not subject to the conditions of the natural, earthly body, but passed where it would. Suddenly **ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον** (*cf.* Lk. xxiv. 36). "Phrasis notat se in publico omnium conspectu sistere." Kypke. Not only as the ordinary salutation, but to calm their perturbation at this sudden

μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν κύριον. 21. εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν, "[a] Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν· καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ πατὴρ, κἀγὼ πέμπω ὑμᾶς." 22. Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν [c] ἐνεφύσησε καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, "[d] Λάβετε Πνεῦμα [d] Ἅγιον. 23. ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφίενται[1] αὐτοῖς· ἄν τινων κρατῆτε, κεκράτηνται." 24. Θωμᾶς δὲ, εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα ὁ λεγόμενος [e] Δίδυμος, οὐκ ἦν μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ὅτε ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. 25. ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ, "Ἑωράκαμεν τὸν κύριον." Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "Ἐὰν μὴ ἴδω ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ τὸν τύπον[2] τῶν ἥλων, καὶ βάλω τὸν δάκτυλόν μου εἰς τὸν τύπον[2] τῶν ἥλων, καὶ βάλω τὴν χεῖρά μου εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσω." 26. Καὶ μεθ᾽ ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ πάλιν ἦσαν [f] ἔσω οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ Θωμᾶς μετ᾽ αὐτῶν. ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, καὶ

a Jud. vi. 23. Dan. x. 19.
c Here only in N.T. Gen. ii. 7.
d vii. 39.
e xi. 16.
f Ezek. ix. 6. Acts v. 23.

[1] αφεωνται with ℵ[c]ADL.

[2] τυπον in its first occurrence in this verse is rendered in the Vulgate by "fixuram," which may mean "the spot where the nail was fixed"; "figuram," "fissuram," and "locum" are also read. See Wordsworth and White *in loc.* τοπον is read by Tisch. instead of τυπον in its second occurrence on the authority of A only, some old Lat. and Syr. versions.

apparition (*cf.* Lk. xxiv. 37), He greets them with Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, and to assure them of His identity ἔδειξεν . . . αὐτοῦ.—Ver. 20. His body, therefore, however changed in its substance, retained its characteristic marks. The fear of the disciples was replaced by joy, ἐχάρησαν . . . Κύριον. In this joy the promise of xvi. 22 is fulfilled (Weiss).—Ver. 21. When they recognised Him and composed themselves, He naturally repeated His greeting, εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, but now adds, καθὼς . . . ὑμᾶς. "As the Father hath sent me, so send I you." In these words (*cf.* xvii. 18) He gives them their commission as His representatives. And in confirmation of it, (ver. 22) τοῦτο εἰπὼν . . . Ἅγιον. "He breathed on them," ἐνεφύσησε; the same word is used in Gen. ii. 7 to describe the distinction between Adam's "living soul," *breathed* into him by God, and the life principle of the other animals. The breathing upon them was meant to convey the impression that His own very Spirit was imparted to them.—Ver. 23. The authorisation of the Apostles is completed in the words: ἄν τινων . . . κεκράτηνται. "Whosesoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven to them: whosesoever ye retain, they are retained." The meaning of κεκράτηνται is determined by the opposed ἀφέωνται [the better reading]. The announcement is unexpected. Yet if they were to represent Him, they must be empowered to continue a function which He constantly exercised and set in the forefront of His ministry. They must be able in His name to pronounce forgiveness, and to threaten doom. This indeed formed the main substance of their ministry, and it was by receiving His Spirit they were fitted for it. The burden was laid upon them of determining who should be forgiven, and who held by their sin. *Cf.* Acts iii. 26, v. 4.—Ver. 24. Θωμᾶς δὲ . . . Ἰησοῦς. Θωμᾶς [תְּאוֹם or תְּאֹם a twin, from תָּאַם to be double; of which Δίδυμος from δύο is the Greek equivalent]. εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα "one of the twelve," the familiar designation still used of the eleven, οὐκ ἦν . . . "was not with them when Jesus came," why, we do not know.—Ver. 25. The rest accordingly, when first they met him, possibly the same evening, said, ἑωράκαμεν τὸν Κύριον; which he heard with incredulity, not because he could mistrust them, but because he concluded they had been the victims of some hallucination. Nothing would satisfy him but the testimony of his own senses: Ἐὰν μὴ ἴδω . . . πιστεύσω. The test proposed by Thomas shows that he had witnessed the crucifixion and that the death and its circumstances had deeply impressed him. To him resurrection seemed a dream. But he still associated with those who believed in it.—Ver. 26. Καὶ μεθ᾽ ἡμέρας . . . αὐτῶν. μεθ᾽ ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ πάλιν. Probably he had been with

g ver. 19. h ver. 21. [g] ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον, καὶ εἶπεν, "[h] Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν." 27. Εἶτα λέγει τῷ Θωμᾷ, "Φέρε τὸν δάκτυλόν σου ὧδε, καὶ ἴδε τὰς χεῖράς μου· καὶ φέρε τὴν χεῖρά σου, καὶ βάλε εἰς τὴν πλευράν μου· καὶ μὴ γίνου
i Gal. iii. 9. Acts xvi. 1, etc.; see Thayer. ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ [i] πιστός." 28. Καὶ ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Θωμᾶς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου." 29. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ὅτι ἑώρακάς με, Θωμᾶ, πεπίστευκας· μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες, καὶ πιστεύσαντες."

j xii. 37; xxi. 25. 30. [j] Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ,[1] ἃ οὐκ ἔστι γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ.
k i. 34; ii. 23; vi. 69. l Acts iii. 6; iv. 10. 1 Cor. vi. 11. 31. ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται, ἵνα πιστεύσητε[2] ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς [k] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ [l] ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

[1] αυτου deleted in ℵB.

[2] πιστευητε in ℵ*B.

them every day during the interval, but as Bengel remarks, "interjectis diebus nulla fuerat apparitio". On the first day of the second week the disciples were "again," as on the previous Sunday, "within," in the same convenient place of meeting, and now Thomas is with them. As on the previous occasion (ver. 19), the doors were shut and Jesus suddenly appeared among them and greeted them with the customary salutation.—Ver. 27. **Εἶτα λέγει . . . πιστός.** He does not need to be informed of Thomas' incredulity; although it is quite possible that, as Lücke supposes, the others had mentioned it to Him. Still, this is not in the text. *Cf.* Weiss, who also quotes Bengel's characteristic note: "Si Pharisaeus ita dixisset, Nisi videro, etc., nil impetrasset; sed discipulo pridem probato nil non datur". Weiss supposes the hands were seen (**ἴδε**), the side only touched under the clothes. Some suppose that as the feet are not mentioned in this passage, they had not been nailed but only bound to the cross. See Lücke's interesting note. **καὶ μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός**, "Incredulitas aliquid habet de voluntario".—Ver. 28. Grotius, following Tertullian, Ambrose, Cyril and others, is of opinion that Thomas availed himself of the offered test: surely it is psychologically more probable that the test he had insisted on as alone sufficient is now repudiated, and that he at once exclaims, **Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου.** His faith returns with a rebound and utters itself in a confession in which the gospel culminates. The words are not a mere exclamation of surprise. That is forbidden by **εἶπεν αὐτῷ**; they mean "Thou art my Lord and my God". The repeated pronoun lends emphasis. In Pliny's letter to Trajan (112 A.D.) he describes the Christians as singing hymns to Christ as God. Our Lord does not reject Thomas' confession; but (ver. 29) reminds him that there is a higher faith than that which springs from visual evidence: **Ὅτι ἑώρακάς με . . . καὶ πιστεύσαντες.** Jesus would have been better pleased with a faith which did not require the evidence of sense: a faith founded on the perception that God was in Christ, and therefore He could not die; a faith in His Messiahship which argued that He must live to carry on the work of His Kingdom. The saying is cited as another instance of the care with which the various origins and kinds of faith are distinguished in this gospel.

Vv. 30-31. *First conclusion of the gospel*—Ver. 30. **πολλὰ μὲν οὖν . . . τούτῳ.** That this was the original or intended conclusion of the gospel is shown by the use of the words "in this book," which indicate that the writer was now looking back on it as a whole (Holtzmann). Perhaps **τούτῳ** is emphatic, contrasted with the Synoptic gospels in which so many other signs were recorded. The expression **πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα** is necessarily of frequent occurrence and is illustrated by Kypke. Beza says these particles in the usage of John "proprie conclusionibus adhibentur". "Many other signs therefore" (R.V.) is not an improvement on A.V. "And many other signs truly." "Many other signs indeed did Jesus" is sufficient. Why **ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν**?

XXI. 1. ΜΕΤΑ ταῦτα [a] ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς [b] Τιβεριάδος· [a] ἐφανέρωσε δὲ οὕτως. 2. ἦσαν [c] ὁμοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ Θωμᾶς ὁ λεγόμενος [d] Δίδυμος, καὶ Ναθαναὴλ ὁ [e] ἀπὸ Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου, καὶ ἄλλοι ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο. 3. λέγει αὐτοῖς Σίμων Πέτρος, "Ὑπάγω [f] ἁλιεύειν." Λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, "Ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν σοί." Ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον εὐθύς,[1] καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ [g] ἐπίασαν οὐδέν. 4. πρωΐας δὲ ἤδη γενομένης [2] [h] ἔστη ὁ Ἰησοῦς [h] εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν· οὐ μέντοι ᾔδεισαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς [i] ἐστί. 5. λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Παιδία, μή τι [j] προσφάγιον ἔχετε;"

a i. 31; ii. 11.
b vi. 1.
c xx. 4 reff.
d xx. 24.
e i. 46.
f Once only in LXX., Jer. xvi. 16.
g ver. 10. Rev. xix. 20.
h xx. 19, 26.
i i. 40.
j Here only.

[1] ευθυς omitted in ℵBC*DL 1, 33.

[2] γινομενης is read by Tr.Ti.W.H.R. following ABC*EL; γενομ. in ℵC²DXΔ, it. vulg. "mane autem facta".

Probably because they are viewed as the cause of faith. ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται, "but these have been written," these, *viz.*, which have been included in this book, ἵνα . . . αὐτοῦ, with an object, and this object has determined their selection: "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God". The use of the 2nd pers. suggests that the writer had in view some special class. But his object was of universal significance. See the Introduction.

CHAPTER XXI.—*Supplementary chapter in which Jesus again manifests Himself after the resurrection.*

[There is no reason why this chapter should be ascribed to a different hand. The style is the same as that of the gospel, and although the gospel closed at the end of chap. xx., this supplementary chapter must have become an integral part of the gospel at a very early period. No trace exists of a gospel without it. It is by no means so certain that ver. 25 is Johannine. It seems an inflated version of xx. 30. The twenty-fourth verse is also rejected by several critics on the ground of οἴδαμεν. This may be valid as an objection; but it is in the manner of the Apostle to testify to his own truthfulness, xix. 35; and the use of the plural instead of the singular is not decisive.]

Ver. 1. Μετὰ ταῦτα, John's usual indefinite note of time, ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν, *cf.* vii. 4, xiii. 4; Mark xvi. 12; πάλιν, over and above the manifestations in Jerusalem, at the Sea of Tiberias; see vi. 1.—Ver. 2. ἦσαν ὁμοῦ, seven of the disciples had kept together, Simon Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, further designated as ὁ ἀπὸ Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, not to remind us of the miracles wrought there (Reynolds), nor "without any special design" (Meyer), but to emphasise the ὁμοῦ by showing that even though not belonging to the lake-side Nathanael remained with the rest. John indicates his own presence with his usual reserve, οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου.—Ver. 3. As the disciples stand together and see boat after boat put off, Simon Peter can stand it no longer but suddenly exclaims, Ὑπάγω ἁλιεύειν, "I am off to fish". This is a relief to all and finds a ready response, Ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν σοί. At once they embark, and as we watch that boat's crew putting off with their whole soul in their fishing, we see in how precarious a position the future of Christianity hung. They were only sure of one thing—that they must live. But ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐπίασαν οὐδέν, "during that night they took nothing". Ἁλίσκονται δὲ μάλιστα οἱ ἰχθύες πρὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς καὶ μετὰ τὴν δύσιν—Aristotle, *Hist. Animal.*, viii. 19, quoted by Lampe. [On ἐπίασαν, see vii. 30 and Rev. xix. 20.] —Ver. 4. πρωΐας δὲ ἤδη γενομένης, "but early morning having now arrived," *i.e.*, when all hope of catching fish was past, ἔστη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς [or ἐπὶ] τὸν αἰγιαλόν, "Jesus stood upon the beach"; for ἔστη, *cf.* xx. 19, 26. It seems to indicate the suddenness of the appearance. οὐ μέντοι . . . ἐστί, "the disciples, however, were not aware that it was Jesus". —Ver. 5. λέγει οὖν . . . ἔχετε; The οὖν is not merely continuative, but indicates that what Jesus said was in some respect prompted by their ignorance of His identity. This is neglected by Lücke when he says that παιδία is not Johannine, and that τεκνία is the regular term used by Jesus in addressing the

k Mk. i. 16. Is. xix. 8. Ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, "Οὔ." 6. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, "[k] Βάλετε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τοῦ πλοίου τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ εὑρήσετε." [k] Ἔβαλον
l Hab. i. 15. m Mk. v. 4, etc. οὖν, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι αὐτὸ [l] ἑλκῦσαι [m] ἴσχυσαν[1] ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἰχθύων. 7. λέγει οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος [n] ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ
n xiii. 23; xx. 2. Πέτρῳ, "Ὁ κύριός ἐστι." Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος ἀκούσας ὅτι ὁ κύριός
o 1 Sam. xviii. 4. ἐστι, τὸν [o] ἐπενδύτην [p] διεζώσατο· ἦν γὰρ γυμνός· καὶ ἔβαλεν
p Cp. xiii. 4. ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. 8. οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ τῷ πλοιαρίῳ
q xi. 18. ἦλθον· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν μακρὰν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἀλλ' ὡς [q] ἀπὸ πηχῶν

[1] ισχυον in ℵBCDL.

disciples. Yes, when He openly addresses them; but here He uses the word any stranger might use, and the rendering "children" retained even in R.V. is wrong. It should be "lads"; παιδίον being the common term of address to men at work, see Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 137, *Frogs*, 33; Euthymius, ἔθος γὰρ τοὺς ἐργατικοὺς οὕτως ὀνομάζειν. Jesus appeared as an intending purchaser and cries, μήτι προσφάγιον ἔχετε; "Have you taken any fish?" (R.V.: "have ye anything to eat?" misapprehends both the words and the situation). προσφάγιον, as its composition shows, means anything eaten as seasoning or "kitchen" to bread; being the Hellenistic word used instead of the Attic ὄψον or προσόψημα. Athenaeus and Plutarch both tell us that fish was so commonly used in this way that προσφάγιον came to mean "fish". ἔχετε has its quasi-technical sense, "have ye caught?" For this sense, see Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 705 (723, 731), where Socrates asks Strepsiades under the blanket, ἔχεις τι; on which the Scholiast remarks, χαριέντως τὸ ἔχεις τι, τῇ τῶν ἀγρευτῶν λέξει χρώμενος· τοῖς γὰρ ἁλιεῦσιν ἢ ὀρνιθαγρευταῖς οὕτω φασίν, ἔχεις τι. So that the words of Jesus are: "Lads, have ye caught no fish?" ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ, "Οὔ". "They answered Him, 'No,'" without any Κύριε or Διδάσκαλε.—Ver. 6. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν . . . καὶ εὑρήσετε. "Cast your net on the right side of the boat, and you will find." They supposed the stranger had been making observations from the shore, had seen a shoal or some sign of fish, and unwilling to come in empty, ἔβαλον οὖν . . . ἰχθύων. "They cast therefore, and were no longer (as they had been before) able to draw it [ἑλκύσαι, not ἑλκῦσαι, see Veitch's *Irreg. Verbs*, seems here to be used as we use 'draw' in connection with a net, meaning to draw over the side of the boat so as to secure the fish. Contrast σύροντες in ver. 8] for the multitude of fishes"; ἀπό often means "on account of" in Dionysius Hal., Plutarch, and even in Thucydides and Sophocles as shown by Kypke.—Ver. 7. This sudden change of fortune John at once traced to its only possible source, Ὁ Κύριός ἐστι. "Vita quieta citius observat res divinas quam activa." Bengel. Σίμων οὖν . . . θάλασσαν. The different temperaments of the two Apostles as here exhibited have constantly been remarked upon; as by Euthymius, "John had the keener insight; Peter the greater ardour". Peter τὸν ἐπενδύτην διεζώσατο. Some writers identify the ἐπενδύτης with the inner garment or χίτων, others suppose it was the outer garment or ἱμάτιον. And the reason assigned, ἦν γὰρ γυμνός, they say, is that he had only the χίτων. That one who was thus half-dressed might be called γυμνός is well known (see Aristoph., *Clouds*, 480); but it was not the outer garment round which the belt was girt, but the inner. And besides, Peter must often have appeared before Jesus in their boat expeditions without his upper garment. And to put on his Tallith when about to plunge into the sea was out of the question. He was rowing, then, with as little on as possible, probably only a *subligaculum* or loin-cloth, and now picks up his ἐπενδύτης, a garment worn by fishers (Theophylact), and girds it on, and casts himself into the sea.—Ver. 8. The rest came in the little boat, οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν . . . ἰχθύων. Bengel correctly explains the γάρ, "Celeriter hi quoque venire poterant". They were not far from the land, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ πηχῶν διακοσίων, "about one hundred yards". πηχῶν, says Phrynichus, is δεινῶς ἀνάττικον; we must use the form πηχέων. Observe the unconscious exactness of the eye-witness. For the Hellenistic con-

διακοσίων, [r] σύροντες τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων. 9. Ὡς οὖν ἀπέβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν, βλέπουσιν [s] ἀνθρακιὰν [t] κειμένην καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον, καὶ ἄρτον. 10. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὧν [u] ἐπιάσατε νῦν." 11. Ἀνέβη Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ [v] εἵλκυσε τὸ δίκτυον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,[1] μεστὸν ἰχθύων μεγάλων ἑκατὸν πεντηκοντατριῶν· καὶ τοσούτων ὄντων, οὐκ [w] ἐσχίσθη τὸ δίκτυον.

12. Λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Δεῦτε ἀριστήσατε. οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτόν, "Σὺ τίς εἶ;" εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κύριός [x] ἐστιν. 13. ἔρχεται οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὀψάριον ὁμοίως. 14. τοῦτο ἤδη [y] τρίτον ἐφανερώθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν.

r 2 Sam. xvii. 13. Acts viii. 3.
s xviii. 18.
t xix. 28.
u ver. 3.
v ver. 6.
w xix. 24.
x i. 40.
y 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1.

[1] εις την γην in ℵABCL.

struction with **ἀπό**, *cf.* xi. 18. The others came **σύροντες . . . ἰχθύων**, "hauling the net of the fishes," or "netful of the fishes"; genitive of contents, like **δέπας οἴνου**, a cup of wine. It is needless, with Lücke, to complete the construction with **μεστόν**, *cf.* ver. 11.—Ver. 9. **Ὡς οὖν . . . ἄρτον.** "When, then, they got out upon the land, they see a fire (or heap) of coals laid and fish laid thereon, and bread"; or, possibly, "a fish" and "a loaf," but see ver. 13. For **ἀνθρακιά**, see xviii. 18. The disciples were evidently surprised at this preparation.—Ver. 10. But miracle is not gratuitously wrought; indeed, Weiss maintains there is neither miracle nor the appearance of one in this preparation. Accordingly Jesus says, **Ἐνέγκατε . . . νῦν.** And in compliance **ἀνέβη . . . δίκτυον.** "Simon Peter went on board and drew the net on shore full of large fishes, 153, and though there were so many the net was not torn." Mysteries have been found in this number. In Hebrew characters Simon Iona is equivalent to 118 + 35, *i.e.*, 153. Some of the Fathers understood that 100 meant the Gentiles, 50 the Jews, 3 the Trinity. Jerome cites the authority of naturalists to prove that there were exactly 153 species of fish, and he concludes that the universality of the Gospel take was thus indicated. Calvin, with his usual robust sense, says: "quantum ad piscium numerum spectat, non est sublime aliquid in eo quaerendum mysterium". Peter never landed a haul of fish without counting them, and John, fisherman as he was, could never forget the number of his largest takes. The number is given, because it was large, and because they were all surprised that the net stood the strain. The only significance our Lord recognises in the fish is that they were food for hungry men.—Ver. 12. **λέγει . . . ἀριστήσατε**, Jesus takes the place of host and says, "Come, breakfast," make your morning meal. **οὐδεὶς . . . Κύριός ἐστιν**, not one of the disciples ventured to interrogate Him; **ἐξετάσαι** is "to examine by questioning". Each man felt convinced it was the Lord, and a new reverence prevented them from questioning Him.—Ver. 13. When they had gathered round the fire, **ἔρχεται . . . ὁμοίως.** "Jesus approaches and takes the bread and gives to them, and the fish" (used here collectively) "in like manner." Evidently there was something solemn and significant in His manner, indicating that they were to consider Him as the Person who supplied all their wants. If they were to be free from care as His Apostles, they must trust Him to make provision for them, as He had this morning done.—Ver. 14. A note is added, perhaps indicating no more than John's orderliness of mind, explaining that this was the third manifestation given by Jesus to His disciples after rising from the dead. For the form of expression, **τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον**, see 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

Vv. 15-18. *Jesus evokes from Peter a confession of love, and commissions him as shepherd of His sheep.*—Ver. 15. **Ὅτε οὖν ἠρίστησαν**, "when, then, they had broken their fast," a note of time essential to the conversation following. Peter had manifested the most ardent affection, by abandoning on the instant the net of fish for which he had been toiling all night, and by springing into the sea to greet his Lord. But was not that a mere impulsive demonstration,

15. Ὅτε οὖν ἠρίστησαν, λέγει τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "[a] Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ,[1] ἀγαπᾷς με πλεῖον τούτων;" Λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ναὶ κύριε· σὺ οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε." Λέγει αὐτῷ, "Βόσκε τὰ ἀρνία μου." 16. Λέγει αὐτῷ πάλιν δεύτερον, "Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ, ἀγαπᾷς με;" Λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ναὶ κύριε· σὺ οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε." Λέγει αὐτῷ, "[b] Ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά[2] μου." 17. Λέγει αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον, "Σίμων

z i. 42. a x. 1-5. Rev. v. 6. b Is. xl. 11. Song i. 8.

[1] Better Ιωανου with ℵBC*DL. So in 16, 17.

[2] προβατια in BC; προβατα in ℵAD. Some have thought there was a climax, αρνια, προβατια, προβατα. "Pasce agniculos meos, pasce agnos meos, pasce oviculas meas."

"the wholesome madness of an hour"? Therefore He lets Peter settle down, He lets him breakfast and then takes him at the coolest hour of the day, and, at last breaking silence, says, Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ [better, Ἰωάνου] ἀγαπᾷς με πλεῖον [better, πλέον] τούτων; "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these?" So far as grammar goes, this may either mean "Lovest thou me more than the other disciples love me?" or "Lovest thou me more than this boat and net and your old life?" It may either refer to Peter's saying, "Though all should forsake Thee, yet will not I," or to his sudden abandonment of the boat and fishing gear. If the former were intended, the second personal pronoun would almost necessarily be expressed; but, as the words stand, the contrast is not between "you" and "these," but between "me" and "these". Besides, would the characteristic tact and delicacy of Jesus have allowed Him to put a question involving a comparison of Peter with his fellow-disciples? The latter interpretation, although branded by Lücke as "eine geistlose lächerliche Frage," commends itself. Difference of opinion also exists about the use of ἀγαπᾷς and φιλῶ, most interpreters believing that by the former a love based on esteem or judgment is indicated, by the latter the affection of the heart. The Vulgate distinguishes by using "diligis" and "amo". Trench (*Synonyms*, 38) uses this distinction for the interpretation of this passage, and maintains that Peter in his reply intentionally changes the colder ἀγαπᾷς into the warmer φιλῶ. It is very doubtful whether this is justifiable. The two words are used interchangeably to express the love of Jesus for John, see xiii. 23, and xx. 2; also for His love for Lazarus, xi. 3, 5, 36. And that the distinction cannot be maintained at any rate in this conversation is obvious from ver. 17; for if the words differed in meaning, it could not be said that "Peter was grieved because Jesus a third time said, φιλεῖς με"; because Jesus had not used these *words* three times. The words seem interchanged for euphony, as in Aelian, *Var. Hist.*, ix. 1, where Hiero is said to have lived with his three brothers, πάνυ σφόδρα ἀγαπήσας αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν φιληθεὶς ἐν τῷ μέρει. In Peter's answer there is no sense of any discrepancy between the kind of love demanded and the love felt. It comes with a ναί, Κύριε. Why need He ask? σὺ οἶδας. . . . In this appeal to Christ's own knowledge there is probably, as Weiss suggests, a consciousness of his own liability to be deceived, as shown in his recent experience.—Ver. 16. To this confession, the Lord responds, Βόσκε τὰ ἀρνία μου, "Feed my lambs," showing that Jesus could again trust him and could leave in his hands those whom He loved. "Lambs" is used instead of "sheep" to bring out more strongly the appeal to care, and the consequent complete confidence shown in Peter. λέγει . . . μου. The second inquiry is intended to drive Peter back from mere customary or lip-profession to the deep-lying affections of his spirit. But now no comparison is introduced into the question, which might be paraphrased: "Are you sure that love and nothing but love is the bond between you and me?" This test Peter stands. He replies as before; and again is entrusted with the work in which his Lord is chiefly interested, Ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου. No different function is intended by ποίμαινε: it repeats in another form the commission already given.—Ver. 17. But to him who had uttered a threefold denial, opportunity is given of a threefold confession, although Peter at first resented the

Ἰωνᾶ, φιλεῖς με;" Ἐλυπήθη ὁ Πέτρος, ὅτι εἶπεν αὐτῷ [c] τὸ τρίτον, "φιλεῖς με;" καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, "Κύριε, σὺ πάντα οἶδας· σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε." Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Βόσκε τὰ πρόβατά μου. 18. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτε ἧς νεώτερος, [d] ἐζώννυες σεαυτὸν, καὶ περιεπάτεις ὅπου ἤθελες· ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, [e] ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ ἄλλος σε ζώσει, καὶ οἴσει ὅπου οὐ θέλεις." 19. Τοῦτο δὲ εἶπε, σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ δοξάσει τὸν Θεόν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν λέγει αὐτῷ, "Ἀκολούθει μοι." 20. Ἐπιστραφεὶς δὲ[1] ὁ Πέτρος βλέπει τὸν μαθητὴν, ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀκολουθοῦντα, ὃς καὶ [f] ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπε, "Κύριε, τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδιδούς σε;" 21. Τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ, [g] "Κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τί;" 22. Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως [g] ἔρχομαι, [h] τί [h] πρός σε; σὺ ἀκολούθει μοι."

c ver. 1:
d ver. 7.
e Ecclus. xv. 16.
f xiii. 12 reff.
g 1 Tim. iv. 13. Burton, 326.
h Mt. xxvii. 4.

[1] δε omitted in ABC 33; inserted in ℵDX.

reiterated inquiry: Ἐλυπήθη . . . He was grieved because doubt was implied, and he knew he had given cause for doubt. His reply is therefore more earnest than before, Κύριε . . . φιλῶ σε. He is so conscious of deep and abiding love that he can appeal to the Lord's omniscience. The σὺ πάντα οἶδας [or πάντα σὺ οἶδας with recent editors] reflects a strong light on the belief which had sprung up in the disciples from their observation of our Lord. And again he is commissioned, or commanded to manifest his love in the feeding of Christ's sheep. The one qualification for this is love to Christ. It is not for want of time no other questions are asked. There was time to put this one question three times over; and it was put because love is the one essential for the ministry to which Peter and the rest are called.—Ver. 18. To this command our Lord unexpectedly adds a reflection and warning emphasised by the usual ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι. It had been with a touch of pity Jesus had seen the impulsive, self-willed Peter gird his coat round him and plunge into the sea. It suggested to Him the severe trials by which this love must be tested, and what it would bring him to: ὅτε ἧς νεώτερος, "when thou wert younger" (the comparative used not in relation to the present, but to the γηράσῃς following) "thou girdedst thyself and walkedst whither thou wouldest," *i.e.*, your own will was your law, and you felt power to carry it out. The "girding," though suggested by the scene, ver. 7, symbolises all vigorous preparation for arduous work. ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς . . . θέλεις. The interpretation of these words must be governed by the succeeding clause, which informs us that by them Jesus hinted at the nature of Peter's death. But this does not prevent us from finding in them, primarily, an intimation of the helplessness of age, and its passiveness in the hands of others, in contrast to the self-regulating activity and confidence of youth. The language is dictated by the contrasted clause, and to find in each particular a detail of crucifixion, is to force a meaning into the words. ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖρας σου is not the stretching out of the hands on the cross, but the helpless lifting up of the old man's hands to let another gird him. δοξάσει τὸν θεόν. "Magnificus martyrii titulus." Grotius. "Die conventionelle Sprache der Märtyrerkirche klingt an in δοξ. τὸν θεόν: weil der Zeugentod zu Ehren Gottes erlitten wird." Holtzmann. The expression has its root in xii. 23, 28. καὶ τοῦτο . . . μοι. It is very tempting to refer this to xiii. 36, ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον, and probably there is a latent reference to this, but in the first instance it is a summons to Peter to accompany Jesus as He retires from the rest. This is clear from what follows.—Ver. 20. Ἐπιστραφεὶς . . . σε. Peter had already followed Jesus some distance, but hearing steps behind him he turns and sees John following. The elaborate description of John in this verse is, perhaps almost unconsciously, introduced to justify his following without invitation. On the word ἀνέπεσεν, see Origen, *in Joan.*, ii. 191 (Brooke's edition).—Ver. 21. Peter, however, seeks an explanation, Κύριε

23. [i]Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ λόγος οὗτος εἰς τοὺς [j]ἀδελφοὺς, "Ὅτι ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει·" καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὅτι οὐκ ἀποθνήσκει· ἀλλ', "Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι, τί πρός σε;"

24. ΟΥΤΟΣ ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων, καὶ γράψας ταῦτα· καὶ οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτοῦ. 25. ἔστι δὲ καὶ [k]ἄλλα πολλὰ ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται [l]καθ' ἕν, οὐδὲ αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον [m]χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία. Ἀμήν.[1]

i Dan. ii. 13. Mt. ix. 26.
j Here only in Gospp., freq. in Ep. and Acts.
k xx. 30. 1 Cor. xiv. 31. Acts xxi. 19. Eph. v. 33.
m ii. 6. Gen. xiii. 6. 2 Chron. iv. 5.

[1] Tisch. omits this verse with ℵ*. For οσα of AC³D α is read in ℵBC*X. For χωρησαι of AC³D χωρησειν is found in ℵBC*. Αμην is omitted in ℵABCD 1, 33.

. . . τί; "Lord, and this man, what of him?"—Ver. 22. To which Jesus replies with a shade of rebuke, Ἐὰν . . . μοι. Peter, in seeking even to know the future of another disciple, was stepping beyond his province, τί πρός σε; σὺ ἀκολούθει μοι. Your business is to follow me, not to intermeddle with others. *Cf.* A Kempis' description of the man who "neglects his duty, musing on all that other men are bound to do". *De Imit. Christi*, ii. 3. Over-anxiety about any part of Christ's Church is to forget that there is a chief Shepherd who arranges for all. This part of the conversation might not have been recorded, but for a misunderstanding which arose out of it. —Ver. 23. Ἐξῆλθεν . . . πρός σε; "There went forth this saying among the brethren, that that disciple should not die". John himself, however, has no such belief, because he remembers with exactness the hypothetical form of the Lord's words, Ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν . . . Another instance of the precision with which John recalled some, at least, of the words of Jesus.

In ver. 24, the writer of the gospel is identified with the disciple whom Jesus loved, and a certificate of his truth is added. The whole verse has a strong resemblance to xix. 35, and it seems impossible to say with certainty whether they were or were not written by the evangelist himself. The οἴδαμεν might seem to imply that several united in this certificate. But who in John's old age were there, who could so certify the truth of the gospel? They could have no personal, direct knowledge of the facts; and could merely affirm the habitual truthfulness of John. *Cf.* too the οἶμαι of ver. 25 where a return to the singular is made; but this may be because in the former clause the writer speaks in the name of several others, while in the latter he speaks in his own name. Who these others were, disciples, Ephesian presbyters, friends, Apostles, it is vain to conjecture. τούτων and ταῦτα refer to the whole gospel, including chap. xxi. Besides the things narrated ἔστι δὲ . . . Ἀμήν. The verse re-affirms the statement of xx. 30, adding a hyperbolical estimate of the space required to recount all that Jesus did, if each detail were separately told, ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἕν.

THE EXPOSITOR'S GREEK TESTAMENT

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

EDITOR OF "THE EXPOSITOR," "THE EXPOSITOR'S BIBLE," ETC.

VOLUME II.

NEW YORK

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

THE ACTS

OF THE

APOSTLES.

INTRODUCTION.

THE AUTHOR OF THE BOOK. Whoever wrote the Acts wrote also the Gospel which bears the name of St. Luke. We find writers far removed in standpoint from each other, *e.g.*, H. Holtzmann, *Einleitung*[3], p. 391, and Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 128, agreeing in this conviction, and appealing to the same work, Friedrich's *Das Lukas Evangelium und die Apostelgeschichte, Werke desselben Verfassers* (1890; see commentary), in support of it. In recent years the philologist Gercke seems to be almost the only convert to the opposite view who, with Sorof, regards the author of Acts as the reviser of the δεύτερος λόγος of Luke; but his efforts in promulgating his views cannot be said to have met with any success (see Zöckler, *u. s.; Theologische Rundschau*, pp. 50, 129: 1899; and Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 4, 1899).

Friedrich's pamphlet, which contains a useful summary of the whole evidence on the subject, much of which had been previously collected by Zeller and Lekebusch (although their readings, like those too of Friedrich, sometimes require careful testing), gives instances of language, style, and treatment of various subjects which place the identity of authorship beyond reasonable doubt (see instances noted in commentary).[1] At the same time it would be misleading to say that recent critics have been unmindful of the linguistic *differences* which the two books present, although a candid examination shows that these differences are comparatively slight (*cf.* Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 140; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 381, 1899). In earlier days Zeller had not lost sight of those peculiarities which are entirely linguistic, and he maintains that they are not of a nature to prove anything against the same origin of the two writings, *Acts*, vol. ii., p. 243, E.T.

[1] Amongst recent writers, Blass, in his Index ii., *Acta Apostolorum*, marks fifty-six words as peculiar to St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts; *cf.* also the list in Plummer's *St. Luke*, lii., liii. The instances of words and phrases characteristic of St. Luke's Gospel in Sir J. Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ*, 1899, pp. 29-41, will enable any one to see at a glance by the references how far such words and phrases are also characteristic of, or peculiar to, Acts· see also in commentary.

Who is the early Christian writer thus able to give us not only such an account of the Life of our Lord that Renan could describe it as the most beautiful book in the world (*Les Evangiles*, p. 283), but also an account of the *origines* of the Christian Church which Jülicher regards as an ideal Church history, *Einleitung*, p. 270, and of which Blass could write "hunc libellum non modo inter omnes Novi T. optima compositione uti, sed etiam eam artem monstrare, quæ Græco Romanove scriptore rerum non indigna sit"? One thing seems certain, that the writer, whoever he was, represents himself in four passages, xvi. 10-17, xx. 5-15, xxi. 1-18, xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16 inclusive, *cf.* also Acts xi. 28, Codex D (on which see below, and *in loco*), as a companion of St. Paul. If we examine the phraseology of these sections (ninety-seven verses in all), we find that it is in many respects common to that employed in the rest of the book (Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 46 ff.; Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 15, 16; Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. 10; Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, p. 41; Hawkins, *u. s.*, p. 149; Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 235, 257).[1]

Those who deny this identity of authorship are not only obliged to face the difficulty of accounting for this similarity of style and language, but also to account for the introduction of the "We" sections at all. If the writer of the rest of the book had wished to palm himself off at a later period as a companion of St. Paul, he would scarcely have sought to accomplish this on the strength of the insertion of these sections alone, as they stand. It may be fairly urged that he would at least have adopted one of the unmistakable

[1] Sir J. Hawkins not only gives us, p. 151, seventeen words and phrases found only in the "We" sections and in the rest of Acts; twenty-seven words and phrases found in the "We" sections and Luke, with or without the rest of Acts also; thirty-seven words and phrases found in the "We" sections, and also used predominantly, though not exclusively, in the rest of Acts or Luke or either of them; but he remarks that out of the eighty-six Matthæan words and phrases, ten, or rather less than *one eighth* occur in the "We" sections; out of the thirty-seven Marcan words and phrases, six, or about *one sixth;* out of the 140 Lucan words and phrases, less than *one third*, p. 14, ff.: "Is it not utterly impossible," he asks, p. 150, "that the language of the original writer of the 'We' sections should have chanced to have so very many more correspondences with the language of the subsequent compiler than with that of Matthew or Mark?" The expressions peculiar to the "We" sections are for the most part fairly accounted for by the subject-matter, p. 153, *e.g.*, εὐθυδρομέω, κατάγεσθαι, παραλέγομαι, πλόος, ὑποπλέω. Part iii., C, Section iv., of the same book should also be consulted where the identity of the third Synoptist with a friend and companion of St. Paul is further confirmed by the similarities between his Gospel and St. Paul's Epistles.

methods of which a Thucydides, a Polybius, a Josephus availed themselves to make their personal relation to the facts narrated known to their readers (Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., pp. 387, 426, 435).

This unknown author of Acts, moreover, whoever he was, was a man of such literary skill that he was able to assimilate the "We" sections to the rest of his book, and to introduce cross references from them to other parts of his work, *e.g.*, xxi. 8 and vi. 5; and yet, with all this, he is so deficient in literary taste as to allow the first person plural in the "We" sections to remain, a blunder avoidable by a stroke of his pen.

The German philologist, Vogel, who cannot be accused of speaking with a theological bias, states the common-sense view of the matter in pointing out that when an author of such literary skill as the author of Acts undoubtedly possessed passes without a break from the third to the first person in his narrative, every unprejudiced reader will explain it on the ground that the author thus wished modestly to intimate his own personal presence during certain events. This is the one natural explanation, and to this Vogel determines to adhere, until it is shown to be untenable; and he justly pours ridicule upon the notion that the author of Acts would have interwoven into a work written in such a delicate and finished style the travel-diary of some other person without altering the pronouns (*Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, pp. 12, 13).

If we are asked to believe that this first person plural was introduced from time to time merely for the purpose of giving an air of verisimilitude to the narrative (or in imitation of certain passages in Ezra and Nehemiah, or Tobit),[1] why should we not find it in the account, *e.g.*, of St. Peter's escape from prison, chap. xii., where Wendt maintains that the author probably had possession of a narrative full of details, derived probably from John Mark himself? There can be no doubt that the "We" sections are introduced for the definite purpose of marking the writer's presence with St. Paul; we cannot, *e.g.*, conclude that there is any other reason for the circumstance that the "We" section of chap. xvi. breaks off at Philippi, and that the following "We" section, chap. xx., commences again at Philippi. But if this is so, how again could a later unknown writer have gained possession of a document of such high value as that comprising or embodying these "We" sections? A day-journal

[1] See Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 583, and Overbeck (De Wette, 4th edition), p. xliv., who both point out that the cases are not analogous, although, on the other hand, Hilgenfeld and Wendt have recently pressed them into service.

left behind by an intimate companion of St. Paul must have been preserved long enough for this unknown writer to have incorporated it, or at least some of it, into his own work, and it must then have vanished altogether out of sight, although one would have supposed that a treasure so valuable would have been preserved and guarded in some Christian circle with the greatest care.[1]

But if we further ask who amongst the companions of St. Paul speaks to us in these "We" sections, the testimony of critics of various schools—of critics who draw a distinction between the authorship of the "We" sections and the rest of the book—may be quoted in favour of St. Luke as the author of the former, if not, as we believe, of the latter also. Thus Holtzmann, *Einleitung*[3], pp. 394, 395, examines the question, and decides in favour of St. Luke as against the claims of Timothy, Silas, or Titus (so Overbeck (De Wette, 4th edit.), pp. l., li.; Mangold, *Einleitung* (Bleek), p. 445; Spitta, *u. s.*, p. 312). Acts xx. 5, 6 may be fairly quoted as decisive against Timothy, to say nothing of the impossibility that the author of Acts should assume the character of a person in the "We" sections, and by naming this same person elsewhere should thus distinguish him from himself (Overbeck). For Silas nothing can be said, and the advocacy of his claims is the most groundless of any of the three. He appears nowhere in the third missionary journey, an absence which would be fatally inconsistent with his presence in the "We" sections, and he is nowhere named in any of the letters of the First Imprisonment, whereas the narrator of xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16 would naturally be found amongst the companions of the Apostle during that period (of course, if xi. 27, 28 in β-text be taken into account, both Timothy and Silas are thereby excluded, Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 425). The same objection may be made to Titus, since there is no hint that he was with St. Paul at Rome (even if we allow that he may have been included in the ἡμεῖς at Antioch, xi. 27, and that, as he is not mentioned at all in Acts, the difficulties which are presented by the names of Timothy and Silas do not occur in his case). Moreover, the travel-journey of Silas would have commenced rather with xv. 1, as Holtzmann urges; nor is there any reason to suppose that Silas was at Philippi during the time required (Holtz-

[1] This, no doubt, presents less difficulty to advanced critics who find it apparently easy to credit that the Pastoral Epistles contain fragments of genuine letters of St. Paul, and that these letters having supplied the fragments to the Pastorals were themselves no longer cared for or regarded (McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 407, 408, and, on the other hand, Dr. Salmon. *Introd.*, p. 408).

mann, *u. s.*, p. 395). See further Zahn, *u. s.*, pp. 351, 388, 425; Lightfoot, B.D.², i., 32.

But if the author of these sections is to be found amongst the intimate companions of St. Paul, and amongst those who were with him in Rome, no one fulfils the conditions better than St. Luke. Even Jülicher, who declines to decide positively which of the four companions, Silas, Timothy, Titus, Luke, was the author, considers that if it was St. Luke, we have in that fact the best explanation that his name remained attached to the Third Gospel and Acts alike, *Einleitung*, p. 269. The writer of Acts xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16 evidently accompanied St. Paul to Rome, and that St. Luke was with the Apostle at the time of his first captivity we learn on the authority of two Epistles which very few of the best critics would now care to dispute, Col. iv. 14, Philem. ver. 24.

But the writer of Acts has not felt the need of using the Epistles of St. Paul as sources for his work, although they were the most weighty documents for the history which he professes to describe. There are numbers of undesigned coincidences between the letters and the history, and Paley, in his *Horæ Paulinæ*, has done invaluable service in drawing attention to them. But still Acts is written independently of the Epistles, and it cannot be said that any one letter in particular is employed by the writer. Yet this would be inconceivable if the former work was composed 100-120 A.D., especially when we remember the knowledge of the Epistles displayed by the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas, by St. Ignatius or St. Polycarp (Harnack, *Chron.*, i., 249). Moreover the writer, whoever he was, was beyond all doubt intensely interested in St. Paul, and it is strange that he should not have made use of his letters, when we remember the impression which they made upon those contemporary with the great Apostle, *cf.* 2 Cor. x. 10, 2 Pet. iii. 15 (Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 412).

But this relation between Acts and the Pauline Epistles not only shows that the former was written before the close of the first century, but that the author stood sufficiently near to St. Paul to be able to write without enriching his knowledge by references to the Apostle's letters. This, however, becomes natural enough on the supposition that the writer was a Timothy, or a Titus, or a Luke. If, however, the two former are excluded, probabilities again point to Luke (Zahn). (For recent writers who deny the acquaintance of the author of Acts with St. Paul's Epistles we may refer to Wendt, Felten, McGiffert, Harnack, Zahn, Jülicher, Rackham.) And we thus come into line with early Church tradition which referred the third

Gospel and the Acts to Luke, the beloved physician, the friend of St. Paul, *cf. Frag. Murator.*, and Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 14.

But Luke, we have been recently reminded, was not an uncommon name, and many Christians may have borne it in the latter part of the first century (McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 435). But not only is the above tradition precise in its mention of Luke as a physician; the writings attributed to him bear upon the face of them indications of the hand of a medical man. No reference, however, to the possibility of this is made by Dr. McGiffert. He tells us, p. 239, that nowhere is the source used by the author of Acts marked by anything like the vividness, preciseness, and fulness of detail that characterise the "We" sections.[1] The writer of these sections was not Silas or Timothy, but "the unknown author of the 'We' passages," p. 239. This unknown author was evidently the intimate companion of St. Paul, and of his other companions in Rome none is more likely to have written the personal notes of travel than Luke, who seems indeed to have been the nearest and dearest to the Apostle of all his friends (pp. 434, 435). The inference from all this, coupled with the tradition of

[1] "If there is one narrative of the N.T. which more than another contains internal proof of having been related by an eye-witness, it is the account of the voyage and shipwreck of St. Paul," Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 5, and this judgment based upon the valuable monograph of James Smith (himself a Fellow of the Royal Society) of Jordan Hill, *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 4th edit., revised and corrected, 1880, has received fresh and remarkable confirmation, not only from English but from German and French sources of a technical and professional kind: *e.g.*, Dr. Breusing, Director of the Seefahrtschule in Bremen, published in 1886 his *Die Nautik der Alten* with a close examination verse by verse of the narrative in Acts xxvii., and he has been followed precisely on the same lines by J. Vars, Professor in the Lycée of Brest in his *L'Art Nautique dans l'antiquité*, 1887. Both writers make constant reference to Smith's work, although they often differ from him in *technical* details, and references to Breusing will be found in Blass and Wendt (1899). The latter writer also refers to a thoughtful article with a similar testimony to St. Luke's accuracy by Von Goerne in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, p. 352, 1898, and allusions will be found to this, as to the above-mentioned works, in the commentary. Breusing's testimony is very striking, p. xiii.: "The most valuable nautical document of antiquity which has come down to us is the account of the voyage and shipwreck of the Apostle Paul. Every one can see at a glance that it could only have been composed by an eye-witness." The strangest exception perhaps to this almost universal recognition of the value of the narrative in Acts xxvii. (*cf.*, *e.g.*, the remarkable testimony in its favour by Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, ii., p. 126 ff., E.T.) is Mommsen's attack upon it in *Sitzungsber. d. berl. Ak.*, 1895, p. 503; but, as Zahn justly remarks, Mommsen has not increased his reputation by alleging that "Luke speaks of the Adriatic Sea by Crete and of the barbarians of Malta"; see answers to these objections in Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 421, and also in commentary, Acts xxvii. 27, and xxviii. 2.

the Church, would seem to be quite plain, but Dr. McGiffert declines to draw it, and falls back upon the belief that some other person named Luke was the writer of the third Gospel and Acts, p. 433. But if there had been such a person there would have been no need for tradition to identify him with Luke the beloved physician, since his own intrinsic merits as an author and historian would have been amply sufficient to secure him an undying recognition.

Here comes in the value of the argument from the medical language employed in the third Gospel and the Acts. The Church in identifying the writer with St. Paul's beloved friend was not following some fanciful or unreliable tradition, but a tradition amply supported by an examination of the language of the books in question; language which not only witnesses to the truth of the tradition, but also to the unity of Acts, since this medical phraseology may be traced in every part, and not in the "We" sections alone. The present Introduction, which must of necessity be brief, does not allow of any lengthy examination of this important subject (to which the writer hopes to return), but in a large number of passages in the commentary notes are given with special reference to indications of medical phraseology. But one or two remarks may be added here. In the first place, it is well to bear in mind that St. Luke's medical phraseology was fully recognised before Dr. Hobart's interesting and valuable book, *The Medical Language of St. Luke*, 1882 (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Dr. Belcher's *Our Lord's Miracles of Healing*, 1st edit., with Preface by Archbishop Trench, 1871, 2nd edit., 1890). The *Gentleman's Magazine*, June, 1841, containing a short article of some two and a half pages, pp. 585-587, is often referred to as a kind of starting-point for this inquiry, but it should not be forgotten that the great names of Wetstein and Bengel may be quoted as fully recognising the hand of a medical writer; thus in commenting not only on Luke xiv. 2, but also on Acts xxviii. 8, Wetstein makes the same remark: "Lucas qui medicus fuerat morbos accuratius describere solet," *cf.* Bengel on Acts iii. 7, "Proprie locutus est *medicus* Lucas," and Luke viii. 43, where the disputed reading does not interfere with the force of the comment: "Lucas medicus ingenue scribit". Indeed it is not too much to say that the main position taken up by Hobart has been abundantly recognised both in France and Germany, and not always in quarters where such a recognition might have been anticipated, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 133, 12th edit.; J. Weiss, *Evangelium des Lukas*, 1892, with reference to Dr. Hobart's book, and with quotations from it, although with the qualification that many of the instances require careful sifting,

p. 274 ff. More recently the German philologist Vogel, 1897, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, p. 17, draws attention to the fact that a large number of words peculiar to the Acts are found in Luke's contemporary, the physician Dioscorides of Anazarbus in Cilicia, not far from Antioch, and he speaks of the use of Dioscorides by the Evangelist as highly probable. But the fullest recognition of Dr. Hobart's work comes to us even more recently by Zahn: "Dr. Hobart has proved for every one for whom anything can be proved, that the author of the Lucan work (by which Zahn means both the third Gospel and Acts) is a Greek physician, acquainted with the technical terms of the medical art," *Einleitung*, ii., pp. 427, 435 (1899). The language is strong, and it may perhaps be fairly contended that some of the instances cited by Dr. Zahn may well have been subjected to the cross-examination instituted so carefully and fully by Dr. Plummer, *St. Luke*, pp. lii., lxiii.-lxvi., in his inquiry into the validity of Dr. Hobart's position.[1] The evidence in favour of this position must be cumulative, but it depends not merely upon the occurrence of technical medical terms in St. Luke's writings, but also upon his *tendency* to employ medical language more frequently than the other Evangelists, upon the passages in his Gospel in which we come across medical terms which are wanting in the parallel passages in St. Matthew and St. Mark, upon the account which he gives of miracles of healing not only in comparison with the other Evangelists, but also of the miracles peculiar to his own narratives; upon the way in which he *abstains from using* in a medical sense words which medical writers abstain from so using, although employed in this sense elsewhere in the Gospels; upon the frequency with which he uses medical language and phraseology in a secondary sense. Illustrations of some of these characteristic peculiarities are noted in the commentary, and a passing reference (space allows this only) may be made to two others. Each of the Synoptists gives our Lord's comparison between the passage of a camel through the eye of a needle and the entrance of a rich man into the kingdom of heaven, St. Matt. xix. 24, St. Mark x. 25, St. Luke xviii. 25. St. Matthew and St. Mark have the same word for

[1] Whatever strictures may be passed upon Dr. Hobart's book, it must not be forgotten that the following authorities amongst others are persuaded that the author's main thesis has been abundantly proved: Bishop Lightfoot, "Acts," B.D.[2], i., p. 31; Dr. Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 129; Professor Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 205; Dr. Plummer, *St. Luke*, *u. s.* (*cf.* Sir J. Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 154, 1899); and it is significant that Dr. B. Weiss in the 3rd edit. of his *Einleitung* refers to the book, and no longer speaks of the argument as mere "trifling".

needle ῥαφίδος: διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος, Matt., T.R.; but W.H. τρήματος in text, τρυπήματος in margin, διὰ (τῆς) τρυμαλιᾶς (τῆς) ῥαφίδος, Mark. But when we turn to St. Luke, he introduces at least one different word (if we adopt W.H. for St. Matt.), and a combination peculiar to himself, διὰ τρήματος βελόνης (W.H. and R.V.). It cannot be said that the words used by St. Luke occur in LXX, since neither of them is found there (although St. Mark's τρυμαλία occurs in LXX possibly six and at least three times). But both words used by St. Luke were in technical medical use, τρῆμα being the great medical word for a perforation of any kind, βελόνη being the surgical needle; and not only so but the two words are found combined as here by Galen: διὰ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν βελόνην τρήματος and again τοῦ διατρήματος τῆς βελόνης (*cf.* Hobart, p. 60, J. Weiss, *u. s.*, p. 567, Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 436, and Nestle, *Einführung in das G. N. T.*, p. 228).

Dr. Plummer points out that τρῆμα is not peculiar to St. Luke (see W.H. above), but the *combination* is peculiar to St. Luke, and the force of this fact and of the combination of undoubted medical terms is not lessened by Grimm's description of βελόνη as a more classical word than ῥαφίς.

Once again: St. Luke's characteristic medical style shows itself in abstention as well as in employment. In three passages, *e.g.*, μαλακία is used by St. Matthew to denote disease, but in medical language it is used as in its primary classical sense of delicacy, effeminacy, and St. Luke never uses it in St. Matthew's sense, although he employs the cognate adjective μαλακός of "soft" raiment in vii. 25. But this non-usage of the noun by the medical Luke is all the more significant, since in the LXX it is found at least a dozen times to denote sickness and disease.

In St. Matt. iv. 24, viii. 6, both βασανίζειν and βάσανος are used of bodily sickness, but in medical writers the words are not employed in this sense, and St. Luke refrains from so employing them (Hobart, p. 63, and Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 435). But here again significance is added to this non-usage by St. Luke when we remember that βάσανος is not only used of the torments after death in Wisd. iii. 1, 4 Macc. iii. 15, *cf.* Luke xvi. 23, 28, but also of the pain of bodily disease, 1 Macc. ix. 56.

THE AIM OF THE BOOK. Not only the aim but the purpose and contents of the book are set forth, according to Lightfoot, in the Preface, chap. i. 1-8. The prophetic words of the Lord in ver. 8 implicitly involve a table of contents: "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Ghost," etc., ii. 1-13; "witnesses unto me" (1) "in Jerusalem," ii. 14-viii. 1, and (2) "in all Judæa and Samaria," viii. 2-xi. 18, (3) "and to the uttermost part of the earth," xi. 19-xxviii.

31 (on the latter expression see comment. *in loco* and reference to *Psalms of Solomon*, viii. 16). The writer closes with the event which his aim required, the preaching of the Gospel in Rome, the capital of the world, the metropolis of the human race, without hindrance; and the fulfilment of the third section mentioned above is thus given, not actually, but potentially, while an earnest is afforded of its ultimate accomplishment; *Philippians*, p. 3; B.D.[2], i., p. 26; *cf.* also Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 562, Blass, *Acta Apost.*, Proleg., p. 3: "At hic liber non est imperfectus, cum longi cursus evangelii Roma terminus sit". But starting from the distinction which Lightfoot himself thus draws between the potential and actual, is it not quite possible that there may thus be room for the τρίτος λόγος for which Lightfoot, it is true, saw no conceivable place, *cf.* Harnack, *Chron.*, i., p. 248, but for the purpose of which Professor Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 380, and others, notably Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 380, have so strongly argued (see list of earlier advocates in Bleek-Mangold, *Einleitung*, p. 462, and note in comment. on xxviii. 31)? It is perhaps worth noting that Bengel, to whom we owe the oft-quoted words, *Victoria verbi Dei, Paulus Romæ, apex evangelii, Actorum Finis,* reminds us on the same page of the words of Estius: "Fortasse Lucas meditabatur *tertium librum*, in quo repeteret acta illius biennii; sicut, *Act.* i., quædam exposuit tacita ultimo capite evangelii". Moreover, if we take Acts i. 8 as giving us in outline the programme of the book, it seems that its purpose would have been fulfilled not so much in the triumph of the Gospel, but in the bearing witness to Christ in Jerusalem, Samaria, and to the end of the earth: the Apostles were to be witnesses, i. 8; St. Paul was told that he was "to bear witness" in Rome, μαρτυρῆσαι xxiii. 11, *cf.* xxviii. 23; the triumph would succeed the witness, and the keynote of victory is struck in the word ἀκωλύτως.

Nothing, it is true, is said in Acts of the beginnings of Christianity in Rome, or as to how the Church was first founded in that city; but when we consider the importance that St. Paul plainly attached to his seeing for himself the metropolis of the world, *cf.* xix. 21, and when his Epistle addressed to the Roman Church indicates how clearly he foresaw the importance which that Church would have for Gentile Christianity in the future, it is quite conceivable that the universalist Luke would draw his second treatise to a fitting close by showing that blindness in part had happened to Israel that the fulness of the Gentiles might come in. "We are not told," says Holtzmann, quoting Overbeck, "how the Gospel came to Rome, but how Paul came to Rome": but this objection, which

Overbeck considered the greatest against the view that the contents of Acts were summed up in chap. i. 8, is obviated by the above considerations; St. Paul was to bear witness in Rome as he had at Jerusalem, but the result of his final witness in Jerusalem, xxiii. 1 ff., resulted in a division among the Jews, and a similar result followed his first testimony in Rome. The Gospel had come to Rome already, but those who accepted it were only a sect everywhere spoken against; now its foremost representative gains it a hearing from the Gentiles, and that too without interruption or prohibition.

But this recognition of the importance of St. Paul's witness and work in Rome, and of their subsequent development, by no means excludes other purposes which may have been present to the mind of St. Luke. "No other N.T. writer," says Zahn, "mentions a Roman emperor by name," and he proceeds to point out the significance of this fact in connection with the whole design of St. Luke to show that Christianity was an historical religion; how the edicts of Augustus, Luke ii. 1, and of Claudius, Acts xviii. 2, had their influence on the new faith (*cf.* Luke iii. 1), how in comparison with the other Evangelists St. Luke constantly introduces the names of those who were connected indirectly as well as directly with political events (*Einleitung*, ii., p. 375, and *cf.* Ramsay, *St Paul*, p. 385, Friedrich, *u. s.*, p. 53 ff.). Not only would notices of this kind impress a reader of the type of Theophilus with a sense of the certainty of those things in which he had been instructed, but they are also of importance in that they indicate that a writer, who thus took pains to gain accurate information with regard to events in the Roman world, would naturally be interested in tracing carefully the relations between the empire and the infant Church, and all the more so if it was important to show his readers that Christianity stood in no hostile relationship to the imperial government (*cf.* Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 379).

But it is one thing to describe one of the objects of the book in this way, *viz.*, as an attempt to reassure those who had been already instructed in the *origines* of the Christian Faith, and to emphasise its evident power and rectitude at the bar of the rulers of this world, and to maintain that all this was done with a political-apologetic aim, regardless of truthfulness to fact, and only concerned with representing Christianity in a favourable light before magistrates and kings. No doubt we are repeatedly told how St. Paul took shelter in an appeal to Roman law and Roman authority, and how much more justly and calmly the Roman authorities judged of his case than the fanatical and insensate Jews; "but," says Wendt with

admirable candour (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 17), "there is no reason to doubt that this representation simply corresponded to historical truth" (see the whole paragraph in Wendt, 1899, and *cf.* Weiss, *u. s.*, p. 569 as against Overbeck and Mangold, *u. s.*, p. 427, following Schneckenburger and Zeller). Moreover, when we remember that the writer of Acts deliberately enters upon a field of history "where perhaps beyond all others there was room for mistake and blunder, the administration of the Roman Empire and its provinces," nothing is more surprising than the way in which his accuracy is confirmed by every fresh and searching investigation.[1]

But if there is no reason to attribute a political tendency (see further below) to the writer, still less is there room for the attribution of a doctrinal tendency. The earlier representatives of this latter view of the book, Baur and Zeller, started with insisting upon the fundamental opposition which prevailed between the view of the relationship of St. Paul with the primitive Apostles as set forth in those Epistles which these critics accepted, and in the Acts: to St. Paul a Judaising tendency was ascribed in the latter which was not in harmony with his statements in his own writings, whilst, on the other hand, to St. Peter especially a liberal standpoint was ascribed, which was not to be expected in view of the utterances of St. Paul in his Epistles, a standpoint which would make Peter, not Paul, the originator of Gentile Christianity. On the whole the Acts represented an idealised and harmonising view of the relation of parties in the primitive Church, and its object as the work of a Pauline Christian was to reconcile the Jewish and Pauline parties. Schneckenburger had previously emphasised the supposed parallel in Acts between Peter and Paul (see further below), and had represented the book as written with the apologetic aim of defending Paul against the misrepresentation of the Judaisers; but it must always be remembered that Schneckenburger, although emphasising the apologetic tendency of St. Luke, never denied

[1] *Cf.*, *e.g.*, the notes on xvii. 6, xxviii. 7, etc., the references to the invaluable and epoch-making works of Professor Ramsay, and Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, p. 28, 1897, on the remarkable degree of confidence with which military, political, and judicial terms are employed in Acts. Professor Schmiedel in his review of Professor Ramsay's *St. Paul* describes it as the work on the whole not of the historian or archæologist, but of the narrow apologist, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1897, No. 23, and more recently, Professor H. Holtzmann, characterises Professor Ramsay's description and illustration of the scene, Acts xvi. 25-34, as "humbug"! *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1899, No. 7; such remarks are ill calculated to promote candid and respectful criticism.

his historical truthfulness, whilst Baur fastened upon Schneckenburger's view, and further developed his own previous attack on the historical character of Acts (Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 393, Lightfoot, B.D.[2], i., 41). But Baur's theory in its extreme form could not maintain its ground, and various modifications of it took place within his own school. Certainly, to take an illustration, it must always remain a strange fact that, if Acts was written with the conciliatory tendency alluded to, only one indirect mention in it is found, xxiv. 17, of the collection for the poor Saints at Jerusalem, which played so prominent a part in St. Paul's work and writings, and which was in itself such a palpable proof of the Apostle's love for his Jewish brethren. The tendency view adopted by some of the writers succeeding Baur, *e.g.*, Reuss, Keim, Weizsäcker, regards the author of Acts as not intentionally departing from the historical relations between the two parties, but as forming his judgment of the relations between them from the standpoint of his own time. One of the most recent attempts to represent the conciliatory tendency of Acts as an apology for the Christian religion before Gentiles, *i.e.*, before a heathen public, against the charges of the Jews, and to show how Judaism, through Christianity, broke up into its world-wide mission, is that of J. Weiss, *Über die Absicht und den literar. Charakter der A. G.*, 1897 (see further below); but whatever amount of correctness there may be in this view we may frankly adopt, without committing ourselves to the very precarious explanations and deductions of the writer; St. Luke's own prologue, and the dedication of his two writings to the Gentile Theophilus, are in themselves sufficient to lead us to expect that the design accentuated by J. Weiss would not be altogether absent from his mind in composing his history (see the remarks of Zahn, *u. s.*, ii., p. 393).

But if there is no satisfaction in the more recent attempts to represent Acts as written mainly with a conciliatory "tendency," still less can satisfaction be found in the view, older in its origin, of a supposed *parallelism* between St. Peter and St. Paul, drawn out by a writer who wished in this way to reconcile the Petrine and Pauline parties in the Church, by placing the leaders of each in a position of equal authority. That there are points of similarity in the life and work of the two Apostles may be readily admitted, but these likenesses are of the most general kind, and only such as we might expect in cases where two men work in the same calling at the same period and under the same conditions, *cf.* to this effect Clemen, *Die Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, pp. 17, 18, and Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, p. 214. The parallel can

only be extended to a few instances such as the healing of the lame man by Peter at Jerusalem, iii. 2, and by Paul at Lystra, xiv. 8, but there is no real ground for the institution of a parallel between the worship paid to Peter by Cornelius, x. 25, and by the inhabitants of Lystra to St. Paul, xiv. 11, or between the judgment inflicted on Ananias and Sapphira by Peter, v. 1, and on Elymas by St. Paul, xiii. 6. The position thus advocated by Clemen is taken up by B. Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 540, 3rd edit., 1897, no less than by earlier writers like Lekebusch and Nösgen (*cf.* too Sanday, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 327, and Salmon, *Introduction*, p. 310). But whether we consider that the parallel was instituted to place Paul on an equality with Peter, or, as Van Manen has recently urged, *Paulus I.: De handelingen der Apostelen*, p. 126, 1890, that the writer wished to represent Peter in accordance with the delineation of Paul, there is one fact fatal to both points of view, *viz.*, that if either of these purposes had been in the mind of the author of Acts, we cannot account for his omission of the crowning point to the parallel between the two Apostles, *viz.*, their martyrdom in the same city, and in the same persecution. An already discredited theory can scarcely survive the ridicule of Dr. Blass, *Proleg.*, p. 8, and of Dr. Salmon, *u. s.*, pp. 310, 311: in all true history we may expect to find parallelisms, and these parallels exist in the lives of nations no less than of individuals. When we consider the various attempts which have been made to describe the aim of Acts, it is something to find that a critic who does not hesitate to regard the book as written to some extent with an idealising and harmonising purpose, should nevertheless be constrained to reckon it, on account of its many trustworthy traditions, as an historical work of invaluable worth, see Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 33, 1899.

Sources. If St. Luke is acknowledged as the writer of Acts, we can understand the remark of Blass that in this case the question of sources for the greater part of the book need not be raised, Blass, *Acta Apost.*, Proleg., p. 10; *cf.* Zahn, *u. s.*, pp. 404, 412; Knabenbauer, *Actus Apostolorum*, p. 8, 1899. It is plain from the narrative that a man in St. Luke's position would be brought into contact with many persons from whom he could have obtained rich and varied information, and in many cases the details of his narrative point unmistakably to the origin of the information. A good example may be seen in chap. xii. (see commentary), in which the vivid and circumstantial details of St. Peter's escape from prison are best accounted for on the supposition that the narrative comes from John Mark: to the house of the mother of Mark St. Peter makes his

way, ver. 12, and not only does later history associate St. Mark with St. Peter, but also with St. Luke and St. Paul, inasmuch as he is with the latter in Rome, Col. iv. 10, Philem., ver. 24 (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 11), to say nothing of an earlier association, *cf.* Acts xiii. (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 385; Blass, *u. s.*, p. 11; Belser, *Theologische Quartalschrift*, p. 62, 1895); and even Wendt, p. 31 (1899), sees no other way of accounting for the contrast between the brief notice of the death of St. James, xii. 1, and the lengthy account of the liberation of St. Peter than the probability that the latter was derived from John Mark, whilst more exact information was wanting for the former.

But John Mark was not the only member of the Jerusalem Church from whom, or through whom, St. Luke could have obtained information as to the origin of the Christian community. Barnabas, the cousin of John Mark, was in a position to know accurately the same events, in some of which he had shared, iv. 36, and if St. Luke was a member of the Church at Antioch when Barnabas settled there (*cf.* note on xi. 28) he would have learnt from the lips of Barnabas the early history of the Jerusalem Church; and it would have been strange if amongst the men of Cyprus and Cyrene who fled from Judæa to Antioch, xi. 19, there had been none who were baptised at the first Christian Pentecost, *cf.* ii. 10, 41 (Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 414).

For the same series of events St. Luke had access also to the information preserved by Mnason, a disciple ἀρχαῖος, *i.e.*, from the first Pentecost, *cf.* xi. 15, xxi. 16, from whom likewise he may have learnt the account given in ix. 31-43. In chap. xxi. we are also told how Luke was a guest for several days in the house of Philip the Evangelist, vv. 8-12, an intercourse which could have furnished him with the information narrated not only in viii. 4-40, but in vi. 1-viii. 3, x. 1-xi. 18. And from Jerusalem itself, no less than from Cæsarea, information might have been acquired, for Luke, xxi. 18, had intercourse not only with the elders but with no less a person than St. James, the head of the Church at Jerusalem, and at an earlier period he must have shared at Philippi, xvi. 19 ff., the company of Silas, who is mentioned as one of the chief among the brethren of the mother city, xv. 22. In this connection we may note that St. Luke alone gives us two incidents connected with Herod Antipas, Luke xiii. 31-33, xxiii. 6-12, 15, *cf.* Acts iv. 27, which are not narrated by the other Evangelists, but this intimate acquaintance of St. Luke with the court of Herod is in strict harmony with the notice of Manaen the foster-brother of Herod, Acts xiii. 1, *cf.* Luke viii. 3, a teacher of the Church at Antioch when St. Luke may

himself have been there, and from whom the Evangelist may at all events have learnt much of the information about other members of the Herodian family which comes to us from him only (Plumptre, Zahn, Belser, Feine). It may no doubt be contended, with considerable plausibility, that St. Luke must have had at his command written documents as well, *e.g.*, in his account of the speeches of St. Peter and St. Stephen, and it is quite possible that he might have obtained such documents from the Church at Jerusalem. One thing is quite certain, that these addresses like all others throughout the book are in striking harmony with the circumstances and crises to which they relate (see further below): "quo intentius has orationes inspexeris," writes Blass, "eo plura in eis reperies, quæ cum sint temporibus personisque egregie accommodata, ad rhetoricam licentiam scriptoris referri se vetent" (*Proleg.*, p. 11). But at the same time it requires no great stretch of imagination to conclude with Zahn (ii., p. 412) that such a man as Luke required no other sources of information for the composition of Acts, or at least for a great portion of that work, than his own recollections, partly of the narratives of St. Paul, partly of the events in which he himself had shared, *cf.* vi. 8-viii. 3, ix. 1-30, xiii.-xxviii. There is abundant proof in St. Paul's Epistles that the Apostle must have constantly referred to his earlier experiences in way of conversation, or in the delivery of his discourses, *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 8-10, xi. 22, xii. 9, Gal. i. 11-ii. 14, Phil. iii. 3-7, Rom. xv. 16-32, xvi. 7, and during periods of enforced inactivity, while Luke was with him at Cæsarea, or during the winter months at Malta, or later in Rome, nothing was more natural, as Zahn urges, than that the great missionary should communicate to his beloved friend the records of his work and experience in great heathen centres of commercial or intellectual life, like Corinth, Ephesus, Athens. After his return from his travels, and on many other occasions, Zahn points out that it was St. Paul's habit to relate minutely καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον, xxi. 19, what God had wrought by him, xiv. 27, xv. 3, 12, 26, Gal. ii. 2, 7-9, and there is no reason whatever to suppose that such recitals were withheld from St. Luke. No doubt it may be urged that the style in the second part of the book is less Hebraistic than in chaps. i.-xii., but this may be fairly accounted for if we remember that St. Luke would often obtain his information for the earlier events from Jewish Christians, and on the soil of Palestine, and that he may have purposely retained the Hebraistic colouring in his embodiment of these narratives, *cf.* Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. xlix.; Zahn, *u. s.*, ii.,

pp. 414, 423; Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 31, 1898.[1] If it be maintained that the earlier chapters of Acts, i.-v., were incorporated from some earlier document, it is admitted that this was of Jewish-Christian origin, derived from the Jewish Church through an eye-witness (*cf.* B. Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 549, 3rd edit.; Feine, *u. s.*, p. 233). Thus in these chapters, *e.g.*, the Sadducees appear as the chief opponents of the new faith, *cf.* note on iv. 1, and the members of the hierarchy are represented as in the main members of the same sect, a fact which strikes us as strange, but which is in strict accordance with the testimony of Josephus. A careful consideration of the speeches and of their appropriateness to their various occasions tends more and more surely to refute the notion that they are fictitious addresses, the work of a writer of the second century. The testimony of Dr. McGiffert may be cited as bearing witness to the primitive character of the reports of the speeches of St. Peter in the early chapters of Acts, and for the truthful manner in which they represent a very early type of Christian teaching (see comment., p. 119), and *cf.* also the remarks of Schmiedel, *Enc. Bibl.*, i., 48, 1899.

At the delivery of St. Stephen's speech Paul himself was present, xxvi. 10, *cf.* vi. 12, and there is good reason for thinking that the speech made a deep impression upon him (see, *e.g.*, Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 31), while the many Lucan expressions and turns of thought which it contains (*cf.* Zeller, *Acts*, ii., p. 313, E.T., and Overbeck, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 93) are natural enough if the address comes to us through the medium of a translation (see commentary for the speech and its meaning).

For the second part of the book we perceive that St. Luke might have easily obtained accurate reports of the speeches even in cases where he was not present; *e.g.*, the speech at the Pisidian Antioch, chap. xiii., gives us what we may well regard as a familiar example of St. Paul's teaching on many similar occasions (*cf.* also in commentary the striking resemblances recently noted by Professor Ramsay between this speech and the Galatian Epistle). The addresses at Lystra and at Athens delivered to heathen, so wonderfully adapted to the audience in each place, in the one instance appealing to a more popular and ruder, in the latter to a more learned and philosophic class of hearers ("ita sunt omnia et loco et

[1] Dr. Dalman's sharp distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms should be noted, p. 16 ff., whilst he allows that the pure Hebraisms in the Gospels are almost exclusively peculiar to that of St. Luke, and that by these peculiarities of diction Acts is also marked, p. 29; see further in commentary.

audientibus accommodata," says Blass); in both cases starting from truths which some of the Greek philosophers might themselves have pressed home, but in each case leading up to and insisting upon the need and necessity of repentance for wise and simple alike; were eminently characteristic of a man who became as a Jew to the Jews, as without law to those without law, as a Greek to the Greeks, and such discourses in the brief form in which they have reached us in Acts may well have expressed the actual teaching delivered by St. Paul in Lystra and in Athens (see for these speeches especially Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 146 ff., and for the speech at Athens, Curtius, "Paulus in Athen," *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., pp. 527-543, and references in commentary[1]): "there is no reason," writes McGiffert, "for questioning the trustworthiness of the discourse at Athens as a whole . . . in fact such a discourse as that ascribed to Paul is exactly what we should expect from him under the circumstances" (*u. s.*, p. 260).

The speech to the Ephesian elders at Miletus, xx. 18-35, is constantly marked by St. Paul's characteristic words and phrases, and its teaching is strikingly connected with that of the Ephesian Epistle (see notes in commentary, and *cf.* Page, *Acts*, p. xxxvi.; Lock, "Ephesians," Hastings' B.D.; Cook, *Speaker's Commentary*, p. 342, and also Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 336-339; Nösgen, *u. s.*, p. 53; Felten, *u. s.*, p. 33). No one has affirmed the historical truthfulness of this address more strongly than Spitta, and in this instance also we may again conclude with McGiffert, p. 339, that "we shall be safe in assuming that the account of Paul's meeting with the elder brethren of Ephesus, and the report of the words which he uttered are substantially accurate". We may well feel this security when we recall that St. Luke would be himself a hearer of St. Paul's pathetic farewell.

The three remaining speeches contain three ἀπολογίαι of St. Paul, one before the Jews and the chiliarch in Jerusalem, xxii. 1-21, the second before Felix, xxiv. 10-21, and the third before Festus and Agrippa, xxvi. The first reaches us through the medium of a Greek translation, and it is noticeable that the speech in this form contains no Pauline words or expressions, although some words remind us of him, *e.g.*, ἀπολογία, ἀπολούειν, παρα-

[1] Hilgenfeld blames Curtius because he has not explained the source of information for St. Paul's address, since the Apostle was at Athens alone, but Knabenbauer writes, *Actus Apostolorum*, p. 308, "Probabilissime is cum aliis id plane superfluum reputavit, quia Paulus post eam orationem neque memoriam neque loquelam amisit; unde ipse potuit narrare quid Athenis egerit".

δέχομαι, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι and τὸ ὄνομα (Nösgen, Felten), while it contains several peculiar to St. Luke. But if the Evangelist was present at the delivery of the defence, he would have been able to reproduce the speech himself, or at least its substance, and we have an explanation of the fact just mentioned (see Salmon, *Introd.*, pp. 317, 318 ; Page, *Acts*, p. xxxvi. ; Alford, *Proleg.*, pp. 13-15).

The vivid description, xxi. 30-40, and especially the local details, vv. 34, 35, point to the presence of an eye-witness, who was in possession of information which he could use with accuracy, and at the same time with discrimination, limiting himself to the requisites of his narrative (Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden*, p. 174). It is difficult to understand why Blass should say that although Luke may have heard the speech, it is doubtful if he understood it. In his *Præf.* to his *Evangelium secundum Lucam*, pp. xxi.-xxiii., he not only adopts Nestle's theory that an Aramaic document underlies the first part of Acts, i.-xii., but amongst the few Aramaisms from chap. xiii. onwards he notes especially, p. xxi., two from the chapter before us, xxii., *viz.*, ver. 19, ἤμην φυλακίζων "periphrasis illa aramaica imperfecti futurique, quæ fit per participium et verbum ἤμην (ἔσομαι)," and ver. 14, φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, *cf.* i. 16, iii. 18, 21 for στόμα. We must also bear in mind the strictures of Dalman upon Blass in this connection : *cf. Die Worte Jesu*, p. 28, 1898.

In the apology before Felix, xxiv. 10-21, we have traces of St. Paul's diction (see commentary, and *cf.* Nösgen, *u. s.*, p. 54, Felten, *u. s.*, p. 34), and although it would be rash to affirm that St. Luke was present at the delivery of this defence, yet, if he was with St. Paul during any of the time of the Apostle's imprisonment at Cæsarea, it is surely not difficult to suppose that he would have received from the prisoner's own lips a summary of his ἀπολογία before Felix. The same remark might account for St. Luke's information as to the longer ἀπολογία before Agrippa, chap. xxvi., and it is specially noteworthy that in this speech, which may easily have been reproduced exactly as it was delivered, *cf.* Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 5, and *Proleg.*, p. 13, we have Greek phrases and words of a more cultured and literary style, such as would be more suited to the most distinguished audience before which the Apostle had yet pleaded (see commentary). At the same time we may note that while the speech has many points of contact with St. Paul's peculiar language and favourite words, there are other expressions which may be described as Lucan, to which we may appeal as justifying the belief that if St. Luke was present at the hearing, he reproduced the speech not immediately, but after an interval, when it had passed through his

own mind, Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden*, pp. 259, 260. That the speeches in Acts bear the impress of St. Luke's own style and revising hand is freely admitted by conservative critics (*cf.* Lightfoot, B.D.[2], i., p. 36; Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., i., p. 34; Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 317), and we may thus unhesitatingly account for the combination in them of peculiar Pauline expressions with those which may be classed as Lucan or Lucan-Pauline. These linguistic phenomena by no means destroy the substantial accuracy of the report; rather they are exactly what we should expect to find. It is admitted on all sides that by comparing the language of St. Paul's speeches in Acts with the language of his Epistles a striking amount of similarity is evident. But if the writer of Acts was not acquainted with St. Paul's Epistles, we cannot account for this similarity of diction on the ground of literary dependence. If, however, the writer of Acts was a constant and frequent companion of St. Paul the explanation is easy enough, and we can readily believe that whilst in his report or revision of a speech words of the disciple might sometimes be found side by side with those of the master, yet the influence of the latter would nevertheless make itself felt in the disciple's thoughts and language (*cf.* Salmon, *u. s.*, p. 315 ff., and Felten, *u. s.*, p. 32). In many cases it is perfectly obvious that the account of the speeches in Acts is an abridged account —the longest of them would not take more than some five or six minutes in delivery—and therefore, as a matter of necessity, such an abridgment would bear upon it, in a sense, the impress of St. Luke's own style. Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. 191, in speaking of St. Paul's address at Athens expresses the belief that it has come down to us "fideliter etsi brevissime: ita sunt omnia et loco et audientibus accommodata," and he adds a remark applicable to all the Apostle's speeches: "Tum quilibet qui paullo recentiore ætate orationes Pauli conficturus esset, usurus erat Pauli epistolis; quarum in hac non magis quam in ceteris orationibus (*c.* 13, 20, 22, 24, 26) ullus usus comparet".

It cannot be said that the recent and frequent attempts to multiply and differentiate sources in Acts, to assign them to various revisers or redactors, have met with any degree of real success. If Holtzmann and Wendt (see also a description of these attempts in *Theologische Rundschau*, Feb., March, April, 1899) contend that they have done so, and that with regard to the first few chapters of Acts some consensus of opinion has been gained, we may set against such contentions not only the opinion of Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., pp. 414, 424, who maintains that none of these repeated attempts

has attained any measure of probability (so too Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 154, 2nd edit., and Knabenbauer, *Actus Apostolorum*, p. 9 ff., 1899), but also the opinion of Wendt, who, after a careful and on the whole sympathetic review, is obliged to confess that one must limit oneself in any attempt to discover the sources of the book to what is attainable and provable in the circumstances, and that the more complicated the hypothesis suggested, the more difficult it is to make it intelligible to others, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 17, 1899. In his own examination of the problem he limits himself to one great source, p. 30, and plainly declares that it does not seem to be possible to discover others, although he enumerates various passages in which old and trustworthy traditions were combined; but whether these were derived from written documents or from one and the same source he declines to say, and he is evidently inclined to admit that in many cases oral tradition may also have been at work. Thus whilst iv. 1-22, v. 17-42, are regarded as parallel pieces of information of what was in reality the same event, or whilst again the liberation of St. Peter in chap. xii. is a parallel to the release of the Apostle in chap. v. 18-20, the work of St. Philip and the death of St. James rest upon good and trustworthy tradition. The source to which Wendt attaches such importance includes the "We" sections, and the whole of the book from xiii. onwards, with the exception of xv. 1-33, the source continuing with ver. 35, whilst it can be traced further back to xi. 19, 27, and to viii. 1-4. But this large source is full of traces of revision and redaction, which mark not only the narratives but also the addresses. Its interest centred chiefly in the person of St. Paul and in his work, and it gave no history of the *origines* of the Church or of the missionary journeys of the other Apostles, although it introduced its account of St. Paul by tracing the foundation of the Church in Antioch from the mother Church in Jerusalem as a result of the death of St. Stephen and the subsequent persecution, and by showing how that same Church of Antioch became the starting-point for St. Paul's missionary labours.

This view of the sources adopted by Wendt contrasts favourably with some of the extraordinary and complicated theories which from time to time have been advocated in Germany, more especially during the last few years.

As early as 1845 Schleiermacher's published lectures referred the authorship of the "We" sections not to Luke but to Timothy, and some two years before this E. M. Mayerhoff had suggested that the same hypothesis might be extended to all parts of Acts, not

however without the opposition of Bleek and Ulrich, the former of whom supported Schleiermacher. But Schleiermacher's view of the part played by Timothy had already met with the strong opposition of Schneckenburger, 1841, and Swanbeck, 1847, attacked it by means of his own more complicated and more hazardous attempt to solve the sources of Acts. According to Swanbeck, the book is made up of a biography of Peter, a source containing the death of Stephen, a biography of Barnabas, the memoirs of Silas including the "We" sections. But the theory gained no acceptance, and most critics will probably agree with Lekebusch (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 188) that Swanbeck in his attempt to avoid the misleading theory as to Timothy involved himself in a still greater error by his advocacy of Silas.

For the Tübingen school the question of sources occupied a less important place than the question of "tendency," and more weight was attached to the imaginative power of the author than to the possibility of his possession of any reliable tradition; and consequently for a time the attempts to discriminate and estimate various sources sank into abeyance. It was, however, supposed by some critics that in the first part of Acts either a pentateuch source or an Hellenistic history of Stephen had been worked up (Zeller, Overbeck), or that some old πράξεις Παύλου formed a foundation for the narrative. Hilgenfeld (see also below) maintained the probable existence of this latter document, and Holsten thought that he could discover traces of a Judaistic source in the speeches of the first part of the book. B. Weiss, as long ago as 1854, had referred the speeches of St. Peter to a written source, but the speeches were closely connected with the historical episodes, and so in his *Einleitung*, 2nd and 3rd editions, Weiss has attempted to trace throughout the whole first part of the book, *i.e.*, from i. 15-xv., a Jewish-Christian source, whilst Feine, 1891, has maintained that the Jewish-Christian source already employed in the third Gospel was also the source of the history of the Jerusalem Church in Acts i.-xii., and he gives, *u. s.*, p. 236 ff., many verbal likenesses between this source in St. Luke's Gospel and in the earlier portion of Acts. Feine's handling of the whole question is much more conservative than that of the other attempts to which allusion will be made, especially as he regards St. Luke as the author of the third Gospel and the Acts, and claims a high historical value for the episodes and speeches in the source.

But the interest in the hypothesis of a source or sources chiefly centres around the second rather than the first part of Acts. For here the "We" sections are concerned, and when the view was

once started that these sections, although not the work of St. Luke, were the work of an eye-witness (since their vividness and circumstantiality could not otherwise be accounted for), and so derived from a source, the whole question of the authorship of this source was revived, and the claims of Timothy, Silas, Titus, again found advocates; and not only so, but the further question was debated as to how far this source extended. Was it limited to the "We" sections only? But the view which prevailed (and which still prevails, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Holtzmann, *Einleitung*[3], p. 393, and see above) makes Luke the author of the "We" sections, although not of the whole book, which was referred to the close of the first, and even to the second century. This latter date (amongst the supporters of which may be included H. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, Jülicher (100-105), Weizsäcker, to say nothing of earlier critics, or of those mentioned below) finds no support in the general character of the book, and it depends upon other very precarious arguments, *e.g.*, the dependency of the author upon Josephus. But if it cannot be substantiated, it is in itself fatal to the partition theories put forward by Van Manen (125-150), Clemen (60-140), and Jüngst (110-125).

With Van Manen we mark one of the earliest of the many complicated attempts, to which reference has been already made, in proof of the use of sources throughout the whole of Acts. According to him, *Acta Petri* and *Acta Pauli* form the two sources, of which the final redactor, writing about the middle of the second century, availed himself. In the *Acta Pauli*, H. Pa., which fill the second half of the canonical book of Acts, with the exception of xv. 1-33 and some other passages due to the reviser (although some of the incidents of these *Acta* which refer to Barnabas, Stephen, Paul, find a place in the first half of the book), a Gentile Christian, the first redactor, writing at the end of the first, or beginning of the second century, has embodied the Lucan Travel-Document, probably written by Luke himself, consisting of the "We" sections and the bare recital of one of Paul's voyages from Jerusalem to Rome. This document is, however, much revised, and according to it the Apostle travels to Rome not as a prisoner, but as a free man. The final redactor, moreover, seems to have forgotten that such a document had ever existed, and to have depended upon the Epistles of St. Paul and the notices of Josephus. The second source, *Acta Petri*, H. Pe., chaps. i.-xii., is of very small historical value; it was composed later than the *Acta Pauli*, and aimed at placing Peter on a level with Paul. It is not perhaps to be wondered at that Van Manen himself seems to hesitate about the exact details of his

partitions, that even Heitmüller cannot give anything but modified commendation to his theory, *Theol. Rundschau*, p. 87, 1899, and that a still severer condemnation is inflicted by Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 114, *cf.* Knabenbauer, p. 11.

In the same year, 1890, Sorof published his *Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte.* He too has his two written sources. Of the first the physician Luke was the author; this source runs through the book, and has for its purpose to represent the missionary spread of Christianity from Jerusalem to Rome, making prominent the figure of Paul. But this source was revised by another disciple of Paul, Timothy, who as the son of a Jewish mother stood nearer than Luke to Jewish-Christian interests. Timothy, to magnify Peter, introduced much legendary matter relating to him in the first portion of St. Luke's account, and also revised and corrected the record of St. Paul's missionary activity on the strength of his authorship of the "We" sections and his own eye-witness. (It is no wonder that Heitmüller, *u. s.*, p. 85, again welcomes this theory with qualified praise, and considers the division of the parts of the book assigned to Luke and Timothy as improbable, if not impossible.) Another attempt in the succeeding year by Spitta gained much more notice than that of Sorof. He also has his two sources—A, an older source including the "We" sections, probably the work of Paul's companion, Luke: a very valuable and erudite source containing the speeches of the book (see references in commentary); and B, a secondary source, unhistorical, depending on popular traditions, with a great tendency to introduce miraculous embellishments. B is the work of a Jewish Christian who writes with a desire to magnify Peter by miracles which equal those of the great Gentile Apostle. Spitta has further to suppose that these two sources, the one Pauline-Lucan and the other Jewish-Christian, were combined by a Catholic-Christian redactor R, with some additions of his own. Here again Heitmüller, p. 91, sees no hope of a satisfactory solution of the problem under investigation, and can only wonder at the manner in which two sources of a directly opposite tendency can be so simply interwoven by the redactor; the part played by the latter is altogether unsatisfactory, as he does little else than effect this combination of the two sources, with an occasional interpolation of his own. Spitta's attempt was also sharply criticised by Jülicher, *Einleitung*, p. 270, and by Von Soden, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 26, 1892, and its value will be seen by references in the commentary.

The most complicated of all these recent attempts at the

reconstruction of Acts is that of Dr. C. Clemen. His three chief sources (with which he closely connects other shorter sources, *e.g.*, a source for vi. 1-6) are named (1) Historia Hellenistarum, H.H., vi. 9, 10, vii. 1-36, 35-58^{a}, 59^{b}, viii. 1^{b}, xi. 19-21, 24^{a}, 26: this source Clemen regards as very old and trustworthy; (2) Historia Petri, H.Pe., consisting chiefly of i.-v., and of some passages inserted in H.H., *viz.*, vi. 7, 8, 11-15, vii. 37, 60, viii. 2, viii. 4-13, 18-24, the account of Simon Magus; viii. 26-40, the conversion of the Ethiopian; (3) Historia Pauli, H.Pa., xiii. 1-xxviii. 30, 31, a source which may have originated in a diary kept by Luke on a journey to Rome called (4) Itinerarium Pauli, I.Pa., containing the "We" sections, and combined with (3) by the first of the three redactors. The first redactor is simply R., and to him are attributed other additions besides the "We" sections to the Historia Pauli, although no "tendency" can be assigned to him, *cf.*, *e.g.*, xiv. 8-18, xvi. 23^{b}-34, xvii. 19-33, the Athenian discourse, etc. The two other redactors are much more pronounced: one, Redactor Judaicus, R.J., writing 93-117 A.D., compiled and revised the above sources, making many additions, *e.g.*, the miracles at Lydda and Joppa, ix. 23-43, and for the most part the Cornelius history, x. 1-xi. 18; xvi. 1-3, xxi. 20^{b}-26, etc.; and finally, the third redactor, Redactor Antijudaicus, R.A., writing probably in the time of Hadrian, with the object of counterbalancing the wrong tendencies of his predecessor; to him we owe, before all, ix. 1-31, Paul's conversion, xii. 1-25, xv. 5-12, 19, 23-33, 41, and additions to the speech at Miletus, xx. 19^{b}, 25-35, 38^{a}. Other instances will be found in the commentary of the manner in which the additions of "these two antipodes," R.J. and R.A., are given precisely by Clemen, even to parts of verses, and it is no unfriendly critic (Heitmüller, *u. s.*, p. 128) who points out that of the five journeys of Paul to Jerusalem mentioned in Acts no less than four are referred by Clemen to his redactors, which is fatal to the historical character of these visits: ix. 26, R.A.; xi. 30, R.A.; xv. 1-33, R.J. and R.A.; and xviii. 22^{b}, R.; the last journey, xxi., is found in the source H.Pa., and this according to Clemen is a journey identical with Gal. ii. 1. There is indeed no occasion to look to a conservative critic like Zöckler for a sharp criticism of the ingenious but purely subjective theory of Clemen; the latter's immediate successor in the same attempt to split up Acts into its component parts not only describes Clemen's theory as over-ingenious, but speaks of the somewhat mechanical way in which his Redactor Judaicus brings Paul into the synagogue, only to allow the Apostle to be at once expelled therefrom by the

Redactor Antijudaicus, Jüngst, *Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 9. Whether we view it from its critical or from its chronological standpoint, Clemen's theory has not gained favour in England; for the former, see Ramsay, *St. Paul,* p. 11, and for the latter, Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. xxxviii. But further, it cannot be said that Jüngst's own theory is likely to find wider acceptance than that of his predecessor. To say nothing of the difficulties of the date which he proposes, and his advocacy of St. Luke's dependence on Josephus, in which he is at one with Clemen (see further below), we find ourselves, as in dealing with Spitta's theory, face to face with two sources, A and B. The Paulinist of the second half of Acts is A, and the simplest and most natural view, according to Jüngst himself, is to identify this A with the beloved physician Luke, Col. iv. 14, Philem. ver. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 11, who was with Paul during his imprisonment at Cæsarea and Rome; B represents the Petrine-Jewish Christian mainly of the first half, but whose hand may be seen in xiii. 40 f., xv. ver. 13 ἀπεκρίθη to ver. 19 κρίνω, and in ver. 20 ἐπιστεῖλαι to αἵματος, whose name and date remain unknown, and whose narrative is full of miraculous events and legendary stories. Jüngst's redactor has an important part to play, and whilst on the one hand he advocates the abrogation of the Mosaic law (Jüngst does not hesitate to attribute to him ver. 39, xiii.), on the other hand he allows Paul to circumcise Timothy, xvi. 2, to undertake a Nazarite vow, xxi. 20^b-26, and to acknowledge himself a Pharisee, xxiii. 6. The redactor's aim was to represent Christianity as a *religio licita*, and he thus endeavours to bring it by a conciliatory process into close connection with the Jewish religion. It would be difficult to find in the range of criticism anything more purely arbitrary than Jüngst's arrangement of his sections chronologically, see Table, p. 225, at the end of his book (and notes in commentary), and the instances given above are sufficient to show how he does not hesitate to split up a verse amongst his various sources: we cannot be surprised that Clemen retorted upon him the charge of over-ingeniousness with which Jüngst had greeted Clemen's own subtle endeavours.

In the same year as Jüngst's publication, the veteran Hilgenfeld explained his own views of the sources of Acts, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1895, 1896, following partly the lines upon which he had previously worked twenty years before in his *Einleitung*, but also taking into account either adversely or with different degrees of agreement, the theories since propounded. According to him the sources are three in number: (1) πράξεις Πέτρου,

A, a Jewish-Christian source, i. 15-v. 42, describing the origin and development of the mother-Church; from it were also derived ix. 31-42, xi. 2, Cod. D, a passage relating a missionary circuit, xii. 1-23; (2) πράξεις τῶν ἑπτά, a Jewish-Christian document hellenised, commencing with vi. 1, and continuing to viii. 40, including the choice of the Seven, and describing what was known of two of them, St. Stephen and St. Philip; (3) πράξεις Παύλου: this C source commences with (vii. 58b, viii. 1a, 3) ix., and includes nearly the whole of that chapter, xi. 27-29, and the greater portion of xiii.-xxviii., with the "We" sections. But it will be noticed that, according to Hilgenfeld, we owe this source C probably to one of the early Christians of Antioch (xi. 28 D), and that it affords us a trustworthy account, and partly that of an eye-witness, of the missionary work of St. Paul begun at Antioch and spread over the heathen world. Each of the three sources is revised and added to by the "author to Theophilus," who as a unionist-Pauline makes it his chief aim to represent the origin of the Gentile Church as essentially dependent upon the mother-Church of Jerusalem, and Paul as in full agreement with the primitive Apostles, and as acting after the precedent of St. Peter; thus to C is referred the whole episode of Cornelius and the account of the Church in Antioch, x. 1-xi. 18 (except xi. 2 β text), xi. 19-26, 30, xii. 24, 25. Hilgenfeld is not only often greatly dependent upon the Western text (see below and in commentary), but it will be seen that the reference of large sections to his "author to Theophilus" is often quite arbitrary (*cf.* notes in comment.).

One more well-known name follows that of Hilgenfeld—the name of J. Weiss. In 1893, *Studien und Kritiken*, Weiss had already to some extent given in his adhesion to Spitta's theory, and had treated Clemen's redactors R.J. and R.A., one of whom always follows the other to undo the effects of his working, with little ceremony; but in opposition to Spitta he sees in i.-v. only source B, a strong Jewish-Christian document, and in this respect he approaches more nearly to B. Weiss and Feine, although he does not attach equal weight to the historical value of the document in question. Unlike Spitta, he refers the speech of Stephen (upon the unity of which Spitta so strongly insists) not to A, but to B. In 1897 J. Weiss admits only A as the source for the second half of Acts, except in some passages in which he cannot refrain from introducing a redactor, *Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der A. G.*, 1897, p. 38. The view taken by J. Weiss certainly has the merit of appearing less complicated than that of Jüngst and Clemen.

Heitmüller, *u. s.*, pp. 94, 139, highly commends the service rendered by J. Weiss in insisting upon the fact that, even if it is derived from sources, the book of Acts forms a whole, written with a definite purpose and aim, and it is no doubt true that the more we recognise this, the more readily shall we recognise parts or sources which are inconsistent with a unity of aim, whether we derive them from oral or written traditions. But what kind of man must the final reviser have been in that he was entirely unaware of the discrepancies and difficulties which the sharp eyes of modern critics have discovered, and allowed them to remain instead of dismissing or explaining them with a few strokes of his pen? Or if he was so skilful as to be able to combine together sources often so unlike, how is it that he was notwithstanding so unskilful as to leave such patent and glaring discrepancies? And if the final revision took place in the second century, how is it that we have no colouring, not even in the speeches, of second-century ideas? (See especially Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 10.) In other respects it will be noticed that these theories, far from possessing even the recommendation of novelty, are nothing but a rehabilitation of the exploded "tendency" theories of Baur and Zeller, or of the discredited "parallelism" between Peter and Paul (see above); in numberless cases one critic flatly contradicts another in the details of his confident partition of sources into verses, or even portions of verses. At the same time hardly any of the writers in question seem able to separate themselves entirely from the traditional view that Luke, the companion of Paul, was more or less concerned in the composition of the book, which, as we believe, is so justly ascribed to him.

Before we pass from this question of sources, a few words must be said as to the alleged dependence of St. Luke upon Josephus. A century and a half ago points of contact between the two historians were collected by Ott and Krebs (see Wendt, *u. s.*, p. 36, and Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas*, p. 1). But only in comparatively recent times has the question been seriously discussed as to whether the author of the third Gospel and of Acts was dependent in a literary sense upon Josephus. At the outset it is well to bear in mind that both men were historians, writing at the same period, and often of necessity referring to the same events. A certain amount, therefore, of parallel description and even of similarity of diction might fairly be expected.[1] But that the author of Acts often showed a know-

[1] Amongst recent critics who have rejected the idea of St. Luke's dependence on Josephus may be mentioned Reuss, Schürer, Gloël, Harnack, Belser, Bousset, and in England, Salmon, Sanday, Plummer (in his review of the latter's *St. Luke* Weiss, however, now inclines to the opposite view).

ledge of independent tradition is admitted even by those who maintain the dependence in question; see, *e.g.*, Krenkel, *u. s.*, p. 207, Clemen, *Die Chronologie der Paulinischen Briefe*, p. 68 (see further in commentary, v. 36, xii. 19, xxi. 38, and Zahn's instances of this independent knowledge of events and persons, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 416).

But more extraordinary than the variations of certainty and uncertainty in these critics is the position taken up by Wendt in his latest edition (1899) of Meyer's Commentary. In his former edition (1888) he maintained that the points of contact between Josephus and Luke were too general in their character to justify the notion of literary dependence, and that the author of Acts would naturally possess independent knowledge of contemporary events and personalities, and he still admits this general similarity and the want of proof in many of the dependencies alleged by Krenkel in his lengthy examination of the question: *e.g.*, the fact that both writers speak of Porcius Festus as the διάδοχος of Felix is no proof of literary dependence (Acts xxiv. 27, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 8, 9). But Wendt fastens on the one passage, v. 36, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 5, 1, as proving a real dependence (see notes in commentary), and argues that if this is so, the same dependence may be naturally expected in other places. Thus, in what appears to be quite an arbitrary manner, he asserts that some notices in Acts are dependent upon Josephus, whilst some may be taken by the author of the book out of his own chief source, *e.g.*, the account of the Egyptian, xxi. 38, and of the high priest Ananias, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1, etc. But having said all this, Wendt proceeds to point out that we must not measure too highly the influence of Josephus on Acts; even the passage v. 36, in which that influence is most marked, proves to us at the same time the nature of the influence in question: it did not consist in an exact familiarity with the words of Josephus, and in a careful employment of his material, but in a superficial reminiscence of an earlier reading of the Jewish historian; thus the deviations side by side with the likenesses are explained. But the most conservative critic might allow as much as this.

Wendt further admits that this dependence cannot extend to the later works of Josephus, *c. Apion.* and his *Vita*. This last work, which must have been written after the year 100 A.D. (see "Josephus" (Edersheim), *Dict. of Chr. Biog.*, iii., p. 448), contains the expression, c. 29, θανεῖν μὲν, εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν, οὐ παραιτοῦμαι, and Krenkel maintains that there is a clear trace of dependence upon this in the words used in Acts xxiv. 11 (pp. 255, 256, so Holtzmann and Steck). But in the first place the supposed dependency is not admitted by Wendt,

and not only may parallels be found to a similar use of the verb παραιτοῦμαι in other Greek writers (Wetstein), but it is also noticeable that in the same speech of St. Paul Krenkel discovers, xxv. ver. 9, what he calls "the most striking reference" to the language of Josephus in the phrase χάριτα, χάριν κατατίθεσθαί τινι (*cf.* also xxiv. 27, Jos., *B.J.*, vi., 3, and commentary, *in loco*). But the phrase is distinctly classical, *cf.* Thuc., i., 33, 138, and if Josephus was acquainted with Thucydides (see Kennedy, *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 56) why not St. Luke? (*Cf.* Belser, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, p. 653, 1895.)

But what can we think of these supposed dependencies upon a book of Josephus written in the early years of the second century, when we read further that St. Paul's account of his dream, xxiii. 11, is modelled upon the dream in Josephus, *Vita*, 42? In the former passage we read σε δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι, and in the latter ὅτι καὶ Ῥωμαίοις δεῖ σε πολεμῆσαι, in each case the dream takes place in the night, and in each case some one stood over the dreamer (ἐπιστάς) (see Bousset's review of Krenkel, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, p. 392, 1895, No. 15). The alleged similarity between the introduction to the third Gospel and the Acts, and the introduction to the *Ant.* of Josephus and to his book, *c. Apionem*, is of the slightest when compared with the likeness between the language of St. Luke in his preface to his Gospel and the introduction of Dioscorides of Anazarbus to his *Materia Medica*, *cf.* Bousset, *u. s.*, Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas*, p. 17, and J. Weiss, Meyer's Commentary, *Evangelium des Lukas*, p. 286; indeed much more might be said for an imitation by St. Luke in his preface of the introduction to the history of Thucydides (*cf.* Belser, *u. s.*, pp. 642, 658, 659, etc.). It would have been very advantageous if Krenkel in his long list of words common to Josephus and Luke, p. 304 ff., had not only given us references in classical writers to the use of the words which he adduces (*e.g.*, the phrase πυρετῷ συνέχεσθαι, Luke iv. 38, *Ant.*, xiii., 15, 5, finds frequent parallels in Plato and Thucydides), but also to the authors whose books form the Apocrypha, and especially to 1 Macc. and 2 Macc. It is also noteworthy that no mention whatever is made of Polybius (Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 414). The whole list requires revision, and it is preposterous to class amongst literary dependencies technical terms like ἀνθύπατος, κολωνία, νεωκόρος, ναύκληρος, σικάριος, στρατοπεδάρχης, τετραρχέω, or ordinary words which since Homer had been common to all Greek literature, *e.g.*, ἐκεῖσε, μόγις, πλοῦς, παροίχομαι, παραπλέω. So far as language is concerned, what is more improbable,

as Zahn points out, than that the man who wrote Luke i. 1-4 should go to school and learn from Josephus? (*Cf. C. Apion.*, i., 9; *Ant.*, xx., 12.) But again what can we expect from an author who can find a parallel between Luke ii. 42 and Jos., *Vita*, 2? (See Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, p. 65.) The "We" sections equally with the other parts of the book contain many points of contact with Josephus, and Krenkel is somewhat puzzled to explain this, p. 281; but when we consider that Josephus has given us a long description of his own voyage to Rome, and of his shipwreck on the way, *Vita*, 3, it was only to be expected that similar nautical terms would be found in the two narratives, and some similarity of description, and the two accounts help to show us how easily and naturally two writers narrating the same experiences would express themselves in the same style and language.

But this question of the author's relation to Josephus is also important in its bearing upon the date of Acts.

The *Antiquities* of Josephus are placed at 93, 94 A.D., and if it could be proved that traces of dependence on the Jewish historian may be found in the third Gospel, those who maintain that a considerable period of time elapsed between the writing of that book and of Acts would be obliged to place the latter work some few years later still. But here again we may see the uncertainty which prevails when conclusions are built upon such *data*. Wendt (p. 40) can find no sure traces of any acquaintance with Josephus in the third Gospel, and so he inclines to date Acts in the interval between 95 and 100 A.D. (although he admits the possibility of a later date still). But 95, 96 A.D. would place the book under Domitian, and the question arises as to whether it can be said with any certainty that Acts was composed at a time when the Christians had gone through such a period of persecution as marked the close of that emperor's reign. Harnack decides without hesitation in the negative, *Chron.*, i., pp. 248-250, and whilst he gives 93 as the *terminus ad quem*, it is satisfactory to find that he holds that the book may have been composed between 80 and 93 A.D. The limit which he thus fixes Harnack regards as in approximate agreement with his other argument (see above) against the later date of Acts, *viz.*, its non-use of St. Paul's Epistles, a fact which alone would prevent us from dating the book in the second century (p. 249). So far as date is concerned, Ramsay would seem to occupy to some extent the same position, at least approximately, for he maintains that the book could not possibly have been written as late as the reign of Trajan, when the Church had long suffered persecution from the State, or even by

a writer who had passed through the reign of Domitian, *St. Paul*, p. 387, and he dates its publication in the year immediately following 81 A.D., *i.e.*, in the early years of Domitian. But whilst Harnack's language might be employed by one who even dated the book *before* the persecution of Nero, Ramsay maintains that there runs through the entire work a purpose which could hardly have been conceived before the State had begun to persecute on political grounds (p. 388). But *when* did this kind of persecution begin? The evidence for the origin of a definite State policy against the Christians points presumably to Nero, and not to Vespasian, *cf.* Hardy, *Christianity and the Roman Government*, p. 80 (1890), Mommsen's letter, *Expositor*, July, 1893, Hort, *First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 3, Pullan, *Early Christianity*, p. 106 ff., 1898. Professor Ramsay speaks of the Flavian policy as declaring Christianity illegal and proscribing the Name, but the first of the three Flavian emperors was Vespasian, and there is no positive evidence to refer the adoption of a definite State policy against the new religion to him (*cf.* Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 256).

But if, from this point of view, there is nothing in the book itself to militate against an earlier date even than that mentioned by Ramsay and Harnack, are we justified in placing it, with Blass, before the fall of Jerusalem? Blass indeed would place it as early as 57-59 A.D., following St. Jerome, and the Gospel in 56, *Evangelium secundum Lucam*, p. lxxix., *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 33 ff. But however this may be, Blass has done invaluable service by pointing out that there is nothing in St. Luke's words, Luke xxi. 20 ff., which can give colour to the theory which regards them as a mere *vaticinium post eventum*, by showing that Daniel ix. 36 ff. already contained much which Luke is alleged to have added from his own knowledge of events already fulfilled, and by adding from modern history at least one remarkable prophecy and its fulfilment. Savona rola foretold as early as 1496 the capture of Rome, which happened in 1527, and he did this not merely in general terms but in detail; his words were realised to the letter when the sacred Churches of St. Peter and St. Paul became, as the prophet had foretold, stables for the conquerors' horses. The difficulties of foreseeing this capture of the Holy City at all by an army which would not have refrained from such an act of sacrilege are vividly depicted by Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 42 ff.[1]

[1] *Cf. Evangelium secundum Lucam*, p. viii., where he adds: "Major utique Christus propheta quam Savonarola; hujus autem vaticinium longe difficilius fuit quam illius; nam hostis Romanus prævideri poterat, exercitus Lutheranus non poterat".

But if on other grounds, *e.g.*, on account of the prologue to St. Luke's Gospel (Harnack, *u. s.*, p. 248, Sanday, *B.L.*, p. 278, Page, *Acts*, p. xviii.), we are asked to place that book after the destruction of Jerusalem, it is further maintained by Harnack that some considerable interval must have elapsed after that event before Acts was written; for if it had been composed immediately after the destruction, the writer would have mentioned it as useful for his aim; and so the book must have been composed at a time, *c.* 80, when the overthrow of the Holy City no longer stood, as it were, in the foreground of events. But it may be doubted if this is a very convincing argument, for the Epistle of Barnabas, written, as Harnack holds, between the wide limits of 80 and 132 A.D., does refer to the destruction, and for the writer of this Epistle equally as for the writer of Acts the event would have been a *fait accompli.* It is doubtful whether, in fact, anything can be gained as to the fixture of date from this omission of any reference to the fate of the Holy City; if anything, the omission would point to the years *before* the destruction for the composition of the book, as Harnack himself allows, if we were not obliged, according to the same writer, by the date of the Gospel to place Acts also after the overthrow. Both in England and in Germany representative writers can be named in support of the earlier and of the later date, Dr. Salmon maintaining that Acts was written a little more than two years after St. Luke's arrival in Rome (*cf.* also Rackham, *Journal of Theol. Studies*, i., p. 77), whilst Dr. Sanday would apparently place Acts about 80 A.D., and the Gospel 75-80, *B. L.*, p. 279, so too Dr. Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. xxxi., both being influenced to a great extent by the presumption that the Gospel followed the fall of Jerusalem. In this the English critics are in interesting agreement with Zahn in his recent volume, *Einleitung*, ii., pp. 433, 434, so far as date is concerned, in that he too regards 80 A.D. as the *terminus ad quem* for both Gospel and Acts, assigning them probably to 75 A.D., but unable to find a place for them before the fall of Jerusalem.[1]

[1] Sir J. Hawkins in his valuable *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 143, has recently drawn attention to the *difference* of vocabulary between the third Gospel and Acts, and whilst maintaining that it is quite insufficient to destroy the argument for the identity of authorship, he thinks that it points to a considerable lapse of time between the two works. But we are dealing with a versatile author acquainted apparently with many writers, Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lucas nach Sprache und Stil*, pp. 15, 17, 38, and the differences in question cannot have weighed with Blass, inasmuch as he places the completion of Acts three years after the Gospel, and still less with Zahn, who still maintains that the two books were published

It would appear then that the date of Acts must be determined to a great extent by the date assigned to the third Gospel; and this apparently was the view of Bishop Lightfoot (*cf.* Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. xxix., and Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 163, 2nd edit.), inasmuch as he leaves the question of the date of Acts undetermined, and refers for its solution to the date assigned to St. Luke's Gospel; although it should be noted that he does not attach any weight to the argument which finds in Luke xxi. 20-24 a proof that the Gospel was written after Jerusalem had fallen (*cf.* also Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., p. 30, and Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 40, for various dates).

As in the case of the Gospel, so in that of the Acts, it is impossible to say at what *place* it was written. The traditional view since the days of St. Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.*, 7, has favoured Rome (although elsewhere Jerome refers the writing of the Gospel to parts of Achaia and Bœotia, *Præf.* to *Comm. in Matt.*), *cf.* Schneckenburger, Lekebusch, Godet, Felten, Blass, amongst others (Wendt, 1899, although rejecting the traditional account of St. Jerome, adds that he knows of no decisive grounds *against* Rome, p. 40). Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 393, 429, in supporting the claims of Rome argues for the probability that St. Luke, like many medical men at the time, would be likely to find in Rome a good field for his professional work. Achaia, Macedonia, Asia Minor, Alexandria have all been mentioned, and Lightfoot also mentions Philippi. Pfleiderer has supported Ephesus on the ground that the writer manifests a special interest in that city, whilst Zöckler thinks that something may be said for Antioch in Syria, owing to St. Luke's traditional connection with the place, Eus., *H. E.*, iii., 4; Jerome, *De Vir. Illust.*, 7, *cf.* Acts xi. 28, D., if there was the slightest ground for supposing that Luke at the period when the book was written had any residence in the Syrian town. On the whole it seems best with Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 42; Lightfoot, *u. s.*, p. 40; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., pp. 337, 439, to leave the locality undetermined; see especially the latter as to the bearing on the question of the mention of insignificant places such as Tres Tabernæ, Appii Forum, in the

in the same year, 75. It is remarkable no doubt that τε is used so often in Acts in all parts of the book: nevertheless it occurs also in the third Gospel nine or ten times, but in St. Mark not at all, and in St. Matthew and St. John only three times in each; μὲν οὖν, although no doubt frequent in Acts, does not occur at all in St. Matthew and St. Mark, although it is found once in St. Luke, iii. 18 (twice in St. John); and καὶ αὐτός, although occurring very frequently in the third Gospel, is not dropped in Acts, although proportionately it is rarely found (eight times).

neighbourhood of Rome, and on the evident ignorance of Theophilus as to the localities of Palestine, and apparently also in some respects, and in comparison with the author, of Macedonia and Greece (*cf.* xvi. 12; xvii. 19, 21).

If we turn to external testimony in favour of the book we find it full and satisfactory (*cf.* Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, 2nd edit., p. 160, Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., i., p. 26, and Gore on the points of contact between the earlier chapters and the *Didache;* see *Church and the Ministry*, p. 416). To Wendt in his latest edition, p. 41 (1899), we again owe much that is of value, both in what he allows, and in what he declines to recognise. One very important point calls for determination at the outset. The likeness between the language of Acts xiii. 22 and Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xviii., 1, in relation to Ps. lxxxviii. 20 (LXX) cannot, as both Clemen and Wendt admit, be accidental. Indeed Wendt is of opinion that it is no more probable that Clement depends upon Acts than Acts upon Clement, while at the same time he holds that a third alternative is possible, *viz.*, that both writings may be dependent on some common third source. But there is no evidence forthcoming as to the existence of this common source, and Lightfoot rightly presses the significance of the threefold coincidence between the language of Acts and Clement, which cannot easily be explained away (*u. s.*, p. 120). In Acts we have three features introduced which are not found in the original of the Psalm, *viz.*, the mention of the "witness," and the addition (*a*) of "a man after my heart," *cf.* 1 Sam. xiii. 14, and (*b*) of "the son of Jesse," but all these are also found in the passage in St. Clement. So again Wendt with many other critics would explain the words ἥδιον διδόντες ἢ λαμβάνοντες, Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, ii., 1, *cf.* Acts xx. 35, not by dependence upon Acts, but by a common tradition of the words of the Lord. But Wendt admits, although very guardedly, the use of Acts in Polycarp, *Phil.*, i., 2, *cf.* Acts ii. 34, Ignat., *Ad Smyrn.*, 3, Acts x. 41, and he does not deny the connection between Ignat., *Ad Magn.*, 5, and Acts i. 25, whilst he admits that in Justin Martyr the references become more clear and frequent (see, for a full and good estimate of the references to Ignatius and Polycarp, Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., i., p. 26).

But it is most important to observe that Wendt fully recognises the influence of the Canonical Acts upon the Apocryphal Acts of the second century, although he points out that of this literature we only possess a small portion, and he expects great things from the recently discovered fragments of the *Acta Pauli* of the middle of

the second century; *cf. Acta Pauli et Theclæ* (apparently a part of the *Acta Pauli*), which are frequently dependent upon our Acts for their notices of persons and places, and also *Acta Petri* dependent again upon our Acts, as in the notice of the meeting of Peter and Simon Magus, *cf.* Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p, 159, and Harnack, *Chron.*, i., pp. 498 and 554 (although Harnack places the *Acta Petri* as late as the middle of the third century, whilst Zahn takes 170 as the *terminus ad quem*). From other writings and documents of the second century the testimony to our book is clear, *cf. Epist. ad Diognetum*, 3, *cf.* Acts xvii. 24; the *Epistle of Vienne and Lyons*, *cf.* Acts vii. 59 ff. (Euseb., *H.E.*, v., 2; *Didache*, iv. 8, Acts iv. 32), and two other references to St. Paul's address at Athens, in Tatian, *Orat. ad Græc.*, 4, and Athenagoras, *Legat.*, 13 (Wendt) (*cf.* possibly Dionysius of Corinth, Euseb., *H.E.*, iv., 23); so too in Justin Martyr, references to the book are found in *Apol.*, i. and ii., and *Dial. cum Tryph.*, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Acts i. 8, 9, ii. 2, *Apol.*, i., 50; Acts xvii. 23, *Apol.*, ii., 10; Acts xxvi. 22 f., *Dial.*, 36 (Wendt, Zöckler, Headlam); and not only so, but it is definitely assigned to St. Luke and treated as Scripture in the Muratorian Fragment, *l.* 34; *cf.* Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 14, 15, Tertull., *C. Marcion.*, v., 2; *De Jejun.*, 10; Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, v., 12. Moreover, we must not lose sight of the fact that "all the evidence which testifies to the authorship of the third Gospel is available also for Acts, and conversely, and that the early testimony in favour of St. Luke as the author of the third Gospel is absolutely unbroken and undisputed for nearly eighteen centuries," Lightfoot, *u. s.*, p. 30; Plummer, *St. Luke*, pp. xiv., xvi.

Space forbids us to enter into the many vexed questions which surround the *chronology* of Acts, but an attempt is made to discuss some of them in the pages of the commentary. A glance at the various tables given us in Meyer-Wendt (1888), p. 31, or in Farrar's *St. Paul*, ii., p. 624, is enough in itself to show us the number and complexity of the problems raised. But fresh interest has been aroused not only by Professor Ramsay, but by the recent return of Harnack and O. Holtzmann (*cf.* also McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 359; Blass, *Proleg.*, p. 22) to the earlier chronology of Eusebius (although O. Holtzmann does not mention him, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 128, 132), formerly advocated by Bengel. According to Eusebius the recall of Felix must be dated between October 55 and 56. Harnack places the entry of Festus upon office in the summer of 56, since Paul embarks for Rome some few months after the arrival of Festus in the autumn, *Chron.*, i., p. 237. The

Apostle would thus arrive in Rome in the spring of 57, and his release follows in 59. (O. Holtzmann from other *data* places the arrival of Festus in Palestine in the summer of 55, and both he and McGiffert place Paul's arrival in Rome in 56, and his imprisonment 56-58.)

This chronology has been severely criticised by Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 57 (1899), and it fails to commend itself to Ramsay, *Expositor*, March, 1897, as also more recently to Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 626. It has been objected to it, *inter alia*, that its supporters, or at all events Harnack and O. Holtzmann, place the conversion of Paul so soon after the death of our Lord that it is doubtful whether sufficient time is allowed for the events recorded in Acts i.-vi. (*cf.* xxvi. 10), although Holtzmann, p. 133, sees no difficulty in placing the conversion in 29, the date of the death of Jesus, as the events in Acts i.-viii. in his view follow quickly upon one another. (Ramsay thinks that the interval before Stephen's murder was short, but he allows two and a half or three years for the event after the great Pentecost; see notes in commentary for the difficulties connected with the martyrdom.) Harnack places the date of the conversion in 30, *i.e.*, according to him, either in the year following, or in the year of, the death of Jesus. On the other hand the chronology in question allows some considerable time for Paul's release from his first captivity (a release admitted by Harnack and Spitta, as earlier by Renan), and for his subsequent journeys east and west, if Mr. Turner, "Chronology," Hastings' B.D., i., 420, is right in placing the death of both Peter and Paul in 64-65 (Harnack placing the death of St. Paul in 64 and of St. Peter in 67, Eusebius, however (so Blass), from whom Harnack here departs, placing the former event in 67 (68)). The received chronology, making 60, 61, the date for the arrival of Festus in Judæa, allows but little interval between the close of St. Paul's first imprisonment and his death, if his martyrdom was in 64. The difficulty is met by Mr. Turner, *u. s.*, p. 421, by assigning 58 (Ramsay 59) as the precise year for the accession of Festus to office, placing the close of the Acts, after the two years' captivity in Rome, early in 61, and so allowing an interval of three years between St. Paul's first and second imprisonment. Unfortunately it must be admitted that we cannot positively fix 58 as the year for the event in question, and this uncertainty sadly interferes with the adoption of any precise chronology for Acts, although on all sides the importance of the date of Festus' arrival is recognised—"the crucial date," Mr. Turner calls it; all depends upon ascertaining it, says Harnack (*cf.* also Wendt, *u. s.*, p. 56;

Page, *Acts*, xxxviii.; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 639; Lightfoot, B.D.[2], i., 42).

If we adopt Mr. Turner's date for Festus—a date intermediate between the earlier and later dates assigned above—and work back, we get 56 as the date for St. Paul's arrest in Jerusalem and imprisonment in Cæsarea, 55 for his leaving Ephesus, 52 for the commencement of his third missionary journey (for he stayed at Ephesus considerably over two years; Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, p. 310, says three), 50 for his reaching Corinth (late in the year), where he sojourned eighteen months, 49 for Council at Jerusalem and second missionary journey. But if we identify the Council at Jerusalem, Acts xv., with the second visit to Jerusalem according to Gal. ii. 1, but the third visit according to Acts, the question arises as to whether the notices in Gal. i. 18 and ii. 1 involve seventeen years as an interval between the Conversion and the Council (with Lightfoot, Harnack, Zahn), or whether the fourteen years, Gal. ii. 1, should be reckoned from the Conversion, *i.e.*, eleven years from the first visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem, including the three in the fourteen (with Ramsay, Turner, McGiffert).[1]

Against the former view Mr. Turner urges the objection that in this case the first visit to Jerusalem would be carried back to 35-36, whereas in all probability Aretas was not ethnarch of Damascus until 37 (2 Cor. xi. 32, Acts ix. 25, 26; see commentary), and he therefore includes the three years in the fourteen, and thus gets 35-36 for the conversion, and 38 (under Aretas) for the first visit. As Mr. Turner places the Crucifixion 29 A.D., his scheme is thus free from the objection referred to above as against Harnack and O. Holtzmann, since it allows some six or seven years for the events in the early chapters of Acts (see further on the whole question of chronology Mr. Turner's full and valuable article already mentioned; Zahn, *u. s.*, ii.; *Excursus*, ii.; Professor Ramsay, "Pauline Chronology," *Expositor*, March, 1897; Professor Bacon (Yale), "Criticism of the New Chron. of Paul," *Expositor*, February, 1898; Wendt, *u. s.* (1899), p. 53 ff.; *Biblical World*, November, 1897; Mr. Vernon Bartlet's article on "Pauline Hist.

[1] But Professor Ramsay, it must be remembered, identifies Gal. ii. with Acts xi. 30, xii. 25 (see notes in commentary), and an interval of fourteen years between St. Paul's conversion and the famine would be more probable than an interval of seventeen, which would throw the conversion back too early, and Dr. McGiffert identifies the accounts of both visits in Acts xi. and xv.—the former for famine relief and the latter for the settlement of the controversy with the Judaisers—with the visit mentioned in Gal. ii. 1, *Apostolic Age*, p. 208.

and Chron.," *Expositor*, October, 1899, written too late for more than a brief mention here, as also Professor Bacon's more recent contribution, *Expositor*, November, 1899).

But although there are so many points of contact between secular history and the Acts, it seems that we must still be content with what Harnack describes as a relative rather than an absolute Chronology. We cannot say, *e.g.*, that we can fix precisely the date of the famine, or the edict of Claudius, or the proconsulship of Gallio, or the reign of Aretas, to take the four events mentioned by Lightfoot, "Acts," B.D.[2], i., p. 4, as also by Harnack, *Chron.*, i., p. 236, *cf.* Zahn, *u. s.*, ii.; *Excursus* ii. But in this respect no blame attaches to St. Luke as an historian. His object was to connect the history of the rise and progress of the Christian Faith with the course of general imperial history around him, and if his chronological sense seems deficient to modern judgment, it was a deficiency in which he was by no means peculiar, but which he shared with his contemporaries and his age, *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 18, 23, and *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* pp. 204, 256.

State of the Text. It is not too much to say that during the last fifteen years chief interest has centred around the Western text and its relative importance (*cf.* Blass, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 86 ff., 1894; *Acta Apostolorum*, 1895, and *Acta Apostolorum*, 1896, also *Evangelium secundum Lucam*, 1897, both edited *secundum formam quæ videtur Romanam*; see also Dräseke, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 192 ff., 1894).[1]

Codex D, its most important representative, contains an unusually large number of variations from the received text in Acts (see for the number Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, 2nd edit., p. 165; he reckons, *e.g.*, some 410 additions or interpolations), and it is no wonder that attempts should have been made to account for this diversity. Bornemann's endeavour some half-century ago (1848) to represent D as the original text, and the omissions in the common text as due to the negligence or ignorance of copyists, found no acceptance, and whilst in one sense Blass may be said to have returned to the position of Bornemann, he has nevertheless found his predecessor's solution totally inadequate, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 105. Joannes Clericus, Jean Leclerc, the Dutch philologist (born 1657), had already suggested that St. Luke had made two

[1] The main division of MSS. of Acts into three groups, with references to W. H. and Blass, is well given in *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, iv., pp. xvii., xviii. (H. J. White, Oxon., 1897).

editions of Acts, and is said by Semler to have published his opinion, although under an assumed name (Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 348; see also on the same page Zahn's interesting acknowledgment that he was himself in 1885-6 working on much the same lines as Blass). Meanwhile Tisch., W. H., B. Weiss have sought to establish the text of Acts essentially on the basis of ℵABC, and it was left for Blass to startle the world of textual criticism by boldly claiming a fresh originality for Codex D. But this originality was not exclusive; St. Luke has given us two originals, first a rough copy β, R(omana), in Blass, and then a fair copy α, and A(ntiochena), for the use of Theophilus; the rough copy remained in Rome and became the foundation of the Western text, copies of it having reached Syria and Egypt in the second century, while the latter abridged by Luke reached Theophilus in Antioch (so Blass), and was thence propagated in the East.[1]

But Codex D is by no means the sole witness, although a very weighty one, upon which Blass depends for his β text. He derives help from Codex E (Laudianus), from the minuscule 137 (M) in Milan, especially for the last chapters in which D is deficient, and in some passages also from Codex Ephraem, C; from the Philoxenian Syriac version with the marginal annotations of Thomas Harkel (unfortunately we have no Old Syriac text as for the Gospels), the Sahidic version, the Latin text in D, d, and E, e, the Fleury palimpsest (Samuel Berger, 1889), Flor. in Blass; the so-called "Gigas" Latin version in Stockholm (Belsheim, 1879), Gig. in Blass; the Codex Parisinus, 321 (S. Berger, 1895), Par. in Blass; a Latin version of the N.T., fifteenth century, in Wernigerode, Wernig., *w.*, in Blass, and a Latin version of the thirteenth century, "in linguam provinciæ Gallicæ Romanæ facta," Prov. in Blass.[2]

In addition to these MSS. and versions Blass also appeals to the

[1] On the difference between the circulation of the two copies in the case of the third Gospel see *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 103. In England Bishop Lightfoot had previously conjectured that the Evangelist might himself have issued two separate editions of both Gospel and Acts, *On a Fresh Revision of the N.T.*, p. 29. For similar instances of the issue of a double edition in classical and other literature see Dräseke, *u. s.*, p. 194; Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 132, and Blass, *Proleg.*, p. 32.

[2] To these may be added fragments of an old Latin translation of Acts in the *Anonymi de prophetis et prophetiis* containing six passages, notably Acts xi. 27, 28, in agreement with Codex D, *cf. Miscellanea Cassinese*, 1897, and Harnack, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, p. 171, No. 6, 1898; the Greek Codex Athous, derived according to Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 250, from an old and very valuable original, and taken into some account by Hilgenfeld, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. ix. (1899), and *cf.*

text employed by Irenæus, which contains many resemblances to D; to the text of St. Cyprian, which shows the same peculiarity; to the text of St. Augustine, especially in his treatises against the Manicheans, containing Acts i.-ii. 13, x. 13, 15, parts which are not found in the Fleury palimpsest: *cf.* also Tertullian, whose text, although it contains few quotations from Acts, resembles that of Irenæus (add to these the work *De promissionibus et prædicationibus Dei,* referred, but wrongly, to Prosper, Prom. in Blass; and the *Contra Varimadum* of Vigilius, Vigil. in Blass: works not valued so highly by Hilgenfeld in his list of authorities for the Western text, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. xiii., 1899). By these aids Blass constructs his β text, even for those portions where D is wanting, *viz.*, from viii. 29, πρόσελθε to x. 14, ἔφαγον; from xxi. 2, ἐπιβάντες to ver. 10, ἀπὸ τῆς; xxii. 10, ὧν τέτακται to ver. 20, συνευδοκῶν, and from xxii. 29, οἱ μέλλοντες to the end of the book, and his aim is to restore the Western text as it existed about the time of Cyprian, *cf. Evangelium secundum Lucam*, p. xxxi. The merit of his work in showing how widespread and interesting was the Western form of text is acknowledged even by those who do not accept his conclusions, see, *e.g.*, Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte* (1899), p. 46, and Bousset, *Theol. Rundschau*, p. 413, 1898, although both object that Blass does not rightly estimate his different witnesses.

But Blass is able to refer in support of his use of some of the authorities mentioned to the important investigation of Dr. P. Corssen in his *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta Apostolorum*, 26 pp., 1892. This Latin text carries us back at least to the middle of the third century (and earlier still according to Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 53 ff., who thinks that the text might be called Tertullianic equally as well as Cyprianic; but see on the other hand Blass, *Acta Apost.*, edit. m., p. xxxi.), as Corssen shows by comparing the readings of the Fleury palimpsest (sixth century) (1) with St. Cyprian's quotations from Acts, (2) with similar quotations in the works of St. Augustine referred to above, *De Actis cum Felice Manichæo* and *Contra epistolam Manichæi*, (3) with the quotations in the work mentioned above as that of Prosper (Harris, *u. s.*, p. 53). Behind these various texts Corssen concludes that there was a common Latin primitive, *i.e.*, the Cyprian text, as he calls it. Moreover, this Cyprian text is a Western witness superior in value

Acts xv. 20, 29. Hilgenfeld also adds to the Latin versions, Codex Vindobonensis s. (probably sixth century), *cf.* xxviii. 20, and see *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, iv. (H. J. White, Oxon., 1897).

even to the Greek of Codex Bezæ, since it has in Corssen's opinion an internal unity and sequence wanting in the latter, although it agrees in many peculiarities with the Greek of that Codex (Harris, *u. s.*, p. 53; Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 594). Corssen thus helps materially to prove the antiquity of the Western Latin.

But Dr. Blass further acknowledges that Corssen has done most valuable service in proving the composite nature of Codex D, and that in it we have not β in its purity, but in a state of frequent mixture and conflation with α. Whilst, however, Blass regards the β text as the older, Corssen regards α in that light, and β as revealing the character of a later revision (*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, pp. 433, 436, 446: 1896); in β he somewhat strangely maintains that we have the hand of a Montanist reviser at work (*cf.* Blass's strictures, *Evang. secundum Lucam*, p. xxiv. ff.), a theory formerly adopted by Professor Harris, but afterwards abandoned by him.

But how far do the variations between the two forms of text justify the hypothesis of Blass that both may be referred to one author, β as the primary, α as the secondary text?[1]

In the *apparatus criticus* of the following pages, in which the variations for the most part in the two texts are stated and examined, it cannot be claimed for a moment that any definite conclusion is reached, simply because the matter is one which may be said to call for suspension of judgment. Certainly there are many difficulties in the way of accepting the theory of Blass in its entirety. There are passages, *e.g.*, of which it may be said that the more detailed form is the original, which was afterwards shortened, while it may be maintained often with equal force that the shortened form may well have been the original; there are passages where a local knowledge or an exact knowledge of circumstances is shown, *e.g.*, xii. 10, xix. 9, xx. 15, xxi. 1, but such passages do not prove the priority of the β text, for if both α and β are referred to the same author, the same hand which omitted in a revision could also have added, although such instances may be cited for the originality of the β text in comparison with α (see notes *in loco* for each passage). To these may be added the famous addition in xi. 28 (see *in loco*), which Blass makes the starting-point for his inquiry, and to which Hilgenfeld, Zahn, Zöckler, Salmon, as against Harnack and B. Weiss, attach so much importance. There are again other passages in which it may be

[1] Blass still maintains, as against Corssen, that the language of the additions, and generally in the variants of β, is Lucan, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 113 ff., and *Evangelium secundum Lucam*, p. xxvii. ff.

maintained that if α is original we can understand the smoothness of β, but not *vice versâ*, and it must always be remembered that this love of paraphrase and simplification has been urged on high authority as a marked characteristic of the Western readings in general, *cf.* W. H., p. 122 ff., and B. Weiss, *Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 52, 105: 1897. There are, moreover, other passages in which Blass seems to assimilate α and β, although the witnesses would differentiate them, *cf.* v. 28, 34, xv. 33, or in which there is a manifest blunder, not only in D but in other Western witnesses, which Blass corrects by α, although such blunders really belong to the β text, *cf.* v. 31, xiii. 48, xv. 15. There are cases in which D affords weighty support to readings otherwise testified to only by B, *e.g.*, xix. 8, xxi. 25, or only by ℵ, *cf.* ii. 20 (Wendt).

But a careful consideration of the whole of the instances justifies the attachment of far greater importance to the Western text than formerly (*cf.*, *e.g.*, Holtzmann's review of Blass's edit. min. of Acts, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, p. 350, 1897, No. 13), and goes some way to break down the former prejudice against Codex Bezæ: not only is it allowed that one revising hand of the second century may be the main source of the most important readings, but that these readings may contain original elements, since they must be based upon a text which carries us back very near to the date of the composition of the book of Acts (Wendt, *u. s.*, p. 52; Bousset, *Theol. Rundschau*, p. 414, 1898). The same tendency to attach more importance to the Western text is observable in Professor Ramsay, for although he regards the most vivid additions of the Western text in Acts as for the most part nothing but a second-century commentary, and while he refuses to introduce xi. 27, 28, D, into his own text, yet he speaks of the high value of D in that it preserves with corruptions a second-century witness to the text, and he places the home of the revision on the line of intercourse between the Syrian Antioch and Ephesus, arguing from xi. 28 that the reviser was acquainted with Antioch (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 151; *St. Paul*, p. 27, and review of Professor Blass, *Expositor*, 1895, and *cf.* Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, pp. 131, 140).

On the other hand the most thorough advocates of Dr. Blass's theory support his view of the priority and originality of β by reference to three classes of passages: (1) those in which the later α has abbreviated the reading of β, *cf.* iii. 1, iv. 1, 3, 24, 32, vii. 29, ix. 5-8, x. 23, xi. 2, xiv. 1-20, xvi. 19, xvii. 12, 15, xxi. 39, xxii. 26; (2) those in which β contains exact and specific notices of time which are wanting in α, *cf.* xv. 30, xvi. 11, xvii. 19, xviii. 19, xix. 9,

xx. 18, xxvii. 1, etc.; (3) those in which exact information appears to characterise the references of β to places, circumstances, persons, *cf.*, in addition to passages of this character already noticed under (1), xi. 28, xii. 1, 10, xvi. 35, xviii. 18, 27, xix. 14, xx. 15, xxi. 16, xxiv. 27, xxviii. 16, 19 (see for these passages Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 134 ff., and notes in *apparatus criticus*, and in opposition to the view of Zöckler Mr. Page's detailed list of passages in D, all of which he regards as bearing traces of being subsequent corrections of the text by a second-rate hand, *Classical Review*, p. 319, July, 1897, and Blass's reply, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 123).[1]

If an examination of these passages, which vary considerably in value and importance, and the proofs of the existence of a second-century Latin text convince us that the readings in β are not to be hastily rejected as the glosses of a careless or blundering scribe, it cannot be said that we are in a position to account for the origin of the Western readings, or that a solution of the problem is yet attained. The hypothesis of Blass, tempting as it is, and simple as it is, wants verification, and the very simplicity which commends it to its supporters is often a sore stumbling-block to its acceptance, inasmuch as it does not seem to account for all the facts of the case. But at the present stage of the controversy it is of interest to note that the honoured name of Theodor Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 340, 1899, may be added to those who accept in the main Blass's position, amongst whom may be mentioned Nestle, Belser, Zöckler, Salmon.[2] Zahn makes some reservations, *e.g.*, with regard to xv. 29 (see *in*

[1] In 1891 Professor Harris regarded the readings of Codex D (see Blass, edit. min., p. xx.) as the result of their adaptation to the Latin version of a bilingual MS. which carries us back to the middle of the second century, a view which he has somewhat modified in 1894, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. viii., although still maintaining a certain amount of Latinisation. Schmiedel, *Enc. Bibl.*, i., 52, 1899, recently supports Harris, and maintains that the Greek of D rests partly on retranslation from the Latin. In his later book Dr. Harris examines the theory of Dr. Chase, that the peculiarities of Codex D are due to retranslation from an old Syriac version, pp. 14, 68, and maintains that whilst Dr. Chase's position is justified in so far that we possess evidence of an old Syriac text of Acts, yet his explanation of the Western variants as due to a Syriac glossator cannot be sustained, see also Zöckler, *u. s.*, p. 131, and Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D.

[2] Amongst the keenest attacks upon the theory may be noted that of B. Weiss in *Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte*, 1897; Page, *Classical Review*, July, 1897, and more recently, Harnack, see notes on xi. 28 and xv. 29; Schmiedel in *Enc. Bibl.*, 50-56, 1899. Wendt's examination of the question, *Apostelgeschichte* (1899), pp. 43-53, should also be carefully considered, whilst Blass has replied to the strictures of Harnack and Zahn in *Studien und Kritiken*, i., 1900.

loco, and Harnack, *Sitzungsberichte d. königl. Preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, xi., 1899), whilst he lays stress upon xi. 28, and maintains the genuine Lucan character of the words used, *e.g.*, ἀγαλλίασις, συστρέφειν.

Still more recently Hilgenfeld, *Acta Apostolorum*, 1899, has again, and more fully, expressed his conviction of the priority of the β text (although he differs from Blass and Zahn in not referring α and β to the same original author[1]), and he has reconstructed it much on the same lines as Blass, and somewhat more boldly. References to the text adopted by Hilgenfeld will be frequently found in the *apparatus criticus* (as also to his annotations which deal largely with the criticisms of B. Weiss in his *Codex D*). In his *Proleg.* Hilgenfeld divides the authorities for the Western text as against ℵABC into various groups: (1) Græco-Latin MSS.: Codex D and E; (2) Latin versions: Flor., Gig., Par., Wernig., Prov., as Blass calls them, see above on p. 42; (3) Oriental versions: especially the marginal readings of Thomas Harkel in the Philoxenian Syriac; also the Sahidic version; (4) the Fathers: especially Irenæus, Cyprian, Tertullian (with reference to Corssen's pamphlet, see above); (5) some readings even in the four great MSS. ℵABC. Hilgenfeld evidently attaches some weight (as Blass) to 137 (M), and to Codex Athous Lauræ, p. ix. (see Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 250; and further, *Studien und Kritiken*, i., 1900).

For *Literature* bearing on Acts see the valuable lists in Headlam, "Acts," Hastings' B.D., pp. 34, 35, and Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 1-4, 1899. The present writer would venture to add to the former: (1) *Commentaries:* Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, 1892; Knabenbauer, *Actus Apostolorum* (Paris, 1899), two learned and reverent works by Romanists, the latter dealing with the most recent phase of modern problems of text, chronology and sources; Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte* (Meyer-Wendt), 1899, with a full Introduction, pp. 1-60, discussing all recent problems, with constant reference in the text to Professor Ramsay's writings, and altogether indispensable for the study of Acts; Matthias, *Auslegung der Apostelgeschichte*, 1897, a compendium useful in some respects, based chiefly upon Wendt's earlier edition; Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, 2nd edit., 1894; to these constant reference is made. (2) *Introductions:* Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii.,

[1] "Blassio debemus alterum Actorum app. textum non ortum ex jam fere recepto, sed hinc ab ipso Actorum app. auctore postea breviante et emendante in chartam puram scriptum esse minime demonstravit, lima ita potitus est, ut etiam genuina et necessaria non pauca sublata sint," p. xiv.

1899; B. Weiss, *Einleitung*, 3rd edit., 1897; Jülicher, *Einleitung*, 1894; (3) *Special Treatises:* Hilgenfeld, *Acta Apostolorum*, Græce et Latine, 1899; J. Weiss, *Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte*, 1897; Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte*, 1887, a reverent and in many respects valuable treatment of the text and sources of St. Paul's addresses; Bishop Williams of Connecticut, *Studies in Acts*, 1888; Gilbert, *Student's Life of St. Paul*, 1899: with appendix on Churches of Galatia; Luckock, *Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke in the Acts*, 1897; (4) *Early Church History:* McGiffert, *Apostolic Age;* Hort, *Ecclesia;* Nösgen, *Geschichte d. Neut. Offenbarung*, ii., 1892; (5) *Monographs on Special Points:* E. H. Askwith, *Epistle to the Galatians*, 1899 (an enlargement of the Norrisian Prize Essay on *The Locality of the Churches of Galatia*); Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil*, 1897; Nestle, *Philologica Sacra* (*Bemerkungen über die Urgestalt der Evangelien und A.G.*), 1896, and his *Einführung in das Griechische N.T.*, 2nd edit., 1899, frequently referred to by Zahn and Dalman; Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, and *Præf.* to *Evangelium secundum Lucam*, 1897; Klostermann, *Probleme im Aposteltexte*, 1883, and *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, 1866; Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, pp. 140-158, *on the Linguistic Relations between St. Luke's Gospel and Acts;* Bousset, *Der Text des N.T.*, 1898 (*Theol. Rundschau*, p. 405 ff.); B. Weiss, *Der Codex D*, 1897, dealing with the hypothesis of Dr. Blass; Harnack, *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akad. der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, xi. and xvii., 1899; Curtius, "Paulus in Athen" (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., pp. 528-543, 1894); see also Ramsay, various articles of great value in Hastings' B.D., i., ii., "Ephesus," "Galatia," "Corinth," etc., and Schmiedel, "Acts," in *Enc. Bibl.*, 1899, which appeared too late for more than a few references here. For literature connected with special points, and the text and sources of Acts, see above, pp. 8, 22, 41, and for grammatical questions and syntax see references in commentary to Simcox, *Language of the N.T.;* Blass, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 1896; Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, 1893 and 1896; and to the numbers of Winer-Schmiedel, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*, now in course of publication.[1]

[1] In the preparation of the textual criticism my best thanks are due to the kind and valuable help of the Rev. Harold Smith, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, sometime Lecturer in King's College, London.

ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ[1] ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ.

I. 1. **ΤΟΝ** μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ὦ Θεόφιλε, ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ[2] Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, 2. ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας

[1] B and also the subscription of ℵ; so Lach., W.H., Wendt. D has **πραξις αποστολων.** ℵ merely **πραξεις**, so Tisch. **πραξεις των αποστολων** 31, 61; so Griesb., Meyer, whilst **των αγιων** before **αποστολων** is found in subscription of EGH. Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, v., 12, has **πραξεις των αποστ.** Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, v., 1, 2, has *Acta Apostolorum.* *Cf.* Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 13, 3, and also lat. title as in Clem. Alex., *Adumbr.*, 1 Pet., v., 13, *Actus Apostolorum;* sometimes simply *Acta* or *Actus;* see further Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., 334, 388 (1899).

[2] ὁ ℵAE, Orig. and Blass in **β**, so also Weiss. Omit. BD, W.H. (see Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 148).

CHAPTER I.—Ver. 1. **τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον**, a reference beyond all reasonable doubt to St. Luke's Gospel. Not merely the dedication of both writings to Theophilus, but their unity of language and style is regarded by critics of all schools as convincing proof of the identity of authorship of Acts and the third Gospel; see *Introd.* and Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 128 (1895). In the expression **πρῶτος λόγος** Ramsay finds an intimation from St. Luke's own hand that he contemplated a third book at least, otherwise we should have had **πρότερος λόγος**, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 23, 27, 28; see to the same effect Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., 371 (1899), Rendall, *Acts of the Apostles*, *in loco*, and *cf.* comment. on Acts xxviii. 31. So, too, *primus* is used in Latin not simply as former but as first in a series, Cicero, *De Invent.*, ii., 3. On the other hand, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 34, *Acta Apost.*, p. 16, and more recently *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 38, maintains that **πρῶτος** simply = **πρότερος** (so also Holtzmann and Felten). But Ramsay, whilst pointing out instances in which St. Luke apparently uses **πρῶτος** differently from this, p. 28 (*cf.* also Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 389), admits that we cannot attain to any absolute certainty in the passage before us, since no instance occurs of the use of **πρότερος** by St. Luke.—**λόγον**: frequently used by classical writers in the sense of a narrative or history contained in a book; see instances in Wetstein. The passage in Plato, *Phædo*, p. 61, B., is valuable not only for the marked contrast between **λόγος** and **μῦθος, ποιεῖν μύθους ἀλλ' οὐ λόγους**, but also for the use of **ποιεῖν** (Wendt). Amongst other instances of the phrase **ποιεῖν λόγον** *cf.* Galen, *De Usu Part.*, ii., **περὶ πρώτων τῶν δακτύλων ἐποιησάμην τὸν λόγον.** St. Chrysostom sees in the phrase a proof of the unassuming character of the author: St. Luke does not say "The former Gospel which I preached". For the anomalous **μέν**, "solitarium," without the following **δέ**, frequent in Luke, see Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 261, *cf.* Luke viii. 5, Acts iii. 21, xxviii. 22, etc., and several times in St. Paul. **μέν** occurs thus six times in the Acts without **οὖν**—on **μὲν οὖν** see ver. 6.—**ὦ Θεόφιλε**: the interjection used here simply in address, as common in Attic Greek, *cf.* xviii. 14, xxvii. 21, 1 Tim. vi. 11; without the epithet **κράτιστε**, as in Luke i. 3, and without **ὦ, Θεόφ.** alone would have seemed too bold, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 258. It has been suggested that the omission of the epithet **κράτιστε**, Luke i. 3, denotes that St. Luke's friendship had become less ceremonious, just as a similar change has been noted

ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, οὓς ἐξελέξατο, ἀνελήφθη.[1] 3. οἷς καὶ παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν

[1] **ανεληφθη** B³ and probably all cursives, but **-λημφθη** ℵAB*CDE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss (see Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 24, 55). **αχρι ης . . . ανεληφ.** Aug., Vig. read "in die quo Apostolos elegit per Spiritum Sanctum," omitting **ανεληφ.** altogether, and continuing with D, Lux., Syr. Harcl. mg., Sah. **και εκελευσεν κηρυσσειν το ευαγγελιον** (*et præcepit prædicare evangelium*). This reading of Aug. Blass adopts (so Corssen, *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta Apost.*, p. 18, and Graefe, *Stud. und Krit.*, p. 136 (1898)) and therefore refers the day mentioned to Luke vi. 12, the day of the choice of the Apostles. But Belser well points out that St. Luke's Gospel (quite apart from chaps. i. and ii.) does not begin with the choice of the Twelve, but with the public appearance of the Baptist and that of Jesus Himself, and with His public teaching. Nor is there anything said, as Blass himself admits, in St. Luke's account of the choice of the Twelve, vi. 12, as to any commission given to them at that time to preach the Gospel (although in his edition of St. Luke's Gospel Blass compares Mark iii. 14, but even then the expression used, **κηρυσσειν το ευαγγελιον**, cannot be called Lucan, see Weiss on Codex D, p. 53). Further, D contains **ανεληφθη**, after **ημερας**, apparently to simplify the structure; there is no Greek authority for its omission, and it is contained in Codex Parisinus (which in many respects approaches so closely to D), where we find it at the end of the verse: *assumptus est.* Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 132 ff., contends for the reading which he had previously adopted in **β**, and sees in it the original draft of Luke who in **α** "has encumbered the clause in order to bring in the Ascension without leaving out the choice of the Apostles" (p. 136).

in the dedication of Shakespeare's two poems to the Earl of Southampton; *cf.* also Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 360. The way in which the epithet **κράτιστε** is employed elsewhere in the book in addressing Roman officials, xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 25, has been thought to indicate that Theophilus held some high official post, or that he was at least of equestrian rank (Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, pp. 388, 389, and his inferences as to the date of Acts). Ramsay is of opinion that the name was given at baptism, and that it was used or known only among Christians, and he infers that this baptismal name is used in Acts because the book was probably written at a time when it was dangerous for a Roman of rank to be recognised as a Christian. But Theophilus was by no means uncommon as a Jewish name; *cf.* B. D.², i., p. 25, and also article "Theophilus," B. D.¹ (see also Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 19). The epithet **κράτιστος** was peculiarly appropriated to Romans holding high office, and actually became during the second century a technical title to denote equestrian rank; and from its use here Zahn maintains not only that Theophilus was a man of some social position, but that he was, when Luke wrote his gospel, not a nember of the Christian Church, since there is no instance in the first two centuries of a Christian addressing his fellow-Christians in a title corresponding as it were to "your Excellency" (*Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., 360, 383). The instance of the address of the *Epist. ad Diognetum*, **κράτιστε Διόγνητε**, is alleged by Blass as an instance that the epithet is not always used in the technical sense mentioned; but to this Ramsay replies that if Diognetus was the friend and teacher of Marcus Aurelius, the emperor might well raise his teacher to equestrian rank; Septimius Severus raised his sons' tutor to the high dignity of the consulship. Ramsay discusses **κράτιστος** at length in *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (1898), pp. 65, 71, 72, as against Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 19. Blass fully recognises that Theophilus held a high position, and that the title in question would naturally occur in a book dedicated to a patron; but it must be borne in mind that Blass regards Theophilus as of Greek extraction, possibly a fellow-citizen with Luke of Antioch, whilst Ramsay sees in him a citizen of Rome and a resident in the imperial city. Theophylact asks why Luke should have cared to write to one man only and to value him so highly, and makes answer that it was because the Evangelist was a guardian of the words spoken by the Lord: "It is not the will of my Father that one of these little ones should perish". There seems no great reason to doubt that Theophilus was a real personage, and the epithet **κράτιστε**, at all events in its

αὐτόν, ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις, δι᾿ ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα [1] ὀπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς, καὶ λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. 4. Καὶ συναλιζό-

[1] **τεσσαρακοντα,** so B³E 1, 13, Meyer; but **τεσσερακοντα** ℵAB*CD 61, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss. D omits **δια,** so Blass in **β.**

technical significance, is hardly consistent with any other supposition (see Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 319, note). The recent attempt to identify Theophilus with Seneca, referred to by Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 163, must be dismissed as equally groundless and fanciful as the former conjecture that he was no other than Philo.—**περὶ πάντων ὧν**: the use of **πᾶς** (mostly after a prep., as here) followed by an attracted relative may be classed amongst the mannerisms of St. Luke (Simcox, *Writers of the N. T.*, p. 24, where other instances are given); see also Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 1, 2.—**ὧν**: in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts the frequency of the attraction of the relative again specially characterises him amongst the N.T. writers, Friedrich, *u. s.*, pp. 36 and 100.—**ἤρξατο**: often regarded as simply pleonastic, but sometimes as emphatic, to intimate that the work which Jesus began on earth He continued in heaven, or that He began the work of the Gospel and committed its continuance to His followers; Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 366 ff. In Winer's view to regard **ἄρχεσθαι** as pleonastic is a mere subterfuge to avoid a difficulty, and he renders the passage "what Jesus began both to do and to teach, and *continued to do* until," etc. (see also Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*), treating it as an example of breviloquence (Winer-Moulton, lxvi., 1). On the whole it is perhaps best to consider the phrase **ἤρξ. ποιεῖν** with Bengel (*in loco*) as equivalent to *fecit ab initio*, although no doubt there is a sense in which, with every Christian for nineteen centuries, St. Luke would regard the *whole* earthly life of Jesus as a *beginning*, a prelude to the glory and mighty working to be revealed and perfected in the ascended Lord. The verb is of frequent use in St. Luke's writings (Friedrich, Zeller, Lekebusch), although in St. Mark's Gospel it is also constantly found. In the LXX it is often found like הֵחֵל hi., and also in Apocr. **ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν,** "Scilicet prius fecit, deinde docuit; prius docuit exemplo, deinde verbo. Unde prius non docuit, quod prius ipse non fecit" (Corn. à Lap.).

Ver. 2. **ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας.** In Matt. **ἄχρι** occurs once or twice, in Mark and John not at all, in Luke four times, and in Acts sixteen; whilst the commoner **μέχρι** is found only once in the Gospels and twice in the Acts (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 227, and on the use of the form **ἄχρι** or **ἄχρις** see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*). It is seldom used in the LXX, but in 2 Macc. xiv. it occurs twice, vv. 10 and 15; *cf.* also Symm., 2 Kings xxi. 16; Theod., Job xxxii. 11.—**διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου.** The older commentators, and Wendt, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Hilgenfeld, amongst moderns, connect the words with **ἐξελέξατο,** the reference to the choice of the Apostles through the Holy Ghost standing significantly at the opening of a book in which their endowment with the same divine power is so prominent. On the other hand, it is urged that there is no need to emphasise further the divine choice of the Apostles (*cf.* Luke vi. 13, and see below on ver. 25), but that it was important to show that the instructions to continue the work and teaching of Jesus were a divine commission (Weiss), and to emphasise from the commencement of the Acts that Jesus had given this commission to His Apostles through the same divine Spirit Whom they received shortly after His Ascension (Felten). Spitta (who refers i. 1-14 to his inferior source B), whilst he connects **διὰ πνεύμ. ἁγ.** with **ἐντειλάμενος,** curiously limits the latter to the command to the Apostles to assemble themselves on the Mount of Olives (so too Jüngst). For other connections of the words see Alford *in loco*.—**ἐξελέξατο,** always in N.T. **ἐκλέγομαι,** middle (except, perhaps, in Luke ix. 35, but see R.V. and W.H.). Another verb very frequent in LXX, used constantly of a divine choice: of God's choice of Israel, of Jacob, Aaron, David, the tribe of Judah, Zion, and Jerusalem. The verb is also found in the same sense in the middle voice in classical Greek.—**ἀνελήμφθη**: the verb is used of Elijah's translation to heaven in the LXX, 2 Kings ii. 9-11, also in Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 9 and 1 Macc. ii. 58, and perhaps of Enoch in Ecclesiasticus xlix. 14 (A, **μετετέθη**). In addition to the present passage (*cf.* vv. 11, 12) it is also used in Mark xvi. 9 and 1 Tim. iii. 16 (where it probably forms part of an early Christian Hymn or confession of faith)

μενος[1] παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός, ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου[2]· 5. ὅτι

[1] **συναλιζομενος**, some good cursives **συναυλιζομενος**. Aug. prefixes **ως** to **συναλ.**; so **β** (see also Belser). D reads **συναλισκομενος** (-**σγομ.** D²). D, Gig., Par.¹, Sah. add **μετ' αυτων**, perhaps explanatory addition, Syriac (Chase), or Latin, to bring out force of **συν.** retained by Blass in **β**. R.V. omits **μετ' αυτων**; so W.H., Wendt, and Weiss.

[2] **ην ηκουσατε μου**; in place of this, D, Par.², Vulg. (Clem.), Hil., Aug. read **ην ηκουσατε φησιν δια του στοματος μου**, so Blass in **β** and Hilgenfeld (see also Belser), may be mere amplification of **μου** in T.R., possibly assimilated to xv. 7 (Chase). Harris ascribes it to a Montanist. **ηκουσα** in D¹.

of our Lord's Ascension; *cf.* also *Gospel of Peter*, 19, in a doubtfully orthodox sense. It is to be noted that the word is here used absolutely, as of an event with which the Apostolic Church was already familiar. On the cognate noun **ἀνάληψις**, used only by St. Luke in N.T., and absolutely, with reference to the same event, in his Gospel, ix. 51, see *Psalms of Solomon*, iv., 20, ed. Ryle and James, p. 49. In the latter passage the word is apparently used for the first time in extant Greek literature, but its meaning is very different from its later technical use with reference to the Assumption of the Blessed; see instances, p. 49, *ubi supra*. St. Irenæus, i., 10, 1, whilst using the noun of our Lord's Ascension, is careful to say **τὴν ἔνσαρκον εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνάληψιν**; see especially Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, pp. 70-72, and below on verse 11.

Ver. 3. **οἷς καὶ παρέστησεν**, "he also showed himself," R.V., but margin "presented himself" (*cf.* ix. 41), *praebuit se*, Vulg. In ix. 41 *monstravit*, h. l. magis *demonstravit* (Blass). The verb is used thirteen times in Acts (once in a quotation, iv. 26), both transitively and intransitively. St. Luke in his Gospel uses it three times, and as in Acts both transitively and intransitively. In this he is alone amongst the Evangelists. In the Epistles it is found only in St. Paul, and for the most part in a transitive sense.—**μετὰ τὸ παθεῖν**, "after his passion," so in A. and R.V.; *post passionem suam*, Vulg.; "too sacred a word to be expunged from this the only place where it occurs in the Bible," Humphry, *Commentary on R.V.; cf.* iii. 18, xvii. 3, xxvi. 23.—**ἐν πολλοῖς τεκμηρίοις** — **τεκμήριον** only here in N.T. — twice in Wisdom v. 11, xix. 13, and 3 Macc. iii. 24. The A.V. followed the Genevan Version by inserting the word "infallible" (although the latter still retained "tokens" instead of "proofs"). But R.V. simply "proofs" expresses the technical use of the word **τεκμήριον**, convincing, certain evidence. Although in a familiar passage, Wisdom v. 11, **τεκμήριον** and **σημεῖον** are used as practically synonymous, yet there is no doubt that they were technically distinguished, *e.g.*, Arist., *Rhet.*, i., 2, **τῶν σημείων τὸ μὲν ἀναγκαῖον τεκμ.** This technical distinction, it may be observed, was strictly maintained by medical men, although St. Luke may no doubt have met the word elsewhere. Thus it is used by Josephus several times, as Krenkel mentions, but he does not mention that it is also used by Thucydides, ii., 39, to say nothing of other classical writers. Galen writes **τὸ μὲν ἐκ τηρήσεως σημεῖον τὸ δὲ ἐξ ἐνδείξεως τεκμήριον**, and the context states that rhetoricians as well as physicians had examined the distinction; Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 184. The word also occurs in the Proem of Dioscorides to his *De Materia Medica*, p. 3, which Vogel and Meyer-Weiss hold that Luke imitated in the Prologue to his Gospel (but see Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 384).—**δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα.** St. Chrysostom comments **οὐ γὰρ εἶπε τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, ἀλλὰ δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα· ἐφίστατο γὰρ καὶ ἀφίστατο πάλιν.** To this interpretation of the genitive with **διά** Blass refers, and endorses it, *Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, p. 129, following the Scholiast. The meaning, if this interpretation is adopted, would therefore be that our Lord did not remain with His disciples continuously (**οὐ διηνεκῶς**, Schol.) as before, but that He appeared to them from time to time; *non perpetuo, sed per intervalla*, Bengel. But *cf.* also Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 140. Men have seen in this period of forty days, mentioned only by St. Luke in N.T., what we may reverently call a symbolical fitness. But in a certain sense the remark of Blass seems justified: *Parum ad rem est quod idem* (*numerus*)

Ἰωάννης[1] μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ, οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας.[2] 6. Οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθόντες

[1] Ιωαννης; in D almost throughout Ιωανης, see W.H., *Notes on Orthography*, p. 166, on authority of B and D. Nestle (*Expository Times*, Nov., 1897, p. 93) points out that in D νν prevails in Matt., Mk., John (νν 66, ν 7), while in Luke and Acts the reverse is the case (νν 3, ν 48); but see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 57.

[2] After ημερας D, Sah. insert εως της πεντηκοστης. Blass sees in the addition an intimate knowledge of the facts (see also Belser); *cf.* ii. 1, but *cf.* on the other hand Weiss on Codex D, p. 54.

alias quoque occurrit. The parallels in the histories of Moses and Elijah to which Holtzmann and Spitta refer are really no parallels at all, and if it be true to say that there was nothing in contemporary Jewish ideas to suggest our Lord's Resurrection *as it is represented as taking place*, it is equally true to maintain that there was nothing to suggest the after sojourn of the forty days on earth as it is represented as taking place; see Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 624.—**ὀπτανόμενος**: if we could call this a frequentative verb with some scholars, it would in itself give the meaning "appearing from time to time," but it is rather a late Hellenistic present, formed from some parts of **ὁρᾶν**; Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 57, 181. But it certainly does not mean that our Lord's appearances were merely visionary. The verb is found only here in N.T., but also in LXX 1 Kings viii. 8 and in Tobit xii. 19 (not in S.). In these two passages the word cannot fairly be pressed into the service of visionary appearances. In 1 Kings the reference is to the staves of the ark which were so long that the ends were seen from the holy place before the oracle, but they were not seen from without, *i.e.*, from the porch or vestibule. In Tobit it is not the appearance of the angel which is represented as visionary, quite the contrary; but his eating and drinking are represented as being only in appearance. But even if the word could be pressed into the meaning suggested, St. Luke's view of our Lord's appearances must be judged not by one expression but by his whole conception, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 39-43 and Acts x. 41. That he could distinguish between visions and realities we cannot doubt; see note below on xii. 12.—**τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θ.**: "speaking the things concerning," R.V., not "speaking of the things," A.V., but speaking the very things, whether truths to be believed, or commands to be obeyed (Humphry, *Commentary on R.V.*). On St. Luke's fondness for **τὰ περί τινος** in his writings see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 10 and 89 (so also Zeller and Lekebusch). The exact phrase is only found in *Acts*, where it occurs twice (in T.R. three times); *cf.* xix. 8 (viii. 12), and see also xx. 25 and xxviii. (23), 31. The expression **ἡ βασ. τοῦ θ.**, instead of **τῶν οὐρανῶν** of the Hebrew Evangelist St. Matthew, is characteristic of St. Luke's writings, although it is found frequently in St. Mark and once in St. John. In St. Luke's Gospel it occurs more than thirty times, and six times in Acts (only four times in St. Matt.). Possibly the phrase was used by St Luke as one more easily understood by Gentile readers, but the two terms **ἡ βασ. τοῦ θ.** and **τῶν οὐρ.** were practically synonymous in the Gospels and in Judaism in the time of our Lord (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 171; E. T. and Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (second edit.), p. 67; Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i., 267; and Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 76 ff.). Dr. Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 226, draws attention to the important fact that the preaching of the original Apostles after the Ascension is not described as that of the preaching of the kingdom of God, but that the phrase is only used of the preaching of St. Paul, and of St. Philip the associate of St. Stephen. But in view of the fact that the original Apostles heard during the Forty Days from their Master's lips **τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ**, we cannot doubt that in deed and in word they would proclaim that kingdom. On the question as to whether they conceived of the kingdom as present, or future, or both, see Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus*, i., 409, E. T., and *Witness of the Epistles* (Longmans), p. 309 ff., and on the conception of the kingdom of God in the Theology of A. Ritschl and his school see Orr, *Ritschlian Theology*, p. 258 ff. For the relation of the Church and the Kingdom see also Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 28, 36 ff., "Church," Hastings, B.D., p. 425; Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 5 ff.

ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Κύριε, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ; 7. εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, Οὐχ ὑμῶν

Ver. 4. **συναλιζόμενος**: a strong array of modern commentators renders "eating with them," following the Vulgate *convescens illis* (so both A. and R.V. in margin, and Wycl. and Rhem.). It is thus rendered by Overbeck (as against De Wette), Wendt, Holtzmann, Felten, Weiss, Matthias, Knabenbauer, and Blass, who adopts the reading **ὡς συναλ.**, and regards the particle as showing that the recapitulation is continued of the events already mentioned in Luke xxiv. 42 ff. It is evidently taken in the same sense by Spitta, Feine, Jüngst. If we so translate it, we must derive it from **ἅλς** (salt), so Schol. **κοινωνῶν ἁλῶν, τραπέζης**, in the sense given to the expression by Chrys., Theophyl., Œcum. In Ps. cxl. 4 LXX, to which Wendt refers, **μὴ συνδυάσω** (although the reading is somewhat doubtful—the word is used by Symmachus, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19) is also rendered **συναλισθῶ** (Alius) as an equivalent of the Hebrew אֶלְחַם, **μὴ συμφάγοιμι**, Symmachus. Blass gives no classical references, but points out that the word undoubtedly exists in the sense referred to in *Clem. Hom.*, xiii., 4 (but see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*). Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 74 (1894)) contends that the use of the word in the psalm quoted and in the passage from the Clementines refers not to the use of salt at an ordinary meal, but rather to the sacrificial and symbolical use of salt in the Old and New Testaments. Thus in the passage *Clem. Hom.*, xiii., 4, **τότε αὐτοῖς συναλιζόμεθα, τότε** means "after the Baptism"; *cf.* also Ignatius, *ad Magnes.*, x., **ἁλίσθητε εν αὐτῷ**, "be ye salted in him". Wendt takes the word quite generally as meaning that the sharing in a common meal with His disciples, as on the evening of the Resurrection, was the habitual practice of the Lord during the Forty Days; *cf.* Acts x. 41 and Luke xxiv. 36 ff. Feine similarly holds that the word presupposes some such incidents as those mentioned in Luke xxiv., and that Luke had derived his information from a source which described the final instructions to the disciples as given at a common meal. On the other hand it must be borne in mind that in classical Greek, as in Herodotus and Xenophon (Wetstein) (as also in Josephus, *B. J.*, iii., 9, 4), **συναλίζω** = to assemble, *cf.* Hesychius, **συναλιζ. = συναλισθείς, συναχθείς, συναθροισθείς**, and it is possible that the preceding present participles in the immediate context may help to account for the use of the same participle instead of the aorist **συναλισθείς**. The verb is then derived from **σύν** and **ἀλής** (ᾱ), meaning lit., close, crowded together. Mr. Rendall (*Acts of the Apostles*, p. 32) would derive it from **Ἁλίη (-α)**, a common term for a popular assembly amongst Ionian and Dorian Greeks, and he supposes that the verb here implies a general gathering of believers not limited to the Twelve; but the context apparently points back to Luke xxiv. 49 to a command which was certainly given only to the Twelve.—**παρήγγειλεν**, "he charged them," R.V., which not only distinguishes it from other verbs rendered "to command," but also gives the emphatic meaning which St. Luke often attaches to the word. It is characteristic of his writings, occurring four times in his Gospel and ten or eleven times in Acts, and it is very frequent in St. Paul's Epistles (Friedrich, Lekebusch).—**Ἱεροσολύμων**: a neuter plural (but *cf.* Matt. ii. 3 and Grimm *sub v.*). St. Luke most frequently uses the Jewish form **Ἱερουσαλήμ**—twenty-seven times in his Gospel, about forty in Acts—as against the use of **Ἱεροσόλυμα** four times in his Gospel and over twenty in Acts (Friedrich, Lekebusch). Blass retains the aspirate for the Greek form but not for the Jewish, *cf. in loco* and *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 17, 31, but it is very doubtful whether either should have the aspirate; W.H., ii., 313; Plummer's *St. Luke*, p. 64; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93. Grimm points out that the Hebrew form is used in the N.T.: "ubi in ipso nomine tanquam sancta vis quædam reponitur ut, Gal. iv. 25; ita in compellationibus, Matt. xxiii. 37, Luke xiii. 34;" see further *sub v.* **Ἱεροσόλυμα.**—**μὴ χωρίζ.**: it was fitting that they should not depart from Jerusalem, not only that the new law as the old should go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, Isa. ii. 3 (Felten), but that the Apostles' testimony should be delivered not to men unacquainted with the facts, but to the inhabitants of the city where Jesus had been crucified and buried. **Εἰ δὲ εὐθὺς ἐχωρίσθησαν Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ τούτων οὐδὲν ἐπηκολούθησεν, ὕποπτος ἂν ἡ ἀνάστασις ὑπῆρξεν**, Œcumenius, *in loco*; see also Theophyl.—**περιμένειν**: not else-

ἐστι γνῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς οὓς ὁ Πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ· 8. ἀλλὰ λήψεσθε δύναμιν, ἐπελθόντος τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς,

where in N.T. (but see x. 24, D), but used in classical Greek of awaiting a thing's happening (Dem.). The passage in LXX in which it occurs is suggestive: τὴν σωτηρίαν περιμένων κυρίου, Gen. xlix. 18 (*cf.* Wisd. viii. 12). On the tradition that the Apostles remained in Jerusalem for twelve years in obedience to a command of the Lord, and the evidence for it, see Harnack, *Chronologie*, i., p. 243 ff. Harnack speaks of the tradition as very old and well attested, and maintains that it is quite in accordance with Acts, as the earlier journeys of the Apostles are there described as missionary excursions from which they always returned to Jerusalem.—τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν: Bengel notes the distinction between ὑπισχνέομαι and ἐπαγγέλλομαι, the former being used of promises in response to petitions, the latter of voluntary offers (Ammonius): "quæ verbi Græci proprietas, ubi de divinis promissionibus agitur, exquisite observanda est". It is therefore remarkable that in the Gospels the word ἐπαγγελία is never used in this technical sense of the divine promise made by God until Luke xxiv. 49, where it is used of the promise of the Holy Spirit, as here. But in Acts and in St. Paul's Epistles and in the Hebrews the word is frequent, and always of the promises made by God (except Acts xxiii. 21). See Sanday and Headlam on *Romans* i. 2, and Lightfoot on *Gal.* iii. 14, and *Psalms of Solomon*, xii., 8 (*cf.* vii., 9, and xvii., 6), ed. Ryle and James, p. 106. "The promise of the Father," *cf.* Luke xxiv. 49, is fulfilled in the baptism with the Holy Ghost, and although no doubt earlier promises of the gift of the Spirit may be included, *cf.* Luke xii. 11, as also the promise of the Spirit's outpouring in Messianic times (*cf.* Joel ii. 28, Isaiah xliv. 3, Ezek. xxxvi. 26), yet the phraseology may be fairly said to present an undesigned coincidence with the more recent language of the Lord to the Twelve, John xiv. 16, xv. 26, xvi. 14. On the many points of connection between the opening verses of Acts and the closing verses of St. Luke's Gospel see below.

Ver. 5. ἐν πνεύματι: the omission of ἐν before ὕδατι and its insertion before πνεύμ. may be meant to draw a distinction between the baptism with water and the baptism *in* the Spirit (R.V. margin "in"). But in Matt. iii. 11 we have the preposition ἐν in both parts of the verse; *cf.* John i. 31. On ἐν with the instrumental dative see Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 114, and Grotius, *in loco; cf.* the Hebrew בְּ.—οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας: not after many, *i.e.*, after few. This use of οὐ with an adjective or adverb is characteristic of St. Luke, *cf.* Luke xv. 13, Acts xxvii. 14, in which places οὐ πολύς = ὀλίγος as here; *cf.* οὐ μετρίως, Acts xx. 12; οὐ μακράν, Luke vii. 6, Acts xvii. 27; οὐκ ἄσημος, Acts xxi. 39; οὐχ ὁ τυχών, Acts xix. 11, xxviii. 2, *cf.* Hawkins, *Horæ Syn.*, p. 153. No doubt μετ᾽ οὐ would be more correct, but the negative is found both before and after the preposition, so in Luke xv. 13; *cf.* Josephus, *Ant.*, i., 12, and xiii., 7, 1, for similar changes of allocation in the same words. ταύτας closely connects the days referred to with the current day; *cf.* also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 221. οὐ μετὰ πολλάς, φησὶν ἵνα μὴ εἰς ἀθυμίαν ἐμπέσωσιν· ὡρισμένως δὲ πότε, οὐκ εἶπεν, ἵνα ἀεὶ ἐκγρηγορῶσιν ἐκδεχόμενοι, Theophylact, *in loco*.

Ver. 6. οἱ μὲν οὖν: the combination μὲν οὖν is very frequent in Acts in all parts, occurring no less than twenty-seven times; *cf.* Luke iii. 18. Like the simple μέν it is sometimes used without δέ in the apodosis. Here, if δέ is omitted in ver. 7 after εἶπεν, there is still a contrast between the question of the Apostles and the answer of Jesus. See especially Rendall, *Acts of the Apostles*, Appendix on μὲν οὖν, p. 160 ff.; *cf.* Weiss *in loco*.—συνελθόντες: the question has often been raised as to whether this word and μὲν οὖν refer back to ver. 4, or whether a later meeting of the disciples is here introduced. For the former Hilgenfeld contends (as against Weiss) and sees no reference to any fresh meeting: the disciples referred to in the αὐτοῖς of ver. 4 and the ὑμεῖς of ver. 5 had already come together. According to Holtzmann there is a reference in the words to a common meal of the Lord with His disciples already mentioned in ver. 4, and after this final meal the question of ver. 6 is asked on the way to Bethany (Luke xxiv. 50). The words οἱ μὲν οὖν συνελθ. are referred by Felten to the final meeting which formed the conclusion of the constant intercourse of ver. 3, a meeting thus specially emphasised, although in reality only one out of many, and the question which follows in ver. 6 was asked, as Felten also supposes

καὶ ἔσεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες ἔν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ[1] καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. 9. Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπών,

[1] **Σαμαρειᾳ**, but ℵADE **Σαμαριᾳ** (but Blass in **β**, **-ειᾳ**); so Tisch., W.H. although **-εια** is given as alternative; see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 45.

(see too Rendall on vv. 7 and 8), on the way to Bethany. But there is no need to suppose that this was the case (as Jüngst so far correctly objects against Holtzmann), and whilst we may take **συνελθ.** as referring to the final meeting before the Ascension, we may place that meeting not in Jerusalem but on the Mount of Olives. Blass sees in the word **συνελθ.** an assembly of all the Apostles, *cf.* ver. 13 and 1 Cor. xv. 7, and adds: "Aliunde supplendus locus ubi hoc factum, ver. 12, Luke xxiv. 50".—**ἐπηρώτων**: imperfect, denoting that the act of questioning is always imperfect until an answer is given (Blass, *cf.* iii. 3), and here perhaps indicating that the same question was put by one inquirer after another (see on the force of the tense, as noted here and elsewhere by Blass, *Hermathena*, xxi., pp. 228, 229).—**εἰ**: this use of **εἰ** in direct questions is frequent in Luke, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 254; *cf.* vii. 1, xix. 2 (in Vulgate *si*); it is adopted in the LXX, and a parallel may also be found in the interrogative הֲ in Hebrew (so Blass and Viteau).—**ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ**: such a promise as that made in ver. 5, the fulfilment of which, according to Joel ii. 28, would mark the salvation of Messianic times, might lead the disciples to ask about the restoration of the kingdom to Israel which the same prophet had foretold, to be realised by the annihilation of the enemies of God and victory and happiness for the good. As in the days of old the yoke of Pharaoh had been broken and Israel redeemed from captivity, so would the Messiah accomplish the final redemption, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 21, and set up again, after the destruction of the world-powers, the kingdom in Jerusalem; Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 360, 361 (1897). No doubt the thoughts of the disciples still moved within the narrow circle of Jewish national hopes: "totidem in hac interrogatione sunt errores quot verba," writes Calvin. But still we must remember that with these thoughts of the redemption of Israel there mingled higher thoughts of the need of repentance and righteousness for the Messianic kingdom (*Psalms of Solomon*, xvii., xviii.; ed. Ryle and James, p. lvii.), and that the disciples may well have shared, even if imperfectly, in the hopes of a Zacharias or a Simeon. Dr. Edersheim notes "with what wonderful sobriety" the disciples put this question to our Lord (*ubi supra*, i., p. 79); at the same time the question before us is plainly too primitive in character to have been invented by a later generation (McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 41).—**ἀποκαθιστάνεις**: **ἀποκαθιστάνω**, a form of **ἀποκαθίστημι** which is found in classical Greek and is used of the restoration of dominion as here in 1 Macc. xv. 3; see also below on iii. 21 and Malachi LXX iv. 5. On the form of the verb see W.H., ii., 162, and on its force see further Dalman, *u. s.*, p. 109. "Dost thou at this time restore . . . ?" R.V.; the present tense marking their expectation that the kingdom, as they conceived it, would immediately appear—an expectation enhanced by the promise of the previous verse, in which they saw the foretaste of the Messianic kingdom.

Ver. 7. **χρόνους ἢ καιρούς**: Blass regards the two as synonymous, and no doubt it is difficult always to maintain a distinction. But here **χρόνους** may well be taken to mean space of time as such, the duration of the Church's history, and **καιρούς** the critical periods in that history: **ὁ μὲν καιρὸς δηλοῖ ποιότητα χρόνου, χρόνος δὲ ποσότητα** (Ammonius). A good instance of the distinction may be found in LXX Neh. x. 34: **εἰς καιροὺς ἀπὸ χρόνων**, "at times appointed"; *cf.* 1 Thes. v. 1. So here Weiss renders: „zu kennen Zeiten und geeignete Zeitpunkte". In modern Greek, whilst **καιρός** means *weather*, **χρόνος** means *year*, so that "in both words the kernel of meaning has remained unaltered; this in the case of **καιρούς** is changeableness, of **χρόνων** duration" (Curtius, *Etym.*, p. 110 *sq.*); *cf.* also Trench, *N. T. Synonyms*, ii., p. 27 ff.; Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 153; and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* **καιρός**. —**ἐξουσία**, *authority*, R.V.—either as delegated or unrestrained, the liberty of doing as one pleases (**ἔξεστι**); **δύναμις**, *power*, natural ability, inherent power, residing in a thing by virtue of its nature, *or*, which a person or thing exerts or puts forth—so **δύναμις** is ascribed to Christ, now in one sense, now in another, so also

βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη, καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.[1] 10. καὶ ὡς ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν,

[1] For T.R. **και ταυτα . . . οφθ. αυτων** D, Sah., Aug., with var. **και ταυτα ειποντος αυτου νεφ. υπελ. αυτον και απηρθη απ' αυτων.** Chase explains from Syriac, but **και απηρ. κ.τ.λ.** may be an assimilation to Matt. ix. 15. Omission of **βλεπ. αυτων** and **απο των οφθαλ.** in Western texts curious; may to some extent support Blass's view or may have been intentional omissions. Vulg. and Flor. retain both omissions. Weiss regards the whole in D as secondary; Hilgenfeld follows D.

to the Holy Spirit as in ver. 8; *cf.* x. 38, Luke iv. 14, Rom. xv. 13; Bengel, Luke iv. 36, and Grimm-Thayer, *Synonyms. Sub v.* **δύναμις**.

Ver. 8. **ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες,** "my witnesses," R.V., reading **μου** instead of **μοι,** not only witnesses to the facts of their Lord's life, *cf.* i. 22, x. 39, but also *His* witnesses, His by a direct personal relationship; Luke xxiv. 48 simply speaks of a testimony to the facts.—**ἔν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ κ.τ.λ.**: St. Luke on other occasions, as here, distinguishes Jerusalem as a district separate from all the rest of Judæa (*cf.* Luke v. 17, Acts x. 39), a proof of intimate acquaintance with the Rabbinical phraseology of the time, according to Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, pp. 17, 73. In this verse, see *Introduction*, the keynote is struck of the contents of the whole book, and the great divisions of the Acts are marked, see, *e.g.*, Blass, p. 12 in *Prologue* to Acts—Jerusalem, i.-vii.; Judæa, ix., 32; xii., 19; Samaria, viii.; and if it appears somewhat strained to see in St. Paul's preaching in Rome a witness to "the utmost parts of the earth," it is noteworthy that in *Psalms of Solomon*, viii., 16, we read of Pompey that he came **ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς,** *i.e.*, Rome—the same phrase as in Acts i. 8. This verse affords a good illustration of the subjective element which characterises the partition theories of Spitta, Jüngst, Clemen and others. Spitta would omit the whole verse from his sources A and B, and considers it as an interpolation by the author of Acts; but, as Hilgenfeld points out, the verse is entirely in its place, and it forms the best answer to the "particularism" of the disciples, from which their question in ver. 6 shows that they were not yet free. Feine would omit the words **ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς** because nothing in the conduct of the early Church, as it is described to us in the Jewish-Christian source, Acts i.-xii., points to any knowledge of such a commission from the Risen Christ. Jüngst disagrees with both Spitta and Feine, and thinks that the hand of the redactor is visible in prominence given to the little Samaria.

Ver. 9. **ἐπήρθη**: the word in ver. 2 is different, and **ἐπήρθη** seems not merely to denote our Lord's first leaving the ground (as Weiss, Overbeck), but also to be more in accordance with the calm and grandeur of the event than **ἀπήρθη**; this latter word would rather denote a taking away by violence.—**καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβε**: the cloud is here, as elsewhere, the symbol of the divine glory, and it was also as St. Chrysostom called it: **τὸ ὄχημα τὸ βασιλικόν**; *cf.* Ps. civ. 3. In 1 Tim. iii. 16 we read that our Lord was received up **ἐν δόξῃ,** "in glory," R.V.

Ver. 10. **ἀτενίζοντες ἦσαν**: this periphrasis of **ἦν** or **ἦσαν** with a present or perfect participle is very frequently found in St. Luke's writings (Friedrich, pp. 12 and 89, and compare the list in Simcox, *u. s.*, pp. 130-134). The verb is peculiar to St. Luke and St. Paul, and is found ten times in Acts, twice in St. Luke's Gospel, and twice in 2 Cor.; it denotes a fixed, steadfast, protracted gaze: "and while they were looking steadfastly into heaven as he went," R.V., thus expressing more clearly the longing gaze of the disciples watching the Lord as He was going (**πορευομένου αὐτοῦ,** the present participle denoting that the cloud was still visible for a considerable time), as if carrying their eyes and hearts with Him to heaven: "Ipse enim est amor noster; ubi autem amor, ibi est oculus et cor" (Corn. à Lapide). The word is also found in LXX 1 Esdr. vi. 28 and 3 Macc. ii. 26 (*cf.* Aquila, Job vii. 8), and also in Josephus, *B. J.*, v., 12, 3, and Polybius. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, 38, 39, gives a most valuable account of the use of the word in St. Luke, and concludes that the action implied by it is quite inconsistent with weakness of vision, and that the theory which makes Paul a permanent sufferer in the eyes, as if he could not distinctly see the persons near him, is hopelessly at variance with St. Luke; *cf.* too the meaning of the word as used by St. Paul himself in 2 Cor. iii. 7, 13, where not weak but strong sight is implied in the word. The verb thus common in St. Luke is frequently employed by medical writers

πορευομένου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν[1] αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ,[2] 11. οἳ καὶ εἶπον, Ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι, τί ἑστήκατε ἐμβλέποντες εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀναληφθεὶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, οὕτως ἐλεύσεται, ὃν τρόπον ἐθεάσασθε αὐτὸν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. 12. τότε ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ

[1] παρειστηκεισαν; W.H. read παριστ., but see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 100.

[2] εσθητι λευκη C³DE Syr. Harcl., Aeth., Orig.-int., Chrys., so Hilgenfeld; but in R.V. εσθησεσι λευκαις ℵABC and good cursives, Vulg., Syr. Pesh.. Arm., Sah. Boh., Tisch., W.H., Weiss; so also Blass in β.

to denote a peculiar fixed look (Zahn); so in Luke xxii. 56, where it is used for the servant-maid's earnest gaze at St. Peter, a gaze not mentioned at all by St. Matthew, and expressed by a different word in St. Mark xiv. 67; Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 76. In LXX, as above, it is employed in a secondary sense, but by Aquila, *u. s.*, in its primary meaning of gazing, beholding. —**καὶ ἰδοὺ**: **καὶ** at the commencement of the apodosis is explained as Hebraistic, but instances are not wanting in classical Greek; *cf.* Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 257, and see also Simcox, *ubi supra*, p. 160 ff. For the formula **καὶ ἰδοὺ** *cf.* the Hebrew וְהִנֵּה, and on St. Luke's employment of it in sudden interpositions, see Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 179. The use of **καί** (which in the most Hebraic books of the N.T. is employed much more extensively than in classical Greek) is most frequent in Luke, who also uses more frequently than other writers the formula **καὶ ἰδού** to introduce an apodosis; *cf.* Friedrich, *ubi supra*, p. 33.—**παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῖς**: in the appearance of angels which St. Luke often narrates there is a striking similarity between the phraseology of his Gospel and the Acts; *cf.* with the present passage Acts x. 30, xii. 7, and Luke xxiv. 4, ii. 9. The description in the angels' disappearances is not so similar, *cf.* Acts x. 7 and Luke ii. 15, but it must be remembered that there is only one other passage in which the departure of the angels is mentioned, Rev. xvi. 2; Friedrich, *ubi supra*, pp. 45, 52, and Zeller, Acts ii., p. 224 (E. T.). For the verb *cf.* Luke i. 19, xix. 24, Acts xxiii. 2, 4, and especially xxvii. 23.—**ἐν ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ**: in R.V. in the plural, see critical notes and also Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 90.

Ver. 11. **ἄνδρες Γαλ.**: the **ἄνδρες** in similar expressions is often indicative of respect as in classical Greek, but as addressed by angels to men it may denote the earnestness of the address (Nösgen). St. Chrysostom saw in the salutation a wish to gain the confidence of the disciples: "Else, why needed they to be told of their country who knew it well enough?" Calvin also rejects the notion that the angels meant to blame the slowness and dulness of apprehension of Galilæans. At the same time the word **Γαλ.** seems to remind us that things which are despised (John vii. 52) hath God chosen. *Ex Galilæa nunquam vel certe raro fuerat propheta; at omnes Apostoli* (Bengel); see also below.—**οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς**: if the mention of their northern home had reminded the disciples of their early choice by Christ and of all that He had been to them, the personal name Jesus would assure them that their master would still be a human Friend and divine Saviour; *Hic Jesus: qui vobis fuit eritque semper Jesus, id est, Salvator* (Corn. à Lap.). —**πορευόμενον**: on the frequency of the verb in St. Luke as compared with other N.T. writers, often used to give effect and vividness to the scene, both Friedrich and Zeller remark; St. Peter uses the same word of our Lord's Ascension, 1 Peter iii. 22. As at the Birth of Christ, so too at His Ascension the angels' message was received obediently and joyfully, for only thus can we explain Luke xxiv. 52.

Ver. 12. **τότε**: frequent in Acts and in St. Luke's Gospel, but most frequent in St. Matthew; on its use see Grimm-Thayer, and Blass, *Gramm. des N. G.*, p. 270.—**ὑπέστρεψαν**: a word characteristic of Luke both in his Gospel and in Acts, occurring in the former over twenty times, in the latter ten or eleven times. Only in three places elsewhere, not at all in the Gospels, but see Mark xiv. 40 (Moulton and Geden, *sub v.*); Friedrich, *ubi supra*, p. 8. On the Ascension see additional note at end of chapter.—**τοῦ καλ. Ἐλαιῶνος**: *ubi captus et vinctus fuerat.* Wetstein. Although

ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος, ὅ ἐστιν ἐγγὺς Ἱερουσαλήμ, σαββάτου ἔχον ὁδόν.

13. Καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθον, ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον οὗ ἦσαν καταμένοντες, ὅ τε Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης[1] καὶ Ἀνδρέας, Φίλιππος

[1] Ιακωβος και Ιωαννης, so E, Syr. Harcl., Arm. Zoh., Chrys., Theodrt.; but in inverse order in ℵABCD 61, Vulg. and good versions, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt. Weiss.

St. Matthew and St. Mark both speak of the Mount of Olives they do not say τοῦ καλ. (neither is the formula found in John viii. 1). It is therefore probable that St. Luke speaks as he does as one who was a stranger to Jerusalem, or, as writing to one who was so. Blass, *ubi supra*, pp. 32, 84, contends that Ἐλαιῶνος ought to give place to ἐλαιῶν, which he also reads in Luke xix. 29, xxi. 37 (W.H. Ἐλαιῶν, and in Luke xix. 37, xxii. 39, τῶν Ἐλαιῶν, in each case as genitive of ἐλαία), the former word being found only here and in Josephus, *Ant.*, vii., 9, 2. But it is found in all the MSS. in this passage, although *falso D. cum cœt.*, says Blass. Blass would thus get rid of the difficulty of regarding Ἐλαιών as if used in Luke xix. 29, xxi. 37 as an indeclinable noun, whilst here he would exchange its genitive for ἐλαιῶν. Deissmann, however, is not inclined to set aside the consensus of authoritities for Ἐλαιῶνος, and he regards ἐλαιών in the two passages above as a lax use of the nominative case. As the genitive of ἐλαιών it would correspond to the Latin *Olivetum* (so Vulgate), an olive-orchard; *cf.* ἄμπελος and ἀμπελών in N.T., the termination ών in derivative nouns indicating a place set with trees of the kind designated by the primitive. For instances *cf.* Grimm-Thayer, *sub* Ἐλαιών, but see on the other hand Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 36 ff. With regard to the parallel between our verse and Josephus, *Ant.*, vii., 9, 2, it is evident that even if St. Luke had read Josephus he was not dependent upon him, for he says here τοῦ καλ. just as in his Gospel he had written τὸ καλ., probably giving one or more popular names by which the place was known; Gloël, *Galaterbrief*, p. 65 (see also on the word W.H., ii., Appendix, p. 165; Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 445; and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93).—σαββάτου ἔχον ὁδόν, not ἀπέχον: the distance is represented as something which the mountain has, Meyer-Wendt; *cf.* Luke xxiv. 13. There is no real discrepancy between this and the statement of St. Luke's Gospel that our Lord led His disciples ἕως πρὸς Βηθανίαν, xxiv. 50, a village which was more than double a sabbath day's journey, fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem. But if the words in St. Luke, *l. c.*, mean "over against Bethany," ἕως πρός (so Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Uberlieferung des Lucas*, p. 79, and Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 80; see also Rendall, *Acts*, p. 171—Blass omits ἕως and reads only πρός and remarks *neque vero* πρός *est* εἰς; *cf.* also Belser, *Theologische Quartalschrift*, i., 79 (1895)), the difficulty is surmounted, for St. Luke does not fix the exact spot of the Ascension, and he elsewhere uses the Mount of Olives, Luke xxi. 37, as the equivalent of the Bethany of Matthew (xxi. 17) and Mark (xi. 1). Nor is it likely that our Lord would lead His disciples into a village for the event of His Ascension. It should be remembered that Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, says that "the Ascension was from the place where that tract of the Mount of Olives ceased to be called Bethphage and began to be called Bethany". The recent attempt of Rud. Hoffmann to refer the Ascension to a "Galilee" in the Mount of Olives rests upon a tradition which cannot be regarded as reliable (see *Galilæa auf dem Oelberg*, Leipzig, 1896), although he can quote Resch as in agreement with him, p. 14. On Hoffmann's pamphlet see also *Expositor* (5th series), p. 119 (1897), and *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, No. 27 (1897). This mention of the distance is quite characteristic of St. Luke; it may also have been introduced here for the benefit of his Gentile readers; Page, *Acts*, *in loco*, and *cf.* Ramsay's remarks, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* pp. 55, 56.

Ver. 13. τὸ ὑπερῷον: "the upper chamber," R.V., as of some well-known place, but there is no positive evidence to identify it with the room of the Last Supper, although here and in Mark xiv. 15, as also in Luke xxii. 12, the Vulgate has *cœnaculum*. Amongst recent writers Hilgenfeld and Feine see in this definite mention of a room well known to the readers a reference to

καὶ Θωμᾶς, Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Ματθαῖος,[1] Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου[2] καὶ Σίμων ὁ Ζηλωτής, καὶ Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου. 14. οὗτοι πάντες ἦσαν

[1] **Ματθαιος** AB³CE, Boh. **Μαθθαιος** ℵB*D, Sah.; so Tisch., W.H., Weiss; see Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 60, 61. For **Ιακ. Αλφαιου** D, Sah. read **Ιακ. ο του Αλφ.**, may be assimilation to Matt. x. 3 and Mc. iii. 18 (not Lc.); Chase explains by Syriac idiom; retained by Blass in **β**.

[2] **και τῃ δεησει** C³, Chrys. Omitted by ℵABC*DE 61, and others, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilgenfeld. **συν γυναιξιν**, D adds **και τεκνοις**, so Hilgenfeld, but rejected by Blass ("male D"), for which see criticism of Weiss, Codex D, p. 54; probably occasioned by mention of the women, *cf.* xxi. 5. **ουτοι παντες** omit. Aug., Cypr. **Μαριᾳ** ℵACD, Boh., Chrys.

the author's first book, Luke xxii. 11, 12. But the word used in St. Mark and in St. Luke's Gospel is different from that in the passage before us—**ἀνάγαιον**, but here **ὑπερῷον**. If we identify the former with the **κατάλυμα**, Luke xxii. 11, it would denote rather the guest-chamber used for meals than the upper room or loft set apart for retirement or prayer, although sometimes used for supper or for assemblies (**ὑπερῷον**). Both words are found in classical Greek, but only the latter in the LXX, where it is frequent. In the N.T. it is used by St. Luke alone, and only in Acts. Holtzmann, following Lightfoot and Schöttgen, considers that an upper room in the Temple is meant, but this would be scarcely probable under the circumstances, and a meeting in a private house, ii. 46, iv. 23, v. 42, is far more likely.—**ὅ τε Π.**: in a series of nouns embraced under one category only the first may have the article, Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 154-157. In comparing this list of the Apostles with that given by the Synoptists we notice that whilst St. Peter stands at the head in the four lists, those three are placed in the first group who out of the whole band are prominent in the Acts as also in the Gospels, *viz.*, Peter, John, and James; all the Synoptists, however, place St. James as the elder brother before St. John. In St. Luke's first list, as in St. Matthew's list, the brothers Peter and Andrew stand first, followed by another pair of brothers James and John; but in Acts Andrew gives place, as we might expect, to the three Apostles who had been admitted to the closest intimacy with Jesus during His earthly life, and St. John as St. Peter's constant companion in the Gospel narrative makes a pair with him. The list in Acts agrees with that given by St. Luke in his Gospel in two particulars (see Friedrich, *ubi supra*, p. 50, and so too Zeller): (1) Simon the Zealot is called not **ὁ Καναναῖος**, as in Matthew and Mark, but **ὁ Ζηλωτής**, *cf.* Luke vi. 15; (2) instead of Thaddæus (or Lebbæus) we have "Judas of James," *cf.* Luke vi. 16.—**Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου**, "the *son* of James," R.V. (so too above **Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου**, "James the *son* of Alphæus"), placing the words "or, brother, see Jude i.," in the margin, so too in Luke vi. 16. The rendering of the words as Jude the *brother* of James was probably caused by Jude i., and it is difficult to believe, as Nösgen argues (see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 262), that in the same list and in such close proximity these two meanings "the son of" and "the brother of" should occur for the genitive, although no doubt it is possible grammatically; see Nösgen and Wendt, *in loco*. On the other hand, see Felten, note, p. 66. But Winer, to whom the latter refers, is by no means positive, and only expresses the opinion that **ἀδελφός** is perhaps to be supplied here and in Luke vi. 16 if the same Apostle is referred to in Jude i. (Winer-Moulton, p. 238). But the identification with the latter is very improbable, as he was most likely the brother of James, known as "the Lord's brother" (see Plummer on *Luke*, vi., 16, and Salmon, *Introduction to N. T.*, pp. 473, 474, fifth edit.). It is also noteworthy that St. Luke uses **ἀδελφός** where he means "brother," *cf.* Luke iii. 1, vi. 14; Acts xii. 2. Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, gives the same reference to *Alciphr.*, ii., 2, as Winer, **Τιμοκράτης ὁ Μητροδώρου**, *sc.* **ἀδελφός**, but at the same time he declines to commit himself as to the passage in Acts and Luke vi. The list, it has been thought, is given here again by St. Luke to show the recovery of the Apostolic band from their denial and flight—so St. Chrysostom remarks that Luke did well to mention the disciples, for since one had betrayed Christ and another had been unbelieving, he hereby shows that, except the first, all were preserved (so to the same effect

προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει, σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ Μαρίᾳ[1] τῇ μητρὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ.

[1] **Μαριαμ** BE (some very good cursives), Sah., Aeth., Chrys.; so Tisch., W.H., Weiss—the latter is said to be put always for the Virgin, but here evidence seems equally divided (see Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 90, 91).

Œcumenius, *in loco*). There may also have been the desire of the author to intimate that although only the works of a few on the list would be chronicled, yet all alike were witnesses to Christ and workers for Him (Lumby).

Ver. 14. **καὶ ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες**: on the construction see ver. 10. In N.T. found only in St. Luke and St. Paul (except once in St. Mark iii. 9); most frequently with the dative of the thing, of continuing steadfast in prayer; *cf.* vi. 4, Rom. xii. 12, Col. iv. 2, and *cf.* also ii. 42 or ii. 46 of continuing all the time *in* (ἐν) a place; in Acts viii. 13, x. 7, it is used with the dative of the person, and in Rom. xiii. 6 with **εἴς τι**. It is found in Josephus with the dative of the thing, *Ant.*, v., 2, 6, and in Polybius, who also uses it with the dative of the person. In LXX it is found in Numbers xiii. 21 and in Susannah ver. 6, Theod., also in Tobit v. 8, S.—**ὁμοθυμαδὸν**, a favourite word of St. Luke: *Lucæ in Actis in deliciis est* (Blass)—used ten or eleven times in Acts, only once elsewhere in N.T., Rom. xv. 6, where it has the same meaning, Vulgate *unanimiter*. In the LXX it is oftener found as the equivalent of Hebrew words meaning simply "together," and Hatch, *Essays in B. G.*, p. 63, would limit it to this meaning in the N.T., but the word cannot be confined to mere outward assembling together; *cf.* Dem., *Phil.*, iv., 147, **ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης** (Meyer-Wendt); so Luther *einmüthig*. It was very natural that St. Luke should lay stress upon the absolute unanimity of the early believers, and the word is used with reference to the Twelve, to the hundred-and-twenty, to the whole number of believers; truly the Holy Ghost was "amator concordiæ" (Corn. à Lapide).—**τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει**: the latter noun cannot be supported by MS. authority; the two words mark the difference between general and specific prayer; *cf.* Bengel on 1 Tim. ii. 1, and *cf. Luke*, v., 33. It is very doubtful whether we can confine **προσευχή** here to the Temple prayers; rather the article, *cf.* vi. 4 and ii. 42, seems to point to a definite custom of common prayer as a bond of Christian fellowship (Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 43, so *Speaker's Commentary*, *in loco*). As in his Gospel, so here and elsewhere in Acts, St. Luke lays stress upon frequency in prayer, and that too in all parts of the book (Friedrich, pp. 55-60).—**σὺν γυναιξὶ**: it is natural to include the women already mentioned in St. Luke's Gospel, *cf.*, *e.g.*, viii. 2, 3, xxiii. 55, "with the women," R.V., or the expression may be quite indefinite as in margin R.V. In this mention of the presence of women, as in the stress laid upon prayer, there is another point of unity between the book and the third Gospel, "The Gospel of Womanhood" (see also Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 50). (The mention of women would certainly indicate a private house rather than the Temple.) Erasmus and Calvin both interpret the words *cum uxoribus*, probably not without desire to make a point against celibacy. J. Lightfoot allows that this meaning may be correct, since the Apostles and disciples who had wives took them with them, "but," he adds, "it is too strait".—**Μαριάμ** (for **Μαρίᾳ**), so always according to W.H. of the Blessed Virgin, nominative, vocative, accusative, dative, except twice in a few of the best MSS. (Matt. i. 20, and Luke ii. 19). *Cf.* Appendix, p. 163. See also Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 28, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 91, note. The **καί** may be taken either to comprehend her under the other women, or as distinguishing her from them. This is the last mention of her in the N.T., and the Scripture leaves her "in prayer".—**σὺν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ**: they are previously mentioned as unbelieving (John vii. 5, and compare Mark vi. 4), but not only the Resurrection of the Lord but also that of Lazarus may well have overcome their unbelief. St. Chrysostom (so too Œcumenius) conjectures that Joseph was dead, for it is not to be supposed, he says, that when the brethren had become believers Joseph believed not. As the brethren are here distinguished from the Eleven, it would seem that they could not have been included in the latter (see, however, "Brethren," B.D.[2] pp. 13, 14). But whatever meaning we give to the word "brethren" here or in the Gospels, nothing could be more significant than the fact that they had now left their

15. ΚΑΙ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἀναστὰς Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν μαθητῶν[1] εἶπεν (ἦν τε ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὡς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν·),

[1] μαθητων; but ℵABC*, Vulg., Tisch., W.H., R.V., so Weiss, Wendt αδελφων.

settled homes in Galilee to take part in the lot of the disciples of Jesus, and to await with them the promise of the Father (Felten). It may have been that James, "the Lord's brother," was converted by the Resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 5, and that his example constrained the other "brethren" to follow him.

Ver. 15. καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις: St. Luke often employs such notes of time, used indefinitely like similar expressions in Hebrew—*e.g.*, 1 Sam. xxviii. 1, both in his Gospel and in Acts. Friedrich, p. 9, Lekebusch, p. 53.—ἀναστὰς: it is very characteristic of St. Luke to add a participle to a finite verb indicating the posture or position of the speaker. This word is found in St. Luke's Gospel seventeen times, and in Acts nineteen times, only twice in Matthew, six or seven times in Mark; *cf.* also his use of σταθείς, three times in Gospel, six times in Acts, but not at all in the other Evangelists. — Πέτρος: that St. Peter should be the spokesman is only what we should naturally expect from his previous position among the Twelve, but, as St. Chrysostom observes, he does everything with the common consent, nothing imperiously. The best fruits of his repentance are here seen in the fulfilment of his commission to strengthen his brethren. ἐν μέσῳ: another favourite expression of St. Luke both in his Gospel and in the Acts, in the former eight times, in the latter five times (four times in St. Matthew, twice in St. Mark). Blass compares the Hebrew בְּתוֹךְ, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 126, and *in loco*. —μαθητῶν: Blass retains and contends that ἀδελφ. has arisen from either ver. 14 or ver. 16; but there is strong critical authority for the latter word; *cf.* vi. 1. In LXX it is used in three senses; a brother and a neighbour, Lev. xix. 17; a member of the same nation, Exod. ii. 14, Deut. xv. 3. In the N.T. it is used in these three senses, and also in the sense of fellow-Christians, who are looked upon as forming one family. The transition is easily seen: (1) member of the same family; (2) of the same community (national), of the same community (spiritual). Kennedy, *Sources of N.T. Greek*, pp. 95, 96. On its use in religious associations in Egypt see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, i., 82, 140, 209. — τε: here for the first time *solitarium*. On the frequent recurrence of this word in Acts in all parts, as compared with other books of the N.T., see Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 257, 258.—ὀνομάτων: R.V., "persons". Lightfoot compares the use of the word in Rev. iii. 4, xi. 13 (so too Wendt), where the word is used to signify any persons without distinction of sex, so that the word may have been used here to include the women also. But he considers that it rather means men as distinct from women, and so, as he says, the Syriac and Arabic understand it here. Its use in the sense of persons reckoned up by name is Hebraistic שֵׁמוֹת LXX, Numb. i. 2, 18, 20; iii. 40, 43; xxii. 53 (Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*), but see also for a similar use on the Egyptian papyri, Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 24 (1897).—ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, "*gathered* together," R.V.; *cf.* Matt. xxii. 34, Luke xvii. 35, Acts ii. 1, 44, 47 (so W.H., R.V., see *in loco*, Wendt, Weiss), 1 Cor. xi. 20, xiv. 23. Holtzmann, *in loco*, describes it as always local, and it is no doubt so used in most of the above passages, as also in LXX Psalm ii. 2 (*cf.* Acts iv. 26), 2 Sam. ii. 13, 3 Macc. iii. 1, Sus. v. 14, and in classical Greek. But when we remember the stress laid by St. Luke in the opening chapters of the Acts upon the unanimity of the believers, it is not unlikely that he should use the phrase, at all events in ii. 44, 47, with this deeper thought of unity of purpose and devotion underlying the words, even if we cannot render the phrase in each passage in Acts with Rendall (*Acts*, p. 34), "with one mind," "of one mind".—ὡς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν. Both Wendt and Feine reject the view that the number is merely mythical (Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, Weizsäcker), and would rather see in it a definite piece of information which St. Luke had gained. It is quite beside the mark to suppose that St. Luke only used this particular number because it represented the Apostles multiplied by 10, or 40 multiplied by 3. If he had wished to emphasise the number as a number, why introduce the ὡς?

16. Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἔδει[1] πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην, ἣν προεῖπε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον διὰ στόματος Δαβίδ, περὶ Ἰούδα τοῦ γενομένου ὁδηγοῦ τοῖς συλλαβοῦσι τὸν Ἰησοῦν· 17. ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν σὺν

[1] εδει ℵABCD²E, Origen, Eus., Ath., W.H., Weiss. δει D*, Vulg., Boh.; so Gig., Par., Aug. (Iren., Vig.), Hilgenfeld. Blass, p. xvii., in his Preface to β, argues that as Irenæus omits 17ᵃ-20 and elsewhere seems to be ignorant of the death of Judas, so his text also omitted from κατηρ. εν ημιν to γενηθητω. In his revised edition Luke added 17ᵃ-20 and also substituted εδει for the original δει: "ut significaretur ex parte jam esse ratum factum vetus vaticinium, exitu nempe Judæ". But the omission of Irenæus may be accidental, or it has been suggested that he too may have regarded 17ᵃ-20 as a parenthesis and not actually part of Peter's speech. Δαβιδ; but in ℵBD, so W.H., Weiss Δαυειδ. ACE read ΔΑΔ; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 65, Blass, Proleg. (*Acta Apost.*), p. 34.

Ver. 16. **Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί**: a mode of address indicating not only respect but also the solemnity of the occasion and the importance of the subject. There is nothing unclassical in this use of the vocative without ὦ at the beginning of speeches. Demosthenes, at least on some occasions, used the phrase Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι without ὦ. Simcox, *ubi supra*, p. 76, note, and see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 258, note.—**ἔδει**: very frequent in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts; in the former nineteen, in the latter twenty-five times, and in all parts of the book, Friedrich, *ubi supra*, p. 22 (Lekebusch). It expresses a divine necessity, and is used by all the Evangelists, as by St. Peter here, and by St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 25), of the events connected with and following upon the Passion.—**δεῖ**, *oportet*, expresses logical necessity rather than personal moral obligation **ὤφειλεν**, *debuit*, or the sense of fitness, **ἔπρεπεν**, *decebat*. The three words are all found in Heb. ii. 1, 17, 10, on which see Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 36, and Plummer's *St. Luke*, p. 247. St. Peter's speech falls into two parts, one introduced by **ἔδει**, and the other introduced by **δεῖ**, ver. 21. —**τὴν γραφὴν**: the reference is undoubtedly to the particular passages in the O.T. which follow, *cf.* Luke iv. 20, Acts viii. 35; see Lightfoot on Galatians iii. 22. There is no reference to Psalm xli. 9, or this passage would have been quoted, but to the passages in ver. 20.—**πληρωθῆναι**, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 44, 45. **πληρόω** (which is very frequently used by St. Luke, Friedrich, *ubi supra*, p. 40) means more than "fulfil" in the popular acceptation of the word; it implies "to fill up to the full"; "Not only is our Lord the subject of direct predictions in the Old Testament, but His claims go to the full extent of affirming that all the truths which are imperfectly, and frequently very darkly shadowed forth in the pages, are realised in Him as the ideal to which they pointed" (Row, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 202, 203).—**τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.** St. Luke uses this, or a similar expression, **πνεῦμα ἅγιον** or **τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα**, about forty times in Acts alone, whilst in St. Luke's Gospel alone it is used about as many times as in the three other Evangelists together (Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 65, and Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 14).—**ὁδηγοῦ τοῖς συλλ. τὸν Ἰησοῦν.** St. Peter simply states a fact, but does not heap scorn or abuse upon Judas (Chrysostom, *Hom.*, iii., *cf.* Theophylact). St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. John simply say of Judas **ὁ παραδιδούς**, "he who delivered Him up," or employ some similar expression; he is never called "*the* traitor" (St. Luke vi. 16, **ἐγένετο προδότης**, "*became a* traitor," see Plummer, *in loco*). This self-restraint is remarkable on the part of men who must have regarded their Master's Death as the most atrocious of murders (see Row, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 179, 180, note). At the same time the word **ὁδηγός** seems to bring before us the scene in Gethsemane, how Judas went before the multitude, and drew near to Jesus to kiss Him (Luke xxii. 47), and to show us how vividly the memories of the Passion were present to St. Peter; *cf.* 1 Peter ii. 21 ff.).

Ver. 17. **ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν κ.τ.λ.** For the construction see ver. 10. **ὅτι** introduces the ground upon which the Scripture to be cited, which speaks of the vacancy in the Apostolic office, found its fulfilment in Judas; "he was numbered," "triste est *numerari* non manere," Bengel.—**καὶ ἔλαχεν τὸν κλῆρον**: lit., "and obtained by lot the lot": **κλῆρος**, a lot, that which is assigned by lot, the portion or share so assigned; so amongst the Greeks, and somewhat similarly in English, *cf.* in LXX Wisdom ii. 9, v. 5, Ecclesiasticus

ἡμῖν, καὶ ἔλαχε τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης. 18. οὗτος μὲν οὖν ἐκτήσατο χωρίον ἐκ τοῦ[1] μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας, καὶ πρηνὴς γενό-

[1] **του** om. ℵABCDE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilgenfeld. After **αδικιας** D inserts **αυτου**; so Syr. Harcl., Sah., Aug., so Blass in **β**, and Hilgenfeld. Blass added at first, but see Hilg., note, p. 4, **και κατεδησεν αυτου τον τραχηλον.**

xxv. 19. The word is used elsewhere in Acts three times, i. 26, viii. 21, xxvi. 18; *cf.* with the last passage its use by St. Paul elsewhere, Col. i. 12. Here the word no doubt may be used by St. Peter with reference to the actual selection by lot which was about to follow. The same word is used elsewhere by the same Apostle, 1 Peter v. 3, "neither as lording it over *the charge allotted* to you," **τῶν κλήρων.** Tyndale and Cranmer render the word here "parishes," which really gives a good interpretation of it = the "lots" assigned to the elders as their portions in God's heritage; and so we have by an easy transition *clerici* = clergy, those to whom such "lots" are assigned: Humphry, *Commentary on R. V.*, p. 446, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 246 ff.—**ἔλαχεν:** here and in 2 Peter i. 1 with an accusative, as in classical Greek, "received his portion" R.V. On the construction of the verb with the genitive, *cf.* Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 100, 230, and Plummer's *St. Luke*, p. 11; with Luke i. 9, *cf.* 1 Sam. xiv., 47. In classical Greek it is used as the opposite of **χειροτονηθῆναι,** *to be elected*, more commonly with the infinitive.—**διακονίας:** "Apostleship the highest form of ministration is repeatedly designated thus," Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 204, *e.g.*, ver. 25, xx. 24, xxi. 19, 2 Cor. iv. 1, v. 18, vi. 3, Rom. xi. 13, and see further on the word, chap. vi. below. It would be difficult to find in such a general term, or in any part of the speech, any reference to a hierarchical constitution of the Church (Zeller, Overbeck). Jüngst cannot derive any such view from this verse, although he sees in the description of **διακονία** as **ἀποστολή,** ver. 25, the mark of a later period than that of the delivery of the speech (so too Wendt).

Ver. 18. **οὗτος μὲν οὖν κ.τ.λ.** This verse and the next are regarded in R.V. as a parenthesis (compare also W.H.), **μὲν οὖν** making the transition from St. Peter's own words to the explanatory statement of St. Luke; see Rendall's Appendix on **μὲν οὖν,** although he would place ver. 20 also in a parenthesis, *Acts*, p. 160 ff. For this frequent use of **μὲν οὖν** in Acts, see also Blass, who regards **μέν** as used here, as in other places, without any following antithesis expressed by **δέ,** *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 261, 267, see also Hackett's note *in loco.* Spitta, Feine, Weiss, see in these two verses an editorial interpolation.—**ἐκτήσατο χωρίον.** To harmonise this with Matt. xxvii. 5, an explanation has been often used to this effect, that although Judas did not purchase the field, it was purchased by his money, and that thus he might be called its possessor. This was the explanation adopted by the older commentators, and by many modern. Theophylact, *e.g.*, describes Judas as rightly called the **κύριος** of the field for the price of it was his. It is no doubt quite possible that St. Peter (if the words are his and not St. Luke's) should thus express himself rhetorically (and some of his other expressions are certainly rhetorical, *e.g.*, **ἐλάκησε μέσος**), or that Judas should be spoken of as the possessor of the field, just as Joseph of Arimathæa is said to have hewn his own tomb, or Pilate to have scourged Jesus, but possibly Dr. Edersheim's view that the blood-money by a fiction of law was still considered to belong to Judas may help to explain the difficulty, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 575. Lightfoot comments, "Not that he himself bought the field, for Matthew resolves the contrary—nor was there any such thing in his intention when he bargained for the money," and then he adds, "But Peter by a bitter irrision showeth the fruit and profit of his wretched covetise:" *Hor. Heb.* (see also Hackett's note). Without fully endorsing this, it is quite possible that St. Peter, or St. Luke, would contrast the portion in the ministry which Judas had received with the little which was the result of the price of his iniquity.—**ἐκ τοῦ μισθοῦ τῆς ἀδικίας** pro **τοῦ ἀδίκου μισθοῦ,** a Hebraism, Blass, *in loco*, see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 268. The phrase only occurs again in 2 Peter ii. 13, 15; on this use of **ἐκ** see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 146. Combinations of words with **ἀδικία** are characteristic of St. Luke (Friedrich). In the other Evangelists the word is only found once, John vii. 18.—**καὶ πρηνὴς γενόμ.** Wendt (following Zeller and Overbeck) and others maintain

μενος ἐλάκησε μέσος, καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ· 19. καὶ γνωστὸν ἐγένετο πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ὥστε κληθῆναι τὸ χωρίον ἐκεῖνο τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν Ἀκελδαμὰ,[1]

[1] Ακελδαμα, so C, Syr. Harcl., Chrys., Vulg.; Αχελδαμαχ ℵA 40, 61, Tisch.; Ακελδαμαχ B, so W.H., Weiss; Ακελδαιμαχ D (Blass in β -δεμαχ), so Hilg., and other variants; in Gig., Par. *-emac(h)*. Final χ (-ακ) seems certain—see comment below.

that St. Luke here follows a different tradition from St. Matthew, xxvii. 6 ff., and that it is only arbitrary to attempt to reconcile them. But Felten and Zöckler (so too Lumby and Jacobson) see in St. Luke's description a later stage in the terrible end of the traitor. St. Matthew says **καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο**: if the rope broke, or a branch gave way under the weight of Judas, St. Luke's narrative might easily be supplementary to that of St. Matthew. Blass, *in loco*, adopts the former alternative, and holds that thus the narrative may be harmonised with that of St. Matthew, *rupto fune Iudam in terram procidisse*. It is difficult to see (as against Overbeck) why **πρηνὴς γεν.** is inconsistent with this. The words no doubt mean strictly "falling flat on his face" opposed to **ὕπτιος**, not "falling headlong," and so they do not necessarily imply that Judas fell over a precipice, but Hackett's view that Judas may have hung himself from a tree on the edge of a precipice near the valley of Hinnom, and that he fell on to the rocky pavement below is suggested from his own observation of the locality, p. 36, *Acts of the Apostles* (first English edition), see also Edersheim, *ubi supra*, pp. 575, 576. At all events there is nothing disconcerting in the supposition that we may have here "some unknown series of facts, of which we have but two fragmentary narratives": "Judas," B.D.[2], and see further Plummer *sub v.* in Hastings' B.D. **ἐλάκησε**: here only in the N.T. **λάσκω**: a strong expression, signifying bursting asunder with a loud noise, Hom., *Iliad*, xiii., 616; *cf.* also *Acta Thomæ*, 33 (p. 219, ed. Tdf.): **ὁ δράκων φυσηθεὶς ἐλάκησε καὶ ἀπέθανε καὶ ἐξεχύθη ὁ ἰὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ χολή**, for the construction *cf.* Luke xxiii. 45.

Ver. 19. **καὶ γνωστὸν . . . πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἱερουσ.**: the words have been taken to support the view that we have here a parenthesis containing the notice of St. Luke, but if St. Peter was speaking rhetorically he might easily express himself so. But many critics, who refuse to see in the whole of the two verses any parenthetical remarks of the historian, adopt the view that **τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν** and **τοῦτ' ἔστιν χωρίον αἵματος** are explanations introduced by St. Luke, who could trust to his Gentile readers to distinguish between his words and those of St. Peter (Wendt, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Nösgen, Jüngst. Matthias).—**τῇ διαλέκτῳ**: only in Acts in the N.T., where it is used six times in all parts; it may mean dialect or language, but here it is used in the latter sense (R.V.) to distinguish Aramaic from Greek (*cf.* its use in Polybius).—**αὐτῶν**, *i.e.*, the dwellers of Jerusalem, who spoke Aramaic—unless the whole expression is used rhetorically, it would seem that it contains the words, not of St. Peter, who himself spoke Aramaic, but of the author (see Blass, *in loco*).—**Ἀκελδαμά**: the Aramaic of the Field of Blood would be חֲקַל דְּמָא, and it is possible that the χ may be added to represent in some way the guttural א, just as Σιράχ = סירא, *cf.* Blass, *in loco*, and *Grammatik des N.G.*, p. 13. W.H. (so Blass) read Ἀκελδαμάχ (and Ἀχελδαμάχ, Tisch. and Treg.); see also on the word Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 60 and 63. A new derivation has been proposed by Klostermann, *Probleme in Aposteltexte*, p. 6 ff., which has gained considerable attention (*cf.* Holtzmann, Wendt, Felten, Zöckler, *in loco*), *viz.*: דְּמַךְ = **κοιμᾶσθαι**, so that the word = **κοιμητήριον**, *cf.* Matt. xxvii. 8. This is the derivation preferred by Wendt, and it is very tempting, but see also *Enc. Bibl.*, I., 32, 1899, *sub v.*

It is true that the two accounts in St. Matthew and St. Luke give two reasons for the name *Field of Blood*. But why should there not be two reasons? If the traitor in the agony of his remorse rushed from the Temple into the valley of Hinnom, and across the valley to "the potter's field" of Jeremiah, the old name of the potter's field might easily become changed in the popular language into that of "field of blood," whilst the reason given by St. Matthew for the name might still hold good, since the blood-money, which by a fiction of law was

τουτέστι χωρίον αἵματος. 20. γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ Ψαλμῶν, "Γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ ἔρημος, καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ·" καί, "Τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτοῦ λάβοι ἕτερος." 21. Δεῖ οὖν τῶν συνελθόντων ἡμῖν ἀνδρῶν ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ ἐν ᾧ εἰσῆλθε καὶ

still considered to belong to Judas, was employed for the purchase of the accursed spot as a burial ground for strangers. See Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 574, 575. Whatever may be alleged as to the growth of popular fancy and tradition in the later account in Acts of the death of Judas, it cannot be said to contrast unfavourably with the details given by Papias, *Fragment*, 18, which Blass describes as "insulsissima et fœdissima".

Ver. 20. The quotation is twofold, the first part from Psalm lxix. 26 (LXX, lxviii.); in the LXX we have **αὐτῶν**, changed here into **αὐτοῦ** with reference to Judas, whilst **ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν** is omitted and the words **ἐν αὐτῇ**, referring to **ἔπαυλις**, are added. The omission would make the application of the words more general than in the original, which related to the desolation of the encampment and tents of a nomadic tribe. The other part of the quotation is *verbatim* from Psalm cviii. 8 (cix.), called by the ancients the Iscariot Psalm. With the exception of Psalm xxii., no Psalm is more frequently quoted in the N.T. than lxix.; *cf.* ver. 9 with John ii. 17; ver. 21 with Matt. xxvii. 34, and with John xix. 28; ver. 22 and 23 with Rom. xi. 9, 10; and ver. 9 with Rom. xv. 3. In these Psalms, as in the twenty-second Psalm, we see how the history of prophets and holy men of old, of a David or a Jeremiah, was typical of the history of the Son of man made perfect through suffering, and we know how our Lord Himself saw the fulfilment of the words of the suffering Psalmist (xli. 9) in the tragic events of His own life (John xiii. 18). So too St. Peter in the recent miserable end of the traitor sees another evidence, not only of the general truth, which the Psalmists learnt through suffering, that God rewarded His servants and that confusion awaited the unrighteous, but also another fulfilment in the case of Judas of the doom which the Psalmists of old had invoked upon the persecutors of the faithful servants of God. But we are not called upon to regard Psalm cix. as the Iscariot Psalm in all its details (see Perowne, *Psalms*, p. 538 (smaller edition)), or to forget, as Delitzsch reminds us, that the spirit of Elias is not that of the N.T. St. Peter, although he must have regarded the crime of Judas as a crime without a parallel, does not dwell upon his punishment, but passes at once to the duty incumbent upon the infant Church in view of the vacant Apostleship.—**ἔπαυλις**: by many commentators, both ancient and modern (Chrys., Oecum., so too Nösgen, Overbeck, Wendt, Blass, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Jüngst), this is referred to the **χωρίον**, which was rendered desolate by the death of Judas in it, on the ground that **γάρ** thus maintains its evident relation to what precedes. But if the two preceding verses are inserted by St. Luke, and form no part of St. Peter's words, it would seem that **ἔπαυλις** must be regarded as parallel to **ἐπισκοπή** in the second quotation.—**ἐπισκοπὴν**: "his office," R.V. ("overseership," margin), so for the same word in LXX, Ps. cix. 8, from which the quotation is made. In the LXX the word is used, Num. iv. 16, for the charge of the tabernacle. St. Peter uses the word **ἐπίσκοπος** in 1 Peter ii. 25, and it is significant that there the translators of 1611 maintain the use of the word "bishop," as here "bishoprick" (so R.V., "overseer," margin), whilst they use "overseer" and "oversight" (**ἐπισκοπή**), Acts xx. 28 and 1 Peter v. 2, where the reference is to the function of the elders or presbyters. The word **ἐπισκοπή**, of course, could not have its later ecclesiastical force, but the Apostolic office of Judas might well be described as one of oversight, and care of others; and it is significant that it is so described, and not only as a **διακονία** (see below on ver. 25, and on **ἐπίσκοπος**, xx. 28, note): "St. Peter would not have quoted the Psalm containing the expression **ἐπισκοπή** unless he had instinctively felt the word to be applicable to Judas' position" (Canon Gore in *Guardian*, 16th March, 1898).

Ver. 21. **δεῖ οὖν**, see ver. 16. As the one prophecy had thus already been fulfilled, so for the fulfilment of the other it was imperative upon the Church to elect a successor to Judas.—**εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθεν**: a Hebraistic formula expressing the whole course of a man's daily life; ix. 28; *cf.* LXX Deut. xxviii. 6, 1 Sam. xxix. 6, Psalm cxx. 8, and for other instances, Wetstein, *in loco*. There is no occasion

ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς, 22. ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος Ἰωάννου ἕως[1] τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἀνελήφθη ἀφ' ἡμῶν, μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ γενέσθαι σὺν ἡμῖν ἕνα τούτων. 23. Καὶ ἔστησαν δύο, Ἰωσὴφ τὸν καλούμενον Βαρσαβᾶν,[2] ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰοῦστος, καὶ

[1] **εως** BCDE, so W.H., Wendt doubtful, Weiss; **αχρι** ℵA 61—both **εως** and **αχρι**, as Wendt points out, are frequent in Luke.

[2] **Βαρσαβαν** C, Vulg. clem., Syrr.; **Βαρσαββαν**, so ℵABE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; **Βαρναβαν** D, Gig., Par. tol., Aeth.—but Blass reads = W.H. in his β text—Wendt thinks that D may have been a confusion with iv. 36—see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56, on the spelling.

to render **ἐφ' ἡμᾶς**, "over us," R.V., margin, for in full the phrase would run: **εἰσῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀφ' ἡμῶν.** The formula shows that St. Peter did not shrink from dwelling upon the perfect humanity of the Ascended Christ, whilst in the same sentence he speaks of Him as **ὁ Κύριος.**

Ver. 22. **ἀρξάμενος**, *cf.* note on verse 1. The word need not be restricted to our Lord's own baptism, but would include the time of the baptism preached by John, as his baptism and preaching were the announcement of, and a preparation for, the Christ. If St. Mark's Gospel, as there is every reason to believe, was closely connected with St. Peter, its opening verses give us a similar date for the commencement of the Apostolic testimony; *cf.* Schmid, *Biblische Theologie des N. T.*, p. 436.—**ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς**: according to Wendt and Weiss, the relative is not attracted for **ᾗ**, but is to be regarded as a genitive of time, but *cf.* Lev. xxiii. 15, Haggai ii. 18, Bar. i. 15; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 226; Blass, *ubi supra*, p. 170.—**μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως.** It has been noted as remarkable that St. Peter here lays down experience of matters of fact, not eminence in any subjective grace or quality, as one of the conditions of Apostleship, but it is evident that from the first the testimony of the Apostles was not merely to the facts, but to their spiritual bearing, *cf.* chap. v. 32: "On the one side there is the historical witness to the facts, on the other, the internal testimony of personal experience" (Westcott's *St. John*, xv., 27), and the appeal to Him "Who knew the hearts," showed that something more was needed than intellectual competency. Spitta and Jüngst (so Weiss) regard the whole clause **ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ . . . ἀφ' ἡμῶν** as introduced by a reviser, but on the other hand Hilgenfeld considers the words to be in their right place. He also rebukes Weiss for maintaining that the whole passage, vv. 15-26, could not have been composed by the author of the book, who gives no intimation of the number of the Apostles, with whom the Twelve as such play no part, and who finds his hero outside their number. But Hilgenfeld points out that the Twelve have for his "author to Theophilus" a very important place; *cf.* ii. 14, 22, iv. 33, v. 12, 40, viii. 1, 14, ix. 27.

Ver. 23. **ἔστησαν**, not **ἔστησεν**: the latter reading, "nimium Petro dat, nihil concilio relinquit" (Blass). "They put forward," R.V., not "appointed," A.V., for the appointment had not yet been made.—**Ἰωσὴφ τὸν καλ. Βαρσαβᾶν**, "Joseph called Barsabbas". We cannot identify him with Joseph Barnabas (iv. 36), or with Judas Barsabbas (xv. 22). Barsabbas may have been a patronymic "son of Sabba," but *cf. Enc. Bibl.*, I., 487, 1899. It is only a conjecture that he was the brother of Judas Barsabbas just mentioned. The name Justus is probably a Roman surname, as **Ἰοῦστος** indicates, adopted after the custom of the time, just as the second Evangelist took the Roman name Marcus in addition to the Hebrew John. Nothing more is said of him in the N.T. Eusebius ranks him with Matthias as one of the Seventy, *H.E.*, i., 12, and Papias is said to have related concerning him that he drank deadly poison but escaped all harm, Euseb., *H.E.*, iii., 39. On the connection of this tradition with Aristion see Nestle, *Einführung in das G. N. T.*, p. 240, and Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 231. If the reading of Blass in β, supported by the Latin, **τὸν καὶ Ἰοῦστον** (*qui et Justus*) may claim acceptance, it affords, as Belser notes, an interesting parallel with the **Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος** of xiii. 8. On the spelling of the word, see W.H. Appendix p. 166, and also Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 56, 57.—**Ματθίαν.** Nothing more is known of him with certainty than that he must have fulfilled the qualifications required

Ματθίαν.[1] 24. καὶ προσευξάμενοι εἶπον, Σὺ Κύριε, καρδιογνῶστα πάντων, ἀνάδειξον ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο ἕνα ὃν ἐξελέξω, 25. λαβεῖν τὸν

[1] Ματθιαν; but Μαθ. in B*D, Sah., so T., W.H., Hilg. (see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 60; W.H., App., pp. 162, 166).

by St. Peter. Both Eusebius and Epiphanius rank him in the Seventy, and he is said to have suffered martyrdom in Ethiopia. An apocryphal Gospel was ascribed to him, Euseb., *H.E.*, iii., 25, and from Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, iv., 6, 35, we find that the words of Zacchæus, Luke xix. 8, were supposed to be his; so too Hilgenfeld, *Actus Apost.*, p. 202, 1899.

Ver. 24. **Κύριε καρδιογνῶστα . . . ὃν ἐξελέξω.** The words may well have been addressed to Christ: St. Peter had just spoken of Him as the Lord, his own experience and that of his fellow-disciples must have taught him that Jesus was One Who knew the hearts of all men (John ii. 25, xxi. 17), and he had heard his Master's claim to have chosen the Apostles (*cf.* Luke vi. 13, and v. 2 above, where the same verb is used). On the other hand Wendt regards as decisive against this view that St. Peter himself in xv. 7 says **ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεός** and then in ver. 8 calls God **καρδιογνώστης** (*cf.* Jeremiah xvii. 10, where Jehovah is said to search the heart). But the passage in Acts xv. is much too general in its reference to consider it decisive against any special prerogative ascribed to Jesus here (*viz.*, the choice of His own Apostles), and the references to 2 Cor. i. 1, Ephes. ii. 1, where St. Paul refers his Apostleship to God, may be fairly met by Acts ix. 17 and xxvi. 16. It is quite true that in iv. 29 **Κύριε** is used in prayer plainly addressed to the Lord Jehovah, but it is equally certain that prayer was directed to Christ in the earliest days of the Church (Zahn, *Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche*, pp. 1-38 and notes), see also below on ii. 21 (and *cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 11, 12, and 2 Thess. ii. 16; Archbishop of Armagh in *Speaker's Commentary*, iii., 690).—**ἀνάδειξον**: in Luke x. 1 the only other passage in the N.T. where the word is used, it is applied to our Lord's appointment of the Seventy, and is rendered "appointed," A. and R.V. But here R.V. renders "show" as A.V. (Rendall, "appoint"). The verb however may be used in the sense of showing forth or clearly, and hence to proclaim, especially a person's appointment to an office (*cf.* the noun **ἀνάδειξις** also used by St. Luke only in his Gospel, i. 80); *cf.* for the former meaning, 2 Macc. ii. 8, *cf.* v. 6, and for the latter, 2 Macc. ix. 14, 23, 35; x. 11; xiv. 12, 26; 1 Esdras i. 35, viii. 23; so too the use of the word in Polybius and Plutarch (see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and Weiss, *in loco*).

Ver. 25. **τὸν κλῆρον**: R.V. **τόπον** marking the antithesis between the place in the Apostleship and "his own place" to which Judas had gone, Vulg. *locum.*—**τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς**: as above we have not only the word **διακονία** used but also **ἐπισκοπή**, v. 17 and 20, so here too we have not only **διακονία** but also **ἀποστολή**, although no doubt there is a sense in which we may truly say with Dr. Hort (*Ecclesia*, p. 204) that Apostleship is the highest form of ministration. On the word **ἀπόστολος** see xiii. 2, 3; the term was undoubtedly used in N.T. to include others besides the Twelve, although there is no reason to suppose that the qualification of having "seen the Lord" was in any case invalidated (*cf.* Gwatkin, "Apostle," Hastings' B.D., p. 126). The whole narrative before us which relates the solemn appeal of the Church to her Ascended Lord, and the choice determined upon in immediate sequence to that appeal, is clearly at variance with any conception of Apostleship as other than a divine commission received directly from Christ Himself (Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 130).—**παρέβη**, "fell away," R.V. *cf.* LXX Exod. xxxii. 8, **ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ**, so Deut. ix. 12, xvii. 20, **ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντολῶν** (*cf.* xxviii. 14, A.), so the Heb. סוּר followed by מִן. A.V. following Tyndall renders "by transgression fell," which lays too much stress upon "fell," which is not the prominent notion of the Greek verb, elsewhere "transgressed" (Humphry on *Revised Version*, p. 188).—**εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον**: on **τόπος** in the sense of social position, dignity, see *Ecclesiasticus*, xii., 12, and also Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 95, of succeeding to the vacant place caused by death in a religious community. Here the phrase is usually explained as the place of punishment, Gehenna, *cf. Baal-Turim* on Numb. xxiv. 25 (and Gen. xxxi. 55) "Balaam ivit in locum suum," *i.e.*, Gehenna, Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, while

κλῆρον[1] τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς, ἐξ[2] ἧς παρέβη Ἰούδας, πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον. 26. καὶ ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν,[3]

[1] κληρον ℵC³E, Syrr., Arm., Eus., Bas., Chrys. τοπον ABC*D, Vulg., Sah., Boh.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. (κληρον probably gloss ver. 17).

[2] εξ; but αφ' in ℵABCD 61, Bas., Aug., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[3] αυτων D*E, Syr. Harcl., Arm.; so Blass in β with Gig. and Par.[1], so Hilg. αυτοις ℵABCD², Vulg., and good versions; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (probably the dative was misunderstood, see comment.).

on the other hand Schöttgen sees no need to explain the expression in this way. In each of the passages in the O.T. the word ἴδιος does not occur in the LXX, although in the still more fanciful comment of the Rabbis on Job ii. 11, we have ἐκ τῆς ἰδίας χώρας. That the phrase ἴδιος τόπος may be used in a good or bad sense is plain from Ignat., *Magn.*, v., in a passage which is naturally referred to the verse before us, where a man's "own place" denotes the place of reward, or that of punishment, *cf.*, *e.g.*, εἰς τὸν ὀφειλόμενον τόπον, Polycarp, *Phil.*, ix., where the words refer to the martyrs who were with the Lord, and εἰς τὸν ὀφειλ. τόπον τῆς δόξης said of St. Peter, Clem. Rom., *Cor.* v. Nösgen argues, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 88, 89, that we are not justified in concluding from a few Rabbinical passages which contain such fanciful interpretations of simple words (*cf.* the comment on Job ii. 11, quoted by Wetstein) that St. Peter must have meant "Gehenna". In his wilful fall from the place chosen for him by God, Judas had chosen in self-will ἴδιος τόπος, and this wilful and deliberate choice St. Peter would emphasise in contrast to the τόπος ἀποστολῆς about to be bestowed, ver. 25 (see also Rendall, *Acts*, p. 174). But however this may be, the words may well indicate a reserve on the part of St. Peter in speaking of the fate and destiny of Judas, characteristic of his reference to him *cf.* note on ver. 16. None of the other explanations offered can be deemed satisfactory, as, *e.g.*, that the word πορευθῆναι κ.τ.λ. refers to the successor of Judas; that Matthias should undertake the Apostolic circuit assigned to Judas (so Oecumenius, and amongst English commentators, Hammond); or, that the words refer to the house or home of Judas, or to his association with the Pharisees, or to his suicide and dishonoured burial, or to the χωρίον mentioned above. Spitta, amongst recent commentators, stands almost alone in referring the words back to ver. 16, and holds that they refer to the position of Judas as the guide to those who took Jesus. The sense of the passage is expressed in the reading of A δίκαιον instead of ἴδιον.

Ver. 26. καὶ ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν, "they gave forth their lots," A.V. But R.V. reads αὐτοῖς, "they gave lots for them". R.V. margin, "unto them". It is difficult to decide whether the expression means that they gave lots unto the candidates themselves or whether they cast lots for them—*i.e.*, on their behalf, or to see which of the two would be selected. How the lot was decided we cannot positively say. According to Hamburger (*Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 5, p. 723) the Bible does not tell us, as the expressions used point sometimes to a casting, sometimes to a drawing out, of the lots; *cf.* Proverbs xvi. 33: "Quo modo et ratione uti sunt Apostoli incertum est. Certum est Deum per eam declarasse Mathiam tum dirigendo sortem ut caderet in Mathiam juxta illud Prov. xvi. 33" (Corn. à Lapide). For the expression *cf.* Lev. xvi. 8. *Hebraismus* (Wetstein), so Blass. καὶ ἔπεσεν, *i.e.*, through shaking the vessel, Jonah i. 7; *cf.* Livy, xxiii., 3; so in Homer and Sophocles πάλλειν, *cf.* Josephus, *Ant.*, vi., 5.—συγκατεψηφίσθη: only here in N.T. "he was numbered with the eleven Apostles," *i.e.*, as the twelfth. The verb is used in the middle voice for condemning with others, Plut., *Them.*, 21, but as it occurs nowhere else we have no parallels to its use here. Grimm explains it "deponendo (κατά) in urnam calculo, *i.e.*, *suffragando assigno* (alicui) *locum* inter (σύν)". But here it is used rather as an equivalent of συγκαταριθμεῖσθαι; *cf.* ver. 17 (and also xix. 19), (Blass and Wendt, *in loco*) = ἐναρίθμιος, συμψηφισθείς, καταριθμηθείς, Hesychius. Wendt as against Meyer maintains that it is not proved that recourse was never again had to lots, because no other instance of such an appeal is recorded in

καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ κλῆρος ἐπὶ Ματθίαν, καὶ συγκατεψηφίσθη[1] μετὰ τῶν ἕνδεκα ἀποστόλων.

[1] **συγκατεψηφισθη**; but **συν**—ABCE 61, so W.H., Weiss; ℵ* has **κατεψηφ.** (*cf. Const. Apost.*, vi., 12, 1); D has **συ(νε)ψηφ.**; probably variants caused by the unusual word. **των ενδεκα**, D reads **ιβ′ = δωδεκα, δωδεκατος** Aug., so Blass in **β** (see p. xx., Pref.); both readings are probably due to taking **μετα των ενδεκα** in an inclusive sense.

Acts. But it is most significant that this one instance should be recorded between the departure of the Lord and the outpouring of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, and that after Pentecost no further reference is made to such a mode of decision. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, x. 19, xvi. 6. With regard to the historical character of the election of Matthias, Wendt sees no ground to doubt it in the main, although he is not prepared to vouch for all the details, but he finds no reason to place such an event at a later date of the Church's history, as Zeller proposed. To question the validity of the appointment is quite unreasonable, as not only is it presupposed in ii. 14, vi. 2, but even the way in which both St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5) and the Apocalypse (xxi. 14) employ the number twelve in a technical sense of the Twelve Apostles, makes the after choice of Matthias as here described very probable (so Overbeck, *in loco*). No mention is made of the laying on of hands, but "non dicuntur manus novo Apostolo impositæ; erat enim prorsus immediate constitutus," Bengel. See also on ver. 25, and xiii. 3.

Ascension of our Lord.—Friedrich in his *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 47 ff., discusses not only similarity of words and phrases, but similarity of contents in St. Luke's writings. With reference to the latter, he examines the two accounts of the Ascension as given in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts. There are, he notes, four points of difference (the same four in fact as are mentioned by Zeller, *Acts of the Apostles*, i., 166, E. T.): (1) Bethany as the *place* of the Ascension, Luke xxiv. 30; Acts i. 12, the Mount of Olives; (2) the *time* of the Ascension; according to Acts the event falls on the fortieth day after the Resurrection, i. 3; according to the Gospel on the Resurrection day itself; (3) the words of Jesus before the Ascension are not quite the same in the two narratives; (4) in the Gospel the words appear to be spoken in Jerusalem, in the Acts at the place of the Ascension. Friedrich points out what Zeller fully admitted, that (1) has no importance, for Bethany lay on the Mount of Olives, and the neighbourhood of Bethany might be described quite correctly as **ὄρος ἐλαιῶνος**; (3) is not of any great importance (as Zeller also admitted), since Luke xxiv. 47-49 and Acts i. 4-8 agree in the main. With regard to (4), Friedrich is again in agreement with Zeller in holding that the difficulty might easily be solved by supposing some slight inaccuracy, or that the words in question were uttered on the way from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives; but he agrees also with Zeller in maintaining that the *time* of the Ascension as given in Luke's Gospel and in Acts constitutes the only definite contradiction between the two writings. But even this difficulty presents itself to Friedrich as by no means insuperable, since the author has not attempted to avoid apparent contradictions in other places in the Acts, and therefore he need not have felt himself called upon to do so in the passage before us, where the book seems at variance with his Gospel (see pp. 48, 49).

But Friedrich proceeds to emphasise the many points in which the history of the Ascension in Acts reminds us of the close of the Gospel (see also Zeller, *u. s.*, ii., pp. 226, 227, E.T., and also Feine). Only St. Luke knows of the command of Jesus, that the Apostles should not leave Jerusalem, and of the promise of the Holy Spirit associated with it, Luke xxiv. 49, and Acts i. 4-8. So also Luke xxiv. 47 reminds us unmistakably of Acts i. 8; also Luke xxiv. 52 and Acts i. 12, Luke xxiv. 53 and Acts i. 14 (ii. 14) (*cf.* also Acts i. 5 and Luke iii. 16). But there is no need to adopt Friedrich's defence of the supposed contradiction with regard to the *time* of the Ascension. Certainly in the Gospel of St. Luke nothing is said of any interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension, but it is incredible that "the author can mean that late at night, vv. 29, 33, Jesus led the disciples out to Bethany and ascended in the dark!" Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 569, see also Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 59, and Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. 44. It is of course possible that St. Luke may have gained his information as to the interval of the forty days between the writing of his two works, but

II. 1. ΚΑΙ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι[1] τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς, ἦσαν ἅπαντες[2] ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. 2. καὶ[3] ἐγένετο ἄφνω ἐκ τοῦ

[1] συμπληρουσθαι ℵB³; συνπλ. AB*CDE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss.

[2] απαντες cursives; παντες ℵcABC 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V. (omit in ℵE). ομοθυμαδον C³E, Chrys.; ομου ℵABC* 61, e, Vulg., Ath., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; ομοθ. very common in Acts, ομου only elsewhere in John (3 times). D instead of και εν τῳ συμπλ. reads και εγενετο εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις του συμπλ., very likely as Blass says in notes on β text, "ut in principio lectionis". d, e, Gig., Par., Vulg., Aug. read τας ημερας (*e.g.*, Par., "et dum complerentur dies"—εν τῳ συμπληρουσθαι την ημεραν is now read by Blass in β, see comment.). (See Page, *Classical Review*, July, 1897, p. 319, and *cf.* also Weiss, Codex D, p. 55, note.) D also reads before επι το αυτο the words οντων αυτων παντων. Hilg. follows D.

[3] After και D inserts ιδου (*cf.* Syriac characteristic, Chase).

however this may be (*cf.* Plummer, but against this view Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 173), it becomes very improbable that even if a tradition existed that the Ascension took place on the evening of the Resurrection, and that Luke afterwards in Acts followed a new and more trustworthy account (so Wendt), that the Evangelist, the disciple of St. Paul, who must have been acquainted with the continuous series of the appearances of the Risen Christ in 1 Cor. xv., should have favoured such a tradition for a moment (see Zöckler, *u. s.*). On the undue stress laid by Harnack upon the famous passage in Barnabas, *Epist.*, xv., see Dr. Swete, *The Apostle's Creed*, p. 68, Plummer, *u. s.*, p. 564, and on this point and also the later tradition of a lengthy interval, Zöckler, *u. s.* For the early testimony to the fact of the Ascension in the Apostolic writings, and for the impossibility of accounting for the belief in the fact either from O.T. precedents or from pagan myths, see Zahn, *Das Apostolische Symbolum*, pp. 76-78, and *Witness of the Epistles* (Longmans), p. 400 ff. The view of Steinneyer that St. Luke gives us a full account of the Ascension in the Acts rather than in his Gospel, because he felt that the true position of such an event was to emphasise it more as the beginning of a new period than as a conclusion of the Gospel history, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, pp. 226, 227, deserves attention, and may be fitly compared with W.H., *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 73.

CHAPTER II.—Ver. 1. ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι, lit., "when the day of Pentecost was being fulfilled" (filled up). R.V. renders "was now come," and a question arises as to whether the words mean this, or that the day was only being filled up, and not fully come. Blass interprets the expression to mean a short time before the day of Pentecost, not the day itself. Weiss and others suppose that the expression refers to the completing of the interval of time between the Paschal Feast and Pentecost. Vulgate (*cf.* Syriac) reads "cum complerentur dies Pentecostes," and so all English versions have "days" except A. and R.V. The verb is only used by St. Luke in the N.T., twice in his Gospel, viii. 23, and in the same sense as here, ix. 51, and once more in the passage before us. We have the noun συμπλήρωσις in the same sense in LXX 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, Dan. (Theod.) ix. 2, 1 Esdras i. 58; see Friedrich, *ubi supra*, p. 44. The mode of expression is Hebraistic, as we see also from Exod. vii. 25, Jeremiah xxxvi. 10 (LXX). St. Luke may be using the expression of a day which had begun, according to Jewish reckoning, at the previous sunset, and which thus in the early morning could not be said to be either fulfilled or past, but which was in the process of being fulfilled (Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 90, 1895; Knabenbauer, *in loco*). The parallel passage in Luke ix. 51 cannot be quoted to support the view that the reference here is to a period *preceding* the day of Pentecost, since in that passage we have ἡμέρας, not ἡμέραν as here, and, although the interpretation of the word as referring to the approach of the Feast is possible, yet the circumstances and the view evidently taken by the narrator point decisively to the very day of the Feast (see Schmid, *Biblische Theol.*, p. 283). On the construction ἐν τῷ with the infinitive, see Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 232, 234, and Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 27. It is quite in the style of St. Luke, who frequently employs it; *cf.* the Hebrew use of בְּ, Fried-

οὐρανοῦ ἦχος ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας, καὶ ἐπλήρωσεν ὅλον τὸν οἶκον οὗ ἦσαν καθήμενοι·[1] 3. καὶ ὤφθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμεριζόμεναι

[1] καθημενοι; CD read καθεζομενοι, so Lach., Meyer, Hilg.; but reading in text ℵABE, minusc., Ath., Cyr.-Jer., Cyr.-Al., Theodrt., Wendt (as against Meyer), W.H., Weiss.

rich, p. 13, *ubi supra*, Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 75). On Spitta's forced interpretation of the word, see p. 100.—τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς: no occasion to add ἡμέρα, as the word was used as a proper name (although as an adjective ἡμέρα would of course be understood with it); *cf.* 2 Macc. xii. 32 (Tob. ii. 1), μετὰ δὲ τὴν λεγομ. Πεντηκοστήν.—ἅπαντες, *i.e.*, the hundred-and-twenty as well as the Apostles (Chrysostom, Jerome), and the expression may also have included other disciples who were present in Jerusalem at the Feast (so Hilgenfeld, Wendt, Holtzmann). This interpretation appears to be more in accordance with the wide range of the prophecy, ii. 16-21.—ὁμοθυμαδὸν, see above on ver. 14. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό may simply = "together," so that of the two expressions ὁμοῦ, R.V., and this phrase "alterum abundat" (Blass, Weiss); but the reference may be to the room in which they were previously assembled; *cf.* i. 15.

Ver. 2. ἄφνω: only in Acts, here, and in xvi. 26, xxviii. 6; Klostermann's *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 55; several times in LXX, but also in classical Greek in Thuc., Dem., Eur.—ἦχος ὥσπερ φερομ. πν. βιαίας, lit., "a sound as if a violent gust were being borne along". St. Chrysostom rightly emphasises the ὡς, so that the sound is not that of wind, but as of the rushing of a mighty wind (so too the tongues are not of fire, but *as of fire*). The words describe not a natural but a supernatural phenomenon, as Wendt pointedly admits. Wind was often used as a symbol of the divine Presence, 2 Sam. v. 24, Psalm civ. 3, 1 Kings xix. 11, Ezekiel xliii. 2, etc.; *cf.* Josephus, *Ant.*, iii., 5, 2; vii., 4; here it is used of the mighty power of the Spirit which nothing could resist. St. Luke alone of the N.T. writers uses ἦχος—Heb. xii. 19 being a quotation, and it is perhaps worth noting that the word is employed in medical writers, and by one of them, Aretæus, of the noise of the sea (*cf.* ἤχους θαλάσσης, Luke xxi. 25).—ὅλον τὸν οἶκον. If the Temple were meant, as Holtzmann and Zöckler think, it would have been specified, iii. 2, 11, v. 21.

Ver. 3. διαμεριζόμ. γλῶσσαι: the audible σημεῖον is followed by a visible: γλῶσσαι the organs of speech by which the wonderful works of God were to be proclaimed, so that the expression cannot be explained from Isaiah v. 24, where the tongue of fire is represented as an organ of destruction (Wendt, note, *in loco*). ὡσεὶ πυρός in their appearance and brightness. The words themselves therefore forbid reference to a natural phenomenon, to say nothing of the fact of the spiritual transformation of the Apostles which followed. Fire like wind was symbolic of the divine Presence, Exod. iii. 2, and of the Spirit who purifies and sanctifies, Ezekiel i. 13, Malachi, iii. 2, 3 (see Wetstein for classical instances of fire symbolical of the presence of the deity; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Homer, *Iliad*, xviii., 214; Virgil, *Æn.*, ii., 683). διαμεριζ., lit., dividing or parting themselves off. R.V. "tongues parting asunder," so that originally they were one, as one mighty flame of fire. This rendering is strictly in accordance with the meaning of the verb. Vulgate *dispertitæ* (the word used by Blass). διαμερίζω is used once again in Acts ii. 45 in the active voice, and once only by St. Matthew and St. Mark (once by St. John as a quotation) in the middle voice, but six times by St. Luke in his Gospel; frequently in the LXX.—ἐκάθισε (not -αν), *sc.*, γλῶσσα (not πῦρ or πνεῦμα ἅγιον), although the latter is advocated by Chrysostom, Theophylact, Bengel: "it sat," R.V. The singular best expresses the result of the tongues parting asunder, and of the distribution to each and all. So too ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, "upon each one of them," R.V., *cf.* ver. 6 εἷς ἕκαστος (and ver. 8). The resting of a flame of fire upon the head as a token of the favour of Heaven may be illustrated from classical sources (see above and instances in Wetstein), but the thought here is not so much of fire as the token of divine favour, as of the tongue (as of fire) conferring a divine power to utter in speech divine things.

Ver. 4. ἀποφθέγγεσθαι—a word peculiar to Acts, *cf.* v. 14 and xxvi. 25; in the LXX used not of ordinary conversation, but of the utterances of prophets; *cf.* Ezek. xiii. 9, Micah v. 12, 1 Chron. xxv.

γλῶσσαι ὡσεὶ πυρὸς, ἐκάθισέ[1] τε ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, 4. καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις, καθὼς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἀποφθέγγεσθαι. 5. Ἦσαν δὲ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ κατοικοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν. 6. γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης, συνῆλθε τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχύθη· ὅτι ἤκουον εἷς ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ

[1] **εκαθισαν** ℵ*D, probably emendation from **γλωσσαι**, but overwhelming evidence for **-σεν**.

1, so fitly here: (*cf.* **ἀποφθέγματα**, used by the Greeks of the sayings of the wise and philosophers, and see also references in Wendt).—**ἑτέραις γλώσσαις**, see additional note.

Ver. 5. **κατοικοῦντες**, probably used not merely of temporary dwellers for the Feast, but of the devout Jews of the Diaspora, who for the purpose of being near the Temple had taken up their residence in Jerusalem, perhaps for the study of the Law, perhaps to live and to die within the city walls (see St. Chrysostom's comment on the word). They were not proselytes as is indicated by **Ἰουδαῖοι**, but probably devout men like Symeon, Luke ii. 25, who is described by the same word **εὐλαβής**, waiting for the consolation of Israel. The expression, as Zöckler points out, is not quite synonymous with that in ver. 14 (or with Luke xiii. 4), and he explains it as above. There is certainly no need to consider the word, with Spitta and Hilgenfeld, as an epithet added by a later editor, or to omit **Ἰουδαῖοι**, as Blass strongly urges (while Hilgenfeld desires to retain this word). The word may fairly be regarded as contrasted with **Γαλιλαῖοι** (ver. 7). The same view of it as applied here to foreign Jews who had their stated residence in Jerusalem is maintained by Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 291 (note) E.T.—**κατοικεῖν** is used generally of taking up a permanent abode as in contrast to **παροικεῖν** used of temporary sojourn, and on the frequent use of the word in St. Luke, Friedrich, *ubi supra*, p. 39. But here it is followed most probably by **εἰς** not **ἐν**, *constructio prægnans*, *cf.* Wendt and Weiss as against W.H. (T.R. **ἐν** and so Blass in β). Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 36, regards this frequent use of **εἰς** as characteristic of the style of Acts, *cf.* ix. 21, xiv. 25, and considers it quite inconceivable that **ἐν** would be changed into **εἰς**, although the reverse is likely enough to have happened (Wendt).—**εὐλαβεῖς**, see viii. 2.—**ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους**: "*from* every nation," so R.V.; "out of," A.V., but this would represent **ἐκ** rather than **ἀπό**, and would imply that they belonged to these different nations, not that they were born Jews residing among them and coming from them (Humphry, *Commentary on R.V.*).—**τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν**, *sc.* **ἐθνῶν**. The phrase is used frequently in LXX, *cf.* Deut. ii. 25, and in classical literature by Plato and Dem. If **κατοικοῦντες** includes the Jews who had come up to the Feast as well as those who had settled in Jerusalem from other countries, this expression is strikingly illustrated by the words of Philo, *De Monarchia*, ii., 1, p. 223. The Pentecost would be more largely attended even than the Passover, as it was a more favourable season for travelling than the early spring (see Wetstein, *in loco*), and *cf.* Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 291, 307, E.T.

Ver. 6. **φωνῆς ταύτης**: "when this sound was heard," R.V. "Hic idem quod **ἦχος** comm. 2," so Wetstein, who compares for **φωνή** in this sense Matt. xxiv. 31, 1 Cor. xiv. 7, 8 (2 Chron. v. 13), and so most recent commentators (*cf.* John iii. 8); if human voices were meant, the plural might have been expected. But the word in singular might refer to the divine voice, the voice of the Spirit, *cf.* Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5. The A.V., so too Grotius, following Erasmus, Calvin, render the word as if **φήμη**, but the two passages quoted from LXX to justify this rendering are no real examples, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Gen. xlv. 16, Jer. xxvii. 46.—**τὸ πλῆθος**: a characteristic word of St. Luke, occurring eight times in his Gospel, seventeen in Acts, and only seven times in rest of the N.T.; on the frequency with which St. Luke uses expressions indicative of fulness, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 40, 102. In inscriptions the word seems to have been used not only of political but of religious communities, see Deissmann, *Neue Bibel-*

διαλέκτῳ λαλούντων αὐτῶν.[1] 7. ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐθαύμαζον, λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Οὐκ [2] ἰδοὺ πάντες οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ λαλοῦντες Γαλιλαῖοι; 8. καὶ πῶς ἡμεῖς ἀκούομεν ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἡμῶν ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν, 9. Πάρθοι καὶ Μῆδοι καὶ Ἐλαμῖται,[3] καὶ οἱ

[1] **τῃ ιδιᾳ διαλ. λαλουντων**; in D **λαλουντας ταις γλωσσαις αυτων**, Syr. Harcl., (Aug. conflate), but not received by Blass in β although retained by Hilg.; may be retranslation from Syriac (Chase), but see Weiss, Codex D, p. 56.

[2] **ουκ** AC; **ουχ** ℵDE 61, so Tisch., W.H. marg.; **ουχι** B, so W.H. text, Weiss (Wendt doubtful); see further Winer-Schmiedel, p. 39.

[3] **Ελαμιται** ℵ[3]EIP, but **Ελαμειται** A(B)(C)D (ℵ omits), so Tisch., W.H., Weiss; Blass in β reads **Αιλαμιται**, *cf.* B.

studien, pp. 59, 60 (1897), and see below on xv. 30.—**συνεχύθη**—from **συνχύνω** (**συνχέω**), only found in Acts, where it occurs five times (*cf.* also **σύγχυσις**, Acts xix. 29), see Moulton and Geden, *sub v.* For its meaning here *cf.* Gen. xi. 7, 9, 1 Macc. iv. 27, 2 Macc. xiii. 23, xiv. 28; Vulg., *mente confusa est.*—**διαλέκτῳ**: only in the Acts in N.T. The question has been raised as to whether it meant a dialect or a language. Meyer argued in favour of the former, but the latter rendering more probably expresses the author's meaning, *cf.* i. 19, and also xxi. 40, xxii. 2, xxvi. 14. The word is apparently used as the equivalent of **γλῶσσα**, ver. 11, A. and R.V. "language". As the historian in his list, vv. 9, 10, apparently is following distinctions of language (see Rendall, *Acts*, p. 177, and Appendix, p. 359), this would help to fix the meaning of the word **διάλεκτος** here. Wendt in revising Meyer's rendering contends that the word is purposely introduced because **γλῶσσα**, vv. 3, 4, had just been employed not in the sense of language but tongue, and so might have been misunderstood if repeated here with **λαλεῖν**. On the other hand it may be urged that some of the distinctions in the list are those of dialect, and that St. Luke intentionally used a word meaning both language and dialect.

Ver. 7. **ἐξίσταντο**: frequent in St. Luke, three times in his Gospel, eight in the Acts, elsewhere once in St. Paul, once in St. Matthew, four times in St. Mark. The word is often found in the LXX in various senses; *cf.* for its meaning here Gen. xliii. 33, Judith xiii. 17, xv. 1, 1 Macc. xv. 32, xvi. 22. **πάντες—Γαλιλαῖοι**: there is no need to suppose with Schöttgen (so Grotius, Olshausen) that the term implies any reference to the want of culture among the Galileans, as if in this way to emphasise the surprise of the questioners, or to explain the introduction of the term because the Galileans were "magis ad arma quam ad litteras et linguas idonei" (Corn. à Lapide). But if there is a reference to the peculiar dialect of the Galileans this might help to explain the introduction of **Ἰουδαίαν** in ver. 9 (Wetstein followed by Weiss, but see below). Weiss sees here, it is true, the hand of a reviser who thinks only of the Apostles and not of the hundred-and-twenty who could not be supposed to come under the term **Γαλιλαῖοι**. But whilst no doubt **Γαλ.** might be considered a fitting description of the Apostolic band (except Judas), Hilgenfeld well asks why the hundred-and-twenty should not have been also Galileans, if they had followed Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem.

Ver. 8. **τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλ. . . . ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθημεν**—used distributively as ver. 11 **ταῖς ἡμετ. γλώσσαις** shows—and hence cannot be taken to mean that only one language common to all, *viz.*, Aramaic, was spoken on the outpouring of the Spirit.

Vv. 9-11. The list which follows has been described as showing the trained hand of the historian, whilst it has also been regarded as a distinctly popular utterance in Greek style (Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 149; but see also Rendall, *Acts*, Introd., p. 13). But, as Dean Plumptre well remarks, the omission of many countries which one might have expected shows that the list was not a made up list after the event, but that St. Luke had accurately mentioned the nations present at the Feast. The reference throughout is of course to Jews of the Dispersion, and Schürer (see too Schöttgen) well parallels the description given here of the extent of the Diaspora with the description in Agrippa's letter to the Emperor Caligula given by Philo (*Legat. ad Gaium*, 36.

κατοικοῦντες τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν, Ἰουδαίαν τε καὶ Καππαδοκίαν, Πόντον καὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, 10. Φρυγίαν τε καὶ Παμφυλίαν, Αἴγυπτον καὶ τὰ μέρη τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην, καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες

Mang., ii., 587). All commentators seem to be agreed in regarding the list as framed to some extent on geographical lines, beginning from Parthia the furthest east. Mr. Page holds that the countries named may be regarded as grouped not only geographically but historically. Of the Jews of the Dispersion there were four classes: (1) *Eastern* or *Babylonian* Jews, corresponding in the list to Parthians, Medes, Elamites; (2) *Syrian* Jews, corresponding to Judæa, Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia; (3) *Egyptian* Jews, corresponding to Egypt and the parts of Libya over against Cyrene; (4) *Roman* Jews. (1) Parthia, mentioned here only in the N.T., is placed first, not only because of the vast extent of its empire from India to the Tigris, but because it then was the only power which had tried issues with Rome and had not been defeated, "Parthia" B.D. (Rawlinson). In Mesopotamia, Elam, and Babylonia were to be found the descendants of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes and of the kingdom of Judah, transported thither by the Assyrians and Chaldeans, now and until the reign of Trajan the subjects of the Parthians, but always of political importance to Rome from their position on the eastern borders of the Empire (Schürer, *ubi supra*, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 223, 224 E.T.). At the head of (2), Ἰουδαίαν is placed by Mr. Page, *i.e.*, at the head of the group with which in his view it is geographically connected. Of Asia, as of Syria, it could be said that Jews dwelt in large numbers in every city, and the statement that Jews had settled in the most distant parts of Pontus is abundantly confirmed by the Jewish inscriptions in the Greek language found in the Crimea. Seleucus Nicator granted to the Jews in Syria and Asia the same privileges as those bestowed upon his Greek and Macedonian subjects (Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 31); and to Antiochus the Great was due the removal of two thousand Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylonia to Lydia and Phrygia (Schürer, *l. c.*, and "Antiochus III.," B.D.[2]; Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 3, 4). Mr. Page uses the word Ἰουδαία as equivalent to the land of the Jews, *i.e.*, Palestine and perhaps also to some part of Syria. In the former sense the word could undoubtedly be employed (Hamburger, "Judäa," *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 5; so too by classical writers and by Strabo, "Judæa," B.D.). But it is very doubtful how far the term can be extended to include any part of Syria, although Josephus (*B.J.*, iii., 3, 5) speaks of the maritime places of Judæa extending as far as Ptolemais. It may well be that Syria was regarded as a kind of outer Palestine, intermediate between it and heathendom (Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, pp. 16-19, 71, 73). St. Jerome reads Syria instead of Judæa, a reading to which Blass apparently inclines. Tertullian conjectured Armenia, *c. Jud.*, vii., and Idumæa (so again Spitta), Bithynia and India have been proposed. It is often very difficult to say exactly what is meant by Asia, whether the term refers to the entire Roman province, which had been greatly increased in the first century B.C. since its formation in 133 B.C., or whether the word is used in its popular sense, as denoting the Ægean coast lands and excluding Phrygia. Here the term is used with the latter signification (Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 150, and also "Asia" in Hastings, B.D.). At the head of (3) stands Egypt, where the Jewish Dispersion, especially in Alexandria, played so important a part in the history of civilisation. The greatest prosperity of the Jews in Egypt began with Alexander the Great, but long before his time, in the seventh century B.C., Jewish immigrants were in the country (Schürer, *ubi supra*, pp. 226, 227, and "Alexandria," B.D.[2]). From Egypt the Dispersion penetrated further westward (Schürer, *u. s.*, pp. 230, 231, and note), and in Libya Cyrenaica or Pentapolitana, the modern *Tripoli*, the Jews were very numerous; *cf.* for their history in Cyrene 1 Macc. xv. 23; 2 Macc. ii. 23; Jos., *Ant.*, xvi., 6, 1, 5, and Acts vi. 9, xi. 30, xiii. 1; Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 232, and Merivale, *Romans under the Empire*, pp. 364, 365. The expression used here, τὰ μέρη τῆς Λ. τῆς κατὰ Κ., affords a striking parallel to that used by Dio Cassius, ἡ πρὸς Κυρήνην Λιβύη, liii., 12; *cf.* also Jos., *Ant.*, xvi., 16; "Cyrene," B.D.[2], and Hastings' B.D. In (4) we have οἱ ἐπιδ. Ῥωμαῖοι. There is no ground for supposing that any Jews dwelt permanently in Rome before the

Ῥωμαῖοι, Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι, 11. Κρῆτες καὶ Ἄραβες, ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεῖα

time of Pompey, although their first appearance there dates from the days of the Maccabees (1 Macc. viii. 17, xiv. 24, xv. 15 ff.). Of the numerous Jewish families brought to Rome by Pompey many regained their freedom, and settled beyond the Tiber as a regular Jewish community with the rights of Roman citizenship. In 19 A.D., however, the whole Jewish population was banished from the imperial city, Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 3, 5; but after the overthrow of Sejanus it may be safely assumed that Tiberius allowed their return to Rome (Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 232 ff.).—**οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι,** "Sojourners from Rome," R.V., *i.e.*, the Jews who live at Rome as sojourners—Roman Jews. Others take **ἐπιδ.** as referring to the Roman Jews who were making a temporary sojourn in Jerusalem for the Feast, or for some other purpose, the word being thus in a certain degree opposed to the **κατοικοῦντες** (of permanent dwelling) in ver. 5. Others again apparently take the expression as describing Roman Jews who, born in Rome, had taken up their dwelling in Jerusalem, and who are thus distinguished from those Jews who, born in Jerusalem, were Romans by right of Roman citizenship. The only other passage in which **ἐπιδημοῦντες** occurs is Acts xvii. 21 (but *cf.* xviii. 27, D and **β** (Blass)), and it is there used of the **ξένοι** sojourning in Athens, and so probably thus making a temporary sojourn, or who were not Athenians by birth or citizenship, as distinct from the regular inhabitants of Athens. *Cf.* Athenæus, viii., p. 361 F.—**οἱ Ῥώμην κατοικοῦντες, καὶ οἱ ἐνεπιδημοῦντες τῇ πόλει,** which passage shows that **ἐπιδ.** "minus significat quam **κατοικεῖν**" (Blass), and other instances in Wetstein. Hilgenfeld, whose pages contain a long discussion of recent views of the words in question, argues that according to what precedes we should expect **καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ῥώμην,** and according to what follows we should expect simply **Ῥωμαῖοι,** and he solves the difficulty by the arbitrary method of omitting **καὶ οἱ ἐπιδ.** before **Ῥωμαῖοι,** and **Ἰουδ. τε καὶ προσήλυτοι** after it, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 93 ff. (1895); see further *Actus Apost.*, p. 260, 1899.—**Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι.** Not only would St. Luke in writing to a Roman convert of social rank like Theophilus be likely to mention the presence of *Roman* Jews at the first Christian Pentecost, but he would also emphasise the fact that they were not only Jews, or of Jewish origin, but that proselytes from heathendom were also included (Felten, Belser). In thus explaining the words Felten refers them, with Erasmus and Grotius, to **οἱ ἐπιδ. Ῥωμαῖοι** only, whilst Overbeck, Weiss, Holtzmann, Wendt, Belser, so Page, Hackett, refer them to the whole of the preceding catalogue. It is evident that Schürer takes the same view, for in speaking of the large offerings contributed by proselytes to the Temple at Jerusalem he mentions that in stating the number of Jews of every nationality living in Jerusalem the *Acts* does not forget to mention the proselytes along with the Jews, ii. 10 (*u. s.*, p. 307).

Ver. 11. **Κρῆτες καὶ Ἄραβες**: both names seem to have been added to the list as an after-thought. Even if we cannot accept Nösgen's idea that St. Luke is repeating *verbatim* the account which he had received orally from an eyewitness who had forgotten the Arabians and Cretans in going through the list geographically, yet the introduction of the two names in no apparent connection with the rest ought to show us that we are not dealing with an artificial list, but with a genuine record of the different nations represented at the Feast. Belser, who endorses this view, supposes that St. Luke obtained his information from an eyewitness who added the Cretans and Arabians supplementarily, just as a person might easily forget one or two names in going through a long list of representative nations at a festival. It is possible, as Belser suggests, that the Cretans and Arabians were thinly represented at the Pentecost, although the notices in Josephus and Philo's letter mentioned above point to a large Jewish population in Crete. The special mention of the Cretans is strikingly in accordance with the statement of the Jewish envoys to Caligula, *viz.*, that all the more noted islands of the Mediterranean, including Crete, were full of Jews, "Crete," B.D.,[2] and Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 232. In R.V. "Cretans"; which marks the fact that the Greek **Κρῆτες** is a dissyllable; in A.V. "Cretes" this is easily forgotten (*cf.* Titus i. 12).—**μεγαλεῖα** only found here

τοῦ Θεοῦ; 12. ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες καὶ διηπόρουν,[1] ἄλλος πρὸς ἄλλον λέγοντες, Τί ἂν θέλοι τοῦτο εἶναι; 13. ἕτεροι δὲ χλευάζοντες[2] ἔλεγον, Ὅτι γλεύκους μεμεστωμένοι εἰσί.

[1] διηπορουν CDEI, Bas., Chrys., so Lach.; διηπορουντο ℵAB, so Tisch., Weiss, W.H., R.V. After προς αλλον D adds επι τῳ γεγονοτι, so Blass in β, and Hilg. (Syr. Harcl., Aug.); *cf.* iii. 10, iv. 21, and Weiss, Codex D, p. 56.

[2] χλευαζοντες, but διαχλευαζ. R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, beyond doubt to be read.

in N.T.; the reading of T.R., Luke i. 49, cannot be supported; *cf.* Psalm lxx. (lxxi.) 19, where the word occurs in LXX. (Hebrew, גְּדֹלוֹת) Ecclesiasticus xvii. 9, xviii. 4, xxxiii. (xxxvi.) 8, xlii. 21, 3 Macc. vii. 22, R. The word is found in Josephus, and also in classical Greek: used here not only of the Resurrection of the Lord (Grotius), but of all that the prophets had foretold, of all that Christ had done and the Holy Ghost had conferred.

Ver. 12. **διηπόρουν**: not found in LXX (only in Psalm lxxvi. 5, and Dan. ii. 3, Symmachus), and peculiar to St. Luke in the N.T., once in his Gospel, ix. 7 (xxiv. 4 ἀπορεῖσθαι, W.H. and R.V.), and three times in Acts, *cf.* v. 24, x. 17. διηποροῦντο in R.V. "were perplexed"; A.V. "were in doubt," although in Luke xxiv. 4 this or a similar word is rendered as in R.V., "were (much) perplexed". The Greek conveys the thought of utter uncertainty what to think, rather than doubt as to which opinion of several is right (Humphry). The word no doubt is frequently found in classical writers, and is found also in Philo (not in Josephus), but it may be worth noting that ἀπορία, εὐπορία, διαπορεῖν, εὐπορεῖν are all peculiar to St. Luke, and were terms constantly employed by medical writers (Hobart, *Medical Language*, etc., p. 163). **τί ἂν θέλοι τοῦτο εἶναι**—θέλω was constantly used in this sense in classical writers, see instances in Wetstein. On the popular use of θέλω instead of βούλομαι in later Greek, *cf.* Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. 15. Blass points out that St. Luke's employment of βούλομαι is characteristic of his culture, although it must be remembered that the Evangelist uses θέλω (as here) very frequently.

Ver. 13. **ἕτεροι δὲ**: although the word is ἕτεροι, not ἄλλοι, it is doubtful how far it indicates a distinct class from those mentioned as speaking in vv. 7-12. At the same time not only πάντες, ver. 12, but also the behaviour of the ἕτεροι, seems to separate them from the εὐλαβεῖς in ver. 5.—**χλευάζοντες**: but stronger with the intensifying διά than the simple verb in xvii. 32; used in classical Greek, Dem., Plato, and in Polybius—here only in N.T., not found in LXX, although the simple verb is used (see below).—**γλεύκους**: if the rendering R.V. "new wine" is adopted, the ridicule was indeed ill-timed, as at the Pentecost there was no new wine strictly speaking, the earliest vintage being in August (*cf.* Chrysostom and Oecumenius, who see in such a charge the excessive folly and the excessive malignity of the scoffers). Neither the context nor the use of the word elsewhere obliges us to suppose that it is used here of unfermented wine. Its use in Lucian, *Ep.*, *Sat.*, xxii. (to which reference is made by Wendt and Page), and also in LXX, Job xxxii. 19, ὥσπερ ἀσκὸς γλεύκους ζέων δεδεμένος, points to a wine still fermenting, intoxicating, while the definition of Hesychius, τὸ ἀπόσταγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὶν πατηθῇ, refers its lusciousness to the quality of its make (from the purest juice of the grape), and not of necessity to the brevity of its age, see B.D. "Wine". It would therefore be best to render "sweet wine," made perhaps of a specially sweet small grape, *cf.* Gen. xlix. 11. "The extraordinary candour of Christ's biographers must not be forgotten. Notice also such sentences as 'but some doubted,' and in the account of Pentecost, 'these men are full of new wine'. Such observations are wonderfully true to human nature, but no less wonderfully opposed to any 'accretion' theory": Romanes, *Thoughts on Religion*, p. 156.

Ver. 14. **σταθεὶς δὲ Πέτρος**: St. Chrysostom rightly remarks on the change which had passed over St. Peter. In the place where a few weeks before he had denied with an oath that he knew "the man," he now stands forth to proclaim him as the Christ and the Saviour. It is quite characteristic of St. Luke thus to introduce participles indicating the position or gesture of the speaker (*cf.* Friedrich, Zöckler, Overbeck); *cf.* St.

14. Σταθεὶς δὲ Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ἕνδεκα,[1] ἐπῆρε τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπεφθέγξατο αὐτοῖς, Ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἅπαντες, τοῦτο ὑμῖν γνωστὸν ἔστω, καὶ ἐνωτίσασθε τὰ ῥήματά μου. 15. οὐ γάρ, ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε, οὗτοι μεθύουσιν· ἔστι γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας· 16. ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ,[2] 17. "Καὶ[3] ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις,

[1] ενδεκα D, Gig., Par., Syr., Pesh., Aug. add αποστολοις; *cf.* i. 20. D reads δεκα for ενδεκα, perhaps through carelessness (Weiss). After επηρεν D, Par.[2] insert πρωτος; E has προτερον after την φωνην αυτου; πρωτος retained by Blass in β, and by Hilg.; it seems a needless addition as it is implied in the verse (see also Harris, *Four Lectures*, p. 58).

[2] Ιωηλ ℵABCEIP, Vulg., Bas., Chrys., Cyr.-Jer.; so W.H., R.V., Weiss. Om. D, Iren., Aug., Hil. "Rebapt.," so Hilg. Blass regards it as an interpolation even in α text.

[3] και om. by D, Gig., Par., Ir., Aug., Sah., Boh.; but in LXX.

Luke xviii. 11, 40, xix. 8, Acts v. 40, xi. 13, xvii. 2, xxv. 18, xxvii. 21.—**σὺν τοῖς ἕνδεκα**, and so with Matthias; *cf.* v. 32, and i. 22.—**ἐπῆρε τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ**: this phrase is only found in St. Luke's Gospel (xi. 29) and the Acts (xiv. 11, xxii. 22), but it is quite classical, so in Demosthenes, and in LXX it occurs several times.—**ἀπεφθέγξατο**: "spake forth," R.V., *cf.* xxvi. 25, expressive of the solemnity of the utterance, see above in ver. 4, and showing that St. Peter's words were inspired no less than the speaking with tongues (Weiss).—**ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι**: no word of reproach, but an address of respect; the words may be taken quite generally to indicate not only those previously present, but also those who were attracted by the noise. There is no need to suppose that St. Peter addressed the inhabitants of Jerusalem and the Jews as if they had been the only scoffers as distinct from the pilgrims from other lands. It is no doubt possible that the first part of the speech was addressed to the native home-bred residents, and that in ver. 22 St. Peter in the word Ἰσραηλῖται includes all the Jews whether resident in Jerusalem or not.—**ἐνωτίσασθε**: only here in N.T., but frequent in LXX, especially in the Psalms. It usually translates Hebrew הֶאֱזִין from Hebrew אֹזֶן = ear; *cf. inaurire*; Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 130. "Give ear unto my words," R.V. *Auribus percipite*, Vulg.

Ver. 15. **ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας**: if the words refer to the hour of early prayer, 9 A.M., the Jews previously did not partake of food, and on festal days they abstained from food and drink until the sixth hour (twelve o'clock). But if Schürer (see on iii. 1, and Blass, *in loco*) is right in specifying other hours for prayer, the expression may mean that St. Peter appeals to the early period of the day as a proof that the charge of drunkenness was contrary to all reasonable probability.

Ver. 17. **ἐν ταῖς ἐσχ. ἡμέρ.**, *i.e.*, the time immediately preceding the Parousia of the Messiah (Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 372). The expression is introduced here instead of **μετὰ ταῦτα**, LXX, to show that St. Peter saw in the outpouring of the Spirit the fulfilment of Joel's prophecy, ii. 28-31 (LXX), and the dawn of the period preceding the return of Christ in glory, Isaiah ii. 2, Micah iv. 1 (2 Tim. iii. 1, James v. 3, Heb. i. 1).—**λέγει ὁ Θεός**: introduced possibly from Joel ii. 12, although wanting in LXX and Hebrew.—**ἐκχεῶ**: Hellenistic future, Blass, *Grammatik des N.G.*, pp. 41, 42, 58, *cf.* x. 45, Titus iii. 6. In LXX the word is used as here, not only in Joel, but in Zach. xii. 10, Ecclus. xviii. 11, xxiv. 33, but very often of pouring forth anger.—**ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύμ. μου**, "I will pour forth of my Spirit," R.V., so in LXX, but in Heb., "I will pour out my Spirit". The partitive **ἀπό** may be accounted for by the thought that the Spirit of God considered in its entirety remains with God, and that men acquire only a certain portion of its energies (so Wendt, Holtzmann). Or the partitive force of the word may be taken as signifying the great diversity of the Spirit's gifts and operations. See also Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 151 (1893).—**πᾶσαν σάρκα**, *i.e.*, all men; but this ex-

λέγει ὁ Θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν[1] καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν· καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια[2] ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, 18. καί γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις[3] ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου,

[1] For **υμων . . . υμων** D, Gig., Tert., "Rebapt." Hil. read **αυτων** (referred by Harris to a Montanistic application).

[2] **ενυπνια** EP, Tert., Chrys. (*cf.* LXX, but AS[3] has **-ιοις**); but **ενυπνιοις** ℵABCD[2] 13, 27, 61, Epiph., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.

[3] **εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις** om. D, Gig. (Cypr.), *Acta Perpetuæ*. **και προφητευσουσιν** om. D, Par.[1], Tert. (Cypr.), *Acta Perpetuæ* (not in LXX). The two clauses come together in Syriac and may have been omitted together (Chase).

pression in itself suggests a contrast beween the weakness and imperfection of humanity and the all-powerful working of the divine Spirit. The expression is Hebraistic, *cf.* Luke iii. 6, John xvii. 2, and Ecclus. xlv. 4, and often in LXX. In Joel's prophecy the expression only included the people of Israel, although the divine Spirit should be no longer limited to particular prophets or favoured individuals, but should be given to the whole nation. If we compare ii. 39, the expression would include at least the members of the Diaspora, wherever they might be, but it is doubtful whether we can take it as including the heathen as such in St. Peter's thoughts, although Hilgenfeld is so convinced that the verse ii. 39 can only refer to the heathen that he refers all the words from **καὶ πᾶσι** to the end of the verse to his "author to Theophilus". Spitta on the other hand regards the expression as referring only to the Jews of the Diaspora; if the Gentiles had been intended, he thinks that we should have had **τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν ἔθνεσιν** as in xxii. 21. Undoubtedly we have an analogous expression to ii. 39 in Eph. ii. 13, **οἵ ποτε ὄντες μακράν,** where the words evidently refer to the heathen, but we must not expect the universalism of St. Paul in the first public address of St. Peter: for him it is still **ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν,** "our God," ver. 39, and even the expression, **πρῶτον,** iii. 26, in which Holtzmann sees a reference to the extension of the Messianic blessings to the Jew first and then to the Gentile, need only mean that in St. Peter's view these blessings could only be secured by the Gentile through becoming a proselyte to the faith of Israel. It is thus only that St. Peter's subsequent conduct becomes intelligible. The reading **αὐτῶν** instead of **ὑμῶν** in the next clause before both **υἱοὶ** and **θυγατέρες** if it is adopted (Blass β) would seem to extend the scope of the prophecy beyond the limits of Israel proper.—**θυγατέρες**: as Anna is called **προφῆτις,** Luke ii. 36, so too in the Christian Church the daughters of Philip are spoken of as **προφητεύουσαι,** xxi. 9.—**νεανίσκοι**: in LXX and Hebrew the order is reversed. It may be that Bengel is right in drawing the distinction thus: "Apud juvenes maximi vigent sensus externi, visionibus opportuni: apud senes sensus interni, somniis accommodati". But he adds "Non tamen adolescentes a somniis, neque sensus a visionibus excluduntur" (see also Keil, *in loco*), and so Overbeck, Winer, Wendt see in the words simply an instance of the Hebrew love of parallelism.—**καί γε** (in LXX) = Hebrew וְגַם—only here in N.T. and in xvii. 27 W.H. (and possibly in Luke xix. 42) = "and even," Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 255. The only good Attic instance of **καί γε** with an intervening word is to be found in Lysias, *in Theomn.*, ii., 7, although not a strict parallel to the passage before us, Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 168.

Ver. 18. As there was to be no limit of sex or age, so too there was no limit of condition. The word **μου** is not in the Hebrew, only in the LXX, but as it is found in the latter and in Acts it is argued that the words **δούλους** and **δούλας** do not mean those of servile rank, but are applied in a general sense to those who are worshippers, and so servants of God. But in retaining the word **μου** we are not obliged to reject the literal meaning "bond-servants," just as St. Peter himself, in addressing household servants and slaves, commands them to act **ὡς δοῦλοι θεοῦ** (1 Peter ii. 16): "Intelliguntur servi secundum carnem, diversi a liberis.

καὶ προφητεύσουσι. 19. καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω, καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω,[1] αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ. 20. ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος, καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα,[2] πρὶν ἢ

[1] **αιμα και πυρ και ατμιδα καπνου** om. D, Gig., Par.[1], Hilg.

[2] **πριν η** BP, Chrys., so W.H., marg.; retained by Weiss (Wendt doubtful). **η** omitted in ℵABCDE 13, 61; so Tisch., W.H., Hilg. text, R.V. (omitted also in LXX). **την ημεραν,** article omitted by ℵ*BD; so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

ver. 17, sed iidem servi Dei," Bengel. According to Maimonides, no slave could be a prophet, but as in Christ there was neither Jew nor Gentile, neither male nor female, so in Him there was neither bond nor free (see also Keil, *in loco*).—**καὶ προφητεύσουσι**: an explanatory addition of the speaker, or an interpolation from ver. 17, not found either in Hebrew or LXX.

Ver. 19. The word **σημεῖα** is wanting in the Hebrew and the LXX, but the co-ordination of the two words **τέρας** and **σημεῖον** is frequent in the N.T. (John iv. 48, Acts iv. 30, Rom. xv. 19, 2 Cor. xii. 12), and even more so in the LXX (Exod. vii. 3, 9, Deut. iv. 34, Neh. ix. 10, Dan. vi. 27), so also in Josephus, Philo, Plutarch, Polybius. For the distinction between the words in the N.T., see below on ver. 22. **τέρας** is often used of some startling portent, or of some strange appearance in the heavens, so here fitly used of the sun being turned into darkness, etc. But God's **τέρατα** are always **σημεῖα** to those who have eyes to see, and significantly in the N.T. the former word is never found without the latter. It is no doubt true to say that St. Peter had already received a sign from heaven above in the **ἦχος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ**, and a sign upon the earth below in the **λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις** (Nösgen), but the whole context, vv. 19-21, shows that St. Peter's thoughts had passed from the day of Pentecost to a period of grace and warning which should precede the Parousia. No explanation, therefore, of the words which limits their fulfilment to the Pentecostal Feast (see Keil, *in loco*, and also his reference to the interpretation of the Rabbis) is satisfactory.—**σημεῖα** is probably introduced into the text to emphasise the antithesis, as also are **ἄνω** and **κάτω**.—**αἷμα καὶ πῦρ**: if we see in these words **σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω**, there is no need to refer them to such startling phenomena as rain of blood, or fiery meteors, or pillars of smoke rising from the earth (so De Wette, Overbeck), but rather to the bloodshed and devastation of war (so Holtzmann, Wendt, Felten); *cf.* our Lord's words, Matt. xxiv. 6, 29. Dean Plumptre thinks of the imagery as drawn from one of the great thunderstorms of Palestine, and *cf.* Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 350, 351 (1897).

Ver. 20. For similar prophetic imagery taken from the startling phenomena of an eclipse in Palestine, *cf.* Isaiah xiii. 10, Ezek. xxxii. 7, Amos viii. 9.—**πρὶν ἢ ἐλθεῖν**. The LXX omit **ἢ**, and Weiss contends that this is the reason of its omission here in so many MSS. Weiss retains it as in vii. 2, xxv. 16; *cf.* also Luke ii. 26 (but doubtful). Blass omits it here, but retains it in the other two passages cited from Acts: "Ionicum est non Atticum"; *cf.* Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 130 (1893).—**τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου.** It is most significant that in the Epistles of the N.T. this O.T. phrase used of Jehovah is constantly applied to the Coming of Jesus Christ to judgment; *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 2, 1 Cor. i. 8, 2 Cor. i. 14, Phil. i. 10; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 104.—**καὶ ἐπιφανῆ**: if the word is to be retained, it means a day manifest to all as being what it claims to be, Vulgate *manifestus*, "clearly visible"; Luke xvii. 24; also 1 Tim. vi. 14, 2 Thess. ii. 8, where the word **ἐπιφάνεια** is used of the Parousia (*cf.* Prayer-Book, "the Epiphany *or* Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles"). But in the Hebrew the word הַנּוֹרָא = "terrible," not "clearly visible," and the LXX here, as elsewhere, Hab. i. 7, Mal. i. 14 (Judges xiii. 6, A.), etc., has failed to give a right derivation of the word which it connects with רָאָה, to see, instead of with יָרֵא, to fear (Niph. נוֹרָא and Part., as here, "terrible"). Zöckler holds that the LXX read not הַנּוֹרָא, but הַנּוֹדָא.

ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ.[1] 21. καὶ ἔσται, πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται." 22. Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται,[2] ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους· Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, ἄνδρα ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀποδεδειγμένον εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι

[1] επιφανη ABCEP, Vulg., Chrys., W.H., Weiss, R.V.; but om. ℵD, Gig., so Tisch., Wendt, Hilg., Blass, who adds "del. igitur et in α, et fort. omnino per locum 4-14 (*i.e.*, vv. 17-20) forma α male interpolata".

[2] Ισραηλιται P; Ισραηλειται ℵABCDE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss.

Ver. 21. **ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα**, the usual LXX rendering of a common Hebrew phrase. The expression is derived from the way in which prayers addressed to God begin with the invocation of the divine name, Psalm iii. 2, vi. 2, etc., and a similar phrase is found in classical writers, **ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τοὺς θεούς**, Xen., *Cyr.*, vii., 1., 35; Plat., *Tim.*, p. 27, c.; Polyb., xv., 1, 13. From this it was an easy step to use the phrase as meaning the worshippers of the one God, Gen. iv. 26, xii. 8, 2 Kings v. 4. It is therefore significant that the Christian converts at Corinth are described by the same phrase, 1 Cor. i. 2. But just as in Rom. x. 12 this same prophecy of Joel is beyond all doubt referred by St. Paul to the Lord Jesus, so here the whole drift of St. Peter's speech, that the same Jesus who was crucified was made both Lord and Christ, points to the same conclusion, ii. 36. In Joel **Κύριος** is undoubtedly used of the Lord Jehovah, and the word is here transferred to Christ. In its bearing on our Lord's Divinity this fact is of primary importance, for it is not merely that the early Christians addressed their Ascended Lord so many times by the same name which is used of Jehovah in the LXX—although it is certainly remarkable that in 1 Thess. the name is applied to Christ more than twenty times—but that they did not hesitate to refer to Him the attributes and the prophecies which the great prophets of the Jewish nation had associated with the name of Jehovah, Zahn, *Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche*, pp. 8, 10, 16 (1894), and for the force of the expression, **ἐπικ. τὸ ὄνομα**, in 1 Cor. i. 2, see Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i., p. 29, E.T.—**ὃς ἂν ἐπικ.**, "whosoever": it would seem that in St. Peter's address the expression does not extend beyond the chosen people; *cf.* v. 36.—**σωθήσεται**: to the Jew salvation would mean safety in the Messianic kingdom, and from the penalties of the Messianic judgment; for the Christian there would be a partial fulfilment in the flight of the believers to Pella for safety when the Son of Man came in the destruction of Jerusalem; but the word carries our thoughts far beyond any such subordinate fulfilment to the fulness of blessing for body and soul which the verb expresses on the lips of Christ; *cf.* Luke vii. 50. And so St. Luke places in the forefront of Acts as of his Gospel the thought of Jesus not only as the Messiah, but also as the **Σωτήρ**, Luke ii. 14; *cf. Psalms of Sol.*, iv., 2 (Ryle and James).

Ver. 22. **Ἰσραηλῖται**: the tone of St. Peter throughout is that of a man who would win and not repulse his hearers, *cf.* v. 29, and so he commences the second part of his speech, in proof that Jesus was both Lord and Christ, with a title full of honour, reminding his hearers of their covenant relation with God, and preparing them for the declaration that the covenant was not broken but confirmed in the person of Jesus.—**Ἰ. τὸν Ναζ.**, "the Nazarene," the same word (not **Ναζαρηνός**) formed part of the inscription on the Cross, and it is difficult to believe with Wendt that there is no reference to this in St. Peter's words (*cf.* **προσπήξαντες**, vv. 23 and 36), although no doubt the title was often used as a description of Jesus in popular speech, iv. 10, xxvi. 9. No contrast could be greater than between **Ἰησοῦς** the despised Nazarene (**ὁ Ν. οὗτος**, vi. 14) dying a felon's death, and **Ἰησοῦς Χριστός**, v. 38, **ὑψωθείς**, v. 33, no longer upon the Cross, but at a seat on the right hand of the Father (*cf.* John xii. 12); again the marvellous change which had passed over St. Peter is apparent: "If Christ had not risen," argues St. Chrysostom, "how account for the fact that those who fled whilst He was alive, now dared a thousand perils for Him when dead? St. Peter, who is struck with fear by a servant-maid, comes boldly forward" (so too Theophylact).—**ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγ. ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς**, "a man approved of God unto you,"

καὶ σημείοις, οἷς ἐποίησε δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, καθὼς καὶ[1] αὐτοὶ οἴδατε, 23. τοῦτον τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ

[1] και αυτοι; but και om. in ℵABC*DE, Vulg. versions (Syr. Pesh.), Ir^int., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

R.V. The word, only used by St. Luke and St. Paul in the N.T. (*cf.* xxv. 7, 1 Cor. iv. 9, 2 Thess. ii. 4) = demonstrated, and "approved" in its old meaning would be a good equivalent; so in classical Greek, in Plato and Aristotle, shown by argument, proved, *cf.* xxv. 7. The sense of the word is given by the gloss in D **δεδοκιμασμένον.** It occurs in Esther ii. 9, AB, and iii. 13 (LXX), and several times in the Books of the Maccabees (see Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.*).—**ἄνδρα**: Erasmus commends the wisdom of Peter, "qui apud rudem multitudinem Christum magnifice laudat, sed *virum* tantum nominat, ut ex factis paullatim agnoscant Divinitatem".—**ἀπό**: probably here not simply for **ὑπό** (as Blass, and Felten, and others). The phrase means "a man demonstrated to have come unto you from God by mighty works," etc. If the words may not be pressed to mean our Lord's divine origin, they at least declare His divine mission (John iii. 2), *divinitus* (Wendt *in loco*).—**δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις**: *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 12, Heb. ii. 4, and 2 Thess. ii. 9; *cf.* Rom. xv. 19.—**σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα**: no less than eight times in Acts.—**δυνάμεις** is often rendered in a way which rather obscures its true form and meaning. Lit. = "powers," and so here in R.V. margin, where in the text we have "mighty works," so in Heb. ii. 4. St. Luke is fond of using **δύναμις** of the power inherent in Christ, and so the plural might well be used of the outward manifestations of this power in Christ, or through Him in His disciples. The word therefore seems in itself to point to the new forces at work in the world (Trench, *N. T. Synonyms*, ii., p. 177 ff.).—**τέρατα**: the word is never used in the N. T. alone as applied to our Lord's works or those of His disciples, and this observation made by Origen is very importaut, since the one word which might seem to suggest the prodigies and portents of the heathen world is never used unless in combination with some other word, which at once raises the N.T. miracles to a higher level. And so whilst the ethical purpose of these miracles is least apparent in the word **τέρατα**, it is brought distinctly into view by the word with which **τέρατα** is so often joined—**σημεῖα**, a term which points in its very meaning to something beyond itself. Blass therefore is not justified in speaking of **σημεῖα** and **τέρατα** as synonymous terms. The true distinction between them lies in remembering that in the N.T. all three words mentioned in this passage have the same denotation but a different connotation—they are all used for miracles, but miracles regarded from different points of view (see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 406).—**οἷς ἐποίησεν . . . ὁ Θεὸς.** The words, as Alford points out against De Wette, do not express a low view of our Lord's miracles. The favourite word used by St. John for the miracles of Christ, **ἔργα**, exactly corresponds to the phrase of St. Peter, since these **ἔργα** were the works of the Father Whom the Son revealed in them (*cf.* St. John v. 19, xiv. 10).—**καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ οἴδατε**: Weiss rightly draws attention to the emphatic pronoun. The fact of the miracles was not denied, although their source was so terribly misrepresented; *cf.* "Jesus Christ in the Talmud," Laible, E.T. (Streane), pp. 45-50 (1893).

Ver. 23. **τοῦτον**, emphatic, **ἔκδοτον** delivered up, by Judas, not by God; only here in the N.T., but see instances from Josephus, also from classical Greek, in Wetstein. In Dan., Theod., Bel and the Dragon ver. 22.—**ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ**: both favourite words of St. Luke: **ὡρισ.** used by him five times in the Acts, x. 42, xi. 29, xvii. 26, 31; once by St. Paul, Rom. i. 4; once in Hebrews, iv. 7, and only in St. Luke amongst the Evangelists, xxii. 22, where our Lord Himself speaks of the events of His betrayal by the same word, **κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον** (*cf.* xxiv. 26).—**βουλῇ**: Wendt compares the Homeric **Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή.** The phrase **βουλή τοῦ Θ.** is used only by St. Luke; once in his Gospel, vii. 30, and three times in Acts, xiii. 36, xx. 27 (whilst **βουλή** is used twice in the Gospel, eight times in the Acts, and only three times elsewhere in the N.T., 1 Cor. iv. 5, Ephes. i. 11, Heb. vi. 17), but *cf.* Wisdom vi. 4, ix. 13, and often **ἡ βουλή Κυρίου** in LXX.—**προγνώσει**: the word is only found again in 1 Peter i. 2. and its

Θεοῦ ἔκδοτον λαβόντες,[1] διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες ἀνείλετε· 24. ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησε, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου,[2] καθότι οὐκ

[1] **λαβοντες** om. ℵ*ABC 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. Pesh., Arm., Aeth., Ath., Irint., Victorin.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss—but omitted by Blass in β although found in Dℵ³EC³P, Syr. Harcl., Eus., Chrys.; Hilg. retains. **χειρων**; but **χειρος** in ℵABC*D 13, 15, 61, Syr. Harcl., Aeth., Eus., Ath., Cyr., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. (plural probably out of the following **ανομων**). **ανειλετε** minusc., but **ανειλατε** ℵABCDEP, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss—see W.H., Appendix, p. 172, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112.

[2] **θανατου** ℵABCEP, Syr. Harcl., Sah., Arm., Aeth., Eus., Ath., Cyr., Theodrt.; so Tisch., W.H., Wendt, Weiss. **ᾳδου** D, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Boh., Gig., Par., Polyc., Epiph., Irenint.—similar *var. l.* in 1 Cor. xv., 55, *cf.* Ps. xvii. (xviii.) 5, 6; **ᾳδου** out of ver. 27, 31 (Wendt).

occurrence in that place, and the thoughts which it expresses, may be classed amongst the points of contact between Acts and 1 Peter (see at end of chap. iii.). In the Passion and Resurrection of Christ, which at one time seemed to Peter impossible, *cf.* Matt. xvi. 22, he now sees the full accomplishment of God's counsel, *cf.* iii. 20, and 1 Peter i. 20 (Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 53, and also 48-52). In this spiritual insight now imparted to the Apostle we see a further proof of the illuminating power of the Holy Ghost, the gift of Pentecost, which he himself so emphatically acknowledges in his first epistle (i. 1-12).—**διὰ χειρῶν,** best explained as a Hebraism. *Cf.* for the frequent use of this Hebraistic expression, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 126, 127; and Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 141. In the LXX, *cf.* 2 Kings xiv. 27, 1 Chron. xi. 3, xxix. 5. St. Luke is very fond of these paraphrases with **πρόσωπον** and **χείρ**, see Friedrich, *Das Lukasevangelium*, pp. 8, 9, and Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 77; *cf.* v. 12, vii. 25, xi. 30, xiv. 3, xv. 23, xix. 11, so **ἐν χειρί, εἰς χεῖρας.**—**ἀνόμων**: "lawless," R.V., generally taken to refer to the Roman soldiers who crucified our Lord, *i.e.*, Gentiles without law, as in 1 Cor. ix. 21, Rom. ii. 14. In Wisdom xvii. 2 the same word is used of the Egyptians who thought to oppress the holy nation—they are described as **ἄνομοι.**—**προσπήξαντες,** *sc.*, **τῷ σταυρῷ**: a graphic word used only here, with which we may compare the vivid description also by St. Peter in v. 29-32, x. 39, *cf.* 1 Peter ii. 24—the language of one who could justly claim to be a witness of the sufferings of Christ, 1 Peter v. 1. The word is not found in LXX, *cf.* Dio Cassius.—**ἀνείλατε**: an Alexandrian form, see for similar instances, Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, pp. 159, 160. The verb is a favourite with St. Luke, nineteen times in Acts, twice in the Gospel, and only once elsewhere in the Evangelists, *viz.*, Matt. ii. 16, and the noun **ἀναίρεσις** is only found in Acts viii. 10 (xxii. 20), *cf.* its similar use in classical Greek and in the LXX. The fact that St. Peter thus describes the Jewish people as the actual murderers of Jesus is not a proof that in such language we have an instance of anti-Judaism quite inconsistent with the historical truth of the speech (Baur, Renan, Overbeck), but the Apostle sees vividly before his eyes essentially the same crowd at the Feast as had demanded the Cross of Jesus before the judgment-seat of Pilate, Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 103.—**ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἀνέστησε,** "est hoc summum orationis," Blass, *cf.* v. 32, and i. 22.

Ver 24. **λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θαν.**: R.V. "pangs" instead of "pains" (all previous versions) approaches nearer to the literal form of the word—"birth-pangs," the resurrection of Christ being conceived of as a birth out of death, as the Fathers interpreted the passage. The phrase is found in the Psalms, LXX xvii. 4, cxiv. 3, but it is most probable that the LXX has here mistaken the force of the Hebrew חבל which might mean "birth-pangs," or the cords of a hunter catching his prey. In the Hebrew version the parallelism, such a favourite figure in Hebrew poetry, decides in favour of the latter meaning, as in R.V. Ps. xviii. 4, 5 (LXX xvii.), Sheol and Death are personified as hunters lying in wait for their prey with nooses and nets (Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, *in loco*, the word מוֹקְשֵׁי meaning snares by which birds or beasts are taken (Amos iii. 5)). In

ἦν δυνατὸν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. 25. Δαβὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν, "Προωρώμην[1] τὸν Κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός· ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μού ἐστιν, ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ· 26. διὰ τοῦτο εὐφράνθη ἡ καρδία

[1] προωρωμην B³P; προορ. ℵAB*CDE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. (see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 101).

the previous verse the parallelism is also maintained if we read "the waves of death" (*cf.* 2 Sam. xxii. 5) "compassed me, the *floods* of ungodliness made me afraid". It is tempting to account for the reading ὠδῖνας by supposing that St. Luke had before him a source for St. Peter's speech, and that he had given a mistaken rendering of the word חבל. But it would certainly seem that λύσας and κρατεῖσθαι are far more applicable to the idea of the hunter's cords, in which the Christ could not be bound, since He was Himself the Life. A similar mistake in connection with the same Hebrew word חבל may possibly occur in 1 Thess. v. 3 and Luke xxi. 34. There is no occasion to find in the word any reference to the death-pains of Christ (so Grotius, Bengel), or to render ὠδῖνες *pains* and *snares* (Olshausen, Nösgen), and it is somewhat fanciful to explain with St. Chrysostom (so Theophylact and Oecumenius) ὁ θάνατος ὤδινε κατέχων αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ δεινὰ ἔπασχε.—καθότι: only found in St. Luke, in Gospel twice, and in Acts four times (Friedrich); generally in classical Greek καθ᾽ ὅ τι (*cf.* Tobit i. 12, xiii. 4).—οὐκ ἦν δυνατὸν . . . γὰρ: the words primarily refer to the proof which St. Peter was about to adduce from prophecy, and the Scripture could not be broken. But whilst Baur sees in such an expression, as also in iii. 15, a transition to Johannine conceptions of the Person of Jesus, every Christian gladly recognises in the words the moral impossibility that the Life could be holden by Death. On the impersonal construction, see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 151 (1893). — κρατεῖσθαι . . . ὑπ᾽, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 16 (John xx. 23), only in these passages in passive voice in N.T., but *cf.* for similar use of the passive voice, 4 Macc. ii. 9, and so in Dem. Schmid compares this verse where the internal necessity of Christ's resurrection is thus stated with 1 Peter iii. 18, showing that the πνεῦμα in Him possessed this power of life (*Biblische Theologie des N. T.*, p. 402).

Ver. 25. Δαυεὶδ γὰρ λέγει: the words which follow are quoted by St. Peter from Psalm xvi.; and it has been said that the Apostle's argument would be the same if the Psalm were the work of some other author than David. But if the following Psalm and the Psalm in question may with considerable reason be attributed to the same author, and if the former Psalm, the seventeenth, may be referred to the period of David's persecution by Saul, then David's authorship of Psalm sixteen becomes increasingly probable (Kirkpatrick). In Delitzsch's view whatever can mark a Psalm as Davidic we actually find combined here, *e.g.*, coincidences of many kinds which he regards as undoubtedly Davidic (*cf.* v. 5 with xi. 6, v. 10 with iv. 4, v. 11 with xvii. 15), and he sees no reason for giving up the testimony afforded by the title. But it is plain that David's experience did not exhaust the meaning of the Psalm, and St. Peter in the fulness of the gift of Pentecost interprets the words εἰς αὐτόν, "with reference to Him," *i.e.*, the Messiah (*cf.* St. Paul's interpretation of the same Psalm in xiii. 35). On the application of the Psalm as Messianic, *cf.* Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., p. 717.—Προωρώμην: not "I foresaw," but "I beheld the Lord always before my face," LXX; Heb., "I have set the Lord always before me". —Κύριον = Jehovah.—ἐκ δεξιῶν μου: as a defence and helper. *Cf.* παραστάτης, Xen., *Cyr.*, iii., 3, 21. The imagery may be taken from that of the trials in which advocates stood at the right hand of their clients (Psalm cix. 31), or there may be a reference to a champion who, in defending another, would stand on his right hand; *cf.* Psalm cx. 5, cxxi. 5 (Kirkpatrick, and Robertson Smith, *Expositor*, 1876, p. 351).—ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ: although the verses which follow contain the chief Messianic references in St. Peter's interpretation, yet in the fullest sense of the words the Christ could say προωρ. κ.τ.λ. (see Felten, *in loco*). But because the Father was with Him, He could add διὰ τοῦτο εὐφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου: "the heart" in O.T. is not only the heart of the affections, but the centre of the man's whole moral and intellectual nature (Oehler, *Theol. des A.T.*, p. 71).—εὐφράνθη

μου, καὶ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου· ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σάρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι· 27. ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχήν μου εἰς

refers rather to a joyous state of mind, "was glad," R.V., ἠγαλλιάσατο used of outward and active expression of joy is rendered "rejoiced," R.V. (in A.V. the meaning of the two verbs is transposed). At the same time εὐφράνθη is sometimes used in LXX and N.T., as in modern Greek of *festive* enjoyment, Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 155.—**ἡ γλῶσσά μου**: in Hebrew כְּבוֹדִי "my glory," *i.e.*, my soul, my spirit (*cf.* Gen. xlix. 6, Schöttgen). The Arabs use a similar expression for the eye, the hand, or any member of the body held in special honour (*cf.* Lumby on Psalm cviii. 1).—**ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σάρξ**: *flesh* does not here mean the dead corpse but the living body (Perowne, Kirkpatrick).—**κατασκηνώσει**, "shall dwell in safety," R.V., "confidently," margin (O.T.); the expression is used frequently of dwelling safely in the Promised Land. In N.T. the R.V. translates "shall dwell," "tabernacle" margin, shall dwell as in a tent, a temporary abode. In its *literal* meaning, therefore, there is no reference to the rest of the body in the grave, or to the hope of resurrection from the grave, but the words must be understood of *this life* (Perowne); *cf.* Deut. xxxiii. 12, 28, Psalm iv. 8, xxv. 13, Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16. For the hope of the Psalmist, expressed in the following words, is primarily for preservation from death: "Thou wilt not give up my soul to Sheol [*i.e.*, to the underworld, so that one becomes its prey], neither wilt thou suffer thy beloved one [singular] to see the pit" (so Delitzsch and Perowne, as also R. Smith and Kirkpatrick).

Ver. 27. In LXX and N.T. rightly **εἰς ᾅδην**. W.H.; *cf.* also Briggs, *Messianic Prophecies*, p. 24; although in T.R. as usually in Attic, **εἰς ᾅδου**, *sc.*, **δόμον**. Blass regards **εἰς** as simply usurping in the common dialect the place of **ἐν**, but we can scarcely explain the force of the preposition here in this way. **ἐγκαταλείψεις** used of utter abandonment, *cf.* Psalm xxii. 1 (*cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 10, 16).—**εἰς ᾅδην**: whilst it is true that the Psalmist "says nothing about what shall happen to him *after* death" (Perowne), he expresses his conviction that his soul would not be given up to the land of gloom and forgetfulness, the abode of the dead, dark and cheerless, with which the Psalmist cannot associate the thought of life and light (see also on ver. 31).—**οὐδὲ δώσεις**: in R.V. (O.T.) the word "suffer" is retained, but in R.V. (N.T.) we find "thou wilt not give," the Hebrew נָתַן being used in this sense to permit, to suffer, to let, like **δίδωμι** and *dare*, Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 156 (1893).—**τὸν ὅσιόν σου**: the Hebrew *Chāsīd* which is thus sometimes translated in the LXX (Vulgate, *Sanctus*) is often rendered "thy beloved one," and the word denotes not only one who is godly and pious, but also one who is the object of Jehovah's loving-kindness. The word might well be used of Him, Who was not only the Holy One of God, but **ὁ ἀγαπητὸς υἱός**, "the beloved Son". On the word *Chāsīd* see Kirkpatrick, *Psalms*, Appendix, p. 221.—**ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν**: "corruption" or "the pit," margin R.V. (O.T.), but in the N.T. simply "corruption" (A. and R.V.), Vulgate, *corruptio*. In the LXX the Hebrew שַׁחַת is often rendered **διαφθορά**, "corruption," as if derived from שָׁחַת **διαφθείρειν**, "to corrupt"; not, however, in the sense of corruption, putridity, but of destruction. The derivation however is probably from שׁוּחַ, to sink down, hence it means a pit, and sometimes a sepulchre, a grave, Psalm xxx. 10, lv. 24, so here "to see the grave," *i.e.*, to die and be buried, *cf.* Psalm xlix. 10 (see Robinson's *Gesenius*, p. 1053, note, twenty-sixth edition). Dr. Robertson Smith maintains that there are two Hebrew words the same in form but different in origin, one masculine = *putrefaction* or *corruption*, the other feminine = the *deep* or the *pit*. So far he agrees with the note in *Gesenius*, *u.s.*, that the word **διαφθορά** should here be rendered by the latter, the *pit*, but he takes the rendering, the *deep* or the *pit*, as an epithet not of the grave but of Sheol or Hades (see *Expositor*, p. 354, 1876, the whole paper on "The Sixteenth Psalm," by Dr. R. Smith, should be consulted, and p. 354 compared with the note in *Gesenius*), and this view certainly seems to fit in better with the parallelism

ᾄδου,[1] οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. 28. ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς· πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου." 29. "Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐξὸν εἰπεῖν μετὰ παῤῥησίας πρὸς ὑμᾶς περὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Δαβίδ, ὅτι καὶ ἐτελεύτησε καὶ ἐτάφη, καὶ τὸ μνῆμα

[1] ᾳδου EP, Chrys. (in LXX A); ᾳδην ℵABCD, Clem., Epiph., so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt (so in LXX B—τον αδην S[1]).

Ver. 28. **ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς**: St. Peter quotes from the LXX, which has the plural ὁδούς—so in Proverbs v. 6, where Hebrew has the same word as here in the singular, the LXX translates **ὁδοὺς ζωῆς**.—**μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου**, "with thy countenance" = "in thy presence," margin; = Hebrew, "in thy presence". The LXX **πρόσωπον** is a literal translation of the Hebrew פָּנִים, *face* or *countenance*, in the O.T. The expression is a common one in the O.T., "in God's presence"; *cf.* Psalm iv. 6, xvii. 15, xxi. 6, cxl. 13. Grimm-Thayer explains (**με**) **ὄντα μετὰ**, etc., "being in thy presence" (see *sub* **μετά**, i. 2 *b*). The force of the expression is strikingly seen in its repeated use in Numbers vi. 25; *cf.* Exodus xxxiii. 14; Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.*, pp. 46, 56, 62, and Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 272. And so the Psalm ends as it had begun with God; *cf.* ver. 2, and ver. 11. The Psalmist's thoughts carried him beyond mere temporal deliverance, beyond the changes and chances of this mortal life, to the assurance of a union with God, which death could not dissolve; while as Christians we read with St. Peter a deeper and a fuller meaning still in the words, as we recall the Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Him, of Whom it was written: **ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν.**

Ver. 29. **ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί**: an affectionate form of address as compared with vv. 14 and 22 (*cf.* vii. 2, xxii. 1), but still much more formal than iii. 17, where we have **ἀδελφοί** alone in St. Peter's pity for those who crucifying the Saviour knew not what they did.—**ἐξὸν**, *sc.*, **ἐστι** (with infinitive), *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 4, only in N.T. Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 200 (1893), *cf.* LXX Esther iv. 2; 4 Macc. v. 18; not "may I speak unto you," but "I may say unto you," R.V., not = **ἔστω**, but **ἐστί** (**ἔξεστι**), Wendt, *in loco*.—**μετὰ παρρησίας**: on the phrase, see below, iv. 13, and its repeated use by St. Luke; *cf.* Heb. iv. 16; Lat., *cum fiducia*, Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 108. In the LXX the phrase is found, Lev. xxvi. 13, Esther viii. 12, 1 Macc. iv. 18, 3 Macc. iv. 1, vii. 12. St. Peter will first of all state facts which cannot be denied, before he proceeds to show how the words used of David are fulfilled in "great David's greater Son". He speaks of David in terms which indicate his respect for his name and memory, and as Bengel well says, "est igitur hoc loco **προθεραπεία**, prævia sermonis mitigatio" ("est hæc **προθερ.** ut aiunt rhetores," Blass, *in loco*).—**τοῦ πατριάρχου**, the name is emphatically used in the N.T. of Abraham; *cf.* Heb. vii. 4 (properly the **ἄρχων** (*auctor*), **πατριᾶς**), and of the sons of Jacob, Acts vii. 8, 9, and *cf.* 4 Macc. vii. 19, used of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In the LXX it is used of the "heads of the fathers' houses," 1 Chron. ix. 9, xxiv. 31, in a comparatively lower sense. Here used, as a term of high honour, of David, regarded as the ancestor of the kingly race. See on the word and its formation, Kennedy, *Sources of New Testament Greek*, p. 114.—**ὅτι καὶ ἐτελεύτησε καὶ ἐτάφη**: "that he both died and was buried," R.V. St. Peter states notorious facts, and refers to them in a way which could not wound the susceptibilities of his hearers, whilst he shows them that David's words were not exhausted in his own case. The argument is practically the same as that of St. Paul in xiii. 36 from the same Psalm.—**καὶ τὸ μνῆμα αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν**, *i.e.*, in Jerusalem, the mention of the tomb emphasises the fact and certainty of the death of David, and implies that *his* body had seen corruption. That David's tomb was shown in the time of Nehemiah we know from Neh. iii. 16. From Jos., *Ant.*, vii., 15, 3; xiii., 8, 4; *B. J.*, i., 2, 5, we learn that Solomon had buried a large treasure in the tomb, and that on that account one of its chambers had been broken open by Hyrcanus, and another by Herod the Great. According to Jos., *Ant.*, xvi., 7, 1, Herod, not content with rifling the tomb, desired to penetrate further, even as far as the bodies of David and Solomon, but a flame burst

αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἐν ἡμῖν ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. 30. προφήτης οὖν ὑπάρχων, καὶ εἰδὼς ὅτι ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς, ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χριστὸν,[1] καθίσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου αὐτοῦ, 31. προϊδὼν ἐλάλησε περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι οὐ κατελείφθη [2] ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ εἰς ᾅδου, οὐδὲ ἡ σὰρξ

[1] **το κατα σ. . . . τον Χ.** om. ℵABCD^2 61, Vulg., good versions, Eus., Cypr., Iren$^{int.}$, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (rejects as a marginal gloss, so Alford); but although a *similar* reading is found in DE Blass does not receive it in his β text (see Weiss on Codex D, p. 57). **οσφυος**, D reads **καρδιας**; Gig., Par., Syr. Pesh., so Hilg., Iren. **κοιλιας** (*ventris*); so in β (LXX Ps. cxxxi. 11, S^{2}R).

[2] **εγκατελειφθη** ℵBCDE, Eus., Chrys., Theodrt., so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, **εν.** A (alt. in W.H.), too well testified to suppose that it is simply derived from ver. 27 (Wendt). **ᾳδου** ACDEP, Chrys., Lach.; **αδην** ℵB, Eus., Thaum., so Tisch., W.H., Wendt, Weiss. **η ψυχη αυτου** om. ℵABC*D 61, 81, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Sah., Aeth., Eus., Iren$^{int.}$, Did$^{int.}$, Victorin. so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (from ver. 27, so also **ου . . . ουδε**, instead of **ουτε . . . ουτε**. **ουδε**; but **ουτε** ℵACD, Eus., Chrys., Cyr., so Tisch., W.H., Wendt; but Weiss **ουτε . . . ουδε**, following B).

forth and slew two of his guards, and the king fled. To this attempt the Jewish historian attributed the growing troubles in Herod's family. In the time of Hadrian the tomb is said to have fallen into ruins. Whatever its exact site, it must have been within the walls, and therefore could not correspond with the so called "tombs of the kings" which De Saulcy identified with it. Those tombs are outside the walls, and are of the Roman period (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. i., p. 276, E.T., "David," B.D.^{2}). Wetstein, *in loco*, quotes the testimony of Maundrell as to the sepulchres of David and his family being the only sepulchres within the walls. St. Jerome, *Epist.*, xlvi., writing to Marcella, expresses a hope that they might pray together in the mausoleum of David; so that at the end of the fourth century tradition must still have claimed to mark the spot.

Ver. 30. **προφήτης**: as David could not have spoken this Psalm of himself, he spoke it of some other, who was none other than the Messiah—here the word is used in the double sense of one declaring God's will, and also of one foretelling how that will would be fulfilled.—**ὑπάρχων**: another favourite word of St. Luke, in his Gospel, and especially in Acts; in the former it is found seven times, and in the latter no less than twenty-four times, and in all parts (excluding **τὰ ὑπάρχοντα**), Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 7. It is not used by the other Evangelists. In the N.T., as in later Greek, it is often weakened into an equivalent of **εἶναι**; Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 239. Here it may indicate that David was a prophet, not only in this one instance, but constantly with reference to the Messiah.—**ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν**, Hebraistic; *cf.* ver. 17. Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 141 (1896); for the oath *cf.* Ps. cxxxii. 11, 2 Sam. vii. 16.—**ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ**, *i.e.*, of his offspring. It is a common Hebraistic form of expression—**ὀσφύς** read here, but **κοιλία** in Ps. cxxxi. 11 (LXX); *cf.* Gen. xxxv. 11 and 2 Chron. vi. 9 (Heb. vii. 5). With regard to the human element in the Person of Jesus, Peter speaks of him as a descendant of David according to prophecy, as in the Synoptists and Rom. i. 3 (Schmid). The exact expression, **καρπὸς τῆς ὀσφύος**, is not found in the LXX, but **καρ. τῆς κοιλίας** is found, not only in the Psalm quoted but in Mic. vi. 7 (Lam. ii. 20), where the same Hebrew words are used as in the Psalm: **ὀσφύς** in the LXX is several times a translation of another Hebrew word חֲלָצַיִם (dual). This partitive construction (supply **τινα**) is also a Hebraistic mode of expression, and frequent in the LXX; *cf.* ii. 18, v. 2. See Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 151 (1896).

Ver. 31. **προϊδών**, *cf.* Gal. iii. 8. The word ascribes prophetic consciousness to David in the composition of the Psalm, but, as we learn from St. Peter himself, that prophetic consciousness did not involve a distinct knowledge of the events foretold (1 Pet. i. 10-12); that which the Holy Ghost presignified was only in part clear to the prophets, both as to the date of fulfilment and also as

αὐτοῦ εἶδε διαφθοράν. 32. τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός, οὗ πάντες ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες. 33. τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑψωθεὶς, τήν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος [1] λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ

[1] του Αγ. Πν.; but τον πν. τον αγ. ℵABCE 13, 61, 130, Vulg., Chrys., so W.H., Weiss; but TR. in DP, Iri^nt., and accepted by Blass in β and by Hilg.

to historical shaping (Schmid, *Biblische Theol. des N. T.*, p. 395, and Alford, *in loco*).—**ὅτι**: introducing the words which follow as a fuller explanation, or simply as expressing a well-known fact.—**ἐγκατελείφθη . . . εἶδεν**: aorists, not futures, because from St. Peter's standpoint the prophecy had been already fulfilled (Felten, Wendt). With this verse we naturally compare the mention of Christ's descent into Hades and His agency in the realms of the dead in St. Peter's First Epistle, iii. 19 (*cf.* Phil. ii. 10, Ephes. iv. 9, Rom. x. 7; Zahn, *Das Apost. Symbolum*, pp. 71-74; but see also Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 414). Thus while the words bore, as we have seen, a primary and lower reference to David himself, St. Peter was led by the Holy Ghost to see their higher and grander fulfilment in Christ.—**εἰς ᾅδου**: on the construction see above on ver. 27, and on the Jewish view of Sheol or Hades in the time of our Lord as an intermediate state, see Charles, *Book of Enoch*, p. 168 and p. 94, and compare also the interesting although indirect parallel to 1 Pet. iii. 19, which he finds in *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch*, p. xlv. ff.; Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 163, 341.

Ver. 32. **οὗ**: may be masculine = Christ, *cf.* xiii. 31, but is taken as neuter by Blass (so too Overbeck, Holtzmann, Weiss, Wendt, Felten). Bengel remarks "nempe Dei qui id fecit," and compares v. 32, x. 41, and 1 Cor. xv. 15.

Ver. 33. **οὖν**: the Ascension is a necessary sequel to the Resurrection, *cf.* Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, iii., 409 ff. and *in loco*. Or the word may mark the result of the assured and manifold testimony to the Resurrection, to which the Apostle had just appealed: "Confirmata resurrectione Christi, ascensio non potest in dubium vocari," Bengel.—**τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ**: best to take the words as an instrumental dative, so in v. 31, with the majority of recent commentators. On grammatical grounds it would be difficult to justify the rendering "*to the right hand*" (although taken in connection with v. 34 it would give very good sense), since such a combination of the dative alone is found only in the poets, and never in prose in classical Greek. The only other instances adduced, Acts xxi. 16 and Rev. ii. 16, can be otherwise explained, *cf.* Winer-Moulton, xxxi., p. 268. On Judg. xi. 18 (LXX) quoted in support of the local rendering by Fritzsch, see Wendt's full note *in loco*. The instrumental meaning follows naturally upon ver. 32—the Ascension, as the Resurrection, was the mighty deed of God, Phil. ii. 9. There is therefore no occasion to regard the expression with De Wette as a Hebraism, see Wetstein, *in loco*.—**ὑψωθεὶς**, *cf.* especially John xii. 32, and Westcott's note on John iii. 14. The word is frequently found in LXX. As Lightfoot points out, in our Lord Himself the divine law which He Himself had enunciated was fulfilled, **ὁ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται** (Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14).—**τήν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος κ.τ.λ.**, see above on i. 4 (Gal. iii. 14). The language of St. Peter is in agreement with, but yet independent of, that in St. John, whilst it calmly certifies the fulfilment of our Lord's promise.—**ἐξέχεε**: "hath poured forth," R.V. All previous English versions except Rhem. = A.V. The verb is used in the LXX in the prophecy cited above, Joel ii. 28, 29 (*cf.* also Zech. xii. 10), although it is not used in the Gospels of the outpouring of the Spirit.—**τοῦτο**: either the Holy Ghost, as the Vulgate takes it, or an independent neuter "this which ye see and hear," *i.e.*, in the bearing and speech of the assembled Apostles. St. Peter thus leads his hearers to infer that that which is poured out is by its effects nothing else than the Holy Ghost. It is noteworthy that just as Joel speaks of God, the Lord Jehovah, pouring out of His Spirit, so the same divine energy is here attributed by St. Peter to Jesus. See above on ver. 17.

Ver. 34. St. Peter does not demand belief upon his own assertion, but he again appeals to the Scriptures, and to words which could not have received a fulfilment in the case of David. In this appeal he reproduces the very words in which, some seven weeks before, our Lord Himself had convicted the scribes of error in their interpretation of this

πατρὸς, ἐξέχεε[1] τοῦτο ὃ νῦν ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε. 34. οὐ γὰρ Δαβὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, λέγει δὲ αὐτός, "Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, 35. ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου." 36. Ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ὅτι καὶ[2] Κύριον καὶ Χριστὸν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησε, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ἡμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε.

[1] After **εξεχεε** and before **τουτο** D (Par.) insert **υμιν**, and E, Syrr. (Pesh. and Harc), Sah. tol. demid., Ir., Did., Ambr., Par. *hoc donum.* Harris ascribes this second addition, though dubiously, to a Montanist; but *cf.* ver. 38, x. 45, xi. 17, although in these passages **δωρεα**, not **δωρον**, is used.

[2] **και Κ.**; **και** in all uncials, also Vulg., Syr. H., W.H., R.V., Weiss; *om.* by many cursives, also Syr. Pesh. **και Χ. αυτον** EP 61, Ath., Epiph.; **αυτον και Χ.** ℵABCD[2] 15, 18, 61, 130, Vulg., Arm., Bas., Ir[int.], so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss.

same Psalm (Matt. xxii. 44, Mark xii. 35, Luke xx. 41), and, "unlearned" in the eyes of the scribes, had answered the question which they could not answer, how David's Son was also David's Lord. No passage of Scripture is so constantly referred to in the N.T. as this 110th Psalm, *cf.* references above, and also 1 Cor. xv. 25, Heb. i. 13, v. 6, vii. 17, 21, x. 13. The Psalm was always regarded as Messianic by the Jews (Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 357 (1897); Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 720 (Appendix); Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 35; Driver, *Introduction to O. T.*, pp. 362, 363; and if it had not been so in the time of our Lord, it is obvious that His argument would have missed its point if those to whom He addressed His question "What think ye of the Christ?" could have answered that David was not speaking of the coming Messiah. For earlier interpretations of the Psalm, and the patristic testimony to its Messianic character, see *Speaker's Commentary*, iv., 427, and on the authorship see Gifford, *Authorship of the 110th Psalm*, with Appendix, 1895 (SPCK), and Delitzsch, *Psalms*, iii., pp. 163-176, E.T.—**κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου**: **κάθου** contracted for **κάθησο** (*cf.* also Mark xii. 36, Heb. i. 13); this "popular" form, which is also found in the Fragments of the comic writers, is the present imperative of **κάθημαι** in modern Greek, Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 162. In the LXX it is frequently used (see Hatch and Redpath, *sub. v.*).—**ἕως**: the word does not imply that Christ shall cease to reign subsequently: the word here, as elsewhere, does not imply that what is expressed will *only* have place up to a certain time (*cf.* Gen. xxxiii. 15, Deut. vii. 4, 2 Chron. vi. 23; *cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 13), rather is it true to say that Christ will only then rightly rule, when He has subjugated all His enemies.—**ἂν** with **ἕως** as here, where it is left doubtful *when* that will take place to which it is said a thing will continue (Grimm-Thayer, and instances *sub* **ἕως**, i., 1 *b*).—**ὑποπόδιον**, *cf.* Josh. x. 24, referring to the custom of conquering kings placing their feet upon the necks of their conquered enemies (so Blass, *in loco*, amongst recent commentators).

Ver. 36. **ἀσφαλῶς**: used here emphatically; the Apostle would emphasise the conclusion which he is about to draw from his three texts; *cf.* xxi. 34, xxii. 30, and Wisdom xviii. 6 (so in classical Greek).—**πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσρ.**, without the article, for **οἶκος Ἰ.** is regarded as a proper name, *cf.* LXX, 1 Sam. vii. 2, 1 Kings xii. 23, Neh. iv. 16, Ezek. xlv. 6, or it may be reckoned as Hebraistic, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 147, 158.—**καὶ Κύριον καὶ Χριστόν**: the **Κύριος** plainly refers to the prophetic utterance just cited. Although in the first verse of Ps. cx. the words **τῷ Κυρίῳ μου** are not to be taken as a name of God, for the expression is Adoni not Adonai ("the LORD saith unto my Lord," R.V.), and is simply a title of honour and respect, which was used of earthly superiors, *e.g.*, of Abraham, Moses, Elijah, Sisera, Naaman, yet St. Peter had called David a Prophet, and only in the Person of the Risen and Ascended Christ Who had sat down with His Father on His Throne could the Apostle see an adequate fulfilment of David's prophecy, or an adequate realisation of the anticipations of the Christ. So in the early Church, Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i., 60, appeals to the words of "the prophet David" in this same Psalm as foretelling the Ascension of Christ and His reign

37. Ἀκούσαντες[1] δὲ κατενύγησαν τῇ καρδίᾳ, εἶπόν τε πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς[2] ἀποστόλους, Τί ποιήσομεν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί;

[1] **ακουσαντες**; before this word D (so Syr. Harcl. mg.) reads **τοτε παντες οι συνελθοντες και**, and after **κατενυγ. την καρδ.** D adds **και τινες εξ αυτων (ειπαν)**, so Hilg. According to Blass's theory this would show more account and detailed information, . . . all were pricked, etc., but only some inquired—but on the other hand it may have been inserted to explain an apparent difficulty. According to Weiss, Codex D, p. 57, this and the following addition in D, **υποδειξατε ημιν**, are emendations of a kind similar to those which we find in ii. 45. In **τοτε κ.τ.λ.** in D, Harris sees either a lectionary preface or reader's expansion. Others find a case of assimilation, *e.g.*, to Luke xxiii. 48 (Chase points out that similar words occur in the Syriac of the two passages). In **τοτε** Weiss can only see one of the frequent ways in which the characteristic alterations of D are introduced.

[2] **λοιπους** om. by D, Gig., Aug.—Hilg., and Blass, who omits it in **β** also, say "recte fort. et in **α**"; *cf.* v. 29. **ποιησωμεν** ℵABCEP, Epiph., Chrys.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (as against Meyer), so also Blass in **β**; but Hilg. follows T.R. **αδελφοι**; after this word D adds **υποδειξατε ημιν**, so E, Gig., Par., Wer. tol., Syr. Harcl. mg., Aug., Prom.; so Hilg. The word could be well connected with the **και τινες** as indicating their earnestness and willingness; *cf.* Luke iii. 7, Matt. iii. 7 (to which Chase sees an assimilation), Acts ix. 16, xx. 35.

over His spiritual enemies. On the remarkable expression **Χριστὸς Κύριος** in connection with Ps. cx. 1, see Ryle and James, *Psalms of Solomon*, pp. 141-143, *cf.* with the passage here x. 36, 42. In 1 Peter iii. 15 we have the phrase **Κύριον δὲ Χριστὸν ἁγιάσατε κ.τ.λ.** (R.V. and W.H.), "sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord" (R.V.), where St. Peter does not hesitate to command that Christ be sanctified in our hearts as Lord, in words which are used in the O.T. of the Lord of hosts, Isa. viii. 13, and His sanctification by Israel. If it is said that it has been already shown that in Ps. cx. 1 Christ is referred to not as the Lord but as "my lord," it must not be forgotten that an exact parallel to 1 Peter iii. 15 and its high Christology may be found in this first sermon of St. Peter, *cf.* note on vv. 18-21 and 33.—**τοῦτον τὸν Ἰ. ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε**, "hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified," R.V., so Vulgate. The A.V., following Tyndale and Cranmer, inverts the clauses, but fails to mark what Bengel so well calls *aculeus in fine*, the stinging effect with which St. Peter's words would fall on the ears of his audience, many of whom may have joined in the cry, Crucify Him! (Chrysostom). Holtzmann describes this last clause of the speech as "ein schwerer Schlusstein zur Krönung des Gebäudes".

Ver. 37. **κατενύγησαν τὴν καρδίαν**: no word could better make known that the sting of the last word had begun to work (see Theophylact, *in loco*) = *compungo*, so in Vulg. The word is not used in classical Greek in the same sense as here, but the simple verb **νύσσειν** is so used. In LXX the best parallels are Gen. xxxiv. 7, Ps. cviii. 16 (cix.): *cf.* Cicero, *De Orat.*, iii., 34. "Hoc pœnitentiæ initium est, hic ad pietatem ingressus, tristitiam ex peccatis nostris concipere ac malorum nostrorum sensu vulnerari . . . sed compunctioni accedere debet promptitudo ad parendum," Calvin, *in loco*.—**τί ποιήσωμεν**; conj., delib., *cf.* Luke iii. 10, 12, 14, Mark xii. 14, xiv. 12, John xii. 27, Matt. xxvi. 54, Burton, *Moods and Tenses of N. T. Greek*, pp. 76, 126, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 28 ff. (1893).—**ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί**: indicating respect and regard—St. Peter's address had not been in vain—"*non ita dixerant prius*" Bengel; but now the words come as a response to St. Peter's own appeal, v. 29, *cf.* also Oecumenius, (so too Theophylact), **καὶ οἰκειωτικῶς αὐτοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καλοῦσιν, οὓς πρώην ἐχλεύαζον**.—**μετανοήσατε**, Luke xxiv. 47. The Apostles began, as the Baptist began, Matt. iii. 2, as the Christ Himself began, Matt. iv. 17, Mark i. 15, with the exhortation to repentance, to a change of heart and life, not to mere regret for the past. On the distinction between **μετανοεῖν** and **μεταμέλομαι**, see Trench, *N. T. Synonyms*, i., 208. Dr. Thayer remarks that the distinction drawn by Trench is hardly sustained by usage, but at the same time he allows that **μετανοεῖν** is undoubtedly the fuller and nobler term, expressive of moral action and issues, as is indicated by the fact that it is often employed in the imperative (**μεταμέλομαι** never), and

38. Πέτρος δὲ ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς, Μετανοήσατε, καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν[1] ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· καὶ λήψεσθε τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. 39. ὑμῖν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακράν, ὅσους

[1] επι ℵAEP, Bas., Chrys., so Tisch. and Weiss; but εν in BCD, Cyr.-Jer., Epiph., Cyr., Theodrt., so W.H., R.V.; both expressions seem to be equally common in Luke and Acts.

by its construction with ἀπό, ἐκ, *cf.* also Acts xx. 31, ἡ εἰς θεὸν μετάνοια (Synonyms in Grimm-Thayer, *sub* μεταμέλομαι). Christian Baptism was not admission to some new club or society of virtue, it was not primarily a token of mutual love and brotherhood, although it purified and strengthened both, *cf.* ver. 44 ff.

Ver. 38. **βαπτισθήτω**: "Non satis est Christo credere, sed oportet et Christianum profiteri, Rom. x. 10, quod Christus per baptismum fieri voluit," Grotius. John's baptism had been a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, but the work of St. Peter and of his fellow-Apostles was no mere continuation of that of the Baptist, *cf.* xix. 4, 5. Their baptism was to be ἐπὶ (ἐν) τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰ. Χ. St. Peter's address had been directed to the proof that Jesus was the Christ, and it was only natural that the acknowledgment of the cogency of that proof should form the ground of admission to the Christian Church: the ground of the admission to baptism was the recognition of Jesus as the Christ. The reading ἐπί (see especially Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 35, 36) brings this out more clearly than ἐν. It is much better to explain thus than to say that baptism in the name of one of the Persons of the Trinity involves the names of the other Persons also, or to suppose with Bengel (so Plumptre) that the formula in Matt. xxviii. 19 was used for Gentiles, whilst for Jews or Proselytes who already acknowledged a Father and a Holy Spirit baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus sufficed; or to conjecture with Neander that Matt. xxviii. 19 was not at first considered as a formula to be adhered to rigidly in baptism, but that the rite was performed with reference to Christ's name alone. This difficulty, of which so much has been made, does not appear to have pressed upon the early Church, for it is remarkable that the passage in the *Didache*, vii., 3, which is rightly cited to prove the early existence of the Invocation of the Holy Trinity in baptism, is closely followed by another in which we read (ix. 5) μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου, *i.e.*, Christ, as the immediate context shows.—**εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν**: εἰς, "unto" R.V., signifying the aim. It has been objected that St. Peter lays no stress upon the death of Christ in this connection, but rather upon His Resurrection. But we cannot doubt that St. Peter who had emphasised the fact of the crucifixion would have remembered his Master's solemn declaration a few hours before His death, Matt. xxvi. 28. Even if the words in this Gospel εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν are rejected, the fact remains that St. Peter would have connected the thought of the forgiveness of sins, a prerogative which, as every Jew was eager to maintain, belonged to God and to God alone, with the (new) covenant which Christ had ratified by His death. Harnack admits that however difficult it may be to explain precisely the words of Jesus to the disciples at the Last Supper, yet one thing is certain, that He connected the forgiveness of sins with His death, *Dogmengeschichte*, i., pp. 55 and 59, see also "Covenant," Hastings, B.D., p. 512.—**ὑμῶν**: the R.V. has this addition, so too the Vulgate (Wycl. and Rheims). As each individual ἕκαστος was to be baptised, so each, if truly penitent, would receive the forgiveness of his sins.—**τὴν δωρεὰν**, not χάρισμα as in 1 Cor. xii. 4, 9, 28, for the Holy Ghost, the gift, was a personal and abiding possession, but the χαρίσματα were for a time answering to special needs, and enjoyed by those to whom God distributed them. The word is used specially of the gift of the Holy Ghost by St. Luke four times in Acts, viii. 20, x. 45, xi. 17, but by no other Evangelist (*cf.*, however, Luke xi. 13), *cf.* Heb. vi. 4 (John iv. 10).

Ver. 39. **ὑμῖν γὰρ**: the promise was made to the very men who had invoked upon themselves and upon their children, St. Matt. xxvii. 25, the blood of the Crucified. See *Psalms of Solomon*, viii., 39 (Ryle and James' edition, p. 88).—

ὃν προσκαλέσηται Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. 40. ἑτέροις τε λόγοις πλείοσι διεμαρτύρετο καὶ παρεκάλει λέγων, Σώθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης. 41. Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀσμένως[1] ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν

[1] **ασμενως** EP, Syrr. (Pesh. and Harcl.), Arm., Chrys.; but om. by ℵABCD 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aeth., Clem., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. For **αποδεξαμενοι** D substitutes **πιστευσαντες**, and Syr. Harcl. mg.. Aug. add **και πιστευσαντες.** (Harris sees a Montanist addition, necessity of faith for baptism.)

πᾶσι τοῖς εἰς μακράν: no occasion with Wendt and others to limit the words to the Jews of the Diaspora. It must not be forgotten that the Apostles were not surprised that the Gentiles should be admitted to the Christian Church, but only that they should be admitted without conforming to the rite of circumcision. If we compare iii. 26, and Ephes. ii. 13, 17 (*cf.* Rom. x. 13), it would seem that no restriction of race was placed upon the declaration of the Gospel message, provided that it was made to the Jew *first* (as was always Paul's custom). Hilgenfeld interprets the words as referring beyond all doubt to the Gentiles, since ὑμῖν . . . ὑμῶν had already expressed the Diaspora Jews. But he contends that as ver. 26 plainly intimates that the address was delivered only to Israelites, the words in question are added by "the author to Theophilus". He therefore places them in brackets. Jüngst in the same way thinks it well to refer them to the Redactor, and Feine refers them to Luke himself as Reviser. Weiss sees in the words an allusion to an O.T. passage which could only have been applied at first to the calling of the Gentiles, but which (in the connection in which it is here placed by the narrator) must be referred to the Jews of the Diaspora. It may well have been that (as in Holtzmann's view) St. Peter's audience only thought of the Jews of the Diaspora, but we can see in his words a wider and a deeper meaning, *cf.* Isaiah v. 26, and *cf.* also Isaiah ii. 2, Zech. vi. 15. Among the older commentators Oecumenius and Theophylact referred the words to the Gentiles.—**ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσηται Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν.** Wendt presses the ἡμῶν to favour his view that St. Peter thinks only of the Jews and not of the Gentiles, since he speaks of "our God," but Blass catches the meaning much better in his comment: "ἡμῶν Israelitarum, qui idem gentes ad se vocat". This gives the true force of **προσκαλ.**, "shall call unto him" (so R.V.). Oecumenius also comments on the words as revealing the true penitence and charity of Peter, **ψυχὴ γὰρ ὅταν ἑαυτὴν καταδικάσῃ, οὐκ ἔτι φθονεῖν δύναται.**

Ver. 40. **ἑτέροις τε λόγοις πλείοσιν τε** (not **δὲ**), as so frequent in Acts; "inducit quæ similia cognataque sunt, δέ diversa," Blass, *in loco*, and *Grammatik des N.G.*, p. 258.—**διεμαρτύρατο**: the translation "testified," both in A. and R.V., hardly gives the full form of the word. Its frequent use in the LXX in the sense of protesting solemnly, *cf.* Deut. iv. 26, viii. 19, 1 Sam. viii. 9, Zech. iii. 7 (6), seems more in accordance with St. Peter's words, who here as elsewhere (x. 42, xliii. 5, xx. 21) was not simply acting as a witness **μαρτυρεῖν**, but was also protesting against the false views of those he was addressing. It must not, however, be forgotten that in other passages in the LXX the verb may mean to bear witness (see Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.*). In the N.T., as Wendt notes, it is used by St. Paul in the former sense of protesting solemnly in 1 Tim. v. 21, 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1. With this Mr. Page rightly compares its use in Acts xx. 23 (*cf.* also v. 20, **μαρτύρομαι**), and Luke xvi. 28. So too in classical writers.—**παρεκάλει**: the imperfect suggests the continuous exhortation which followed upon the Apostles' solemn protest (Weiss, *in loco*).—**τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης**: the adjective is used to describe the rebellious Israelites in the wilderness, LXX, Deut. xxxii. 5 (and Ps. lxxvii. 8), a description used in part by our Lord Himself, Matt. xvii. 17, Luke ix. 41, and wholly by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 15. The correct translation "crooked," R.V. (which A.V. has in Luke iii. 5, Phil. ii. 15), signifies perversity in turning off from the truth, whilst the A.V. "untoward" (so Tyndale) signifies rather backwardness in coming to the truth (Humphry, *Commentary on R. V.*), Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 41, 42.

Ver. 41. **Οἱ μὲν οὖν**: a truly Lucan formula, see i. 6. There is no anacoluthon, but for the answering δέ see v. 43. The words therefore refer to those mentioned in v. 37; in contrast to the three

λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθησαν· καὶ προσετέθησαν[1] τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ψυχαὶ ὡσεὶ τρισχίλιαι.

42. Ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ

[1] προσετεθησαν; after the verb εν inserted by ℵABCD 15, 18, 61, Vulg., so T W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

thousand fear came upon every person, ψυχή, so Mr. Page, on μὲν οὖν, *in loco*. Mr. Rendall finds the answering δέ in v. 42; two phases of events are contrasted; three thousand converts are added in one day—they clave stedfastly to the Christian communion. See also his Appendix on μὲν οὖν, p. 162.—ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ: used in classical Greek, especially in Plato, of receiving a teacher or his arguments with acceptance, and in the N.T. of receiving with approval; *cf.* xxiv. 3. The verb is only found in St. Luke in the N.T. with varying shades of meaning, twice in his Gospel, and five times in Acts in all parts. Only found in LXX in Apocryphal books, Tob. vii. 17, Judith xiii. 13 (but see Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.*), and in the Books of the Maccabees; *cf.* xviii. 27, xxi. 17, xxiv. 3, xxxviii. 30, see below.—ἐβαπτίσθησαν. There is nothing in the text which intimates that the Baptism of the three thousand was performed, not on the day of Pentecost, but during the days which followed. At the same time it is not said that the Baptism of such a multitude took place at one time or in one place on the day of the Feast, or that the rite was performed by St. Peter alone. Felten allows that others besides the Twelve may have baptised. See his note, *in loco*, and also Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 183.—προσετέθησαν, *cf.* ver. 47, and v. 14, xi. 24. In the LXX the same verb is used, Isa. xiv. 1, for a proselyte who is joined to Israel, so too Esth. ix. 27.—ψυχαί, "souls," *i.e.*, persons. See on ver. 43.—ὡσεὶ τρισχίλιαι: the adverb is another favourite word of St. Luke (Friedrich)—it is not found in St. John, and in St. Mark only once, in St. Matthew three times, but in St. Luke's Gospel eight or nine times, and in Acts six or seven times. As in i. 15 the introduction of the adverb is against the supposition that the number was a fictitious one. We cannot suppose that the influence and the recollection of Jesus had vanished within a few short weeks without leaving a trace behind, and where the proclamation of Him as the Christ followed upon the wonderful gift of tongues, in which many of the people would see the inspiration of God and a confirmation given by Him to the claims made by the disciples, hearts and consciences might well be stirred and quickened—and the movement once begun was sure to spread (see the remarks of Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 60, on the birthday of the Church, in spite of the suspicion with which he regards the number three thousand).

Ver. 42. The growth of the Church not merely in numbers but in the increase of faith and charity. In R.V. by the omission of καὶ before τῇ κλάσει two pairs of particulars are apparently enumerated—the first referring to the close adherence of believers to the Apostles in teaching and fellowship, the second expressing their outward acts of worship; or the first pair may be taken as expressing rather their relation to man, the second their relation to God (Nösgen). Dr. Hort, while pointing out that the first term τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων ("the teaching," R.V., following Wycliffe; *cf.* Matt. vii. 28, "doctrine," A.V., which would refer rather to a definite system, unless taken in the sense of the Latin *doctrina*, *teaching*) was obviously Christian, so that the disciples might well be called scribes to the kingdom, bringing out of their treasures things new and old, the facts of the life of Jesus and the glory which followed, facts interpreted in the light of the Law and the Prophets, takes the next words τῇ κοινωνίᾳ as separated altogether from τῶν ἀποστόλων, "and with the communion": κοινωνία, in Dr. Hort's view by parallelism with the other terms, expresses something more external and concrete than a spirit of communion; it refers to the help given to the destitute of the community, not apparently in money, but in public meals, such as from another point of view are called "the daily ministration" (*cf.* Acts vi. 2, τραπέζαις). There are undoubtedly instances of the employment of the word κοινωνία in this concrete sense, Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13, Heb. xiii. 26, but in each of these cases its meaning is determined by the context (and Zöckler, amongst recent commentators, would so

κοινωνίᾳ[1] καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς. 43. ἐγένετο δὲ πάσῃ ψυχῇ φόβος, πολλά τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα διὰ τῶν ἀποσ-

[1] **και τη κλασει**; om. **και** ℵ*ABCD* 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg., so Alford. **κοινωνια της κλασεως του αρτου,** so d, Vulg., Sah. (so in Gig., Par. **του αρ. της κλ.**), of which Blass says "recte, nisi delenda **τ. κλ.**". But the Western readings look like attempts to remove a difficulty.

restrict its meaning here). But, on the other hand, there are equally undoubted instances of **κοινωνία** referring to spiritual fellowship and concord, a fellowship in the spirit; *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 4, xiii. 14, Phil. ii. 1, Gal. ii. 9, 1 John i. 3, 6, 7; *cf.* also in classical writers, Arist., *Ethic.*, viii., 9, 12, **ἐν κοινωνίᾳ ἡ φιλία ἐστί.** Here, if the word can be separated from **ἀποσ.**, it may be taken to include the inward fellowship and its outward manifestation, ver. 44. May not a good parallel to this signification of the word be found in Phil. i. 5, where **κοινωνία,** whilst it signifies co-operation in the widest sense, including fellowship in sympathy, suffering and toil, also indicates the special and tangible manifestation of this fellowship in the ready almsgiving and contributions of the Philippian Church; see Lightfoot, *Philippians, in loco.* The word naturally suggests the community of goods, as Weizsäcker points out, but as it stands here without any precise definition we cannot so limit it, and in his view Gal. ii. 9 gives the key to its meaning in the passage before us—the bond which united the **μαθηταί** was the consciousness of their belief in Christ, and in the name **ἀδελφοί** the relationship thus constituted gained its complete expression.—**τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου**: no interpretation is satisfactory which forgets (as both Weizsäcker and Holtzmann point out) that the author of Acts had behind him Pauline language and doctrine, and that we are justified in adducing the language of St. Paul in order to explain the words before us, *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 16, xi. 24, Acts xx. 7 (and xxvii. 35, Weizsäcker). But if we admit this, we cannot consistently explain the expression of a mere common meal. It may be true that every such meal in the early days of the Church's first love had a religious significance, that it became a type and evidence of the kingdom of God amongst the believers, but St. Paul's habitual reference of the words before us to the Lord's Supper leads us to see in them here a reference to the commemoration of the Lord's death, although we may admit that it is altogether indisputable that this commemoration at first followed a common meal. That St. Paul's teaching as to the deep religious significance of the breaking of the bread carries us back to a very early date is evident from the fact that he speaks to the Corinthians of a custom long established; *cf.* "Abendmahl I." in Hauck's *Real-Encyklopädie*, heft i. (1896), p. 23 ff., on the evidential value of this testimony as against Jülicher's and Spitta's attempt to show that the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the early Church rested upon no positive command of Jesus. Weizsäcker's words are most emphatic: "Every assumption of its having originated in the Church from the recollection of intercourse with Him at table, and the necessity felt for recalling His death is precluded—the celebration must rather have been generally observed from the beginning" *Apostolic Age*, ii., p. 279, E.T., and *cf. Das apostol. Zeitalter*, p. 594, second edition (1892), Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theol.*, i., p. 155. Against any attempt to interpret the words under discussion of mere benevolence towards the poor (Isaiah lviii. 7) Wendt regards xx. 6, 7 (and also xxvii. 35) as decisive. Weiss refers to Luke xxiv. 30 for an illustration of the words, but the act, probably the habitual act of Jesus, which they express there, does not exhaust their meaning here. Spitta takes vi. 2, **διακονεῖν τραπέζαις** as = **κλάσις ἄρτου,** an arbitrary interpretation, see also below. The Vulgate connects **τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου** with the preceding **κοινωνία,** and renders *in communicatione fractionis panis*, a rendering justified in so far as the **κοινωνία** has otherwise no definite meaning, and by the fact that the brotherly intercourse of Christians specially revealed itself in the *fractio panis*, *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 16, and Blass, *in loco*, and also β where he reads **καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς κλάσεως τοῦ ἄρτου.** But whilst Felten refers to the evidence of the Vulgate, and also to that of the Peshitto, which renders the words before us "in the breaking of the Eucharist" (so too in xx. 7), it is worthy of note that he refuses to follow the usual Roman

τόλων ἐγίνετο.[1] 44. πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, καὶ εἶχον[2] ἅπαντα κοινά, 45.[3] καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις ἐπίπρασ-

[1] In ver. 43 ℵACE 13, many cursives, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Boh. add **εν Ιερουσαλημ** (which is added by D to **των αποστ.** in ver. 42); so Tisch., R.V. marg. But the addition is not found in BD 1, 31, 61, Sah., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aeth., Chrys.; so W.H., R.V. text, Weiss, Wendt. ℵAC 40, Vulg., Boh. add also **φοβος τε ην μεγας επι παντας**, so Tisch.; but omitted by BDE, Sah., Syrr. (P. and H.), Arm., Aeth., Chrys.—perhaps assimilation to iv. 33, v. 5; it has been already expressed in the first clause of the verse, and as the authorities for its retention are mainly the same as for **εν Ιερ.**, it would seem that the former addition may also be rejected.

[2] **ησαν επι το αυτο και ειχον**, so Tisch., Hilg.; but B 57, Orig., so W.H., Weiss, Wendt have only **επι το αυτο ειχον—ησαν** and **και** might easily be added, but their falling out is difficult to imagine.

[3] D (*cf.* Pesch.) reads **και οσοι κτηματα ειχον η υπαρξεις επιπρασκον**; so Hilg. Before **πασι** D, Gig., Par. insert **καθ' ημεραν**. For **καθοτι . . . ειχε** D reads **τοις αν τις χρειαν ειχεν** (**τοις χρειαν εχουσιν** in β); *cf.* iv. 35. The remarks of Belser and Weiss on the passage should be compared—the former sees in β a more precise account and, at the same time, a more moderate account of the "community of goods" at Jerusalem than is sometimes derived from this passage (see comments), whilst here Weiss sees in D nothing but fruitless and even senseless emendations.

interpretation, *viz.*, that the words point to a communion in one kind only, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 94. It is possible that the introduction of the article before at least one of the words **τῇ κλάσει** (*cf.* R.V.) emphasises here the Lord's Supper as distinct from the social meal with which it was connected, whilst ver. 46 may point to the social as well as to the devotional bearing of the expression (*cf.* Zöckler, note *in loco*), and this possibility is increased if we regard the words **τῶν ἀποστόλων** as characterising the whole sentence in ver. 42. But unless in both verses some deeper meaning was attached to the phrases **τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου—κλῶντες ἄρτον**, it seems superfluous, as Schöttgen remarked, to introduce the mention of common food at the time of a community of goods. No doubt St. Chrysostom (so Oecum., Theophyl.) and Bengel interpret the words as simply = *victus frugalis*, but elsewhere St. Chrysostom speaks of them, or at least when joined with **κοινωνία**, as referring to the Holy Communion (see Alford's note *in loco*), and Bengel's comment on ver. 42 must be compared with what he says on ver. 46.—**καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς**, "and [in] the prayers" R.V. Dr. Hort suggests that the prayers may well have been Christian prayers at stated hours, answering to Jewish prayers, and perhaps replacing the synagogue prayers (not recognised in the Law), as the Apostles' "teaching" had replaced that of the scribes (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 44, and *Ecclesia*, p. 45). But the words may also be taken to include prayers both new and old, *cf.* iv. 24, James v. 13 (Eph. ii. 19, Col. iii. 16), and also Acts iii. 1, where Peter and John go up to the Temple "at the hour of prayer," *cf.* Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, ii., p. 159.

Ver. 43. **πάσῃ ψυχῇ**, *i.e.*, every person, and so iii. 23, Hebraistic, *cf.* כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ, Lev. vii. 17, xvii. 12, etc., and *cf.* 1 Macc. ii. 38. In ver. 41 the plural is used rather like the Latin *capita* in enumerations, *cf.* Acts vii. 14, xxvii. 37, and LXX, Gen. xlvi. 15, Exod. i. 5, Num. xix. 18, etc. But Winer-Moulton (p. 194, xxii. 7) would press the meaning of **ψυχή** here, and contends that the fear was produced in the *heart*, the seat of the feelings and desires, so that its use is no mere Hebraism, although he admits that in Rom. xiii. 1 (1 Peter iii. 20) the single **πᾶσα ψυχή** = every person, but see *l.c.*—**φόβος**, *cf.* iii. 10, *i.e.*, upon the non-believers, for "perfect love casteth out fear". Friedrich notes amongst the characteristics of St. Luke that in his two books one of the results of miraculous powers is fear. Here the **φόβος** means rather the fear of reverential awe or the fear which acted *quasi freno* (Calvin), so that the early growth of the Church was not destroyed prematurely by assaults from without. There is surely nothing inconsistent here with ver. 47, but Hilgenfeld ascribes the whole of ver. 43 to his "author to Theophilus," partly on the ground of this supposed inconsistency, partly be-

κον, καὶ διεμέριζον αὐτὰ πᾶσι, καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχε· 46.[1] καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλῶντές τε κατ'

[1] D omits καθ' ημεραν (see previous note) and reads παντες τε προσκαρτερουν, perhaps for additional clearness, or perhaps some confusion (see also Weiss's comments). D reads also και κατοικουσαν επι το αυτο—D² del. αν, and so Blass corrects και κατ οικους ησαν; so too Hilg. Belser sees in κατ' οικους an answer to the objection that κατ' οικον in a text refers to the house of assembly of the Christians, and that as the number 3000 could not assemble in a single dwelling it must be an exaggeration—no doubt if Luke had meant one house of assembly he would have written κατα τον οικον, but the reading κατ' οικους puts the matter beyond a doubt, and shows how κατ' οικον must be taken as = vicissim per domos.

cause the mention of miracles is out of place. But it is nowhere stated, as Hilgenfeld and Weiss presuppose, that the healing of the lame man in iii. 1 ff. was the *first* miracle performed (see note there, and Wendt and Blass).

Ver. 44. **πάντες δὲ κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* iii. 24, all, *i.e.*, not only those who had recently joined, ver. 41.—**ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ**, see note on i. 15; here of place. Theophylact takes it of the unanimity in the Church, but this does not seem to be in accordance with the general use of the phrase in the N.T. = **ὁμοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον** (Hesychius). Blass points out that **ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ** demands **ἦσαν**, and if we omit this word (W.H.) we must supply **ὄντες** with **ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ**, as **ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἶχον** could not stand (W.H.). The difficulty raised by Hilgenfeld, Wendt, Holtzmann, Overbeck, in this connection as to the number is exaggerated, whether we meet it or not by supposing that some of this large number were pilgrims who had come up to the Feast, but who had now returned to their homes. For in the first place, **ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ** cannot be taken to mean that all the believers were always assembled in one and the same place. The reading in **β**, ver. 46, may throw light upon the expression in this verse **καὶ κατ' οἴκους ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό**, or the phrase may be referred to their assembling together in the Temple, ver. 46, and v. 12 may be quoted in support of this, where all the believers apparently assemble in Solomon's Porch. It is therefore quite arbitrary to dismiss the number here or in iv. 4 as merely due to the idealising tendency of the Apostles, or to the growth of the Christian legend. —**εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά**, "held all things common," R.V. Blass and Weiss refer these words with **ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ** to the assembling of the Christians together for common meals and find in the statement the exact antithesis to the selfish conduct in 1 Cor. xi. 20, 21. But the words also demand a much wider reference. On the "Community of Goods," see additional note at end of chapter.

Ver. 45. **τὰ κτήματα . . . τὰς ὑπάρξεις**: according to their derivation, the former word would mean that which is acquired, and the latter that which belongs to a man for the time being. But in ordinary usage **κτήματα** was always used of real property, fields, lands, *cf.* v. 1, whilst **ὑπάρξεις** was used of personal property (= **τὰ ὑπάρχοντα** in Heb. x. 34). This latter word, **τὰ ὑπάρχοντα**, was a favourite with St. Luke, who uses it eight times in his Gospel and in Acts iv. 32. No doubt **κτῆμα** is used in LXX for field and vineyard, Prov. xxiii. 10, xxxi. 16, but the above distinction was not strictly observed, for **τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, ὕπαρξις**, are used both of movable and immovable property (see Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.*).—**ἐπίπρασκον**: all three verbs are in the imperfect, and if we remember that this tense may express an action which is done often and continuously without being done universally or extending to a complete accomplishment (*cf.* iv. 34, xviii. 8, Mark xii. 41), considerable light may be thrown upon the picture here drawn (see Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 186, on the tense and this passage): "And kept getting . . . and distributing to all, as any man [**τις**] [not 'every man,' A.V.] had need". See Rendall, *Acts*, *in loco*, and on iv. 32, and *Expositor*, vii., p. 358, 3rd series.—**καθότι**: peculiar to St. Luke; in Gospel twice, and in Acts four times. **ἄν** makes the clause more indefinite: it is found in relative clauses after **ὅς, ὅστις**, etc., with the indicative—here it is best explained as signifying "accidisse aliquid non certo quodam tempore, sed quotiescumque occasio ita ferret," quoted by Wendt from Herm., *ad Vig.*, p. 820; *cf.* Mark vi. 56, Blass, *in loco*, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 142 (1893). Grimm renders **καθότι ἄν** here "in so far," or

"so often as," "according as". Spitta refers vv. 45-47 to the Apostles only, but to justify this he is obliged to refer ver. 44 to his reviser. Hilgenfeld brackets the whole verse, referring it to his "author to Theophilus," retaining ver. 44, whilst Weiss also refers the whole verse to a reviser, who introduced it in imitation of St. Luke's love of poverty as indicated in his Gospel. But by such expedients the picture of the whole body of the believers sharing in the Apostles' life and liberality is completely marred.

Ver. 46. **ὁμοθυμαδόν**, see note on i. 14.—**προσκαρτεροῦντες**, *cf.* i. 14.—**ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ**: we are not told how far this participation in the Temple extended, and mention is only made in one place, in xxi. 26, of any kind of connection between the Apostles or any other Christians and any kind of sacrificial act. But that one peculiar incident may imply that similar acts were not uncommon, and their omission by the Christians at Jerusalem might well have led to an open breach between them and their Jewish countrymen (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 44, 45). No doubt the Apostles would recommend their teaching to the people by devout attendance at the Temple, *cf.* iii. 1, v. 20, 42, like other Jews.—**κατ' οἶκον**, R.V. "at home" (so in A.V. margin). But all other English versions except Genevan render the words "from house to house" (Vulgate, *circa domos*), and this latter rendering is quite possible, *cf.* Luke viii. 1, Acts xv. 21, xx. 20. If we interpret the words of the meeting of the believers in a private house (*privatim* in contrast to the **ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ**, *palam*), *cf.* Rom. xvi. 3, 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Col. iv. 15, Philemon 2, it does not follow that only one house is here meant, as Wendt and Weiss suppose by referring to i. 13 (see on the other hand Blass, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Spitta, Hort)—there may well have been private houses open to the disciples, *e.g.*, the house of John Mark, *cf.* Dr. Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, pp. 259, 260. Hilgenfeld, with Overbeck, rejects the explanation given on the ground that for this **κατ' οἴκους**, or **κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους**, would be required—an argument which does not however get over the fact that **κατά** may be used distributively with the singular—according to him all is in order if ii. 42 follows immediately upon 41[a], *i.e.*, he drops 41[b] altogether, and proceeds to omit also the whole of vv. 43 and 45.—**κλῶντες ἄρτον**: the question has been raised as to whether this expression has the same meaning here as in ver. 42, or whether it is used here of merely ordinary meals. The additional words **μετελάμβανον τροφῆς** have been taken to support this latter view, but on the other hand if the two expressions are almost synonymous, it is difficult to see why the former **κλῶντες ἄρτον** should have been introduced here at all, *cf.* Knabenbauer *in loco.* It is not satisfactory to lay all the stress upon the omission of the article before **ἄρτον**, and to explain the expression of ordinary daily meals, an interpretation adopted even by the Romanist Beelen and others. In the *Didache* the expression **κλάσατε ἄρτον**, chap. xiv. 1, certainly refers to the Eucharist, and in the earlier chap. ix., where the word **κλάσμα** occurs twice in the sense of broken bread, it can scarcely refer to anything less than the *Agape* (Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 565, and Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 414, on the value of the Eucharistic teaching in the *Didache*).—**μετελ.**: the imperf. denotes a customary act, the meaning of the verb with the gen. as here is frequently found in classical Greek; *cf.* LXX, Wisdom xviii. 9, 4 Macc. viii. 8, AR., and xvi. 18.—**ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει**: exulting, bounding joy; Vulgate, *exultatione*, "extreme joy," Grimm, used by St. Luke twice in his Gospel, i. 14, 44—only twice elsewhere in the N.T., Heb. i. 9, quotation, and in Jude, ver. 24. The word, though not occurring in classical Greek, was a favourite in the LXX, where it occurs no less than eighteen times in the Psalms alone. This "gladness" is full of significance—it is connected with the birth of the forerunner by the angel's message to Zacharias, Luke i. 14; the cognate verb **ἀγαλλιάω, -άομαι**, common to St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, denotes the spiritual and exultant joy with which the Church age after age has rejoiced in the Song of the Incarnation, Luke i. 47.—**ἀφελότητι καρδίας**: rightly derived from **α** priv. and **φελλεύς**, *stony ground* = a smooth soil, free from stones (but see Zöckler, *in loco*, who derives **ἀφέλεια**, the noun in use in Greek writers, from **φέλα, πέλλα**, Macedon. *a stone*). The word itself does not occur elsewhere, but **ἀφέλεια, ἀφελής, ἀφελῶς** are all found (Wetstein), and just as the adj. **ἀφελής** signified a man **ἁπλοῦς ἐν τῷ βίῳ**, so the noun here used might well be taken as equivalent to **ἁπλότης** (Overbeck) "in simplicity of heart," *simplicitate*, Bengel. Wendt compares the words of Demosthenes, **ἀφελὴς καὶ παρρησίας μεστός**.

Ver. 47. **αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεὸν**: a favourite expression with St. Luke, *cf.* Gospel

οἶκον ἄρτον, μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας, 47. αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ἔχοντες χάριν πρὸς ὅλον τὸν

ii. 13, 20, xix. 37, Acts iii. 8, 9, elsewhere only in Rom. xv. 11 (a quotation), and Rev. xix. 5, with dative of person, W.H. The praise refers not merely to their thanksgivings at meals, but is characteristic of their whole devotional life both in public and private; and their life of worship and praise, combined with their liberality and their simplicity of life, helped to secure for them the result given in the following words, and an unmolested hearing in the Temple "Hunc inveniunt (favorem) qui Deum laudant" Bengel. **αἰνέω** is very frequent in the LXX, and nearly always of the praise of God, but *cf.* Gen. xlix. 8, Prov. xxxi. 28, 30, 31, Ecclus. xliv. 1, etc.—**ἔχοντες χάριν**: if the life of the Church at this stage has been compared with that of her divine Master, inasmuch as it increased in wisdom and stature, another point of likeness may be found in the fact that the Church, like Christ, was in favour with God and man.—**χάριν**: very frequent in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts (Friedrich), only three times in the Gospel of St. John, and not at all in St. Matthew or St. Mark. In the O.T. it is often used of finding favour in the sight of God, and in the N.T. in a similar sense, *cf.* Luke i. 30, Acts vii. 46. It is also used in the O.T. of favour, kindness, goodwill, especially from a superior to an inferior (Gen. xviii. 3, xxxii. 5, etc.), so too in the N.T., here, and in Acts vii. 10. See further note on Acts xiv. 3. In Luke's Gospel eight times, in Acts seventeen times. See also Plummer's full note on Luke iv. 22, Sanday and Headlam's *Romans*, p. 10, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* Rendall would render "giving Him thanks before all the people," and he refers to the fact that the phrase is always so rendered elsewhere (though once wrongly translated, Heb. xii. 28). But the phrase is also found in LXX, Exodus xxxiii. 12, 1 Esdras vi. 5 (see also Wetstein, *in loco*) in the sense first mentioned.—**ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει**, *i.e.*, the Lord Christ, *cf.* ver. 36 (as Holtzmann, Wendt, Weiss, amongst others). The pure and simple life of the disciples doubtless commended them to the people, and made it easier for them to gain confidence, and so converts, but the growth of the Church, St. Luke reminds us, was not the work of any human agency or attractiveness.—**τοὺς σωζομένους**: naturally connected with the prophecy in ver. 21 (*cf. v.* 40), so that the work of salvation there attributed to Jehovah by the Old Testament Prophet is here the work of Christ the inference is again plain with regard to our Lord's divinity. The expression is rightly translated in R.V. (so too in 1 Cor. i. 18, 2 Cor. ii. 15. See Burton, *Moods and Tenses in N. T. Greek*, pp. 57, 58). It has nothing to do, as Wetstein well remarks, with the secret counsels of God, but relates to those who were obeying St. Peter's command in ver. 40. An apt parallel is given by Mr. Page from Thuc., vii., 44.

Gift of Tongues, ii. 4. **λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις.**—There can be no doubt that St. Luke's phrase (*cf.* **γλώσσαις καιναῖς**, Mark xvi. 17, W.H., margin, not text), taken with the context, distinctly asserts that the Apostles, if not the whole Christian assembly (St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, including the hundred-and-twenty), received the power of speaking in foreign languages, and that some of their hearers at all events understood them, vv. 8, 11 (**ἡμετέραις**). (On the phrase as distinguished from those used elsewhere in Acts and in 1 Cor., see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, **γλῶττα** 2, and Blass, *Acta Apost.*, p. 50, "**γλῶττα** etiam ap. att. per se est lingua peregrina vel potius vocabulum peregrinum".) Wendt and Matthias, who have recently given us a lengthy account of the events of the first Christian Pentecost, both hold that this speaking with tongues is introduced by St. Luke himself, and that it is a legendary embellishment from his hand of what actually took place; the speaking with tongues at Pentecost was simply identical with the same phenomenon described elsewhere in x. 46, xix. 6, and in 1 Cor. xii.-xiv. This is plain from St. Peter's own words in xi. 15, 17; so in xix. 6, the speaking with tongues is the immediate result of the outpouring of the Spirit. So too Wendt lays stress upon the fact that St. Paul says **λαλεῖν γλώσσαις** or **γλώσσῃ**, but not **λαλ. ἑτέρ. γλ.** The former was evidently the original mode of describing the phenomenon, to which Luke recurs in his own description in x. 46 and xix. 6, whereas in the passage before us his language represents the miraculous enhancement of the events of Pentecost. M'Giffert, in the same way, thinks that the writer of Acts, far re-

moved from the events, could hardly avoid investing even the common phenomena of the *Glossolalia* with marvel and mystery. Wendt however admits that this embellishment was already accomplished by Christian tradition before Luke. But if St. Luke must have had every means of knowing from St. Paul the character of the speaking with tongues at Corinth, it does not seem unfair to maintain that he also had means of knowing from the old Palestinian Christians, who had been in union with the Church at Jerusalem from the beginning, *e.g.*, from a John Mark, or a Mnason (ἀρχαῖος μαθητής, xxi. 16), the exact facts connected with the great outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost (Schmid, *Biblische Theologie*, pp. 278, 279). But it is further to be noted that Wendt by no means denies that there was a miraculous element, as shown in the outpouring of the Spirit, in the events of the Pentecostal Feast, but that he also considers it quite unlikely that Luke's introduction of a still further miraculous element was prompted by a symbolising tendency, a desire to draw a parallel between the Christian Pentecost and the miraculous delivery of the Law, according to the Jewish tradition that the one voice which proceeded from Sinai divided into seventy tongues, and was heard by the seventy nations of the world, each in their mother tongue (so Zeller, Pfleiderer, Hilgenfeld, Spitta, Jüngst and Matthias, and so apparently Clemen in his "Speaking with Tongues," *Expository Times*, p. 345, 1899). But in the first place there is no convincing evidence at the early date of the Christian Pentecost of any connection in Jewish tradition between the Feast of Pentecost and the giving of the Law on Sinai (*cf.* Schmid, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 286; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 7, 1057, and Holtzmann, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 330), and it is significant that neither Philo nor Josephus make any reference to any such connection; and in the next place it is strange, as Wendt himself points out, that if Luke had started with the idea of the importance of any such symbolism, no reference should be made to it in the subsequent address of Peter, whereas even in the catalogue of the nations there is no reference of any kind to the number seventy; the number actually given, vv. 9, 11, might rather justify the far-fetched notice of Holtzmann (*u. s.*, p. 331), that a reference is meant to the sixteen grandsons of Noah, Gen. x. 1, 2, 6, 21. Certainly Heb. ii. 2-4 cannot, as Schmid well points out against Holtzmann, lead to any such connection of ideas as the μερισμοὶ πνεύμ. ἁγ. are evidently the distribution of the gifts of the Spirit. We may readily admit that the miracle on the birthday of the Christian Church was meant to foreshadow the universal progress of the new faith, and its message for all mankind without distinction of nation, position, or age. But even if the Jewish tradition referred to above was in existence at this early date, we have still to consider whether the narrative in Acts could possibly be a copy of it, or dependent upon it. According to the tradition, a voice was to be expected from Heaven which would be understood by different men in their mother tongues, but in our narrative the Apostles themselves speak after the manner of men in these tongues. For to suppose that the Apostles all spoke one and the same language, but that the hearers were enabled to understand these utterances, each in his own language, is not only to do violence to the narrative, but simply to substitute one miraculous incident for another. Nor again, as Wendt further admits, is there any real ground for seeing in the miraculous event under consideration a cancelling of the confusion of tongues at Babel which resulted from rebellion against God, for the narrative does not contain any trace of the conception of a unity of language to which the Jewish idea appears to have tended as a contrast to the confusion of Babel (Test. xii., Patr., *Jud.*, xxv.). The unity is not one of uniformity of speech but of oneness of Spirit and in the Spirit. At the same time there was a peculiar fitness in the fact that the first and most abundant bestowal of this divine gift should be given at a Feast which was marked above all others by the presence of strangers from distant lands, that a sign should thus be given to them that believed not, and that the firstfruits of a Gentile harvest should be offered by the Spirit to the Father (Iren., *Adv. Haer*, iii., 17), an assurance to the Apostles of the greatness and universality of the message which they were commissioned to deliver. But there is no reason to suppose that this power of speaking in foreign languages was a permanent gift. In the first place the Greek language was known throughout the Roman Empire, and in the next place Acts xiv. 11 (see *in loco*) seems to forbid any such view. The speaking

λαόν.[1] ὁ δὲ Κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.[2]

[1] τον λαον; D has τον κοσμον. Nestle and Chase point out Syriac as probable source; the former, with Blass, thinking that St. Luke first of all translated the word wrongly, κοσμον, and corrected it in later edition to λαον, whilst Chase gives the variation a much later origin. Harris supposes that the translator first introduced "mundum" (*cf.* "tout le monde") and thence it crept into the Greek. Belser finds no need for Syriac influence, as St. Luke in revising might easily substitute "people" for the more general term "world". *Some* Syriac influence may have been at work, or possibly a corruption of the Greek may be suggested. Hilg. also has κοσμον. See further Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 54.

[2] τη εκκλησια. επι το αυτο (iii.) EP, Syrr. (P. and H.); but for omitting τη εκκλ. and concluding ii. with επι το αυτο ℵABCG 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., so Bengel, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. The T.R. was followed by Meyer, De Wette, Nösgen, on account of the extreme difficulty of the proposed correction, but the latter is too well attested. Hilg. has επι το αυτο εν τη εκκλησια, so D.

with tongues in Acts ii. and in other passages of the N.T. may be classed as identical in so far as each was the effect of the divine Πνεῦμα, each a miraculous spiritual gift, marking a new epoch of spiritual life. But in Acts we have what we have not elsewhere—the speaking in foreign tongues—this was not the case in Corinth; there the speaking with tongues was absolutely unintelligible, it could not be understood without an interpreter, *i.e.*, without another gift of the divine Spirit, *viz.*, interpretation, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 30 (the word *unknown* inserted in A.V. in 1 Cor. xiv. is unfortunate), and the fact that the Apostle compares the speaking with tongues to a speaking in foreign languages shows that the former was itself no speaking in foreign tongues, since two identical things do not admit of comparison (Schmid, *u. s.*, pp. 288, 289).

Peter might well express his belief that Cornelius and those who spoke with tongues had also received the Holy Ghost, *cf.* x. 44, xi. 17, 24, *in loco*; but it does not follow that the gift bestowed upon them was identical with that bestowed at Pentecost—there were diversities of gifts from the bounty of the One Spirit. Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 78; Evans in *Speaker's Commentary* on 1 *Cor.*, p. 334; Plumptre, B.D.[1] "Tongues, Gift of"; Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, ii., pp. 272, 273, E.T., and Feine, *Eine Vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas*, n., p. 167; Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 177; Page, *Acts of the Apostles*, note on chap. ii., 4; and A. Wright, *Some N. T. Problems*, p. 277 ff.

The objection urged at length by Wendt and Spitta that foreign languages could not have been spoken, since in that case there was no occasion to accuse the Apostles of drunkenness, but that ecstatic incoherent utterances of devotion and praise might well have seemed to the hearers sounds produced by revelry or madness (*cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 23), is easily met by noting that the utterances were not received with mockery by all but only by some, the word ἕτεροι apparently denoting quite a different class of hearers, who may have been unacquainted with the language spoken, and hence regarded the words as an unintelligible jargon.

Spitta attempts to break up Acts ii. 1-13 into two sources, 1.[a], 4, 12, 13, belonging to A, and simply referring to a *Glossolalia* like that at Corinth, whilst the other verses are assigned to B and the Redactor, and contain a narrative which could only have been derived from the Jewish tradition mentioned above, and introducing the notion of foreign tongues at a date when the *Glossolalia* had ceased to exist, and so to be understood. Spitta refers συμπληροῦσθαι ii. 1 to the filling up of the number of the Apostles in chap. i., so that his source A begins καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπλ. . . . ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες π. ἁγ., *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 52. It is not surprising that Hilgenfeld should speak of the narrative as one which cannot be thus divided, upon which as he says Spitta has in vain essayed his artificial analysis.

Community of Goods.—The key to the two passages, ii. 42 ff. and iv. 32 ff., is to be found in the expression in which they both agree, occurring in ii. 45 and iv. 35, καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν. Such expressions indicate, as we have seen, not reckless but judicious charity (see also Ramsay, *St. Paul*, etc., p. 373, and

reading in D, ii., 45); they show wise management, as in early days St. Chrysostom noted in commenting on the words, so that the Christians did not act recklessly like many philosophers among the Greeks, of whom some gave up their lands, others cast great quantities of money into the sea, which was no contempt of riches, but only folly and madness (*Hom.*, vii.). Not that St. Luke's glowing and repeated description (on St. Luke's way of sometimes repeating himself as here, see Harris, *Four Lectures on the Western Text*, p. 85) is to be confined to the exercise of mere almsgiving on the part of the Church. Both those who had, and those who had not, were alike the inheritors of a kingdom which could only be entered by the poor in spirit, alike members of a family and a household in which there was one Master, even Christ, in Whose Name all who believed were brethren. In this poverty of spirit, in this sense of brotherhood, "the poor man knew no shame, the rich no haughtiness" (Chrys.).

But whilst men were called upon to give ungrudgingly, they were not called upon to give of necessity: what each one had was still his own, **τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῷ**, iv. 32, although not even one (**οὐδὲ εἷς**) of them reckoned it so; the daily ministration in vi. 1 seems to show that no equal division of property amongst all was intended; the act of Barnabas was apparently one of charity rather than of communism, for nothing is said of an absolute surrender of all that he had; the act of Ananias and Sapphira was entirely voluntary, although it presented itself almost as a duty (Ramsay, *u. s.*); Mark's mother still retains her home at Jerusalem, xii. 12, and it would seem that Mnason too had a dwelling there (see on xxi. 16). At Joppa, ix. 36, 39, and at Antioch, xi. 29, there was evidently no absolute equality of earthly possessions—Tabitha helps the poor out of her own resources, and every man as he prospered sent his contributions to the Church at Jerusalem.

It is sometimes urged that this enthusiasm of charity and of the spirit (**ἐνθουσιασμός**, as Blass calls it), which filled at all events the Church at Jerusalem, was due to the expectation of Christ's immediate return, and that in the light of that event men regarded lands and possessions as of no account, even if ordinary daily work was not neglected (O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 233). But it is strange that if this is the true account of the action of the Church at Jerusalem, a similar mode of life and charity should not have found place in other Churches, *e.g.*, in the Church at Thessalonica, where the belief in Christ's speedy return was so overwhelmingly felt (Felten). No picture could be more extraordinary than that drawn by O. Holtzmann of the Christian Church at Jerusalem, driven by the voice of Christian prophets to enjoin an absolutely compulsory community of goods in expectation of the nearness of the Parousia, and of Ananias and Sapphira as the victims of this tyrannical product of fanaticism and overwrought excitement. It is a relief to turn from such a strange perversion of the narrative to the enthusiastic language in which, whilst insisting on its idealising tendency, Renan and Pfleiderer alike have recognised the beauty of St. Luke's picture, and of the social transformation which was destined to renew the face of the earth, which found its pattern of serving and patient love in Jesus the Friend of the poor, whose brotherhood opened a place of refuge for the oppressed, the destitute, the weak, who enjoyed in the mutual love of their fellows a foretaste of the future kingdom in which God Himself will wipe all tears from their eyes. Whatever qualifications must be made in accepting the whole description given us by Renan and Pfleiderer, they were at least right in recognising the important factor of the Person of Jesus, and the probability that during His lifetime He had Himself laid the foundations of the social movement which so soon ennobled and blessed His Church. It is far more credible that the disciples should have continued the common life in which they had lived with their Master than that they should have derived a social system from the institutions of the Essenes. There is no proof of any historical connection between this sect and the Apostolic Church, nor can we say that the high moral standard and mode of common life adopted by the Essenes, although in some respects analogous to their own, had any direct influence on the followers of Christ. Moreover, with points of comparison, there were also points of contrast. St. Luke's notice, ii. 46, that the believers continued steadfastly in the Temple, stands out in contrast to the perpetual absence of the Essenes from the Temple, to which they sent their gifts (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii. 2, 5); the common meals of the Essene brotherhood naturally present a likeness to St. Luke's description of the

III. 1.[1] ᾿ΕΠΙ τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ ᾿Ιωάννης ἀνέβαινον εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς τὴν ἐνάτην. 2. καί[2] τις ἀνὴρ

[1] D begins εν δε ταις ημεραις ταυταις, so Par. Blass (so Harris) regards the phrase as addition "in principio novæ lectionis," but the addition is characteristic of Luke; Hilg. retains. After ιερον D also inserts το δειλινον (the acc. of time, like τὸ πρώϊ, v. 21—defended by Belser (and by Zöckler), who argues that it is more likely to have been struck out on revision than added by a later hand); Hilg. retains.

[2] After και D, Par.[2], Syr. Pesh. insert ιδου. υπαρχων om. D, Gig., Par.

early Christian Church, but whilst the Essenes dined together, owing to their scrupulosity in avoiding all food except what was ceremonially pure, the Christians saw in every poor man who partook of their common meal the real Presence of their Lord. Of all contemporary sects it may no doubt be said that the Christian society resembled most nearly the Essenes, but with this admission Weizsäcker well adds: "The Essenes, through their binding rules and their suppression of individualism, were, from their very nature, an order of limited extent. In the new Society the moral obligation of liberty reigned, and disclosed an unlimited future," *Apostolic Age*, i., 58 (E.T.). It is often supposed that the after-poverty of the Church in Jerusalem, Rom. xv. 26, Gal. ii. 10, etc., was the result of this first enthusiasm of love and charity, and that the failure of a community of goods in the mother city prevented its introduction elsewhere. But not only is the above view of the "communism" of the early Christians adverse to this supposition, but there were doubtless many causes at work which may account for the poverty of the Saints in Jerusalem, *cf.* Rendall, *Expositor*, Nov., 1893, p. 322. The collection for the Saints, which occupies such a prominent place in St. Paul's life and words, may not have been undertaken for any exceptional distress as in the earlier case of the famine in Judæa, Acts xi. 26, but we cannot say how severely the effects of the famine may have affected the fortunes of the Jerusalem Christians. We must too take into account the persecution of the Christians by their rich neighbours; the wealthy Sadducees were their avowed opponents. From the first it was likely that the large majority of the Christians in Jerusalem would possess little of this world's goods, and the constant increase in the number of the disciples would have added to the difficulty of maintaining the disproportionate number of poor. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that there was another and a fatal cause at work—love itself had grown cold—the picture drawn by St. James in his Epistle is painfully at variance with the golden days which he had himself seen, when bitter jealousy and faction were unknown, for all were of one heart and one soul, Zahn, *Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche*, p. 39 ff.; Zöckler, *u.s.*, pp. 191, 192; Wendt, *in loco;* M'Giffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 67; Conybeare, "Essenes," Hastings' B.D.; Kaufmann, *Socialism and Communism*, p. 5 ff.

CHAPTER III.—Ver. 1. St. Luke selects out of the number of τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα the one which was the immediate antecedent of the first persecution. "Non dicitur primum hoc miraculum fuisse, sed fuit, quanquam unum e multis, ipso loco maxime conspicuum," Blass, as against Weiss, Hilgenfeld, Feine.—ἀνέβαινον, *cf.* Luke xviii. 10. "Two men went up into the Temple to pray," *i.e.*, from the lower city to Mount Moriah, the hill of the Temple, "the hill of the house," on its site see "Jerusalem," B.D.[2]. The verb is in the imperfect, because the Apostles do not enter the Temple until ver. 8. St. Chrysostom comments: Πέτρος καὶ ᾿Ιωάννης ἦσαν καὶ τὸν ᾿Ιησοῦν εἶχον μέσον, Matt. xviii. 20.—ἐπὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς, not *during* or *about*, but marking a definite time, *for the hour*, *i.e.*, to be there during the hour—sometimes the words are taken to mean "towards the hour": see Plummer on Luke x. 35 (so apparently Weiss). Page renders "for, *i.e.*, to be there at the hour" (so Felten, Lumby). In going thus to the Temple they imitated their Master, Matt. xxvi. 55.—τὴν ἐνάτην, *i.e.*, 3 P.M., when the evening sacrifice was offered, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 4, 3. Edersheim points out that although the evening sacrifice was fixed by the Jews as "between the evenings," *i.e.*, between the darkness of the gloaming and that of the night, and although the words of Psalm cxxxiv., and the appointment of Levite singers for night service, 1 Chron. ix. 33, xxiii. 30, seem to imply an evening service, yet in the time of our Lord

χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων ἐβαστάζετο· ὃν ἐτίθουν καθ' ἡμέραν πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὴν λεγομένην Ὡραίαν, τοῦ

the evening sacrifice commenced much earlier, *The Temple; its Ministry and Services*, pp. 115, 116. According to Schürer, followed by Blass who appeals to the authority of Hamburger, there is no ground for supposing that the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day were regular stated times for prayer. The actual times were rather (1) early in the morning at the time of the morning sacrifice (see also Edersheim, *u. s.*, p. 115); (2) in the afternoon about the ninth hour (three o'clock), at the time of the evening sacrifice; (3) in the evening at sunset (*Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., 290, E.T.). The third, sixth, and ninth hours were no doubt appropriated to private prayer, and some such rule might well have been derived from Psalm lv. 7; *cf.* Dan. vi. 11. This custom of prayer three times a day passed very early into the Christian Church, *Didache*, viii. 3. To Abraham, Isaac and Jacob the three daily times of prayer are traced back in the *Berachoth*, 26 *b;* Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, p. 99.

Ver. 2. **τις**, by its position as in Luke xi. 27 directs attention to this man, "the man was conspicuous both from the place and from his malady" Chrys., *Hom.*, viii.—**χωλὸς . . . ὑπάρχων**: "a certain man that was lame" R.V., otherwise **ὑπάρχων** is not noticed, fittingly used here in its classical sense expressing the connection between the man's present state and his previous state, see on ii. 30.—**ἐβαστάζετο**: imperf., expressing a customary act, the man was being carried at the hour of worship when the Temple would be filled with worshippers (Chrysostom); or the verb may mean that he was being carried in the sense that the bearers had not yet placed him in the accustomed spot for begging, *cf.* 2 Kings xviii. 14, Ecclesiasticus vi. 25, Bel and the Dragon, ver. 36; Theod.—**ὃν ἐτίθουν**: the imperfect used of customary or repeated action in past time, Burton, *Syntax of Moods and Tenses*, etc., p. 12, on the form see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 121; Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 48: in Acts there are several undoubted instances of the way in which the imperfect 3rd plural of verbs in **μι** was often formed as if from a contract verb, *cf.* iv. 33, 35, xxvii. 1.—**πρὸς τὴν θύραν**: R.V. "door," although in ver. 10 we have not **θύρα** but **πύλη**.—**τὴν λεγ. Ὡραίαν**: it may have been the gate of Nicanor (so called because Judas Maccabæus had nailed to the gate the hand of his conquered foe, 1 Macc. vii. 47). The description given of it by Josephus, *B. J.*, v., 5, 3, marks it as specially magnificent, *cf.* also Hamburger, *Real-Encycl.*, ii., 8, p. 1198. This view was held by Wetstein, see, *in loco*, Nicanor's gate. Another interpretation refers the term to the gate Shushan, which was not only close to the Porch of Solomon, but also to the market for the sale of doves and other offerings, and so a fitting spot for a beggar to choose (Zöckler). The gate may have been so called because a picture of the Persian capital Susa was placed over it (Hamburger, *u. s.*), *i.e.*, Town of Lilies. *Cf.* Hebrew Shushan, a lily, the lily being regarded as the type of beauty. Wendt suggests that the title may be explained from the decoration on the pillars of lily work מַעֲשֵׂה שׁוֹשָׁן. Mr. Wright, *Some N.T. Problems*, 1898, has recently argued that the eastern gate of the Court of the Women is meant, p. 304 ff. (so too Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 180, E.T.). This court was the place of assembly for the services, and a beggar might naturally choose a position near it. The decision as to which of these gates reference is made to is rendered more difficult by the fact that, so far as we know, no gate bore the name "Beautiful". But the decision apparently lies between these alternatives, although others have been proposed, *cf.* John Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, *in loco*, and Wright, *u. s.* In such notices as the mention of the Beautiful Gate, Solomon's Porch, Feine sees indications of a true and reliable tradition.—**τοῦ αἰτεῖν**: genitive of the purpose, very frequent in this form, genitive of the article with the infinitive both in the N.T. and in the LXX, *cf.* Gen. iv. 15, 1 Kings i. 35, Ezekiel xxi. 11; Luke xxiv. 16, see especially Burton, *Syntax of Moods and Tenses*, p. 159. It is very characteristic of St. Luke, and next to him of St. Paul—probably indicates the influence of the LXX, although the construction is found in classical Greek, *cf.* Xen., *Anab.*, iii., 5, see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 172 (1893). It was a common thing for beggars amongst the Jews as amongst the Christians (just as amongst the Romans, Martial, i., 112) to frequent the Temple

αἰτεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην [1] παρὰ τῶν εἰσπορευομένων εἰς τὸ ἱερόν. 3. ὃς ἰδὼν [2] Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην μέλλοντας εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἠρώτα [3] ἐλεημοσύνην λαβεῖν. 4. [4] ἀτενίσας δὲ Πέτρος εἰς αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ, εἶπε, [5] Βλέψον εἰς ἡμᾶς. 5. [6] ὁ δὲ ἐπεῖχεν αὐτοῖς, προσδοκῶν

[1] For παρα των εισπ. εις το ιερον D has παρ' αυτων εισπορ. αυτων εις το ιερ., but not received by Blass in β (Chase sees in first part exact reproduction of Syriac αυτων being carelessly repeated).

[2] For ος ιδων D, Flor. read ουτος (so Gig., Par.) ατενισας τοις οφθαλμοις αυτου και ιδων (Chase: interpolation arose in Syriac). Belser again sees the longer form which Luke abbreviated in α.

[3] After ηρωτα D, Flor., Par.[1] insert αυτους. λαβειν (ℵABCE, b, 13, 61, Vulg., Boh., Arm., Chrys.) om. by DP, h, Fl., Gig., Par.[1], Syr. Harcl., Lucif.—Blass "recte ut vid.".—added by T.R., W.H.. Weiss.

[4] For ατενισας D, Flor., Par.[2] read εμβλεψας (εμβλεπειν not uncommon in the Gospels); (συν Ιωανην in D is attributed by Chase to Syriac influence, *cf.* Aquila, συν τον ουρανον και συν την γην); Hilg. follows D.

[5] For ειπε Flor. has "(ad)stans dixit ei"; so in β επιστας ειπεν αυτῳ, in which Belser sees the simpler form of Luke's own revision. For βλεψ. εις ημας D, Flor. ατενισεν εις εμε (ημας D); εμε is curious, but may be earlier edition, or introduced later because John here says nothing. Throughout the passage D, as compared with T.R. or with W.H., introduces different synonyms for "see". Thus T.R. ιδων . . . ατενισας . . . βλεψον, D ατενισας (τους οφθ. και ιδων) . . . εμβλεψας . . . ατενισον, or from Belser's point of view, we must see in the T.R. three words for "see" which may be introduced by Luke in revising his rough draft. But it is difficult to account even in a rough draft for ατενισας in ver. 5 instead of ητενισεν, and for the και introduced before ειπεν without any construction in ver. 4.

[6] επειχεν αυτοις; D reads ατενισας; Flor. represents ητενισεν εις αυτον (so β), see above. But in the fact that D reads αυτοις instead of εις αυτους (ον), as we might expect after ατεν., Weiss sees a further proof of the secondary character of the reading.

and Churches for alms. St. Chrysostom notes the custom as common as it is to-day in continental cathedrals or modern mosques.—**ἐλεημοσύνην**: common in the LXX but not classical, sometimes used for the feeling of mercy (**ἔλεος**), Prov. iii. 3, xix. 22, and constantly through the book; and then for mercy showing itself in acts of pity, almsgiving, Tobit i. 3, xii. 8, *cf.* Acts ix. 36, x. 2, where it is used in the plural, as often in the LXX. Our word *alms* is derived from it and the German *Almosen*, both being corruptions of the Greek word.

Ver. 3. **ἠρώτα λαβεῖν**: "asked to receive," R.V., as other English versions except A.V. The expression is quite classical, **αἰτῶν λαβεῖν**, Aristoph., *Plut.*, 240, *cf.* Mark i. 17, and LXX, Exodus xxiii. 15, for similar instances of a redundant infinitive. The verb is in the imperfect, because the action of asking is imperfect until what is asked for is granted by another, Blass, *in loco*, and *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 187, 236, and Salmon, *Hermathena*, xxi. p. 228.

Ver. 4. **ἀτενίσας**, *cf.* i. 10. **βλέψον εἰς ἡμᾶς**: it has sometimes been thought that the command was given to see whether the man was a worthless beggar or not (Nösgen), or whether he was spiritually disposed for the reception of the benefit, and would show his faith (as in our Lord's miracles of healing), or it might mean that the man's whole attention was to be directed towards the Apostles, as he evidently only expects an alms, ver. 5. At the same time, as Feine remarks, the fact that the narrative does not mention that faith was demanded of the man, forms an essential contrast to the narrative often compared with it in xiv. 9.

Ver. 5. **ὁ δὲ ἐπεῖχεν**, *sc.*, **νοῦν** (not **τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς**); *cf.* Luke xiv. 7, 1 Tim. iv. 16, Ecclesiasticus xxxi. (xxxiv.) 2, 2 Macc. ix. 25 (Job xxx. 26, A.S.[2] *al.*) with dative *rei*; so in Polybius.

Ver 6. **ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον**: the words do not suggest the idea of a complete communism amongst the believers, although Oecumenius derives from them a proof of the absolute poverty of the Apostles.

τι παρ' αὐτῶν λαβεῖν. 6. εἶπε δὲ Πέτρος, Ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι· ὃ δὲ ἔχω, τοῦτό σοι δίδωμι. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου, [1] ἔγειραι καὶ περιπάτει. 7. καὶ πιάσας

[1] εγειραι και περιπατει; AEGP 61 ead εγειρε, found in ACEGP 61, Vulg., Boh., Syrr. (P. and H.), Arm., Aeth., Irint.; but omitted by ℵBD, Sah., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Hilg., Wendt (who sees in the preceding words assimilation to passages in the Gospels). αναστα Epiph.

They may perhaps be explained by remembering that if the Apostles had no silver or gold with them, they were literally obeying their Lord's command, Matt. x. 9, or that whatever money they had was held by them in trust for the public good, not as available for private charity. Spitta, who interprets ii. 45 of the Apostles alone (pp. 72-74), sees in St. Peter's words a confirmation of his view, and a further fulfilment of our Lord's words in Luke xii. 33, but if our interpretation of ii. 44 ff. is correct, our Lord's words were fully obeyed, but as a principle of charity, and not as a rule binding to the letter. St. Chrysostom (*Hom.*, viii.) justly notes the unassuming language of St. Peter here, so free from boasting and personal display. Compare 1 Peter i. 18 (iii. 3), where the Apostle sharply contrasts the corruptible gold and silver with higher and spiritual gifts (Scharfe).—**ὃ δὲ ἔχω**: the difference between this verb and **ὑπάρχει** may be maintained by regarding the latter as used of worldly belongings, **ἔχω** of that which was lasting and most surely held.—**ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι**: no occasion to prefix such words as **λέγω σοι** for the expression means "in the power of this name" (*cf.* Matt. vii. 22, Luke x. 17, Acts iv. 10, xvi. 18, James v. 14, Mark xvi. 17). So too the Hebrew בְּשֵׁם in the name of any one, *i.e.*, by his authority, Exodus v. 23, and thus "in the name of Jehovah," *i.e.*, by divine authority, Deut. xviii. 22, 1 Chron. xxii. 19, Jer. xi. 21, and frequently in the Psalms, *cf.* also *Book of Enoch*, xlviii. 7 (Charles, p. 48). On the use, or possible use, of the phrase in extra-biblical literature, see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 145, and also *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 25 (1897). When Celsus alleged that the Christians cast out demons by the aid of evil spirits, Origen claims this power for the name of Jesus: **τοσοῦτον γὰρ δύναται τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ**, *cf.* also Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 85.—**Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ Ναζωραίου**: the words must n themselves have tested the faith of the lame man. His part has sometimes been represented as merely passive, and as if no appeal of any kind were made to his faith contrasted with xiv. 9 (ver. 16 in this chapter being interpreted only of the faith of the Apostles), but a test of faith was implied in the command which bade the man rise and walk in the power of a name which a short time before had been placed as an inscription on a malefactor's cross, but with which St. Peter now bids him to associate the dignity and power of the Messiah (see Plumptre, *in loco*). It is necessary from another point of view to emphasise this implied appeal to the man's faith, since Zeller and Overbeck regard the omission of faith in the recipient as designed to magnify the magic of the miracle. Zeller remarks: "Our book makes but one observation on his state of mind, which certainly indicates a receptivity, but unfortunately not a receptivity for spiritual gifts". But nothing was more natural than that the man should at first expect to receive money, and his faith in St. Peter's words is rather enhanced by the fact that the Apostle had already declared his utter inability to satisfy his expectations. St. Luke much more frequently than the other Evangelists names our Lord from His early home Nazareth in which frequency Friedrich sees another point of likeness between St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 85. Holtzmann attempts to refer the whole story to an imitation of Luke v. 18-26, but see as against such attempts Feine, *Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas*, pp. 175, 199, 200.

Ver. 7. **πιάσας**, *cf.* xii. 4: so in LXX, Cant. ii. 15, Ecclesiasticus xxiii. 21, A. *al.* **χειρὸς** very similar to, if not exactly, a partitive genitive, found after verbs of touching, etc., inasmuch as the touching affects only a part of the object (Mark v. 30), and so too often after verbs of *taking hold of*, the part or the limit grasped is put in the genitive, Mark v. 41 (accusative being used when the whole person is

αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς[1] ἤγειρε· παραχρῆμα δὲ ἐστερεώθησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ βάσεις καὶ τὰ σφυρά,[2] 8. καὶ[3] ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη καὶ περιεπάτει, καὶ εἰσῆλθε σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν περιπατῶν καὶ ἁλλόμενος καὶ

[1] **ηγειρε** ℵABCG 15, 18, 61, Syr. (P. and H.), Arm., Sah., Boh., Aeth., Bas., Cypr., Lucif. insert **αυτον**; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (but omitted by Meyer)—omitted in DEP.

[2] **αυτου αι βασεις** DEGP, Chrys.; but **αι β. αυτου** ℵABC 61, Vulg., Bas., Tert., Lucif., so Tisch., W.H., Weiss. **σφυρα** $ℵ^3B^3C^2$DEGP, so Hilg.; but **σφυδρα** ℵ*B*C*, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 64).

[3] **και εξαλλομενος εστη** omit Flor. **περιεπατει,** after this word D inserts **χαιρομενος** (**χαιρων** E), Flor. *gaudens et exultans* = **χαιρων και εξαλλομενος** in β, so Hilg. **περιπατων και αλλ. και** omitted by D, Flor. It is difficult to determine the precise order of events—possibly "leaping" is not mentioned at all in Western text, and in it the healed man does not at all events "leap" in the Temple. It is again difficult to believe that in this passage the common text comes from a revision of the author, and not rather through corruption and confusion.

seized, Matt. xiv. 3), Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 100, *cf.* classical use in Eurip., *Hec.*, 523. The meaning of **πιάζω** in N.T. and in the LXX has passed into modern Greek = **πιάνω** = seize, apprehend (Kennedy). For a similar use see also 2 Cor. xi. 32, Rev. xix. 20, and John vii. 30, 32, 33, 44, viii. 20, x. 39, xi. 57, xxi. 3, 10.—**παραχρῆμα,** *i.e.*, **παρὰ τὸ χρῆμα,** forthwith, immediately, *auf der Stelle*, on the spot, specially characteristic of St. Luke, both in Gospel and Acts (*cf.* **εὐθύς** of St. Mark). It is found no less than ten times in the Gospel, and six to seven times in Acts, elsewhere in N.T. only twice, Matt. xxi. 19, 20; several times in LXX, Wisdom xviii. 17, Tobit viii. 3, S., 2 Macc. iv. 34, 38, etc., 4 Macc. xiv. 9, Bel and the Dragon, ver. 39, 42, Theod., and in Num. vi. 9, xii. 4, AB^2R., Isaiah xxix. 5, for Hebrew, פִּתְאֹם; frequent in Attic prose; see also Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 22, 29. But as the word is so manifestly characteristic of St. Luke it is noteworthy that in the large majority of instances it is employed by him in connection with miracles of healing or the infliction of disease and death, and this frequency of use and application may be paralleled by the constant employment of the word in an analogous way in medical writers; see, *e.g.*, Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, and instances in Hippocrates, Galen, Dioscorides. — **ἐστερεώθησαν**: **στερεόω** = to make firm or solid; it cannot by any means be regarded only as a technical medical term, but as a matter of fact it was often employed in medical language (so also the adjective **στερεός**), and this use of the word makes it a natural one for a medical man to employ here, especially in connection with **βάσεις** and **σφυρά.** It is used only by St. Luke in the N.T. (ver. 16 and xvi. 5), but very frequently in the LXX. The nearest approach to a medical use of the word is given perhaps by Wetstein, *in loco*, Xen., *Pæd.*, viii.—**αἱ βάσεις,** "the feet" (**βαίνω**). The word is constantly used in LXX, but for the most part in the sense of something upon which a thing may rest, but it is found in the same sense as here in Wisdom xiii. 18; *cf.* also Jos., *Ant.*, vii., 3, 5, so in Plato, *Timæus*, 92, A. It was in frequent use amongst medical men, and its employment here, and here only in the N.T., with the mention of the other details, *e.g.*, the more precise **σφυρά,** "anklebones," also only found in this one passage in N.T., has been justly held to point to the technical description of a medical man; see not only Hobart, p. 34 ff., *u. s.*, and Belcher's *Miracles of Healing*, p. 41, but Bengel, Zöckler, Rendall, Zahn.

Ver. 8. **ἐξαλλόμενος**: not leaping out of his couch (as has sometimes been supposed), of which there is no mention, but leaping up for joy (*cf.* Isaiah lv. 12, Joel ii. 5) (on the spelling with one λ see Blass, p. 51); *cf.* also Isaiah xxxv. 6. This seems more natural than to suppose that he leaped because he was incredulous, or because he did not know how to *walk*, or to avoid the suspicion of hypocrisy (Chrys., *Hom.*, viii., so too Oecumenius). St. Chrysostom remarks that it was no less than if they saw Christ risen from the dead to hear Peter saying: "In the name," etc., and if Christ is not

αἰνῶν τὸν Θεόν. 9. καὶ εἶδεν αὐτὸν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς περιπατοῦντα καὶ αἰνοῦντα τὸν Θεόν· 10. ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτὸν ὅτι οὗτος ἦν ὁ πρὸς τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῇ Ὡραίᾳ πύλῃ τοῦ ἱεροῦ· καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν θάμβους καὶ [1] ἐκστάσεως ἐπὶ τῷ συμβεβηκότι αὐτῷ.

[1] **εκστασεως**, before this word Flor., Par.[1] insert **παντες**. For **θαμβ. και εκστασ.** Flor., Par.[1] read **εκστασ. και εθαμβουντο εφ' ᾡ αυτῳ συμβεβηκεν ιαοις**; but D with a accepts **γεγενημενω** instead of **συμβεβ.**, *cf.* iv. 22; so Hilg.

raised, how account for it, he asks, that those who fled whilst He was alive, now dared a thousand perils for Him when dead?—**ἔστη καὶ περιεπάτει**: "he stood and began to walk" R.V., thus marking the difference between the aorist and the imperfect. Such vivid details may have been derived from St. Peter himself, and they are given here with a vividness characteristic of St. Mark's Gospel, of which St. Peter may reasonably be regarded as the main source. If St. Luke did not derive the narrative directly from St. Peter, he may easily have done so from the same Evangelist, John Mark, see on chap. xii., and Scharfe, *Die petrinische Strömung der N. T. Literatur*, pp. 59, 60 (1893).—**αἰνῶν τὸν Θεόν**: commentators from the days of St. Chrysostom have noted that by no act or in no place could the man have shown his gratitude more appropriately; characteristic of St. Luke, to note not only fear, but the ascription of praise to God as the result of miraculous deeds; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Luke xix. 37, xxiv. 53, Acts iii. 9, iv. 21, xi. 18, and other instances in Friedrich (*Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 77, 78). On the word see further, p. 97. Spitta regards ver. 8 as modelled after xiv. 10, a passage attributed by him to his inferior source B. But on the other hand both Feine and Jüngst regard the first part of ver. 8 as belonging to the original source.

Ver. 10. **ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε**: "took knowledge of him" or perhaps better still "recognised". The word is so used of recognising any one by sight, hearing, or certain signs, to perceive who a person is (Grimm), *cf.*, *e.g.*, Luke xxiv. 16, 31, Matt. xiv. 35, Mark vi. 54.—**ὁ . . . καθήμενος**: imperfect, may refer to the customary action of the man: or may be equivalent here to an imperfect, a force of the imperfect usual in similar cases when reference is made to a time before the actual time of recognition, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 188.—**ἐπὶ**: for the local dative *cf.* v. 9, Matt. xxiv. 33, Mark xiii. 29, John v. 2, Rev. ix. 14.—**θάμβους**, *cf.* Luke iv. 36 and v. 9. A word peculiar to St. Luke in the N.T. (so St. Luke alone uses **ἔκθαμβος**, ver. 11); used from Homer downwards, of amazement allied to terror or awe, *cf.* LXX, Ezek. vii. 18, Cant. iii. 8, vi. 3 (4), 9 (10).—**ἐκστάσεως**: for the word in a similar sense, Mark v. 42, xvi. 8, Luke v. 26. Its use in ordinary Greek expresses rather distraction or disturbance of mind caused by a shock. The word is very common both in Hippocrates and Aretaeus. In the LXX it is employed in various senses, *cf.* Deut. xxviii. 28, **ἐκστάσει διανοίας**; elsewhere it is used of agitation, trouble, 2 Chron. xxix. 8, and most frequently of terror, fear, 1 Sam. xi. 7, Ezek. xxvi. 16. See further on. Here the word expresses more than simple astonishment as its collocation with **θάμβος** shows (Wendt, *in loco*), rather "bewilderment," *cf.* Mark v. 42. See on ii. 43 for this characteristic of St. Luke. But there is no occasion to conclude with Weiss that these strong expressions as to the effect of the miracle show that it must have been the first which the disciples performed. It was the unique nature of the miracle which affected the beholders so powerfully.

Ver. 11. **κρατοῦντος**: in his joy and gratitude, "holding them" in a physical sense, although it is possible that it signifies that the healed man joined himself to the Apostles more closely as a follower (iv. 14), fearing like the demoniac healed by Christ (Luke viii. 38) lest he should be separated from his benefactors, *cf.* Cant. iii. 4.—**ἐπὶ τῇ στοᾷ τῇ καλ. Σ.**: better "portico," R.V. margin; colonnade, or cloister (John x. 23). It derived its name from Solomon, and was the only remnant of his temple. A comparison of the notices in Josephus, *B. J.*, v., 5, 1; *Ant.*, xv., 11, 5 and xx., 9, 7, make it doubtful whether the foundations only, or the whole colonnade, should be referred back to Solomon. Ewald's idea that the colonnade was so called because it was a place of concourse for the wise in their teaching has not found any support: Stanley's *Jewish Church*, ii.,

11. Κρατοῦντος δὲ[1] τοῦ ἰαθέντος χωλοῦ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην, συνέδραμε πρὸς αὐτοὺς πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ τῇ στοᾷ τῇ καλουμένῃ Σολομῶντος, ἔκθαμβοι. **12.** ἰδὼν δὲ Πέτρος ἀπεκρίνατο πρὸς τὸν λαόν, Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, τί θαυμάζετε ἐπὶ τούτῳ, ἢ ἡμῖν τί ἀτενίζετε,[2] ὡς ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ εὐσεβείᾳ πεποιηκόσι τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν;

[1] **του ιαθεντος**; but **αυτου** in ℵABCDE 61, Vulg., Syrr. P. H., Sah., Boh., Arm., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss; Rec. = prob. beginning of a church lectionary. But in ver. 11 Western text quite different. D, Flor. **εκπορευομενου** (Fl. **-νων**) **δε του Π. και Ιω. συνεξεπορευετο κρατων αυτους**, and D continues (not Flor. = α) **οι δε θαμβηθεντες εστησαν εν τη στοᾳ τη καλ. Σ. εκθαμβοι** (but in β Blass brackets the last word); Hilg. follows D. There is a distinction evidently drawn between the area of the Temple and Solomon's Porch, "nam porticus illa extra aream sacram fuit," Blass; and **ιερον** might perhaps be so used as distinct from the outer court or cloisters. If so, the Western text may contain the more precise account of a writer who wishes to bring the Apostles and the lame man from the one into the other, in accordance with the topography with which he was familiar. But if, as Weiss admits, **εκπορ. . . . συνεξεπορευετο** is implied in the **κρατων** and change of locality, *cf.* vv. 8 and 11, we may have another case in which the theory of Blass may hold good, and Luke himself may have revised for shortness (see Belser's retention of the β reading, and Blass, *Acta Apost.*, *in loco*). **Σολομωντος** ℵ(A)BCP 1, 13, 31, 61; so Tisch., W.H., Weiss (but see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93).

[2] D, Flor., Par. begin **αποκριθεις δε ὁ Π. ειπεν προς αυτους**—**ο λαος** and **πας ο λαος** both omitted. **ως ιδια . . . περιπ. αυτον**, for this D, Flor., Gig., Severian. read **ως ημων τη ιδια δυν. η ευσεβ. πεποιηκοτων του περιπ. αυτον**, so Hilg.—gen. abs. characteristic of the Western text (see Weiss, Codex D, p. 60); *cf.* ii. 1, 15; may be careless transcription or through translation. D has **τουτο** both before and after **πεποιηκοτων** (Harris, Latinising; Chase, due to Syriac); but see iv. 7—the second **τουτο** perhaps confusion with **του** or **το**.

184; Edersheim, *Temple and its Services*, pp. 20, 22, and Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii., 161. It was situated on the eastern side of the Temple, and so was sometimes called the Eastern Cloister, and from its position it was a favourite resort.—**τῇ καλ.**: the present participle is used just as the present tense is found in the notice in St. John's Gospel, chap. v. 2 (see Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 241, 242), and if we cannot conclude from this that the book was composed before the destruction of the Temple, the vividness of the whole scene and the way in which Solomon's Porch is spoken of as still standing, points to the testimony of an eye-witness. Nösgen argues that this narrative and others in the early chapters may have been derived directly from St. John, and he instances some verbal coincidences between them and the writings of St. John (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 28). But if we cannot adopt his conclusions there are good reasons for referring some of these Jerusalem incidents to St. Peter, or to John Mark, see introduction and chap. xii. Feine rightly insists upon this notice and that in ver. 2 as bearing the stamp of a true and trustworthy tradition.

Ver. 12. This address of St. Peter divides itself into two parts, 12-16, 17-26, and although it covers much of the same ground as in chap. ii., there is no need to regard it with Overbeck and Holtzmann as unhistorical: see Blass, *in loco*, and Feine; the latter points out that St. Peter would naturally, as in chap. iii., take the incident before him as his text, place it in its right light, and draw from it an appeal to repentance and conversion. But whilst we may grant the common and identical aim of the two discourses, to proclaim the Messiahship of Jesus before the Jews, none can fail to see that in chap. iii. the Messianic idea becomes richer and fuller. Jesus is the prophet greater than Moses: Jesus is the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant, through which the blessing of Abraham is to extend to all the earth, Matt. viii. 11. And more than this: St. Peter has learnt to see in the despised Nazarene not only the suffering servant of Jehovah (**παῖς**), but in the servant the King, and in the seed of David the Prince of Life. And in the light of that revelation the future opens out more clearly before him, and he becomes the first prophet in the Messianic age—the spirit-

13.[1] ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἐδόξασε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· ὃν ὑμεῖς[2] παρεδώκατε, καὶ

[1] ὁ Θ. Αβρ. και Ισ. και Ιακ. BEP 61, Sah., Syr. (Pesh. Harcl.); so W.H., Weiss, R.V., T.R.; Wendt, who explains the reading in Tisch., Hilg. introducing (ο) Θεος (ℵACD) before Ισ. and before Ιακ. as out of LXX, Exod. iii. 6 (*cf.* Matt. xxii. 32).

[2] παρεδωκατε; D adds εις κρισιν, so Hilg.; E εις κριτηριον (*cf.* also Flor., Par.[1], Syr. Harcl. mg., Iren., *cf.* Luke xxiv. 30; see also Chase, *in loco*).

ual presence which the believers now enjoyed, and by which those mighty deeds are wrought, is only a foretaste of a more visible and glorious Presence, when the Messiah should return in His glory; and for that return repentance and remission of sins must prepare the way (see Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, pp. 31, 32). On St. Peter's discourses see additional note at end of chapter.—ἀπεκρίνατο: *cf.* Luke xiii. 14, xiv. 3, answered, *i.e.*, to their looks of astonishment and inquiry. The middle voice as here, which would be the classical usuage, is seldom found in the N.T., but generally the passive aorist, ἀπεκρίθη, and so in the LXX. "In Biblical Greek the middle voice is dying, in modern Greek it is dead," Plummer. Thus in modern Greek, ὑποκρίνομαι in the passive = to answer, Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 155, and Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 44.—ὡς πεποιηκόσιν τοῦ περιπατεῖν: this use of the infinitive with the genitive of the article, instead of the simple infinitive with or without ὥστε, to express a purpose, or result as here: "non de consilio sed de eventu" (Blass), may be illustrated from the LXX, Gen. xxxvii. 18, 1 Chron. xliv. 6, Isaiah v. 6.—εὐσεβείᾳ: "godliness," R.V., as always elsewhere in A.V., *i.e.*, by our piety towards God, as always in the Bible, although εὐσέβεια may be used like the Latin *pietas* of piety towards parents or others, as well as of piety towards God. It is frequently used in the LXX of reverence towards God, εἰς, so too in Josephus, πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, *cf.* Prov. i. 7, xiii. 11, Isaiah xi. 2, Wisdom x. 12, and often in 4 Macc. In Trench, *N. T. Synonyms*, ii., p. 196, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* In the N.T. the word is used, in addition to its use here, by St. Paul ten times in the Pastoral Epistles, and it is found no less than four times in 2 Peter, but nowhere else. St. Chrysostom, *Hom.* ix., comments: "Do you see how clear of all ambition he is, and how he repels the honour paid to him?" so too Joseph: Do not interpretations belong to God?

Ver. 13. ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ κ.τ.λ.: the words were wisely chosen, not only to gain attention and to show that the speaker identified himself with the nation and hope of Israel, but also because in Jesus St. Peter saw the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham.—ἐδόξασε, John viii. 54, xi. 4. Again we mark the same sharp contrast as in St. Peter's former address—God hath *glorified* . . . but *you* put to an open shame. The objections of Weiss, who traces a reviser's hand in the double mention of the glorification of Jesus in ver. 13 and in 15, fail to secure the approval of Spitta, Feine, Jüngst, who all hold that ἐδόξασε refers to the power of the Risen Jesus, shown in the healing of the lame man, which Peter thus expressly emphasises. But the glorification was not, of course, confined to this miracle: "auxit gloria hoc quoque miraculo" (Blass).—τὸν παῖδα: "his Servant," R.V. (margin, "Child"). Vulgate has *filium*, which all other English versions (except A.V., "Child") seem to have followed. But the rendering "Servant" is undoubtedly most appropriate, *cf.* ver. 26, and iv. 27, 30 (employed in the Messianic sense of Isa. xlii. 1, lii. 13, liii. 11), where the LXX has παῖς, Hebrew עֶבֶד. In Matt. xii. 18 the Evangelist sees the fulfilment of the first passage in Jesus as the Christ, the Servant of Jehovah. Wendt rightly emphasises the fact that no Apostle ever bears the name παῖς Θεοῦ, but δοῦλος; *cf.* iv. 29. In the LXX Moses is called both παῖς and δοῦλος. The rendering of R.V. is generally adopted, and by critics of very varying schools, *e.g.*, Overbeck, Nösgen, Holtzmann, Felten, Hilgenfeld. Zöckler, whilst he adopts the rendering "Servant," still maintains that Luther's translation, *Kind Gottes*, cannot be regarded as incorrect (*cf.* the double meaning of the word in classical literature). Certainly he seems justified in maintaining that in the numerous parallels in the sub-apostolic writings the conception of the Servant by no means always excludes that of the Son, *e.g.*, *Epist. ad Diogn.*, viii., 11 and 9, where of

ἠρνήσασθε αὐτὸν κατὰ πρόσωπον [1] Πιλάτου, κριναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολύειν. 14. ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον [2] ἠρνήσασθε, καὶ ᾐτήσασθε

[1] Πιλατου; B*D read Πειλ., so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg.—see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 43. κριναντος εκεινου απολ.; D adds αυτου θελοντος and prefixes του (om. in D[2]); conflate θελοντος assim. to Luke xxiii. 20.

[2] ηρνησασθε, but D, Iren., Aug. have εβαρυνατε (*aggravastis*), so Hilg.; Nestle (so Blass, Chase, and see also Belser) believes confusion arose in Syriac between כפרתם־כברתם; see Nestle, *Philologia Sacra*, 1896, p. 40, and *Einführung in das G. N. T.*, p. 240 (and also Harris, who explains through ητησατε, ver. 6, for ητησασθε, displaced ηρνησασθε, and became corrupted into ηττησατε, transl. *aggravastis*); see also Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 194, and also Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 54, and *Enc. Bibl.*, i., 56. φονεα; after this word D inserts ζην και, so E, Flor., Aug. Gloss.; but Belser sees in it a marked contrast to φονεα, "that a murderer should live," original. αυτον om. ℵABC, Tisch., W.H., R.V.

God's great scheme it is said ἀνεκοινώσατο μόνῳ τῷ παιδί (to His Son alone), called in 11 τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ παιδός; *cf. Martyr. Polyc.*, xiv., 3, where the same phrase occurs, reminding us of Matt. iii. 17 (Col. i. 13, Eph. i. 6) and xiv. 1, where God is spoken of as ὁ πατήρ of the well-beloved Son παιδός. In Clem. Rom., *Cor.* lix. 2-4, the word is used three times of Jesus Christ, and twice with τοῦ ἠγαπημένου (παιδός), and if there is nothing in the context to determine the exact sense of the word, in the previous chapter St. Clement had written ζῇ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ζῇ ὁ Κυριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κ.τ.λ.; *cf.* also Barnabas, *Epist.* (iii., 6), vi., 1; *Apost. Const.*, viii., 5, 14, 39, 40, 41; and *Didache*, ix., 2, 3; x., 2, 3, where, however, at the first introduction of the word, David and Jesus are both called by it in the same sentence. In the *Didache* the title is found altogether five times, once as above, and four times as applied to Jesus alone. But these passages all occur in the Eucharistic Prayers of the *Didache* (placed by Resch as early as 80-90 A.D.), and in them we find not only the title "Lord" used absolutely of Jesus, ix., 5, but He is associated with the Father in glory and power, ix., 4. Knowledge, faith, and immortality are made known by Him, spiritual food and drink, and eternal life are imparted by Him, x., 2, 3. Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, *in loco;* Lock, *Expositor*, p. 183 ff. (1891), "Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts"; Schmid, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 405. But further: if we bear in mind all that the "Servant of the Lord" must have meant for a Jew, and for a Jew so well versed in the O.T. Prophets as St. Peter, it becomes a marvellous fact that he should have seen in Jesus of Nazareth the realisation of a character and of a work so unique (*cf.* Isaiah xlii. 1 ff., xlix. 1-3, 5, 8, l. 4-9, lii. 13-liii. 12). For if we admit that the word "Servant" may be used, and is sometimes used, of the nation of Israel (*cf.* Isaiah xli. 8, xlv. 4), and if we admit that some of the traits in the portrait of Jehovah's "Servant" may have been suggested by the sufferings of individuals, and were applicable to individual sufferers, yet the portrait as a whole was one which transcended all experience, and the figure of the ideal Servant anticipated a work and a mission more enduring and comprehensive than that of Israel, and a holiness and innocency of life which the best of her sons had never attained (Driver, *Isaiah*, pp. 175-180). But not only in His miraculous working, but in His Resurrection and Ascension St. Peter recognised how God had glorified His Servant Jesus; and whilst it was natural that the word "Servant" should rise to his lips, as he recalls the submission to betrayal and death, whilst he never forgets the example of lowliness and obedience which Christ had given, and commends to poor Christian slaves the patience and humility of Him Who was "the first Servant in the world" (1 Peter ii. 18-25), he sees what prophets and wise men had failed to see, how the suffering "Servant" is also "the Prince of Life," *cf.* chap. v. 15, and v. 31.—ὑμεῖς μὲν: there is no regular answering δὲ in the text (*cf.* i. 1), but the words in ver. 15 ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν express the antithesis (Blass, Wendt, Holtzmann). In dwelling upon the action of Pilate and the guilt of the Jews, the Apostle loses the direct grammatical construction; he emphasises the denial (ἠρνήσασθε twice) and its baseness; but nothing in reality was more natural, more like St. Peter's impetuosity. —κατὰ πρόσωπον, *coram*, *cf.* Luke ii. 31,

ἄνδρα φονέα χαρισθῆναι ὑμῖν, 15. τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνατε· ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, οὗ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρές ἐσμεν.

2 Cor. x. 1—the expression need not be explained as a Hebraism, it is found several times in Polybius; see Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 23. In the LXX it is frequent in various senses, and sometimes simply in the sense of before, in the presence of, a person, 1 Sam. xvii. 8, 1 Kings i. 23, 1 Chron. xvii. 25, Ecclesiasticus xlv. 3, Jer. lii. 12, 33, Judith x. 23, xi. 5, etc. Rendall takes the words as usually denoting open encounter with an opposite party face to face, *cf.* xxv. 16, Gal. ii. 11, and so here; the Jews met Pilate's proposal to free the prisoner with a point-blank denial. 13[b] is referred by Hilgenfeld to the revising hand of "the author to Theophilus," and he sees in its introduction a proof of the anti-Judaism of the reviser, whilst Jüngst prefers to regard the first part of ver. 14 as an insertion, but this Hilgenfeld will not accept, as thus the antithesis in ver. 15 is not marked.—**κρίναντος**: "when he had determined," R.V., not a purpose only, but a decision, Luke xxiii. 16.—**ἐκείνου**, not **αὐτοῦ**, emphasising the antithesis between what *Pilate* had determined and what *they* had done: **ὑμεῖς ἐκείνου θελήσαντος οὐκ ἠθελήσατε** (Chrys.).

Ver. 14. **τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον**: both epithets are used of John the Baptist, Mark vi. 20, **ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον**, but Jesus is emphatically "the Holy and Righteous One" R.V. Not only is the sinlessness of His human character emphasised, but also associated with the language of prophecy. St. Peter had already spoken of Jesus as God's Holy One, ii. 27, and if the word used here means rather one consecrated to God's service, it is the thought involved in the **παῖς Θεοῦ** (ἅγιος, *e.g.*, ἐκλεκτὸς Θεοῦ, see Grimm, *sub v.*, and *cf* Isaiah xlii. 1 LXX). The word was used by the demoniacs as they felt the power of the unique holiness of Christ, Mark i. 34, Luke iv. 34, and in St. John's Gospel vi. 69, it is the title given to Jesus by St. Peter in his great confession.—**τὸν δικ.**: the reference to the language of prophecy is unmistakable. The suffering Servant of Jehovah was also the righteous Servant, Isaiah liii. 11 (*cf.* xi. 5, and Jer. xxiii. 5), see Acts vii. 52, xxii. 14. Later, in the *Book of Enoch*, the title is applied to the Messiah as the *Righteous One*, xxxviii. 2, liii. 6, xlvi. 3 (Charles' edition, pp. 48, 112, 144). In Acts vii. 52, 56, the title is found on the lips of St. Stephen, and in xxii. 14, Ananias, a Jewish Christian, announces to Paul that God had chosen him to see the *Righteous One*. When we remember too that this title is used again in the writings of each of the Apostles, who now appealed to it, 1 Peter iii. 18, 1 John ii. 1, *cf.* ver. 20 (Rev. iii. 7), it would seem that it was not only a favourite one amongst these early believers, but that it affords in itself a marvellous proof of the impression made by the human life of Jesus upon those who knew Him best, or who at all events, like St. Stephen, had ample opportunities of learning the details of that life of holiness and righteousness, *cf.* also Matt. xxvii. 19, 24, Luke xviii. 47.—**ἄνδρα φονέα**: nearly all commentators dwell upon the marked contrast between this description of Barabbas and that just given of Jesus. Both St. Mark, xv. 7, and St. Luke, xxiii. 19, notice that Barabbas was not only a robber but a murderer. The addition, **ἄνδρα**, common in Luke, makes the expression stronger than the simple **φονέα**; *cf.* Soph., *O. C.*, 948, **ἄνδρα πατροκτόνον**, *O. R.*, 842, **ἄνδρας λῃστάς**. No crime was more abhorrent to the Christian life, as St. Peter himself indicates, 1 Peter iv. 15.—**χαρισθῆναι**: to be granted to you as a **χάρις** or favour, as if St. Peter would recall the fact that Pilate had given them a gratification! The verb is used several times in Luke, three times in his Gospel, vii. 21, 42, 43, and four times in Acts, *cf.* xxv. 11, 16, xxvii. 24, elsewhere only in St. Paul's Epistles, where it is found fifteen times. In the LXX, *cf.* Esther viii. 7, Ecclus. xii. 3, and several times in the Books of the Maccabees, *cf.* 2 Macc. iii. 31, 33, and other instances in Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.* St. Chrys. writes: "Peter shows the great aggravation of the act. As he has them under his hand, he strikes hard; while they were hardened he refrained from such language, but when their minds are most moved then he strikes home, now that they are in a condition to feel it" (*Hom.*, ix.).

Ver. 15. **τὸν δὲ ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς**: again the words stand in marked contrast not only to **φονέα** but also to **ἀπεκτείνατε**; magnificum antitheton, Bengel. The word is rendered "Author" in the margin of R.V. (Vulgate, *auctorem*) but "Prince" in the text and so in v. 31 (Vulg., *principem*). In the two other passages in

16. καὶ[1] ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, τοῦτον, ὃν θεωρεῖτε καὶ οἴδατε, ἐστερέωσε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν

[1] **επι** ℵ³ACDEP, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Irint., so Tisch., and so Weiss; but om. ℵB 61, Arm., so W.H. (Lachmann and Blass punctuate **εστερεωσεν· το ονομ.**)

which the word occurs in the N.T., *viz.*, Heb. ii. 10, xii. 2, R.V. renders "Author," "the author of their salvation," "the author and perfecter of our faith," margin "captain" (Vulgate, *auctorem*); see Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 49, 395. Christ is both the Prince of life and the Source (*auctor*) of life: "Vitam aliis dat Christus, opp. φονεύς qui adimit" (Blass). Grimm and others draw a distinction between the meaning attaching to the word here and in v. 31. The use of the word in the LXX may help to justify such a distinction, for whilst it is found in the sense of a leader or a captain (Num. xiv. 4, Judith xiv. 2), or the chief of a family or tribe (R.V. renders it "every one a prince" in Num. xiii. 2, but in the next verse "heads of the children of Israel"), it is also used to signify the author, or beginner, the source, *cf.* 1 Macc. ix. 61, x. 47, Micah i. 13 (although it was never used for a prince or to describe kingly attributes); but in many respects the rendering "Prince" may be compared with the Latin *princeps*, which signifies the first person in order, a chief, a leader, an originator, the founder of a family (in the time of the emperors it was used of the heir to the throne). So in classical Greek the word was used for a leader, a founder, Latin *auctor*, for the first cause, author, so God **τῶν πάντων**, Plat., and also for a prince, a chief, and, especially in later Greek, of the person from whom anything good or bad first proceeds in which others have a share, *e.g.*, **ἀρχηγὸς καὶ αἴτιος** combined (*antesignanus et auctor*), Polyb., i., 66, 10; Hdian., ii., 6, 22, and as Alford points out in Heb. ii. 10, this later usage throws a light upon its meaning in Acts iii. 15, *cf.* Chrys. on Heb. ii. 10, **ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας τουτέστι τὸν αἴτιον τῆς σωτηρίας.** Christ is the source of life, a life in which others share through Him; in this very place where St. Peter was speaking our Lord had spoken of Himself as the giver of eternal life, John x. 28, although doubtless the expression may include the thought that in Him was life in its fullest and widest sense — physical, intellectual, moral, spiritual. St. Chrysostom comments on the words "Prince of Life," *Hom.*, ix.: "It follows that the life He had was not from another, the Prince or Author of Life must be He who has life from Himself". Theophylact and Oecumenius see in the words a contrast to the **φονέα**, in that Christ gives life, while the murderer takes it away—a contrast deepened by the words of St. Peter's fellow-disciple whom he here associates with himself in his appeal to the people, *cf.* 1 John iii. 15. In ver. 31 **ἀρχ.** in its rendering "Prince" of kingly dignity may be compared with the use of the word in Thuc., i., 132, Æsch., *Agam.*, 259. Rendall sees in the expression both here and Acts v. 31 a reference to Jesus (the name used by St. Peter) as the second Joshua. As Joshua was the captain of Israel and led them across the Jordan into the land of promise, so Jesus was the Captain of the living army of the Resurrection; and for Saviour, v. 31, he compares Matt. i. 21. Such associations may be included in St. Peter's words, but they seem much more applicable to v. 31. In modern Greek the word **ἀρχηγός** = leader, in the ordinary sense, Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 153; see Grimm, *sub v.*—**οὗ** may refer to **ὃν**, *cf.* i. 8, xiii. 31, or to the fact of the Resurrection, *cf.* ii. 32, v. 32, x. 39. R.V. reads "of whom" in the margin.

Ver. 16. **ἐπὶ**: so T.R., and so Weiss and Wendt: "on the ground of faith in His name," R.V. margin; *cf.* Luke v. 5 (not expressing the aim as if it meant with a view to faith in His name). But the name is no mere formula of incantation, see xix. 13, nor is it used as, in Jewish tradition, the name of God, inscribed on the rod of Moses, was said to have given him power to work his miracles in Egypt and the wilderness, see above on ver. 5. On the use of **ὄνομα** in formulæ of incantation, see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 25-54.—**ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ**: "the faith which is through Him," not by it, *i.e.*, the name —not only the healing power is through Christ, but also the faith of the Apostles as of the man who was healed, *cf.*, especially, 1 Pet. i. 21. **τοὺς δι' αὐτοῦ πιστοὺς εἰς Θεόν**, *i.e.*, his converts who through Christ are believers in God: He is the object and the author of our faith,

αὐτῷ τὴν ὁλοκληρίαν ταύτην ἀπέναντι πάντων ὑμῶν. 17. καὶ νῦν, ἀδελφοί,[1] οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν· 18. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἃ προκατήγγειλε διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν

[1] Before **αδελφοι** DE, Flor., Par.[1] insert **ανδρες**. For **οιδα οτι** D, Flor. read **επισταμεθα οτι υμεις μεν**, perhaps for emphasising contrast (*cf.* vv. 13, 14) with ver. 18, **ο δε Θεος** (Chase, Syriac). **επραξατε**, D, Fl., Gig., Par., Syr. H. mg., Irint., Aug., Ambrst. add **το πονηρον**, so Hilg., a gloss to explain **επραξ.** since it is not in accordance with the exculpating tone of the context (Weiss).

Cf. also Nestle, *Expository Times*, Feb., 1899, p. 238, and the connection of this phrase with Codex D, xviii. 8, and xx. 21 (see Blass, *l. c.*).—**ὁλοκληρίαν**: only here in N.T., *integram sanitatem*, Vulgate, but the adjective **ὁλόκληρος** in an ethical sense, 1 Thess. v. 23, James i. 4. The noun is only used once in the LXX, and there in a physical sense, Isaiah i. 6. The adjective is used by Josephus of a sacrifice complete in all its parts (*integer*), *Ant.*, iii., 12, 2, *cf.* its use in Philo., but in LXX, Zach. xi. 16, its use in a physical sense is a very doubtful rendering of the Hebrew, see further Trench, *N. T. Synonyms*, i., 85, and Mayor's *St. James*, p. 34. *Cf.* Plato, *Tim.*, 44.—**ὁλόκληρος ὑγιής τε παντελῶς.** In Plutarch the noun is joined with **ὑγίεια,** and also with **τοῦ σώματος** (Grimm), but whilst the noun does not seem to be used by the strictly medical writers, **ὁλόκληρος** is frequently used of complete soundness of body (Hobart, Zahn).

Ver. 17. **καὶ νῦν**: favourite formula of transition, *cf.* vii. 35, x. 5, xx. 25, xxii. 16, 1 John ii. 28, 2 John 5. See Wendt and Page, *in loco*. Bengel describes it as "formula transeuntis a præterito ad præsens". Blass, "i.e., quod attinet ad ea quæ nunc facienda sunt, ver. 19".—**ἀδελφοί**: affectionate and conciliatory, *cf.* ver. 12, where he speaks more formally because more by way of reproof: "One of the marks of truth would be wanting without this accordance between the style and the changing mental moods of the speaker" (Hackett).—**κατὰ ἄγνοιαν**: the same phrase occurs in LXX, Lev. xxii. 14 (*cf.* also Lev. v. 18, Eccles. v. 5). On **κατά** in this usage, see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 149, who doubts whether it is quite good Greek. It is used in Polybius, and Blass compares **κατ' ἀνάγκην** (Philem., ver. 14), which is found in Xen., *Cyr.*, iv., 3. Their guilt was less than if they had slain the Messiah **κατὰ πρόθεσιν, κατὰ προαίρεσιν,** or **ἐν χειρὶ ὑπερηφανίας,** Num. xv. 30, and therefore their hope of pardon was assured on their repentance (*cf.* 1 Pet. i. 14, **ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ**, and *Psalms of Solomon*, xviii., 5, for the same phrase). St. Peter speaks in the spirit of his Master, Luke xxiii. 34. See instances in Wetstein of the antithesis of the two phrases **κατ' ἄγνοιαν** and **κατὰ πρόθεσιν** (**προαίρεσιν**) in Polybius.—**οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν,** *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 8. The guilt of the rulers was greater than that of the people, but even for their crime St. Peter finds a palliation in the fact that they did not recognise the Messiah, although he does not hold them guiltless for shutting their eyes to His holiness and innocence.

Ver. 18. **δὲ**: a further mitigation; whilst they were acting in their ignorance, God was working out His unerring counsel and will.—**πάντων τῶν προφητῶν**: not to be explained by simply calling it hyperbolic. The prophets are spoken of collectively, because the Messianic redemption to which they all looked forward was to be accomplished through the death of Christ, *cf.* x. 43. The view here taken by St. Peter is in striking harmony with his first Epistle, i. 11, and ii. 22-25.—**παθεῖν τὸν Χ. αὐτοῦ,** R.V., "his Christ," *cf.* Luke xvii. 25, xxiv. 26. The phrase, which (W.H.) is undoubtedly correct, is found in Psalm ii. 2, from which St. Peter quotes in iv. 26, and the same expression is used twice in the Apocalypse, but nowhere else in the N.T.; xi. 15, xii. 10 (*cf.* also Luke ii. 26, ix. 20). See also the striking passage in *Psalms of Solomon*, xviii., 6 (and ver. 8), **ἐν ἀνάξει Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ,** and Ryle and James on *Psalm* xvii. 36. The paradox that the suffering Messiah was also the Messiah of Jehovah, *His* Anointed, which the Jews could not understand (hence their **ἄγνοια**), was solved for St. Peter in the Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus. On the suffering Messiah, see note xxvi. 23.—**ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτω**: "He thus fulfilled," *i.e.*, in the way described, vv. 14, 15. On **πληρόω**, see i. 16. "In the gardens of the Carthusian Convent . . .

προφητῶν αὐτοῦ, παθεῖν τὸν Χριστόν, ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτω. 19. μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε, εἰς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας,

near Dijon . . . is a beautiful monument. . . . It consists of a group of Prophets and Kings from the O.T., each holding in his hand a scroll of mourning from his writings—each with his own individual costume and gesture and look, each distinguished from each by the most marked peculiarities of age and character, absorbed in the thoughts of his own time and country. But above these figures is a circle of angels, as like each to each as the human figures are unlike. They, too, as each overhangs and overlooks the Prophet below him, are saddened with grief. But their expression of sorrow is far deeper and more intense than that of the Prophets, whose words they read. They see something in the Prophetic sorrow which the Prophets themselves see not: they are lost in the contemplation of the Divine Passion, of which the ancient saints below them are but the unconscious and indirect exponents:" Stanley's *Jewish Church*, pref. to vol. ii.

Ver. 19. **ἐπιστρέψατε**: "turn again," R.V.; *cf.* also Matt. xiii. 15, Mark iv. 12, and Acts xxviii. 27 (Luke xxii. 32), in each of these passages, as in the text, A.V., "should be converted," following the Vulgate, *convertantur*. But the verb is in the active voice in each of the passages mentioned; *cf.* LXX, 1 Kings viii. 33, 2 Chron. vi. 24, 37, Isaiah vi. 10 ("turn again," R.V.), Tobit xiii. 6—**ἐπιστρέψατε ἁμαρτωλοί**: this passive rendering in the Vulgate and A.V. testifies to the unwillingness in the Western Church to recognise the "conversion" to God as in any degree the spontaneous act of the sinner himself—men have enlarged upon Lam. v. 21, but have forgotten James iv. 8 (Humphry, *Commentary on the R. V.*, pp. 31, 32).—**πρὸς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι**: in the LXX the verb is found in the sense of obliterating **ἀνομίας**, Ps. l. (li.) 1, 9; Isaiah xliii. 25, Ecclesiasticus xlvi. 20, Jer. xviii. 23, with **ἁμαρτίας**, 2 Macc. xii. 42, with **ἁμάρτημα** (*cf.* 3 Macc. ii. 19, **ἀπαλείφειν** with **ἁμαρτίας**), and in N.T.; *cf.* Col. ii. 14. For other instances of its use in the N.T., *cf.* Rev. iii. 5, with Deut. ix. 14, Ps. ix. 5, etc., and see also Rev. vii. 17, xxi. 4. In *Psalms of Solomon* it is used twice—once of blotting out the memories of sinners from off the earth, Psalm ii. 19; *cf.* Exod. xvii. 14, etc., and once of blotting out the transgressions of Saints by the Lord, Psalm xiii. 9. Blass speaks of the word as used "de scriptis proprie; itaque etiam de debita pecunia"; *cf.* Dem., 791, 12 (Wendt), and see also Wetstein, *in loco*. The word can scarcely be applied here to the Baptism (as Meyer), for which a word expressing washing would rather be required, *cf.* xxii. 16, although no doubt, as in ii. 38, Baptism joined with Repentance was required for the remission of sins.—**ὅπως ἂν**: not "when" (as if **ὅπως** = **ὅτε**), but "that so there may come," R.V., **ἂν** with **ὅπως** indicates that the accomplishment of the purpose is dependent upon certain conditions; here dependent upon the repentance. In the N.T. there are only four instances of this use of **ὅπως ἄν**, all in pure final clauses, *viz.*, in the text, Luke ii. 35, and in two quotations from the LXX, Acts xv. 17 (where **ἂν** is wanting in LXX, Amos ix. 12), and Rom. iii. 4 = LXX, Ps. l. (li.) 4, so that this usage is practically peculiar to St. Luke in the N.T. Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 80 (1893); Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 207, and Burton, *N.T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 85.—**καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως**: the word **ἀνάψυξις**, used only by St. Luke, means refreshing or refreshment. In the LXX it occurs in Exod. viii. 15 (but *cf.* Aq. on Isaiah xxviii. 12, and Sym. on Isaiah xxxii. 15), where it is translated "respite," although the same Hebrew word רְוָחָה, in the only other place in which it occurs, Lam. iii. 56, may have the sense of "relief" (see Dr. Payne Smith, *in loco*, *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. v.). In Strabo **ἀνάψυξις** is found in the sense of recreation, refreshment, x., p. 459; see also Philo, *De Abr.*, 29, and *cf.* the verb **ἀναψύχω** in 2 Tim. i. 16 (*cf.* Rom. xv. 32, **ἀναψύξω μεθ' ὑμῶν**, DE, *refrigerer vobiscum*, Vulgate, and Nösgen on Acts iii. 19). Rendall would render it here "respite," as if St. Peter urged the need of repentance that the people might obtain a respite from the terrible visitation of the Lord. But the **καιροὶ ἀναψ.** are identified by most commentators with the **ἀποκατα. πάντων**, and **ἀναψ.** need by no means be rendered "respite". Nösgen, connecting the words with the thought of **ἀνάπαυσις** (*cf.* the various renderings in Rom. xv. 32), would see here a fulfilment of Christ's promise, **κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς**, Matt. xi. 28, to those who turned to Him in true re-

ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσι καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου, 20. καὶ ἀποστείλῃ τὸν προκεκηρυγμένον ὑμῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, 21. ὃν δεῖ

pentance, and so in his view the expression applies to the seasons of spiritual refreshment which may be enjoyed by the truly penitent here and now, which may occur again and again as men repent (Isaiah lvii. 16); so J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, interprets the word of the present refreshing of the Gospel, and God's present sending of Christ in His ministry and power, and in the same manner **ἀποστείλῃ**, *i.e.*, not at the end of the world, when Christ shall come as Judge, but in the Gospel, which is His voice. But the context certainly conceives of Christ as enthroned in Heaven, where He must remain until His Second Advent, although we may readily admit that there is a spiritual presence of the enthroned Jesus which believers enjoy as a foretaste of the visible and glorious Presence at the Parousia, Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 31 ff.—**ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ K. πρόσωπ.**, lit., face, often used as here for "the presence"; *cf.* Hebrew, מִפְּנֵי, frequently in LXX, and see above on ii. 28, here of the refreshment which comes from the bright and smiling presence of God to one seeking comfort (so Grimm). The phrase occurs three times in Acts v. 41, vii. 45, elsewhere in 2 Thess. i. 9, and three times in Apoc. On St. Luke's fondness for phrases with **πρόσωπον (ἀπό, πρό, κατά)**, see Friedrich (*Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 8, 9, 89). The Lord is evidently God the Father, the **καιροί** are represented as present before God, already decreed and determined, and as coming down from His presence to earth (Weiss, Wendt). Christ speaks, i. 6, of the seasons which the Father hath set in His own power, and so St. Chrysostom speaks of God as **αἴτιος** of the seasons of refreshment.

Ver. 20. **καὶ ἀποστείλῃ**, *i.e.*, at His Parousia. The construction is still **ὅπως ἂν** with the verb. **ἀποστ.** is here used as in Luke iv. 18, 43, expressing that the person sent is the envoy or representative of the sender (**πέμπω** is also used of the mission of our Lord).—**τὸν προκεκηρυγμένον**, T.R., see on ver. 18; but W.H., Blass, Weiss, **τὸν προκεχειρισμένον ὑμῖν Χριστόν, Ἰησοῦν**: "the Christ who hath been appointed for you, *even* Jesus". So R.V. This verb is found with accusative of the person in the sense of choosing, appointing, in Acts xxii. 14, xxvi. 16, and nowhere else in the N.T.; *cf.* Josh. iii. 12, 2 Macc. iii. 7, viii. 9, Exod. vi. 13 (*cf.* its use also in Dem., Polyb., Plut., and instances in Wetstein); Latin *eligere*, *destinare*. The expression here refers not only to the fact that Jesus was the appointed Christ, inasmuch as the covenant with Abraham was fulfilled in Him, ver. 25, but also to the return of Jesus as the Christ, the Messianic King, at His Parousia, in accordance with the voices of the Prophets. This is more natural than to suppose that the expression means foreordained, *i.e.*, from eternity, although St. Peter's words elsewhere may well be considered in connection with the present passage, 1 Pet. i. 20.

Ver 21. **μὲν**: no answering **δέ** expressed, but the antithesis is found in the **ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκ.**, "quasi dicat: ubi illud tempus venerit, ex coelo in terras redibit," Grotius (so Weiss, Blass).—**ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν δέξασθαι**: the words have been rendered in three ways: (1) "whom the heaven must receive," *i.e.*, as the place assigned to Him by God until the Parousia, Phil. iii. 20, Col. iii. 4. In this case **δεῖ** is not used for **ἔδει**, as if St. Luke were referring to the past historical fact of the Ascension only, but Christ's exaltation to heaven is represented as a fact continually present until His coming again; or (2) the words have been taken as if **ὃν** were the subject, "who must possess the heaven". But the former seems the more natural rendering, so in A.V. and R.V., as more in accordance with the use of **δέχεσθαι**, and **κατέχειν** would be rather the word in the second rendering (see Wendt's note). Zöckler takes the words to mean "who must receive heaven," *i.e.*, from the Father. Here St. Peter corrects the popular view that the Messiah should remain on earth, John xii. 34, and if we compare the words with the question asked in i. 6, they show how his views had changed of his Master's kingdom (see Hackett's note).—**ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως**: the latter noun is not found either in LXX or elsewhere in N.T., but it is used by Polybius, Diodorus, Plutarch. In Josephus, *Ant.*, xi., 3, 8, 9, it is used of the restoration of the Jews to their own land from the captivity, and also in Philo., *Decal.*, 30, of the restoration of inheritances at the Jubilee. The key to its meaning here is found not in the question of the disciples in i. 6, but in our Lord's own saying, Matt. xvii. 11, Mark ix. 12, "Elias truly

οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων, ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ στόματος[1] πάντων ἁγίων αὐτοῦ προφητῶν ἀπ'

[1] **αγιων**, prefix **των** instead of **παντων** ℵABCD 27, 61, Vulg. verss., Ir^int^., Chrys., Orig.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. **αυτου προφ. απ' αιωνος**; but ℵ*AB*C 61, 69 read **απ' αιωνος αυτου προφητων**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. In D, Flor., Gig., Par., Iren., Tert., so Arm. **απ' αιωνος** omitted; so in Hilg.

first cometh, and shall restore all things," **καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα**, and *cf.* LXX, Mal. iv. 6, where the same verb is found (**ἀποκαταστήσει**). It was the teaching of the Scriptures that Elias should be the forerunner of the Messiah, Mal. iv. 5, and Matt. xvii. 11, and xi. 14. But his activity embraced both an external and an internal, *i.e.*, a moral restoration, Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 10. He is said **καταστῆσαι φυλὰς Ἰακώβ**, to enable those who had been illegally excluded from the congregation to attain their inheritance. But he is eager also for the moral and religious renewal of his people. All disputes would be settled by him at his coming, and chiefly and above all he conducts the people to a great repentance, which will not be accomplished before he comes, Luke i. 16, 17 (Mal. iv. 6, LXX). This is the inward and moral side of the **ἀποκατάστασις**, Matt. xvii. 11, Mark ix. 12. But as in Acts i. 6 our Lord had corrected the ideas of the disciples as to an external restoration of the kingdom to Israel, so in the Gospels He had corrected their ideas as to the coming of Elias, and had bidden them see its realisation in the preaching of John the Baptist in turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just. And so the **ἀποκατάστασις πάντων** had already begun, in so far as men's hearts were restored to obedience to God, the beginning of wisdom, to the purity of family affection, to a love of righteousness and a hatred of iniquity. Even when the thoughts of the N.T. writers embrace the renewal of the visible creation, the moral and spiritual elements of restoration were present and prominent; *cf.* 2 Pet. iii. 13, Rom. viii. 19-21, Rev. xxi. 5. So too the **παλινγενεσία**, in Matt. xix. 28, is joined with the rule which the disciples would share with their Lord, and involved great moral issues. A renewal of all things had no doubt been foretold by the prophets, Is. xxxiv. 4, li. 6, lxv. 17; it was dwelt upon in later Jewish writings, and often referred to by the Rabbis (*cf.*, *e.g.*, *Book of Enoch*, xlv., 2; lxii., 1; xci., 16, 17; *Apocalypse of Baruch*, xxxii., and instances in Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., p. 343); but even amongst pious Israelites there was always a danger lest their hopes for the future should be mainly associated with material prosperity and national glorification. It is perhaps significant thas Josephus uses the two terms **ἀποκατάστασις** and **παλινγενεσία** in close conjunction of the restoration of the Jews to their own land after the exile. How this restoration of all things was to be effected, and what was involved in it, St. Peter does not say, but his whole trend of thought shows that it was made dependent upon man's repentance, upon his heart being right with God, see Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 352 ff. (1897); Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., pp. 343, 706; Hauck's *Real-Encyclopädie*, "Apokatastasis," p. 616 ff. (1896).—**ὧν** refers to **χρόνων**, so R.V. "whereof," *i.e.*, of which times. Holtzmann and Wendt on the other hand refer **ὧν** to **πάντων**. But the words of our Lord in Matt. xvii. 11 certainly point to the former reference, and the words are so taken by Weiss, Page, Hackett. In the article from Hauck quoted above, the writer speaks of the reference to **χρόνων** as the more correct, and points out that if **ὧν** is the relative to **πάντων**, the restoration spoken of would no longer be a restoration of all things, but only of those things of which the prophets had spoken. On the prophecies referred to see above. All the words from **πάντων** to **προφητῶν** are ascribed by Hilgenfeld to his "author to Theophilus"; the thought of the prophets existing **ἀπ' αἰῶνος** (Luke i. 70) belongs in his opinion to the Paulinism of this reviser, just as in Luke's Gospel he carries back the genealogy of Jesus not to Abraham but to Adam. To a similar Pauline tendency on the part of the same reviser, Hilgenfeld refers the introduction in vv. 25, 26 of the promise made to Abraham embracing all the nations of the earth (Gal. iii. 16), and also the introduction of the word **πρῶτον** (Rom. i. 16, ii. 9), to show that not only upon the Jews, but also upon the Gentiles had

αἰῶνος. 22.[1] Μωσῆς μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας εἶπεν, "Ὅτι προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε κατὰ πάντα ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς. 23. ἔσται δέ, πᾶσα ψυχή, ἥτις ἂν μὴ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου,

[1] **Μωσης**, so ℵEP; but **Μωυσης** in ABCD, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg., so Winer-Schmiedel, p. 51. **μεν γαρ**; but only **μεν** in ℵABCDE, vers., Iren., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. **προς τους πατερας** om. ℵABC 15, 18, 61, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Boh.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

God conferred the blessings of the Christ; *cf.* ii. 39, where the same revising hand is at work. But St. Peter's "universalism" here is in no way inconsistent with that of a pious Jew who would believe that all nations should be blessed *through Israel*, so far, *i.e.*, as they conformed to the covenant and the law of Israel. Spitta sees no difficulty in referring both the passage before us and ii. 39 to the Jewish Diaspora (so too Jüngst).—**διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγ. προφ.**: *cf.* Luke i. 70, a periphrasis of which St. Luke is fond (Plummer), *cf.* i. 16, iii. 18, iv. 25, 30, xv. 7, not found in the other Evangelists except once in St. Matthew in a quotation, iv. 4.—**ἀπ' αἰῶνος**: in the singular the phrase is only used by St. Luke in the N.T., Luke i. 70, Acts iii. 21, and xv. 18, but the plural **ἀπ' αἰώνων** is used twice, Col. i. 26, Ephes. iii. 9 (Friedrich), *cf.* in LXX, Gen. vi. 4, Isaiah xlvi. 9, Jer. xxxv. (xxviii.) 8. The phrase here may be taken simply = "of old time," *cf.* Tobit iv. 12.

Ver. 22. **μὲν**: answered by, or rather connected with, **καὶ πάντες δὲ** (ver. 24), "Moses indeed, yea and all the Prophets from Samuel"—not "truly" as in A.V., as if **μὲν** were an adverb. The quotation is freely made from Deut. xviii. 15. On the Messianic bearing of the passage see Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 364 (1897), and Lumby, *Acts*, *in loco*. Wetstein sees no necessity to refer the word **προφήτην**, ver. 22, to Jesus, but rather to the succession of prophets who in turn prophesied of the Coming One. But "similitudo non officit excellentiæ" (Bengel, so Wendt), and the words in Deuteronomy were *fulfilled* in Christ alone, the new Law-giver; the Revealer of God's will, of grace and truth, "Whom the Lord knew face to face," Who was from all eternity "with God". But the N.T. gives us ample reason for referring the verse, if not to the Messiah, yet at least to the Messianic conceptions of the age. To say nothing of St. Stephen's significant reference to the same prophecy, vii. 37, it would certainly seem that in the conversation of our Lord with the Samaritan woman, John iv. 19 ff., the conception of the Messianic prophet is in her mind, and it was upon this prediction of a prophet greater than Moses that the Samaritans built their Messianic hopes (Briggs, *Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 272, and see also for Deut. xviii. 15, and its Messianic fulfilment, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 110 ff.). On other allusions in St. John's Gospel to the anticipation in Deut. xviii. 15 see Bishop Lightfoot, *Expositor*, i. (fourth series), pp. 84, 85; there are, he thinks, four passages, John i. 21, 25, vi. 14, vii. 40, in all of which "*the* prophet" is mentioned (so R.V. in each place). But whilst in St. John the conception is still Jewish (that is to say, St. John exhibits the Messianic conceptions of his countrymen, who regard *the* Christ and *the* prophet as two different persons), in Acts it is Christian. St. Peter identified *the* prophet with the Christ (and so inferentially St. Stephen). (But see also Alford's note on St. John vi. 14, and also Weber, *ubi supra*, p. 354, for the view that Jeremiah was **ὁ προφ.**, in John i. 21, 25, vii. 40 (*cf.* 2 Macc. xv. 14), whilst Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*, i., pp. 67-69, E.T., should also be consulted.)—**ὡς ἐμέ**: rendered by A.V. and R.V. "like me" (the meaning of the Hebrew, *in loco*), but in margin R.V. has "as he raised up me," a rendering adopted as the only admissible one of the Greek by Page and Rendall; as no doubt it is, if we read **ὥσπερ**, as in LXX, Deut. xviii. 18. But **ὡς** is found in the LXX in v. 15. Certainly the rendering in A.V. and R.V. could not be applied to any one prophet so truly as to Christ, and the **ὡς ἐμέ** is a rendering of the familiar Hebrew כְּ (Lumby), which is so frequent in the LXX; see also Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and Delitzsch, *Messianische Weissagungen*, p. 46 ff., second edition (1899).

Ver. 23. **ἔσται δὲ**, *cf.* ii. 17. The expression, which is not in the Hebrew,

ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ." 24. καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς,[1] ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν, καὶ προκατήγγειλαν

[1] οσοι, D has ὁ ελαλησεν—Harris accounts for as *quodquod* of *d*, read as *quod*, and so ὁ. T.R. has the support of ℵBC³EP; so W.H., Weiss. οι in ℵC²D², Vulg., Gig., Par.².

seems to call attention to what follows.—ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ: "shall be utterly destroyed" (ἐξ), R.V. In the LXX, Deut. xviii. 19, following the Hebrew, the words are ἐγὼ ἐκδικήσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, "I will require it of him". But the phrase which St. Peter uses was a very common one, from Gen. xvii. 14, for the sentence of death, *cf.* also Exod. xii. 15, 19, Lev. xvii. 4, 9, Num. xv. 30. Here again the quotation is evidently made freely or from memory. The strong verb, although frequent in the LXX, is found only here in the N.T. It is used by Josephus and by Philo, but not in classical Greek. The warning is evidently directed against wilful disobedience, and is expressed in terms signifying the utterness of the destruction from the people. But in their original meaning in the O.T. they need not refer to anything more than the penalty of the death of the body, and it is not necessary to see in them here any threat of eternal punishment in Gehenna (so Wendt, Holtzmann, Felten). If the word has any eschatological bearing it would support the theory of annihilation more easily. Grotius explains ἐξολεθ., "morte violenta aut immatura," and he adds "mystice etiam Rabbini hoc ad poenas post hanc vitam referunt," but this is quite apart from the primary meaning of the word.

Ver. 24. Σαμουὴλ: On Samuel as the founder of the prophetic schools and the pattern of all later prophets, see Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 6, p. 854; "Prophet," *cf. Midrash Shemuel*, c. 24, where Samuel is called the Rabban, the chief and teacher of the prophets (Wetstein, *in loco*, and Lumby), *cf.* also Heb. xi. 32, Δαυείδ τε καὶ Σ. καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.—καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς: an unmistakable tautology. Wendt considers the expression as inaccurate, see his note, and for a full discussion *cf.* Winer-Moulton, lxvii. 2, who compares Luke xxiv. 27, = "all the series of prophets beginning from Samuel" (Page); "longa tamen successione, uno tamen consensu" (Calvin). καθεξ. used by St. Luke alone, Luke i. 3, viii. 1, Acts xi. 4, xviii. 23. In Greek writers = ἐφεξῆς, not found in LXX.—καὶ κατήγγ. τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας: "have also told of these days," *i.e.*, the present days, *cf.* v. 36, Luke xxiv. 18. This interpretation does not prevent the identification of "these days" with the χρόνοι τῆς ἀποκαταστάσεως, since in one sense the restoration had already begun with the coming of the forerunner and of the Christ, and in the acceptance of the repentance which they had preached. Rendall renders "yea, so said all the prophets from Samuel . . . as many as have spoken and told of these days," as if the fact which St. Peter wished to emphasise was that all the prophets had spoken threats of utter destruction like Moses. But the Greek does not by any means of necessity bear this construction (Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 55 (1896), and such an interpretation seems too harsh. As Wendt admits, the reference is not merely to the prophetical sayings relating to the last judgment, but also to the promises of salvation and to all which is connected with the χρόνοι ἀποκατ. Moreover the reference to Samuel is made because of Nathan's prediction, "the fundamental prophecy respecting the seed of David," 2 Sam. vii. 12 ff., in which it is foretold that mercy shall not be taken away even in the midst of punishment. Blass explains the expression τὰς ἡμερ. ταύτ. "regni felicis Messianici"; but we must remember that it does not follow that the popular views of the Messianic kingdom and judgment were still held by St. Peter.

Ver. 25. ὑμεῖς, as in ver. 26, emphatic, "obligat auditores" Bengel, *cf.* ii. 39, Rom. ix. 4, xv. 8; their preference and destiny ought to make them more sensible of their duty in the reception of the Messiah; υἱοί, "sons" as in Matt. viii. 12, R.V. The rendering "disciples" (Matt. xii. 2), even if υἱοί could be so rendered with προφητῶν (J. Lightfoot, Kuinoel), could not be applied to τῆς διαθήκης. The expression is Hebraistic, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub* υἱός, 2, and on many similar expressions Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 163 ff.—διαθ. διέθετο, *cf.* Heb. viii. 10, x. 16, Gen. xv. 18, 1 Macc. i. 11, for a similar construction in LXX

τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας. 25. ὑμεῖς ἐστε[1] υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας[2] ἡμῶν, λέγων πρὸς

[1] υιοι, prefix οι ℵABCE 61, Boh., Sah.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss.

[2] ημων ℵ*CDP 1, 13, 31, Vulg., Boh., Sah., Syrr. (P. and H.), Arm., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H. margin, Hilg.; υμων ℵ³ABE, Sahwol., Armcodd., Chrys., so W.H. text, Weiss, Wendt.

in more than seventy places, so also frequently in classical writers.—**διαθήκης**: on the word, see below, vii. 8.—**ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου**, *cf.* Gen. xxii. 18, xii. 3. For the application of the prophecy to the Messiah as the seed of Abraham by the Rabbinical writers, see Wetstein on Gal. iii. 16 (and Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., p. 712); so by St. Luke, although the words of the prophecy were first uttered in a collective sense.—**πατριαί**: "families," R.V., Luke ii. 4, Eph. iii. 15; "kindreds," A.V., is the rendering of other words, iv. 5, vii. 3. **πατριά** is found in LXX (and in Herodotus); in Gen. xii. 3 **φυλαί** is used, and in xviii. 18 **ἔθνη**, but in Ps. xxii. 27 and in 1 Chron. xvi. 28 we have the phrase **αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν** (but see Nösgen, *in loco*). In this quotation, *cf.* Gal. iii. 8, 16, and in the **πρῶτον** of the next verse we may see a striking illustration of the unity of Apostolic preaching, and the recognition of God's purpose by St. Peter and St. Paul alike (Rom. i. 16, ii. 9, 10).—**ἐνευλογηθήσονται**: **ἐν** of the instrument as often: the verb is not used in classical writers, but Blass gives several instances of verbs similarly compounded with **ἐν**, *cf.* **ἐνευδαιμονεῖν, ἐνευδοκιμεῖν**. The compound verb is found several times in LXX.

Ver. 26. **ὑμῖν πρῶτον—ὑμῖν**: again emphatic. In the words of St. Peter we may again note his agreement with St. Paul, xiii. 46, Rom. i. 16 (x. 11), although no doubt St. Peter shared the views of his nation in so far that Gentiles could only participate in the blessings of the Messianic kingdom through acceptance of Judaism.—**ἀναστήσας**, *cf.* ver. 22, **τὸν παῖδα**, "his servant," R.V., see above on ver. 13. **ἀπέστειλεν** also shows that **ἀναστ.** here refers not to the Resurrection but to the Incarnation.—**εὐλογοῦντα**: as in the act of blessing, present participle; the present participle expressing that the Christ is still continuing His work of blessing on repentance, but see also Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 171.—**ἐν τῷ**: this use of **ἐν** governing the dative with the infinitive is most commonly temporal, but it is used to express other relations, such as manner, means, as here (*cf.* iv. 30, where the attempt to give a temporal sense is very far-fetched, Hackett, *in loco*); see Burton, *u. s.*, p. 162, and Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 232. This formula of **ἐν** with the dative of the article and the infinitive is very common in St. Luke, both in his Gospel and in the Acts, and is characteristic of him as compared with the number of times the same formula is used by other writers in the N.T., Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 37, and also Zeller, [illegible] *of the Apostles*, ii., p. 196, E. [illegible] also in the LXX the same construction is found, *cf.* Gen. xix. 16, xxxiv. 15, etc.—**ἀποστρέφειν**: probably intransitive (Blass, Grimm, and so often in LXX, although the English A. and R.V. may be understood in either sense). Vulgate renders "ut convertat se unusquisque," but the use of the verb elsewhere in Luke xxiii. 14 (*cf.* also Rom. xi. 26, Isa. lix. 20) makes for the transitive sense (so Weiss, *in loco*). The argument from ver. 19 (as Alford points out) does not decide the matter either way (see also Holtzmann).—**πονηριῶν**, *cf.* Luke xi. 39, and adjective **πονηρός** frequent both in the Gospel and in the Acts; in LXX both words are very common. The word may denote miseries as well as iniquities, as Bengel notes, but the latter sense is demanded by the context. **πρῶτον** according to Jüngst does not mark the fact that the Jews were to be converted first and the Gentiles afterwards, but as belonging to the whole clause, and as referring to the first and past sending of Jesus in contrast to the second (ver. 20) and future sending in glory. But to support this view Jüngst has no hesitation in regarding 25ᵇ as an interpolation, and so nothing is left but a reference to the **διαθήκη** of God with the fathers, *i.e.*, circumcision, which is quite in place before a Jewish audience.

St. Peter's Discourses.—More recent German criticism has departed far from the standpoint of the early Tübrigen school, who could only see in these discourses the free composition of a later

Ἀβραάμ, "Καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου ἐνευλογηθήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς." **26.** ὑμῖν πρῶτον ὁ Θεὸς ἀναστήσας τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ

age, whilst Dr. McGiffert, in spite of his denial of the Lucan authorship of Acts, inclines to the belief that the discourses in question represent an early type of Christian teaching, derived from primitive documents, and that they breathe the spirit of St. Peter and of primitive Jewish Christianity. Feine sees in the contents of the addresses a proof that we have in them a truthful record of the primitive Apostolic teaching. Just the very points which were of central interest in this early period of the Church's life are those emphasised here, *e.g.*, the proof that Jesus of Nazareth, the Crucified One, is the Messiah, a proof attested by His Resurrection, the appeal to Israel, the chosen people, to repent for the remission of sins in His name. Nor is there anything against the speeches in the fact of their similarity; in their first and early preaching, as Feine urges, the Apostles' thoughts would naturally move in the same circle, they would recur again and again to the same facts, and their addresses could scarcely be otherwise than similar. Moreover we have an appeal to the facts of the life of Jesus as to things well known in the immediate past: "Jesus of Nazareth" had been working in the midst of them, and Peter's hearers were witnesses with him of His signs and wonders, "as ye yourselves know," ii. 23; we become conscious in such words and in their context of all the moral indignation and the deep pain of the Apostles at the crucifixion of their Master, just as in iii. 13 we seem to listen to another personal reminiscence of the Passion history (see Beyschlag, *Neutest. Theol.*, i., pp. 304, 305; Scharfe, *Die Petrinische Strömung*, 2 *c.*, pp. 184, 185).

The fact that no reference is made to, or at all events that no stress is laid upon, the doctrinal significance of the death of Christ, as by St. Paul, is again an intimation that we are dealing with the earliest days of Apostolic teaching—the death of the Cross was in itself the fact of all others which was the insuperable offence to the Jew, and it could not help him to proclaim that Christ died for his sins if he had no belief in Jesus as the Christ. The first and necessary step was to prove to the Jew that the suffering of the Messiah was in accordance with the counsels of God and with the voices of the prophets (Lechler, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, pp. 230, 231). But the historical fact accepted, its inner and spiritual significance would be imparted, and there was nothing strange in the fact that disciples who had themselves found it so difficult to overcome their repugnance to the mention of their Master's sufferings, should first direct their main efforts to remove the like prejudice from the minds of their countrymen. But we cannot adduce from this method that the Apostles had never heard such words as those of Christ (Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, *cf.* 1 Peter i. 18) (*cf.* the striking passage in Beyschlag, *u. s.*, pp. 306, 307), or that they were entirely ignorant of the atoning significance of His Death. St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 1-3, speaks of the tradition which he had received, a tradition in which he was at one with the Twelve, ver. 11, *viz.*, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (Feine, *Die vorkanonische Ueberlieferung des Lukas;* see p. 230).

When we pass to the consideration of St. Peter's Christology, we again see how he starts from the actual experience of his hearers before him: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man," etc.—plainly and fearlessly St. Peter emphasises the manhood of his Lord—the title which is never found in any of the Epistles leads us back to the Passion and the Cross, to the early records of the Saviour's life on earth, Acts xxiv. 9, xxii. 8. And yet the Crucified Nazarene was by a startling paradox the Prince or Author of Life (see note on ἀρχηγός); by a divine law which the Jews could not discern He could not save Himself—and yet—another paradox—there was no other Name given amongst men whereby they must be saved.

St. Paul could write of Him, Who took upon Him the form of a servant, Who humbled Himself, and became obedient to the death of the Cross, Phil. ii. 6; and St. Peter, in one familiar word, which so far as we know St. Paul never used, brings before his hearers the same sublime picture of obedience, humility, death and glory; Jesus is the ideal, the glorified "Servant" of God (see note on iii. 13). But almost in the same breath St. Peter speaks of the Servant as the Holy and Righteous One, iii. 14; holy, in that He was consecrated to the service of Jehovah (ἅγιος, iv. 27, 30, see note, and ii. 27); righteous, in that He was

Ἰησοῦν,[1] ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς, ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν.

[1] Ιησουν om. ℵBCDE 61, Vulg.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Hilg. υμων ℵAC³DEP 1, 31, 61, Syrr. (P. and H.), Arm., Aeth., so Tisch. [W.H.], Weiss; in B, Chrys., Theophyl. omitted; C² 13, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Irint. read αυτων.

also the impersonation of righteousness, a righteousness which the Law had proclaimed, and which Prophets and Kings had desired to see, but had not seen (Isaiah liii. 11). But whilst we note these titles, steeped each and all of them in O.T. imagery, whilst we may see in them the germs of the later and the deeper theology of St. Paul and St. John (see Dr. Lock, "Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts," *Expositor*, iv. (fourth series), p. 178 ff.), they carry us far beyond the conception of a mere humanitarian Christ. It is not only that Jesus of Nazareth is set before us as "the very soul and end of Jewish Prophecy," as Himself the Prophet to whom the true Israel would hearken, but that He is associated by St. Peter even in his earliest utterances, as none other is associated, with Jehovah in His Majesty in the work of salvation, ii. 34; the salvation which was for all who called upon Jehovah's Name, ii. 21, was also for all in the Name, in the power of Jesus Christ, iv. 12 (see notes, *l. c*, and *cf.* the force of the expression ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα in 1 Cor. i. 2, Schmid, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 407); the Spirit which Joel had foretold would be poured forth by Jehovah had been poured forth by Jesus raised to the right hand of God, ii. 18, 33 (see further notes in chap. x. 36, 42, 43).

One other matter must be briefly noticed—the correspondence in thought and word between the St. Peter of the early chapters of the Acts and the St. Peter of the First Epistle which bears his name. A few points may be selected. St. Peter had spoken of Christ as the Prince of Life; quite in harmony with this is the thought expressed in 1 Pet. i. 3, of Christians as "begotten again" by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. St. Peter had spoken of Christ as the Holy and Righteous One, so in the First Epistle he sets forth this aspect of Christ's peculiar dignity, His sinlessness. As in Acts, so also in 1 Pet. the thought of the sufferings of Christ is prominent, but also that of the glory which should follow, chap. i., ver. 11. As in Acts, so also in 1 Pet. these sufferings are described as undeserved, but also as foreordained by God and in accordance with the voices of the Prophets, 1 Pet. i. 11 and ii. 22-25. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. it is the special task of the Apostles to be witnesses of the sufferings and also of the resurrection of Christ, chap. v. 1. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. we have the clearest testimony to the δόξα of Christ, 1 Pet. i. 21 and iv. 11. As in Acts stress is laid not only upon the facts of the life of Christ, but also upon His teaching, x. 34 ff., so also in 1 Pet., while allusions are made to the scenes of our Lord's Passion with all the force of an eye-witness, we have stress laid upon the word of Christ, the Gospel or teaching, i. 12, 23, 25, ii. 2, 8, iii. 19, iv. 6. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. we have a reference to the agency of Christ in the realm of the dead, 1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6. As in Acts, x. 42, so in 1 Pet. Christ is Himself the judge of quick and dead, iv. 6, or in His unity with the Father shares with Him that divine prerogative, *cf.* i. 17. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. the communication of the Holy Spirit is specially attributed to the exalted Christ, *cf.* Acts ii. 33, 1 Pet. i. 11, 12. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. Christ is the living corner-stone on which God's spiritual house is built, Acts iv. 12 and 1 Pet. ii. 4-10. As in Acts, so in 1 Pet. not only the details but the whole scope of salvation is regarded in the light and as a fulfilment of O.T. prophecy, *cf.* Acts iii. 18-25, 1 Pet. ii. 22, 23, and i. 10-12. But this correspondence extends to words, amongst which we may note πρόγνωσις, Acts ii. 23, 1 Pet. i. 2, a word found nowhere else in the N.T., and used in each passage in the same sense; ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, 1 Pet. i. 17, and only here in N.T., but *cf.* Acts x. 34, οὐκ ἔστιν προσωπολήμπτης. ξύλον twice used by St. Peter in Acts v. 30, x. 39 (once by St. Paul), and again in 1 Pet. ii. 24; ἀθέμιτος only in the Cornelius history, Acts x. 28, by St. Peter, and in 1 Pet. iv. 3; μάρτυς with the genitive of that to which testimony is rendered, most frequently in N.T. used by St. Peter, *cf.* Acts i. 22, vi. 32, x. 39, and 1 Pet. v. 1; and further, in

IV. 1. ΛΑΛΟΥΝΤΩΝ δὲ αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν λαόν, ἐπέστησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ ἱερεῖς[1] καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι, 2. διαπονού-

[1] ιερεις ℵADEP 1, 31, 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syrr. (P. and H.), Lucif., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H. margin, R.V. text, Weiss, Hilg.; αρχιερεις BC 4, Arm., Aeth., so W.H. text, R.V. margin, Wendt; ο στρατ. του ιερου om. by D, but accepted by Blass in β.

Acts iv. 11 = 1 Pet. ii. 7, Acts x. 42 = 1 Pet. iv. 5, the verbal correspondence is very close.

See on the whole subject Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 48; Lechler, *Das Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 428 ff.; Scharfe, *Die Petrinische Strömung*, 2 *c.*, p. 122 ff.; Lumby, *Expositor*, iv. (first series), pp. 118, 123; and also Schmid, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 389 ff. On the striking connection between the *Didache*, and the language of St. Peter's sermons, and the phraseology of the early chapters of Acts, see Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 416.

CHAPTER IV.—Ver. 1. **λαλούντων δὲ αὐτῶν**: the speech was interrupted, as the present participle indicates, and we cannot treat it as if we had received it in full. It is no doubt possible to infer from **αὐτῶν** that St. John also addressed the people.—**ἐπέστησαν αὐτοῖς**: commonly used with the notion of coming upon one suddenly, so of the coming of an angel, xii. 7, xxiii. 11, Luke ii. 9, xxiv. 4, sometimes too as implying a hostile purpose, *cf.* vi. 12, xvii. 5, and St. Luke (x. 40), xx. 1. For its use in the LXX *cf.* Wisdom vi. 5, 8, xix. 1.—**οἱ ἱερεῖς**: "the priests," so A. and R.V., but the latter, margin, "the chief priests," see critical note. **ἀρχιερεῖς** would comprise probably the members of the privileged high-priestly families in which the high-priesthood was vested (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., pp. 203-206, E.T.), Jos., *B. J.*, vi., 2, 2. That the members of these families occupied a distinguished position we know (*cf.* iv. 6), and there is nothing improbable in the supposition that the description **ἀρχιερεῖς** would include them as well as the ex-high-priests, and the one actually in office; this seems justified from the words of Josephus in the passage referred to above (Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 231).—**ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ**: the captain of the Temple (known chiefly in Jewish writings as "the man of the Temple Mount"). He had the chief superintendence of the Levites and priests who were on guard in and around the Temple, and under him were **στρατηγοί**, who were also captains of the Temple police, although subordinate to the **στρατηγός** as their head. The **στρατ. τοῦ ἱεροῦ** was not only a priest, but second in dignity to the high-priest himself (Schürer, *u. s.*, pp. 258, 259, 267, and Edersheim, *u. s.*, and *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 139), Acts v. 24, 26, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 6, 2, *B. J.*, vi., 5, 3. For the use of the term in the LXX, see Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 258. In 2 Macc. iii. 4 the "governor of the Temple" is identified by some with the officer here and in v. 24, but see Rawlinson's note *in loco* in *Speaker's Commentary*.—**καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι**: at this time, as Josephus informs us, however strange it may appear, the high-priestly families belonged to the Sadducean party. Not that the Sadducees are to be identified entirely with the party of the priests, since the Pharisees were by no means hostile to the priests as such, nor the priests to the Pharisees. But the Sadducees were the aristocrats, and to the *aristocratic* priests, who occupied influential civil positions, the Pharisees were bitterly opposed. Jos., *Ant.*, xvii., 10, 6, xviii., 1, 4, xx., 9, 1. Schürer, *u. s.*, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 29-43, and div. ii., vol. i., p. 178 ff. The words **οἱ Σαδδ.** and **ἡ οὖσα αἵρεσις τῶν Σ.**, ver. 17, are referred by Hilgenfeld to his "author to Theophilus," as also the reference to the preaching of the Resurrection as the cause of the sore trouble to the Sadducees; but the mention of the Sadducees at least shows (as Weizsäcker and Holtzmann admit) that the author of *Acts* had correct information of the state of parties in Jerusalem: "The Sadducees were at the helm, and the office of the high-priest was in Sadducean hands, and the Sadducees predominated in the high-priestly families" (Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i., 61, E.T.).

Ver. 2. **διαπονούμενοι**, *cf.* xvi. 18, only in *Acts* in the N.T., not, as often in classical Greek, referring to the exertions made by them, but to the vexation which they felt, "being sore troubled," R.V. (**πόνος**, *dolor*, Blass), *cf.* LXX, Eccles. x. 9, used of pain caused to the body, and 2 Macc. ii. 28, R. (A. *al.* ἀπονοοῦντες), but *cf.* Aquila, Gen. vi. 6, xxxiv. 7, 1 Sam. xx. 3, 34, of mental grief.—**ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ**:

μενοι διὰ τὸ διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς τὸν λαόν, καὶ [1] καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν· 3. καὶ ἐπέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας,[2] καὶ ἔθεντο εἰς τήρησιν εἰς τὴν αὔριον· ἦν γὰρ ἑσπέρα ἤδη. 4. πολλοὶ δὲ τῶν ἀκουσάντων τὸν λόγον ἐπίστευσαν· καὶ ἐγενήθη ὁ

[1] D reads αναγγελλειν τον Ι. εν τη αναστασει των νεκρων, but Blass rejects (Chase contends for Syriac); την εκ νεκρων ℵABCE, Vulg., Boh., Syrr. (P. and H.); των νεκρων DP, h, 31, Flor., Gig., Par., Sah., Arm., Aeth., Lucif., Ir., Chrys.

[2] χειρας; after this word Flor. inserts εκρατησαν αυτους (which Zöckler and Belser regard as original); for επεβαλον D reads επιβαλοντες.

not "through," but as in R.V., "in Jesus," *i.e.*, "in persona Jesu quem resurrexisse dicebant" (Blass). Others render it "in the instance of Jesus" (so Holtzmann, Wendt, Felten, Zöckler).—τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν: on the form of the expression see Plummer on *St. Luke*, xx. 35, and Lumby's note, *in loco*. It must be distinguished from (ἡ) ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. It is the more limited term implying that *some* from among the dead are raised, while others as yet are not; used of the Resurrection of Christ and of the righteous, *cf.* with this passage 1 Peter i. 3 (Col. i. 18), but see also Grimm-Thayer, *sub* ἀνάστασις. It was not merely a dogmatic question of the denial of the Resurrection which concerned the Sadducees, but the danger to their power, and to their wealth from the Temple sacrifices and dues, if the Resurrection of Jesus was proclaimed and accepted (see Wendt and Holtzmann, *in loco*, and Plummer on Luke xxiii. 1-7, note). Spitta agrees with Weiss, Feine, Jüngst, in regarding the mention of the distress of the Sadducees at the preaching of the Apostles as not belonging to the original source. But it is worthy of notice that in estimating the positive value of his source, A., he decides to retain the mention of the Sadducees in iv. 1—it would have been more easy, he thinks, for a forger to have represented the enmity to the Church as proceeding not from the Sadducees but from the Pharisees, as in the Gospels. But the Sadducees, as Spitta reminds us, according to Josephus, included the high-priestly families in their number, and it was by this sect that at a later date the death of James the Just was caused. Only once in the Gospels, John xii. 10, the chief priests, rather than the Pharisees, take the initiative against our Lord, but this was in the case of what was essentially a question for the Sadducees (as here in Acts iv. 2), the advisability of getting rid of Lazarus, a living witness to the truth which the Sadducees denied. It is no unfair inference that the chief priests in St. John occupy the place of the Sadducees in the Synoptists, as the latter are never mentioned by name in the fourth Gospel; and if so, this is exactly in accordance with what we should expect from the notices here and in Acts v. 17, and in Josephus; see on the point Lightfoot in *Expositor*, 1890, pp. 86, 87.

Ver. 3. ἐπέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας: the verb is always as here joined with the same noun in Acts, and twice in the Gospel; the phrase is found once in Matthew and Mark, and twice in John; see Luke xx. 19, xxi. 12, Acts iv. 3, v. 18, xii. 1, xxi. 27, *cf.* in LXX, Gen. xxii. 12, 2 Sam. xviii. 12; Esther vi. 2, so also in Polybius.—τήρησιν, *cf.* v. 18, only used elsewhere in N.T. by St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 19; in Thuc., vii., 86 (Wendt), it denotes not only the act of guarding, but also a place of custody. Five times in LXX, but in the former sense. For another instance of its meaning as a place of custody (see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 55), on papyrus in Egypt, second or third century after Christ.—ἦν γὰρ ἑσπέρα ἤδη, *cf.* iii. 1, the judicial examination must therefore be postponed until the next day, see Jer. xxi. 12, on which it appears that the Rabbis founded this prohibition against giving judgment in the night (Lumby and Felten, *in loco*).—ἑσπέρα: only in St. Luke in the N.T., Luke xxiv. 29, Acts iv. 3 (xx. 15, W.H. margin) and xxviii. 23.

Ver. 4. ἐγενήθη: "came to be" R.V., only here in St. Luke, except in the quotation in i. 20 (see also vii. 13, D., and Blass in β—hellenistic, frequently in LXX; in N.T. *cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 14, Col. iv. 11; also Jos., *Ant.*, x., 10, 2, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 108, note).—ἀνδρῶν. This word here appears to be used of *men* only (so Wetstein, Blass), *cf.* Matt. xiv. 21, Mark vi. 40, for although we cannot argue with Weiss from v. 14, that women in great

ἀριθμὸς[1] τῶν ἀνδρῶν ὡσεὶ χιλιάδες πέντε. 5. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον[2] συναχθῆναι αὐτῶν τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ γραμματεῖς εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, 6. καὶ Ἄνναν[3] τὸν ἀρχιερέα καὶ Καϊάφαν καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον, καὶ ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐκ γένους ἀρχιερατικοῦ.

[1] **ὁ αριθμος**, so AEP 31, 61, Chrys.; but article om. ℵBD, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss. **ωσει** EP, Chrys.; **ως** BD, so W.H., Weiss, Hilg.; om. ℵA 61, Vulg. verss., so Tisch., Wendt (who compares ii. 41 and regards **ως** or **ωσει** as added accordingly).

[2] After **αυριον** D, Flor. add **ημεραν**, so Hilg.; Chase by assim. to Syriac, Harris by assim. to Bezan Latin—*crastinum diem*. But *cf.* **σημερον ημερα** in N.T., Acts xx. 26, Rom. xi. 8, 2 Cor. iii. 14. **εις Ιερ.** ℵP 1, 31, Syr. Harcl., so Tisch., Wendt; **εν** ABDE 61, Chrys., so W.H., R.V., Weiss, Hilg.; Flor., Syr. Pesh. omit. **συναχθηναι**, D, Flor. change constr. **συνηχθησαν οι αρχ.**

[3] **Ανναν**, acc., EP 1, 31, 61, Chrys.; **Αννας**, nom. (and so all the proper names), ℵBD 15, 18, 36, 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (who holds, as against Meyer, that the noms. are not derived from **συνηχθησαν** in D, but that the latter was occasioned by the noms.). **Ιωαννην**, D, Gig., Par.[1] read **Ιωναθας**. Blass contends for the correctness of D, so Hilg., **Ιωναθας** = Jonathan, son of Annas, who succeeded Caiaphas, Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii., 4, 3 (see Blass, *Acta Apost.*, 72 and 35), **Ιωαννης** being a common name and an unknown man. But we cannot conceive that Luke would himself have altered **Ιωναθας** into **Ιωαννης**, so Blass regards the former as the reading in **α** and **β**—**Ιωαννης** a later blunder.

numbers did not join the Church until a later period (*cf.* also ii. 41, where women may well have been included), yet it seems that St. Luke, by his use of one word, **ἀνδρῶν**, here refers to the additional number of *men*. St. Luke does not say that five thousand of St. Peter's hearers were converted, in addition to those already converted at Pentecost (although Dr. Hort, following Chrys., Aug., Jer., takes this view, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 47), or that five thousand were added, but his words certainly mark the growing expansion of the Church in spite of threatening danger, as this is also evident on the view that five thousand represent the total number of believers. The instances above from the Gospels are generally quoted to confirm the view here taken, but Wendt, *in loco*, curiously quotes the same passages in proof that **ἀνδρῶν** here includes women. The numbers are regarded by him as by Weizsäcker as artificial, but see above on i. 15.

Ver. 5. **ἐγένετο δὲ**: the formula is another characteristic of St. Luke's style, Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 13, also Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 26, 29. Compare for the type of construction, according to which what takes place is put in the infinitive mood, depending upon **ἐγένετο**, ix. 32, 37, 43, xi. 26, xiv. 1, and other instances in Dr. Plummer's exhaustive note, *St. Luke*, p. xlv.—**ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον**: here only and in Luke x. 35, in N.T. For the temporal use of **ἐπί** iii. 1.—**συναχθῆναι**, *i.e.*, the Sanhedrim. **ἄρχοντας** here = **ἀρχιερεῖς**, who are mentioned first as a rule, where the N.T. enumerates the different orders of the Sanhedrim, whilst **οἱ ἄρχοντες** is an interchangeable expression, both in the N.T. and in Josephus (see, for instance, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., pp. 177, 205, E.T.), although there are two instances in which both words occur together, Luke xxiii. 13 and xxiv. 20. Whatever may have been the precise significance of the term **ἀρχιερεῖς**, Schürer, *u. s.*, pp. 203-206, E.T., it included, beyond all doubt, the most prominent representatives of the priesthood, belonging chiefly, if not entirely, to the Sadducean party.—**πρεσβυτέρους**: those members were known simply by this title who did not belong to either of the two special classes mentioned.—**γραμματεῖς**: the professional lawyers who adhered to the Pharisees, Jos., *Ant.*, xvii., 6, 2. Even under the Roman government the Sanhedrim possessed considerable independence of jurisdiction, both civil and criminal. Not only could it order arrests to be made by its own officers, but it could dispose, on its own authority, of cases where the death penalty was not involved, Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 187, E.T., and Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 103 ff.—**εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ**: Weiss would restrict **ἐν Ἱερ.** to the scribes of Jerusalem to distinguish them

7. καὶ στήσαντες αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ μέσῳ, ἐπυνθάνοντο, Ἐν ποίᾳ δυνάμει ἢ ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι ἐποιήσατε τοῦτο ὑμεῖς; 8. Τότε Πέτρος, πλησθεὶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ πρεσ-

from the scribes of Galilee, but it is doubtful whether the words can bear this (see also Rendall, who favours the same view as Weiss). Holtzmann and Wendt, on the other hand, defend **εἰς**, and suppose that the members of the Sanhedrim were obliged to hurry into the city from their country estates. Zöckler applies **ἐν Ἰερ.** not only to **γραμματεῖς**, but also to the other members of the Sanhedrim, and sees in the words an intimation that the sitting was hurriedly composed of the members actually present in Jerusalem.

Ver. 6. **Ἄννας**: Caiaphas, the son-in-law of Annas, was the high priest actually in office, but like other retired high priests, the latter retained not only the title, but also many of the rights and obligations of the office. Josephus certainly appears to extend the title to ex-high priests, and so in the N.T. where **ἀρχιερεῖς** appear at the head of the Sanhedrim as in this passage (**ἄρχοντες**), the ex-high priests are to be understood, first and foremost, as well as the high-priest actually in office. The difficulty here is that the title is given to Annas alone, and this seems to involve that he was also regarded as president of the Sadducees, whereas it is always the actual **ἀρχιερεύς** who presides, *cf.* Acts v. 17, vii. 1, ix. 1, xxii. 5, xxiii. 2, 4, xxiv. 1. But not only is the laxity of the term to be considered, but also the fact that Annas on account of his influence as the head of the **γένος ἀρχιερατικόν** may have remained the presiding **ἀρχιερεύς** in spite of all the rapid changes in the tenure of the high-priestly office under the Romans. These changes the Jews would not recognise as valid, and if the early chapters of Acts came to St. Luke as seems probable from Jewish Christian sources, Annas might easily be spoken of as high-priest. His relationship to Caiaphas helps to explain the influence and power of Annas. On Hamburger's view (*Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 8, p. 1151, "Synhedrion"), that a Rabbi and not the high-priest presided over the Sadducees, see Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 522, and Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 180. For Annas, see Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 2, 12, xx., 9, 1, and see further "Annas" in B.D.[2] and Hastings' B.D.—**Ἰωάννης**: identified by J. Lightfoot (*cf.* also Wetstein) with the famous Johanan ben Zacchai, president of the Great Synagogue after its removal to Jamnia, who obtained leave from Vespasian for many of the Jews to settle in the place. But the identification is very uncertain, and does not appear to commend itself to Schürer; see critical note above.—**Ἀλέξανδρος**: of him too nothing is known, as there is no confirmatory evidence to identify him with the brother of Philo, alabarch of Alexandria, and the first man of his time amongst the Jews of that city, Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 8, 1, xix., 5, 1, xx., 5, B.D.[2] and Hastings' B.D., "Alexander".

Ver. 7. **ἐν τῷ μέσῳ**: according to the Mishnah the members of the court sat in a semicircle, see Hamburger, *u. s.*, to be able to see each other. But it is unnecessary to press the expression, it may be quite general, *cf.* Matt. xiv. 6, Mark iii. 3, John viii. 3. On the usual submissive attitude of prisoners, see Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 9, 4. In this verse R.V. supplies "was there" as a verb, Annas being its subject. Various attempts to amend the broken construction—all the proper names are in the nominative (not in accusative as T.R.), so W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss; D. reads **συνήχθησαν**, so Blass in **β**.—**ἐν ποίᾳ**: by what kind of power; or may = **τίνι**, xxiii. 34.—**ἐν ποίῳ ὀνόματι**: in virtue of what name? "nomen hic vis ac potestas" Grotius and Wetstein, *in loco*. They ask as if they would accuse them of referring to some magical name or formula for the performance of the miracles, xix. 13 (on **ὄνομα** see iii. 16), *cf.* LXX, Exodus v. 23. Probably they would like to bring the Apostles under the condemnation pronounced in Deut. xiii. 1. "So did they very foolishly conceit that the very naming of some name might do wonders—and the Talmud forgeth that Ben Sadha wrought miracles by putting the unutterable name within the skin of his foot and then sewing it up," J. Lightfoot.—**ὑμεῖς**: as if in scorn, with depreciatory emphasis at the close of the question, so Wendt, and Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 160.—**τοῦτο**: not this teaching (Olshausen), but the miracle on the lame man.

Ver. 8. **πλησθεὶς πνεύ. ἁγ.**: the whole phrase is characteristic of St. Luke, who employs it in the Gospel

βύτεροι τοῦ Ἰσραήλ,[1] 9. εἰ ἡμεῖς σήμερον ἀνακρινόμεθα ἐπὶ εὐεργεσίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀσθενοῦς, ἐν τίνι οὗτος σέσωσται· 10. γνωστὸν ἔστω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου, ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε, ὃν ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν ἐκ

[1] **του Ισραηλ** om. ℵAB, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aeth., Cyr., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss; but retained in DEP, Flor., Par., Syrr. (P. and H.), Irint., Chrys., Cypr., so Meyer, Blass, Hilg. D adds **εν αλλω δε ουδενι** to this verse, so E, Flor., Syr. Harcl. mg., Cypr.; but see Weiss, Codex D, p. 64, and, on the other hand, Belser.

three times and in Acts five (Friedrich, Lekebusch, Zeller). Acts has sometimes been called the Gospel of the Holy Spirit, and the number of times St. Luke uses the title "Holy Spirit" justifies the name, see above also p. 63. All three expressions, **πνεῦμα ἅγιον, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα**, and **τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον** are found in the Gospel and Acts, though much more frequently in the latter, the first expression (in the text) occurring quite double the number of times in Acts as compared with the Gospel, *cf.* in the LXX, Ps. l. (li.) 11, Isa. lxiii. 10, 11, Wisdom i. 5, ix. 17; and with 1 Cor. ii. 10, 12, *cf.* Wisdom ix. 17, and Isa. lxiii. 10, 11. On the omission of the article see Simcox, *Language of N. T. Greek*, p. 49. **πλησθεὶς**—the verb **πίμπλημι** common both in Gospel and in Acts, only found twice elsewhere in N.T., as against thirteen times in Gospel and nine times in Acts (Friedrich, Lekebusch). The word was also very frequent in LXX, *cf.* Ecclesiasticus xlviii. 12, A. The phrase **πλησθῆναι πνεύμ. ἀγ.** is peculiar to St. Luke, in Gospel three times, i. 15, 41, 67, and Acts ii. 4, iv. 31, ix. 17, xiii. 9, *cf.* Luke xii. 12, and xxi. 14; see also Matt. x. 20, Mark xiii. 11. St. Peter's courage in thus openly proclaiming the Crucified for the first time before the rulers of his people might well be significantly emphasised, as in ver. 13. St. Chrysostom comments (*Hom.*, x.) on the Christian wisdom of St. Peter on this occasion, how full of confidence he is, and yet how he utters not a word of insult, but speaks with all respect.

Ver. 9. **εἰ**: chosen not without oratorical nicety, *if, as is the case* = **ἐπεὶ ἡμεῖς**, expressing at the same time the righteous indignation of the Apostles in contrast to the contemptuous **ὑμεῖς** of ver. 7, and their surprise at the object of the present inquiry; so too in **ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ** St. Peter again indicates the unfairness of such inquisitorial treatment ("cum alias dijudicari debeant, qui *malum fecerunt*," Bengel).—**ἀνακρινόμεθα**: used here of a judicial examination, see xii. 19 and Luke xxiii. 14, and *cf.* Acts xxiv. 8, xxviii. 18, and 1 Cor. ix. 3, although the strictly technical sense of **ἀνάκρισις** as a preliminary investigation cannot be pressed here.—**ἐπ' εὐεργ. ἀ. ἀσθενοῦς**: "concerning a good deal done to an impotent man"—the omission of the articles in both nouns adds to St. Peter's irony; "he hits them hard in that they are always making a crime of such acts, finding fault with works of beneficence," Chrys., *Hom.*, x.; **ἀνθρώπου** on the objective genitive, Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 260 and 267.—**ἐν τίνι**: "by what means," R.V.; "in whom," margin. The neuter instrumental dative, *cf.* Matt. v. 13, is supported by Blass, Weiss, Holtzmann, and others, as if the expression embraced the two questions of ver. 7. Rendall, following the older commentators, regards the expression as masculine.—**οὗτος**: the healed man is thought of as present, although nothing is said of his summons; "this man," R.V.—**σέσωσται**: the word familiar to us in the Gospels, Luke vii. 50, Mark x. 52, with the pregnant meaning of health for body and soul alike.

Ver. 10. St. Peter does not hesitate to refer his judges to the same passage of Scripture which a few short weeks before Jesus of Nazareth had quoted to a deputation of the Sanhedrim. In that case too the question put to Jesus had been as to the authority by which He acted, Matt. xxi. 42, Mark xii. 10, Luke xxi. 17. It is possible that the words from Ps. cxviii. 22 were already regarded as Messianic, from the fact that the people had welcomed Jesus at His public entry into Jerusalem with part of a verse of the same Psalm, ver. 26, Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 368. Moreover, the passage, Isa. xxviii. 16, which forms the connecting link between the Psalm and St. Peter's words, both here and in his First Epistle (1 Pet. ii. 7, *cf.* Rom. ix. 33, x. 11), was interpreted as Messianic, apparently by the Targums, and un-

νεκρῶν, ἐν τούτῳ οὗτος παρέστηκεν ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ὑγιής. 11. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐξουθενηθεὶς ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδομούντων, ὁ γενόμενος εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. 12.[1] καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία· οὔτε γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

[1] **και ουκ . . . η σωτηρια** omit Flor., Ir., Cypr., Aug.; D and Par.[1] omit also **η σωτηρια**.

doubtedly by Rashi in his Commentary, *cf.* also Wetstein on Matt. xxi. 42; Edersheim, *u. s.*, ii., 725. In the original meaning of the Psalm Israel is the stone rejected by the builders, *i.e.*, by the heathen, the builders of this world's empires, or the expression may refer to those in Israel who despised the small beginnings of a dawning new era (Delitzsch); but however this may be, in the N.T. the builders are the heads and representatives of Israel, as is evident from our Lord's use of the verse, and also by St. Peter's words here, "*you the builders*," R.V. But that which the Psalmist had spoken of the second Temple, that which was a parable of the history of Israel, had its complete and ideal fulfilment in Him Who, despised and rejected of men, had become the chief corner-stone of a spiritual Temple, in whom both Jew and Gentile were made one (1 Cor. iii. 11, Eph. ii. 20).—**ἐσταυρώσατε**: mentioned not merely to remind them of their fault, *cf.* ii. 36, but perhaps also that they might understand how vain it was to fight against God (Calvin).—**ἐν τούτῳ**: "in him," or "in this name" R.V. margin. For the former Wendt decides, although in the previous verse he takes **ἐν τίνι** as neuter; so too Page and Holtzmann. On the other hand Rendall (so De Wette, Weiss) adopts the latter rendering, while admitting that the reference to Jesus Himself is quite possible, as in ver. 12.—**ἐνώπ. ὑμῶν**: Hebraism, characteristic of St. Luke in his Gospel and in the Acts. The expression is never used in Matthew and Mark, and only once in John, xx. 30, but thirty-one times in the Hebraistic Apocalypse—frequent in LXX, but not found in classical or Hellenistic Greek, although **τὰ ἐνώπια** in Homer, Blass, *in loco*, and *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 125. The word is also found on papyri twice, so Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 40.

Ver. 11. **οὗτος**: "He, as in R.V. All E.V. previously translated it "this," referring it to **ὁ λίθος**, but in the next verse a person is directly spoken of, not under the metaphor of a stone, and the pronoun finds its subject better in the **ἐν τούτῳ**, masculine of ver. 10. See Winer-Schmiedel, p. 216.—**ὁ ἐξουθενηθεὶς**: in the LXX and in the Gospels the word used is **ἀπεδοκίμασαν**. St. Peter, quoting apparently from memory, used a word expressing still greater contempt. It is used, *e.g.*, very significantly by St. Luke in his Gospel, xxiii. 11, and again in xviii. 9. The word is found in none of the other Gospels, and is characteristic of St. Luke and of St. Paul (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 3, 10, 1 Cor. i. 28, 1 Cor. vi. 4, etc.). It occurs several times in the LXX; *cf.* Wisdom, iii. 11, iv. 18, Ecclesiasticus xix. 1, 2 Macc. i. 27, and *Psalms of Solomon*, ii., 5. In classical writers it is not found at all.—**ὁ γενόμ. εἰς**, "which was made," R.V. Blass compares the Hebrew phrase הָיָה לְ and finds parallels in v. 36, Luke xiii. 19, but **γίγνεσθαι εἰς**, while common in the LXX, is a correct expression in classical Greek, although the places in the N.T. in which the formula is found in O.T. quotations are undoubtedly Hebraisms (see below on v. 36), Winer-Schmiedel, p. 257, and with this may be connected the frequency of its occurrence in the Apocalypse (see Simcox on the phrase, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 143).—**κεφαλὴν γωνίας**: not "the topmost pinnacle-stone," but a corner-stone uniting two walls, on which they rested and were made firm, *cf.* the meaning of **ἀκρογωνιαῖος** (Isa. xxviii. 16), 1 Pet. ii. 6-8, Eph. ii. 20, which is used here by Symmachus instead of **κεφ. γων.** The Hebrew פִּנָּה elsewhere always refers not to the upper part of the building, but to the lower (Isa. xxviii. 16, Jer. li. 26, Job xxxviii. 6, **ὁ βαλὼν λίθον γωνιαῖον**, Delitzsch). Probably therefore the expression here refers to a foundation-stone at the base of the corner. On the occurrence of the phrase from Ps. cxviii. 22 in St. Peter's First Epistle, and in his speech here, see p. 119, and also Scharfe, *Die Petrinische Strömung*, 2 c., p. 126.

13. Θεωροῦντες δὲ τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου παῤῥησίαν καὶ Ἰωάννου, καὶ καταλαβόμενοι ὅτι ἄνθρωποι ἀγράμματοί εἰσι καὶ ἰδιῶται, ἐθαύ-

Ver. 12. ἡ σωτηρία, *cf.* v. 31, xvii. 11, *i.e.*, κατ' ἐξοχήν, the Messianic salvation. The interpretation which would limit ἡ σωτ. to bodily healing is less satisfactory; infinitely higher than the healing of one man, ver. 9, stands the Messianic salvation, for which even the Sanhedrists were hoping and longing, but see also Rendall's note, *in loco.* A parallel to the expression is found in Jos., *Ant.*, iii., 1, 5, but there are many passages in the O.T. which might have suggested the words to St. Peter, *cf.* Isa. xii. 2, xlix. 6-8, lii. 10.—οὔτε γὰρ ὄνομα, see on i. 15, ii. 21. οὐδὲ is the best reading, Winer-Moulton, liii. 10, "for not even is there a second name"—the claim develops more precisely and consequently from the statement ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί· ἕτερος μὲν, ἐπὶ δυοῖν· ἄλλος δὲ, ἐπὶ πλειόνων (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 8, 2 Cor. xi. 1, Gal. i. 6, 7), Ammonius, quoted by Bengel.—τὸ δεδομένον: on the force of the article with the participle, see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, pp. 183, 184 (1893) = τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα, τὸ δεδομ. ἐν ἀνθρώποις, μόνον ἐστὶν ἐν ᾧ δεῖ . . . and Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 238; *cf.* Luke xviii. 9, Gal. i. 7, Col. ii. 8.—ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι: "Jesus when He spoke of the rejection as future, predicted that the stone would be a judgment-stone to destroy the wicked builders. But Peter takes up the other side, and presents the stone as the stone of Messianic salvation; this name is the only name under heaven that is a saving name. Here Peter apprehends the spiritual significance of the reign of the Messiah," Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 34, and the whole passage.

Ver. 13. θεωροῦντες δὲ, *cf.* iii. 16, not merely βλέπ., as in ver. 14, but "inest notio contemplandi cum attentione aut admiratione," Tittm., *Synon. N. T.*, p. 121. The present participle marks this continuous observation of the fearless bearing of the Apostles during the trial (Rendall).—παρρησίαν: either boldness of speech, or of bearing; it was the feature which had characterised the teaching of our Lord; *cf.* Mark viii. 32, and nine times in St. John in connection with Christ's teaching or bearing; and the disciples in this respect also were as their Master, *c.* iv. 29, 31 (ii. 29); so too of St. Paul, xxviii. 31, and frequently used by St. Paul himself in his Epistles; also by St. John four times in his First Epistle of confidence in approaching God: "urbem et orbem hac parrhesia vicerunt," Bengel. *Cf.* παρρησιάζεσθαι used of Paul's preaching, ix. 27, 28, and again of him and Barnabas, xiii. 46, xiv. 3, of Apollos, xviii. 26, and twice again of Paul, xix. 8, xxvi. 26; only found in Acts, and twice in St. Paul's Epistles, Eph. vi. 20, 1 Thess. ii. 2, of speaking the Gospel boldly. For παρρησία, see LXX, Prov. xiii. 5, 1 Macc. iv. 18, Wisdom v. 1 (of speech), *cf.* also Jos., *Ant.*, ix., 10, 4, xv., 2, 7.—Ἰωάννου: even if St. John had not spoken, that "confidence towards God," which experience of life deepened, 1 John iv. 17, v. 14, but which was doubtless his now, would arrest attention; but it is evidently assumed that St. John had spoken, and it is quite characteristic of St. Luke's style thus to quote the most telling utterance, and to assume that the reader conceives the general situation, and procedure in the trial, Ramsay's *St. Paul*, pp. 371, 372.—καὶ καταλαβόμενοι: "and had perceived" R.V., rightly marking the tense of the participle; either by their dress or demeanour, or by their speech (*cf.* x. 34, xxv. 25, Eph. iii. 18, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 181). —ὅτι . . . εἰσι . . . ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰ. ἦσαν in dependent clauses where English usage would employ a past tense and a pluperfect, N.T. usage employs a present and an imperfect "perceived that they *were* . . . that they *had been* . . .," Blass, and see Salmon on Blass's Commentary, *Hermathena*, xxi., p. 229.—ἄνθρωποι: Wendt sees in the addition something depreciatory.—ἀγράμματοι: lit., unlettered, *i.e.*, without acquaintance with the Rabbinic learning in τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (2 Tim. iii. 15), the Jewish Scriptures (lit., letters, hence γραμματεύς), *cf.* John vii. 15, Acts xxvi. 24, where the word is used without ἱερά, so that it cannot be confined to the sacred Scriptures of the O.T., and includes the Rabbinic training in their meaning and exposition. In classical Greek the word = "illiterati," joined by Plato with ὄρειος, ἄμουσος, see also Xen., *Mem.*, iv., 2, 20; by Plutarch it is set over against the μεμουσωμένος, and elsewhere joined with ἄγροικος, Trench, *N. T. Synonyms*, ii., p. 134, and Wetstein, *in loco*, *cf.* Athenæus, x., p. 454 B., βοτὴρ δ' ἐστὶν ἀγράμματος.—ἰδιῶται: the word properly signifies a private person (a man occupied with τὰ ἴδια), as opposed to any one who

μαζον, ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτοὺς ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν· 14. τὸν δὲ ἄνθρωπον βλέποντες σὺν αὐτοῖς ἑστῶτα τὸν τεθεραπευμένον, οὐδὲν

holds office in the State, but as the Greeks held that without political life there was no true education of a man, it was not unnatural that ἰδιώτης should acquire a somewhat contemptuous meaning, and so Plato joins it with ἀπράγμων, and Plutarch with ἄπρακτος and ἀπαίδευτος (and instances in Wetstein). But further: in Trench, *u. s.*, p. 136, and Grimm, *sub v.*, the ἰδιώτης is "a layman," as compared with the ἰατρός, "the skilled physician," Thuc. ii. 48, and the word is applied by Philo to the whole congregation of Israel as contrasted with the priests, and to subjects as contrasted with their prince, *cf.* its only use in the LXX, Prov. vi. 8 (*cf.* Herod., ii., 81, vii., 199, and instances in Wetstein on 1 Cor. xiv. 16). Bearing this in mind, it would seem that the word is used by St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 16, 23, 24) of believers devoid of special spiritual gifts, of prophecy or of speaking with tongues, and in the passage before us it is applied to those who, like the ἀγράμματοι, had been without professional training in the Rabbinical schools. The translation "ignorant" is somewhat unfortunate. ἰδιώτης certainly need not mean ignorant, *cf.* Plato, *Legg.*, 830, A., ἀνδρῶν σοφῶν ἰδιωτῶν τε καὶ συνετῶν. St. Paul uses the word of himself, ἰδιώτης ἐν λόγῳ, 2 Cor. xi. 6, in a way which helps us to understand its meaning here, for it may well have been used contemptuously of him (as here by the Sadducees of Peter and John) by the Judaisers, who despised him as "unlearned" and a "layman": he would not affect the Rabbinic subtleties and interpretations in which they boasted. Others take the word here as referring to the social rank of the Apostles, "plebeians" "common men" (Kuinoel, Olshausen, De Wette, Bengel, Hackett), but the word is not so used until Herodian, iv., 10, 4. See also Dean Plumptre's note on the transition of the word through the Vulgate *idiota* to our word "idiot": Tyndale and Cranmer both render "laymen".—ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε: if we take those words to imply that the Sanhedrim only recognised during the trial that Peter and John had been amongst the disciples of Jesus, there is something unnatural and forced about such an interpretation, especially when we remember that all Jerusalem was speaking of them, vv. 16, 21, and that one of them was personally known to the high priest (John xviii. 15). In Codex D (so β) an attempt is apparently made to meet this difficulty by reading τινες δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπεγίνωσκον αὐτούς. Others have pointed out that the same word is used in iii. 10 of the beggar who sat for alms, and that here, as there, ἐπεγίν. implies something more than mere recognition (see especially Lumby's note on the force of ἐπί); thus the revisers in both passages render "took knowledge of". But here as elsewhere Professor Ramsay throws fresh light upon the narrative, *St. Paul*, p. 371. And however we interpret the words, St. Chrysostom's comment does not lose its beauty: ἐπεγίν. τε . . . ἦσαν, *i.e.*, in His Passion, for only those were with Him at the time, and there indeed they had seen them humble, dejected—and this it was that most surprised them, the greatness of the change; *Hom.*, x.—The τε after ἐπεγίν., and its repetition at the commencement of ver. 14 (so R.V., W.H., Weiss), is very Lucan (see Ramsay's paraphrase above); for this closely connecting force of τε *cf.* Weiss's commentary, *passim.* With σύν κ.τ.λ. Weiss compares Luke viii. 38, xxii. 56.

Ver. 14. ἑστῶτα: standing, no longer a cripple, *firmo talo* (Bengel), and by his presence and attitude affording a testimony not to be gainsaid.—σὺν αὐτοῖς, *i.e.*, with the disciples. We are not told whether the man was a prisoner with the disciples, but just as the healed demoniac had sought to be with Jesus, so we may easily imagine that the restored cripple, in his gratitude and faith, would desire to be with his benefactors: "great was the boldness of the man that even in the judgment-hall he had not left them: for had they (*i.e.*, their opponents) said that the fact was not so, there was he to refute them," St. Chrysostom, *Hom.*, x. On St. Luke's fondness for the shorter form, ἑστώς not ἑστηκώς, both in Gospel and Acts, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 8.—οὐδὲν εἶχον ἀντ.: this meaning of ἔχω with the infinitive is quite classical; *cf.* the Latin *habeo dicere;* on St. Luke's fondness for phrases with εὑρίσκειν and ἔχειν see Friedrich, *u. s.*, pp. 11, 12.—ἀντειπεῖν: only used by St. Luke in the N.T., Luke xxi. 15. The miracle, as St. Chrysostom says, spoke no less forcibly than the Apostles themselves, but the word may be taken, as in the Gospel, of contradicting personal adversaries, *i.e.*,

εἶχον ἀντειπεῖν.[1] 15. κελεύσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξω τοῦ συνεδρίου ἀπελθεῖν, συνέβαλον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, 16. λέγοντες, Τί ποιήσομεν[2] τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις; ὅτι μὲν γὰρ γνωστὸν σημεῖον γέγονε δι' αὐτῶν, πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἱερουσαλὴμ φανερόν,[3] καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀρνήσασθαι· 17. ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖον διανεμηθῇ εἰς τὸν λαόν, ἀπειλῇ[4] ἀπειλησώμεθα αὐτοῖς μηκέτι λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ

[1] **αντειπειν**; D, Flor. insert before, **ποιησαι η**. D also omits last clause of ver. 13, and puts in altered form at end of ver. 14 **τινες δε εξ αυτων κ.τ.λ.** The **τινες δε** would follow naturally enough if we read with Flor. **ακουσαντες δε παντες** at the beginning of ver. 13; but see connection of passage in comment.

[2] **ποιησομεν** DP, Flor., Gig., Par., Vulg., Bas., Chrys., so Meyer and Hilg.; **ποιησωμεν** ℵABE, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, and so Blass in β.

[3] **φανερον**, D reads **φανερωτερον**, according to Blass (in **β** retained), for superl. defended by Belser and Hilg.

[4] **απειλη** om. ℵABD vers., Lucif., Bas., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Hilg.; but retained by EP, Syr. Harcl., Chrys., so by Meyer and Weiss (Wendt doubtful but on the whole against retention); *cf.* v. 28, Blass retains: "optime".

here, the Apostles, **so Weiss, and** *cf.* Rendall, *in loco*.

Ver. 15. **συνέβαλον πρὸς ἀλλήλους**, *sc.*, **λόγους**: only in St. Luke's writings, in different significations; *cf.* for the construction here, Eurip., *Iphig. Aul.*, 830, and Plutarch, *Mor.*, p. 222, C.—see on xvii. 18.

Ver. 16. **τί ποιήσομεν**: for the deliberative subjunctive, which should be read here, *cf.* ii. 37; it may express the utter perplexity of the Sanhedrists (so Rendall); in questions expressing doubt or deliberation, the subjunctive would be more usual in classical Greek than the future indicative, Blass, *u. s.*, p. 205.—**ὅτι μὲν**: **μέν** answered by **ἀλλά** in ver. 17 (omitted by D.), *cf.* Mark ix. 12, see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 168, and for other instances of **μέν** similarly used, see also Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 74, 75.—**γνωστὸν**, that which is a matter of knowledge as opposed to **δοξαστόν**, that which is matter of opinion (so in Plato). The word is characteristic of St. Luke, being used by him twice in the Gospel, ten times in Acts, and elsewhere in N.T. only three times (Friedrich).

Ver. 17. **ἐπὶ πλεῖον** may be taken as = *latius* (2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9) or = *diutius* (Acts xx. 9, xxiv. 4), but the context favours the former. The phrase is quite classical, and it occurs several times in LXX, *cf.* Wisdom viii. 12; 3 Macc. v. 18.—**διανεμηθῇ**: only here in N.T. but frequently used in classical writers in active and middle—to divide into portions, to distribute, to divide among themselves — here = lest it should spread abroad (or better perhaps in D (β)) It has been taken by some as if it had a parallel in **ὡς γάγγραινα νομὴν ἕξει**, 2 Tim. ii. 17, and expressed that the report of the Apostles' teaching and power might spread and feed like a cancer (see Bengel, Blass, Zöckler, Rendall), but although **νέμω** in the middle voice (and possibly **ἐπινέμω**) could be so used, it is very doubtful how far **διανέμω** could be so applied. At the same time we may note that **διανέμω** is a word frequently used in medical writers, Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, pp. 196, 197, and that it, with the two other great medical words of similar import, **διασπείρειν** and **ἀναδιδόναι**, is peculiar to St. Luke. In the LXX **διανέμω** is only found once, Deut. xxix. 26 (25), in its classical sense as a translation of the Hebrew חָלַק.—**ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλησώμεθα**: if we retain the reading in T.R., the phrase is a common Hebraism, *cf.* v. 28, xxiii. 14, ii. 17, 30, Luke xxii. 15, *cf.* John vi. 29, James v. 7, and from the LXX, Matt. xiii. 14, xv. 4. The form of the Hebrew formula giving the notion of intenseness is rendered in A.V. by "straitly," as by the revisers (who omit **ἀπειλῇ** here) in v. 28. Similar expressions are common in the LXX, and also in the Apocrypha, *cf.* Ecclus. xlviii. 11, Judith vi. 4, and occasionally a similar formula is found in Greek authors, see especially Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 83, and Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 116, 117.—

μηδενὶ ἀνθρώπων. 18.[1] καὶ καλέσαντες αὐτούς, παρήγγειλαν αὐτοῖς τὸ καθόλου μὴ φθέγγεσθαι μηδὲ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 19. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀποκριθέντες πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπον, Εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑμῶν ἀκούειν μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κρίνατε. 20. οὐ δυνάμεθα γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἃ[2] εἴδομεν καὶ ἠκούσαμεν μὴ

[1] At begin. of ver. D, Flor., Syr. Harcl. mg., Lucif., Hilg. add **συγκατατιθεμενων δε αυτων τη γνωμη**. Belser sees here the hand of Luke who omitted the clause in revision, as he thinks no one could have added it (so **τα ρηματα αυτων** after λαον in ver. 17, see β); but, on the other hand, Weiss, Codex D, p. 61. **καλεσαντες**, D has **φωνησαντες**. **αυτοις** om. ℵABDE 13, Vulg., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss; so **το** before **καθολου** ℵ*B, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt.

[2] **ειδομεν** B³EP, Chrys., Cyr.; **ειδαμεν** ℵAB*D 4, Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg.; see W.H., *App.*, p. 171 (so for **ειπαν** above), Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112.

ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι: on the name, *i.e.*, resting on, or with reference to, this name, as the basis of their teaching, Winer-Moulton, xlviii. c., *cf.* v. 28, and Luke xxiv. 47, ix. 48, xxi. 8. The phrase has thus a force of its own, although it is apparently interchangeable with **ἐν**, ver. 10 (Simcox, see also Blass, *in loco*); Rendall takes it = "about the name of Jesus," **ἐπί** being used as often with verbs of speech.—**τούτῳ**: "quem nominare nolunt, v. 28, vid. tamen 18," Blass; (on the hatred of the Jews against the name of Jesus and their periphrastic titles for him, *e.g.*, *otho ha'ish*, "that man," "so and so," see "Jesus Christ in the Talmud," H. Laible, pp. 32, 33 (Streane)).

Ver. 18. **καθόλου**: only here in N.T. The word which had been very common since Aristotle (previously **καθ' ὅλου**) is quite classical in the sense in which it is used here, and it is also found a few times in the LXX (see Hatch and Redpath for instances of its use without and with the art., as here in T.R.). It is frequently used by medical writers, Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 197.—**μὴ φθέγγεσθαι**: "not to utter a word," so Rendall, *ne muttire quidem* (Blass). The word seems to indicate more than that the disciples should not speak, "ne hiscerent aut ullam vocem ederent," Erasmus. In contrast to **διδάσκειν** we might well refer it to the utterance of the name of Jesus in their miracles, as in iii. 6; only found twice elsewhere in N.T., and both times in 2 Peter, ii. 16, 18, but its use is quite classical, and it is also found several times in LXX.

Ver. 19. Parallel sayings may be quoted from Greeks and Romans, and from Jewish sources, see instances in Wetstein, *cf.* Plato, *Apol.*, 29, D., the famous words of Socrates: **πεισόμεθα τῷ θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ὑμῖν**, and Livy, xxxix., 37; Jos., *Ant.*, xvii., 6, 3; xviii. 8, 2; on **ἐνώπιον** see ver. 10; **ἀκούειν = πειθαρχεῖν**, v. 29, and *cf.* iii. 22, Luke x. 16, xvi. 31; **μᾶλλον** = *potius*, *cf.* Rom. xiv. 13, 1 Cor. vii. 21.—**κρίνατε**: this appeal to the Sadducees could only be justified on the ground that the Apostles were sure of the validity of their own appeal to a higher tribunal. No man could lay down the principle of obedience to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether to the king or to governors, more plainly than St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 13, *cf.* Rom. xiii. 1), and he and his fellow-disciples might have exposed themselves to the charge of fanaticism or obstinacy, if they could only say **οὐ δυν. . . . μὴ λαλεῖν**; but they could add **ἃ εἴδομεν καὶ ἠκούσ.**, *cf.* Acts i. 8. The same appeal is made by St. John, both in his Gospel (i. 14) and in his First Epistle (i. 1, 2), in vindication of his teaching; and here the final answer is that of St. John and St. Peter jointly.

Ver. 20. **οὐ . . . μὴ**: on the two negatives forming an affirmative *cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 15; Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 220 (1893). Winer-Moulton, lv., 9, compares Aristoph., *Ran.*, 42; see also Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 184.

Ver. 21. **προσαπειλησάμενοι**: "when they had further threatened them" R.V., or the word may mean "*added* threats to their warning" ver. 18 ("prius enim tantum præceperunt," Erasmus). So Wendt as against Meyer; *cf.* in LXX, Ecclus. xiii. 3, S., and Dem., p. 544, 26.—**ἀπέλυσαν**: "dimiserunt [iii. 13] non absolverunt," Blass; see St. Chrysostom's striking contrast between the boldness of the Apostles and the fear of their judges (*Hom.*, xi.).—

λαλεῖν. 21. οἱ δὲ προσαπειλησάμενοι ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς,[1] μηδὲν εὑρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται αὐτούς, διὰ τὸν λαόν, ὅτι πάντες ἐδόξαζον τὸν Θεὸν ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι. 22. ἐτῶν γὰρ ἦν πλειόνων τεσσαράκοντα[2] ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐφ' ὃν ἐγεγόνει τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο τῆς ἰάσεως.

23. Ἀπολυθέντες δὲ ἦλθον πρὸς τοὺς ἰδίους, καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν ὅσα πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι εἶπον. 24. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες,[3] ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἦραν φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἶπον,

[1] D seems to read **μη ευρισκοντες αιτιαν**, so Hilg., see Harris (p. 90).

[2] **τεσσαρ.**, see on i. 3.

[3] After **ακουσαντες** D adds **και επιγνοντες την του θεου ενεργειαν**, so Hilg.—Belser and Zöckler hold that the clause cannot be a later addition, but Weiss objects that no reference is found to the words in ver. 29 which follows. **επιγινωσκω** is used more frequently by St. Luke than by the other Evangelists, but **ενεργεια** is entirely confined to St. Paul in the N.T.

τὸ πῶς: finding nothing, namely (**τὸ**), how they might, etc.; this use of the article is quite classical, drawing attention to the proposition introduced by it and making of it a compound substantive expressing one idea, most commonly with an interrogation; it is used by St. Luke and St. Paul, and both in St. Luke's Gospel and in the Acts, *cf.* Luke i. 62, ix. 46, xix. 48, xxii. 2, 4, 23, 24, Acts xxii. 30, Rom. viii. 26, 1 Thess. iv. 1, *cf.* Mark ix. 23. So here the Sanhedrists are represented as asking themselves **τὸ πῶς κολ.** (Friedrich and Lekebusch both draw attention to this characteristic of St. Luke's writings). See Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, pp. 67, 68 (1893). **κολ.** only here and in 2 Pet. ii. 9 in N.T.; *cf.* 3 Macc. vii. 3, where it is also used in middle, expressing to cause to be punished, *cf.* 1 Macc. vii. 7, AS.—**διὰ τὸν λαόν** belongs not to **ἀπέλυσαν**, but rather to **μὴ εὑρίσκ. κ.τ.λ.**—**ἐδόξαζον**: see on ii. 46; *cf.* Luke ii. 20, 2 Cor. ix. 13, for the construction; the verb never has in Biblical Gr. mere classical meaning of *to think*, *suppose*, *entertain an opinion* (but *cf.* Polyb., vi., 53, 10; **δεδοξασμένοι ἐπ' ἀρετῇ**); in the LXX very frequently of glory ascribed to God, see Plummer's note on Luke ii. 20.

Ver. 22. Characteristic of St. Luke to note the age, as in the case of Æneas, ix. 33, and of the cripple at Lystra, xiv. 8, *cf.* also Luke viii. 42 (although Mark also here notes the same fact), xiii. 11. The genitive with **εἶναι** or **γίγνεσθαι**, instead of the accusative, in reference to the question of age, is noted by Friedrich as characteristic of St. Luke; *cf.* Luke ii. 42 (iii. 23), viii. 42, and here; but *cf.* Mark v. 42.—**ἐγεγόνει**: in this episode "with its lights and shades" Overbeck (so Baur) can only see the idealising work of myth and legend, but it is difficult to understand how a narrative which purports to describe the first conflict between the Church and the Sanhedrim could be free from such contrasts, and that some collision with the authorities took place is admitted to be quite conceivable (Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i., 46, E.T.); we should rather say that St. Luke's power as an historian is nowhere more visible than in the dramatic form of this narrative (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, *u. s.*).

Ver. 23. **τοὺς ἰδίους**: not necessarily limited to their fellow-Apostles (so Meyer, Blass, Weiss), but as including the members of the Christian community (so Overbeck, Wendt, Hilgenfeld, Zöckler), *cf.* xxiv. 23, John xiii. 1, 1 Tim. v. 8, and also of one's fellow-countrymen, associates, John i. 11, 2 Macc. xii. 22.

Ver. 24. **ὁμοθυμαδὸν**, see above on i. 14. The word must not be pressed to mean that they all simultaneously gave utterance to the same words, or that they were able to do so, because they were repeating a familiar Hymn; it may mean that the Hymn was uttered by one of the leaders, by St. Peter, or St. James (Zöckler), and answered by the responsive Amen of the rest, or that the words were caught up by the multitude of believers as they were uttered by an inspired Apostle (so Felten, Rendall).—**ἦραν φωνήν**: the same phrase is used in Luke xvii. 13, so in Acts ii. 14, xiv. 11,

Δέσποτα, σὺ[1] ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, 25.[2] ὁ διὰ στόματος Δαβὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου εἰπών, "Ἵνα τί ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη, καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν.

[1] **ο Θεος** DEP, Gig., Par., verss., Irint., Luc., so Meyer, so Hilg.; but om. ℵBA, best MS. of Vulg., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (who refers the construction of the words to Isaiah xxxvii. 16).

[2] **ο δια στοματος Δαβιδ του παιδος σου ειπων** P 1, 31, Chrys., so Meyer; but **του** omitted by ℵABDEP. **ο του πατρος ημων δια πνευματος αγιου στοματος Δαυειδ παιδος σου ειπων**, so ℵABE 13, 15, 27, 29, 36, 38; so Lach., Treg., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Alford. **ο δια πν. αγ. δια στομ., του πατρος ημων Δ.**, so Vulg., Iren., apparently for improvement in order. D reads **δια πν. αγ. δια του στοματος λαλησας Δ.**, omit. **του πατρος ημων**; so apparently Syr. Pesch., Boh. P, Hil., and Aug. omit **πνευματος αγιου**—Syr. Harcl., Arm. place **δια πν. αγ.** after **παιδος σου**; so Par. Blass in β omits **του πατρος ημων** and brackets **πν. αγ.**, practically agreeing with T.R. (see also *Acta Apost.*, p. 77). W.H. mention the extreme difficulty of the text and hold that it contains a primitive error (so also Holtzmann), and each makes an attempt at solution, App., *Select Readings*, p. 92. Felten follows the solution offered by Westcott. Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 39, 40 (1893), speaks of **πνευματος αγιου** as perfectly senseless (so too Zöckler, who follows T.R.) and regards the expression as an old gloss for **στομα Δ.**, but which afterwards came into the text with the latter words; or some scribe, as he thinks, may have introduced **δια πν. αγ.** expected by him from i. 2, 16 (see also Blass, *in loco*), and then continued the text lying before him. Weiss therefore follows P although it omits **του πατρος ημων**, which Weiss retains and reads **ο του πατρος ημων δια στομ. Δ. παιδος σου ειπων.** Wendt and Alford maintain that the more complicated readings could scarcely have arisen through additions to the simpler text of T.R. and that the contrary is more probable.

xxii. 22, **ἐπαίρειν**, and also in Luke xi. 27. Both phrases are peculiar to St. Luke, but both are found in the LXX, and both are classical (Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 29, and Plummer on Luke xi. 27).—**Δέσποτα κ.τ.λ.**: the words form the earliest known Psalm of Thanksgiving in the Christian Church. In its tenor the Hymn may be compared with Hezekiah's Prayer against the threats of Assyria, Isa. xxxvii. 16, 20. It begins like many of the Psalms (xviii., xix., liii.) with praising God as the Creator, a thought which finds fitting expression here as marking the utter impotence of worldly power to withstand Him. The word **Δέσποτα**, thus used in the vocative in addressing God here and in Luke ii. 29 only (found nowhere else in Gospels, although several times in the Epistles), expresses the absolute control of a Master over a slave, *cf.* also Luke ii. 29, where **τὸν δοῦλόν σου** answers to it, as here **τοῖς δούλοις** in ver. 29. It also expresses here as often in the LXX the sovereignty of God over creation, *cf.* Job v. 8, Wisdom vi. 7, Judith ix. 12. So Jos., *Ant.*, iv., 3, 2, puts it into the mouth of Moses. It is very rarely used in the N.T. as a name of God or of Christ, but *cf.* Rev. vi. 10 of God, and 2 Pet. ii. 1 of Christ (where the metaphor of the master and slave is retained), and see Jude ver. 4, R.V. (although the name may refer to God); and so in writings ascribed to men who may well have been present, and have taken part in the Hymn. The word is also used of the gods in classical Greek; but the Maker of heaven and earth was no "despot," although His rule was absolute, for His power was never dissociated from wisdom and love, *cf.* Wisdom xi. 26, **Δέσποτα φιλόψυχε.** On the use of the word in *Didache*, x., 3, in prayer to God, see Biggs' note.

Ver. 25. The words form an exact quotation from the LXX (Psalm ii. 1). **ἵνα τί**, again in quotation, vii., 26; *cf.* Luke xiii. 7, 1 Cor. x. 29; twice in Matt. ix. 4, xxvii. 46, quotation; W.H., Blass (Weiss, **ἱνατί**), *sc.*, **γένηται**, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 14, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 36.—**ἐφρύαξαν**: in the active form the verb occurs once in LXX, *viz.*, in this passage, as a translation of רָגַשׁ, **φρυάσσομαι**, primarily of the snorting and neighing of a high-spirited horse, then of the haughtiness and insolence of men; twice it is used as a dep. in LXX, 2 Macc. vii. 34, R.; iii. 2,

κενά; 26. παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ." 27. συνήχθησαν γὰρ[1] ἐπ' ἀληθείας ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου, Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ἔχρισας, Ἡρώδης τε καὶ Πόντιος[2] Πιλάτος, σὺν ἔθνεσι καὶ λαοῖς

[1] **επ' αληθειας**; ℵABDE, Vulg., Syr. P. H., verss., Eus., Ir., Tert.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. add **εν τῃ πολει ταυτῃ** (wanting in the Psalm).

[2] **Πιλατος**; but B* **Πειλατος**, so Tisch., W.H.; see on iii. 13.

2, and so in profane writers.—**ἔθνη**, *i.e.*, the Gentiles, see on ver. 27. **λαός** might be used, and is used of any people, but it is used in Biblical Greek specially of the chosen people of God, *cf.* Luke ii. 32, Acts xxvi. 17, 23, Rom. xv. 10, and it is significant that the word is transferred to the Christian community, which was thus regarded as taking the place of the Jewish theocracy, Acts xv. 14, xviii. 10, Rom. ix. 25, 1 Peter ii. 10; Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 11, 12, Grimm, *sub v.*, **λαός**; so too in the LXX, **ἔθνος** in the plural is used in an overwhelming number of instances of other nations besides Israel, *cf.* Psalm lvi. (lvii.) 9, Zech. i. 15; in N.T., **ἔθνη** = pagans, Rom. iii. 29, and Roman Christians, Rom. xv. 27, *cf. populus*, the Roman people, as opposed to *gentes*, Lucan, *Phars.*, i., 82, 83 (Page); Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 98.

Ver. 26. **παρέστησαν**: not necessarily of hostile intent, although here the context indicates it; R.V., "set themselves in array," lit. "presented themselves," an exact rendering of the Hebrew יִתְיַצְּבוּ, which sometimes implies rising up against as here, Psalm ii. 2, and *cf.* 2 Sam. xviii. 13 (R.V. margin). Of the generally accepted Messianic interpretation of the Psalm, and of the verses here quoted, there can be no doubt, *cf.* Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 716 (appendix on Messianic passages), and Wetstein, *in loco*. The Psalm is regarded as full of Messianic references (Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 132-140, and 492, 493), *cf.*, *e.g.*, the comment on this verse of the Psalm in the *Mechilta* (quoted in the *Yalkut Shimeoni*, ii., f. 90, 1 Sch. p. 227), Perowne, *Psalms* (small edition), p. 16; and Edersheim, *u. s.* The Psalm carries us back to the great Davidic promise in 2 Sam. vii. 11-16, and it reflects the Messianic hopes of the Davidic period. That hope the N.T. writers who quote this Psalm very frequently or refer to it, *cf.* xiii. 33, Heb. i. 5, v. 5, see *fulfilled* in Christ, the antitype of David and of Solomon. Thus the gathering together of the nations and their fruitless decrees find their counterpart in the alliance of Herod and Pilate, and the hostile combination of Jew and Gentile against the holy Servant Jesus, the anointed of God, and against His followers; although the words of the Psalm and the issues of the conflict carry on our thoughts to a still wider and deeper fulfilment in the final triumph of Christ's kingdom, *cf.* the frequent recurrence of the language of the Psalm in Rev. xii. 5, xix. 15, and *cf.* i. 5, ii. 26, 27.

Ver. 27. **γάρ**: confirms the truth of the preceding prophecy, by pointing to its historical fulfilment, and does not simply give a reason for addressing God as **ὁ εἰπών**—to emphasise this fulfilment **συνήχ.** is again quoted, and placed first in the sentence.—**ἐπ' ἀληθείας**, of a truth, *i.e.*, assuredly, Luke iv. 25, xx. 21, xxii. 59, Acts x. 34; so too in LXX, Job ix. 2, and also in classical Greek. The phrase is characteristic of St. Luke, and is only used elsewhere in N.T. in Mark xii. 14, 32, the usual expression being **ἐν ἀληθείᾳ**, never used by St. Luke (Friedrich).—**παῖδα**, see on iii. 13. —**ὃν ἔχρισας**: showing that Jesus = **τοῦ Χριστοῦ** named in the quotation just made, *cf.* Luke iv. 18, and Isa. lxi. 1 and Acts x. 38. Nösgen compares also John x. 36, and refuses to limit the reference to iii. 21. The words may no doubt be referred to the Baptism, but they need not be confined to that.—**Ἡρῴδης** = **βασιλεῖς** of the Psalm, **Π. Πειλᾶτος** = **ἄρχοντες**, but Nösgen, referring to iii. 17, regards the **ἀρχ.** as included in the **λαοί**. **Ἡρ.** instead of **Ἡρωίδης**, Blass, *in loco*, and *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 7, 8, the iota subscript W.H. thus accounted for; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 41.—**ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰ.**: the first word = the centurion and soldiers, those who carried out the orders of Pilate; **λαοί** the plural (quoted from the Psalm) does not refer with Calvin to the different nationalities out of which the Jews

Ἰσραήλ, 28. ποιῆσαι ὅσα ἡ χείρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλή σου[1] προώρισε γενέσθαι. 29. καὶ τὰ νῦν, Κύριε, ἔπιδε ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπειλὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ δὸς τοῖς δούλοις σου μετὰ παῤῥησίας πάσης λαλεῖν τὸν λόγον σου, 30. ἐν τῷ τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐκτείνειν σε εἰς ἴασιν, καὶ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ.

[1] σου omit A*B, Arm., Lucif. (Cod. Am. of Vulg.), so W.H., Weiss, Wendt; retained by ℵAaDEP, Vulg., vers., Irint., so Tisch. Here, as commonly, Tisch. follows ℵ, W.H., B—and difficult, as often, to decide; insertion appears more obvious than omission.

who came up to the Feast were gathered, but possibly to the tribes of Israel, Grimm-Thayer, *sub*, λαός, like עַמִּים, Gen. xlix. 10, Deut. xxxii. 8, Isa. iii. 13, etc., R.V., "the peoples of Israel". St. Luke's Gospel alone gives us the narrative of Herod's share in the proceedings connected with the Passion, xxiii. 8-12; see Plumptre, *in loco*, and Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 54, 55.

Ver. 28. ποιῆσαι, infinitive of purpose, see on iii. 2; but even this purpose was overruled by God to the accomplishment of His will, *cf.* Luke xxii. 22, xxiv. 26, συνῆλθον μὲν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι ὡς ἐχθροὶ . . . ἐποίουν δὲ ἃ σὺ ἐβούλου, Oecum.—ἡ χείρ σου, a common expression to signify the controlling power of God, *cf.* in the N.T. (peculiar to St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts) the phrases χεὶρ Κυρίου, Luke i. 66, Acts xi. 21, xiii. 11.—ἡ βουλὴ: only used by St. Luke, *cf.* Luke vii. 30, Acts ii. 23, xiii. 36, xx. 27.—προώρισε: only in St. Luke and St. Paul, but never in LXX or Apocrypha, Rom. viii. 29, 30, 1 Cor. ii. 7, Ephes. i. 5, 11, but the thought which it contains is in striking harmony with St. Peter's words elsewhere; *cf.* ii. 23, x. 42, and 1 Pet. i. 2, 20, ii. 4-6—see above on Peter's speeches—*cf.* Ignat., *Ephes.*, tit.—ἡ χείρ connected with β. by Zeugma, since only βουλή directly suits the verb; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 2, and Luke i. 64. (The two verses (27, 28) are referred by Hilgenfeld to the "author to Theophilus". In his view there is a want of fitness in introducing into the Church's prayer the words of the Psalm, and their reference to the closing scenes of the life of Jesus; he thinks with Weiss that in the αὐτῶν of ver. 29 there is quite sufficient reference to the words of the Psalm.)

Ver. 29. τὰ νῦν (*cf.* iii. 17) only used in the Acts v. 38, xvii. 30, xx. 32, xxvii. 22, but frequently found in classical writers (Wetstein), *cf.* also 1 Macc. vii. 35, ix. 9; 2 Macc. xv. 8, Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 53. As elsewhere St. Peter's words have a practical bearing and issue, ii. 16, iii. 12 (Felten).—ἔπιδε: only used here and in Luke i. 25, and both times of God; so in Homer, of the gods regarding the affairs of men (and so too in Dem. and Herod.), *cf.* the use of the simple verb ἰδεῖν in Gen. xxii. 14, and also of ἐπιδεῖν in Gen. xvi. 13, 1 Chron. xvii. 17, Ps. xxx. (xxxi. 7), 2 Macc. i. 27, and viii. 2.—τὸν λόγον σου: a characteristic phrase in St. Luke, *cf.* his use of ὁ λόγ. τοῦ Θεοῦ, ver. 31, four times in his Gospel, and twelve times in Acts, as against the use of it once in St. Mark, St. John and St. Matthew, xv. 6 (W.H.). The phrase is of frequent occurrence in St. Paul's Epistles, and it is found several times in the Apocalypse.—μετὰ παρρησίας, see above on iv. 13. There is an antithesis in the Greek words, for boldness of speech was usually the privilege, not of slaves, but of freemen—but it is the duty of those who are in the service of Christ (Humphry, *Acts*, *in loco*).

Ver. 30. ἐν τῷ κ.τ.λ., iii. 26: a Hebraistic formula; for similar expressions used of God *cf.* Exodus vii. 5, Jeremiah xv. 6, Ezek. vi. 14, etc., most frequently in the act of punishment; but here the context shows that it is for healing, Luke v. 13, vi. 10; "while thou stretchest forth thine hand"—the construction is very frequent in Luke and the Acts, see Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 162, and Friedrich, p. 37. Commenting on the prayer, St. Chrysostom writes: "Observe they do not say 'crush them, cast them down,' . . . let us also learn thus to pray. And yet how full of wrath one would be when fallen upon by men intent upon killing him, and making threats to that effect! how full of animosity! but not so these saints."—γίγνεσθαι: A. and R.V. make γιγ. to depend upon δός, but better to regard it

31. Καὶ δεηθέντων αὐτῶν ἐσαλεύθη ὁ τόπος ἐν ᾧ ἦσαν συνηγμένοι, καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ μετὰ παῤῥησίας.[1]

[1] At end of ver. D (E, Ir., Aug.) adds **παντι τω θελοντι πιστευειν** (last word omitted by Aug.); so Hilg. Chase points out that Syriac often inserts "will" when nothing corresponding in Greek, but see Harris on a primitive Latin redaction, *Four Lectures, etc.*, pp. 89, 90.

as infinitive of purpose, subordinate to **ἐν τῷ κ.τ.λ.** (see Wendt and Page). Weiss regards from **καὶ σημ.** to **γιγ.** as the reviser's insertion.—**εἰς ἴασιν**: St. Luke alone employs the good medical word **ἴασις**, see ver. 22, and Luke xiii. 32, so whilst **ἰᾶσθαι** is used only three or four times by St. Matthew, two or three times by St. John, and once by St. Mark, it is used by St. Luke eleven times in his Gospel, and three or four times in the Acts. The significant use of this strictly medical term, and of the verb **ἰᾶσθαι** in St. Luke's writings, comes out by comparing Matt. xiv. 36, Mark vi. 56, and Luke vi. 19, see Hobart. **ἴασιν—Ἰησοῦ**, paronomasia; Wordsworth. In this ver., 30, Spitta, agreeing with Weiss as against Feine, traced another addition in the reviser's hand through the influence of source B, in which the Apostles appear, not as preachers of the Gospel, but as performers of miraculous deeds.

Ver. 31. **δεηθέντων**, *cf.* xvi. 26, where a similar answer is given to the prayer of Paul and Silas: the verb is characteristic of St. Luke and St. Paul, and is only used by these two writers with the exception of one passage, Matt ix. 38; in St. Luke's Gospel it is found eight times, and in Acts seven times, and often of requests addressed to God as here, *cf.* x. 2, viii. 24, Luke x. 2, xxi. 36, xxii. 32, 1 Thess. iii. 10. See on **αἰτέω**, Grimm-Thayer (Synonyms). This frequent reference to prayer is characteristic of St. Luke both in his Gospel and the Acts, *cf.* Acts i. 14, ii. 42, iv. 31, vi. 4, x. 2, xiii. 3, xiv. 23, xvi. 13, 25, xxviii. 8; Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 59, 60.—**ἐσαλεύθη**, xvi. 26; Luke (vi. 38, 48, vii. 24) xxi. 26; Heb. xii. 26, 27; in the O.T. we have similar manifestations of the divine Presence, *cf.* Ps. cxiv. 7, Amos ix. 5, where the same word is used; *cf.* also Isa. vi. 4, Hag. ii. 6, Joel iii. 16, Ezek. xxxviii. 19. For instance of an earthquake regarded as a token of the presence of a deity, see Wetstein, *in loco;* Virgil, *Æneid*, iii., 90; Ovid, *Met.*, xv., 672, and so amongst the Rabbis, Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.*, *in loco*. In the Acts it is plainly regarded as no chance occurrence, and with regard to the rationalistic hypothesis that it was merely a natural event, accidentally coinciding with the conclusion of the prayer, Zeller admits that there is every probability against the truth of any such hypothesis; rather may we see in it with St. Chrysostom a direct answer to the appeal to the God in whose hands were the heaven and the earth (*cf.* Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, iii., 12, 5). "The place was shaken, and that made them all the more unshaken" (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius).—**συνηγμένοι**, "were gathered," so in ver. 27; the aorist in the former verse referring to an act, but here the perfect to a state, but impossible to distinguish in translation, Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 45. That the shaking is regarded as miraculous is admitted by Weiss, who sees in it the reviser's hand introducing a miraculous result of the prayer of the Church, in place of the natural result of strengthened faith and popular favour.—**καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν**, ver. 8. So here the Holy Ghost inspired them all with courage: He came *comfortari*, to strengthen; they had prayed that they might speak the word **μετὰ παρρ.** and their prayer was heard and fulfilled to the letter (ver. 31) as Luke describes "with simple skill".—**ἐλάλουν**: mark the force of the imperfect. **ἐπλησθ.** (aorist), the prayer was immediately answered by their being filled with the Holy Ghost, and they proceeded to speak, the imperfect also implying that they continued to speak (Rendall); there is no need to see any reference to the speaking with tongues. Feine sees in the narrative a divine answer to the Apostles' prayer, so that filled with the Holy Ghost they spoke with boldness. And he adds, that such divine power must have been actually working in the Apostles, otherwise the growth of the Church in spite of its opposition is inexplicable—a remark which might well be considered by the deniers of a miraculous Christianity. It is in reality the same

32. ΤΟΥ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων ἦν ἡ καρδία καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία[1]· καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα κοινά. 33. καὶ μεγάλῃ δυνάμει ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, χάρις

[1] After **μια** DE, Cypr., Amb., Zeno. insert **και ουκ ην διακρισις** (**χωρισμος**, E) **εν αυτοις ουδεμια** (**τις**, E); so Hilg. Belser (so too Zöckler) again sees an original reading which, beautiful as it is, was sacrificed to brevity; but Weiss objects that the words are no explanation of the preceding words, which point, as the context shows, to a fulness of love rather than to the mere absence of division. But it is possible that the words may at first have been written in close connection with what follows as a fuller picture of the **ψυχη μια** and afterwards abbreviated. Chase suggests Syriac—assim. to John ix. 16, where Greek has **σχισμα**—see further on this and other points in connection with parallel passage in ii. 44 ff., Harris, *Four Lectures, etc.*, pp. 57, 85.

argument so forcibly put by St. Chrysostom: "If you deny miracles, you make it all the more marvellous that they should obtain such moral victories—these illiterate men!" Jüngst refers the whole verse to a redactor, recording that there was no one present with reference to whom the **παρρησία** could be employed. But the distinction between the aorist **ἐπλήσ.** and the imperfect **ἐλάλουν** shows that not only the immediate but the continuous action of the disciples is denoted.

Ver. 32. **δέ** marks no contrast between the multitude and the Apostles; it introduces a general statement of the life of the whole Christian community, *cf.* xv. 12, 30. On St. Luke's frequent use of words expressing fulness, see iv. 32. Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 59 (1897), points out that in the inscriptions **πλῆθος** with a genitive has a technical significance, not only in official political life, but also in that of religious communities, *cf.* Luke i. 10, xix. 37, Acts ii. 6, but especially xv. 30; so too iv. 32, vi. 2, 5, xv. 12, xix. 9, xxi. 22, where the word = not *Menge* or *Masse*, but *Gemeinde*.—**καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία**: it is difficult to distinguish precisely between the two words, but they undoubtedly imply entire harmony in affection and thought according to a common Hebrew mode of expression; *cf.* passages in the LXX in which both **ψυχή** and **καρδία** occur as here with **μία**, 1 Chron. xii. 38, 2 Chron. xxx. 12 (Wetstein); but in each passage the Hebrew word is the same, לֵב, and it would include not only affection and emotion, but also understanding, intelligence, thought; *cf.* Phil. i. 27, ii. 2, 20. "Behold heart and soul are what make the together!" Chrys. **δύο φίλοι, ψυχὴ μία**, Plutarch, *cf.* instances in Blass, *in loco*, from Aristotle and Cicero. Grotius comments "erant ut Hebræi loquuntur כְּאִישׁ אֶחָד".—**καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς**, "and not one of them said," R.V., *i.e.*, not one among so many; *cf.* John i. 3. **οὐδὲ ἕν**, "not even one thing"; *cf.* Rom. iii. 10; see above on ii. 45 and J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, *in loco*. On the difference between the classical and N.T. use of the infinitive after verbs of declaring, see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, pp. 51, 52, 153, 155 (1896); except in Luke and Paul the infinitive tends to disappear, whilst these two writers retain the more literary usage.

Ver. 33. **ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον**, "gave the Apostles their witness," R.V. See ver. 12. **τὸ μαρτ.**, prop., "res quæ testimonio est," but sometimes in N.T. pro **μαρτυρία** (Blass). **ἀπεδ.**, however, implies paying or rendering what is due; it suggests that there is a claim in response to which something is given (Westcott on Heb. xiii. 11); *cf.* Matt. xii. 36, Luke xii. 59, xvi. 2, xx. 25, Rom. xiii. 7, 1 Cor. vii. 3, etc. This was its first and strict significance in classical Greek, *cf.* also its use in LXX, frequently. The Apostles therefore bear their witness as a duty to which they were pledged, *cf.* i. 8, 22, iv. 20; **καὶ ὡς περὶ ὀφλήματος λέγει αὐτό**, Oecum.—**δυνάμει μεγάλῃ**: the words may include miraculous powers, as well as stedfast witness. But the **τε** must not, as Weiss maintains, be so taken as to indicate that **χάρις μεγάλη** was the result, as in ii. 47. For if we regard **χάρις** as referring to the favour of the people (as in the former narrative in ii.), the **γάρ** in ver. 34 seems to point to the love and liberality of the Christians as its cause. But many commentators prefer to take **χάρις** as in vi. 8 (and as in Luke ii. 40, Hilgenfeld), of the grace of God, since here as there it is used absolutely, and ver. 34 would thus be a proof of the efficacy of this grace, *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 14.

τε μεγάλη ἦν ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς. 34. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ὑπῆρχεν[1] ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, πωλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων, 35. καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων· διεδίδοτο[2] δὲ ἑκάστῳ καθότι ἄν τις χρείαν εἶχεν.

[1] τις υπηρχεν DEP, Chrys.; τις ην ℵAF² 15, 69, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss; ην τις B. D reads οσοι κτητορες ησαν οικ. η χωρ. υπηρχον πωλουντες και φεροντες combination, so Hilg.; Harris thinks *erant* Lat. brought in ησαν out of place, while Chase refers to fusion of true Greek text with Syr. trans. Whatever theory we adopt it seems that both ησαν and υπηρχον got into the text, and that alteration was made so as to include them both. Blass's theory seems difficult to accept although St. Luke, with whom υπαρχειν is such a favourite word, might conceivably have written υπηρχον πωλοντες και φεροντες in a rough draft.

[2] διεδιδοτο B³P; διεδιδετο ℵAB¹DE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 121; Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 48; Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 159.

χάρις, as Bengel maintains, may include grace, favour with God and man, as in our Lord Himself, *Gratia Dei et favor populi*.

Ver. 34. **οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής**: *cf.* Deut. xv. 4, where the same adjective occurs; *cf.* xv. 7, 11, xxiv. 14, Isa. xli. 17. No contradiction with vi. 1, as Holtzmann supposes; here there is no ideal immunity from poverty and want, but distribution was made as each fitting case presented itself: "their feeling was just as if they were under the paternal roof, all for a while sharing alike," Chrys., *Hom.*, xi.—**ὅσοι γὰρ . . . ὑπῆρχον**, "non dicitur: omnes hoc fecerunt [aorist] ut jam nemo vel fundum vel domum propriam haberet, sed: vulgo [saepe] hoc fiebat [imperfect] ad supplendum fiscum communem pauperibus destinatum; itaque nunquam deerat quod daretur," Blass, *in loco*, *cf.* remarks on ii. 47.—**τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων**, "the prices of the things which were being sold". The language shows that we are not meant to infer that the men sold all that they had (*cf.* Wetstein, especially Appian, *B. Civ.*, v., p. 1088, τιμὰς τῶν ἔτι πιπρασκ.). πωλοῦντες et πιπρασκ. both imperfect (Blass), and see also Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 58.—**κτήτορες** in N.T. only here, rarely elsewhere, see instances in Wetstein; not in LXX, but *cf.* Symmachus, Joel i. 11.

Ver. 35. The statement marks, it is true, an advance upon the former narrative, ii. 44, but one which was perfectly natural and intelligible. Here for the first time we read that the money is brought and laid at the Apostles' feet. As the community grew, the responsibilities of distribution increased, and to whom could the administration of the common fund be more fittingly committed than to the Apostles? The narrative indicates that this commital of trust was voluntary on the part of the Ecclesia, although it was marked by an act of reverence for the Apostles' authority. The fact that Barnabas is expressly mentioned as laying the value of his field at the Apostles' feet, may be an indication that the other members of the community were acting upon his suggestion; if so, it would be in accordance with what we know of his character and forethought, *cf.* ix. 27, xi. 22-24, Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 47, 48. There is no reason to reject this narrative as a mere repetition of ii. 44, 45. The same spirit prevails in both accounts, but in the one case we have the immediate result of the Pentecostal gift, in the case before us we have the permanence and not only the vitality of the gift marked—the Christian community is now organised under Apostolic direction, and stress is laid upon the continuance of the "first love," whilst the contrast is marked between the self-sacrifice of Barnabas and the greed of Ananias and Sapphira, see Rendall, *Acts*, p. 196, and also Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 198, in answer to recent criticisms.—**παρὰ τοὺς πόδας**: the Apostles are represented as sitting, perhaps as teachers, xxii. 3, *cf.* Luke ii. 46, and also as an indication of their authority: the expression in the Greek conveys the thought of committal to the care and authority of any one, *cf.* v. 2, vii. 58, xxii. 20, so Matt. xv. 30, or that of reverence and thankfulness. Oecumenius sees in the words an indication of the great honour of the Apostles, and the

36. Ἰωσῆς[1] δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρνάβας ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων (ὅ ἐστι μεθερμηνευόμενον, Υἱὸς παρακλήσεως), Λευΐτης, Κύπριος τῷ γένει,

[1] Ιωσης P 1, 13, 31, Sah., Syr. Harcl., Chrys., Theophy., Meyer, Alford; Ιωσηφ ℵABDE, Vulg., Boh., Syr. Pesh., Arm., Aeth., Epiph., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.—see Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 30.

reverence of those who brought the money. Friedrich notes the expression as characteristic of St. Luke's style, since it is used by him five times in the Gospel, six times in Acts, and is found in the N.T. only once elsewhere, see above, *cf.* Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, 28, and instances in Wetstein.—**διεδίδετο**: impersonal, or **τὸ ἀργύριον** may be supplied, Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 57 (1896), and in St. Luke's Gospel twice, xi. 22, xviii. 22; only once elsewhere in N.T., John vi. 11; on the abnormal termination **ετο** for **οτο**, *cf.* LXX, Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 159, *cf.* Exodus v. 13, **ἐδίδοτο**, but A **-ετο**; Jer. lii. 34, **ἐδίδοτο**, but AB[1]S **-ετο**; 1 Cor. xi. 23, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 121.—**καθότι**: only found in St. Luke in N. T., twice in Gospel, four times in Acts; Luke i. 7, xix. 9, Acts ii. 24, 45, iv. 35, xxii. 31; on the imperfect with **ἄν** in a conditional relative clause, Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, pp. 13, 125, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 142 (1893), *cf.* ii. 45. 33b-35 are ascribed by Hilgenfeld to his "author to Theophilus," but this reviser must have been very clumsy to introduce a notice involving a general surrender of all landed property, as Hilgenfeld interprets the verse, which could not be reconciled with St. Peter's express words in v. 4—words which, on Hilgenfeld's own showing, the reviser must have had before him.

Ver. 36. **Ἰωσῆς δὲ**: **δέ** introduces the special case of Barnabas after the general statement in ver. 34.—**ὁ ἐπικ.**, *cf.* i. 23. On what occasion this surname was conferred by the Apostles nothing certain is known (**ἀπό** as often for **ὑπό**, ii. 22), although the fact that it was conferred by them may indicate that he owed his conversion to them. Possibly it may not have been bestowed until later, and reference may here be made to it simply to identify him (Nösgen).—**βαρνάβας**: most commonly derived from בַּר נְבוּאָה ("quod neque ad sensum neque ad litteras prorsus convenit," Blass) = properly **υἱὸς προφητείας**. But St. Luke, it is argued, renders this **υἱὸς παρακλήσεως**, because under the threefold uses of prophecy, 1 Cor. xiv. 3, the special gift of **παράκλησις** distinguished Barnabas, *cf.* Acts xi. 23. So Harnack (whose full article "Barnabas" should be consulted, *Real-Encyclopädie für prot. Theol. und Kirche*," xv., 410) explains it as indicating a *prophet* in the sense in which the word was used in the early Church, Acts xv. 32 (xi. 23), **παράκλησις** = edifying exhortation. But not only is בַּר an Aramaic word, whilst נבואה is Hebrew, but the above solution of St. Luke's translation is by no means satisfactory (see Zöckler, *in loco*). In 1 Cor. xiv. 3 **παράκ.** might equally mean consolation, *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 3-7, and it is translated "comfort" (not "exhortation") in the R.V. In St. Luke's Gospel the word is used twice, ii. 25, vi. 24, and in both passages it means comfort, consolation, *cf.* the cognate verb in xvi. 25. Another derivation has been suggested by Klostermann, *Probleme im Aposteltexte*, pp. 8-14. He maintains that both parts of the word are Aramaic, בר and נְוחָא, *solatium*, and that therefore St. Luke's translation is quite justified. Blass however points out that as in the former derivation so here there is a difficulty in the connection between **βαρνάβας** and the somewhat obscure Aramaic word. In the conversion of Barnabas, the first man whose heart was so touched as to join him, in spite of his Levitical status and culture, to ignorant and unlettered men, the Apostles might well see a source of hope and comfort (*cf.* Gen. v. 29), Klostermann, p. 13. It is also worthy of note that the LXX frequently uses **παράκλησις** as a translation of the common Hebrew words for comfort or consolation; *cf.* Job xxi. 2, Ps. xciii. 19, Isa. lvii. 8, Jer. xvi. 17, etc., and *cf.* *Psalms of Solomon* xiii., title, **παράκλησις τῶν δικαίων.** On the whole question, Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 175 ff., should be consulted. Deissmann, referring to an inscription recently discovered in Northern Syria, in the old Nicopolis, probably of the third or fourth century A.D., explains the word as follows: The inscription contains the

37. ὑπάρχοντος αὐτῷ ἀγροῦ,[1] πωλήσας ἤνεγκε τὸ χρῆμα, καὶ ἔθηκε παρὰ[2] τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων.

[1] αγρου; D has χωριον, but αγρος only here in Acts. ' For χωριον *cf.* iv. 34, v. 3, 8.

[2] παρα BP, Chrys., so W.H. (so Lach.); προς ℵE 15, 18, 37, so Tisch., Weiss, Wendt; *cf.* ver. 35 and v. 2.

name βαρνεβοῦν, which D. considers rightly = Son of Nebo; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Symmachus, Isa. xlvi. 1, who renders נְבוֹ, *Nebo* (transcribed by the LXX, Aquila and Theodotion, Ναβώ), by Νεβοῦς. The view of the connection or identity of βαρνάβας with βαρνεβοῦς is facilitated by the fact that in other words the ε sound in Nebo is replaced by α; *cf. Ne*buchadnezar = LXX Ν α βουχοδονοσορ, so *Ne*buzaradan = LXX Να βουζαρδαν. Very probably therefore βαρναβοῦς will occur instead of βαρνεβοῦς—and the Jews themselves might easily have converted βαρναβοῦς into βαρναβᾶς—ας being the constant termination of Greek names. In his *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 16, Deissmann is able to refer to an Aramaic inscription from Palmyra, dating 114 A.D., with the word Barnebo, and *cf.* also *Enc. Bibl.*, i., 484.—Λευείτης: although the Levites were not allowed to hold possessions in land, since God Himself was their portion (Num. xviii. 20, Deut. x. 9), yet they could do so by purchase or inheritance, *cf.* Jer. xxxii. 7-12, or it is possible that the field of Barnabas may not have been in Palestine at all (see Bengel, but, on the other hand, Wendt, *in loco*), and that the same Messianic regulations may not have applied to the Levites in other countries (Wetstein). It would also seem that after the Captivity the distribution of land, according to the Mosaic Law, was no longer strictly observed (Overbeck, Hackett (Hastings' B.D.), "Barnabas," *e.g.*, Josephus, a Levite and Priest, has lands in the vicinity of Jerusalem, and gains others in exchange for them from Vespasian, *Vita*, 76. — Κύπριος τῷ γένει: soon after the time of Alexander, and possibly before it, Jews had settled in Cyprus, and 1 Macc. xv. 23 indicates that they were there in good numbers. This is the first mention of it in the N.T.; see also xi. 19, 20, xiii. 4-13, xv. 39, xx. 16, and the geographical notices in xxi. 3, xxvii. 4. From the neighbouring island, Cyprus, Barnabas might well have been sent to the famous University of Tarsus, and so have made the acquaintance of Saul. In this way the previous acquaintance between the two men goes far to explain succeeding events, ix. 27: see "Cyprus," B.D. (Hastings), Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i. 2, 216.—γένει, "a man of Cyprus by race," R.V. not "of the country of Cyprus": γένει refers to his parentage and descent, *cf.* xviii. 2, 24.

Ver. 37. ἀγροῦ, better "a field" R.V.; the possession was not great, but if the field lay in the rich and productive island of Cyprus, its value may have been considerable. — τὸ χρῆμα: rarely in this sense in the singular, only here in the N.T., and never in Attic Greek, but *cf.* Herod., iii., 38, and instances in Wetstein, and see Blass, *in loco*. The money, *i.e.*, the proceeds, the money got (German *Erlös*). Lumby suggests that the word may be used here to indicate the entirety, the sum without deduction, in contrast to the action of Ananias and Sapphira, v. 2. The same unselfish spirit manifested itself in Barnabas at a later date, when he was content to live from the produce of his hands, 1 Cor. ix. 6. Possibly at Tarsus, so near his own home, he may have learnt with Saul in earlier days the craft of tent-making, for which the city was famous (Plumptre). In connection with this passage, and ix. 26, see Renan's eulogy on the character of Barnabas. In him Renan sees the patron of all good and liberal ideas, and considers that Christianity has done him an injustice in not placing him in the first rank of her founders, *Apostles*, p. 191, E.T.

CHAPTER V.—Ver. 1. Ἀνὴρ δέ τις: in striking contrast to the unreserved self-sacrifice of Barnabas, St. Luke places the selfishness and hypocrisy of Ananias and Sapphira. It is in itself no small proof of the truth of the narrative, that the writer should not hesitate to introduce this episode side by side with his picture of the still unbroken love and fellowship of the Church. He makes no apology for the facts, but narrates them simply and without comment. — Ἀνανίας — written in W.H. (so Blass) Ἁ., prob. Hebrew חֲנַנְיָה = Hananiah = *to whom Jehovah*

V. 1. Ἀνὴρ δέ τις Ἀνανίας[1] ὀνόματι, σὺν Σαπφείρῃ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐπώλησε κτῆμα, 2. καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, συνειδυίας καὶ τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνέγκας μέρος τι παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔθηκεν. 3. εἶπε δὲ[2] Πέτρος, Ἀνανία, διατί ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαί σε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, καὶ νοσφίσασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ χωρίου; 4. οὐχὶ μένον σοὶ ἔμενε, καὶ πραθὲν ἐν τῇ σῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ὑπῆρχε; τί ὅτι ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου

[1] Αν. ονοματι ℵBEP, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 256; ον. Αν. AD, Vulg., Chrys. Σαπφειρη AP, so Tisch., W.H., so Blass in β; Σαπφειρᾳ B, so Weiss. Many variations: ℵ Σαμφιρῃ, D σαφφυρα, corr. Σαφφιρᾳ (so Hilg.); E has Σαφφιρῃ; see comment.

[2] Πετρος DP; but ὁ Π. ℵABE, Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., Wendt, Weiss.

has been gracious (the Hebrew name of Shadrach, Dan. i. 6, LXX, Jer. xxviii. 1, Tob. v. 12, (Song of the Three Children, ver. 66) (Lumby, but see also Wendt, note, *in loco*).—Σαπφείρῃ, so also W.H., either from σάπφειρος (σάμφ., so here Σαμφ., ℵ*, Blass), a sapphire, or from the Aramaic שַׁפִּירָא, beautiful. The latter derivation is adopted by Blass (*Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 8), and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 76. It is declined like σπεῖρα, μάχαιρα, Acts x. 1, xii. 2, etc., in N.T., and so makes dative ῃ, Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 80, 93, and Blass, *u. s.*—κτῆμα = χωρίον, ver. 3: but may mean property of any kind. It is used in the singular several times in the LXX, as a possession, heritage, etc., Job xx. 29, Prov. xii. 27, xxxi. 16, Wisdom viii. 5, Ecclus. xxxvi. 30, li. 21, etc.

Ver. 2. ἐνοσφίσατο: may merely mean from its derivation, to set apart νόσφι. But both in LXX and N.T. it is used in a bad sense of appropriating for one's own benefit, purloining, Josh. vii. 1, of Achan, 2 Macc. iv. 32, so here and in ver. 3, and Tit. ii. 10, *cf.* also a similar use of the word in Jos., *Ant.*, iv., 8, 29 (so in Greek authors, Xen., Polyb., Plut.).—ἀπό: the same combination in Josh. vii. 1 (*cf.* ii. 17 above, ἐκχεῶ ἀπό, *cf.* Hebrew מִן. See Bengel's note, *in loco*, on the sin of Achan and Ananias).—συνειδυίης: it was thus a deliberate and aggravated offence. On the irregular form, instead of -υιας, *cf.* the LXX, Exod. viii. 21, 24, 1 Sam. xxv. 20; and see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 81, note, and Blass on instances from the papyri, *in loco.*—παρὰ τοὺς πόδας: a further aggravation (iv. 35), since the money was brought ostentatiously to gain a reputation for the donors. Blass well comments: "in conventu ecclesiæ hoc liberalitatis documentum editum"; *cf.* Calvin, who in marking the ambition of Ananias to gain a reputation for liberality adds: "ita fit ut pedes Apostolorum magis honoret quam Dei oculos".

Ver. 3. διὰ τί: not simply "why?" but "how is it that?" R.V., *cf.* Luke ii. 49; the force of the Greek seems to emphasise the fact that Ananias had it in his power to have prevented such a result, *cf.* James iv. 7, 1 Peter v. 9.—ἐπλήρωσεν, *occupavit* (*cf.* John xvi. 6), so that there is room for no other influence, Eccles. ix. 3. On the Vulgate, *tentavit*, which does not express the meaning here, see Felten's note.—ψεύσασθαι, *sc.*, ὥστε, often omitted; *cf.* Luke i. 54, the infinitive of conceived result, see Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, pp. 148, 154. The verb with the accusative of the person only here in N.T., but in LXX, Deut. xxxiii. 29, Psalm lxv. 3, Isa. lvii. 11, Hos. ix. 2, 4 Macc. v. 34, etc., and frequently in classical writers.

Ver. 4. οὐχὶ, "id quaerit quod sic esse nemo negat," Grimm, "while it remained, did it not remain thine own?" R.V. Very frequent in Luke as compared with the other Evangelists, see also vii. 50. This rendering better retains the kind of play upon the word μένω, to which Weiss draws attention, and compares 1 Macc. xv. 7 for the force of ἔμενεν.—πραθὲν, *i.e.*, the price of it when sold (*rectius* πραθέντος τὸ ἀργύριον, *cf.* Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 57 (1896)); so αὐτά in ii. 45 is used for the prices of the possessions and goods sold. The whole question, while it deprived Ananias of every excuse, also proves beyond doubt that the community of goods in the Church of Jerusalem was not compulsory

τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο[1]; οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ τῷ Θεῷ. 5. ἀκούων δὲ Ἀνανίας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, πεσὼν ἐξέψυξε· καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος

[1] το πραγμα τουτο; but D, Par., Sah. read ποιησαι (το) πονηρον τουτο—πραγμα once elsewhere in Luke's Gospel i. 1, once in St. Matt., four times in St. Paul. Αν. ℵABEP, Chrys. prefix article, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt. πεσων; D, Par., so Hilg., prefix παραχρημα—and Par. also adds after πεσ. επι την γην, *cf.* ix. 4, read by Blass in **β**. ταυτα om. ℵ*ABD, verss., Orig., Lucif., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss; *cf.* ver. 11 end.

but voluntary.—ἐξουσίᾳ, power or right (ἔξεστι): "The Ecclesia was a society in which neither the community was lost in the individual, nor the individual in the community," Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 48.—τί ὅτι, *sc.*, τί ἔστιν ὅτι, *cf.* Luke ii. 49, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 101 (1893), Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 173.—ἔθου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, xix. 21, and Luke xxi. 14. The phrase is rightly described as having a Hebraistic colouring, *cf.* LXX, 1 Sam. xxi. 12, Dan. i. 8, Hag. ii. 16, 19, Mal. i. 1, and the Homeric θέσθαι ἐν φρεσί, ἐν θυμῷ βάλλεσθαι.—τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο: so frequently in LXX, Gen. xliv. 15, Exod. i. 18, Josh. ix. 24, 1 Chron. xxi. 8; Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 149 (1896).—οὐκ ἐψεύσω: the words do not here of course mean that Ananias had not lied unto men, but an absolute negative is employed in the first conception, not to annul it, but rhetorically to direct undivided attention to the second, *cf.* Matt. x. 20, Mark ix. 37, 1 Thess. iv. 8, Winer-Moulton, lv. 8, 6. The dative of the person is found after ψεύδεσθαι in the LXX, but not in classical Greek. The sin of Ananias was much more than mere hypocrisy, much more than fraud, pride or greed—hateful as these sins are—the power and presence of the Holy Spirit had been manifested in the Church, and Ananias had sinned not only against human brotherhood, but against the divine light and leading which had made that brotherhood possible. In the words there lies an undeniable proof of the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost, and a refutation of Macedonius long before he was born (see Bede's note *in loco*, and on patristic authorities, Felten). We cannot satisfactorily explain the words by supposing that offence against the public spirit of that Church is meant, and that the sin against the Holy Ghost may be identified with this.

Ver. 5. ἀκούων, "as he heard these words" = μεταξὺ ἀκούων, so Weiss, Blass, Rendall.—ἐξέψυξεν: only found here, in ver. 10 of Sapphira, and xii. 23 of the death of Herod, in the N.T.; not found in classical writers, and only twice in the LXX, Judg. iv. 21 where A reads it to describe the death of Sisera, but = a Hebrew word which may only mean to faint, to faint away; Ezek. xxi. 7 (12) where it translates a Hebrew word כָּהָה meaning to be faint-hearted, to despond, to be dim. But as Blass points out it is used by Hippocrates; indeed it would seem that its use is almost altogether confined to medical writers (Hobart, Zahn). It is therefore a word which may probably be referred to St. Luke's employment of medical terms; Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, p. 37, for instances of its use not only in Hippocrates but in Galen and Aretaeus (Lumby refers to *Acta Andr. et Matth. Apocr.*, 19, where the word is also used of men suddenly falling down dead). In classical Greek ἀποψύχειν (βίον), or ἀποψ. absolutely is the term employed. There can be no doubt that the narrative implies the closest connection between the guilt of Ananias and his sudden death. It therefore cannot be regarded as a narrative of a chance occurrence or of the effect of a sudden shock caused by the discovery of guilt in St. Peter's words. No one has shown more clearly than Baur (*Paulus*, i., 27-33, especially against Neander) that all such explanations are unsatisfactory (see also Zeller and De Wette). In the early history of the Church, Origen, *Tract.* ix. *in Matt.*, had espoused the view that Ananias had died overcome by shame and grief at the sudden detection of his sin. But no such explanation could account for the death of Sapphira which Peter foretells as about to follow without delay. That the narrative is not without historical foundation is frankly admitted by Wendt, and also by Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, and most recently by Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, Spitta. But this stern condemnation of any attempt to lie unto God is a stumbling-block even to those who with Wendt recognise not only some historical fact underlying the

μέγας ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας ταῦτα. 6. ἀναστάντες δὲ οἱ νεώτεροι συνέστειλαν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξενέγκαντες ἔθαψαν. 7. Ἐγένετο

narrative, but also the danger and culpability of the action of Ananias and his wife. It may however be justly observed that our Lord Himself had condemned no sin so severely as that of hypocrisy, and that the action of Ananias and Sapphira was hypocrisy of the worst kind, in that they sought by false pretences to gain a reputation like the Pharisees for special sanctity and charity; the hypocrisy of the leaven of the Pharisees had entered the Church (Baumgarten), and if such a spirit had once gained ground in the Christian community, it must have destroyed all mutual affection and all brotherly kindness, for how could men speak the truth, every one with his neighbour, unless their love was without hypocrisy? Rom. xii. 9; how could they claim to be citizens of a city, into which none could enter who "made a lie"? Rev. xxi. 27, xxii. 15. The sin before us was not one sin but many (Chrys., *Hom.*, xii., on ver. 9), and in its deliberateness it came perilously near that sin against the Holy Ghost which, whatever else it may mean, certainly means a wilful hardening against divine guidance. For further considerations on the necessity of this unhesitating condemnation of such a sin at the outset of the life of the Church, see St. Chrysostom's remarks. We must guard against supposing that St. Peter had imprecated the death-penalty upon Ananias (as Porphyry asserted, see against such a view, Jerome, *Epist.*, 130). St. Jerome speaks of Ananias and Sapphira as not only deceitful, but also as timid stewards, keeping back a part of the price "through fear of famine which true faith never fears". On his judgment that the avenging stroke was inflicted, not in cruelty to them, but as a warning to others, see below.—**καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας κ.τ.λ.**, *i.e.*, upon all who were present, as distinct from ver. 11—but see Page's note. Overbeck, with De Wette, regards the remark as proleptical, as if the writer hurried to describe the impression made —but why should the words not include the judgment uttered by St. Peter? for the construction see Luke i. 65, iv. 36. On the characteristic reference to φόβος as following upon the exhibition of divine miraculous power both in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 77, and above on ii. 43.

Ver. 6. **ἀναστάντες**, see on ii. 14.—**οἱ νεώτεροι**: the fact that they are called simply **νεανίσκοι** in ver. 10 seems decisive against the view that reference is made to any definite order in the Church. Nor is it certain that we can see in the fulfilment of such duties by the **νεώτεροι** the beginnings of the diaconate, although on the natural distinction between **πρεσβύτεροι** and **νεώτεροι** it may well have been that official duties in the Church were afterwards based, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 1, Tit. ii. 1-6, 1 Pet. v. 5, Clem. Rom., i., 3; iii., 3; xxi., 6; Polycarp, *Epist.*, v., 3 (*cf.* Luke xxii. 26). In comparatively early days it belonged to the duties of the deacons to provide for the burial of the strangers and the poor, but it seems hardly probable that **οἱ νεώτεροι** were appointed as a separate body to bury the dead, before any attempt had been made to relieve the Apostles of the more pressing duty of distributing the public funds, vi. 1. On the other hand it is possible that the company of public "buriers" whom the prophet saw in vision, Ezek. xxxix. 12-16, may have become quite customary in N.T. days. R.V. margin renders simply "the younger men".—**συνέστειλαν**, "wrapped him round," R.V., probably in their own mantles (for no formal laying-out in robes can be supposed by the context), for which **περιστέλλω** would be the usual word, *cf.* Eur., *Troad.*, 378 (see Grimm, Blass, Weiss). But Meyer on the other hand is against the parallel, and argues, following Grotius, that the word should be rendered "placed him together," *i.e.*, laid out or composed his limbs, so that he might be carried out more conveniently (so too Overbeck, Holtzmann, Zöckler). Vulgate, *amoverunt*, followed by Luther, Erasmus, Beza, cannot be said to be supported by any parallel use of the word (Par.[2] also same verb as Vulg.). The word is frequently used by medical writers in various senses, one of which, to bandage, to compress by bandaging, is that which seems to afford a possible parallel to its use here, Hobart, *Medical Language*, etc., pp. 37, 38. The use of the word by Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii., 3; xix., 4, is not sufficient to justify us in taking it here to express all the preparations for burial.—**ἐξενέγκαντες**: outside the walls of the city, the usual place for graves—only prophets and kings had their graves in the city—Hamburger,

δὲ ὡς ὡρῶν τριῶν διάστημα, καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδυῖα τὸ γεγονὸς εἰσῆλθεν. 8. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῇ ὁ Πέτρος,[1] Εἰπέ μοι, εἰ τοσούτου τὸ χωρίον ἀπέδοσθε; ἡ δὲ εἶπε, Ναί, τοσούτου. 9. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπε πρὸς αὐτήν, Τί ὅτι συνεφωνήθη[2] ὑμῖν πειράσαι τὸ πνεῦμα Κυρίου; ἰδοὺ οἱ πόδες τῶν θαψάντων τὸν ἄνδρα σου ἐπὶ τῇ θύρᾳ, καὶ ἐξοίσουσί σε. 10. ἔπεσε δὲ παραχρῆμα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέψυξεν· εἰσελθόντες δὲ οἱ νεανίσκοι εὗρον αὐτὴν νεκράν, καὶ ἐξενέγκαντες

[1] For ειπε μοι ει . . . απεδ. D reads επερωτησω σε ει αρα το χ. τοσ. απεδ., so Hilg.; *cf.* Sah.

[2] συνεφωνηθη, D has συνεφωνησεν, so Hilg.; but in β Blass has T.R. (see Chase on retrans. from Syriac—possibly active may be a retranslation of Latin *convenit*, Harris).

Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums, i., 4, 475, "Grab"; Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 169, *cf.* the use of ἐκφέρω and ἐκκομίζω in classical Greek, Latin, *efferre*.—ἔθαψαν: partly for sanitary reasons, partly to avoid defilement; the interval between death and burial was very brief, especially in Jerusalem (Numb. xix. 11, Deut. xxi. 23; Hamburger, *u. s.*, i., 2, 161, "Beerdigung," with reference to this passage, Edersheim, *u. s.*, p. 168; for the existing custom in Jerusalem of speedy burial, see Hackett, *in loco*, and Schneller, *Kennst du das Land?* (eighth edition), p. 188).

Ver. 7. ἐγένετο δὲ . . . καί, *cf.* for construction Luke v. 1, 17, viii. 1, 22, ix. 51, xiv. 1, etc. Hebraistic, if not strictly a Hebraism; on καί thus uniting two co-ordinate statements with ἐγένετο see Plummer's valuable note, p. 45; *St. Luke*, first edition; and on the use of καί see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, pp. 161, 162; Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 256, 257.—διάστημα: as if a nominative absolute, here parenthetical from ὡς, *cf.* Luke ix. 28. *Cf.* Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 83 (1896). St. Luke alone uses διάστημα (only here in N.T.), *cf.* Polyb., ix., 1, 1; διάστημα τετραετές, and the verb διίστημι, *cf.* Luke xxii. 59, xxiv. 51, Acts xxvii. 28. In *Apocryph. Act. Andreæ*, 14, we have ἡμιωρίου διάστημα (Lumby), and in LXX, *cf.* Ecclesiast., *prol.*, 24, 3 Macc. iv. 17.—ὡς = ὡσεί, *fere*, *cf.* i. 15, ii. 4, etc.—ὡρῶν τριῶν: Nösgen supposes the approach of the next hour of prayer in this mention of the time, μὴ *pro* οὐ (Blass), see also Lumby's note.

Ver. 8. τοσούτου, *monstrat pecuniam*, Blass, so Zöckler, Holtzmann, Felten, Weiss, and others: genitive of the price. The position of the word in the question is emphatic, *cf.* Luke xv. 29. Blass would render *non pluris* (Bornemann, *tantilli*), but this is implied rather than expressed by the word here (see Wendt's note for classical instances). The question of St. Peter and the emphatic reply of Sapphira show that opportunity was given her by the inquiry to retract, and that she wilfully persisted in her sin (Chrys.; so Calvin, "tempus illi ad resipiscendum datur").

Ver. 9. τί ὅτι, ver. 4. συνεφωνήθη: only here in the N.T. in the passive, for its use in the active, xv. 15. Blass maintains that this passive usage συμφωνεῖταί τισι is Latin rather than Greek (*convenit inter aliquos*), and that it may have arisen from the intercourse between Greeks and Romans, see *in loco*, and *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 112, 235; in LXX only in the active. *Cf.* also Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 155 (1893). "The aggravation was that they committed the deed as with one soul, just as upon a settled compact between them," Chrys., *Hom.*, xii.; *cf.* the plural ἀπέδοσθε.—πειράσαι: the rendering "to tempt," does not seem to express the idea so well as "to try," to make trial whether the Holy Ghost would discover their deception, whether He knew all things: *cf.* xv. 10, and in LXX, Exod. xvii. 2, 7, Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 41, 56, etc. (in Rev. ii. 2 the same verb as here = "try," A. and R.V.).—ἰδού, see on i. 10. οἱ πόδες, *cf.* Luke 1. 79, Rom. iii. 15, x. 15. A Hebraistic expression—the whole description is full of dramatic intensity—the returning steps of the νεώτεροι are heard ἐπὶ τῇ θύρᾳ. But Alford thinks that they were probably bare-footed, and that the words mean that the time was just at hand for their return, *cf.* James v. 9.— ἐξοίσουσίν σε, see on ver. 6.

Ver. 10. παραχρῆμα, see on iii. 7. The introduction of the word shows that

ἔθαψαν[1] πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς. 11. καὶ ἐγένετο φόβος μέγας ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντας ταῦτα.

12. Διὰ δὲ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τῷ λαῷ πολλά· (καὶ ἦσαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅπαντες[2] ἐν τῇ στοᾷ Σολομῶντος· 13. τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς,

[1] **εξενεγκαντες**, D reads **συστειλαντες εξηνεγκαν**; so Hilg.

[2] **απαντες**, D, Sah., Aeth. add **εν τῳ ιερῳ**—E **εν τῳ ναῳ συνηγμενοι**. But the words **εν τω ιερω** are not received by Blass in β; *Acta Apost. in loco*, he says: "*cf.* ii. 43, videtur interpolatio esse; nam sec. iii. 10, hæc porticus extra **τὸ ἱερόν** erat, *cf.* ver. 21". **Σολομωντος**, see above, iii. 11.

the writer regarded the death as supernatural, see above on ver. 5. **πρός**, by, beside her husband = **παρά** with dative, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 135, note; Winer-Moulton, xlix. h. Although the whole narrative shows that in each case the death was caused by the judgment of God, yet nothing whatever is said as to the world beyond the grave: "As it is, both the man himself is benefited, in that he is not left to advance further in wickedness, and the rest, in that they are made more earnest," Chrys., *Hom.*, xii. Wendt points out that the punishment inflicted by St. Paul, 1 Cor. v. 5, was of a wholly different kind, because it had the avowed aim of saving the spirit of the sinner in the day of the Lord by delivering him over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh; but it should not be forgotten that St. Peter himself speaks of a judgment according to men in the flesh, which has its issue in a life according to God in the spirit (1 Pet. iv. 6). St. Augustine's words may fairly be quoted not against but in favour of applying to the cases before us the principle of judgment employed by St. Paul: "Credendum est autem quod post hanc vitam eis pepercerit Deus. . . . Correpti sunt mortis flagello, ne supplicio puniantur æterno," Serm., *de Verbis Act.* v., 4, *cf.* Origen, *Tract.* viii., *in Matth.*, and Jerome, *Epist.*, cxxx. See *Speaker's Commentary*, *in loco*, and Bengel, Felten, Zöckler, Plumptre. Felten's reverent thoughts, p. 124, may well be compared with the remarks of Dr. Pusey on the case of Ananias, *What is of Faith? etc.*, p. 14.

Ver. 11. **φόβος μέγας**: evidently one purpose in the infliction of this stern penalty was at once obtained, see above on ver. 5.—**ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: St. Luke, as it seems, uses the word **ἐκκλησία** here for the first time. Dr. Hort thinks that he may employ it by anticipation, and that we cannot be sure that it was actually in use at this early date (*Ecclesia*, p. 49), but, as the same writer reminds us, our Lord's saying to St. Peter, Matt. xvi. 18, must have had its influence upon the minds and teaching of the Apostles. Moreover, we can see a special fitness in the employment here, after the preceding description, not only of the growth, but of the organisation of the Christian community, iv. 32 ff., and of the judgment which followed upon the attempt to challenge its powers and to violate its harmony, *cf.* Bengel's note, *in loco.* The context too probably marks a distinction between the members of the **ἐκκλησία** and those without (Weiss, Hort, Blass).

Ver. 12. **δέ**: merely transitional; **ἐγίνετο** marking the continuance of the miracles; **διὰ τῶν χειρῶν** characteristic of St. Luke in Acts, *cf.* ii. 23, vii. 25, xi. 30, xiv. 3, xv. 23, xix. 11. On Luke's fondness for this and similar phrases with **χείρ**, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 8; Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 77. Such phrases, *cf.* **διὰ στόματός τινος**, are thoroughly Hebraistic; so also in iii. 13, Luke iii. 21, **κατὰ πρόσωπον**, and for other instances, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, pp. 126, 147.—**Στοᾷ Σολ.**, iii. 11.—**ἅπαντες**, *cf.* ii. 1, including other believers as well as the Apostles, see below. **ὁμοθυμαδὸν**, see i. 14.

Ver. 13. **τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν**: variously interpreted (1) of the rest of the believers in contrast to the Apostles, but this is unnatural, as the Apostles are not elsewhere regarded as objects of fear to their fellow-believers, and **ἅπαντες** above certainly need not = **ἀπόστολοι** as Hilgenfeld interprets it. See, however, Alford, *in loco*, and Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 256, note. J. Lightfoot applies **ἅπαντες** to the hundred-and-eight (the Apostles making up the hundred-and-twenty), who durst not join themselves

ἀλλ' ἐμεγάλυνεν αὐτοὺς ὁ λαός· 14. μᾶλλον δὲ προσετίθεντο πιστεύοντες τῷ Κυρίῳ, πλήθη ἀνδρῶν τε καὶ γυναικῶν·) 15. ὥστε κατὰ[1] τὰς πλατείας ἐκφέρειν τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς καὶ τιθέναι ἐπὶ κλινῶν καὶ κραββάτων, ἵνα ἐρχομένου Πέτρου κἂν ἡ σκιὰ ἐπισκιάσῃ τινὶ

[1] **κατα (τας)** D*P 1, Chrys., Theoph., so Meyer; **και εις τας** ℵABD²(E), Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. **κλινων** EP, Chrys., Theodrt.; **κλιναριων** ℵABD, Cyr.-Jer., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **κραββατων** B³EP; **κραβαττων** ℵAB*D, so W.H., Weiss, Hilg.; but see Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 12, who reads in β, **κραβατος** (*grabatus*), and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56. **επισκιασῃ** ℵADEP, so Tisch. (W.H. alt.), Weiss, Hilg.; **επισκιασει** B 13, 31, W.H. following B, Wendt (probable). At end of verse D, Par. (Gig.[1], Wern.) add **απηλλασσοντο γαρ απο πασης ασθενειας ην ειχε εκαστος αυτων**, whilst E (Vulg., Lucif.) adds **και ρυσθωσιν απο πασης ασθενειας ης ειχον.** Variations between D and E may be due to retranslation from Latin, see Harris; Chase from assim. of Acts xix. 12, through Syriac; an explanatory addition of the result of Peter's shadow falling upon them according to Weiss, Codex D, p. 64; but Belser sees in vv. 15 and 16 in β original, revised in α.

in the dignity and office of Apostleship, properly so called, having seen the judgment that one of the Twelve had brought upon Ananias, one of their own number (as Lightfoot ranks Ananias amongst the hundred-and-twenty); (2) of non-believers as contrasted with **ἅπαντες**; this is adopted by Blass, but it obliges him to translate **κολλᾶσθαι**, *se eis immiscere = interpellare, vexare*, whereas the word is more often used, as he admits, both in the Acts and in the LXX of friendly intercourse דָּבַק, Deut. x. 20, 2 Sam. xx. 2, 2 Kings xviii. 6, Ps. cxviii. (cxix.) 31, *cf.* Acts viii. 29, ix. 26, x. 28, xvii. 34; (3) of the rest including **ὁ λαός**, who stood aloof from joining their lot, but at the same time regarded them with respect; (4) of the rest, *i.e.*, rulers, scribes, priests, men of position, as contrasted, **ἀλλά**, with the **λαός**, the populace, *cf.* iv. 21, where the same contrast is marked (so Hort, Page, Rendall), see also Luke xxi. 38. For **κολλᾶσθαι** see further on ver. 36.

Ver. 14. **μᾶλλον δέ προσετίθεντο**: the favour of the people which still protected the Church (*cf.* ver. 17) resulted in further increase of believers, "were the more added," *um so mehr;* imperfect, signifying the continuous growth of the Church; on the verb see ii. 41. **πλήθη**, plural (only here in N.T.), because not only men as in iv. 4, but women also (Weiss), but Bengel "pluralis grandis: jam non initur numerus, uti 4, 4," to the same effect Blass, "sæpe fiebat ut magnus numerus accederet, inde plur. hic tantum N.T.". On St. Luke's characteristic fondness for this and similar words see iv. 32. **γυναικῶν**: this mention of women forms as it were an introduction to the further mention in vi. 1 ff., *cf.* viii. 3, where women are again mentioned amongst the victims in the general persecution of the Church (see Plumptre's note, *in loco*). This constant reference to the share of women in the ministry of the Gospel and the life of the Church is characteristic of St. Luke in both his writings.

Ver. 15. **ὥστε καὶ εἰς**, "insomuch that they even," R.V.—**κατὰ**, T.R., so Alford, Meyer, "all down the streets," as if the streets were entirely beset with sick folk (see Holtzmann, *in loco*).—**πλατείας**, feminine of the adjective **πλατύς**, *sc.*, **ὁδός**, a broad way, so here, the open streets, in classical Greek, and frequently in LXX, chiefly for Hebrew, רְחֹב, Tobit xiii. 17, Judith i. 14, vii. 14, 22, 1 Macc. i. 55, ii. 9, 3 Macc. i. 18, used by St. Luke three times in his Gospel, x. 10, xiii. 26, xiv. 21, but only here in Acts, see below on ix. 11. For **κλινῶν** read **κλιναρίων**, which is found only here in N.T., not at all in LXX, and very rarely in other Greek authors, Aristoph., *Frag.*, 33, d, and Arrian, *Epict. Diss.*, iii., 5, 13, where it is used for the couch of a sick person; Artem., *Oneir.*, ii., 57. As Dr. Hobart points out, St. Luke employs no less than four different words for the beds of the sick, two in common with the other Evangelists, *viz.*, **κλίνη** (not in John), and **κράβαττος** (not in Matthew). But two are peculiar to him, *viz.*, **κλινίδιον** (Luke v. 19, 24), and **κλινάριον** only here. Neither word is found in the LXX, but **κλινίδιον**, although rare elsewhere, is used in Artem., also in Plutarch, and Dion. Hal. (*Antiq. Rom.*, vii., 68), for a litter for carrying the sick, Hobart, *Medical*

αὐτῶν. 16. συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, φέροντες ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ὀχλουμένους ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων, οἵτινες ἐθεραπεύοντο ἅπαντες.[1]

[1] **εις** DEP demid., Arm., Chrys., so Meyer; om. ℵAB vers., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. **οιτινες εθεραπευοντο απαντες**, D, Par. (Gig., Lucif.) read **και ιωντο παντες**; both verbs almost equally common. At end of verse "duo codices Bergeri" add *et magnificabant Dominum J. C.*, added by Blass in β (Greek); *cf.* Acts xix. 17.

Language, etc., pp. 116, 117. Dr. Kennedy sees in **κλινίδιον** an instance of rare words used by the comic poets, especially Aristophanes, found also in the N.T., and almost nowhere else, and hence a proof of the "colloquial" language of the N.T. writers (*Sources of N. T. Greek*, pp. 76-79). But the fact remains that the word in question is found only in St. Luke, and that both it and **κλινάριον** were employed for the couch of a sick person.—**ἐρχομένου Πέτρου**, genitive absolute, "as Peter came by," R.V. (very frequent in Luke), it does not mean, as Felten admits, that none of the other Apostles possessed such powers.—**κἄν = καὶ ἐάν** — even if it were only his shadow, "at the least his shadow," R.V., *cf.* Mark v. 28, vi. 56, 2 Cor. xi. 16; the usage is not unclassical, Soph., *Elect.*, 1483; Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 170; Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 118 (1893).—**ἐπισκιάσῃ** with dative, Luke i. 35, Mark ix. 7; B so W.H., future indicative **σει**, a construction common with **ὅπως** in classical Greek (Page); for other examples of the future indicative with **ἵνα** see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 81 (1893), of which several are found in the N.T., although not in classical Greek; *cf.* Luke xiv. 10, xx. 10, 1 Cor. ix. 18, 1 Pet. iii. 1, Acts xxi. 24, W.H.; John vii. 3, Gal. ii. 4, etc.; Burton, *u. s.*, p. 86. Undoubtedly this action of the people showed the lively power of their faith (Chrys., Theod., Aug.), but the further question arises in spite of the severe strictures of Zeller, Overbeck, Holtzmann, as to how far the narrative indicates that the shadow of Peter actually produced the healing effects. Ver. 16 shows that the sick folk were all healed, but Zöckler maintains that there is nothing to show that St. Luke endorses the enthusiastic superstition of the people (so J. Lightfoot, Nösgen, Lechler, Rendall). On the other hand we may compare Matt. ix. 20, Mark vi. 56, John ix. 5, Acts xix. 12; and Baumgarten's comment should be considered that, although it is not actually said that a miraculous power went forth from Peter's shadow, it is a question why, if no such power is implied, the words should be introduced at all into a narrative which evidently purports to note the extraordinary powers of the Apostles. The parallels just instanced from the Gospels could, of course, have no weight with critics who can only see in such comparisons a proof that the Acts cannot rise above the superstitious level of the Gospels, or who start like Renan with "an absolute rule of criticism," *viz.*, the denial of a place in history to all miraculous narratives. β adds **ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: but even here, as Blass says, Luke does not distinctly assert that cures were wrought by the shadow of Peter, although there is no reason to deny that the Evangelist had this in mind, since he does not hesitate to refer the same miraculous powers to St. Paul. Hilgenfeld refers vv. 14-16 to his "author to Theophilus," and sees in the expressions used in ver. 16 a reminiscence of Luke vi. 17.

Ver. 16. **δὲ καὶ**: very common in St. Luke, Luke ii. 4, iii. 9, v. 10, ix. 61, xiv. 12, etc., and also nine times in Acts. St. John uses it frequently, but seldom in Matt. and Mark; used for the sake of giving emphasis.—**πέριξ** only here, strengthened for **περί**, not in LXX, but see Hatch and Redpath, found in *Acta Andr. et Matth. Apocr.*, 26 (see Lumby's note), in classics from Æschylus.—**τῶν π. πόλεων**, "the cities round about Jerusalem," omitting **εἰς** before **Ἱερουσ.**—**ὀχλουμένους**: only here in N.T., *cf.* Luke vi. 18, **οἱ ἐνοχλούμενοι** (W.H., R.V.) **ὑπὸ πν. ἀκαθ.** Both verbs are peculiar to St. Luke in the N.T. in connection with disease (**ἐνοχλεῖν** is used in Heb. xii. 15 in a different sense), and both were often used by medical writers. In Tobit vi. 8, **ὀχλῇ** the simple verb is used of the vexing and disturbing of an evil spirit, and **ἐνοχλεῖν** is used several times in the LXX, of being troubled with sicknesses, Gen. xlviii. 1, 1 Sam. xix. 14, xxx. 13, Mal. i. 13. So J. Weiss, who is by no means inclined to overrate Dr.

17. Ἀναστὰς[1] δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, ἡ οὖσα αἵρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου, **18.** καὶ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ ἔθεντο αὐτοὺς ἐν τηρήσει

[1] **αναστας**, Par. reads **Αννας**, "cod. Dubl. ap. Berger" (Blass); so also Prov. after **αναστ. δε**—Blass follows Par. in **β**. **αναστας** is no doubt a very common word, but it is quite characteristic of St. Luke. Western reading may have possessed the true text, *cf.* iii. 6, but if **Αννας** is original then **αναστας** is a corruption, not a revision.

Hobart's work, regards the use of the two verbs just mentioned as the employment in St. Luke of technical medical terms, *Evangelium des Lukas*, pp. 273, 274 (1892); found in Hipp., Galen, Dioscorides, *cf.* in the latter, *Mat. Med.*, iii., 116, **τοὺς ὑπὸ ξηρᾶς βηχὸς καὶ ὀρθοπνοίας ὀχλουμένους θεραπεύει**, see also Luke vi. 19, viii. 46, for a like effect following on the manifestation of the miraculous powers of Christ.

Ver. 17. **ἀναστὰς**, see on i. 15, *cf.* vi. 9: it may denote a hostile intention (but need not force this), Mark iii. 26, Luke x. 35, Matt. xii. 41, in LXX, Job xvi. 8; see Overbeck, Blass, Weiss; **ὁ ἀρχ.**, *i.e.*, Annas not Caiaphas, iv. 6.—**πάντες οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ**: the context seems to imply that more are included than referred to in iv. 6.—**ἡ οὖσα αἵρεσις**(= **οἵ εἰσιν αἵρεσις**), a rare employment of the relative in the N.T., but found in Luke and Paul, most of all in the latter; *cf.* Acts xvi. 12, 1 Cor. iii. 17, Gal. iii. 16, Ephes. iii. 13, vi. 2, Phil. i. 28, etc. (*cf.* Rev. iv. 5, v. 9); Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 192 (1896).—**αἵρεσις**: (1) a choosing, choice, so in classical writers, *cf.* also LXX, Lev. xxii. 18, 21, 1 Macc. viii. 30; (2) that which is chosen, a chosen method of thought and action; (3) later, a philosophic principle; those who have chosen certain principles, a school, a sect, so six times in Acts. It is used thrice elsewhere in N.T., 1 Cor. xi. 29, Gal. v. 20, 2 Pet. ii. 1 in the plural, of factions or parties *within* the Church; in its later ecclesiastical use, applied to doctrines, "heresies," which tended to cause separation from the Church. The word need not therefore be used in a bad sense, although it is so used of the Nazarenes, *cf.* xxiv. 5, 14, xxviii. 22, whilst on the other hand St. Paul uses it of the Pharisees, xxvi. 5 (*cf.* xv. 5), in no depreciatory sense (*cf.* its use by Josephus of the Sadducees, *Ant.*, xx., 9, 1). Lumby gives a disparaging use of the word in *Apocr. Act. Phil. in Hellad.*, 10, see his note. It is not expressly said by St. Luke that Annas was a Sadducee, although he seems to imply it. But this is not in itself inconceivable (see iv. 1) in spite of the strictures of Zeller and Overbeck; Josephus distinctly says, *u. s.*, that the son of Annas who bore his father's name was of the sect of the Sadducees, and if he mentions this as something peculiar, and as showing why the younger Annas was so bold and insolent (Zeller, *cf.* Nösgen's note, *in loco*), yet there is no difficulty in supposing that the elder Annas was at least associated with the Sadducees if only for political reasons.—**ζήλου**: jealousy, R.V., so rightly A.V in xiii. 45; Wycliffe "envy," *cf.* Rom. xiii. 13, 1 Cor. iii. 3, 2 Cor. xi. 2, Gal. v. 20, James iii. 14, 16, Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, iii., 4 and iv.-vi. (*cf.* Numb. xxv. 10, 11, 1 Macc. viii. 16, **οὐκ ἔστι φθόνος οὐδὲ ζῆλος ἐν αὐτοῖς**, and ii. 54, 58, *Psalms of Solomon*, ii., 27), and in some places of the jealousy which God has, as in 2 Cor. xi. 2, Numb. xxv. 10, 11, and *cf.* *Psalms of Solomon*, ii., 27, iv., 2, 1 Macc. ii. 54. But **φθόνος** is capable only of an evil signification. By Aristotle **ζῆλος** is used in its nobler sense (*Rhet.*, ii., 11), as opposed to **τὸ φθονεῖν**, but it seems to be used by other writers as = **φθόνος** or coupled with it. The meaning is defined by the context. Trench, *N. T. Synonyms*, i., 99. Here the envy and jealousy of the Sanhedrim was provoked by the popular favour shown to the disciples, and hence to their doctrine of the resurrection.

Ver. 18. **ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας**: a phrase used twice in St. Luke's Gospel, and three times in the Acts, *cf.* Gen. xxii. 12. *Cf.* Hebrew שָׁלַח יָד אֶל.—**ἐν τηρήσει δημοσίᾳ**, "in public ward," R.V. **δημ.** used here as an adjective, only found in N.T. in Acts, in the three other passages used as an adverb, xvi. 37, xviii. 28, xx. 20 (2 Macc. vi. 10, 3 Macc. ii. 2), *cf.* Thuc., v., 18, where **τὸ δημόσιον** = the public prison. See note above on iv. 3. Hilgenfeld is so far right in pointing out that the two imprisonments, iv. 3 and v. 18, are occasioned by two different causes, in the first case by the preaching of the Apostles

δημοσίᾳ.[1] 19. ἄγγελος δὲ Κυρίου διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἤνοιξε τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς, ἐξαγαγών τε αὐτοὺς εἶπε, 20. Πορεύεσθε, καὶ σταθέντες

[1] **αυτων** om. ℵABD 15, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Arm., Lucif., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; but retained by EP, verss., Bas., Chrys., Meyer. At end of verse D adds **και επορευθη εις εκαστος εις τα ιδια**, so Hilg.; *cf.* John vii. 55; see Harris and Chase, who both think that the gloss comes from John, *l. c.*, but the resemblance is not verbal. **εις τα ιδια** is characteristic of St. John, but it is also found in Acts xxi. 6.

to the people, and in the second by the reverence which their miracles gained from the people.

Ver. 19. **ἄγγελος δὲ K.**: the narrative must be accepted or rejected as it stands. As Wendt, following Zeller in earlier days, candidly admits, every attempt to explain the narrative by referring the release of the prisoners to some natural event, such as an earthquake or lightning, or to some friendly disposed person, who with the assistance of the gaoler opened the prison doors, and who was mistaken by the Apostles for an angel in the darkness and excitement of the night, is shattered at once against the plain meaning of the text. Nor can it be deemed satisfactory to believe that St. Luke has unconsciously given us two narratives of the liberation of St. Peter, here and in xii., and that the former is merely an echo of the later deliverance transferred to an earlier date (Weiss, Sorof, Holtzmann). But St. Luke had the best means of knowing accurately the events narrated in xii. from John Mark (see below on chap. xii., and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, etc., p. 385), *Introd.*, p. 17, and there is no ground whatever for supposing that xii. is simply an embellished version of this former incident. Attempts have been made to show that St. Luke introduces the same doubling of narratives in his Gospel (Wendt, Holtzmann), *e.g.*, the sending forth of the disciples in ix. 3 and x. 1, but the former chapter is concerned with the mission of the Twelve, and the latter with that of the Seventy. Further objections have been made as to the uselessness of the miracle—the disciples are found, to be imprisoned again! But not only was the miracle a source of fresh strength and faith to the disciples, but—as Hilgenfeld notes—their release can scarcely be described as purposeless, since it called forth a public transgression of the command of silence imposed upon the two chief Apostles, iv. 17-21. Moreover, the deliverance was another indication to the Sadducees, if they would have accepted it, that it was useless for them to attempt to stay the movement. "Quis ergo usus angeli?" asks Blass; and he answers: "Sed est aliquis: augetur enim apostolorum audacia (21), tum ira adversariorum magis accenditur; nihilominus Deus suos perire non patitur". That the Sadducees should ignore the miracle (ver. 28) is surely not strange, although it may well have influenced their subsequent deliberations; that the action of the Sadducees should now be more coercive than on the former occasion was only natural on the part of men who feared that vengeance would be taken on them for the death of Jesus by an uprising of the people (vv. 28 and 26).—**διὰ νυκτὸς** = **νυκτός, νύκτωρ** (*cf.* Luke ii. 8) in classical Greek. The phrase is used four times by St. Luke in Acts, *cf.* xvi. 19, xvii. 10, xxiii. 31, and *cf.* Luke v. 5 (and ix. 37, D, **διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας**): nowhere else in N.T. In all the passages Meyer thinks that the expression means *throughout the night*, but such a meaning would be inconsistent with the context at all events here and in xvi. 19; and xvii. 10 is doubtful.—See Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 129, "by night" (*nachts*). Simcox speaks of this expression in Acts as an "almost adverbial phrase," *Language of N. T.*, p. 140.

Ver. 20. **Πορεύεσθε**: characteristic of St. Luke both in Gospel and Acts. The word appears here in Acts for the first time, and it is found in St. Luke's Gospel about fifty times, and in this book nearly forty (Friedrich, Lekebusch).—**σταθέντες**, ii. 14, on this pictorial use of the word, see Page's note, and Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 42; so also **ἀναστάς, ἐπιστάς, ἐγερθείς, καθίσας, στραφείς**—here it intimates the boldness with which the Apostles were to proclaim their message.—**ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ**: they were to speak not only boldly but publicly.—**τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης** (*cf.* xiii. 26, **τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης**, and Rom. vii. 24), *i.e.*, the life to which the whole Apostolic preaching referred, the life which the Sadducees denied, bestowed by Him who was Himself the Resurrection and the Life, *cf.* iii. 15, iv. 12. This or a similar explanation is accepted by Holtzmann,

λαλεῖτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τῷ λαῷ πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης. **21.** ἀκούσαντες δὲ εἰσῆλθον ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, καὶ ἐδίδασκον.[1] παραγενόμενος δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, συνεκάλεσαν[2] τὸ συνέδριον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γερουσίαν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν

[1] **ακουσαντες δε,** E, Pesh. read **εξελθοντες δε εκ της φυλακης,** received by Blass in **β**; but *cf.* xvi. 40; may have been omitted on revision, or added for exactness. After **εδιδασκον** Prov., Wern. add **εν τω ονοματι K. I.**; *cf.* iv. 18, ix. 27.

[2] For **συνεκαλεσαν** D has **εγερθεντες το πρωι και συγκαλεσαμενοι** (so also Hilg.); may be addition for sake of clearness, or omitted in revision; assim. to our Lord's trial and the Jewish authorities seems unnecessary.

Wendt, Weiss, Zöckler, Blass. On the attempt to explain the words as simply = these words of life, see Winer-Moulton, xxxiv. 3, *b.*, and see also Grimm, *sub v.* **ῥῆμα.**

Ver. **21.** **ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον,** "about daybreak," R.V., *i.e.*, without delay they obeyed the angel's command (Weiss). The words may also indicate the customary usage of Palestine where the heat was great in the daytime. The people rose early and came to our Lord to hear Him, Luke xxi. 38 (John viii. 2). **ὑπὸ** = *sub*, *circa* (of time), so in classical Greek, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 132. The first sacrifice took place in the Temple very early, Edersheim, *Temple and its Services*, p. 132, and it may be that the Apostles went to catch the people at the hour of their early devotions (Plumptre).—**ὑπό** is used nowhere else in the N.T. with an accusative in this sense, *cf.* Tobit vii. 11, S, *al*; **ὑπὸ τὴν νύκτα,** 3 Macc. v. 2.—**παραγενόμενος**: having come, *i.e.*, to the place where the Sadducees met, not merely pleonastic; the verb may fairly be regarded as characteristic of St. Luke in both his writings—it occurs eight times in his Gospel and thirty in the Acts, and frequently absolutely as here—elsewhere in N.T. only eight or nine times, frequent in LXX.—**τὸ συνέδριον καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γερουσίαν**: does **γερουσία** represent an assembly or body in addition to the **συνέδριον,** or do the two words represent the same Court? The word **γερ.** appears nowhere else in the N.T., but in the LXX it is used in several places of the Jewish Sanhedrim, 1 Macc. xii. 6, 2 Macc. i. 10, iv. 44, xi. 27, Jud. iv. 8, xiv. 4, xv. 8. In the N.T. the Sanhedrim is also called **πρεσβυτέριον,** Luke xxii. 66, Acts xxii. 5. If the two words denote the same body **καὶ** must be regarded as merely explicative (so Wendt as against Meyer) to emphasise the solemn importance and representative nature of the assembly (so Grimm-Thayer to signify the full Sanhedrim *sub v.* **γερ.** and so apparently Blass). If we adopt Rendall's view **καί** may still be explicative, but in another way, specifying the comprehensive character of this meeting as compared with the hasty and informal gathering in iv. 5, 6 (*cf.* Kuinoel's view, *in loco*). The difficulty has caused others to suggest that **γερ.** refers to men of age and experience who were asked to join the Council as assessors, or to some other assembly larger than the Sanhedrim and only summoned on special occasions. For the former view, Lumby and Plumptre (see also Page's note) refer to Mishna, *Joma*, i., 1, where mention is made of "the chamber of the assessors," *parhedrin* = **πάρεδροι.** Further we may note, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 172, E.T., in a note on this passage points out that as there can be no doubt as to the identity of the two conceptions **συνέδριον** and **γερουσία** (so too Zöckler and Weiss, *in loco*), **καί** must be taken as explanatory, or St. Luke makes a mistake in assuming that the **συνέδριον** was of a less comprehensive character than the **γερουσία,** "the Sanhedrin and all the elders of the people together". Schürer prefers the latter alternative, but the former may reasonably be maintained not only from the Greek text but also because St. Luke's information admittedly derived from a Jewish-Christian source is not likely to have been inaccurate. Hilgenfeld agrees with Weiss that in the source the O.T. expression **γερουσία,** Exod. iii. 16, iv. 29, xii. 21, stood alone, but that the reviser prefixed the usual expression **συνέδριον** which in v. 27 and 34 is found without any addition. On "Synhedrion," see Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 8, 1149, and "Aelteste," i., 1, pp. 59, 60, and O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 175, 176 (1895).—**δεσμωτήριον,** xvi. 26; Thuc.

εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον, ἀχθῆναι αὐτούς. 22. οἱ δὲ ὑπηρέται παραγενόμενοι[1] οὐχ εὗρον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ· ἀναστρέψαντες δὲ ἀπήγγειλαν, λέγοντες, 23. Ὅτι τὸ μὲν δεσμωτήριον εὕρομεν κεκλεισμένον ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ, καὶ τοὺς φύλακας ἔξω[2] ἑστῶτας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν· ἀνοίξαντες δέ, ἔσω οὐδένα εὕρομεν. 24. ὡς δὲ ἤκουσαν τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὅ τε ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς[3] τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, διηπόρουν περὶ αὐτῶν, τί ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο. 25. παραγενόμενος δέ τις ἀπήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς λέγων, Ὅτι ἰδού, οἱ ἄνδρες οὓς ἔθεσθε ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, εἰσὶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἑστῶτες καὶ διδάσκοντες τὸν

[1] After **παραγενομενοι** D adds **και ανοιξαντες την φυλακην**, so Par., Vulg., Syr. H. mg.; *cf.* ver. 23, assimilation or revision?

[2] **εξω** om. ℵABDEP, Vulg., verss., Chrys., Lucif., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **προ** EP, Vulg.-Clem., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Chrys.; **επι** ℵABD, so "ad" d, e, am. fu. demid., Sah., Syr. Pesh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

[3] **ο τε ιερευς και ο στρατηγος** P 13, 31 (E), so Meyer; **ο τε στρατηγος**, om. **ιερευς και ο** ℵABD, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Arm., Syr. Pesh., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Alford, Hilg. (other variations in Wendt and Alford).

vi. 60 and LXX, Gen. xxxix. 20-23, xl. 3-5. On the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim and its right to order arrests by its own officers, and to dispose of cases not involving capital punishment, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., 187, 188, E.T., O. Holtzmann, *u. s.*, p. 173.

Ver. 22. **ὑπηρέται**: apparently some of the Temple guard, ver. 26; see above on **ὁ στρατηγός**, iv. 1, and Edersheim, *Temple and its Services*, pp. 119, 120. In the N.T. the word is not used of the military.—**ἀναστρέψαντες**: used only here in this sense (xv. 16 is not strictly a parallel), *cf.* LXX, Gen. viii. 9, 1 Kings xxi. (xx.) 5, and frequently.

Ver. 23. **ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ**, "in all safety," R.V. (not *cum omni diligentia*, Vulgate); "in omni firmitate," Flor.; in LXX generally **μετά** with genitive; *cf.* 2 Macc. iii. 22, xv. 1, **μετὰ πάσης ἀσφ.** The Vulgate is misleading; the words mean not that the prison had been carefully shut, but that it was found in a state of perfect security.

Ver. 24. **ὅ τε ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ ἀρχ.**: if we retain **ὁ ἱερεύς** it must mean the high priest, ver. 27, *cf.* 1 Macc. xv. 1; Jos., *Ant.*, vi., 12, 1. But Weiss and Wendt both follow W.H. and R.V., and omit **ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ** (so Blass β). **ὁ στρατ.** and **οἱ ἀρχ.** are thus closely united by the **τε καί**, inasmuch as the former in the flight of the prisoners had the greatest responsibility, and the **ἀρχ.** had occasioned the imprisonment, ver. 17. The **στρατ. τοῦ ἱερ.** was present at the meetings of the Sanhedrim, and assisted in their deliberations.—**ἀρχιερεῖς**: see on iv. 1. The word is probably used as including the heads of the twenty-four courses, those who had been high priests and still retained the title, and also those referred to in iv. 6. Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., 203-206; O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, p. 142.—**διηπόρουν**, ii. 12, "were much perplexed," R.V.—See on **περὶ αὐτῶν**, *sc.*, **λόγοι**: not the Apostles, as Alford and Meyer.—**τί ἂν γένοιτο τοῦτο**, "whereunto this might grow," so A. and R.V. Blass interprets *quomodo hoc factum esse posset*, *cf.* x. 17; *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 173. St. Luke alone uses the optative with **ἄν** in the N.T., *cf.* Luke i. 62, vi. 11, ix. 46, Acts v. 24, viii. 31, x. 17, xvii. 18 (Luke xv. 26, xviii. 36, Acts xxvi. 29, doubtful text); Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, pp. 80 and 133; see also Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 66 (1893).

Ver. 25. **ἰδοὺ . . . εἰσίν**: on the characteristic use of the verb **εἶναι** after **ἰδοὺ** or **ἴδε** in St. Luke's writings as compared with other N.T. writers and the LXX, see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, pp. 200, 205 (1896); *cf.* ii. 7, xvi. 1, and Luke ii. 25, vii. 25, xi. 41, etc.—**παραγεν.**, see on ver. 22.—**ἑστῶτες**, *cf.* ver. 20. antitheton: *posuistis* (Bengel).

Ver. 26. **ἤγαγεν**: but imperfect with W.H. and Weiss, so Blass "quia modus quo res gesta est describitur; perfecta res indicatur, ver. 27, **ἀγαγόντες**".—**οὐ**

λαόν. 26. Τότε ἀπελθὼν ὁ στρατηγὸς σὺν τοῖς ὑπηρέταις, ἤγαγεν αὐτούς, οὐ μετὰ βίας, ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν, ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν.[1] 27. ἀγαγόντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔστησαν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ· καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ ἀρχιερεύς,[2] λέγων, 28. Οὐ [3] παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν μὴ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ; καὶ ἰδού, πεπληρώκατε [4] τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν, καὶ βούλεσθε ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ

[1] ηγαγεν AEP, Vulg., Chrys., Lucif.; D* ηγαγον; ηγεν ℵBD², so Tisch., W.H., Weiss. εφοβουντο . . . λιθασθωσιν, Flor. om., represents φοβουμενος μηποτε λιθασθη υπο του λαου; D φοβουμενος γαρ. ινα om. ℵBDE 5, 13, 40, 96, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.; but ins. AP, Chr., Theophyl., T.R., Meyer.

[2] αρχιερευς; D, Gig., Par., Lucif. have ιερευς, Flor. *praetor*=στρατηγος, instead; other additions in Flor., but no difference in sense.

[3] ου ℵ³DEP, Flor., Par., Sah., Syrr. P. and H., Arm., Aeth., Ath., Bas.; but om. ℵ*B 13, Gig., Vulg., Boh., Ath., Cyr., Lucif., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (who thinks with Alford that it was suggested by επηρωτησεν); Blass retains the negative, so Hilg.

[4] πεπληρωκατε BDEP, Bas., Tisch., Weiss, W.H., Hilg.; επληρωσατε ℵA 15, Chrys., Cyr. In Western text Flor., Pesh. insert υμεις δε instead of και before ιδου, and D*, Flor., Gig., Sah. read εκεινου for τουτου, emphasis.

μετὰ βίας, "*but* without violence," R.V. Weiss compares with the whole phrase ἦγεν . . . βίας (Exod. xiv. 25); βία three or four times in Acts only, xxi. 35, xxiv. 7 (omit W.H., R.V.), xxvii. 41; used in the LXX in the same sense as here and with the genitive, *cf.* Exod. xiv. 25 (*cf.* i. 14), 3 Macc. iv. 7; classical usage more frequently has βίᾳ, ἐκ βίας, etc.—**ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ**: the favour of the people which the Apostles so fully enjoyed at this time might well have caused an outbreak of fanaticism as later in the case of Stephen. The subjects to ἐφοβ. and to ἔστησαν (27) are ὁ στρατ. and οἱ ὑπηρέται. St. Chrysostom well comments on those who would thus fear—not God, but the people. On the Greek of the verse, see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 116 (1896).—**ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν**: the reading μὴ undoubtedly correct, so W.H., Wendt, Weiss, Blass.—**τὸν λαόν**: denoting the persons feared, and μὴ λιθασ., the thing feared, so that the meaning is as in R.V., "for they were afraid that they should be stoned by the people," or ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαὸν may be taken as parenthetical (so Weiss), and μὴ λιθασ. as limiting ἦγεν . . . βίας. In the N.T. after verbs of fearing the subjunctive only is used where after secondary tenses we should have expected the optative, or sometimes the subjunctive is explained as implying more certainty of a result. Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, pp. 95, 96.—**λιθασ.**: very seldom in Attic Greek, where we should expect καταλεύειν; only twice in LXX, 2 Sam. xvi. 6, 13, where usually λιθοβολέω (not used in classical writers, but six or seven times in N.T.); but λιθάζειν is found eight or nine times in N.T.

Ver. 27. **ἔστησαν**, *cf.* iv. 7, during the investigation the judges would sit, vi. 15, xxiii. 3, the accused, the witnesses, and those speaking, stood, Mark xiv. 57, 60, Acts iv. 7, v. 27, 34, vi. 13, xxiii. 9, O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, p. 177.

Ver. 28. **παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν**: for the Hebraism *cf.* iv. 17, "we straitly," etc., R.V. (and A.V.), expressing intensity—"commanding, we commanded you," Wycliffe. The T.R. makes the clause a question, commencing with οὐ, but the evidence is too strong against it, evidently it was occasioned by the ἐπηρώτησεν, but St .Chrysostom adopts it, see *Hom.*, xiii., 1. Bengel remarks on παραγγελίᾳ, "pudet dicere *minando*, iv. 17, nam non poterant punire". But St. Chrysostom rightly notes that they ought to have asked πῶς ἐξήλθετε, *i.e.*, from the prison, but they ask as if nothing had happened. —**ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ**, iv. 17, here as there the Council do not mention the name of Jesus, perhaps because they disdained it; in sharp contrast stands not only St. Peter's mention of the name, but his glorying in it, ver. 30, 31.—**τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ**: fem. here and elsewhere, *cf.* Gal. iv. 25, Rev. iii. 12, so in Matt.

αἷμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου. 29.[1] ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι εἶπον, Πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ Θεῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀνθρώποις. 30. ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ἤγειρεν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ὑμεῖς διεχειρίσασθε

[1] **ο Π.**, article om. ℵABEHP, Bas., Chrys., so W.H., Weiss; **ειπον**, but **-αν** ℵABE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss. At the commencement of the verse **αποκ. . . . προς αυτον** is omitted in D, and the words **πειθαρχειν δει** (**δε** in D) follow as part of the high priest's remarks; but Blass in β, following Flor., Gig., Lucif., adds to **αποκ. δε Πετρος** the words **ειπεν προς αυτον**, and proceeds "**τινι πειθαρχειν δει Θεῳ η ανθρωποις;**" making these words a question asked by Peter of the high priest, who replies, according to a further addition of Flor., Gig., **ο δε ειπεν** "**Θεῳ**". Weiss, Codex D, p. 64, thinks that the emendator took offence at the repetition of iv. 19, and thereupon places the words **πειθαρχειν δε** (not **δει**) **κ.τ.λ.** on the lips of the high priest as if he thus took up their own words contemptuously in addressing the Apostles, and the whole from **βουλεσθε** might thus originally have formed a question: "You wish to bring this man's blood upon us—but thus, indeed, to obey God rather than man? Such blood revenge cannot surely be the command of God;" but see further Blass, *in loco*, and Weiss, *u. s.* D, Flor., Gig. all add at the end of ver. 29, as introductory to ver. 30, **ο δε Πετρος ειπεν προς αυτους.**

ii. 3, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 32; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 153.—**διδαχῆς**, "teaching," R.V., *cf.* Matt. vii. 28.—**βούλεσθε**: the charge was untrue—the wish was their own, not that of the Apostles, *cf.* Matt. xxvii. 25. St. Peter's earnest desire was that they should be saved.—**ἐπαγαγεῖν**, xviii. 6, xxii. 20, and 2 Sam. i. 16, *cf.* 2 Peter ii. 1, 5; nowhere else in N.T.—**ἐφ' ἡμᾶς**: to bring His blood upon us, *i.e.*, the vengeance of the people for His murder. **αἷμα** pro **φόνον**, Hebraistic—no thought of divine punishment from their point of view; *cf.* LXX. Gen. xx. 9, Exod. xxxii. 34, Judges ix. 24, and *cf.* Josh. xxiii. 15 (in N.T., Matt. xxiii. 35, Rev. xviii. 24).

Ver. 29. St. Peter as the spokesman, *primus inter pares;* the Apostles as a body are associated with him in his answer: "but Peter and the Apostles," R.V. A.V. renders "Peter and the other Apostles," and we may understand an ellipse of **ἄλλοι** or **λοιποί** before **οἱ ἀπόστολοι**, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 286.—**ἀποκ.**, *cf.* Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 112 (1896).—**πειθαρχεῖν**: only used by St. Luke and St. Paul; *cf.* ver. 32, xxvii. 21, Titus iii. 1; in this chapter and in St. Paul, in its classical use, obeying one in authority, or **τοῖς νόμοις**, etc. The word is used in Polybius, and Josephus, and frequently in Philo, but only three times in the LXX; *cf.* 1 Esd. viii. 94, of obeying the law of the Lord. The reply of St. Peter, who speaks for all the Apostles, is practically the same as in iv. 19, but still more decisive in its tone as was natural after the recent command, ver. 20.

Ver. 30. **ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν**, *cf.* iii. 13. St. Peter, as before, will not dissociate himself from the commonwealth of Israel, or his hearers from the message and works of the Christ.—**ἤγειρεν**: does this word refer to the Resurrection, or to the sending of Jesus into this world, and His raising up by God as the Messiah? The former is the view taken by St. Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Erasmus, and amongst moderns by Meyer-Wendt, Nösgen, Alford, Overbeck, Felten, Blass, Holtzmann, Weiss, Hilgenfeld; but in iii. 15, iv. 10, the phrase is **ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν** (*cf.* Ecclesiast. xlviii. 5: **ὁ ἐγείρας νεκρὸν ἐκ θανάτου**), although in x. 40, xiii. 37, the word evidently refers to the Resurrection. Others interpret the word as **ἀνίστημι** in iii. 22, and as in xiii. 22, **ἤγειρεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δαυείδ** (*cf.* Luke i. 69, vii. 16), so Calvin, Bengel, De Wette, Lechler, Hackett, Page. One of the chief arguments for the former interpretation is the contrast marked in the next clause between the death of the Cross and the Resurrection, but this contrast would still be marked by the following verb. Is it not possible that, as in the days of old God had raised up a Saviour, or Saviours, for Israel, *cf.* Jud. ii. 18, **ἤγειρε Κ. αὐτοῖς κριτάς**, Jud. iii. 9, 15, **ἤγειρε Κ. σωτῆρα τῷ Ἰ.**, St. Peter may now speak of Him as raising up **Ἰησοῦς**, *i.e.*, a Saviour? see further, ver. 31.—**διεχειρίσασθε**, *cf.* xxvi. 21, "whom ye slew, hanging Him on a tree," R.V., not as in A.V., "whom ye slew and hanged on a tree," which would make the words refer to a Jewish mode of punishment, for, according to Jewish

κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου· 31. τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα ὕψωσε τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. 32. καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν αὐτοῦ μάρτυρες[1] τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων, καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ Ἅγιον, ὃ ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν αὐτῷ.

[1] **εσμεν αυτου μαρτυρες** D²EHP, Syr. Harcl., Aeth., Chrys; **εσμεν μαρτ.**, om. **αυτου** ℵD*, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Arm., Did., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H. text, R.V. text, Hilg.; **εν αυτῳ μαρτ.**, so B, W.H. marg., Wendt (crit. note, p. 141) om. **εσμεν αυτου**; **εσμεν εν αυτῳ μαρτ.** R.V. marg.; **εσμεν αυτῳ μαρτυρες** Weiss, see comment. **δε** D²EHP, Syr. Harcl., Chrys.; om. ℵABD* 31, Did. Chrys., so Vulg., d, Syr. Pesh., Arm., Aeth., Ir^int^., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. After **μαρτυρες** D, Flor., Par. add **παντων**; Par. omits **των ρηματων**, Blass brackets in β. **ο** ℵAD²HP, so Weiss; om. B 17, Ægypt., so W.H. marg., R.V. marg.; **ον** DE—Harris refers to Latin *quem*, but if article originally omitted possibly the **ον** of **αγιον** may have been repeated, and = an after-correction.

law, only those were hanged who were already dead (Deut. xxi. 22, Josh. x. 26). The word which means in middle to lay hands upon, and so to slay, to kill, is only used by St. Luke (not in LXX), and forcibly represents the guilt of the Jews in the murder of Jesus, as if they had perpetrated it with their own hands (*cf.* xxvi. 24), "made away with violently," Page; *cf.* instances in Wetstein (*trucidastis*).—**κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου**, LXX, Gen. xl. 19, Deut. xxi. 22, 23, Josh. x. 26, Esth. v. 14, vi. 4 (Gal. iii. 13). Although St. Luke uses **κρεμασθείς** of crucifixion, Luke xxiii. 39, St. Peter alone uses the exact phrase of the text given in x. 39, and so he too has **ξύλον**, 1 Pet. ii. 24, for the Cross (although St. Paul uses the same word, Acts xiii. 29). The word may therefore have a place amongst the many coincidences between St. Peter's addresses and the language of his Epistles, see above on pp. 121 ff. The fact that their victim was thus accursed in the eyes of the law aggravated their guilt, and at the same sharply contrasted their act and that of God; for a similar contrast see iii. 14, 15.

Ver. 31. **ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα**: the former word as it is used here without any qualification, *cf.* iii. 15, may imply, like **σωτῆρα**, a reference to the earlier days of Israel's history, when God raised up for them from time to time judges of whom the title **ἀρχηγός**, Jud. xi. 6, 11, might be used no less than **σωτήρ**. In Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ, St. Peter saw the true Leader and Saviour. For St. Peter no less than for St. Paul the ascended Jesus had led captivity captive and received gifts for men, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 47-49.—**ὕψωσεν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ**, *cf.* ii. 33: "exalt with his right hand," R.V., "at" margin. Here as elsewhere Briggs interprets **τῇ δεξιᾷ** as local not instrumental, and prefers R.V. margin, *Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 37, note; but see note on ii. 33 above. The verb is used also by St. John, iii. 14, viii. 28, xii. 32, and also by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 9 (see Westcott on St. John iii. 14). But in the passive (as twice in St. John) it is employed in the LXX of the high exaltation of the Servant of God, in the picture which had evidently passed before the eyes of St. Peter, Isaiah lii. 13; and he sees in the ascension of his Lord, and His spiritual sovereignty, a fulfilment of the prophecy of the suffering Servant, who is also a Prince and a Saviour.

Ver. 32. "And we are witnesses of these things," R.V. (W.H.), but in margin, "witnesses in Him," **ἐν αὐτῷ** (*cf.* Luke xxiv. 47); "nos in eo testes sumus," Iren., see also above critical notes. For an explanation of the reading in T.R. and the two genitives, see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 84, note, and compare 2 Cor. v. 1, Phil. ii. 30, 1 Thess. i. 3.—**ῥημάτων**: here = Hebrew דָּבָר, *cf.* x. 37 (Grotius, Blass), the words standing for their contents, *i.e.*, the things, the facts. Meyer understood the facts to be the Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus, but Wendt understands them to be the gifts of the Messianic salvation mentioned in ver. 31, and compares ver. 20. But the use of the word in ver. 20 need not limit its use here: the Apostles were called above all things to witness to the facts of Christ's life, x. 37, and the **ζωή** in ver. 20 depended upon the Resurrection. In Luke i. 37 R.V. has "no word," **ῥῆμα**, where A.V. has "no thing," *cf.* Luke i. 65, where A.V. has "things" in the margin

33. Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες διεπρίοντο, καὶ ἐβουλεύοντο ἀνελεῖν αὐτούς.
34. ἀναστὰς δέ τις ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ[1] Φαρισαῖος, ὀνόματι Γαμαλιήλ,

[1] εν τῳ συνεδριῳ; DE, Flor., Par. read (τις) εκ του συνεδριου, E adds αυτων.

(ῥήματα), and R.V. reads "sayings" in text: Luke ii. 15, where R.V. has "this thing" (ῥῆμα) in the text, and "saying" in margin; in ii. 19, 51, R.V. has "sayings" in the text, "things" in the margin —so in LXX, the same uncertainty, *cf.* Gen. xv. 1, xviii. 14, Exod. ii. 14, 15. ῥῆμα is used frequently by St. Luke in his writings, and much more so than by the other Evangelists; although it is found in all parts of the Acts, it is noticeable that it is employed more frequently in the earlier chapters, as in the first two chapters of the Gospel.—**καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον δὲ**: on the expression see iv. 8. The Holy Ghost συμμαρτυρεῖ with the Apostles, Rom. viii. 16 (*cf.* Acts xv. 28). We may well compare with these words of St. Luke our Lord's parting words in John xv. 26, 27. Here we have also the twofold witness—the historical witness borne to the facts—and the internal witness of the Holy Ghost in bringing home to men's hearts the meaning of the facts (see Westcott on St. John, *in loco*).—**τοῖς πειθαρχοῦσιν αὐτῷ**: not to be limited to the Apostles, although by repeating this verb used at the opening of the speech St. Peter intimates that the ὑπακοὴ τῆς πίστεως (Rom. i. 5) was the first requisite for the reception of the divine gift. In their own case the witness of the Spirit had been clearly shown, not only in the miracles which the Apostles had done, but also in the results of their preaching, in the enthusiasm of their charity, and we need not limit with Nösgen the thought of the gift of the Holy Spirit to the events of Pentecost. If this short speech of St. Peter, 29-32, reads like a summary of much which he is represented as saying on former occasions, we have no warrant for dismissing it as unhistorical, or even for supposing that St. Luke has only given us a summary of the address. It is rather "a perfect model of concise and ready eloquence," and a striking fulfilment of the Lord's promise, Matt. xi. 19. Nothing was more natural than that St. Peter and his fellow-Apostles, like men whose minds were finally made up, should thus content themselves with an emphatic re-assertion of the main issues involved in teaching which was already widely known, and with a justification of their disobedience to man by an appeal to the results which accompanied their obedience to God.

Ver. 33. **διεπρίοντο**: lit., were sawn asunder (in heart), *dissecabantur*, Vulgate (*cf.* use of *findo* in Persius and Plautus), *cf.* vii. 54 (Luke ii. 35), Euseb., *H. E.*, v., i., 6 (see Grimm, *sub v.*). The word is used in its literal sense in Aristoph., *Equites*, 768, Plato, *Conv.*, p. 193 *a*, and once in the LXX, 1 Chron. xx. 3. The rendering "sawed their teeth" would certainly require τοὺς ὀδόντας as in other cases where the verb (and the simple verb also) has any such meaning. Dr. Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, pp. 72, 73, also refers to its use in the comic poet Eubulus (Meineke), 3, 255, and classes it among the words (colloquial) common to the comic poets (including Aristophanes) and the N.T. Here we have not the pricking of the heart, ii. 37, which led to contrition and repentance, but the painful indignation and envy which found vent in seeking to rid themselves of the disciples as they had done of their Master.—**ἀνελεῖν**: the verb is found no less than nineteen times in Acts, twice in St. Luke's Gospel, and only two or three times in the rest of the N.T., once in Matt. ii. 16, Heb. x. 9 (2 Thess. ii. 8); often used as here in LXX and classical Greek; it is therefore not one of those words which can be regarded as distinctly medical terms, characteristic of St. Luke (so Hobart and Zahn), although it is much used in medical writers. The noun ἀναίρεσις, viii. 1, is only found in St. Luke, and is also frequent in medical writers, Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, pp. 209, 210; but this word is also used in LXX of a violent death or destruction, *cf.* Numb. xi. 15, Judith xv. 4, 2 Macc. v. 13. At the same time it is interesting to note that ἐπιχειρεῖν, another medical word characteristic of St. Luke, and used by him in the sense of attempting, trying, is found with ἀνελεῖν in Acts ix. 29, *cf.* Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 384, with which Hobart compares ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἰατρὸς ἀνελεῖν ἐπιχειρεῖ τὸ νόσημα (Galen), see *in loco*.

Ver. 34. **ἀναστὰς**, see ver. 17.—**συνεδρίῳ**: the word is used here and in ver. 27 above, without γερουσία, and

νομοδιδάσκαλος τίμιος παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἐκέλευσεν ἔξω βραχύ τι τοὺς ἀποστόλους[1] ποιῆσαι, 35. εἶπέ τε πρὸς αὐτούς,[2] Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις τί μέλλετε πράσσειν.

[1] **τι** HP (put by many before **ποιησαι**); om. ℵABDE, vers., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **τους αποστολους** DEHP, Par., Flor., Gig. (Vulg. am.corr. tol.), Sah., Syrr. P. and H., Aeth., Chrys.; **τους ανθρωπους** ℵAB (Vulg.), Boh., Arm., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, so also Blass in β; *cf.* vv. 35, 38, but here in narrative **ανθρωπ.** seemed undignified word.

[2] **αυτους**; D (Flor.), Sah. has **τους αρχοντας και τους συνεδρους (-ιους)**, d has "concilium," Flor. "ad totum concilium". **Ισραηλιται,** see above.

this seems to indicate that in ver. 21 the Sanhedrim is meant, and no additional council.—**Γαμαλιήλ**: it has sometimes been urged that Saul, the persecutor, could not have been the pupil of such a man as is here described—a man who was so liberal in his religious opinions, and so adverse to political agitation. But whatever may have been the extent of his liberality, Gamaliel remained firmly attached to the traditions of the fathers, and whilst we may see in his recorded principle his abhorrence of wrangling and over-scrupulosity, we may also see in it a proof of his adherence to traditionalism: "Procure thyself a teacher, avoid being in doubt; and do not accustom thyself to give tithes by guess" (Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 128). But in itself there is nothing strange in the fact that Saul should surpass the zeal of Gamaliel, for not only does history often show us how one side of the teaching of a master may be exaggerated to excess by a pupil, but also the specific charge against Stephen of destroying the Temple and of changing the customs of Moses had not been formulated against St. Peter and his brother-Apostles, who still attended the Temple worship, and whose piety gained them the regard of the people. That charge against the first martyr was nothing less than the charge brought against Jesus of Nazareth: the burning words and scathing denunciations of Stephen could only be answered, as those of Jesus had been answered, by the counter charge of blasphemy, and the punishment of death (see Sabatier's *L'Apôtre Paul*, 21 ff.).

Gamaliel appears as an ordinary member, and there can be no reasonable doubt that the high priest was always the President during the Roman-Herodian period. Not until after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the priesthood had lost its importance, was a Rabbi chosen as President of a reconstituted Sanhedrim. For a summary of the views for and against the Rabbinic tradition that this Gamaliel was the President of the Sanhedrim, see Appendix iii., "The President of the Sanhedrim," by the late Rev. H. A. White, in Dr. Edersheim's *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 522 ff. The influence of Gamaliel may easily be understood (1) when we remember that whilst the **ἀρχιερεῖς** belonged chiefly if not exclusively to the Sadducees, the Pharisees who also had seats in the Sanhedrim (*cf.* Acts xxiii. 6, and Jos., *B. J.*, ii., 17, 3, *Vita*, 38, 39, *C. Apion*, ii., 22) possessed *practically* a predominating influence in the Council. The remark of Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 1, 4, gives us, as Schürer says, "a deep insight into the actual position of matters," Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 178 ff., E.T., and O. Holtzmann *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 175. (2) But we have also to take into account the personal influence of the man, which was no doubt at its height about the time described in Acts v.—he died A.D. 57-58. Not only was he the first teacher of the seven to whom the title Rabban was given (higher than that of Rab or Rabbi), but Jewish tradition respecting him shows the dignity and influence which attached to his name, Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 2, 236, and see on the titles given to Gamaliel, Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 239-246, and Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 364. We may see a further proof of his influence in the fact that a certain proviso with regard to the determining leap year, which was passed in the Sanhedrim in his absence, was only to come into force if it received the confirmation of Gamaliel (*Edajoth*, vii., 7). So far then St. Luke's account of the weight which would be carried by Gamaliel in the assembly is amply justified, and Schürer's description of the constitution of the Sanhedrim, *u. s.*, p. 174 ff., is sufficient reply to the strictures of Jüngst

36. πρὸ γὰρ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀνέστη Θευδᾶς, λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν,[1] ᾧ προσεκολλήθη[2] ἀριθμὸς ἀνδρῶν ὡσεὶ τετρακοσίων· ὃς ἀνῃρέθη,[3] καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ διελύθησαν καὶ ἐγένοντο

[1] **εαυτον** ℵA*BCHP, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Eus., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V.; **εαυτον μεγαν** (*or* **μεγαν εαυτον**) A²DE tol., Flor., Gig., Syr. Pesh., Cyr., Or., Hier.

[2] **προσεκολληθη** 13, Chrys., Cyr.; **προσεκλιθη** ℵABC² 17, 31, Cyr., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (Blass in β), Hilg.; **προσεκληθη** C*D*EHP—**προσεκλιθη** orig. only here in N.T., others = interpretations of it. **ωσει** ℵHP, Cyr.; but **ως** ℵᶜABCDE, Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Hilg.

[3] **ανηρεθη**, instead D has **διελυθη αυτος δι' αυτου** (**διελυθησαν** omitted below). Eus. and Par. read **κατελυθη** (the latter *dissolutus est* = **διελ.** or **κατελ.**); see Blass, who maintains with Belser that this word rather than **ανηρεθη** is required by Gamaliel's argument, but why? **αυτῳ**, after this word **διελ.** omitted by D, **και** om. in d, and **και εγεν.** in Par.[1] but **διελ.** (*dissoluti sunt*) retained. (Weiss holds that the corrector refers **ος** the subject of **κατελυθη** not to **Θευδας** but to **αριθμος**.)

against Gamaliel's appearance as a member of the Council, *cf.* Derenbourg, *u. s.*, pp. 201, 213. On the words attributed to Gamaliel see below.—**νομοδιδάσκαλος**: only in St. Luke and St. Paul, *cf.* Luke v. 17, 1 Tim. i. 7, almost = **γραμματεύς**, **νομικός**, not found in LXX.—**βραχύ (τι)**: = "a little while," R.V., Luke xxii. 58, "a little space," A.V.; ambiguous, in classical Greek the word might be used as either **βραχύ**, a short distance, Xen., *Anab.*, iii., 3, 7, or **ἐν βραχεῖ**, "in a short time," Herod., v., 24, *cf.* Thuc., vi., 12. In Acts xxvii. 28 the word may be taken either of space or time (see Blass). In the LXX it is used of space in 2 Sam. xvi. 1, and 2 Sam. xix. 36, and most likely of degree in Psalm viii. 6 (although the expression may be taken of time, *cf.* Heb. ii. 7, 9, R.V.), and of time in Psalm xciii. 17, and in Isa. lvii. 17 (Weiss, Westcott; but see Hatch and Redpath, doubtful). But whether we take the word of space or time in this passage, it is noteworthy that St. Luke alone of the N.T. writers can be said to use **βραχύ** temporally (in Hebrews it is a quotation), Friedrich, and so Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 54.—**ἔξω ποιεῖν** (*hinausthun*): only here in this sense, *cf.* Blass, *in loco*, for classical instances, and *cf.* Psalm cxli. 8 (Symmachus)—Weiss, Wendt.

Ver. 35. **ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλεῖται**, see on ii. 22. **προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς**: phrase only found in St. Luke, *cf.* Luke xii. 1, xvii. 3, xxi. 34, and Acts xx. 28. **προσέχειν** without the pronoun is found six times in Matthew alone of the Evangelists, but in LXX frequently used in the phrase **πρόσεχε σεαυτῷ**. The phrase may be connected with **ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις**, "as touching these men, what you are about to do," R.V., hence the reading **ἀπὸ τῶν**, etc., E. Or we may take it with **μέλλετε πράσσειν**, "what you are about to do to these men". In favour of the latter it may be said that the construction **πράσσειν τι ἐπί τινι** is very common, whereas **προσέχειν ἑαυτοῖς** is never found in construction with **ἐπί**, and that this rendering rightly marks the evidently emphatic position of **τοῖς ἀνθρώποις** (so Weiss, Wendt, Holtzmann, Hackett).—**τί μέλλετε πράσσειν**, *quid acturi sitis*, Vulgate. Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 36, **μέλλειν** never found with future infinitive except in the phrase **μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι** used in Acts, almost always has a present infinitive, although its force is akin to that of the future (Grimm-Thayer); also Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 120. **μέλλειν** is used over thirty times in Acts in all its parts, and is found very often in St. Luke's Gospel.

Ver. 36. **πρὸ γὰρ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν**: Gamaliel appeals to the experience of the past—the phrase is placed first with emphasis, *cf.* xxi. 38; on St. Luke's fondness for phrases with **ἡμέρα** see above, and Friedrich, pp. 9, 89. But whilst Gamaliel appeals to the past, his appeal is not to a remote but to a near past which was still fresh in the memories of his generation, perhaps because, as St. Chrysostom urges, such recent examples **μάλιστα πρὸς πίστιν ἦσαν ἰσχυρά**.—**ἀνέστη**, *cf.* vii. 18, like the Hebrew קוּם, and so constantly in LXX, Exod. i. 8, Deut. xiii. 1, xxxiv. 10, Judg. ii. 10, iv. 9, v. 7, etc.—**Θεῦδας**: St. Luke evidently places Theudas before Judas. But

εἰς οὐδέν. 37. μετὰ τοῦτον ἀνέστη Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς, καὶ ἀπέστησε λαὸν ἱκανὸν[1] ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ·

[1] ικανον om. ℵA*B 81, d, Vulg., Eus., Cyr.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. πολυν in CD, so Hilg., but not retained by Blass in β. απωλετο, Par. reads κατελυθη; "recte," says Blass, who receives κατελ. in β. This will be only consistent with the former rejection of ανηρεθη.

a difficulty arises from the fact that the only Theudas of this period known to us is placed by Josephus in the reign of Claudius, about the year 44, 45. He gave himself out as a false prophet, gathered round him "a great part of the people," and persuaded them to follow him to the Jordan with a promise that its waters should miraculously divide before him as in the days of Moses. But the Roman procurator, Cuspius Fadus, sent a troop of horse to meet him, some of his followers were slain, others taken captive, whilst he himself was made prisoner and beheaded, and his head sent to Jerusalem, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 5, 1. But a serious chronological discrepancy must be faced if the Theudas of Josephus is the Theudas of St. Luke. Gamaliel speaks of a Theudas who arose before the days of the enrolment, R.V., which marked the attempt of Judas, *i.e.*, about 6-7 A.D. But are they the same? As early as the days of Origen their identity was denied (*c. Cels.*, i., 57), see "Acts," B.D.², Bishop Lightfoot, p. 40, and in comparing the two accounts in Josephus and Acts there is no close resemblance beyond the name, see Nösgen, *in loco*, and Belser, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, i., p. 70 (1896). St. Luke speaks definitely of 400 followers; Josephus evidently considers that the pretender was much more successful, so far as numbers were concerned, for he writes: πείθει τὸν πλεῖστον ὄχλον. These and similar discrepancies are also well insisted upon by Zahn in his recent *Introduction*, ii., 416, 417 (1899), and his own conclusion is that only such ordinary words are common to the two accounts as Luke, ἀνῃρέθη; Jos., ἀνεῖλε; Luke, ἐπείθοντο; Jos., ἔπειθε; and that we cannot get beyond the bounds of possibility that the two authors refer to the same fact (on Zahn's criticism of Krenkel's view of the dependence of Luke on Josephus in the narrative, see *u. s.*). In referring to the appearance of the many false Messiahs, such as the Theudas of Josephus, *Ant.*, xx., 5, 1, Dr. Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 66, remarks: "Of course this could not have been the Theudas of Acts v. 36, 37, but both the name and the movement were not solitary in Israel at the time"; see also Ramsay, *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* p. 259. And no testimony could be stronger than that of Josephus himself to the fact that at the time of the Advent Judæa was full of tumults and seditions and pretenders of all kinds, *Ant.*, xvii., 10, 4, 8; *B. J.*, ii., 4, 1. The view has been maintained by many commentators that the Theudas of Josephus may reasonably be supposed to be one of the many false teachers and leaders mentioned by the Jewish historian and not always by name, who pandered to the feverish hopes of the people and gave themselves out as of kingly rank—(so recently Belser, Felten, Page, Plumptre, Knabenbauer). The name Theudas contracted from Theodorus may not have been so common as that of Simon or Judas (although on the other hand, see Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 147)—"Josephus describes four men bearing the name of Simon within forty years, and three that of Judas within ten years, all of whom were instigators of rebellion"—but it was the Greek equivalent to several familiar Hebrew names, *e.g.*, Jonathan, Matthias; and Bishop Lightfoot allows that there is something to be said for Wieseler's suggestion that on the ground of the name the Theudas here may be identified with Matthias, the son of Margalothus, an insurgent in the time of Herod, prominent in the pages of Josephus, *Ant.*, xvii., 6, 2 (see also Zöckler on the whole question, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 197, 2nd edit.). We must admit the objection of Wendt that this and other identifications of names and persons cannot be proved (and some of them certainly are very precarious, as Alford pointed out), but we cannot suppose that St. Luke could have made the gross blunder attributed to him in the face of his usual accuracy (see Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. 90), or endorse with Schürer what he calls "the slight authority of the Acts in such matters" (*Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 169). If it is hardly possible that Josephus can have been mistaken, although some writers

κἀκεῖνος ἀπώλετο, καὶ πάντες ὅσοι ἐπείθοντο αὐτῷ διεσκορπίσθησαν. 38. καὶ τὰ νῦν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀπόστητε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων, καὶ

have held that it is by no means impossible that even here he may have been (*cf.* Alford, Rendall, Belser, and compare the remarks of Zahn, *ubi supra*), we may at least claim the same probability of freedom from error for St. Luke, "temporum bene memorem se scriptor monstrat: quo minus est probabile eum de Theuda tam graviter errasse quam plerique putant" (Blass), and see the recent remarks of Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 252 ff. It cannot be said that some recent attempts at a solution of the difficulty are very promising; for whilst H. Holtzmann severely blames Blass for maintaining that some Christian had interpolated the name Theudas in the text of Josephus (see Blass, *in loco*, and p. xvi., edit. min.), he himself is prepared to endorse the view recently maintained amongst others by Clemen that the writer of Acts in his mention of Theudas gives us a vague but yet recognisable recollection of Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 5, 1; see *in loco* and *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 3, 1896, and 13, 1897. B. Weiss thinks that the notorious difficulty may easily be got rid of by supposing that the reviser inserted the example of Theudas in the wrong place, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 574.—**λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν**: of consequence, really "somebody," *cf.* viii. 9 (and R.V.); "ein grosser Mann," Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 76; so we have its opposite, **οὐδείς**, *cf.* instances in Wetstein in classical Greek; so in Latin *quidam*, *aliquis*, Juvenal, i., 74; Cicero, *ad Atticum*, iii., 15; and *cf.* also 1 Cor. iii. 7, Gal. ii. 6, vi. 3; Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 148 (1893). And yet the jealous eye of the Pharisees was blind to the difference between such a man as Theudas, whom Gamaliel so contemptuously described, and the Apostles who sought not their own honour (Nösgen); *cf.* Vulgate, "dicens se esse aliquem," so Rhem. and Wycl., "saying that he was somebody".—**προσεκολλήθη**: better reading **προσεκλίθη**, a word not found elsewhere in N.T., *cf.* 2 Macc. xiv. 24; and so also in LXX, *cf.* Ps. xxxix. (xl.) 2, Symmachus; *cf.* Polyb., iv., 51, 5; so also **πρόσκλισις**; for its further use see Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xlvii., 4.—**ὡσεὶ (ὡς) τετρακοσίων**, see above on "Theudas".—**ἀνῃρέθη**, see also on **ἀναιρέω**, ver. 33, often of violent death in Acts. The two clauses stand in sharp contrast—the one emphasises the large number which joined Theudas, the other the fact that notwithstanding he was slain; *cf.* iv. 10.—**διελύθησαν κ.τ.λ.**: nowhere else in N.T., but its use is quite classical, *cf.* Thuc., ii., 12; Xen., Cyr., v., 5, 43; Polyb., iv., 2. Blass remarks that the whole phrase "apte de secta quæ paullatim dilabitur, minus apte de multitudine per vim disjecta".—**ἐγένοντο εἰς οὐδέν**: phrase only here in N.T. (*cf.* xix. 27), but see in LXX, Job xxiv. 25, Isa. xl. 17, Wisd. iii. 17, xx. 16. **γίνομαι εἰς** in LXX and also in classics; in N.T. *cf.* Luke xiii. 19, xx. 17, Acts iv. 11, and *cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 5. In the first passage it is Hebraistic; in the passage before us and in 1 Thess. the phrases are quite possibly Greek, *cf.* especially Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 143. The phrase is more frequent in St. Luke's writings than in any other books of the N.T., except the Apocalypse.

Ver. 37. **Ἰούδας ὁ Γαλ.**: here too an inaccuracy might have been charged against St. Luke, but it is to be noted that while Josephus speaks of Judas as a Gaulonite in one passage, Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 1, 1, he frequently, as both Belser and Wendt point out, speaks of him as a Galilean, *cf. Ant.*, xviii., 1, 6; xx., 5, 2; *B. J.*, ii., 8, 1, and 17, 8. But the name Galilean might easily be given to him because Galilee was the scene of his exploits, or because Gamala, his home, belonged to Lower Gaulonitis, which was reckoned as part of Galilee. The accuracy of St. Luke in the account of Judas is remarkable, for Gamaliel speaks of his insurrection as coming to nothing. He could so speak, say in 34 or 35 A.D., but not some ten years later, when the followers of Judas had again gathered together, and formed a kind of school or party, to say nothing of the rebellion of his three sons, James, Simon, and later, Menahem; see Belser, *u. s.*, p. 61, so Lightfoot, *u. s.*, Nösgen, and Alford's note.

As we consider the characteristics of such men as Theudas and Judas, it is difficult to suppose that the age which produced them could have produced the Messiah of the Gospels. He is, in truth, the Anti-Christ of Judaism. Instead of giving Himself out to be somebody, Jesus is meek and lowly of heart; instead of stirring revolt in Galilee, a burning furnace of sedition, His blessing is upon

ἐάσατε αὐτούς[1]· ὅτι ἐὰν ᾖ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη ἢ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο, καταλυθήσεται· 39. εἰ δὲ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐστιν, οὐ δύνασθε καταλῦσαι

[1] After **αφετ. αυτους** (W.H., R.V.) DE, Flor. insert **μη μιαναντες τας χειρας** (E has **μολυνοντες**), d *non coinquinatas manus*, e *non coinquinantes manus*, Flor. *non maculetis manus vestras*. Blass and Hilg. follow D. Chase thinks that the gloss arose in Syriac by assim. of O.T. passages, *cf.* Isa. lix. 3; but see Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 79 ff., as against this, and for the possible deriv. from Syriac through the trans. of **δυνησεσθε** (W.H., R.V.), and for theories that the gloss has moved away (as in other instances according to H.) from its right place. Belser sees in each word of the **β** recension in vv. 38 and 39 "the stamp of originality". Mr. Harold Smith suggests that there was a gloss on **εασατε (αφετε) αυτους** from ver. 33: **μη αναιρουντες**—ΜΗΑΝΑΙΡΟΥΝΤΕϹ—then **μη** became repeated—ΜΗΜΗΑΝΑΙΡΟΥΝΤΕϹ—the second **μη** became ΜΙ (by itacism), while ΑΙΡ dropped out after ΑΝ. This produces ΜΗΜΙΑΝΟΥΝΤΕϹ which would easily be read **μη μιαναντες—τας χειρας** being added for sense. **ἀναιρεῖν** is very common in *Acts*.

the peace-makers; instead of seeking a kingly crown, like Judas the Gaulonite, He withdraws from those who would take Him by force, and make Him a king; instead of preaching revolt and licence in the name of liberty for merely selfish ends, He bade men render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; instead of defiantly bidding His followers to be in subjection to no man, and inaugurating a policy of bloodshed and murder, He bade them remember that whilst One was their Master and Teacher, they all were brethren. Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. iii., p. 80, E.T., well points out that we have a literary memorial of the views and hopes of the Zealots in the *Assumption of Moses*, which goes so far as to prophesy that Israel will tread on the neck of the eagle, *i.e.*, the Romans, x. 8; but see also edition of *Assumption of Moses* by Prof. Charles, p. 42.

Ver. 37. **ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογ.**, see Blass, *in loco*, on St. Luke's accuracy. We must be careful to distinguish this from Luke ii. 1. The tribal method of numbering which forms an essential part of St. Luke's story in the Gospel may explain why no such serious disturbance followed as resulted from the Roman numbering and valuation which marked Quirinius' second Roman administration, "the great census," **ἡ ἀπογ.** (in 6-8 A.D.), taken when Judæa had just become a part of the Roman province of Syria. This "great census," taken after the Roman method, involved the imposition of a tax, Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 1, 1, and it was this impost which roused the indignation of Judas. To pay tribute to a foreign power was to violate an Israelite's allegiance to Jehovah: "We have no Lord and Master but God," was the watchword of Judas and his followers. For the whole subject see Ramsay, *Expositor*, April and June, 1897, and *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (1898), *e.g.*, pp. 107, 108, 127, 139.—**καὶ ἀπέστησε λαὸν**: used here transitively, and here only in the N.T., *cf.* Deut. vii. 4, and in classical writers, Herod., i., 76. The verb **ἀφίστημι** is not found in any of the Gospels except St. Luke's, where it occurs four times, and in the Acts six times. It is not only one of the words characteristic of the two books, but also of St. Luke and St. Paul (so also **μεθίστημι**, see on xix. 26), as it is only found once outside St. Paul's Epistles (in which it is employed four times), *viz.*, Heb. iii. 12; "drew away *some of the people*," R.V. There is no word which actually expresses this as in T.R., where we have **ἱκανόν** = "much," A.V.—**ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ**: this prepositional use of **ὀπ.** is not found in classical writers, where the word is always an adverb. In the N.T. and LXX the prepositional use is derived from Hebrew אַחֲרֵי, *cf.* xx. 30, Luke ix. 23, xxi. 8. Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 126.—**διεσκορπίσθησαν**: it is true that the sect revived under the name of Zealots, and played an active part in the Jewish wars, but there is no reason for charging St. Luke's account with inaccuracy (so Overbeck following De Wette). The fate of the leader and the dispersion of his followers was quite sufficient to point the moral which Gamaliel wished to draw.

Ver. 38. **καὶ τὰ νῦν**, *cf.* also in iv. 29, xvii. 30, xx. 32, xxvii. 22. **τὰ** neuter accusative absolute — as respects the present, now, *cf.* 2 Macc. xv. 8; thus in all parts of Acts, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, Klostermann, p. 53, so Zeller, Leke-

αὐτό,[1] μήποτε καὶ θεομάχοι εὑρεθῆτε. 40. Ἐπείσθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκαλεσάμενοι τοὺς ἀποστόλους, δείραντες παρήγγειλαν μὴ λαλεῖν

[1] **αυτο** C*HP, Vulg. (clem. and demid.), Sah., Boh., Syr. Pesh., Chrys.; **αυτους** ℵABC²DE, Vulg. (am. fu.), Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aeth., Bede, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.—**αυτο** may have come in from **το εργον τουτο.** Flor. apparently paraphrases latter part of verse, see Blass **β.** After **αυτους** E, Gig., Wern. add **ουτε υμεις ουτε οι αρχοντες υμων**; D, Flor., Syr. Harcl. mg. demid. add **ουτε υμεις ουτε βασιλεις ουτε τυραννοι,** so Hilg. Belser lays special stress on these words, whilst Weiss only sees here and in the following words of D unfortunate attempts at emending; *cf.* Wisd. xii. 14, **ουτε βασιλευς η τυραννος,** and see also below on vi. 10. D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor. demid., 33 mg., 180 add **απεχεσθε ουν απο των ανθρωπων τουτων.** Weiss sees an empty repetition of ver. 38, but Belser finds in **απεχ.** that which enables the construction of the following **μηποτε και κ.τ.λ.** to run quite smoothly.

bisch, Friedrich. The expression is quite classical. —**ἐάσατε**: **ἐάω** characteristic of Luke, and is only used once elsewhere in the Gospels, Matt. xxiv. 43 (also in 1 Cor. x. 13), but twice in St. Luke's Gospel, and seven times in Acts —**ἀφίημι** occurs only thrice in Acts; viii. 22, xiv. 17.—**καταλυθήσεται,** "will be overthrown," R.V. *evertere*, Blass, so Rendall. This rendering gives the proper force of the word; it is not **διαλύομαι** as in ver. 36, which might be rendered "will be dissolved," but **κατά** indicates subversion, *cf.* Rom. xiv. 20, Acts vi. 14, Gal. ii. 18; *cf.* 2 Macc. ii. 22, 4 Macc. iv. 16, and frequently *ibid.*, Vulgate, "dissolvetur".

Ver. 39. **ἐάν . . . εἰ δὲ**: it has sometimes been thought that the change of mood from subjunctive to indicative, "but if it is of God," as if indicating that the second supposition were the more probable (*cf.* Gal. i. 8, 9), indicates sympathy on the part of Gamaliel. It is of course possible that he may have been rendered favourably disposed towards the Christians by their strict observance of the Law, and by their appeal to a doctrine which widely divided Pharisees and Sadducees. Others have attributed the change in mood, not to Gamaliel at all, but to the author (so Overbeck, Holtzmann), and have maintained (so Blass, Weiss, *cf.* Winer-Moulton, xli. 2) that the indicative may be used because the second is the case with which the Council had actually to deal, the assertion, *i.e.*, of the Apostles. There may also be an underlying contrast between the transitoriness of all mere human schemes, all of which would be overthrown, and the certainty of that which is "of God," and which has Him for its Author. There cannot be the least ground for supposing that Gamaliel's counsel was in its tenor a mere invention, as it bears the impress of a thorough Rabbinical wise saying, *cf. Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, v., 24 (Taylor, p. 93, second edition). See too Herod., ix., 16; Eur., *Hippol.*, vi., 76; for the construction, *cf.* Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 96, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, pp. 103, 113 (1893), who compares LXX, Gen. xliv. 23, 26.—**οὐ δύνασθε**: R.V. and W.H., **δυνήσεσθε. καταλῦσαι** with accusative of person in Xen., *Cyr.*, viii., 5, 24; Plato, *Legg.*, iv., p. 714, C., *cf.* 4 Macc. iv. 16. But without this addition it is usual to refer back to **προσέχετε** in ver. 35 (*cf.* Luke xxi. 34) for the construction of **μήποτε**; but **μήποτε . . . εὑρεθῆτε** may be explained on the principle that a verb of *fearing* is sometimes unexpressed, the idea of fear being supplied by the context (in clauses where **μή** with the subjunctive is found), Burton, *u. s.*, p. 96.—**μήποτε,** "lest haply," its use in later Greek, Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 208. **καί** sometimes interpreted (so Alford, Wendt, Holtzmann), as if it meant not only against man *but also* against God. **θεομάχοι**: not found elsewhere, but *cf.* LXX, Job xxvi. 5, Symm., and in Prov. ix. 18, xxi. 16, applying the word to the Rephaim (see B.D.² "Giants"); in 2 Macc. vii. 19 we have **θεομαχεῖν ἐπεχείρησας.** In classical Greek the same verb is found, see Grimm and Wendt for instances; **θεομαχία,** Plato, *Rep.*, 378, D. (as certain books of the *Iliad* were called, especially the xix.). The tolerance of the sentiments here attributed to Gamaliel is undoubtedly in perfect accordance with what we know of his character and opinions; the decisions attributed to him, *e.g.*, that relating to the law of the Sabbath (Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 2, 237; see also Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 239-246, and *cf.* also Renan, *Apostles*, p. 153, E.T.), are marked by a

ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς. 41. Οἱ μὲν οὖν[1] ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι ὑπὲρ τοῦ

[1] μεν ουν (Flor. δε), D, Par. add αποστολοι, so Hilg.; Flor. adds απολυθεντες, *cf.* iv. 23; Blass in β combines both.

tendency to mildness and liberality; and perhaps a still more remarkable illustration of the same tendency is afforded by the enactment so often referred to him (Hamburger, *u. s.*) to allow to the poor of the heathen, as well as of Israel, the gleaning and a participation in the corn left standing in the corner of the fields, to inquire after the welfare of the Gentile poor, to maintain them, to visit their sick, to bury their dead (the prayer against heretics belonged not to this Gamaliel, but to Gamaliel II.). But the decision of Gamaliel was not prompted by any sympathy with the Christians; it was the judgment of toleration and prudence, but certainly nothing more, although it scarcely falls under the head of "cynical"; it was rather, as Ewald called it, that of an ordinary politician. No credence whatever can be attributed to the tradition that Gamaliel became a Christian, or that he was secretly a Christian, although we may sympathise with St. Chrysostom's words, "it cannot be that he should have continued in unbelief to the end". The Talmud distinctly affirms that he died a Jew, and, if he had betrayed his faith, we cannot understand the honour which Jewish tradition attaches to his name, "Gamaliel," B.D.[2]; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 364. Wendt, while he refuses to admit the historical character of the speech of Gamaliel, is evidently puzzled to discover any definite grounds for St. Luke's wilful introduction of the famous Rabban into the scene (so too Feine). He therefore supposes that the decision in ver. 38, in which he sees a wise saying similar to those attributed to other Rabbis, was assigned by tradition to Gamaliel, and that St. Luke, who was in possession of the further tradition that Gamaliel had given a decisive judgment in the trial of the Apostles, introduces this saying into the speech which he attributes to Gamaliel as fitting to the occasion. But there is no indication in our authorities that the sentiment thus attributed to Gamaliel was in any way different from what might have been expected of him (see Schürer, *Jewish People*, *u. s.*). The chief objection to the speech, *viz.*, the alleged anachronism involved in the mention of Theudas, really begs the question as to its authenticity, and even on the supposition of an inaccuracy in the point mentioned, we cannot get rid of the fact that the attitude of Gamaliel in itself betrays no inconsistency. It was this alleged anachronism which caused Spitta to refer the incident of Gamaliel in this chapter to his inferior source B., and to refuse to adopt the solution of Weiss and Feine, who solved the difficulty involved in the mention of Theudas by introducing the hand of a reviser.

Ver. 40. **ἐπείσθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ**: whatever scruples Gamaliel may have had in pressing matters against the Apostles, or even if the teaching of Christ, as some have conjectured, with much of which he might have sympathised as a follower of Hillel, had influenced his mind, or if, like Joseph of Arimathea, he too had not consented to the counsel and will of his fellow-Sanhedrists, there is no reason to suppose (see above) that he ever advanced beyond the compromise here suggested. It may be that Neander was right in his judgment that Gamaliel was too wise a man to render a fanatical movement more violent still by opposing it. Others however see in his words a mere *laisser-aller* view of matters, or a timid caution which betokened a mere waiter upon Providence. But at the same time there are occasions when Gamaliel's advice may not be out of place, see Bengel on ver. 38, and Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 110 ff.—**δείραντες**, Deut. xxv. 3, 2 Cor. xi. 24: the punishment was for minor offences, and it was now inflicted upon the Apostles because they had trangressed the command enjoined upon them previously, iv. 18. The Pharisees, probably by their superior number in the Sanhedrim (Jos., *Ant.*, xiii., 10, 6), were able to secure the following of Gamaliel's advice, and to prevent extreme measures against the Apostles, but they were not prepared to disregard the previous injunction of the Council which bade the Apostles refrain from uttering a word in the name of Jesus. But the Apostles themselves must have seen in the punishment a striking fulfilment of their Lord's words, as in the closing hours of His earthly life He foretold their future sufferings for His Name. The

ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ [1] κατηξιώθησαν ἀτιμασθῆναι· 42. πᾶσάν τε ἡμέραν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ κατ' οἶκον οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν.[2]

[1] After ονοματος a few cursives read αυτου; but om. ℵABCDHP, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

[2] Flor., Gig. add *Jesu*, Par. adds *Christi* (see for variations Alford and Wendt). R.V., W.H., Weiss have τον Χριστον Ιησουν; D, Flor., Par. τον κυριον Ι. Χ., so Hilg.

penalty which must have been a very painful one, although the command not to exceed forty stripes often led to its mitigation, was often inflicted by the synagogues, and not only by the great Sanhedrim, for all kinds of offences as against heretics and others. These verses 40-42, with the exception of the words ἐπείσθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ, were referred by Jüngst to the redactor on the ground that they do not fit in well after Gamaliel's speech, and that the Apostles would have been at once released, but the Apostles were punished for a transgression of the command previously laid upon them in iv. 18. According to Jüngst, who here follows Spitta, the original conclusion of the narrative is to be found in inserting after ver. 39, chap. vi. 7! Here we are told is a notice, which is quite out of place where it now stands, that a great number of the priests were obedient to the faith: this was the result of the speech of Gamaliel, and his warning not to be found "fighting against God"; a speech delivered in the Sanhedrim in the midst of the priests!

Ver. 41. οἱ μὲν οὖν: no answering δέ as after i. 6, ii. 41, but explained because immediately upon ἐπορεύοντο (which answers to ἀπέλυσαν) follows χαίροντες, marking the attitude of the Apostles, and showing how little they proposed to obey the injunction from fear of further punishment. But see also Mr. Rendall's note, and also his Appendix on μὲν οὖν, *Acts*, p. 163, in which he examines this view at length; according to him there is an answering δέ, but it is found in the antithesis to this sentence in chap. vi. 1, the connection being that the Apostles now became more absorbed in their spiritual work, and a murmuring arose in consequence of their neglect of the distribution of the common funds. But this antithesis does not seem natural, and a censure on the Apostles is not necessarily contained in vi. i. ff.—ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες: "imperf. quia describitur modus" (Blass, *Grammatik des N. G.*, p. 186; if one prophecy of their Lord had been already fulfilled, another was fulfilled in the sequel, Matt. v. 11, 12, Phil. i. 29.—κατηξιώθησαν . . . ἀτιμασθῆναι: oxymoron, *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 8-10; *cf.* Bengel's note—he calls it "eximium oxy.". The verb καταξ. is used by St. Luke in his Gospel, xx. 35 (xxi. 36, T.R., but not W.H. or R.V.), and here; only found once elsewhere, 2 Thess. i. 5, in a passage where the thought of Christian suffering and inheritance is combined; 2 Macc. xiii. 12, 3 Macc. iii. 21, iv. 11, 4 Macc. xviii. 3. ἀτιμασθῆναι only used once elsewhere by St. Luke, *cf.* Luke xx. 11, where it is also found in connection with δέρω.—ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόμ., "the Name"—*i.e.*, the Name κατ' ἐξοχήν, *cf.* 3 John 7, and James v. 14 (ii. 7) (τοῦ Κ. doubtful), *cf.* also Clem. Rom., 2 *Cor.* (so called), xiii., 4, Ignat., *Ephes.*, iii., 1, used here as the absolute use of שֵׁם in Lev. xxiv. 11, 16, by which the Jews understood Jehovah. See Grimm, Mayor's *St. James* above, and Taylor, *Pirke Aboth*, p. 67, second edition; *cf.* τῆς ὁδοῦ, "the Way," ix. 2, etc. — πᾶσάν τε ἡμέραν: the τε joins the imperfect ἐπαύοντο closely to the preceding, indicating the continuance of the work of the Apostles in spite of threats and blows, and of their resolve to welcome suffering for Christ as an honour = κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν. This use of παύεσθαι with the participle almost entirely in Luke and Paul may be regarded as a remains of literary usage, Luke v. 4, Col. i. 9, Ephes. i. 16 (Heb. x. 2); Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 193 (1893).—ἐν τῷ ἱερ. καὶ κατ' οἶκον: the words may mark a contrast between the public preaching which was not discontinued, *cf.* ver. 21, and the teaching continued at home in a household assembly, or κατά may be taken distributively, and refer to the Christian assemblies met together in various houses in the city, as in ii. 46. See Zöckler's note, and Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, pp. 259, 260.—τὸν Χρ. Ἰ.: "Jesus *as* the Christ," R.V. The contents of the first Apostolic preaching, the sum and substance of the Apostles'

VI. 1. ἘΝ δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις πληθυνόντων τῶν μαθητῶν, ἐγένετο γογγυσμὸς τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους, ὅτι παρε-

message to their fellow-countrymen. This is allowed and insisted upon by Schwegler, Renan, and others, but in the statement what an intimate knowledge of the life of Jesus is presupposed, and how great must have been the impression made by Him upon His daily companions!

CHAPTER VI.—Ver. 1. δὲ; *cf.* i. 15, and see above in v. 41. There seems no occasion to regard δὲ as marking a contrast between v. 41 and the opening of this chapter, or as contrasting the outward victory of the Church with its inward dissensions (as Meyer, Holtzmann, Zechler, see Nösgen's criticism *in loco*); simply introduces a new recital as in iii. 1. It may refer back to the notice in v. 14 of the increase of the disciples, and this would be in harmony with the context. On the expression ἐν ταῖς ἡμέρ. ταύτ., as characteristic of Luke, see above, and Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 9; in both his Gospel and the Acts expressions with ἡμέρα abound. Harnack admits that in passing to this sixth chapter "we at once enter on historical ground," *Expositor*, v., p. 324 (3rd series). For views of the partition critics see Wendt's summary in new edition (1899), p. 140, Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 390 ff. (1895), and also in commentary below. Wendt sees in vi. 1-7 the hand of the redactor, the author of Acts ii. 5; others suppose that we have in vi. the commencement of a new Hellenistic source; so Feine, J. Weiss, Hilgenfeld. Clemen refers vi. 7, 8 to his *Historia Petri*, whilst ver. 9 commences his *Historia Hellenistarum* (vv. 1-6 belong to a special source); others again see in chap. vi. the continuance of an earlier source or sources.—πληθυνόντων, when the number of the disciples was multiplying (present part.); verb frequent in LXX, sometimes intrans. as here, Exod. i. 20, etc., and see *Psalms of Solomon*, x., 1, and note in Ryle and James' edition; *cf.* also its classical use in its more correct form, πληθύω, in the Acts: vi. 7, vii. 17, ix. 31, xii. 24. On St. Luke's fondness for this and similar words (Friedrich) see p. 73. Weiss calls it here a very modest word, introduced by one who knew nothing of the conversions in many of the preceding chapters. But the word, and especially its use in the present participle, rather denotes that the numbers went on increasing, and so rapidly that the Apostles found the work of relief too great for them.—μαθητῶν, the word occurs here for the first time in the Acts (surely an insufficient ground for maintaining with Hilgenfeld that we are dealing with a new source). The same word is found frequently in each of the Gospels, twenty-eight times in Acts (μαθήτρια once, ix. 36), but never in the Epistles. It evidently passed into the ancient language of the early Church from the earthly days of the ministry of Jesus, and may fairly be regarded as the earliest designation of the Christians; but as the associations connected with it (the thought that Jesus was the διδάσκαλος and His followers His μαθηταί) passed into the background it quickly dropped out of use, although in the *Acts* the name is still the rule for the more ancient times and for the Jewish-Christian Churches; *cf.* xxi. 16. In the Acts we have the transition marked from μαθηταί to the *brethren* and *saints* of the Epistles. The reason for the change is obvious. During the lifetime of Jesus the disciples were called after their relationship to Him; after His departure the names given indicated their relation to each other and to the society (Dr. Sanday, *Inspiration*, p. 289). And as an evidential test of the date of the various N.T. writings this is just what we might expect: the Gospels have their own characteristic vocabulary, the Epistles have theirs, whilst Acts forms a kind of link between the two groups, Gospels and Epistles. It is, of course, to be remembered that both terms ἀδελφοί and ἅγιοι are also found in Acts, not to the exclusion of, but alongside with, μαθηταί (*cf.*, *e.g.*, ix. 26, 30, xxi. 4, 7, 16, 17): the former in all parts of the book, and indeed more frequently than μαθηταί, as applied to Christians; the latter four times, ix. 13, 32, 41, xxvi. 10. But if our Lord gave the charge to His disciples recorded in St. Matt. xxviii. 19, bidding them make disciples of all the nations, μαθητεύσατε (*cf.* also Acts xiv. 21 for the same word), then we can understand that the term would still be retained, as it was so closely associated with the last charge of the Master, whilst a mutual discipleship involved a mutual brotherhood (Matt. xxiii. 8). St. Paul in his Epistles would be addressing those who enjoyed through Christ a common share with himself in a holy fellowship and calling, and whom

he would therefore address not as **μαθηταί** but as **ἀδελφοί** and **ἅγιοι.** They were still **μαθηταί,** yet not of man but of the Lord (only in one passage in Acts, and that a doubtful one, ix. 43, is the word **μαθηταί** or **μαθητής** used of any human teacher), and the word was still true of them with that significance, and is still used up to a period subsequent (we may well believe) to the writing of several of Paul's Epistles, Acts xxi. 16. How the word left its impress upon the thought of the Church, in the claim of the disciple to be as his Master, is touchingly evidenced by the expressions of St. Ign., *Ephes.* i. 2; *Magn.*, ix., 2; *Rom.* iv. 2; *Tral.*, v., 2 (St. Polyc., *Martyr*, xvii., 3, where the word is applied to the martyrs as disciples of the Lord, and the prayer is offered: **ὧν γένοιτο καὶ ἡμᾶς συγκοινωνούς τε καὶ συμμαθητὰς γενέσθαι**). — **γογγυσμὸς** and **γογγύζειν** are both used by St. Luke (*cf.* Luke v. 30), by St. John, and also by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 14, and 1 Cor. x. 10, the noun also by St. Peter, i. 4, 9. The noun is found seven times in the LXX of Israel in the wilderness (*cf.* 1 Cor. x. 10); so in Phil. ii. 14 it is probable that the same passage, Exod. xvi. 7, was in the Apostle's mind, as in the next verse he quotes from the Song of Moses, Deut. xxxii. 5, LXX; so **γόγγυσις** is also found in LXX with the same meaning, Numb. xiv. 27. **γογγυσμός** is also found in Wisd. i. 10, Ecclus. xlvi. 7, with reference to Numb. xiv. 26, 27, and twice in Psalms of Solomon v. 15, xvi. 11. In Attic Greek **τονθυρισμός** would be used (so **τονθρίζω** and **τονθυρίζω**). Phrynichus brands the other forms as Ionian, but Dr. Kennedy maintains that **γογγυσμός** and **γογγύζειν** from their frequent use in the LXX are rather to be classed amongst "vernacular terms" long continued in the speech of the people, from which the LXX drew. Both words are probably onomatopoetic.—Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, pp. 38-40, 72, 73, 76; see also Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 463; Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 106. Here the word refers rather to *indignatio clandestina*, not to an open murmuring. —**Ἑλληνιστῶν.** The meaning of the term, which was a matter of conjecture in St. Chrysostom's day, cannot be said to be decided now (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 48). The verb **Ἑλληνίζειν**, to speak Greek (Xen., *Anab.*, vii., 3, 25), helps us reasonably to define it as a Greek-speaking Jew (so also Holtzmann and Wendt). The term occurs again in **ix. 29** (**and xi. 20?** see *in loco*), and includes those Jews who had settled in Greek-speaking countries, who spoke the common Greek dialect in place of the vernacular Aramaic current in Palestine, and who would be more or less acquainted with Greek habits of life and education. They were therefore a class distinguished not by descent but by language. This word "Grecians" (A.V.) was introduced to distinguish them from the Greeks by race, but the rendering "Grecian Jews" (R.V.) makes the distinction much plainer. Thus in the Dispersion "the cultured Jew was not only a Jew but a Greek as well"; he would be obliged from force of circumstances to adapt himself to his surroundings more or less, but, even in the more educated, the original Jewish element still predominated in his character; and if this was true of the higher it was still more true of the lower classes amongst the Hellenists—no adoption of the Greek language as their mode of speech, no separation of distance from the Holy City, no defections in their observances of the law, or the surrender as unessential of points which the Pharisees deemed vital, could make them forget that they were members of the Commonwealth of Israel, that Palestine was their home, and the Temple their pride, see B.D.[2], "Hellenist," Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 282, E.T.; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 3, "Griechenthum". But bearing this description in mind, we can the more easily understand the conflict with Stephen, and his treatment by those who were probably his fellow-Hellenists. If as a cultured Hellenist St. Stephen's sympathies were wider and his outlook less narrow than that of the orthodox Jew, or of the less educated type of Hellenist, such a man, who died as St. Stephen died with the prayer of Jesus on his lips (see Feine's remarks), must have so lived in the spirit of his Master's teaching as to realise that in His Kingdom the old order would change and give place to new. But the same considerations help us to understand the fury aroused by St. Stephen's attitude, and it is not difficult to imagine the fanatical rage of a people who had nearly risen in insurrection because Pilate had placed in his palace at Jerusalem some gilt shields inscribed with the names of heathen gods, against one who without the power of Pilate appeared to advocate a change of the customs which Moses had delivered (see Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 69).—**Ἑβραῖοι**—in W.H. with smooth breath-

θεωροῦντο ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ αἱ χῆραι αὐτῶν.[1] 2. προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ[2] οἱ δώδεκα τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν, εἶπον, Οὐκ

[1] At end D adds εν τῃ διακονιᾳ των Εβραιων, according to Flor. οτι εν τ. καθ. διακ. αι χ. των Ελλ. υπο των διακονων των Εβρ. παρεθεωρ. Blass in β reads simply after αι χ. αυτων the words υπο των διακ. των Εβραιων.

[2] ουν CEHP, Vulg.; δε ℵB, so Tisch., W.H. text, R.V. marg., Weiss, Wendt; δη A, so Lach., W.H. marg. D reads τι ουν εστιν αδελφοι; επισκεψ., so Flor., Par.; *cf.* xxi. 22 (Weiss).

ing, see W.H., Introduction, p. 313, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 40; here those Jews in Palestine who spoke Aramaic; in the Church at Jerusalem they would probably form a considerable majority, *cf.* Phil. iii. 5, and Lightfoot's note. In the N.T. Ἰουδαῖος is opposed to Ἕλλην (Rom. i. 16), and Ἑβραῖος to Ἑλληνιστής, Acts vi. 1. In the former case the contrast lies in the difference of race and religion; in the latter in the difference of customs and language. A man might be called Ἰουδαῖος, but he would not be Ἑβραῖος in the N.T. sense unless he retained in speech the Aramaic tongue; the distinction was therefore drawn on the side of language, a distinction which still survives in our way of speaking of the *Jewish* nation, but of the *Hebrew* tongue. See Trench, *Synonyms*, i., p. 156 ff. In the two other passages in which Ἑβρ. is used, Phil. iii. 5 and 2 Cor. xi. 22, whatever difficulties surround them, it is probable that the distinctive force of the word as explained above is implied. But as *within* the nation, the distinction is not recognised by later Christian writers, and that it finds no place at all in Jewish writers like Philo and Josephus, or in Greek authors like Plutarch and Pausanias (Trench, *u. s.*).—πρὸς, *cf.* St. Luke v. 30, ἐγόγγυζον πρὸς τ. μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ.—παρεθεωροῦντο: not found elsewhere in N.T. and not in LXX, but used in this sense in Dem. (also by Diodorus and Dion. Hal.) = παρορᾶν, Attic: imperfect, denoting that the neglect had been going on for some time; how the neglect had arisen we are not told—there is no reason to suppose that there had been previously Palestinian deacons (so Blass in β, critical notes), for the introduction of such a class of deacons, as Hilgenfeld notes, is something quite new, and does not arise out of anything previously said, although it would seem that in the rapidly growing numbers of the Church the Hebrew Christians regarded their Hellenist fellow-Christians as having only a secondary claim on their care. Possibly the supply for the Hellenists fell short, simply because the Hebrews were already in possession. The Church had been composed first of Galileans and native Jews resident in Jerusalem, and then there was added a wider circle—Jews of the Dispersion. It is possible to interpret the incident as an indication of what would happen as the feeling between Jew and Hellenist became more bitter, but it is difficult to believe that the Apostles, who shared with St. James of Jerusalem the belief that θρησκεία consisted in visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction, could have acted in a spirit of partiality, so that the neglect, if it was due to them, could be attributed to anything else than to their ignorance of the greatness of the need.—διακονίᾳ, see below on ver. 2.—καθημερινῇ: not found elsewhere in N.T. or in LXX, only in Judith xii. 15. It is a word only used in Hellenistic Greek, *cf.* Josephus, *Ant.*, iii., 10, 1; but it may be noted that it is also a word frequently employed by medical writers of a class of fevers, etc. See instances in Hobart, pp. 134, 135, and also in Wetstein, *in loco.*—αἱ χῆραι αὐτῶν: not merely a generic term for the poor and needy—under the Mosaic dispensation no legal provision was made for widows, but they would not only receive the privileges belonging to other distressed classes, but also specific regulations protected them — they were commended to the care of the community, and their oppression and neglect were strongly condemned — it is quite possible that the Hellenistic widows had previously been helped from the Temple Treasury, but that now, on their joining the Christian community, this help had ceased. On the care of the widow in the early Church, see James i. 27 (Mayor's note); Polycarp, *Phil.*, vi., 1, where the presbyters are exhorted to be εὔσπλαγχνοι μὴ ἀμελοῦντες χήρας ἢ ὀρφανοῦ ἢ πένητος, and *cf.* iv. 3. The word χήρα occurs no less than nine times in St. Luke's Gospel, three times in the Acts, but elsewhere in the Evangelists only three times in St. Mark (Matt. xxiii. 14, omitted by W.H. and R.V.), and two

of these three in an incident which he and St. Luke alone record, Mark xii. 42, 43, and the other time in a passage also peculiar to him and St. Luke (if we are justified in omitting Matt. xxiii. 14), *viz.*, Mark xii. 40.

Ver. 2. **προσκαλεσάμενοι δὲ οἱ δώδεκα**: whatever may have been the irritation caused by the pride or neglect of the Hebrews, the Apostles recognised that there was ground for complaint, and thus showed not only their practical capacities, but also their freedom from any partiality. **οἱ δώδ.**: only here in Acts, but *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 5, where St. Paul uses the title as if it were well and widely known, and required no explanation from him. It is found six times in St. Luke's Gospel, and no less than ten in St. Mark's. See also above i. 26, ii. 14. — **τὸ πλῆθος** = the whole Church, not the hundred-and-twenty, as J. Lightfoot. The expression is a general one, and need not imply that every single member of the Church obeyed the summons. For the word **πλῆθος** and the illustration of its use in religious communities on the papyri by Deissmann, see p. 73. The passage has been quoted in support of the democratic constitution of the Apostolic Church, but the whole context shows that the government really lay with the Apostles. The Church as a whole is under their direction and counsel, and the Apostles alone determine what qualification those chosen should possess, the Apostles alone lay hands upon them after prayer: "The hand of man is laid upon the person, but the whole work is of God, and it is His hand which toucheth the head of the one ordained, if he be duly ordained" (Chrys., *Hom.*, xiv.). The dignity of the Apostles, and their authority as leaders of the Church and ordainers of the Seven, is fully recognised by Feine, but he considers that their position is so altered, and the organisation of the Church so much more developed, that another source and not the Jerusalem *Quellenschrift* must be supposed; but if, as Feine allows, such passages as iv. 34, v. 2, belong to the Jerusalem source, it would appear that the authority of the Apostles in the passage before us was a very plain and natural development.—**καταλείψαντας**: on the formation of the first aorist see Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 43, and also Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 18; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 109.—**διακονεῖν τραπέζαις**: there seems to be an intentional antithesis between these words and **τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου** in ver. 3. The Twelve do not object to the work of ministering, but only to the neglect of ministering to the higher sustenance for the sake of the lower (Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 206); thus Bengel speaks of the expression as used with indignation, "Antitheton, *ministerium verbi*". **διακονία** and **διακονεῖν** are used for ministrations to man, although more usually of man to God; *cf.* Acts xix. 22, of service to St. Paul, **διακονία**, Acts xi. 29, xii. 25, of service to the brethren of Judæa in the famine, Rom. xv. 25, 31, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12, 13, of the Gentile collections for the same purpose, so too probably in Rom. xvi. 1 of the service rendered by Stephanas to travelling Christians, *cf.* Heb. vi. 10, and its use of the verb in the Gospels of ministering to our Lord's earthly wants, Luke viii. 3, x. 40 (both noun and verb), John xii. 2; *cf.* also Luke xii. 37, xxii. 27, Matt. iv. 11, Luke iv. 39; see further on the use of the word in classical Greek, Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 203. The word had a high dignity conferred upon it when, in contrast to the contemptuous associations which surrounded it for the most part in Greek society, Epictetus remarks that it is man's true honour to be a **διάκονος** of God (*Diss.*, iii., 22, 69; 24, 65; iv. 7, 20; *cf.* iii. 26, 28), and a dignity immeasurably higher still, when the Son of Man could speak of Himself as in Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45; *cf.* Luke xxii. 27. "Every clergyman begins as a deacon. This is right. But he never ceases to be a deacon. The priest is a deacon still. The bishop is a deacon still. Christ came as a deacon, lived as a deacon, died as a deacon: **μὴ διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι**" (Lightfoot, *Ordination Sermons*, p. 115). In the LXX the verb does not occur at all, but **διάκονος** is used four times in Esther i. 10, ii. 2, vi. 3, 5, of the king's chamberlains and of the servants that ministered to him, and once in 4 Macc. ix. 17; **διακονία** is also found in two of the passages in Esther just quoted, vi. 3 and 5, where in A we read **οἱ ἐκ τῆς διακονίας** (BS **διάκονοι**), and once in 1 Macc. xi. 58, of the service of gold sent by Jonathan to Antiochus. What is meant by the expression here? does it refer to distribution of money or in kind? The word in itself might include either, but if we were to limit **διακονία** to alms, yet the use of the word remarked upon above renders the service higher than that of ordinary relief: "*ministration*," says St. Chrysostom (although he takes it of alms, *Hom.*, xiv.), "extolling by this at once the doers and

ἀρεστόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς, καταλείψαντας τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, διακονεῖν τραπέζαις. 3. ἐπισκέψασθε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἄνδρας ἐξ ὑμῶν μαρτυρου-

those to whom it was done". But **τραπέζαις** presents a further difficulty; does it refer to the tables of exchange for money, a rendering which claims support from Matt. xxi. 12, xxv. 27, Luke xix. 23, John ii. 15, or to tables for food, Luke xvi. 21, xxii. 21, 30? Possibly the use of the word in some passages in the N.T., and also the fact that the **διακονία** was **καθημερινή**, may indicate the latter, and the phrase may refer to the actual serving and superintending at the tables at which the poor sat, or at all events to the supplying in a general way those things which were necessary for their bodily sustenance. Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte* (second edition), refers the word to the ministration of the gifts of love offered at the Eucharist in the various Christian houses (so Scaliger understood the expression of the Agapæ). Mr. Humphry reminds us that the words were quoted by Latimer (1548) in a sermon against some bishops of his time who were comptrollers of the mint.

Ver. 3. **ἐπισκέψασθε οὖν**: the verb, though frequently used by St. Luke in both his writings, is not elsewhere used in the sense of this verse, "look ye out," *cf.* **σκέπτεσθαι** in Gen. xli. 33.—**μαρτυρουμένους**, *cf.* Heb. xi. 2, 39, and *cf.* 4, 5, and 1 Tim. v. 10, Acts x. 22, xxii. 12, also xvi. 2; *cf.* its use also in Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xvii., 1; xviii. 1, etc.; Ignat., *Phil.*, xi., 1; *Ephes.*, xii. 2. See also the interesting parallels in Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 93. In Jos., *Ant.*, iii., 2, 5, and xv., 10, 5, it is used as here, but of hostile testimony in Matt. xxiii. 31, John xviii. 23.—**ἑπτά**: why was the number chosen? Various answers have been given to the question: (1) that the number was fixed upon because of the seven gifts of the Spirit, Isa. xi. 2, Rev. i. 4; (2) that the number was appointed with regard to the different elements of the Church: three Hellenists, three Hebrews, one Proselyte; (3) that the number was regulated by the fact that the Jerusalem of that day may have been divided into seven districts; (4) that the number was suggested by the Hebrew sacred number—seven; (5) Zöckler thinks that there is no hypothesis so probable as that the small Jerusalem **ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον** were seven in number, each with its special worship, and its special business connected with alms-giving and distribution—alms-giving closely related to the Eucharist or to the Love-Feasts; (6) the derivation of the number from Roman usage on the analogy of the *septemviri epulones* advocated by Dean Plumptre, officials no doubt well known to the *Libertini* (see also B.D.[2] "Deacon," and the remarks of Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 375, on Roman organisation and its value). This is far more probable than that there should be any connection between the appointment of the Seven and the two heathen inscriptions quoted by Dr. Hatch (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 50, note 56), in which the word **διάκονος** is used of the assistants in the ritual of sacrificial and temple feasts at Anactorium in Acarnania and Metropolis in Lydia (see on the other hand, Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 210), for in the incident before us the word **διάκονος** is not used at all, and later in the history, xxi. 8, Philip is described not by that title but as one of the Seven. Nor is there any real likeness to be found between the office assigned to the Seven and that of the Chazzan or officer of the Jewish synagogue (**ὑπηρέτης**, Luke iv. 20), who corresponded rather to our parish-clerk or verger, and whose duties were confined to the synagogue; a nearer Jewish parallel is to be found in the צְדָקָה גַּבָּאֵי, collectors of alms, but these officers would rather present a parallel to the tax-gatherers than to those who ministered to the poor (see "Deacon" in Hastings, B.D.). Whilst, however, these analogies in Jewish offices fail us, we stand on much higher ground if we may suppose that as our Lord's choice of the Twelve was practically the choice of a number sacred in its associations for every Israelite, so the number Seven may have been adopted from its sacredness in Jewish eyes, and thus side by side with the sacred Apostolic College there existed at this period another College, that of the Seven. What was the nature of the office? Was it the Diaconate in the modern sense of the term? But, as we have noted above, the Seven are never called Deacons, and therefore it has been thought that we have here a special office to meet a special need, and that the Seven were rather the prototypes of the later archdeacons, or corresponded to the elders who are mentioned in xi. 30 and xiv. 23. On the other hand St. Luke,

μένους ἑπτά, πλήρεις Πνεύματος [1] Ἁγίου καὶ σοφίας, οὓς καταστήσωμεν [2] ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης· 4. ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ διακονίᾳ

[1] **αγιου** om. ℵBC²D 137, 180 (Vulg. am. fu. lux), Syr. Harcl., Chrys.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

[2] **καταστησομεν** ℵABCDE, Bas., Chrys., Wendt, Weiss, W.H; **καταστησωμεν** HP (d, e, Vulg.).

from the prominence given to the narrative, may fairly be regarded as viewing the institution of the office as establishing a new departure, and not as an isolated incident, and the emphasis is characteristic of an historian who was fond of recording "beginnings" of movements. The earliest Church tradition speaks of Stephen and Nicolas as ordained to the diaconate, Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, i., 26; iv., 15, and the same writer speaks of Stephen as "the first deacon," iii., 12; *cf.* also the testimony of St. Cyprian, *Epist.*, 3, 3, and the fact that for centuries the Roman Church continued to restrict the number of deacons to seven (Cornelius, ap. *Euseb. H. E.*, vi., 43). It is quite true that the first mention of **διάκονοι** in the N.T. (although both **διακονία** and **διακονεῖν** are used in the passage before us) is not found until *Phil.* i. 1, but already a deaconess had been mentioned in writing to the Church at Rome (xvi. 1, where Phœbe is called **διάκονος**), in the Church at Philippi the office had evidently become established and familiar, and it is reasonable to assume that the institution of the Seven at Jerusalem would have been well known to St. Paul and to others outside Palestine, "and that analogous wants might well lead to analogous institutions" (Hort, and to the same effect, Gore, *The Church and its Ministry*, p. 403). But if the Seven were thus the prototypes of the deacons, we must remember that as the former office though primarily ordained for helping the Apostles in distribution of alms and in works of mercy was by no means confined to such duties, but that from the very first the Seven were occupied in essentially spiritual work, so the later diaconate was engaged in something far different from mere charity organisation; there were doubtless qualifications demanded such as might be found in good business men of tact and discretion, but there were also moral and spiritual qualities which to a great extent were required of the **διάκονοι** no less than of the **πρεσβύτεροι** and **ἐπίσκοποι**: there was the holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience, there was the moral and spiritual courage which would enable the **διάκονοι** to gain even in the pursuit of their **διακονία** "great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus," 1 Tim. iii. 13 (Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 138 ff.); see also on the whole subject, Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 139 ff.; Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 206 ff.; Lightfoot, *Philippians*, "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry," and *Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theol. und Kirche* (Hauck), "Diakonen" (Heft 38, 1898).—**σοφίας**: practical wisdom, *prudentia*, *cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 5 (Blass, so Grimm); in ver. 10 the use of the word is different, but in both places **σοφία** is referred to the Spirit, "it is not simply spiritual men, but full of the Spirit and of wisdom . . . for what profits it that the dispenser of alms speak not, if nevertheless he wastes all, or be harsh and easily provoked?" Chrys., *Hom.*, xiv.—**οὓς καταστήσομεν** (on the reading *whom ye*, which was exhibited in some few editions of A.V., see *Speaker's Commentary*, *in loco*): the appointment, the consecration, and the qualifications for it, depend upon the Apostles—the verb implies at all events an exercise of authority if it has no technical force, *cf.* Titus i. 5. The same shade of meaning is found in classical writers and in the LXX in the use of the verb with the genitive, with **ἐπί**, sometimes with a dative, sometimes with an accusative: Gen. xxxix. 4, xli. 41, Exod. ii. 14, xviii. 21, Num. iii. 10, Neh. xii. 44, Dan. ii. 48, 49, 1 Macc. vi. 14; *cf.* its use in Luke xii. 14, 42, 44. The opposite is expressed by **μεταστήσασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς χρ.**, Polyb., iv., 87, 9; 1 Macc. xi. 63 (Wendt).—**χρείας**: the word might mean need in the sense of necessity, Latin *opus*, want, 2 Chron. ii. 16, Wisdom xiii. 16, 1 Macc. iii. 28, or it might mean business, Latin *negotium*, *officium*. In the LXX it seems to be employed in both senses, as also in classical writers, but here both A. and R.V. render "business" (so in Polybius), *cf.* Judith xii. 10 AB., 1 Macc. x. 37, xi. 63, xii. 45 (**χρεία** is found no less than eight times in 1 Macc., seven times in 2 Macc., once in 3 Macc.); see Wetstein

τοῦ λόγου προσκαρτερήσομεν.[1] 5. καὶ ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος[2] ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους· καὶ ἐξελέξαντο Στέφανον, ἄνδρα πλήρη[3] πίστεως καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ Φίλιππον, καὶ Πρόχορον καὶ Νικάνορα, καὶ

[1] **προσκαρτερησομεν**; D, Flor., Gig., Par., Vulg. read **εσομεθα . . . προσκαρτερουντες.** This participial construction with the substantive verb is characteristic of St. Luke, and occurs with the same verb as here in i. 14, ii. 42, viii. 13.

[2] **ο λογος**; D, Flor. (Gig.) add **ουτος**; Harris refers to retrans. from Latin, **παντος του πληθους**; D adds **των μαθητων**, so Hilg.; Flor. substitutes **παντων των μαθητων**, so Blass in **β**.

[3] **πληρη** BC corr., T.R.; so **Weiss, Wendt, W.H., R.V.**; **πληρης** ℵBC*DEHP so Lach. See further below.

for uses of the word in Philo and Josephus.

Ver. 4. **ἡμεῖς δὲ**: in marked contrast to the service of tables, etc., but still every work in the Church, whether high or low, was a **διακονία.**—**τῇ διακ. τοῦ λ.**, see above.—**προσκαρτερήσομεν**, "will continue steadfastly," R.V., see above on i. 14.—**τῇ προσ.**, "the prayer" (Hort); the article seems to imply not only private prayer and intercession, but the public prayer of the Church.

Ver. 5. **ἤρεσεν ἐνώπιον**: phrase not usual in classical Greek; but **ἐνώ.** in this sense, so **κατενώπιον ἔναντι κατέναντι**, derived from the LXX (**ἐναντίον** frequent in LXX, is also classical); *cf.*, *e.g.*, Deut. i. 23 A, 2 Sam. iii. 36, 1 Kings iii. 10, xx. (xxi.) 2, Jer. xviii. 4, Ju. vii. 16, xiii. 20, 1 Macc. vi. 60, viii. 21 (**ἐναντίον**, S), where the whole phrase occurs. Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 125, and see on iv. 10.—**πλήθους**, *cf.* Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 60, and above on p. 73.—**ἐξελέξαντο**, see above, *cf.* xv. 22, 25, always in the middle in N.T. (Luke ix. 35 doubtful), so in LXX. Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 181, nearly always = בָּחַר. On the importance of the step thus taken as marking a distinct stage in the organisation of the Church, and in the distribution of work amongst the members of what was now a true body politic, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 372; Hort., *Ecclesia*, p. 52, and on its further importance in the emancipation of the Church, see Lightfoot's "Paul and the Three". The choice of the names has often been held to indicate the liberal spirit in which the complaint of the Hellenists was met, since the Seven bear purely Greek names, and we infer that the bearers were Hellenists, "elegerunt ergo Graecos non Hebræos, ut magis satisfacerent murmuri Graecorum" Cornelius à Lapide. But the inference is not altogether certain, however probable (see Wendt, Felten), for Greek names, *e.g.*, Philip, Didymus, Andrew, were also found amongst the Palestinian Jews. Bengel holds that part were Hebrew, part Hellenist, whilst Gieseler hazarded the opinion that three were Hebrews, three Hellenists, and one a proselyte. But we cannot conclude from the fact that they were probably Hellenists, that the Seven were only charged with the care of distribution amongst the Hellenist section of the Church, as there is nothing in the narrative to warrant this. We cannot say that we know anything of the Seven except Stephen and Philip—Stephen the preacher and martyr of liberty, Philip the practical worker (Lightfoot, "Paul and the Three"). Baronius hazarded the fanciful conjecture that Stephen as well as Saul was a pupil of Gamaliel. Both Stephen and Philip were said to have been amongst the Seventy, Epiphanius, *Haer.*, xx., 4 (but see Hooker, v., lxxviii., 5). If so, it is possible that they may have been sent to labour in Samaria as our Lord had laboured there, Luke ix. 52, xvii. 11; and possibly the after work of Philip in that region, and possibly some of the remarks in St. Stephen's speech, may be connected with a mission which had been committed to Hellenistic Jews. See further on his name and work, Dean Plumptre, *in loco*, and also below, notes on chap. vii. He may well be called not only the proto-martyr, but also the first great Christian Ecclesiastic (B.D.[1] "Stephen").—The description given of Stephen (as of Barnabas, so closely similar, xi. 24, *cf.* Numb. xxvii. 18 of Joshua) shows that the essential qualifications for office were moral and spiritual; see also below on **Φίλιππον.**—**πλήρη**: in some MSS. the word appears as indeclinable, W.H. margin, so in ver. 3, xix. 28, Mark viii. 19, 2 John 8. Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 81. St. Luke uses the adjective twice in his

Τίμωνα καὶ Παρμενᾶν, καὶ Νικόλαον προσήλυτον Ἀντιοχέα, 6. οὓς ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων· καὶ προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς

Gospel, and eight times in the Acts; on his fondness for such words, see p. 73.—**πίστεως**: not in the lower sense of honesty or truthfulness, but in the higher sense of religious faith, *cf.* xi. 24, "non modo fidelitate sed fide spirituali," Bengel.—**Φίλιππον**, *cf.* viii. 5, xxi. 8: we may probably trace his work also along the coasts of Palestine and Phœnicia, *cf.* viii. 40, xv. 3, xxi. 3, 7 (Plumptre's notes on these passages), and no doubt St. Luke would have learnt from him, when he met him at Cæsarea, xxi. 8, much that relates to the early history of the Church, *Introd.*, 17. It would appear both in his case and in that of St. Stephen that the duties of the Seven could not have been confined to service of the tables. In the deacons M. Renan saw a proclamation of the truth that social questions should be the first to occupy the attention of man, and the deacons were, for him, the best preachers of Christianity; but we must not forget that they did not preach merely by their method and works of charity, but by a proclamation of a Saviour and by the power of the Holy Ghost. In the reference to Philip in xxi. 8 as simply "one of the Seven" we may fairly see one of the many proofs of the unity of the authorship of *Acts*, see Salmon, *Introd.*, chapter xviii., and Lightfoot, "Acts," B.D.[2], and see further, Salmon in the same chapter, on the proof which is afforded in the account of Philip of the antiquity of the *Acts*; see below also on xxi. 8.—**Πρόχορον**: tradition says that he was consecrated by St. Peter Bishop of Nicomedia, and a fabulous biography of John the Evangelist had his name attached to it, as a companion of the Apostle in Asia, and his biographer—but we cannot attach any credence to any such professed information; see Blass, *in loco*, Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1895, p. 426; B.D.[1] iii. *sub v.* Of Simon, Parmenas, Nicanor, it cannot be said that anything is known, as is frankly admitted by the Romanist commentator Felten.—**Νικόλαον προσήλυτον Ἀ.**: that the name proselyte is given to him has been held by many to mark him out as the only proselyte among the Seven; otherwise it is difficult to see why he alone is so designated (so Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 375, Lightfoot, Hort, Weiss, Felten, and amongst earlier writers, De Wette and Ewald). No doubt he was a proselyte of the higher and more complete type (a "proselyte of the gate," the lower type—as distinct from a "proselyte of righteousness"—is always in Acts **φοβούμενος** or **σεβόμενος τὸν θεόν**), but Ramsay sees in his election to office another distinct step in advance: "the Church is wider than the pure Jewish race, and the non-Jewish element is raised to official rank," although, as Ramsay himself points out, there was nothing in this step out of harmony with the principle of the extreme Judaistic party (*St. Paul*, p. 375, *cf.* 157). The case of Cornelius was of a different kind, see below on chap. x. But the notice is all the more interesting because it contains the first mention of the Church afterwards so important, the Mother Church of the Gentiles, Antioch in Syria, and this may point to the reason of the description of Nicolaus as a proselyte of Antioch. It was a notice of special interest to St. Luke if his own home was at Antioch, but we cannot say positively that the notice means that Nicolaus was the *only* proselyte among the Seven. That the Jews were numerous at Antioch and had made many proselytes we learn from Jos., *B. J.*, vii., 3, 3: of the supposed connection between this Nicolaus and the sect of the Nicolaitans, Rev. ii. 6, 14, we may hesitate to say with Blass that it is worthy of no more credit than the notice which attaches to Prochorus, although we may also well hesitate to accept it, but it has been advocated by Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 297, and recently by Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 199. Zöckler goes so far as to see in the list of the Seven a copy of the list of the Apostles, inasmuch as the most distinguished is placed first, the traitor last. But Nicolaus would be fitly placed last if he were the only proselyte. The Patristic evidence in support of the connection in question is by no means conclusive, see Ritschl, *Altkatholische Kirche*, p. 135 and note (second edition), Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 140, and Wendt, *in loco*, Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 425 (1895). Holtzmann on Rev. ii. 6 holds that the Nicolaitans, who are not to be connected with Nicolaus the deacon, may = symbolically, the Bileamites, ver. 14; so Grimm, *sub. v.* **Νικολαΐτης**, if we take the latter as coinciding with the Hebrew בִּלְעָם = *destruction of the people.*

τὰς χεῖρας. 7. καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ[1] ηὔξανε, καὶ ἐπληθύνετο ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν μαθητῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ σφόδρα, πολύς τε ὄχλος τῶν ἱερέων[2] ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει.

[1] θεου ℵABCHP; but DE 180, Vulg., Par., Syr. Harcl., Chrys., Or[int.] read Κυριου.
[2] ιερεων; but ℵ* Syr. Pesh., Theophyl. read Ιουδαιων. (See below.)

Ver. 6. ἔστησαν, *cf.* i. 23; for ἐνώπιον, see above.—καὶ προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας: change of subject. This is the first mention of the laying on of hands in the Apostolic Church. No doubt the practice was customary in the Jewish Church, Num. xxvii. 18, Deut. xxxiv. 9; see also Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 281, and *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 382, and Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie*, ii., 6, pp. 882-886, "Ordinirung, Ordination"; Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 216; Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, pp. 187, 382; but the constant practice of it by our Lord Himself was sufficient to recommend it to His Apostles. It soon became the outward and visible sign of the bestowal of spiritual gifts in the Apostolic Church, *cf.* Acts viii. 15, xiii. 3, 1 Tim. iv. 14, v. 22, 2 Tim. i. 6, and every convert was instructed in its meaning as one of the elementary teachings of the faith, Heb. vi. 2. That the act was a means of grace is evident from St. Paul's words, for he reminds Timothy of the grace thus bestowed upon him, 1 Tim. iv. 14, 2 Tim. i. 6, and from the narrative of St. Luke in viii. 15, 17, and passages below. But that it was not a mere outward act dissociated from prayer is evident from St. Luke's words in the passage before us, in viii. 17, xiii. 3, and xix. 6. See especially Hooker, v., lxvi., 1, 2; see below in viii. and xiii., and Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, especially note G. Holtzmann would draw a distinction between the laying on of hands here and in viii. 17, xix. 6. Here, he contends, it only corresponds to the customary usage at the ordination of a Rabbi, as the Seven had already received the Holy Ghost, ver. 3, 5, *cf.* xiii. 1. But ver. 8 undoubtedly justifies us in believing that an accession of power was granted after the laying on of hands, and now for the first time mention is made of St. Stephen's τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα (see St. Chrysostom's comment).

Ver. 7. τῶν ἱερέων: the reading Ἰουδαίων is advocated by Klostermann, *Probleme in Aposteltexte*, pp. 13, 14, but not only is the weight of critical evidence overwhelmingly against it, but we can scarcely doubt that St. Luke would have laid more stress upon the first penetration of the Christian faith into districts outside Jerusalem—this is represented as the result of the persecution about Stephen, viii. 4; *cf.* John xii. 42 (see also Wendt, 1899, p. 145, note). The whole verse shows that the γογγυσμός had not interfered with the growth of the Church. The conjecture that in the word ὄχλος reference is made to the priests of the *plebs* in contrast to the learned priests is in no way satisfactory; if this had been the meaning, the words would have been πολλοί τε ἱερεῖς τοῦ ὄχλου, and no such distinction of priests is anywhere noticed in the N.T., see further below.—ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ: Hilgenfeld (so Weiss) considers that, as this notice implies that there were disciples outside Jerusalem, such a remark is inconsistent with the statements of the after-spread of the Church in this chapter and in viii., and that therefore the words ἐν Ἰ. are to be referred to the "author to Theophilus". But so far from the words bearing the interpretation of Hilgenfeld, the historian may have introduced them to mark the fact that the growth of the Church continued in Jerusalem, in the capital where the hierarchical power was felt, and that the growth included the accession of priests no less than of laymen.—ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει: the imperfect may denote repetition—the priests kept joining the new community, Blass, *in loco; cf.* Rom. i. 5, xi. 16, 17, x. 16, 2 Thess. i. 8—the verb (very frequent in LXX) is only used in Acts in this place in the sense given, but often in St. Paul's Epistles. No doubt when the number of Jewish priests was so large (according to Josephus, twenty thousand) both poor and wealthy would have been included in the statement, and we cannot limit it to the Sadducees. It must be borne in mind that the obedience of these priests to the Christian faith need not of necessity have interfered with the continuance of their duties in the Temple (so Felten), especially when we remember the attitude of Peter and John; but the words certainly seem to mark their complete obedience to the

8. ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ δὲ πλήρης πίστεως[1] καὶ δυνάμεως ἐποίει τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἐν τῷ λαῷ. 9. ἀνέστησαν δέ τινες τῶν ἐκ τῆς συνα-

[1] πιστεως HP, Syr. Harcl., Chrys.; *cf.* ver. 5. χαριτος ℵABD, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. Pesh., Arm., Bas., Did.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Hilg. After λαῳ D (Syr. H. mg.), Par. (E, Flor., Gig.), so Hilg., add δια του ονοματος κυριου I. X.; *cf.* iv. 30 (and in *Classical Review*, July, 1897, p. 319).

faith (see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* πίστις, i. *b*, α), and in face of the opposition of the Sadducees and the more wealthy priestly families, an open adherence to the disciples of Jesus may well have involved a break with their former profession (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 49, and *Ecclesia*, p. 52). May there not have been many among the priests waiting for the consolation of Israel, men righteous and devout like the Pharisee priest or priests, to whom perhaps we owe that expression of the hopes of the pious Jew in the *Psalms of Solomon*, which approach so nearly in style and character to the Hymns of the priest Zacharias and the devout Symeon in the early chapters of St. Luke's Gospel? see Ryle and James's edition, *Psalms of Solomon*, Introd., lix., lx. Spitta refers the whole verse to his source B, as a break in the narrative, without any connection with what follows or precedes. Clemen assigns vi. 1-6 to his special source, *H*(*istoria*) *H*(*ellenistarum*); vi. 7 to his *H*(*istoria*) *Pe*(*tri*). Jüngst assigns vi. 1-6. 7[b, c] to his source B, 7[a] to his R(edactor). The comment of Hilgenfeld on ver. 7 is suggestive (although he himself agrees with Spitta, and regards the verse as an interpretation), "Clemen und Jüngst nicht einmal dieses Verstein ungeteilt".

Ver. 8. πλήρης πίστεως, but χάριτος, R.V. Vulgate, *gratia* = divine grace, xviii. 27, not merely favour with the people—the word might well include, as in the case of our Lord, the λόγοι χάριτος which fell from his lips (Luke iv. 22). On the word as characteristic of St. Luke and St. Paul, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 28, 96; in the other Gospels it only occurs three times; *cf.* John i. 14, 16, 17. See Plummer's note on the word in *St. Luke*, *l. c.*—δυνάμεως: not merely power in the sense of courage, heroism, but power to work miracles, supernatural power, *cf.* viii. 13 and Luke v. 17. That the word also means spiritual power is evident from ver. 10.—ἐποίει, "was doing," imperfect, during Stephen's career of grace and power the attack was made; notice imperfect combined with aorist, ἀνέστησαν, see Rendall's note. In ver. 8 Spitta sees one of the popular legendary notices of his source B. St. Stephen is introduced as the great miracle-worker, who is brought before the Sanhedrim, because in v. 17, a parallel incident in B, the Apostles were also represented as miracle-doers and brought before the same assembly; it would therefore seem that the criticism which can only see in the latter part of the Acts, in the miracles ascribed to St. Paul, a repetition in each case of the miracles assigned in the former part to St. Peter, must now be further utilised to account for any points of likeness between the career of St. Stephen and the other leaders of the Church. But nowhere is it said that Stephen was brought before the Sanhedrim on account of his miracles, and even if so, it was quite likely that the ζῆλος of the Sanhedrim would be stirred by such manifestations as on the former occasion in chap. v.

Ver. 9. ἀνέστησαν: in a hostile sense, *cf.* Luke x. 25, Mark xiv. 57, and see above on v. 17.—τῆς συναγωγῆς: in Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome and the larger towns there was no doubt a considerable number of synagogues, but the tradition that assigned no less than four hundred and eighty to Jerusalem alone is characterised by Schürer as a Talmudic myth (*Jewish Temple*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 73, E.T., so too Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, pp. 83, 252, but see also Renan, *Apostles*, p. 113, E.T.). The number four hundred and eighty was apparently fixed upon as the numerical equivalent of the Hebrew word for "full," in Isa. i. 21, a city "full of judgment". The names which follow have been variously classified, but they have always proved and still prove a difficulty. Ramsay considers that the bad form of the list is due to the fact that St. Luke is here dependent on an authority whose expressions he either translated *verbatim* or did not understand, *Expositor* (1895), p. 35. One thing seems certain, *viz.*, that Λιβερτίνων does not refer to any town Libertum in the neighbourhood of

·ωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης[1] Λιβερτίνων, καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξανδρέων, καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας,[2] συζητοῦντες τῷ Στεφάνῳ· 10. καὶ

[1] της λεγομενης BCDEHP, Vulg. Syrr. P.H., Arm., Aeth. (Chrys.), so Lach., W.H., Weiss, Wendt; των λεγομενων ℵA 13, 47, Gig., Sah., Boh., Chrys., so Tisch.

[2] Ασιας om. AD[2] d, so Lach., Hilg. brackets; may easily have dropped out after Κιλικιας. συζητουντες, B[3]HP.

Carthage, which has been urged as an explanation of the close juxtaposition of Cyrene, also in Africa. The existence of a town or region bearing any such name is merely conjectural, and even if its existence could be demonstrated, it is improbable that many Jews from such an obscure place should have been resident in Jerusalem. There is therefore much probability that St. Chrysostom was correct in referring the word to the Libertini, Ῥωμαῖοι ἀπελεύθεροι. The Libertini here were probably Roman "freedmen" who were formerly captive Jews brought to Rome by Pompey, B.C. 63 (Suet., *Tib.*, 36; Tac., *Ann.*, ii., 85; Philo, *Legat. ad Gaium*, 23), and afterwards liberated by their Roman masters. These men and their descendants would enjoy the rights of Roman citizenship, and some of them appear to have returned to Jerusalem, where they had their own community and a synagogue called συναγ. Λιβερτίνων (according to Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* Λιβερτ., some evidence seems to have been discovered of a "synagogue of the Libertines" at Pompeii), see Schürer, *Jewish Temple*, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 57, 276, 277; O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 89; and Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 201 (second edition). But a further question arises as to the number of synagogues intended. Thus it has been maintained that they were five in number. This is Schürer's decided view, Weiss, Meyer (in earlier editions), so Hackett, so Matthias, *Handbuch zum N. T., V. Apostelgeschichte*, 1897. By other writers it is thought that reference is made to two synagogues. This is the view advocated by Wendt as against Meyer. Wendt admits that as in the places named there were undoubtedly large numbers of Jewish inhabitants, so it is possible that in Jerusalem itself they may have been sufficiently numerous to make up the five synagogues, but his own view is based upon the ground that τῶν before ἀπὸ Κ. καὶ Ἀ. is parallel with the τῶν after τινες (so Holtzmann, Felten). So too Zöckler, who depends upon the simple καί before Κυρηναίων and Ἀλεξ. as pointing to one group with the Libertines; τῶν ἀπὸ Κ. καὶ Ἀσίας forming a second group. Dr. Sanday, *Expositor*, viii., p. 327 (third series), takes the same view of two synagogues only, as he considers that it is favoured by the Greeks (so too Dean Plumptre and Winer-Moulton, xix., 5*a*, note, but see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 158; *cf.* critical note above). Mr. Page is inclined to think that three synagogues are intended: (1) *i.e.*, of the Libertini, (2) another of the men of Alexandria and Cyrene, (3) another of the men of Cilicia and Asia; whilst many writers from Calvin, Bengel and others to O. Holtzmann and Rendall hold that only one synagogue is intended; so Dr. Hort maintains that the Greek suggests only the one synagogue of the Libertines, and that the other names are simply descriptive of origin—from the south, Cyrene, and Alexandria; from the north, Cilicia, and Proconsular Asia. On the whole the Greek seems to favour the view of Wendt as above; καὶ Κυρην. καὶ Ἀλεξ. seem to form, as Blass says, a part of the same appellation with Λιβερτίνων. Blass himself has recently, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 49 ff., declared in favour of another reading, Λιβυστίνων, which he regards as the correct text, Λιβερτίνων being corrupt although differing only in two letters from the original. In the proposed reading he is following Oecumenius and Beza amongst others; the same reading is apparently favoured also by Wetstein, who gives both the passages to which Blass refers, one from Catullus, lx., 1, "Leæna montibus Libystinis," and the other from the geographical Lexicon of Stephanus Byzantinus. Λιβυστίνων would mean Jews inhabitants of Libya, not Libyans, and the synagogue in question bore the name of Λιβυσ. καὶ Κυρηναίων καὶ Ἀλεξ., thus specifying the African Jews in the geographical order of their original dwelling-places.—Κυρηναίων, see on ii. 9, and below, xi. 20, xiii. 1.—Ἀλεξ.: probably there was no city, next to Jerusalem and Rome, in which the Jewish population was so numerous and influential as in Alexan-

οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ[1] καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει.[2] 11. τότε[3] ὑπέβαλον ἄνδρας λέγοντας, Ὅτι ἀκηκόαμεν αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ῥήματα

[1] After σοφιᾳ DE, Flor. add τῃ ουσῃ εν αυτῳ, so Hilg., and after πνευματι DE, Flor., Gig., Par. add τῳ αγιῳ. (Harris regards as Montanist additions.)

[2] At end of verse 10 D (E), Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor., Wern. add δια το ελεγχεσθαι υπ' αυτου μετα πασης παρρησιας; (11) μη δυναμενοι ουν αντοφθαλμειν τῃ αληθειᾳ so Hilg., Blass. E, διοτι ηλεγχοντο . . . επειδη ουκ ηδυναντο αντιλεγειν τῃ αληθειᾳ, possible influence of Luke xxi. 15, 2 Tim. iii. 8 (see Chase); Harris refers to Latin and regards as Montanistic. μετα π. παρρησιας characteristic of Luke and Paul, iv. 29, etc.; αντοφθαλμειν Acts xxvii. 15. Blass refers to Wisdom xii. 14 (also in Polyb.); *cf.* also v. 39 with Wisdom *l.c.*

[3] Both ουν and τοτε are retained by Blass in β, but see Weiss, Codex D, p. 66, Flor. reads τοτε ουν μη δυν.

dria. In his new city Alexander the Great had assigned the Jews a place: their numbers rapidly grew, and, according to Philo, two of the five districts of the town, named after the first five letters of the alphabet, were called "the Jewish," from the number of Jews dwelling in them, one quarter, Delta, being entirely populated by them. Julius Caesar and Augustus confirmed their former privileges, and they retained them for the most part, with the important exception described by Philo, during subsequent reigns. For some time, until the reign of Claudius, they had their own officer to represent them as ethnarch (alabarch), and Augustus appointed a council who should superintend their affairs according to their own laws, and the Romans evidently recognised the importance of a mercenary race like the Jews for the trade and commerce of the city. Here dwelt the famous teacher Philo, B.C. 20-A.D. 50; here Apollos was trained, possibly under the guidance of the famous philosopher, and here too St. Stephen may have belonged by birth and education (Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 253). St. Paul never visited Alexandria, and it is possible that the Apostle may have felt after his experience at Corinth, and the teaching of Apollos (1 Cor. i. 12), that the simplicity of his own message of Christ Crucified would not have been acceptable to hearers of the word of wisdom and the lovers of allegory. On the causes which tended to produce a distinct form of the Jewish character and faith in the city, see B.D.[2] "Alexandria," and Hastings, B.D., *sub v.*; Stanley's *Jewish Church*, iii., xlvii.; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 1, 47. We know that Alexandria had, as was only likely, a synagogue at Jerusalem, specially gorgeous (Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 253); on the history of the place see, in addition to literature already mentioned, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 73, 228, 229, 244, E.T.; Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 7, 2; x., 1; xix., 5, 2.—**Κιλικίας**: of special interest because Saul of Tarsus would probably be prominent amongst "those of Cilicia," and there is no difficulty in supposing with Weiss and even Spitta (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 115) that he belonged to the members of the Cilician synagogue who disputed with Stephen. To the considerable Jewish community settled in Tarsus, from the time of the Seleucidæ, Saul belonged. But whatever influence early associations may have had upon Stephen, Saul by his own confession was not merely the son of a Pharisee, but himself a Pharisee of the Pharisees in orthodoxy and zeal, Gal. i. 14, Phil. iii. 5. It would seem that there was a synagogue of the Tarsians at Jerusalem, *Megilla*, 26*a* (Hamburger, *u. s.*, ii., 1, 148); see also B.D.[2] "Cilicia," Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 222; O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 100. The "Jews from Asia" are those who at a later date, xxi. 27, are again prominent in their zeal for the sacredness of the Holy Place, and who hurl against Paul the same fatal charge which he now directs against Stephen (Plumptre, *in loco;* Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 20).—**συνζητοῦντες**: not found in LXX or other Greek versions of the O.T., or Apocrypha, although it may occur, Neh. ii. 4, in the sense of request, but the reading is doubtful (see Hatch and Redpath). In the N.T. it is used six times by St. Mark and four times by St. Luke (twice in his Gospel), and always in the sense of questioning, generally in the sense of disputatious questioning. The words of Josephus in his preface (sect. 5), *B. J.*, may help us to understand the characteristics of the Hellenists. The same verb is used by

βλάσφημα[1] **εἰς Μωσῆν**[2] **καὶ τὸν Θεόν. 12. συνεκίνησάν τε τὸν λαὸν καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ τοὺς γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἐπιστάντες συνήρπασαν**

[1] **βλασφημα** ℵABCEHP, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss; **βλασφημιας** ℵ*D, Vulg., Flor., Gig., so Blass in β, and Hilg.

[2] **Μωσην**; but **Μωυσην** ℵABCDH, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg. (See esp. Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 51, 52, and note 43.)

St. Paul himself, as in this same Jerusalem he disputed, possibly in their synagogue, with the Hellenists on behalf of the faith which he was now seeking to destroy, Acts ix. 29. In modern Greek the verb has always the meaning *to discuss, to dispute* (Kennedy).

Ver. 10. **καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀντιστῆναι**: the whole phrase is an exact fulfilment of Luke xxi. 15, *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 17, ii. 6. **πνεῦμα**, as Wendt points out, was the Holy Spirit with which Stephen was filled, *cf.* 3, 5. Vulgate renders "Spiritui Sancto *qui* loquebatur," as if it read **ᾧ**; see critical notes.

Ver. 11. **ὑπέβαλον**: only found here in N.T., not in LXX in this sense; *subornaverunt;* Vulgate, *submiserunt* (Suet., *Ner.*, 28), *cf.* Appian, *B. C.*, i., 74, **ὑπεβλήθησαν κατήγοροι**, and Jos., *B. J.*, v., 10, 41, **μηνυτής τις ὑπόβλητος.**—**ῥήματα βλασφημίας** = **βλάσφημα**, Hebraism, *cf.* Rev. xiii. 1, xvii. 3, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 266.—**εἰς Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Θεόν**: Rendall draws a distinction between **λαλοῦντος . . . εἰς** and **λαλῶν ῥήματα κατά** in ver. 13, the former denoting charges of blasphemy *about* Moses, and the latter *against*, etc., *cf.* ii. 25, Heb. vii. 14, but it is doubtful whether this distinction can be maintained, *cf.* Luke xii. 10 and xxii. 65. The R.V. renders both prepositions *against: cf.* Dan., LXX, vii., 25, and iii. 29 (96; LXX and Theod.).

Ver. 12. **συνεκίνησαν**: not found in LXX or other Greek versions of O.T., or in the Apocrypha, *cf.* Polyb., xv., 17, 1, so too in Plutarch. As this word and **συνήρπασαν** are found only in St. Luke it is perhaps worth noting that they are both frequent in medical writers, see below.—**τὸν λαὸν**: a crafty design to gain the people first, not only because they had hitherto favoured the Nazarenes, but because the Sanhedrim would be more inclined to take action if they felt that the people were with them, *cf.* iv. 26.—**ἐπιστάντες**, see on iv. 1.—**συνήρπασαν**, "seized him," R.V.; "caught," A.V., signifies rather capture after pursuit than a sudden seizure (Humphry); only in St. Luke in the N.T., once in his Gospel, viii. 29, and Acts xix. 29, xxvii. 15. In the first passage it is used of the demoniac of the country of the Gerasenes; many times the evil spirit **συνηρπάκει αὐτόν**; see 2 Macc. vii. 27, Prov. vi. 25, 2 Macc. iv. 41, 4 Macc. v. 4. The word is also quite classical, see Hobart, *Medical Language*, pp. 204, 243; on the hostility against Stephen and its causes, see above. At this word **συνήρπ.** Hilgenfeld would stop, and the rest of the verse, **ἤγαγον** to vii. 2, is referred by him to his "author to Theophilus". The leading Stephen before the Sanhedrim is thus excluded by Hilgenfeld, because nothing is said of the previous summoning of the Council as in iv. 5, 6! and the introduction of false witnesses and their accusation is something quite different from the charge of blasphemous words against Moses and God! In somewhat the same manner Spitta refers vi. 1-6, 9-12^a^, to his source A, and sees so far a most trustworthy narrative, no single point in which can fairly be assailed by criticism, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 115, whilst vi. 7 f., 12^b^-15 constitute B, a worthless document on account of its legendary and fictitious character—instituting a parallel between the death of Stephen and that of Christ, and leaving nothing historical except the fact that Stephen was a conspicuous member of the early Church who died as a martyr by stoning. But whilst Hilgenfeld and Spitta thus treat the passage beginning with **καὶ ἤγαγον**, Jüngst refers these verses and the rest of the chapter as far as ver. 14 to his source A, whilst the previous part of ver. 12, **συνεκίνησαν—αὐτόν**, is in his view an insertion of the Redactor. Clemen regards the whole incident of the bringing before the Sanhedrim as a later addition, and as forming part of his *Historia Petri*, the revolutionary nature of Stephen's teaching being placed in the mouth of false witnesses, and the fanaticism of the Jews being lessened by their susceptibility at any rate to the outward impression made by their opponents (ver. 15).

αὐτόν, καὶ ἤγαγον εἰς τὸ συνέδριον, 13. ἔστησάν τε μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς[1] λέγοντας, Ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος οὐ παύεται ῥήματα βλάσφημα[2] λαλῶν κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου καὶ τοῦ νόμου· 14. ἀκηκόαμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, Ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος καταλύσει τὸν τόπον

[1] ψευδεις; D, Flor. add **κατα αυτου**, so Hilg.; ℵABCD om.

[2] **βλασφημα**, om. Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

Ver. 13. **οὗτος**: here and in ver. 14 used contemptuously, *iste*, so Vulgate; *cf.* vii. 40, xviii. 18, xix. 26, ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος.—**οὐ παύεται λαλῶν**: the words in themselves are sufficient to indicate the exaggerated and biassed character of the testimony brought against Stephen —" invidiam facere conantur," Bengel, **βλάσφημα** omitted, see above.—**μάρτυρας ψευδεῖς**, "false," inasmuch as they perverted the meaning of Stephen's words, which were no blasphemy against Moses or against God, although no doubt he had taught the transitory nature of the Mosaic law, and that the true worship of God was not confined to the Temple (see Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i., 64, 83, E.T., and Wendt, p. 148 (1899)). So also in the very same manner Christ's words had been perverted (John ii. 21, *cf.* Mark xiv. 56, Matt. xxvii. 63), and it is likely enough that the spirit of His teaching as to the Sabbath, the laws of purifying, the fulfilling of the law, breathed again in the words of His disciples. But such utterances were blasphemous in the eyes of the Jewish legalists, and Stephen's own words, vii. 48, 49, might well seem to them an affirmation rather than a denial of the charges brought against him.—**κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου**: if **τοῦτον** is retained (W.H.), phrase could refer not only to the Temple as the holy place, but also to the place of assembly of the Sanhedrim, where according to ver. 15 the charge was brought, which was probably situated on the Temple Mount on the western side of the enclosing wall, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 190, E.T., so Hilgenfeld and Wendt, and also Blass, who adds " itaque etiam **τούτου** (B, *cf.* 14) recte se habet," although he omits the word in his own text. Weiss thinks that the word dropped out because it could have no reference to a scene in the Sanhedrim.

Ver. 14. **ὁ Ναζ. οὗτος**: not part of the words of Stephen, but of the witnesses—see however Blass, *in loco*.—**καὶ καταλύσει**: the closest similarity to the words in Mark xiv. 58 (*cf.* Matt. xxvi. 61), and in both passages the same verb **καταλύειν** is used. It is also found in all three Synoptists in our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of the Temple, Matt. xxiv. 2, Mark xiii. 2, Luke xxi. 6, and we find it again in the bitter scorn of the revilers who passed beneath the cross (Mark xv. 29, Matt. xxvii. 40). The prophecy, we cannot doubt, had made its impression not only upon the disciples, but also upon the enemies of Jesus, and if St. Stephen did not employ the actual words, we can easily understand how easily and plausibly they might be attributed to him.—**ἀλλάξει τὰ ἔθη**, *cf.* Ezra vi. 11, Isaiah xxiv. 5. **ἔθος** is used by St. Luke seven times in Acts, three times in his Gospel, and it is only found twice elsewhere in the N.T., John xix. 40, Heb. x. 25; in the Books of the Maccabees it occurs three or four times, in Wisdom iv. 16 (but see Hatch and Redpath), in Bel and the Dragon v. 15, in the sense of custom, usage, as so often in the classics. Here it would doubtless include the whole system of the Mosaic law, which touched Jewish life at every turn, *cf.* xv. 1, xxi. 21, xxvi. 3, xxviii. 17. For the dignity which attached to every word of the Pentateuch, and to Moses to whom the complete book of the law was declared to have been handed by God, see Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 307, E.T., and Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 378 (1897). We have moreover the testimony of Jewish literature contemporary with the N.T. books, *cf.*, *e.g.*, *Book of Jubilees*, placed by Edersheim about 50 A.D., with its ultra-legal spirit, and its glorification of Moses and the Thorah, see too *Apocalypse of Baruch*, *e.g.*, xv., 5; xlviii., 22, 24; li., 3; lxxxiv., 2, 5.

Ver. 15. **ἀτενίσαντες**, see above on i. 10.—**ὡσεὶ πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου**, *cf.* LXX, Esth. v. 2, where Esther says to the king in reverence **εἶδόν σε κύριε, ὡς ἄγγελον Θεοῦ**; in 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20, the reference is not to outward appearance, but to inward discernment (see Wetstein,

τοῦτον, καὶ ἀλλάξει τὰ ἔθη ἃ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωϋσῆς. 15. καὶ ἀτενίσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν[1] ἅπαντες οἱ καθεζόμενοι ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου.[2]

[1] **ατενισαντες εις αυτον**, but in D **ητενιζον δε αυτω**; and at the end of verse D, Flor. add **εστωτος εν μεσω αυτων**; *cf.* iv. 7, etc. (and see below).

[2] On the words in Flor., "stantis inter illos," see esp. Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 70 ff. Blass regards the words as favourable to his theory and as part of Luke's own text. Hilg. retains them. Harris sees in them an instance (amongst many in D) of a wrongly inserted gloss from vii. 1; *cf.* Mark xiv. 60.

who refers also to Gen. xxxiii. 10, and quotes other instances from the Rabbis, *e.g.*, Dixit R. Nathanael: parentes Mosis viderunt pulchritudinem ejus tanquam angeli Domini: and we have the same expression used by St. Paul in *Acta Pauli et Theklæ*, 2; **ἀγγέλου πρόσωπον εἶχεν.** See too Schöttgen, *in loco*. R. Gedalja speaks of Moses and Aaron when they came to Pharaoh as angels ministering before God). At such a moment when Stephen was called upon to plead for the truth at the risk of his life, and when not only the calmness and strength of his convictions, but also the grace, the beauty of his Master, and the power of His spirit rested upon him, such a description was no exaggeration, *cf.* a striking passage in Dr. Liddon's *Some Elements of Religion*, p. 180. It was said of the aged Polycarp, as he faced a martyr's death: **τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ χάριτος ἐπληροῦτο,** and "to have lived in spirit on Mount Tabor during the years of a long life, is to have caught in its closing hours some rays of the glory of the Transfiguration". But if the brightness on the face of St. Stephen is represented by St. Luke as supernatural (as Wendt admits), we are not called upon to conclude that such a description is due to the glorification of the Saint in Christian legend: "the occasion was worthy of the miracle," the ministration of the Spirit, **ἡ διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος,** in which St. Stephen had shared, might well exceed in glory; and a brightness like that on the face of Moses, above the brightness of the sun, might well have shone upon one who like the angels beheld the face of the Father in heaven, and to whom the glory of the Lord had been revealed: "As if in refutation of the charge made against him, Stephen receives the same mark of divine favour which had been granted to Moses" (Humphry). St. Chrysostom speaks of the face of Stephen as being terrible to the Jews, but lovable and wonderful to the Christians (*cf.* Theophylact, *in loco*). But although St. Stephen's words must afterwards have proved terrible to his opponents, we scarcely associate the thought of terror with the verse before us; we may speak of such faces as that of the proto-martyr as **αἰδέσιμα** but scarcely as **φοβερά.** It is possible that the representation of St. Stephen in sacred art as a young man may be due to this comparison of his face to that of an angel, angels being always represented as in the bloom of youth (Dr. Moore, *Studies in Dante*, first series, p. 84).

CHAPTER VII.—Ver. 1. The question of the high priest breaks in upon the silence (Holtzmann). St. Chrysostom, *Hom.*, xv., thought that the mildness of the inquiry showed that the assembly was overawed by St. Stephen's presence, but the question was probably a usual interrogation on such occasions (Felten, Farrar).—On **εἰ** see i. 6, and Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 254.

Ver. 2. **Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες,** *cf.* St. Paul's address, xxii. 1, and also note on xxiii. 1. On St. Stephen's speech see additional note at the end of chapter.—**ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης**: lit., "the God of the glory," *i.e.*, the glory peculiar to Him, not simply **ἔνδοξος**, a reference to the Shechinah, Exod. xxiv. 16, 17, Ps. xxix. 3, Isa. vi. 3, and in the N.T. *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 8, and James ii. 1 (John i. 14). The appearances to Abraham and Moses were similar to those later ones to which the term Shechinah was applied. Such words were in themselves an answer to the charge of blasphemy; but Stephen proceeds to show that this same God who dwelt in the Tabernacle was not confined to it, but that He appeared to Abraham in a distant heathen land. **ὤφθη**: there was therefore no need of a Temple that God might appear to His own (Chrys., *Hom.*, xv.; see Blass, *in loco*).—**τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν**: emphatic, *cf.* vv. 19, 38, 39, 44, 45; St. Stephen

VII. 1. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, Εἰ ἄρα ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει; 2. ὁ δὲ ἔφη, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατε. ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης ὤφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἀβραὰμ [1] ὄντι ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ, πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι

[1] vii. 2-4. For T.R. Blass reads (2) (**οντι εν τη Μεσοποταμιᾳ εν Χαρραν μετα το αποθανειν τον πατερα αυτου**); (3) **και ειπεν προς αυτον** "**Εξελθε απο . . . δειξω**"; (4) **και μετῳκισεν αυτον.** In Par. we read "cum esset in Mesopotamia in Charran postquam mortuus est pater ipsius, et dixit . . . monstravero, et inde transtulit eum," etc. This reading agrees almost entirely with that adopted by Blass, but it contains the word bracketed by him in ver. 2, and also apparently **κακειθεν** (*et inde*) (see below). The difficulties in these verses are attributed by Blass and Belser to Alexandrian copyists. An explanatory note was added very early to ver. 2 **οτε Α. εξελθεν εκ γης Χαλδαιων και κατῳκησεν εν Χαρραν κακει ην μετα το αποθανειν τον πατερα αυτου.** These words (which may easily have been derived from the narrative in Genesis) were thought by the Alexandrian copyists to be the additional words of Luke himself, and they inserted them (*inferserunt in ver.* 4, Blass) in ver. 4 as they could not add them at the end of ver. 2, **οτε** being changed into **τοτε, Αβρααμ** being omitted, and **κακειθεν** being substituted for **κακει,** whilst the words **μετα το αποθ. τον πατερα αυτου,** originally belonging to ver. 2 (so Par. above), were then omitted altogether and added in the text after **κακειθεν**; then between the words **Μεσοπ.** and **εν Χαρραν,** which are joined together in Par., these copyists (*audacissimum*, Blass) inserted **πριν η κατοικησαι αυτον,** no doubt with the view of showing that Stephen referred not only to the later injunction from Haran to Canaan but to the earlier one from Ur to Haran. But there is no need to suppose that the text was thus tampered with (see Wendt's note, p. 154, edit. 1899), and whatever difficulties this part of the speech contains, they may be easily explained on the supposition that Stephen in these verses, as elsewhere, was expressing himself in accordance with well-known traditions. In support of his view Blass (so Belser) appeals to Irenæus, iii. 12, who quotes the whole passage from vii. 2, **ὁ θεὸς τῆς δ.,** to ver. 8, **τὸν Ἰσαάκ,** omitting what Par. omits, and thus being in agreement with it on the whole in Belser's judgment. But Blass admits that Irenæus (who apparently leaves out all not in LXX) also omits words which occur in ver. 2, partly in all authorites and partly in Par. (Gig.): **οντι εν τη Μ. εν Χαρραν μετα το αποθ. τον πατερα αυτου**: "delenda igitur haec quoque" (see above) "neque ea quidquam desiderabit," Blass, *Praef.* xv. (*Acta Apost. secundum formam quae videtur Romanam*). Belser is not prepared to go so far as this, but he sees in the original text of Luke a much simpler version of Stephen's speech; no reference is made to the original dwelling-place of Abraham in Ur, and only the call given to him in Mesopotamia (in Haran) is specified. According to Belser the original text reads thus: (Ver. 2) **ὁ θεος της δοξης ωφθη τῳ πατρι ημων Α. οντι εν τη Μ. μετα το αποθανειν τον πατερα αυτου,** (Ver. 3) **και ειπεν προς αυτον· εξελθε εκ της γης σου και της συγγενειας σου, και δευρο εις την γην, ην αν σοι δειξω.** (Ver. 4) **και μετῳκισεν αυτον εις την γην ταυτην,** etc. (*Beiträge zur Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 48). See further on Gen. xii. 1-3 and the quotation here, in the passages in Philo, and in Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, x., 2, Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 154.

thus closely associates himself with his hearers. Wetstein comments: "Stephanus ergo non fuit proselytus, sed Judæus natus," but it would seem from Wetstein himself that a proselyte might call Abraham father; *cf.* his comment on Luke i. 73, and *cf. Ecclus.*, xliv., 21; *Speaker's Commentary*, "Apocrypha," vol. ii.; see also Lumby's note, *in loco*, and *cf.* Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 326, note, E.T.—**Μεσοποταμίᾳ**: a difficulty at once arises in comparing this statement with the Book of Genesis. Here the call of Abraham is said to have come to him *before* he dwelt in Haran, but in Gen. xii. 1, *after* he removed thither. But, at the same time Gen. xv. 7, *cf.* Josh. xxiv. 3, Neh. ix. 7, distinctly intimates that Abraham left "Ur of the Chaldees" (see "Abraham," Hastings' B.D., p. 14, and Sayce, *Patriarchal Palestine*, pp. 166-169, as to its site) in accordance with the choice and guidance of God. St. Stephen applies the language of what we may describe as the second to the first call, and in so doing he was really following on the lines of Jewish literature, *e.g.*, Philo, *De Abrah.*, ii., 11, 16, Mang., paraphrases the divine counsel,

αὐτὸν ἐν Χαῤῥάν, 3. καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν, "Ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου, καὶ δεῦρο εἰς γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι δείξω." 4. τότε ἐξελθὼν ἐκ γῆς Χαλδαίων, κατῴκησεν ἐν Χαῤῥάν· κἀκεῖθεν, μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, μετῴκισεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν

and then adds **διὰ τοῦτο τὴν πρώτην ἀποικίαν ἀπὸ τῆς Χαλδαίων γῆς εἰς τὴν Χαῤῥαίων λέγεται ποιεῖσθαι.** Moreover the manner of St. Stephen's quotation seems to mark the difference between the call in Ur and the call in Haran (R.V., not Charran, Greek form, as in A.V.). In Gen. xii. 1 we have the call to Abraham in Haran given as follows: **ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου.** But the call in Ur, according to St. Stephen's wording, is one which did not involve the sacrifice of his family, for Abraham was accompanied by them to Haran, and so the clause **ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου κ.τ.λ.** is omitted because inappropriate. Of course if we omit **ἐκ** before **τῆς συγγενείας** (see critical notes), St. Stephen's words become more suitable still to the position of Abraham in Ur, for we should then translate the words, "from thy land and the land of thy kindred" (Rendall, *cf.* Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*). St. Stephen may naturally have referred back to Abraham's first migration from Ur to Haran, as desiring to emphasise more plainly the fact that since the call of God came to him before he had taken even the first step towards the Holy Land by settling in Haran, that divine revelation was evidently not bound up with any one spot, however holy.—**Χαῤῥάν,** Gen. xi. 31, xii. 5, xxvii. 43, LXX, in the old language of Chaldea = road (see Sayce, *u. s.*, pp. 166, 167, and "Haran" Hastings' B.D., and B.D.², i. (Pinches)), in Mesopotamia; little doubt that it should be identified with the *Carræ* of the Greeks and Romans, near the scene of the defeat of Crassus by the Parthians, B.C. 53, and of his death, Lucan, i., 104; Pliny, N.H., v., 24; Strabo, xvi., p. 747. In the fourth century *Carræ* was the seat of a Christian bishopric, with a magnificent cathedral. It is remarkable that the people of the place retained until a late date the Chaldean language and the worship of the Chaldean deities, B.D.², "Haran," and see Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 4, p. 499, and references cited by him for identification with *Carræ* (*cf.* Winer-Schmiedel, p. 57).

Ver. 4. **μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν**: St. Stephen apparently falls into the same chronological mistake as is made in the Pentateuch and by Philo (*De Migr. Abrah.*, i., 463, Mang.). According to Gen. xi. 26 Terah lived seventy years and begat Abraham, Nahor, Haran; in xi. 32 it is said that Terah's age was 205 years when he died in Haran; in xii. 4 it is said that Abraham was seventy-five years old when he left Haran. But since 70 + 75 = 145, it would seem that Terah must have lived some sixty years *after* Abraham's departure. Perhaps the circumstance that Terah's death was *mentioned*, in Gen. xi. 32, *before* the command to Abraham to leave Haran, xii. 1, may be the cause of the mistake, as it was not observed that the *mention* of Terah's death was anticipatory (so Alford). Blass seems to adopt a somewhat similar view, as he commends the reading in Gigas: "priusquam mortuus est pater ejus," for the obedience of the patriarch, who did not hesitate to leave even his father, is opposed to the obstinacy of the Jewish people (see Blass, *in loco*). Other attempts at explanation are that reference is made to *spiritual* death of Terah, who is supposed to have relapsed into idolatry at Haran, a view which appears to have originated with the Rabbis, probably to get rid of the chronological difficulty (Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*; Meyer-Wendt, *in loco*), but for which there is absolutely no justification in the context; or that Abraham need not have been the eldest son of Terah, but that he was mentioned first because he was the most famous, a view adopted with more or less variation by Wordsworth, Hackett, and recently by Felten (see too B.D.², p. 16, note), but apparently in opposition to the authority of Hamburger, who states that Terah was seventy years old when Abraham was born, that he was alive when Abraham departed at the age of seventy-five, being released from the duty of caring for his father by the more imperative command to obey the call of God. Lumby quotes from *Midrash Rabbah*, on Genesis, cap. 39, that God absolved Abraham from the care of his father, and yet, lest Abraham's departure from Terah should lead others to claim the same relaxation of a commandment for themselves, Terah's death is mentioned in Holy Scripture before Abra-

ταύτην εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε[1]· 5. καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κληρονομίαν ἐν αὐτῇ, οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός· καὶ[2] ἐπηγγείλατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι εἰς κατάσχεσιν αὐτήν, καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτόν, οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου. 6. ἐλάλησε δὲ οὕτως ὁ Θεός, "Ὅτι ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ, καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ[3] καὶ κακώσουσιν,

[1] After κατοικειτε DE, Syr. Harcl. mg., Aug. add και οι πατερες υμων (ημων) προ υμων (ημων); Weiss (Codex D, p. 67) points out that the addition demands κατωκησαν; the words might have been easily added, *cf.* O.T. phraseology.

[2] For και επηγ. D, Gig., Vulg. read αλλ' επηγ., so Hilg.

[3] αυτο; D, Gig., Vulg. read αυτους, so Hilg.; *cf.* LXX, Gen. xv. 13.

ham's departure, *cf.* Gen. xi. 32, and xii. 1. One other solution has been attempted by maintaining that μετῴκισεν does not refer to the removal, but only to the quiet and abiding settlement which Abraham gained *after* his father's death, but this view, although supported by Augustine and Bengel, amongst others, is justly condemned by Alford and Wendt. The Samaritan Pentateuch reads in Gen. xi. 32, 145 instead of 205, probably an alteration to meet the apparent contradiction. But it is quite possible that here, as elsewhere in the speech, Stephen followed some special tradition (so Zöckler).—μετά with infinitive as a temporal proposition frequent in Luke (analogous construction in Hebrew), *cf.* Luke xii. 5, xxii. 20, etc., *cf.* LXX, Baruch i. 9; Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 165 (1893).—μετῴκισεν, subject ὁ Θεός: *cf.* for a similar quick change of subject vi. 6. Weiss sees in this the hand of a reviser, but the fact that Stephen was speaking under such circumstances would easily account for a rapid change of subject, which would easily be supplied by his hearers; verb only in ver. 43 elsewhere, in a quotation—found several times in LXX, and also in use in classical Greek.

Ver. 5. κληρονομίαν: the field which Abraham bought, Gen. xxiii. 9-17, could not come under this title—the field was Abraham's purchase, not God's gift as κληρονομία (see Meyer - Wendt, and Westcott, Heb. vi. 12, additional note, also Bengel, *in loco*); ver. 16 sufficiently shows that Stephen was fully acquainted with Abraham's purchase of the field.—οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός, *cf.* Deut. ii. 5, xi. 24, same Hebrew (*cf.* Heb. xi. 9), "spatium quod planta pedis calcatur" (Grimm); *cf.* also its use in Xen. It may have been a kind of proverbial expression, *cf.* Gen. viii. 9 (Schöttgen).—καὶ ἐπηγγείλατο, *cf.* Gen. xii. 7 (xvii. 8, xlviii. 4), so that here again God appeared unto Abraham in what was a strange and heathen land. See also for verb, James i. 12, ii. 5. On the force of the word see p. 54.—εἰς κατάσχεσιν: "in possession," R.V., the A.V. renders the word in its secondary or derivative sense, which is found in ver. 45.—οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου: the faith of Abraham "tecte significatur" (Blass), first because nothing was given—there was only a promise—and secondly because the promise was made while yet he had no child.

Ver. 6. δέ: not in contrast to the fact just mentioned that Abraham had no child, but introducing a fuller account of God's promise. The quotation is from LXX, Gen. xv. 13, with a few alterations; in LXX and Heb., the second person, not the third, is used; instead of οὐκ ἰδίᾳ in LXX, ἀλλοτρίᾳ, *cf.* Heb. xi. 9; and instead of αὐτούς, αὐτό corresponding to σπέρμα. Wendt takes ὅτι as "recitantis," and not with Meyer as a constituent part of the quotation itself, LXX: Γιγνώσκων γνώσῃ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.—πάροικον in LXX as a stranger or sojourner in a country not one's own, several times in combination with ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ, *cf.* Gen. xxi. 23, 34, xxvi. 3, and in N.T. *cf.* this passage and ver. 29. In Eph. ii. 19, 1 Pet. ii. 11, the word is also used, but metaphorically, although the usage may be said to be based on that of the LXX; *cf. Epist. ad Diognet.* v., 5, and Polycarp, *Phil.*, inscript. See Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 102.—ἔτη τετρακόσια: so too Gen. xv. 13. The period named belongs not only to κακώσουσιν but also to ἔσται, as Meyer rightly observes. But in Exod. xii. 40 four hundred and thirty years are mentioned as the sojourning which Israel sojourned in Egypt, and in both passages the whole space of time is so occupied; or, at all events it may be fairly said that this is implied in the Hebrew text in both Gen. xv. 13 and Exod. xii. 40:

ἔτη τετρακόσια. 7. καὶ τὸ ἔθνος, ᾧ ἐὰν[1] δουλεύσωσι, κρινῶ ἐγώ," εἶπεν ὁ Θεός· "καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται, καὶ λατρεύσουσί μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ." 8. καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην περιτομῆς· καὶ οὕτως ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαάκ, καὶ περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ·

[1] **εαν** ℵACEHP, so Tisch., W.H. alt., Weiss; **αν** BD, so W.H. **δουλευσωσι** ℵBEHP, d, Vulg., Chrys., Lach., Weiss, Wendt, so in LXX, Gen. xv. 14; **δουλευσουσι** ACD 26, 96, Sah., Ir., so Tisch., Alford, W.H., R.V., so Blass in β (see his Proleg. to *Acta Apost.*, p. 35, and *Grammatik*, p. 212). In vii. 3 on the contrary the LXX has **ην αν σοι δειξω**; only ℵ reads **εαν**, perhaps anticipating the reading in vv. before us (Weiss). Winer-Schmiedel, p. 52, points out that **δουλευσουσιν**, though well attested, is open to suspicion.

cf. also for the same mode of reckoning Philo, *Quis rer. div. her.*, 54, p. 511, Mang. But neither here nor in Gal. iii. 17 is the argument in the least degree affected by the precise period, or by the adoption of one of the two chronological systems in preference to the other, and in a speech round numbers would be quite sufficient to mark the progressive stages in the history of the nation and of God's dealings with them. For an explanation of the point see Lightfoot, Gal. iii. 17, who regards the number in Genesis as given in round numbers, but in Exodus with historical exactness (to the same effect Wendt, Felten, Zöckler). But in the LXX version, Exod. xii. 40, the four hundred and thirty years cover the sojourn both in Egypt and in Canaan, thus including the sojourn of the Patriarchs in Canaan before the migration, and reducing the actual residence in Egypt to about half this period, the Vatican MS. reading four hundred and thirty-five years after adding **καὶ ἐν γῇ Χαναὰν** (the word *five*, however, **πέντε**, being erased), and the Alexandrian MS. reading after **ἐν Χαναὰν** the words **αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν**, making the revision in the chronology more decisive. This is the chronology adopted in Gal. iii. 17, and by Josephus, *Ant.*, ii., 15, 2; but the latter writer in other passages, *Ant.*, ii., 9, 1, and *B.J.*, v., 9, 4, adopts the same reckoning as we find here in Acts. But see also Charles, *Assumption of Moses*, pp. 3, 4 (1897).

Ver. 7. The *oratio recta* is introduced by the words **εἶπεν ὁ Θεός . . . κρινῶ ἐγώ** emphatic, *cf.* Rom. xii. 19. In this verse the quotation is a free rendering of Gen. xv. 14, the words **ὧδε μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς** being omitted after **ἐξελ.**, and the latter part of the verse being apparently introduced from Exod. iii. 12. And so at length, after so long a time, God appointed for Himself a "holy place," *cf.* vi. 13 (Blass).—**ᾧ ἐὰν δουλεύσωσι**, *cf.* LXX, Gen. xv. 14, and see critical note above, *cf.* also Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 123.

Ver. 8. **διαθήκην**, *fœdus* (Grimm, Blass), the same word is used in LXX, Gen. xvii. 10, and with two or three exceptions uniformly in LXX for "covenant," so too in the Apocrypha with apparently two exceptions. The ordinary word for "covenant," **συνθήκη**, is very rare in LXX (though used by the later translators, Aquila, Sym., Theod., for בְּרִית, but see also Ramsay, *Expositor*, ii., pp. 322, 323 (1898)). But the word **διαθ.** would be suitably employed to express a *divine* covenant, because it could not be said that in such a case the contractors are in any degree of equal standing (**συνθήκη**). In the N.T. the sense of "covenant" is correct (except in Gal. iii. 15 and Heb. ix. 16). But in *classical* writers from the time of Plato **διαθήκη** generally has the meaning of a will, a testament, a disposition of property, and in the Latin renderings of the word in the N.T. we find uniformly *testamentum* in cases where the sense of "covenant" is beyond dispute (Luke i. 72, Acts iii. 25 d. *dispositionis;* and here d. has *dispositionem*, also in Rom. xi. 27), *cf.*, *e.g.*, in this verse, Vulgate and Par. No doubt the early translators would render **διαθήκη** by its ordinary equivalent, although in the common language it is quite possible that *testamentum* had a wider meaning than the classical sense of *will*, see Westcott, *Hebrews*, additional note on ix. 16; Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 15; A. B. Davidson, *Hebrews*, p. 161; and "Covenant" in Hastings' B.D. and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.;* Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, pp. 47, 48; and more recently Ramsay, *Expositor*, ii., pp. 300 and 321 ff. (1898).

Ver. 9. **ζηλώσαντες**, *cf.* Gen. xxxvii.

καὶ ὁ Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακώβ, καὶ ὁ Ἰακὼβ τοὺς δώδεκα πατριάρχας. 9. καὶ οἱ πατριάρχαι ζηλώσαντες τὸν Ἰωσὴφ ἀπέδοντο εἰς Αἴγυπτον· 10. καὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξείλετο αὐτὸν ἐκ πασῶν τῶν θλίψεων αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ χάριν καὶ σοφίαν ἐναντίον Φαραὼ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου, καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενον ἐπ᾽ Αἴγυπτον καὶ ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ. 11. ἦλθε δὲ λιμὸς ἐφ᾽ ὅλην τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου καὶ Χαναάν, καὶ θλίψις μεγάλη· καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκον χορτάσματα οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. 12. ἀκούσας δὲ Ἰακὼβ ὄντα σῖτα[1] ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, ἐξαπέστειλε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν πρῶτον· 13. καὶ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ ἀνεγνωρίσθη Ἰωσὴφ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ φανερὸν ἐγένετο τῷ

[1] **σιτα** HP, Chrys.; **σιτια** ℵABCDE 5, 8, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. (see Wendt, crit. note, p. 168, and Field, *Otium Norvic.*, iii., 76).

11, and so in Gen. xxvi. 14, xxx. 1, Isa. xi. 13, Ecclus. xxxvii. 10; used also in a bad sense in Acts xvii. 5, 1 Cor. xiii. 4, James iv. 2, and so in classical writers. It may be used here absolutely, as in A.V. (see Grimm, Nösgen), or governing **Ἰωσήφ**, as in R.V.—**ἀπέδ. εἰς**, *cf.* for construction Gen. xlv. 4.

Ver. 10. **ἦν ὁ Θεὸς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ**, *cf.* Gen. xxxix. 2, 21, 23 (*cf.* Luke i. 28, 66).—**ἐξείλετο . . . ἐκ**: the same construction in Gen. xxxii. 11, Exod. iii. 8, and in N.T., Acts xii. 11, xxvi. 17, Gal. i. 4; so in classical Greek. The middle force of the verb in the sense of causing to be saved is lost.—**χάρις**, *cf.* ii. 41. The word means primarily, as the context shows, favour with man, *cf.* Gen. xxxix. 21; but this **χάρις** was also a divine gift: **ἔδωκεν**. It is significant also that Pharaoh speaks of Joseph, Gen. xli. 38, as a man in whom the spirit of God is, although no doubt the expression refers primarily to Joseph's skill in foretelling and providing against the famine.—**σοφίαν**: in interpreting the king's decree, Gen. xli. 25 ff.—**ἐναντίον**, so in Gen. xxxix. 21.—**βασ. Αἰγ.**: without the article as in Hebrew (Blass), *cf.* Gen. xli. 46; see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 185.—**καὶ κατέστησεν**, *sc.*, Pharaoh, *cf.* change of subject as in ver. 4, in which Weiss also sees the hand of a reviser, but see above. The same word is used in Gen. xli. 43, and *cf.* for **ἡγούμενον** the same chap., ver. 41, where the sense of the title is shown—the exact word is used of Joseph in Ecclus. xlix. 15 (**ἡγούμενος ἀδελφῶν**); in N.T. four times in Luke, see Luke xxii. 26, Acts vii. 10, xiv. 12, xv. 22; elsewhere only in Hebrews, *cf.* xiii. 7, 17, 24.

Ver. 11. **λιμὸς**, *cf.* Luke iv. 25, where **ἐπί** follows.—**χορτάσματα**: sustenance, R.V., fodder, provender for their cattle, *cf.* Gen. xxiv. 25, 32, xlii. 27, Judg. xix. 19; only here in N.T., *cf.* Polyb., ix., 43. The want of it would be a most pressing need for large owners of flocks. Blass takes it as meaning *frumentum*, corn, food for man as well as for beasts, since **χορτάζειν**, both in LXX and N.T. (Mark viii. 4, *cf.* vii. 27, 28), is used of the food of man, *cf.* Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, pp. 82, 156.

Ver. 12. **σῖτα**, but **σιτία** in R.V. (Blass follows T.R.), *cf.* LXX, Prov. xxx. 22 = properly food made of corn opposed to **χόρτος** (**σῖτα** not elsewhere in N.T., but in LXX **τὰ σῖτα**, corn, *frumenta*). In Gen. xlii. 2 we have **σῖτος**. But as Wendt points out, in the words which follow: **πρίασθε ἡμῖν μικρὰ βρώματα** we have what may well correspond to **σιτία**.—**ὄντα**: on the participle after verbs of sense, *e.g.*, **ὁρῶ, ἀκούω, οἶδα**, in classical Greek, construction same as here—especially in Luke and Paul in N.T., *cf.* Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 196 (1893).—**πρῶτον** = "the first time," R.V. = **τὸ πρότερον** opposed to **ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ**, ver. 13, which is only found here in N.T.: generally **δεύτερον** (*cf.* **ἐκ δευτέρου**, 1 Macc. ix. 1 and Dan. ii. 7 (LXX)).

Ver. 13. **ἀνεγνωρίσθη**: the compound verb apparently from LXX, Gen. xlv. 1.—**φανερὸν ἐγέν.**, *cf.* Luke viii. 17, iv. 36, i. 65, vi. 49, etc.; on Luke's fondness for periphrasis with **γίνομαι**, see Plummer on Luke iv. 36.—**τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰ.**: R.V. "race," so ver. 19, *cf.* iv. 36, because wider than **συγγένειαν**, "kindred," in ver. 14. R.V. "became manifest" strictly; the captain of the guard, Gen. xli. 12, had previously mentioned that Joseph was a Hebrew, but the fact which

Φαραὼ τὸ γένος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ.[1] 14. ἀποστείλας δὲ Ἰωσὴφ μετεκαλέσατο τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Ἰακώβ, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν συγγένειαν αὐτοῦ, ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομηκονταπέντε.[2] 15. κατέβη δὲ Ἰακὼβ εἰς Αἴγυπτον,[3] καὶ ἐτε-

[1] **το γενος του Ιωσηφ** DHP, Chrys., so Hilg.; om. **Ιωσηφ** BC 47, so Lach., W.H., Wendt, Weiss. **το γενος αυτου** ℵAE 40, Vulg., Arm., so Tisch., Blass; **την συγγ. αυτου—αυτου** om. ℵABCHP, Vulg. (am. fu. demid.), Syr. Harcl., Arm., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

[2] DH, Gig. read **εν εβδ. και πεντε ψυχαις** (*cf.* Deut. x. 22), so Blass and Hilg.

[3] **εις Αιγυπτον** om. B (W.H. in brackets)—Wendt regards as an addition from LXX—but retained in ℵACDEHP, Vulg., Syrr. (P.H.), etc.; so Weiss and Hilg.

had been only mentioned incidentally "became manifest" when Joseph's brethren came, and he revealed himself to them, so that Pharaoh and his household were aware of it, ver. 16. It was not until later that five of Joseph's brethren were actually presented to Pharaoh, xlvii. 1 ff. (Hackett).

Ver. 14. **μετεκαλέσατο**: four times in Acts, and nowhere else in N.T., *cf.* x. 32, xx. 17, xxiv. 25, only once in LXX, H. and R., *cf.* Hosea xi. 2, A; so **εἰσκαλέομαι**, only once in N.T., *cf.* Acts x. 23; not in LXX or Apocrypha. Both compounds are peculiar to St. Luke in N.T., and are frequent in medical writers, to "send for" or to "call in" (although Polyb. in middle voice, xxii. 5, 2, in same sense) a physician, Hobart, *Medical Language*, etc., p. 219. In Attic Greek we should have **μεταπέμπεσθαι.—ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε**: **ἐν** = Hebrew בְּ, *cf.* Deut. x. 22, in (consisting in) so many souls, *cf.* Luke xvi. 31. Here in Deut., LXX, as also in Hebrew, we have the number given as seventy (although in A, seventy-five, which seems to have been introduced to make the passage similar to the two others quoted below) who went down into Egypt. But in Gen. xlvi. 27, and in Exod. i. 5, LXX, the number is given as seventy-five (the Hebrew in both passages however giving seventy as the number, although in Gen. xlvi. 26 giving sixty-six, making up the seventy by adding Jacob, Joseph, and his two sons). For the curious Rabbinical traditions current on the subject, see Lumby, *Acts*, p. 163. In Gen. xlvi. 27 the LXX make up the number to seventy-five by adding nine sons as born to Joseph while in Egypt, so that from this interpolation it seems that they did not obtain their number by simply adding the sons and grandsons, five in all, of Ephraim and Manasseh from Gen. xlvi. 20 (LXX) to the seventy mentioned in the Hebrew text, as Wetstein and others have maintained. But there is nothing strange in the fact that Stephen, as a Hellenist, should follow the tradition which he found in the LXX. Josephus in *Ant.*, ii., 7, 4; vi., 5, 6, follows the Hebrew seventy, and Philo gives the two numbers, and allegorises about them. See Meyer-Wendt, p. 174, note, Hackett, Lumby, *in loco*, and Wetstein. Nothing in the argument is touched by these variations in the numbers.

Ver. 15. The frequent mention of Egypt may perhaps indicate that Stephen meant to emphasise the fact that there, far away from the land of promise, God's Presence was with the chosen race (who were now all in a strange land) and His worship was observed.—**μετετέθησαν**: only here in this sense in N.T. Some have supposed that only **οἱ πατέρες** and not **αὐτός** is the subject; this would no doubt avoid the first difficulty of the verse, *viz.*, that Jacob was buried in Shechem, whereas according to Gen. l. 13 he was laid to rest in the cave of Machpelah. But a further difficulty must be met. Joseph is the only son of the Patriarch who is expressly stated to have been buried in Shechem, Josh. xxiv. 32, and of the removal of the bodies from Egypt nothing is said. But the silence as to the latter fact need not trouble us, as whether we accept the tradition mentioned by Josephus or by St. Jerome, they both presuppose the removal of the bodies of the Patriarchs to the promised land, *cf.* the discussion on Exod. xiii. 19. *Mechilta* (Lumby, p. 164), Wetstein, *in loco*, and see also the tradition in the *Book of Jubilees*, chap. xlvi., that the children carried up the bones of the sons of Jacob, and buried them in Machpelah, except those of Joseph. But another tradition is implied in *Sot.* 7 *b*. According to Josephus, who probably repeats a local tradition, *Ant.*, ii., 8, 2, they were buried at Hebron. But according to

λεύτησεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν· 16. καὶ μετετέθησαν[1] εἰς Συχέμ, καὶ ἐτέθησαν ἐν τῷ μνήματι ὃ ὠνήσατο[2] Ἀβραὰμ τιμῆς ἀργυρίου παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ[3] τοῦ Συχέμ. 17. Καθὼς δὲ ἤγγιζεν ὁ χρόνος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἣν ὤμοσεν[4] ὁ Θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ηὔξησεν ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐπληθύνθη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, 18. ἄχρις[5] οὗ ἀνέστη βασιλεὺς ἕτερος, ὃς οὐκ

[1] **μετετεθησαν**; but in D **μετηχθησαν**, so Hilg. and Blass, who thinks **μετετεθ** suggested by **ετεθ.** below—but D stands alone.

[2] **ο ωνησ.** HP, Chrys.; **ῳ** ℵABCDE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[3] **εν** for **του** is read by ℵ[1]BC, and so Tisch., Blass (**α** and **β**), Weiss.

[4] **ωμοσεν** HP 31, 61, Syrr. Pesh. Harcl. text, Boh., Chrys.; **ωμολογησεν** ℵABC 15, 36, Vulg., Sah., Arm. (Syr. Harcl. mg.), Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (gloss, after LXX), rare in sense of "promised," and so **επηγγειλατο** DE tol. (Syr. Harcl. marg.), also Hilg., gloss for **ωμολ.** corrupted into **ωμοσε.**

[5] **αχρις** ℵAB[3]EHP; **αχρι** B*CD, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg. (see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, on the two forms and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 63). After **ετερ.** ℵABC, so W.H., R.V., Weiss, add **επ' Αιγυπτον.**

St. Jerome their tombs were shown at Shechem, and the Rabbinical tradition mentioned by Wetstein and Lightfoot places their burial there, a statement supported by a Samaritan tradition existing to this day (*Palestine Exploration Fund*, December, 1877, see Felten and Plumptre, *in loco*). When we consider the prominent position of Shechem as compared with Hebron in the time of Joshua, there is nothing strange in the fact that the former place rather than Machpelah should have been chosen as the resting-place not only of Joseph but also of his brethren. Plumptre has ingeniously contended that St. Stephen might have followed the Samaritan tradition, *cf.* Acts vi. 5, and see *Expositor*, vol. vii., first series: "The Samaritan element in the Gospels and Acts," p. 21 ff., although we need not suppose that in this reference to the hated Samaritans Stephen proposed to show that not even they had been rejected by God. There is certainly no difficulty in supposing that here and elsewhere Stephen might easily have adopted some popular tradition, and at all events the fact that the mistake, if it is one, is left unnoticed by the historian is a plain proof of the truthfulness of the record. But a further difficulty. Abraham purchases the cave of Machpelah, but from Ephron the Hittite, Gen. xxiii. 16. The sons of Hamor sell a field, but to Jacob—a field at Shechem, Gen. xxxiii. 19, Josh. xxiv. 32. How can we explain this with reference to the statement in the text? Shechem was the earliest settlement of Abraham when he entered Canaan, and there he built an altar, Gen. xii. 6, 7. But no devout Hebrew worshipper, with all his reverence for holy places, would be content to see the altar so consecrated belonging to others, and so exposed to desecration; the purchase of the ground on which an altar stood would therefore seem to follow as a kind of corollary from the erection of an altar on that ground. This is at all events a more satisfactory solution than omitting the word Ἀβραάμ or exchanging it for Ἰακώβ (see Hackett). Of course the reading of R.V., W.H. (as above), prevents a further difficulty as to the rendering of τοῦ Συχέμ if the reading τοῦ Συχέμ is retained, *cf.* Wendt, critical note, p. 157 (edition 1899), who follows A.V. in supporting "the father of Sichem," so Hackett, but see on the other hand Plumptre, *Acts*, *in loco*, and Felten, *in loco*. For the way in which the two purchases and the two burials may have been confused in popular tradition, see Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 302, 2nd edit. (*cf.* Bengel, Stier, Nösgen).

Ver. 17. **καθὼς**: not "when" as in A.V., but "as" R.V., *prout*, *quemadmodum*, *cf.* Mark iv. 33: "in the degree that": Felten thinks that it is temporal, as in 2 Macc. i. 31.—**τῆς ἐπαγγελίας**, *cf.* ii. 33.—**ἧς**: Attic attraction.—**ὤμοσεν**: but if we read with R.V., etc., **ὡμολόγησεν** "vouchsafed," so in classical Greek, *cf.* Jer. li. 25 (LXX), Matt. xiv. 7 (ὤμοσεν, a gloss from the LXX according to Wendt).—**ηὔξησεν ὁ λ. καὶ ἐπληθύνθη**, *cf.* Exod. i. 7, so in a strange land the blessing was continued (Weiss).

Ver. 18. *Cf.* Exod. i. 8, and Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 9, 1. After **ἕτερος** add **ἐπ' Αἰγ.**, see

ᾔδει τὸν Ἰωσήφ. 19. οὗτος[1] κατασοφισάμενος τὸ γένος ἡμῶν, ἐκάκωσε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκθετα τὰ βρέφη αὐτῶν, εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογονεῖσθαι. 20. Ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ ἐγεννήθη Μωσῆς,[2] καὶ ἦν ἀστεῖος τῷ

[1] **ουτος**, D reads **και**, so Hilg.

[2] **Μωσης** AEP; **Μωυσης** ℵBCDH, W.H., Weiss.

above. **ἕτερος** not ἄλλος, probably meaning the native sovereign after the expulsion of the Shepherd Kings, "Joseph," B.D.[2]; "Egypt," B.D.[2], pp. 886, 887; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 5, pp. 759, 760; Sayce, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 237.—**ἄχρις οὗ**: only in Luke amongst the Evangelists, Luke xxi. 24, Acts vii. 18, xxvii. 33. Sayce, following Dr. Naville, argues in favour of Ramses II. as the Pharaoh of the Oppression, see *u. s.* and *Expository Times*, January and April, 1899, but see on the other hand the number of February, p. 210 (Prof. Hamond), and *Expositor*, March, 1897, Prof. Orr on the Exodus. Joseph settled under the Hyksos or Shepherd Kings, but the words "who knew not Joseph" should apparently refer, according to Dr. Sayce, not to the immediately succeeding dynasty, *i.e.*, the eighteenth, in which a Canaanite might still have occupied a place of honour, but rather to the nineteenth, which led to the overthrow of the stranger, and to a day of reckoning against the Hebrews. But it becomes difficult to speak with absolute confidence in the present state of Egyptological research, see *Expositor*, *u. s.*, p. 177. **οὐκ ᾔδει**: in Robinson's *Gesenius*, p. 380, the word is taken literally, or it may mean "who does not know Joseph's history or services"; others take it "who had no regard for his memory or services". Hamburger understands by it that Joseph was quite forgotten under the new national dynasty, whilst Nösgen refers to the use of **οἶδα** in Matt. xxv. 12.

Ver. 19. **κατασοφισάμενος**: in Exod. i. 10 we have the same verb "let us deal wisely with them" here translated "deal subtilly"; Vulgate, "circumveniens," *cf.* Rhemish version: "circumventing our stock" (**γένος**, as in iv. 36); *cf.* Judith v. 11, x. 19, in both passages the same verb is used, translated (R.V.), v. 11, "dealt subtilly"—the Syriac, probably nearest to the Hebrew, "*dealt* wisely with them," *i.e.*, the Egyptians dealt so with the Hebrews. In the second passage, R.V., word is rendered "might deceive"; same verb in Syriac as in Exod. i. 10, Heb.; *Speaker's Commentary*, "Apocrypha," i., p. 290. Josephus and Philo use verb in same sense as in text; see for the force and meaning of **κατά** here, Page and Rendall.—**ἐκάκωσε**, *cf.* Exod. i. 11, where the same word is used of task-masters afflicting the people with burdens. For other ways in which Pharaoh is said to have afflicted the people, see Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 9, 1.—**τοῦ ποιεῖν κ.τ.λ.**, "that they [*or* he, *margin*] should cast out their babes," R.V. But a comparison with Exod. i. 22 (LXX) justifies us in taking these words, as in R.V. margin, as describing the tyranny of Pharaoh, not as declaring that the parents themselves exposed their children. For the construction see Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 231; *cf.* 1 Kings xvii. 20, etc., genitive of result, see Page on iii. 12, and *in loco*, and Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 157.—**ἔκθετα**: only here in N.T. and not in LXX, but used with **γόνος** in Eur., *Andr.*, 70.—**εἰς τὸ**: expressing the purpose, *cf.* Luke v. 17.—**ζωογονεῖσθαι**: in the active the verb is used three times, in Exod. i., of the midwives saving the Hebrew children alive, ver. 17, 18, 22 (*cf.* Judg. viii. 19, etc.), *vivum conservare*. In the N.T. the word is only used by St. Luke here and in his Gospel, chap. xvii. 33, and once by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 13 (see R.V. margin). St. Chrysostom comments on the thought that where man's help was despaired of, and the child was cast forth, then God's benefit did shine forth conspicuous, *Hom.*, xvi.

Ver. 20. **ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ**, *cf.* i. 7, iii. 19, characterising the time, comp. Bengel, *tristi*, *opportuno*: on the name **Μωυσῆς** see Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 10, and Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 5, p. 768, and critical notes.—**ἀστεῖος τῷ Θεῷ**: if we render the expression as in A. and R.V., "exceeding fair," the dative **τῷ Θεῷ** is used as an equivalent of the Hebrew expression employed almost in a superlative sense, לֵאלֹהִים, Jonah iii. 3, **πόλις μεγ. τῷ Θεῷ**. Or the expression may be rendered "fair to God," *i.e.*, in the judgment of God; *cf.* **δυνατὰ τῷ Θεῷ**, 2 Cor. x. 4 and James ii. 5, **τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ**. Page and Wendt

θεῷ· ὃς ἀνετράφη μῆνας τρεῖς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. 21. ἐκτεθέντα δὲ αὐτόν,[1] ἀνείλετο αὐτὸν ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραώ, καὶ ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν. 22. καὶ ἐπαιδεύθη Μωσῆς πάσῃ σοφίᾳ

[1] DE, Syr. Harcl. mg. add παρα (E εις) τον ποταμον after εκτ. . . . αυτον, Blass in β, so Hilg. ανειλετο; but -ατο in ℵABCDE (H) 61, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg., Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112.

compare Æsch., *Agam.*, 352, and see also Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 81. ἀστεῖος, lit., belonging to the city (opposite to ἄγροικος), witty, clever; then, elegant, pretty; Vulgate, *elegans*, used as a general word of praise: applied to Moses here, in Exod. ii. 2, and Heb. xi. 23, and also by Philo, *cf.* also Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 97, and see Hamburger, *u. s.*, i., 5, p. 773; *Jalkut Rubeni*, f. 75, 4. For other instances of the use of the word see LXX, Num. xxii. 32, Judges iii. 17, and Judith xi. 23, Susannah, ver. 7; in the last two passages used of physical fairness, prettiness (*cf.* Arist., *Eth. Nic.*, iv., 3, 5, and instances in Wetstein). In 2 Macc. vi. 23 it is also used, and ἀστείως in 2 Macc. xii. 43 in the general sense of right and good, honestly.—ἀνετράφη μῆνας τρεῖς, *cf.* Exod. ii. 2, verb used only by St. Luke, twice in this chapter, and in xx. 3, once in Luke iv. 16, but *cf.* margin, W.H.—not used in LXX, but in Wisdom vii. 4 (where A has ἀνεστρ.), and see also 4 Macc. x. 2 and xi. 15 (but A.R., τραφ.). The word is used in classical Greek, as in Wisdom vii. 4 and here, of a child nourished to promote its growth (although sometimes with the idea of improving the mind, *cf.* Acts xx. 3). In the N.T. it is peculiar to St. Luke, and it is just the word which a medical man would use, frequently found in medical writings, opposed to ἰσχναίνω; see L. and S., *sub v.*, and Hobart, *Medical Language*, p. 207.

Ver. 21. ἐκτεθ.: the regular word for exposure of children in classical Greek; see also Wisdom xviii. 5, peculiar to Luke in N.T., and only here in this sense; *cf.* Exod. ii. 3, and β critical note above.—ἀνείλετο—same word in Exod. ii. 5. The verb, though very frequent in Luke in the sense of *to kill*, is only used here in the sense of A. and R.V., Vulgate, *sustulit*—but *cf.* Aristoph., *Nub.*, 531; Epict., *Diss.*, i. 23, 7. ἑαυτῇ: as in contrast to the child's own mother. According to tradition, Pharaoh's daughter designed him for the throne, as the king had no son, Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 9, 7.—εἰς υἱόν, Exod. ii. 10; *cf.* xiii. 22, 47; Simcox, *Language of N. T.*, p. 80.

Ver. 22. ἐπαιδεύθη, *cf.* xxii. 3 here with instrumental dative, or, better, dative of respect or manner; not mentioned in Exodus, but see Philo, *Vita Moys.*, ii., 83, Mang., and also Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 343, E.T.; *cf.* the knowledge of magic ascribed to Pharaoh's wise men in Exod. vii. 11, and "Jannes and Jambres," B.D.[2], and also 1 Kings iv. 30, and Isa. xix. 2, 11, 12; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums* "Zauberei," i., 7, 1068, and references in Wetstein, *in loco*. παιδεύω, both in LXX and N.T., used in the sense of *training*; *cf.* Prov. v. 13 (Jos., *C. Apion*, i., 4), 1 Tim. i. 20, Titus ii. 12, and also in the sense of *chastising*, so often in LXX and in N.T., and also similarly used in classical Greek. The passage is also important because it helped to fix the attention of cultivated early Christian writers upon the wisdom of Greek poets and philosophers, and to give a kind of precedent for the right pursuit of such studies; *cf.* Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, i., 5, 28; vi., 5, 42; Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.*, c., 1-4; see Dean Plumptre's note, *in loco*.—ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς, *cf.* xviii. 24, and especially Luke xxiv. 19; see also Ecclus. xxi. 7, Judith xi. 8. If αὐτοῦ is retained, the mode of expression is Hebraistic (Blass). There is no contradiction with Exod. iv. 10, and no need to explain the expression of Moses' writings, for Stephen has in his thoughts not so much, as we may believe, the oratorical form as the powerful contents of Moses' words (*e.g.*, his prophetical teaching, Hamburger, "Moses," *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 5, 772). Josephus speaks of him as πλήθει ὁμιλεῖν πιθανώτατος, *Ant.*, iii., 1, 4 (see also Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 10, 1, for the traditional exploits of Moses, and Hamburger, *u. s.*, p. 771).

Ver. 23. ὡς, *cf.* i. 10, Lucan. The exact age is not mentioned in O.T., but it was traditional (Weiss refers its mention to the reviser, perhaps introduced as a parallel to ver. 30). According to the tradition, which Stephen apparently followed, Moses lived forty years in Pharaoh's palace, but some accounts

Αἰγυπτίων· ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἐν ἔργοις. 23. Ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετὴς[1] χρόνος, ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ. 24. καὶ ἰδών τινα ἀδικούμενον[2] ἠμύνατο καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν τῷ

[1] **τεσσαρακονταετης** B³EHP, so Hilg.; but **τεσσερακον.** ℵAB*C, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss (Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 45, 54).

[2] After **αδικουμενον**, DE, Gig., Syr. Harcl. mg. read **εκ του γενους αυτου**, so Hilg.

give twenty years; his dwelling in Midian occupied forty years, and he governed Israel for the same period, xiii. 18. See *Midrash Tanchuma* on Exod. ii. 6 (Wetstein, with other references, so too Lumby).—**ἐπληροῦτο**, "but when he was well-nigh," etc., R.V., lit. "when the age of forty years was being fulfilled to him" (imperf. tense), *cf.* Luke xxi. 24, Acts ii. 1, ix. 23, xxiv. 27, and ver. 30 below; so repeatedly in LXX.—**ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ**, *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 9 for the expression, probably taken from LXX, Isa. lxv. 17, *cf.* Jer. iii. 16, xxxii. 35, Ezek. xxxviii. 10, and 2 Kings xii. 4. The phrase is an imitation of the Hebrew. Gesenius compares the phrase before us with Heb., Ezek. xiv. 3, 4; see also Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 66 (1896).—**ἐπισκέψασθαι**, *cf.* Luke i. 68, 78, and vii. 16, *cf.* Exod. iv. 31, of God visiting His people by Moses and Aaron (Acts xv. 14). In each of these passages the verb is used of a divine visitation, and it is so used by St. Luke only amongst N.T. writers, except Heb. ii. 6 = Ps. viii. 5, LXX. It is used elsewhere in Matt. xxv. 36, 43, James i. 27, Acts vi. 3, xv. 36 (*cf.* Judg. xv. 1). The word is used of visits paid to the sick, *cf.* Ecclus. vii. 35, and so in classical Greek (see Mayor on James i. 27), often in medical writings and in Plutarch (Grimm, *sub v.*, and Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 105); mostly in the LXX, as always in the N.T., in good sense (Gen. xxi. 1, Ps. viii. 4, lxxix. 14, Ecclus. xlvi. 14, Judith viii. 33, but also with reference to divine punishment, Ps. lxxxviii. 31, 32, Jer. ix. 9, 25, xi. 22, xxxiv. (xxvii.) 8, etc.), *cf.* its use in *Psalms of Solomon*, where it is generally employed with reference to divine visitation, either for purposes of punishment or deliverance. In modern Greek = *to visit*, same sense as in LXX and N.T.; Kennedy, *u. s.*, p. 155. For its old English sense of *visit*, as looking upon with kindness, Lumby compares Shaks., *Rich. II.*, i., 3, 275: "All places that the eye of heaven *visits*".—**τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ**: though in a king's palace, and far removed in one sense from his people, Moses remembers that he is an Israelite, and that he has brethren; while others forgot their brotherhood he reminded them of it: "motivum amoris quod Moses etiam aliis adhibuit ver. 26," Bengel, *cf.* Exod. ii. 10, and Heb. xi. 24, 25.

Ver. 24. **ἀδικούμενον**, "wronged," *i.e.*, by blows, Exod. ii. 11.—**ἠμύνατο**: only here in N.T. (*sc.*, **τὸν ἀδικοῦντα**); in active the verb means to defend, "debebat scribere **ἤμυνε**," says Blass, but in the middle it means defence of oneself, or of a friend, with the collateral notion of requital or retaliation on an enemy (see Rendall). In the middle it has also the meaning of avenging, and therefore might mean here "he took vengeance on" or "he repulsed" (*cf.* Josh. x. 13, 2 Macc. x. 17, Wisdom xi. 3, and Jos., *Ant.*, ix., 1, 2), although this is expressed in the next words.—**ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν**, *cf.* Luke xviii. 7, 8, xxi. 22; lit., "wrought an avenging," Rom. xii. 19 (*cf.* Heb. x. 30), 2 Cor. vii. 11, 2 Thess. i. 8, 1 Pet. ii. 14. This and similar expressions are common in LXX, Judg. xi. 36, Ps. cxlix. 7, Ezek. xxv. 17, 1 Macc. iii. 15, vii. 9, 24, 38; **ἐκδ.** in Polybius with **ποιεῖσθαι**, iii., 8, 10.—**καταπονουμένῳ**: only here and in 2 Pet. ii. 7; *cf.* 2 Macc. viii. 2 (R has **κατα-π α τ ούμ.**, of the Jews oppressed, trodden down, in the days of Judas Maccabæus), 3 Macc. ii. 2, 13; used in Polyb. and Josephus, etc. The exact word is found in *Didache*, v., 2.—**πατάξας**: lit., to strike, hence to kill, in Biblical language only, *cf.* Exod. ii. 12 and 14, and ver. 28 below: so also in Matt. xxvi. 31, Mark xiv. 27 (Zech. xiii. 7, LXX). The verb is very frequent in LXX. "Smiting the Egyptian," R.V.—**τὸν Αἰγ.**: not previously mentioned, but implied in **ἀδικ.**, which involves an oppressor; as in ver. 26 the facts are regarded by St. Stephen as known to his audience.

Ver. 25. **ἐνόμιζε δὲ**: a comment by St. Stephen, but we are not told upon

καταπονουμένῳ, πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον.[1] 25. ἐνόμιζε δὲ συνιέναι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς διὰ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς σωτηρίαν· οἱ δὲ οὐ συνῆκαν. 26. τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὤφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένοις, καὶ συνήλασεν[2] αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην, εἰπών, "Ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἐστε ὑμεῖς[3]· ἱνατί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους;" 27. ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτόν, εἰπών, "Τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ

[1] After **Αιγυπτιον**, D (Wer.) add **και εκρυψεν αυτον εν τη αμμῳ**; *cf.* Exodus ii. 12 (Blass rejects, Hilg. retains).

[2] **συνηλασεν** AEP, Chrys., some verss., so Meyer, Alford; **συνηλλασσεν** ℵBCD e, Vulg., Syrr. (P. and H.), Sah., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. After **μαχομενοις** D adds **ειδεν αυτους αδικουντας** (not retained by Blass but by Hilg.).

[3] **υμεις** HP, Boh., Syr. Harcl., Aeth.; om. ℵABCDE 27, 61, Vulg., Sah., Arm., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. For **ανδρες αδελφοι εστε**, D, Prom. read **τι ποιειτε, ανδρες αδελφοι;**

what grounds Moses based his expectation (see however Lumby's note, *in loco*). The verb is found in Luke ii. 44, iii. 23, and seven times in Acts, but elsewhere in the Gospels only three times in St. Matthew; it is used three times by St. Paul. It is frequently found in ii. and iv. Macc., twice in Wisdom and once in Ecclesiasticus.—**διὰ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ**, ii. 23. **δίδωσι**, "was giving them," R.V. (not "would give," A.V.), as if the first step in their deliverance was already taken by this act, so **συνιέναι**, "understood," R.V. (not "would understand," A.V.). In Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 9, 2, 3, reference is made to the intimation which was said to have been vouchsafed by God to Amram the father of Moses that his son should be the divine agent who was expected to arise for the deliverance of the Hebrews, and whose glory should be remembered through all ages. It has been sometimes thought that St. Stephen had this tradition in mind.—**οἱ δὲ οὐ συνῆκαν**: Mr. Page notes the rhetorical power in these words, *cf.* ver. 53 **καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε.**

Ver. 26. **ὤφθη**: Wendt commends Bengel, who sees in the word the thought that he appeared *ultro, ex improviso*, *cf.* ii. 3, vii. 2, Heb. ix. 28.—**συνήλασεν**: but if we read **συνήλλασσεν**, see critical note = imperfect, *de conatu*, *cf.* Matt. iii. 14, Luke i. 59, xv. 14, Acts xxvi. 11, see Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 12, from **συναλλάσσω**, only found here in N.T., not in LXX or Apocrypha, but in classical Greek, *cf.* Thuc., i., 24. —**ἱνατί = ἵνα τί γένηται;** *cf.* iv. 25, and Luke xiii. 7 (Matt. ix. 4, xxvii. 46, 1 Cor. x. 29), and with the words **ἱνατί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους;** Exod. ii. 13 (Moulton and Geden); used several times in LXX, also by Aristoph. and Plato. Like the Latin *ut quid?* see Grimm, *sub v.*, and for spelling; and comp. also Blass, *Gram.*, p. 14, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 36.—**ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἐστε**: the fact of their brotherhood aggravated their offence; it was no longer a matter between an Egyptian and a Hebrew as on the previous day, but between brother and brother—community of suffering should have cemented and not destroyed their sense of brotherhood. Hackett and Alford take **ἄνδρες** as belonging to **ἀδελφοί** (not as = **κύριοι**, 'Sirs' in A. and R.V.), *men* related as *brethren are ye*, *cf.* Gen. xiii. 8.

Ver. 27. **ἀπώσατο** for Attic **ἀπεώσατο** (see also ver. 45), not found in the O.T. parallel, but added by Stephen, *cf.* ver. 38, compare LXX, Jer. iv. 30. The word may be introduced to emphasize the contumaciousness of the people, which in Stephen's narrative is the motive of the flight of Moses; in Exodus, Moses flees from fear of Pharaoh, and the answer of the Hebrew demonstrates to him that his deed of yesterday was known—but there is no contradiction in the two narratives. The matter would become known to Pharaoh, as the words of the Hebrew intimated; it could not be hidden; and in spite of the attempt at concealment on the part of Moses by hiding the body in the sand, his life was no longer safe, and so he fled because he had nothing to hope for from his people. Stephen's words would be quite consistent with the narrative in Exodus (Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 163, as against Overbeck).

δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς[1]; 28. μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις, ὃν τρόπον ἀνεῖλες χθὲς[2] τὸν Αἰγύπτιον;" 29.[3] ἔφυγε δὲ Μωσῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, καὶ ἐγένετο πάροικος ἐν τῇ Μαδιάμ, οὗ ἐγέννησεν υἱούς δύο. 30. Καὶ πληρωθέντων ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα, ὤφθη αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὄρους

[1] **ημας** DE, Chrys., so Meyer, Hilg.; **ημων** ℵABCHP 13, 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

[2] **χθες** AEHP, Chrys; **εχθες** ℵB*CD 34, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 54).

[3] D reads **ουτως και εφυγαδευσεν Μωυσης** (**και ουτως** d), so Hilg.; E reads **εφυγαδευσεν δε Μωυσην**; Gig. has *fugatus est autem M.*; and Par. *effugavit autem se M.* Weiss (Codex D, p. 67) inclines to consider **φυγαδ.** as the original reading (so Zöckler), and to take it trans., understanding **ο αδικων** as the nom. **φυγαδευω** nowhere else in N.T.; in LXX found both trans. and intrans. but gen. the latter; commoner **εφυγεν** *may* be corruption of it here; **φυγαδεύω** frequent in Letters of Pseudo-Heraclitus.

Ver. 28. *Cf.* Exod. ii. 14.

Ver. 29. ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ· Weiss points out that Moses fled on account of this word, because he saw that his people would not protect him against the vengeance of Pharaoh. Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 11, 1, makes the cause of the flight of Moses not the words which told him that his deed was known, but the jealousy of the Egyptians, who represented to the king that he would prove a seditious person. — **Μαδιάμ**: generally taken to mean or to include the peninsula of Sinai (Exod. ii. 15, and iii. 1), and thus agrees with the natural supposition that his flight did not carry Moses far beyond the territory of Egypt (*cf.* Exod. xviii. 1-27). The name Midianites would be applied to the descendants of Abraham's fourth son by Keturah, who in various clans, some nomadic, some mercantile (*e.g.*, those to whom Joseph was sold), may be described as Northern Arabs. (Dr. Sayce, *u. s.*, p. 270, maintains that Moses to get beyond Egyptian territory must have travelled further than to the S. peninsula of our modern maps, and places Sinai in the region of Seir, with Midian in its close neighbourhood.) Amongst one of these tribes Moses found a home in his flight, Hamburger, "Midian," *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 5, 755. Hackett, *Acts*, p. 104, "Midian," B.D.[1]. —**οὗ ἐγένν.**, *cf.* Exod. ii. 22, iv. 20, xviii. 3. Weiss thinks the notice due to a reviser, who wished to show that Moses had given up his people, and made himself a home in a strange land.

Ver. 30. **πληρωθέντων**, see ver. 23, *cf.* Exod. vii. 7, "fulfilled," R.V. **ὤφθη**, ver. 2, so the second fundamental revelation of God to Israel took place in the wilderness far away from the Promised Land (Weiss), see also ver. 33.—**τεσσαράκοντα**, *cf.* i. 3.—**Σινᾶ**: there is no contradiction between this and Exod. iii. 1, where the appearance is said to take place in Horeb, for whilst in the N.T. and Josephus Sinai only is named for the place of the law-giving, in the O.T. the two names are interchanged, *cf.* also Ecclus. xlviii. 7. According to Hamburger the two names are identical, signifying in a narrower sense only one mountain, the historical mountain of the giving of the law, but in a wider sense given to a whole group of mountains. Thus Hamburger declines to accept the view that Horeb was the name of the whole ridge of mountain-cluster, whilst Sinai specially denotes the mountain of the law-giving, since Horeb is also used for the same event (*cf.* Exod. iii. 1, xvii. 6, xxxiii. 6), *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 7, 940. See also B.D.[1], "Sinai," Wendt, edition (1899), *in loco*; Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopædia*, iv., "Sinai" (also for literature); and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* According to Sayce, *Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 263 ff., Sinai is a mountain of Seir, rather than of the Sinaitic peninsula so called. The same writer lays stress upon the fact that Sinai is associated with Seir and Edom, Deut. xxxiii. 2, Judg. v. 4, 5, and maintains that it is nowhere in the O.T. transported to the Sinaitic peninsula of our modern maps. The word **Σινᾶ** is an indeclinable noun **τό** (*sc.*, **ὄρος**); Josephus **τὸ Σιναῖον** and **τὸ Σιναῖον ὄρος**; Grimm-Thayer, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 91, Blass, *Gram.*, 8, 32; and see also Sayce, *u. s.*, p. 268, 269, and *Patriarchal Palestine*, p. 259, who renders as adjective "(the mountain)

Σινᾶ ἄγγελος Κυρίου[1] ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς[2] βάτου. 31. ὁ δὲ Μωσῆς ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασε[3] τὸ ὅραμα· προσερχομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ κατανοῆσαι, ἐγένετο φωνὴ Κυρίου πρὸς αὐτόν, 32. "Ἐγὼ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ Θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ ὁ Θεὸς Ἰακώβ." ἔντρομος δὲ γενόμενος Μωσῆς οὐκ ἐτόλμα κατανοῆσαι. 33. εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος, "Λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου· ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐν ᾧ

[1] **Κυριου** om. ℵABC 61, 81, Vulg., Sah., Boh.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass (α and β, although found in D), Weiss, Wendt (prob. added from Exod. iii. 2); Hilg. retains.

[2] **εν φλογι πυρος** ℵBDHP, Sah., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aeth., Chrys., so W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, and Hilg.; **εν πυρι φλογος** ACE, Vulg., Syr. Pesh. (so LXX, Exod. iii. 2, varies: **εν πυρι φλογος** in B; **εν φλογι πυρος** AF).

[3] **εθαυμασε** ABC 13, Vulg., Chrys., so Lach., Meyer, W.H., R.V.; **εθαυμαζεν** ℵDEHP 1, 31, 61, Aug., so Tisch., Weiss (Wendt doubtful), Hilg. Blass and Hilg. both read **ακηκοα** (D) for **ηκουσα**; *cf.* Exod. iii. 7.

which belongs to Sin," *i.e.*, like desert which it overlooked, to the worship of the Babylonian Moon-God Sin in that region.—**ἄγγελος**: in Exod. iii. 2 "the angel of the Lord," but in ver. 7 "the Lord said," so here in ver. 31 "the voice of the Lord said," *cf.* ver. 33. For the same mode of expression *cf.* Acts xxvii. 23 with xxiii. 11. In this Angel, the Angel of the Lord, *cf.* Exod. iii. 2 with vv. 6, 14, and Gen. xxii. 11 with ver. 12; the Angel of the Presence, Exod. xxxiii. 11, *cf.* Isa. lxiii. 9 (ver. 38 below), although Jewish interpreters varied, the Fathers saw the Logos, the Eternal Word of the Father. See references in Felten, *in loco*, and Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, Lect. ii., and "Angel," B.D.². Otherwise we can only say that Jehovah Himself speaks through the Angel (Weiss, Blass, *in loco*).—**ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βάτου**: words interchanged as in LXX A, Exod. iii. 2; according to Hebrew **πυρὸς ἐκ τοῦ βάτου—πυρός** here = an adjective, *rubus incensus* (Blass, Weiss); *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 8, **ἐν πυρὶ φλογός**. For gender of **βάτος** see ver. 35.

Ver. 31. **κατανοῆσαι**: this careful observation is implied in the narrative of Exodus though the word is not employed. It is a favourite word with St. Luke, and is used by him four times in his Gospel and four times in Acts, elsewhere in Gospels only in Matt. vii. 3 (five times in Epistles). On its force see Westcott on Heb. iii. 1: "oculos vel mentem defigere in aliquo" Grimm; properly = to take notice of, so in classical Greek; it is used also in the sense of observing, looking at, *cf.* James i. 27; and in a general sense, to see, *cf.* LXX, Ps. xciii. 9, *cf.* xc. 8; and also, to consider, Heb. x. 24 (Mayor, note on James i. 27). In the LXX, where it is frequent, it is used with both shades of meaning.

Ver. 32. **ἔντρομος γεν.** (*cf.* x. 4, **ἔμφοβος γεν.**), xvi. 29, *cf.* Exod. iii. 6, expression used only in Acts in these two passages (Heb. xii. 21, quotation from LXX). **ἔμφοβος** is found five times in Luke, in Gospel xxiv. 5, 37, in Acts x. 4, xxiv. 25 (only once elsewhere, in Rev. xi. 33, with **ἐγένοντο**), and in each passage with **γενόμενος**. **ἔντρομος**, Dan. (Theod.) x. 11, Wisdom xvii. 10, 1 Macc. xiii. 2, and in Ps. xvii. (xviii.) 7, lxxvi. (-vii.) 18, **ἔντρομος ἐγενήθη ἡ γῆ**—the word is also used by Plutarch.

Ver. 33. **λῦσον**, *cf.* Josh. v. 15, **λῦσον** A., *cf.* Exod. iii. 5; in classical Greek, **λῦσαι**, omitting **σου**. On the custom of worshipping bare-footed, as the priests when actually engaged in the Temple, or as the Arabs enter their mosques with bare feet, or the Samaritan the holiest place on Gerizim, see instances, both classical, Juvenal, *Sat.*, vi., 158, and from Josephus and others, Wetstein and Wendt, *in loco*. The latter refers to an Egyptian custom the order of Pythagoras **ἀνυπόδητος θῦε καὶ προσκύνει**, Jamblich., *Vit. Pyth.*, 23, and *cf.* 18 in Wetstein.—**τὸ ὑπόδημα**, *cf.* xiii. 25, and John i. 27, where in each passage the singular is used. Both Weiss and Wendt note the significance of the verse—a strange land is consecrated (*cf.* vi. 13, **τόπος ἅγιος**) by the presence of God—the Jews thought that the Temple was the only holy place, *cf.* add. note for significance in connection with the aim

ἕστηκας γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν. 34. ἰδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα· καὶ κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτούς· καὶ νῦν δεῦρο, ἀποστελῶ[1] σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον." 35. τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες, "Τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν[2];" τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἄρχοντα[3] καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέστειλεν[4] ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βάτῳ. 36. οὗτος ἐξήγαγεν αὐτούς, ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐν Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα.

[1] **αποστελω** HP.; **αποστειλω** ℵABCDE 61, Chrys., so Tisch., Alford, W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.

[2] **δικαστην**, ℵCD 61, Gig., Par., Syr. Harcl. mg. add **εφ' ημων** (**εφ' ημας** in E and Chrys.), so Hilg., but text in ABHP, Vulg., Syr. Harcl. text, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss.

[3] **αρχοντα**, before this word **και** inserted by ℵABDE 15, 18, 61, Syr. Harcl.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.

[4] **απεστειλεν** CHP, Chrys., so Blass; **απεσταλκεν** ℵABDE, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; **εν** ℵHP d, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Arm., Aeth., Meyer; **συν** ABCDE, Vulg., Sah., Syr. Harcl., Chrys., so Tisch., Alford, W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; **εν** probably from confusion with last syll. in **απεσταλκεν**. **συν χειρι** only here in N.T.; **εν χειρι** not uncommon.

of St. Stephen's speech, and St. Chrysostom's comment *in loco*.

Ver. 34. **ἰδὼν εἶδον**: Hebraism, so LXX, Exod. iii. 7, and so frequently, *e.g.*, Ps. xl. 1, *cf.* Matt. xiii. 14, Heb. vi. 14 (Gen. xxii. 17), the participle with the verb emphasising the assurance. But similar collocations are not wanting in classical Greek, see Page, *in loco*, and Wendt, who compares 1 Cor. ii. 1. The phrase **ἰδὼν εἶδον** occurs in Lucian, *Dial. Mar.*, iv., 3 (Wetstein). "I have surely seen," R.V., so in A. and R.V., Exod. iii. 7, see Simcox, *Language of N. T.*, p. 130, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 217 (1896).—**καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστελῶ**, but *cf.* Exod. iii. 10; **ἀποστείλω**; see critical notes. On the hortatory subj. in first person singular with **δεῦρο** or **ἄφες** prefixed, see Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 74, *cf.* Matt. vii. 4, Luke vi. 42, but translated by the revisers, "I will send," with an imperative force as of a divine command (see Rendall's note, *in loco*). For classical instances *cf.* Wendt, *in loco*.

Ver. 35. **τοῦτον**: followed by the triple **οὗτος**, a significant and oratorical repetition—*anaphora* or repetition of the pronoun, *cf.* ii. 23, v. 31 (so Bengel, Blass, Viteau, see also Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, pp. 65, 66). It plainly appears to be one of the purposes, although we cannot positively say the chief purpose, of the speech to place Moses in typical comparison to Jesus and the behaviour of the Jews towards Him, ver. 25.—(**καὶ**) **ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν**: Moses was made by God a ruler and even more than a judge—not **δικαστής** but **λυτρωτής**. But just as the denial of the Christ is compared with the denial of Moses, *cf.* **ἠρνήσαντο** and **ἠρνήσασθε** in Acts iii. 13, so in the same way the **λύτρωσις** wrought by Christ is compared with that wrought by Moses, *cf.* Luke i. 68, ii. 38, Heb. ix. 12, Tit. ii. 14 (so Wendt, *in loco*) "omnia quæ negaverant Judæi Deus attribuit Moysi" (Blass). **λυτρωτής** in LXX and in Philo, but not in classical Greek. In the Sept. the word is used of God Himself, Ps. xix. 14, lxxviii. 35 (*cf.* Deut. xiii. 5, and *Psalms of Solomon*, ix. 1).—**ἐν χειρὶ**, *cf.* xi. 21, but **σύν** is closer to the classical **σὺν θεοῖς** with the helping and protecting hand, **ἐν χειρὶ** = בְּיַד, *cf.* Gal. iii. 19.—**τῇ βάτῳ**: **ὁ** Attic, **ἡ** Hellenistic, but in N.T. it varies, in Luke xx. 37 feminine, in Mark xii. 26 (and in LXX) masculine (W.H.); Blass, *Gram.*, p. 26; Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*

Ver. 36. On **οὗτος** see ver. 35.—**ἐξήγαγεν**, Exod. iii. 10, **καὶ ἐξάξεις τὸν λαόν μου**.—**Ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ** in LXX frequent, יַם סוּף sometimes with, sometimes without the article, here as in the Heb. without: *cf.* the parallel in *Assumption of Moses*, iii., 11 (ed. Charles), and see below on ver. 38.

37. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἰπὼν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, "Προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῶν [1] ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς ἐμέ· αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε." [2] 38. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ [3] λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ καὶ

[1] **Κυριος** CEHP, Boh., Syr. Harcl., Aeth., Chrys., so LXX, Deut. xviii. 15; om. ℵABD 61, Vulg., Sah., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **υμων** (1) om. ℵABCD 61, Vulg. verss., Chrys.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss.

[2] **αυτου ακουσεσθε** CDE, Gig., Par., Wern., Vulg., Syrr. (P. and H.), Boh., Arm., Aeth.; om. ℵABHP 61, Sah., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt (*cf.* Deut. xviii. 15, and Acts iii. 22).

[3] **αγγελου του** om. Gig., "recte ut videtur," according to Blass, *cf.* ver. 44—Blass brackets in β.

Ver. 37. **οὗτός**, *cf.* ver. 35, *cf.* Deut. xviii. 15, and iii. 22, above. The introduction of the prophecy may mean that St. Stephen wished in this as in the preceding and following verse to emphasise the position and the work of Moses, and to mark more strongly the disobedience of the people. Blass regards **οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μ. κ.τ.λ.** as intended to show that Moses, whom the Jews accused Stephen of injuring, was himself by his own words a supporter of the claims of Christ: "hic est ille M. qui dixit".

Ver. 38. **οὗτός**: again emphatic use.—**ἐκκλησίᾳ**: "in the congregation," R.V. margin: held in the wilderness for the giving of the law, although the word does not occur in Exod. xix., but *cf.* Deut. xxxi. 30, Josh. viii. 35 (ix. 2). By Wycliffe the word was translated "Church" here, but afterwards "congregation," so in Tynd., Cranm., Gen., until A.V. again rendered "Church," *cf.* Heb. ii. 12, and on the word see above on v. 11, Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 3 ff., and B.D.² "Church". In Heb. ii. 12, R.V. reads "congregation" in text (but "Church" in margin), following Tynd. and Cranm., and Ps. xxii. 22 from which the quotation is made (where both A. and R.V. have "congregation"). Schmiedel would dismiss the word as a later gloss, which has been inserted here in a wrong place, see Wendt (edit. 1899), p. 160, note.—**γενόμ. . . . μετὰ**, *cf.* ix. 19, xx. 18 (Mark xvi. 10); no Hebraism, *cf.* **σύν** in Luke ii. 13.—**τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λαλ.**, but in Exodus Moses is said to speak with God, *cf.* ver. 30 above, and see also ver. 53, "who was with the angel . . . and with our fathers," *i.e.*, who acted as the mediator between the two parties, who had relations with them both, *cf.* Gal. iii. 19, and Philo, *Vit. Moys.*, iii., 19, where Moses is called **μεσίτης καὶ διαλλακτής**, *cf.* also Heb. ii. 2, and Jos., *Ant.*, xv., 5, 3; the latter passage represents Herod as saying that the Jews learned all that was most holy in their law **δι' ἀγγέλων παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ** (see Westcott *Hebrews*, and Wetstein on Gal. iii. 19). On the title **μεσίτης** as given to Moses, see further *Assumption of Moses*, i., 14, and Charles' note and introd. lxiii., but it does not follow that the inference is justified that the Apocryphal Book in question was known to the writer of St. Stephen's speech. Dr. Charles maintains this on the ground of three passages, but of (1) it may be said that the term **μεσίτης** evidently could have been known from other sources than Acts, (2) the parallel between ver. 36 and *Assumption of Moses*, iii., 11, is, as Dr. Charles admits, an agreement verbally "for the most part," but the words "Egypt, the Red Sea, and the wilderness for forty years" might often be used as a summary of the history of Israel at a particular period, whilst the context with which the words are here associated is quite different from that in *Assumption of Moses*, l.c., and (3) there is no close resemblance between the prophecy from Amos quoted in ver. 43 below and the prophecy in *Assumption of Moses*, ii., 13; in both the phraseology is quite general. Perhaps the omission of the word **μετά** before **τῶν πατέρων** gives emphasis to the privilege of "our fathers," when one can speak of being with the angel and with them, Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 159. Thus Moses prefigures the Mediator of the new coventant, *cf.* Heb. viii. 15, ix. 15, xii. 24, and the mention of this honour bestowed upon Moses emphasises still more fully the indignity which he received from his countrymen, *cf.* St. Chrysostom on the force of **οὗτος** in this verse.—**λόγια**, *cf.* Rom. iii. 2, as in LXX

τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν.[1] 39. ᾧ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ὑπήκοοι γενέσθαι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἀλλ'[2] ἀπώσαντο, καὶ ἐστράφησαν[3] ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν εἰς Αἴγυπτον, 40. εἰπόντες τῷ Ἀαρών, "Ποίησον ἡμῖν θεοὺς οἳ προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν· ὁ γὰρ Μωσῆς οὗτος, ὃς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί γέγονεν[4] αὐτῷ." 41. καὶ ἐμοσχοποίησαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, καὶ ἀνήγαγον θυσίαν τῷ εἰδώλῳ, καὶ εὐφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. 42. Ἔστρεψε δὲ ὁ Θεός, καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς λατρεύειν τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν, "Μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι ἔτη τεσσαρά-

[1] **ημιν**; but ℵB read **υμιν**, so W.H. text, Weiss.

[2] **αλλ'**; but **αλλα** in ℵABCDEH, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilg.

[3] **εστραφησαν**, D reads **απεστραφησαν**, so Hilg. **ταις καρδιαις** DE, Vulg., Arm., Syr. Pesh., Chrys., Iren^int.; so Meyer; **εν** pref. in ℵABC, so W.H., R.V., Weiss.

[4] **εγενετο** ℵABC, so W.H., R.V., Blass (*cf.* Exod. xxxii. 1, pr. R.V.).

of the words of God, *cf.* Numb. xxiv. 4, 16, and chiefly for any utterance of God whether precept or promise, only once of human words (Ps. xviii. (xix.) 14); so Philo speaks of the decalogue as **τὰ δέκα λόγια**, and Jos., *B. J.*, vi., 5, 4, of the prophecies of God in the O.T., and Philo writes **τὸ λόγιον τοῦ προφήτου** (*i.e.*, Moses), *Vit. Moys.*, iii., 35, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, **λόγιον**, lit., a little word, from the brevity of oracular responses.—**ζῶντα**: "vim vitalem habentia," Blass, *cf.* Heb. iv. 12, 1 Pet. i. 23, *cf.* Deut. xxxii. 47. The words again show how far St. Stephen was from despising the Law of Moses, *cf.* Heb. iv. 12, "living," R.V. ("quick," A.V.); 1 Pet. i. 3, and ii. 5, where R.V. has "living" instead of "lively"; in Ps. xxxviii. 19 "lively" is retained in R.V. (see also in Exod. i. 19, in contrast to feeble, languid), *cf.* Spenser, *Faërie Queene*, iii., 8, 5. Here the word has the sense of living, *i.e.*, enduring, abiding, *cf.* "thy true and lively [living] word" in prayer for the Church Militant, *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 23, R.V.

Ver. 39. **ἐστράφησαν**, *i.e.*, in their desires after the Egyptian gods, *cf.* ver. 40, not "turned back again," but simply "turned" (Rendall, *in loco*). The words cannot be taken literally (as Corn. à Lap. and others), or we should have to render "who may go before us *in our return* to Egypt," which not only is unsupported by the Greek, but *cf.* Exod. xxxii. 4, 1 Kings xii. 28; see also on this verse, Exod. xvi. 3, Num. xi. 4, 5, but the desires there expressed marked a later date.

Ver. 40. **προπορεύσονται** (Exod. xvi. 3, Num. xi. 4, 5), only elsewhere in N.T., in Luke i. 76, with which *cf.* Deut. xxxi. 3. The words in Acts are taken from Exod. xxxii. 1, 23; frequent in LXX, 1 Macc. ix. 11 (but see H. and R.), and also in Xen. and Polyb.—**οὗτος**, *iste*, *cf.* vi. 14, the same anacoluthon as in LXX, Exod. xxxii. 23, so in the Heb., "who brought us up": no mention of God—they ascribed all to Moses (Chrysostom); see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 135 (1896).

Ver. 41. **ἐμοσχοποίησαν**: not in LXX or in classical Greek; in Exod. xxxii. 2, **ἐποίησαν μόσχον**.—**ἀνήγαγον θυσίαν**, *cf.* 1 Kings iii. 15 (and 2 Sam. vi. 17, A.), for similar use of the word, "quia victima in aram tollitur," Grimm.—**εὐφραίνοντο**, *cf.* Exod. xxxii. 6 and 18; the word is very frequent in LXX, and several times with **ἐν**, *cf.*, *e.g.*, 2 Chron. vi. 41, Ecclesiast. xiv. 5, 1 Macc. iii. 7; **χαίρειν ἐν**, Luke x. 20; used only by St. Luke amongst the Evangelists, six times in his Gospel, twice in Acts (but ii. 26 is a quotation). Bengel points out that God rejoices in the works of His own hands, and men in the work of God's hands, but not as here—half irony in the words.

Ver. 42. **ἔστρεψε**: properly intransitive. Weiss takes it transitively: God turned them from one idol worship to another; but here probably means that God turned away from them, in the sense that He cared no longer for them as before; so Grimm, *sub v.*; or that He actually changed so as to be opposed to them; *cf.* Josh. xxiv. 20, Heb., so Wet

κοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ; 43. καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥεμφάν,[1] τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς· καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα[2]

[1] **υμων** ℵACEHP, Vulg., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Aeth., Chrys. (so LXX, Amos v. 26), so Blass; om. BD 15, 18, Syr. Pesh., Sah., Arm., Ir., Or., Philast., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **Ρεμφαν** 1, 31, Or., Chrys.; **Ρεμφαμ** D, Flor., Gig., Par., Wern., Vulg., Iren., so Blass in β, and Hilg.; **Ρεφαν** ℵ[3]ACE, Syrr. (P. and H.), Boh., Sah., so R.V.; **Ρομφαν** ℵ* 3, so Tisch.; **Ρομφα** B, so W.H., Weiss. In LXX **Ραιφαν** or **Ρεφαν**. Wendt prefers **Ρομφαν** or **Ρομφα**.

[2] **επεκεινα**; D[1], Gig., Par. read **επι τα μερη**, so Blass in **α** and β, so Hilg., *cf.* LXX; originality of Western reading not imposs., or **επι τα μερη** may have been substituted for a phrase unique in N.T. (see also Wendt, p. 163, edit. 1899).

stein "Deus se ab iis avertit," and *cf.* LXX, Isa. lxiii. 10.—**παρέδωκεν**, *cf.* Rom. i. 24, and **εἴασε** in xiv. 16; Ephes. iv. 19, "gave themselves up". **ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν**, from the side of man.—**λατρεύειν τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρ.**, *cf.* Deut. xvii. 3, 2 Kings xvii. 16, xxi. 3, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 3, 5, Jer. viii. 2, xix. 13, a still grosser idolatry: "antiquissima idolatria, ceteris speciosior" Bengel. The created host was worshipped in place of Jehovah Sabaoth, "the Lord of Hosts". The word, though used always in the N.T. of religious service, is sometimes applied to the worship of idols, as well as of the One God; *cf.* Rom. i. 25 (LXX, Exod. xx. 5, xxiii. 24, Ezek. xx. 32), so **λατρεία** is used of the worship of idols in 1 Macc. i. 43; see Trench, *Synonyms*, i., p. 142 ff.—**ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφ.**: here part of the Hebrew Scriptures which the Jews summed up under the title of "the Prophets," as a separate part, the other two parts being the Law and the Hagiographa (the Psalms, Luke xxiv. 44); or Twelve Minor Prophets which probably formed one book.—**Μὴ σφάγια κ.τ.λ.**: a quotation from Amos v. 25-27, with little variation—the quotation in ver. 42 is really answered by the following verse. The question does not mean literally that no sacrifices were ever offered in the wilderness, which would be directly contrary to such passages as Exod. xxiv. 4, Num. vii. 9. The sacrifices no doubt were offered, but how could they have been real and effectual and acceptable to God while in their hearts the people's affections were far from Him, and were given to idol deities? **μή**, expecting a negative answer = *num* (see Zöckler's note, *in loco*).—**οἶκος**: nominative for vocative, as often, as if in apposition to the **ὑμεῖς** contained in **προσηνέγκατε** (Blass). Some emphasise **μοι** = *mihi soli*, or suppose with Nösgen that the question is ironical.

Ver. 43. The answer of God to His own question: **καί** should be explained "ye actually took up" ("yea," R.V., in Amos v. 26); **ἀνελάβετε**, "ye took up," *i.e.*, to carry in procession from one halting place to another. **τὴν σκηνήν**, properly **σκηνή** = סִכּוּת, which has sometimes been explained as the tent or tabernacle made by the idolatrous Israelites in honour of an idol, like the tabernacle of the covenant in honour of Jehovah, but R.V. renders "Siccuth your king" (margin, "the tabernacle of your king"), Amos v. 26, see below.—**τοῦ Μολόχ**: s in LXX, but in Hebrew, מַלְכְּכֶם, *i.e.*, your king (as A.V. in margin, Amos v. 26). The LXX, either as explanatory, or perhaps through another reading מִלְכֹּם, 2 Kings xxiii. 13, here render by the name of the idol. Sayce also (*Patriarchal Palestine*, p. 258) renders "Sikkuth your Malik," *i.e.*, the Babylonian god Sikkuth also represents "Malik," the king, another Babylonian deity (= Moloch of the O.T.). Most commentators maintain that ver. 26 (Amos v.) is not in the original connected with ver. 25 as the LXX render, referring the latter verse back to Mosaic times. The LXX may have followed some tradition, but not only does the fact that the worship of Moloch was forbidden in the wilderness seem to indicate that its practice was a possibility, but there is also evidence that long before the Exodus Babylonian influence had made itself felt in the West, and the statement of Amos may therefore mean that the Babylonian god was actually worshipped by the Israelites in the wilderness (Sayce, *u. s.*, p. 259). In margin of R.V. we have "shall take up," *i.e.*,

Βαβυλῶνος." 44. Ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ αρτυρίου ἦν ἐν τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς διετάξατο ὁ λαλῶν τῷ Μωσῇ, ποιῆσαι

carry away with you into exile (as a threat), while others take the verb not in a future but in a perfect sense, as referring to the practice of the contemporaries of the prophet: "de suo tempore hæc dicit Amos" (Blass). *Siccuth* or rather *Saccuth* is probably a proper name (a name given to Nin-ip, the warlike sun-god of Babylonia (Sayce)), and both it and *Kewan* (*Kaivan*), כִּיּוּן, represent Babylono-Assyrian deities (or a deity), see Schrader, *Cun. Inscript. and the O. T.*, ii., 141, 142, E.T.; Sayce, *u. s.*, Art. "Chiun" in Hastings' B.D., and Felten and Wendt, *in loco*. For the thought expressed here that their gods should go into captivity with the people, *cf.* Isa. xlvi. 2.—**καὶ τὸ ἄστρον . . . Ῥεμφάν,** T.R.—but R.V. **Ῥεφάν,** on the reading see critical notes, and Wendt, p. 177. For the Hebrew (Amos v. 26) כִּיּוּן *Chiun*, the LXX has **Ῥαιφάν.** How can we account for this? Probably LXX read the word not *Chiun* but *Kewan* כֵּיוָן (so in Syr. Pesh., *Kewan* = Saturn your idol), of which **Ῥαιφάν** is a corruption through **Καιφάν** (*cf.* similar change of כ into ר in Nah. i. 6, כאשׁ in LXX **ἀρχάς** as if ראשׁ, Robinson's *Gesenius*, p. 463). *Kewan* = Ka-ai-va-nu, an Assyrian name for the planet Saturn, called by the same name in Arabic and Persian (Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 2, 216, and Art. "Chiun," *u. s.*); and this falls in perfectly with the Hebrew, "the star of your god" (your star-god) — אֱלֹהֵיכֶם כּוֹכַב, the previous word, צַלְמֵיכֶם, "your images," being placed after the two Hebrew words just quoted, *cf.* LXX (but see also Sayce, *u. s.*, who renders "Chiun, your Zelem," Zelem denoting another Babylonian deity = the image or disc of the sun). It seems plain at all events that both in the Hebrew and in the LXX reference is made to the divine honours paid to the god Saturn. In the words "ye took up the star," etc., the meaning is that they took up the star or image which represented the god Saturn—*your* god with some authorities (so in LXX, see Blass, *in loco*). **ὑμῶν,** *i.e.*, the deity whom these Israelites thus placed on a level with Jehovah. If we take כִּיּוּן *Chiun* = the litter, or pedestal, of your gods, *i.e.*, on which they were carried in procession, as if from כּוּן (a meaning advocated by Dr. Robertson Smith), and not as a proper name at all: "the shrines of your images, the star of your God," R.V. margin, Amos v. 26, we may still infer from the mention of a star that the reference is to the debasement of planet worship (so Jerome conjectured Venus or Lucifer). It is to be noted that the vocalisation of *Siccuth* and *Chiun* is the same, and it has been recently suggested that for the form of these two names in our present text we are indebted to the misplaced zeal of the Massoretes, by the familiar trick of fitting the pointing of one word to the consonant skeleton of another—here the pointing is taken from the word שִׁקּוּץ, "abomination," see Art., "Chiun," *u. s.*—**τοὺς τύπους,** *simulacra:* in LXX, in opposition to **σκηνή** and **ἄστρον.** If the **σκηνή** is to be taken as meaning the tent or tabernacle containing the image of the god, it might be so described. **τύποι** is used, Jos., *Ant.*, i., 19, 11; xv. 9, 5, of the images of Laban stolen by Rachel.—**προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς**: not in LXX, where we read **τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν οὓς ἐποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς.—ἐπέκεινα** βαβυλῶνος: in LXX and Hebrew "Damascus". **ἐπέκ.** only here in N.T., but in classical authors, and in LXX, Gen. xxxv. 16 (21), Jer. xxii. 19 (and Aquila on passage in Genesis). "Babylon" may have been due to a slip, but more probably spoken designedly: "interpretatur vaticinium Stephanus ex eventu" (as the Rabbis often interpreted passages), see Wendt, *in loco*, and Lightfoot. It may be that St. Stephen thus closes one part of his speech, that which shows how Israel, all through their history, had been rebellious, and how punishment had followed. If this conjecture is correct, we pass now to the way in which Stephen deals with the charge of blasphemy against the temple.

Ver. 44. Here again we notice that the first sanctuary of the fathers was not the temple, nor was it erected on holy ground, but **ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ** according to

αὐτὴν κατὰ τὸν τύπον ὃν ἑωράκει· 45. ἣν καὶ εἰσήγαγον διαδεξάμενοι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει τῶν ἐθνῶν ὧν ἐξῶσεν[1] ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ἕως τῶν ἡμερῶν Δαβίδ· 46. ὃς εὗρε χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ᾐτήσατο εὑρεῖν σκήνωμα

[1] εξωσεν ℵ³ABCDHP, Chrys., so W.H., Weiss, Hilg.; εξεωσεν ℵ*E 5, Tisch., so Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 37.

God's direct command.—**ἡ σκηνὴ τοῦ μαρτ.**: it is possible that there was in the speaker's mind a contrast to the **σκηνή** in ver. 43, but the connection is not clearly drawn out, **ἀσυνδέτως**, "ut in oratione concitatiore" (Blass).—**ἡ σ. τοῦ μαρτυρίου**, "the tabernacle of the testimony". The same phrase in LXX is used (incorrectly as Meyer noted) to translate the Hebrew tabernacle of the congregation *or* tabernacle of meeting, *i.e.*, of God with His people, *cf.* Exod. xxvii. 21. But the tabernacle was justly called **μαρτυρίου**, because it contained "the ark of the testimony," LXX, Exod. xxv. 9 (10), **κιβωτὸς μαρτυρίου**, and so frequently in the rest of the book, and xxxi. 18, **τὰς δύο πλάκας τοῦ μαρτυρίου.** The tabernacle might properly be so called as a witness of God's presence, and a testimony to the covenant between God and His people. See also Westcott on Heb. viii. 5, additional note.—**διετάξατο**, *cf.* xx. 13, xxiv. 23; only in St. Luke and St. Paul in N.T., except once in Matt. xi. 1; in Gospel four times, in Acts four or five times, and frequent in LXX. Grimm compares *disponere* (verordnen).—**καθὼς δ. ὁ λαλῶν**: "even as he appointed who spake," R.V.; "per reverentiam appellatio siletur" Blass; *cf.* Exod. xxv. 40, Heb. viii. 5.—**κατὰ τὸν τύπον**, *cf.* Wisdom ix. 8, where the command is given to Solomon.—**μίμημα σκηνῆς ἁγίας ἣν προητοίμασας**: "according to the figure," R.V., *i.e.*, pattern, likeness, *cf.* ver. 43 and Rom. v. 14. Again we see how far Stephen was from denying the divine sanction given to Moses for the tabernacle. In the thought thus implied lies the germ of Hooker's great argument, *Eccles. Pol.*, iii., 11 (Plumptre).

Ver. 45. **διαδεξάμενοι**: having received in their turn, *i.e.*, from Moses, only here in N.T., *cf.* 4 Macc. iv. 15; so also in classical Greek, in Dem. and in Polyb., *cf.* **διαδοχῆς**, "in their turn," Herod., viii., 142: (on the technical meaning of **διάδοχος**, to which in the LXX **διαδεχόμενος** is akin to the term of a deputy, or of one next to the king, see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 111, 112).—**μετὰ Ἰησοῦ**, *cf.* Heb. iv. 8, where Syr. Pesh. has "Jesus the son of Nun" (but not here).—**ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει τῶν ἐθνῶν**: "when they entered on the possession of the nations," R.V., lit., in the taking possession of the nations, *i.e.*, of the land inhabited by the nations (Wendt). A.V. follows Vulgate; frequent in LXX, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, ix., 1, 2, and *Test. xii. Patr.*, x., used by Philo in the sense of a portion given to keep (Grimm-Thayer).—**ὧν**: Attic attraction, *cf.* i. 1.—**ἀπὸ προσώπου**: for a similar phrase *cf.* Deut. xi. 23, xii, 29, 30, etc., and frequently in LXX, Hebrew מִפְּנֵי.—**ἕως τῶν ἡμ. Δ.**: to be connected with the first part of the verse, "which also our fathers brought in . . . unto the days of David" (inclusively), see Wendt, *in loco*, *i.e.*, "et mansit tabernaculum usque ad tempora Davidis" (Blass). Rendall takes the words as closely joined to **ὧν ἐξῶσεν**, but the clause **ὧν ἐξῶσεν . . . ἡμῶν** is rather subordinate.

Ver. 46. **ὃς εὗρε χάριν**, *cf.* Luke i. 30, Hebraistic, *cf.* Gen. vi. 8; it may be tacitly implied that had the temple been so important as the Jew maintained, God would have allowed the man who found favour before him to build it; on the phrase **ἐνώπ. K.** or **Θεοῦ** see above on iv. 10.—**ᾐτήσατο εὑρειν**, *i.e.*, **σκήνωμα**, *cf.* iii. 3; **ἠρώτα λαβεῖν**, and instances in Wetstein, "asked to find," not only "desired," LXX, 2 Sam. vii. 2 ff., 1 Chron. xxii. 7, Ps. lxxxi. 5.—**σκήνωμα**: perhaps used by David (as in the Psalm quoted) in his humility (Meyer); used of the temple in 1 Esdras i. 50. David of course desired to build not a **σκηνή**, which already existed.—**τῷ Θεῷ Ἰακώβ**, see critical notes.

Ver. 47. **Σολομῶν**, see above on iii. 11.—**δὲ**: "But" or "And"—**δὲ**, adversative as in A. and R.V., *cf.* 2 Chron. vi. 7-9, where Solomon is represented as claiming God's promise that he should build the house—a favour denied to his father David.

Ver. 48. **ἀλλ' οὐχ**: But the presence of the Most High (in contrast to the

τῷ Θεῷ[1] Ἰακώβ· 47. Σολομῶν[2] δὲ ᾠκοδόμησεν[3] αὐτῷ οἶκον. 48. Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς[4] κατοικεῖ, καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει, 49. "Ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος, ἡ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου· ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι; λέγει Κύριος· ἢ τίς[5] τόπος τῆς

[1] θεῳ ℵ[3]ACEP, Vulg., Syrr. (P. and H.), Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys.; οικῳ ℵ[1]BDH, so Weiss (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 7), so also Hilg. W.H. (Appendix, 92) think that although θεῳ is a very ancient correction of οικῳ the latter can hardly be genuine and that there is apparently a primitive error, and with this judgment Wendt agrees. Hort suggests κυριῳ, and concludes that τωοικω may have come from τωκ̅ω̅ (so too Wendt), and refers to LXX, Ps. cxxxi. 5; but we have still to ask if the expression "Lord of Jacob" ever occurred, whilst no doubt "God of Jacob," "House of Jacob" are familiar expressions. In LXX, Ps. cxxxi. 3, we have σκηνωμα οικου, and a similar expression *may* have been the orig. reading here; again, in Ps. xxiv. 6, Heb., we have "Jacob" = "the God of Jacob" (see LXX), and it has been suggested that some such abbreviation or mode of speech lies at the bottom of the difficulty here. Blass holds that οικῳ comes from the next verse "corrupte" (orig. a gloss on σκηνωμα).

[2] Σολομών BDEHP, so Blass in β, Weiss; Σολομῶν W.H., Hilg.; Σαλωμων AC, so Tisch.; Σαλομων ℵ. (See Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93; Blass, *Gram.*, p. 29.)

[3] ῳκοδομησεν ℵAB[3]CEHP, so Tisch.; οικοδομησεν BD, so W.H., Weiss, Blass in β, Hilg., but see W.H., App., 170. (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 100; Blass, *Gram.*, p. 37.)

[4] ναοις om. ℵABCDE; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. (*cf.* xvii. 24).

[5] τις; D, Flor. read ποιος, so Blass in β, and Hilg.—assim. either to preceding ποιον or to LXX.

smallness of any building made by hands) was not so confined—the previous words must not be misunderstood by Stephen's hearers. Solomon's οἶκος might have given the idea of greater permanency, but still Isaiah had taught, lxvi. 1, 2, and even the builder of the temple, Solomon himself, had acknowledged that God was not confined to any single place of worship, 1 King viii. 27, 2 Chron. vi. 18 (Hackett), *cf.* also David's prayer, 1 Chron. xxix. 10-19.—ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ—omit ναοῖς, probably an exegetical addition, *cf.* xvii. 24, where the word is found. The omission makes the contrast with οἶκος still more emphatic. "But Solomon . . . a *house*, howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in *houses* made with hands" (R.V.). For χειροποίητος and ἀχειρ. see Westcott on Heb. ix. 11, 24. Both words occur in Mark xiv. 58, in the charge of the false witness against our Lord. In the LXX χειροποίητος is used several times of idols made with hands, and occasionally found in classical Greek. Weiss compares as a parallel with its use here Isa. xvi. 12 (see R.V.), but the meaning is doubtful.—ὁ ὕψιστος, emphatic—Solomon's building a house must not be misunderstood—see too ver. 49. ὁ ὕψ., xvi. 17, used here absolutely (*cf.* Luke i. 32, 35, 76, vi. 35, without the article), so often in LXX, 2 Sam. xxii. 14, Ps. xvii. 13, and often in Psalms, Isa. xiv. 14, Ecclus. xii. 6, etc. R.V. writes "Most High," instead of A.V. "most High," thus making the proper name of God more emphatic, *cf.* Winer-Schmiedel, p. 172—so in classical Greek Ζεὺς ὕψιστος; ὁ ὕψιστος θεός in Greek inscriptions of Asia Minor; for the Hebrew equivalents, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* St. Stephen's words apparently impressed at least one of his hearers, for the same thought is reproduced in the words of St. Paul at Athens, where he asserts the same truth, and makes St. Stephen's words as it were his text to emphasise the real power and worship of God: "atque similiter hic Judæi atque illic Græci castigantur" (Blass), *cf.* the teaching of our Lord in John iv. 21 (and see Plumptre's note on this passage in Acts).—καθὼς ὁ προφ., Isa. lxvi. 1, 2 (LXX). The quotation is almost identical with few slight changes, as *e.g.*,

Ver. 49. τίς τόπος for ποῖος, and οὐχὶ introducing the conclusion instead of γάρ. Although Solomon had expressed this

καταπαύσεώς μου; 50. οὐχὶ ἡ χείρ μου ἐποίησε ταῦτα πάντα[1];" 51. Σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι τῇ καρδίᾳ[2] καὶ τοῖς ὠσίν, ὑμεῖς ἀεὶ τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ ἀντιπίπτετε, ὡς οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς.[3] 52. τίνα τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἐδίωξαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν[4]; καὶ ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς προκαταγγείλαντας περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ δικαίου,

[1] Flor. omits whole verse, but Blass and Hilg. retain it. Variation from LXX decisive for retention.

[2] (τῃ) **καρδιᾳ** EHP 61, Flor., Gig., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Boh., Eus., Lucif., so Blass, Meyer, Alford; **καρδιαις** (א)ACD 7, 14 (Chrys.), Cyr. (Vulg., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aeth.), so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; **καρδιας** B, W.H. marg. Meyer and Alford retain **καρδιᾳ** because (they think) **καρδιαις** was introduced to suit plural subject, but *cf.* Ezek. xliv. 7. **καρδιας** in LXX, Jer. ix. 26, but the reading can scarcely be original here on account of the following dat. **τοις ωσιν** (Wendt). But on the whole W.H.'s decision is best.

[3] **και υμεις** om. D², Flor., Gig., but Blass retains; Hilg. omits.

[4] **οι πατερες υμων**; D, Flor. read **εκεινοι.**

same truth in the dedicatory prayer of his temple, St. Stephen appeals to the great Messianic prophet. It is not, as some have thought, the worthlessness of the temple, but rather its relative value upon which Stephen insists. Those who take the former view of the words must suppose that St. Stephen had forgotten that Solomon had given utterance to the same thought at the moment when he was consecrating the temple (so Wendt, Felten, McGiffert, *in loco*). Weiss sees in the question another proof of the thought running through the whole address, that God's presence, with the blessings which He confers and the revelations which He imparts, is not confined to the temple: *cf.* the use of the same quotation as here against the Jews, *Epist. Barn.*, xvi., 2, after the destruction of the temple.

Ver. 51. **σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι τῇ καρδίᾳ,** *cf.* Exod. xxxiii. 3, 5, xxxiv. 9, Deut. ix. 6, Baruch ii. 30, etc., Ecclus. xvi. 11 (*cf.* Cicero, *Verr.*, iii., 95, "tantis cervicibus est"). Both adjectives had been used to describe the sins of Israel in former days. On this reading see above and Wendt, critical note, p. 190, *cf.* Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 116. For the expression **ἀπερ.,** *cf.* Deut. x. 16, Jer. iv. 4, and **ἀπερ. τὰ ὦτα,** Jer. vi. 10. In the N.T. *cf.* Rom. ii. 25, 29 (which sounds like another echo of St. Stephen's teaching), *cf.* also *Epist. Baru.*, ix. (Jer. iv. 4). Similar expressions occur in Philo and the Rabbis, and also 1 Macc. i. 48, ii. 46, and see further Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 150, 151. Many writers have maintained that St. Stephen's sharp and abrupt declaration marks the increasing impatience of his hearers at this point, as if the speaker felt that the murmurs of his audience would not allow him much more speech. But on the other hand St. Stephen's whole speech led up to this point, and his words were not so much an interruption, but a continuance and a summary of what had gone before. No doubt the speech was left unfinished: "cujus cursus ad Iesum tendebat" (Blass); since in His rejection the obstinacy of the people which had marked and marred their history had reached its climax; and the indignant words of St. Stephen bring to mind the indignation of a greater than he against the hyprocrisy and wilfulness of the nation—"the wrath of the Lamb" against the Pharisees and the oppressors (Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 68).—**ἀεὶ**: "summa tractationis — *semper* quotiescumque vocamini" Bengel.—**ἀντιπίπτετε,** *cf.* Num. xxvii. 14, of Israel striving against God, and also in Polyb. and Plut.

Ver. 52. **τίνα τῶν προφ.—ἀσυνδέτως,** to mark the vehemence of the speech, as above, verse 51: *cf.* 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16 for the general statement, and for individual cases, Jeremiah, Amos, and probably Isaiah, the prophet just quoted. We may compare the words of our Lord, Matt. v. 12, Luke xiii. 34, and also Luke xi. 49, Matt. xxiii. 29-37 where the same words **ἐδίωξαν** and **ἀπέκτειναν** are used of the treatment of the prophets.—**καὶ ἀπέκ.**: "they even slew"—perhaps the force of **καί** (Wendt), "they slew them also" (Rendall).—**ἐλεύσεως**: only here in the N.T., not in LXX or Apocrypha, or

οὗ νῦν ὑμεῖς προδόται καὶ φονεῖς γεγένησθε[1]· 53. οἵτινες ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, καὶ οὐκ ἐφυλάξατε. 54. Ἀκούοντες δὲ ταῦτα, διεπρίοντο ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔβρυχον τοὺς ὀδόντας

[1] γεγενησθε HP, Chrys.; εγενεσθε ℵABCDE, Orig., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

in classical writers, but found in *Acta Thomæ* 28, and in Iren., i., 10, in plural, of the first and second advent of Christ (see also Dion. Hal., iii., 59).—**τοῦ δικαίου,** see Acts iii. 14 and note. It has been suggested that it is used here and elsewhere of our Lord from His own employment of the same word in Matt. xxiii. 29, where He speaks of the tombs **τῶν δικαίων** whom the fathers had slain whilst the children adorned their sepulchres. But it is more probable that the word was applied to our Lord from the LXX use of it, *cf.* Isa. liii. 11. Even those Jews who rejected the idea of an atoning Messiah acknowledged that His personal righteousness was His real claim to the Messianic dignity, Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 362; Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, p. 185, second edition. We cannot forget that one of those present who heard St. Stephen's burning words was himself to see the Just One and to carry on the martyr's work, *cf.* xxii. 14, **ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον κ.τ.λ.**—**νῦν ἐγένεσθε**: "of whom ye have now become," R.V., the spirit of their fathers was still alive, and they had acted as their fathers had done; **ὑμεῖς** again emphatic.

Ver. 53. **οἵτινες,** *quippe qui* ("ye who," R.V.), as often in Acts and Epistles not simply for identification, but when as here the conduct of the persons already mentioned is further enlarged upon (Alford), *cf.* viii. 15, ix. 35, x. 41, 47, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 235, but see also Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 169.—**εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων**: "as it was ordained by angels," R.V. **εἰς**: at the appointment of, *cf.* its use in Matt. xii. 41, or better **εἰς** as in ver. 21 = received the law as ordinances of angels (**νόμον** being regarded as an aggregate of single acts and so with plural "ordinances"), so Rendall, who takes **εἰς** = **ὡς**, and Page, *cf.* Heb. xi. 8, *i.e.*, it was no human ordinance. But see on the other hand Wendt's note, p. 192, where he points out that the law was not received as commands given by angels but by God. This was undoubtedly the case, but St. Stephen was here probably referring to the current tradition in Philo and Josephus, and LXX, Deut. xxxiii. 2. **ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ,** *cf.* Ps. lxvii. 17; Philo, *De Somn.*, p. 642 Mang., so Jos., *Ant.*, xv., 5, 3, and also *Book of Jubilees,* chap. i. (see Wetstein and Lightfoot (J. B.) on Gal. iii. 19). Others again take **εἰς** = **ἐν,** "accepistis legem ab angelis promulgatam" = **διατασσόντων ἀγγέλων,** so Blass. Certainly it does not seem possible to take **διαταγή** = **διάταξις** = *agmen dispositum* (*cf.* Judith i. 4, viii. 36), and to render "præsentibus angelorum ordinibus," so that here also **εἰς** = **ἐν** (Meyer and others). Lightfoot (J.) takes the "angels" as = Moses and the Prophets; Surenhusius as = the elders of the people, whilst St. Chrysostom sees a reference to the angel of the burning bush. It must not be thought that St. Stephen is here depreciating the Law. From a Christian standpoint it might of course be urged that as Christ was superior to the angels, so the introduction of angels showed the inferiority of the Law to the Gospel (*cf.* Heb. ii. 2, Gal. iii. 19), but St. Stephen's point is that although the Law had been given with such notable sanctions, yet his hearers had not kept it, and that therefore they, not he, were the real law-breakers.—**οὐκ ἐφύλαξατε**: "cum omnibus *phylacteriis* vestris," Bengel. Note the rhetorical power of the words *cf.* ver. 25 (Page).

Ver. 54. No charge could have been more hateful to such an audience, *cf.* our Lord's words, John vii. 19; see Schürer, *Jewish People*, vol ii., div. ii., p. 90 ff., E.T. Schürer twice quotes St. Paul's words, pp. 96, 124, **ζῆλον Θεοῦ ἔχουσιν ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν**; no words could better characterise the entire tendency of the Judaism of the period.—**διεπρίοντο,** *cf.* v. 33.—**ἔβρυχον**: not elsewhere in N.T., in LXX, Job xvi. 10 (9), Ps. xxxiv. (v.) 16, xxxvi. (vii.) 12, *cf.* cxi. (xii.) 10; Lam. ii. 16, *cf.* Plutarch, *Pericles*, 33 (without **ὀδόντας,** intransitive). The noun **βρύχη** is found in the same sense, *Ap. Rh.*, ii., 83, of brute passion, not the despair so often associated with the cognate noun; *cf.* Matt. viii. 12, xiii. 42, etc.

ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν. 55.[1] Ὑπάρχων δὲ πλήρης Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, ἀτενίσας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εἶδε δόξαν Θεοῦ, καὶ Ἰησοῦν[2] ἑστῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ,[3] 56. καὶ εἶπεν, Ἰδοί, θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀνεῳγμένους, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν ἑστῶτα τοῦ Θεοῦ. 57. κράξαντες δὲ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, συνέσχον τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν, καὶ ὥρμησαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν·

[1] **υπαρχων δε πληρης Π. Α.**, Flor. represents **ὁ δε υπαρχων** (or **ων**) **ἐν πνευματι αγιῳ**; possibly assim. to Apoc. i. 10, iv. 2, as it has been thoughtfully suggested that to be "in the spirit" would account for his vision, whereas the expression in T.R. would not seem to account for it.

[2] **Ιησουν**; D, Flor., Gig. add **τον Κυριον**, so Hilg.

[3] For **του θεου** Par., Wern. read *virtutis Dei;* Const. Apost. **της δυναμεως**, "recte ut videtur" Blass, so in β; *cf.* Matt. xxvi. 64, Luke xxii. 69.

Ver. 55. **ἀτενίσας**, *cf.* i. 10, **εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν**, *cf.* John xvii. 1, "ubi enim est oculus, ibi est cor et amor". In the power of the Holy Ghost, with which Stephen is represented as being full, as in life so in death, he saw **δόξαν Θεοῦ**, in which He had appeared to Abraham, *cf.* ver. 2, **πλήρης**, "crescente furore hostium, in Stephano crescit robur spiritus, omnisque fructus Spiritus," Bengel.—**Ἰησοῦν ἑστῶτα**: elsewhere He is represented as sitting, ii. 34. If St. Luke had placed this saying in the mouth of St. Stephen in imitation of the words of Jesus, Matt. xxi. 64, Mark xvi. 19, Luke xxii. 69, he would, without doubt, have described Him as sitting, *cf.* also the expression "Son of Man," only here outside the Gospels, and never in the Epistles (Rev. i. 13, a doubtful instance), a noteworthy indication of the primitive date and truthfulness of the expression and the report. See especially Wendt's note on p. 194 (1888). Standing, as if to succour and to receive His servant, **ἵνα δείξῃ τὴν ἀντίληψιν τὴν εἰς αὐτόν** (Oecum., and so Chrys.); "quasi obvium Stephano," Bengel, so Zöckler, and see Alford's note and Collect for St. Stephen's day. St. Augustine represents Christ as standing: "ut Stephano stanti, patienti, et reo, ipse quoque stans, quasi patiens et reus compatiatur". Alford supposes reference in the vision to that of Zech. iii. 1.—**ἐκ δεξιῶν**: as the place of honour, *cf.* 1 Kings ii. 19, Matt. xx. 21. The Sanhedrin would recall the words "the Son of Man," as they had been spoken by One Who was Himself the Son of Man, and in Whom, as in His follower, they had seen only a blasphemer. On the expression "Son of Man" *cf.* Charles, *Book of Enoch*, Appendix B, p. 312 ff., and *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 286 (1892).

Ver. 57. **κράξαντες**: so as to silence him.—**συνέσχον τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν**: in order that the words which they regarded as so impious should not be heard, *cf.* Matt. xxvi. 65. Blass compares the phrase LXX, Isa. lii. 15, **καὶ συνέξουσι βασιλεῖς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν**.—**ὥρμησαν . . . ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν**, *cf.* 2 Macc. x. 16, and in several places in 2 Macc. the verb is found with the same construction (although not quite in the same sense).

Ver. 58. **ἔξω τῆς πόλεως**: according to the law, Lev. xxiv. 14, so in Luke iv. 29, our Lord is cast out of Nazareth to be stoned.—**ἐλιθοβόλουν**: as guilty of blasphemy. St. Stephen's closing remarks were in the eyes of his judges a justification of the charge; imperf. as in ver. 59, see note below. The judicial forms were evidently observed, at least to some extent (Weiss attributes the introduction of the witnesses to a reviser), and whilst the scene was a tumultuous one, it was quite possible that it was not wholly bereft of judicial appearances.—**μάρτυρες**: whose part it was to throw the first stone, *cf.* Deut. xvii. 7 (John viii. 7).—**ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν**: to perform their cruel task with greater ease and freedom, *cf.* xxii. 20.—**νεανίου**: only used in Acts, where it occurs three or four times, xx. 9, xxiii. 17 (18), several times in LXX. It has been thought (Wendt) that the term could not have been used of Saul if he had been married, or if he was at this time a widower, but if **νεανίας** might be used to denote any man of an age between twenty-four and forty, like Latin *adulescens* and the Hebrew נַעַר, Gen. xli. 12 (Grimm-Thayer), Saul might be so described. Josephus applies the term to Agrippa I. when he was at least forty. Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 6, 7. See further on

58. καὶ ἐκβαλόντες ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, ἐλιθοβόλουν. καὶ οἱ μάρτυρες[1] ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν[2] παρὰ τοὺς πόδας νεανίου καλουμένου

[1] μαρτυρες, Gig., Par. *falsi testes*; *cf.* vi. 12. Blass rejects in β.
[2] αυτων; B has εαυτων, so Weiss, but W.H. as in T.R.

xxvi. 10.—Σαύλου: "If the Acts are the composition of a second-century writer to whom Paul was only a name, then the introduction of this silent figure in such a scene is a masterpiece of dramatic invention" (Page, *Acts*, Introd., xxxi.); for the name see below on xiii. 9, and also on its genuineness, Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., 49, as against Krenkel. Of Saul's earlier life we gather something from his own personal notices, see notes on xxii. 3, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 14, xxvi. 4, and *cf.* ix. 13. He was a Hebrew sprung from Hebrews, Phil. iii. 5; he was a Roman citizen, and not only so, but a Tarsian, a citizen of no mean city; *cf.* for the two citizenships, xxi. 39 (ix. 11) and xxii. 27, "Citizenship," Hastings' B.D.; Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 48; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 30. Zahn, *u. s.*, pp. 35, 49, maintains that Saul's family had only recently settled in Tarsus (but see Ramsay, *u. s.*), and defends the tradition that his parents had come there from Gischala, their son being born to them in Tarsus. On Saul's family and means see notes on xxiii. 16 and xxiv. 26. But whatever his Roman and Tarsian citizenship may have contributed to his mental development, St. Paul's own words clearly lead us to attach the highest and most significant influence to the Jewish side of his nature and character. Paul's Pharisaism was the result not only of his training under Gamaliel, but also of the inheritance which he claimed from his father and his ancestors (xxiii. 6, Φαρισαίων not Φαρισαίου, *cf.* Gal. i. 14). His early years were passed away from Jerusalem, xxvi. 4 (the force of τε (R.V.) and the expression ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου, Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 48), but his home-training could not have been neglected (*cf.* 2 Tim. i. 3), and when he went up to the Holy City at an early stage to study under Gamaliel (xxii. 3, ἀνατεθραμμένος, on its force see Sabatier *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 30) he "lived a Pharisee," and nothing else than his well-known zeal is needed to account for his selection to his dreadful and solemn office at St. Stephen's martyrdom. As a Pharisee he had been "a separated one," and had borne the name with pride, not suspecting that a day was at hand when he would speak of himself as ἀφωρισμένος in a far higher and fuller sense, Rom. i. 1, Gal. i. 15 (Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 48); as a Pharisee he was "separated from all filthiness of heathenism" around (Nivdal), but he was to learn that the Christian life was that of the true "Chasid," and that in contrast to all Pharisaic legalism and externalism there was a cleansing ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, a perfecting holiness in the fear of God—God Who chooseth before all temples the upright heart and pure (Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 231). On the question whether St. Paul ever saw our Lord in the flesh, see Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i., 35, 36, and references, and for the views of more recent writers, *Witness of the Epistles* (Longmans), chaps. i. and ii.

Ver. 59. καὶ ἐλιθ. τὸν Σ. ἐπικ.: imperf., as in ver. 58, "quia res morte demum [60] perficitur," Blass. ἐπικ., present participle, denoting, it would seem, the continuous appeal of the martyr to his Lord. Zeller, Overbeck and Baur throw doubt upon the historical truth of the narrative on account of the manner in which the Sanhedrists' action is divided between an utter absence of formal proceedings and a punctilious observance of correct formalities; but on the other hand Wendt, note, p. 195 (1888), points out with much force that an excited and tumultuous crowd, even in the midst of a high-handed and illegal act, might observe some legal forms, and the description given by St. Luke, so far from proceeding from one who through ignorance was unable to distinguish between a legal execution and a massacre, impresses us rather with a sense of truthfulness from the very fact that no attempt is made to draw such a distinction of nicely balanced justice, less or more. The real difficulty lies in the relations which the scene presupposes between the Roman Government and the Sanhedrim. No doubt at this period the latter did not possess the power to inflict capital punishment (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 187, E.T.), as is evident from the trial of our Lord. But it may well be that at the time of Stephen's murder Roman authority was

somewhat relaxed in Judæa. Pilate had just been suspended from his functions, or was on the point of being so, and he may well have been tired of refusing the madness and violence of the Jews, as Renan supposes, or at all events he may well have refrained, owing to his bad odour with them, from calling them to account for their illegal action in the case before us (see McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 91). It is of course possible that the stoning took place with the connivance of the Jewish authorities, as Weizsäcker allows, or that there was an interval longer than Acts supposes between the trial of Stephen and his actual execution, during which the sanction of the Romans was obtained. In the absence of exact dates it is difficult to see why the events before us should not have been transacted during the interregnum between the departure of Pontius Pilate, to answer before Tiberius for his misgovernment, and the arrival of Marcellus, the next Procurator. If this was so, we have an exact historical parallel in the illegal murder of James the Just, who was tried before the high priest, and stoned to death, since Ananias thought that he had a good opportunity for his violence when Festus was dead, and Albinus was still upon his road (Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 9, 1). But if this suggestion of an interregnum is not free from difficulties, we may further take into consideration the fact that the same Roman officer, Vitellius, prefect of Syria, who had caused Pilate to be sent to Rome in disgrace, was anxious at the same time to receive Jewish support, and determined to effect his object by every means in his power. Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii., 4, 2-5, tells us that Vitellius sent a friend of his own, Marcellus, to manage the affairs of Judæa, and that, not content with this, he went up to Jerusalem himself to conciliate the Jews by open regard for their religion, as well as by the remission of taxation. It is therefore not difficult to conceive that both the murder of Stephen and the persecution which followed were connived at by the Roman government; see, in addition to the above references, Rendall's *Acts*, Introd., p. 19 ff.; Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., p. 648 ff., and note, p. 649. But this solution of the difficulty places the date of Saul's conversion somewhat late—A.D. 37—and is entirely at variance with the earlier chronology adopted not only by Harnack (so too by McGiffert), but here by Ramsay, *St. Paul*, 376, 377, who places St. Stephen's martyrdom in A.D. 33 at the latest. In the account of the death of Stephen, Wendt, following Weiss, Sorof, Clemen, Hilgenfeld, regards vii. 58b, viii. 1a, 3, as evidently additions of the redactor, although he declines to follow Weiss and Hilgenfeld in passing the same judgment on ver. 55 (and 56, according to H.), and on the last words of Stephen in ver. 59b. The second **ἐλιθοβόλουν** in 59b, which Hilgenfeld assigns to his redactor, and Wendt now refers to the action of the witnesses, as distinct from that of the whole crowd, is repeated with dramatic effect, heightened by the present participle, **ἐπικ.**, "ruthless violence on the one side, answered by continuous appeals to heaven on the other"; see Rendall's note, *in loco*.—**ἐπικ.**: "calling upon *the Lord*," R.V. ("calling upon *God*," A.V.), the former seems undoubtedly to be rightly suggested by the words of the prayer which follow—on the force of the word see above, ii. 21.—**Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου**: a direct prayer to our Lord, *cf.* for its significance and reality, Zahn, "Die Anbetung Jesu" (*Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche*, pp. 9, 288), Liddon, *Our Lord's Divinity*, lect. vii.; *cf.* Luke xxiii. 46. (Weiss can only see an imitation of Luke, and an interpolation here, because the kneeling, and also another word follow before the surrender of the spirit; but see on the other hand the remarks of Wendt, note, p. 196.)

Ver. 60. **θεὶς δὲ τὰ γόνατα**: a phrase not used in classical writers, but Blass compares Ovid, *Fasti*, ii., 438; five times in St. Luke's writings, Luke xxii. 41, Acts ix. 40, xx. 36, xxi. 5; only once elsewhere in N.T., Mark xv. 19. The attitude of kneeling in prayer would no doubt commend itself to the early believers from the example of their Lord. Standing would seem to have been the more common attitude among the Jews, but *cf.* instances in the O.T. of kneeling in prayer, LXX, 1 Kings viii. 54, Ezra ix. 5, Dan. vi. 10, and also the expression used twice by St. Paul, **κάμπτειν τὰ γόνατα**, 1 Chron. xxix. 20, 1 Esdras viii. 73, Isa. xlv. 23, etc., Ephes. iii. 14, and Phil. ii. 10 (Rom. xi. 4, xiv. 11). See Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 42.—**φωνῇ μεγάλῃ**, *cf.* Luke xxiii. 46. The last final effort of the strong love which showed itself also in the martyr's bended knees (see Wendt, *in loco*). Eusebius, *H. E.*, v., 2, tells us how the martyrs of Vienne and Lyons took up St. Stephen's words in their own prayer for their persecutors (*cf.* the famous instance of the last words of Sir Thomas More before

Σαύλου, 59. καὶ ἐλιθοβόλουν τὸν Στέφανον, ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ λέγοντα, Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. 60. θεὶς δὲ τὰ γόνατα,

his judges, and Dante, *Purgatorio*, xv., 106 ff., on the dying Stephen): **μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην**: the negative expression best corresponds to the positive **ἀφιέναι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν** (Wendt), *cf.* 1 Macc. xiii. 38, 39, xv. 5, 8, where the contrast marked between **ἱστάναι** and **ἀφιέναι** seems to favour this explanation. Blass takes it as marking a contrast like that between **ἱστάναι** and **ἀναιρεῖν**, *cf.* Heb. x. 9. Weiss lays stress upon **ταύτην**, and regards the prayer as asking that their present sin might not be weighed out to them in an equivalent punishment, *cf.* Grotius on the Hebrew שָׁקַל, 1 Kings xx. 39, whilst De Wette (so Felten) takes it as simply "reckon it not," *i.e.*, "weigh it not," *cf.* Zech. xi. 12. Schöttgen sees a reference to the Rabbinical notion "si quis bonum aut malum opus facit, hoc sequitur eum, et stat juxta eum in mundo futuro," Rev. xiv. 13, and *cf.* a similar view quoted by Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 167. Rendall regards it as a judicial term, as if Stephen appealed to Christ as *Judge* not to impute their sin to the murderers in condemnation (Rom. x. 3). The words of St. Stephen again recall the words of his Master, Luke xxiii. 34, words which (Eusebius, *H. E.*, *cf.* ii., 20) also formed the dying prayer of James, "the Lord's brother". In James as in Stephen we may see how the true Christian character, whilst expressing itself in righteous indignation against hypocrisy and wrong, never failed to exhibit as its counterpart the meekness and gentleness of Christ.—**ἐκοιμήθη** (*cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 18), a picture-word of rest and calmness which stands in dramatic contrast to the rage and violence of the scene. The word is used of death both in LXX and in classical Greek, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Isa. xiv. 8, 18, xliii. 17, 1 Kings xi. 43, 2 Macc. xii. 45, etc.; Homer, *Il.*, xi., 241; Soph., *Elect.*, 509. Blass well says of this word, "sed nullo loco æque mirandum," and describes the reference in Homer, **κοιμήσατο χάλκεον ὕπνον**, as "et simile et dissimile": Christians sleep in death, but no "brazen sleep"; they sleep **ἐν Χριστῷ**; simple words which formed the epitaph on many a Christian grave—in Him, Who is Himself "the Resurrection and the Life". Page notes the cadence of the word expressing rest and repose, *cf.* Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 167, note, and **ἀκωλύτως**, xxviii. 31.

St. Stephen's Speech.—Many and varied explanations have been given of the drift and purpose of St. Stephen's address. But the various explanations need not be mutually exclusive, and St. Stephen, like a wise scribe instructed unto the kingdom, might well bring out of his treasury things new and old. It is often said, *e.g.*, that the address is no reply to the charges alleged, that it would be more intelligible how the charges were framed from a perversion of the speech, than how the speech could be framed out of the charges; whilst, on the other hand, it is possible to see from the opening to the closing words an implicit repudiation of the charges of blasphemy against God and contempt of the law. The speech opens with a declaration of the divine majesty of Jehovah; it closes with a reference to the divine sanction of the law, and with the condemnation of those who had not kept it. This implicit repudiation by Stephen of the charges brought against him is also contained in St. Chrysostom's view of the purpose of the martyr, *viz.*, that he designed to show that the covenant and promises were before the law, and sacrifice and the law before the temple. This view, which was adopted by Grotius and Calvin, is in some degree retained by Wendt (so also Felten), who sums up the chief aim of the speech as a demonstration that the presence of God is not confined to the holy place, the temple, but that long before the temple was built, and before the people had settled in the promised land, God had given to the fathers a share in the proofs of this revelation, and that too in strange countries (although there is no reason to suppose that Stephen went so far as to contend that Jew and Gentile were on a precisely equal footing). But Wendt is conscious that this view does not account for the whole of the speech, and that it does not explain the prominence given in it to the obstinacy of Israel against the revelation of God vouchsafed to Moses, with which the counter accusation against Stephen is so closely connected (see Spitta's severe criticism, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 111, 112, and Weizsäcker's evident failure to maintain the position that the climax of the whole address is to be found in the declaration about Solomon's temple, which he is obliged to explain as a later thought belonging to a later time, *Apostolic Age*,

i., pp. 68-71, E.T.). Thus in his last edition, p. 151 (1899), he points out that in section vv. 35-43, as also in vv. 25 and 27, the obstinacy of the people against Moses, sent to be their deliverer, is evidently compared with their obstinacy in rejecting Jesus as the Messiah, and in vv. 51-53 the murder of Jesus is condemned as a fresh proof of the opposition of the people to God's revelation to them: here is a point of view which in Wendt's judgment evidently had a share in the composition of the address. Wendt urges his view against the older one of Meyer and to some extent at all events that of Baur, Zeller and Overbeck, that the central point of the speech is to be found in ver. 51, to which the whole preceding sketch of the history of the people led up: however great had been the benefits bestowed by God upon His people, on their part there had been from the beginning nothing in return but a corresponding thanklessness and resistance to this purpose. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 87, 88, also recognises that the theme of the address is to be found in vv. 51-53, but he also admits the double purpose of St. Stephen, *viz.*, not only to show (as Meyer and others) that at all stages of their history Israel had been stiffnecked and disobedient, but also (as Wendt) to draw a parallel between their conduct and the treatment of Jesus by those whom he is addressing.

This leads us to a consideration of the view of Spitta as to the main purpose of St. Stephen's speech. Whatever may be thought of its merits, it gives a unity to the speech which is wanting in many earlier and more recent expositions of it, as Hilgenfeld recognises, although he himself holds a different view, and one essentially similar to that of Baur. According to Spitta, in vv. 2-16 we have an introduction to the chief section of the address which begins with ver. 17, καθὼς δὲ ἤγγιζεν ὁ χρόνος τῆς ἐπαγ. Moses, ver. 20, was the person through whom God would save His people, and lead them to His true service in the promised land, vv. 7, 35, 38, 44. If we ask why Moses occupies this important place in the speech, the answer is found in ver. 37, which forms the central point of the description of Moses, and divides it into two parts (a verse in which Clemen and Hilgenfeld can only see an interpolation of a redactor, and in which Weiss finds something suspicious, see Zöckler's note, *in loco*). In the first part, 17-36, we are told how Moses by divine and miraculous guidance grows up to be the deliverer of Israel. But when he would commence his work of deliverance his brethren will not understand his aim and reject him, 23-28. In the wilderness he receives a fresh commission from God to undertake the delivery of the people, 29-34. But *this* Moses (οὗτος) who was thus repulsed God had sent to be a ruler and deliverer—*this* man was he who led these people forth—and it was *this* Moses who said to the children: "A prophet" etc., v. 37. Why is this prophecy introduced except to support the inference that as Moses, a type of the Messiah, was thus repulsed, and afterwards raised to be a ruler and deliverer, so must, according to Moses' own words, the Messiah of Israel be first rejected by His people? In the next division, vv. 38-50, the same parallel is again instituted between Moses and the Messiah. The former had delivered a law which consisted of "living oracles," but instead of receiving it, Israel had given themselves up to the worship of idols, 35-43; instead of establishing a worship well-pleasing to God, those who came after Moses, not content with the tabernacle, which was not confined to one place, and which represented the heavenly archetype, had built a temple which called forth the cutting words of the prophet, 47-50. In his explanation of these last verses there lies at least one weakness of Spitta's explanation, for he does not seem in his disapproval of the temple to allow that it had even a relative value, and that Solomon was well aware that God did not dwell only in temples made with hands. But Spitta's main point is to trace again a connection with the verse which forms his centre, ver. 37 (Deut. xviii. 15). As Moses in vain communicated a spiritual law and a corresponding worship to a people whose heart turned after idols and the service of a temple, so the Messiah must also experience that the carnal mind of the people would oppose His revelation of the divine will in relation to a rightful service. Thus the whole speech becomes a proof of the Messiahship of Jesus as against those who appealed to the authority of Moses, and saw in Jesus a twofold cause of offence: (1) that He was rejected by His people and crucified; (2) that He had treated with impiety that which they held most sacred—the law and the temple.

In all this Spitta sees no direct answer to the false witnesses; but the speech, he maintains, is much rather an answer to the two causes of offence which must

ἔκραξε φωνῇ μεγάλῃ,[1] Κύριε, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη.[2] Σαῦλος δὲ ἦν συνευδοκῶν τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ.

[1] D, Vulg., Gig. (not Flor.) add **λεγων**, so Blass in **β**, and Hilg.; prob. assim. to more usual **λεγων** after **κραζειν** where the words are given.

[2] **εκοιμηθη**, Par., Wern., Vulg. add *in Domino*, but not Blass.

have been discussed in every synagogue, and which the infant Church must have been obliged to face from the first, especially as it took its stand upon the proof that Jesus was the Christ. Stephen in his disputations, vi. 9, must have often faced opponents who thus sought to invalidate the Messianic claims of Jesus; what more natural than that he should now repeat before the whole assembly the proofs which he had before given in the synagogue, where no one could resist the spirit and the wisdom with which he spake? In this way Spitta maintains that the charges in vv. 52, 53 occupy their proper place; the Jews had rejected the prophets—Moses and his successors—finally they rejected the Messiah, whom the prophets had foretold (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 105 ff.). Whatever strictures we may be inclined to pass upon Spitta (see, *e.g.*, Wendt in new edition, 1899, pp. 150, 151), it is not unlikely that he has at all events grasped what others have failed to see, *viz.*, that in the nature of the case, Stephen in his **ἀπολογία**, or counter-accusation—whichever it was—could not have been unmindful of the Prophet like unto Moses, whom Moses had foretold: his dying prayer revealed the Name, not uttered in the speech, which was enshrined in his inmost heart; Jesus was the Christ—He came **οὐ καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι**, whether that fulfilment was made by a spiritual temple or a spiritual law. In thus keeping the thought of Jesus of Nazareth prominent throughout the speech, whilst not actually uttering His Name, in thus comparing Moses and Christ, Stephen *was answering* the charges made against him. "This Nazarene" (so it was said in the charge made against Stephen) "would destroy this place and change the customs," etc.—the prophet Moses had given the people living oracles, not a law which should stifle the spirit in the letter; the prophet Isaiah had spoken of a presence of God far transcending that which filled any earthly temple; and if these prophets had pointed on to the Messiah, and if the Nazarene were indeed the Christ thus foretold, what wonder that He should reveal a commandment unto life, and a worship of the Father in spirit and in truth? Nor must it be forgotten that if Stephen was interrupted before his speech was concluded, he may well have intended to drive home more closely the manifest fulfilment in Christ of the deliverance dimly foreshadowed in the work of Moses and in the freedom from Egyptian bondage. This was the true parallel between Moses and the Messiah on which the Rabbis were wont to dwell. Thus the Messiah, in comparison with Moses, was the second, but in comparison with all others the great, deliverer; as Moses led Israel out of Egypt, so would the Messiah accomplish the final deliverance, and restore Israel to their own land (Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, pp. 359, 364 (1897)). It is to be observed that Spitta warmly supports the historical character of the speech, which he ascribes without interpolations to his source A, although in vv. 55-60 he refers some "insertions" to B. His criticism as against the *tendency* critics, especially Overbeck, is well worth consulting (pp. 110-123), and he quotes with approval the judgment of Gfrörer—"I consider this speech unreservedly as the oldest monument of Gospel history". So too Clemen, pp. 97, 288, allows that the speech is essentially derived, with the exception of ver. 37, as also the whole chapter with the exception of ver. 60, from an old written source, H.H., *Historia Hellenistarum;* and amongst more recent writers, McGiffert holds that whilst many maintain that the author of the Acts composed the speech and put it into the mouth of Stephen, its contents are against such a supposition, and that Luke undoubtedly got the substance of the discourse from an early source, and reproduced it with approximate accuracy (p. 89 and note). So Weiss refers the speech to his Jewish-Christian source, and refuses to admit that with its profound knowledge of the O.T. it could have been composed by the author of

VIII. 1. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ διωγμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις· πάντες τε διεσπάρησαν κατὰ τὰς

the book. The attempt of Feine (so also Holtzmann and Jüngst) to split up the speech into two distinct parts is based upon the idea that in one part an answer is made to the charge that Stephen had spoken against God, and that the other part contains an answer to the charge that he had spoken against the temple. The first part is contained in vii. 2-21, 29-34, 44-50, and the second part in vii. 22-28, 35-43, 51-53. The latter sections are taken from Feine's Jerusalem source; they are then added to those which belong to a new source, and finally combined by the canonical Luke. Hilgenfeld may well ask how it is possible to break up in this manner the narrative part of the speech relating to Moses, so as to regard vv. 22-28 as a section alien from what precedes and what follows! (see especially Hilgenfeld's criticism on Feine, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 396 (1895) and Knabenbauer, p. 120); on the truthful record of the speech see Lightfoot's striking remarks "Acts," B.D.², i., p. 33. Whatever may be said as to the various difficulties which the speech contains, two things are apparent: (1) that these difficulties do not touch the main drift of the argument; (2) that the fact of their presence, where their removal was easy, bears witness to the accuracy of the report.

CHAPTER VIII.—Ver. 1. **Σαῦλος δὲ κ.τ.λ.**, R.V. joins these words to the conclusion of the previous chapter, and thus brings them into a close and fitting connection with vii. 58. So too Wendt, Blass, Nösgen, Zöckler.—**ἦν συνευδοκῶν**: for this characteristic Lucan use of the imperfect of the substantive verb with a participle, see chap. i. 10. The formula here indicates the lasting and enduring nature of Saul's "consent". The verb **συνευδοκέω** is peculiar to St. Luke and St. Paul, and is used by the former in his Gospel as well as in Acts, *cf.* Luke xi. 48, Acts xxii. 20 (by St. Paul himself with reference to his share in the murder of St. Stephen), Rom. i. 32, 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13. The word is also found in 1 Macc. i. 57 (iv. 28), 2 Macc. xi. 24, 35, signifying entire approval; it is also twice used by St. Clement, *Cor.*, xxxv., 6; xliv., 3: "consent" does not express the force of the word—"was approving of his death" (Rendall).—**ἀναιρέσει**: used only here in N.T. (on St. Luke's favourite word **ἀναιρέω**, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 22); both verb and noun were frequent in medical language (Hobart, Zahn), see below on ix. 29, but the noun in LXX, Num. xi. 15, Judith xv. 4, 2 Macc. v. 13, and in classical Greek, *e.g.*, Xen., *Hell.*, vi., 3, 5.—**ἐγένετο δὲ**: another characteristic formula in St. Luke, Friedrich, *u. s.*, p. 13; here introduces a new section of the history.—**ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ**: R.V. "on that day" (A.V. "at that time"), *cf.* ii. 41; the persecution broke out at once, "on that very day" (so Wendt, Rendall, Hort, Hackett, Felten, Zöckler, Holtzmann), the signal for it being given by the tumultuous stoning of the first martyr (but see on the other hand Alford, *in loco*). Weiss draws attention to the emphatic position of **ἐκείνῃ** before **τῇ ἡμέρᾳ**.—**ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τὴν ἐν Ἱ.**: hitherto as, *e.g.*, v. 11, the Church has been thought of as one, because limited in fact to the one city Jerusalem, but here we have a hint that soon there would be new Ecclesiæ in the one Ecclesia, as it spread throughout the Holy Land (Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 53-56, 227, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, etc., pp. 41, 127, 377).—**πάντες τε**: "ridiculum est hoc mathematica ratione accipere" (Blass)—it is evident from ver. 3 that there were some left for Saul to persecute. In ix. 26 we have mention of a company of disciples in Jerusalem, but there is no reason to suppose (Schneckenburger, Zeller, Overbeck) that Luke has made a mistake in the passage before us, for there is nothing in the text against the supposition that some at least of those who had fled returned again later.—**διεσπάρησαν**: only in St. Luke in N.T., here and in ver. 4, and in xi. 19. This use of the word is quite classical, and frequent in LXX, *e.g.*, Gen. ix. 19, Lev. xxvi. 33, 1 Macc. xi. 47. Feine remarks that even Holtzmann allows that the spread of Christianity throughout Judæa and Samaria may be regarded as historical.—**χώρας**: here rendered "regions": Blass takes the word as almost = **κώμας**, and see also Plummer on Luke xxi. 21, **ἐν ταῖς χώραις** "in the country," R.V. The word is characteristic of St. Luke, being used in his Gospel nine times, and in Acts eight; it is used thrice by St. Matthew and by St. John, four times by St. Mark, but elsewhere in N.T. only once, James v. 4.

χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας, πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων.[1] 2. συνεκόμισαν δὲ τὸν Στέφανον ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς, καὶ ἐποιήσαντο

[1] **Σαμαρειας** ABCHP, so W.H. alt. App., p. 160, Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; **Σαμαριας** ℵDE, so Tisch., W.H., see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 45. After **διωγμος** D, Flor., Sah. **και θλιψις**, assim. to Matt. xiii. 21, 2 Thess. i. 4, so Hilg. The same addition occurs in Western text in xiii. 50. After **αποστολων** D[1], Flor., Gig., Prov., Sah., Aug. add **οι εμειναν εν Ιερ.**, retained by Blass in **β**, so Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 49, and Hilg.

It is found frequently in LXX and in 1, 2, 3 Macc.—**τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας**: thus the historian makes another step in the fulfilment of the Lord's command, i. 8, and see also Ramsay, *St. Paul*, etc., p. 41. St. Chrysostom remarks **ὅτι οἰκονομίας ὁ διωγμὸς ἦν**, since the persecution became the means of spreading the Gospel, and thus early the blood of the martyrs became the seed of the Church.—**πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων**—**πλήν**: characteristic of St. Luke, sometimes as an adverb, sometimes as a preposition with genitive as here and in xv. 28, xxvii. 22; elsewhere it is only found once as a preposition with genitive, in Mark xii. 32, although very frequent in LXX. The word occurs at least thirteen times in the Gospel, four times in Acts, in St. Matthew five times, in St. Mark once, and in John viii. 10; see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 16, 91. This mention of the Apostles seems unlikely to Schneckenburger, Schleiermacher, and others, but, as Wendt points out, it is quite consistent with the greater steadfastness of men who felt themselves to be **πρωταγωνισταί**, as Œcumenius calls them, in that which concerned their Lord. Their position too may well have been more secure than that of the Hellenists, who were identified with Stephen, as they were held in favour by the people, v. 13, and as regular attendants at the temple services would not have been exposed to the same charges as those directed against the proto-martyr. There was, too, a tradition (very old and well attested according to Harnack, *Chronologie*, i., 243) to the effect that the Apostles were commanded by Christ not to depart from Jerusalem for twelve years, so that none should say that he had not heard the message, Euseb., *H. E.*, v., 18, 14; nor is there anything inconsistent with this tradition in the visit of St. Peter and St. John to Samaria, since this and other journeys are simply missionary excursions, from which the Apostles always returned to Jerusalem (Harnack). The passage in Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, vi., 5, 43, limited the Apostles' preaching for the time specified not to Jerusalem, but to Israel.—**Σαμαρείας**: our Lord had recognised the barrier between the Samaritan and the Jew, Matt. x. 5; but now in obedience to His command (i. 8) both Samaritan and Jew were admitted to the Church, for although the Apostles had not originated this preaching they very plainly endorsed it, ver. 14 ff. (*cf.* Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 54). Possibly the very fact that Philip and others were flying from the persecution of the Jewish hierarchy would have secured their welcome in the Samaritan towns.

Ver. 2. Spitta connects ver. 2 with xi. 19-21, and all the intermediate section, viii. 5-xi. 19; forms part of his source B (so also Sorof, Clemen, who joins his H.H., viii. 1 to xi. 19; but on the other hand see Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 501 (1895), and Jüngst, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 79). According to Spitta the whole narrative of Philip's ministry in viii. ought not to be connected so closely with the death of Stephen, but should fall after ix. 31. The only reason for its earlier insertion is the desire to connect the second deacon with the first (but Hilgenfeld, *u. s.*, pp. 413, 414 (1895), as against both Spitta and Clemen, regards the account of Philip and that of Stephen as inseparable). Spitta strongly maintains that Philip the Apostle, and not the deacon, is meant; and if this be so, he would no doubt help us to answer the objection that in viii. 14-17, and indeed in the whole section 9-24 we have an addition of the sub-Apostolic age inserted to show that the Apostles alone could bestow the Holy Spirit. But it cannot be said that Spitta's attempt at the identification of Philip in viii. with the Apostle is in any way convincing, see, *e.g.*, Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 212; Hilgenfeld, *u. s.*, p. 416 (note), and Jüngst, *u. s.*, p. 81. Feine's objection to viii. 14-17 leads him, whilst he admits that the meeting with Simon Magus is historical, to regard the conversion of the sorcerer as doubtful, because the whole passage presupposes

κοπετὸν μέγαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ. 3. Σαῦλος δὲ ἐλυμαίνετο τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους εἰσπορευόμενος, σύρων τε ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας

(vv. 18-24) that the laying on of the Apostles' hands bestowed the Spirit; so Clemen refers the whole representation in its present form of the communication of the Spirit, not through Baptism, but through the laying on of the Apostles' hands, to his Redactor Antijudaicus (*cf.* xix. 6), and to the same hand he attributes the **πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων**, ver. 1, and *cf.* ver. 25, introduced for the purpose of showing that the Apostles Peter and John sanctioned the Samaritan mission from the central home of the Christian Church.—**συνεκόμισαν**: in its primary sense the verb means to carry or bring together, of harvest; to gather in, to house it; so also in LXX, Job v. 26; in a secondary sense, to help in burying; so Soph., *Ajax*, 1048; Plut., *Sull.*, 38. The meaning is not "carried to his burial," as in A.V., but rather as R.V., "buried," for, although the Greek is properly "joined in carrying," the word includes the whole ceremony of burial—it is used only here in the N.T., and in LXX only in *l. c.*—**εὐλαβεῖς**: only found in St. Luke in N.T., and used by him four times, once in Luke ii. 25, and in Acts ii. 5, xxii. 12 (**εὐσεβής**, T.R.). The primary thought underlying the word is that of one who handles carefully and cautiously, and so it bears the meaning of cautious, circumspect. Although **εὐλάβεια** and **εὐλαβεῖσθαι** are both used in the sense of caution and reverence towards the gods in classical Greek, the adjective is never expressly so used. But Plato connects it closely with **δίκαιος** (*cf.* Luke ii. 25), *Polit.* 311 A and 311 B (so **εὐσεβῶς** and **εὐλαβῶς** are used together by Demosthenes). In the LXX all three words are found to express reverent fear of, or piety towards, God; **εὐλαβεῖσθαι**, frequently, **εὐλάβεια** in Prov. xxviii. 14, where **σκληρὸς τὴν καρδίαν** in the second part of the verse seems to point to the religious character of the **εὐλαβ.**, whilst **εὐλαβής** is found in Micah vii. 2 as a rendering of חָסִיד (*cf.* *Psalms of Solomon*, p. 36, Ryle and James' edition); *cf.* also Ecclus. xi. 17 (but see for both passages, Hatch and Redpath); in Lev. xv. 31 we find the word **εὐλαβεῖς ποιήσετε τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰ. ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν αὐτῶν**, נָזַר hi. The adverb **εὐλαβῶς** is found once, 2 Macc. vi. 11. St. Luke uses the word chiefly at all events of O.T. piety. In Luke ii. 45 it is used of Simeon, in Acts ii. 5 of the Jews who came up to worship at the feasts in Jerusalem, and in xxii. 12, although Ananias was a Christian, yet the qualifying words **εὐλ. κατὰ τὸν νόμον** point again to a devout observance of the Jewish law. Trench, *N. T. Synonyms*, i., pp. 38, 198 ff.; Westcott, *Hebrews*, on v. 7; Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and *sub v.* **δειλία**.—**ἄνδρες εὐλ.**: much discussion has arisen as to whether they were Jews or Christians. They may have been Christians who like the Apostles themselves were still Jews, attending the temple services and hours of prayer, some of whom were doubtless left in the city. But these would have been described more probably as **ἀδελφοί** or **μαθηταί** (so Felten, Page, Hackett). Or they may have been devout Jews like Nicodemus, or Joseph of Arimathea, who would show their respect for Stephen, as Nicodemus and Joseph for Jesus (so Holtzmann, Zöckler). Wetstein (so too Renan and Blass) explains of Gentile proselytes, men like Cornelius, who rendered the last offices to Stephen out of natural respect for the dead, and who stood outside the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim, so that the funeral rites need not have been performed in secret. But St. Luke as a rule uses other words to denote Gentile proselytes, and the Sanhedrim would probably not have interfered with the burial, not only on account of the known Jewish care for the dead, but also because devout Jews would not have been obnoxious in their eyes to the charges brought against Stephen, vi. 14 (so Nösgen). The word might therefore include both devout Jews and Jewish Christians who joined together in burying Stephen.—**κοπετὸν μέγαν**, from **κόπτω, κόπτομαι**, *cf.* *planctus* from *plango*, to beat the breast or head in lamentation. Not used elsewhere in N.T., but frequent in LXX; *cf.*, *e.g.*, Gen. l. 10, 1 Macc. ii. 70, iv. 39, ix. 20, xiii. 26, for the same allocation as here, and for **ποιῆσαι κοπετόν**, Jer. vi. 26, Mic. i. 8, and *cf.* also Zech. xii. 10. In classical Greek **κομμός** is found, but see Plut., *Fab.*, 17, and Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 74, for reference to the comic poet Eupolis (*cf.* also Blass), and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* For the Jewish customs of mourning *cf.* Matt. ix. 23, Hamburger, *Real-Encyclo-*

παρεδίδου εἰς φυλακήν. 4. οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες διῆλθον, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον.[1]

[1] διηλθον; for this word Gig., Par., Wern. seem to have read επορευοντο, *ibant*. After λογον Par., Wern. and other Latin authorities add "circa (per) civitates et castella Judææ," κατα τας πολεις και κωμας της Ι., Blass in β, evidently for the sake of clearness, as also in previous επορ., *cf.* Wendt. After λογον E, Vulg., Par², Wern. add του θεου, again addition apparently for clearness (if not omission). Blass rejects in β; where ὁ λόγος is used in Acts in this sense we almost always have this addition or του Κυριου.

pädie des Judentums, i., 7, 996, "Trauer"; Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i., p. 616, and *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 172 ff. If the mourners included Jews as well as Jewish Christians, it may well have been that the lamentation was not only a token of sorrow and respect, but also in the nature of a protest on the part of the more moderate section of the Pharisees (see also Trench's remarks, *u. s.*, p. 198). According to the tradition accepted by St. Augustine, it is said that both Gamaliel and Nicodemus took part in the burial of Stephen, and were afterwards laid in the same grave (Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 167, and Plumptre *in loco*).

Ver. 3. ἐλυμαίνετο: deponent verb, used in classical Greek of personal outrage (λύμη), of scourging and torturing, of outraging the dead, of the ruin and devastation caused by an army (Wetstein). In the LXX it is found several times, *cf.* especially Ps. lxxix. (lxxx.) 13, of a wild boar ravaging a vineyard, and *cf.* also Ecclus. xxviii. 23. As the word is used only by St. Luke it is *possible* that it may have been suggested by its frequent employment in medical language, where it is employed not only of injury by wrong treatment, but also of the ravages of disease, Hobart, *Medical Language*, pp. 211, 212. R.V. renders "laid waste," A.V. (so Tyndale) "made havoc of," but the revisers have rendered πορθέω by the latter, *cf.* Acts ix. 21, Gal. i. 3. St. Paul's description of himself as ὑβριστής, 1 Tim. i. 13, may well refer to the infliction of personal insults and injuries, as expressed here by λυμαίνομαι (*cf.* Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, xi., 5).—τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *i.e.*, the Church just mentioned at Jerusalem—Saul's further persecution, even to Damascus, probably came later (Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 53).—κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους εἰσπορ.: the expression may denote "entering into every house," R. and A.V., or perhaps, more specifically, the houses known as places of Christian assembly, the ἐκκλησίαι κατ' οἶκον, see on ii. 46. In any case the words, as also those which follow, show the thoroughness and relentlessness of Saul's persecuting zeal.—σύρων: haling, *i.e.*, hauling, dragging (*schlappend*), *cf.* James ii. 6. The word is used by St. Luke three times in Acts (only twice elsewhere in N.T.), and he alone uses κατασύρω, Luke xii. 58, in the same sense as the single verb (where St. Matthew has παραδῷ). For its employment in the Comic Poets see Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 76, and also Arrian, *Epict.*, i. 29, 22, and other instances in Wetstein; *cf.* LXX, 2 Sam. xvii. 13, 4 Macc. vi. 1, ἔσυραν ἐπὶ τὰ βασανιστήρια τὸν 'Ελ.—γυναῖκας: repeated also in ix. 2, and xxii. 4, as indicating the relentless nature of the persecution. Some of the devout and ministering women may well have been included, Luke viii. 2, 3, Acts i. 14.

Ver. 4. οἱ μὲν οὖν: marking a general statement, δὲ in following verse, introducing a particular instance (so Rendall, Appendix on μὲν οὖν, *Acts*, p. 162, and see also p. 64).—διῆλθον: the word is constantly used of missionary journeys in *Acts*, *cf.* v. 40, xi. 19, ix. 32 (Luke ix. 6), *cf.* xiii. 6, note.—εὐαγγελιζόμενοι: it is a suggestive fact that this word is only used once in the other Gospels (Matt. xi. 5 by our Lord), but no less than ten times in St. Luke's Gospel, fifteen in Acts, and chiefly elsewhere by St. Paul; truly "a missionary word," see ver. 12. Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 79, speaks of its introduction into the N.T. with "such a novel force as to be felt like a new word". It is used several times in LXX, and is also found in *Psalms of Solomon*, xi., 2 (*cf.* Isa. xl. 9, lii. 7, and Nah. i. 15). On its construction see Simcox, *u. s.*, p. 79, and Vogel, p. 24.

Ver. 5. Φίλιππος δὲ: the Evangelist, *cf.* xxi. 8, and note on vi. 5.—εἰς πόλιν: if we insert the article (see above on critical notes), the expression means "the city of Samaria," *i.e.*, the capital of the district (so Weiss, Wendt,

5. ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ δὲ κατελθὼν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας,[1] ἐκήρυσσεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Χριστόν. 6. προσεῖχόν τε[2] οἱ ὄχλοι τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἐν τῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοὺς καὶ βλέπειν τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει. 7.[3] πολλῶν γὰρ τῶν ἐχόντων πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα βοῶντα μεγάλῃ φωνῇ ἐξήρχετο· πολλοὶ δὲ παραλελυμένοι καὶ χωλοὶ

[1] **εις Σ. την πολιν** Par. ("Samaria in civitate," again for clearness (Wendt)), so Blass in β; **Σαμαρειας** ABHP, so Blass; **-ιας** ℵ³DE, so Tisch., W.H., see on ver. 1. (See on the reading Winer-Schmiedel, p. 266.)

[2] **προσειχον τε** EHP, Chrys.; but **δε** ℵABCD² 61, e, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. Harcl., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt, Weiss. In D this verse begins **ως δε ηκουον παν(τες) οι οχλοι προσειχον τοις λεγ. παν** (*omnis turbæ*, d), but Blass rejects; Hilg. retains. Weiss, Codex D, p. 68, expresses surprise at this rejection by Blass, as the reading is not more superfluous than countless additions in D; the words already lay in the following **εν τω ακουειν αυτους**. Chase refers to Syriac with considerable probability.

[3] **πολλων** HP, Boh., Arm., Chrys. (D¹ **παρα πολλοις**, D² **απο πολλοι**, *a multis*, d); **πολλοι** ℵABCD²E 18, 36, 40, 61, Vulg., Sah. Syr., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt, Weiss, Hilg. Blass inserts **ἃ** after **ακαθαρτα**, so Hilg., "bene" Blass (see below and Wendt, note, p. 172, eighth edition).

Zöckler, see Blass, *in loco*), or *Sebaste*, so called by Herod the Great in honour of Augustus, **Σεβαστή** (Jos., *Ant.*, xv., 7, 3; 8, 5; Strabo, xvi., p. 860), see Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. 1, p. 123 ff., E.T., and O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 93.—**ἐκήρυσσεν**: the revisers distinguish between this verb and **εὐαγγελ.** in ver. 4, the latter being rendered "preaching," or more fully, preaching the glad tidings, and the former "proclaimed" (see also Page's note on the word, p. 131), but it is doubtful if we can retain this full force of the word always, *e.g.*, Luke iv. 44, where R.V. translates **κηρύσσων**, "preaching".—**αὐτοῖς**, *i.e.*, the people in the city mentioned, see Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 162, and *cf.* xvi. 10, xx. 2.

Ver. 6. **προσεῖχον . . . τοῖς λεγ.**, *cf.* xvi. 14, 1 Tim. i. 4, Tit. i. 14, 2 Pet. i. 9, see note on v. 35, used in classical Greek sometimes with **νοῦν**, and sometimes without as here; frequent in LXX, *cf.* with this passage, Wisdom viii. 12, 1 Macc. vii. 12.—**ὁμοθυμαδόν**, see above on i. 14.

Ver. 7. **πολλῶν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: if we accept reading in R.V. (see critical notes above), we must suppose that St. Luke passes in thought from the possessed to the unclean spirits by which they were possessed, and so introduces the verb **ἐξήρχοντο** (as if the unclean spirits were themselves the subject), whereas we should have expected that **ἐθεραπεύθησαν** would have followed after the first **πολλοί**, as after the second, in the second clause of the verse. Blass conjectures that **ἃ** should be read before **βοῶντα**, which thus enables him, while retaining **ἐξήρχοντο**, to make **πολλοί** in each clause of the verse the subject of **ἐθεραπ.** One of the most striking phenomena in the demonised was that they lost at least temporarily their own self-consciousness, and became identified with the demon or demons, and this may account for St. Luke's way of writing, as if he also identified the two in thought, Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i., 479, 647, ff. As a physician St. Luke must have often come into contact with those who had unclean spirits, and he would naturally have studied closely the nature of their disease. It is also to be noted that **πολλοί** with the genitive, **τῶν ἐχόντων** (not **πολλοὶ ἔχοντες**), shows that not all the possessed were healed, and if so, it is an indication of the truthfulness of the narrative. Moreover, St. Luke not only shows himself acquainted with the characteristics of demoniacal possession, *cf.* his description in Luke viii. 27, ix. 38, 39, but he constantly, as in the passage before us, distinguishes it from disease itself, and that more frequently than the other Evangelists. Hobart draws special attention to Luke vi. 17, viii. 4, xiii. 32, which have no parallels in the other Gospels, and Acts xix. 12. To which we may add Luke iv. 40, Acts v. 16 (Wendt); see further on xix. 12.—**βοῶντα**, *cf.* Mark i. 26, Luke iv. 33.—**παραλελυμένοι**: St. Luke alone of the Evangelists uses the participle of **παρα-**

ἐθεραπεύθησαν.[1] 8. καὶ ἐγένετο χαρὰ μεγάλη[2] ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ. 9. Ἀνὴρ δέ τις ὀνόματι Σίμων προϋπῆρχεν[3] ἐν τῇ πόλει μαγεύων καὶ

[1] εθεραπευθησαν; D reads εθεραπευοντο, so Hilg., perhaps assim. to εξηρχοντο, Blass in β rejects.

[2] χαρα μεγαλη DEHP, Vulgclem., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Chrys.; πολλη χαρα ℵABC 47, 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; χαρα τε μεγαλη εγενετο, so Gig., Par., Syr. Pesh., Blass in β, and Hilg. χαρα often joined with μεγ. elsewhere in N.T.; *cf.* Luke ii. 10, xxiv. 52, Acts xv. 3.

[3] προϋπηρχεν . . . εξιστων, D reads προϋπαρχων . . . εξιστανεν; Par., Vulg., Iren. also read προυπαρχων, so Hilg. Σαμαρειας, see on ver. 1. μεγαν, "delevi," so Blass on the authority of some codices of Iren. see comment. below.

λύειν, instead of παραλυτικός, the more popular word; and here again his usage is exactly what we should expect from a medical man acquainted with technical terms (Hobart, Zahn, Salmon), *cf.* ix. 33 and Luke v. 18, 24 (παραλυτικῷ, W.H. margin). Dr. Plummer, *St. Luke*, Introd., lxv., points out that Aristotle, a physician's son, has also this use of παραλελυμένος (*Eth. Nic.*, i., 13, 15), but he adds that its use in St. Luke may have come from the LXX, as in *Heb.* xii. 12, where we have the word in a quotation from Isa. xxxv. 3 (*cf.* also Ecclesiast. xxv. 23). It may be added that the participle is also found in 3 Macc. ii. 22, καὶ τοῖς μέλεσι παραλελυμένον, and *cf.* 1 Macc. ix. 15, where it is said of Alcimus, καὶ παρελύθη. But the most remarkable feature in St. Luke's employment of the word is surely this, that in parallel passages in which St. Matthew and St. Mark have παραλυτικός he has παραλελυμένος, *cf.* Luke v. 18, Matt. ix. 2, Mark ii. 3; in Luke v. 24 this same distinction is also found in the Revisers' text (but see W.H. above), when this verse is compared with Matt. ix. 6 and Mark ii. 10.

Ver. 8. This detail, and indeed the whole narrative, may have been derived by St. Luke from the information of St. Philip himself, *cf.* xxi. 8, xxiv. 27, or from St. Paul as he travelled through Samaria, xv. 3.

Ver. 9. Σίμων: very few of the most advanced critics now dismiss Simon as an unhistorical character, or deny that the account before us contains at least some historical *data;* see McGiffert's note, *Apostolic Age*, p. 100. Hilgenfeld and Lipsius may be reckoned amongst those who once refused to admit that Simon Magus was an historical personage, but who afterwards retracted their opinion. But it still remains almost unaccountable that so many critics should have more or less endorsed, or developed, the theory first advocated by Baur that the Simon Magus of the Clementine Homilies is none other than the Apostle Paul. It is sufficient to refer for an exposition of the absurdity of this identification to Dr. Salmon "Clementine Literature" (*Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, iii., pp. 575, 576; see also Ritschl's note, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, p. 228 (second edition)). This ingenuity outdid itself in asking us to see in Simon's request to buy the power of conferring the Holy Ghost a travesty of the rejection of Paul's apostolic claims by the older Apostles, in spite of the gift of money which he had collected for the poor Saints in Jerusalem (Overbeck). No wonder that Spitta should describe such an explanation as "a perfect absurdity" (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 149). Before we can believe that the author of the Acts would make any use of the pseudo-Clementine literature in his account of Simon, we must account for the extraordinary fact that an author who so prominently represents his hero as triumphing over the powers of magic, xiii. 6-12, xix. 11-19, should have recourse to a tradition in which this same hero is identified with a magician (see Spitta, *u. s.*, p. 151; Salmon, "The Simon of Modern Criticism," *Dict. of Christian Biog.*, iv., p. 687; Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 212, and Wendt's note, p. 201). In Acts xxi. 8 we read that St. Luke spent several days in the house of Philip the Evangelist, and if we bear in mind that this same Philip is so prominent in chap. viii., there is nothing impossible in the belief that St. Luke should have received his narrative from St. Philip's lips, and included it in his history as an early and remarkable instance of the triumph of the Gospel—we need not search for any more occult reason on the part of the historian (see Salmon, *u. s.*, p. 688). Simon then is an historical personage, and it is not too much to say that to all the stories which have gathered round his name the narrative of

ἐξιστῶν τὸ ἔθνος τῆς Σαμαρείας, λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαν·
10. ᾧ προσεῖχον πάντες[1] ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου, λέγοντες, Οὗτός

[1] παντες ℵABCDE 61, Vulg., many other verss., Chrys., so all edd.; om. HP, Aethpp., Iren.; Blass brackets: "nec opus".

Acts always stands in a relation of priority—the two facts mentioned in Acts, that Simon was a magician, and that he came into personal antagonism with St. Peter, always recur elsewhere—but Acts tells us nothing of the details of Simon's heretical preaching, and it draws the veil entirely over his subsequent history. But "the hero of the romance of heresy" comes into prominence under the name of Simon in Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i., 26, Irenæus, i., 23 (who speaks of Simon the Samaritan, from whom all heresies had their being), and in the Clementine literature. But there is good reason for thinking that St. Irenæus, whilst he gives us a fuller account, is still giving us an account dependent on Justin, and there is every reason to believe that the Clementine writers also followed the same authority; see further, Salmon, "Simon Magus," *u. s.*, iv., p. 681 ff., and for a summary of the legends which gathered round the name of the Samaritan magician Plumptre's note, *in loco*, may be consulted. To the vexed question as to the identification of the Simon of Justin with the Simon of the Acts Dr. Salmon returns a decided negative answer, *u. s.*, p. 683, and certainly the Simon described by Justin seems to note rather the inheritor and teacher of a Gnostic system already developed than to have been in his own person the father of Gnosticism. Simon, however, was no uncommon name, *e.g.*, Josephus, *Ant.*, xx., 7, 2, speaks of a Simon of Cyprus, whom there is no valid reason to identify with the Simon of the Acts (although famous critical authorities may be quoted in favour of such an identification). On the mistake made by Justin with reference to the statue on the Tiberine island with the words *Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio* inscribed (*cf.* the account of the marble fragment, apparently the base of a statue, dug up in 1574, marked with a similar inscription, in Lanciani's *Pagan and Christian Rome*) in referring it to Simon Magus, *Apol.*, i., 26, 56, Tertullian, *Apol.*, c. xiii., and Irenæus, i., 23, whilst in reality it referred to a Sabine god, Semo Sancus, the Sabine Hercules, see further, Salmon, *u. s.*, p. 682, Rendall, *Acts*, p. 220. (Van Manen, followed by Feine, claims to discover two representations of Simon in Acts—one as an ordinary magician, viii. 9, 11, the other as a supposed incarnation of the deity, ver. 10—so too Jüngst, who refers the words from μαγεύων to Σαμαρίας to his Redactor; but on the other hand Hilgenfeld and Spitta see no contradiction, and regard the narrative as a complete whole.)—**μαγεύων**: only here in N.T., not found in LXX (but *cf.* μάγος in Dan. i. 20, ii. 2), though used in classical Greek. The word μάγος was used frequently by Herodotus of the priests and wise men in Persia who interpreted dreams, and hence the word came to denote any enchanter or wizard, and in a bad sense, a juggler, a quack like γόης (see instances in Wetstein). Here (*cf.* xiii. 6) it is used of the evil exercise of magic and sorcery by Simon, who practised the charms and incantations so extensively employed at the time in the East by quacks claiming supernatural powers (Baur, *Paulus*, i., p. 107; Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, *cf.* i., 84, 85 (fifth edit.); Wendt, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 202; Blass, *in loco;* Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 19, and see below on xiii. 6.—**ἐξιστῶν**, from ἐξιστάω (ἐξίστημι); so ἐξιστάνων, W. H. from ἐξιστάνω (hellenistic), see Blass, *Grammatik*, pp. 48, 49, transitive in present, future, first aorist active, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 22—so ἐξεστακέναι, ver. 11, perfect active, hellenistic form, also transitive; see Blass, *u. s.* (also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 118, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*) (in 3 Macc. i. 25 ἐξιστάνειν also occurs).—ἵσταμαι, intransitive, ver. 13, Blass, *u. s.*, p. 49—the revisers have consistently rendered the verb by the same English word in the three verses 9, 11, 13, thus giving point and force to the narrative, see on ver. 13.—**λέγων κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* v. 36 Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 174, regards μέγαν as an interpolation, and it is not found in the similar phrase in v. 36 (so too Winer-Schmiedel, p. 243), *cf.* Gal. ii. 6, and vi. 3, and the use of the Latin *aliquis*, Cicero, *Att.*, iii., 15, so too vii. 3, etc. It may be that Simon set himselt up for a Messiah (see Ritschl's note, p. 228, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, second edition), or a Prophet, Jos.,

ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη.[1] 11. προσεῖχον δὲ αὐτῷ, διὰ τὸ ἱκανῷ χρόνῳ ταῖς μαγείαις[2] ἐξεστακέναι αὐτούς. 12. Ὅτε δὲ

[1] **η μεγαλη** HLP, Sah., Syr. Pesh., Aethpp., Chrys.; **η καλουμενη μεγαλη** ℵABCDE, Vulg., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aethr., Irint., Orig., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Hilg.

[2] **μαγειαις** BLP, so Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; **μαγιαις** ℵACDEH, so Tisch., W.H. (see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 44).

Ant., xviii., 4, 1, but ver. 14 points to a definite title, and it is likely enough that the people would repeat what Simon had told them of himself. His later followers went further and made him say, "Ego sum sermo Dei, ego sum speciosus, ego paraclitus, ego omnipotens, ego omnia Dei" Jerome, *Commentar. in Matt.*, c. xx., 24 (Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, *cf.* i., 85, note).—**ἑαυτὸν**: contrast Philip's attitude; he preached Christ, not himself (*cf.* Rev. ii. 20).

Ver. 10. **ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ μεγάλη**: in R.V. the power of God which is called (**καλουμένη**) Great, see above, critical notes. T.R. may have omitted the word because it appeared unsuitable to the context; but it could not have been used in a depreciatory sense by the Samaritans, as if to intimate that the person claimed was the so-called "Great," since they also gave heed to Simon. On the other hand it has been argued that the title "Great" is meaningless in this relation, for every divine power might be described by the same epithet (so Wendt, *in loco*, and Blass: "mirum maxime **ἡ καλ.** quasi **δύναμις Θ. μικρά** quoque esse possit". This difficulty leads Blass in his notes to introduce the solution proposed by Klostermann, *Probleme im Aposteltexte*, pp. 15-20 (1883), and approved by Wendt, Zöckler, Spitta, and recently by Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii. 420; see also Salmon's remarks in *Hermathena*, xxi., p. 232), *viz.*, that **μεγάλη** is not a translation of the attribute "great" רַב, but rather a transcription of the Samaritan word מגלי or מגלא meaning *qui revelat* (*cf.* Hebrew גָּלָה, Chaldean גְּלָא גְּלָה, to reveal). The explanation would then be that in contrast to the hidden essence of the Godhead, Simon was known as its revealing power. Nestle however (see Knabenbauer *in loco*) objects on the ground that **καλουμένη** is not read at all in many MSS. But apart from Klostermann's explanation the revised text might fairly mean that amongst the "powers" of God (*cf.* the N.T. use of the word **δυνάμεις** in Rom. viii. 38, 1 Peter iii. 22, and *cf. Book of Enoch* lxi. 10) Simon was emphatically the one which is called great, *i.e.*, the one prominently great or divine. The same title was assigned to him in later accounts, *cf.* Irenæus, i., 23 (Clem. *Hom.*, ii., 22; Clem. *Recog.*, i., 72; ii., 7; Tertullian, *De Præscr.*, xlvi.; Origen, *c. Celsum*, v.). But whatever the claims made by Simon himself, or attributed to him by his followers, we need not read them into the words before us. The expression might mean nothing more than that Simon called himself a great (or revealing) angel of God, since by the Samaritans the angels were regarded as **δυνάμεις**, powers of God (*cf.* Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i., 402, note 4, and De Wette, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 122, fourth edition). Such an explanation is far more probable than the attribution to the Samaritans of later Gnostic and philosophical beliefs, while it is a complete answer to Overbeck, who argues that as the patristic literature about Simon presupposes the emanation theories of the Gnostics so the expression in the verse before us must be explained in the same way, and that thus we have a direct proof that the narrative is influenced by the Simon legend. We may however readily admit that Simon's teaching may have been a starting-point for the later Gnostic developments, and so far from ver. 10 demanding a Gnostic system as a background, we may rather see in it a glimpse of the *genesis* of the beliefs which afterwards figure so prominently in the Gnostic schools (Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, *in loco*, and p. 186, and see McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 99, and "Gnosticism," *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, ii., 680). On the close connection between the Samaritans and Egypt and the widespread study of sorcery amongst the Egyptian Samaritans see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 18, 19. In Hadrian's letter to Servianus we find the Samaritans in Egypt described, like the Jews and Christians there, as all astrologers, sooth-

ἐπίστευσαν τῷ Φιλίππῳ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ τὰ[1] περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐβαπτίζοντο ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες. 13. ὁ δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίστευσε, καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ἦν προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ· θεωρῶν τε σημεῖα καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας γινομένας, ἐξίστατο. 14. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἀπόστολοι, ὅτι δέδεκται ἡ Σαμάρεια τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀπέστειλαν

[1] **τα** omit W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss.

sayers and quacks (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 230 E.T.).: no doubt an exaggeration, as Deissmann says, but still a proof that amongst these Egyptian Samaritans magic and its kindred arts were widely known. In a note on p. 19 Deissmann gives an interesting parallel to Acts viii. 10, **ἐπικαλοῦμαί σε τὴν μεγίστην δύναμιν τὴν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (ἄλλοι· τὴν ἐν τῇ ἄρκτῳ) ὑπὸ Κυρίου Θεοῦ τεταγμένην** (*Pap. Par. Bibl. nat.*, 1275 ff.; Wessely, i., 76) (and he also compares *Gospel of Peter*, ver. 19, **ἡ δύναμίς μου** (2)). The expression according to him will thus have passed from its use amongst the Samaritans into the *Zauber-litteratur* of Egypt.

Ver. 11. **ἱκανῷ χρόνῳ**: dative for accusative, *cf.* xiii. 20, and perhaps Luke viii. 29, Rom. xvi. 25—the usage is not classical, Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 118, but see also Winer-Moulton, xxxi. 9 *a*. St. Luke alone uses **ἱκανός** with **χρόνος**, both in his Gospel and in Acts (Vogel, Klostermann).—**μαγείαις**: only here in N.T., not found in LXX or Apocryphal books, but used in Theophrastus and Plutarch, also in Josephus. It is found in a striking passage in St. Ignatius (*Ephes.*, xix., 3) in reference to the shining forth of the star at the Incarnation, **ὅθεν ἐλύετο πᾶσα μαγεία καὶ πᾶς δεσμός**, and it is also mentioned, *Didache*, v., 1, amongst the things comprised under "the way of death," and so in ii. 1 we read **οὐ μαγεύσεις οὐ φαρμακεύσεις**.—**ἐξεστακέναι**, see above on ver. 9.

Ver. 12. **εὐαγγελ. περὶ**: only here with **περί**, *cf.* Rom. i. 3 (Jos., *Ant.*, xv., 7, 2). Amongst the Samaritans Philip would have found a soil already prepared for his teaching, *cf.* John iv. 25, and a doctrine of the Messiah, in whom the Samaritans saw not only a political but a religious renewer, and one in whom the promise of Deut. xviii. 15 would be fulfilled (Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i., 402, 403; Westcott, *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, pp. 162, 163).—**ἄνδρες τε καὶ γυναῖκες**, *cf.* v. 14: "etiam mulieres quae a superstitionibus difficilius abstrahuntur," Wetstein, *cf.* John iv. 35 ff.

Ver. 13. **καὶ αὐτὸς**: characteristic of St. Luke, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 37.—**βαπτισθεὶς**—**ἐβαπτίσθη ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφωτίσθη** (St. Cyril).—**ἦν προσκαρτερῶν**: on **ἦν** with a participle as characteristic of St. Luke see on i. 10, and Friedrich, *u. s.*, p. 12; on **προσκαρτ.** see on i. 14. Here with dative of the person (*cf.* x. 7); the whole expression shows how assiduously Simon attached himself to Philip.—**θεωρῶν**: the faith of Simon rested on the outward miracles and signs, a faith which ended in amazement, **ἐξίστατο**—but it was no permanent abiding faith, just as the amazement which he had himself inspired in others gave way before a higher and more convincing belief. The expression **δυνάμεις μεγάλας** may have been purposely chosen; hitherto men had seen in Simon, and he himself had claimed to be, **ἡ δύν. ἡ μεγάλη** (Weiss).—**ἐξίστατο**: "Simon qui alios obstupefaciebat, jam ipse obstupescit," Wetstein. **ἐξίσταμαι**, intransitive, Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 49. Irenæus speaks of him as one who pretended faith, i. 23 (so too St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose): he may have believed in the Messianic dignity of Christ, and in His Death and Resurrection, constrained by the miracles which Philip wrought in attestation of his preaching, but it was a belief about the facts, and not a belief in Him whom the facts made known, a belief in the *power* of the new faith, but not an acceptance of its *holiness*, ver. 18 (see further, Rendall's note *in loco*, and on the Baptism of Simon, "Baptism," in Hastings' B.D.).

Ver. 14. **ἡ Σαμ.**: here the district; Weiss traces the revising hand of St. Luke (but see on the other hand Wendt, *in loco*). There is nothing surprising in the fact that the preaching of the Gospel in the town should be regarded by the Apostles at Jerusalem as a proof that the

πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην· 15. οἵτινες καταβάντες προσηύξαντο περὶ αὐτῶν, ὅπως λάβωσι Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον. (16. οὔπω γὰρ ἦν ἐπ' οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιπεπτωκός, μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι

good news had penetrated throughout the district, or that the people of the town should themselves have spread the Gospel amongst their countrymen (*cf.* John iv. 28).—**δέδεκται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θ.**: the phrase is characteristic of St. Luke, as it is used by him, Luke viii. 13, Acts xi. 1, xvii. 11, but not by the other Evangelists—it is found once in St. Paul, 1 Thess. i. 6 (*cf.* ii. 13 and James i. 21). In the mention of John here, as in iii. 4, Weiss can only see the hand of a reviser, since the beloved disciple is mentioned with Peter in a way for which, as Weiss alleges, no reason can be assigned, iii. 4, 11, iv. 13; but nothing was more likely than that Peter and John should be associated together here as previously in the Gospels, see Plumptre's note on Acts iii. 1.

Ver. 15. **οἵτινες**: on this form of the relative see Rendall, *in loco;* Blass however regards it as simply = οἵ, *Grammatik*, p. 169, *cf.* xii. 10.—**καταβάντες**, *cf.* xxiv. 1 (Luke ii. 42), xi. 2, xxi. 12, 15. Wendt defends the historical character of this journey to Samaria as against Zeller and Overbeck.—**προσηύξαντο περὶ**: here only with **περί**; the verb is characteristic of St. Luke, and he alone has the construction used in this verse, *cf.* Luke vi. 28, W.H. The exact phrase is found in St. Paul's Epistles four or five times (and once in Hebrews), but often in LXX, and *cf.* Baruch i., 11, 13; 2 Macc. i. 6, xv. 14. The laying on of hands, as in vi. 7 and xiii. 3, is here preceded by prayer, see Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, v., chap. lxvi., 1-4.—**ὅπως λάβωσι Πν. Ἅγιον**: the words express the chief and highest object of the Apostles' visit: it was not only to ascertain the genuineness of the conversions, or to form a connecting link between the Church of Samaria and that of Jerusalem, although such objects might not have been excluded in dealing with an entirely new and strange state of things —the recognition of the Samaritans in a common faith. It has been argued with great force that the expression Holy Spirit is not meant here in its dogmatic Pauline sense; Luke only means to include in it the ecstatic gifts of speaking with tongues and prophecy. This view is held to be supported by **ἰδών** in ver. 18, intimating that outward manifestations which meet the eye must have shown themselves, and by the fact that the same verb, **ἐπέπεσε**, is used in cases where the results which follow plainly show that the reception of the Holy Ghost meant a manifestation of the outward marvellous signs such as marked the day of Pentecost, x. 44, 46, xi. 15 (*cf.* xix. 6). In the case of these Samaritans no such signs from heaven had followed their baptism, and the Apostles prayed for a conspicuous divine sanction on the reception of the new converts (Wendt, Zöckler, Holtzmann, and see also Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 54, 55). But even supposing that the reception of the Holy Ghost could be thus limited, the gift of tongues was no mere magical power, but the direct result of a super natural Presence and of a special grace—of that Presence speaking with tongues, prophesyings, and various gifts, 1 Cor. xiv. 1, 14, 37, were no doubt the outward manifestations, but they could not have been manifested apart from that Presence, and they were outward visible signs oı an inward spiritual grace. In a book so marked by the working of the Holy Spirit that it has received the name of the "Gospel of the Spirit" it is difficult to believe that St. Luke can mean to limit the expression **λαμβάνειν** here and in the following verse to anything less than a bestowal of that divine indwelling of the spirit which makes the Christian the temple of God, and which St. Paul speaks of in the very same terms as a permanent possession, Gal. iii. 2, Rom. viii. 15 (Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 258). St. Paul's language, 1 Cor. xii. 30, makes it plain that the advent of the Holy Spirit was not of necessity attested by any peculiar manifestations, nor were these manifestations essential accompaniments of it: "Do all speak with tongues?" he asks, "Are all prophets?" See further on ver. 17.

Ver. 16. **ἐπιπεπτωκός**: the verb is characteristic of St. Luke, and used by him both in his Gospel and in Acts of the occurrence of extraordinary conditions, *e.g.*, the sudden influence of the Spirit, *cf.* Luke i. 12, Acts x. 44, xi. 15, xix. 17, *cf.* Rev. xi. 11 (Acts x. 10 cannot be supported, and in xiii. 11 read **ἔπεσεν**). Similar usage in LXX, Exod. xv. 16, 1 Sam. xxvi. 12, Ps. liv. 4, Judith ii. 28, xi. 11, etc. Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 41

ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.) 17. τότε ἐπετίθουν[1] τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς, καὶ ἐλάμβανον Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον. 18. Θεασάμενος[2] δὲ ὁ Σίμων, ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων δίδοται

[1] **επετιθουν**, see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 121; Blass, *Gram.*, p. 48.

[2] **θεασαμενος** HLP, Chrys.; **ιδων** ℵABCDE, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

For the word as used by St. Luke in another sense also characteristic of him, see below on xx. 37, and Plummer on xv. 20. On the formula of baptism see above p. 91, and "Baptism," B.D.², p. 352, and Hastings' B.D.—**ὑπῆρχον** here perhaps = "made a beginning," took the first step (Lumby).

Ver. 17. There cannot be any reason to doubt the validity of St. Philip's baptism, and it is therefore evident that the laying on of hands (*cf.* xix. 6) is here distinct from baptism, and also from the appointment to any Church office (as in vi. 6, xiii. 3), or the bestowal of any special power of healing as in the person of Ananias, ix. 12, 17, although gifts of healing might no doubt accompany it. But both here and in xix. 6 (*cf.* Heb. vi. 2) it follows closely upon baptism, and is performed by Apostles, to whom alone the function belongs, although it is reasonable to suppose that the prophets and teachers who were associated with them in their Apostolic office, and who could lay on hands in Acts xiii. 1-3, could do so in other cases also for the reception of the Holy Ghost (Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 258). The question why St. Philip did not himself "lay hands" upon his converts has been variously discussed, but the narrative of Acts supplies the answer, inasmuch as in the only two parallel cases, *viz.*, the verse before us and xix. 6, the higher officers alone exercise this power, and also justifies the usual custom of the Church in so limiting its exercise ("Confirmation," *Dict. of Christian Antiq.* (Smith & Cheetham), i., p. 425; B.D.¹, iii., *App.;* and Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, v., ch. lxvi. 5, and passage cited; Jerome, *Advers. Lucif.*, *c.* 4, and St. Cyprian, *Epis.* 73, *ad Jubaianum* (reference to the passage before us)). Undoubtedly there are cases of baptism, Acts iii. 41, xvi. 15, 33, where no reference is made to the subsequent performance of this rite, but in these cases it must be remembered that the baptiser was an Apostle, and that when this was the case its observance might fairly be assumed. For the special case of Cornelius see below on x. 44, see further "Confirmation," B.D.², i., 640. Weizsäcker contrasts this account in viii., v. 16, which he describes as this crude conception of the communication of the Spirit solely by the imposition of the Apostles' hands (*Apostolic Age*, ii., 254 and 299, E.T.), and which represents baptism as being thus completed, with the account of baptism given us by St. Paul in 1 Cor. i. 14-17. But in the first place we should remember that Acts does not describe *baptism* as being completed by the laying on of hands; the baptism was not invalid, the Samaritan converts became by its administration members of the Church; and the laying on of hands was not so much a completion of baptism as an addition to it. And, in the next place, Heb. vi. 2 certainly indicates that this addition must have been known at a very early period (see Westcott, *in loco*). It may also be borne in mind that 2 Cor. i. 21 is interpreted of confirmation by many of the Fathers (*cf.* too Westcott's interpretation of 1 John ii. 20, 27), and that St. Paul is writing a letter and not describing a ritual.—**ἐλάμβανον**: Dr. Hort, who holds that the reception of the Holy Spirit is here explained as in x. 44 by reference to the manifestation of the gift of tongues, etc., points out that the verb is not **ἔλαβον**, but imperfect **ἐλάμβανον**, and he therefore renders it "showed a succession of signs of the Spirit" (see also above). But this interpretation need not conflict with the belief in the gift of the Spirit as a permanent possession, and it is well to remember that **ἐπετίθεσαν** (**ἐπετίθουν**) is also imperfect. Both verbs may therefore simply indicate the continuous administration of the laying on of hands by the Apostles, and the continuous supernatural result (not necessarily external manifestation) which followed upon this action; *cf.* **ἐβαπτίζοντο** in ver. 12, imperfect, and so in xviii. 8.

Ver. 18. **θεασάμενος**: the word would seem to point on (so **ἰδών**, see critical notes) to some outward manifestation of

τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα,[1] λέγων, 19. Δότε κἀμοὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην, ἵνα ᾧ ἐὰν ἐπιθῶ τὰς χεῖρας, λαμβάνῃ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον. 20. Πέτρος δὲ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτόν, Τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ὅτι τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνόμισας διὰ

[1] D, Gig. Par. read **παρακαλων και λεγων** (*cf.* ver. 24 where **παρακαλω** is also found in D), so Hilg.; combination not infrequent, Matt. viii. 5, Acts ii. 40, xvi. 9, to strengthen the request. After **ινα** D, Par. Const. apost. insert **καγω**. **εαν** ℵABCELP, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss; **αν** DH 36, Const. apost., Bas., Chrys., Cyr.-Jer. (so Blass in **β**, and Hilg.).

the inward grace of the Spirit, so Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler; so Felten, although he does not of course limit the reception of the Holy Spirit to such outward evidences of His Presence. The word may further give us an insight into Simon's character and belief—the gift of the Spirit was valuable to him in its external manifestation, in so far, that is, as it presented itself to ocular demonstration as a higher power than his own magic.—**διὰ τῆς ἐπιθ. τῶν χ. τῶν ἀποστ.**, see above on ver. 17, *cf.* **διά**, "the laying on of hands" was the instrument by which the Holy Ghost was given in this instance: "Church," Hastings' B.D., i., 426.—**προσήνεγκεν αὐτοῖς χρήματα**: Simon was right in so far as he regarded the gift of the Spirit as an **ἐξουσία** to be bestowed, but entirely wrong in supposing that such a power could be obtained without an inward disposition of the heart, as anything might be bought for gold in external commerce. So De Wette, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 124 (fourth edition), and he adds: "This is the fundamental error in 'Simony,' which is closely connected with unbelief in the power and meaning of the Spirit, and with materialism" (see also Alford *in loco*). (See further on "Simony," Luckock, *Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke*, i., 208.) Probably Simon, after the manner of the time, *cf.* xix. 19, may already have purchased secrets from other masters of the magical arts, and thought that a similar purchase could now be effected.

Ver. 19. **ἵνα ᾧ ἐὰν ἐπιθῶ**: "that on whomsoever I lay my hands," *i.e.*, quite apart from any profession of faith or test of character; no words could more plainly show how completely Simon mistook the essential source and meaning of the power which he coveted.

Ver. 20. **τὸ ἀργύριόν σου κ.τ.λ.**: the words are no curse or imprecation, as is evident from ver. 22, but rather a vehement expression of horror on the part of St. Peter, an expression which would warn Simon that he was on the way to destruction. Rendall considers that the real form of the prayer is not that Simon may perish, but that as he is already on the way to destruction, so the silver may perish which is dragging him down, to the intent that Simon himself may repent and be forgiven: so Page, "thy money perish, even as thou art now perishing," *cf.* Œcumenius, *in loco* (and to the same effect St. Chrys.): **οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα ἀρωμένου ἀλλὰ παιδεύοντος, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι· τὸ ἀργύριον σου συναπόλοιτό σοι μετὰ τῆς προαιρέσεως.** But see also on the optative of wishing, Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 79, where he speaks of Mark xi. 14 and Acts viii. 20 as peculiar, being imprecations of evil, and *cf.* also Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 215.—**εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν**: a frequent construction, "go to destruction and remain there," see Felten, Wendt, Page, and *cf.* ver. 23, **εἰς χολὴν . . . ὄντα.** The noun occurs no less than five times in St. Peter's Second Epistle, *cf.* also 1 Peter i. 7. **εἰς ἀπώλ.** occurs five times elsewhere, Rom. ix. 22, 1 Tim. vi. 9, Heb. x. 39, Rev. xvii. 8, 11, and it is frequent in LXX; *cf.* 1 Chron. xxi. 17, Isa. xiv. 23, liv. 16, Dan. iii. 29, and ii. 5, Theod., etc.; 1 Macc. iii. 42, Bel and the Dragon, ver. 29, and several times in Ecclus.—**τὴν δωρεὰν**: and so, not to be bought, *cf.* Matt. x. 8, and our Lord's own words in Samaria, John iv. 10, **εἰ ᾔδεις τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.**—**ὅτι . . . ἐνόμισας διὰ χ. κτᾶσθαι**: "because thou hast thought to obtain," to acquire, gain possession of, **κτᾶσθαι**, deponent verb, so in classical Greek, not passive as in A.V., see Matt. x. 9, and elsewhere twice in St. Luke's Gospel, xviii. 12, xxi. 19, and three times in Acts, i. 18, viii. 20, xxii. 28, and once in St. Paul, 1 Thess. iv. 4, frequent in LXX, and in same sense as here of acquiring by money.—**ἐνόμ.**: it was not a mere error of judgment, but a sinful intention, which

χρημάτων κτᾶσθαι. 21. οὐκ ἔστι σοι μερὶς οὐδὲ κλῆρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ· ἡ γὰρ καρδία σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεῖα ἐνώπιον[1] τοῦ Θεοῦ. 22. μετανόησον οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας σου ταύτης, καὶ δεήθητι τοῦ Θεοῦ,[2] εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεταί σοι ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου· 23. εἰς[3] γὰρ χολὴν

[1] ενωπιον EHLP; εναντι ℵABD 15, 36, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Hilg. (*cf.* Luke i. 8, a rarer word).

[2] Θεου HLP, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Ir[int.], Blass in β (prob. after ver. 21); Κυριου ℵABCDE, Sah., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Const. apost., Bas., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, so Hilg.

[3] D[1] has ην (=εν (?)) γαρ πικριας χολη και συνδεσμῳ αδικ., so Blass and Hilg., prob. caused by the difficult εις. ορω—DE read θεωρω, so Const. apost., Chrys.; "recte" Blass, so in α and β, and Hilg.; but there seems no real reason why ορω should not occur here.

had come from a heart not right before God, ver. 21; *cf.* Matt. xv. 19.

Ver. 21. **μερὶς οὐδὲ κλῆρος**, *cf.* Deut. xii. 2, xiv. 27, 29, xviii. 1, Isa. lvii. 6, and instances in Wetstein, see on i. 17.—**λόγῳ τούτῳ**: both A. and R.V. "in this matter," *i.e.*, in the power of communicating the Holy Spirit, but Grotius, Neander, Hackett, Blass, Rendall and others refer it to the Gospel, *i.e.*, the word of God which the Apostles preached, and in the blessings of which the Apostles had a share. **λόγος** is frequently used in classical Greek of that *de quo agitur* (see instances in Wendt). Grimm, *sub v.*, compares the use of the noun in classical Greek, like **ῥῆμα**, the thing spoken of, the subject or matter of the **λόγος**, Herod., i., 21, etc.—**ἡ γὰρ καρδία . . . εὐθεῖα**, *cf.* LXX, Ps. vii. 10, x. 3, xxxv. 10, lxxii. 1, lxxvii. 37, etc., where the adjective is used, as often in classical Greek, of moral uprightness (*cf.* **εὐθύτης** in LXX, and *Psalms of Solomon*, ii., 15, **ἐν εὐθύτητι καρδίας**), so also in Acts xiii. 10, where the word is used by St. Paul on a similar occasion in rebuking Elymas; only found once in the Epistles, where it is again used by St. Peter, 2 Pet. ii. 15.

Ver. 22. **κακίας**: not used elsewhere by St. Luke, but it significantly meets us twice in St. Peter, *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 1, 16.—**ἀφεθ.**: if we read above, **Κυρίου**, the meaning will be the Lord Jesus, in whose name the Apostles had been baptising, ver. 16, and **ἀφεθ.** may also point to the word of the Lord Jesus in Matt. xii. 31 (so Alford, Plumptre).—**εἰ ἄρα**, Mark xi. 13 (Acts xvii. 27). R. and A.V. both render "if perhaps," but R.V. "if perhaps . . . shall be forgiven thee"; A.V. "if perhaps . . . may be forgiven thee". St. Peter does not throw doubt on forgiveness after sincere repentance, but the doubt is expressed, because Simon so long as he was what he was (see the probable reading of the next verse and the connecting **γάρ**) could not repent, and therefore could not be forgiven, *cf.* Gen. xviii. 3. "If now I have found favour in thine eyes," **εἰ ἄρα** (אִם־נָא), which I hope rather than venture to assume; see also Simcox, *Language of N. T. Greek*, pp. 180, 181, and compare Winer-Moulton, xli., 4 *c.*, and liii., 8 *a;* and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 62 (1893).—**ἐπίνοια**: only here in N.T.; *cf.* Jer. xx. 10, Wisdom vi. 16, etc., 2 Macc. xii. 45, 4 Macc. xvii. 2, and often in classical Greek.

Ver. 23. **εἰς γὰρ χολὴν**: The passages in LXX generally referred to as containing somewhat similar phraseology are Deut. xxix. 18, xxxii. 32, Lam. iii. 15. But the word **χολή** is found in LXX several times, and not always as the equivalent of the same Hebrew. In Deut. xxix. 18, xxxii. 32, Ps. lxix. 21, Jer. viii. 14, ix. 15, Lam. iii. 19, it is used to translate רֹאשׁ (רוֹשׁ, Deut. xxxii. 32), a poisonous plant of intense bitterness and of quick growth (coupled with wormwood, *cf.* Deut. xxix. 18, Lam. iii 19, Jer. ix. 15). In Job xvi. 14 (where, however, AS[2] read **ζωήν** for **χολήν**) it is used to translate מְרֵרָה, *bile, gall* in xx. 14 of the same book it is the equivalent of מְרֹרָה in the sense of the gall of vipers, *i.e.*, the poison of vipers, which the ancients supposed to lie in the gall. In Prov. v. 4 and Lam. iii. 15 it is the rendering of לַעֲנָה.

πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας ὁρῶ σε ὄντα. 24. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Σίμων εἶπε, Δεήθητε ὑμεῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, ὅπως μηδὲν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὧν εἰρήκατε.[1] 25. Οἱ μὲν οὖν διαμαρτυράμενοι καὶ λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, ὑπέστρεψαν[2] εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, πολλάς τε κώμας τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν εὐηγγελίσαντο.

[1] Before **δεηθητε** D, Gig., Syr. Harcl. mg., Const. apost. prefix **παρακαλω**; *cf.* ver. 19, so Hilg. For **ων** D has **τουτων των κακων**, and adds **μοι** after **ειρηκατε**, so Hilg. At end of verse D adds **ος πολλα κλαιων ου διελιμπανεν**, so Syr. H. mg. without **ος**—so Blass in β, but **και** for **ος**; Hilg. follows D; see Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 4, who refers to xx. 27, xvii. 13, for **διαλιμπανειν, διαλειπειν**, constr. with participle as here, instances which he regards as beyond doubt Lucan; *cf.* Luke vii. 45, where **διαλειπω**, *used only by Luke*, is found with a similar constr., **διαλιμπανω** only found elsewhere in Tobit x. 7 (but S *al.*), but also in Galen, *cf.* Grimm, *sub v.*, and L. and S. But in spite of the Lucan phraseology it seems difficult to suppose that Luke would himself have struck out the words, unless, indeed, he had gained further information about Simon which led him to conclude that the repentance was not sincere. Such an omission could scarcely be made for the sake of brevity. Weiss, Codex D, p. 68, evidently regards the words as added by a later hand, not as omitted by Luke himself; see also Wendt, edit. 1899, p. 177, note.

[2] **υπεστρεψαν** CEHLP, several verss., Chrys.; **υπεστρεφον** ℵABD 15, 61, Vulg., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **Σαμαρειτων** ABCDHLP, so W.H. (and see App., p. 161), Hilg.; **Σαμαριτων** ℵE, so Tisch., Blass. **ευηγγελισαντο** HLP, Boh., Syr. Pesh., Aeth., Chrys.; **ευηγγελιζοντο** ℵABCD, Vulg., Sah., Syr. Harcl., Arm., Aug., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

wormwood; and in the former passage we have **πικρότερον χολῆς**. If we take the most usual signification of **χολή** in the LXX, *viz.*, that of the *gall plant* (see R.V., margin, *in loco*, *gall*, or *a gall root*), the thought of bitterness would naturally be associated with it (in the passage which presents the closest parallel to the verse before us, Deut. xxix. 18, **ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ, πικρία** is a translation of the Hebrew word for *wormwood*); **ἐν χολῇ πικρίας** might therefore denote the intefnse malignity which filled the heart o Simon. (On the word **χολή** in its sense here, and in Matt. xxvii. 34, see Meyer-Weiss, *Matth.*, p. 546.) The preposition **εἰς** is generally taken as = **ἐν** in this passage; but Rendall suggests that here, as is sometimes elsewhere, it = **ὡς**, and he therefore renders: "I see that thou art as gall of bitterness," denoting the evil function which Simon would fulfil in the Church if he continued what he was. Westcott's note on Heb. xii. 15 should also be consulted.—**σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας**: R.V. translates "thou art . . . in the bond of iniquity". But if the passage means that Simon "will become . . . a bond of iniquity," R.V., margin, or that he is now *as* a bond of iniquity (Rendall), the expression denotes, not that Simon is bound, but that he binds others in iniquity. Blass refers to Isa. lviii. 6, where a similar phrase occurs, **σύνδ. ἀδικ.**, and explains: "improbitate quasi vinctus es"; so Grimm, while pointing out that the phrase in Isa. lviii. 6 is used in a different sense from here, explains "vinculum improbitatis, *i.e.*, quod ab improbitate nectitur ad constringendos animos". Others again take the expression to denote a *bundle*, *fasciculus* (Wetstein) (*cf.* Hdian., iv., 12, 11), Simon being regarded "quasi ex improbitate concretum," *cf.* especially Cicero, *in Pison.*, ix., 21; but such a rendering is rejected by Grimm, as no examples can be adduced of this tropical use of the noun, and by Wendt, on the ground that **ἀδικία** is not in the plural, but in the singular. Combinations with **ἀδικία** are characteristic of St. Luke; *cf.* Luke xiii. 27, xvi. 8, 9, xviii. 6; *cf.* Act i. 18; the word only occurs once elsewhere in the Gospels, John vii. 18; Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 23.

Ver. 24. **Δεήθητε**: the verse is often taken (as by Meyer and others) as a further proof of the hollowness of Simon's belief, and his ignorance of the way of true repentance—he will not pray for himself, and he only asks for deliverance from fear of the penalty and not from hatred of the sin (so Bengel). But on the other hand Wendt, in criticising Meyer, objects to this further condemna-

26. Ἄγγελος δὲ Κυρίου ἐλάλησε πρὸς Φίλιππον, λέγων, Ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου κατὰ μεσημβρίαν, ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν καταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ

tion of Simon as not expressed in the text. So far as the petition for the Apostles' prayers is concerned, it is of course possible that it may have been prompted by the belief that such prayers would be more efficacious than his own (so Blass, Wendt, see also conclusion of the story in D); he does not ask them to pray instead of himself but ὑπέρ, on his behalf.—ἐπέλθῃ: not used by the other Evangelists, but three times in St. Luke's Gospel and four times in Acts, with ἐπί and accusative both in Gospel (i. 35, *cf.* xxi. 35) and Acts.

Ver. 25. οἱ μὲν οὖν: the μὲν οὖν and δέ in ver. 26 may connect the return of the party to Jerusalem and the following instructions to Philip for his journey, and so enable us to gather for a certainty that Philip returned to Jerusalem with the Apostles, and received there his further directions from the Lord; see Rendall's Appendix on μὲν οὖν, *Acts*, p. 164, but *cf.* on the other hand, Belser, *Beiträge*, pp. 51, 52. On the frequent and characteristic use of μὲν οὖν in Luke, see above on i. 6, etc.—ὑπέστρεψαν: if we read the imperfect, we have the two verbs in the verse in the same tense, and the sense would be that the Apostles did not return at once to Jerusalem, but started on their return (imperfect), and preached to the Samaritan villages on the way (as Belser also allows)—the τε closely unites the two verbs (Weiss). The verb is characteristic of St. Luke: in his Gospel twenty-one or twenty-two times; in Acts, eleven or twelve times; in the other Evangelists, only once, Mark xv. 40, and this doubtful; only three times in rest of N.T. (Lekebusch, Friedrich).

Ver. 26. ἄγγελος: on the frequency of angelic appearances, another characteristic of St. Luke, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, pp. 45 and 52 (so Zeller, *Acts*, ii., 224, E.T.), *cf.* Luke ii. 9 and Acts xii. 7, Luke i. 38 and Acts x. 7, Luke xxiv. 4 and Acts i. 10, x. 30. There can be no doubt, as Wendt points out, that St. Luke means that the communication was made to Philip by an angel, and that therefore all attempts to explain his words as meaning that Philip felt a sudden inward impulse, or that he had a vision in a dream, are unsatisfactory.—ἀνάστηθι, as Wendt remarks, does not support the latter supposition, *cf.* v. 17, and its frequent use in Acts and in O.T. see below.—δὲ may be taken as above, see ver. 25, or as simply marking the return of the narrative from the chief Apostles to the history of Philip. As in vv. 29, 39, πνεῦμα and not ἄγγελος occurs; the alteration has been attributed to a reviser, but even Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 153, can find no reason for this, and sees in the use of πνεῦμα and ἄγγελος here nothing more strange than their close collocation Matt. iv. 1, 11.—ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου, words often similarly joined together in LXX.—κατὰ μεσημβρίαν: towards the south, *i.e.*, he was to proceed "with his face to the south," *cf.* xxvii. 12 (Page).—ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν (not πρός), on, *i.e.*, along the road (not "unto," A.V.). R.V. margin renders κατὰ μεσ. "at noon"; so Rendall, *cf.* xxii. 6, as we have κατά not πρός; so Nestle, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 335 (1892) (see Felten's note, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 177; but as he points out, the heat of the day at twelve o'clock would not be a likely time for travelling, see also Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 52, as against Nestle). Wendt, edition 1899, p. 177, gives in his adhesion to Nestle's view on the ground that in LXX, *cf.* Gen. xviii. 1, etc., the word μεσημβρ. is always so used, and because the time of the day for the meeting was an important factor, whilst there would be no need to mention the direction, when the town was definitely named (see also O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 88).—αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος: opinion is still divided as to whether the adjective is to be referred to the town or the road. Amongst recent writers, Wendt, edition 1899, p. 178; Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., 438 (1899); Belser, Rendall, O. Holtzmann, *u. s.*, p. 88, Knabenbauer (so too Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 79; Conder in B.D.[2] "Gaza," and Grimm-Thayer) may be added to the large number who see a reference to the route (in Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 71, E.T., it is stated that this view is the more probable). But, on the other hand, some of the older commentators (Calvin, Grotius, etc.) take the former view, and they have recently received a strong supporter in Prof. G. A. Smith, *Historical Geog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 186-188. O. Holtzmann, although referring αὕτη to ὁδός, points out that both Strabo, xvi., 2, 30, and the Anonymous Geographical Fragment (*Geogr. Græc. Minores*, Hudson, iv., p. 39) designate Gaza as ἔρημος. Dr.

Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Γάζαν· αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος. 27. καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ Αἰθίοψ εὐνοῦχος δυνάστης Κανδάκης τῆς [1] βασιλίσσης Αἰθιόπων, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς, ὃς ἐληλύθει

[1] της HLP, Chrys.; om. ℵABC(D)E 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; D adds **τινος**, but Blass rejects in **β**, Hilg. retains. **ος** (2) ℵ³BC²D²EHLP, Syr. Harcl., Arm., Chrys., so Weiss (see comment. below), [W.H.]; *om.* ℵ¹AC¹D¹, Vulg., Sah., so Tisch., Blass, Hilg. Blass suggests orig. reading was **ουτος**, which might easily fall out after **αυτης—ουτος** in Gig., Boh. For **αυτης** D reads **αυτου**, but Blass rejects, so Hilg.—suggested as due from retrans. of Latin, or unpointed Syriac. **εις** om. in D¹, **εν** in D².

Smith strengthens these references, not only by Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 4, 4, and Diodorus Siculus, xix., 80, but by maintaining that the New Gaza mentioned in the Anonymous Fragment was on the coast, and that if so, it lay off the road to Egypt, which still passed by the desert Gaza; the latter place need not have been absolutely deserted in Philip's time; its site and the vicinity of the great road would soon attract people back, but it was not unlikely that the name **Ἔρημος** might still stick to it (see also ver. 36 below). If we take the adjective as referring to the road, its exact force is still doubtful; does it refer to one route, specially lonely, as distinguished from others, or to the ordinary aspect of a route leading through waste places, or to the fact that at the hour mentioned, noon-day (see above), it would be deserted? Wendt confesses himself unable to decide, and perhaps he goes as far as one can expect to go in adding that at least this characterisation of the route so far prepares us for the sequel, in that it explains the fact that the eunuch would read aloud, and that Philip could converse with him uninterruptedly. Hackett and others regard the words before us as a parenthetical remark by St. Luke himself to acquaint the reader with the region of this memorable occurrence, and **αὕτη** is used in a somewhat similar explanatory way in 2 Chron. v. 2, LXX, but this does not enable us to decide as to whether the explanation is St. Luke's or the angel's. Hilgenfeld and Schmiedel dismiss the words as an explanatory gloss. The argument sometimes drawn for the late date of Acts by referring **ἔρημος** to the supposed demolition of Gaza in A.D. 66 cannot be maintained, since this destruction so called was evidently very partial, see G. A. Smith, *u. s.*, and so Schürer, *u. s.*

Ver. 27. **καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐπορεύθη**: immediate and implicit obedience.—**καὶ ἰδού**, see on i. 11; *cf.* Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 179, on the force of the phrase; used characteristically by St. Luke of sudden and as it were providential interpositions, i. 10, x. 17, xii. 7, and see note on xvi. 1.—**εὐνοῦχος**: the word can be taken literally, for there is no contradiction involved in Deut. xxiii. 1, as he would be simply "a proselyte of the gate" (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 54). The instances sometimes referred to as showing that the exclusion of eunuchs from the congregation of the Lord was relaxed in the later period of Jewish history can scarcely hold good, since Isa. lvi. 3 refers to the Messianic future in which even the heathen and the eunuchs should share, and in Jer. xxxviii. 7, xxxix. 15 nothing is said which could lead us to describe Ebed Melech, another Ethiopian eunuch, as a Jew in the full sense. On the position and influence of eunuchs in the East, both in ancient and modern times, see "Eunuch," B.D.², and Hastings' B.D. St. Luke's mention that he was a eunuch is quite in accordance with the "universalism" of the Acts; gradually the barriers of a narrow Judaism were broken down, first in the case of the Samaritans, and now in the case of the eunuch. Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii., 1, speaks of him as **πρῶτος ἐξ ἐθνῶν**, who was converted to Christ, and even as a "proselyte of the gate" he might be so described, for the gulf which lay between a born Gentile and a genuine descendant of Abraham could never be bridged over (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 326, E.T.). Moreover, in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch, descended from the accursed race of Ham, this separation from Israel must have been intensified to the utmost (*cf.* Amos ix. 7). No doubt St. Luke may also have desired to instance the way in which thus early the Gospel spread to a land far distant from the place of its birth (McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 100).—**δυνάστης**: noun in apposition to **ἀνὴρ Αἰθ.**, only used by St. Luke here and in

προσκυνήσων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, 28. ἦν τε ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅρματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀνεγίνωσκε τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν.[1] 29. εἶπε δὲ τὸ Πνεῦμα τῷ Φιλίππῳ, Πρόσελθε καὶ κολλήθητι τῷ ἅρματι

[1] τον προφ. Ησ. EHLP 61, Boh., Syr. Harcl.; Ησ. τον προφ. ℵABC 13, 69 Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Arm., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V. See for this note v. 30

his Gospel, i. 52, and once again by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 15. In LXX frequent (used of God, Ecclus. xlvi. 5, 2 Macc. xv. 3, 23, etc.; so too of Zeus by Soph.), for its meaning here *cf.* Gen. l. 4, Latin, *aulicus.*—**Κανδάκης**: not a personal name, but said to be a name often given to queens of Ethiopia (*cf.* Pharaoh, and later Ptolemy, in Egypt), Pliny, *N. H.*, vi., 35, 7. In the time of Eusebius, *H. E.*, ii., 1, Ethiopia is said to be still ruled by queens, Strabo, xvii., I., 54; Bion of Soli, *Ethiopica* (Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Græc.*, iv., p. 351). According to Brugsch the spelling would be Kanta-ki: *cf.* "Candace," B.D.², and "Ethiopia," Hastings' B.D.—**γάζης**: a Persian word found both in Greek and Latin (*cf.* Cicero, *De Off.*, ii., 22; Virg., *Æn.*, i., 119; and see Wetstein, *in loco*). In LXX, Ezra vi. 1 (Esth. iv. 7), *treasures;* v. 17, vii. 20, *treasury;* vii. 21, *treasurers; cf.* also Isa. xxxix. 2, and **γαζοφυλάκιον** in LXX, and in N.T., Luke xxi. 1, Mark xii. 41 (2), 43, John viii. 20. "Observat Lucas, et locum, ubi præfectus Gazæ Philippo factus est obviam, Gazam fuisse vocatum" Wetstein; see also on the *nomen et omen* Felten and Plumptre, and compare on the word Jerome, *Epist.*, cviii., 11. If the second **ὃς** is retained (R.V.) it emphasises the fact that the eunuch was already a proselyte Weiss).—**προσκυνήσ ων**: proves not that (he was a Jew, but that he was not a heathen (Hackett). The proselytes, as well as foreign Jews, came to Jerusalem to worship. We cannot say whether he had gone up to one of the feasts; St. Chrysostom places it to his credit that he had gone up at an unusual time.

Ver. 28. **ἅρματος**: the chariot was regarded as a mark of high rank: very frequent word in LXX, but in N.T. only here, and in Rev. ix. 9, *cf.* xviii. 13. "Chariot," Hastings' B.D., properly in classics a war-chariot, but here for **ἁρμάμαξα**, a covered chariot (Blass), Herod., vii., 41.—**ἀνεγίνωσκεν**: evidently aloud, according to Eastern usage; there is no need to suppose that some slave was reading to him (Olshausen, Nösgen, Blass). As the following citation proves, he was reading from the LXX, and the widespread knowledge of this translation in Egypt would make it probable *a priori* (Wendt), *cf.* Professor Margoliouth, "Ethiopian Eunuch," Hastings' B.D. It may be that the eunuch had bought the roll in Jerusalem "a pearl of great price," and that he was reading it for the first time; ver. 34 is not quite consistent with the supposition that he had heard in Jerusalem rumours of the Apostles' preaching, and of their reference of the prophecies to Jesus of Nazareth: Philip is represented as preaching to him Jesus, and that too as good news. "The eunuch came to worship—great was also his studiousness—observe again his piety, but though he did not understand he read, and after reading, examines," Chrys., *Hom.*, xix., and Jerome, *Epist.*, liii., 5. See also Corn. à Lapide, *in loco*, on the diligence and devotion of the eunuch.

Ver. 29. **τὸ πνεῦμα εἶπεν**: nothing inconsistent with the previous statement that an angel had spoken to him, as Weiss supposes by referring the angel visit to a reviser. There was no reason why the angel should accompany Philip, or reappear to him, whilst the inward guidance of the Spirit would be always present, as our Lord had promised.—**κολλήθητι**, *cf.* v. 13, in Acts five times, and in each case of joining or attaching oneself closely to a person, of social or religious communion with a person, twice in Luke's Gospel, *cf.* xv. 15 for its sense here, and elsewhere only once in the Evangelists, Matt. xix. 5, and that in a quotation, Gen. ii. 24, *cf.* its use three times in St. Paul, Rom. xii. 9, 1 Cor. vi. 16, 17. In classical Greek similar usage, and *cf.* LXX, Ruth ii. 8, Ecclus. ii. 3, xix. 2, 1 Macc. iii. 2, vi. 21, etc. Hebrew דָּבַק, see Wetstein on x. 28.

Ver. 30. **προσδραμὼν δὲ**: rightly taken to indicate the eagerness with which Philip obeyed.—**Ἆρά γε**—the **γε** strengthens the **ἆρα**, dost thou really understand? *num igitur?* **ἆρα** without **γε** is only found elsewhere in Luke xviii. 8, and in Gal. ii. 17 (W.H., and also Lightfoot, *Galatians*, *l.c.*), see Blass, *in*

τούτῳ. 30. προσδραμὼν δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος τὸν προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν, καὶ εἶπεν, Ἆρά γε γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις; 31. ὁ δὲ εἶπε, Πῶς γὰρ ἂν δυναίμην, ἐὰν μή τις ὁδηγήσῃ[1] με; παρεκάλεσέ τε τὸν Φίλιππον ἀναβάντα καθίσαι σὺν αὐτῷ. 32. ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν, ἦν αὕτη, "Ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη, καὶ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος[2] αὐτὸν ἄφωνος, οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. 33. ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη,[3] τὴν δὲ γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται; ὅτι αἴρεται

[1] **οδηγηση** AB³HLP, Chrys., so Blass, Weiss; **οδηγησει** ℵB¹CE 13, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Hilg.

[2] **κειροντος** BP, Orig., so Lach., W.H. text, Blass, Weiss; **κειραντος** ℵACEHL, Chrys., so Tisch., W.H. marg., Hilg. But as Wendt points out, readings vary as in LXX.

[3] **εν τῃ ταπει. . . . ηρθη** D, Par., Iren. omit. Blass brackets in β; may have been a "Western non-interpolation," or the omission may have been for shortness. **αυτου** CEHLP, Syrr. (P. and H.), several verss., Chrys.; om. ℵAB, Vulg., Irint., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, so LXX.

loco, and *Grammatik*, p. 254. In LXX very rare, see Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.*, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 22 (1893).—**γιν. ἃ αναγ.**: for *paronomasia*, see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 292, where other instances in N.T. are given, and also Wetstein, *in loco*. Julian's well-known saying with reference to the Christian writings, and the famous retort, are quoted by Alford, Plumptre, Page, Meyer-Wendt, *in loco*.

Ver. 31. **γὰρ**; "elegans particula hoc sensu *quid quaeris?*" implies, Why do you ask? for how should I be able? (*cf.* Matt. xxvii. 23, Mark xv. 14, Luke xxiii. 22); see Simcox, *Language of N. T. Greek*, p. 172; Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, I.—**ἂν δυναίμην**: optative with ἂν; occurs only in Luke, both in his Gospel and Acts, expressing what would happen on the fulfilment of some supposed condition: see, for a full list of passages, Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 80; Simcox, *u. s.*, p. 112: twice in direct questions, here and in xvii. 18, but only in this passage is the condition expressed, *cf.* also Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, pp. 33 and 66 (1893).—**ὁδηγήσῃ**, see critical notes, and Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 210; if we read future indicative it will be an instance of a future supposition thus expressed with more probability, Burton, *u. s.*, pp. 104, 105, 109, and see also Simcox, note on the passage, *u. s.*, p. 112. Burton compares Luke xix. 40 (W.H.), see also Viteau, *u. s.*, pp. 4, 111, 226, whilst Blass maintains that there is no one certain example of this usage of **ἐάν** with future indicative. The word used here (" insignis modestia eunuchi," Calvin) is used also by our Lord Himself for the Holy Spirit's leading and guidance, John xvi. 13, and also in the LXX, as in the Psalms, of divine guidance.—**παρεκάλεσέν**: "he besought," R.V. ("desired" A.V.), the word is rightly taken to denote both the humility and the earnestness of the eunuch (Bengel): a verb frequent both in St. Luke and St. Paul, six or seven times in Gospel, twenty-two or twenty-three times in Acts.—**τε**: note the closing connecting particle, showing the necessary result of the question (Weiss).

Ver. 32. **περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς** "the contents of the passage of Scripture" *i.e.*, the one particular passage, Isa. liii. 7, 8 (so Meyer-Wendt, Holtzmann, Hackett), *cf.* i. 16, and 1 Pet. ii. 6: **περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ** and **ταύτης** in ver. 35 below; **περιοχή** has been taken to mean a *section*, as in Cicero, *Epist. ad Att.*, xiii., 25 (so in Codex A, before the Gospel of St. Mark, its **περιοχαί**, *i.e.*, *sectiones*, are prefixed), but in Cicero also Meyer-Wendt take the word to mean the *contents* of a passage, *cf.* notes, edit. 1888 and 1899; see also Felten and Plumptre, *in loco*. St. Chrysostom apparently takes **γραφή** here as = **αἱ γραφαί**, "totum corpus scripturae sacræ," see Blass, *in loco*, but if so, the plural would be used as always; see above references and Lightfoot on *Gal.*, iii., 22. The fact that the eunuch was reading Isaiah is mentioned by St. Chrysostom as another indication

ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ." 34. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ εὐνοῦχος τῷ Φιλίππῳ εἶπε, Δέομαί σου, περὶ τίνος ὁ προφήτης λέγει τοῦτο; περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, ἢ περὶ ἑτέρου τινός; 35. ἀνοίξας δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης, εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτῷ

of character, since he had in hand the prophet who is more sublime than all others, *Hom.*, xix.

Ver. 33. **ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* Isa. liii. 7, 8, "in his humiliation his judgment was taken away" (LXX), so A. and R.V., generally taken to mean by his humbling himself his judgment was cancelled, *cf.* Phil. ii. 6, 7, so Wendt in seventh and eighth editions: *cf.* Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, **κρίσις**, the punishment appointed for him was taken away, *i.e.*, ended, and so *sub v.*, **αἴρω** = to cause to cease, Col. ii. 14. But the words "in his humiliation" etc., may also fairly mean that in the violence and injustice done to him his judgment, *i.e.*, the fair trial due to him, was withheld, and thus they conform more closely to the Hebrew "by oppression and by (unjust) judgment he was taken away," so Hitzig, Ewald, Cheyne and R.V. So to the same effect Delitzsch takes the words to mean that hostile oppression and judicial persecution befel him, and out of them he was removed by death (*cf.* R.V. margin). (The words have been taken to mean that by oppression and judgment he was hurried off and punished, *raptus est ad supplicium.*)—**τὴν (δὲ) γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται;** (LXX), "his generation who shall declare?" R.V., the words may mean "who shall declare the wickedness of the generation in which he lived?" (see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, **γενεά**)—their wickedness, *i.e.*, in their treatment of him; so De Wette (and Meyer in early editions), and to the same effect, Lumby, Rendall, *cf.* our Lord's own words, Matt. xii. 39-42, etc. In Meyer-Wendt (seventh and eighth edition) the words are taken to mean "who can fitly declare the number of those who share his life?" *i.e.*, his posterity, his disciples, so Felten (but see on the other hand, Delitzsch, *in loco*). The Hebrew seems to mean, as in R.V. text, "and as for his generation who *among them* considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living? for the transgression of my people" etc., see Cheyne, *in loco;* Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 358, and Delitzsch, *Jesaia*, pp. 523, 524, fourth edition (see also Page's note, and Wendt, edition 1899). The references by the Fathers (*cf.* Bede and Wordsworth) to the eternal generation of the Son, and the mystery of His Incarnation, do not seem to find support in the Hebrew or in the Greek rendering. On the *oldest* Jewish interpretations of Isaiah liii., see Dalman's *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias*, pp. 21-23, 27-35, 89, 91; and see also in connection with the passage before us, Athanasius, *Four Discourses against the Arians*, i., 13, 54, and Dr. Robertson's note; see also above on St. Peter's Discourses in chap. iii., and below on xxvi. 23.—**αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς**: "is taken," *i.e.*, with violence (here = Hebrew (נִגְזַר), *cf.* use of **αἴρω**, LXX, Acts xxii. 22, xxi. 36, Matt. xxiv. 39, Luke xxiii. 18, John xix. 15.

Ver. 34. **ἀποκ.**, see above iii. 12, v. 8. It has been sometimes supposed that the eunuch was acquainted with the tradition that Isaiah had been sawn asunder by Manasseh — Felten, see Wetstein on Heb. xi. 37.

Ver. 35. **ἀνοίξας τὸ στ. αὐτοῦ**: the phrase is used to introduce some weighty and important utterance, *cf.* x. 34, xviii. 14, and Luke i. 64, so too Matt. v. 2, 2 Cor. vi. 11, also frequent in LXX; "aperire os in Scriptura est ordiri longum sermonem de re gravi et seria. Significat ergo Lucas coepisse Philippum pleno ore disserere de Christo," Calvin, *cf.* Hebrew phrase פָּתַח אֶת־פִּיו, in various senses.—**ἀρξάμενος**, see on i. 22, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 27.—**ταύτης**, see above on ver. 32.—**εὐηγγελίσατο**: used with an accusative both of the person addressed, as in vv. 25, 40, and of the message delivered, *cf.* Luke viii. 1, Acts v. 42, viii. 4, 12, etc., but when the two are combined the person is always expressed by the dative, *cf.* Luke i. 19, ii. 10 (Acts xvii. 18), Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 79. From the sequel it is evident that Philip not only preached the glad tidings of the fulfilment of the prophecies in Jesus as the ideal and divine Sufferer, but that he also pointed out to the eunuch the door of admission into the Church of Jesus; *cf.* Jerome, *Epist.*, liii., 5.

Ver. 36. **ἰδοὺ ὕδωρ**: "intus *fides*, foris *aqua* præsto erat" Bengel. According

τὸν Ἰησοῦν. 36. ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ἦλθον ἐπί τι ὕδωρ· καί φησιν ὁ εὐνοῦχος, Ἰδοὺ ὕδωρ· τί κωλύει με βαπτισθῆναι; 37.[1] εἶπε δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος, Εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, ἔξεστιν. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε, Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. 38. καὶ ἐκέλευσε στῆναι τὸ ἅρμα· καὶ κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, ὅ τε Φίλιππος καὶ ὁ εὐνοῦχος· καὶ ἐβάπτισεν

[1] The whole verse as it stands in T.R. is read in one form or another, with varying variations, also in Patristic quotations, by E (D is wanting from viii. 29b—x. 14), 15, and other good cursives, Gig., Par., Wern., Vulg. (clem. + am.xx demid. tol.), Arm., Syr. Harcl. mg., Iren., Cypr., R.V. marg., and by Hilg.; *om.* by ℵABCHLP 13, 61, Vulg. (am.x fu.), Syr. Pesh. Harcl. text, Sah., Boh., Aeth., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V. text. The verse is strongly defended by Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 50, as originally Lucan, but omitted by Luke for brevity as in many other cases—but on the other hand Wendt, edit. 1899, p. 180, note, justly points out that it is difficult to see any reason for its omission, whilst it is easily conceivable that the words would have been inserted perhaps originally as a marginal note, since otherwise the belief of the eunuch is nowhere expressly stated in the text; *cf.* Rom. x. 9 (but *cf.* ii. 41, xvi. 33). But they were evidently known as early as Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.*, iii., 12, as also to Oecumenius and Theophylact, and they may well have expressed what actually happened, as the question in ver. 36 evidently required an answer. Augustine did not question its genuineness, although he refused to shorten the profession at Baptism on account of it, *De Fide et Operibus*, ix. (see W.H., *App.*, p. 93; Felten, crit. notes, p. 177; *Speaker's Comm.*, *in loco*).

to Jerome (*Epist.*, ciii.) and Eusebius (**περὶ τόπων**), the site of the baptism was placed at Bethsura (Bethzur, Josh. xv. 28, 2 Chron. xi. 17, Neh. iii. 16, etc.), about twenty miles from Jerusalem, and two from Hebron. Robinson (*Biblical Researches*, ii., 749) thinks that the place is more probably to be found on the road between Eleutheropolis (Beit-Jibrin) and Gaza, whilst Professor G. A. Smith (see above on ver. 26) considers that the fact that Philip was found immediately after at Azotus suggests that the meeting and baptism took place, not where tradition has placed them, among the hills of Judæa, but on the Philistine plain (*Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 186, 240). But as he finds it impossible to apply the epithet "desert" to any route from Jerusalem to Gaza, whether that by Beit-Jibrin, or the longer one by Hebron, he does not hesitate to apply the epithet to Gaza itself, and as the meeting (according to his view) took place in its neighbourhood, the town would naturally be mentioned. Gaza and Azotus, ver. 40, are the only two Philistine towns named in the N. T.—**τί κωλύει με βαπτισθῆναι;** "mark the eager desire, mark the exact knowledge . . . see again his modesty; he does not say Baptise me, neither does he hold his peace, but he utters somewhat betwixt strong desire and reverent fear" Chrys., *Hom.*, xix.

Ver. 38. **εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ**: even if the words are rendered "unto the water" (Plumptre), the context **ἀνέβησαν ἐκ** indicates that the baptism was by immersion, and there can be no doubt that this was the custom in the early Church. St. Paul's symbolic language in Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12, certainly seems to presuppose that such was the case, as also such types as the Flood, the passage of the Red Sea, the dipping of Naaman in Jordan. But the *Didaché* is fairly quoted to show that at an early period immersion could not have been regarded as essential, *cf.* vii. 3. See also "Teaching of the Apostles," iv., 807, in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.* (Smith & Wace), "Apostellehre" in *Real-Encyclopädie für protestant. Theol. und Kirche* (Hauck), p. 712; "Baptism" in B.D.². "Mutavit Æthiops pellem suam" is the comment of Bede, "id est sorde peccatorum abluta, de lavacro Jesu dealbatus ascendit."

Ver. 39. **Πνεῦμα Κ. ἥρπασε**: although the expression is simply **Πνεῦμα Κ.** the reference is evidently to the same divine power as in ver. 29, and cannot be explained as meaning an inward impulse of the Evangelist, or as denoting a hurricane or storm of wind (as even Nösgen and Stier supposed). The article is omitted before **Πνεῦμα Κ.** in Luke iv. 18, so also in LXX, Isa. lxi. 1, and we

αὐτόν. 39. ὅτε δὲ ἀνέβησαν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἥρπασε τὸν Φίλιππον [1]· καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν οὐκέτι εὐνοῦχος, ἐπορεύετο γὰρ

[1] **Πνευμα Κ. ηρπασε τον Φ.**; instead of this A², Par., Wern., Syr. H. mg., Jer., Aug. read **πνευμα αγιον επεπεσεν επι τον ευνουχον, αγγελος δε Κ. ηρπασεν τον Φ.** Wendt regards as interpolation partly according to ver. 26 and partly according to ver. 44. Hilg. retains and Belser, p. 51, defends as Lucan. It is fitting that in Scripture the Holy Ghost is not represented as given after Philip's Baptism, because his work was to be completed by the advent of Peter and John; but in the case before us no Apostle was present, and so the Holy Spirit came down miraculously after Philip had baptised the eunuch. So, too, Hilgenfeld leans towards the reading *l. c.*, and regards it as just possible that the ordinary text is a set-off against the contradiction involved with viii. 15-18, in accordance with which the Holy Spirit was only bestowed through the laying on of the hands of the Apostles. Blass rejects, and follows T.R. (see below). After **Φιλιππον** Par., Syr. H. mg. (no other authorities) add "ab eo"; so Hilg., and so Blass in **β**, **απ' αυτου**, which seems somewhat strange in the case of the latter writer.

cannot therefore conclude anything from its omission here. **ἥρπασε**, *abripuit*, the disappearance, as the context shows, was regarded as supernatural, *cf.* LXX, 1 Kings xviii. 12, 2 Kings ii. 16 (Ezek. iii. 14, Hebrew only רוח). Thus Hilgenfeld recognises not only a likeness here to the O.T. passages quoted, but that a miraculous transference of Philip to another place is implied. No doubt, as Hilgenfeld points out, **πνεῦμα** may mean *wind*, John iii. 8, but this by no means justifies exclusion of all reference here to the Holy Spirit. No doubt we may see with Blass a likeness in the language of the narrative to the O.T. passages just cited, and St. Luke's informants may have been the daughters of Philip, who were themselves **προφήτιδες** (see Blass, *in loco*); but there is no reason why he should not have heard the narrative from St. Philip himself, and the rendering **πνεῦμα** by *ventus* is not satisfactory, although Blass fully recognises that Philip departed by the same *divine* impulse as that by which he had come. Holtzmann endorses the reference to the O.T. passages above, but specially draws attention to the parallel which he supposes in Bel and the Dragon, ver. 34 ff. But this passage should be contrasted rather than compared with the simple narrative of the text, so free from any fantastic embellishment, while plainly implying a supernatural element: *cf.* for the verb **ἁρπάζω**, 1 Thess. iv. 17, 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4 (a reference to which as explaining Philip's withdrawal is not to the point, since the narrative cannot imply that Philip was **ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος**), Rev. xii. 5, used of a snatching or taking up due to divine agency, *cf.* Wisdom iv. 11, where it is said of Enoch **ἡρπάγη.** Both in classical Greek and in the LXX the word implies forcible or sudden seizure (John vi. 15).—**καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν . . . ἐπορεύετο γὰρ κ.τ.λ.** If these two clauses are closely connected as by R.V., they do not simply state that the eunuch went on *his own* way (Rendall), (in contrast with Philip who went *his* way), rejoicing in the good news which he had heard, and in the baptism which he had received; and R.V. punctuation surely need not prevent the disappearance of Philip from being viewed as mysterious, even if the words **καὶ οὐκ εἶδον αὐτὸν οὐκέτι** do not imply this. Moreover **αὐτοῦ** may rather emphasise the fact that the eunuch went *his* way, which he would not have done had he seen Philip, but would perhaps have followed him who had thus enlightened his path (so Weiss, *in loco*, reading **αὐτοῦ τὴν ὁδόν—αὐτοῦ** emphatic: see also St. Chrysostom's comment *in loco*).—**χαίρων**: "the fruit of the Spirit is . . . joy," Gal. v. 22 (the word at the end of a clause is characteristic of Luke; Luke xv. 5, xix. 6, see Vogel, p. 45). Eusebius describes the eunuch, to whom he gives the name of Indich, as the first preacher to his countrymen of the tidings of great joy, and on the possible reception in the earliest Christian times of the Gospel message in the island of Meroë at least, see "Ethiopian Church," *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, ii., 234 (Smith & Wace). In the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch men have seen the first fulfilment of the ancient prophecy, Ps. lxviii. 31 (Luckock, *Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St Luke*, i., 219, and C. and H., p. 66).

Ver. 40. **εὑρέθη εἰς Ἄ.**: *constructio prægnans* = was borne to and found at,

τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ χαίρων. 40. Φίλιππος δὲ εὑρέθη εἰς Ἄζωτον· καὶ διερχόμενος εὐηγγελίζετο τὰς πόλεις πάσας, ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς Καισάρειαν.[1]

[1] **Καισαρειαν** BCHLP, so Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; **Καισαριαν** ℵAE 61, so T sch., W.H. (see W.H., *App*., p. 160, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 45).

cf. xxi. 13; or, as **εἰς** means more than **ἐν**, implying that he had come *into* the city and was staying there, *cf*. Esth. i. 5; marg. Hebrew "found," A.V., **εὑρίσκω**, מָצָא, is very often found in the LXX in similar phrases, *e.g*., 1 Chron. xxix. 17, 2 Chron. xxxi. 1, 1 Sam. xiii. 15, etc. The word may imply, however, much more than the fact that Philip *was present* at Azotus, and Alford sees in it a probable reference to 2 Kings ii. 17 (*cf*. passages in O.T. above), where the same word is used, **εὑρέθη**. Blass takes it to mean "vento quasi ibi dejectus," but see above on ver. 39.—**Ἄζωτον**, אַשְׁדּוֹד: only mentioned here in N.T., but in LXX Ashdod, Josh. xi. 22, xiii. 3, xv. 46, 1 Sam. v. 5, 2 Chron. xxvi. 6, Neh. iv. 7, xiii. 20, Jer. xx. 20, xlvii. 5, Amos i. 8, Zeph. ii. 4, Zech. ix. 6; Azotus in 1 Macc. v. 18, x. 84; Herod., ii., 157: Herod. speaks of the siege of the twenty-nine years under Psammetichus as the longest in history (**ζ** = **σδ**, as in **Ὠρομάζης**, *Ahuramazda*, Blass, *in loco*). An old Philistine town, and one of the five chief cities—it might be regarded as the half-way station on the great road between Gaza and Joppa. Schürer holds that the population was Jewish to a considerable extent, as we find that Vespasian was obliged to place a garrison there (Jos., *B. J*., iv., 3, 2); it is now a mere village of no importance, and still bearing the name *Esdûd*. Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., pp. 62, 67 ff., E.T.; G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 192, 193; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 1, 124, "Ashdod," B.D.², "Azotus," and also Col. Conder *sub v*., Hastings' B.D.—**διερχόμενος εὐηγγελ**., see above on ver. 4 and also xiii. 6, and *cf*. Luke ix. 6 for a similar combination of the two verbs.—**τὰς πόλεις πάσας**: from their position between Azotus and Cæsarea, Lydda and Joppa may well have been included, *cf*. ix. 32, 36, in which we may see something of the effects of St. Philip's preaching, "hic quoque, uti in urbe Samariæ, Apostolis auditores præparavit," Bengel. — **Καισαρείαν** (mentioned no less than fifteen times in Acts): its full name was **Καισαρεία Σεβαστή**, so named by Herod the Great in honour of Augustus (Jos., *Ant*., xvi., 5, 1); sometimes also **παράλιος** or **ἡ ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ** (Jos., *B. J*., iii., 9, 1; vii., 1, 3); it was also called "Straton's Tower" (*cf*. K. **ἡ Στράτωνος**, *Apost. Const*., vi., 12), although it was virtually a fresh site. Schürer derives this latter name from Straton, the name of one or more of the last kings of Sidon, who towards the end of the Persian period were probably in possession of the strip of coast upon which the tower was built (Schürer, *u. s*., div. ii., vol. i., p. 84 ff.). Herod's lavish expenditure and enlargement gave it such importance that it came to be called *Caput Judææ*, Tacitus, *Hist*., ii., 79, *i.e*., of the Roman Province, for it never could be called truly Judæan. For its magnificence, see Jos., *Ant*., xv., 9; *B. J*., i., 21, *cf*. *Ant*., xvi., 5. It was a seaport suited to his taste, which Herod wanted, and in Cæsarea he found it—"Joppa, Jerusalem's port, was Jewish, national, patriotic; Cæsarea, Herodian, Roman in obedience, Greek in culture". The buildings were magnificent — a temple with its two statues of Augustus and of Rome, a theatre, an amphitheatre; but above all, the haven was the chief work of art, Sebastos Limen, so large and important that the name of the city was even dwarfed beside it (see especially Dr. G. A. Smith, *u. s*., p. 140). Here the Roman procurators had their abode, both before and after Agrippa's reign; here, too, was the chief garrison of the troops of the province. The population was chiefly heathen, but with a considerable mixture of Jews, and so both Gentile and Jew had equal rights, while each claimed exclusive powers. In the time of Felix things came to such a pass that bloodshed ensued, and Felix exasperated the Jews by leaving the sole direction of the town in the hands of the heathen party. It was this which in the first place provoked the great rising of the Jews, A.D. 66 (Jos., *Ant*., xx., 8, 7, 9; *B. J*., ii., 13, 7; 14, 4, 5). The war broke out, and, according to Josephus, all the Jewish in-

IX. 1. Ὁ ΔΕ Σαῦλος ἔτι ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦ Κυρίου, προσελθὼν τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, 2. ᾐτήσατο παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς, ὅπως ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγῃ εἰς

habitants, twenty thousand in number, were massacred in an hour. Here the famous Rabbi Akiba met a martyr's death, here Eusebius of Cæsarea and Procopius were born, and hither Origen fled. See Schürer, *u. s.*; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 1, 123; G. A. Smith, *u. s.*, pp. 138, 143 ff., B. D.[2]; Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, pp. 21, 23, 156, 199, 251, 265, etc. Among the Jews Cæsarea was called by the same name by which we know it, but sometimes from its fortifications, Migdal Shur, or after its harbour, Migdal Shina, or after both, and once by its ancient name, "Straton's Tower" (*cf.* also *Strabo*, xvi., p. 758), but as the seat of the Roman power, and for its preponderating heathen population, it was specially hated; and so it was designated "the daughter of Edom," although the district, so rich and fertile, was still called "the land of life". Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, pp. 24, 72, 202, and Hamburger, *u.s.* Cæsarea is mentioned in the verse before us not because of its political and commercial importance, but because it became the after home of Philip, xxi. 8. But it also might be named here as marking a further and interesting stage in the progress of the Gospel (see also below on chap. x.). We cannot say whether at the time of the narrative in chap. x. Philip had already settled and worked in Cæsarea.

CHAPTER IX.—Ver. 1. **Ὁ δὲ Σαῦλος**: takes up and continues the narrative from viii. 3; the resumptive use of **δέ**.—**ἔτι**: "Sic in summo fervore peccandi ereptus et conversus est" Bengel.—**ἐμπνέων**: only here in N.T., not "breathing out," A.V., but rather "breathing of," lit., "in" (R.V. simply "breathing"), *cf.* LXX, Josh. x. 40; **πᾶν ἐμπνέον ζωῆς** (*cf.* Ps. xvii. 15)—threatening and murdering were as it were the atmosphere which he breathed, and in and by which he lived, *cf.* Stobæus, *Flor.*, 85, 19, **ὀδμῆς ἐμπνέοντα,** L. and S. and Blass, *in loco* (*cf.* also Aristoph., *Eq.*, 437, **οὗτος ἤδη κακίας καὶ συκοφαντίας πνεῖ,** and Winer-Moulton, xxx., 9).—**τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ**: probably Joseph Caiaphas, who continues thus to persecute the Church, see on iv. 6 (v. 17); he held office until 36 A.D., see Zöckler's note, *in loco*, and "Caiaphas," B.D.[2], and Hastings' B.D. "Saul as a Pharisee makes request of a Sadducee!" says Felten.

Ver. 2. **ᾐτήσατο,** see on iii. 2, with **παρά,** in iii. 3, we have the imperfect, but "inest in aoristo quod etiam accepit," Blass; on the use of the verb in N.T., see also Blass, *Gram.*, p. 182, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*—**ἐπιστολὰς,** *cf.* xxii. 5, xxvi. 12; on the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim, see above on iv. 5; Weber, *Jüdische Theol.*, p. 141 (1897); O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 174, 175; and Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 185, E.T.: only within the limits of Judæa had the Sanhedrim any direct authority, although its orders were regarded as binding over *every* Jewish community. But the extent to which this obligation prevailed depended on the disposition of the Jewish communities towards the Sanhedrim.—**Δαμασκὸν**: "In the history of religion," writes Dr. G. A. Smith, "Damascus was the stage of two great crises. She was the scene of the conversion of the first Apostle of Christianity to the Gentiles; she was the first Christian city to be taken by Islam. It was fit that Paul's conversion, with his first sense of a mission to the Gentiles, should not take place till his journey had brought him to Jewish soil." If Damascus was not the oldest, it may at all events be called the most enduring city in the world. According to Josephus, *Ant.*, i., 6, 4, it was founded by Uz, the grandson of Shem, whilst a Moslem tradition makes Eliezer its founder, and Abraham its king (see also Jos., *Ant.*, i., 7, 2). Here, too, was the traditional scene of the murder of Abel (Shakespeare, 1 *King Henry VI.*, i., 3). Damascus was situated some seventy miles from the seaboard (about six or eight days' journey from Jerusalem), to the east of Anti-Lebanon in a great plain, watered by the river Abana with her seven streams, to which the city owes her beauty and her charm. Travellers of every age and of every nationality have celebrated the gardens and orchards, the running waters and the fountains of Damascus, and as the Arab passes from the burning desert to its cooling streams and rich verdure, it is not surprising that he hails it as an earthly paradise. From

Ἱερουσαλήμ. 3. ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι, ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ, καὶ ἐξαίφνης[1] περιήστραψεν αὐτὸν φῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ·

[1] ἐξαιφνης—in ℵB[1]CE 13 ἐξεφνης, so W.H., but see xxii. 6.; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 47.

a commercial point of view Damascus has been called the meeting-place and mart of the nations, and whilst the armies of the ancient world passed through her streets, she was also the great avenue of communication for the wealth of north and south, east and west (*cf.* the significant passage, Ezek. xxvii. 16, 18, and Amos iii. 12, R.V., from which it seems that the city was known at an early date for her own manufactures, although the passing trade of the caravans would be its chief source of income). For its political position at the period of Acts, see below on ver. 24, and for its history in the O.T., its after struggles, and its present position as still the chief city of Syria, see G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 641 ff.; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 2, p. 220, B.D.[2]; and Hastings' B.D., Conybeare and Howson (smaller edition, p. 67 ff.); Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 96, E.T.—**πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς,** *cf.* vi. 9, as at Jerusalem—the number of Jews dwelling in Damascus was so numerous that in a tumult under Nero ten thousand were put to death, Jos., *B. J.*, vii., 8, 7; ii., 20, 2; as at Jerusalem, the Christians of Damascus may not as yet have formally separated from their Jewish brethren; *cf.* the description of Ananias in xxii. 12; but as communication between Damascus and the capital was very frequent, refugees from Jerusalem would no doubt have fled to Damascus, and it is difficult to believe that the views advocated by Stephen had in him their sole representative. There is no reason to question with Overbeck the existence in Damascus of a community of believers in the claims of Jesus at this early date; but whilst those Christians who devoutly observed the law would not have aroused hostility hitherto, Saul came armed with a commission against all who called on the name of Christ, and so probably his object was not only to bring back the refugees to Jerusalem, but also to stir up the synagogue at Damascus against their own fellow-worshippers who acknowledged that Jesus was the Christ.—**ἐάν τινας εὕρῃ:** the phrase does not mean that the existence of Christians was doubtful, but whether Saul would succeed in finding them out (Weiss).—**ὄντες τῆς ὁδοῦ:** the genitive with **εἶναι** or **γίγνεσθαι,** very common in N.T. (as in classical Greek); may be explained as the genitive of the *class* to which a man belongs, or as the genitive of the property in which any one participates, expessed by the genitive singular of an abstract noun, and also, as here, of a concrete noun, Winer-Moulton, xxx., 5, *c.* (and Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 269, 270). "The Way," R.V., all E.V., "this way," except Wycliff, who has "of this life," apparently reading *vitæ* instead of *viæ* in the Vulgate; see Humphry on the R.V., *in loco.* (In xviii. 25 we have **τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ K.** of the instruction given to Apollos, *cf.* the common metaphorical use of the word in LXX.) In the text (as in xix. 9, xxii. 4, xxiv. 14, 22) the noun is used absolutely, and this use is peculiar to St. Luke (*cf.* **ὁ λόγος,** *sc.*, **τοῦ θ.,** x. 44, xiv. 25, etc., and **τὸ ὄνομα,** v. 41). The term may have originated amongst the Jews who saw in the Christians those who adopted a special way or mode of life, or a special form of their own national belief, but if so, the Christians would see in it *nomen et omen*—in Christ *they* had found the Way, the Truth, the Life, John xiv. 6 (so Holtzmann points out the parallel in St. John, and thus accounts for the article **τῆς ὁδοῦ**—there is only one way of salvation, *viz.*, Christ). Chrysostom (so Theophylact) thinks that the believers were probably so called because of their taking the direct way that leads to heaven (*Hom.*, xix.): see also Dean Plumptre's interesting note. The expression seems to point to the early date of Acts. As it is used thus, absolutely, and with no explanation in the context, Hilgenfeld sees in chap. ix. the commencement of a third source C (see *Introd.*, p. 29).—**γυναῖκας,** see above on viii. 3. Although no doubt the women referred to were Jewesses, yet it is of interest to note the remark of Josephus, *B. J.*, ii., 20, 2, *viz.*, that the women of Damascus were addicted to the Jewish religion. Their mention also indicates the violence of Saul. "quod nullum sexus respectum habuit,

4. καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν,[1] ἤκουσε φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ, Σαούλ, Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; 5. εἶπε δέ, Τίς εἶ, Κύριε[2]; ὁ δὲ Κύριος εἶπεν,

[1] After γην Par. (Flor.) add "cum magna mentis alienatione"; μετα μεγαλης εκστασεως, so Blass; *cf.* rendering of εκστασις in x. 10. Hilg. adds the words αληθως και after γην. After διωκεις E. Syr. Harcl. mg. add σκληρον σοι κ.τ.λ., but *cf.* xxvi. 14—Blass rejects.

[2] Κυριος ειπεν HLP, Syrr. (P. and H.), Sah.; om. ABC, Vulg., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss; om. K., reading ο δε ειπεν, ℵ, Boh., Arm.

cui etiam armati hostes in medio belli ardore parcere solent" Calvin.

Ver. 3. ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι, ἐγένετο: on the frequency of the infinitive as here, and of ἐγένετο in St. Luke, see Friedrich, *Das Lucasevangelium*, p. 13, but whilst St. Luke, even more than the other Evangelists, connects his narratives by more or less Hebraistic formulæ, so he often tones down the Hebraism by changes of order or other modifications, *cf.* Luke i. 8, 9, v. 17, vi. 1, Acts iv. 5, and ix. 3, etc., see especially Simcox, *Writers of the N. T.*, p. 19, *cf.* also Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 232, 234.—ἐγγίζειν τῇ Δ.: for a recent description of the three roads which lead from Jerusalem to Damascus, see Luckock, *Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke*, i., pp. 223, 224. We may well believe that Saul in his haste and passion would choose the quickest and best frequented route which ran straight to Shechem, and after inclining to the east, by the shores of the lake of Galilee, leads straight to Damascus, with an entrance on the south; possibly he may have been stirred to "exceeding madness" by seeing in the Samaritan villages indications of the spread of the faith which it was his purpose to destroy (Plumptre, *Expositor*, p. 28 (1878)). Ramsay, *Expositor*, p. 199, note (1898), follows the old tradition as to the locality (following Sir C. Wilson). But, as he points out, this locality fixed at Kaukab (so Luckock, also *u. s.*), some ten or twelve miles from Damascus, was changed in modern times for a site nearer the city (so the Romanist commentator Felten, p. 185, laying stress on ἐγγίζειν); but the spot so chosen seems an impossible one from the fact that it is on the east side of the city, not on the south; see also "Damascus" Hastings' B.D., i., 548. Moreover the tradition for this site (one out of four selected at different times) does not appear to have existed for more than some two hundred years, and although we can well understand the action of the Christians in Damascus, who, on St. Paul's Day, walk in procession to this traditional site, and read the narrative of the Apostle's wonderful conversion, it seems that there is no adequate evidence in support of the spot selected. "It was a true instinct that led the Church to take the Conversion as the day of St. Paul. For other saints and martyrs their day of celebration was their *dies natalis*, the day on which they entered their real life, their day of martyrdom. But the *dies natalis* of St. Paul, the day on which his true life began, was the day of his Conversion," Ramsay, *Expositor*, p. 28 (1898).—ἐξαίφνης: the word is used by St. Luke twice in his Gospel and twice in the Acts—only once elsewhere, Mark xiii. 36. Hobart and Zahn claim it as a medical term, and it was no doubt frequent amongst medical writers, as in Hippocrates and Galen (Hobart, *Medical Language of St. Luke*, pp. 19, 20), but the word is also used in LXX several times in same sense as here.—περιήστραψεν: only twice in N.T.—not found at all in classical Greek, but see 4 Macc. iv. 10. The simple verb occurs in Luke xvii. 24, xxiv. 4. The word is used in St. Paul's own account of the event (xxii. 6), (and περιλάμψαν in his second account xxvi. 13); noun in classical Greek of flashing like lightning. In xxii. 6 the time is fixed "about noon," and in xxvi. 13 it is said that the light was "above the brightness of the sun," and shone round about those who journeyed with Paul. But St. Luke states the general fact, and St. Paul, as was natural, is more explicit in his own account. But St. Paul's mention of the time of day, when an Eastern sun was at its brightest, and of the exceeding glory of the light, evidently indicates that no natural phenomenon was implied.

Ver. 4. καὶ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, *cf.* xxii. 7, both expressions show the overwhelming impression made by the sudden bright light. In xxvi. 14 all fall to the ground, but there is no contradiction with ix. 7, see below on verse 7. Lewin, Farrar (so Hackett, and some early interpreters)

Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς[1] ὃν σὺ διώκεις[2]· σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. 6. τρέμων τε καὶ θαμβῶν εἶπε, Κύριε, τί με θέλεις ποιῆσαι; καὶ ὁ

[1] Ιησους ℵABLP, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. Harcl. text, Arm., Orig., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss; Ι. ο Ναζ. ACE 25, Par., Flor. (Vulg. demid.), Syr. (Pesh. and Harcl.), Aeth., Hil., but *cf.* xx. 8—Blass rejects; Hilg. retains.

[2] After διωκεις Flor., Gig., Par., Wern., Vulg. (fu. demid.), Syr. Harcl. mg. read σκληρον σοι l. κ.τ.λ. So, too, the same authorities (– Gig., Wer. + Hil.) read also ο δε τρεμων τε και θαμβων ειπε, Κυριε . . . αυτον—Blass receives, so too Hilg. For all this between διωκ. and αναστηθι the true reading appears to be αλλα (all else omitted), ℵABCEHLP, Vulg. (am.), Syr. P. and H. text, Sah., Boh., Arm., Tisch., Chrys.; evidence for insertions purely Western—inserted under influence of xxii. and xxvi. After θαμβων all these Western authorities except Vulg. add επι τῳ γεγονοτι αυτῳ; this is a clear case of assimilation to iii. 10. There seems no Greek authority for the whole insertion; apparently a retranslation by Erasmus from the Latin.

have held that Saul and some at least of his companions were mounted, since Saul was the emissary of the high priest, and the journey would occupy some days. On the other hand Felten (following Corn. à Lapide) holds that the text makes no suggestion of this, and that the expression "they led him by the hand" and the command "rise and enter into the city" are against it; but the near neighbourhood of Damascus might easily account for the fact that his companions led Saul by the hand for the remaining distance, which could not have been long, although the immediate proximity of the traditional site cannot be maintained (see above on ver. 3). As the strict Jews, like the Pharisees, seldom used horses, Felten may be right in conjecturing that Saul rode upon an ass or a mule (p. 186, note).—ἤκουσε φωνὴν λέγουσαν: in St. Paul's own account we have ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης, xxii. 7, and ἤκουσα φωνὴν λέγ., as here, in xxvi. 14. It would seem therefore that the distinction between ἀκούειν with (1) accusative, and (2) genitive; (1) to hear and understand, (2) to hear, merely, cannot be pressed (so Alford, *in loco*, and Simcox, *Language of N. T.*, p. 90, and Weiss on xxii. 7; but see on the other hand Rendall on ix., ver. 7). Thus in the passage before us it has been usual to explain ἀκούειν with φωνήν, ver. 4, as indicating that Saul not only heard but understood the voice, *cf.* xxii. 14, whilst ἀκούειν with φωνῆς, ver. 7, has been taken to show that his comrades heard, but did not understand (so Weiss, *in loco*, and also on xxii. 9). But there is (1) no contradiction with xxii. 9, for there it is said of Paul's companions: τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι—they heard the utterance, ix. 7, xxii. 7, but did not hear definitely, or understand who it was that spoke, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες. But (2) on comparing the passages together, it appears that in ix. 4 and 7 a distinction is drawn between the contents of the utterance and the mere sound of the voice, a distinction drawn by the accusative and genitive; in xxii. 7 the same distinction is really maintained, and by the same cases, since in xxii. 7 Paul, in speaking of himself, says that he heard a voice, *i.e.*, was conscious of a voice speaking to him (genitive, φωνῆς), (Simcox, *u. s.*, p. 85), whilst in ver. 9 (accusative φωνήν) the contents of the utterance are referred to, *cf.* ver. 14 in the same chapter; in xxvi. 14 the accusative is rightly used for the contents of the utterance which are given there more fully than elsewhere.—Σαούλ, Σαούλ: in each of the three narratives of the Conversion it is significant that the Hebrew form is thus given, and it is also found in the address of Ananias, probably himself a Hebrew, ver. 17, to the new convert. On the emphatic and solemn repetition of the name *cf.* Gen. xxii. 11, and in the N.T., Luke x. 41, xxii. 31, Matt. xxiii. 37, and on the frequency of this repetition of a name as characteristic of Luke in Gospel and Acts see Friedrich, pp. 75, 76, *cf.* Luke viii. 24, x. 41, xxii. 31, *cf.* xxiii. 21 (see also Deissmann's note *Bibelstudien*, p. 184, on the introduction of the Hebrew name).—τί με διώκεις; *cf.* vii. 52, and 1 Cor. xv. 9, Gal. i. 13. "Saul's first lesson was the mystical union between Christ and His Church" *cf.* Matt. x. 40, xxv. 40, 45, John x. 16, etc. No wonder that Felten sees "an ineffable pathos" in the words; Wendt quotes St. Augustine: "caput pro membris clamabat," *cf.* also Corn. à Lapide: "corpus enim mysti-

Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἀνάστηθι καὶ εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν πόλιν, καὶ λαληθήσεταί σοι τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν. 7. οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες οἱ συνοδεύοντες αὐτῷ εἱστήκεισαν ἐννεοί,[1] ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες. 8. ἠγέρθη δὲ ὁ Σαῦλος ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς· ἀνεῳγμένων δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ, οὐδένα ἔβλεπε, χειραγωγοῦντες δὲ αὐτὸν εἰσήγαγον εἰς

[1] εννεοι L; but ενεοι ℵABCEHP 61, Syr. Harcl. mg., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Hilg.; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 55. Blass reconstructs the conclusion of ver. 7 and the first half of ver. 8; Flor. (and partly Gig., Par., Wern.) μηδενα δε θεωρ. μεθ' ου ελαλει· εφη δε προς αυτους· εγειρατε με απο της γης και εγειραντων δε αυτον ουδεν εβλ. ανεωγμ. τ. οφθ. χειραγωγ. τε—probably these additions arose partly from the wish to explain the μηδενα standing absolutely in ver. 7 (*cf.* xxii. 9), partly to represent the blindness as coming on Saul at once (and not after he had risen), and thus making him need immediate help.

cum Christi est ecclesia, membra sunt fideles".

Ver. 5. **Τίς εἶ, Κύριε;** the title is here used in reverent and awestruck response to the question of a speaker, in whose voice, accompanied as it was by the supernatural light, Saul recognised a divine utterance—it is therefore more than a mere word of respect, as in xvi. 30, xxv. 26; it indicates, as St. Chrysostum noted, a purpose to follow the voice, whether it was that of an angel or of God Himself (Felten), "Jam parat se ad obediendum, qui prius insaniebat ad persequendum," Augustine.—**Ἐγὼ . . . σὺ**: both pronouns are emphatic, and contrasted: **Ἰησοῦς**, *cf.* xx. 8, and note. For rest of verse see critical notes.

Ver. 6. For this verse see critical notes and also xxii. 10. **Ἀνάστηθι**: verb characteristic of St. Luke, see on v. 7. Here, if we compare xxvi. 16 (xiv. 10), it is evidently used in a literal sense.—**καὶ λαληθήσεταί σοι**, see note on xxvi. 15.

Ver. 7. **οἱ συνοδεύοντες**: probably riding in company with him; not found in classical Greek, but used in the same sense as here in Plutarch—not elsewhere in N. T; but see Wisdom vi. 23, and Tobit v. 16 S (AB *al.*), so according to S[1] in Zech. viii. 21 (ABS[3] *al.*), *cf.* also Symm. in Gen. xxxiii. 12.—**εἱστήκεισαν ἐννεοί**. The form **ἐννεός** is incorrect, see critical notes: in LXX, *cf.* Prov. xvii. 28, Isa. lvi. 10, Epist. of Jer. 41 (Symm. in Hos. ix. 7); see critical notes. It is frivolous to find a contradiction here with xxvi. 14. No stress is laid upon **εἱστήκ.**, which may be used like **εἶναι**, and even if there is, it does not preclude a previous falling. We have merely to suppose that the sight and sound had affected Saul's companions in a less degree than Saul, and that they rose from the ground before him, to make the narratives quite consistent (see Felten, p. 193, Hackett, *in loco;* B.D.[1], iv., "Paul" p. 733). Or it is quite possible, as Weiss points out on xxvi. 14, that here the narrative emphasises the impression made by the hearing of the voice, and in xxvi. 14 the immediate result produced by the light, and that the narrator is quite unconscious of any contradiction in his recital (see notes below on xxii., xxvi.).—**μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες**: there is no contradiction between this statement and xxii. 9, where it is said that they saw the light—here it is not denied that they saw a light, but only that they saw no person. Holtzmann apparently forgets this, and says that whilst in xxix. 9 they see the light, in ix. 7 they see nothing; but the pronoun is not neuter, but masculine; **μηδένα** (see critical notes and reading in β). The inference is that Saul saw Jesus, but although this is not stated in so many words here, it is also to be inferred from the words of Ananias in ver. 17, and xxii. 14, and from St. Paul's own statement in 1 Cor. xv. 8, and ix. 1. St. Chrysostom refers **ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φ.** to the words of Saul, but this is certainly not natural, for **τῆς φ.** evidently refers back to **ἤκουσα φωνὴν** in ver. 4.

Ver. 8. **ἀνεῳγμένων**; see critical notes. —**οὐδένα ἔβλεπε**: his eyes, which he had closed mechanically, as he fell overwhelmed with the dazzling brightness of the light, and of the appearance of Jesus, he now opens, but only to find that he saw nothing (**οὐδέν**) (see critical note)—he had become blind (so Weiss and Wendt, *cf.* xxii. 11). This blindness was the clearest proof that the appearances vouchsafed to him had been a reality (Felten), see also ver. 18.—**χειραγωγοῦντες**: the necessary result of

Δαμασκόν. 9. καὶ ἦν ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων, καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν. 10. Ἦν δέ τις μαθητὴς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὀνόματι Ἀνανίας, καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος ἐν ὁράματι, Ἀνανία. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ἰδοὺ

his blindness, *cf.* Judg. xvi. 26 and Tob. xi. 16, but in each case the reading is varied (see H. and R.); in N.T. only in Acts, *cf.* xxii. 11 (and see xiii. 11); it is also found in the Apocryphal *Gospel of Peter*, x. (ver. 40 in Harnack's edition). "He who would strike others was himself struck, and the proud Pharisee became a deeply humbled penitent —a guide of the blind" he was himself to be guided by others (Felten).

Ver. 9. **ἦν . . . μὴ βλέπων**: on ἦν with participle, characteristic, see above on chap. i. 10. Wendt (in seventh edition, not in eighth), and so Felten, Alford, Hackett, distinguish between **μή** and **οὐ** with **ἔφαγεν** and **ἔπιεν**, and see especially Winer-Moulton, lv., 5. **οὐ β.** would have simply meant *blind;* **μὴ β.** is *not seeing* (*not able to see*)—said of one who had been, and might appear to be again, possessed of sight; the not eating and not drinking are related simply as matters of fact; see the whole section. Blass regards **μή** with participle as simply = **οὐ**, so in ver. 7 **μηδένα** with participle = **οὐδένα**, *ut alias* (see also Lumby's note).—**οὐκ ἔφαγ. κ.τ.λ.**: there is no reason why the words should not be taken literally, in spite of Wendt's objection as against Meyer *in loco*, as an expression of penitential sorrow and contrition for his perversity (so Weiss and Holtzmann, no less than Felten): "with what fervour must he then have prayed for 'more light'" (Felten). On Saul's blindness and its possibly lasting effects, see Plumptre, *in loco*, Felten, p. 196, and on the other hand Lightfoot on Gal. vi. 11, and Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, etc., pp. 38, 39.

Ver. 10. **Ἀνανίας**: *nomen et omen*, "Jehovah is gracious" (*cf.* xxii. 12). No doubt a Jewish Christian (he is supposed by some, as by St. Augustine, to have been the presbyter to whose care the Church at Damascus was committed). For more details and traditions concerning him, see Dr. James, "Ananias," Hastings' B.D., and Felten, *in loco*. The objections raised against the historical character of the meeting between Ananias and Saul, by Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, are considered by Wendt as quite insufficient. Weizsäcker regards the narrative of the blindness and its cure by Ananias as transparently symbolical, and adds that in any case it is suggestive that Paul, Gal. iv. 15, seems, at least in later days, to have had a severe ailment in his eyes (see however on this point ver. 9 above). But the weakness, if it existed, might have been caused by the previous blindness at Damascus, and this suggestion, if it is needed, has at all events more probability than the supposition that the narrative in the text was due to the fact that in after years Saul's eyes were affected! (so Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i., 72). Zeller indeed admits, *Acts*, i., 289, E.T., that the connection of Saul with Ananias, "irrespective of the visions and miracles," may have been historical, and he falls back upon Schneckenburger's theory that the author of Acts had a special aim in view in introducing a man so avowedly pious in the law (xxii. 12) to introduce Paul to Christianity. But Schneckenburger does not seem to deny the main fact of the meeting between the two men (*Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 168, 169), and St. Paul would scarcely have spoken as he did later (xxii. 12) before a Jewish crowd, in a speech delivered when the capital was full of pilgrims from all parts, and at a time when the constant communication between Damascus and Jerusalem would have exposed him to instant refutation, had his statements with regard to Ananias been incorrect. It is evident that the supernatural element in the narrative is what really lay at the root of Zeller's objections. —**ὁ Κύριος**, *i.e.*, Jesus, as is evident from a comparison of vv. 13, 14, 17.—**ἐν ὁράματι**: critical objections have been raised by Baur and others against the double vision narrated here of Saul and Ananias, as against the double vision of Cornelius and St. Peter in x. 3 and xi., but see Lumby's note, *in loco*, and reference to Conybeare and Howson, quoted also by Felten. The idea of the older rationalists that Saul and Ananias had previously been friends, and that thus the coincidence of their visions may be accounted for, is justly regarded by Wendt as entirely arbitrary. The vision, as narrated by Luke, is evidently regarded as something objective, *cf.* vv. 10, 13.

Ver. 11. **ἀναστὰς**: the word as has been previously remarked is characteristic of Luke (*cf.* its use in O.T.), and does

ἐγώ, Κύριε. 11. ὁ δὲ Κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἀναστὰς[1] πορεύθητι ἐπὶ τὴν ῥύμην τὴν καλουμένην Εὐθεῖαν, καὶ ζήτησον ἐν οἰκίᾳ Ἰούδα Σαῦλον ὀνόματι,[2] Ταρσέα. ἰδοὺ γὰρ προσεύχεται, 12.[3] καὶ εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι ἄνδρα ὀνόματι Ἀνανίαν εἰσελθόντα καὶ ἐπιθέντα αὐτῷ χεῖρα,

[1] **Αναστας** ℵACEHLP, Vulg. (am. demid. tol.), so Tisch., W.H. marg., Weiss, Hilg. (*cf.* x. 13, 20); but **αναστα** in B and most verss., so Lach., W.H. text, Wendt.

[2] Before **Ταρσεα** Flor. and Par. have **γενει**, not an unusual word with adjectives of nationality.

[3] Blass in **β**, following Flor., omits the whole verse, Hilg. brackets; but there seems no reason for its insertion if not genuine, as it is not influenced by any parallel passage (*cf.* long discussion in Corssen, *Der Cyprianische Text*, p. 21 ff.). Wendt (edit. 1899) decides for its retention, but another and a further question arises as to the original reading if the verse is retained. **εν οραματι** om. ℵA 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aeth., so Tisch. R.V., Wendt. The words may be an explanatory gloss. In BC 163, so Blass [W.H.] Weiss **εν οραμ.** follow **ανδρα.** Instead of **χειρα** the plural **χειρας** is found in ℵABCE, Vulg., Boh., Arm., so W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, but the art. **τας** is doubtful, probably to be omitted (Wendt) with ℵ*AC 61, so Tisch., Weiss; but retained by ℵcBE, R.V. [W.H.].

not in the least support the idea that the vision was a dream of the night, *cf.* viii. 26.—**ἐπὶ τὴν ῥύμην τ. κ. Εὐθεῖαν**: **ῥύμη**, *cf.* xii. 10, Matt. vi. 2. In Luke xiv. 21 it seems to be used in contrast to **πλατεῖα**, but in LXX at least in one passage it is used as its equivalent, Isa. xv. 3, *cf.* R.V., "broad places," רְחֹב. It is found also in Ecclus. ix. 7 (perhaps twice) and in Tobit xiii. 18, where in the previous ver., 17, we have **πλατεῖαι**, although it is very doubtful whether we can press a contrast here, and **ῥύμη**, ver. 18, might perhaps be taken as meaning a city-quarter, Latin *vicus*, see *Speaker's Commentary*, *in loco*. On the stages in the history of the word, and its occurrence in Attic Greek, *e.g.*, in the comic writers Antiphanes (380 B.C.) and Philippides (323 B.C.), see Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, pp. 15, 16; Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 488. — **Εὐθεῖαν**: "the street called Straight" may be traced from the eastern to the western gate, and it still bears the name, *Derb el-Mustakîm*, Schneller, *Apostelfahrten*, pp. 254, 255, "Damascus," Hastings' B.D. The "house of Judas," also that of Ananias, are still pointed out, but considerable uncertainty attaches to the attempts at identification, see "Damascus," *u. s.*, also Felten, *in loco*.—**Ταρσέα**: Tarsus was the capital of the Roman Province of Cilicia. Curtius has called it the Athens of Asia Minor, and Strabo emphasises its celebrity for the production of men famous in all branches of science and art. As a celebrated university town it may have ranked amongst its students not only St. Paul but his companion St. Luke, attracted it may be by the renown of its medical school; and if this be so, the acquaintance of the two men may date from their student days. To Tarsus, moreover, and to a country where Stoicism was cradled, St. Paul may have been indebted for his evident familiarity with the ideas and tenets of the Stoic philosophy. From Cyprus came Zeno and Persæus, from Soli, Chrysippus and Aratus, whilst Anazarba in Cilicia was the birthplace of the physician Dioscorides, contemporary of St. Luke as of St. Paul. It is indeed possible to enumerate at least six Stoic teachers whose home was Tarsus. See notes on St. Paul at Athens and at Ephesus, and see J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, on Acts vi. 9; Curtius, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., p. 538 ff.; Zahn, *Einleitung* i., pp. 37, 50; Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 303 ff.; Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 317.—**ἰδοὺ γὰρ προσεύχεται**: "orantes videt Jesus" Bengel; present tense, continuous prayer, 1 Thess. v. 17.

Ver. 12. **ἐν ὁράματι**, see critical notes. —**ἄνδρα Ἀ. ὀνόμ.**: the words would certainly indicate, as Wendt points out (seventh edition, not eighth), that Saul was previously unacquainted with Ananias. Jesus communicates the contents of the vision, and speaks as it were from the standpoint of Saul (see Felten's note, p. 190).—**ἐπιθέντα κ.τ.λ.**, see above on viii. 17.

ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃ. 13. ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ Ἀνανίας, Κύριε, ἀκήκοα[1] ἀπὸ πολλῶν περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου, ὅσα κακὰ ἐποίησε τοῖς ἁγίοις σου ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· 14. καὶ ὧδε ἔχει ἐξουσίαν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων, δῆσαι πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομά σου. 15. Εἶπε δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Κύριος, Πορεύου, ὅτι σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς μοι ἐστὶν οὗτος, τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον[2] ἐθνῶν καὶ βασιλέων, υἱῶν τε Ἰσραήλ.

[1] **ακηκοα** HLP, Chrys.; **ηκουσα** ℵABCE, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] **εθνων**, but art. **των** prefixed in BC*, so Lach., R.V. (W.H.), Weiss, Wendt (probably); but **των** apparently does not suit the context.

Ver. 13. Ananias naturally hesitates to go to a man who had undoubtedly inflicted harm upon the Christians, and had come to Damascus with the same intent. But there is nothing inconsistent in the fact that Ananias should not be acquainted with Saul personally, whilst he knew of his persecuting zeal.—**τοῖς ἁγίοις σου**: used here for the first time as a name for the Christians; *cf.* vv. 32, 41, xxvi. 10. Every Israelite was **ἅγιος** by the mere fact of his membership in the holy Ecclesia of Israel, and Ananias, himself a Jew, does not hesitate to employ the same term of the members of the Christian Ecclesia (see Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 56, 57, and Grimm, *sub v.*, 2). Its use has therefore a deep significance: "Christus habet sanctos, ut suos: ergo est Deus," says Bengel. The force of the words can be more fully appreciated in connection with the significance of the phrase in ver. 14, **τοῖς ἐπικ. τὸ ὄνομά σου.** In xxvi. 10 it is noticeable that the word occurs on St. Paul's own lips as he stood before Agrippa "in the bitterness of his self-accusation for his acts of persecution, probably in intentional repetition of Ananias's language respecting those same acts of his. It was a phrase that was likely to burn itself into his memory on that occasion." And so we find St. Paul addressing at least six of his Epistles to those who were "called *to be* Saints," indicating that every Christian as such had this high calling. If Christians individually had realised it, the prophetic vision of the *Psalms of Solomon* (xvii. 36) would have been fulfilled in the early Church of Christ: **ὅτι πάντες ἅγιοι, καὶ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν Χριστὸς Κύριος** (see Ryle and James' edition, p. 141).—**ἐν Ἱερ.** belongs to **ἐποίησε**, and so points back to viii. 3, and to Saul as the soul of the persecution which broke out in Jerusalem, *cf.* Paul's own language before Agrippa, xxvi. 10.

Ver. 14. **ὧδε** *hic* et *huc* (Blass), ver. 21.—**τοὺς ἐπικ. τὸ ὄνομά σου**—note the repeated pronoun and compare 1 Cor. i. 2s where **ἐπικ.** is closely joined with **ἅγιοι.** and on the whole phrase see above ii. 21

Ver. 15. **σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς**, *cf.* St. Paul's own language in Gal. i. 15, genitive of quality; common Hebraistic mode of expression (*cf.* viii. 23) = **ἐκλεκτόν**, see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 96; *cf.* Luke xvi. 8, xviii. 6, etc. For **σκεῦος** similarly used see Jer. xxii. 28, Hosea viii. 8, and Schöttgen, *Horæ Hebraicæ, in loco;* and in N.T. Rom. ix. 22, 23, 1 Thess. iv. 4. Grimm and Blass both compare **σκ.** *de homine* in Polyb., xiii., 5, 7; xv., 25, 1. *Vas electionis;* the words are written over what is said to be St. Paul's tomb in the church dedicated to him near the city of Rome.—**τοῦ βαστάσαι**, genitive of purpose; verb as used here continues the metaphor of **σκεῦος**; may mean simply to bear, to carry, or it may denote to bear as a burden; *cf.* 2 Kings xviii. 14, Ecclus. vi. 25; *cf.* Luke xiv. 27, Acts xv. 10, Rom. xv. 1, etc.—**ἐθνῶν καὶ βασιλέων** — **ἐθν.**, placed first because Saul's special mission is thus indicated. —**βασιλ.**, *cf.* xxvi. 12, 2 Tim. i. 16; also before the governors of Cyprus, Achaia, Judæa.—**υἱῶν τε Ἰ.**, see critical notes above, again the closely connecting **τε**, all three nouns being comprehended under the one article **τῶν**—the Apostle's work was to include, not to exclude, his brethren according to the flesh, whilst mission to the Gentiles is always emphasised; *cf.* xxii. 15 and 21, xxvi. 17; *cf.* Rom. i. 13, 14.

Ver. 16. **ἐγὼ γὰρ**: he is a chosen vessel unto me, and therefore **ὑποδ.** Wendt disagrees with Meyer, who finds the showing in the experiences of the sufferings (so Hackett and Felten), and

16. ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑποδείξω αὐτῷ, ὅσα δεῖ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου παθεῖν.

17.[1] Ἀπῆλθε δὲ Ἀνανίας καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ ἐπιθεὶς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας εἶπε, Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ, ὁ Κύριος ἀπέσταλκέ με, Ἰησοῦς ὁ ὀφθείς σοι ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ᾗ ἤρχου, ὅπως ἀναβλέψῃς καὶ πλησθῇς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου. 18. καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέπεσον ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ λεπίδες, ἀνέβλεψέ τε παραχρῆμα,[2] καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐβαπτίσθη, καὶ λαβὼν τροφὴν ἐνίσχυσεν.[3] 19. Ἐγένετο δὲ ὁ Σαῦλος μετὰ τῶν ἐν

[1] Blass, following Flor., reconstructs (so very simil. Hilg.) τοτε εγερθεις (as if the vision came in sleep; *cf.* Corssen, *G. G. A.*, p. 437 (1896), who thinks that the expression is an interpolation and compares β text in xvi. 9 ff., p. 436, *u. s.*) Αν. απηλθεν και εισ. εις την οικ.; so again Flor. has επεθηκε αυτῳ την χειρα εν τῳ ονομ. Ι. Χ. λεγων.

[2] παραχρημα om. ℵABCHP, Vulg., Boh., Syr. Pesh., Arm., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. ℵC[2] 40, Boh. read δε instead of τε.

[3] ενισχυσεν, so Tisch., Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; ενισχυθη BC*, so W.H., Wendt (probably). ὁ Σαυλος om. ℵABCE 13, 61, Vulg., many vers., so Tisch., W.H., R.V.; beginning, perhaps, of a Church lectionary. Flor. reads "dies autem plurimos et in civitate. D cum discentibus transegit," perhaps some influence of xvi. 12, xiv. 28, xxv. 14. Blass suspects Δαμασκῳ and brackets in β. Blass places St. Paul's visit to Arabia before this period, a visit which St. Luke omits.

refers the word with De Wette, Overbeck, to a revelation or to some directing counsel of Christ, *cf.* xiii. 2, xvi. 6, 9, xx. 20, so too Blass—*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 25-28. Either interpretation seems better than that of Weiss, who refers the γάρ back to πορεύου, as if Christ were assuring Ananias that Saul would not inflict suffering upon others, but *I* will show him how much *he* (αὐτόν, with emphasis) must suffer, etc., *cf.* also Bengel's comment.

Ver. 17. ἐπιθεὶς ἐπ' ἀ. τὰς χ.: not as bestowing the Holy Ghost (for see context), but as recovering from his blindness, *cf.* Mark xvi. 18. Σαούλ, see on ver. 4, perhaps too the word used by Jesus would reassure Saul.—ἀδελφέ: as a Christian brother, and not merely as a brother in nationality, ii. 29, xxii. 1, xxviii. 17—for the word see further, Kennedy, p. 95, and see on i. 15.—ὁ Κ. . . . Ἰησοῦς: the words must have further reassured Saul—the title by which he had himself addressed Jesus is more than justified.

Ver. 18. καὶ εὐθέως: as the immediate result of the laying on of hands the recovery of sight is given, but the baptism follows for the reception of the Holy Ghost, *cf.* xxii. 13 ff.—ἀπέπεσον . . . ὡσεὶ λ.: the words cannot be taken as merely figurative with Weiss or Zöckler, or with Blass as merely indicating the speediness of the cure—some scaly substance had formed over the eyes, probably as the result of the dazzling brightness which had struck upon them, *cf.* Tobit iii. 17, xi. 13, and ii. 10 (*cf.* vi. 8), λευκώματα = white films (see H. and R., *sub v.*, λεύκωμα). St. Chrysostom's comment is also to be noted: καὶ ἵνα μὴ νομίσῃ φαντασίαν τις εἶναι τὴν πήρωσιν, διὰ τοῦτο αἱ λεπίδες. Here, as elsewhere, we may see traces of St. Luke's accuracy as a physician. Both ἀποπίπτειν and λεπίς are used only by St. Luke in N.T. (λεπίς, although found six times in LXX, does not occur in the sense before us), and both words are found conjoined in medical writers, the former for the falling off of scales from the cuticle and particles from the diseased parts of the body or bones, etc., and λεπίς as the regular medical term for the particles or scaly substances thrown off from the body (see instances in Hobart, p. 39, and Felten, *in loco*), and *cf.* also Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., p. 436 (1899).—ἀναστὰς, see above on viii. 26; the word may here be taken literally (although not necessarily so), as of Saul rising from a sitting or reclining position (so Weiss).—ἐβαπτίσθη: no doubt by Ananias—there was no reception into the Church without this.—λαβὼν τροφὴν, see on ver. 9.—ἐνίσχυσεν: here used intransitively (1 Macc. vii. 25, 3 Macc. ii. 32), if we adopt reading of T.R. which is

Δαμασκῷ μαθητῶν ἡμέρας τινάς· 20.[1] καὶ εὐθέως ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ἐκήρυσσε τὸν Χριστόν,[2] ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. 21. ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες καὶ ἔλεγον, Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πορθήσας ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομα τοῦτο, καὶ ὧδε εἰς τοῦτο ἐληλύθει ἵνα δεδεμένους αὐτοὺς ἀγάγῃ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς; 22. Σαῦλος δὲ μᾶλλον ἐνεδυναμοῦτο, καὶ συνέχυνε[3] τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Δαμασκῷ, συμβιβάζων ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός.

[1] Flor., Par., Wern. read **και εισελθων εις τας συναγωγας των Ι.**, *cf.* xiii. 5, xiv. 1, xix. 8, so Hilg. The phrase "synagogue of the Jews" usually implies contrast between Jews and Gentiles, which is hardly the case here, but the writer might wish to emphasise the boldness of Saul: Flor., Iren. read **μετα πασης παρρησιας**, so Hilg. **ο Χριστος** after **εστι** 68, Flor., Iren[lat.] (Iren[gk.] after **Θεου**), retained by Blass and by Hilg., perhaps from ver. 22 (*cf.* John xx. 31).

[2] **Χριστον** HLP, Chrys.; **Ιησουν** ℵABCE 61, Iren., Vulg., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; Hilg. has **τον κυριον Ιησουν** with Flor.; **ουτος** in ver. 22 seems to demand a preceding **Ιησουν**.

[3] **συνεχυνε** AB³HLP, so Blass; **συνεχυννε** ℵB*C, Tisch., W.H., App., p. 172, and see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 111; Hilg. has **συνεχεεν**. **τους Ιουδ.**, but **τους** om. by ℵ*B, so W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. At end of verse Flor., Gig., Par. add **εις ον ευδοκησεν ο Θεος**—retained by Blass and Hilg.

retained by Weiss. We have the verb, in the N.T. peculiar to St. Luke, used in the transitive sense (*cf.* Luke xxii. 43 and 44, W. H., *App.*, 67, and Plummer, *in loco*), and in *this sense* its use outside the LXX is confined to Hippocrates and St. Luke, Hobart, p. 80 (*cf.* 2 Sam. xxii. 40, Ecclus. l. 4); but *cf. Psalms of Solomon*, xvi. 12. The reading here to which Wendt apparently inclines is **ἐνισχύθη** (see critical notes), as this would be in accordance with the transitive use of the verb in Luke xxii. 43, and other instances.

Ver. 19. **ἡμέρας τινάς**: used here apparently, as in x. 48, xvi. 12, xxiv. 24, etc., of a short period; see note on ver. 23, and *cf.* critical notes, Blass in β, and see ver. 23.

Ver. 20. **ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς**—publicly in the Jewish Assemblies: **οὐκ ᾐσχύνετο** (Chrys.).—**ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ**: only here in Acts. As the preaching was in the synagogue the term would be used in its Messianic sense (*cf.* John i. 49), according to the early Messianic interpretation of Psalm ii. 7; *cf.* xiii. 33 and St. Paul's reference to the Psalm in another address to Jews, in the Pisidian Antioch. For the use of the term as applied to the Messiah by the Jews see further *Book of Enoch*, cv., 2, and Dr. Charles' note.

Ver. 21. **πορθήσας**: same word used by St. Paul of himself in Gal. i. 13, 23; nowhere else in N.T., but see 4 Macc. iv. 23, xi. 4; used often in classical Greek. Blass draws attention to the coincidence between this passage and the use of the word in Gal., and adds: "ut a Paulo hoc ipsum verbum scriptorem accepisse dicas". Wendt (1899) dismisses the point of connection in the use of the word by the two authors Luke and Paul as accidental. He bases his objection, p. 35, upon the view that St. Paul's Epistles and Acts are independent of each other; but this would not prevent St. Luke from receiving the narrative of the events at Damascus from the lips of Paul himself.—**τοὺς ἐπικ.**, see above on ver. 14.—**ἐληλύθει**, pluperfect: "inest indicatio voluntatis mulctæ," Blass, *cf.* also Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 44, and Blass, *Gramm.*, p. 197. On the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrim and their commissions to their officers see iv. 5, and Lewin, *St. Paul*, i., 52 (smaller edition). For **ἵνα** followed by the conjunctive after a past tense in preference to the optative *cf.* v. 26, xxv. 26, in Winer-Moulton, xli. *b.* 1 *a.*

Ver. 22. **ἐνεδυναμοῦτο**: only used here by St. Luke, and elsewhere only by St. Paul (five or six times), and always of religious and spiritual strength; used also three times in the LXX; twice with reference to the power of the Spirit, Judg. vi. 34, 1 Chron. xii. 18; in Psalm li. 7, perhaps the simple verb **δυναμόω**.—**συνέχυνε**: "confounded," so A. and R.V., or rather, "continued to confound," imperfect active, *cf.* ii. 6, "were con-

23. ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦντο ἡμέραι ἱκαναί, συνεβουλεύσαντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν· 24. ἐγνώσθη δὲ τῷ Σαύλῳ ἡ ἐπιβουλὴ αὐτῶν. παρε-

founded," passive, see also xix. 32, xxi. 31 (critical notes above): from **συγχύννω** (**συγχύνω**), nowhere used except in Acts, as above (see Moulton and Geden). **συγχύννω**: not found in classical Greek nor in LXX, a later form of **συγχέω**, **συγχέω** T. W. H. (*cf.* **ἐκχύννομαι** from **ἐκχέω**, three times in Acts, also two or three times in Luke's Gospel; in Matthew twice, in Mark once, also Rom. v. 5, Jude ver. 11; not found in LXX, but see Theod., 2 Sam. xiv. 14); in Acts, xxi. 27. **συνέχεον** from **συγχέω** (but see *in loco*), Moulton and Geden. According to the best MS., Tisch., W.H., read the double **ν**, but elsewhere we have only one **ν**, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 132, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 41.—**συμβιβάζων**: only used by St. Luke and St. Paul, *cf.* xvi. 10, xix. 33, see especially for this last passage, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 16. In the LXX the word is used in the sense of teaching, instructing, Exod. iv. 12, 15, xviii. 16, Isa. xl. 13, etc., this usage is purely Biblical (in Attic Greek rather **προσβ.** in this sense): lit., (1) to bring together; (2) then like **συμβάλλω**, to put together, to compare, to examine closely; (3) so to deduce, to prove; thus here the word may well imply that Saul compared Messianic passages of the O.T. with the events of the life of Jesus of Nazareth, and hence deduced the proof that He was the Christ, *cf.* **παρατιθέμενος** in xvii. 3. So Theophylact explains **διδάσκων καὶ ἑρμηνεύων** out of the Scriptures which the Jews themselves knew.

Ver. 23. **ἡμέρας ἱκανάς**: whether the period thus described was meant to cover the definite period in Gal. i. 16, *i.e.*, as including St. Paul's visit to Arabia, it is difficult to decide. Lightfoot holds that **ἱκανός** in St. Luke's language is connected rather with largeness than with smallness, Luke vii. 12, Acts xx. 37, and that the Hebrew phrase ימים which St. Luke is copying admits of almost any extension of time (*Galatians*, p. 89, note). Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, v., 2, pointed out in the Hebrew of 1 Kings ii. 38, 39, an instance of the use of the phrase "many days" = a period of three years (so Lewin, Felten). It is therefore possible that St. Luke might employ an indefinite, vague expression, an expression which at all events is characteristic of him. On the other hand, Wendt (1899), whilst seeing here a longer period than in ver. 19, compares ver. 43, xviii. 18, xxvii. 7, and decides that the phrase cannot denote time measured by years (so Blass). A reason for St. Luke's indefiniteness may perhaps be that St. Paul's visit to Arabia was not within the scope and purpose of his narrative; or Belser, *Beiträge* (p. 55), and others may be right in maintaining that the visit may lie between vv. 22 and 23, and that, as such intervals are not wanting in Luke's Gospel, it is not strange that they should occur in Acts, but that it does not at all follow that the historian was unacquainted with St. Luke's Arabian journey, as Wendt maintains: "sed aliquid omittere non est idem atque illud negare" Knabenbauer, *in loco*. But if we take the expression, ver. 19, *certain* days to indicate the first visit to Damascus, and the expression, ver. 23, *many* days to indicate a second visit, the visit to Arabia, Gal. i. 19, may lie between these two (Knabenbauer), and if we accept the reading **Ἰησοῦν** in ver. 20, it may be that Saul first preached that Jesus was the Son of God, and then after his first retirement in Arabia he was prepared to *prove* on his return to Damascus that He was also *the Christ*, ver. 22 (see Mr. Barnard's article, *Expositor*, April, 1899).

Ver. 24. **ἐπιβουλή**: "plot"; N.T. only used in Acts; in three other passages, xx. 3, 19, xxiii. 30. It is used in the same sense in LXX, Esth. ii. 22 (for other instances of the word see H. and R.), and frequently in classical Greek.—**παρετήρουν**: if we follow R.V., see critical notes, we have the middle for the active, *cf.* Luke xiv. 1, vi. 7, Gal. iv. 10. There is no contradiction involved with 2 Cor. xi. 32. The ethnarch acted as the instrument of the Jews, at their instigation, or they acted by his permission, or possibly as the Jews were the actual originators of the persecution of Saul, St. Luke for brevity speaks of them as carrying it out, *cf.* ii. 23, xxviii. 27. See to this effect, Blass, Zöckler, Felten, Wendt.—**τε**: if we add **καὶ** R.V., see critical notes, the two words **τε καὶ** signify that they not only laid wait for him, but also watched the city gates day and night, to secure the success of their design; "and they watched the gates also," R.V. In 2 Cor. xi. 32, according to Paul's own statement, the ethnarch under Aretas the king guarded the walls to prevent his escape. But this seems

τήρουν[1] τε τὰς πύλας ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτός, ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀνέλωσιν· 25. λαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ[2] νυκτός, καθῆκαν διὰ τοῦ τείχους,

[1] **παρετηρουν** HLP, Chrys.; **παρετηρουντο** ℵABCEFa 61, Vulg., Or., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. Instead of **τε**, ℵABCEFa 61, Vulg., Or., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Hilg. read **δε και**—Alford supposes that **το** in **παρετηρουντο** became mistaken for **τε**, and then **δε και** was struck out, no other copula being wanted.

[2] **οι μαθηται**, after these words ℵABCFa 61, Vulg. (am. fu. demid. tol.), Or. read **αυτου**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler, Holtzmann; perhaps omitted because in vv. 19 and 26 **μαθηται** is used absolutely. **σπυριδι**—but in ℵC **σφυρ.**, so W.H. (but not Weiss, who follows AB, etc.), although with **σπ.** as alternative, App., pp. 155, 156, and Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 59, 60; see also Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 157, and *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 13.

strange, as Damascus was part of the Roman province of Syria. The difficulty is met by a large number of modern writers by the assumption that Caligula, whose reign began in 37 A.D., gave Damascus to Aretas, to whose predecessors it had belonged (Jos., *Ant.*, xiii., 5, 2). On the accession of Caligula a great change of policy occurred—Antipas, the old foe of Aretas, who was indignant with him for the divorce of his daughter, was shortly after deposed, and his kingdom was added to that of Herod Agrippa, who had already received from the emperor the tetrarchy of Philip and Lysanias (Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 6, 10). But this latter grant was one of the first acts of Caligula's reign, and there is nothing improbable in the supposition that the new ruler should also bestow some gift of territory on the great foe of the Herodian house, who apparently reigned until 40 A.D. Added to this there is the fact that we have no coins of Damascus with the imperial superscription from 34-62 A.D. In 62-63 the image of Nero begins, but there are no coins marked with that of Caligula or Claudius. The latter emperor died in 54 A.D., and in a few years Damascus must have passed again into Roman hands, if the above theory is correct. Certainly this theory is more feasible than that which supposes that Aretas had actually seized Damascus himself in 37 A.D., when upon the death of Tiberius (who had supported Antipas), Vitellius, the governor of Syria, had withdrawn his troops and the expedition which the emperor had despatched against Aretas. But whether this forcible taking possession of the city is placed before, during, or after the expedition of Vitellius, we should expect that it would have met with energetic punishment at the hands of the governor of Syria, but of this there is no mention or trace (P. Ewald). McGiffert, who favours an earlier chronology, and dates Paul's conversion in 31 or 32 A.D., contends that the flight from Damascus may have occurred as well in the year 35, *i.e.*, in the reign of Tiberius, as in 38, when no change had taken place in the status of Damascus; the city was subject to Rome, but Aretas may have had control over it, just as Herod had control over Jerusalem. There is at all events no ground for supposing that the term ethnarch denotes that Aretas was only head of the Arabian colony in Damascus (so O. Holtzmann, following Keim, Nösgen, etc.), or that he was only a chance visitor who exercised his authority to the detriment of Paul (Anger); any such suggestion utterly fails to account for the fact that he is represented as guarding Damascus. It has been suggested that the wife of Aretas may well have been a proselyte, but the fact that the Jews of Damascus were both numerous and powerful is quite sufficient to explain the attitude of the governor, Jos., *B. J.*, ii., 20, 2; vii., 8, 7. See "Aretas" in Hastings' B.D., and B.D.². McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 164, 165; G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, pp. 619, 620; O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 97; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 356, and div. ii., vol. i., p. 98, E.T.; *Real-Encyclopädie für protestant. Theol.* (Hauck), i., pp. 795-797, by P. Ewald. See further on the title **ἐθνάρχης** Schürer, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1899 (1), which he explains by the conditions of the Nabatean kingdom, in which *tribes* not *cities* were concerned—the head of such a tribe being actually so called in more than one inscription.

Ver. 25. **οἱ μαθηταὶ**—if we add **αὐτοῦ**, see critical notes, the words would apparently refer to Jews converted by Saul, so Chrysostom: "but his disciples" R.V. Alford, who reads **αὐτοῦ**, supposes that we have here an unusual government of

χαλάσαντες ἐν σπυρίδι. 26. Παραγενόμενος δὲ ὁ Σαῦλος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἐπειρᾶτο[1] κολλᾶσθαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς| καὶ πάντες ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτόν, μὴ πιστεύοντες ὅτι ἐστὶ μαθητής· 27. Βαρνάβας δὲ ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτόν, ἤγαγε πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδε τὸν Κύριον, καὶ ὅτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ, καὶ

[1] **επειρατο**—but ℵABC 61, 81 read **επειραζεν**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (against Meyer); latter verb much more common in N.T., but elsewhere is used in a different sense from this passage, and so **επειρατο** introduced. Hilg. has this latter verb here.

the genitive by **λαβόντες**, and compares Luke viii. 54 and classical instances, see *in loco*.—**διὰ τοῦ τείχους**: "through the wall," R.V., *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 33, where we read **διὰ θυρίδος . . . διὰ τοῦ τείχους**, perhaps a window in the external face of the wall opening into the house on the inside, rather than simply a window of a house overhanging the wall; *cf.* Josh. ii. 16, 1 Sam. xix. 12. Blass takes it of a window made "in ipso muro scil. ad tormenta mittenda," but there is no need for this explantion; see Hackett's note on his own observations at Damascus of two or three windows built in the wall as above.—**χαλάσαντες ἐν σπυρίδι**: "lowering him," R.V., not expressed in A.V.; on spelling of **σπυρ.** see critical note. In 2 Cor. xi. 33 Paul uses the word **σαργάνη**, a basket of wickerwork, **σπυρ.** a basket larger than the **κόφινος**, the small handbasket of the Jew, *Juv.*, iii., 14; vi., 541, probably a provision basket of considerable size, used as by the Paeonians for fishing, *Herod.*, v., 16. **σαργάνη** too is used of a fish basket by Timokles, **Ληθ.**, i., see further, "Basket," Hastings' B.D., and Plummer on Luke ix. 17. Neither word is met with in the LXX or Apocrypha. For the naturalness of the incident according to the present customs of the country see Hackett, *in loco*. The traditional spot of its occurrence is still shown, but we can only say of it as of the "house of Judas," see above on ver. ii. Wendt, p. 35 (1899), thinks that here we have a coincidence with the account in 2 Cor., which cannot be accounted for except by the acquaintance of the author of Acts with the Epistle.

Ver. 26. **παραγενόμενος**: on its frequency in St. Luke's Gospel and Acts see v. 21; apparently presupposes that Saul betook himself immediately to Jerusalem, so that the stay in Arabia cannot be inserted here (Weiss. *in loco*), a stay which Weiss holds was unknown to the author of Acts, see his note on ver. 19. **παραγ.** is found four times in Acts with **εἰς**, c. *acc. loci*, elsewhere only in Matt. ii. 1 (*cf.* John viii. 2).—**ἐπειρᾶτο**: the verb **πειράομαι** only found once in N.T., *viz.*, xxvi. 21, and the true reading here is **ἐπείραζε**, which is used in a similar sense in xvi. 7, xxiv. 6, only in the active in this sense = Attic **πειρῶμαι**, according to Blass, *in loco*, and *Gram.*, 56, 221; "he assayed," R.V. = to essay, attempt, try, Deut. iv. 34, 2 Macc. ii. 23.—**κολλᾶσθαι**, *cf.* v. 13, x. 28, and also Matt. xix. 5, Luke xv. 5, 1 Cor. vi. 16—evidently means that he sought to join himself to them intimately.—**καὶ πάντες ἐφοβ. αὐτόν**—**καὶ** "and," R.V., not "but," A.V.; it is not adversative, but simply introduces the unfavourable result of Saul's endeavour. This does not necessarily require that the conversion should have been recent, as Weiss maintains. If three years had elapsed, Gal. i. 16, during a portion of which at all events Saul had been in retirement, the Christians in Jerusalem might very naturally still feel apprehensive when their former persecutor was thus for the first time since his conversion actually present amongst them, and the memory of his former fierce hatred could not have been effaced. If it seems unlikely that this should have been their attitude had they known of Saul's profession of faith at Damascus, there are critics who would have expressed great surprise if the Apostle had been received with open arms, and without any credentials: "credo si contrarium exstaret, hoc rursus mirarentur" (Blass).

Ver. 27. **Βαρνάβας**, *cf.* iv. 36. Saul and Barnabas may have been previously acquainted, see J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, and note on iv. 36. St. Chrysostom, *Hom.*, xxi. (so Theophylact and Oecumenius), sees here a proof of the kindly

πῶς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐπαῤῥησιάσατο ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 28. καὶ ἦν μετ' αὐτῶν εἰσπορευόμενος καὶ ἐκπορευόμενος ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· καὶ παῤῥησιαζόμενος[1] ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, 29. ἐλάλει τε

[1] **εν Ι. και π.**—but **εις Ι. παρρησ.** ℵABCELP 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; **εις** perhaps not understood. Blass takes **εις** = **εν** *ut alias*.

nature of Barnabas, so truly called "Son of Consolation". For an appreciative notice of the goodness and generosity of Barnabas, from a very different standpoint, see Renan, *Apostles*, p. 191 E.T.—**ἐπιλ.**, *cf.* xxiii. 19; so as to disarm fear: on the force of this characteristic word of St. Luke see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 245, Friedrich, p. 27, and below xvii. 19; generally constructed with genitive, but here **αὐτὸν** is probably governed by **ἤγαγε**; *cf.* xvi. 19, and xviii. 17, where also the accusative is found in cases of a finite transitive verb following the participle, **ἐπιλ.** Blass, *Gram.*, p. 100, note 2, refers **αὐτόν** to **ἤγαγε**, and understands **αὐτοῦ** with **ἐπιλ.**—**πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους**, *cf.* Gal. i. 19; there is no contradiction, although St. Paul's own narrative confines Saul's introduction to Peter and James: "though most of the Apostles were absent, yet the two real leaders were present" (Ramsay), and this was the point which St. Luke would emphasise. Wendt (1899) rejects the narrative of Acts as indistinct when compared with Gal. i., but see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 91, and Drummond, *Galatians*, p. 67; see below on ver. 30 also.—**διηγήσατο**, *exposuit*, *i.e.*, Barnabas (but Beza and Meyer make Saul the subject, although unlikely from construction and context); verb twice in Luke's Gospel, viii. 39, ix. 10, and three times in Acts, viii. 33 (quotation), xii. 17; *cf.* Heb. xi. 32, and Mark v. 16, ix. 9; and nowhere else in N.T.; frequent in LXX to recount, narrate, declare, *cf.* 1 Macc. v. 25, viii. 2, x. 15, xi. 5, and several times in Ecclesiasticus. Similarly used in classical Greek; Grimm compares figurative use of German *durchführen.*—**πῶς εἶδε Κ.**: while it is not said in any part of the three accounts of the Conversion that Saul *saw* Jesus, it is distinctly asserted here in a statement which Barnabas may well have received from Saul himself, and also in the two expressions of Ananias, *cf.* ver. 17, xxii. 14; *cf.* also the Apostle's own words, 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8.—**ἐπαῤῥησιάσατο**, *cf.* the verb with the expression **μετὰ παρρησίας λαλεῖν**, see above on iv. 13, and of the preaching of the other Apostles and of the Church, *cf.* xxviii. 31 (of Paul). Verb only used by Luke and Paul, and always of speaking boldly the truths of the Gospel; so seven times in Acts, and also in 1 Thess. ii. 2, Ephes. vi. 20.

Ver. 28. **ἦν . . . εἰσπ.**: for characteristic construction see i. 10, etc. **εἰς καὶ ἐκπ.**, *cf.* i. 21. Hebraistic formula to express the daily confidential intercourse with the Apostles; *cf.* 1 Sam. xviii. 13, 2 Chron. xxiii. 7 (1 Macc. xiii. 49, xv. 14, 25, for somewhat similar expressions, but see H. and R.).—**ἐν**: if we read **εἰς**, see critical note. Weiss connects closely with **ἐκπ.** and takes it to signify that Saul was not only associated with the Apostles privately, but openly in the town, so Wendt and Holtzmann, *privatim* and *publice*. Page connects **ἦν εἰς** together, and thinks **εἰς** probably due to the intervention of the verbs expressing motion. Zöckler compares xxvi. 20, and takes **εἰς** as referring to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood (but see critical notes).

Ver. 29. **συνεζήτει**, *cf.* vi. 9.—**πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλην.**, of whom Saul himself was one; see critical notes. Saul's visit was a short one (Gal. i. 18), and although we must not limit his opportunities of disputation to the two Sabbaths with Blass (note the two imperfects), yet it is evident that the Hellenists were at once enraged against the deserter from their ranks. There is no contradiction with xxii. 17, as Zeller and Overbeck maintained—it is rather a mark of truth that Luke gives the outward impulse, and Paul the inner ground (Hackett, Lightfoot, Lumby); but see on the other hand Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 62, against the identification of xxii. 17 with Paul's first visit; according to Ramsay, xxii. 17, 18 refer to the close of the Apostle's second visit. Wendt (1899) still identifies xxii. 18 with the passage before us, ix. 29; in seventh edition he speaks more fully of the fulfilment of the negative prophecy in xxii. 18, by the positive fact here narrated.—**ἐπεχείρουν**: only used by St. Luke; St. Luke i. 1, Acts xix. 13; it is used in same sense in

καὶ συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστάς[1]· οἱ δὲ ἐπεχείρουν αὐτὸν ἀνελεῖν. 30. ἐπιγνόντες δὲ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Καισάρειαν, καὶ

[1] Ελληνιστας ℵABCEHLP; but A has Ελληνας, and Vulg. (not am. demid.) has "loquebatur quoque gentibus et disputabat cum Græcis," see Felten's note, *in loco.*

classical Greek; and it also occurs in Esther ix. 25, 1 Esd. i. 28, 2 Macc. ii. 29, vii. 19, ix. 2, etc., and 3 Macc. vii. 5, where it occurs as here with **ἀνελεῖν** (see also below), and for other instances *cf.* Hatch and Redpath. The word was frequently employed in medical language, sometimes in its literal sense "to apply the hand to," but generally as in N.T. Both Hippocrates and Galen use the verb as St. Luke does, with **γράφειν**—**ἐπειχείρησαν γράφειν.** Hobart, pp. 87 and 210, points out that Galen also employs the verb with **ἀνελεῖν,** as here. It is true that the word is also used in the same sense by Josephus, *c. Apion*, ii., with **συγγράφειν,** but the medical use of the term is so striking in Hippocrates that its use here is noted by J. Weiss, *Evangelium des Lukas*, p. i., as a probable reminiscence by the writer, and still more positively so by Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., p. 384 (1899).

Ver. 30. **ἐπιγνόντες**: the preposition may signify here as elsewhere accurate and certain knowledge or information—a favourite word with St. Luke, in the Gospel seven times, in Acts thirteen times; it was also a favourite word with St. Paul, *cf.*, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, 2 Cor. vi. 9; frequent in LXX, or it may simply mean to find out, to ascertain (Grimm); see Blass *in loco* on its force in LXX. 5.—**οἱ ἀδελφοὶ**: the expression seems expressly used to imply that the disciples at Jerusalem recognised Saul as a brother. Wendt (1899) rejects all the narrative in Acts as unhistorical, and compares with the statement here Gal. i. 22; but there mention is only made of the "Churches of Judæa," whilst the inference that Paul could scarcely fail to have been known to the members of the Church in Jerusalem seems quite justifiable, Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 86.—**κατήγαγον,** *i.e.*, brought him down to the sea coast, *ad mare deduxerunt*, word used only by Luke and Paul; but by St. Luke only as a nautical expression, *cf.* xxvii. 3, xxviii. 12 (xxi. 3), and Luke v. 11; so in classical writers.—**εἰς** K. as in viii. 40 (not Cæsarea Philippi which is always so called); if he found Philip there (xxi. 8), the friend and the accuser of the proto-martyr would meet face to face as brethren (Plumptre).—**ἐξαπέστειλαν**: the word might mean by sea or by land, but the former is supported amongst recent commentators by Blass, so too Page (*cf.* Lightfoot on Gal. i. 21, p. 85), Knabenbauer, p. 174. But if so, there is no contradiction with Gal. i. 21, where Paul speaks of coming into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, as if he went to the latter through the former. The expressions in *Galatians* have sometimes been explained on the supposition that the two countries, Syria and Cilicia, are named there as elsewhere in that order, Acts xv. 23, 41, as a kind of general geographical expression (Felten), the most important country being mentioned first, so Lightfoot, Nösgen, Conybeare and Howson; or that as Paul would remain at Syrian ports on the way to Cilicia, he might fairly speak as he does, or that he went first to Tarsus, and thence made missionary excursions into Syria. If neither of these or similar explanations are satisfactory, we can scarcely conclude with Blass that Gal. i. 21 is accounted for "inverso per incuriam ordine". Ramsay has lately argued with much force that here as elsewhere Paul thinks and speaks of the Roman divisions of the empire (*cf.* Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, i., p. 124 (1897)), and that here the two great divisions, Syria and Cilicia, of the Roman province are spoken of; and he accordingly reads, with the original text of ℵ, **τὰ κλίματα τῆς Σ. καὶ Κ.,** the article used once, and thus embracing the two parts of the one province (sometimes three parts are enumerated, Phœnicia being distinguished from Syria). There is apparently no example of the expression *Prov. Syria et Cilicia*, but Ramsay points to the analogy of Bithynia-Pontus; see *Expositor*, p. 29 ff., 1898, and "Cilicia" and "Bithynia" (Ramsay) in Hastings' B.D. Ramsay therefore concludes that Gal. i. 21 simply implies that Paul spent the following period of his life in various parts of the province Syria-Cilicia.—**Ταρσόν,** see above, ver. 11; on the years of quiet work at Tarsus and in its neighbourhood, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 46, 47, and below on xi. 25.

ἐξαπέστειλαν αὐτὸν εἰς Ταρσόν. 31. Αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι[1] καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας[2] καὶ Σαμαρείας εἶχον εἰρήνην, οἰκοδομούμεναι καὶ πορευόμεναι τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τῇ παρακλήσει τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐπληθύνοντο.

[1] **αι εκκλησιαι**; but sing. **η εκκλη.** ℵABC, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.; see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 128.

[2] **και Γαλιλαιας,** Blass brackets in **β** because om. by Chrys., Cassiod., perhaps because nothing has been said of the Church in Galilee, but it obviously must have existed there, though never actually mentioned in Acts (see Plumptre's note, *in loco*), see also below.

Ver. 31. **αἱ ἐκκλησίαι**—if we read the singular **ἡ ἐκκλ.** with the great MS. the word shows us that the Church, though manifestly assuming a wider range, is still one: Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 55, thinks that here the term in the singular corresponds by the three modern representative districts named, *viz.*, Judæa, Galilee, Samaria, to the ancient Ecclesia, which had its home in the whole land of Israel; but however this may be, the term is used here markedly of the unified Church, and in accordance with St. Paul's own later usage of the word; see especially Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 126, 127, and also p. 124.—**καθ' ὅλης**: the genitive in this sense is peculiar to St. Luke, and always with the adjective **ὅλος**; Luke iv. 14, xxiii. 5, Acts ix. 42, x. 37, the phrase, although not the best classically, seeming to "sound right," because **καθόλου**, only in Acts iv. 18 in N.T., had come into common use since Aristotle (Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 148; Vogel, p. 45).—**οὖν** connects with the preceding narrative; so Bengel, Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Zöckler; the Church had rest because the persecutors had become converted; but see also Rendall, Appendix, on **μὲν οὖν**, p. 164, and Hackett, Felten. —**οἰκοδομούμεναι**: "being edified," R.V. (see critical notes) (not "and were edified," A.V.)—as an accompaniment of the peace from persecutors. The term may refer primarily to the organisation of the Church as a visible institution, but would also indicate the spiritual edification which is so often expressed by the word in St. Paul's Epistles, where both the verb and its cognate noun are so frequent; *cf.* xx. 32, and note. The fact that the verb is employed only once in the Gospels, Matt. xvi. 18, of the Church, as here in a non-literal sense, as compared with its constant use by St. Paul as above, is a striking indication of the early date of the Synoptic Gospels or their source (see Page, *in loco*). For the metaphorical use of the word in the O.T. of good fortune and prosperity, *cf.* LXX, Ps. xxvii. (xxviii.) 5, Jer. xii. 16, xl. (xxxiii.) 7, xxxviii. (xxxi.) 4, xlix. (xlii.) 10. (Hilgenfeld refers the whole section ix. 32-42 to the same source A from which his "author to Theophilus" derived the founding, and the first incidents in the history, of the early Church, i. 15-iv. 42, although the "author to Theophilus" may have added the words **καὶ τῇ παρακ. . . . ἐπληθύνοντο.** But if we desire a good illustration of the labyrinth (as Hilgenfeld calls it) through which we have to tread, if we would see our way to any coherent meaning in ix. 31-xii. 25, it is sufficient to note the analysis of the sources of the modern critics given us by Hilgenfeld himself, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, pp. 481, 482; 1895.)—**οἰκοδ.**: may refer to the inward spiritual growth, **ἐπληθ.** to the outward growth in numbers; a growth attributed not to human agency but to the power of the Holy Ghost. **παράκλησις** only here in Acts of the Holy Ghost. Hort renders "and walking by the fear of the Lord and by the invocation [**παρακ.**] of the Holy Spirit [probably invoking His guidance as Paraclete to the Ecclesia] was multiplied" (*Ecclesia*, p. 55), and it is not strange that the working of the **Παράκλητος** should be so described; while others connect the word with the divine counsel or exhortation of the prophets in opening hearts and minds; others again attach **παρακ.** to **ἐπληθ.** as expressing increase of spiritual strength and comfort (see Blass, Rendall, Felten, and *cf.* Col. i. 11, 1 Pet. i. 2). On the verb and its frequency in Acts see p. 73.

Vv. 32-35. *Healing of Aeneas.*—Ver. 32. **ἐγένετο δὲ Π. διερχ.**: on the formula and its frequency in Luke see Friedrich, p. 13, and above on p. 124. We have here a note of what may fairly be

32. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ Πέτρον διερχόμενον διὰ πάντων,[1] κατελθεῖν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἁγίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Λύδδαν. 33. εὗρε δὲ ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπόν τινα Αἰνέαν ὀνόματι, ἐξ ἐτῶν ὀκτὼ κατακείμενον ἐπὶ

[1] **δια παντων**, instead of this Par. and Wern. read "per omnes civitates et regiones," accepted by Blass; no doubt to explain **δια παντων**, which is difficult, see below.

taken as a specimen of many similar missionary journeys, or rather journeys of progress and inspection, mentioned here perhaps more in detail because of the development which followed upon it, *cf.* with chap. x. New congregations had been formed, and just as Peter and John had gone down to Samaria to the Christians converted by Philip, so it became necessary that the congregations which had grown up in many towns (viii. 14, 25, 40) should be visited and kept in touch with the centre at Jerusalem (see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 41, 42; Felten and Plumptre, *in loco*).—**διερχ. διὰ πάντων**, see note on xiii. 6, and for the construction Luke ix. 6, xi. 24.—**κατελθεῖν**, *i.e.*, probably from Jerusalem, *cf.* viii. 5, Luke iv. 31 *devenire*, *cf.* Plummer's note on Luke iv. 31. On the frequent use of **διέρχομαι** and **κατέρχομαι** in Luke, see Friedrich, p. 7.—**διὰ πάντων**, *sc.*, **ἁγίων**, so Meyer-Wendt, Weiss, Bengel, Alford, Hackett, De Wette, Holtzmann; *cf.* for similar construction 2 Cor. i. 16, and *cf.* Acts xx. 25, Rom. xv. 28, or it may mean "through all parts," R.V., so Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 58 (see critical notes). Hort seems to take it of the whole land (*Ecclesia*, p. 56).—**ἁγίους**, see on ver. 13.—**Λύδδαν**, Hebrew לד, Lod, perpetuated in the modern Ludd; on the word see critical notes, *cf.* 1 Chron. viii. 2, Ezra ii. 23, Neh. vii. 37, xi. 35, 1 Macc. xi. 34; "a village not less than a city" Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 6, 2; three hours from Joppa in the plain of Sharon: its frontier position often involved it in battle, and rendered it a subject of treaty between Jews and Syrians, and Jews and Romans. At this period not only Jerusalem but Joppa and Lydda were centres of Jewish national feeling, and were singled out by Cestius Gallus as the centres of the national revolt. On its importance as a place of refuge and a seat of learning after the destruction of Jerusalem, see Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 5, p. 721; Edersheim, *History of the Jewish People*, pp. 155, 215, 479, 512, and also *Jewish Social Life*, pp. 75-78; G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 141, 160 (and his interesting remarks on the connection of St. George of England with Lydda); Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 159, E.T. As the place lay on the route from Azotus to Cæsarea the planting or at any rate the strengthening of its Christianity may be referred to Philip the Evangelist, viii. 40. But on the other hand the close proximity to Jerusalem, within an easy day's journey, may induce us to believe that Lydda had its congregation of "saints" almost from the first, Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 75. On the curious Talmudical notices with reference to our Lord and the Virgin Mother, *e.g.*, that He was condemned at Lydda, see Edersheim, *u. s.*, p. 76. Such passages perhaps indicate a close connection between Lydda and the founding of Christianity.

Ver. 33. **Αἰνέαν**: the name in this form is found in Thuc., Xen., Pindar. and is not to be identified with that of the Trojan **Αἰνείας**, although in a fragment of Sophocles we have for the sake of the verse **Αἰνέας** instead of **Αἰνείας**; see Wendt, seventh edition, and Wetstein, *in loco*. The name is also used of a Jew, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 10, 22. Probably a Hellenistic Jew; but although he is not expressly named a disciple (as in the case of Tabitha), yet as Peter visited him, and he knew the name of Jesus Christ, he may have become a Christian (so Blass); the fact that Peter went to the "saints" may imply this; but see Alford's note, and so too Hilgenfeld.—**ἐξ ἐτῶν ὀκτώ**: characteristic of Luke as a medical man; in the cases of disease which he alone mentions, St. Luke frequently gives their duration, *e.g.*, xiii. 11, Acts iii. 2, iv. 22, xiv. 8, see Hobart, p. 40, Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., p. 427.—**κραββάτῳ**, see above on v. 15, and spelling.—**παραλελυμένος**, see above on viii. 7, and *cf.* also Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., p. 436 (1899).

Ver. 34. **ἰᾶταί σε Ἰ.**: perhaps a *paronomasia*, iv. 30 (see Page, *in loco*); present tense, indicating that the healing was immediately effected, Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 9; Blass, *Gram.*, p. 183; verb much more frequent in St. Luke than in the other N.T. writers; in Gospel eleven times, in Acts three times,

κραββάτῳ, ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος. 34. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος, Αἰνέα, ἰᾶταί σε Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός· ἀνάστηθι καὶ στρῶσον σεαυτῷ. καὶ εὐθέως ἀνέστη· 35. καὶ εἶδον αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες Λύδδαν καὶ τὸν Σάρωνα,[1] οἵτινες ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον.

36. Ἐν Ἰόππῃ δέ τις ἦν μαθήτρια ὀνόματι Ταβιθά,[2] ἣ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς· αὕτη ἦν πλήρης ἀγαθῶν ἔργων καὶ ἐλεημοσυνῶν

[1] **Λυδδαν**: but in ℵAB, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, **Λυδδα**; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 93, Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 25, 31 (so for ver. 25). **Σαρωνα** ℵABCE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilg., but with varying accent; Blass, *Gram.*, p. 31. ℵ has **Σαρρωνα**.

[2] **Ταβιθα**; but BC **Ταβειθα**, so W.H., Weiss, but in W.H., alt., see App., p. 162.

and one quotation; in St. Matthew three times, and same quotation; in St. John twice, and same quotation; in St. Mark only once; in Epistles three times, but perhaps only figuratively; so in Deut. xxx. 3, of the diseases of the soul. The term is used by St. Luke in a passage where a similar statement is made by St. Matthew and St. Mark, in which they employ another verb, less precise, **σώζειν, διασώζειν**, and not so strictly medical, *cf.* Matt. xiv. 36, Mark vi. 56, Luke vi. 19, Hobart, p. 9. **ἴασις**: the cognate noun, only in St. Luke, Luke xiii. 32, Acts iv. 32, and see further also Hobart, pp. 23, 24. Both noun and verb are also frequent in LXX, and *cf.* Plummer on Luke v. 19, who points out that **ἰᾶσθαι** in its active significance is peculiar to St. Luke, except in the quotations from LXX (Matt. xiii. 15, John xii. 40, both figurative), and in John iv. 47.—**στρῶσον σεαυτῷ**, *cf.* xxii. 12, where, as here, the context must be supplied. The aorist denotes performance without delay—now and at once make thy bed for thyself—an act which hitherto others have done for thee.—**καὶ εὐθ. ἀνέστη** corresponds to **ἀνάστηθι** and indicates the completeness of the healing.

Ver. 35. **τὸν Σάρωνα,** on accentuation see critical notes: "at Lydda and in Sharon," R.V. *In* Sharon, because it was not a town as Lydda, but rather a level tract, the maritime plain between Carmel and Joppa, so called in Hebrew (with article), meaning "the Level"; in Greek, the Forest, **δρυμός**, LXX, because it was once covered by a great oak forest; full of quiet but rich beauty; *cf.* 1 Chron. xxvii. 29, Isa. xxxiii. 9, xxxv. 2, xxxvii. 24, lxv. 10, celebrated for its pasturage, Cant. ii. 1. "The masculine article doth show that it is not named of a city, and so doth the LXX article in Isa. 33, 9," J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* There is no ground for supposing that it meant a village in the neighbourhood, as no place bearing the name Saron can be satisfactorily cited, but *cf.* Nösgen, *in loco;* see G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land*, pp. 52, 147, 148; Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 74; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 6, p. 897.—**πάντες**: the expression may be taken to mean that a general conversion of the inhabitants followed. Rendall renders "and all that dwelt, etc., who had turned to the Lord, saw Him," *i.e.*, attested the reality of the miracle, *Acts*, pp. 72 and 232. But it might fairly be urged that many would see the man besides those who had become Christians. It helps us to understand the passage if we remember with Nösgen (so Bengel) that the expression **ἐπὶ τὸν Κ.** applies not to God the Father, but to Jesus Christ, so that we learn that a conversion of the Jewish population at Lydda to the claims of Jesus as the Messiah was the result of the miracle (see also Hackett's useful note). On the use of **οἵτινες** see Alford's note on vii. 53, quoted by Page (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 235). For the phrase **ἐπισ. ἐπὶ τὸν Κ.** *cf.* xiv. 15.

Vv. 36-43. *Tabitha raised from the dead.*—Ver. 36. **Ἰόππῃ,** on the spelling, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56; and below on ver. 43.—**μαθήτρια**: only here in N.T.: the word occurs in the Apocryphal *Gospel of Peter:* Mary Magdalene is described as **μ. τοῦ Κυρίου**: it is also used by Diod., ii., 52; Diog. Laert., iv., 2; viii., 2. The form **μαθητρίς** is found in Philo.—**Ταβιθά**, see critical notes. טְבִיתָא, Aramaic, = צְבִי, Hebrew: (1) splendour, beauty; (2) Greek **Δορκάς**, specially prized by

ὧν ἐποίει· 37. ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἀσθενήσασαν αὐτὴν ἀποθανεῖν· λούσαντες δὲ αὐτὴν ἔθηκαν ἐν ὑπερῴῳ. 38. ἐγγὺς δὲ οὔσης Λύδδης[1] τῇ Ἰόππῃ, οἱ μαθηταὶ ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Πέτρος ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ, ἀπέστειλαν δύο ἄνδρας πρὸς αὐτόν, παρακαλοῦντες μὴ ὀκνῆσαι[2] διελθεῖν ἕως αὐτῶν. 39. ἀναστὰς δὲ Πέτρος συνῆλθεν αὐτοῖς· ὃν παραγενόμενον ἀνήγαγον εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον, καὶ παρέστησαν αὐτῷ πᾶσαι αἱ χῆραι κλαίουσαι καὶ ἐπιδεικνύμεναι χιτῶνας καὶ

[1] **Λυδδης**; but Tisch., Blass, W.H. **-ας**, see on ver. 35, and W.H., App., p. 163.

[2] **δυο ανδρας** ℵABCE; om. HLP, Chrys. **οκνησαι**; but **οκνησῃς** ℵABC[1]E 40, 61, 81, Vulg., Sah., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

the Orientals for its elegance, Cant. ii. 9,—so called from the large bright eyes of the animal (**δέρκομαι**). The name was found as a feminine name amongst both Greek and Jews, see instances in Wetstein (*e.g.*, Jos., *B. J.*, iv., 3, 5), Plumptre, Wendt, seventh edition, *sub v.*, and more recently Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 17. This Greek equivalent (found several times in LXX) may not have been actually borne by Tabitha as a name, for St. Luke may only mean to interpret the Aramaic word for his Gentile readers; but she may have been known by both names. Like Æneas, she may have been an Hellenist. There is nothing to indicate that she should be called a deaconess, nor can we tell from the narrative what was the state of this true Sister of Charity, whether she was a widow, whether married or unmarried (Weiss); see further, "Dorcas," Hastings' B.D., and Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 78. On the phrase here see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 232.—**ἐλεημοσυνῶν** in singular, iii. 2; in plural x. 2, as here; "species post genus ut, 41," Blass, but by the former term also **ἀγαθ. ἔργων** works of charity may be more especially intended; see Weber, *Jüdische Theol.*, p. 284 (1897); *cf.* Ecclus. xx. 16, **τὰ ἀγαθά μου** (and xviii. 15; Tobit xii. 13); "Dorcas" and "Almsgiving," Hastings' B.D.—**ὧν**, see on i. 1.

Ver. 37. **ἐγέν. δὲ**: on the frequency of the formula in Luke see above p. 124, and Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 45, on the use of **ἐγένετο**. — **ἀσθενήσασαν**: aorist, marking the time when she fell sick (Weiss).—**λούσαντες**: after the manner of the Jews as well as of the Greeks, *cf.* instances in Wetstein and Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 2, 162, "Beerdigung". Outside Jerusalem three days might elapse between the death and burial, but in Jerusalem no corpse lay over night, see Hamburger, *u. s.*, p. 161; in the case of Ananias and Sapphira we may note the accuracy of this distinction.—**ἔθηκαν**: burial did not take place until the danger of an apparent death was considered past; in uncertain cases a delay as above might be allowed, or for other special reasons, and children were forbidden to hasten the burial of their parents, Hamburger, *u. s.*, p. 161; and further for burial and mourning customs, Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 168, and *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 311.—**ἐν ὑπερῴῳ**: the body was usually laid in an upper chamber when burial was delayed; see Hackett's note and also on ver. 39, and Alford on the article.

Ver. 38. **Λύδδης**, on the form see above on ver. 35; nine miles from Joppa. —**παρακαλοῦντες**; the only passage in which the *oratio recta* follows if we read **μὴ ὀκνήσῃς**, see critical notes; this also best represents the urgency of the message (*cf.* John xi. 3), as in R.V.—**μὴ ὀκν.**: "fides non tollit civilitatem verborum," Bengel. Verb only here in N.T., *cf.* LXX, Num. xxii. 16, of Balak to Balaam, a phrase almost identically similar.—**διελθεῖν**, *cf.* Luke ii. 15, and ver. 32 above, and below xi. 19. Like other compounds of **ἔρχομαι** very frequent in Luke, as compared with other writers (Friedrich, p. 7).—**ἕως αὐτῶν**: use of **ἕως** locally, common in St. Luke (Friedrich, p. 20); **ἕως** with genitive of the person as here, *cf.* Luke iv. 42, 1 Macc. iii. 26; not so used in classical writers (Plummer).

Ver. 39. It is not said that they sent for St. Peter to work a miracle, but his near presence at Lydda would naturally make them turn to him in a time of sorrow.

ἱμάτια[1] ὅσα ἐποίει μετ' αὐτῶν οὖσα ἡ Δορκάς. 40. ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας ὁ Πέτρος, θεὶς τὰ γόνατα προσηύξατο· καὶ ἐπιστρέψας πρὸς τὸ σῶμα, εἶπε, Ταβιθά,[2] ἀνάστηθι. ἡ δὲ ἤνοιξε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

[1] After **ιματια** Par., Ps.-Aug. add **διηγουντο αυτῳ**, accepted by Blass. Belser supports, pp. 58, 59, as being clearer, and showing that the widows not only pointed to the garments with them in proof of the charity of Dorcas, but also showed how much good work she had down besides.

[2] After **αναστηθι** Syr. Harcl., Sah., Gig., Par., Cypr., Ps.-Aug., Cassiod. add "in nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi". Cypr. and Cassiod. omit "domini nostri". Blass accepts this latter form, Hilg. the former. Belser, *u. s.*, thinks that the words might easily be omitted on revision by an author who was not afraid of any obscurity arising after ver. 34

—**παραγενόμενον**: a characteristic Lucan expression (Weiss), see above v. 21.—**τὸ ὑπερ.**: here the article would naturally be used on referring to the chamber, *cf.* ver. 37, in which the body lay.—**αἱ χῆραι**: they may have been the poor of the Church, vi. 1, whom Dorcas had befriended, or those who had been associated with her in good works (see also Plumptre's suggestive note). In connection with St. Luke's marked sympathy with women, we may note that the word **χήρα** is used by him no less than nine times in his Gospel, three in Acts.—**κλαίουσαι**, *cf.* Luke vii. 13, viii. 52, Hamburger, *u. s.* (ver. 37).—**ἐπιδεικ.**: only here in middle voice, perhaps as pointing to the garments which they were themselves wearing (so Blass, Wendt, Felten, Grimm-Thayer), which Dorcas had given them.—**χιτῶνας**: "coats," close-fitting undergarments; the word was used in classical Greek of men and women, more perhaps like a dressing-gown or cassock; "Coat," "Dress," Hastings' B.D.—**ἱμάτια**, the long flowing outer robes.—**ὅσα**: "all which," *i.e.*, so many (Blass, Page, Hackett, Knabenbauer); see reading in **β** (Blass), critical notes.—**ἐποίει**: imperfect as denoting her customary mode of action.

Ver. 40. **ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας**: nothing could be more natural than this action of St. Peter as a reminiscence of his Master's action, when He was about to perform a similar miracle, *cf.* Matt. ix. 25, Mark v. 40 (*cf.* 2 Kings iv. 33, and vv. 4, 5 in same chapter), but in Luke viii. 54 it is noteworthy that the similar words are omitted by W.H. and the revisers, see above. In St. Matthew the multitude **ὁ ὄχλος** is put out, but in St. Mark (and St. Luke), whilst all are described as put out (the same verb), Peter, James and John, with the parents, are allowed to be present at the miracle. Weiss points out the reminiscence of Mark v. 40, but this we might expect if St. Mark's Gospel comes to us through St. Peter. St. Chrysostom marks the action of St. Peter as showing how entirely free he was from any attempt at display.—**θεὶς τὰ γόνατα**, see note on vii. 60, "hoc Dominus ipse non fecerat" Blass. St. Peter had been present on each of the three occasions recorded in the Gospels when his Master had raised the dead, but he does not venture at once to speak the word of power, but like Elijah or Elisha kneels down in prayer (see Rendall's note).—**Τ. ἀνάστηθι**, *cf.* Mark v. 41. Here again we note the close agreement with St. Mark's narrative—the words to the damsel are not given at all by St. Matthew ix. 25, and by St. Luke in Greek, viii. 54, not in Aramaic as by Mark. On the absurdity of identifying the **Ταβιθά** here with the **Ταλιθά** of Mark v. 41 see Nösgen and Zöckler, *in loco*. It may suffice to note with Lumby that in each case an interpretation of the word used is given.—**ἀνεκάθισε**: not found in LXX, and used only by St. Luke in this passage and in his Gospel, vii. 15 (but B has **ἐκάθισεν**, which W.H. reads only in margin), in both cases of a person restored to life and sitting up. In this *intransitive* sense it is almost entirely confined to medical writers, to describe patients sitting up in bed. It occurs in Plato, *Phædo*, 60 B, but in the middle voice, and with the words **ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην** expressed: in Xen., *Cyr.*, v., 7, it is also used, but in a different sense (to sit down again), *cf.* Hobart, pp. 11, 40, 41, who also notices that the circumstantial details of the gradual recovery of Tabitha are quite in the style of medical description. **τὸ σῶμα**, Luke xvii. 37, the word is quite

αὐτῆς· καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὸν Πέτρον, ἀνεκάθισε. 41. δοὺς δὲ αὐτῇ χεῖρα, ἀνέστησεν αὐτήν· φωνήσας δὲ τοὺς ἁγίους καὶ τὰς χήρας, παρέστησεν αὐτὴν ζῶσαν. 42. γνωστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο καθ᾽ ὅλης τῆς Ἰόππης,[1] 43. καὶ πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον· ἐγένετο δὲ ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς μεῖναι αὐτὸν[2] ἐν Ἰόππῃ παρά τινι Σίμωνι βυρσεῖ.

[1] **της Ιοππης**, on spelling see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56. Art. om. by W.H. after BC[1], but retained here by Weiss.

[2] **αυτον** om. ℵ[1]B, so Tisch., W.H. (Weiss); and there are various other readings but none possessing such strong support.

classical for a dead body, so too in LXX, *cf.* Deut. xxi. 23, 1 Kings xiii. 24, 1 Macc. xi. 4, 2 Macc. ix. 29. Everything, as Wendt admits (1888), points to the fact that no apparent death, or a raising by natural means, is thought of by the narrator. Holtzmann and Pfleiderer can only find a parallel here with xx. 9-12, but none can read the two narratives without seeing their independence, except in the main fact that both narrate a similar miracle.—**ἤνοιξε τοὺς ὀφθ.**: to this there is nothing corresponding in the details given by the Gospel narratives, as Blass points out.

Ver. 41. **δοὺς δὲ αὐτῇ χ.**: here for help to her to rise, after she had been restored to life, but in the Gospels Christ takes the damsel by the hand *before* she is restored, Mark v. 41, Luke viii. 54. Thus, while retaining a close resemblance, as we might surely expect, to our Lord's action in St. Mark's narrative, there is yet sufficient independence of detail to show that one description is not a slavish imitation of the other.—**τὰς χήρας**: Rendall sees in the words reference to an organised body, 1 Tim. v. 11-16, engaged in the service of the Church, but the context only points to the widows who had been previously mentioned, *species post genus*, as in ver. 36 (Blass).

Ver. 42. **καθ᾽ ὅλης**, see above on ver. 31.

Ver. 43. **ἐγένετο δὲ**, see on ver. 37, Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 45, on the use of **ἐγένετο**. The phrase also marks (as often in Luke) a transition to the following narrative (Nösgen).—**ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς**, see on viii. 11, and xxvii. 7. Kennedy speaks of the adjective as used in the vernacular sense of "long," "many," Aristoph., *Pax.*, 354.—**βυρσεῖ**, in classics **βυρσοδέψης**: it is difficult to suppose that the common estimate of the work of a tanner amongst the Jews as unclean, on account of their constant contact with dead animals, has here no significance. At least the mention of the trade seems to show that St. Peter was already in a state of mind which would fit him for the further revelation of the next chapter, and for the instructions to go and baptise the Gentile Cornelius. On the detestation in which this trade was held by the Jews, see Wetstein, *in loco*; Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 158; *cf.* Mishna, *Khethuboth*, vii., 10. It does not in any way militate against the historical character of the narrative, as Overbeck maintains, to admit that the description is meant to introduce the "universalism" of the following incident. Both Chrysostom and Theophylact (so too Erasmus) dwell upon this incident in St. Peter's life as illustrating his unassuming conduct. —**Ἰόππῃ**, see on ver. 36. Heb. יָפוֹ, "beauty," *Jaffa;* see for references Josh. xix. 46, 2 Chron. ii. 16, Jonah i. 3, Ezra iii. 7; the port of Jerusalem from the days of Solomon (from which it was distant some thirty-five miles), situated on a hill so high that people affirmed, as Strabo mentions, that the capital was visible from its summit. It was *comparatively* (Schürer) the best harbour on the coast of Palestine (although Josephus, *B. J.*, iii., 9, correctly describes it as dangerous), and in this lay its chief importance. The Maccabees were well aware of this, and it is of Simon that the historian writes: "With all his glory he took Joppa for an haven, and made an entrance to the isles of the sea" 1 Macc. xiv. 5 (about 144 B.C.). The Judaising of the city was the natural result of the Maccabean occupation, although the Syrians twice retook Joppa, and twice Hyrcanus regained it for the Jews. Taken by Pompey B.C. 63, restored to the Jews by Cæsar 47, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 4, 4; *B. J.*, i., 7, 7, and *Ant.*, xiv., 10, 6, and at length added to the kingdom of Herod the Great, *Ant.*, xv., 7, 3; *B. J.*, i., 20, 3, Joppa remained Jewish, imbued with all the fanatic patriotism of the mother-city, and in

X. 1. ἈΝΗΡ δέ τις ἦν ἐν Καισαρείᾳ ὀνόματι Κορνήλιος, 2. ἑκατοντάρχης ἐκ σπείρης[1] τῆς καλουμένης Ἰταλικῆς, εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεὸν σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν τε ἐλεημοσύνας

[1] σπειρης ℵACEL, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; but σπειρας in BP, Chrys., W.H., alt., App., p. 164.

the fierce revolt of 66 A.D. Joppa still remained alone in her undivided allegiance to Judaism, and against Joppa the first assault of Cestius Gallus was directed. On the Joppa which St. Peter entered, Acts x., and its contrast to the neighbouring Cæsarea, see viii. 40 and G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, p. 136 ff.; see also Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 79 ff. E.T.; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 4, 601; B.D.[2], "Joppa".

CHAPTER X. *Baptism of Cornelius and his friends.*—Ver. 1. **ἀνήρ τις**: on the expression see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 202.—**ἐν Κ.**, see viii. 40.

Ver. 2. **ἑκατοντάρχης**: form general in N.T., and so in later Greek, although **χιλίαρχος** is always retained in N.T., and **ἑκατόνταρχος** is also found, Matt. viii. 5, 8 (W.H.), Luke vii. 2, Acts xxii. 25 (W.H.); so **πατριάρχης, πολιτάρχης, ἐθνάρχης**, see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 82, and note on forms employed in Josephus and LXX; W.H., Appendix, p. 163; Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 28, 68; and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, for various authorities.—**ἐκ σπείρης τῆς Ἰ.**: the word **σπεῖρα** here = *cohors*, although used in the N.T. in a more general way as of the band which arrested Jesus, and so also of Jewish troops in Judith xiv. 11, 2 Macc. viii. 23, xii. 20, 22. Each legion was subdivided into ten cohorts, but besides the legionary cohorts there were auxiliary cohorts, and Josephus mentions that five of these cohorts were stationed at Cæsarea at the time of the death of Herod Agrippa, composed to a great extent at all events of the inhabitants of Cæsarea and Sebaste, *Ant.*, xix., 9, 2; xx., 8, 7. There were in the provinces Italic cohorts composed of volunteer Roman citizens born in Italy, and in answer to the strictures of Schürer, who contends that there was no Italic cohort in Cæsarea at this time, Blass, *in loco*, asks why one of the five cohorts mentioned by Josephus may not have been composed of Roman citizens who had made their home at Cæsarea or Sebaste, a cohort known by the name mentioned. But Ramsay has given great interest to the subject by his account of a recently discovered inscription at Carnuntum—the epitaph of a young Roman soldier, a subordinate officer in the second Italic cohort, who died at Carnuntum while engaged on detached service from the Syrian army. He sees reason to infer that there was an Italic cohort stationed in Syria in A.D. 69, and although the new discovery does not prove anything with certainty for the period in Acts x., say 40-44 A.D., yet it becomes in every way probable that at that date, when Cornelius is described as in x. 1, an Italic cohort recruited from the east was stationed in the province Syria. But even if it could be shown that no Italic cohort was stationed at Cæsarea from A.D. 6-41, or again from 41-44 in the reign of Herod, it by no means follows that a centurion belonging to the cohort may not have been on duty there. He may have been so, even if his cohort was on duty elsewhere, and it would be a bold thing to deny such a possibility when the whole subject of detached service is so obscure; Ramsay, *Expositor*, September, 1896, also *Expositor*, December, 1896 (Schürer's reply), and January, 1897 (Ramsay); Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 53 ff. E.T.; Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* pp. 260-269; O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 108; and Wendt, *in loco*, (1899).—**εὐσεβὴς καὶ φ. τὸν Θεὸν**: the adjective is only used here and in ver. 7 (xxii. 12), and once again in 2 Peter ii. 9 in the N.T. In the LXX it is found four times in Isaiah, thrice as an equivalent of צַדִּיק, xxiv. 16, xxvi. 7 (2), righteous, upright, *cf.* also Prov. xii. 12, once as an equivalent of נָדִיב, liberal, generous, see on viii. 2 above; frequent in Ecclus. and Macc., see also Trench, *N.T. Synonyms*, i., p. 196. Taken by itself the word might denote goodness such as might characterise a Gentile, *cf.* xvii. 23, and its classical use (like the Latin *pietas*); but construed with **φ. τὸν Θεόν** it certainly seems to indicate that Cornelius was "a God-fearing proselyte" (not to

πολλὰς τῷ λαῷ, καὶ δεόμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ παντός· 3. εἶδεν ἐν ὁράματι φανερῶς,[1] ὡσεὶ ὥραν ἐννάτην τῆς ἡμέρας, ἄγγελον τοῦ Θεοῦ

[1] εν οραματι φαν. om. by Iren.; Blass brackets, and see Pref. to β text, p. xviii. ωσει add περι, so ℵABCE, many min., Syr. (P. and H.), Boh., Irint., Dam., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; Blass omits in β; evidence for the addition seems conclusive, and περι may have dropped out as superfluous after ωσει. εννατην; ℵABCEP have εvατην, and Tisch., W.H., Blass, Hilg., see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 55.

be identified it would seem with "proselytes of the gate," although the confusion is common (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 316 E.T.)). In Acts this class of proselyte is always so described (or σεβόμενοι τὸν Θ.) "they that fear God," *i.e.*, the God of the Jews, *cf.* x. 22, 35, xiii. 16, 26, etc. All the incidents of the story seem to point to the fact that Cornelius had come into relations with the synagogue, and had learned the name and the fear of the God of Israel, *cf.* x. 2, 22, 25, without accepting circumcision, see especially Ramsay, *Expositor*, p. 200 (1896), where he corrects his former remarks in *St. Paul*, p. 43; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, "Fremder," i., 3, p. 382; Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 58; O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 184, 185; Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i., 103 E.T.; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 101, note, and for a further explanation of the distinction between the σεβόμενοι and the "proselytes of the gate" *cf.* Muirhead *Times of Christ* (T. & T. Clark), pp. 105, 106.—σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ: the centurions of the N.T. are always favourably represented, *cf.* Matt. viii. 5, Luke vii. 9, xxiii. 47, Acts xxvii. 3. οἶκος here includes not only the family but the whole household, *cf.* vii. 10, xi. 14, xvi. 31, xviii. 8, etc.; Luke i. 27, x. 5, xix. 9, thus the soldier "who waited on him continually" is also called εὐσεβής. οἶκος (*cf.* πᾶς ὁ οἶκ. ὅλος ὁ οἶκ.), favourite word with St. Luke in the sense of "family" (Lekebusch, Friedrich) as compared with the other Evangelists, but often found in St. Paul (*cf.* Hebrews), so also LXX, Gen. vii. 1, xlvii. 12. St. Peter uses the word so in xi, 14, and in 1 Peter ii. 18 we have οἰκέτης. St. Chrysostom well says: "Let us take heed as many of us as neglect those of our own house" (*Hom.*, xxii.). *Cf.* too Calvin, *in loco*.—ποιῶν ἐλεημ. τῷ λαῷ, see note on ix. 36; the word occurs frequently in Ecclus. and Tobit, and its occurrence here and elsewhere in Acts illustrates the Jewish use of the term; but although it is true to say that it does not occur in Acts in any Christian precept, St. Paul applies the word to the collection made from the Christian Churches for his nation at Jerusalem, xxiv. 17, a collection to which he attached so much importance as the true outcome of Christian love and brotherhood, see *l.c.* How highly almsgiving was estimated amongst the Jews we may see from the passages referred to in Hastings' B.D. and B.D.[2]; Uhlhorn's *Christian Charity in the Ancient Church*, p. 52 ff. E.T.; but it should be remembered that both in Ecclus. and Tobit there are passages in which both almsgiving and fasting are also closely connected with prayer, Ecclus. vii. 10, Tob. xii. 8.—τῷ λ., *i.e.*, Israel, as always in Luke, see above on iv. 25. Both this and his continuous prayer to God, ver. 30, characterise him as half a Jew (Weiss).—διὰ παντός: Luke xxiv. 53, and three times in Acts (once in a quotation, ii. 25), but only used once in Matthew and Mark, and not at all by St. John; on St. Luke's predilection for πᾶς and its compounds see Friedrich, pp. 5, 6. The description of the centurion no doubt reminds us of the description of another centurion in Luke vii. 5 (so Weiss), but we are not obliged to conclude that the centurion here is merely pictured after the prototype there; but the likeness may possibly point to the same source for both narratives, as in some respects the language in the two cases is verbally alike, see Feine.—δεόμενος: "*preces* et *liberalitas* commendantur hic; accedit *jejunium*, ver. 30"; so Bengel, and he adds, "Benefici faciunt, quod Deus vult: precantes iidem quod volunt, Deus facit".

Ver. 3. εἶδεν: there is no ground for explaining away the force of the words by assuming that Cornelius had formerly a longing to see Peter. — φανερῶς: "openly," R.V.; *manifeste*, Vulgate. The words plainly are meant to exclude any illusion of the senses, not in a trance as in ver. 10, *cf.* xxii. 17; only here in Luke's writings, *cf.* 2 Macc. iii. 28.—ὡσεὶ

εἰσελθόντα πρὸς αὐτόν, 4. καὶ εἰπόντα αὐτῷ, Κορνήλιε. ὁ δὲ ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ καὶ ἔμφοβος γενόμενος εἶπε, Τί ἐστι, Κύριε; εἶπε δὲ αὐτῷ, Αἱ προσευχαί σου καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἀνέβησαν εἰς μνημόσυνον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 5. καὶ νῦν πέμψον εἰς Ἰόππην ἄνδρας, καὶ μετάπεμψαι Σίμωνα[1] ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος· 6. οὗτος ξενίζεται παρά τινι Σίμωνι βυρσεῖ, ᾧ ἐστιν οἰκία παρὰ θάλασσαν· οὗτος λαλήσει σοι τί σε δεῖ ποιεῖν.[2] 7. ὡς δὲ ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ λαλῶν τῷ Κορνηλίῳ, φωνήσας δύο τῶν οἰκετῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ στρατιώτην εὐσεβῆ

[1] After **Σιμωνα** add **τινα** W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss.

[2] **ουτος λαλησει . . . δει ποιειν,** whole clause om. ℵABCELP 13, 61, Vulg. (am. fu. tol.), Syr., P. and H., etc., so W.H., R.V., Hilg., retained by Blass in β on the authority of Vulgcl., Par.[2], and a few min., evidently case of insertion, *cf.* ix. 6, xi. 14.

(**περί**): the **ὡσεί**, as Blass points out, intimates the same as **περί**—the dative which is read here by Chrysostom (omit **περί**) is sometimes confused with the accusative in the sense of duration of time, see Blass on ver. 30, and viii. 11 (for the accusative see John iv. 52, Rev. iii. 3), and *Gram.*, p. 93. Cornelius observed without doubt the Jewish hours of prayer, and the vision is represented as following upon, or whilst he was engaged in, prayer, and in answer to it.

Ver. 4. **Κορνήλιε**, *cf.* ix. 10 (1 Sam. iii.). Of Cornelius the words of the Evangelical Prophet were true, xliii. 1, "Fear not, for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine".—**ἀτενίσας**, see above on i. 10.—**ἔμφοβος**: four times in St. Luke, twice in Gospel, twice in Acts, and always with second aorist participle of **γίγνομαι** as here, only once elsewhere in N.T., Rev. xi. 13 (with **ἐγένοντο**); *cf.* Ecclus. xix. 24 (21), of the fear of God; and in 1 Macc. xiii. 2 both **ἔντρομος** and **ἔμφοβος** are apparently found together, *cf.* Acts vii. 32 and xvi. 29, but in classical Greek the word is used properly actively, *formidolosus.*—**τί ἐστι, Κύριε;** the words, similar to those used by Paul at his conversion, reveal the humility and the attentive attitude and readiness of Cornelius.—**αἱ προσ.**, *cf.* ii. 22, with article: of regular prayers.—**ἀνέβησαν**: *tanquam sacrificia*, *cf.* Ps. cxli. 2, Phil. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 15, and for the word, 2 Kings iii. 20, Job xx. 6, Ezek. viii. 11, 1 Macc. v. 31.—**εἰς μνημόσυνον**: in Lev. ii. 2, 9, 16, v. 12, vi. 15, Num. v. 26 (*cf.* Ecclus. xxxviii. 11, xlv. 16), the word is used as a translation of the Hebrew אַזְכָּרָה, "a name given to that portion of the vegetable oblation which was burnt with frankincense upon the altar, the sweet savour of which ascending to heaven was supposed to commend the person sacrificing to the remembrance and favour of God," *a remembrance offering*. The words at all events express the thought that the prayers and alms of Cornelius had gained the favourable regard of God, and that they would be remembered, and are remembered accordingly (see notes by Wendt, Felten and Holtzmann), the alms being regarded by zeugma as ascending like the prayers. With this passage *cf.* Tob. xii. 12, 15, and Mr. Ball's note in *Speaker's Commentary*, i., p. 231. "O quam multa in terram cadunt, non ascendunt" Bengel, and *cf. Hamlet*, Act iii., Sc. 3: "My words fly up," etc.: see *Book of Enoch*, xlix., 3, for a striking parallel to the thought of raising prayers as a memorial to God, Charles' edition, pp. 70, 284.

Ver. 5. **μετάπεμψαι**: middle, his messengers were to perform his wishes; only in Acts in N.T., where it occurs nine times, but found twice in LXX and in Maccabees; so too mostly in the middle in classical writers, although the active is also found in same sense.—**Σίμωνά (τινα)**, see critical notes; as unknown to Cornelius, marked out by his surname as the one of the many who were called Simon.

Ver. 6. **ξενίζεται**, see ver. 33.—**παρὰ θάλασσαν**: perhaps to secure water for the purpose of his trade, perhaps because it seems that a tanner was not allowed to carry on his business unless outside the walls of a town, see on ix. 43, at a distance of fifty cubits, see Wendt, *in loco;* Hackett, p. 135.

Ver. 7. **οἰκετῶν**: one related to the **οἶκος**, a milder and a narrower term than **δοῦλος**, which would simply de-

τῶν προσκαρτερούντων αὐτῷ, 8. καὶ ἐξηγησάμενος αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Ἰόππην. 9. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ὁδοιπορούντων ἐκείνων καὶ τῇ πόλει ἐγγιζόντων, ἀνέβη Πέτρος ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα προσεύξασθαι, περὶ ὥραν ἕκτην. 10. ἐγένετο δὲ πρόσπεινος, καὶ ἤθελε γεύσασθαι· παρασκευαζόντων δὲ ἐκείνων, ἐπέπεσεν[1] ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔκστασις, 11. καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγμένον, καὶ καταβαῖνον ἐπ' αὐτὸν σκεῦός τι ὡς ὀθόνην μεγάλην, τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς[2] δεδεμένον, καὶ

[1] **επεπεσεν**, but **εγενετο** in ℵABC 40, 61, Boh., Or., Did., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] **δεδεμενον και** om. ℵABC²E 40, Vulg., Boh., Aeth., Or., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Blass (but see crit. below), Wendt (as against Meyer). d, Gig., Par. (Syr. Harcl.), Apost. Const. (Hilg.) read **τεσσ. αρχαις δεδ. σκευος τι ως οθονην λαμπραν καθ. επι της γης**, so Blass in β, "recte fort." (*cf.*, xi. 5).

note ownership; more closely associated with the family than other servants, **οἰκέτας τε καὶ δούλους**, *cf.* Rom. xiv. 4, 1 Pet. ii. 18.—**εὐσεβῆ**: not of itself showing that the soldier had entered into any relationship with the Jews, but in connection with ver. 2 it can scarcely imply less than in the case of Cornelius; of each it might be said, as of St. Paul in his service of Christ, **δουλεύων τῷ Κ. μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης** (xx. 19), and both master and servant were about to become **οἰκέται** of a nobler household: **οἰκεῖοι τοῦ Θεοῦ** and **συμπολῖται τῶν ἁγίων**; see xi. 14. —**προσκαρτερούντων**, see above on chap. i. 14. A good reference is given by Wendt to Dem., 1386, 6, **θεραπαίνας τὰς Νεαίρᾳ τότε προσκαρτερούσας** (so too Polyb., xxiv., 5, 3); but see on the other hand Blass, *in loco*. Kuinoel supposes that they acted as house-sentries, but there is no need to limit the service to that; *cf.* viii. 13, and LXX, Susannah, ver. 6.

Ver. 8. **ἐξηγησάμενος ἅπαντα**: only in Luke in N.T., except once in John i. 18, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 35, Acts xv. 12, 14, xxi. 19, and in LXX, Judg. vii. 13, 1 Chron. xvi. 24, 2 Kings viii. 5, etc. The word plainly suggests the mutual confidence existing between Cornelius and his household (**ἅπαντα**, as if nothing were forgotten in the communication), Weiss.

Ver. 9. **ὁδοι.**: the distance was thirty miles; only here in N.T., not LXX; but **ὁδοιπορία** is found in N.T. and LXX; **ὁδοιπόρος** in LXX and Ecclus., but not in N.T.: all three words are found in classical Greek. It is perhaps to be noted that the word here used was also much employed in medical language (Hobart).—**δῶμα**: sometimes taken here to mean a room on the roof, or an upper room, but the idea of prayer under the free canopy of heaven is better fitting to the vision; see Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 121; = flat roof in N.T. and LXX; in modern Greek = terrace.—**περὶ ὥραν ἕκτην**: about twelve o'clock, midday; see G. A. Smith, *Hist. Geog.*, pp. 138-142.

Ver. 10. **πρόσπεινος**: only here, not found in LXX or classical Greek, probably intensive force in **πρός**, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, although not in R.V.—**ἤθελε γεύσασθαι**: there is no mention of any long period of previous fasting, as if that would account for the vision; Peter was about to partake of his ordinary meal.—**ἐπέπεσεν**, see critical notes. —**ἔκστασις**: represented in such a way as to distinguish it from the **ὅραμα** of Cornelius in ver. 3; a trance, an ecstasy in which a person passes out of himself, always in connection with "visions," in what may be called its technical use; sometimes it is used as expressing simple astonishment, *cf.* Acts iii. 10, etc.; for a good account of the word and its various significations in N.T. and LXX, see Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, pp. 121, 122; on the distinction between **ἔκσ.** and **ὅρ.** see Alford, note, *in loco*.

Ver. 11. **θεωρεῖ**: "beholdeth," historic present, giving vividness.—**ὡς ὀθόν. μεγ.** Both words, **ὀθόνη** and **ἀρχή** (in this sense), are peculiar to St. Luke in N.T.—the phrase **ἀρχαὶ ὀθόνης** is medical, so that the expression here rendered ends or corners of a sheet is really technical medical phraseology, see Hobart, p. 218, Plummer, *Introd. to St. Luke*, lxv., Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 436. **ἀρχαί** is also used

καθιέμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς· 12. ἐν ᾧ ὑπῆρχε πάντα τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία[1] καὶ τὰ ἑρπετὰ καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 13. καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἀναστάς,[2] Πέτρε, θῦσον καὶ φάγε. 14. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος εἶπε,[3] Μηδαμῶς, Κύριε· ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον. 15. καὶ φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἃ[4] ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε, σὺ μὴ κοίνου. 16. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρίς· καὶ πάλιν[5] ἀνελήφθη τὸ σκεῦος εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.

[1] According to ℵAB 61 the words **τα θηρια** and the articles before **ερπετα** and **πετεινα** are to be omitted, and **της γης** to be inserted after **ερπετα** according to ℵABCE, etc.; see R.V., W.H., Wendt, Weiss.

[2] For **αναστας Π.**: Aug. has **Πετρε παν ὃ εν τῳ σκευει βλεπεις**, see β text (Blass).

[3] For **μηδαμως . . . ακαθαρτον** Aug. has **Κυριε κοινου και ακαθαρτου ουχ αψομαι** (see β).

[4] For **ἃ ὁ Θ. . . . κοινου** Aug. has **ὃ εγω ηγιασα ακαθαρτον μη λεγε** (see β). These three readings are preferred by Belser, p. 59, as clearer, and more characteristic in Peter's answer. **εκ δευτερου** om. Gig., Aug., Apost., Const. Blass brackets, and *cf.* xi. 9.

[5] **παλιν**, *cf.* xi. 10; but **ευθυς** is supported by ℵABCE 61, Vulg., Boh., Syr. Harcl. mg., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. In β Blass omits, for which there is some authority, but evidence for **ευθυς** strongest; Hilg. reads **παλιν**.

in LXX, Exod. xxxvi. 24 (xxxix. 17), **ὀθόνη** not at all in LXX, but both words are found in classical writers in senses approaching their meaning here; but here as elsewhere in St. Luke it is the combination which arrests attention, for **ἀρχή** and **ἀρχαί** are found again and again in medical language with **ὀθόνη** or **ὀθόνιον**.—**τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς**: "by four corners," R.V. No article; there might have been many ends or corners. It is doubtful how far we can therefore press the imagery as referring to the four regions of the world, or that men would come from the north, south, etc., to share the kingdom.

Ver. 12. **τετράποδα κ.τ.λ.**: fish are not mentioned, perhaps because the vessel was not represented as containing water (so Blass, Weiss, Wendt), although fish also were divided into clean and unclean, Lev. xi. 9, Deut. xiv. 9.

Ver. 13. **ἀναστάς,** see above on v. 17: he may have been, as St. Chrysostom says, on his knees.—**θῦσον**: the beasts are represented as living—not here in a sacrificial sense, *cf.* Luke xv. 23.

Ver. 14. **Μηδαμῶς**: *absit* (LXX for חָלִילָה), 1 Sam. xx. 2, xxii. 15 (Weiss).—**Κύριε**: Weiss refers to i. 24, and takes it as meaning Jehovah, but others refer the expression here to Christ; the next verse shows us that there was still the same element of self-will in the Apostle which had misled the Peter of the Gospels.—**οὐδέποτε . . . πᾶν**: the words of strong negation, characteristic of the vehement and impulsive Peter—Hebraistic, *cf.* Exod. xx. 10, Judg. xiii. 4, and in N.T., Matt. xxiv. 22, Luke i. 37, Rom. iii. 12, 1 Cor. i. 29; Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, pp. 72, 73, and Blass, *Gram.*, p. 174.—**κοινὸν** = **βέβηλος**; 1 Macc. i. 62, opposed to **ἅγιος,** Lev. x. 10, *cf.* Ezek. xxii. 26, often used in N.T. for unclean, *cf.* Mark vii. 2.—**ἀκάθαρτος,** Lev. xx. 25, of clean and unclean animals; **κοινός** in 1 Macc. above is used, as ver. 63 shows, for defilement from meats.

Ver. 15. The last word of ver. 14 carries us back to the thought of the teaching of his Master, which St. Peter had evidently not yet realised, *cf.* Mark vii. 19. Mark alone draws the inference, "*this He said*, making all meats clean," which, compared with this verse, makes another link of interest between St. Mark and St. Peter.—**ἐκ δευτ. . . . ἐπὶ τρίς** (only here and in xi. 10, in classics **εἰς τρίς**), to emphasise the command, *cf.* Gen. xli. 32, "ad confirmationem valuit" Calvin.—**ἐκαθάρισε,** declarative: "de coelo enim nil nisi purum demittitur" Bengel.—**κοίνου**: "make not thou common," R.V., "as though man by his harsh verdict actually created unclean-

17. Ὡς δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ[1] διηπόρει ὁ Πέτρος, τί ἂν εἴη τὸ ὅραμα ὃ εἶδε, καὶ ἰδού, οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου, διερωτήσαντες τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος, ἐπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὸν πυλῶνα· 18. καὶ φωνήσαντες ἐπυνθάνοντο, εἰ Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται. 19. Τοῦ δὲ Πέτρου ἐνθυμουμένου[2] περὶ τοῦ ὁράματος, εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα, Ἰδού, ἄνδρες τρεῖς[3] ζητοῦσί σε· 20. ἀλλὰ ἀναστὰς κατάβηθι, καὶ πορεύου σὺν αὐτοῖς, μηδὲν διακρινόμενος· διότι ἐγὼ ἀπέσταλκα αὐτούς. 21. καταβὰς δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας τούς ἀπεσταλμένους ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου πρὸς αὐτόν, εἶπεν, Ἰδού, ἐγώ εἰμι ὃν

[1] After εαυτῳ D, Par., Aug., add εγενετο, "when P. came to himself, he doubted . . .," so Hilg., *cf.* xii. 11.

[2] ενθυμουμενου, but ℵABCDELP have διενθ., so all edd. αυτῳ το Πν. om. B, Boh., so W.H. text, Weiss, Wendt (probably). Par. prefixes ετι before διεν., and Par., Syr. Harcl. και διαπορουντος before περι.

[3] τρεις ℵACE 13, 61, many verss.; Lach. [W.H. marg.], R.V., Hilg.; δυο B, W.H. text, Weiss; om. DHLP, Syr. H., Apost. Const., Cyr.-Jer., Chrys., Aug., Amb.; so Tisch., Blass, Wendt. Those who favour omission contend that τρεις comes from xi. 11, δυο from ver. 7. But Weiss maintains that δυο is quite correct, as in ver. 7, the soldier is regarded as a guard for the two servants who convey the message: this was overlooked, and δυο was either allowed to drop out, or was changed into τρεις, *cf.* xi. 11. It is possible that if τρεις was original it fell out after ανδρες (-ΔΡΕϹΤΡΕΙϹ).

ness where God had already bestowed His cleansing mercy in Christ" (Rendall). We cannot limit the words, as has been attempted, to the single case of Cornelius, or refer them only to the removal of the distinction between clean and unclean meats.

Ver. 16. **πάλιν**: if we read **εὐθύς**, see critical notes, we have St. Mark's characteristic word (used by St. Luke only here in Acts, and once in Luke vi. 49), a suggestive fact in a section of the book in which the pen or the language of St. Peter may fairly be traced.

Ver. 17. **διηπόρει**: "was much perplexed," R.V., *cf.* ii. 12, v. 24; see Page's note, *Acts*, p. 145.—**τί ἂν εἴη**: on the optative in indirect questions used by St. Luke only, with or without **ἂν**, see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 112; Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, pp. 80, 133.—**διερωτήσαντες**: only here in N.T., not in LXX, but in classical Greek for asking constantly or continually; preposition intensifies. Here it may imply that they had asked through the town for the house of Cornelius (Weiss).—**πυλῶνα**, *cf.* xii. 13 (and Blass, *in loco*). R.V. renders not "porch," as in Matt. xxvi. 71, but "gate," as if it were **θύρα**. The **πυλών** was properly the passage which led from the street through the front part of the house to the inner court. This was closed next the street by a heavy folding gate with a small wicket kept by a porter (see Alford on Matt., *u. s.*, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*).

Ver. 18. **φωνήσαντες**: "having called out some one of the servants" (Blass, Alford, Kuinoel), but = "called" simply, R.V.; "vocantes portæ curatorem," Wetstein.

Ver. 19. **ἐνθυμουμένου**: compound verb best, see critical notes: "pondered on the vision," Rendall; **διενθ.** verb = to weigh in the mind, only here, not found in LXX or elsewhere, except in ecclesiastical writers.—**ἄνδρες τρεῖς**, so A. and R.V., see critical notes.

Ver. 20. **μηδὲν διακ.**: "nothing doubting," *i.e.*, without hesitation as to its lawfulness, *cf.* Matt. xxi. 21, Rom. xiv. 23, Mark xi. 23, James i. 6; the verb is not so used in classical Greek. See Mayor's note on James i. 6, apparently confined in this sense to N.T. and later Christian writings. For the active voice see xi. 12, xv. 9. If we read a stop after **διακ.** and **διότι** or **ὅτι** immediately following, we may translate, "nothing doubting; for I have sent them," R.V.; but if no punctuation (so Rendall, Weiss) translate, "nothing doubting that I have sent them," *i.e.*, the fact that I have sent them. In either case **ἐγώ** emphatic. Nothing had been spoken to him of his journey, but in the path of unhesitating obedience he was led to the meaning of the revelation (*cf.* John xiii. 7).

ζητεῖτε[1]· τίς ἡ αἰτία δι' ἣν πάρεστε; 22. οἱ δὲ εἶπον, Κορνήλιος ἑκατοντάρχης, ἀνὴρ δίκαιος καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν Θεόν, μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐχρηματίσθη ὑπὸ ἀγγέλου ἁγίου, μεταπέμψασθαί σε εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ῥήματα παρὰ σοῦ. 23. εἰσκαλεσάμενος[2] οὖν αὐτοὺς ἐξένισε. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ὁ Πέτρος ἐξῆλθε σὺν αὐτοῖς, καί τινες τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς[3] Ἰόππης συνῆλθον αὐτῷ. 24. καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον εἰσῆλθον[4] εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν· ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἦν προσδοκῶν αὐτούς, συγκαλεσάμενος

[1] After **ζητειτε** D, Syr. Harcl. add **τι θελετε; (ἢ)** **κ.τ.λ.** looks like an anticipatory gloss of **τις ἡ αιτια.**

[2] For **εισκαλεσαμενος** D, Par. read **εισαγαγων,** a fairly common word (six times in Acts), but **εισκ.** "**απ. λεγ.**" in N.T.

[3] The art. before **Ι.** should be omitted, on the evidence of ℵABCDEHLP; Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[4] **εισηλθον**—but BD 47, 61, Vulg., Syr. Harcl. text, Aeth. **εισηλθεν**, so W.H., R.V., marg., Weiss, Hilg.—but plural AEHLP (**εισηλθαν** in ℵC), and several vers., Chrys., Tisch., Blass. Alford thinks sing. a corrn. to suit **εξηλθεν** above; but, on the other hand, as the sing. lies between several plurals, transcriptural prob. seems to favour it. **Καισαρειαν,** see on viii. 40. D, Syr. Harcl. Par.[1] add **περιεμενεν** at the end of verse retained by Blass and Hilg., see Weiss, Codex D, p. 68, on its possible force here.

Ver. 22. **δίκαιος**: "sensu Judaico" (Blass), *cf.* Luke i. 6, ii. 25, xxiii. 50.—**μαρτ.**, see on vi. 3. **τε** closely joins it, as confirming the judgment. On construction with **ὑπό** in inscriptions, Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 95.—**ἔθνους τῶν Ἰ.**: **ἔθνος** in the mouth of Gentiles, *cf.* Luke vii. 5 and see above on iv. 25.—**ἐχρηματίσθη**: "was warned *of God*," R.V., Matt. ii. 12, 22, Luke ii. 26, *cf.* Heb. viii. 5, xi. 7, and Jos., *Ant.*, iii., 8, 8; see Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 217. For use of the active in LXX, see Jer. xxxiii. (xxvi.) 2, *cf.* also xi. 26.—**ἁγίου**: only here with **ἀγγέλου**, expressing the reverence of these pious men (Weiss).

Ver. 23. **εἰσκ.**: only used here in N.T., so **μετακ.** in ver. 32; both verbs are also frequent in medical writers, as Hobart urges, but both are found in classical Greek, and the latter three times in LXX, although the former not at all.—**ἐξένισε**, *recepit hospitio*, Vulgate, *cf.* Heb. xiii. 2, and Westcott, *l.c.;* verb used six times in Acts in this sense, but nowhere else in N.T.; *cf.* Ecclus. xxix. 25. In this Christian hospitality to Gentile strangers Peter had taken another step towards understanding what the will of the Lord was.—**τινες τῶν ἀδελφῶν** = xi. 12.

Ver. 24. On the route see Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 27; and on this and the following verse in **β** text as specially supporting his theory, see Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 116 ff. and 127.—**ἦν προσδοκῶν**: characteristic Lucan construction, see above i. 10; *cf.* Luke i. 21. **προσδ.**, favourite with St. Luke; six times in Gospel, five in Acts, elsewhere in Gospels only twice in Matthew.—**συγκ.**, *i.e.*, on the day on which he expected the advent of Peter and the returning messengers as to a feast; they were probably also fearers of the true God, and of a like mind with Cornelius.—**ἀναγκαίους**, *necessarios* *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, vii., 14, 4; xi., 6, 4; xiii., 7, 2, etc., and instances in Wetstein.

Ver. 25. **ὡς δὲ ἐγέν. (τοῦ) εἰσ.**: for **τοῦ** see critical notes; "and when it came to pass that Peter entered," R.V., *i.e.*, into the house, see Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 139. It may be regarded as an extension of **τοῦ** beyond its usual sphere, see Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, for instances in LXX, pp. 166, 170 (1893). Simcox regards the sense as much the same as in the common (and specially Lucan), **ἐγένετο τὸν Π. εἰσελθεῖν.**—**προσεκύνησεν** (*cf.* xiv. 15): expressive of lowliest humiliation, but not of necessity involving divine worship, *cf.* LXX, Gen. xxiii. 7, 12, etc. Weiss thinks that as the verb is used here absolutely, as in viii. 27, the act was

τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἀναγκαίους φίλους. 25.[1] Ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον, συναντήσας αὐτῷ ὁ Κορνήλιος, πεσὼν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας προσεκύνησεν. 26. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤγειρε λέγων, Ἀνάστηθι[2]· κἀγὼ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπός εἰμι. 27. καὶ συνομιλῶν αὐτῷ, εἰσῆλθε, καὶ εὑρίσκει συνεληλυθότας πολλούς, ἔφη τε πρὸς αὐτούς, 28. Ὑμεῖς[3] ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι ἀλλοφύλῳ· καὶ ἐμοὶ ὁ Θεὸς ἔδειξε μηδένα κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον· 29. διὸ καὶ ἀναντιῤῥήτως[4] ἦλθον μετα-

[1] For the whole verse D, Syr. Harcl., Gig. read **προσεγγιζοντος δε του Π. (εις την Κ.) προδραμων εις των δουλων διεσαφησεν παραγεγονεναι αυτον.** D, Syr. Harcl. read also **ο δε Κ. εκπηδησας και συναντησας αυτῳ.** Hilg. reads as above and Belser strongly supports β text, p. 60; so Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 63, who calls these details "as lifelike as anything we could wish," but see also Corssen, *G. G. A.*, p. 437, Weiss, Codex D, p. 68, and Wendt, *in loco*, edit. 1899, where he refers the expansion in Western text to a misunderstanding of **εισελθειν** in **α** text. After **εγεν.** ℵABCELP, Tisch, Weiss., W.H. read **του.**

[2] D, Syr. Harcl., Par., Wern. read **τι ποιεις;** (*cf.* Acts xiv. 15); whilst D omits **αναστηθι,** the others read it after **ποιεις.** Par.[2], Wern. add **τον Θεον προσκυνει,** *cf.* Apoc. xix. 10, xxii. 9, so after **ειμι** DE, Gig., Par., Wern. add **ως και συ.**

[3] After **υμεις** D, Aug. insert **βελτιον,** so Hilg. (*cf.* compar. in iv. 16, **β**).

[4] **αναντιρρητως,** so Tisch., Blass, Weiss; but **αναντιρητως** BD, 61, W.H., Hilg.

one of worship towards one regarded after the vision as a divine being; but on the other hand the language of the vision by no means involved such a belief on the part of Cornelius (see ver. 5), and as a worshipper of the one true God he would not be likely to pay such divine worship.

Ver. 26. The conduct of Christ may be contrasted with that of His Apostles, so Blass: "illi (Petro) autem is honor recusandus erat, *cf.* Apoc., 19, 10; 22, 8; quem nunquam recusavit Jesus, Luc., 4, 8; 8, 41" (see Hackett's note and Knabenbauer *in loco*).

Ver. 27. **καὶ συνομιλῶν αὐτῷ**: "and as he talked with him," R.V.; only here in N.T., not in LXX (but **συνόμιλος**, Symm. Job xix. 19), *cf.* xx. 11 for similar use of the simple verb **ὁμιλέω**, which is also used in a similar sense in LXX and in Josephus (so too in Xen.), and also in modern Greek (Kennedy).—**εἰσῆλθε,** *i.e.*, into the room, in distinction to ver. 25 of entrance into the house, or it may signify the *completion* of his entering in (so De Wette, Weiss).

Ver. 28. **ἀθέμιτον**: only once again in N.T., and significantly in 1 Pet. iv. 3, but *cf.* for a similar sense to its use here 2 Macc. vi. 5, vii. 1. On the extent to which this feeling was carried see Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, pp. 26-28; Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, pp. 15, 26, 137 (second edition); Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 68; so too Jos., *c. Apion*, ii., 28, 29, 36; Juvenal, xiv., 103; Tacitus, *Hist.*, v., 5.—**κολλᾶσθαι**, see on v. 13 and Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, *in loco*.—**προσέρχεσθαι**: objected to by Zeller and Overbeck, because we know of instances where Jews went without scruple into the houses of Gentiles (*cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 2, 3); but here the whole context plainly shows what kind of intercourse was intended (see also Wetstein). Hilgenfeld too regards the notice as unhistorical, but an answer may be found to his objections in the references above and in Feine, pp. 202, 204, although his language seems inconsistent with that on p. 205.—**ἀλλοφύλῳ**: in the LXX and Apocrypha, so in Philo and Josephus as here; nowhere else in N.T. but here with a certain delicate touch, avoiding the use of the word "heathen"; in xi. 3 no such delicacy of feeling.—**καὶ**: not "but," A.V., but as in R.V., "and yet," *i.e.*, in spite of all these prohibitions and usages.—**ὁ Θ.**: emphatic, preceding **ἔδειξε** (Weiss). How fully Peter afterwards lived and preached this truth his First Epistle shows, *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 17.

Ver. 29. **ἀναντιῤῥήτως**: only here in N.T., but see xix. 36; on spelling see critical notes; used also by Polyb. "sanctum fidei silentium" (Calvin).—**μεταπεμφθείς**: only here in passive in N.T., see ver. 22.

πεμφθείς. πυνθάνομαι οὖν, τίνι λόγῳ μετεπέμψασθέ με; 30. Καὶ ὁ Κορνήλιος ἔφη, Ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας[1] μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην νηστεύων, καὶ τὴν ἐννάτην ὥραν προσευχόμενος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου· καὶ ἰδού, ἀνὴρ ἔστη ἐνώπιόν μου ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ, 31. καί φησι, Κορνήλιε, εἰσηκούσθη σου ἡ προσευχή, καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἐμνήσθησαν ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ· 32. πέμψον οὖν εἰς Ἰόππην, καὶ μετακάλεσαι Σίμωνα ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται Πέτρος· οὗτος ξενίζεται ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος βυρσέως παρὰ θάλασσαν· ὃς[2] παραγενόμενος λαλήσει σοι. 33. ἐξαυτῆς οὖν ἔπεμψα πρὸς σέ· σύ τε καλῶς ἐποίησας παραγενόμενος.[3] νῦν οὖν πάντες ἡμεῖς ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ πάρεσμεν ἀκοῦσαι πάντα τὰ προστεταγμένα σοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.[4]

[1] **απο τ. ημερας**; Blass emends: **τεταρτην ημεραν ταυτην**, a more usual construction, but β emendation has no support. **τεταρτης**—D reads **της τριτης**, due, perhaps, to diff. modes of calculation, so Hilg. For **ταυτης της ωρας** D reads **της αρτι ωρας** (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 11), so Hilg. **νηστευων και** om. ℵABC 61, Vulg., Boh., Arm., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt(against Meyer). **εννατην**, on spelling see above. **ωραν** om. ℵABCD 40, 61, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Hilg.

[2] **ος παραγεν. . . . σοι** om. ℵAB 3, 15, 18, 61, Vulg., Boh., Aethro., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; retained by Blass in β and by Hilg., following CDEHLP, Syr. P. and H., Sah., Gig. and Par.

[3] **παραγενομενος**, D inserts **εν ταχει** before (ix. 38), and so Hilg. Instead of **ενωπιον του Θ.** Blass (so Hilg.) reads **σου** ("verum puto"), so D, d, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Aeth., Par.—here Western reading may be correct, as **ενωπ. του Θ.** is so common in N.T., and might easily creep in, but see also Weiss, Codex D, p. 69.

[4] **Θεου** DHLP, Par., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Chrys., so Hilg.; but **Κυριου** ℵABCE, Vulg., Boh., Syr. Harcl., Arm., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, and so too Blass.

Ver. 30. For readings see critical notes. "Four days ago, until this hour, I was keeping the ninth hour of prayer," R.V., this hour, *i.e.*, the present hour, the hour of Peter's visit; four days ago reckoned from this present hour, lit., "from the fourth day," "quarto abhinc die". The four days according to the Jewish mode of reckoning would include the day of the vision and departure of the messengers, the day they reached Joppa, the day of their return with Peter, and the day of their reaching Cæsarea. Cornelius wishes to signify two things: (1) that the vision occurred, even to the hour, four days before Peter's arrival; (2) that this period of time when it occurred was the ninth hour.—**ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ**, see on i. 11, "cur illum contemneremus et fugeremus cui angeli ministrant?" Wetstein.

Ver. 31. **εἰσηκούσθη**: perhaps "was heard" or "has been heard" is best (see Rendall and Hackett). **ἡ προσ.** may refer to his present prayer, as it is in the singular, but the burden of all his past prayers had doubtless been the same, *cf.* ver. 33 for God's guidance into truth.—**ἐμνήσθησαν**, *cf.* LXX, Ps. xix. 3, Ezek. xviii. 22, 24; Rev. xvi. 19.

Ver. 33. **ἐξαυτῆς**, *sc.*, **ὥρας**: four times in Acts, otherwise only once in Mark vi. 25 and once in Phil. ii. 23, not in LXX; for instances in Polyb., Jos., see Wetstein, *sub* Mark *l.c.*—**καλῶς ἐποίησας**, *cf.* Phil. iv. 14, 2 Pet. i. 19, 3 John ver. 6, 1 Macc. xii. 18, 22. In some instances it may be described as a formula of expressing thanks, see Page's note.—**ἀκοῦσαι**: as in iv. 20, *i.e.*, to obey.—**ἐνώπ. τοῦ Θ.**: this is the way we ought to attend to God's servants, Chrys., *Hom.*, xxii.

Ver. 34. **ἀνοίξας κ.τ.λ.**: a solemn formula, *cf.* viii. 35, xviii. 14, Matt. v. 2, xiii. 35; Hort, *Judaistic Christ.*, p. 57.—**ἐπ' ἀληθ.**: used in Luke's Gospel three times, iv. 25, xx. 21, xxii. 59, and in Acts twice, iv. 27, x. 34, elsewhere only twice in N.T., Mark xii. 14, 32; the customary **ἐν ἀληθείᾳ** is altogether wanting in Luke.—**καταλαμβ.**: three times in Acts, not found in Luke's Gospel; here = *mente comprehendo*, *cf.* Eph. iii. 15, similar sense; so in Plato, Polybius, and Philo.—**προσωπολήπτης**, see Mayor on James

34. Ἀνοίξας δὲ Πέτρος τὸ στόμα εἶπεν, Ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας καταλαμβάνομαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι προσωπολήπτης ὁ Θεός, 35. ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ὁ φοβούμενος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστι. 36. τὸν λόγον ὃν[1] ἀπέστειλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, (οὗτός ἐστι πάντων Κύριος,) 37. ὑμεῖς οἴδατε τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα καθ᾽ ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξάμενον[2] ἀπὸ

[1] ον ℵ*CDEHLP, Syr. Chrys., Weiss; but wanting in ℵ^{a}AB 61, W.H., R.V. marg. Blass rejects **Κυριος**: the word which God sent, this (word) applies to, appertains to, all men. But it has been not unfairly said that almost as good result follows by omitting **ον** on good authority, as by omitting **K.** on no authority. Blass parallels for his explanation xxvii. 23, Luke iv. 7, but it may be questioned whether these are quite exact. See also below. Clemen (p. 108) regards the whole verse as marg. note of his R. Antijud., which crept into the text by mistake with 37^{a}.

[2] **αρξαμενον** LP 31, 61, and so Weiss, Wendt; **αρξαμενος** ℵABCDEH 40, so Lach., Tisch., W.H., R.V., see below. Blass regards **αρξ. . . . Γαλ.** as interpolated after Luke xxiii. 5, and brackets in **β**. See also Wendt, note edit. 1899. Clemen, p. 108, refers the whole of 37^{b} to his R. Antijud.; *cf.* i. 22. After **αρξ.** DA, Par., Vulg., Iren. add **γαρ**, so Hilg.; Blass rejects.

ii. 1, **πρόσωπον-λαμβάνειν.** The actual word is not found in LXX (or in classical Greek), but for the thought of God as no respecter of persons see Deut. x. 17, Lev. xix. 15, Mal. ii. 9, etc., etc., and Luke xx. 21, Gal. ii. 16 (so too **προσωποληψία** in N.T. three times). The expression **πρόσ. λαμβ.** is Hebraistic, not necessarily in a bad sense, and in the O.T. more often in a good one, but in the N.T. always in a bad sense, since **πρόσωπον** acquired the meaning of what was simply external (through its secondary signification *a mask*) in contrast to a man's real intrinsic character, but the noun and adj. always imply favouritism: see Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 6 and Plummer on Luke xx. 21. Even the enemies acknowledged our Lord's God-likeness at least in this respect, Matt. xxii. 16, Mark xii. 14, Luke xx. 21.

Ver. 35. **ἀλλ᾽ ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει κ.τ.λ.** The words are taken by Ramsay to mean that Cornelius was regarded as a proselyte by Peter, and that only on that condition could he be admitted to the Christian Church, *i.e.*, through Judaism; so apparently *St. Paul*, pp. 42, 43. On the other hand the general expression **ἐργαζ. δικαι.** inclines Weiss to refer all the words to the piety attainable by a heathen, who need not be a proselyte. Bengel's words should always be borne in mind: "non indifferentissimus religionum sed indifferentia nationum hic asseritur," see also below, and Knabenbauer, p. 193.—**δεκτὸς**: "acceptable to him," R.V., and this is best, because it better expresses the thought that fearing God and working righteousness place a man in a state preparatory for the salvation received through Christ, a reception no longer conditioned by nationality, but by the disposition of the heart. St. Peter does not speak of each and every religion, but of each and every nation, and ver. 43 plainly shows that he by no means loses sight of the higher blessedness of the man whose sin is forgiven through conscious belief in Christ; *cf.* the language of St. Paul, Rom. x. 9-14. **δεκτὸς** only in Luke and Paul in N.T., in LXX frequently, and once in the recently discovered *Sayings of Jesus*, No. 6, which agrees remarkably with St. Luke iv. 24.

Ver. 36. For readings see critical notes; translate: "the word he sent unto" R.V., *cf.* Ps. cvii. 20.—**λόγον**, *cf.* for use of the word as a divine message iv. 31, viii. 14, 25, xiii. 26, xiv. 3, xvi. 32; here it may mean the Gospel message sent to Israel as distinct from the **τὸ ῥῆμα**, *i.e.*, the previous teaching of John the Baptist (see Rendall); but R.V. like A.V. regards **ῥῆμα** and **Ἰ. τὸν ἀπὸ N.** as in apposition to **λόγον**, but Rendall and Weiss place a full stop after **Κύριος**, and begin a new sentence with **ὑμεῖς**.—**εὐαγγελ. εἰρήνην** with the accusative as signifying the contents of the glad tidings, *cf.* v. 42.—**οὗτός ἐστι πάντων K.**: the parenthetical turn given to the words seem to express the way in which the speaker would guard against the thought that Jesus of Nazareth was simply on a level with those who were spoken of as **ἀπόστολοι**, as the **ἀπέστειλε** might perhaps suggest to his hearers (see Nösgen). The words are simply the natural ex-

τῆς Γαλιλαίας, μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐκήρυξεν Ἰωάννης· 38. Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, ὃς διῆλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ· 39. καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν μάρτυρες πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν ἔν τε τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· ὃν ἀνεῖλον[1] κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου. 40. τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρε τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,[2] καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῆ

[1] **ανειλον**; in ℵABCDE **και ανειλαν**, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Hilg., see Kennedy, p. 160, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112. After **ον** Blass inserts **απεδοκιμασαν οι Ιουδαιοι**, but no Greek MS., quite insuff.

[2] **τῃ τριτῃ ημερᾳ** ℵ^{c}ABD^{2}EHLP, so W.H., Blass; with prep. **εν** prefixed ℵ*C 31, so Tisch., Weiss (Wendt doubtful). Hilg. follows D and reads the phrase in the acc.

pression of the divine power and authority already assigned by St. Peter to our Lord, *cf.* ii. 33, 36 (*cf.* Rom. x. 12); on their explanation by St. Athanasius and their place in the Arian controversy, see *Four Discourses against the Arians*, iv., 30, E.T. (Schaff and Wace edition). On Blass's "brilliant suggestion" to omit K., see Blass, *in loco* (he seems to think that **κοινός** is possible), and Page, *Classical Review*, p. 317, July, 1897.

Ver. 37. **τὸ ῥῆμα**: so far Peter has referred to a message which would be unknown to Cornelius, the message of peace through Christ, but he now turns to what Cornelius probably did know by report at all events; **τὸ ῥ.** not the **λόγος** of ver. 36, but only the "report".—**καθ᾽ ὅλης τῆς Ἰ.**, *i.e.*, all Palestine including Galilee, *cf.* ii. 9, xi. 1, 29, St. Luke i. 5 (iv. 44), vii. 17, xxiii. 5, see on ix. 31, 42 above.—**ἀρξάμενον**, see critical notes; *cf.* i. 22 and Luke xxiii. 5. If we read the accusative it agrees with **ῥῆμα** (see above); if the nominative, *cf.* for a similar construction Luke xxiv. 47, and see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 81. The abruptness of the construction is quite in accordance with that elsewhere marked in St. Peter's speeches, *cf.* ii. 22-24, iii. 14 ff.

Ver. 38. **Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ν.**: in apposition to **ῥῆμα**, the person in Whom all else was centred, and in Whom Peter had found and now preached "the Christ"; or may be treated as accusative after **ἔχρισεν**.—**ὡς ἔχρ.**: taken by St. Ambrose, St. Cyril of Jerusalem (so by Bede) to refer to the Incarnation, by St. Athanasius to the Baptism only. But the expression may also be connected with the entrance of our Lord upon His ministry at Nazareth, *cf.* Luke iv. 14; *cf.* in this passage the mention of Nazareth and Galilee.—**εὐεργετῶν**: our Lord was really **εὐεργέτης**, *cf.* Luke xxii. 25 (only in St. Luke); "far more truly used of Christ than of Ptolemy the king of Egypt," Cornelius à Lapide.—**καταδυναστευομένους**: only elsewhere in James ii. 6 in N.T., but *cf.* Wisdom ii. 10, xv. 14, Ecclus. xlviii. 12, Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 2, 3. No doubt other diseases besides those of demoniacal possession are included, *cf.* especially Luke xiii. 11, 16; but a special emphasis on the former exactly corresponds to the prominence of a similar class of disease in Mark i. 23.—**ὁ Θεὸς ἦν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ**, *cf.* vii. 9, John iii. 2, so also Luke i. 28, 66, and in LXX, Judg. vi. 16. We cannot see in the expression a "low" Christology; St. Peter had first to declare that Jesus was the Christ, and it is not likely that he would have entered upon a further exposition of His Person in his introductory discourse with a Gentile convert; but vv. 42 and 43 below, to say nothing of St. Peter's public addresses, certainly do not point to a humanitarian Christ.

Ver. 39. **ἀνεῖλον**, see above, p. 155.—**κρεμάσαντες**, p. 154.

Ver. 40. **ἐν τῇ τ. ἡμ.**: only alluded to here in Acts, but a positive testimony from St. Peter to the resurrection appearances on the third day, 1 Cor. xv. 4; the expression is specially emphasised by St. Luke in his Gospel, where it occurs some six times.—**ἐμφανῆ γεν.**: a phrase only found here and in Rom. x. 20, in a quotation from Isa. lxv. 1, "to be made manifest," R.V., *viz.*, that He was the same Person as before His Passion, not "openly showed," A.V., which gives an idea not in accordance with the present context.

Ver. 41. **οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ**, and therefore Cornelius could not have known the details fully. Theophylact well remarks,

γενέσθαι, 41. οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἀλλὰ μάρτυσι τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῖν, οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν[1] αὐτῷ, μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν· 42. καὶ παρήγγειλεν[2] ἡμῖν κηρύξαι τῷ λαῷ, καὶ διαμαρτύρασθαι, ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὡρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν. 43. τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν. 44. Ἔτι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Πέτρου τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, ἐπέπεσε[3] τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐπὶ πάντας

[1] After **συνεπ. αυτῳ** D, Par., Syr. H. (*cf.* Wern.) add **και συνανεστραφημεν**; D¹ has **συστραφημεν**, *cf.* Matt. xvii. 22; **συστρεφομενων**, W.H.; **αναστρεφομενων** in CD, etc. St. Luke himself never uses **συστρεφω** in this sense, nor **αναστρεφω** at all; but Hilg. **συνεστραφημεν**, and compares D xi. 28, and xvi. 39; see, however, note on xi. 28. After **νεκρων** D, Sah. (Wern.), Apost. Const. (Syr. H. mg.) (*cf.* E also) add **ημερας τεσσαρακοντα**, so Hilg., see Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 44; Ephrem's commentary implies such a reading of the old Syriac. Par. also adds **και ανεβη εις τον ουρανον**, see Harris, *u. s.*, for addition in Ephrem.

[2] **παρηγγειλε**, D has **ενετειλατο**; but **παραγγελλω** is also a favourite word with Luke; an instance where D seems to be a reminiscence of i. 2. **τῳ λαῳ** om. Par., Blass brackets, see below. **αυτος** but **ουτος** BCDE, Syrr. P. and H., Sah., Boh., Lach., W.H., Hilg., Wendt, Weiss, R.V.; Tisch. and Meyer follow ℵAHP 61, Vulg., Aeth., Iren., Chrys., and read **αυτος**, see Wendt's note in 1899, and also former edit. in favour of **ουτος**.

[3] **επεπεσε** ℵBEHLP; all edd. **επεσε** AD.

"If even the disciples were incredulous, and needed touch and talk, what would have happened in the case of the many?"—**προκεχειροτονημένοις**, *i.e.*, by God; only here, not used in LXX or Apocrypha; in classical Greek in same sense as here, see xiv. 23 for the simple verb. The preposition points back to the choice of the disciples with a view to bearing their testimony, i. 18, so that their witness was no chance, haphazard assertion.—**συνεφάγ.**, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 41, 43 (John xxi. 13), see also Ignat., *ad Smyrn.*, iii., 3 (*Apost. Const.*, vi., 30, 5).—**συνεπίομεν**: it is surely a false method of criticism which cavils at this statement, because in St. Luke's Gospel nothing is said of drinking, only of eating (see Plummer, *in loco*). Bede comments: "here Peter mentions what is not in the Gospel, unless intimated when He says 'until I drink it new'" etc.

Ver. 42. **παρήγγειλεν**: charged us, see on i. 4.—**διαμαρτύρ.**, see above on ii. 40, viii. 25.—**ὁ ὡρισμένος**, see ii. 23, *cf.* xvii. 31, in a strikingly similar statement by St. Paul at Athens. St. Peter and St. Paul are both at one in their witness to the Resurrection of the Christ on the third day, and also in their witness to His appointment as the future Judge of mankind. This startling claim made by St. Peter with reference to Jesus of Nazareth, with Whom he had lived on terms of closest human intimacy, and in Whose death he might well have seen the destruction of all his hopes, is a further evidence of the change which had passed over the Apostle, a change which could only be accounted for by the belief that this same Jesus was risen and declared to be the Son of God with power; *cf.* Enoch xli. 9, edition Charles; *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 403.—**κριτὴς ζ. καὶ ν.**, *cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 5; the words point back to the universal lordship of Christ over Jew and Gentile alike, ver. 36, *cf.* Rom. xiv. 9.

Ver. 43. **πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα**, *cf.* Rom. x. 11, whether Jew or Gentile; the phrase emphatic at the close of the verse, *cf.* Rom. iii. 22. There is no occasion to refer the words to a reviser in their Pauline meaning (Weiss); St. Peter in reality says nothing more than he had already said and implied, ii. 38, iii. 16, 26.

Ver. 44. **ἔτι λ.**: the Apostle is apparently interrupted (*cf.* xi. 15); but in this instance we can agree with Overbeck that the concluding phrase, in its relation to ver. 34 and its proof that God was no respecter of persons, gives to the whole speech a perfect completeness (so

τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὸν λόγον. 45. καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοὶ ὅσοι[1] συνῆλθον τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκκέχυται· 46. ἤκουον γὰρ αὐτῶν λαλούντων γλώσσαις,[2] καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν Θεόν. 47. τότε ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πέτρος, Μήτι τὸ ὕδωρ κωλῦσαι δύναταί τις τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι τούτους, οἵτινες τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἔλαβον καθὼς[3] καὶ ἡμεῖς; 48. προσέταξέ τε αὐτοὺς[4] βαπτισθῆναι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου.[5] τότε ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἐπιμεῖναι ἡμέρας τινάς.

[1] **οσοι** retained by Tisch., W.H. marg., Blass, Hilg., and even Weiss with ℵADEHLP; but Lach., W.H. text, Wendt follow B, d, Vulg.

[2] **γλωσσαις**, D[1] prefixes **καιναις**, d *prævaricatis* (= **ποικιλαις**, so Hilg.), Sah., *aliis*, see below.

[3] **καθως** EHLP; **ως** ℵAB, Iren., Chrys., Epiph., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss. Hilg. has **ωσπερ** with D.

[4] **αυτους** BDEHLP, Cyr.-Jer., Chrys., so W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; **αυτοις**, Tisch. following ℵA 33.

[5] **του Κ.** ℵABE verss. have instead **Ιησου Χριστου**, so all edd., so also Blass in β; but D has **του κ. Ι. Χ.**, so Hilg.; Meyer retains T.R.

Zöckler).—**ἐπέπεσε**, *cf.* x. 44, xi. 15, and for the frequency of the word in Acts and its use in Luke's Gospel, see Friedrich, p. 41. By this wonderful proof St. Peter and his Jewish brethren with him saw that, uncircumcised though they were, Cornelius and his household were no longer "common or unclean": "The Holy Ghost," said the Jews, "never fell upon a Gentile". Bengel comments, "Alias baptismus susceptus est ante adventum Spiritus Sancti . . . Liberum gratia habet ordinem".—**ἀκούοντας**, as in ver. 33.

Ver. 45. **οἱ ἐκ π.**, see ver. 23, *cf.* Rom. iv. 12, and for the phrase as describing St. Paul's most bitter and narrow opponents, see Gal. ii. 12, Col. iv. 11, Tit. i. 10. The fact was thus fully testified, even by those who were not in sympathy with it.—**καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη**: "nam uno admisso jam nulli clausa est janua" Bengel. *Cf.* ii. 38, a gift which they thought did not appertain to the Gentiles; see on ver. 44, and Schöttgen, *Hor. Heb.*, *in loco*.

Ver. 46. **λαλούντων γλώσσαις**, see on ii. 13; here no speaking in different languages is meant, but none the less the gift which manifested itself in jubilant ecstatic praise was a gift of the Spirit, and the event may well be called "the Gentile Pentecost"; see on xi. 15 and Plumptre, *in loco;* Wendt, edition 1899. The words of ver. 47 need not mean that this gift of tongues was manifested precisely as the Pentecostal gift.

Ver. 47. **μήτι τὸ ὕ. . . . τοῦ μὴ βαπτισθῆναι**, *cf.* xiv. 18: on construction, Burton, p. 159; so also in LXX and classical Greek, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 230; Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 172 (1893).—**οἵτινες**, *quippe qui*, so Blass in this passage.—**τὸ ὕδωρ**: "the water" R.V., not simply "water" as A.V., as Bengel admirably says, "Non dicit: jam habent Spiritum, ergo aqua carere possunt". In baptism both the water and the Spirit were required, xi. 16. The greater had been bestowed; could the lesser be withheld? See the striking passage in Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 108, on the fact that Cornelius and his companions, even after they had first received the presence of the Holy Ghost, were nevertheless ordered to be baptised.

Ver. 48. **προσέταξε**, *cf.* St. Paul's rule, 1 Cor. i. 17. If Philip the Evangelist was at Cæsarea at the time, the baptism may have been intrusted to him.—**ἐπιμεῖναι**: *diutius commorari*, Blass, so *manere amplius*, Bengel, *cf.* xxi. 4, 10, xxviii. 12, 14, and xv. 34 β (Blass); only in Luke and Paul, frequent in Acts, not found in Luke's Gospel, *cf.* John viii. 7; only once in LXX, Exod. xii. 39, in classics as in text.—**ἡμέρας τινάς**, no doubt spent in further instruction in the faith: *aurei dies*, Bengel.

CHAPTER XI.—Ver. 1. For Western readings see critical notices.—**κατὰ τὴν**

XI. 1. ἬΚΟΥΣΑΝ δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ οἱ ὄντες κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, ὅτι καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 2.[1] καὶ ὅτε ἀνέβη Πέτρος εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, διεκρίνοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, λέγοντες, 3. Ὅτι πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας εἰσῆλθες,[2] καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς. 4. Ἀρξάμενος δὲ ὁ Πέτρος ἐξετίθετο

[1] The Western text is here considerably expanded. Blass, following D, Syr. Harcl., Par., Wern. (with differences in particulars), reads in **β**: **ο μεν ουν Π. δια ικανου χρονου ηθελησεν πορευθηναι εις Ι. και προσφωνησας τους αδελφους και επιστηριξας (αυτους) εξηλθεν, πολυν τε χρονον ποιουμενος (επορευετο) δια των χωρων διδασκων αυτους. οτε δε κατηντησεν εις Ι. και απηγγειλεν αυτοις την χαριν του Θεου οι εκ περιτομης αδελφοι διεκρινοντο προς αυτον, λεγοντες·** This, according to Belser, is an irrefutable proof that **β** gives us the original text of Luke, p. 63, and see also Blass, *Phil. of the Gospels*, p. 129, and *cf.* xxi. 16. It is true that in the first part of the addition all the words and clauses are Lucan (although if we read with D **ος και κατηντησεν αυτοις** instead of **οτε δε κατην. εις Ι.** we have no instance in Luke of **καταντάω** in construction with a dative). But Weiss, Codex D, takes a very opposite view from Belser (see also Wendt (1899)), p. 206, and it is, of course, quite possible that the additions were made on account of the apparent abrupt ending of the passage about Cornelius, and to show that Peter, too, did not break off his missionary work hurriedly, etc.

[2] **εισηλθες και συνεφαγες**; W.H., following BL, Syrr., Arm., has the 3rd person sing., but Weiss has the 2nd person sing., as in TR (so Tisch.).

Ἰ.: not simply *in* but *throughout* Judæa, "all about Judæa," Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 57, *cf.* viii. 1.

Ver. 2. **διεκρίνοντο**, *cf.* Jude, ver. 9, with dative of the person (Polyb., ii., 22, 11). For similar construction as here see LXX, Ezek. xx. 35, 36, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* Otherwise in x. 20.—**οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς**, *cf.* Gal. ii. 12; we can scarcely confine the term here to those mentioned in x. 45 (although Dr. Hort takes this view as most probable), but how far there was a section of the Church at Jerusalem who could thus be described at this time it is difficult to say, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 44.

Ver. 3. **ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας**: the expression intimates the bitterness of the opposition. Bengel curiously comments "benigne loquuntur". On **ἀκροβ.** see especially Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 111.—**καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς**: this was the real charge, the violation of the ceremonial law, *cf.* x. 28; see on the intolerant division between Pharisaical Jews and Gentiles, Weber, *Jüdische Theol.*, pp. 59, 60; Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, pp. 26-28. There is therefore nothing in the statement to justify the objection raised by Zeller and others against the whole narrative of the baptism of Cornelius (so Wendt, edition 1888 and 1899). But if the complaint against Peter was based not upon the fact that he had baptised Cornelius but had eaten with him, then we can see a great difference between the narrative here and that of the Ethiopian eunuch in chap. viii. In the latter case there was no question of the obligations of the ceremonial law—the baptism was administered and Philip and the eunuch separated, but here the whole stress of the narrative lies in the fact referred to in ver. 3, so that if the eunuch and Cornelius both belonged to the class of "half-proselytes" their cases are not parallel. But even if they were, in other respects there would still remain a distinction between them. It was one thing for the Ethiopian to be received into the Church of Christ by the Hellenist Philip, but it was another thing—and a marked advance—when the principle asserted by Philip was ratified by the Apostles of the circumcision in the case of Cornelius. Wendt, edition 1899, pp. 181, 198, and Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 300.

Ver. 4. **ἀρξ. δὲ ὁ Π.** "But Peter began, and expounded the matter": **ἀρξ.** may be pleonastic, i. 4, *cf.* **καθεξῆς**, or may be used graphically, or because the reproaches of **οἱ ἐκ περιτ.** gave the *first* incentive to St. Peter's recital.—**καθ.** only in Luke, Gospel and Acts, see iii. 24.—**ἐξετίθετο**, xviii. 26, xxviii. 23, Jos., *Ant.*, i., 12, 2, so also in Polyb., x., 9, 3. Perhaps used here by St. Luke from its use by Dioscorides; familiar word to him also as a physician, see Vogel, p. 17.

αὐτοῖς καθεξῆς λέγων, 5. Ἐγὼ ἤμην ἐν πόλει Ἰόππῃ προσευχόμενος, καὶ εἶδον ἐν ἐκστάσει ὅραμα, καταβαῖνον σκεῦός τι ὡς ὀθόνην μεγάλην[1] τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς καθιεμένην ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἦλθεν ἄχρις ἐμοῦ· 6. εἰς ἣν ἀτενίσας κατενόουν, καὶ εἶδον τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἑρπετὰ καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. 7. ἤκουσα δὲ φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι, Ἀναστάς, Πέτρε, θῦσον καὶ φάγε. 8. εἶπον δέ, Μηδαμῶς, Κύριε[2]· ὅτι πᾶν κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον οὐδέποτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ στόμα μου. 9. ἀπεκρίθη δέ μοι φωνὴ ἐκ δευτέρου[3] ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Ἃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε, σὺ μὴ κοίνου. 10. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τρίς, καὶ πάλιν ἀνεσπάσθη ἅπαντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. 11. καὶ ἰδού, ἐξαυτῆς τρεῖς ἄνδρες ἐπέστησαν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐν ᾗ ἤμην,[4] ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ Καισαρείας πρός με. 12. εἶπε δέ μοι τὸ Πνεῦμα συνελθεῖν αὐτοῖς, μηδὲν διακρινόμενον[5]· ἦλθον δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ καὶ οἱ ἕξ

[1] **μεγαλην**, but **λαμπραν** in Syr. Harcl., Par.[1] has **μεγαλην λαμπραν**. Blass rejects (*cf.* x. 11).

[2] Orig. has **κυριε συ οισθα οτι**, Blass rejects.

[3] **εκ δευτερου** D omits, as also some Western authorities in x. 15, and Blass in **β**.

[4] **ημην** EHLP, Vulg., Syrr. (P. and H.), Boh., Sah., Aeth., Chrys., so Blass, W.H. marg.—assim. apparently to ver. 5. **ημεν** אABD 40, Tisch., W.H. text, R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.

[5] **διακρινομενον** HLP, Chrys. (*cf.* x. 20, Meyer, who suspects it here). **διακριναντα** א^c AB 13, 40, 61, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V.; **διακρινοντα** א*E 15, 18*, 36. Blass rejects altogether, so Hilg., with D, Syr. H. (text and margin), Par.[1]. But *cf.* Acts xv. 9, where act. occurs in similar context.

Evidently St. Luke by the two accounts attaches great significance to this first reception, exceptional case as it was, of a Gentile proselyte like Cornelius into the Christian Church, but it was an isolated case, and moreover a case within Palestine, not beyond its borders, so that the great questions of a mission to the Gentiles of the heathen world, and of the conditions for their reception as Christians, were not matter for consideration as afterwards in chap. xv., see Wendt, edition 1899, p. 211; Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 58, 59; and see below on ver. 12.

Ver. 6. **κατενόουν**, *cf.* vii. 31, 32, Matt. vii. 3, Luke vi. 41, R.V., etc., the seeing is the result of the considering—"*contemplabar* singula, effectus comprehenditur aoristo" **εἶδον**.—**θηρία**: not specially mentioned in x. 12 (see critical notes), but there **πάντα** precedes **τετράποδα**.

Ver. 8. **εἰσῆλθεν**, *cf.* Matt. xv. 11, 17. Blass sees in the phrase "locutio hebraismum redolens," *cf.* viii. 35; on the other hand the Hebraistic **πᾶν** of x. 14 is omitted (Weiss).

Ver. 10. **ἀνεσπάσθη**: only found in Luke xiv. 5 in N.T., another touch of vividness as in vv. 5, 6. In LXX three times, and possibly once in Bel and the Dragon, ver. 42, of drawing up Daniel from the den (but reading may be the simple verb, see H. and R.).

Ver. 12. **μηδὲν διακρινόμενον**, *cf.* x. 20, but if we read (see critical notes) **μ. διακρίναντα**, "making no distinction," R.V.—**οἱ ἓξ ἀδελφοὶ οὗτοι**: who had been with Peter at Cæsarea, and had returned with him to Jerusalem, see x. 45. Hilgenfeld would regard them as constant companions of St. Peter on his Apostolic journeys. Differences such as these between the narrative here and that in x. 23 where the brethren are mentioned without their number constrain Feine to regard xi. 1-18 as derived like the earlier narrative in x. from one and the same source, not as added by a reviser (although he excludes vv. 1 and 18 in xi. from the original narrative). Spitta agrees with Feine in this view of xi. 2-17; a forger writing with a "tendency" would have smoothed away any apparent discrepancies, as Zöckler well points out. With regard to the whole Cornelius

ἀδελφοὶ οὗτοι, καὶ εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀνδρός, 13. ἀπήγγειλέ τε ἡμῖν πῶς εἶδε τὸν ἄγγελον ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ σταθέντα καὶ εἰπόντα αὐτῷ Ἀπόστειλον εἰς Ἰόππην ἄνδρας, καὶ μετάπεμψαι Σίμωνα τὸν ἐπικαλούμενον Πέτρον, 14. ὃς λαλήσει ῥήματα πρὸς σέ, ἐν οἷς σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου· 15. ἐν δὲ τῷ ἄρξασθαί με λαλεῖν, ἐπέπεσε[1] τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτούς, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ. 16. ἐμνήσθην δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος Κυρίου, ὡς ἔλεγεν, "Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ." 17. εἰ οὖν τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν, πιστεύσασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, ἐγὼ δὲ τίς ἤμην δυνατὸς κωλῦσαι τὸν Θεόν[2]; 18. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ ταῦτα ἡσύχασαν, καὶ ἐδόξαζον[3] τὸν Θεόν, λέγοντες, Ἄραγε[4] καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν ἔδωκεν εἰς ζωήν.

[1] **επεπεσε**, but D reads simple verb, which Blass rejects here, although he accepts it in x. 44 (AD). Hilg. has simple verb.

[2] **ο Θεος** om. D, Aug., so Hilg., but Blass retains. D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Par. Aug. (Hilg. follows D) add **του μη δουναι αυτοις π. αγ.**, and D further adds **τοις πιστευσασιν επ' αυτῳ** and Syr. Harcl. **πιστ. εις τον Κ. Ι. Χ.** Blass omits these last two additions (with Aug.), but places **πιστευσασιν επ' αυτῳ** in brackets; additions apparently to explain of what the **κωλ. τον Θ.** consisted, described by Weiss as quite superfluous, see Codex D, p. 71, and note.

[3] **εδοξαζον** AEHLP, Arm., so Meyer; Blass (see force of imperf. in his comment.), Wendt, Weiss. **εδοξασαν** ℵBD^b, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. P. and H., Aeth., so Gig., Par.; Tisch., W.H., Hilg. But aor. manifestly conformed to aor. **ησυχασαν** (so Weiss, Wendt).

[4] **αραγε**, but **αρα** only in ℵABD 40, 61, 65, 133; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Blass, Wendt (against Meyer). D omits **την** before **μετανοιαν**.

episode, Spitta and Feine (so Weiss and Wendt), inasmuch as they regard St. Luke's narrative as containing at least a genuine historical kernel, and as marking a special exceptional case, and not a general rule as existing at such an early time, are much less radical than Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, and Clemen. For a good review of the relation of modern criticism to the narrative see Wendt (1899) on x. 1 and Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 226, 227 (second edition).

Ver. 13. **σταθέντα—σταθείς**: used only by St. Luke, in Gospel and Acts: Luke xviii. 11, 40, xix. 8, Acts ii. 14, v. 20, xi. 13, xvii. 22, xxv. 18, xxvii. 21, found therefore in *all* parts of Acts (Friedrich, Vogel).

Ver. 14. **ἐν οἷς σωθ. σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκ. σου**: words not found in x., but may be fairly taken as implied; the prayers of Cornelius we can scarcely doubt had been that he might see the salvation of God, and his household were devout like himself, *cf.* x. 2-6.

Ver. 15. **ἄρξασθαι**: somewhat more precisely stated than in x. 44. The speech has there no abruptness, but St. Peter may well have intended to say much more; if this was so, the notice here is quite natural, Winer-Moulton, lxv., 7 *d.*—**ἐν ἀρχῇ**, *i.e.*, at the great Pentecost.

Ver. 16. Words not found in the Gospels, but in Acts i. 5, quoted here with the omission of **οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας**, showing that St. Peter regarded the baptism of the Holy Ghost received by Cornelius as equally decisive of the Spirit's presence as the bestowal upon himself and others at Pentecost.—**ὡς ἔλεγεν**: not merely pleonastic, *cf.* Luke xxii. 61; Winer-Moulton, lxv., 1 *a*, Wendt, Felten.

Ver. 17. **πιστεύσασιν**, see R.V., best to take participle as referring both to **αὐτοῖς** and to **ἡμῖν**; in each case the Holy Spirit was bestowed, and in each case as a result of the preceding belief, not as a result of circumcision, or of

19. Οἱ μὲν οὖν διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ,[1] διῆλθον ἕως Φοινίκης καὶ Κύπρου καὶ Ἀντιοχείας, μηδενὶ λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον εἰ μὴ μόνον Ἰουδαίοις. 20. ἦσαν δέ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες Κύπριοι καὶ Κυρηναῖοι, οἵτινες εἰσελθόντες εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἐλάλουν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνιστάς,[2] εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν

[1] **επι Στεφανῳ** ℵBHLP 61, Bas., Chrys, Theophl., best supported; **επι Στεφανου** perhaps a gloss since **επι** was taken temporally; **απο του Στεφανου** D, so Hilg. (but not Blass in **β**). **Κυπρου**, Par. reads **Τυρου**; Blass rejects.

[2] **Ελληνιστας** BD²EHLP 61, W.H., R.V. marg., so Sanday (*cf.* Shirley, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 27, 28; Wordsworth, and Hastings' B.D., art. "Christian," p. 384); **Ελληνας** ℵ³A (discounted by reading **Ελληνας** wrongly in ix. 27), D¹, Arm., Eus., Chrys., Tisch., Weiss, Blass, R.V. text. ℵ¹ **ευαγγελιστας** claimed as supporting **Ελληνιστας**, but see Sanday, *u. infra*. Lightfoot and a large number of recent writers (Page, Ramsay, Zöckler, Holtzmann, Felten, Rendall, G. A. Smith, McGiffert) accept **Ελληνας** (although, in some cases, admitting that MS. authority is adverse), because demanded as antithetical to the preceding **Ιουδαιοι**. It is urged that **Ελληνιστ.** are included under **Ιουδ.**, but whilst in one sense this is so, it is also possible to draw a distinction between the two, **Ιουδ.** may be used as = **Εβραιοι** in vi. 1, or as in xiv. 1, xviii. 4 where evidently Jews and proselytes (not heathen) are distinguished, so that whilst as far as Antioch *Jews only* had been addressed, now the Cyprians and Cyrenians addressed Hellenists, God-fearers (like Cornelius), "Greeks who came into relations with the Jews," whilst not addressing as yet those who were entirely heathen. In view of the great importance and future position of the Church of Antioch, it is not unlikely that Luke should carefully note the elements of which it was originally composed. The real turning-point in the sphere of Peter and Paul is not yet, but in xiii. 46. See W.H., *Select Readings*, p. 94; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 59, 60; *Ecclesia*, p. 61; Sanday, *Expositor*, pp. 60-62, and Ramsay, p. 47 (1896).

uncircumcision; sometimes referred to **ἡμῖν**, so Bengel, Nösgen, Wendt, sometimes to **αὐτοῖς**, so Weiss, Blass.—**τίς ἤμην δ.**, *cf.* Exod. iii. 11, 2 Kings viii. 13, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 173; in reality two questions: Who was I? Was I able to withstand God? Winer-Moulton, lxvi., 5.—**ἐγὼ**, emphatic, "merum organon," Bengel.

Ver. 18. **ἡσύχασαν**, *cf.* xxi. 14 and Luke xiv. 3, so in LXX, Neh. v. 8 (Job xxxii. 6, Hebrew different); also in a different sense in Luke xxiii. 56, 1 Thess. iv. 11, only in Luke and Paul in N.T.—**ἐδόξαζον**, see critical notes, imperfect of continuous action—the writer about to pass to other things thus depicts the state of things which he leaves, *cf.* viii. 3 (Blass).—**Ἄραγε**, see critical notes.

Vv. 19-26. Further spread of the Gosael to Antioch.

Ver. 19. **οἱ μὲν οὖν**, *cf.* viii. 4. **μὲν οὖν** introduces a general statement, whilst **δέ** (ver. 20) marks a particular instance. —**ἐπὶ Σ.**: "about Stephen" A. and R. V. (best); some render "against Stephen," and others "post Stephanum". See also critical note.

Ver. 20. **ἄνδρες Κύπ. καὶ Κυρ.**, *cf.* iv. 36, xxi. 16; ii. 10, vi. 9.—**Ἑλληνιστάς**, see critical notes.—**εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Κ. Ἰ.**: on construction with accusative of the message, Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 79. We can scarcely take the phrase given here, instead of "preaching that Jesus was the Christ," as a proof that the word was preached not to Jews but to Gentiles.—**Ἀντιόχειαν**: on the Orontes, distinguished as **Ἀ. ἡ πρός**, or **ἐπὶ Δάφνῃ**, and bearing the title **μητρόπολις**. There appear to have been at least five places in Syria so called under the Seleucids. For the Arabs Damascus was the capital, but the Greeks wanted to be nearer the Mediterranean and Asia Minor. The city built in 500 B.C. by Seleucus Nicator I. became more and more beautiful, whilst all the trade of the Mediterranean was connected with it through its harbour Seleucia. All the varied elements of the life of the ancient world found a home there. From the first there were Jews amongst its inhabitants. But in such a mixed population, whilst art and literature could gain the praise of Cicero, vice as well as luxury made the city infamous as well as famous. Josephus calls it the third city of the empire, next to Rome and Alex-

Κύριον Ἰησοῦν. 21. καὶ ἦν χεὶρ Κυρίου μετ' αὐτῶν· πολύς τε ἀριθμὸς πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον. 22. Ἠκούσθη δὲ ὁ λόγος εἰς τὰ ὦτα τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις περὶ αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν διελθεῖν [1] ἕως Ἀντιοχείας. 23. ὃς παραγενόμενος καὶ ἰδὼν τὴν χάριν [2] τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐχάρη, καὶ παρεκάλει πάντας τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ Κυρίῳ· 24. ὅτι ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης Πνεύματος Ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως. καὶ προσετέθη ὄχλος ἱκανὸς τῷ Κυρίῳ. 25.[3] Ἐξῆλθε δὲ εἰς Ταρσὸν ὁ Βαρνάβας ἀναζητῆσαι Σαῦλον, καὶ εὑρὼν αὐτὸν ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν.

[1] διελθειν om. ℵAB 61, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Boh., Arm., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (against Meyer); but retained by Blass and Hilg., so in D, Syr. Harcl., Chrys.—perhaps added from xi. 19.

[2] χαριν την του Θ., so ℵAB, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt om. την in T.R., so DEHLP, Chrys., Hilg.

[3] Blass (*cf.* Hilg.) reconstructs according to D, Gig., Par., Syr. Harcl. mg.: ακουσας δε οτι Σαυλος εστιν εις Ταρσον εξηλθεν αναζητων αυτον και συντυχων παρεκαλεσεν ελθειν εις Α. οιτινες παραγενομενοι ενιαυτον ολον συνηχθησαν τῃ εκκ. κ. εδιδαξαν οχλον ικανον (D has ενι. ολ. συνεχυθησαν οχλ. ικ., omits και εδιδ.). It is difficult to see why this should have been shortened if original; perhaps added to definitely show why Barnabas went to Tarsus, and to mark that Saul was not brought to Tarsus but "besought to come". συνεχυθησαν, D (Par.[1]), evident mistake, Blass emends; see Weiss, Codex D, pp. 71, 72. Hilg. has συνεχυσαν.

andria, but Ausonius hesitates between Antioch and Alexandria, as to the rank they occupied in eminence and *vice*. The famous words of Juvenal: "in Tiberim defluxit Orontes," *Sat.*, iii., 62, describe the influences which Antioch, with its worthless rabble of Greeks and parasites, with its quacks and impostors, its rivalries and debaucheries, exercised upon Rome. Gibbon speaks of the city in the days of Julian as a place where the lively licentiousness of the Greek was blended with the hereditary softness of the Syrian. Yet here was the μητρόπολις, not merely of Syria, but of the Gentile Christian Churches, and next to Jerusalem no city is more closely associated with the early history and spread of the Christian faith. See "Antioch" (G. A. Smith) in Hastings' B.D.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chaps. xxiii., xxiv.; Renan, *Les Apôtres*, chaps. xii., xiii. — ἐλάλουν: "used to speak," so Ramsay.

Ver. 21. χεὶρ K., *cf.* iv. 28, 30, xiii. 11, Luke i. 66; frequent in O.T. τε closely connects the two clauses, showing that the result of "the hand of the Lord" was that a great number, etc. (Weiss).

Ver. 22. τῆς ἐκκ. τῆς ἐν Ἰ.: in contrast here to Antioch, in which the existence of an Ecclesia was not yet formally recognised; but *cf.* ver. 26, Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 59-61. — περὶ αὐτῶν: "concerning them" R.V., *i.e.*, the persons who had believed and turned to the Lord. Meyer takes it of the preachers, Felten of both preachers and converts.

Ver. 23. τὴν χάριν: if we add τὴν, see critical notes, "the grace that was of God" Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 60, so Alford.—παρεκάλει: a true son of encouragement, exhortation—see on iv. 36, imperfect because Barnabas remained at Antioch, and the result is indicated in ver. 24, προσετέθη. This mention of Barnabas and the part played by the primitive Church is referred by Clemen to his Redactor Antijudaicus, p. 109. If we read ἐν τῷ K. with R.V. margin we could render "to abide by the purpose of their heart in the Lord," so Hort, *u. s.*, p. 60; Rendall; *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 10; and Symmachus, Ps. x. 17 (Weiss). τῷ K., *i.e.*, Christ; with this verse *cf.* xv. 32, where St. Luke similarly insists upon the due qualification of divine gifts; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 45.

Ver. 25. Luke gives no reason why Barnabas goes to seek Saul, but Barnabas who had already vouched for Saul's sincerity before the Church of Jerusalem, ix. 27, could scarcely be ignorant that the sphere of his friend's future work was to be the Gentile world. In ix. 30 Saul was sent away to Tarsus, and now Bar-

26. ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐνιαυτὸν[1] ὅλον συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ διδάξαι ὄχλον ἱκανόν, χρηματίσαι τε πρῶτον[2] ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς

[1] **αυτους**, but **αυτοις** ℵABE 13, 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt. **ενιαυτον** ℵAB 13, Syr. Harcl., Did., Ath.; Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt prefix **και**, but see Blass's comment on **β**, *in loco*, p. 136.

[2] **πρωτον** ℵBD² 36, 163, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; **πρωτως**, see also Alford's note on its force; D, Gig., Par. read **και τοτε πρωτον**, so Hilg. Harnack regards the **τοτε** as secondary, and introduced by the Western reviser to mark that the disciples were *then* called Christians, which in Harnack's opinion was very improbable, see *Sitzungsberichte d. Königl. preuss. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, xvii., p. 4, 1899. **Χριστιαν.** ℵ¹ has **Χρηστιανοι**, "recte," Blass (so 61), but there is no reason to suppose that this was the original, although it may well have been a corrupted form, *cf.* the testimony of Tert., Just. Mar., Lactant.; D has **Χρειστ.**

nabas goes to Tarsus to seek him; each statement is the complement of the other, and a long period intervenes not marked by any critical event in Saul's history. So also Paul's own statement, Gal. i. 21, 22, marks the same period, and the two writers complete each other. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 45, 46, on Luke's style and reading in D above.—**ἀναζητῆσαι**, *cf.* Luke ii. 44, 45, nowhere else in N.T., a word therefore not only common to, but peculiar to Luke's writings.—**ἀνά**: giving idea of thoroughness; it was not known at what precise spot Saul was prosecuting his work, so the word implies effort or thoroughness in the search; **εὑρὼν** implies the same uncertainty. In LXX, *cf.* Job iii. 4, x. 6, 2 Macc. xiii. 21. Calvin comments on the fresh proof of the "simplicitas" of Barnabas; he might have retained the chief place at Antioch, but he goes for Paul: "videmus ergo ut sui oblitus nihil aliud spectat, nisi ut emineat unus Christus".

Ver. 26. **ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοὺς**, see critical notes, if dative **αὐτοῖς** = *accidit eis*, see Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 45, on the use of **ἐγένετο.**—**ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον**: "even a whole year" R.V.—**συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλ.**: "they were gathered together *in* the Church," so R.V. margin. Rendall holds that **ἐν** is fatal to the A.V. and R.V. text, and renders "they [*i.e.*, Barnabas and Saul] were brought together in the Church," an intimate association of inestimable value. Hort adopts as "the least difficult explanation of this curious word" "were hospitably received in the Church," so Wendt, Weiss, Nösgen, *cf.* Matt. xxv. 35; Deut. xxii. 2, Josh. ii. 18, Judg. xix. 18, 2 Sam. xi. 27.—**διδάξαι . . . χρηματίσαι**: *both* infinitives depend upon **ἐγένετο**, "and that the disciples," etc., suggesting that the name "Christian" followed as result upon the widespread teaching of the Apostles amongst the Gentiles. If St. Luke, as Eusebius states, was himself a native of Antioch, it has been well noted that he might well record such a distinction for his city as the origin of the name "Christian".—**χρηματίσαι**: prim. to transact business (**χρῆμα**), passes into the meaning of taking a name from one's public business, so to receive a name, to be called, *cf.* Rom. vii. 3, so in Josephus and Philo, and instances in Grimm-Thayer. See also x. 22 for another shade of meaning, and so elsewhere in N.T.; and for its use to express a reply or information by a king or those in authority to inquiry, see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 118.—**πρῶτον**, see critical notes.—**Χριστιανούς**: in the N.T. the Christians always named themselves **μαθηταί, ἀδελφοί, ἅγιοι, πιστοί**, etc., but on no occasion "Christians," whilst the Jews not only refused to recognise that Jesus had any claim to be the Christ, but also called His followers **Ναζωραῖοι** (xxiv. 5), or spake of them as **ἡ αἵρεσις αὕτη** (xxviii. 22, *cf.* xxiv. 14). On the probably contemptuous use of the word in 1 Peter iv. 16 and Acts xxvi. 28 as not inconsistent with the above statements, see Wendt, edition 1899, *in loco*, and "Christian" in Hastings' B.D. But whilst it is difficult to find an origin for the title amongst Christians or amongst Jews, there is no difficulty in attributing it to the keen-witted populace of Antioch, already famous for their bestowal of nicknames, although perhaps the possibility that the name may have originated amongst the Latin-speaking official retinue of the *legatus* at Antioch should not be excluded (though there is no evidence whatever that it became at this early date an official name). But there is no need to suppose that the name

μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς. 27. Ἐν ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις κατῆλθον ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων προφῆται εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν.[1] 28. ἀναστὰς δὲ εἷς ἐξ

[1] At end of verse and commencement of ver. 28 we have the remarkable reading in β: **ην δε πολλη αγαλλιασις. συνεστραμμενων δε ημων εφη εις εξ αυτων,** so D, Aug., Par., Wern., and also, a new witness, Fragment of the Old Latin translation of Acts in the *Miscellanea Cassinese*, 1897 (see Harnack's note in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, p. 172, 1898). **αγαλλιασις** is quite Lucan, *cf.* ii. 46, and the solutions of Weiss and Corssen are not sufficient to weaken the view that here, at least, we may have an original draft. If it is said that the words are introduced to show the impression made by the visit of the prophets (so Weiss), we must remember that they stand in strange contrast to the announcement of the coming famine, and that it would have been a bold thing for an emendator to introduce them here. The circumstances in viii. 8 are quite different. Blass sees in the following words, p. 137, "luculentissimum testimonium, quo auctor sese Antiochenum fuisse monstrat," see also *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 131; we get by these three words, **συνεσ. δε ημων**, a fresh *we-section;* to the same effect Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 137; Salmon, *Introd.*, pp. 597, 602; Belser, p. 64; see also Harnack, *u. s.*, and Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., pp. 341, 350. Wendt (1898), p. 216, note, inclines to accept the reading as original, and even Weiss, Codex D, p. 111, thinks it not impossible; so too Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 505 (1895); and *cf.* Jülicher, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 271. Harnack, *u. s.*, admits, p. 6, that the language is not un-Lucan, but he regards the other passages in which **συστρεφ.** occurs as Western interpolations, and **ην δε πολλη αγαλλ.** as a mere amplification, as in viii. 24, xiii. 8.

was of Roman origin, although we may readily concede that the Latin termination *-ianus* was common enough at this period. There is ample proof of the use of the same termination not only in Latin but in Greek, even if we do not regard **-ιανός** with Wendt as a termination of a native "Asiatic type". The notice in Tacitus, *Ann.*, xv., 44 (*cf.* Suetonius, *Nero*, 16), who was probably in Rome during Nero's persecution, A.D. 64, is very significant, for he not only intimates that the word was commonly and popularly known, but also that the title had been in vogue for some time: "quos vulgus Christianos appellabat," note the imperfect tense. Against the recent strictures of Weizsäcker and Schmiedel we may place the opinion of Spitta, and also of Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 158. How soon the title given in mockery became a name of honour we may gather from the Ignatian Epistles, *cf. Rom.*, iii., 3; *Magn.*, iv.; *Ephes.*, xi., 2, and *cf. Mart. Polyc.*, x. and xii., 1, 2. See further Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 16; Lechler, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 129 ff.; Smith, B.D.[2] "Christian," Conybeare and Howson, p. 100 (smaller edition), and *Expositor*, June, 1898.

Ver. 27. Antioch sends relief to Jerusalem.—**ἐν ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡ.**, *cf.* i. 15, vi. 1. **ταύταις** emphatic, by its position and also by its significance, days full of importance for Barnabas and Saul, who were still at Antioch (Weiss).—**προφῆται**: the coming of the prophets gave an additional sanction to the work at Antioch. There is no reason in the uncertainty of the dates to suppose that they had been driven from Jerusalem by persecution. For the position of the Christian prophets in the N.T. *cf.* Acts xiii. 1, where Barnabas and Saul are spoken of as prophets and teachers; afterwards as Apostles, xiv. 4; xv. 32, where Judas and Silas are described as prophets, having been previously spoken of, ver. 22, as **ἡγούμενοι** amongst the brethren at Jerusalem (while Silas later bears the name of Apostle); *cf.*, further, 1 Cor. xii. 28, xiv. 29-33, 39, Ephes. iv. 11, where in each case the Prophet is placed next to Apostles (although in 1 Cor. he may have been merely a member of a local community), perhaps because "he belonged to the same family as the great prophets of the Old Testament," for whilst foreknowledge of events was not necessarily implied by the word either in the O.T. or in the N.T., the case of Agabus, both here and in xxi. 10, 11, shows that predictiveness was by no means excluded. The Christian prophets, moreover, as we see them in Acts, combine the duty of "ministering to the Lord" with that of preaching the word; they are not only foretellers, but forthtellers of God's will, as in the case of a Samuel or an Elijah, Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, pp. 240, 261, 393, etc.; Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 160 ff.; and for *Sub-Apostolic Age*, p. 179 ff.; Bigg, *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, p.

αὐτῶν, ὀνόματι Ἄγαβος, ἐσήμανε[1] διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, λιμὸν μέγαν[2] μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην· ὅστις καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου[3] Καίσαρος. 29. τῶν δὲ μαθητῶν[4] καθὼς ηὐπορεῖτό τις,

[1] **εσημανε** ℵAEHLP, most verss., so Tisch., W.H. marg.; but B, d, Vulg., Chron., Aug., so Lach., W.H., Weiss read imperf. **εσημαινε**—Wendt undecided.

[2] **μεγαν** D[1]EHLP, Chrys., Chron.; but ℵABD[2] 61, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. have **μεγαλην (ητις)**.

[3] **Καισαρος** om. ℵABD 13, 61, Vulg., several verss., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, so Hilg.

[4] **των δε μαθητων,** D, Par., Vulg. (Gig.) read **οι δε μαθηται,** and so D **καθως ευπορουντο** instead of **ευπ. τις.**

28 (1898); Harnack, "Apostellehre" in *Real-Encyclopädie für Protestant. Theol.* (Hauck), p. 716, and see, further, on xiii. 1.

Ver. 28. **Ἄγαβος**: on derivation see W.H., ii., 313, from עגב "to love"; or from חגב "a locust," Ezra ii. 45, Neh. vii. 48, with rough breathing Ἅγ. W.H. follow Syriac and read the former as in T.R., so Weiss; Blass doubtful; Klostermann would connect it with Ἀγαυός, *Probleme im Aposteltexte*, p. 10. As a Jewish prophet he would naturally use the symbolic methods of a Jeremiah or an Ezekiel, see on xxi. 10, 11. On insertion in D see critical notes.—**μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι**: future infinitive only used in N.T. with **μέλλειν** in this one phrase, and only so in Acts, *cf.* xxiv. 15, xxvii. 10. In xxiii. 30 **μέλλειν** omitted (although in T.R.), and in xxiv. 25 **ἔσεσθαι** omitted (although in T.R.). Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 51, Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 120, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 158 (1893).—**λιμὸν**: masculine in Luke iv. 25, and so in common usage, but in Doric usage, as it is called, feminine, and so also in later Greek; feminine in Luke xv. 14 and here; see critical notes; Blass, *Gram.*, p. 26.—**ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκ.**—the civilised world, *i.e.*, the Roman Empire. *Cf.* xxiv. 5, and Luke ii. 1, see Plummer's note on Luke iv. 5 (and Hackett's attempt, *in loco*, to limit the expression), and Ramsay, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 118. We have ample evidence as to a widespread dearth over various parts of the Roman Empire, to which Suetonius, Dion Cassius, Tacitus, and Eusebius all bear witness, in the reign of Claudius; and in no other reign do we find such varied allusions to periodical famines, "assiduae sterilitates," Suetonius, *Claudius*, xviii., *cf.* Dion Cassius, lx., 11; Tac., *Ann.*, xii., 43, etc. These and other references are given by Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 170, E.T. (so also by O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 124), but instead of drawing from these varied references the inference that the author of Acts had ample justification for his statement as to the prevalence of famine over the Roman Empire, he takes him to task for speaking of a famine "over the whole world". See Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 48, 49, and also *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* pp. 251, 252, *cf.* vv. 29 and 30. At least there is no ground to suppose, with Clemen and others, that the writer of Acts was here dependent on Josephus for the mention of the famine which that historian confined to Judæa, but which the writer of Acts, or rather Clemen's Redactor Antijudaicus, magnified according to his usual custom.

Ver. 29. **καθὼς ηὐπορεῖτό τις**: only here in N.T., and the cognate noun in xix. 25, but in same sense in classical Greek; *cf.* Lev. xxv. 26, 28, 49, and Wisdom x. 10 (but see Hatch and Redpath on passages in Lev.). "According to his ability," so A. and R.V., *i.e.*, as each man prospered, in proportion to his means. The expression intimates that the community of goods, at least in a communistic sense, could not have been the rule, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 2, but a right view of "the community of goods" at Jerusalem invokes no contradiction with this statement, as Hilgenfeld apparently maintains, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 506, 1895. On the good effect of this work of brotherly charity and fellowship, this practical exhibition of Christian union between Church and Church, between the Christians of the mother-city and those of the Jewish dispersion, see Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 62; Ram-

ὥρισαν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς· 30. ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν, ἀποστείλαντες πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους διὰ χειρὸς Βαρνάβα καὶ Σαύλου.

say, *u. s.*, p. 52; Baumgarten (Alford, *in loco*).—**εἰς διακονίαν**: "for a ministry," R.V. margin, *cf.* Rom. xv. 31, 2 Cor. ix. 1, etc., *Acta Thomæ*, 56; "contributions for relief" Ramsay, see further below; on the construction and complexity of the sentence see especially Page's note, and Wendt.—**ἀδελφοῖς**: not merely as fellow-disciples, but as brethren in the One Lord.

Ver. 30. **ὃ καὶ ἐποίησαν κ.τ.λ.**: a question arises as to whether this took place during, or at a later date than, Herod's persecution in 44 A.D.—the year of his death. Bishop Lightfoot (with whom Dr. Sanday and Dr. Hort substantially agree) maintains that Barnabas and Saul went up to Jerusalem in the early months of 44, during Herod's persecution, deposited their **διακονία** with the elders, and returned without delay. If we ask why "elders" are mentioned, and not Apostles, the probability is suggested that the Apostles had fled from Jerusalem and were in hiding. Against this view Ramsay strongly protests, not only on account of the part assigned to the leading Apostles, but also because of the meaning which he attaches to the **διακονία** of Barnabas and Saul (see on xii. 25). The elders, not Apostles, are mentioned because the embassy was of a purely business kind, and it was not fit that the Apostles should serve tables. Moreover, Ramsay places the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem in 45, or preferably in 46, at the commencement of the great famine in Judæa—not in 44, but in 45. Still, as Dr. Sanday urges, the entire omission of any reference to the Apostles is strange (*cf.* Blass on xi. 30, xii. 17, who holds that the Apostles had fled), especially as elsewhere Apostles and elders are constantly bracketed together as a single body (xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23, xvi. 4, *cf.* xxi. 18). Nor does it follow that because James, presumably "the brother of the Lord," is mentioned as remaining in Jerusalem during the persecution (but see Lightfoot, *Gal.*, p. 127, note), which his reputation for sanctity amongst his countrymen might have enabled him to do, that the other Apostles could have done so with equal safety. But Ramsay at all events relieves us from the difficulty involved in the entrance of Paul into Jerusalem at a time of persecution, and the more so in view of the previous plots against his life, a difficulty which is quite unsatisfactorily met by supposing that Paul did not enter the city at all for some unknown reasons, or more unsatisfactorily still by attributing to the author of Acts a mistake in asserting that any visit of Paul to Jerusalem was made at this time. On the chronological order involved in accordance with the two views mentioned, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 48 ff., 68, 69; Lightfoot, *Gal.*, p. 124, note; and, as space forbids more, for the whole question *Expositor* for February and March, 1896; Lightfoot, *Gal.*, p. 123 ff.; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 61, and *Ecclesia*, p. 62; Wendt, p. 265 (1888) and p. 218 (1899).—**τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους**, see previous verse. It is also noticeable that St. Luke gives no account of the appointment of the elders; he takes it for granted. These Christian elders are therefore in all probability no new kind of officers, but a continuation in the Christian Church of the office of the זְקֵנִים, **πρεσβύτεροι**, to whom probably the government of the Synagogue was assigned—hence we may account for St. Luke's silence (Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 141; Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 62; Lightfoot, *Phil.*, pp. 191-193; "Bishop" (Gwatkin), Hastings' B.D.). In the Christian **συναγωγή** (James ii. 2) there would naturally be elders occupying a position of trust and authority. There is certainly no reason to regard them as the Seven under another name (so Zeller, Ritschl), although it is quite conceivable that if the Seven represented the Hellenists, the elders may have been already in existence as representing the Hebrew part of the Church. But there is need to guard against the exaggeration of the Jewish nature of the office in question. In the N.T. we find mention of elders, not merely so on account of age, not merely as administrative and disciplinary officers (Hatch, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 58, 61), as in a Jewish synagogue, but as officers of the Christian Church with spiritual functions, *cf.* James v. 14, 1 Pet. v. 2, Acts xx. 17, Tit. i. 5, and also 1 Thess. v. 12-14, Heb. xiii. 7 (see Mayor, *St. James*, p. cxxviii; Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, pp. 253, 263, and note

XII. 1. ΚΑΤ' ἐκεῖνον δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπέβαλεν Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς χεῖρας κακῶσαί τινας τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.[1] 2. ἀνεῖλε δὲ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρᾳ. 3. καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι ἀρεστόν ἐστι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις,[2] προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον· (ἦσαν δὲ

[1] After εκκλησιας D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Par., Wern. add της εν τῃ Ἰουδαιᾳ—if the words were original it seems difficult to account for their omission; but see Belser's defence, p. 64, of this and β in vv. 3 and 5.

[2] After Ιουδαιοις D, Syr. H. mg., Par., so Hilg., add η επιχειρησις αυτου επι τους πιστους—this again may be an explanatory gloss, defining what pleased the Jews—but επιχ. and πιστ. are used by Luke in his writings.

K). At the same time there is nothing to surprise us in the fact that the administration of alms should be connected *in loco* with the office of elders. If they were representing the Apostles at the time in Jerusalem, it is what we should expect, since the organisation of almsgiving remained part of the Apostolic office, Gal. ii. 10, 2 Cor. viii., etc.; and if in a passage from Polycarp (quoted by Dr. Hatch) we find the two connected—the presbyterate and what looks like the administration of alms, Polycarp, *Phil.*, vi., xi.—this again need not surprise us, since not only in the N.T., but from the passage referred to in Polycarp, it is evident that the elders, whilst they exercised judicial and administrative functions, exercised also spiritual gifts, and discharged the office of teachers, functions to which there was nothing analogous in the Jewish presbyters (see Gore, *u. s.*, note K, and Gwatkin, *u. s.*, p. 302). *To turn back the sheep that are gone astray* (ἐπιστρέφοντες τὰ ἀποπεπλανημένα) is one of the first commands laid by Polycarp in his Epistle upon the Christian Presbyters (vi., quoted by Hatch), and from this alone it would appear that a familiar title in the Jewish Church passed into the Church of Christ, gaining therein a new and spiritual power. See further on xx. 17, and for the use of the word in inscriptions, Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 153, and *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 160.

CHAPTER XII. *Persecution by Herod; St. Peter's deliverance.*—Ver. 1. **κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν**: "about that time," or more precisely "at that time," Rendall, *cf.* Rom. ix. 9, so in Gen. xviii. 10, 2 Macc. iii. 5: in the early part of 44 A.D.—**Ἡρώδης ὁ β.**, Herod Agrippa I.: only in this chapter in the N.T.: on his character and death, see below xii. 3, 23. Born in B.C. 10 and educated in his early life in Rome, he rose from a rash adventurer to good fortune and high position first through the friendship of Caligula and afterwards of Claudius. He united under his own sway the entire empire of his grandfather, Herod the Great, while his Pharisaic piety and also his attachment to the Roman supremacy found expression in the titles which he bore, **βασιλεὺς μέγας φιλόκαισαρ εὐσεβὴς καὶ φιλορώμαιος.** On the pathetic story told of him in connection with the Feast of Tabernacles (A.D. 41) see Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 1, p. 28, and the whole article; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 150 ff., E.T.; Farrar, *The Herods*, p. 179 ff. (1898).—**ἐπέβαλεν τὰς χεῖρας**, Luke xx. 19, xxi. 12, and *cf.* Acts iv. 3, v. 18, xxi. 27, once in Matthew and Mark, in John twice; Friedrich, p. 39, *cf.* LXX, Gen. xxii. 12, 2 Sam. xviii. 12 (so in Polyb.), *cf.* for similar construction of the infinitive of the purpose xviii. 10, not in the sense of ἐπεχείρησε, *conatus est*, but to be rendered quite literally; *cf.* also the context, ver. 3.—**κακῶσαι**: five times in Acts, only once elsewhere in N.T., 1 Peter iii. 13, "to afflict," R.V., A.V. "vex," so Tyndale.—**τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκ.**, for the phrase *cf.* vi. 9, xv. 5, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, ἀπό, ii., but see also Blass, *Gram.*, p. 122 and *in loco*.

Ver. 2. **ἀνεῖλε**, characteristic word, see on v. 33.—**Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀ. Ἰ.**: St. Chrysostom reminds us of our Lord's prophecy in Mark x. 38 ff. (Matt. xx. 23), distinguished thus from the James of i. 13. Possibly his prominent position, and his characteristic nature as a son of Thunder marked him out as an early victim.—**μαχαίρᾳ**: so in the case of John the Baptist. This mode of death was regarded as very disgraceful among the Jews (J. Lightfoot, Wetstein), and as in the Baptist's case so here, the mode of execution shows that the punishment was not for blasphemy, but that James was apprehended and killed by the political power. For the touching account of his

ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων·) 4. ὃν καὶ πιάσας ἔθετο εἰς φυλακήν, παραδοὺς τέσσαρσι τετραδίοις στρατιωτῶν φυλάσσειν αὐτὸν, βουλόμενος μετὰ τὸ πάσχα ἀναγαγεῖν αὐτὸν τῷ λαῷ. 5. ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος ἐτηρεῖτο ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ[1]· προσευχὴ δὲ ἦν ἐκτενὴς[2] γινομένη ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ.

[1] After **φυλακῃ** Syr. H. mg., Par. add **υπο της σπειρης του βασιλεως**—here, again the words may be a gloss to explain **ετηρειτο**, unnecessary after ver. 4.

[2] **εκτενης** A²EHLP 61, Bas., Chrys., so Meyer; **εκτενως** ℵA¹B 13, 40, 81, Vulg., Lucif., so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V.; D has **εν εκτενειᾳ** (*cf.* xxvi. 7), so Hig.

martyrdom narrated by Clement of Alexandria, see Eus., *H. E.*, ii., 9. Whatever St. Luke's reason for the brevity of the account, whether he knew no more, or whether he intended to write a third book giving an account of the other Apostles besides Peter and Paul, and so only mentioned here what concerned the following history (so Meyer, but see Wendt, p. 267 (1888)), his brief notice is at least in striking contrast (**ἁπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν**, Chrys.) with the details of later martyrologies.

Ver. 3. **ἀρεστόν . . . τοῖς Ἰ.**: exactly what we should expect from the character and policy of Herod in his zeal for the law, and from the success with which during his short reign he retained the favour of Jews and Romans alike. Holtzmann, p. 370, seems inclined to doubt the truth of this description of Herod, and lays stress upon the mention of the king's mild disposition in Josephus, *Ant.*, xix., 7, 3. But Josephus also makes it quite plain how zealous Agrippa was, or pretended to be, for the laws and ordinances of Judaism, *u. s.* and xx., 7, 1, and see Schürer, *u. s.*, and Feine, p. 226. Nor is it at all certain that Agrippa's reputed mildness and gentleness would have kept him from rejoicing in the persecution of the Christians, *cf.* the description of his delight in the bloody gladiatorial games, Jos., *Ant.*, xix., 9, 5.—**προσέθετο συλλ.**: a Hebraism, *cf.* Luke xix. 11, xx. 11: LXX, Gen. iv. 2, viii. 12, xxv. 1, Exod. xiv. 13, etc., peculiar to St. Luke in N.T., Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 209 (1893).—**αἱ ἡ. τῶν ἀζύμων**, and therefore a large number of Jews would be in Jerusalem, and Herod would thus have a good opportunity of gaining wide popularity by his zeal for the law.

Ver. 4. **ὃν καὶ πιάσας**, iii. 7, really Doric form of **πιέζω** (*cf.* Luke vi. 38, nowhere else in N.T.), used in this sense also in LXX, and elsewhere in N.T., *cf.* Cant. ii. 15, Ecclus. xxiii. 21 (not A). Modern Greek **πιάνω** = seize, apprehend.—**καὶ**: "when he had taken him, indeed," so Rendall, as if a delay had taken place, before the arrest was actually made.—**τέσσαρσι τετραδ.**: the night was divided by the Romans—a practice here imitated by Herod—into four watches, and each watch of three hours was kept by four soldiers, *quaternio*, two probably guarding the prisoner within the cell, chained to him, and two outside. **τετραδ.**, *cf.* Philo, *in Flaccum*, 13; Polyb., xv., 33, 7, and see for other instances, Wetstein.—**μετὰ τὸ πάσχα**, "after the Passover," R.V., *i.e.*, after the whole festival was over: Herod either did not wish, or affected not to wish, to profane the Feast: "non judicant die festo" (*Moed Katon.*, v., 2).—**ἀναγαγεῖν**: only here in this sense (in Luke xxii. 66, **ἀπήγαγον**, W. H.), probably means to lead the prisoner up, *i.e.*, before the judgment tribunal (John xix. 13), to sentence him openly to death before the people.

Ver. 5. **ὁ μὲν οὖν . . . προσευχὴ δὲ**: both A. and R.V. regard **προσ. δὲ** in the same verse as the antithesis, but see Page's note, where the antithesis is found in ver. 6, **ὅτε δέ**. If we retain the former interpretation, ver. 5 may be regarded as a kind of parenthesis, the **ὅτε δέ** in ver. 6 forming a kind of antithesis to ver. 4.—**ἐκτενής**, see critical notes; if we read **ἐκτενῶς** = "earnestly," R.V. (Latin, *intente*), adverb is Hellenistic, used (by St. Luke xxii. 44, and) once elsewhere in 1 Peter i. 22 (*cf.* the adjective in 1 Peter iv. 8), so of prayer in Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xxxiv., 7. In LXX *cf.* the use of the word in Joel i. 14 (but see H. and R.), Jonah iii. 8, Judith iv. 12 (see H. and R.), 3 Macc. v. 9. The adjective is also found in 3 Macc. iii. 10 and v. 29. Their praying shows "non fuisse animis fractos," Calvin. The word passed into the services of the Church, and was often repeated by the deacon: **δεηθῶμεν ἐκ.** or **ἐκτενέστερον.**

6. Ὅτε δὲ ἔμελλεν αὐτὸν προάγειν [1] ὁ Ἡρώδης, τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ ἦν ὁ Πέτρος κοιμώμενος μεταξὺ δύο στρατιωτῶν, δεδεμένος ἁλύσεσι δυσί, φύλακές τε πρὸ τῆς θύρας ἐτήρουν τὴν φυλακήν. 7. καὶ ἰδού, ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐπέστη,[2] καὶ φῶς ἔλαμψεν ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι· πατάξας δὲ τὴν πλευρὰν τοῦ Πέτρου, ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν λέγων, Ἀνάστα ἐν τάχει. καὶ ἐξέπεσον [3] αὐτοῦ αἱ ἁλύσεις ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν. 8. εἶπέ τε ὁ ἄγγελος πρὸς αὐτόν, Περίζωσαι, καὶ ὑπόδησαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου. ἐποίησε δὲ οὕτω. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου, καὶ ἀκολούθει

[1] **προαγειν** DEHLP, Chrys., so Meyer, Blass, and Hilg.; **προαγαγειν** A 8, 15, 61, so Tisch., W.H., marg., Weiss; **προσαγειν** ℵ 5, 29; **προσαγαγειν** B 13, 57, so W.H. text, Wendt. Compounds in **προ** and **προς** often interchanged (see Weiss, p. 20).

[2] Western text, **β**, adds **τῳ Πετρῳ** after **επεστη**, for **ελαμψεν** reads **επελαμψεν**, adds **απ' αυτου** (the angel), and instead of **τῳ οικ.** reads **τῳ τοπῳ εκεινῳ**. **παταξ.**, instead D, Gig. read **νυξας**, so Hilg., *cf.* John xix. 34.

[3] **εξεπεσον**, but **-εσαν** ℵABDE 61, Tisch., W.H., Blass, Hilg., Weiss, W.H., App., p. 171, and Kennedy, p. 169.

Ver. 6. **τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκείνῃ**: "that very night," *i.e.*, the night before the trial.—**κοιμώμενος**, *cf.* 1 Peter v. 7 and Ps. cxxvii. 2: "for so He giveth His beloved sleep": "and there too it is beautiful that Paul sings hymns, whilst here Peter sleeps," Chrys., *Hom.*, xxvi: *cf.* xvi. 25. **τὸ πᾶν ῥίψας ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον**, Oecumenius (*cf.* Blass, *in loco*).—**ἁλύσεσι δυσί**, *cf.* xxi. 33; on the usual Roman custom see Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 6, 7, in the account of Herod's own imprisonment by Tiberius; *cf.* Pliny, *Epist.*, x., 65; Seneca, *Epist.*, i., 5, "eadem catena et custodiam (vinctum) et militem copulabat," perhaps most natural to suppose that Peter was bound on either hand to each of the soldiers, the two chains being used perhaps for greater security on account of the former escape.—**φύλακες**, *i.e.*, the other two of the quaternion to make escape impossible.

Ver. 7. **ἐπέστη**: often as here with the notion of coming suddenly, in classical Greek it is often used of dreams, as in Homer; or of the coming of heavenly visitors, very frequent in Luke, and with the same force as here, Friedrich, pp. 7 and 87, and almost always in second aorist, see also Plummer on Luke ii. 9.—**οἰκήματι**: only here in N.T., used in Wisdom xiii. 15 (and perhaps in Tobit ii. 4), but not in same sense. Dem. and Thuc. use it for a prison: R.V. "the cell," lit., the chamber.—**πατάξας δὲ τὴν πλευρὰν**: to rouse him, an indication of the sound and quiet sleep which the prisoner slept in spite of the fateful morrow (so Weiss); *cf.* vii. 24, and ver. 23).

Ver. 8. **περίζωσαι**, but simple verb in R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt; bind thy tunic with a girdle: during the night the long flowing undergarment was loosened, but fastened up by day, so as not to impede the movements. Wetstein, Weiss, Page, and others contrast Hor., *Sat.*, i., 2, 132. "Colligit sarcinulas nec festinat" (Wetstein), simple verb only twice elsewhere in N.T., and there also of St. Peter, *cf.* John xxi. 18.—**σανδάλιά**: Mark vi. 9, elsewhere **ὑποδήματα**. St. Peter still observed his Master's rule to be shod with sandals (Mark, *u. s.*), *i.e.*, the shoes of the poor as distinguished from those of the more wealthy: dim. of **σάνδαλον**, ***a wooden sole***. In LXX *cf.* Josh. ix. 5, Isa. xx. 2; in Judith x. 4, xvi. 9, of the sandals of the richer class.—**περιβαλοῦ**, only here in Acts; Luke xii. 27, xxiii. 11, often elsewhere in N.T., and in LXX.—**τὸ ἱμάτιον**: the outer garment worn over the **χιτών**, and laid aside at night with the sandals. Lumby compares *Didache*, i., 4. Mark the distinction between the aorist and present tense, **περίζωσαι . . . ὑπόδ. . . . περιβ.**, but **ἀκολούθει** (*cf.* John ii. 16). "Præsens propter finem non indicatum" Blass; Simcox, *Language of N. T.*, p. 114.

Ver. 9. **ἐδόκει δὲ ὅραμα βλέπειν**: even those who regard the narrative as unhistorical can scarcely say that the writer cannot understand how to distinguish between an actual fact and a vision; moreover, this same writer describes visions such as that of Peter, x. 10, and of Paul, xxii. 17, as ecstacies; once in xxvi. 19 Paul speaks of the appearance of Christ vouchsafed to him before Damascus as a

μοι. 9. καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ· καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι ἀληθές ἐστι τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου, ἐδόκει δὲ ὅραμα βλέπειν. 10. διελθόντες δὲ πρώτην φυλακὴν καὶ δευτέραν, ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν, τὴν φέρουσαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, ἥτις αὐτομάτη ἠνοίχθη[1] αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐξελθόντες[2] προῆλθον ῥύμην μίαν, καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέστη ὁ ἄγγελος ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. 11. καὶ ὁ Πέτρος γενόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἶπε, Νῦν οἶδα ἀληθῶς ὅτι ἐξαπέστειλε Κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξείλετό με ἐκ χειρὸς Ἡρώδου καὶ πάσης τῆς προσδοκίας τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων·

[1] ηνοιχθη EHLP, Chrys.; ηνοιγη A, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 103; Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 17.

[2] After εξελθοντες D, Par. add κατεβησαν τους επτα βαθμους και. Both Weiss (p. 110) and Corrsen (p. 441) (see too Harris, p. 63, *Four Lectures*, etc.) regard this as possibly original, so Wendt (p. 221, edit. 1899), whilst Belser (p. 65), Zahn (ii., 350), Salmon (pp. 600, 601), Zöckler incline still more strongly to its acceptance, and Blass and Hilg. retain. The addition has been referred to the mention of the seven steps in Ezek. xl. 22 (*cf.* 26, 31) as its source (so Chase), but, on the other hand, Zahn can see no explanation of the present passage in the seven or the eight (ver. 31) steps of Ezekiel. It is quite possible, he thinks, that the writer might introduce a detail of the kind into his first draft, but omit it afterwarde as unnecessary for distant readers. In xxi. 35, 40, the steps lead not into the street, but from Antonia into the Temple, and there is no connection between them and the definite seven steps here, which are evidently presupposed (note the article) to be well known to the reader.

vision, **ὀπτασία**, but this word is not confined to appearances which the narrators regard as visions, *cf.* Luke i. 22, xxiv. 23, *cf.* Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 203, 1864; *Witness of the Epistles* (Longmans, 1892).

Ver. 10. **φυλακὴν**: "ward," perhaps the best translation here with **διελθόντες** so often used of traversing a place. The first ward might be the place outside the cell where the other soldiers of the quaternion were on guard, and the second ward might refer to some other part of the prison or fortress Antonia (see Blass *in loco*) where sentinels were stationed. Weiss apparently takes the expression to refer to the two **φύλακες**, ver. 6, *cf.* 1 Chron. xxvi. 16.—**σιδηρᾶν**: specially noted since such a gate, when shut, would effectually bar their way; but it opened **αὐτομάτη**, only here in N.T. and in Mark iv. 28, *cf.* Lev. xxv. 5, 11, 2 Kings xix. 29, Wisdom xvii. 6, and in classical writers the striking parallel, Hom., *Iliad*, v., 749 (Wendt, Blass); Virgil, *Æneid*, vi., 81 (Wetstein).—**φέρουσαν εἰς**: only here in N.T., but quite usual in classical Greek. If the narrative means that immediately they were out of the prison they were in the street (so Weiss), evidently the prison was in the city, and **εἰς τὴν π.** would simply mean the open town, in contrast to the confined prison-house (so Weiss and Wendt, 1899). Blass decides for the tower of Antonia on account of D.—**ἠνοίχθη**, see critical notes.—**ἐξελθόντες**: for remarkable addition in D see critical notes.—**εὐθέως**: used several times in Acts, but **εὐθύς** only once, see x. 16.—**ἀπέστη**: when there were no further hindrances to the Apostle's flight, then the angel departed (Chrys.).

Ver. 11. **γενόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ**, *cf.* Luke xv. 17, and compare instances of similar phrases in Greek and Latin classical writers in Wetstein and Blass.—**Κύριος**, see critical notes, if without the article Nösgen (so Weiss) takes it of God, Jehovah. — **ἐξαπέστειλε**: a compound only found in Luke and Paul; four times in Luke's Gospel, six or seven times in Acts, and Gal. iv. 4, 6; very frequent in LXX, and used also in active voice by Polybius.—**ἐξείλετο ἐκ χ.**: close parallels in LXX, *cf.* Exod. iii. 8, 2 Sam. xxii. 1, Isa. xliii. 13, Baruch iv. 18, 21, etc.—**ἐκ χειρὸς**: Hebraism, *cf.* Luke i. 74. The expression is also classical, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 127, for close parallel.—**προσδοκία**: only in Luke here and in Luke xxi. 26, *cf.* Gen. xlix. 10, but more allied to its sense here Ps. cxix. 116, Wisdom xvii. 13, Ecclus. xl. 2, and in 2 and 3 Macc. (see H. and R.), and *Psalms of Solomon*, Tit. xi.; frequently in classics. Ho-

12. συνιδών τε ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν[1] Μαρίας τῆς μητρὸς Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου, οὗ ἦσαν ἱκανοὶ συνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι. **13.** Κρούσαντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου[2] τὴν θύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος, προσῆλθε παιδίσκη ὑπακοῦσαι, ὀνόματι Ῥόδη· **14.** καὶ ἐπιγνοῦσα τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Πέτρου, ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς οὐκ ἤνοιξε τὸν πυλῶνα, εἰσδραμοῦσα δὲ ἀπήγγειλεν ἑστάναι τὸν Πέτρον πρὸ τοῦ πυλῶνος.

[1] **Μαρ.**, but with art. **της** preceding ℵABD 33, 61, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt—Blass omits.

[2] Instead of **του Π.**, great preponderance of authorities for **αυτου** ℵABDLP 61, maj. of vers., W.H., R.V., etc.

bart claims as a medical word, especially as the verb **προσδοκᾷν** is also so frequent in Luke; so too Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 436; but see Plummer on Luke xxi. 36. Both verb and noun are also frequent in classical use.

Ver. 12. **συνιδών**, *cf.* xiv. 6; so several times in Apocrypha, so in classical writers, and also in Josephus. It may also include a consideration of the future (Bengel and Wetstein), but the aorist refers rather to a single act and not to a permanent state (so Alford).—**Μαρίας**: as no mention is made of Mark's father, she may well have been a widow, possessed of some wealth like Barnabas; see below.—**Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἐπικ.**, i. 23; iv. 36; x. 5, 18, 32; xi. 13; and below, xiii. 9. As in the case of Paul, his Roman name is used most frequently, *cf.* xv. 39, 2 Tim. iv. 11, Philem. 24, although in xiii. 5, 13 he is spoken of as John. No reason to doubt the identity of this John Mark with the second Evangelist: the notice of Papias that Mark was the **ἑρμηνευτής** of Peter, Eusebius, *H. E.*, iii., 39, is quite in accordance with the notice here of the Apostle's intimacy with the family of Mark, and with his mention in 1 Pet. v. 13. Blass comments on **Μάρκου**, "quasi digito monstratur auctor narrationis," and similarly Proleg., p. 11; *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 192, 193. In Col. iv. 10 the A.V. calls him "sister's son to Barnabas," **ὁ ἀνεψιός**, but **ἀνεψ.** properly means "first cousin"; so R.V. the cousin of Barnabas (*cf.* LXX, Num. xxxvi. 11, Tob. vii. 2), Lightfoot on Col. iv. 10; see on xv. 39.—**προσευχόμενοι**, *cf.* James v. 16; "media nocte," Bengel; they betook them to prayer, "to that alliance which is indeed invincible," Chrys., *Hom.*, 26. On **ἦσαν** with participle as characteristic of St. Luke, see i. 10. As in the former miraculous deliverance, v. 16, all attempts to get rid of the supernatural in St. Luke's narrative are unsuccessful. This is frankly admitted by Wendt, although he also maintains that we cannot discern the actual historical conditions owing to the mingling of legend and history. But he does not deny that St. Peter was liberated, and the same fact is admitted by Weizsäcker, see Wendt (1899), p. 219; and Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 230, and Wendt (1888), pp. 269, 270, for an account of the different attempts to explain the Apostle's liberation. In contrast to all such attempts the minute circumstantiality and the naturalness of the narrative speak for themselves, and we can hardly doubt (as Wendt is inclined to admit in some details) that John Mark has given us an account derived partly from St. Peter himself, *cf.* vv. 9, 11, and partly from his own knowledge, *cf.* the peculiarly artless and graphic touches in vv. 13, 14, which could scarcely have come from any one but an inmate of the house, as also the mention of the name of the servant; *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 385; Blass, *Acta Apostolorum*, p. 142; Belser, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, Heft ii. (1895), p. 257; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 244.

Ver. 13. **τὴν θ. τοῦ πυλῶνος**: the door of the gateway, *cf.* x. 17. **πυλών** as in Matt. xxvi. 71, of the passage leading from the inner court to the street, so that strictly the door in the gateway opening upon this passage would be meant, *cf.* **εἰσδ.**, ver. 14 (and **προσῆλθε**, ver. 13).—**κρούσαντος**: to knock at a door on the outside, *cf.* Luke xiii. 25, but elsewhere in Luke without **τὴν θύραν**, Luke xi. 9, 10, xii. 36 (Matt. vii. 7, Rev. iii. 20); so too in classical Greek, Xen., *Symp.*, i., 11, see Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 266; in LXX, Judg. xix. 22, Cant. v. 2, Judith xiv. 14.—**παιδίσκη**, *i.e.*, the portress, *cf.* John xviii. 17, see Rutherford, *u. s.*, p. 312; Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*,

15. οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπον, Μαίνῃ. ἡ δὲ διϊσχυρίζετο οὕτως ἔχειν. οἱ δ' ἔλεγον,[1] Ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν. 16. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος[2] ἐπέμενε κρούων· [3] ἀνοίξαντες δὲ εἶδον αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξέστησαν. 17. κατασείσας δὲ αὐτοῖς τῇ χειρὶ σιγᾶν,[4] διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ὁ Κύριος αὐτὸν ἐξήγαγεν ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς. εἶπε δέ, Ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰακώβῳ καὶ τοῖς

[1] Before ο αγγ. D (Pesh.) prefix τυχον, so Blass, Hilg. (as if only a possible solution, see Weiss, p. 72). (τυχον only occurs in N.T. in 1 Cor. xvi. 6, but in classical Greek adv.)

[2] D omits Π. with Par., but all edit. retain except Blass in β and Hilg.

[3] D reads εξανοιξαντες δε και ιδοντες αυτον εξεστ., a graphic touch perhaps orig., but if so, hardly corrected for brevity.

[4] For σιγαν D (Vulg., Gig., Par.) ινα σιγησωσιν, and D, Syr. H. mg., Par. εισηλθεν και—may be explanatory by reviser; Belser defends as orig., p. 65.

p. 40.—ὑπακοῦσαι, R.V., "to answer," *cf.* above, Xen., *Symp.*, i., 11 (so in Plato, *Phædo*, 59 *e*, etc.).—Ῥόδη: a rose, *cf.* Dorcas and other names of the same class. The name occurs in myths and plays, see Blass's note.

Ver. 14. τῆς χαρᾶς: with article, the joy which she felt at the voice of Peter, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 41 for the same emphatic expression.—εἰσδ.: see above on ver. 10, only here in N.T., *cf.* 2 Macc. v. 26.

Ver. 15. Μαίνῃ: used as in a colloquial expression, not meaning literal insanity, see Page's note on xxvi. 24, so in 2 Kings ix. 11, ἐπίληπτος seems to be used.—διϊσχυρίζετο: only here and in Luke xxii. 59 (*cf.* xv. 2 β). In Luke, A.V. renders "confidently affirmed" as it should be here, and as it is in R.V.; found in classical Greek, and so also in Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 6, 4, but not in LXX; *cf.* also its use in *Acta Petri et Pauli Apocryph.*, 34, 39 (Lumby). Both ἰσχυρίζεσθαι and its compound here are used in medical language, and both in the same way as in this passage. If we compare the parallel passages, Matt. xxvi. 73, Mark xiv. 70, Luke xxii. 59, in Matthew we have εἶπον, in Mark ἔλεγον, but in Luke the strong word in the passage before us; Hobart, p. 77, and see also a similar change in parallel passages on p. 76.—Ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ ἐστιν, *cf.* Matt. xviii. 10, Heb. i. 14. According to Jewish ideas they would believe that Peter's guardian angel had assumed his form and voice, and stood before the door, see Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 748-755, especially 752; "*Apocrypha*" ("Speaker's Commentary") "Angelology," i., 171 ff.; Weber, *Jüdische Theol.*, pp. 170, 171 (1897); "Angels," B.D., 1², Blass, Nösgen, J. Lightfoot, *in loco*. We may contrast the reserve of the canonical books of the Jews with the details of their later theology, "Engel," Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 2 and 3.

Ver. 16. ἐπέμενε, *cf.* John viii. 7, with a participle as here; only found elsewhere in N.T. in Luke and Paul; see on x. 48.—ἀνοίξ., another natural touch; those assembled went to the door themselves.

Ver. 17. κατασείσας . . . σιγᾶν: only in Acts xiii. 16, xix. 33, xxi. 40, prop. to shake down (as fruit from trees), thus to shake up and down (the hand), to beckon with the hand for silence, used with accusative, and later with dat. instrument. χειρί: so in classical Greek and Josephus, *cf.* Ovid, *Met.*, i., 206; *Æneid*, xii., 692, and instances in Wetstein; not in LXX as parallel to this; on the phrase, and also on σιγᾶν, as characteristic of Luke, see further Friedrich, pp. 26, 79.—διηγήσατο, ix. 27, only in Luke and Mark (except Heb. xi. 32). — Ἀπαγγείλατε: "tell," R.V., characteristic of Luke, eleven times in his Gospel, thirteen or fourteen in Acts.—Ἰακώβῳ: "the Lord's brother," Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 1 Cor. xv. 7 (from Mark vi. 3 it has been inferred that he was the eldest of those so called). This James may have become more prominent still since the murder of James the son of Zebedee. On his position in the Church at Jerusalem see below on xv. 13, and also on xi. 30. For arguments in favour of the identification of this James with James the son of Alphæus, see B.D., 1², p. 1512; Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 239; and, on the other hand, Mayor, Introd. to *Epistle of*

ἀδελφοῖς ταῦτα. καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον. 18. Γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας, ἦν τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος [1] ἐν τοῖς στρατιώταις, τί ἄρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο. 19. Ἡρώδης δὲ ἐπιζητήσας αὐτὸν καὶ μὴ εὑρών, ἀνακρίνας τοὺς φύλακας, ἐκέλευσεν [2] ἀπαχθῆναι· καὶ κατελθὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν διέτριβεν.

[1] **ουκ ολιγος** om. D, Gig., Par., so Blass in β, and Hilg., may be "Western non-interpolation," and for ordinary reading *cf.* xx. 23. At end of verse β adds **η πως εξηλθεν,** *cf.* Par.[2] "aut quomodo exisset"; *cf.* Blass, p. ix., for defence, so Belser, p. 65.

[2] **απαχθ.,** D[1] reads **αποκτανθηναι,** so Hilg., but Blass rejects—certainly looks like a gloss.

St. James; Zahn, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, i., 72; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 252 ff. and 364; Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 76, 77. In this mention of James, Feine points out that a knowledge as to who he was is evidently presupposed, and that therefore we have another indication that the "Jerusalem tradition" is the source of St. Luke's information here.—**εἰς ἕτερον τόπον**: all conjectures as to the place, whether it was Antioch, Rome, Cæsarea, are rendered more arbitrary by the fact that it is not even said that the place was outside Jerusalem (however probable this may have been); **ἐξελθών** need not mean that he went out of the city, but out of the house in which he had taken refuge, *cf.* ver. 9. For all that can be said in support of the view that he went to Rome, see Felten, *u. s.*, pp. 240-244, Knabenbauer, p. 214. Harnack, *Chronol.*, i., p. 243, apparently is prepared to regard the visit to Rome in the reign of Claudius, A.D. 42, as not impossible, although unprovable. But see the whole question treated from the opposite side by Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 233, 234 (second edition). The notice is so indefinite that we cannot build anything upon it, and we can scarcely go beyond Wendt's view that if Peter left Jerusalem at all, he may have undertaken some missionary journey, *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 5.

Ver. 18. **τάραχος** (generally **ταραχή**): only in Acts xix. 23, although several times in LXX.—**οὐκ ὀλίγος**: only found in Acts, where it occurs eight times (litotes), *cf.* xix. 11, xx. 12, xxvii. 14, and for similar expressions Luke xv. 13 (Acts i. 5), vii. 6: see Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 52, and Page, *in loco.* The guards would answer for the escape of the prisoner by suffering a like penalty, *cf. Cod. Just.*, ix., 4, 4. —**τί ἄρα** (*cf.* Luke i. 66), Peter has disappeared, *what*, *then*, has become of him? (Grimm, *sub v.* **ἄρα** (i.), and Winer-Moulton, liii. 8); it thus marks the perplexity of the soldier as to what had become of Peter.—**ἐγέν.**: Blass, *quid Petro* (ablat.) *factum sit.*

Ver. 19. **μὴ** for **οὐ**, as often with a participle. Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 188.—**ἀνακρίνας**, Acts iv. 9, xxiv. 8, xxviii. 18, Luke xxiii. 14, of a judicial investigation, *cf.* also 1 Cor. ix. 3 for this judicial use by St. Paul, see Grimm *sub v.*—**ἀπαχθῆναι**, "to be put to death," R.V., only here in this sense in N.T. *absolutely*; so Latin *duci* in Pliny, *ad Traj.*, 96 (Page); Nestle, *Philologia Sacra* (1896), p. 53, *cf.* Gen. xxxix. 22, xl. 3, xlii. 16, LXX, use of the same verb of carrying off to prison.—**κατελθών**: Herod was wont to make his residence for the most part at Jerusalem, Jos., *Ant.*, xix., 7, 3, and we are not told why he went down to Cæsarea on this occasion. Josephus, xix., 8, 2, tells us that the festival during which the king met his death was appointed in honour of the emperor's safety, and the conjecture has been made that the thanksgiving was for the return of Claudius from Britain (see Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 315), but this must remain uncertain; he may have gone down to Cæsarea "propter Tyros," Blass, see also B.D., 1[2], p. 135.

Ver. 20. **θυμομαχῶν**: lit., "to fight desperately" Polyb., ix., 40, 4; xxvii., 8, 4, and it might be used not only of open warfare, but of any violent quarrel; here almost = **ὀργίζεσθαι**. There could be no question of actual warfare, as Phœnicia was part of the province of Syria, and Herod had no power to wage war against it. Probably the cause of this **θυμομαχία** lay in commercial interests. The word is not found in LXX, or elsewhere in N.T.—ὁμοθυμαδόν, i. 14.—πείσαντες, *cf.* Matt. xxviii. 14, possibly with bribes, as Blass and Wendt suggest.—**τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ**

20. Ἦν δὲ ὁ Ἡρώδης θυμομαχῶν Τυρίοις καὶ Σιδωνίοις[1]· ὁμοθυμαδὸν δὲ παρῆσαν πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ πείσαντες Βλάστον τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος τοῦ βασιλέως, ᾐτοῦντο εἰρήνην, διὰ τὸ τρέφεσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς. 21. Τακτῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἐνδυσάμενος ἐσθῆτα βασιλικήν, καὶ καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτούς· 22. ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπεφώνει, Θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου. 23. παραχρῆμα δὲ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἄγγελος Κυρίου, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν οὐκ ἔδωκε τὴν δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ[2]· καὶ γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος, ἐξέψυξεν.

[1] **ομοθ.**, D, Syr. H. mg. (Par. Vulg.), so Blass and Hilg. read **οι δε ομοθ. εξ αμφοτερων των πολεων παρησαν.**, may be a gloss on **ομοθ.** meaning that the two cities made common cause, *cf.* **τας χωρας** for **την χωραν** in same verse (Western). D, Par.[2] (Wern.) add at end of ver. 21 **καταλλαγεντος δε αυτου τοις Τ. και τοις Σ.** D omits **και τοις Σ.** Syr. H. mg. has **κατηλλαγη δε αυτοις.** But this appears to introduce a fresh connection into the narrative, and to divert attention from the main point, *viz.*, the speech. So Weiss, p. 73, thinks **φωναι** (β), for **φωνη**, ver. 22, is introduced to indicatet he *contents* of the speech.

[2] D reads **καταβας απο του βηματος** after **Θεῳ και.** After **σκωλ.** D adds **ετι ζων και ουτως**, so Blass and Hilg. Blass in β reads **εγεν.** for **γενομ.**; insertions avoid possible misunderstandings, see comment.

κοιτῶνος, "chamberlain," perhaps best. **κοιτών** will imply that he was over the king's bed-chamber. Exod. viii. 3, *cf.* 2 Sam. iv. 7, 2 Kings, vi. 12, 1 Esd. iii. 3 = Latin *cubicularius*. **κοιτών**, in Dio Cassius, lxi., 5, is used of the king's treasury, but the ordinary usage is as above. In Attic Greek **δωμάτιον**, not **κοιτών**.—**τρέφεσθαι**, *i.e.*, with corn (*cf.* 1 Kings v. 9, Ezra iii. 7, Ezek. xxvii. 17; Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 10, 6), and see Blass, note *in loco*.

Ver. 21. **τακτῇ**: only here in N.T.; *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xix., 8, 2 (*cf.* xviii., 6, 7), **δευτέρᾳ δὲ τῶν θεωριῶν ἡμέρᾳ.** It is quite true that Josephus says nothing directly of the Tyrians and Sidonians, but the audience was evidently granted to them on the second day of the public spectacle; *cf.* for the expression, Polyb., iii., 34, 9. The description of Josephus evidently implies some special occasion, and not the return of the ordinary Quinquennalia; see on ver. 19 and also below. Josephus does not menion Blastus, or those of Tyre and Sidon, but this is no reason against the narrative, as Krenkel maintains. Belser, much more reasonably, contends that Luke's narrative supplements and completes the statement of Josephus.—**ἐνδ. ἐσθῆτα βασιλικήν**, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xix., 8, 2, **στολὴν ἐνδυσάμενος ἐξ ἀργυρίου πεποιημένην πᾶσαν.**; on **ἐσθ.** see i. 10.—**βήματος**: Josephus speaks of the event happening in the theatre, and the **βῆμα** here = rather "the throne," R.V. (margin, "judgment-seat"), the royal seat in the theatre from which the king saw the games and made his harangues to the people (so of an orator's pulpit, Neh. viii. 4, 2 Macc. xiii. 26), see Blass and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*—**ἐδημηγόρει**: only here in N.T. In 4 Macc. v. 15 = *contionari*, frequent in classical Greek.—**πρὸς αὐτούς**, *i.e.*, to the Tyrian and Sidonian representatives, but the word **ἐδημ.** might well be used of what was in any case an address, *ad populum*, *cf.* ver. 22.

Ver. 22. **δῆμος**: only in Acts, xvii. 5, xix. 30, 33, but in the same signification in classical Greek.—**ἐπεφώνει**: later Greek in this sense (*cf.* the flatterers in the description of Josephus, *u. s.*, **ἀνεβόων**, that Herod was **θεός**, and so in the words **εὐμενὴς εἴης**). In N.T. only in Luke, *cf.* Luke xxiii. 21, Acts xxi. 34, xxii. 24; *cf.* 2 Macc. i. 23, 3 Macc. vii. 13, 1 Esd. ix. 47. The imperfect quite corresponds to the description of Josephus: **ἄλλος ἄλλοθεν φωνῆς ἀνεβ. θ. φωνή**; for instances of similar flattery see Wetstein, and *cf.* Josephus, *u. s.*

Ver. 23. **παραχρῆμα**, see above, p. 106.—**ἐπάταξεν**, *cf.* Exod. xi. 23, 2 Sam. xxiv. 17, 2 Kings xix. 35, 1 Chron. xxi. 15, Isa. xxxvii. 36, 1 Macc. vii. 41. See p. 188. On the confusion in the reading of Eusebius, *H.E.*, ii., 10, where for the owl whom Josephus describes as appearing to Herod as **ἄγγελος κακῶν** we have the reading "the angel" of the Acts, the unseen minister of the divine will, see B.D. 1[2], p. 1345, and *Eusebius*, Schaff and Wace's

24. Ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ηὔξανε καὶ ἐπληθύνετο. 25. Βαρνάβας δὲ καὶ Σαῦλος[1] ὑπέστρεψαν ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ, πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον.

[1] After **Σαυλος** Syr. H. mg., Par. add **ο επικαλουμενος Παυλος**. Par. also reads **Παυλος** in xiii. 1, 2. This seems a mere anticipation of xiii. 9. Blass in **β** follows Par. (p. ix.), and regards **Παυλος** as original. So Belser, pp. 65, 66, warmly defends, as showing that there is no need to see in xiii. 9 a sudden introd. of the name Paul, but that Luke, at least in the first draft of his work, had already spoken of him here as bearing a double name, like John Mark. **υπεστρεψαν εξ Ι.** A 13, 27, Syr. P. and H., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys., so Tisch., Weiss, W.H. marg., R.V.; but ℵBHLP 61, Syr. H. mg., Aeth^ro.; W.H., Wendt, R.V. marg. read **εις Ι.**, and DE 15, 180, Vulg., Chrys. read **απο**, so Blass in **β**, and so Hilg. Tisch. maintains that scribe began to write **απο** but turned it into **εις**. The latter prep. would not be understood if taken with **υπεστρεψαν**, as it would have no meaning, and so **εξ** and **απο** substituted. E, Syr. Pesh., Sah., and so Par. and Blass in **β**, added **εις Αντιοχειαν** (but see Weiss, Introd. to *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 37). But the reading **εις Ι.** can be fairly explained if the words are connected with **πληρ. την διακ.**, so Wendt and W.H. (*App.*, p. 94), and Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 232. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 64, holds that **εις** was a deliberate alteration of an editor who thus brought the text into conformity with xxii. 17 because the two passages referred to the same visit.

edition, *in loco;* see also Bengel's impressive note on this verse on the difference between human history and divine.—**ἀνθ' ὧν = ἀντὶ τούτων ὅτι**, *cf.* Luke i. 20, xix. 44, see also xii. 3; only once outside St. Luke's writings in N.T., 2 Thess. ii. 10; see Simcox, *Language of N. T.*, p. 137; Plummer on Luke i. 20 and xii. 3; quite classical and several times in LXX.—**ἔδωκε τὴν δ.**: *debitum honorem*, *cf.* Isa. xlviii. 11, Rev. xix. 7; article elsewhere omitted (*cf.* Luke xvii. 18); a Hebrew phrase. How different the behaviour of St. Peter and of St. Paul, x. 26, xiv. 14. Josephus expressly says that the king did not rebuke the flatterers or reject their flattery.—**καὶ γενόμ. σκ.**: see below. St. Luke does not say that Herod died on the spot, but simply marks the commencement of the disease, **παραχρῆμα**; Josephus describes the death as occurring after five days. Wendt (1899 edition) admits that the kind of death described may well have been gradual, although in 1888 edition he held that the **ἐξέψυξεν** meant that he expired immediately; see also Zöckler and Hackett, as against Weiss. **ἐξέψ.**, see on v. 5, 10.—**σκωλ.**: only here in N.T.; no contradiction with Josephus, but a more precise description of the fatal disease, *cf.* 2 Macc. ix. 5, 9, with which detailed and strange account the simple statement of the fact here stands in marked contrast. The word cannot be taken metaphorically, *cf.* Herod., iv., 205: and Jos., *Ant.*, xvii., 6, 5, of the death of Herod the Great. Such a death was regarded as a punishment for pride; so in 2 Macc. and Herod., Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 318. The term itself was one which we might expect from a medical man, and St. Luke may easily have learnt the exact nature of the disease during his two years residence in Cæsarea (Belser). See Hobart, pp. 42, 43, Knabenbauer *in loco*. The word was used of a disease of plants, but Luke, no less than his contemporary Dioscorides, may well have been acquainted with botanical terms (Vogel). To think with Baur and Holtzmann of the gnawing worm of the damned is quite opposed to the whole context. If we place the two narratives, the account given by Josephus and that given by St. Luke side by side, it is impossible not to see their general agreement, and none has admitted this more unreservedly than Schürer. On reasons for the silence of Josephus as to the death as a punishment of the king's impiety in contrast with the clear statement of St. Luke; and also on the whole narrative as against the strictures of Spitta, see Belser, *Theologische Quartalschrift*, p. 252 ff., 2e Heft, 1895; for a full examination; *cf.* also Nösgen to the same effect, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 242, Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 417. Belser should also be consulted as against Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas*, p. 203 ff. It should be noted that Krenkel does not affirm that Luke derived his material from Josephus in xii. 1-23, but only that he was influenced by the Jewish historian, and that with regard to the hapaxlegomenon, **σκωληκόβρωτος**, he can only affirm that Josephus affords us an analogous expression, *B. J.*, vii., 8, 7.

Ver. 24. **δὲ**, marking the contrast, not

XIII. 1. ἮΣΑΝ δέ τινες[1] ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι, ὅ τε[2] Βαρνάβας καὶ Συμεὼν ὁ καλούμενος Νίγερ, καὶ Λούκιος ὁ Κυρηναῖος, Μαναήν τε Ἡρώδου τοῦ τετράρχου

[1] τινες om. ℵABD 61, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Boh., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

[2] For ο τε D, Vulg. read εν οις, and before Κυρ. D omits ο—Blass, "recte," but there may have been some other Lucius from whom this one was distinguished. Σαυλος, Par. reads Παυλος, so in ver. 2, and Blass in β; see on xii. 25.

only between the death of the persecutor and the growth of the Word, but also between the persecution and the vitality of the Church.—ηὔξανε καὶ ἐπληθ. imperfects, marking the continuous growth in spite of all obstacles; *cf.* Luke viii. 11, Matt. xiii. 32, 2 Cor. ix. 10.

Ver. 25. ὑπέστρεψαν ἐξ Ἰ., see critical notes, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 63, 64, and note on xxii. 17, below.—πληρ. τὴν διακ.; if the visit extended over as long a period as Ramsay believes, *viz.*, from the time when the failure of harvest in 46 turned scarcity into famine until the beginning of 47 (*u. s.*, pp. 51, 63), no doubt the delegates could not have simply delivered a sum of money to the elders, but would have administered the relief (not money), and carried a personal message of cheer to the distressed (Ramsay, p. 49 ff., *u. s.*), and so have "fulfilled" their ministry. But the word διακονία does not of necessity involve this personal and continuous ministration, *e.g.*, *cf.* Rom. xv. 31, where St. Paul uses the word of the money collection brought by him to Jerusalem for the poor, a passage in which the Western gloss is δωροφορία, *cf.* Rom. xv. 25, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12, 13. Grimm writes that the word is used of those who succour need by either collecting or bestowing benefactions; see further, *Expositor*, March and July, 1896 (Ramsay), April, 1896 (Sanday), also Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 206, and above on xi. 29. —Σαῦλος, see critical notes for Western addition. — συμπαραλαβόντες, *cf.* xv. 37, 38, of bringing as a companion in N.T., only once elsewhere in same sense, Gal. ii. i. (*cf.* 3 Macc. i. 1). This incidental notice of John Mark may well emphasise the fact that he was taken with Paul and Barnabas as a supernumerary, and to mark his secondary character as compared with them. In view of subsequent events, it would be important to make this clear by introducing him in a way which showed that he was not essential to the expedition, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 71, 170, 177; *cf.* xv. 37, 40.

CHAPTERS XIII.-XIV. *First Missionary Journey of St. Paul.*—On the unity of xiii. and xiv. with the rest of the book see additional note at end of chap. xiv.—Ver. 1. κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκ.: the word οὖσαν may well be used here, as the participle of εἰμί is often used in Acts to introduce some technical phrase, or some term marked out as having a technical force, *cf.* v. 17, xiv. 13, xxviii. 17, so that a new stage in the history of the Christians at Antioch is marked—no longer a mere congregation, but "the Church that was there" (Ramsay, *Church in the R. E.*, p. 52). So also Weiss, *in loco*; οὖσαν stands in contrast to xi. 21-26: there was no longer a mere company of believers at Antioch, but a Church.—ἐν Ἀ.: Blass maintains that the order of words as compared with the mention of the Church in Jerusalem, xi. 22, emphasises the fact that Antioch is the starting-point of the succeeding missionary enterprise, and is named first, and so distinctively set before men's eyes.—προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι, see above on xi. 27. From 1 Cor. xii. 28 it would seem that in Corinth at all events not all teachers were prophets, although in a sense all prophets were teachers, in so far as they edified the Church. The two gifts might be united in the same person as in Paul himself, Gal. ii. 2, 2 Cor. xii. 1 (Zöckler). In Ephes. iv. 11, as in 1 Cor. xii. 28, Apostles stand first in the Church, Prophets next, and after them Teachers. But whilst it is quite possible to regard the account of the gift of προφητεία in 1 Cor. xii.-xiv. as expressing "inspiration" rather than "official character," this does not detract from the pre-eminent honour and importance assigned to the prophets and teachers at Antioch. Their position is such and their powers are such in the description before us that they might fairly be described as "presbyters," whose official position was enhanced by the possession of a special gift, "the prophecy" of the New Testament, "presbyters' who like those in 1 Tim. v. 17 might also be described as κοπιῶντες ἐν διδασκαλίᾳ, Moberly, *Ministerial Priest-*

σύντροφος, καὶ Σαῦλος. 2. λειτουργούντων δὲ αὐτῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων, εἶπε τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, Ἀφορίσατε δή μοι τόν τε Βαρνάβαν καὶ τὸν Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς.

hood, pp. 159, 160, 166, 208. See further on the relation of the prophets and teachers in the *Didaché* "Church," Hastings' B.D., i. 436, Bigg, *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 27; and on the relation of prophecy and teaching in the N.T., McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 528, Zöckler, *in loco*.—**τε . . . καὶ**: a difficulty arises as to the force of these particles. It is urged that two groups are thus represented, the first three names forming one group (prophets), and the last two another group (teachers), so Ramsay (p. 65), Weiss, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Harnack, Knabenbauer, and amongst older commentators Meyer and Alford; but on the other hand Wendt, so Nösgen, Felten, Hilgenfeld think that there is no such separation intended, as Paul himself later claims the prophetic gift (1 Cor. xiv. 6), to which Zöckler would reply that at this time Paul might well be described as a teacher, his prophetic gift being more developed at a later date. Amongst recent English writers both Hort and Gore regard the term "prophets and teachers" as applying to all the five (so Page).—**Συμεὼν**: nothing is known of him. Spitta would identify him with Simon of Cyrene, Matt. xxvii. 32, but the epithet Niger may have been given to distinguish him from others of the same name, and possibly from the Simon to whom Spitta refers.—**Λούκιος ὁ Κ.**: Zöckler describes as "quite absurd" the attempt to identify him with Luke of the Acts. The names are quite different, and the identification has been supported on the ground that Cyrene was a famous school of medicine. This Lucius may have been one of the men of Cyrene, xi. 20, who first preached the Gospel at Antioch. Others have proposed to identify him with the Lucius of Rom. xvi. 21.—**Μαναὴν**: of the three names, as distinct from Barnabas and Paul, Blass says *ignoti reliqui*, and we cannot say more than this. For although Mark is described as **σύντροφος** of Herod the Tetrarch (Antipas), the description is still very indefinite. A.V. "brought up with," R.V. "foster-brother," *collactaneus*, Vulgate. For an ingenious study on the name and the man see Plumptre, *in loco*, *cf.* also Wetstein and Zöckler. The name occurs in 1 Macc. i. 6, but the reading must apparently give place to **συνέκτροφοι**. It is also found in 2 Macc. ix. 29, and once in the N.T. in the present passage. Deissmann, from the evidence of the inscriptions, regards it as a court title, and quotes amongst other places an inscription in Delos of the first half of the second century B.C., where Heliodorus is described as **σύντροφος τοῦ βασιλέως Σελεύκου Φιλοπάτορος**. So Manaen also might be described as a confidential friend of Herod Antipas, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 173, 178-181.—**Σαῦλος**, placed last probably because the others were older members of the Church. The position certainly does not mark the list as unhistorical; if the account came from the Apostle himself, the lowest place was eminently characteristic of him.

Ver. 2. **λειτουργούντων**: "as they ministered to the Lord," A. and R. V., *ministrantibus Domino*, Vulgate. It would be difficult to find a more appropriate rendering. On the one hand the word is habitually used in the LXX of the service of the priests and Levites (*cf.* Heb. viii. 2, x. 11), although it has a wider meaning as, *e.g.*, when used to describe the service of Samuel to God, 1 Sam. ii. 18, iii. 1, or of service to man, 1 Kings i. 4, 15, 2 Chron. xvii. 19, Ecclus. x. 25. So too in the N.T. it is used in the widest sense of those who aid others in their poverty, Rom. xv. 27 (*cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 12), Phil. ii. 25, 27, and also **λειτουργία τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν**, Phil. ii. 17, of the whole life of the Christian Society. But here the context, see on ver. 3 (*cf.* xiv. 23), seems to point to some special public religious service (Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 63, but see also Ramsay's rendering of the words, and Zöckler, *in loco*). In this early period **λειτουργία** could of course not be applied to the Eucharist alone, and the Romanist commentator Felten only goes so far as to say that a reference to it cannot be excluded in the passage before us, and in this we may agree with him. At all events it seems somewhat arbitrary to explain *Didaché*, xv. 1, where we have a parallel phrase, of the service of public worship, whilst in the passage before us the words are explained of serving Christ whether by prayer or by instructing others concerning the way of salvation; so Grimm-Thayer. In each passage the verb should certainly be taken as referring to the

3. τότε νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι, καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς, ἀπέλυσαν.[1] 4. Οὗτοι μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος

[1] απελυσαν D omits, Blass retains, so Hilg.; its omission ruins the construction. (τον Β. και) τον Σ., *om.* τον ℵ[a]ABCDE, Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Hilg.; *cf.* Ramsay, "Forms of Classif. in Acts," *Expositor*, July, 1895.

ministry of public worship. In the N.T. the whole group of words, λειτουργέω, λειτουργία, λειτουργός, λειτουργικός, is found only in St. Luke, St. Paul, and Hebrews. See further on the classical and Biblical usage Westcott, *Hebrews*, additional note on viii. 2. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 137, from pre-Christian papyri points out that λειτουργία and λειτουργέω were used by the Egyptians of the sacred service of the priests, and sometimes of a wider religious service. —αὐτῶν: not the whole Ecclesia, but the prophets and teachers: "prophetarum doctorumque qui quasi arctius sunt concilium," Blass.—νηστευόντων, *cf.* x. 30, xiv. 23, xxvii. 9, and in O.T. 1 Sam. vii. 5, 6, Dan. ix. 3, on the union of fasting and prayer. In *Didaché*, viii., 1, while the fasts of the "hypocrites" are condemned, fasting is enjoined on the fourth day of the week, and on Friday, *i.e.*, the day of the Betrayal and the Crucifixion. But *Didaché*, vii., 4, lays it down that before baptism the baptiser and the candidate should fast. The conduct therefore of the prophets and teachers at Antioch before the solemn mission of Barnabas and Saul to their work is exactly what might have been expected, *cf.* Edersheim, *Temple and its Services*, p. 66.—εἶπε τὸ Π.: we may reasonably infer by one of the prophets; it may have been at a solemn meeting of the whole Ecclesia held expressly with reference to a project for carrying the Gospel to the heathen (Hort, Felten, Hackett). Felten sees in δή an indication of an answer to a special prayer. But it does not follow that the "liturgical" functions should be assigned to the whole Ecclesia. —'Αφορίσατε, *cf.* the same word used by St. Paul of himself, Rom. i. 1, Gal. i. 15, LXX, Lev. xx. 26, Numb. viii. 11. μοι. Such words and acts indicate the personality of the Holy Ghost, *cf.* δή emphatic, signifying the urgency of the command (*cf.* use of the word in classical Greek). A. and R.V. omit altogether in translation. In Luke ii. 15 both render it "now," in Matt. xiii. 23, R.V. "verily," Act xv. 36, "now," 1 Cor. vi. 20, A. and R.V. "therefore," to emphasise a demand as here. With this force the word is thus peculiar to Luke and Paul (in other passages, reading contested). The translation of the word may have been omitted here, since the rendering "now" would have been taken in a temporal sense which δή need not suggest.—ὃ for εἰς ὅ, *cf.* i. 21, Luke i. 25, xii. 46. Grimm-Thayer, Winer-Moulton, l., 7 *b*, so in Greek writers generally.—προσκέκλημαι, *cf.* ii. 39, xvi. 10. Grimm-Thayer, *sub v. b.* Winer-Moulton, xxxix. 3.

Ver. 3. τότε probably indicating a new and special act of fasting and prayer. But is the subject of the sentence the whole *Ecclesia*, or only the prophets and teachers mentioned before? Ramsay maintains that it cannot be the officials just mentioned, because they cannot be said to lay hands on two of themselves, so that he considers some awkward change of subject takes place, and that the simplest interpretation is that the Church as a whole held a meeting for this solemn purpose (*cf.* πάντες in D). But if the whole Church was present, it does not follow that they took part in every detail of the service, just as they may have been present in the public service of worship in ver. 2 (see above) without λειτουργ. τῷ K. equally with the prophets and teachers (*cf.* Felten and also Wendt). There is therefore no reason to assume that the laying on of hands was performed by the whole Church, or that St. Luke could have been ignorant that this function was one which belonged specifically to the officers of the Church. The change of subject is not more awkward than in vi. 6. Dr. Hort is evidently conscious of the difficulty, see especially *Ecclesia*, p. 64. No doubt, on the return of the two missionaries, they report their doings to the whole Church, xiv. 27, but this is no proof that the laying on of hands for their consecration to their mission was the act of the whole Church. That prophets and teachers should thus perform what is represented in Acts as an Apostolic function need not surprise us, see Gore, *u. s.*, pp. 241, 260, 261. A further question arises as to whether this passage conflicts with the fact that St. Paul

τοῦ Ἁγίου,[1] κατῆλθον εἰς τὴν Σελεύκειαν, ἐκεῖθέν τε ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν Κύπρον. 5. καὶ γενόμενοι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι, κατήγγελλον τὸν λόγον

[1] εκπεμφ. υπο του Π., Par. has *egressi e sanctis* = οι μεν ουν εξελθοντες απο των αγιων, Blass in β, and for απηλθον D has καταβαντες (so Blass and Hilg.).

was already an Apostle, and that his Apostleship was based not upon his appointment by man, or upon human teaching, but upon a revelation from God, and upon the fact that he had seen the Lord. It is certainly remarkable that both Barnabas and Saul are called Apostles by St. Luke in connection with this first missionary journey, and that under no other circumstance does he apply the term to either, xiv. 4, 14, and it is possible that the title may have been given here in a limited sense with reference to their special mission; see Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 28, 64, 65. But at the same time we must remember that in the N.T. the term ἀπόστολος is never applied to any one who may not very well have satisfied the primary qualification of Apostleship, *viz.*, to have seen the Lord, and to bear witness to His Resurrection, see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 95 ff. (as against the recent statements of McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 653): "We have no reason to suppose that this condition was ever waived, unless we throw forward the *Teaching* into the second century," Gwatkin, "Apostle," Hastings' B.D.: see further, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 350, additional note on the *Didaché*. This we may accept, except in so far as it bears upon the *Didaché*, in which the Apostles (only mentioned in one passage, xi. 3-6) may be contrasted rather than compared with the Apostles of the N.T., inasmuch as they are represented as wandering missionaries, itinerating from place to place, in days of corruption and gross imposture, and inasmuch as the picture which the *Didaché* reveals is apparently characteristic of a corner of Church life rather than of the whole of it; Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 176; Bright, *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life*, p. 34, and the strictures of Bigg, *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 27, 40 ff. It may of course be urged that we know nothing of Barnabas and of the others, to whom Lightfoot and Gwatkin refer as to their special call from Christ, whilst in the case of St. Paul we have his own positive assertion. But even in his case the laying on of hands recognised, if it did not bestow, his Apostolic commission, and "the ceremony of Ordination when it was not the channel of the grace was its recognition," Gore, *u. s.*, pp. 257-267, 383, 395, etc., and see especially the striking passage in Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 107, 108.

Ver. 4. μὲν οὖν answered by δέ in ver. 5, so Weiss and Rendall, Appendix on μὲν οὖν, p. 161. Page takes διελ. δέ in ver. 6 as the antithesis, see his note on ii. 41.—ἐκπεμφ., *cf.* ver. 2; only in N.T. in xvii. 10, *cf.* 2 Sam. xix. 31, where it denotes personal conduct. Mr. Rendall's note takes the verb here also of the personal presence of the Holy Spirit conducting the Apostles on their way.—κατῆλθον: "went down," R.V., of a journey from the interior to the coast, *cf.* xv. 30; Vulgate, *abierunt*, and so A.V. "departed," which fails to give the full force of the word.—Σελεύκειαν: the port of Antioch, built by the first Seleucus, about sixteen miles from the city on the Orontes; *Seleucia ad mare* and ἡ ἐν Πιερίᾳ to distinguish it from other places bearing the same name, see Wetstein for references to it. On its mention here and St. Luke's custom see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 70.—Κύπρον, *cf.* iv. 36. Although not expressly stated, we may well believe that the place was divinely intimated. But it was natural for more reasons than one that the missionaries should make for Cyprus. Barnabas was a Cypriote, and the nearness of Cyprus to Syria and its productive copper mines had attracted a large settlement of Jews, *cf.* also xi. 19, 20, and the Church at Antioch moreover owed its birth in part to the Cypriotes, xi. 20 (xxi. 16).

Ver. 5. Σαλαμῖνι: the nearest place to Seleucia on the eastern coast of Cyprus. A few hours' sail in favourable weather would bring the traveller to a harbour convenient and capacious. The Jewish colony must have been considerable since mention is made of synagogues.—κατήγγελλον: "they began to proclaim" . . . ἐν ταῖς συν., it was St. Paul's habitual custom to go to the synagogues first, *cf.* ix. 20, xiv. 1, etc.—Ἰωάννην: the marked silence about him previously seems to emphasise the fact that he was not selected by the Holy Ghost in the same solemn way as Barnabas and Saul.—

τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην.[1] 6. διελθόντες[2] δὲ τὴν νῆσον ἄχρι Πάφου, εὗρόν τινα μάγον

[1] **υπηρετην,** D, Par., Syr. Harcl. mg. read **υπηρετουντα αυτοις** (E reads **εις διακονιαν**). Weiss considers that this is in order to avoid describing Mark as **υπηρετης.**

[2] **διελθοντες δε,** D[1] reads **και περιελθοντων αυτων,** and so Blass and Hilg., and D[2] **διελθοντων δε αυτων. περι** may have been changed into **δια,** as the latter prep. may have been thought to mean that they went straight through, instead of going about the island; see also Weiss, Codex D, p. 73. **ολην την νησον,** so ℵABCDE 61, Vulg., several vers., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.—perhaps fell out, as in T.R., because the situation of Paphos was not known, and **ολην** seemed to contradict **αχρι Π.** (Wendt). D reads **ονοματι καλουμενον**; **ῳ ονομα** is common in Gospels but not elsewhere in Acts, **ονοματι** and **καλου.** are both common; *cf.* also Luke xix. 1. **Βαριησοῦς** BCE 13, Sah., Chrys., so W.H., Weiss; **Βαριησοῦν** AD[2]HLP, Syr. H. mg.; **Βαριησοῦ** ℵ 40, Vulg., Boh., Syr. H. text, Arm., Tisch.; **Βαριησουα** D, so Blass, Hilg. with **ν** or **μ** added (D[2])—other variations. E, Gig., Wer., Lucif. add **ο μεθερμηνευεται Ετοιμας** (see on ver. 8) according to Blass in β (E reading **Ελυμας,** Gig., Wer., Lucif. reading *paratus* = **Ετοιμος**). In ver. 8 almost all authorities read **Ελυμας,** but D, Lucif. have **Ετοιμας** (not Gig., Par.). This reading is defended by Klostermann, *Prob. im Aposteltexte*, p. 21, and adopted by Blass (although he is not satisfied with Klostermann's derivation) and also by Ramsay. Blass holds that this name **Ετοιμας,** whatever it is, must be interpretation of **Βαριησους**—not **μαγος** of *it*. It is possible that some desire may have been at work to avoid any connection between the name of the Magian and the name of Jesus, and thus the words **ουτος γαρ μεθ. . . . αυτου** in ver. 8, which are omitted by Blass without any authority, simply because of the reading in ver. 6 in E, etc., may have crept into ver. 6 as more appropriate. See also "Barjesus," Hastings' B.D. Weiss, Codex D, p. 74, points out that **Ετοιμας** may be an old corruption for **Ελυμας,** and this seems very probable. See further, Schmiedel, *Enc. Bibl.*, i., 478 ff.

ὑπηρέτην, *cf.* Luke iv. 20, and many writers give it here a kind of official sense (although the word may be used of any kind of service), "velut ad baptizandum," *cf.* x. 48 (1 Cor. i. 14), Blass; so Alford, Felten, Overbeck, Weiss. But the word may express the fact that John Mark was able to set the Apostles more free for their work of evangelising.

Ver. 6. **διελθόντες δὲ (ὅλην) τὴν ν.:** "and they made a missionary progress through the whole island," Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 72 and 384, and "Words denoting Missionary Travel in Acts," *Expositor*, May, 1896; on **ὅλην**, see critical notes. Ramsay gives nine examples in Acts of this use of **διέρχεσθαι** or **διελθεῖν** with the accusative of the region traversed, the only other instance in the N.T. being 1 Cor. xvi. 5. In each of these ten cases the verb implies the process of going over a country as a missionary, and it is remarkable that in i.-xii. this construction of **διέρχομαι** never occurs, though there are cases in which the idea of a missionary tour requires expression. Ramsay therefore sees in the use of the word in the second part of the book a quasi technical term which the writer had caught from St. Paul himself, by whom alone it is also employed.—**Πάφου:** Nea Paphos—the chief town and the place of residence of the Roman governor—some little distance from the old Paphos (**Παλαίπαφος,** Strabo) celebrated for its Venus temple. The place still bears the name of *Baffa*, Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 14; O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 101; C. and H., smaller edition, p. 125.—**μάγον,** *cf.* viii. 9; "sorcerer," A. and R.V. margin, *cf.* Matt. ii. 1, but word used here as among the Greeks and Romans in a bad sense. Wycl. has "witch," and this in its masculine form "wizard" has been suggested as an appropriate rendering here. On the absurd attempt to show that the whole narrative is merely introduced as a parallel to St. Peter's encounter with Simon, chap. viii., see Nösgen, p. 427; Zöckler, *in loco*, and Salmon, *Introduction*, p. 310. The parallel really amounts to this, that both Peter and Paul encountered a person described under the same title, a magician—an encounter surely not improbable in the social circumstances of the time (see below)! For other views see Holtzmann, who still holds that the narrative is influenced by viii. 14 ff. The word is entirely omitted by Jüngst, p. 120, without any authority whatever. Elymas, according

ψευδοπροφήτην Ἰουδαῖον ᾧ ὄνομα Βαριῃσοῦς, 7. ὃς ἦν σὺν τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ Σεργίῳ Παύλῳ, ἀνδρὶ συνετῷ. οὗτος προσκαλεσάμενος Βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαῦλον,[1] ἐπεζήτησεν ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

[1] **Σαυλον**, so in all auth. Blass says "even by Par."—to distinguish him from Sergius Paulus—see above on ver. 1; Blass, p. ix., and Wendt (1899), p. 230, note.

to the narrative, says Jüngst, was either a magician *or* a false prophet. But the proconsul is styled **ἀνὴρ συνετός**, and this could not have been consistent with his relation with a magician: Elymas was therefore a kind of Jewish confessor. But neither supposition does much to establish the wisdom of Sergius Paulus. —**ψευδοπροφήτην** like **ψευδόμαντις** in classical writers, here only in Acts; and Luke vi. 26, by St. Luke. But frequently used elsewhere in N.T., and in the LXX, and several times in *Didaché*, xi. On the "Triple beat," Magian, false prophet, Jew, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 415.—**Βαριῃσοῦς**, on the name see critical notes.

Ver. 7. **ὃς ἦν σὺν τῷ ἀ.**, *cf.* iv. 13. Nothing was more in accordance with what we know of the *personnel* of the strange groups which often followed the Roman governors as *comites*, and it is quite possible that Sergius Paulus may have been keenly interested in the powers or assumed powers of the Magian, and in gaining a knowledge of the strange religions which dominated the East. If the Roman had been completely under the influence of the false prophet, it is difficult to believe that St. Luke would have described him as **συνετός** (a title in which Zöckler sees a distinction between Sergius Paulus and another Roman, Felix, over whom a Jewish Magian gained such influence, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 7, 2), although magicians of all kinds found a welcome in unexpected quarters in Roman society, even at the hands of otherwise discerning and clear-sighted personages, as the pages of Roman writers from Horace to Lucian testify. It was not the first time in the world's history that credulity and scepticism had gone hand in hand: Wetstein, *in loco;* Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., pp. 351, 352; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 74 ff.—**ἐπεζήτησεν**; perhaps means, as in classical Greek, "put questions to them". The typical Roman is again marked by the fact that he was thus desirous to hear what the travellers would say, and it is also indicated that he was not inclined to submit himself entirely to the Magian.—**τῷ ἀνθυπάτῳ**: "the proconsul," R.V., "deputy," A.V. In the reign of James I. the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland was called "the deputy" (*cf.* Shakespeare, *Measure for Measure*, i., 2, 161). Under Augustus, B.C. 27, the Roman provinces had been divided into two classes: (1) imperial and (2) senatorial, the former being governed by proprætors or generals, and the latter by proconsuls. But as the first kind of government would often be required when a province was unruly, it frequently happened that the same province might be at one time classed under (1) and at another time under (2). Cyprus had been originally an imperial province, Strabo, xiv., but in 22 B.C. it had been transferred by Augustus to the Senate, and was accordingly, as Luke describes it, under a proconsul, Dio Cassius, liii., 12, liv., 4. Under Hadrian it appears to have been under a proprætor; under Severus it was again under a proconsul. At Soloi, a town on the north coast of Cyprus, an inscription was discovered by General Cesnola, *Cyprus*, 1877, p. 425 (*cf.* Hogarth, *Devia Cypria*, 1889, p. 114), dated **ἐπὶ Παύλου (ἀνθ)υπάτου**, and the probable identification with Sergius Paulus is accepted by Lightfoot, Zöckler, Ramsay, Knabenbauer, etc.; see especially amongst recent writers Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., Excurs. ii., p. 632, for a similar view, and also for information as to date, and as to another and more recent inscription (1887), bearing upon the connnection of the Gens Sergia with Cyprus; see also McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 175, note, and Wendt, edition 1899.—**συνετῷ**: R.V., "a man of understanding," *cf.* Matt. xi. 25. A.V. and other E.V. translate "prudent," Vulgate, *prudens*, but see Genevan Version on Matt., *u. s.;* frequent in LXX in various significations: **σύνεσις**, practical discernment, intelligence, so **συνετός**, one who can "put things together" (**συνιέναι**): **σοφία**, the wisdom of culture (Grimm-Thayer); on "prudent," see Humphry, Commentary on R.V., p. 28.

Ver. 8. **ἀνθίστατο**: because he saw that his hope of gain was gone, *cf.* xvi. 19, xix. 27, and the hope of retaining influence with the proconsul; see reading in D, *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 8, where St. Paul

8. ἀνθίστατο δὲ αὐτοῖς Ἐλύμας, ὁ μάγος, (οὕτω γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,) ζητῶν διαστρέψαι τὸν ἀνθύπατον ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως.[1] 9. Σαῦλος δέ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, πλησθεὶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, καὶ ἀτενίσας εἰς αὐτόν, εἶπεν, 10. Ὦ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥᾳδιουργίας, υἱὲ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης, οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς

[1] After **πιστεως** D, Syr. Harcl. mg. add **επειδη ηδιστα ηκουεν αυτων** (*cf.* E). We may compare Mark vi. 20; see also Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 81.

uses the same verb of the magicians withstanding Moses.—**Ἐλύμας**, see critical notes in answer to Klostermann, who finds in **Ἐ.** a translation of Bar-Jesus; Wendt points out (1899) that in this case **οὕτω γὰρ μεθ.** would follow immediately after **Ἐ.**, but as **οὕτω κ.τ.λ.** follows immediately upon **ὁ μάγος**, **Ἐ.** can only be a translation of that word; see also MS. authority, so Blass in **β**, where he adds to **βαριησοῦς** the words **ὁ μεθ. Ἑτοιμᾶς**. In **Ἐλύμας** we have the Greek form either of Aramaic *Alīmā*, strong, or more probably of an Arab word *'alim*, wise; we cannot arrive at any derivation closer than this, *cf.* "Bar-Jesus," Hastings' B.D., and for a similar explanation Zöckler, *in loco;* and Wendt (1899), Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 74, and so Blass, *in loco*, read **Ἑτοιμᾶς**, and render "Son of the Ready".—**διαστρέψαι**, Exod. v. 4, same construction with **ἀπό**; 1 Kings xviii. 17, 18, Matt. xvii. 17, Luke ix. 41, Phil. ii. 15; see also critical notes.

Ver. 9. **Σαῦλος δέ, ὁ καὶ Παῦλος**: since the days of St. Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.*, chap. vi., *cf.* Aug., *Confess.*, viii., 4, etc., *cf.* amongst moderns Bengel, Olshausen, Ewald, Meyer) it has been thought that there is some connection here emphasised by the writer between the name Sergius Paulus and the assumption of the name Paul by the Apostle at this juncture. (Wendt (1899) inclines to the view that the name Paul was first used in ver. 1. See *in loco* and critical notes.) So too Baur, Zeller, Hausrath, Overbeck, Hilgenfeld are of opinion that Luke intended some reference to the name of the proconsul, although they regard the narrative of his conversion as unhistorical. But Wendt rightly maintains (1899) that the simple **ὁ καὶ** without the addition of **ἀπὸ τότε** would not denote the accomplishment of a change of name at this juncture, and that if the change or rather addition of name had been now effected, the mention of it would naturally have followed after the mention of the conversion of the proconsul in ver. 13. The connection seemed so strained and artificial to many that they abandoned it, and regarded the collocation of the two names as a mere chance incident, whilst Zöckler (whose note should be consulted, *Apostelgeschichte*, *in loco*, second edition), who cannot thus get rid of the striking similarity in the names of the two men, thinks that the narrative of St. Luke is too condensed to enable us fully to solve the connection. But since it was customary for many Jews to bear two names, a Hebrew and a Gentile name, *cf.* Acts i. 23, xii. 25, xiii. 1, Col. iv. 11, Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 9, 7, and frequent instances in Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, pp. 182, 183, *cf.* Winer-Schmiedel, p. 149 note, it may well be that Luke wished to intimate that if not at this moment, yet during his first missionary journey, when the Apostle definitely entered upon his Gentile missionary labours, he employed not his Jewish but his Gentile name to mark his Apostleship to the Gentile world („Seit 13. 1. ist der jüdische Jünger **Σαῦλος** Weltapostel," Deissmann); by a marvellous stroke of historic brevity the author sets before us the past and the present in the formula **ὁ καὶ Π.**—a simple change in the order of a recurring pair of names: see Ramsay's striking remarks, *St. Paul*, p. 83 ff., with which however, *mutatis mutandis*, his more recent remarks, *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* p. 54, should be carefully compared. See also Deissmann, *u. s.*, Nösgen, Wendt, Hackett, Felten, and Zöckler, *in loco*, and McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 176. This preference by St. Luke of the Gentile for the Hebrew name has its analogy in St. Paul's own use in his Epistles (and in his preference for Roman provincial names in his geographical references, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 1, ix. 2, Rom. xv. 26, Phil. iv. 15).

Ver. 10. **πλήρης**: for an interesting parallel in Plato *cf.* Wetstein, *in loco*, Plato, *Legg.*, 908 D.—**ῥᾳδιουργίας**: only here in N.T., *cf.* xviii. 14, hellenistic, R.V. "villainy," A.V. "mischief" (so Genevan),

ὁδοὺς Κυρίου[1] τὰς εὐθείας; 11. καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ χεὶρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ ἔσῃ τυφλὸς μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον ἄχρι καιροῦ. παραχρῆμα δὲ ἐπέπεσεν[2] ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀχλὺς καὶ σκότος, καὶ περιάγων ἐζήτει χειραγωγούς. 12. τότε ἰδὼν ὁ ἀνθύπατος τὸ γεγονὸς ἐπίστευσεν,[3] ἐκπλησσόμενος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Κυρίου.

[1] **Κυριου,** but ℵ*B **του Κ.,** so W.H. text, *cf.* Hos. xiv. 9 (10) (but see *var. lec.*), so Weiss, Wendt.

[2] **επεπεσεν,** but **επεσεν** ℵABD 61, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt, Hilg.; see, on the other hand, Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, Introd., pp. 19, 20.

[3] **επιστευσεν**—DE prefix **εθαυμασεν και**; after **επισ.** D adds **τῳ Θεῳ,** so Blass and Hilg.

but other E.V. "deceit"; the idea of deceit, however, is more properly contained in δόλου R.V., "guile". ῥᾳδ., lit., ease in doing, so easiness, laziness, and hence fraud, wickedness, *cf.* **πανουργία,** frequently used, although not necessarily so, in a bad sense.—**υἱὲ διαβόλου,** John viii. 44, the expression may be used in marked and indignant contrast to the name "Son of Jesus," *cf.* iii. 25, iv. 36. But without any reference to ver. 6 the expression would describe him as the natural enemy of the messengers of God. On the phrase and its use here see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 163. Note the thrice **παντὸς — πάσης — πάσης,** "ter repetitur emphatice" Wetstein. — **διαστρέφων,** *cf.* LXX, Prov. x. 9, and Isa. lix. 8, Micah iii. 9.—**τὰς ὁδοὺς . . . τὰς εὐθείας**: similar expressions frequent in LXX, so of the ways of the Lord in contrast to the ways of men, Ezek. xxxiii. 17, Ecclesiast. xxxix. 24, Song of the Three Children, ver. 3.

Ver. 11. **καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ,** *cf.* Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 179.—**μὴ βλέπων τὸν ἥλιον**: emphasising the punishment, as it would imply that he should be stone-blind (Weiss).—**ἄχρι καιροῦ**: "until a season," R.V. margin, "until the time" (Rendall), *i.e.*, the duly appointed time when it should please God to restore his sight, *cf.* Luke iv. 13, xxi. 24 (Acts xxiv. 25). The exact expression is only found here and in Luke iv. 13. Wendt (1899) asks if the ceasing of the punishment is conceived of as ceasing with the opposition in ver. 8. See his earlier edition, 1888, and the comment of Chrys., so Oecumenius: **οὐκ ἄρα τιμωρία ἦν ἀλλ' ἴασις**: so too Theophylact.—**παραχρῆμα,** see above on p. 106. — **ἐπέπεσεν,** see critical notes. If we retain T.R. with Weiss, the word may be called characteristic of St. Luke, see above on p. 216 its use as denoting an attack of disease is quite medical, Hobart, p. 44.—**ἀχλὺς**: only here in N.T., not in LXX. Galen in describing diseases of the eye mentions **ἀχλύς** amongst them. So Dioscorides uses the word of a cataract, and Hippocrates also employs it, Hobart, p. 44. The word is no doubt frequent in Homer, sometimes of one deprived of sight by divine power, and it also occurs in Polyb. and Josephus. But here it is used in conjunction with other words which may also be classed as medical, **παραχ., σκότος,** to say nothing of **(ἐπ)έπεσεν.**—**σκότος**: marks the final stage of blindness—the word is no doubt a common one, but it is used, as also some of its derivatives, by medical writers in a technical sense, and Dioscorides in one place connects **σκοτώματα** and **ἀχλύς** together.—**περιάγων**: only absolutely here in N.T., so sometimes in classical Greek, and sometimes with acc. loci, as also in N.T. (*cf.* Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, etc.).—**ἐζήτει,** imperf., he sought but did not find.—**χειραγωγούς**: only here in N.T., not in LXX, *cf.* the verb in ix. 8, xxii. 11, and in LXX, Judg. xvi. 26 A, Tobit xi. 16 (but not A, B); used by Plutarch, etc.

Ver. 12. **ἐπίστευσεν**: "the blindness of Elymas opened the eyes of the proconsul" (Felten). If the verb is understood in its full sense, *viz.*, that Sergius Paulus became a convert to the faith, ver. 48, ii. 44, iv. 4, xi. 21, baptism would be implied, viii. 12.—**ἐκπλησσ.,** Matt. vii. 28, Mark i. 22, xi. 18, Luke iv. 32, ix. 43, etc., so in classical Greek with **ἐπί.** The verb is also found in Eccl. vii. 17 (16), Wisdom xiii. 4, 2 Macc. vii. 12, 4 Macc. viii. 4, xvii. 16. Bengel's comment is suggestive, "miraculo acuebatur attentio ad doctrinam": the conversion is not represented as the result of the miracle alone. The conversion of a Roman proconsul is regarded as absolutely incredible by Renan (so more recent critics). But if

13. Ἀναχθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάφου οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἦλθον εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας. Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀποχωρήσας ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. 14. αὐτοὶ δέ, διελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Πέργης, παρεγένοντο εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας,[1] καὶ εἰσελθόντες

[1] της Πισιδιας, DEHLP but acc. in ℵABC, so Tisch., W. H., Weiss, Wendt. Blass (so Hilg.) retains gen. on the ground that the adj. Πισίδιος "non exstat," but see Ramsay, and Wendt (1899), p. 231; also Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* and *sub* Ἀντιόχεια, 2.

the narrative had been a mere fiction to magnify Paul's powers in converting such an important personage in his first encounter with the powers of heathenism, the forger would not have contented himself with the brief **Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Π.** of ver. 9; see Zöckler's *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 245, second edition, on this and other objections against the narrative. See *Introd.* for the favourable light in which St. Luke describes the relations between the Roman government and Christianity.

Ver. 13. **Ἀναχθέντες**, "set sail," R.V. So in classical use, here in its technical nautical sense—so too, in opposite sense, **κατάγεσθαι.** In this sense thirteen times in Acts, and once in Luke's Gospel, viii. 22, but not in the other Gospels at all; it is only used once, in another sense, by St. Matthew among the Evangelists, *cf.* iv. 1. **ἄγειν** and its compounds with **ἀνά, κατά, εἰς**, are characteristic of Luke's writings, Friedrich, p. 7.—**οἱ περὶ τὸν Π.**: Paul now taking the first place as the leader of the company, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 84, the order henceforth is Paul and Barnabas, with two significant exceptions, xv. 12, 25, and xiv. 12, see *in loco.*—**Ἰ. δὲ . . . ὑπέστρεψεν**: Ramsay refers St. Mark's withdrawal to the above circumstances, inasmuch as he disapproved of St. Paul's change of place, which he regarded as an abandonment of the work. But the withdrawal on the part of Mark is still more difficult to understand, if we are to suppose that he withdrew because Paul and Barnabas made, as it were, a trip to Antioch for the recovery of the former; and xv. 38 seems to imply something different from this. Various reasons may have contributed to the desertion of Mark, perhaps the fact that his cousin Barnabas was no longer the leader, or Paul's preaching to the Gentiles may have been too liberal for him, or lack of courage to face the dangers of the mountain passes and missionary work inland, or affection for his home at Jerusalem and anxiety for the coming famine (he withdrew, says Holtzmann, "zu seinem Mutter"). See Deissmann's striking note, *Bibelstudien*, p. 185, on the fact that here, where John Mark leaves Paul for Jerusalem, he is simply "John," his Jewish name; in xv. 39 he goes with Barnabas to Cyprus, and on that occasion only he is described by his Gentile name "Mark" alone. On the "perils of rivers, and perils of robbers," see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 23, and in connection with the above, pp. 62, 65, also C. and H. (smaller edition), p. 129, Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, iii., 133.

Ver. 14. **διελθόντες**: in this journey northwards to Antioch the Apostles would probably follow the one definite route of commerce between Perga and that city; the natural and easy course would lead them to Adada, now *Kara Bavlo*, and the dedication there of a church to St. Paul may point to the belief that he had visited the place on his way to Antioch (Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 21, and Zöckler, *in loco*, who agrees here with Ramsay's view). Although disagreeing with C. and H. in bringing the Apostles to Adada, Ramsay fully agrees with them in emphasising the dangers of the journey across the Pisidian highlands, and in referring to his travels from Perga across Taurus to Antioch and back his perils of rivers, and perils of robbers, 2 Cor. xi. 26 (see too Wendt, *in loco* (1899), in agreement with Ramsay, whose instances of the dangers of the way, from the notices of the inscriptions, should be consulted, *u. s.*).—**Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας**, see critical notes. If we adopt with R.V., etc., **Ἀ. τὴν Πισιδίαν** = an adjective, **τὴν Πισιδικήν**, "Pisidian Antioch," or, as it was also called, Antioch towards Pisidia, or on the side of Pisidia, to distinguish it from Antioch on the Maeander, or Carian Antioch. At this period Antioch did not belong to Pisidia at all (Strabo, pp. 557, 569, 577), but later the term Pisidia was widened, and so the expression "Antioch of Pisidia" came into vogue. Ptolemy, v., 4, 11, employs it

εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων, ἐκάθισαν. 15. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι πρὸς αὐτούς, λέγοντες, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, εἰ ἔστι λόγος

and so some MSS. in the passage before us; see critical notes, and Ramsay, "Antioch in Pisidia," in Hastings' B.D., *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 25, and Wendt (1899), *in loco;* see further on xvi. 6. On the death of Amyntas, B.C. 25, Antioch became part of the Roman province Galatia, and a little later, some time before 6 B.C., it was made a *colonia* by Augustus, with Latin rights, and as such it became an administrative and military centre in the protection of the province against the Pisidian robbers in their mountain fortresses, Ramsay, *u. s.* There can be no doubt that Paul would also find there a considerable Jewish population, as the Jews were trusty supporters of the Seleucid kings, and found a home in many of the cities which they founded.—**ἀπὸ τῆς Πέργης**: Ramsay supposes that the travellers hurried on from Perga (chief town of Pamphylia on the Cestrus, and an important place of commerce) to Antioch, without any evangelisation on their way, because in Perga the Apostle had been smitten with an attack of malarial fever, which obliged him to seek the higher ground of Antioch. In Gal. iv. 13 Ramsay finds a corroboration of this view, a passage in which Paul himself states that an illness occasioned his first preaching to the Churches of Galatia, *i.e.*, of the Roman province Galatia. The suggestion has much to recommend it, see *St. Paul*, p. 92. McGiffert's remarks, however, should be consulted in support of the view that the illness overtook the Apostle at Antioch rather than at Perga, *Apostolic Age*, p. 177, and Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i., 275, E.T.—**εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν**, "to the Jew first," was Paul's primary rule, and here amongst those **φοβ. τὸν Θεόν** he would find, perhaps, the best soil for his labours, *cf.* xvi. 14, and also xiii. 5, xiv. 1, xvi. 13, xvii. 2, 10, 17, xviii. 4, xix. 8. Against the doubts raised by the Tübingen School as to the historical character of the notice, see especially Wendt, 1888 and 1899 editions. It is inconceivable, as he says, that Paul, who could express himself as in Rom. i. 16, ix. 32, x. 16, xi. 30, should entirely disregard the Jews in his missionary efforts. The notice in xvi. 13, from a "We-source," of St. Paul's first Sabbath at Philippi enables us to form a correct judgment as to his probable course in other places.—**τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαβ.**; not necessarily the first Sabbath after their arrival; some time may have been spent previously in mission work before a critical event took place, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 99, 100.—**ἐκάθισαν**: the word may mean that they sat down in the seat of the Rabbis, so J. Lightfoot, *in loco*, as intimating that they expected to be called upon to preach, or we may infer, ver. 15, that they were called upon on the present occasion because they were well known in the city as men who claimed to have a message to deliver, and the rulers of the synagogue could invite whom they would, Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 281; Lumby, p. 252, "on the Jewish Manner of *reading the Scriptures*".

Ver. 15. **τὴν ἀνάγ. τοῦ ν. καὶ τῶν π.**: the first and second lesson, Edersheim, *u. s.*, p. 278, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 443; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 79 ff., E.T., the first from the Pentateuch, and the second a paragraph from the Prophets, including the older historical books. As there is no evidence that the lectionary of the Prophets existed in the time of our Lord, it is precarious to attempt to fix the particular Sabbath for St. Paul's address. It is however significant that he uses two remarkable words from the LXX, Deut. i. 31: **ἐτροφ.** (see critical notes), in ver. 18, and from Isa. i. 2: **ὕψωσεν** in ver. 17, and that in the present table of Jewish lessons that from the Law for the forty-fourth Sabbath in the year is Deut. i.-iii. 22, while the corresponding lesson from the Prophets is Isa. i. 1-22; see Bengel on ver. 18, and Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., pp. 368, 369; Plumptre, *in loco*. But we cannot safely go beyond the view of Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 100, who points out that the present list of Jewish lessons is of decidedly later origin, but adds that "probably it was often determined by older custom and traditional ideas of suitable accompaniment".—**ἀπέστειλαν**: the words seem hardly consistent with Lumby's view that St. Paul was himself the Haphtarist.—**οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι**; generally only one, Luke xiii. 14, but *cf.* Mark v. 22 (Weiss, *in loco*), and the passage before us; the office was specially concerned with the care of public worship,

ἐν ὑμῖν παρακλήσεως[1] πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγετε. 16. ἀναστὰς δὲ Παῦλος, καὶ κατασείσας τῇ χειρὶ, εἶπεν, Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν, ἀκούσατε. 17. ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραὴλ ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν· καὶ τὸν λαὸν ὕψωσεν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς·

[1] D reads **λογος σοφιας εν υμιν παρακλησεως.** Blass inserts **η** before **παρακ.**; *cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 8.

and the name was given to those who conducted the assemblies for that purpose. They had to guard against anything unfitting taking place in the synagogue (Luke xiii. 14), and to appoint readers and preachers, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 65, E.T.; Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 281, and on the present passage, *Jesus the Messiah*, i., 434, and for the title in inscriptions, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.;* see also below on xiv. 2.—**ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί**: courteous address, ii. 37, "Gentlemen, brethren" (Ramsay).

Ver. 16. **κατασείσας,** see above on xii. 17, and *cf.* xix. 33, xxi. 40 (xxvi. 1), "made a gesture with his hand," a gesture common to orators, "nam hoc gestu olim verba facturi pro contione silentium exigebant," and here a graphic touch quite characteristic of Acts. The speech which follows may well have remained in the memory, or possibly may have found a place in the manuscript diary of one of Paul's hearers (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 100), or St. Paul may himself have furnished St. Luke with an outline of it, for the main sections, as Ewald suggested, may have formed part of the Apostle's regular mode of addressing similar audiences; and if not St. Paul himself, yet one of those who are described as **οἱ περὶ Παῦλον,** ver. 13 (Zöckler), may have supplied the information. On the other hand it is maintained that the speech in its present form is a free composition of the author of Acts, since it is so similar to the early addresses of St. Peter, or to the defence made by St. Stephen, and that St. Luke wished to illustrate St. Paul's method of proclaiming the Messianic salvation to Jews. But considering the audience and the occasion, it is difficult to see how St. Paul could have avoided touching upon points similar to those which had claimed the attention of a St. Peter or a St. Stephen: "non poterat multum differre vel a Petri orationibus, vel a defensione Stephani . . . hæc igitur non magis in Paulum cadunt quam in quemvis novae salutis praeconem" (Blass), while at the same time it is quite possible to press this similarity too far and to ignore the points which are confessedly characteristic of St. Paul, *cf.*, *e.g.*, vv. 38, 39 (Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 19-22; Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 244, 245; Lechler, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 272; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, i., p. 46 (1896)); see further, Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., p. 369, note, and Alford references for the several Pauline expressions, and the remarkable list of parallels drawn out recently by Ramsay between the speech at Pisidian Antioch and the thoughts and phrases of the Epistle to the Galatians, *Expositor*, December, 1898 (see below on pp. 295, 297); also Nösgen's list of Pauline expressions, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 53, in this and in other speeches in Acts.—**ἄνδρες Ἰ.,** *cf.* ii. 22, iii. 12, v. 35, a mode of address fitly chosen as in harmony with the references to the history of Israel which were to follow.—**οἱ φ. Θεόν,** *cf.* x. 2, xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, etc.

Ver. 17. **τούτου**: this points back to **Ἰσρ.**: an appeal to the national pride of the people in their theocratic privileges and names, *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 22, Rom. ix. 6.—**ἐξελ.** so often in LXX of God's choice of Israel.—**ὕψωσεν**: "exalted," A. and R.V. Weiss and Wendt, with Bethge and Blass, restrict its meaning to increase in numbers, Gen. xlviii. 19, Acts vii. 17, so also Overbeck; whilst others refer it to the miraculous events connected with their sojourn as well as to their increase in numbers (so St. Chrysostom), others take it of the exaltation of the people under Joseph. But the word may certainly mean something more than numerical increase, and include increase in strength and power (so Hackett, Page). It is used once by St. Paul elsewhere, 2 Cor. xi. 7, in contrast with **ταπεινόω,** *cf.* its similar use in Luke i. 52. Rendall refers its use here to 2 Kings xxv. 27, "lifted up," *i.e.*, at the end of a miserable state of bondage, a passage where the verb is closely joined with **ἐξήγαγεν.** In Isaiah i. 2 and xxiii.

18. καὶ ὡς τεσσαρακονταετῆ χρόνον ἐτροποφόρησεν [1] αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· **19.**[2] καὶ καθελὼν ἔθνη ἑπτὰ ἐν γῇ Χαναάν, κατεκληροδότησεν αὐτοῖς [3] τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν. **20.**[4] καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις

[1] **ετροπ.** ℵBC²DHLP 36, 61, Vulg., Syr. Harcl. mg., so W.H., Blass, R.V. text, Rendall, Weiss; **ετροφ.** AC*E 13, d, Gig., Sah., Boh., Syrr. Pesh. Harcl. text, so Tisch., R.V. marg., and Hilg. Wendt cannot decide, although he considers **ετροφ.** as more fitting here, while he regards **ετροπ.** as the more original reading in LXX Deut. i. 31 (B*, Orig.). Tischendorf, however, regards **ετροφ.** as best attested in Deut. i. 31 and as best suited to the context both there and here. W.H., *App.*, p. 94, maintain that **τροπ.** is the more obvious rendering of נָשָׂא, but that when the orig. meaning was forgotten, the context in Deut. i. 31 led to the change to **τροφοφ.** This corruption in LXX was doubtless widely current in the Apostolic age, and might have been followed here. W.H. conclude that there can be no reason to question a reading supported by ℵB 61, Vulg., and many good cursives, a reading which they regard as best authenticated in the LXX and as agreeing with the Heb., especially when it was liable to be changed by the influence of the common and corrupt text of the LXX. They add that both here and in Deut. either reading gives excellent sense.

[2] **και** om. B 61, Sah., W.H. text, Wendt—but Blass, Hilg. and Weiss retain. W.H. take **ως** in ver. 18 as "when," not "about".

[3] **κατεκληροδοτησεν,** but **κατεκληρονομησεν** ℵABCDEHLP 13, 61, Chrys., Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **-δοτ-** arose from missing active use of **κληρονομ.** Similar instances of confusion between the two verbs in LXX; *cf.* H. and R. **αυτοις** om. ℵBD* 13, 40, 61, Sah., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. For **αυτων** D, Syr. Harcl. read **των αλλοφυλων,** so Blass and Hilg.

[4] The words **ως ετεσιν τετρ. κ. πεντ.** are to be placed before **και μετα ταυτα**—so ℵABC, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Arm., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss. Wendt thinks with Meyer and Holtzmann that the transposition may have been made to meet a difficulty; see also Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 370. D, Sah., Syr. Harcl. mg. omit **μετα ταυτα** altogether, so Blass and Hilg.

4 it is used of bringing up children.—**παροικίᾳ,** *cf.* vii. 6, and for the noun as here, LXX, 2 Esdras viii. 35, Wisdom xix. 10. Prologue of Ecclus., ver. 26, Ps. cxx. 5.—**μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψ.,** *cf.* Exod. vi. 1, 6, Deut. v. 15, etc., Ps. cxxxvi. 12, Baruch ii. 11, etc. Hebraistic, *cf.* Luke i. 51, where we have **ἐν** as in Hebrew, but in LXX **μετά** as of the accompanying the arm of God, and not merely of his power as bringing the people out.

Ver. 18. **ἐτροποφόρησεν,** see critical notes. **ἐτροπ.,** "suffered he their manners," so A. and R.V. **ἐτροφ.,** "bare he them as a nursing father," R.V. margin. This latter rendering is supported by Bengel, Alford, Bethge, Nösgen, Hackett, Page, Farrar, Plumptre, etc., as more agreeable to the conciliatory drift of the Apostle's words, but see above, *cf.* 2 Macc. vii. 27.

Ver. 19. **καθελὼν,** *cf.* Deut. vii. 1. In LXX the stronger verb **ἐξαίρειν** is used, but **καθαιρεῖν** in LXX often means to destroy, Jer. xxiv. 6, Ps. xxvii. 5, and so in classical Greek. Weiss prefers the force of the verb as in Luke i. 52, to cast down, *i.e.*, from their sovereignty.-**κατεκληροδότησεν,** see critical notes. If we adopt reading of R.V. W.H.: "he gave *them* their land for an inheritance".

Ver. 20. If we follow the best attested reading, see critical notes, we may connect the dative of time **ἔτεσι,** *cf.* viii. 11, closely with the preceding words as signifying the period within which an event is accomplished. The **κληρονομία** was already assured to the fathers as God's chosen, vii. 5, and the four hundred years of the people's sojourn in a strange land, Acts vii. 6, Gen. xv. 13, forty years in the wilderness, and some ten years for the actual conquest of the land made up the four hundred and fifty years (so Weiss, Felten, see Wendt, *in loco*). If reading in T.R. is accepted (strongly defended by Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., p. 370), although it is at variance with 1 Kings vi. 1, according to which Solomon began his Temple in the 480th (LXX 440th) year after the Exodus, we

καὶ πεντήκοντα, ἔδωκε κριτὰς ἕως Σαμουὴλ τοῦ προφήτου· 21. κἀκεῖθεν ᾐτήσαντο βασιλέα, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς τὸν Σαοὺλ υἱὸν Κίς, ἄνδρα ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμίν, ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα· 22. καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτόν, ἤγειρεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δαβὶδ εἰς βασιλέα, ᾧ καὶ εἶπε μαρτυρήσας, "Εὗρον Δαβὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου." 23. Τούτου ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ἤγειρε [1] τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν, 24. προκηρύξαντος Ἰωάννου πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ βάπτισμα μετανοίας παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ. 25. ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρου ὁ Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον, ἔλεγε, "Τίνα με [2] ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ, ἀλλ' ἰδού, ἔρχεται μετ' ἐμέ, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν

[1] **ηγειρε**, *cf.* ver. 22; but **ηγαγε** ℵABEHLP 61, Vulg., Boh., Aeth., Ath., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt.

[2] **τινα με**, but **τι εμε** ℵAB 61, Sah., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; Blass follows T.R. with CDEHLP, Vulg., Boh., Syrr. P. and H., so Hilg., but in Blass punctuation differs from T.R.

have merely to suppose that the Apostle followed the popular chronology adopted by Josephus, *Ant.*, viii., 3, 1; x., 8, 5, especially when we remember that speaking in round numbers (**ὡς**) that chronology tallies very fairly with that of the Book of Judges. See Meyer-Wendt, Alford, and *cf.* also the almost similar reckoning in Wetstein, and Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden*, pp. 30, 31. Another explanation is given by Rendall, *in loco*, where **ἔτεσι** is taken as marking not duration of time (which would require the accusative), but the limit of time within which, etc.

Ver. 21. **κἀκεῖθεν**: only here of time in N.T. as in later Greek. Weiss even here interprets the expression to mean that they asked for a king from him, *i.e.*, Samuel, in his character as prophet.—**ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα**: not mentioned in O.T., but *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, vi., 14, 9. The period does not seem much too long for Saul's reign when we remember that Ishbosheth was forty years old at his father's death, when he was placed on the throne by Abner, 2 Sam. ii. 10.—**Σαοὺλ κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* Paul's description of himself in Phil. iii. 5.

Ver. 22. **μεταστήσας**, Luke xvi. 4: refers here to Saul's deposition from the throne, 1 Sam. xv. 16, *cf.* Dan. ii. 21, 1 Macc. viii. 13, not as Bethge thinks to his removal from the presence of God, *cf.* 2 Kings xvii. 23, nor to his death, 3 Macc. iii. 1, vi. 12. Saul therefore could not have been the bringer of the promised salvation.—**εὗρον κ.τ.λ.**: a combination of two passages, Ps. lxxxix. 20 and 1 Sam. xiii. 14, and freely referred to as a saying pronounced by God Himself, but the latter part was pronounced by Samuel in God's name.—**τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί**, but in LXX **τὸν δοῦλόν μου. ἄνδρα** to mark the dignity (Bethge).—**κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν**, *cf.* Jer. iii. 15.—**ὃς ποιήσει**, *cf.* Isa. xliv. 28, Ps. xl. 8. The fact that these quotations are thus left in their present shape with no attempt to correct them justifies the belief that we have here St. Paul's own words. With the first part of the quotation *cf.* Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xviii., 1, a striking agreement; see on the one hand as against its dependence on Acts, Wendt, p. 41 (1899), and on the other hand, Bethge, *in loco*, and *Introd.*, p. 37.

Ver. 23. **κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν**: phrase only found in Gal. iii. 29, 2 Tim. i. 1: the Messianic promises generally, or more specifically 2 Sam. vii. 12, Ps. cxxxii. 11, Isa. xi. 1, 10, Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, Zech. iii. 8. In the last prophecy the LXX read the verb **ἄγω** which is found in the verse before us, see critical notes.—**Ἰησοῦν**: emphatic at the end of the clause, as **τούτου** at the beginning of the verse.

Ver. 24. **προκηρύξ.** not in LXX or Apocrypha, but in classical Greek, *cf.* also Josephus, *Ant.*, x., 5, 1, and also in Plut., Polyb.—**πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου**; "before the face of his entering in," R.V. margin, *cf.* Luke i. 76; here used temporally, really a Hebraistic pleonasm, *cf.* Mal. iii. 1, an expression used as still under the influence of that passage, Simcox, *Language of the*

λῦσαι." 26. Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ, καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν Θεόν, ὑμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἀπεστάλη.[1] 27. οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν,[2] τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες, καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας, κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν· 28. καὶ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν

[1] υμιν CEHLP, Vulg., Syrr. P. and H. (text), Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys., so Blass; ημιν ℵABD 13, 61, Sah., Syr. Harcl. mg.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, so Hilg. απεσταλη EHLP; εξαπεσ. ℵABCD 13, 61, Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] For τουτον αγν. . . . των προφ. τας D has μη συνιεντες τας γραφας των π. τας . . ., *cf.* Luke xxiv. 45. D also reads και κριναντες επληρ., so Hilg. Par. reads *reprobaverunt* for επληρωσαν, so Blass τουτον απεδοκιμασαν (omitting κριναντες επληρ.), reading κριναντες in the next verse; see on ver. 29.

N. T., p. 154, and also Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 23.—εἰσόδου: the entry of Jesus upon His public Messianic ministry, a word which may also have been suggested by Mal. iii. 2, LXX.

Ver. 25. ἐπλήρου: "*i.e.*, non multo ante finem vitæ," Blass, *cf.* vii. 23.—δρόμον: "Paulum sapit," *cf.* xx. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 7, Gal. ii. 2.—ὑπονοεῖτε: three times in Acts, *cf.* xxv. 18, xxvii. 27; nowhere else in N.T., but see Judith xiv. 14, Tob. viii. 16, Ecclus. xxiii. 21. Note this free reproduction of the words of the Evangelists—essentially the same but verbally different.—οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ, I am not he, *i.e.*, the Messiah; best to punctuate as in A. and R.V., so Wendt; but see on the other hand Bethge and Weiss, and the reading they adopt: τί ἐμὲ ὑπον. εἶναι, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ; the gloss ὁ XC. after ἐγώ, old enough to have crept into the text, shows that the punctuation in A.V. was a natural one, Simcox, *u. s.*, p. 70.

Ver. 26. ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί: the address of ver. 16 is here renewed in more affectionate tones, and here as in ver. 16 both Jews and proselytes are two classes, here both regarded by Paul as ἀδελφοί.—ὑμῖν, see critical notes. Some take it as marking a sharp antithesis between the Jews of Antioch and those of Jerusalem (an antithesis not removed by ἡμῖν), as if the Jews at Antioch and of the Dispersion were contrasted with the Jews of the capital. But γὰρ need not mark a contrast, it may rather confirm the implication in σωτ. ταύτης that Jesus was the Saviour, for He had suffered and died, and so had fulfilled the predictions relating to the Messiah. Nor indeed was it true that those who crucified the Saviour had excluded themselves from the offer of the Gospel: ὁ λόγος τῆς σ., *cf.* Ephes. i. 13, Phil. ii. 16, 1 Thess. ii. 13, etc.—ἀπεστάλη: if we read the compound ἐξαπ., critical notes, R.V. "is sent forth," *i.e.*, from God, *cf.* x. 36. Weiss takes the verb as simply referring to the sending forth of the word from the place where it was first announced. But *cf.* on the other hand Gal. iv. 4, 6, and ver. 23 above, where God is spoken of as the agent in the Messianic salvation, and on the possible force of ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτ. and ἐξαπεστάλη here see Ramsay, *Expositor*, December, 1898.

Ver. 27. Both A. and R.V. take ἀγνοήσαντες as governing τοῦτον and τὰς φωνάς. But καί may be not copulative but intensive—not only did they not recognise the Christ, but even condemned Him to death; so Rendall. Meyer rendered καί = "also," and makes τὰς φωνάς the direct object of ἐπλήρ. Wendt renders as A. and R.V., see critical notes.—ἀγνοήσαντες, *cf.* iii. 14, it is very doubtful how far we can see in the expression an excuse in the former passage, and guiltiness here. Paul speaks of himself as acting ἀγνοῶν and yet obtaining mercy, 1 Tim. i. 13, *cf.* also for the use of the word by Paul xvii. 23, and frequently in his Epistles.

Ver. 29. ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν ἅπαντα: St. Paul was evidently acquainted with the details of the Passion as well as with the main facts of the death and burial, *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 23; and for the verb used here Luke xviii. 31, xxii. 37, John xix. 28, 30; only here in Acts, Weiss regards the subject of ἐτέλ., καθέλ., ἔθηκαν as presupposed as known in accordance with the Gospel history, but St. Paul may have been speaking in general terms of the action of the Jews, although not the enemies of Christ but His friends actually took Him down and buried Him. Taken literally, St. Paul's statement agrees with

θανάτου εὑρόντες, ᾐτήσαντο [1] Πιλάτον ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτόν. 29. ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν [2] ἅπαντα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα, [3] καθελόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου ἔθηκαν εἰς μνημεῖον. 30. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 31. ὃς ὤφθη ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, οἵτινες [4] εἰσι μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν. 32. καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν γενομένην, 33. ὅτι ταύτην ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκε τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἡμῖν, [5] ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν· ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ τῷ

[1] **ητησαντο**—ℵ reads **ητησαν**, so W.H. marg., but mid. better, "asked for themselves". D reads **κριναντες αυτον παρεδωκαν Πιλατῳ ινα εις αναιρεσιν**; Blass and Hilg. omit **ινα**; see ver. 29.

[2] **ετελεσαν**, in D **ετελουν**.

[3] D reads after **γεγρ.**: **ητουντο τον Π. τουτον μεν σταυρωσαι και επιτυχοντες παλιν** . . . The reason of these insertions, as has been suggested, seems the same as in the previous verses—to gain a complete, although summary, account according to the Gospels. Syr. Harcl. mg. after **γεγρ.** *postquam crucifixus esset, petierunt a Pilato ut de ligno detraherent eum. Impetraverunt* . . . Blass combines the two in β (*cf.* also Hilg.). But one seems rather a corruption of the other, although the same motive mentioned above might lead to the insertion of either.

[4] After **οιτινες** ℵAC 13, 15, 18, 61, Sah., Boh., Syrr. P. (H.), Arm., Aeth. read **νυν**, so Tisch., R.V., [W.H.]; but om. BEHLP, Chrys., so Blass, Weiss, [W.H.]. Perhaps it fell out because the Apostles not only now first, but for a long time past, were witnesses. D, Vulg., Syr. Harcl. read **αχρι νυν**, so Blass in β, and Hilg.

[5] **αυτων ημιν** C³EHLP 61, Syr. P. and H., Arm., Chrys., Weiss, Hilg.; **ημων** (om. **αυτων**) ℵABC*D, Vulg., Aeth., Hil., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt; **αυτων** (om. **ημων**) Sah., Gig., Amb., Blass. Wendt (1899) attaches great prob. to W.H. explanation, see *App.*, p. 95; **ημιν** alone being the orig. reading. DE, Gig., Vulg., so Blass and Hilg., add **ημων** after **πατερας**, which shows how easily additions would follow **τεκνοις**.

the *Gospel of Peter*, 21-24, as Hilgenfeld noted. But Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus were both Jews and members of the Council.—**τοῦ ξύλου**, *cf.* v. 30, x. 39. Jüngst, without any ground, as Hilgenfeld remarks, refers ver. 29 partly on account of this expression to a reviser, and so 34-37. On **ξύλον**, significant here and in Gal. iii. 13, see Ramsay, *Expositor*, December, 1898.—**εἰς μν.**, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 4, the death followed by the burial, and so the reality of the death, "**ἐκ νεκρῶν**," was vouched for.

Ver. 31. **ὤφθη**, see Milligan's note on the word, *Resurrection of our Lord*, p. 265; *Witness of the Epistles* (1892), pp. 369, 377, 386; and Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i., p. 434 (second edition), *cf.* Luke xxiv. 34, 1 Cor. xv. 5 ff.—**ἐπὶ**: with accusative of duration of time, *cf.* xvi. 18, xviii. 20, xix. 8, 10, 34, xxvii. 20, *cf.* Luke iv. 25, xviii. 4; in classical writers, but only in St. Luke in N.T., except Heb. xi. 30, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 53.—**οἵτινες**: if we add **νῦν**, see critical notes, the word intimates that this announcement of Jesus as the Messiah was not first made by Paul, as some new thing, but that His Apostles were still bearing the same witness to the Jews (**λαόν**) as a living message in the same city in which Jesus had been crucified.

Ver. 32. **καὶ ἡμεῖς**, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 11, "whether it were I or they," etc., "ut illi illis, sic nos vobis".—**εὐαγγελ.**, see above on p. 210, and Simcox, *u. s.*, pp. 78, 79.—**τὴν πρὸς τοὺς π. ἐπαγγελίαν γεν.**, *cf.* Rom. xv. 8, Acts xxvi. 6.

Ver. 33. **ἐκπεπλήρωκε**: "hath fulfilled to the utmost," *cf.* 3 Macc. i. 2, 22, Polyb., i., 67, 1, **τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἐκπ.**—**τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἡμῖν**, see critical notes.—**ἀναστήσας**: "in that he raised up Jesus," R.V.; "in that he hath raised up Jesus again," A.V. The former rendering is quite compatible with the view that the reference of the word here is not to the resurrection of Jesus, but to the raising up of Jesus as the Messiah, *cf.* iii. 22, vii. 37, Deut. xviii. 15. The

δευτέρῳ[1] γέγραπται, "Υἱός μου εἶ σύ· ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε." 34. ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθορὰν, οὕτως εἴρηκεν, "Ὅτι δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαβὶδ τὰ πιστά." 35. διὸ[2] καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει, "Οὐ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν." 36. Δαβὶδ μὲν γὰρ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρετήσας τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλῇ ἐκοιμήθη, καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶδε

[1] **τῳ ψαλμῳ τῳ δευτερῳ γεγ.** ELP, Vulg., Syr. H., R.V. (T.R.); **τῳ ψ. γεγ. τῳ δευτ.** ℵABC 13, 61, Arm., W.H. But in D (**τῳ**) **πρωτῳ ψ. γεγ.**, *cf.* Or., Hil., Gig., Latin MS. known to Bede, Tisch., Meyer, Blass. The **δευτ.** and **πρωτ.** is the only important var., and the authority for the latter is almost entirely Western. According to Origen the Jews frequently combined Ps. i. and ii. (*cf.* also Justin, *Apol.*, i., 40; Tert., *adv. Marc.*, iv., 22; Cypr., *Testim.*, i., 13), "so that a 'Western' scribe, being probably accustomed to read the two Psalms combined, would be under a temptation to alter **δευτ.** to **πρωτ.** and not *vice versâ*," W.H., *App.*, p. 95. In D, Syr. Harcl. marg. the quotation also comprises Ps. ii. 5 (*cf.* Blass in β, and Hilg.); see Wendt (1899), note, p. 241; Belser, p. 69. Wern. omits **εν τ. πρ. ψ.** altogether; "fort. recte," Blass.

[2] **εν ετερῳ**, D, Gig., Vulg., Hilg. read **ετερως**—may have been changed into **εν ετερ.** **διοτι**, so ℵAB, R.V., W.H., under influence of Heb. v. 6, but more probably corruption.

first prophecy, ver. 33, would be fulfilled in this way, whilst in vv. 34 and 35 the prophecy would be fulfilled by the resurrection from the dead, **ἀνασ. ἐκ νεκρῶν** (see Knabenbauer *in loco*, p. 233 ff.). Wendt argues that Heb. i. 5, where the same prophecy is quoted as in ver. 33, also refers to the raising up as the Messiah, but see on the other hand Westcott, *Hebrews*, *in loco*.

Ver. 34. **μηκέτι μ. ὑποσ. εἰς διαφθ.**, *cf.* Rom. vi. 9, "no more to return to corruption," does not of course mean that Christ had already seen corruption, so that there is no need to understand **διαφθ.** of the place of corruption, *sepulchrum*, with Beza, Kuinoel. Hilgenfeld refuses to follow Jüngst, Sorof, Clemen in referring vv. 34-37 to a reviser, for he justly remarks that the speech which was intended to move the Israelites to a recognition of Jesus as the promised Saviour of the seed of David, would have been imperfect, unless it had set forth His sufferings and after-resurrection.—**Δώσω κ.τ.λ.**: "I will give you the holy and sure *blessings* of David". This rendering makes the connection with the next verse more evident, *cf.* Isa. lv. 3, **καὶ διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά.** "By David was understood the Messiah, which yet the Rabbis themselves have well observed:" J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* (so Schöttgen), *in loco*. "The everlasting covenant," what was it but the holy and sure blessings promised to David? But these blessings, **ὅσια**, *sancta promissa Davidi data*, are connected with the resurrection of Christ because ("**διότι** not **διό**, T.R., see critical notes, stating the cause, not the consequence") only in the triumph of God's Holy One (**τὸν ὅσιον**) are these blessings ratified and assured. Just as Peter (ii. 47), so here Paul applies the passage in Ps. xvi. directly to Christ, Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 151.

Ver. 36. **γὰρ**: David is contrasted with Christ by St. Paul as by St. Peter, ii. 29.—**ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρ.**: "after he had in his own generation served the counsel of God, fell on sleep," R.V., but in margin the rendering of A.V. is practically retained. It seems best to take **ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ** as a dative of time, *cf.* ver. 20, Ephes. iii. 5 (so Blass, Wendt, Zöckler, Felten), and not as *dat. commodi*. St. Paul's point seems to be (1) the contrast between the service of David which extended only for a generation, and the service of Christ which lasted through all ages permanently. But this contrast would be also marked if we adopt R.V. margin rendering and govern **ἰδίᾳ γεν.** by **ὑπηρ.** (see Weiss). (2) The second point of contrast is between the corruption which David saw, and the incorruption of the Holy One of God. Weiss still connects **τῇ Θεοῦ βουλῇ** with **ἐκοιμήθη**; see margin (2) in R.V.; but this does not seem so significant as the contrast drawn between David serving the counsel or purpose of God for one, or during one generation, whilst in Christ the eternal purpose of God was realised.—**προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς π. αὐτοῦ**: Hebraistic expression, lit., "was added," *i.e.*, in Sheol, *cf.* Gen. xxvi. 8, Judg. ii. 10, 1 Macc. ii. 69.

διαφθοράν. 37. ὃν δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν, οὐκ εἶδε διαφθοράν. 38. Γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὅτι διὰ τούτου [1] ὑμῖν ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν καταγγέλλεται· 39. καὶ [2] ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωσέως δικαιωθῆναι, ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται.

[1] **δια τουτου** ℵAB³CDLP, so all edd.; **δια τουτο** B* 15, 18, 180—Weiss here follows above authorities.

[2] **και** BC³(D)ELP, Sah., Boh., Syrr. P. and H., Arm., Aethro., Chrys., W.H., Weiss, R.V. (T.R.); om. ℵAC, Vulg. (am. fu. demid.), Aethpp., Tisch., Blass; **και** might easily drop out after TAI (Weiss). D 137, Syr. H. mg. add **παρα θεῳ** after **δικαι.**

Ver. 37. **ἤγειρεν**: more than resurrection from the dead, "hic non notatur resuscitatio ex mortuis; quippe quæ ipsa in conclusione evincitur: sed *quem Deus suscitavit* est *Sanctus Dei*, ver. 35, ut hæc Subjecti descriptio contineat ætiologiam," Bengel.

Ver. 38. **γνωστὸν οὖν**: "incipit adhortatio quæ orationem claudit," Blass.—**ἄφεσις ἁμαρ.**: the keynote of St. Paul's preaching, *cf.* xxvi. 18, as it had been of St. Peter's, ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43; and as it had been of the preaching of the Baptist, and of our Lord Himself.—**διὰ τούτου**, *i.e.*, Christ—through Him Who died, and was risen again—the phrase is characteristically Pauline, *cf.* x. 43.

Ver. 39. So far the words represent the entire harmony between the preaching of St. Peter and St. Paul, and there is no reason to attribute this verse, as also x. 43, with Jüngst, to any reviser; **δικαιοῦσθαι ἀπό** *only* elsewhere in Rom. vi. 7. But *if* St. Paul's next words seem to imply that within certain limits, *i.e.*, so far as it was obeyed, the law of Moses brought justification, they affirm at the same time the utter inefficacy of all legal obedience, since one thing was certain, that the law exacted much more than Israel could obey; complete justification must be found, if anywhere, elsewhere. Can we doubt that St. Paul is here giving us what was really his own experience? (See Briggs, *Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 76.) In spite of all his efforts to fulfil the law, there was still the feeling that these efforts were hopelessly deficient; there was an area of transgression in which the law, so far from justifying, condemned. But in the Messiah, the Holy One of God, he saw a realisation of that perfect holiness to which in the weakness of the flesh he could not attain, and in Him, Who died, and rose again, for us—that Righteous One, Whom he saw, not only on the road to Damascus, but ever on his right hand by the eye of faith—he found complete and full justification. That this forgiveness of sins is not connected specially with the Death of Christ, but with His Resurrection, or rather with His whole Messianic character, to which the Resurrection put the final seal, is certainly not to be regarded as an indication of a non-Pauline view, *cf.* Romans iv. 25, viii. 34, 2 Cor. v. 15. Moreover, if we consider the connection of the whole address, the Resurrection is not regarded apart from the Death of Christ: vv. 26-29 show us that the Message of Salvation starts from the Death of Christ, and is based upon that, *cf.* Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden*, p. 54. It is unreasonable to complain that St. Paul's conception of justification in this address falls below his characteristic and controlling idea of it (McGiffert, p. 186). We could not justly expect that the Apostle's utterances, thus summarised by St. Luke, would contain as full and complete a doctrinal exposition as his Galatian and Roman Epistles. To the former Epistle McGiffert points as giving us what Paul actually taught in Galatia; but there is no contradiction between the teaching given us in St. Luke's account of the address in Pisidian Antioch and St. Paul's account of his teaching to his converts in his letter "the coincidences between the two are so striking as to make each the best commentary on the other . . . and there is no such close resemblance between the Epistle and any other of Paul's addresses reported in Acts," Ramsay, *Expositor*, December, 1898. "Historical Commentary on Gal." see below, and also Lightfoot, on Gal. iii. 11. St. Paul's teaching is essentially the same in the synagogue at Antioch as when he is writing to his Galatian converts: only in Christ is justification, and in the law as such there is no forgiveness of sins. He does not say in so many words that there was no sin from which men could be freed under the law of Moses, but it is evident that the most solemn warning with which the Apostle

40. βλέπετε οὖν μὴ ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, 41. "Ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ θαυμάσατε καὶ ἀφανίσθητε· ὅτι ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, ἔργον ᾧ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε, ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν.[1]"

42. Ἐξιόντων δὲ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων,[2] παρεκάλουν τὰ ἔθνη εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον λαληθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα.

[1] At end D adds **και εσιγησαν**, Syr. Harcl. mg. **και εσιγησεν**. In the former case points to the impression the speech made; in the latter, merely to the fact that he finished it; *cf.* xv. 12, 13. Blass reads **εσιγησεν** (β), so Hilg.; see Weiss, Codex D, p. 76.

[2] **εκ της σ. των Ι.**, but **αυτων** only in ℵABCDEI 13, 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. (Pesh.) and Harcl., Arm., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **τα εθνη**, but om. ℵA(B)CD(E), Syr. P. and H., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. Evidence overwhelming for R.V; the subject of the verbs not being clear the sentence was interpreted wrongly. BE (81) omit **παρεκαλουν**—B inserting **ηξιουν** after **σαβ.**, while Chrys. substitutes **ηξιουν** for **παρεκ.** W.H., *App.*, p. 95, suspect primitive corruption, probably in opening words, and see Hort's suggestion. **μεταξυ**—D reads **εξης**, Hilg. retains; Blass rejects, although he thinks it good as an explanation.

follows up his declaration could only be justified on the ground that some essential principle was involved in the acceptance or rejection of the work of Christ. On **δικαιόω** in classical literature, in LXX, and in N.T., see Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, pp. 104, 105, and Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 30, 31.

Ver. 40. **ἐν τοῖς προφ.**, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 44, and Acts xxiv. 14; John vi. 45.—**ἐπέλθῃ**: quite Lucan in this sense, *cf.* viii. 24, Luke xi. 22, xxi. 26 (James v. 1).

Ver. 41. Hab. i. 5, but here slightly different from the Hebrew "behold, ye among the nations," in LXX through the possible mistake of reading the Hebrew noun as if = deceitful ones (with the idea perhaps of impudence, shamelessness). On **βλέπ. μὴ ἐπέλ.** see Burton, pp. 85, 89; Viteau, p. 83 (1893).—**ἀφανίσθητε**: added by LXX to the "wonder marvellously" of Heb. and LXX: "perish," "vanish away," R.V. margin, an idea involved in Heb. though not expressed: verb frequent in LXX, in N.T. three times, in Matt. vi., and nowhere else except James iv. 14, see Mayor's note, *in loco*. The Apostle here transfers the prophecies of the temporal judgments following on the Chaldean invasion to the judgment of the nation by the Romans, or to the punishment which would fall upon the Jews by the election of the Gentiles into their place. Perhaps the latter is more probable before his present audience. The **πᾶς ὁ πιστ.** naturally leads him to the warning for those who disbelieved (**ἔργον ᾧ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε**). It is tempting to regard the words with Ramsay (*Expositor*, December, 1898), as insisting upon the marvellous and mysterious nature of God's action in the sending forth of His Son, but the context (*cf.* **ἐπέλθῃ**) here, and the O.T. prophecy, both point to the imminence of judgment and penalty.—**ἐργάζομαι**: the present (so in LXX), because the result was so certain that it was regarded as actually in process. With true rhetorical force St. Paul concludes his speech, as at Athens, by an appeal to awaken all consciences, *cf.* St. Peter's closing words, ii. 36, iii. 26—possibly, as at the close perhaps of St. Stephen's speech, signs of impatience had begun to manifest themselves in his audience (Plumptre).

Ver. 42. **ἐξιόντων**: "and as they went out," *i.e.*, the Apostles, before the synagogue broke up the congregation of Jews and proselytes besought them—not "when they had gone out," which would introduce a confusion of time; see critical notes. Wendt refers to ver. 15, and takes **ἀρχισυ.** as the subject of **παρεκάλουν**.—**εἰς τὸ μ. Σ.**: "the next Sabbath," A. and R.V., *cf.* for **εἰς** iv. 3. **μετ.** here an adverb, later Greek, *cf.* Barn., *Epist.*, xiii., 5; Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, i. 44, and so in Josephus; ver. 44 apparently decides for the rendering above. Others take it of the days during the intervening week, between the Sabbaths, *cf.* J. Lightfoot, *in loco*, and Schöttgen.

Ver. 43. **λυθ. δὲ**: Paul and Barnabas

43. λυθείσης δὲ τῆς συναγωγῆς, ἠκολούθησαν πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ [1]· οἵτινες προσλαλοῦντες αὐτοῖς, ἔπειθον αὐτοὺς ἐπιμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ.

44. Τῷ δὲ ἐρχομένῳ [2] σαββάτῳ σχεδὸν πᾶσα ἡ πόλις συνήχθη ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ. 45.[3] ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τοὺς ὄχλους ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου, καὶ ἀντέλεγον τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένοις, ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ βλασφημοῦντες. 46. παῤῥησιασάμενοι δὲ ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ὁ Βαρνάβας εἶπον, Ὑμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἐπειδὴ δὲ [4] ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ ἀξίους κρίνετε

[1] **Βαρναβᾳ**, 137, Syr. Harcl. mg. add **αξιουντες βαπτισθηναι**, so Blass in **β**. Belser supports, p. 69, and thinks that it explains context, but if thus important it seems curious that it should have been omitted. At end of verse D, Syr. H. mg., Prov. add **εγεν. καθ' ολης της πολεως διελθειν τον λογον** (*cf.* E, Wern.), so Blass in **β**., and Hilg. **επιμενειν**, but **προσμ.** ℵABCDE 61, Chrys., Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss Wendt, Hilg.

[2] **ερχομενῳ** ℵBC*DE²LP 61, Chrys., Tisch., W.H., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg; **εχομενῳ** AC²E* 13, 40, W.H. marg., Blass (**ἡ ἐχομένη** several times in Luke). For **τον λογον του Θ.** (K.) D reads only **Παυλου**; so Blass and Hilg. Belser defends (with addition in previous verse) as marking exactly what the people would be likely to say, p. 69. But as D reads **τον λογον του Θ.** in previous verse, probably the change may have been made here merely to avoid repetition, Weiss, Codex D, p. 76.

[3] D commences **πολυν τε λογον ποιησαμένου περι του κυριου** (all this following upon **Παυλου** at close of previous verse): may be meant to mark that the opposition showed itself after Paul had spoken at length. **αντιλ. και** DIP 40, Syr. Harcl., Chrys., Theophyl., Par.[1], Tisch., Wendt, Hilg.; om. ℵABCL 13, 61, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss. **εναντιομενοι** (*sic*) **και** E, Gig.; Blass in **β** **αντιτασσομενοι** (*cf.* xviii. 6).

[4] **επειδη δε**, but **δε** om. ℵ*BD* 180, Syr. H., Sah., Boh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt (Weiss retains, so Blass and Hilg.). **απωθ. . . . κρινετε . . .**, Gig., Par., Wern., Cypr., Prom., so Blass in **β**, read **απωσασθε . . . εκρινατε**, marking that the opportunity was past and gone.

had gone out before the synagogue was formally broken up; **δέ** marks the contrast in the case of those who followed them to hear more.—**τῶν σεβ. προσ.**: only here. **σεβ. τὸν Θεόν** or **φοβ. τὸν Θεόν**: used elsewhere of the uncircumcised Gentiles who joined the Jewish synagogue, whilst **προσήλυτοι** means those who became circumcised and were full proselytes: "devout," R.V., referring rather to the outward worship, "religious," A.V., rather to inward feelings (but in ver. 50, "devout," A.V.).—**οἵτινες** (ix. 35, xi. 28) refers to the Apostles, but see on the other hand Rendall's note, pp. 92, 165, referring it to the people (so apparently Calvin). The Apostles thought by the eager following of the people that the grace of God had found an entrance into their souls, see critical notes for D. —**προσλαλοῦντες**: in N.T. only elsewhere in xxviii. 20, *cf.* Wisdom xiii. 17 (Exod. iv. 16, A B³).

Ver. 44. **ἐρχ.**, see critical notes.—**σχεδὸν**, *cf.* xix. 26, Heb. ix. 22, each time before **πᾶς**, and in 2 Macc. v. 2, 3 Macc. v. 14, 45. In classical use as in text, often with **πᾶς**.—**συνήχθη**, *i.e.*, in the synagogue, not, as some have thought, before the lodging of the Apostles.

Ver. 45. **οἱ Ἰ.**: not the proselytes with them (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 101). —**τοὺς ὄχλους**, *cf.* ver. 48, **τὰ ἔθνη**.—**ἀντιλ. καὶ**, see critical notes; if retained, participle emphasises finite verb: "not only contradicting but blaspheming"; see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 130.—**βλασ.**: nomen Christi, xviii. 6, xxvi. 11.

Ver. 46. **παῤῥησιασάμενοι**, see on ix. 27.—**ἦν ἀναγκαῖον**, *cf.* on ver. 14.—**ἐπειδὴ δὲ**, see critical notes. **δέ** marks the contrast, but its omission emphasises it even more vividly and sternly.—**ἀπωθεῖσθε**: "ye thrust it from you," R.V.; *repellitis*, Vulgate; only in Luke and

ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη· 47. οὕτω γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ Κύριος, "Τέθεικά[1] σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν, τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς." 48. ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαιρον, καὶ ἐδόξαζον[2] τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 49. διεφέρετο δὲ ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας. 50. οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι παρώτρυναν τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας[3] καὶ τὰς εὐσχήμονας καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐπήγειραν διωγμὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Βαρνάβαν,

[1] DE, Cypr. prefix **ιδου** to quot., so LXX. D, Cypr., Gig. read **φως τεθ. σε τοις εθν.**, so Blass and Hilg., but here variance from LXX.

[2] **εδοξαζον**, D, Gig., Aug. read **εδεξαντο**, so Hilg.—rejected by Blass in β, but see also his Commentary, *in loco;* for the phrase *cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 1. **τον Κυριον**, but **του Θ.** BD*E 180, Boh., Arm., Aug., W.H. text, R.V. text, Blass, Hilg.—Weiss retains **του K.**, so Tisch., W.H. mg. following ℵACLP 61, Vulg., Sah., Chrys.

[3] **και** (1) om. ℵcABCD 61, 180, Sah., Boh., Syrr. P. and H., Arm., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Hilg. Gig. **τινας των σεβ. (τον θεον) γυναικας ευσχημονας.** DE (Ephraem, Harris, *Four Lectures*, p. 23) read **θλιψιν μεγ. και διωγμον**, *cf.* viii. 11, Western text, and Phil. i. 16; see also Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 106.

Paul, *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 19, Rom. xi. 1, Acts vii. 27, 39; frequent in LXX, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Ps. xciii. 14, Ezek. xliii. 9, and 3 Macc. iii. 22, vi. 32, 4 Macc. ii. 16.—**οὐκ ἀξίους**, *cf.* Matt. xxii. 8.

Ver. 47. **γὰρ**: this action of the Apostles in turning to the Gentiles was not arbitrary.—**Τέθεικα**, *cf.* Isa. xlix. 6 (Luke ii. 32). In LXX B reads **δέδωκα** instead of **Τέθ.**, and inserts after it **εἰς διαθήκην γένους**; not in Hebrew.—**σε** really refers to the Servant of the Lord, the Messiah; *cf.* Delitzsch, *Das Buch Jesaia*, p. 486, fourth edition; but the Apostles speak of an **ἐντολή** given to them, because through them the Messiah is proclaimed to the Gentiles; see note on i. 8.

Ver. 48. **ἐδόξ. τὸν λ. τοῦ K.**: **δοξ. τὸν Θ.**; frequent in Luke and Paul, *cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 1 for the nearest approach to the exact phrase here. — **ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγ.**: there is no countenance here for the *absolutum decretum* of the Calvinists, since ver. 46 had already shown that the Jews had acted through their own choice. The words are really nothing more than a corollary of St. Paul's **ἀναγκαῖον**: the Jews as a nation had been ordained to eternal life—they had rejected this election—but those who believed amongst the Gentiles were equally ordained by God to eternal life, and it was in accordance with His divine appointment that the Apostles had turned to them. Some take the word as if middle, not passive: "as many as had set themselves unto eternal life," and in support of this Rendall refers to 1 Cor. xvi. 15, **ἔταξαν ἑαυτοὺς** (see also Blass, *in loco*). The rendering here given by Rendall may be adopted without pressing the military metaphor in the verb, as has sometimes been done; see Wendt's note, p. 308 (1888). St. Chrysostom takes the expression (rightly as Wendt thinks): **ἀφωρισμένοι τῷ Θεῷ.** Mr. Page's note, *in loco*, should be consulted.

Ver. 49. **διεφέρετο**; *divulgabatur*, "was spread abroad," R.V.; not only by the preaching of the Apostles themselves, but by small knots of Christians in other towns, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 105, and so Blass, *in loco;* only here in N.T. in this sense, so in (Wisdom xviii. 10) Plut.; Lucian; imperfect, a certain lapse of time is implied, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 105.—**ὅλης τῆς χώρας**: the phrase, "the whole *Region*," indicates that Antioch was the centre of a *Region*, a notice which introduces us to an important fact of Roman imperial administration. Antioch, as a Roman colony, would be the natural military and administrative centre of a certain *Regio*, and there is evidence that in Southern Galatia there were also other distinct *Regiones*, **χῶραι**, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 102-104, 109, 110-112.

Ver. 50. **παρώτρυναν**: "urged on," R.V.; only here in N.T., not in LXX or Apocrypha; so in Pind., Lucian, and so too in Josephus, *Ant.*, vii., 6, 1,

καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν. 51. οἱ δὲ ἐκτιναξάμενοι τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν αὐτῶν ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς, ἦλθον [1] εἰς Ἰκόνιον. 52. οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἐπληροῦντο χαρᾶς καὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

XIV. 1. ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν Ἰκονίῳ, κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ λαλῆσαι οὕτως ὥστε πιστεῦσαι

[1] ηλθον, D reads **κατηντησαν,** so Blass and Hilg., a common word in Acts but not necessary here.

and also in Hippocrates and Aretaeus.—**ἐπήγειραν,** *cf.* xiv. 2; nowhere else in N.T., several times in LXX, and also frequently in Hippocrates and Galen, Hobart, pp. 225, 226. On the addition in Codex D see critical notes, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 105, 106.—**τὰς εὐσχ.**: "of honourable estate," R.V.; not of character, but of position, *cf.* Mark xv. 43. This influence assigned to women at Antioch, and exerted by them, is quite in accordance with the manners of the country, and we find evidence of it in all periods and under most varying conditions. Thus women were appointed under the empire as magistrates, as presidents of the games, and even the Jews elected a woman as an Archisynagogos, at least in one instance, at Smyrna, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 102; *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 67; C. and H., p. 144; "Antioch," Hastings' B.D.; Loening, *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums*, p. 15.—**τοὺς πρώτους**: perhaps approaching them through their wives. On the addiction of women to the Jewish religion *cf.* Jos., *B. J.*, ii., 20, 2; Strabo, vii., 2; Juvenal, vi., 542; see Blass, Felten, Plumptre, *in loco*, and instances in Wetstein.—**ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς,** see xiv. 21.

Ver. 51. **ἐκτιναξάμενοι,** *cf.* Matt. x. 14, Luke x. 11, Mark vi. 11. The symbolic act would be understood by the Jews as an intimation that all further intercourse was at an end. There is no reason to see in the words a late addition by the author of Acts to the source; the disciples mentioned in ver. 52 need not have been Jews at all, but Gentiles, and in xiv. 21 nothing is said of any intercourse except with those who were already disciples.—**Ἰκόνιον,** see on xiv. 1.

Ver. 52. **χαρᾶς,** *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 6, Rom. xiv. 17, 2 Tim. i. 4.

CHAPTER XIV.—Ver. 1. **ἐν Ἰκονίῳ** (*Konia*), sometimes regarded as a Roman colony towards the end of the reign of Claudius, thus dignified on account of the title conferred upon the frontier town, Claudio-Derbe. But Hadrian, not Claudius, constituted it a colony. In ver. 6 the Apostles flee from Iconium to the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra and Derbe, and the inference from this statement is that Iconium was not itself Lycaonian. But this inference justifies the local accuracy of the historian, as it would appear that the people of Iconium regarded themselves as Phrygian even after Iconium had been united with Lycaonia in one district of Roman administration: *cf.* Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 37 ff., and the testimony of the Christian Hierax, 163 A.D., before his Roman judge: "I have come hither (*i.e.*, as a slave), torn away *from Iconium of Phrygia*": on the road travelled by the Apostles see also Ramsay, *u. s.*, p. 27 ff. Strictly speaking, Lystra and Derbe were cities of Lycaonia-Galatica, while Iconium reckoned itself as a city of Phrygia-Galatica, all three being comprised within the Roman province of Galatia. See also Rendall, *Acts*, p. 262. On the place and its importance, situated with a busy trade on the principal lines of communication through Asia Minor, see C. and H., smaller edition, p. 145, B.D.². Iconium is the scene of the famous *Acts of Paul and Thekla*, forming a part of the *Acts of Paul*, C. Schmidt's translation of which we must await with interest. See Harnack, *Chronol.*, i., p. 493, Wendt (1899), p. 42, Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 375, and "Iconium," Hastings' B.D.—**κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ,** "together," so R. and A.V., *cf.* LXX, 1 Sam. xi. 11, or it may mean "at the same time". Blass however (so Ramsay, Weiss, Rendall) renders "after the same fashion," *i.e.*, as at Antioch. But for this meaning *cf.* xvii. 2, where a different phrase is used.—**Ἑλλήνων**: on the whole best taken as referring to the **σεβ.** or **φοβ. τὸν Θεόν,** because in ver. 2 we have **ἔθνη,** which would signify the Gentiles generally, as opposed to those devout persons who as proselytes had joined the Jewish synagogue.

Ver. 2. **ἀπειθοῦντες,** see critical notes. If we read **ἀπειθήσαντες,** "that were disobedient," R.V., but *cf.* John iii. 36, and Page's note *in loco*. Lumby quotes

Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος. 2. οἱ δὲ ἀπειθοῦντες[1] Ἰουδαῖοι ἐπήγειραν καὶ ἐκάκωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. 3. ἱκανὸν μὲν οὖν χρόνον διέτριψαν παῤῥησιαζόμενοι ἐπὶ

[1] **απειθουντες**, but aor. **απειθησαντες** ℵABC 13, 61, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. D, Syr. Harcl. mg., *cf.* Blass in **β**, and Hilg., read **οι δε αρχισυναγωγοι των Ιουδαιων και οι αρχοντες της συναγωγης** (**τ. σ.** *om.* by Syr. H.), and for **επηγειραν** DE, Gig., Wern., Syr. H. read **επηγαγον** (**αυτοις** *om.* by Syr. H.) **διωγμον κατα των δικαιων.** These readings may have arisen from the seeming inconsequence of vv. 1-3 as they stand in the ordinary text. We read of the opposition of the Jews, and yet the Apostles abode a long time, etc. Ramsay therefore maintains that there is some corruption, and is prepared to follow Spitta in omitting ver. 3 (although for a different reason). But as the text stands it is quite possible to suppose that the effect of the preaching in the synagogue would be twofold, ver. 2 thus answering to the last clause of ver. 1, and that the disciples continued to speak boldly, encouraged by success on the one hand and undeterred by opposition on the other, the consequence being that the division in the city was still further intensified. Ramsay sees in the reading at the commencement of the verse which marks the distinction between **αρχοντες** and **αρχισυναγωγοι** a proof that the Bezan reading here cannot be an original first century one, although in its carefulness to enumerate the different classes of Jews it may embody an actual popular tradition (see his article on "The Rulers of the Synagogue," *Expositor*, April, 1895, and compare *C. R. E.*, p. 46). On **κατα των δικαιων** see also Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 46; **δικαιοι** is not used by Luke of *Christians*, rather **αγιοι** or **αδελφοι.** At the end of the verse D(E), Gig., Par., Wern., Syr. H. mg. add **ὁ δε κυριος εδωκεν ταχυ ειρηνην,** which seem introduced to make an easy transition from ver. 2 to ver. 3, a second tumult being referred to in ver. 5; see crit. notes. *Cf.* **εκ δευτερου,** Blass in **β.** See further Weiss, Codex D, p. 77; Wendt (1899), pp. 247, 248; Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., pp. 23, 69; and for decided support of β, Belser, p. 70 ff.; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, i., pp. 52, 53, 1896, and *Acta Apost.*, p. 245, 1899; and especially Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 121, 127; Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 135; see also Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 598; but on the other hand Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bibl.*, i., p. 53.

Baruch i. 19, and regards the expression here as stronger than "unbelieving," rather unbelief breaking forth into rebellion, as in the case of these Jews at Iconium and elsewhere. Ramsay renders "the disaffected".—**ἐκάκωσαν**: "exasperated," Ramsay; only here in N.T. in this sense, five times in Acts, once in quotation; only once elsewhere in N.T., 1 Pet. iii. 13, *cf.* for its use here Jos., *Ant.*, xvi., 1, 2; vii., 3; viii., 6. It is used several times in LXX, but not in this sense, the nearest approach to it is Ps. cv. (LXX) 32. The same phrase occurs twice, Num. xxix. 7, xxx. 14, but with a different meaning or reading in D. See critical notes.

Ver. 3. **ἱκανὸν μὲν οὖν χ. οὖν**: as a result from the two previous verses, the accession to their numbers and the disaffection. Blass sees in the aorists **ἐπήγ.** and **ἐκάκ.** a proof that the disaffected Jews succeeded in their attempts, and he asks if this was so, how were the Apostles able to remain? The answer is to be found, he thinks, in D, see above, so Hilgenfeld, who holds that this reading makes it conceivable how Paul and Barnabas could continue their work. On **ἱκανός** with **χρόνος,** peculiar to St. Luke, see p. 215. Ramsay sees the same force in the aorists, and therefore ver. 3 seems so disconnected that he can only regard it as an early gloss similar to many which have crept into the Bezan text. He thus inclines to adopt here Spitta's hypothesis, and to regard vv. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 as a primitive document. The Bezan text is to him simply an attempt to remedy the discrepancy which was felt to exist between vv. 2 and 3, and it presupposes two tumults: one in ver. 2, and the other in vv. 4 and 5. But there seems nothing unnatural in taking **οὖν** as marking a result from the events of the two previous verses, not from the second alone, or in the extended stay of the Apostles in the divided city. (Wendt (1899) supposes that in the original source ver. 3 preceded ver. 2, which makes the sequence quite easy. Clemen is much more drastic in his

τῷ Κυρίῳ τῷ μαρτυροῦντι τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, καὶ διδόντι σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν. 4. ἐσχίσθη [2] δὲ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς πόλεως· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἦσαν σὺν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, οἱ δὲ σὺν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. 5.[3] Ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ὁρμὴ τῶν ἐθνῶν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων σὺν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αὐτῶν, ὑβρίσαι καὶ λιθοβολῆσαι αὐτοὺς,

[1] Wendt (1899), p. 248, maintains that ver. 3 preceded ver. 2 in the source, thus simplifying, as he thinks, the order of thought. **τῳ λογῳ**, in ℵA, Syr. Pesh. **επι** precedes, so Tisch., Wendt, and Weiss; *cf.* Heb. xi. 4, but prep. om. by ℵcBCDELP, Chrys., so W.H., Blass, Hilg. **και διδ.**, om. **και** ABDEP, Chrys., so W.H., Blass, R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.; **διδοντος** so ℵ 4, 21, 133, Tisch.

[2] **εσχισθη**, D, Syr. Pesh. **ην εσχισμενον**, and for **οι δε** D reads **αλλοι δε**, so Hilg.; Harris regards these as cases of Latinisation, so Corssen, p. 43. At end of verse, D, Syr. Harcl. mg. add **κολλωμενοι δια τον λογον του Θεου** (so Blass in β and so Hilg.), the verb is Lucan, but we cannot say that it is original.

[3] Syr. Harcl. mg. has "et iterum excitaverunt persecutionem secundo Judæi cum Gentibus et lapidantes eos eduxerunt eos ex civitate," so Blass in β; *cf.* also Ephrem; Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 23. Hilg. follows T.R. Harris also quotes "et iniuriaverunt et lapidaverunt eos," d, which he suspects to be more archaic than its Greek. It is difficult to see how this can agree with **συνιδοντες** in the next verse, which could not be used of an assault actually committed, but Syr. Harcl. omits **συνιδ.**

methods, and refers ver. 2 and vv. 4-6a to his Redactor Antijudaicus.)—**παῤῥησ.**: speaking boldly in spite of the opposition of the Jews, see above on the verb, p. 242.—**ἐπὶ**, *cf.* iv. 17, 18 (elsewhere with **ἐν**), the Lord being the ground and support of their preaching; Calvin notes that the words may mean that they spoke boldly in the cause of the Lord, or that relying on His grace they took courage, but that both meanings really run into each other.—**τῷ Κυρίῳ**: difficult to decide whether the reference is to Jesus; Nösgen takes it so, not only on account of St. Luke's usual way of giving Him this title, but also because the Acts speak expressly of the miracles of the Apostles as works of Christ, iii. 16, *cf.* iv. 30. On the other hand Meyer-Wendt appeals to iv. 29, xx. 24, 32 (but for last passage see var. lect.), Heb. ii. 4.

Ver. 4. **ἐσχίσθη δὲ**, better "and the multitude" (see Page's note on ver. 3), *cf.* xxiii. 7, John vii. 43. There is no such marked success in ver. 3 as in Ramsay's view. In Thessalonica, xvii. 4, 5, a similar division, *cf.* Luke xii. 51.—**ἀποστόλοις**: the note of Weiss here takes the word, not in its technical sense at all, but only as missionaries; but see above on xiii. 1.

Ver. 5. The real contrast is marked in this verse, **ὡς δὲ ἐγέν.** Hitherto the evil results indicated in ver. 2 had not resulted in an open combination of Jews and Gentiles to injure Paul and Barnabas, but now the Jews and their rulers were prepared to act in concert with the Gentiles, so that the opposition assumed a public shape, and a definite accusation of blasphemy could be formulated against the Apostles.—**ὁρμὴ**, "onset," R.V.; "assault," A.V., but neither word seems appropriate, since neither onset nor assault actually occurred. It seems therefore better to take the word as expressing the inclination, or hostile intention, or instigation, and to connect it with the infinitives. In classical Greek the word is used of eagerness (joined with **ἐπιθυμία**), of impulse, of eager desire of, or for, a thing, *cf.* Thuc. iv. 4, Plat., *Phil.*, 35 D, although it is also used of an assault or attack. The only other place in the N.T. in which it occurs is James iii. 4 (R.V. renders "impulse"). Hesychius regards it as equivalent to **βουλή, ἐπιθυμία**, but see also for its use as expressing attack, violence, 3 Macc. i. 16, 23; iv. 5.—**σὺν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αὐτῶν**, *i.e.*, of the Jewish synagogues, as **αὐτῶν** shows. Hackett and Lumby take it of the heathen magistrates. On the distinction between these and the **ἀρχισυνάγωγος**, see Schürer, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 64, 250, E.T. The magistrates of the city could not have participated in an act of mob-violence, and the plot to *stone* the Apostles seems to point to Jewish instigation for enforcing the punishment of blasphemy.—**ὑβρίσαι**, "to entreat them shamefully," so A. and R.V., indicating

6.[1] συνιδόντες κατέφυγον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας, Λύστραν καὶ Δέρβην, καὶ τὴν περίχωρον, 7. κἀκεῖ ἦσαν εὐαγγελιζόμενοι.[2]

[1] Syr. Harcl. mg. (*cf.* Flor.) reads "et fugientes pervenerunt in Lycaoniam, in civitatem quandam, quæ vocatur Lystra, et Derben," so Blass in β; *in civit. quandam* does not sound Lucan. After **περιχωρον** DE (Flor., Vulg.) add **ολην**, so Blass and Hilg., but see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 113.

[2] At end of verse D(E), Flor., Wern., Prov. add **εκινηθη ολον το πληθος επι τη διδαχη**, and also apparently by way of transition to the following narrative **ὁ δε Π. και Β. διετριβον εν Λυστροις**, so Blass and Hilg., but see Ramsay, *u. s.*, and Weiss, Codex D, p. 78. E has **εξεπλησσετο πασα ἡ πολυπληθεια επι τη διδαχη αυτων**, and Harris thinks that the gloss arose in Latin and points out the closeness of d and e here (see also Blass, *Proleg.*, p. 28). But it has been pointed out that the Latin of d and Flor. also differ.

outrage, insolence in act, *cf.* Matt. xxii. 6, Luke xviii. 32, 2 Macc. xiv. 42, 3 Macc. vi. 9; in Luke xi. 45 of insulting words. St. Paul uses the same word of treatment at Philippi, 1 Thess. ii. 2, and he describes his own conduct towards the Christians by the cognate noun **ὑβριστής**, 1 Tim. i. 13.

Ver. 6. **συνιδόντες**, *cf.* xii. 12, v. 2, only in Luke and Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 4; 1 Macc. iv. 21; 2 Macc. iv. 41, xiv. 26, 30; 3 Macc. v. 50.—**κατέφυγον**, *cf.* Matt. x. 23: "We ought not to run into danger, but to flee from it if needful, like these leaders of the Church wishing to extend their preaching, and to multiply by persecution" Oecumenius; only elsewhere in N.T., Heb. vi. 18; see Westcott, *l.c.*, *cf.* Deut. iv. 42, Numb. xxxv. 26; 1 Macc. v. 11, etc. So in classical Greek with **εἰς, ἐπί, πρός**.—**εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λ. Λύστραν καὶ Δέρβην, καὶ τὴν περίχωρον**: in these words Ramsay sees a notable indication of St. Luke's habit of defining each new sphere of work according to the existing political divisions of the Roman Empire: "Lystra and Derbe and the surrounding *Region*"; in going from Antioch to Iconium the travellers entered no new *Region* (**χώρα**), but in ver. 6 another *Region* is referred to, comprising part of Lycaonia, consisting of two cities and a stretch of cityless territory; and if this is so, we see also in the words an indication of St. Paul's constant aim in his missionary efforts, *viz.*, the Roman world and its centres of life and commerce; when he reached the limit of Roman territory (Derbe) he retraced his steps. The position of Lystra, about six hours south-south-west from Iconium, near the village *Khatyn Serai*, is now considered as established by Professor Sterrett's evidence based on an inscription; and from similar evidence of inscriptions it appears that Lystra had been a Roman *colonia* since Augustus, Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 47 ff., and Wendt (1899), p. 248; O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, p. 102. The site of Derbe cannot be quite so satisfactorily determined, but probably near the village Losta or Zosta; about three miles north-west of this place, a large mound, by name Gudelissin, is marked by evident traces of the remains of a city, "Derbe," Hastings' B.D.; Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 54 ff., and Wendt (1899), p. 249. From 41-72 A.D. Derbe was the frontier city of the Roman province on the south-east. But if St. Paul thus found in Lystra and Derbe centres of Roman commercial life, we must modify our view of the wild and uncivilised nature of the region into which the Apostles penetrated after leaving Antioch and Iconium, *cf.* C. and H., p. 147, with Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 56, 57. If Paul had gone to the ruder parts of Lycaonia, it is very doubtful whether the inhabitants could have understood him, or any one addressing them in Greek (see also Rendall, *Acts*, p. 263).

Ver. 7. See critical notes for reading in D.—**κἀκεῖ**; found in four other places in Acts, but not at all in Luke's Gospel.—**εὐαγγελ. ἦσαν**: "they were engaged in preaching the Gospel," Ramsay; on participle with **ἦν** or **ἦσαν** see i. 10.

Ver. 8. **ἐν Λύστροις**: here neuter plural, and not as in vv. 6 and 21, feminine. Clemen, p. 115, and Jüngst, p. 131, see a proof in this that 8-18, or 21a, was interpolated by a redactor. But Hilgenfeld points out that the same interchange of feminine singular and neuter plural recurs in xvi. 1, 2; *cf.* also 2 Tim. iii. 11. The miracle which follows has often been compared with those narrated in iii. 1 ff., and it has been alleged that this second miracle is a mere imitation of the first, to

8. Καί τις ἀνὴρ ἐν Λύστροις[1] ἀδύνατος τοῖς ποσὶν ἐκάθητο, χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αυτοῦ ὑπάρχων,[2] ὃς οὐδέποτε περιεπεπατήκει.[3] 9. οὗτος ἤκουε[4] τοῦ Παύλου λαλοῦντος· ὃς ἀτενίσας αὐτῷ, καὶ ἰδὼν ὅτι πίστιν ἔχει τοῦ σωθῆναι, 10. εἶπε μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ, Ἀνάστηθι

[1] **εν Λυστροις,** D omits (so Hilg. and Blass in β, where he reads **και (εκει)**)—attractive, although probably due to the previous interpolation, because it would do away with the perplexity of the two readings **εν Λ. αδυν.** (so Weiss) and **αδυν. εν Λ.** (W.H.).

[2] **εκ κ. μητρος** Blass thinks out of iii. 2, so apparently Wendt—**χωλος** om. D, Gig., but see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 114.

[3] **περιεπεπατηκει,** but **περιεπατησεν** ℵABC 61, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V., Blass. At end of verse Flor. reads **υπαρχων εν φοβῳ του θεου,** so Blass in β; D omits **του θεου** and puts the clause after **λαλουντος** in ver. 9; so Hilg. **υπαρχ.** omitted above, where it seems clearly an interpolation in T.R. out of iii. 2. According to Flor. the man would be a proselyte, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 116, Hilgenfeld, Blass; but Weiss, Codex D, p. 78, regards the reading in Flor. as quite secondary, and it is to be noticed that D omits entirely the words **του θεου** after **φοβῳ.**

[4] **ηκουε** BCP, Sah., Syr. Harcl., so W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt, Weiss; **ηκουσεν** ℵADEHL 13, 61, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Arm., Æth., Chrys., so Tisch. Flor. adds "libenter," and Gig. adds **επιστευσεν,** so Blass in β.

keep up the parallel between Peter and Paul. But whilst there are, no doubt, features in common in the two narratives—no great matter for surprise in similar healings, where a similarity of expressions would fitly recur, especially in the literary usage of a medical writer (see Zöckler, p. 240)—the differences are also marked: *e.g.*, in the Petrine miracle the man is a beggar, and asks only for alms; in the Pauline nothing is said of all this, even if the first fact is implied—in the Petrine miracle nothing is said of the man's faith, although it is implied (see notes, *in loco*); here it is distinctly stated—in the earlier miracle Peter is represented as taking the man and raising him up; here nothing of the kind is mentioned (see further on the two miracles, and the different motive in their performance, Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 267). On St. Paul's own claim to work miracles see 2 Cor. xii. 12, Rom. xv. 19, Gal. iii. 5. If the latter passage occurs in an Epistle addressed amongst other Churches to Christians in Lystra, in accordance with the South Galatian theory, the assertion of miraculous powers is the more notable; see also McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 189.—**ἀδύν. τοῖς π.**: adjective only here in N.T. in this sense, *cf.* LXX, S. Tobit ii. 10, v. 9, **ἀδύν. τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς.** It is used frequently in a similar sense by medical writers, Hobart, p. 46.—**ἐκάθητο**; not "dwelt" Hebraistic; but simply "used to sit," *cf.* Luke xviii. 35, John ix. 8; probably in the forum, *cf.* ver. 11 (Blass).—**ἐκ κοιλ. μητρὸς α.**; "no mendicant pretender, but one whose history from infancy was well known". See Ramsay on the "triple beat," *St. Paul*, p. 115.

Ver. 9. **οὗτος**; a genuine Lucan mark of connection, Friedrich, p. 10.—**ἤκουε**; "used to hear," or "was listening to," *i.e.*, was an habitual hearer of Paul's preaching, see critical notes on D. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 114, 116, regards the man as a proselyte, *cf.* additions in Bezan text, but for another view of the additions here and in ver. 10, Page, *Classical Review*, July, 1899.—**ἀτεν.**, see above, i. 10.—**τοῦ σ.**, Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, p. 158.

Ver. 10. **ἀνάσ. . . . ὀρθός**: verb, as elsewhere, ix. 34, 40, but only here with **ἐπὶ τοὺς π.**, hitherto they had been too weak to support him, **ὀρθός** signifying that he was entirely whole, *cf.* reading in D. On **ὀρθός** see Hobart, p. 46: it was frequently used by medical writers, so by Hippocrates and Galen, with **ἵστημι**; only elsewhere in N.T. in a figurative sense and in a quotation, Heb. xi. 13. The collocation is also found in classical Greek, and *cf.* 1 Esdras ix. 46 (see also Hatch and Redpath), but *cf.* also **ἀνορθόω**, Luke xiii. 13, and the combination in Galen of **ὀρθόω** and **τὸ ἀδύνατον κῶλον.**—**ἥλλετο καὶ περιεπ.**, see also reading in D. If we read **ἥλατο**, note aorist and imperfect, he sprang up with a single bound, whilst the walking is a continuous action, or inceptive: "he began to walk".

ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου ὀρθός. καὶ ἥλλετο[1] καὶ περιεπάτει. 11. Οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἰδόντες ὃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Παῦλος, ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν Λυκαονιστὶ λέγοντες, Οἱ θεοὶ ὁμοιωθέντες ἀνθρώποις κατέβησαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς· 12. ἐκάλουν τε τὸν μὲν Βαρνάβαν, Δία[2]· τὸν δὲ Παῦλον,

[1] **ηλλετο**, but **ηλατο** ℵABC 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss. D, Syr. H. mg. (Flor.), Hilg. have **και ευθεως παραχρημα ανηλατο**, so Vulg., Gig. **ανηλ.** for **ηλ.** (**εξηλ.** E).

[2] **Δια** ℵABCP, Syr. H. mg., so Weiss, W.H., Blass in **β**; **Διαν** DEHLP[2] 15, 40, 61, so Hilg.; *cf.* Grimm-Thayer and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 89.

Ver. 11. **ἐπῆραν τὴν φ. αὐτῶν**: aorist; lifted up their voices with a sudden outburst, and then went on to devise names for the two: **ἐκάλουν**, "were for calling," imperfect; *cf.* Luke i. 54 (Rendall). The phrase here only found in ii. 14, xxii. 22 and Luke xi. 27; Friedrich, p. 29, *cf.* LXX, Judg. ix. 7; phrase also found in classical Greek.—**οἱ ὄχλοι**: the common city mob; the crowd, who would speak in their own native tongue. The Apostles had evidently spoken in Greek, which the native Lycaonians would understand and speak, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 57. But in moments of excitement their native tongue would rise more naturally to their lips, and they would give expression to their old superstitious beliefs, see *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 58, and Wendt (1888), p. 313.—**Λυκαονιστὶ**: specially mentioned not only on account of its naturalness here (see above) but also because, as St. Chrysostom noted, this mention of the fact would explain why Paul and Barnabas made no protest. Bethge's objection that **ὁμοιοπαθεῖς** (ver. 15) shows that St. Paul understood the words of ver. 11 is no answer, because the preparations for the sacrifice, rather than the words of the people, enabled the Apostles to understand the bearings of the scene. On the speech of L. see Conder, *Palestine Explor. Fund*, October, 1888.—**Οἱ θεοὶ κ.τ.λ.**: the knowledge of the story of Baucis and Philemon, according to which Jupiter and Mercury visited in human form the neighbouring district, Ovid, *Met.*, viii., 611 ff., would render such words quite natural (*cf. Fasti*, v., 495, and Dio Chrys., *Orat.*, xxxiii., p. 408). Baur, Zeller, and Overbeck, followed by Wendt, object that the people would not have thought of such high gods, but rather of magicians or demons, and the latter evidently thinks that St. Luke has coloured the narrative by introducing into it the form which in his opinion the adoration of the Apostles would assume; but the same narrative emphasises the fact that the miracle was a notable one, and we can scarcely limit the bounds of excitement on the part of a superstitious people who were wont to make their pilgrimages to the spot where Jupiter and Mercury conversed with men. At Malta a similar result follows from the miracle of Paul, and heathen mythology was full of narratives of the appearances of high gods, which were by no means strange to N.T. times (see Holtzmann's note, *Hand-Commentar*, p. 378). Moreover, the people, rude as they were, might easily have seen that Paul and Barnabas were not altogether like the common magicians of the day. The main incident, McGiffert admits, was entirely natural under the circumstances, and is too striking and unique to have been invented, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 188, 189.

Ver. 12. **ἐκάλουν**, see above on ver. 11.—**τὸν μὲν Β. Δία· τὸν δὲ Π. Ἑρμῆν.** The relative estimate of the Lycaonians was strikingly in accordance with Oriental notions—Barnabas, the more silent and passive, is identified with Jupiter; and Paul, the more active, with Mercury. Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 57; *St. Paul*, pp. 84, 85; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 189. With the reason given for the identification of Paul with Mercury, *cf.* Iamblichus, *De Myst. Ægypt.*, i., where Mercury is designated as **Θεὸς ὁ τῶν λόγων ἡγεμών** (see also Wetstein). The comparison could not have been because of the Apostle's insignificant appearance (although the fact that he was the younger of the two men may be taken into account), since Hermes is always represented as of a graceful well-formed figure. On the traditional accounts of Paul's personal appearances see Wendt (1888), *in loco*, Blass, Renan, and Plumptre, *Acts* (Excursus, pp. 191, 192). It is of interest to note that in Gal. iv. 14 Paul writes to

Ἑρμῆν, ἐπειδὴ αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ἡγούμενος τοῦ λόγου.[1] 13. ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως[2] αὐτῶν, ταύρους καὶ στέμματα

[1] Flor. om. **επειδη αυτος . . . του λ.**, and Blass brackets, comparing xvii. 18, xviii. 3, where some Western authorities omit explanatory clause. Ramsay also rejects clause, *St. Paul*, p. 117, but Hilg. retains. It is quite possible that in these cases the Western reading may be original, and the explanation may have been added later.

[2] D reads **του οντος Διος προ πολεως** (Blass accepts, so Hilg., adding **της** before **πολ.**), and D, Gig. read **οι ιερεις**, so Hilg. (Blass rejects), so D reads **επιθυειν**, so Hilg. (not Blass). Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 51, and *St. Paul*, p. 118, defends all these readings as indications of local accuracy; see notes. Perhaps he forces too much his rendering of **επιθυειν**.

the Galatians: "Ye received me as a messenger of God," Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 117.

Ver. 13. **ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς**. Plural in D; strongly rejected by Blass, with other details. Ramsay defends D (p. 118), and points out that at each of the great temples in Asia Minor a college of priests would be in regular service: see also *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 52, 53.—**τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς π. αὐτῶν**, see critical notes. R.V., omitting **αὐτῶν**, renders "whose *temple* was before the city," *i.e.*, enshrined in the temple outside the gate as the protecting deity. Zöckler, with Ramsay, compares "**Ζεὺς Προάστιος**" on an inscription at Claudiopolis, *cf.* also **παρὰ Διΐ** (=ad fanum Jovis), **παρ᾽ Ἥρῃ**, and modern, the name of a church in Rome, "S. Paolo fuori le mura" (see also Holtzmann and Wendt). Here again the reading of D seems to bring out the technical force of the phrase more accurately, **τοῦ ὄντος Δ. πρὸ πόλεως** (so Blass in β)—possibly = **Προπόλεως** (*cf.* an unpublished inscription of Smyrna with the phrase **ἱέρεια πρὸ πόλεως** or **Προπόλεως**). In this phrase, as read in D, the force of the participle is retained in a way characteristic of Acts, as almost = **τοῦ ὀνομαζομένου**: see on xiii. 1, a characteristic lost by the transposition of **ὄντος**; see on the whole question Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 51 ff., and also on the possible site of the temple. The words cannot refer to the statue of Jupiter (so lately Rendall), to which no priests would be attached. See Blass in *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1900, p. 27, n. 1.—**ταύρους καὶ στέμματα**: brought by the *ministri* who would be included in the generic term priests. On the sacrifice of a bull to Jupiter, Ovid, *Met.*, iv., 755, as also to Mercury, Persius, *Sat.*, ii., 44. On the garlands to wreathe and adorn the victims, *Æneid*, v., 366; Eur., *Heracl.*, 529, perhaps also for the priests and the altars, the doors, and the attendants; see instances in Wetstein, and *cf.* Tertullian, *De Corona*, x. The words do not refer to the Apostles; the aim seems to be indicated in **ἤθελε θύειν**.—**ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας**: some see a reference to the gates of the city, mainly because of the collocation **τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς Π.** Blass supposes that the priest came from the temple outside to the city gates, but in that case Ramsay urges that Lucan usage would = **πύλη** rather than **πυλών**, *cf.* ix. 24, xvi. 13. Others take it of the gates of the temple in front of which the altar stood, *cf.* **οἱ μὲν ἱεροὶ τοῦ νεὼ πυλῶνες**, Plut., *Tim.*, xii. Ramsay suggests that the priests probably prepared their sacrifices at the outer gateway of the temple grounds, as something beyond the usual ritual, and so not to be performed at one of the usual places, *cf.* **ἐπιθύειν** D; *St. Paul*, p. 119. Others again refer the words to the gates leading into the *atrium* or courtyard of the house in which the Apostles were lodging, partly on the ground that the word **ἐξεπήδησαν** is best referred to the house (*cf.* Judith xiv. 17, and Susannah, ver. 39). But the verb may mean that they ran hastily out of the city to the temple, and there mingled with the crowd: in 2 Macc. iii. 18 the same verb is used of a general rush of the people to the temple for supplication to heaven.—**ἤθελε θύειν**: What was his motive? Was he acting in good faith, or out of complaisant regard to the wishes of the multitude (Ewald), or for the sake of gain? On the attitude of the native priests see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 144. In the present instance it would appear that they had known of the Apostles' preaching for some time at all events, and also, it may be, of its success, *cf.* D., xiv. 7, critical notes, and apparently they were willing to honour the Apostles with divine honours, and to turn the religious revival to their own ends.

ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας ἐνέγκας, σὺν τοῖς ὄχλοις ἤθελε θύειν. 14. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι [1] Βαρνάβας καὶ Παῦλος, διαῤῥήξαντες τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν εἰσεπήδησαν [2] εἰς τὸν ὄχλον, κράζοντες καὶ λέγοντες, 15. Ἄνδρες, τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε; καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἐσμεν ὑμῖν ἄνθρωποι, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ζῶντα, [3] ὃς ἐποίησε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν

[1] **οι αποστολοι** om. D, Flor., Gig., Syr. Pesh., Blass "recte". Weiss thinks om. caused because offence was taken at the extension of the title to Barnabas. In ver. 4 Barnabas is not expressly mentioned, while here he is not only mentioned by name but placed first.

[2] **εισεπηδησαν**, but **εξεπ.** ℵABCDE 13, 61, Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[3] **επι τον Θεον τον ζωντα** ℵcABCD²E 13, 40, 61, Ath., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; *cf.* Blass, *Gram.*, p. 144. D has **ευαγγ. υμιν τον Θεον** (so Iren.), and again **επι τον Θεον ζωντα τον ποιησαντα**, thus reading **τον Θεον** in both places (whilst Blass in β and Hilg. follow Flor. in omitting **τον Θεον** the second time). Ramsay however also retains the words in both places, as "the God" was the title under which the supreme God was worshipped in Asia Minor, *St. Paul*, p. 118.

Ver. 14. **ἀκούσ.**: how, we are not told; whether, as Blass supposes, they had returned to their lodgings, and hurried forth to the city gates when they heard what was going on, or whether, later in the day, they hurried from the city to the temple when they heard of the approaching sacrifice, we do not know, and a better knowledge of the localities would no doubt make many points clearer. The crowd who had seen the miracle, ver. 11, would naturally be eager to follow the priest to the sacrifice, **σὺν τοῖς ὄχλοις**, ver. 13.—**διαῤῥήξαντες**: in token of distress and horror, *cf.* Gen. xxxvii. 29, 34; Josh. vii. 6; Matt. xxvi. 65; frequently in LXX, and several times in 1 Macc.—**εἰσεπήδησαν**: xvi. 29, see critical notes.

Ver. 15. **ἄνδρες**: brief address in accordance with the hurry of the moment. —**ὁμοιοπαθεῖς**, James v. 17, "of like passions," so R.V. in both passages, but '*nature*' in margin, so Ramsay. But to others the latter word seems too general, and they explain it as meaning equally capable of passion or feeling, as opposed to the **ἀπάθεια** of the idols; or, equally prone to human weakness, and not all-powerful as the people seemed to infer from the miracle (Bethge); whilst others again take it as meaning **ὁμοίως θνητός** (so Blass). On its meaning in Wisdom vii. 3 see Grimm, *sub v.*, and *Speaker's Commentary*. In 4 Macc. xii. 13 it is also used to mark the atrocious nature of persecution inflicted by one who, a man himself, was not ashamed **τοὺς ὁμοιοπαθεῖς γλωττοτομῆσαι**: *cf.* its use in medical writers and in classical Greek (Wetstein); by the Fathers it was used of our Lord Himself, Euseb., *H. E.*, i., 2, *cf.* Heb. iv. 15 (see Mayor on James v. 17).—**εὐαγγελιζ.**: we preach not ourselves—Paul was a "messenger of God" in a higher sense than the people conceived; on the construction see above p. 210 and Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 79. For reading in D see critical note = bringing you glad tidings of "the God"—in Asia Minor a familiar term for the great God, so that just as St. Paul introduces the Christian God at Athens as "the Unknown God," whom the Athenians had been worshipping, so here he may have used a familiar term known to the crowd around him at Lystra, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 118.—**ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ**, *cf.* especially 1 Thess. i. 9, in Acts ix. 35, xi. 21, xv. 19, xxvi. 20; on the construction see Wendt, and Weiss, *in loco*, *cf.* iv. 18, v. 28, 40, infinitive after **παραγγέλλειν.**—**τὸν ζῶντα**, see critical note.—**τούτων**: may be used contemptuously, as if St. Paul pointed to the preparations for the sacrifice.—**ματαίων**, *cf.* Jer. ii. 5, x. 3, of the gods of the nations and their worship, *cf.* also 2 Kings xvii. 15 B, Jer. viii. 19; *cf.* Rom. i. 21, Ephes. iv. 17. R.V. and A.V. take it as neuter, others as masculine, *sc.*, Θεῶν.—**ὃς ἐποίησε κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* especially Jer. x. 11, 12-15, 16, for the contrast between the gods who are no gods, and the God Who made the heavens, and *cf.* also Acts xvii. 24 for a similar appeal from the same Apostle.

θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς· 16. ὃς ἐν ταῖς παρῳχημέναις γενεαῖς εἴασε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν· 17. καίτοιγε[1] οὐκ ἀμάρτυρον ἑαυτὸν ἀφῆκεν, ἀγαθοποιῶν,[2] οὐρανόθεν ἡμῖν ὑετοὺς διδοὺς καὶ καιροὺς καρποφόρους, ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς καὶ

[1] **καιτοιγε** ℵ*C³HLP 61**, Chrys., Theodt.; **καιτοι** ℵᶜABC* 13, 61*, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt; **καιγε** DE, so Hilg. (see Wendt's note (1888), p. 312); *cf.* xvii. 27.

[2] **αγαθοποιων**, but ℵABC 13, 61, 180 **αγαθουργων**, and so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

The "living" God manifests His life in creation—a manifestation to which St. Paul would naturally appeal before such an audience; even in writing to Christian converts of the deepest mysteries of the faith he does not forget that the God of Nature and the God of Redemption are one, *cf.* Ephes. iii. 9, R.V.; so too St. Peter prefaces the first Christian hymn with the same words used here by the Apostle of the Gentiles, iv. 24. On the tact of St. Paul at Lystra and at Athens, laying the foundation of his teaching as a wise master-builder in the truths of natural religion, and leading his audience from them as stepping-stones to higher things, see notes on xvii. That he did not even at Lystra confine his teaching or his appeal simply to Nature's witness, see notes on vv. 22 and 23.

Vv. 16-17. **ὅς**: God working not only in creation, but in history, not only the source of life but the personal living Guide and Ruler of man, even in His tolerance far removed from the easy indifference of the gods of Olympus. The three present participles **ἀγαθ. . . . διδ. . . . ἐμπ. . . .** mark the continuous activity and goodness of God, and are all three epexegetical of **ἀμάρτυρον**; whilst the second participle is generally regarded as specifying a mode of the first, and the third as expressing a consequence of the second.—**οὐρανόθεν**: only again in xxvi. 13 in N.T., see 4 Macc. iv. 10; so in Hom. and Hes., old genitive of **οὐρανός**.—**ὑετοὺς διδοὺς καὶ καιροὺς καρπ.**: the Apostle's appeal becomes more significant when we remember that Zeus was spoken of as **ὑέτιος, ἐπικάρπιος** (Bethge); the rain was regarded in the East as a special sign of divine favour, and here, as in the O.T., God's goodness and power in this gift are asserted as against the impotence of the gods of the heathen, see especially Jer. xiv. 22, and *cf.* 1 Kings xviii. 1 and 1 Sam. xii. 17 where this same phrase **ὑετ. διδόναι** is used of God.—**καρπ.**: here only in N.T., *cf.* LXX, Jer. ii. 21, Ps. cvi. 34, and also classical; *cf.* for the whole passage Cicero, *De Nat. Deorum*, ii., 53.—**ἐμπιπλῶν** (ἐμπιπλάω), *cf.* Luke i. 53, vi. 25, Rom. xv. 24, John vi. 12, frequent in LXX, *e.g.*, Ps. cvi. 9, Isa. xxix. 19, Jer. xxxviii. 14, Ecclus. iv. 12; see also below on **εὐφροσ.**—**καρδίας**: Blass compares Luke xxi. 34, where the heart is spoken of as overcharged with surfeiting, as here it is spoken of as filled with food. But the word may be used not merely as = **ὑμᾶς**, or in a merely material sense, but as including the idea of *enjoyment*, *cf.* LXX, Ps. ciii. 15; Winer-Moulton, xxiii. 1, and Alford on James v. 5.—**εὐφροσύνης**: in its ordinary Greek use might simply mean "good cheer," although we need not limit it here with Grotius to wine as in Ecclus. xxxi. 28; very frequently used in LXX (only here and in ii. 28 in N.T.), sometimes of mere festive joy, Gen. xxxi. 27, sometimes of religious gladness, Deut. xxviii. 47. Although St. Paul could not have used it here as it is employed in ii. 28, yet he might perhaps have used it as a kind of transition word to lead his hearers on to a deeper gladness of heart, a richer gift of God than corn and wine, *cf.* Ps. iv. 7, and for the phrase **ἐμπ. εὐφροσ.** Isa. xxix. 19, Ecclus. iv. 12. It may well be that whilst we have in this address the germ of the thoughts afterwards developed in Rom. i. 18, 23, etc., St. Paul did not press his argument on this occasion as in his Epistle, but took the first step to arrest the attention of his hearers by an appeal to the goodness, not to the severity, of God—the goodness which leadeth to repentance. It has been thought that the words **οὐρ. ἡμῖν διδούς κ.τ.λ.** are rhythmical, and may have been some familiar fragment of a song, or a citation from a Greek poet, in which the Apostle expressed his thoughts; others have maintained that they may have formed part

εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν.[1] 18. καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντες, μόλις[2] κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς.

19.[3] Ἐπῆλθον δὲ ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας καὶ Ἰκονίου Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ πείσαντες τοὺς ὄχλους, καὶ λιθάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον, ἔσυρον ἔξω τῆς

[1] **ημιν . . . ημων**, but **υμιν . . . υμων** ℵ*BCDE, Syr. Harcl., Arm., Ir., Ath., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; **υμιν** however is om. by ℵcA 13, 61, Vulg.

[2] **μολις**, D reads **μογις**, and for **κατεπαυσαν . . . αυτοις** Flor. has "vix persuaserunt ne immolarent sibi illi homines" (so Blass in β, *cf.* Hilg.). C, many min., and Syr. H. mg. add **αλλα πορευεσθαι εκαστον εις τα ιδια**, *cf.* v. 18 D, John vii. 53; Flor. adds "et discedere eos ab se" (so Blass in β preceding previous addition; Hilg. omits).

[3] At the begin. of verse CDE (Flor. Cassiod.), Syr. H. mg., Arm., Bed. read **διατριβοντων δε αυτων και διδασκοντων** evidently to show that the outbreak did not ensue immediately upon the intended worship. D, Flor., Syr. H. mg. (E, Vulg.) insert **τινες** before **Ιουδ.** and change order. C, Syr. H. mg., Flor. proceed **και διαλεγομενων αυτων παρρησιᾳ επεισαν τους οχλους αποστηναι απ' αυτων** ("ne crederent illis docentibus," Flor.), **λεγοντες οτι ουδεν αληθες λεγουσιν αλλα παντα ψευδονται**—so Blass throughout in β, and Hilg., see Belser, p. 71, in support, on the ground that β thus explains fully the change in the attitude of the people; but the whole might proceed from a reviser, and need not be original.

of the hymn sung in the procession for the sacrifice, and that St. Paul made the words his text; see Humphry, *in loco;* Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., p. 384; Felten, *in loco;* but it may be fairly said that the O.T. language was in itself quite sufficient to suggest the Apostle's words. On the remarkable parallels between this speech and the sayings of Pseudo-Heracleitus in his letters see Gore, *Ephesians*, p. 253 ff., but see also Bernays, *Die Heraklitischen Briefe*, p. 29.—**πάντα τὰ ἔθνη**: "all the Gentiles," R.V., the words divided mankind into two classes, but there was the same Lord over all, Rom. iii. 29.—**ἐν ταῖς παρῳχ. γενεαῖς**: "in the generations gone by," R.V. **παρῳχ.**: not in LXX or Apocrypha, but classical, and used also by Josephus.—**εἴασε** (*cf.* xvii. 30, Rom. iii. 25, 26) . . . **πορεύ. ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν**, *i.e.*, without summoning them as now to repent, *cf.* for the combination ix. 31, and for the expression 2 Cor. xii. 18, Jude v. 11, James v. 20 (in classical Greek *cf.* Thuc., iii., 64, **ἄδικον ὁδὸν ἰέναι**), *cf.* also the contrast between God's ways and the wilfulness of Israel in the past, Ps. lxxxi. 13 and previous verses, expressed in the same phraseology.

Ver. 17. **καίτοιγε**, see critical notes. If we read **καίτοι** the word is only found in the N.T. here and in Heb. iv. 3; used here as an adversative conjunction; see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 168, and further Blass, *Gramm.*, pp. 242, 264; Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 118 (1893); see 4 Macc. ii. 6.—**ἀμάρτυρον**: not in LXX or Apocrypha; only here in N.T., but in classical Greek, and also in Josephus, see instances in Wetstein. This witness is not as at Athens, xvii. 27, Rom. ii. 15, to man's consciousness and conscience, but rather to God's presence in nature, *cf.* for the expression LXX, Ps. lxxxviii. 37, **ὁ μάρτυς ἐν οὐρανῷ πιστός**, and Pseudo-Heracleitus, letter iv., where the moon is spoken of as God's **οὐράνιος μαρτυρία**; see below on ver. 17.—**οὐκ ἀφῆκεν**: non *reliquit* sed *sivit* (Blass).—**ἀγαθοποιῶν**, see critical notes. Neither **ἀγαθουργέω** nor **ἀγαθοεργέω**, 1 Tim. vi. 18, occur in classical Greek or LXX. T.R. uses the more familiar word; found three times in Luke's Gospel and elsewhere in N.T., and also a few times in LXX (in different senses), but not in classical Greek; see Plummer on Luke vi. 33, and Hatch, *Essays in B. G.*, p. 7.

Ver. 18. **μόλις**: used only by Luke and Paul (with one exception of a quotation, 1 Pet. iv. 18), Luke ix. 39, W.H.; four times in Acts, and Rom. v. 7.—**κατέπαυσαν τοῦ μὴ**, x. 47, Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, pp. 159, 184.

Ver. 19. **ἐπῆλθον δὲ**: on readings to account for the interval see critical notes. Nothing in the narrative forbids some kind of interval, whilst nothing is said as to its duration.—**Ἰουδαῖοι**: a proof of their enmity in that they undertook a long journey of some one hundred and

πόλεως, νομίσαντες[1] αὐτὸν τεθνάναι. 20.[2] κυκλωσάντων δὲ αὐτὸν τῶν μαθητῶν, ἀναστὰς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν· καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐξῆλθε σὺν τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ εἰς Δέρβην. 21. εὐαγγελισάμενοί[3] τε τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, καὶ μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανούς, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Λύστραν

[1] **νομιζοντες** ℵABD 13, 40, 61, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] Flor. reads "tunc circumdederunt eum discentes et cum surressisset (x) populus vespere . . ." Par.[2] adds **μογις** before **ανασ.**, so Blass in **β**; *cf.* Belser, p. 71.

[3] **ευαγγελισαμενοι** ℵ^c^BCL 61, Bas., Chrys., so W.H., Blass, R.V.; **ευαγγελιζομενοι** ADEHP, Lach., Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg., the aor. part. probably a mechanical conformity to the following part.

thirty miles.—**πείσαντες τοὺς ὄ.**: *mobile vulgus.* The change in their attitude need not surprise us, *cf.* the fickleness of the inhabitants of Malta, xxviii. 6, and, more notably still, the change of feeling in the multitudes who could cry Hosannah! and Crucify! The Scholiast, Homer, *Il.*, iv., 89-92, has **ἄπιστοι γὰρ Λυκάονες, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης μαρτυρεῖ.** These Jews may have received help from their fellow-countrymen, some few of whom were resident in Lystra, xvi. 1, or possibly, as McGiffert suggests, it may have been easy to incite the populace against Paul and Barnabas, because of the Apostles' rejection of the divine honours offered to them. But probably the persuasion implies that they influenced the multitudes to regard the miracle, the reality of which they could not dispute, as the work not of beneficent gods but of evil demons. The form of punishment, **λιθάσαντες**, would seem at all events to point to Jewish instigation, although the stoning took place not outside but inside the city, *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 25, 2 Tim. iii. 11, and Wendt (1888), p. 318, as against Zeller. In Gal. vi. 17 the Apostle may allude to the scars marked on him by these same people (Ramsay, Zahn), *cf.* also Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, v. 6. **λιθασθείς**: "Uti Paulus prius lapidationi Stephani consenserat: ita nunc veterem culpam expiat, 2 Cor. xi. 25" (Wetstein). On the undesigned coincidence between this narrative and the notice in 2 Tim. *cf.* Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, xii., 5. Hilgenfeld refers this verse to his "author to Theophilus," but the change in the multitude and the hatred of the Jews are not surprising, but perfectly natural. —**ἔσυρον**: perhaps as a last indignity, *cf.* viii. 3, xvii. 6.—**νομίσαντες**: St. Luke's words do not require us to infer that St. Paul was rendered lifeless, and we need not suppose that he was more than stunned. But at the same time the narrative undoubtedly leads us to recognise in St. Paul's speedy recovery from such an outrage, and his ability to resume his journey, the good hand of God upon him. We may again notice St. Luke's reserve in dwelling on the Apostle's sufferings, and his carefulness in refraining from magnifying the incident.

Ver. 20. **κυκλ.**: Bengel says "tanquam sepeliendum," and others have held the same view, but the word need not imply more than that the disciples surrounded him, to help if human aid could profit, and to lament for him in his sufferings. Amongst the mourners the youthful Timothy may well have found a place. On Timothy's means of knowing of the Apostle's sufferings here narrated see Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ, u. s.*—**μαθητῶν**: the Apostles' work had not therefore been unsuccessful: there were converts willing to brave persecution, and to avow themselves as disciples.—**τῇ ἐπαύριον**: the journey to Derbe was one of some hours, not free from risk, and the mention of Paul's undertaking and finishing it on the morrow indicates how wonderfully he had been strengthened in his recovery. The word is found ten times in Acts, and not at all in Luke's Gospel, but *cf.* **αὔριον** Luke x. 35, Acts iv. 5 only; Hawkins' *Horæ Syn.*, p. 144. It occurs three times in chap. x., no less than in the second half of the book.—**σὺν τῷ Β.**: apparently he had been free from attack, since Paul was the chief speaker, and consequently provoked hostility.

Ver. 21. **εὐαγγελ.**: continuous preaching, present participle, and the result, many disciples; not "having taught many," A.V., but "had made many disciples," R.V., *cf.* Matt. xxviii. 19. No doubt they pursued the same course as at Lystra, and again we have direct proof that the teaching of the Gospel was not in vain: it is therefore quite unwarrantable to suppose that Paul's

καὶ Ἰκόνιον καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν, 22. ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν, παρακαλοῦντες ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει, καὶ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν θλίψεων δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 23. χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, προσευξάμενοι μετὰ νηστειῶν, παρέθεντο αὐτοὺς τῷ Κυρίῳ εἰς ὃν

speech at Lystra indicates the powerlessness of the message of the Gospel in contact with deep-rooted heathenism (Bethge); in vv. 22, 23 we have abundant proof that Paul had not limited his first preaching in Lystra to truths of natural religion, for now on his return the disciples are bidden **ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει**, and they are commended to the Lord, **εἰς ὃν πεπιστεύκεισαν**, "on whom they had believed". No persecution is mentioned at Lystra, with which *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 11.—**ὑπέστρεψαν**: how they were able to do this after they had been recently expelled, *cf.* Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 70 ff., and McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 190, 191—no permanent disability could be inflicted on them by the magistrates, and the person expelled might return after a little, especially if new magistrates had been appointed in the interim. Moreover, on their return journey the Apostles may have refrained from open and public preaching, and devoted themselves rather to the organisation of the Christian communities. (There is therefore no ground for Hilgenfeld's and Wendt's reference of ver. 19 to a different source from the verse before us.) At the same time the courage of the Apostle is also noteworthy: "neque enim securum petit, ubi instar emeriti militis otio fruatur, sed etiam repetit loca, in quibus paullo ante male tractatus fuerat," Calvin.

Ver. 22. **ἐπιστηρίζοντες**: only in Acts, *cf.* xv. 32, 41; for the simple verb see xviii. 23 (W.H., R.V.), and Luke xxii. 32, and six times in St. Paul's Epistles, frequent in LXX, but not in any similar sense, although for the simple verb *cf.* Ps. li. (l.) 12.—**ἐμμένειν**, Gal. iii. 10, Heb. viii. 9, two quotations: in the former, with the simple dative; in the latter, with **ἐν**; several times in LXX, and with both constructions, *cf.* Xen., *Mem.*, iv., 4.—**τῇ πίστει**: subjective or objective, as a feeling of trust, or a belief, a creed? That it was used in the latter sense by St. Paul we cannot doubt, in such passages as Col. i. 23, 1 Tim. v. 8 (*cf.* 1 Pet. v. 9, Jude vv. 3, 20), and St. Luke may have used the word in this latter sense in recording the incident. But *cf.* also vi. 7, xiii. 8, where the word may be used, as perhaps here, in a kind of intermediate stage.—**ὅτι**, *cf.* xi. 3, xv. 1, we have the language of the preachers themselves, but it is precarious to conclude that **ἡμᾶς** includes the presence of the author of the book, St. Luke himself. The **ἡμᾶς** may simply mean that the speakers thus associated themselves with their hearers, and drew a general lesson similar to that drawn by St. Paul in 2 Tim. iii. 12, as he looked back upon these same sufferings at the close of his life. The teaching thus expressed may have struck deep root in the heart of one of St. Paul's hearers—why not Timothy?—and have been repeated by him to St. Luke as the Apostle had uttered it; see further in its bearing on the date, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 123. Alford's note strongly maintains that Luke himself was present, see *in loco* and also Proleg., pp. 6, 7. On the possibility that the words contain an *Agraphon* of the Lord see Resch, *Agrapha*, pp. 148, 278, and *cf. Epist. Barn.*, vii., 11.—**θλίψεων**, *cf.* xx. 23, quite a Pauline word, not used by Luke at all in his Gospel (five times in Acts), *cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 3 and ii. 12, and *Epist. Barn.*, *u. s.* On St. Paul's reference to "the kingdom of God," sometimes as future, sometimes as actually present, see *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 311, note (1892).

Ver. 23. **χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβ.**, see above, x. 41, where the compound verb is used, "chosen of God," **ὑπὸ Θ.** The simple verb is only used here and in 2 Cor. viii. 19: lit., to elect by popular vote, by show of hands, but it is by no means a word of certain meaning, and came to be used, as Ramsay admits, in the sense of appointing or designating. Here evidently the word is not used in the literal sense given above, as Paul and Barnabas appoint, and that the idea of popular election did not necessarily belong to the word, at least in later Greek, is evident from Josephus, *Ant.*, vi., 13, 9, **τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ κεχειροτονημένον βασιλέα**: *cf.* xiii. 2, 2, of the appointment of Jonathan as high priest by Alexander. On the later use of the word, of which there is no early trace, as referring to the stretching out of the bishop's hands in the laying on of hands, *cf.*

πεπιστεύκεισαν. 24. καὶ διελθόντες τὴν Πισιδίαν, ἦλθον εἰς Παμφυλίαν· 25. καὶ λαλήσαντες ἐν Πέργῃ[1] τὸν λόγον, κατέβησαν εἰς

[1] εν Περγῃ ℵcBCDEHLP, so Lach., W.H. text, Rendall, Hilg.; εις την Π. ℵ*A (without art.) 61, so Tisch., W.H. marg., Weiss, Wendt, Blass—the change of εν into εις is quite inconceivable, so Weiss, who compares other frequent uses of εις as characteristic of Acts ii. 5, ix. 21 (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 36).

"Ordination" (Hatch, *Dict. of Chr. Ant.*, ii., p. 1501 ff.). Blass takes the word here as = **καθιστάναι**, and compares Titus i. 5, although he thinks that nothing is said here about the mode of election, and that the Church may have had some share in it. So too Ramsay compares the same passage, Titus i. 5, and concludes that St. Paul doubtless followed there the same method which he followed here, a method in which the votes and voices of each congregation were considered, *cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 19. But the office to which Luke was appointed in 2 Cor., *l. c.*, was not an office which involved ordination, and we could not argue from it alone to the method of the appointment of elders in the passage before us. At the same time it may be fully admitted that the Church was not without some share in the election of the elders, and it must not be forgotten that, in the case of the Seven, the Church had elected, and the Apostles had ordained, Acts vi. 3. In Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xliv., whilst the Apostles took care to secure that after their death distinguished men should appoint presbyters and deacons, yet the latter were elected *with the consent of the whole Church*, and they were exposed, as it were, to the judgment of the Church (see on this voice of the Church, Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 89, and Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 100 ff.). If we compare the language of Acts vi. 3, Tit. i. 5, Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xlii., 4, xliv., 2, 3, and the use of the verb **καθίστημι** in each, it would seem that the **κατάστασις** was throughout reserved to the Apostles or their representatives, whilst the Church, if not always selecting, may at least be regarded as consenting, **συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης**, Clem. Rom., *u. s.*, xliv., 3; see "Bishop" (Haddan), *Dict. of Chr. Ant.*, i., p. 213. But, further, in the passage before us it is not impossible that the choice as well as the ordination of the presbyters may be referred to Paul and Barnabas, *cf.* the pronoun **αὐτοῖς**: "having appointed for them," and in newly founded communities it was not unnatural that the Apostles should exercise such choice and authority. On the use of the verb in the *Didaché*, xv., 1, and its compatibility with ordination in accordance with Apostolic practice and injunction, see Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 281; and further, *Church Quarterly Review*, 42, p. 265 ff., on the strictures passed by Loening, *Die Gemeindeverfassung*, 61, 62.—**κατ' ἐκκλησίαν**, "in every Church," distributive, ii. 46, v. 42, *cf.* Titus i. 5, Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xlii., 4. On the spread of Christianity in Asia Minor see additional note at end of chapter.—**προσευξ. μετὰ νησ.**: Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 122, speaks of the solemn prayer and fasting which accompanied the appointment of the elders, and of this meeting and rite of fasting, as the form permanently observed, *cf.* xiii. 1-3. The two participles **χειροτ.** and **προσευξ.** evidently refer to the appointment, and not to the subsequent commendation. See also Harnack, Proleg. to *Didaché*, p. 148; and on the other hand, Overbeck, Wendt, Weiss, Zöckler.—**παρέθεντο**, xx. 32, *cf.* Luke xii. 48, xxiii. 46, 1 Pet. iv. 19, *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 18, 2 Tim. ii. 2 (in no parallel sense in the other Evangelists). In the first three passages above used as here of solemn committal to God; also of giving into another's charge or keeping, *cf.* **παραθήκη**, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. i. 12, 14. In classical Greek of money or property entrusted to one's care. In Tobit x. 12 (*cf.* i. 14, iv. 1, 20) both verb and noun are found together, **παρατίθεμαί σοι τὴν θυγατέρα μου ἐν παραθήκῃ** S (see Hatch and Redpath).—**αὐτοὺς** may refer to the believers in general, *cf.* Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 66.—**τῷ Κ.**, *i.e.*, Christ, as the **πιστεύω** indicates: the phrase **πιστ. εἰς**, or **ἐπί τινα**, is peculiarly Christian, *cf.* Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 16.

Ver. 24. **διελ. τὴν Π.** "having made a missionary journey through Pisidia," see above on xiii. 6. Here it seems clearly implied that Pisidian Antioch was not in Pisidia, see above on xiii. 14, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 124.

Ver. 25. **καὶ λ. ἐν Πέργῃ τὸν λόγον**: in the beginning of their journey they probably made a slight stay at Perga, but without preaching there—possibly

Ἀττάλειαν· 26. κἀκεῖθεν ἀπέπλευσαν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ὅθεν ἦσαν παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ ἐπλήρωσαν.

for the reason mentioned above which prompted them to hurry on to Antioch, and possibly because, as C. and H. (so Felten) think, the inhabitants at the time of the Apostles' first visit were all leaving Perga for the cool mountain districts, their summer retreats, whereas on the return journey of the missionaries Perga would again be full (C. and H., pp. 131, 158, smaller edition).—**ἐν Π.**, see critical notes. — **κατέβησαν,** went down, *i.e.*, to the sea coast where Attalia lay, *cf.* xvi. 8 (xiii. 4), Jonah i. 3, so in classical Greek **ἀναβαίνω,** to go up from the coast.—**Ἀττάλειαν**: mentioned because it was the harbour of embarkation, and so called from Attalus II. Philadelphus, king of Pergamus, its builder, B.C. 159-138; is a port for the trade of Egypt and Syria, Strabo, xiv., 4. It bears the modern name of Adalia, and until quite recent days it was the chief harbour of the south coast of Asia Minor. See B.D.[2], and Hastings' B.D., "Attalia" (Ramsay). The distance from Perga was about sixteen miles, and the travellers would reach it across the plain: formerly they had gone up the Cestrus to Perga, and probably they now go to Attalia to find a ship for Antioch. See Hackett, *in loco*, and C. and H.

Ver. 26. **κἀκεῖθεν,** *cf.* vii. 3, and Luke xi. 53, in six other places in Acts in a local sense as here, only once elsewhere in N.T., in Mark ix. 30, in same sense; see also xiii. 21.—**ἦσαν παραδεδομ.**: "they had been committed," R.V., in xv. 40 "commended"; in both passages A.V. "recommended," a rendering which has changed its meaning; only in these two passages in this sense, but *cf.* 1 Pet. ii. 23 (John xix. 30).—**ὃ ἐπλήρωσαν,** *cf.* xii. 25, xiii. 25, still, as hitherto, St. Paul found the **χάρις** of God "sufficient".

Ver. 27. **συν. τὴν ἐκκλ.,** *cf.* xv. 30, as was natural, for they had been sent out by them.—**ἀνήγγειλαν**: xv. 4 (xx. 20, 27), lit., to carry back tidings (so in classical Greek, as from a less to a greater), *cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 7; used here as in Æschylus, Xen., Polyb., of messengers reporting what they had seen or heard (Grimm). Blass takes it as simply = **ἀπαγγέλλω** as in LXX and later Greek. —**ὅσα**: "how many (or 'how great') things". — **μετ' αὐτῶν,** *i.e.*, on their behalf; *cf.* xv. 4, Luke i. 58, 72, x. 37, *cf.* 1 Sam. xii. 24, Ps. cxxvi. 2, 3, Hebrew עָשָׂה עִם, Ps. cxix. 65, and cannot = *per ipsos*, which would require **διά**—the phrase may therefore be described as a Hebraism; it occurs only in Luke; Friedrich, p. 33.—**ὅτι ἤνοιξε . . . θύραν**: a striking coincidence with St. Paul's use of the same metaphor elsewhere, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 9, 2 Cor. ii. 12, Col. iv. 3, and *cf.* Rev. iii. 8. St. Paul's Galatian Epistle clearly shows that his missionary work in Galatia had met with much success, and that the Churches now founded held a large place in his affections, *cf.* Gal. iv. 14, 15. Enough had been accomplished, even if all his desires were still unfulfilled, to make him eager for a continuation of the work to which he had been called as an Apostle of the Gentiles, see McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 191, 192; Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 66: "perhaps the greatest epoch in the history of the Ecclesia at large": Spitta refers the whole verse to his Redactor, p. 171.

Ver. 28. **χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον**: only in *Acts*, where it occurs eight times, *cf.* xii. 18, etc.; on the length of time thus spent see "Chronology of the N.T.," Hastings' B.D., and also Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 74, with which *cf.* Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, p. 288.

Additional Note.—In chapters xiii. and xiv. many critics find the commencement of a new source, a belief based to a great extent upon the view that Barnabas and Saul are here introduced as if they had not been previously mentioned. But whilst some description is given of each of the remaining persons in the list (xiii. 1), nothing is added to the name of Barnabas or of Saul, so that it seems quite permissible to argue that these two are thus simply mentioned by name because they were already known. It is therefore not surprising to find that some writers, *e.g.*, Hilgenfeld, regard these chapters as part of a previous source, so too Wendt, Spitta, Jüngst. Others see in these chapters a separate document, possibly not used again by the author of Acts; a document composed by a different hand from that to which we owe the "We" sections, and incorporated by the author of the whole book into his work (McGiffert). Others again see in these same chapters the commencement of a Travel-Document, containing not only these two chapters, but also the later journeys of St. Paul, coming to us from

27. παραγενόμενοι δὲ καὶ συναγαγόντες τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀνήγγειλαν[1] ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξε τοῖς ἔθνεσι θύραν πίστεως. 28. διέτριβον δὲ ἐκεῖ χρόνον οὐκ ὀλίγον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

[1] **ανηγγειλαν**, but imperf. ℵABC 18, 40, 61, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt—Blass and Hilg. follow T.R. For **μετ' αυτων** D, Gig., so Hilg., read **μετα των ψυχων αυτων**, perhaps Syriac influence (Harris). Blass brackets **και οτι . . . θ. πιστεως** without any authority, and adds the same words to xv. 4, see below *l. c.*

the same hand as the "We" sections, and from the same hand as the rest of the book (Ramsay). It is disappointing to find how Clemen, while referring xiii., xiv. to his good source, *Historia Pauli*, goes even further than Spitta in breaking up the different parts of the narrative: *e.g.*, xiv. 8-11, we owe to the Redactor Judaicus, and vv. 19, 20, 22*b*, 23 in the same chapter to the Redactor Anti-Judaicus. (See on the whole question Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, 1e Heft, 1896; Wendt (1899), p. 225, note; Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 243, 244 (second edition).) It is no wonder in face of the unsatisfactory attempts to break up these chapters, or to separate their authorship from that of the rest of the book, that Zahn should maintain that a man like Luke needed for the composition of chapters xiii.-xxviii. no other source than his recollections of the narratives recited by St. Paul himself, or of the events in which he, as St. Paul's companion, had participated, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, ii., 412 (1899), *cf.* Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 25, 26. Certainly the unity of authorship between the two chapters under consideration and the rest of the book seems most clearly marked in language and style: *e.g.*, **κατασείειν**, xiii. 6, only found elsewhere in N.T., Acts xii. 17, xix. 33, xxi. 40; **ἐπαίρειν τὴν φωνήν**, xiv. 11, only elsewhere in N.T., Luke xi. 27, Acts ii. 14, xxii. 22; **παραχρῆμα**, xiii. 11, elsewhere in N.T., ten times in Luke's Gospel (only twice in St. Matthew, and not at all in the other Evangelists), Acts iii. 7, v. 10, xii. 23, xvi. (26), 33; **ἦν**, with participle, xiii. 48, xiv. 7, 12, 26; **δή**, xiii. 2; **ἄχρι**, xiii. 6, 11; **ἱκανός** with **χρόνος**, xiv. 3, elsewhere in N.T. in Luke only, and eight times in Acts in all parts; **ἀτενίζειν** in xiii. 9 and xiv. 9 and the frequent recurrence of **τέ** in both chapters. It is also perhaps worthy of observation that out of some twenty-one words and phrases found only in the "We" sections, and in the rest of Acts (Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 151), six occur in these two chapters, and two of them twice: **ἀποπλέω**, xiii. 4, xiv. 26; **διατρίβω** with accusative of time, xiv. 3; **ἔξειμι**, xiii. 42; **ἡμέραι πλείους**, xiii. 31; **προσκέκλημαι** with accusative, xiii. 2, 7; **ὑπονοέω**, xiii. 25. On the position of these two chapters relatively to chap. xv. see below.

Additional note on xiv. 23.—On the rapid spread of Christianity in Asia Minor see Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i., pp. 87, 94, 95, 135-137, and *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 161, 397. The old nature religion with its negation of moral distinctions and family ties was doomed, a religion which on the one hand made woman the head of the family, and on the other hand compelled her to a so-called sacred service which involved the surrender of all which in a civilised community womanhood held most dear. The strength of the old ritual, however, was so great that it seems to have been maintained in Phrygia even after a higher type of society became known in the Roman period. But with the growth of Roman organisation and educational influences the minds of men were at least prepared for new ideas, and at this juncture St. Paul came preaching a gospel of home life, of Christian purity; and wherever higher social ideas had already penetrated he found converts disposed to follow his teaching as "a more excellent way". In connection with the wide spread of Christianity in Asia Minor see also Orr, *Some Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity*, p. 48 ff. (1899).

CHAPTER XV.—Ver. 1. **τινες κατελ. ἀπὸ τῆς 'Ι.**: on the vagueness of the expression see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 158, 159.—**κατελ.**, *i.e.*, to Antioch; see critical notes for β reading, and additional note at end of chapter on the identification of Gal. ii. 1-10 with Acts xv.: in the early Church in favour of the identification, *cf.* Iren., *Hær.*, iii., 13, 3; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, v., 2.—**ἐδίδασκον**: imperfect, representing perhaps their continuous efforts to force their teaching on

XV. 1. ΚΑΙ τινες κατελθόντες ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐδίδασκον τοὺς ἀδελφούς, Ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ περιτέμνησθε[1] τῷ ἔθει Μωϋσέως, οὐ δύνασθε

[1] περιτεμνησθε, but περιτμηθητε ℵABCD 13, 40, 180, Const. Apost., Epiph., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. After Ιουδαιας Syr. Harcl. mg., 8, 137 add των πεπιστευκοτων απο της αιρεσεως των Φαρισαιων, obviously anticipating ver. 5. After Μωυσεως Const. App. add και τοις αλλοις απασιν (εθεσιν) οις διεταξατο περιπατητε: in D, Syr. Harcl. mg. (Sah.) after περιτ. και τῳ εθει M. περιπατητε, *cf.* xxi. 21. Blass in β follows Const. App. The Western reading may be original, but it may also be due to assimilation to ver. 5 and xxi. 21.

the brethren.—περιτέμνησθε, see critical note.—τῷ ἔθει M.: R.V. as in vi. 15, "custom of Moses"; in A.V. "manner," which might be used of a temporary fashion or habit; ἔθος marks a national custom, but see also Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 79. On its national significance, see art. "Circumcision," B.D.², and Hastings' B.D., "Beschneidung"; Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 2, 174; Weber, *Jüdische Theol.*, p. 266 (1897); Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 66; and *cf. Book of Jubilees*, xv., *cf.* i.; *Assumption of Moses*, viii.; Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 2, 4; *c. Apion.*, ii., 14; *Vita*, xxiii.—σωθῆναι, *i.e.*, in the Messianic salvation, *cf.* ii. 40, iv. 12, xi. 14. On the tradition that Cerinthus was amongst these Judaisers, as he and his had already rebuked Peter, Acts xi. 2, see "Cerinthus," *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, i., 447. It is very probable that the successful mission of Paul and Barnabas was really the immediate cause of this protest on the part of the narrow Judaic party. This party, as the Church in Jerusalem grew, may well have grown also; the case of Cornelius had been acquiesced in, but it was exceptional, and it was a very different thing to be asked to embrace all Gentiles in the new covenant, and to place them on a level with the Jewish Christians, whether they did homage or not to the Mosaic law, Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 67; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 192.

Ver. 2. στάσεως: the word, with the exception of Mark xv. 7, and Heb. ix. 8 (in a totally different sense), is peculiar to St. Luke: twice in his Gospel, and five times in Acts; used in classical Greek of sedition, discord, faction, and so of the factious opposition of parties in the state; frequent in LXX, but only once in any similar sense, Prov. xvii. 14.—συζητήσεως, but ζητ.: "questioning," R.V., *cf.* John iii. 25; three times in St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 9, in a depreciatory sense in each case; not in LXX or Apocrypha.—οὐκ ὀλίγης, see on xii. 18 and xiv. 28; eight times in Acts.—ἔταξαν, *sc.*, οἱ ἀδελφοὶ, ver. 1; no discrepancy with Gal. ii. 2, see additional note.—τινας ἄλλους: Titus amongst them, Gal. ii. 1, 3; expression found only here in N.T.; men like the prophets and teachers in xiii. 1 may have been included. On the attempt to identify Titus with Silas see Zöckler, *in loco*, and further Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 390, for the entire omission of Titus from Acts and its probable reason; Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 281; Farrar, *St. Paul*, ii., 532; Alford, iii., 106, Proleg. A Gentile convert, and so keenly concerned in the settlement of the question, and in himself a proof of the "repentance unto life" granted to the Gentiles.—πρεσβ.: first mentioned in xi. 30, *cf.* note, in all official communications henceforth prominent, xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23, xvi. 4, xxi. 18, Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 193.—ζητήματος: five times in Acts, nowhere else in N.T.; once in LXX, Ezek. xxxvi. 37 A (see Hatch and Redpath), and in classical Greek; "question," A. and R.V.

Ver. 3. οἱ μὲν οὖν: Phœnicia and Samaria on the one hand welcome them with joy, but on the other hand the Church in Jerusalem is divided, ver. 5, see Rendall, Appendix on μὲν οὖν, p. 161. Blass however thinks that the words are used "without opposition" as often.—διήρχοντο τὴν Φ. καὶ Σ., see note on xiii. 6. In both cases the presence of brethren is presupposed, *cf.* viii. 25, xi. 19, imperfect, "peragrabant donec pervenerunt," ver. 4 (Blass).—προπεμφ.: escorted on their way, not as Tit. iii. 13, of being provided with necessaries for the journey (Wisdom xix. 2); *cf.* xx. 38, xxi. 5, and so in classical Greek, only in Luke and Paul in N.T. (except once, 3 John 6), *cf.* Rom. xv. 24; but in 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11, 2 Cor. i. 16, R.V. renders as in Titus, *l. c.*, and John, *l. c.*; *cf.* 1 Esd. iv. 47, Judith x. 15, 1 Macc. xii. 4, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*; Polycarp, *Phil.*, i., 1, of the conduct of St. Ignatius through Macedonia, amongst the early

σωθῆναι. 2. γενομένης οὖν στάσεως καὶ συζητήσεως[1] οὐκ ὀλίγης τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ πρὸς αὐτούς, ἔταξαν ἀναβαίνειν Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν καί τινας ἄλλους ἐξ αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, περὶ τοῦ ζητήματος τούτου. 3. οἱ μὲν οὖν προπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, διήρχοντο τὴν Φοινίκην καὶ Σαμάρειαν, ἐκδιηγούμενοι τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν· καὶ ἐποίουν χαρὰν μεγάλην πᾶσι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. 4. παραγενόμενοι δὲ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἀπεδέχθησαν[2] ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν

[1] **συζητησεως**, but **ζητησεως** ℵABCDHLP, Const., Apost., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt. Blass in β reads without authority **εγενετο δε στασις και ζητησις ουκ ολιγη**, to give good construction, and on the supposition that all authorities have been influenced by **α**. After **αυτους** D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Gig., Wer., Prov. add **ελεγεν γαρ ο Π. μενειν (εκαστον) ουτως καθως επιστευσεν διισχυριζομενος**; *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 17, 20, 24. Hilg. brackets all this. **διισχυριζ.** only in Luke in N.T., Luke xxii. 59, Acts xii. 15 (Zahn). In place of **εταξαν** D, Syr. Harcl. mg. read **οι δε εληλυθοτες απο Ιερ. παρηγγειλαν αυτοις**. The subject of **εταξαν** is probably the Antiochian Christians, the brethren, vv. 1 and 3, but "those from Jerusalem" was assumed to be the subject, and so to remove all doubt the gap was supplied as above, and **παρηγγειλαν** appeared more fitting than **εταξαν**, which seemed too dictatorial when applied to men in the high position of Paul and Barnabas (Weiss, Codex D, p. 80). Blass reading **αυτοις** omits **Π. και Β. . . . εξ αυτων**. But D, which alone has **αυτοις**, has the rest as well, and it is uncertain whether **αυτοις** ever stood alone. After **εις Ι.** D 137, Syr. Harcl. mg. insert **οπως κριθωσιν επ' αυτοις** (137, **αυτων**) **περι τ. ζητηματος τουτου**, *cf.* xxv. 9; so Blass and Hilg.

[2] **απεδεχθησαν**, but **παρεδεχ.** ℵABD² 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.; Blass retains T.R.; D¹ has **παρεδοθησαν**. **υπο** ℵADEHLP 31, 61, Chrys., so Tisch., Blass, Hilg.; **απο** BC 18, 180, W.H., Weiss, Wendt (as the more probable). After **παρεδ.** CD 137, Syr. Harcl. mg., Sah., Cassiod. insert **μεγαλως**, so Blass and Hilg., but **ασμενως**, xxi. 17, would seem to be a fitter word; D¹ has **μεγως**. At end of verse C³HL add **και οτι ηνοιξεν τοις εθνεσιν θυραν πιστεως**, *cf.* xiv. 27, where all authorities read it; Blass however inserts it here (so also Hilg.) on the ground of its suitability and rejects it in the former passage; see also Blass, p. xv.

Christians, as amongst the Jews (Gen. xviii. 16), a mark of affection and respect. The meaning of the word, as Wendt points out, depends on the context.—**ἐκδιηγ.**: only here and in quotation, xiii. 41 in N.T., "telling the tale of the conversion of the Gentiles"; so **διηγεῖσθαι** and **ἐξηγεῖσθαι** more frequently in Luke than in other N.T. writers. Hobart describes all three as medical terms but all three also occur frequently in LXX. **ἐκδ.**: *cf.* Hab. i. 5; several times in Ecclus., also in Josephus and Arist. (Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*).—**χ. μεγάλην**: on Luke's fondness for the predicate **μέγας**, Friedrich, p. 41, with **χαρά** as here, *cf.* Luke ii. 10, xxiv. 52, Acts viii. 8 (Matt. ii. 10, xxviii. 8), *cf.* LXX, Jon. iv. 6, Isa. xxxix. 2, A. S.—**ἐποίουν**, imperfect, continuous joy, as they went from place to place, perhaps visiting Cornelius or Philip the Evangelist, viii. 40, in their progress.—**ἐπιστροφὴν**: only here in N.T. (*cf.* 1 Thess. i. 9), Ecclus. xviii. 21 (20), xlix. 2.

Ver. 4. *Council at Jerusalem.*—**παραγεν.**, Lucan, see above on v. 21.—**ἀπεδέχθησαν**—if we read **παρεδέχ.**, *cf.* 2 Macc. iv. 22 (but see Hatch and Redpath); with the idea of receiving with welcome, *cf.* Mark iv. 20, Heb. xii. 6 (quotation); see Syn. **δέχ.** and **λαμβ.**, Grimm-Thayer; in classical Greek = **ὑποδέχομαι**.—**ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκ.**: the whole Church is regarded as concerned in the matter; as present at the public discussion in ver. 12 and as concurring in the decision, ver. 22 (30); the decree is issued by the Apostles and Elders, see on ver. 23.—**μετ' αὐτῶν**, see above on xiv. 27.

Ver. 5. For D see critical note.—**ἐξανέστησαν**: compound verb in this sense here only in N.T. (only elsewhere in quotation, Mark xii. 19, Luke xx. 28), but in classical Greek and in LXX, *cf.* Obad. i. 1, Ecclus. viii. 11, xvii. 23, 1 Macc. ix. 40. The double compound apparently gives at least some measure of emphasis, Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 43.—**τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρ. τῶν Φ.**:

πρεσβυτέρων, ἀνήγγειλάν τε ὅσα ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησε μετ' αὐτῶν. 5. ἐξανέστησαν[1] δέ τινες τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες, λέγοντες, Ὅτι δεῖ περιτέμνειν αὐτούς, παραγγέλλειν τε τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως. 6. Συνήχθησαν δὲ οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι[2] ἰδεῖν περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου.

[1] D, Syr. Harcl. mg. begin verse **οι δε παραγγειλαντες αυτοις αναβαινειν προς τους πρεσ. εξανεστησαν λεγοντες**, so Blass in β, so Hilg., but with **αποστολους** instead of **πρεσβ.**, Blass "male," omitting **τινες . . . πεπιστευκοτες**. According to this reading the Jerusalem Christians who stirred up the disputed question in Antioch are now identified with those who rise up against Paul and Barnabas in Jerusalem. A.V. margin, following Beza and some of the older commentators, make this sentence part of the narrative of Paul and Barnabas, "there rose up, said they (**ελεγον**)," etc. Weiss, Völter, Spitta, see here a proof of a combination of two sources. But there does not seem to be any reason why, as in T.R., the Pharisees at Jerusalem should not represent the same point of view as had been presented by the Jews who had come down to Antioch; that they did so with accentuated bitterness in Jerusalem is quite in accordance with the notice in Gal. ii. 4, but this fact need not exclude the previous raising of the question against the Apostles in Antioch, especially as the Jews who had come thither from Jerusalem were plainly not merely Jews but Judaisers. See Wendt (1899), following Meyer, and for a favourable judgment of the Bezan text Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 598; see also Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, i., 1896, and *Acta Apost.*, p. 246, 1899; on the other hand Weiss, Codex D, p. 80, and Wendt (1899), Introd., p. 49, and on this occasion Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 344.

[2] After **πρεσβ.** 137, Syr. Harcl. mg. add **συν τω πληθει** so Blass in β, and Hilg. The **πληθος** here, although not mentioned except in authorities just named, is plainly presupposed in vv. 12 and 22, and Wendt (1899) opposes the view that we have before us in its omission elsewhere a trace of distinct sources.

probably in some smaller and more private assembly in answer to the **ἀνήγγ.** of ver. 4, which seems to mean that the delegates at first announced informally in Jerusalem what had happened, just as they had done in Phœnicia and Samaria, *cf.* **παρείσακτοι ἀδελφοί**, Gal. ii. 4. The Pharisees took up their remarks, objected—probably basing their teaching on the necessity of circumcision on such passages as Isa. lvi. 6, *cf.* lii. 1 (Lumby); and then followed as a consequence the official assembly in ver. 6 (see Zöckler's note, ver. 4, and *in loco*, p. 246, second edition). Or if we consider that a representative meeting of the whole Church is implied in ver. 4, and that the Apostles spoke before it, then the private conference of Gal. ii. 2 may be regarded as taking place between the first public assembly, ver. 4, and the second in ver. 6 (Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 69, *cf.* Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 126).—**αἱρέσεως**, see above p. 148.—**τῶν Φ.**: the Pharisaic spirit had already shown itself in xi. 2, but this is the first definite mention in the book of the conversion of any of the Pharisees; not strange after the conversion of the priests, see note on vi. 7, or after the attitude of men like Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathæa towards our Lord, and the moderate counsels of Gamaliel.—**πεπιστευκότες**: believed, *i.e.*, that Jesus was the Messiah, and the fulfiller of the law—but still only as the Head of a glorified Judaism, from which Gentiles were to be rigidly excluded unless they conformed to the enactments relating to circumcision. How difficult it was for a Pharisee Quietist probably of the earlier part of the first century to acknowledge that the law of circumcision and of Moses could possibly be regarded as unessential we may learn from *Assumption of Moses*, ix., 4-6, and viii., on circumcision, and see references on ver. 1.—**αὐτούς**, *i.e.*, the Gentiles, speaking generally, not the **τινας ἄλλους** of ver. 2 (Lekebusch), the uncircumcised companions of Paul and Barnabas, although in accordance with Gal. ii. 3-5 such persons would no doubt have been included.—**τηρεῖν**: only used here by St. Luke of keeping the law, and only elsewhere in James ii. 10 in a similar phrase, *cf.* Mark vii. 9, John ix. 16, of keeping the law of the Sabbath; Matt. xix. 17, of keeping the commandments; Tobit xiv. 9 (S, *al.*), Jos., *Ant.*, xiii., 10, 6.

7. Πολλῆς δὲ συζητήσεως[1] γενομένης, ἀναστὰς Πέτρος εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο[2] διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, καὶ πιστεῦσαι. 8. καὶ ὁ καρδιογνώστης Θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς, δοὺς αὐτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον, καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν· 9. καὶ οὐδὲν διέκρινε μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν. 10. νῦν οὖν τί πειράζετε τὸν Θεόν,[3] ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες

[1] **συζητησεως**, but **ζητησεως** as in ver. 1 ℵAB, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt. Meyer retains T.R. with Lach. (so Hilg. and Blass) on the ground of alteration to **ζητ.** after ver. 1.

[2] **εν ημιν εξελ.**, but **εν υμιν** ℵABC 13, 40, 61, Arm., Const., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (as against Meyer, Blass, Hilg.).

[3] After **πειραζετε** one Latin MS. and several Latin Fathers omit **τον Θεον**. Blass says "recte fort.," but does not follow in **β**. But no need to omit the words or to regard **πειραζειν = πειρασθαι** (Wendt *in loco*).

Ver. 6. **λόγου**: "de causâ quæ in disceptationem venit" (Blass), *cf.* viii. 21, xix. 38. The Ecclesia at large was in some manner also present at this final assembly, *cf.* vv. 12, 22, although the chief responsibility would rest with the Apostles and Elders, *cf.* Iren., *Hær.*, iii., chap. xii. 14, "cum universa ecclesia convenisset in unum," Zöckler, *in loco*, p. 246, and *cf.* p. 254; Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 66, 70, and see critical notes above.

Ver. 7. **ἀναστὰς**, Lucan, see v. 17; the position of Peter is one of authority, not of pre-eminence—the latter belongs to James. The part which Peter had formerly taken in the conversion of Cornelius would naturally make him the most fitting person to introduce the discussion. From Gal. ii. 3 we learn that the general principle was debated with reference to the individual case of Titus.—**ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων**: "a good while ago," meaning probably from the beginnings of the Christian Church, *cf.* xi. 15, xxi. 16; *cf.* Phil. iv. 15 (see Lightfoot's note, *l. c.*), and *cf.* Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xlvii., 2, and Polycarp, *Phil.*, i., 2; or, if the words are referred to the one definite incident of the conversion of the Gentile Cornelius, some ten or twelve years (Blass, "fortasse") may have passed since that event, possibly longer, see Zöckler, Page, Knabenbauer, *in loco.* Others take the words as referring to our Lord's declaration to St. Peter as long ago as at Cæsarea Philippi, Matt. xvi. 13-20; see *Speaker's Commentary*, so Bishop Williams of Connecticut, *Studies in the Book of Acts*, p. 139 (1888). Rendall connects **ἐν ἡμῖν** with **ἀρχ.** on the ground that thus the whole phrase would point to early Christian days, whereas, without qualification, confusion as to its meaning would arise, *cf.* ver. 21. But a reference to the case of Cornelius need not exhaust the meaning of the phrase, and St. Peter would naturally think of his own choice by God as going back earlier still, dating from the foundation of the Church, and receiving its confirmation and significance in the acceptance of the Gospel by Cornelius.—**ἐξελέξατο**, see on i. 2.—**τοῦ εὐαγγ.**: not used by St. Luke in his Gospel, but here and in xx. 24; used once by St. Peter, 1 Pet. iv. 17; so also **εὐαγγελίζομαι**, three times in the same Epistle.

Ver. 8. **ὁ καρδιογνώστης**, i. 24, where the same word is used by St. Peter; *cf.* Jer. xvii. 10. **ἐτάζων καρδίας**, and *cf.* St. Peter's words in x. 34.—**καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν**, x. 44, xi. 15.

Ver. 9. **τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τ. κ.**: the thought is described by Zöckler as equally Petrine, Pauline, and Johannine; *cf.* iii. 16, 19, 1 Pet. i. 18-21, xiii. 38, Rom. iii. 24, 1 John i. 8, ii. 2, Rev. vii. 14; here it stands in contrast to the outward purification of circumcision upon which the Judaisers insisted, *cf.* also x. 15, and for the phrase **καθαρ. τὴν κ.**, Ecclus. xxxviii. 10. Rendall renders **τῇ πίστει**, the faith, *i.e.*, the Christian faith, and he is no doubt right in this, in so far as the faith is faith in Jesus Christ (Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, pp. 424, 425), *cf.* St. Peter's language in 1 Pet. i. 18-22.

ἡμῶν οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι; 11. ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς χάριτος Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι, καθ' ὃν τρόπον κἀκεῖνοι. 12.[1] Ἐσίγησε δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ ἤκουον Βαρνάβα καὶ Παύλου ἐξηγουμένων ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι

D, Syr. Harcl. mg. prefix **συγκατατιθεμενων δε των πρεσβυτερων τοις υπο του Πετρου ειρημενοις**, so Blass and Hilg., an addition which shows why the multitude kept silence, and connects Peter's speech with Paul and Barnabas. Weiss, p. 84, sees here the characteristic love of D for the gen. abs., *cf.* ii. 1, iv. 18, etc., and notes that the same stress is here laid as in ver. 5 upon the **πρεσβυτεροι** rather than upon the Apostles.

Ver. 10. **νῦν οὖν**: in Acts four times, nowhere else in N.T.; *cf.* x. 35, *nunc igitur:* LXX, Gen. xxvii. 8, etc.; 1 Macc. x. 71.—**τί πειράζετε τὸν Θ.**, *cf.* v. 9, they put God to the proof, as to whether He had not admitted unworthy persons into the Church.—**ἐπιθ. ζυγὸν**: on the infinitive see Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 151; Blass, *Gram.*, p. 221: metaphor common among the Rabbis, and also in classical literature, *cf.* Jer. v. 5, Lam. iii. 27, Ecclus. li. 26 (Zeph. iii. 9), and Matt. xi. 29 (Luke xi. 46), Gal. v. 1. Possibly in Jer. v. 5 reference is made to the yoke of the law, but *Psalms of Solomon*, vii., 8, *cf.* xvii., 32, present undoubted instances of the metaphorical use of the term "the yoke" for the service of Jehovah. In *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, iii., 8 (Taylor, second edition, p. 46), we have a definite and twice repeated reference to the yoke of Thorah, *cf. Apocalypse of Baruch*, xli., 3 (Charles' edition, p. 66 and note), and also *Psalms of Solomon*, Ryle and James, p. 72, note. It would seem therefore that St. Peter uses an almost technical word in his warning to the first Christians.—**τῶν μαθητῶν**, *i.e.*, of those who had learnt of Christ and knew the meaning of His yoke, Matt. xi. 29.—**ἰσχ. βαστάσαι**: *cf.* xiii. 39. St. Peter no less than St. Paul endorses the charge made by St. Stephen, vii. 53.—**οὔτε ἡμεῖς**: a remarkable confession on St. Peter's lips: the conversations with Paul and Barnabas, Gal. ii. 7, may well have confirmed the attitude which he had taken after the baptism of Cornelius (Zöckler).

Ver. 11. **διὰ τῆς χ.**: twice in his First Epistle St. Peter speaks of the grace of God, of the God of all grace; so also of the grace prophesied beforehand, of the grace brought to them, *cf.* also iii. 7 and 2 Pet. iii. 18. The exact phrase here is not found elsewhere in St. Peter, although common in St. Paul, but see Plumptre (*Cambridge Bible*) on 1 Pet. v. 12. In R.V. **σωθῆναι** is joined more clearly with **διά** than in A.V.—**κἀκεῖνοι**, *i.e.*, the Gentile Christians, not **οἱ πατέρες** (as St. Aug. and Calvin). For points of likeness between these, the last words of St. Peter in Acts, and his previous utterances, with characteristic idioms and expressions, see Alford on Acts xv. 7 ff., *cf.* Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, p. 427.

Ver. 12. **ἐσίγησε**: may mean "became silent," "itaque antea non tacuerant" (Blass), *cf.* Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, 21, A. and R.V., "kept silence".—**πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος**: implying a general assembly of the Church; on the word see ii. 6, iv. 32, etc.—**ἤκουον**: imperfect, marking a continuous hearing; the silence and the audience both testified to the effect produced by St. Peter's words.—**Βαρ. καὶ Π.**, on the order here and in ver. 25 *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 84.—**ἐξηγουμένων**: setting forth in detail; see above on ver. 3, and x. 8.—**ὅσα ἐποί.**, *cf.* xiv. 27 and ver. 4. In each case the appeal is made to what God had done, and to the further answer to the prayer of iv. 30 by the miracles wrought among the Gentiles: it was an answer which a Jewish audience would understand, John iii. 2. The historical truthfulness of Paul and Barnabas thus recounting the facts, and leaving the actual proof of the rightfulness of their method of working to Peter and James, is to Zeller inconceivable—an objection sufficiently answered by the consideration that Luke wished to represent not so much the attitude of Paul and Barnabas, but that of the original Apostles to the Gentile-question; and in Jerusalem it was only natural that Peter and James should be the spokesmen.

Ver. 13. **μετὰ δὲ τὸ σ.**, *i.e.*, after Barnabas and Paul had ceased speaking.—**ἀπεκ. Ἰ. λ.**: his speech may be divided into two parts: (1) reference to the prophecy foretelling the reception of the

δι' αὐτῶν. 13. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ σιγῆσαι αὐτούς, ἀπεκρίθη Ἰάκωβος λέγων, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατέ μου· 14. Συμεὼν ἐξηγήσατο, καθὼς πρῶτον ὁ Θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν ἐπὶ[1] τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ· 15. καὶ τούτῳ συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν, καθὼς γέγραπται, 16. "Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαβὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν· καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα[2] αὐτῆς

[1] επι, but om. ℵABCDE 61, Vulg., Sah., Syr. P. and H., Arm., Iren., Const. Rebapt., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] κατεσκαμμενα ACDEHLP, Const., Chrys., so Lach., Blass in β, and Hilg.; κατεστραμμενα ℵ(B) 13, 33, 34, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss. Similar variation in the passage in LXX.

Gentiles; (2) his opinion on the conditions of that reception. **ἀ. ἀκούσατέ μου**: only here and in James ii. 5.

Ver. 14. **Συμεὼν**: Peter so named only here and in 2 Pet. ii. 1. The use of the word here in its old Hebrew form by James is exactly what we should expect, *cf.* Luke ii. 25, 34, W.H.; probably therefore the form current in Jerusalem, a form which reappears in the list of the successors of St. James in the bishopric of the Holy City, Eusebius, *H. E.*, iv., 5, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 34, from which also it would appear that the Hebrew name of Peter, in the contracted or uncontracted form, was current in Jerusalem.—**πρῶτον** like **ἀπ' ἀρ. ἡμ.** in ver. 7.—**ἐπεσκέψατο**, *cf.* James i. 27, and above on vii. 23, Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 105.—**λαβεῖν**: infinitive of purpose, **ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν**, *ex gentibus populum*, "egregium paradoxon" Bengel; the converts from among the Gentiles were no less than Israel the people of God. On **ἔθνος** and **λαός** see iii. 25.—**τῷ ὀνόματι**, *i.e.*, who should bear His Name as a people of God, or may mean simply "for Himself," God's name being often so used. On the "pregnant use" of the word *cf.* James ii. 7, v. 10, 14. St. James thus in his address agrees with St. Peter.

Ver. 15. **καὶ τούτῳ**, "and to this agree," A. and R.V., *i.e.*, to the fact just stated (so Wendt, Weiss, Blass, Ramsay); if the pronoun referred to St. Peter, as some take it, we should have had **οἱ προφῆται**, not as in text, **οἱ λ. τῶν π.** The quotation Amos. ix. 11, 12, is freely cited from the LXX, and indeed the chief point made by St. James depends upon that version.—**τῶν προφ.**, plural, as including those prophets whose words of prophecy had been of similar import.

Ver. 16. **Μετὰ ταῦτα**: both Hebrew and LXX, **ἐν τῇ ἐκεῖ. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ**, *i.e.*, in the Messianic times, after the predicted chastisement of Israel: the house of David is in ruins, but it is to be re-erected, and from the restoration of its prosperity the Messianic blessings will flow: "the person of the Messiah does not appear in this prophecy, but there is the generic reference to the house of David, and the people of Israel," Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 163, Delitzsch, *Messianische Weissagungen*, second edition, p. 94. St. James sees the spiritual fulfilment of the prophecy in the kingdom of Christ erected on the Day of Pentecost, and in the ingathering of the Gentile nations to it. On the Messianic interpretations of the passage amongst the Jews see Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 734.—**ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἀνοι.**: like Hebrew אָשׁוּב = I will return and do, *i.e.*, I will do again—but not in LXX or Hebrew. In the latter we have simply אָקִים, and in LXX **ἀναστήσω**, where St. James has **ἀνοικοδομήσω**: the idea of restoration is fully contained in the twice repeated **ἀνοι.** and in **ἀνορθώσω.—τὴν σκ. Δ. πεπτ.**: the noun is used to show how low the house of David (2 Sam. vii. 12) had fallen—it is no longer a palace but a hut, and that in ruins: the Hebrew word might be used for a temporary structure of the boughs of trees as at the Feast of Tabernacles. We may compare the way in which this hope of restoration asserted itself in *Psalms of Solomon*, xvii., 23, where Ryle and James, p. 137, compare the words with Amos ix. 11, Jer. xxx. 9, etc. From the passage before us the Messiah received the name of Bar Naphli, "Son of the fallen".—**κατεσκαμμένα**, see critical note. In LXX B has **κατεσκαμ.**, A **κατεστρ.**

ἀνοικοδομήσω, καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν· 17. ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Κύριον, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς· λέγει Κύριος ὁ[1] ποιῶν ταῦτα πάντα." 18.[2] γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνός ἐστι τῷ Θεῷ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. 19. διὸ ἐγὼ[3] κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν

[1] **ο ποιων**, art. *om.* ℵ*B, Vulg., Irint., Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt. **ταυτα**, *om.* **παντα** ℵABCD 61, Vulg., Boh., Aeth., Irint., Rebapt., Const., so Lach., Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, and Hilg. (**παντα ταυτα** ELP, Syr. H.). Amos ix. 12 **ο ποιων ταυτα.**

[2] **γνωστα απ' αιωνος**, *om.* rest, so ℵBC 61, 180, Sah., Boh., Arm., so also Tisch., Alford, W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; see W.H., App., p. 96, and for the same explanation Wendt, 1888 and 1899, *in loco*. The quot. in Amos ix. does not contain **γνωστα απ' αιωνος**, so that the words were separated from the clause and formed into an independent sentence. T.R. is supported by EHLP, Syr. H., Const., Chrys.; whilst AD, Vulg., Syr. H. mg., Irint., Blass in both texts, and Hilg. read **γνωστον απ' αιωνος εστι τῳ κυριῳ το εργον αυτου.**

[3] After **εγω** Iren. adds **το κατ' εμε** "secundum me," *cf.* Rom. i. 15; may be translator's paraphrase; retained by Blass in **β**.

Ver. 17. **ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητ. οἱ κ. τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν Κ.**: LXX and Hebrew are here considerably at variance. Hebrew: "that they may possess the remnant of Edom". In LXX: "that the rest of men may seek after (the Lord)" (so also Arabic Version, whilst Vulgate, Peshitto, and Targum support the Massoretic text, see Briggs, *u. s.*, p. 162). In LXX A **τὸν Κ.** is found, but not in B. In LXX rendering אָדָם, *men*, takes the place of אֱדוֹם, *Edom*, and יִדְרְשׁוּ instead of יִירְשׁוּ, *i.e.*, דָּרַשׁ, to seek, instead of יָרַשׁ, to possess.—**καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη**: explicative, "the rest of men," *i.e.*, the heathen: "sine respectu personarum et operum".—**ὅπως ἄν**, Winer-Moulton, xlii., 6; Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 85; *cf.* Luke ii. 35, Acts iii. 19, Rom. iii. 4, and in no other instances, three of these quotations from LXX.—**ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκ. . . . ἐπ' α.**: "upon whom my name is called [pronounced]": Hebraistic formula, *cf.* LXX, Jer. xli. 15; and Deut. xxviii. 10, Isa. lxiii. 19, 2 Macc. viii. 15. In James ii. 7, and only there in the N.T. does the same formula recur (see Mayor, *Introd.*, and Nösgen, *Geschichte der Neutest. Offb.*, ii., 51).

Ver. 18. In R.V. the phrase **ἀπ' αἰῶνος** is connected closely with the preceding clause, see critical notes: "who maketh these things known from the beginning of the world" ("of time," Ramsay), or margin, "who doeth these things which were known" etc. St. James may perhaps have added the words freely to the LXX to emphasise his argument that the call of the Gentiles was a carrying out of God's eternal purpose, but there is nothing corresponding to the words in the Hebrew, although at the end of ver. 11 we have כִּימֵי עוֹלָם: LXX, **καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι ἀπ' αἰῶνος**, and somewhat similar phrase in Isa. xlv. 21, see Zöckler, *in loco*, for different authorities, and for further discussion of the words, Klostermann, *Probleme im Aposteltexte*, p. 128. **ἀπ' αἰῶνος** is peculiar to Luke in N.T., *cf.* Luke i. 70, Acts iii. 21; it may simply = "of old time," see Plummer, *St. Luke*, *l. c.*, but here it may intimate that St. James refers to that purpose of God revealed by all the prophets, as in iii. 21. In *Psalms of Solomon*, viii., 7, **ἀπ' αἰῶνος** seems to be equivalent to "from the creation of the heaven and earth," *cf.* Ps. cxviii. 52. If the conference was held in Greek, as we may reasonably conclude from the fact that Gentile interests were at stake, and that many of the Gentiles, as of the Hellenistic Jews, would probably be present, it is very significant that St. James, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, quotes the rendering of the LXX so apposite for his purpose, and that he should see the spiritual restoration of the house of David in the kingdom of Jesus, and the fulfilment of prophecy in the reception of the Gentiles into the kingdom of the Messiah, so exclusively guarded by the Jews.

ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν· 20. ἀλλὰ ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι[1] ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ τῆς πορνείας καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ καὶ τοῦ

[1] απο *om.* ℵBD 61, 180, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. και του πνικτου *om.* art. AB 13, 61, so W.H., Weiss. D, Gig., Iren. omit και του πνικτου (see also ver. 29). Wendt (1888) accounts for the omission partly by the fact that no such command was precisely given in Lev. xvii. 13 (so Meyer, Alford), and partly from the laxer views of the Western Church; but (1899, Introd., p. 50) he now gives in his adherence to Corssen's view (*G. G. A.*, p. 442; 1896), with which compare for similarity Zahn's explanation, *Einleitung*, ii., pp. 344, 345 (1899), Weiss, Codex D, p. 198, that the omission, as also the addition following (see below), were intended to do away with the Judaic and ceremonial character of the decree, and to substitute the comprehensive moral prescription of the Sermon on the Mount; so too recently Harnack. του πνικ. being eliminated αιμα can be referred to *homicidium*, Tert., *De Pud.*, xii., so that the decree means that they should abstain from pollutions, *viz.*, idolatry, fornication, bloodshed (*cf.* the punctuation in β), and that they should love their neighbours (the *negative* injunction of the Golden Rule); see below. See further in favour of the omission Blass, Præf., *Evang. sec. Lucam*, p. xxv. (1897); *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 250; but for a very different reason; as against the interpretation given above by Harnack and others to αιμα, see also Blass, *Studien und Kritiken*, i., 1900; Hilgenfeld, also Corssen, *C. G. G.*, p. 445 ff., remark on the probability of Montanistic influences in the Bezan text of the passage before us, and in reply to their strictures see Blass, *Evang. sec. Lucam*, Præf., p. xxiv. ff. At the end of the clause we have και οσα μη θελουσιν εαυτοις γινεσθαι ετεροις μη ποιειν, so D, 11 minuscules, Sah., Aeth., Iren. (*cf.* also ver. 29). Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., pp. 31, 32, points out that the addition was known to Aristides (Seeberg, *Die Apologie des A.*, p. 213), and that therefore the Acts was known and used and interpolated by the middle of the second century. But he refrains from speaking positively as to the source of this variant in Acts, as "the negative precept turns up everywhere in the early Church, having been absorbed in the first instance from Jewish ethics"; *cf.* also Weiss, Codex D, p. 109. So Theophilus, Didache, Const. Apost. and Ephrem on Rom. iii. 21 and viii. 7; see Harris, *u. s.*; Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 95; W.H., App., 96. Zahn unhesitatingly refers the addition to the *Didache*, but it is very doubtful how far the *Didache* enjoyed the high and wide credit which Zahn attaches to it: about 110-140 the words were interpolated in the text in the East, and soon after, but by no means with universal acceptance, they found their way into the Western text. Blass in *Studien und Kritiken*, *u. s.*, replies further to Harnack. Harnack asks why the "golden rule," if genuine, is not found in xxi. 25. Blass replies that Luke kept a rough draft for himself in which were both πνικτα and the rule, and thus omitted πνικτα in β, and in α the rule "brevitati consulens".

Ver. 19. διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω: "wherefore my judgment is". St. James apparently speaks as the president of the meeting, Chrysostom, *Hom.*, xxxiii., and his words with the emphatic ἐγώ (Weiss) may express more than the opinion of a private member—he sums up the debate and proposes "the draught of a practical resolution" (see however Hort, *Ecclesia*, 79; Hackett, *in loco;* and on the other hand Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 147). If a position of authority is thus given to St. James at the conference, it is very significant that this should be so in Jerusalem itself, where the Twelve would naturally carry special weight. But this presidency and Apostolic authority of St. James in Jerusalem is exactly in accordance with the remarkable order of the three names referred to by St. Paul in Gal. ii. 9 (*cf.* Acts xii. 17, xxi. 18). At the same time ver. 22 shows us that neither the authority of St. James nor that of the other Apostles is conceived of as overriding the general consent of the whole Church.—μὴ παρενοχλεῖν: only here in N.T.; "not to trouble," A. and R.V.; it may be possible to press the παρά, "not to trouble further," *i.e.*, by anything more than he is about to mention, or in their conversion to God. The verb is found with dative and accusative in LXX; for the former *cf.* Judg. xiv. 17, 1 Macc. x. 63 SR, xii. 14; and for the latter Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 27, 1 Macc. x. 35. Bengel takes παρά as = *præter*, but whilst it is very doubtful how far the preposition can be so rendered here, he adds *fides quieta non obturbanda.*—τοῖς ἐπισ. *cf.* xi. 21, "who are turn-

αἵματος· 21.[1] Μωσῆς γὰρ ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων κατὰ πόλιν τοὺς κηρύσσοντας αὐτὸν ἔχει ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκόμενος.

[1] Blass in β brackets whole verse on the ground of its omission by Irenæus, but the latter may easily have omitted it as superfluous or irrelevant to his argument, whilst the obscurity of the verse has been well noted as a reason for its retention.

ing to God"; present participle, as in acknowledgment of a work actually in progress.

Ver. 20. **ἐπιστεῖλαι** (xxi. 25), Heb. xiii. 22; the verb is used of a *written* injunction, Westcott, *l. c.* (so Wendt here and in xxi. 25, and so Klostermann), and so often in ecclesiastical writers; here it may mean to write or enjoin, or may well include both, *cf.* Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 70, Westcott, *u. s.*, Weiss, *in loco;* in classical Greek it is used in both senses. In LXX it is not used, except in a few passages in which the reading is doubtful, **ἀπ.** for **ἐπ.**, see Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.*—**τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι**: Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 159, *cf.* Jer. vii. 10, 1 Pet. ii. 11, 1 Tim. iv. 3; generally without **ἀπό.**—**τῶν ἀλισγημάτων**: from Hellenistic verb, **ἀλισγεῖν**, LXX, Dan. i. 8, Mal. i. 7, 12, Ecclus. xl. 29 (S, *al*); may mean the pollution from the flesh used in heathen offerings = **εἰδωλοθύτων** in ver. 29 (xxi. 25), *cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 1, x. 14 ff., but see further Klostermann, *Probleme im Aposteltexte*, p. 144 ff., and Wendt, 1888 and 1899, *in loco.* The phrase stands by itself, and the three following genitives are not dependent upon it. If St. James's words are interpreted more widely than as = **εἰδωλοθύτων**, ver. 29, they would involve the prohibition for a Christian not only not to eat anything offered to idols, or to share in the idolatrous feasts, but even to accept an invitation to a domestic feast of the Gentiles or at least to a participation in the food on such an occasion. That it was easy for Christians to run these risks is evident from 1 Cor. viii. 10 when St. Paul refers to the case of those who had not only eaten of the flesh offered to idols, but had also sat down to a feast in the idol's temple.—**τῆς πορνείας**: the moral explanation of this close allocation of idolatry and uncleanness is that the former so often involved the latter. But Dr. Hort whilst pointing out that such an association is not fanciful or accidental, reminds us that we ought not to lay too much stress on the connection, since many forms of idolatry might fairly be regarded as free from that particular stain. The language, however, of St. James in his Epistle shows us how imperative it was in the moral atmosphere of the Syria of the first century to guard the Christian life from sexual defilement, and the burning language of St. Paul in 1 Cor. vi. 15 and 1 Thess. iv. 3, etc., shows us the terrible risks to which Christian morality was exposed, risks enhanced by the fact that the heathen view of impurity was so lax throughout the Roman empire, *cf.* Horace, *Sat.*, i., 2, 31; Terence, *Adelphi*, i., 2, 21; Cicero, *Pro Cælio*, xx.; and on the intimate and almost universal connection between the heathen religious guilds and societies and the observance of nameless breaches of the Christian law of purity, see Loening, *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums*, and his references to Foucart, p. 12 ff. Without some special prohibition it was conceivable that a man might pass from some scene of licentious indulgence to the participation in the Supper of the Lord (Plumptre, Felten). An attempt has been made to refer the word here to the sin of incest, or to marriage within the forbidden degrees, rather than to the sin of fornication, so Holtzmann, Ritschl, Zöckler, Wendt, Ramsay; but on the other hand Meyer, Ewald, Godet, Weiss, and others take the word in its general sense as it is employed elsewhere in the N.T. From what has been said above, and from the way in which women might be called upon to serve impurely in a heathen temple (to which religious obligation, as Zöckler reminds us, some have seen a reference in the word here, *cf.* also Wendt, p. 332 (1888)), we see the need and the likelihood of such a specific enjoinder against the sin of fornication. Bentley conjectured **χοιρείας** or **πορκείας.**—**τοῦ πνικτοῦ**: "from that which has been strangled," lit., such beasts as had been killed through strangling, and whose blood had not been let out when they were killed. For this prohibition reference is usually made to Lev. xvii. 13, Deut. xii. 16, 23, so Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler, Plumptre, Felten, Hackett. But on the other hand Dr. Hort

22. Τότε ἔδοξε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν σὺν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ, Ἰούδαν τὸν [1] ἐπικαλούμενον Βαρσαβᾶν, καὶ

[1] επικ., but καλ. ℵABCDEL, Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt. Βαρσαβαν Vulg., Arm., Chrys.; βαρσαββαν ℵABCEHLP 61, Sah., Boh., Const., Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt; see on the word Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 56, 57; βαραββαν D, so Hilg.

contends that all attempts to find the prohibition in the Pentateuch quite fail, although he considers it perfectly conceivable that the flesh of animals strangled in such a way as not to allow of the letting out of blood would be counted as unlawful food by the Jews, *cf.* Origen, *c. Cels.*, viii., 30; *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 73, and Appendix, p. 209. But his further remark, that if such a prohibition had been actually prescribed (as in his view it is not) we should have a separate fourth precept referring only to a particular case of the third precept, *viz.*, abstinence from blood, is probably the reason why in D, *cf.* Irenæus, *Hær.*, iii., 12, 14; Cyprian, *Testim*, iii., 119; Tertullian, *De Pudicitia*, xii., the words **καὶ τοῦ πνικτοῦ** are omitted here and in the decree, ver. 29, although it is also possible that the laxer views on the subject in the West may have contributed to the omission (see Zöckler and Wendt). Dr. Hort leaves the difficulty unsolved, merely referring to the "Western" text without adopting it. But in xxi. 25 the words are again found in a reference to, and in a summary of, the decree, although here too D consistently omits them (see critical notes).—**τοῦ αἵματος**: specially forbidden by the Jewish law, Lev. xvii. 10, *cf.* iii. 17, vii. 26, xix. 26, Deut. xii. 16, 23, xv. 23, and we may refer the prohibition, with Dr. Hort, to the feeling of mystery entertained by various nations of antiquity with regard to blood, so that the feeling is not exclusively Jewish, although the Jewish law had given it such express and divine sanction. "The blood is the life," and abstinence from it was a manifestation of reverence for the life given by and dedicated to God. This was the ground upon which the Jews based, and still base, the prohibition. Nothing could override the command first given to Noah, Gen. ix. 4, together with the permission to eat animal food, and renewed in the law. **αἷμ.** cannot refer (so Cyprian and Tertullian) to homicide, as the collocation with **πνικτοῦ** (if retained) is against any such interpretation. See additional note (2) at end of chapter.

Ver. 21. **ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων**: pointing back to the first days when the Diaspora had first spread to any considerable extent in heathen lands: see on ver. 7. The exact phrase (**ἀπὸ**) **γενεῶν ἀρχ.** occurs in *Psalms of Solomon*, xviii., 14—from the generations of old the lights of heaven have not departed from their path. For the custom referred to here, see Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 55, E.T. The words seem closely connected in sense with the preceding in this way, *viz.*, that the Gentile proselytes could long ago in the synagogues have been acquainted week by week with the spirit and enactments of the Mosaic law, and they would thus be the more easily inclined to take upon themselves the few elementary precepts laid down in the decree of the Jerusalem Church, so as to avoid any serious cause of offence to their Jewish-Christian brethren. Others however take the meaning to be that, as the Jewish Christians in their continual association with the synagogue would still hear the law read every Sabbath, there would be no intercourse between them and the *Gentile* Christians, unless the latter observed the necessary restrictions enjoined by the decree for brotherly intercommunion. There is no occasion to interpret the meaning to be that it is superfluous to write the decree to the Jewish Christians, since they knew its contents already from the law (so St. Chrysostom, and Blass), for a decree for the Jewish Christians is not in question, see ver. 23. Others again interpret: there is no fear that the Mosaic law should be neglected or despised "for Moses, etc.". See further, Wendt, Weiss, McGiffert, Knabenbauer.

Ver. 22. **ἔδοξε**: the word is often found in public resolutions and official decrees, Herod., i., 3; Thuc., iv., 118 L) and S.).—**τοῖς ἀποσ. . . . ἐκλεξ. . . . γράψ.**: on the irregular construction see Page and Rendall, and instances in Alford and Lumby; and further, Burton, *N. T. Moods and Tenses*, p. 173.—**σὺν ὅλῃ τῇ ἐκκλ.**, *cf.* ver. 12, **πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος**, *cf.* Iren., *Hær.* iii., 12.—

Σίλαν, ἄνδρας ἡγουμένους ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, 23. γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν τάδε· Οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι[1] καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί, τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν,

[1] και οι αδελφοι ℵcEHLP, Syrr. P. and H., ArmZoh., Aethut., Chrys., so Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 57; *om.* και οι ℵ*ABCD, 13, 61, Armusc., Irint., Ath., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt. Blass, following Sah., Orig., reads αδελφοις here and brackets the same word after Κιλ., so Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 171, rejecting the word as an accidental corruption; "The Apostles and the Elders unto the brethren," etc., R.V. renders "The Apostles and the elder brethren," a title which the Jerusalem Church might use in addressing younger Churches (Rendall), but see commentary.

ἐκλεξ. ἄνδρας πέμψαι: "to choose men out of their company, and send," R.V. In A.V. we lose sight of the fact that the choice was thus made in the rendering "chosen men," a rendering which takes ἐκλεξ. middle as if passive (see Wendt's just criticism, and *cf.* ver. 40 ἐπιλεξ.).—**Ἰούδαν τὸν ἐπικ. Β.**, see critical note, sometimes regarded as a brother of Joseph Barsabbas in i. 23. Ewald thinks that he was actually identical with him. Nothing further is known of him, but if he was a brother of Joseph Barsabbas, he too may have been amongst the personal followers of the Lord; hence his leading position, see also B.D.[2] "Judas," p. 1830.—**Σίλαν**, *cf.* ver. 40, xvi. 19, 25, 29, xvii. 4, 10, 14, xviii. 5, 2 Cor. i. 19, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1, 1 Pet. v. 12. The name may have been contracted for Silvanus, but it may also have been a Greek equivalent for a Hebrew name שְׁלִשִׁי = Tertius, or שֶׁלַח, Gen. x. 24, see especially Winer-Schmiedel, p. 143, note, and Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 23, who prefers שָׁאַל, „bitten, erfragen". Paul always used the form Σιλουανός (so 1 Pet. v. 12), Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 70, 71, Winer-Schmiedel, *u. s.*, and also pp. 74, 75. On the supposed identity of Silas with Titus, who is never mentioned in Acts, see above; and Wendt, *in loco*. If the two passages, 2 Cor. i. 19 and viii. 23, on which the advocates of this view rely make the identity possible, the description of Titus, Gal. ii. 3, is completely at variance with the description of Silas in this chapter ("perversa, ne quid durius dicam, conjectura" Blass, in commenting on the supposed identity).—**ἡγουμένους**, *cf.* ver. 32, **προφῆται ὄντες**: the word is also used in Heb. xiii. three times, once of those who had passed away, ver. 7, and in vv. 17 and 24 of actual authorities to be obeyed. The word is applied in the LXX to various forms of authority and leadership (see also references to the word in classical Greek, Grimm-Thayer), and *cf.* Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, i., 3 (xxi., 6), with v. 7, xxxvii. 2, lv. 1, lx. 4. It is quite possible that it may have essentially = διδάσκαλοι, xiii. 1 (*cf.* xiv. 12, ἡγούμ. τοῦ λόγου), *cf.* Heb. *u. s.*, with *Didaché*, iv., 1, and see Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 249; Harnack, Proleg. to *Didaché*, p. 95; or the mere fact that Judas and Silas may both have been personal followers of Jesus would have conferred upon them a high degree of authority (Plumptre); or the term ἡγου. may be used as a general one, and we cannot say to what particular office or qualification it may have extended besides that involved in ver. 32. For use of the word in sub-apostolic times see Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 322, etc., Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 166, 186. The word may be called characteristic of St. Luke (Friedrich, p. 22, *cf.* Luke xxii. 26, Acts vii. 10 (of civil rule), xiv. 12).

Ver. 23.—**οἱ ἀπόστ. καὶ οἱ πρεσβ. καὶ οἱ ἀδελ.**, but in R.V. "the Apostles and the elder brethren," see critical notes. The phrase as it stands in R.V. has been called meaningless (Page), but Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 71, while admitting that the phrase is unusual, defends it as indicating that they who held the office of elder were to be regarded as bearing the characteristic from which the title itself had arisen, and that they were but elder brethren at the head of a great family of brethren (*cf.* Knabenbauer *in loco*). It is of course quite possible that ἀδελ. is merely to be taken as in apposition to ἀπόστ. and πρεσβ., meaning that as brethren they sent a message to brethren (Wendt, Felten, Page).—**τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀ. κ.τ.λ.**, see below.—**χαίρειν**: amongst the Epistles of the N.T. only that of St. James thus commences, as has been often pointed out by Bengel and others. The

χαίρειν. 24. ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσαμεν ὅτι τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν[1] ἐξελθόντες ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις, ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν,[2] λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον, οἷς οὐ διεστειλάμεθα· 25. ἔδοξεν ἡμῖν γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδόν,[3] ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας πέμψαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, σὺν τοῖς

[1] **εξελθοντες** *om.* ℵ*B, Arm., Aethro., Const., Ath., Chrys., so W.H., R.V. marg., Weiss, Wendt; but retained ℵcACDEP, Vulg., Syrr. P. and H., Sah., Boh., Aethpp., Iren., so Tisch., Blass, Hilg. It might have been introduced (*cf.* ver. 1, **κατελ.**) to guard against the appearances that **τινες εξ ημων** belonged to the senders of the letter (see Wendt's note, 1888).

[2] **λεγ. . . . τον νομον** *om.* ℵABD 13, 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aethro., Or., Const., Ath., so Tisch., W.H., Blass., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; but Blass retains in **β**, following CEHLP, Gig., Iren. (Chrys.), so Hilg.

[3] **εκλεξαμενους** ℵCDEHP, Const., Iren., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H. marg., Blass, Weiss and Hilg.; **-οις** ABL 61, Lach., W.H. text. Wendt unable to decide whether acc. after ver. 22 or dat. for gram. was the later reading.

coincidence may be a chance one, but it is the more remarkable, since the letter may well have been written and dictated by St. James in his authoritative position. On the phrase in letters see Mayor's interesting note on James i. 1. It occurs again in Acts xxiii. 26, but nowhere else in N.T.

Ver. 24. On the similarity of this verse in phraseology to St. Luke's preface, Luke i. 1, Schwegler, Zeller, Weiss, Friedrich, Hilgenfeld, and others have commented. But, after all, in what does the likeness consist? Simply in the fact that here as there we have **ἐπειδή** introducing the antecedent clause, and **ἔδοξεν** the subsequent clause. Friedrich (p. 46) considers this as too striking to be a matter of chance, but strangely he writes each of the two passages as if they commenced with the same word, see below on ver. 28 —**ἐπειδήπερ.** This word is a curious one, and is only found in Luke i. 1 (not in LXX), but there is no authority for reading it in the passage before us in Acts. Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 45, refers to instances of a similar formula and phraseology as in use in Jewish writings, *cf.* Jost, *Jüd. Gesch.*, i., 284.—**τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν**, *cf.* for the expression Gal. ii. 12.—**ἐξελ.**, see critical notes.—**ἐτάραξαν ἡμᾶς**, *cf.* Gal. i. 7, v. 10. **λόγοις** may mean with words only, words without true doctrine.—**ἀνασκευάζοντες**, "subverting," A. and R.V.; not in LXX, and only here in N.T., in classical Greek, primarily *colligere vasa*, to pack up, and so to carry away: or to dismantle a place; to destroy, overthrow, and so trop. as in text—of breaking treaties (Polyb.), of destroying an opponent's arguments (Arist.). Nösgen and Felten note it amongst the non-Lucan words in the decree, so **βάρος, τὸ ἐπάναγκες, διὰ λόγου, ἀπαγγέλλειν, εὖ πράττειν, ἔρρωσθε, ἀγαπητός.**—**οἷς οὐ διεστειλάμεθα**: "to whom we gave no commandment," R.V., omitting "such," not in text, and weakens; in Tyndale, Cramner, and Genevan Version; *cf.* Gal. ii. 12, and Acts xxi. 20; only used once in passive in N.T., Heb. xii. 20, often in LXX in middle voice, meaning to warn, *cf.* also its meaning in Judith xi. 12 with Mark v. 43, etc.

Ver. 25. **γενομ. ὁμοθυμαδόν**: "having come to one accord," "einmutig geworden," Weiss: **ὁμοθ.**, though frequent in Acts, see i. 14, only here with **γεν.** For the form of the phrase as indicating mutual deliberation on the part of the Church collectively see "Council," *Dict. of Chr. Ant.*, i., 474.—**ἐκλεξ. ἄνδρας**: "to choose out men and send them unto you," R.V., whether we read accusative or dative see critical note, and *cf.* ver. 22.—**ἀγαπητοῖς**: very frequent in St. Paul's Epistles; used three times by St. James in his Epistle, twice by St. Peter in his First Epistle, four times in the Second, *cf.* iii. 15, where the word is used by St. Peter of St. Paul, ten times by St. John: it was therefore a very natural word to occur in the letter, and we may compare it with the right hand of fellowship given by the three Apostles just named to Barnabas and Paul, Gal. ii. 9.—**Β. καὶ Π.**: this order because in Jerusalem Church; see above on ver. 12. Meyer, Bleek, Nösgen, Wendt, all note its truthful significance.

Ver. 26. **παραδεδωκόσι τὰς ψ. α.**: "hazarded their lives," A. and R.V.; so in classical Greek, and in LXX, Dan. iii. 28 (95). The sufferings of the mission-

ἀγαπητοῖς ἡμῶν Βαρνάβᾳ καὶ Παύλῳ, 26. ἀνθρώποις παραδεδωκόσι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.[1] 27. ἀπεστάλκαμεν οὖν Ἰούδαν καὶ Σίλαν, καὶ αὐτοὺς διὰ λόγου ἀπαγγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτά. 28. ἔδοξε γὰρ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν, μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλὴν τῶν ἐπάναγκες

[1] At end of verse, DE 137, Syr. Harcl. mg. add **εις παντα πειρασμον**, so Blass in β, Hilg. Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., pp. 85, 86, describes this as the best example extant of a Syriac assimilation in the text of Acts; **παραδεδωκασιν** in D, ambiguous, but in *Sirach*, ii., 1, Syriac had rendered "thou hast surrendered thy soul to all temptations" (**ετοιμασον την ψυχην σου εις πειρασμον**, LXX); gloss added here for clearness. Weiss, Codex D, p. 82, refers the words to a reminiscence of Acts xx. 19.

aries in their first journey were evidently well known, and appeal was fittingly made to them in recognition of their self-sacrifice, and in proof of their sincerity.

Ver. 27. **Ἰ. καὶ Σ. καὶ αὐτοὺς**: "who themselves also shall tell you the same things by word of mouth," R.V. Judas and Silas were sent to confirm personally the contents of the letter, as they could speak with authority as representing the Church at Jerusalem, while Barnabas and Saul alone would be regarded as already committed to the conciliatory side (Alford). The present participle, as the writer thinks of Judas and Silas as actually present with the letter at its reception, *cf.* **ἀπεστάλκαμεν**, "we have sent" by a common idiom, and also xxi. 16; Blass compares Thuc., vii., 26, **ἔπεμψαν ἀγγέλλοντας**, *Gram.*, p. 194.—**τὰ αὐτὰ**: not the same things as Barnabas and Paul had preached, but, as **διὰ λ.** intimates, the same things as the letter contained, see critical notes.

Ver. 28. **ἔδοξε γὰρ τῷ Ἁ. Π. καὶ ἡμῖν**: "causa principalis" and "causa ministerialis" of the decree. The words of Hooker exactly describe the meaning and purpose of the words, *E. P.*, iii., 10, 2, *cf.* viii., 6, 7, and *cf.* St. Chrysostom's words, *Hom.*, xxxiii., "not making themselves equal to Him [*i.e.*, the Holy Ghost]—they are not so mad—the one *to the Holy Ghost*, that they may not deem it to be of man; the other *to us*, that they may be taught that they also themselves admit the Gentiles, although themselves being in circumcision". On other suggested but improbable meanings see Alford's and Wendt's notes. The words became a kind of general formula in the decrees of Councils and Synods, *cf.* the phrase commonly prefixed to Councils: *Sancto Spiritu suggerente* (*Dict. Chr. Ant.*, i., 483). On this classical construction of **ἔδοξε τῷ** with the infinitive see Nestle's note, *Expository Times*, December, 1898. Moreover it would seem that this **ἔδοξε** is quite in accordance with the manner in which Jewish Rabbis would formulate their decisions.—**μηδὲν πλέον . . . βάρος**: the words indicate authority on the part of the speakers, although in ver. 20 we read only of "enjoining". St. Peter had used the cognate verb in ver. 10, *cf.* Rev. ii. 24, where the same noun occurs with a *possible* reference to the decree, see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 309, and Plumptre, *in loco*.—**ἐπάναγκες**, *i.e.*, for mutual intercourse, that Jewish and Gentile Christians might live as brethren in the One Lord. There is nothing said to imply that these four abstinences were to be imposed as necessary to salvation; the receivers of the letter are only told that it should be well with them if they observed the decree, and we cannot interpret **εὖ πράξετε** as = **σωθήσεσθε**. At the same time the word was a very emphatic one, and might be easily interpreted, as it speedily was, in a narrower sense, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 172; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 310. Rendall compares the use of **ἀναγκαῖος** in Thuc., i., 90.

Ver. 29. **ἀπέχ.**: preposition omitted as in ver. 20, W.H.; so usually in classical Greek, but in N.T. **ἀπέχ. ἀπό**, 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 22; so in LXX, Job i. 1, 8, ii. 3, etc. On the difference in meaning in the two constructions, see Alford and Wendt, *in loco*.—**εἰδωλοθύτων**, see ver. 20.—**πνικτοῦ**: omitted in Western text; see critical notes.—**διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς**: verb, only in Luke, *cf.* Luke ii. 51 (in LXX with **ἐκ** or **ἀπό**, Ps. xi. 7, Prov. xxi. 23). In Jas. i. 27 we have a somewhat striking similarity of expression (*cf.* also John xvii. 15).—**εὖ πράξετε**: "it shall be well with you," R.V.; *viz.*, through the peace and concord established in the Christian community, *cf.* 2 Macc. ix. 19, so in classical Greek. The reading in A.V. is somewhat ambiguous, but the Greek signifies

τούτων, 29. ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ[1] πνικτοῦ καὶ πορνείας. ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὖ[2] πράξετε. ἔῤῥωσθε.

30. Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολυθέντες[3] ἦλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν· καὶ συναγαγόντες τὸ πλῆθος, ἐπέδωκαν τὴν ἐπιστολήν. 31. ἀναγνόντες δὲ ἐχάρησαν ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει. 32. Ἰούδας δὲ καὶ Σίλας, καὶ αὐτοὶ προφῆται ὄντες,[4] διὰ λόγου πολλοῦ παρεκάλεσαν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, καὶ

[1] **και πνικτου** *om.* D, Iren., Tert., Cypr., Amb., Pac., Aug., so Blass in **β**; see above on ver. 20, and Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 353; **πνικτου** ℵcA²EHLP, Vulg., Syrr. P. and H., Arm., Aeth., Const., Chrys., etc.; **πνικτων** ℵ*A*BC 61, 137, Sah., Boh., Clem., Or., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt (**πνικτου** introduced after ver. 20). After **πορνειας** D, Par., Wer.², Syr. Harcl. mg., Sah., Aeth., Irint., Cypr. (with many variations) read **και οσα μη θελετε εαυτοις γινεσθαι, ετερῳ μη ποιειν,** so Blass in **β**, and Hilg.

[2] **πραξετε** ℵAB, Vulg., all edd.; **πραξατε** CDHL; **πραξητε** E; see Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 354. After **πραξ.** D, Iren., Tert. (Ephrem) add **φερομενοι εν τω αγιῳ πνευματι,** so Blass in **β**. Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 77, thinks that the gloss has been misplaced, and declining all references to Montanus or Marcion or to N.T. parallels, regards it as simply an expansion or explanation of **απολυθεντες**, ver. 30; *cf.* xiii. 4. Weiss also declines all Montanist influence, but takes the words after **ευ πραξ.** as meaning that they would fare well being guided by the Holy Spirit, by Whom the decree, ver. 28, had been inspired. **ερρωσθε,** Blass brackets in **β**, *om.* by Irenæus; see also Zahn, *u. s.*, p. 354.

[3] **ηλθον,** but **κατηλθον** ℵABCD 61, Vulg., Arm., Aeth., Theophyl., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt. After **απολυθεντες** D* adds **εν ημεραις ολιγαις,** so Blass in **β**, and Hilg. Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 72, speaks of the addition as more valuable than much gold, as showing their eagerness to bring the good news to Antioch, and the speed of their travelling, contrasted with ver. 3. Weiss however would connect it (p. 82), not with the time consumed in the journey, but with the time of their departure, *i.e.*, they set off a few days after the Council to put an end to the disquietude at Antioch.

[4] After **οντες** D adds **πληρεις πνευματος αγιου,** so Blass and Hilg., no Montanistic source; either explanation of **προφ.** (unnecessary), or may be connected with **δια λογου** implying that their oral words no less than the written letter were spoken in the Holy Ghost (Weiss, p. 82). Mr. Page, *Classical Review*, p. 320 (1897), refers this addition, with similar ones in vv. 7 and 29 of this chap., to the characteristic of D "to emphasise words and actions as inspired".

prosperity. For D, see critical notes.—**ἔῤῥωσθε**, see critical notes, 2 Macc. xi. 21 and 33, 3 Macc. vii. 9, etc., and often in classics; a natural conclusion of a letter addressed to Gentile Christians, see additional note (2) at end of chapter.

Ver. 30. **οἱ μὲν οὖν . . . ἀναγνόντες δέ**: two parties are presented as acting in concert as here (or in opposition), see Rendall, *Acts*, Appendix on **μὲν οὖν**, p. 161.—**ἦλθον,** but **κατῆλθον** R.V., Jerusalem is still the centre from which Barnabas and Paul go down. See reading in D, critical note.—**τὸ πλῆθος = ἡ ἐκκλησία**, *cf.* xiv. 27; Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 59, especially refers to this passage: **τὸ πλ.** = *Christengemeinde* at Antioch, *cf. plebs, populus* in Lat. Chr. authors.—**ἐπέδωκαν τὴν ἐπισ.**, see instances in Wetstein of same phrase in same sense.

Ver. 31. **παρακλήσει**: A. and R.V. "consolation" ("exhortation" margin, R.V.). The former rendering seems suitable here, because the letter causes rejoicing, not as an exhortation, but as a message of relief and concord. Ramsay and Hort render "encouragement". Barnabas was a fitting bearer of such a message, *cf.* iv. 36.

Ver. 32. **καὶ αὐτοὶ προφ. ὄντες**: Wendt, so Meyer, takes **καὶ αὐτοί** not with **προφ. ὄντες** (these words in commas), but with the words which follow, indicating that Judas and Silas gave encouragement to the brethren personally (*cf.* ver. 27), as the letter had verbally; but punctuation of T.R. in R.V., W.H., Weiss, etc. On **καὶ αὐτοί** and its frequency in St. Luke, Friedrich, p. 37; Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ* (1899), p.

ἐπεστήριξαν. 33. Ποιήσαντες δὲ χρόνον, ἀπελύθησαν μετ' εἰρήνης ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους.[1] 34.[2] ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλᾳ

[1] **αποστολους** EHLP, Syrr. P. and H., Boh^wi., Arm., Chrys.; but **αποστειλαντας αυτους** ℵABCD, Vulg., Sah., Boh^boett., Aeth^ro., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass and Hilg.

[2] *Om.* ℵABEHLP 61, Vulg. (am. fu. demid.), Syr. Pesh., Syr. H. text, Boh^boett., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V. text, Weiss, Wendt. In CD 13, Vulg^clem. + tol., Sah., Boh^wi., Syr. Harcl. mg., Arm., Aeth^ut., so Blass and Hilg. Also D, Gig., Wern., Prov., Vulg.^clem., Cassiod. add **μονος δε Ιουδας επορευθη** (Wern. adding "reversus est Hierosolyma," *cf.* also Vulg.^cl.). It is difficult to see why if 34^a was genuine it should have been omitted, but the sentence may have been introduced to account for the presence of Silas at Antioch in ver. 40; so Weiss and Corssen. (In C and D **αυτους** instead of **αυτου**, and in a few mins. **αυτοθι**.) Ver. 34^a is defended as genuine by Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 174, 175; Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 148 (whilst both regard 34^b as a gloss); *cf.* Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 73, on the same ground, *viz.*, that ver. 33 does not declare that Judas and Silas actually departed, but only that they were free to depart. The Bezan reviser found the first part of the verse in his text and added the second. Blass retains both parts of the verse in **β**. If the first clause was introduced to explain a supposed difficulty about Silas, it must be remembered that the difficulty was more fanciful than real, since Barnabas *takes Mark from Jerusalem*, xiii. 13 (see Ramsay, *u. s.*). W.H., *App.*, p. 96, considers the first clause as probably Alexandrian, as well as Western, while Corssen regards them both as Western.

33.—**παρεκάλεσαν**: A. and R.V. "exhorted"; R.V. margin, "comforted," Ramsay, "encouraged" (so Hort; or "exhorted"). Possibly the word may include something of all these meanings (see also Alford's note).—**ἐπεστήριξαν**, *cf.* xiv. 22.

Ver. 33. **ποιήσαντες δὲ χρόνον**, *cf.* xviii. 23, and xx. 3, only in Acts in N.T., *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 25, James iv. 13. For the phrase both in LXX and classical Greek (so in Latin), see Wetstein, Blass, Grimm. In LXX *cf.* Prov. xiii. 23, Eccl. vi. 12 (Tob. x. 7), so Hebrew עָשָׂה.—**μετ' εἰρήνης**: exact phrase only Heb. xi. 31 in N.T.; in LXX several times; in Apocryha, in 1 and 3 Macc.—**πρὸς τοὺς ἀποσ.**: but if as in R.V., "unto those that had sent them" (see critical notes and Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 73), *i.e.*, the whole synod at Jerusalem, not only the Apostles.

Ver. 34. Omitted in R.V. text, but not in margin. See critical notes.

Ver. 35. **διέτριβον**, *cf.* xii. 19, and see also on xvi. 12. In LXX *cf.* Lev. xiv. 8, Jer. xlii. (xxxv.) 7, Judith x. 2, 2 Macc. xiv. 23. So also in classics with or without **χρόνον**.—**διδάσ. καὶ εὐαγγ.**: possibly the first may refer to work inside the Church, and the second to work outside, but the distinction can scarcely be pressed. Within this time, according to Wendt, falls the incident between Paul and Peter, Gal. ii. 11. On the other hand, see Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 194, who thinks that the **τινας ἡμέρας** excludes, Gal. ii., etc., but the phrase is very indefinite, and may have included months as well as days, *cf.* xvi. 12, and ix. 23. On the incident referred to see additional note at end of chapter.

Ver. 36. **μετὰ δέ**: second missionary journey commences, ending xviii. 22.—**ἐπιστρέψαντες**, *reversi*, *cf.* Luke ii. 39, W.H., xvii. 31. The word is so used in LXX, and in modern Greek (Kennedy, p. 155).—**δή**, see on xiii. 2.—**ἐπισκεψ.**, see above on vi. 3. The word was characteristic of a man like St. Paul, whose heart was the heart of the world, and who daily sustained the care of all the churches.—**πῶς ἔχουσι**: "in fide, amore, spe . . . nervus *visitationis* ecclesiasticæ" Bengel.

Ver. 37. **ἐβουλεύσατο**, but **ἐβούλετο** see critical note, "wished," *volebat*; R.V., "was minded" almost too strong. Possibly owing to his kinship, Barnabas may have taken a more lenient view than Paul.

Ver. 38. **ἠξίου**, *cf.* xxviii. 22 (Luke vii. 7), and *cf.* 1 Macc. xi. 28, 2 Macc. ii. 8, etc.—**ἐβούλ.** is a mild word compared with this.—**συμπαραλαβεῖν**, *cf.* xii. 25, used also by Paul in Gal. ii. 1 of taking Titus with him to Jerusalem, and nowhere else in N.T. except in this passage, *cf.* Job i. 4, 3 Macc. i. 1, so in classical Greek.—**τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν**: the neutral word **ἀποχωρεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν**, xiii. 13, is not used here, but a word which may denote not disloyalty in the sense of apostasy from Christ, but to the mission,

ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ. 35. Παῦλος δὲ καὶ Βαρνάβας διέτριβον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, μετὰ καὶ ἑτέρων πολλῶν, τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου.

1 Tim. iv. 1 (Rendall); it is doubtful, however, whether we can press this (see Weiss, *in loco*).—**τοῦτον**: significant at the end of the verse, and note also decisive contradiction between **συμπαραλ.**, ver. 37, and **μὴ συμπαραλ.** here.

Ver. 39. **παροξυσμός**, Heb. x. 24, in different sense, nowhere else in N.T. The verb is found twice, Acts xvii. 16, 1 Cor. xiii. 5; in the former passage of Paul's righteous provocation in Athens, and in the latter of irritation of mind as here; the noun twice in LXX of God's righteous anger, Deut. xxix. 28, Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 37 (*cf.* also the verb, Deut. ix. 7, 8, etc.), so too in Dem. Both noun and verb are common in medical language (Hobart); **παροξυσμός, φησίν, ἐγένετο οὐχ ἔχθρα οὐδὲ φιλονεικία**; in the result good, for Mark was stirred up to greater diligence by Paul, and the kindness of Barnabas made him cling to him all the more devotedly, *cf.* Oecumenius, *in loco*.—**ἀποχωρισθῆναι**: "they parted asunder," R.V., *cf.* **διαχωρίζεσθαι ἀπό**, Gen. xiii. 11, 14, *cf.* Luke ix. 33.—**παραλαβόντα**: not the compound verb, because Barnabas alone takes Mark.—**ἐκπλεῦσαι**: with **εἰς** also in xviii. 18, with **ἀπό** in xx. 6; on **πλέω** and the number of its compounds in St. Luke, *cf.* xxvii. 4, etc.—**εἰς Κ.**: where he could be sure of influence, since by family he belonged to the Jews settled there, iv. 36. Barnabas is not mentioned again in Acts, and it is to be noted that St. Paul's friendship was not permanently impaired either with him or with Mark (see Chrysostom, *in loco*, and *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 6). In Gal. ii. 13 St. Paul in speaking of Barnabas marks by implication his high estimate of his character and the expectations he had formed of him; **καὶ Β.** "even Barnabas" (Lightfoot, *Gal.*, *in loco*, and Hackett). According to tradition Barnabas remained in Cyprus until his death, and the appearance of Mark at a later stage may point to this; but although possibly Mark's rejoining Paul may have been occasioned by the death of Barnabas, the sources for the life of Barnabas outside the N.T. are quite untrustworthy, "Barnabas," B.D.[2]; Hackett, *Acts*, p. 192. Whatever his fortunes may have been, St. Luke did not estimate his work in the same category as that of Paul as a main factor in the development of the Church, although we must never forget that "twice over did Barnabas save Saul for the work of Christianity".—**Μάρκον**: In his two imprisonments St. Paul mentions Mark in terms of high approval, Col. iv. 10, 11, Philem. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 11. In the first imprisonment St. Paul significantly recommends him to the Colossians as being the cousin of Barnabas, one of his own fellow-labourers unto the kingdom of God, one amongst the few who had been a **παρηγορία**, a comfort unto him. In such words as these St. Paul breaks the silence of the years during which we hear nothing of the relations between him and Mark, although the same notice in *Colossians* seems to indicate an earlier reconciliation than the date of the letter, since the Churches of the Lycus valley had already been instructed to receive Mark if he passed that way, *Expositor*, August, 1897, "St. Mark in the N.T." (Dr. Swete), p. 85.

Ver. 40. **Π. δὲ ἐπιλεξ. Σ.**: not in the place of Mark, but in the place of Barnabas, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 171; having chosen, *i.e.*, for himself: *sibi eligere;* only in N.T. in this sense, but in classical Greek and in LXX, 1 Sam. ii. 28 A, 2 Sam. x. 9 R, Ecclus. vi. 18, 1 Esdras ix. 16, 1 Macc. i. 63 R, v. 17, etc.; "elegit ut socium, non ut ministrum" (Blass). If Silas had not returned to Jerusalem, but had remained in Antioch (see above on ver. 35), he had doubtless recommended himself to Paul by some special proof of fitness for dealing sympathetically with the relations of the Jewish Christians and the Gentile converts. This sympathy on the part of Silas would be the more marked and significant as he was himself almost certainly a Hebrew; otherwise we cannot account for his high position in the Jerusalem Church, ver. 22, although his Roman citizenship is implied in xvi. 37; perhaps this latter fact may account for his freedom from narrow Jewish prejudices. If we may identify, as we reasonably may, the Silas of Acts with the Silas (Silvanus) of the Epistles, 2 Cor. i. 19, 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1, 1 Pet. v. 12, the last mention of him by St. Peter becomes very suggestive. For St. Peter's First Epistle contains the names of the two men, Mark and Sil-

36. ΜΕΤΑ δέ τινας ἡμέρας εἶπε Παῦλος πρὸς Βαρνάβαν, Ἐπιστρέψαντες δὴ ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἡμῶν[1] κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν, ἐν

[1] ημων *om.* with ℵABCDE, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syrr. P. and H., Arm., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, and Hilg.

vanus, who had originally been members of the Jerusalem Church, Acts xii. 12, xv. 22, and moreover the two oldest of St. Paul's associates, whose brotherly Christian concord had been broken for the time (when Paul chose the latter in the place of Barnabas, and rejected Mark's services altogether), but who are now both found at St. Peter's side in Rome (assuming that Babylon is Rome), evidently at one with him and with each other; the one the bearer of a letter, the other the sender of greetings, to *Pauline* Churches. If St. Paul had passed to his rest, and the leader had thus changed, the teaching was the same, as the names of Silvanus and Mark assure us, and St. Peter takes up and carries on the work of the Apostle of the Gentiles, see Dr. Swete, *u. s.*, pp. 87, 88.—**ἐξῆλθε**, *cf.* Luke ix. 6, 3 John, ver. 7, where the word is used of going forth for missionary work.—**παραδοθεὶς**, *cf.* xiv. 26. Possibly we may infer that the Church took Paul's view of the point at issue between himself and Barnabas, but on the other hand we cannot prove this, because the writer's thoughts are so specially fixed upon Paul as the great and chief worker in the organisation and unification of the Church.

Ver. 41. **διήρχετο**, see above on xiii. 6.—**Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν**: as Barnabas had turned to Cyprus, the scene of his early labours in the Gospel, and perhaps also his own home, so Paul turned to Syria and Cilicia, not only because his home was in Cilicia, but also because he had worked there in his early Christian life and labours, *Gal.*, i., 21, 23. It is a coincidence with the notice in *Gal.* that St. Luke here and in ver. 23 presupposes the existence of Churches in Syria and Cilicia, although nothing had been previously said of their foundation, whilst the presence of Saul at Tarsus is twice intimated, ix. 30, xi. 25. Moreover the commencement of the letter, vv. 22, 23, indicates that these regions had been the centre of the teaching of the Judaisers, and St. Paul's presence, together with the fact that Silas, a prominent and leading member of the Jerusalem Church, was his colleague, would doubtless help to prevent further disquiet. On the addition to the verse in the Bezan text see critical note.

Additional note (1).

Amongst recent writers on the *Acts*, Mr. Rendall has stated that the evidence for the identification of Acts xv. with Gal. ii. 1-10 is overwhelming, *Appendix* to Acts, pp. 357, 359. If we cannot fully endorse this, it is at all events noticeable that critics of widely different schools of thought have refused to regard the alleged differences between the two as irreconcilable; in this conservative writers like Lechler, Godet, Belser, Knabenbauer and Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 627, 628; scientific critics, as we may call them, like Reuss, B. Weiss; and still more advanced critics like Lipsius and H. Holtzmann are agreed. This general agreement is recognised and endorsed by Wendt, p. 255 (1899), see also K. Schmidt, "Apostelkonvent," in *Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theol.* (Hauck), p. 704 ff. Amongst English writers Lightfoot, Hort, Sanday, Salmon, Drummond, Turner may be quoted on the same side (so too McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 208), (see for the points of agreement, Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 123; Drummond, *Galatians*, p. 73 ff.; Salmon, "Galatians," B.D.²; Reuss, *Geschichte des h. S. des N. T.*, p. 60, sixth edition, and very fully in Belser, *Die Selbstvertheidigung der h. Paulus im Galaterbriefe*, p. 83 ff., 1896; for the difficulty in identifying Gal. ii. with any other visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem, *cf.* Salmon, Lightfoot, *u. s.*, and Zahn, *u. s.*, Felten, *Introd.* to *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 46). But the recent forcible attempt of Professor Ramsay to identify Gal. ii. 1-10 with St. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, and not with the third visit, Acts xv., has opened up the whole question again (see on the same identification recently proposed from a very different point of view by Völter, *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 231, and also by Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 184). At first sight it is no doubt in favour of this conclusion that according to Acts the journey, xi. 30, is the second made by St. Paul to Jerusalem, and the journey in xv. the third, whilst Gal. ii. 1 also describes a journey which the Apostle

αἷς κατηγγείλαμεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου, πῶς ἔχουσι· 37.[1] Βαρνάβας δὲ ἐβουλεύσατο συμπαραλαβεῖν τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν καλούμενον Μάρκον·

[1] After πως εχουσι and at commencement of verse Syr. Harcl. mg. prefixes "placuit autem cogitatio Barnabæ," so Blass in β. εβουλευσατο, but with ℵABCE 13, 61, Vulg. verss., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, εβουλετο; D, Gig. εβουλευετο, so Hilg.

himself represents as his second to the mother-city. We cannot fairly solve this difficulty by cutting the knot with McGiffert, who regards Acts xi. 30 and xv. as = Gal. ii. 1-10, and thinks that Luke found two independent accounts of the same journey, and supposed them to refer to separate events (*Apostolic Age*, p. 171); or by concluding with Drummond, *Galatians*, p. 78, that the writer of Acts made a mistake in bringing St. Paul to Jerusalem at the time of the famine, so that Gal. ii. and Acts xv. both refer to his second visit (*cf.* to the same effect, Wendt, p. 218 (1899), who looks upon the visit described in xi. 25 as a mistake of the author, at all events as regards Paul). But McGiffert and Drummond are both right in emphasising one most important and, as it seems to us, crucial difficulty in the way of the view advocated by Ramsay; if he is correct, it is difficult to see any object in the visit described in Acts xv. After the decision already arrived at in Gal. ii. 1-10: Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, the question then *ex hypothesi* at issue could scarcely have been raised again in the manner described in Acts xv. Moreover, whilst Ramsay admits that another purpose was achieved by the journey to Jerusalem described in Gal. ii. 1-10, although only as a mere private piece of business, *St. Paul*, p. 57, he maintains that the special and primary object of the visit was to relieve the poor. But if the pillars of the Church were already aware, as *ex hypothesi* they must have been aware, that St. Paul came to Jerusalem bringing food and money for the poor (Acts xi. 29, 30), we may be pardoned for finding it difficult to believe that the "one charge alone" (Gal. ii. 10) which they gave him was to do the very thing which he actually came for the purpose of doing. If, too, Barnabas and Saul had just been associated in helping the poor, and if the expression ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα, Gal. ii. 10, refers, as Professor Ramsay holds, to this service, we should hardly have expected Paul to use the first person singular, but rather to have associated Barnabas with himself in his reference to their work of love and danger. Professor Ramsay emphasises the fact (*Expositor*, p. 183, March, 1896) that Luke *pointedly records* that the distribution was carried out to its completion by Barnabas and Saul in person (Acts xii. 25). Why then does Paul only refer to his own zeal in remembering the poor in Acts xi. 29, and xii. 25 = Gal. ii. 1-10? (On the force of the aorist as against Professor Ramsay's view, see *Expositor*, March, 1899, p. 221, Mr. Vernon Bartlet's note.) Gal. ii. 10 should rather be read in the light of 1 Cor. xvi. 1-3; if the first-named Epistle was also the first in point of time, then we can understand how, whilst it contains no specific and definite mention of a collection for the Church at Jerusalem, which is so emphasised in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 9, etc., yet the eager desire of the pillars of the Church that the poor in Judæa should be remembered, and the thought of a fund for supplying their needs, may well have been working in St. Paul's mind from the earlier time of the expression of that desire and need, Gal. ii. 10, *Expositor*, November, 1893, "Pauline Collection for the Saints,' and April, 1894, "The Galatians of St. Paul," Rendall Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 67.

For reasons why St. Paul did not refer to his second visit to Jerusalem when writing to the Galatians see on xi. 30, and Salmon, "Galatians," B.D.[2], p. 1111; Sanday, *Expositor*, February, 1896, p. 92; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 61; "Acts of the Apostles," p. 30, Hastings' B.D. and "Chron. of the N.T.," *ibid.*, p. 423; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 629. Further: Dr. Sanday has emphasised the fact that at the time of St. Paul's second visit to Jerusalem the state of things which we find in Acts xv. (the third visit) did not exist; that a stage in the controversy as to the terms of admission of Gentile converts had been reached by the date of Acts xv. which had not been reached at the date of xi. 30; that at this latter date, *e.g.*, there was no such clear demarcation of spheres between St. Peter and St. Paul, and that it is not until Acts xiii. 46 that the turning-point is actually

38. Παῦλος δὲ ἠξίου,[1] τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας, καὶ μὴ συνελθόντα αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἔργον,[2] μὴ συμπαραλαβεῖν τοῦτον.

[1] For ηξιου D reads ουκ εβουλετο λεγων.

[2] For μη συμπ. τουτον D reads τουτον μη ειναι συν αυτοις; see on the passage Weiss, Codex D, p. 83; but if Weiss is correct, it has been well asked, how came Paul to take Silas? Hilg. reads ιεναι for ειναι. συμπαραλαβειν, *cf.* ver. 37, but pres. infin. ℵABC 61, 180, Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Wendt, Weiss.

reached: henceforth St. Paul assumes his true "Apostleship of the Gentiles," and preaches a real "Gospel of the uncircumcision"; see especially *Expositor*, July, 1896, p. 62. Of course Professor Ramsay's theory obliges us to place Gal. ii. 1-10 *before* the Apostolic Conference, and to suppose that when the events narrated in Gal. ii. took place, the journey of Acts xiii., xiv. was still in the future. But is not the whole tone and attitude of St. Paul in Gal. ii. 1-10, placing himself, *e.g.*, before Barnabas in ver. 9 and evidently regarding himself as the foremost representative of one sphere of missionary work, as St. Peter was of the other, ver. 8, more easily explained if his first missionary journey was already an accomplished fact and not still in the future?

In the two short references to Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, it is still "Barnabas and Saul," so too in xiii. 1, 2, 7; not till xiii. 9 does the change come: henceforth Paul takes the lead, vv. 13, 16, 43, 45, 50, etc., with two exceptions as Professor Ramsay pointedly describes them (see above on xiii. 9), and in the account of the Conference and all connected with it St. Luke and the Church at Antioch evidently regard Paul as the leader, xv. 2 (2), 22 (although the Church at Jerusalem places Barnabas first, vv. 12, 25). But in xi. 30, xii. 25 the historian speaks of "Barnabas and Saul". The whole position of St. Paul assigned to him by St. Luke in Acts xv. is in harmony with the Apostle's own claims and prominence in Gal. ii. 1-10; it is not in harmony with the subordinate place which the same St. Luke assigns to him in the second visit to Jerusalem. In other words, if Gal. ii. 1-10 = Acts xv., then St. Paul's claim to be an Apostle of the Gentiles is ratified by the Gentile Luke; but if Gal. ii. 1-10 = Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, then there is no hint in Acts that Luke as yet regarded Paul in any other light than a subordinate to the Hebrew Barnabas; he is still Saul, not Paul. For the points of discrepancy between Gal. ii. 1-10 and Acts xv. see same authorities as above; one point upon which Ramsay strongly insists, *viz.*, that a visit which is said to be "by revelation," Gal. ii. 2, cannot be identified with a visit which takes place by the appointment of the Church, Acts xv. 2, is surely hypercritical; it would not be the first occasion on which the Spirit and the Church had spoken in harmony; in Acts xiii. 3, 4 the Church ἀπέλυσαν sent away Paul and Barnabas, and yet in the next verse we read οἱ ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 125; Drummond, *Galatians*, p. 75; Turner, "Chronology of the N.T.," Hastings' B.D., p. 424; *cf.* also Wendt, p. 258 (1899), and Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 632, who both point out that the statements referred to are by no means mutually exclusive. On the whole question see Wendt's 1899 edition, p. 255 ff., and *Expositor*, 1896 (February, March, April, July) for its full discussion by Dr. Sanday and Professor Ramsay.

A further question arises as to the position to be assigned to the incident in Gal. ii. 11-14. Professor Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 157 ff., supposes that it took place *before* the Apostolic Conference, and finds a description of the occasion of the incident in Acts xv. 1, Acts xv. 24, Gal. ii. 12, *i.e.*, in the words of three authorities, St. Luke, the Apostles at Jerusalem, and St. Paul himself; the actual conflict between St. Peter and St. Paul took place after the latter's second visit to Jerusalem, but before his third visit. The issue of the conflict is not described by Paul, but it is implied in the events of the Jerusalem Conference, Acts xv. 2, 7. Barnabas had wavered, but had afterwards joined Paul; Peter had been rebuked, but had received the rebuke in such a way as to become a champion of freedom in the ensuing Conference, employing to others the argument which had convinced himself, *cf.* Acts xv. 10, Gal. ii. 14. Mr. Turner, "Chronology of the N.T.," Hastings' B.D., i., 424, is inclined to adopt this view, which identifies the two Judaising missions from Jerusalem to Antioch, Gal.

39. ἐγένετο οὖν παροξυσμός, ὥστε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, τόν[1] τε Βαρνάβαν παραλαβόντα τὸν Μάρκον ἐκπλεῦσαι εἰς Κύπρον·

[1] D amplifies after αλληλων τοτε Β. παραλαβ. τον Μ. επλευσεν εις Κ., so Blass and Hilg. Weiss sees in τοτε a characteristic of D; *cf.* ii. 37.

ii. 12 and Acts xv. 1, while he still maintains the ordinary view that Gal. ii. 1-10 = Acts xv. This, as he points out, we may easily do, whilst Gal. ii. 11-14 may be allowed to precede Gal. ii. 1-10 in order of time, and in the absence of the ἔπειτα in Gal. i. 18, 21, ii. 1 there is nothing to suggest that the chronological series is continued. It may be noted that Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, v., 9, had remarked that there is nothing to hinder us from supposing that the dispute at Antioch was prior to the Conference at Jerusalem. Moreover it may be fairly urged that this view puts a more favourable construction on the conduct of St. James and St. Peter in relation to the compact which they had made with Paul at the Jerusalem Conference. But on the attitude of St. James and the expression ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, see Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 79; Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 12; Drummond, *Galatians*, p. 85; and with regard to the conduct of St. Peter, see Hort, *u. s.*, p. 76; Lightfoot on the collision at Antioch, *Galatians*, p. 125 ff.; and Salmon, "Galatians," B.D.², p. 1114; Drummond, *u. s.*, p. 78.

On Zahn's position that the dispute between Peter and Paul took place before the Apostolic Conference, when the former betook himself to Antioch after his liberation, Acts xii. 5 ff., a view put forward also by Schneckenburger, *Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 109 ff., see *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, p. 435 ff., 1894, and Belser's criticism, *Die Selbstvertheidigung des h. Paulus im Galaterbriefe*, p. 127 ff., 1896 (*Biblische Studien*).

Wendt, pp. 211, 212 (1899), while declining to attempt any explanation either psychological or moral of St. Peter's action in Gal. ii. 11-14, points out with justice how perverse it is to argue that Peter could not have previously conducted himself with reference to Cornelius as Acts describes when we remember that in the incident before us Barnabas, who had been the constant companion of St. Paul in the Gentile mission, shared nevertheless in St. Peter's weakness.

Additional note (2), *cf.* ver. 29.

A further question arises as to why the particular prohibitions of the Decree are mentioned. According to a very common view they represented the Seven Precepts of Noah, six of which were said to have been given by God to Adam, while the seventh was given as an addition to Noah. The Seven Precepts were as follows: (1) against profanation of God's name; (2) against idolatry; (3) against fornication; (4) against murder; (5) against theft; (6) to obey those in authority; (7) against eating living flesh, *i.e.*, flesh with the blood in it, see Schürer *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 318, E.T.; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 69. No doubt there are points of contact between these Precepts and the four Prohibitions of the Decree, but at the same time it would seem that there are certainly four of the Precepts to which there is nothing corresponding in the Decree. The Precepts were binding on every *Gêr Toshav*, a stranger sojourning in the land of Israel, but it has been erroneously supposed that the *Gêr Toshav* = σεβόμενος, and thus the conclusion is drawn that the idea of the four prohibitions was to place Gentiles on the footing of σεβόμενοι in the Christian community. Against this identification of the *Gêr Toshav* and the σεβόμενος Schürer's words are decisive, *u. s.*, pp. 318, 319. But if this view was valid historically, the position of the Gentile Christians under such conditions would have been far from satisfactory, and we cannot suppose that Paul would have regarded any such result as a success; still circumcision and the keeping of the law would have been necessary to entitle a man to the full privilege of the Christian Church and name. Ritschl, who takes practically the same view as Wendt below, admits that in a certain degree the Gentile Christians would be regarded as in an inferior position to the Jewish Christians, *Altkatholische Kirche*, pp. 131, 133, second edition.

It seems even more difficult to trace the prohibitions of the Decree to the Levitical prohibitions, Lev. xvii., xviii., which were binding on strangers or sojourners in Israel (LXX προσήλυτοι), since, if the written law was to be the source of the Jerusalem prohibitions, it is inexplicable that the variations from it both in matter and number should be

40. Παῦλος δὲ ἐπιλεξάμενος Σίλαν ἐξῆλθε, παραδοθεὶς τῇ χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ[1] ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. 41. διήρχετο δὲ τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν,

[1] **του Θεου**, *cf.* xiv. 26, but best **του Κ.** with ℵAB(D), Vulg. (am. fu. demid. tol.), Sah., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg.

so observable (Hort, *u. s.*, p. 70); and although Wendt (so Ritschl, Overbeck, Lipsius, Zöckler, Holtzmann, and others; see on the other hand, Weiss, *Biblische Theol.*, p. 145; Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 297; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 306; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, i., 72, 73, 1896) adopts the view that in the four prohibitions of the Jerusalem Decree we have the form in which prohibitions binding upon proselytes in the wider sense, *i.e.*, upon the uncircumcised φοβούμ. or σεβ. τὸν Θεόν, existed in the Apostolic days, he can only say that this is "very probable": of direct historical evidence, as Zöckler admits, there is none. The difficulty is so great in supposing that Paul and Barnabas could have submitted to the distinction drawn between the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians that it has led to doubts as to the historical character of the decree. Weizsäcker and McGiffert maintain that the decree was formulated after Paul's departure, when James had reconsidered the matter, and had determined that some restriction should be put upon the complete Gentile liberty which had been previously granted. But this view can only be maintained by the sacrifice of xvi. 4, where Paul is distinctly said to have given the decrees to the Churches to keep.

Ramsay, agreeing with Lightfoot, calls the Decree a compromise, and although, as he points out, it seems impossible to suppose that St. Paul would have endorsed a decree which thus made mere points of ritual compulsory, it is probable, he thinks, that after the exordium in which the Jewish party had been so emphatically condemned, the concluding part of the Decree would be regarded as a strong recommendation that the four points should be observed in the interests of peace and amity (*St. Paul*, p. 172). In a previous passage, p. 167, he seems to take a very similar view to Wendt, who answers the question as to how the Precepts of the Decree were to be observed by the Gentile converts by maintaining that they were an attempt to make intercourse more feasible between the Jewish Christians and their Gentile brethren, p. 265 (1899).

We naturally ask why the Decree apparently fell so quickly into abeyance, and why it did not hold good over a wider area, since in writing to Corinth and Rome St. Paul never refers to it. But, to say nothing of the principle laid down in the reading of Codex D (see above on p. 323), St. Paul's language in 1 Cor. viii. 1-13, x. 14-22, Rom. xiv., may be fairly said to possess the spirit of the Decree, and to mark the discriminating wisdom of one eager to lead his disciples behind the rule to the principle; and there is no more reason to doubt the historical truth of the compact made in the Jerusalem Decree, because St. Paul never expressly refers to it, than there is to throw doubt upon his statement in Gal. ii. 10, because he does not expressly refer to it as an additional motive for urging the Corinthians to join in the collection for the poor saints, 2 Cor. viii. 9. But further, there is a sufficient answer to the above question in the fact that the Decree was ordained for the Churches which are specifically mentioned, *viz.*, those of Antioch (placed first as the centre of importance, not only as the local capital of Syria, but as the mother of the Gentile Churches, the Church from which the deputation had come), Syria and Cilicia. In these Churches Jewish prejudice had made itself felt, and in these Churches with their constant communication with Jerusalem the Decree would be maintained. The language of St. James in xxi. 25 proves that some years later reference was naturally made to the Decree as a standard still regulating the intercourse between Jewish and Gentile Christians, at least in Jerusalem, and we may presume in the Churches neighbouring. St. Paul's attitude towards the Decree is marked by loyal acceptance on the one hand, and on the other by a deepening recognition of his own special sphere among the Gentiles as the Apostle of the Gentiles, Gal. ii. 9. Thus we find him delivering the Decrees to the Churches of his first missionary journey, xvi. 4, although those Churches were not mentioned in the address of the Decree (no mention is made of the same action on his part towards the Churches in Syria

and Cilicia, xv. 41, doubtless because they were already aware of the enactments prescribed). It may well be that St. Paul regarded himself as the missionary-Apostle of the Church at Antioch, sent forth from that Church for a special work, and that he would recognise that if the Antiochian Christians were to be loyal to the compact of Jerusalem, he as their representative and emissary must enforce the requirements of that compact in revisiting those regions in which the converts had been so instrumental in causing the Decree to be enacted.

But the work upon which he had been specially sent forth from Antioch had been fulfilled, xiv. 27; the Conference at Jerusalem had assigned a wider and a separate sphere to his labours; henceforth his Apostleship to the Gentiles εἰς τὰ ἔθνη was more definitely recognised, and more abundantly fulfilled; and in what may be called strictly Gentile Churches, in Churches not only further removed from Palestine, but in which his own Apostleship was adequate authority, he may well have felt that he was relieved from enforcing the Decree. In these Churches the stress laid upon such secondary matters as "things strangled and blood" would simply have been a cause of perplexity, a burden too heavy to bear, the source of a Christianity maimed by Jewish particularism, see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 127, 305; Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 88, 89; *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 74; *Speaker's Commentary*, Acts, p. 325; Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 254; "Apostelkonvent," K. Schmidt in *Real-Encyclopädie für protest. Theol.* (Hauck), pp. 710, 711 (1896); Wendt, p. 269 (1899); and for the after-history of the Decree, K. Schmidt, *u. s.*, Lightfoot, *u .s.*, Plumptre, Felten, and *cf.* also Hooker's remarks, *Eccles. Pol.*, iv., 11, 5 ff.

On the attempt to place the Apostolic Conference at Jerusalem *before* chaps. xiii. and xiv., see *Apostelgeschichte*, Wendt (1899), pp. 254, 255, and McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 181. Weizsäcker adopts this view because no mention is made in Gal. i. 21 of the missionary journey in Acts xiii., xiv., and he therefore maintains that it could only have taken place after the Conference, but the Epistle does not require that Paul should give a complete account of all his missionary experiences outside Judæa; he is only concerned to show how far he was or was not likely to have received his Gospel from the older Apostles.

Moreover, it is very difficult to find a place for the close companionship of Paul and Barnabas, and their mutual labours in xiii., xiv. subsequent to the incident described in Gal. ii. 13, whether that incident took place just before or just after the Jerusalem Conference; in either case a previous mutual association between Paul and Barnabas in mission work amongst the Gentiles, such as that described in Acts xiii., xiv., accounts for the expectations Paul had evidently formed of Barnabas, Gal. ii. 13, and also for the position which the latter holds in Gal. ii. 1-10.

Space forbids us to make more than a very brief reference to the attempts to break up chap. xv. into various sources. Spitta, who places the whole section xv. 1-33 before chap. xiii., refers vv. 1-4, 13-33 to his inferior source B, which the reviser has wrongly inserted here instead of in its proper place after xii. 24, and has added vv. 5-12. Clemen in the same section, which he regards as an interpolation, assigns vv. 1-4, 13-18, 20-22, to his Redactor Judaicus, and vv. 5-12, 19, 23-33 to Redactor Antijudaicus. Clemen, like Spitta, holds that ver. 34 simply takes up again xiv. 28; further, he regards xxi. 17-20a as the source of xv. 1-4, but Jüngst cautiously remarks that there is nothing strange in the fact that an author should use similar expressions to describe similar situations (p. 146)—a piece of advice which he might himself have remembered with advantage on other occasions. Hilgenfeld's "author to Theophilus" plays a large part in the representation of the negotiations at Jerusalem in respect to the Conference and the Decree, and this representation is based, according to Hilgenfeld, upon the narrative of the conversion of Cornelius which the same author had formerly embellished, although not without some connection with tradition (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 59 ff., 1896). Still more recently Wendt (1899) credits the author of Acts with a tolerably free revision of the tradition he had received, with a view of representing the harmony between Paul and the original Apostles in the clearest light: thus the speeches of Peter and James in xv. are essentially his composition; but Wendt concludes by asserting that it seems in his judgment impossible to separate exactly the additions made by the author of Acts from the tradition, another note of caution against hasty subjective conclusions.

CHAPTER XVI.—Ver. 1. **κατήντησε**: only in Luke and Paul, nine times in Acts, four times in Paul, xviii. 19, 24, xx.

ἐπιστηρίζων τὰς ἐκκλησίας.[1] XVI. 1.[2] Κατήντησε δὲ εἰς Δέρβην καὶ Λύστραν· καὶ ἰδού, μαθητής τις ἦν ἐκεῖ ὀνόματι Τιμόθεος, υἱὸς γυναικός τινος Ἰουδαίας πιστῆς, πατρὸς δὲ Ἕλληνος· 2. ὃς ἐμαρ-

[1] At end of verse D, Gig., Vulg., Syr. H. mg. add **παραδιδους τε και εντολας των αποστολων και (αποστ. και** *om.* D, Cassiod) **πρεσβυτερων**, so Blass in **β** and Hilg. (*cf.* vv. 5, 12 for omission of **αποστολοι** in **β**). The words look like an obvious addition, *cf.* xvi. 4, but Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 73, defends as "very interesting," as showing that whilst the mission of Judas and Silas was limited to Antioch, Paul was afterwards in person the bearer of the decree to the Churches in Syria and Cilicia; see however Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 173, 174; *C. R. E.*, p. 87.

[2] Before **εις Δ. και** with AB, Boh., Syr. Harcl. text, so W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, R.V. ℵAB 61 insert **εις** before **Λ.**, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt. **τινος** *om.* with ℵABCDE 61, Vulg., many verss., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. After **γυν.** 25 (Gig., Prov., Wern.) has **χηρας**—Blass rejects. At beginning of verse D, Syr. Harcl. mg. (Gig., Cassiod.) prefix **διελθων δε τα εθνη ταυτα**, to show that Lystra and Derbe were not included in Syria and Cilicia, so also the **και** in AB may point to the same reason; see Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 87.

15, xxi. 7, xxv. 13, xxvi. 7, xxvii. 12, xxviii. 13, 1 Cor. x. 11, xiv. 36, Ephes. iv. 13, Phil. iii. 11. But whilst in St. Paul it is used in a figurative sense, it is used eight times by St. Luke of arriving at a place and making some stay there, *cf.* 2 Macc. iv. 21, 44. The fact that the verb is thus used frequently in the second part of Acts and not in i.-xii. is surely easily accounted for by the subjects of the narrative (Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 147).—**εἰς Δέρβην καὶ Λ.**: if we read **εἰς** before **Λ.**, also (see critical note): "he came also to Derbe and to Lystra". The purpose was implied in xv. 36, but here places mentioned in the inverse order of xiv. 6 since coming from Cilicia through the "Cilician Gates" St. Paul would visit Derbe first, see Hastings' B.D., "Derbe" (Ramsay). The two places are grouped together as a *region* according to the Roman classification (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 110, 179). The second **εἰς** before **Λ.** marks that while Derbe is mentioned as a place visited, Lystra is the scene of the events in the sequel.—**καὶ ἰδού**: indicating the surprising fact that a successor to Mark was found at once (so Weiss); whilst Hort still more significantly marks the form of the phrase by pointing out that St. Luke reserves it for sudden and as it were providential interpretations, *Ecclesia*, p. 179, *cf.* i. 10, viii. 17, x. 17, xi. 7: however disheartening had been the rupture with Barnabas, in Timothy Paul was to find another "son of consolation," *cf.* Hort's comment on 1 Tim. i. 18 in this connection, *u. s.*, pp. 179-185. It must not however be forgotten that there are good reasons for seeing in Timothy not the successor of Barnabas (this was Silas), but of Mark. It could hardly be said of one in the position of Silas that he was like Mark a **ὑπηρέτης**, on a mere subordinate footing, whereas on the other hand the difference of age between Barnabas and Timothy, and their relative positions to St. Paul would have naturally placed Timothy in a subordinate position from the first.—**ἐκεῖ**, *i.e.*, at Lystra, most probably. The view that reference is made not to Lystra but to Derbe arises from supposing that in xx. 4 the word **Δερβαῖος** refers to Timothy and not to Gaius, the truth being that Timothy is not described because already well known. Certainly the fact that his character was testified of by those of Lystra, as well as St. Paul's reference to Lystra in 2 Tim. iii. 11, seems to favour Lystra as being at all events the home of Timothy, if not his birthplace. There is no reason why the Gaius mentioned as of Macedonia, xix. 29, should be identified with the Gaius of xx. 4. Gaius was a very common name, and in the N.T. we have apparently references to four persons bearing the name. Blass however refers **Δερβαῖος** in xx. 4 to Timothy.—**υἱὸς γυναικός τ. Ἰουδ. πιστῆς π. δὲ Ε.**: such marriages although forbidden by the law, Ezra x. 2, were sanctioned under certain conditions, *cf.* xxiv. 24 in the case of Drusilla, wife of Aziz, king of Emesa (see also C. and H., p. 203), who became a proselyte and actually accepted circumcision. In the Diaspora such marriages would probably be more or less frequent, especially if the husband became a proselyte. In this case even if he were ranked as one,

τυρεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν Λύστροις καὶ Ἰκονίῳ ἀδελφῶν. 3. τοῦτον ἠθέλησεν ὁ Παῦλος σὺν αὐτῷ ἐξελθεῖν, καὶ λαβὼν περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς τόποις ἐκείνοις· ᾔδεισαν

it could only have been as a "proselyte of the gate," otherwise Timothy would surely have been circumcised. We cannot argue from the fact that the boy had been trained in the Jewish Scriptures that his father was a proselyte, for the early training of the child was evidently the work of the mother, 2 Tim. iii. 15. But such a duty according to Jewish law rested primarily upon the father, and the fact that the father here is described as a Greek, without any qualifying adjective as in the case of the wife, indicates that he was a heathen, see Weiss, *in loco;* Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 115. The mother, Eunice (on spelling see Hastings' B.D.), may conceivably have been a proselyte, as the name is Greek, as also that of Lois, but Ἰουδ. seems to indicate that she was a Jewess by birth. Whether she was a widow or not we cannot say, although there is some evidence, see critical note, which points to the influence of some such tradition. On the picture of a Jewish home, and the influence of a Jewish mother, see Edersheim, *u. s.*—**πιστῆς**: Lydia uses the same term of herself in ver. 15. Both mother and son were probably converted in St. Paul's former visit, and there is no reason to suppose with Nösgen that the conversion of the latter was a proof of the growth of the Church in the Apostle's absence.

Ver. 2. **ἐμαρτυρεῖτο**, *cf.* vi. 3, x. 22, xxii. 12. The good report which may well have been formed to some extent by the aptitude and fitness which Timothy had shown in the Church during St. Paul's absence may also have helped the Apostle in the selection of his future companion. The union of Lystra and Iconium is quite natural for common intercourse, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 178. There is no reason to suppose with Rendall that Iconium would be the home of Eunice, as the synagogue and principal Jewish colony were there, see Edersheim, *u. s.*

Ver. 3. **περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν**: the act might be performed by *any Israelite; cf.* Gen. xvii. 23 for a similar phrase which may indicate that St. Baul performed the act himself. See also Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii., 674; the marriage and the exemption of Timothy from the Mosaic law may be regarded as typical of a relaxation of the exclusive Jewish standard in Lycaonia and Phrygia, and an approximation of the Jew to the pagan population around him, confirmed as it is by the evidence of inscriptions.—**διὰ τοὺς Ἰ.**: the true answer to the objection raised against Paul's conduct may be found in his own words, 1 Cor. ix. 20 (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 19). As a missionary he would have to make his way amongst the unbelieving Jews in the parts which were most hostile to him, *viz.*, Antioch and Iconium, on his road into Asia. All along this frequented route of trade he would find colonies of Jews in close communication, and the story of Timothy's parentage would be known (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 180). But if so, his own usefulness and that of Timothy would be impaired, since his Jewish countrymen would take offence at seeing him in close intercourse with an uncircumcised person (a reason which McGiffert admits to be conceivable, *Apostolic Age*, p. 232), and Timothy would have been unacceptable to them, since with a Jewish mother and with a Jewish education he would be regarded as one who refused to adhere to the Jewish rule: "partus sequitur ventrem" (see Wetstein and Nösgen), and to remedy the one fatal flaw which separated him from them: see, however, B. Weiss, *Die Briefe Pauli an T.*, Introd., p. 2, who disagrees with this reason, whilst he lays stress on the other reason mentioned above. On the other hand, both among unbelieving and Christian Jews alike the circumcision of Timothy would not fail to produce a favourable impression. Amongst the former the fact that the convert thus submitted even in manhood to this painful rite would have afforded the clearest evidence that neither he nor his spiritual father despised the seal of the covenant for those who were Jews according to the flesh, whilst the Christian Jews would see in the act a loyal adherence to the Jerusalem decree. It was no question of enforcing circumcision upon Timothy as if it were necessary to salvation; it was simply a question of what was necessary under the special circumstances in which both he and Paul were to seek to gain a hearing for the Gospel on the lines of the Apostolic policy: "to the Jew first, and also to the Greek"; "neque salutis æternæ causa Timotheus circumciditur, sed utilitatis,

γὰρ ἅπαντες [1] τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, ὅτι Ἕλλην ὑπῆρχεν. 4.[2] ὡς δὲ διεπορεύοντο τὰς πόλεις, παρεδίδουν αὐτοῖς φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ. 5. αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ πίστει, καὶ ἐπερίσσευον τῷ ἀριθμῷ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν.

[1] ℵABC 13, 31, 180, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aeth[wi.]; W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt read οτι Ελλην ο πατηρ αυτου υπηρχεν; Blass, Hilg., Tisch. follow T.R. (DEHLP).

[2] D, Gig. read διερχομενοι δε τας πολεις; D, Syr. Harcl. mg. continue εκηρυσσον αυτοις μετα πασης παρρησιας τον κυριον Ιησουν Χριστον, and D adds αμα παραδιδοντες και τας εντολας των αποστ. . . ., see Weiss, Codex D, p. 85, who regards the addition as made to account for the growth of the Church described in ver. 5, but also *cf.* Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 158.

Blass, *cf.* Godet, *Epître aux Romains*, i., pp. 43, 44; Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 85-87; Knabenbauer, *in loco*. "There is no time in Paul's life when we should suppose him less likely to circumcise one of his converts," says McGiffert, *u. s.*, p. 233, but there were converts and converts, and none has pointed out more plainly than McGiffert that the case of Titus and that of Timothy stood on totally different grounds, and none has insisted on this more emphatically than St. Paul himself: **ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ Τίτος**, *Gal.* ii. 3. The case of Titus was a case of principle: Titus was a Greek, and if St. Paul had yielded, there would have been no need for the Apostle's further attendance at the conference as the advocate of freedom for the Gentile Churches. In the words **Ἕλλην ὤν**, *Gal.* ii. 3, there may have been a tacit allusion to the different position of Timothy, whose parentage was different, and not wholly Gentile as in the case of Titus. For a defence of the historical nature of the incident as against the strictures of Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, Weizsäcker, see Wendt, 1898 and 1899, who regards St. Paul's action as falling under the Apostle's own principle, 1 Cor. ix. 19.—**ὑπῆρχεν**: Blass translates *fuerat*, and sees in the word an intimation that the father was no longer living, otherwise we should have **ὑπάρχει**, *cf.* Salmon, *Hermathena*, xxi., p. 229.

Ver. 4. A proof of St. Paul's loyalty to the Jerusalem compact. The decree had not been delivered in Syria and Cilicia (where the letter had been already received), but in Galatia St. Paul delivers it. Wendt regards vv. 4 and 5 as interpolated by the author, who desires to give a universal importance to the decree which had previously been read to a few specified Churches (so too Spitta, Jüngst, Hilgenfeld, Clemen, who refers the verses to his Redactor Antijudaicus). But St. Paul might well feel himself bound to deliver the decree to the Churches evangelised by him before the conference in Jerusalem. Weiss, therefore, is probably right in pointing out that as no mention is again made of any similar proceeding, the action was confined to the Pauline Churches which had been previously founded, Churches which were, as it were, daughter Churches of Antioch.—**δόγματα**: in the N.T. only in Luke and Paul (cannot be supported in Heb. xi. 23), and only here of the decrees of the Christian Church relative to right living, *cf.* Ignat., *Magnes.*, xiii., 1; *Didachê*, xi., 3. In 3 Macc. i. 3 it is used of the rules and requirements of the Mosaic Law, *cf.* its use by Philo, see further Plummer on *Luke* ii. 1, and Grimm, *sub v.* Dr. Hort refers the word back to xv. 22, **ἔδοξεν**, and so **κεκρ.** to **κρίνω**, xv. 19 (*cf.* xxi. 25), used by St. James. In these expressions he sees "more than advice," but "less than a command," and so here he regards "resolutions" as more nearly expressing the force of this passage, *Ecclesia*, pp. 81, 82; see however above on xv. 19.

Ver. 5. **αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκ.**: the last time **ἐκκλησία** is used by St. Luke, except of the Jerusalem Church, and in the peculiar case of the elders at Ephesus, Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 95. Rendall, *Appendix*, **μὲν οὖν**, p. 165, connects this verse with the following paragraph, *cf.* ix. 31, so apparently Blass in **β**.—**ἐστερεοῦντο**: only used in N.T. in Acts, *cf.* iii. 7, 16, and only here in this figurative sense, and it is very possible that St. Luke as a medical man might thus employ the verb which he had twice used in its literal sense, *cf.* similar instances in Hobart's *Introd.*, p. xxxii.; here as in vi. 7, ix. 31, we have the outward growth of numbers and the inward in the stead-

6.[1] **Διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν, κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, 7.[2] ἐλθόντες κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν ἐπείραζον κατὰ τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορεύεσθαι· καὶ οὐκ**

[1] **διελθοντες** HLP, . . . Chrys.; **διηλθον** ℵABCDE 61, Syrr. Pesh.-Harcl., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. This latter has therefore overwhelming evidence in its favour, however the passage may be interpreted. **την Γαλ.**, *om.* **την** ℵABCD 13, 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. Par. reads "Phrygiam et Galatie regiones," and so Blass in **β**: **την Φρυγιαν και τας Γαλατικας χωρας** (*i.e.*, "vicos Galatiæ"). Belser, following Blass, sees in the expression sufficient to destroy the South Galatian theory. *cf. Beiträge*, p. 74. But it can scarcely be said that this reading in Par. is of any special value.

[2] **ελθοντες κατα**, but **δε** after **ελθ.** in ℵABC(D)E 13, 61, Vulg., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss. Blass and Hilg. read **γενομενοι** for **ελθοντες**. **κατα την Β.**, but **εις** in ℵABCD, Epiph., Did., Cyr., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. **πορευεσθαι** CDHLP, so Hilg., but **-θηναι** ℵABE 31, 61, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt, Weiss. **πνευμα**, add **Ιησου** ℵABC²DE, Vulg., Syrr. Pesh.-Harcl., Boh., Arm^codd. 3^, Aeth^ut.^, Did., Cyr., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; for a gloss one would have added **το αγιον**, *cf.* ver. 6, but the expression **πνευμα Ι.** is not found elsewhere in N.T. For **επειραζον** D reads **ηθελαν**, so Blass in **β**, and Hilg.; see Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 88.

fast holding of the faith, extensive and intensive.

Ver. 6. **διελθόντες δὲ τὴν Φ. καὶ τὴν Γ. χώραν**, see critical notes, and also additional note at the end of chap. xviii. If we follow R.V. text and omit the second **τὴν**, and regard both **Φ.** and **Γ.** as adjectives with Ramsay and Lightfoot (so Weiss and Wendt, *cf.* adjective **Πισιδίαν**, xiii. 14; but see also xviii. 23), under the *vinculum* of the one article we have one district, "the Phrygo-Galatic country," *i.e.*, ethnically Phrygian, politically Galatian; see also Turner, "Chronology of the N.T.," Hastings' B.D., i., 422, and "The Churches of Galatia," Dr. Gifford, *Expositor*, July, 1894. But Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., 134, objects that if Ramsay sees in ver. 6 a recapitulation of the journey, and action in vv. 4 and 5, and includes under the term Phrygo-Galatia the places visited in the first missionary journey, we must include under the term not only Iconium and Antioch, but also Derbe and Lystra. But the two latter, according to xiv. 6, are not Phrygian at all, but Lycaonian. Ramsay, however, sufficiently answers this objection by the distinction which he draws between the phrase before us in xvi. 6 and the phrase used in xviii. 23: **τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν**. In the verse before us reference is made to the country traversed by Paul after he left Lystra, and so we have quite correctly the territory about Iconium and Antioch described as Phrygo-Galatic; but in xviii. 23 Lystra and Derbe are also included, and therefore we might expect "Lycaono-Galatic and Phrygo-Galatic," but to avoid this complicated phraseology the writer uses the simple phrase: "the Galatic country," while Phrygia denotes either Phrygia Galatica or Phrygia Magna, or both, and see Ramsay, ***Church in the Roman Empire***, pp. 77 and 91-93, and ***Expositor***, August, 1898. Dr. Gifford, in his valuable contribution to the controversy between Prof. Ramsay and Dr. Chase, *Expositor*, July 1894, while rejecting the North-Galatian theory, would not limit the phrase "the Phrygian and Galatian region" to the country about Iconium and Antioch with Ramsay, but advocates an extension of its meaning to the borderlands of Phrygia and Galatia northward of Antioch.—**κωλυθέντες**: a favourite word in St. Luke, both in Gospel and Acts, six times in each, *cf.* viii. 36, x. 47. How the hindrance was effected we are not told, whether by inward monitions, or by prophetic intimations, or by some circumstances which were regarded as providential warnings: "wherefore they were forbidden he does not say, but that they were forbidden he does say—teaching us to obey and not ask questions," Chrys., *Hom.*, xxxiv. On the construction of **κωλυθ.** with **διῆλθον** (see critical notes) *cf.* Ramsay, ***Church in the Roman Empire***, p. 89; ***St. Paul***, p. 211; ***Expositor*** (Epilogue), April, 1894, and Gifford, *u. s.*, pp. 11 and 19. Both writers point out that the South Galatian theory need not depend upon this construction, whether we render it according to A.V. or R.V.,

εἴασεν αὐτοὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα. 8.[1] παρελθόντες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν, κατέβησαν εἰς Τρῳάδα. 9. καὶ ὅραμα διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ὤφθη τῷ Παύλῳ[2]· ἀνήρ τις ἦν Μακεδὼν ἑστώς, παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγων, Διαβὰς εἰς

[1] For **παρελθοντες** D, Gig., Vulg. read **διελθοντες**, so Blass ("recte ') in **α** and **β**. But the meaning of **παρελ.** is disputed. In its ordinary sense of "passing alongside" it can hardly stand, or even "passing along Mysia," *i.e.*, on border of Mysia and Bithynia (Weiss, Codex D, p. 26), as the travellers to reach Troas would pass through Mysia, see below in comment. It seems unlikely that **διελθ.**, a common word, should be changed to **παρελθ.**—the converse is far more probable; see also Harris, *Four Lectures, etc.*, p. 83, note. For **κατεβησαν** D has **κατηντησαν**: "nos venimus," Iren., iii., 14, 1; see especially Harris, *u. s.*, pp. 64, 65.

[2] In R.V. (**ανηρ**) **Μακεδων τις ην**, so ℵABCD² 13, 31, 61, Vulg., so Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; **Μακ. τις**, *om.* **ην** DE; so D reads also **εν οραματι**, and before **ανηρ** D, Syr.-Pesh., Sah. insert **ωσει**. After **εστως** D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Sah. add **κατα προσωπον αυτου**. Belser points out that the phrase occurs only in Luke, Luke ii. 31, Acts iii. 13, xxv. 16, and regards it as original; but see also Corssen, *u. s.*, pp. 436, 437, who compares **α** and **β**, and holds that in the latter the reviser has purposely added words for clearness in the description. Blass in **β** and Hilg. both read these additions.

see further Askwith, *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 46, 1899.

Ver. 7. **κατὰ τὴν Μ.**: "over against Mysia," R.V., *i.e.*, opposite Mysia, or perhaps, on the outskirts of Mysia, *cf.* xxvii. 7, and Herod., i., 76, **κατὰ Σινώπην**, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 194, Wendt, p. 354 (1888), and Gifford, *u. s.*, p. 13. If we read **εἰς** for **κατά** (2), it means that they endeavoured to go out of Asia into the Roman province Bithynia on the north, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 195.—**ἐπείραζον**: for a similar use of the verb *cf.* ix. 26, xxiv. 6.—**τὸ Πνεῦμα**, add **Ἰησοῦ**, see critical note. Doctrinally, the expression shows that the Spirit may be called the Spirit of Christ, *Rom.* viii. 9, or of Jesus, no less than the Spirit of God, *Rom.*, *l. c.*, Matt. x. 20; see Westcott, *Historic Faith*, p. 106.

Ver. 8. **παρελθόντες**: "passing by Mysia". Ramsay renders "neglecting Mysia," *cf. St. Paul*, pp. 194, 196, 197, *i.e.*, passing through it without preaching. McGiffert, p. 235, so Wendt (1899), following Ramsay. Rendall, p. 278, explains "passing along or alongside of Mysia," *i.e.*, skirting it, the southern portion of it. The words cannot mean passing by without entering. Mysia was part of Asia, but there was no disobedience to the divine command, which, while it forbade them to preach in Mysia did not forbid them to enter it. Troas could not be reached without crossing Mysia; Blass sees this clearly enough (but note his reading): "non prætereunda sed transeunda erat Mysia, ut ad Ægæum mare venirent," Blass, *in loco*, *cf.* also Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 76; Wendt (1899), *in loco*.—**Τρῳάδα**: a town on the sea coast (Alexandria Troas, in honour of Alexander the Great), a Roman colony and an important port for communication between Europe and the north-west of Asia Minor, opposite Tenedos, but not to be identified with *New Ilium*, which was built on the site of ancient Troy, considerably further north. It was not reckoned as belonging to either of the provinces Asia or Bithynia, *cf.* also xx. 5, 2 Cor. ii. 13, 2 Tim. iv. 13: C. and H., pp. 215 and 544, Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 128, Zöckler, *in loco*.

Ver. 9. **καὶ ὅραμα**: used by St. Luke eleven times in Acts elsewhere (in N.T. only once, Matt. xvii. 19), three times in i.-xii., and eight times in xii.-xxviii. (see Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 144). But St. Luke never uses **ὄναρ**; sometimes **ὅρ. διὰ νυκτός** as here, sometimes **ὅρ.** alone. It is quite arbitrary on the part of Baur, Zeller, Overbeck to interpret this as a mere symbolical representation by the author of the Acts of the eagerness of the Macedonians for the message of salvation; see as against this view not only Wendt and Zöckler but Spitta, p. 331. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, ii., p. 189, 1896, thinks that the "author to Theophilus" here used and partly transcribed an account of one of the oldest members of the Church of Antioch who had written the journey of St. Paul partly as an eye-witness, and see for the question of the "We" sections Introduction.—**ἀνήρ τις ἦν Μ.**: Ramsay,

Μακεδονίαν βοήθησον ἡμῖν. 10.[1] ὡς δὲ τὸ ὅραμα εἶδεν, εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν, συμβιβάζοντες ὅτι προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ Κύριος εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτούς. 11. Ἀναχθέντες οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς Τρωάδος, εὐθυδρομήσαμεν εἰς Σαμοθράκην, τῇ τε

[1] D, Sah. read διεγερθεις ουν διηγησατο το οραμα ημιν, and D continues και ενοησαμεν οτι προσκεκληται ημας ο κ. ευαγγελισασθαι τους εν τη Μακεδονιᾳ, so Blass in β, and Hilg. Wendt (1899) refers to Corssen, *u. s.*, and regards addition as simply elaboration of the vision.

here in agreement with Renan, identifies this man with St. Luke, *St. Paul*, pp. 202, 203. But it can scarcely be said that anything in the narrative justifies this identification. Ramsay asks: Was Luke already a Christian, or had he come under the influence of Christianity through meeting Paul at Troas? and he himself evidently sympathises entirely with the former view. The probability, however, of previous intercourse between Luke and Paul has given rise to some interesting conjectures—possibly they may have met in student days when Luke studied as a medical student in the university (as we may call it) of Tarsus; in the passage before us the succeeding words in ver. 10 lead to the natural inference that Luke too was a preacher of the Gospel, and had already done the work of an Evangelist. Ramsay admits that the meeting with Luke at Troas may have been sought by Paul on the ground of the former's professional skill, p. 205. He further maintains that Paul could not have known that the man was a Macedonian unless he had been personally known to him, but surely the man's own words sufficiently implied it (Knabenbauer), even if we do not agree with Blass, *in loco*, that Paul must have recognised a Macedonian by his dress. At all events it is quite unnecessary with Grotius (so Bede) to suppose that reference is made to the angel of Macedonia, "angelus Macedoniam curans," Dan. x. 12. On the importance of this verse in the "We" sections see Introduction: Ramsay, p. 200, Blass, *Proleg.*, p. x.

Ver. 10. **εἰς Μ.**: It is easy to understand St. Paul's eagerness to follow the vision after he had been twice hindered in his purpose, although it may well be that neither he nor St. Luke regarded the journey from Troas to Philippi as a passage from one continent to another continent—Macedonia and Asia were two provinces of the Roman empire, Ramsay, p. 199. But in the good Providence of Him Who sees with larger other eyes than ours St. Paul's first European Church was now founded, although perhaps it is venturesome to say that the Gospel was now first preached on the continent of Europe, as the good tidings may have reached Rome through the Jews and proselytes who heard St. Peter on the day of Pentecost, *cf.* Acts ii. 9; see McGiffert's remarks, pp. 235, 236, on the providential guidance of St. Paul at this juncture, and Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays* "The Churches of Macedonia".—**συμβιβάζοντες**, see on ix. 22.

Ver. 11. **ἀναχθέντες**, see on xiii. 13.—**εὐθυδρομήσαμεν**: only in Acts here and in xxi. 1, nowhere else in N.T., not in LXX or Apocrypha but used by Philo, *cf.* St. Luke's true Greek feeling for the sea, Ramsay, p. 205. Strabo used **εὐθύδρομος**, p. 45, and elsewhere St. Luke's language may point to the influence of the great geographer; see Plumptre's *Introduction* to St. Luke's Gospel.—**Σαμοθρᾴκην**: an island of the Ægean sea on the Thracian coast about half-way between Troas and Neapolis, but with adverse winds or calms the voyage from Philippi to Troas takes five days, xx. 6. Samothracia, with the exception of Mount Athos, was the highest point in this part of the Ægean, and would have been a familiar landmark for every Greek sailor, see C. and H., pp. 220, 221.—**Νεάπολιν**: modern *Cavallo*, the harbour of Philippi, lying some miles further north: Thracian, but after Vespasian reckoned as Macedonian; opposite Thasos, C. and H., p. 221; Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 139.—**τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ**, *sc.*, **ἡμέρᾳ**, *cf.* xx. 15, xxi. 18, with **ἡμέρᾳ** added, vii. 26, xxiii. 11, so too in classical Greek, Polyb., Jos.; in N.T., phrase only found in Acts: mark the exact note of time.

Ver. 12. **ἐκεῖθέν τε εἰς Φ.**: on or near the site of Krenides (*Wells* or *Fountains*), so called from its founder Philip, the father of Alexander the Great. Near Philippi, Octavius and Anthony had decisively defeated Brutus and Cassius,

ἐπιούσῃ εἰς [1] Νεάπολιν, 12. ἐκεῖθέν τε εἰς Φιλίππους, ἥτις ἐστὶ πρώτη [2] τῆς μερίδος τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις κολωνία.

Ἦμεν δὲ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει διατρίβοντες ἡμέρας τινάς, 13. τῇ τε ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων ἐξήλθομεν ἔξω τῆς [3] πόλεως παρὰ ποταμόν, οὗ ἐνομίζετο προσευχὴ εἶναι, καὶ καθίσαντες ἐλαλοῦμεν ταῖς συνελθούσαις

[1] **Νεαπολιν,** but **Νεαν Πολιν** ℵABD², so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 37; D 137, Syr. Harcl. mg. prefix **τῃ δε επαυριον,** so Blass and Hilg. If this is a revision, it is a further proof of the oft-recurring fact that the Western reviser takes nothing for granted.

[2] **πρωτη της μεριδος της Μ. πολις κολωνια**; *om.* **της** before **Μ.** ℵACE 31, 40, 61, 180, Tisch., W.H., R.V., but retained in BDHLP, so by Weiss; B has the article before **Μ.** instead of before **μεριδος**. ℵAC read **πρωτη της μεριδος Μακεδονιας π. κ.**; B has **πρωτη μεριδος της Μακ.**; D has **κεφαλη της Μακ.** (so Hilg.). Blass in **β** (so Prov.) (see p. xx.) inserts **πρωτης μεριδος της Μακ.** and rejects **κεφαλη**, which is read in D and Syr.-Pesh., Lat. *caput*, while **μεριδος** is omitted by D 137, Syr. Pesh. and Harcl.; see W.H., App., for Hort's conjecture, **Πιεριδος**; Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 50; Wendt, 1888 and 1899; and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 100, and *C. R. E.*, p. 156; see additional note at end of chapter.

[3] **πολεως,** but **πυλης** ℵABCD 13, 40, 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., W.H., R.V., Weiss, so Blass and Hilg.; **πολ.** may have been a marginal expl. of **πυλης** (see Alford and Wendt). **ενομιζετο προσευχη ειναι,** so EHLP, Amm., Chrys., Theophyl., but Ramsay and Wendt both follow T.R.—Tisch., W.H., Weiss, R.V. prefer **ενομιζομεν προσευχην**, following ℵC 13, 40, 61, Boh., Aethro. (ℵ **ενομιζεν**)—AB have **ενομιζομεν προσευχη**, but this may testify to the originality of the nom., so D **εδοκει προσευχη** (Blass in **β**, so Hilg.); *cf.* Vulg., "videbatur oratio". In **α** text Blass conjectures **ου ενομιζον εν προσευχῃ ειναι.** Weiss maintains that in AB the **ν** in **προσευχην** has dropped out, and regards ℵC as unquestionably correct.

and to that event it owed the honour of being made a Roman colony with the *jus Italicum* (R.V., "a *Roman* colony"), or in other words, "a miniature likeness of the great Roman people," *cf.* Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 51. Hence both in St. Luke's account of the place, and in St. Paul's Epistle we are constantly face to face with the political life of Rome, with the power and pride of Roman citizenship. But its geographical position really invested Philippi with its chief importance, thoroughfare as it was on the great Egnatian Way for the two continents of Europe and Asia. At Philippi we are standing at the confluence of the stream of Europe and Asiatic life; we see reflected in the evangelisation of Philippi as in a mirror the history of the passage of Christianity from the East to the West, Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 49; Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 140; McGiffert, *Apostolic Christianity*, p. 239; *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. iii., 580; C. and H., p. 202 ff.—**πρώτη τῆς μερίδος,** see Additional note. — **κολωνία**: "a *Roman* colony," R.V., there were many Greek colonies, **ἀποικία** or **ἐποικία**, but **κολ.** denoted a Roman colony, *i.e.*, a colony enjoying the *jus Italicum* like Philippi at this time, governed by Roman law, and on the model of Rome; see "Colony" in B.D.² and Hastings' B.D.—**ἦμεν . . . διατρ.**, see above on i. 10; characteristic Lucan construction.

Ver. 13. **πόλεως,** see critical notes, and C. and H., p. 226, note.—**παρὰ ποταμόν**: "by a river side," A. and R.V., see critical notes; here Ramsay sees in the omission of the article a touch of local familiarity and renders "by the river side". On the other hand Weiss holds that the absence of the article merely denotes that they supposed they should find a place of prayer, since a river provided the means for the necessary purifications.—**οὗ ἐνομ. προσευχὴ εἶναι,** see critical notes: "where there was wont to be held a meeting for prayer" (Ramsay); on the nominative see above. A further difficulty lies in the word **ἐνομίζετο**. Can it bear the above rendering? Rendall, p. 103, thinks that it hardly admits of it; on the other hand Wendt and Grimm compare 2 Macc. xiv. 4, and see instances of the use of the passive voice in L. and S., Herod., vi., 138. Thuc., iv., 32. Wendt renders

γυναιξί. 14. Καί τις γυνὴ ὀνόματι Λυδία, πορφυρόπωλις πόλεως Θυατείρων, σεβομένη τὸν Θεόν,[1] ἤκουεν· ἧς ὁ Κύριος διήνοιξε τὴν

[1] ηκουεν, D*E, Vulg., Chrys. read ηκουσεν; Blass rejects.

"where there was according to custom a place for prayer". The R.V. reads οὗ ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι, "where we supposed there was a place of prayer". There is very good authority for rendering προσευχή, "a place of prayer," *cf.* 3 Macc. vii. 20; Philo, *In Flacc.*, 6; Jos., *Vita*, 54, *cf.* also Juvenal, iii., 295, and Tertullian, *Adv. Nat.*, i., 13, etc. To these instances we may add a striking use of the word in an Egyptian inscription, possibly of the third century B.C., Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, pp. 49, 50, see also Curtius, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii. 542. No doubt the word occurs also in heathen worship for a place of prayer, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 69, E.T., *cf.* also Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 214. Where there were no synagogues, owing perhaps to the smallness of the Jewish believers or proselytes, there may well have been a προσευχή, and St. Luke may have wished to mark this by the expression he chooses (in xvii. 1 he speaks of a συναγωγή at Thessalonica), although on the other hand it must not be forgotten that προσευχή might be used of a large building capable of holding a considerable crowd (Jos., *u. s.*), and we cannot with certainty distinguish between the two buildings, Schürer, *u. s.*, pp. 72, 73. That the river side (not the Strymon, but a stream, the Gangas or Gangites, which flows into the larger river) should be chosen as the place of resort was very natural for the purpose of the Levitical washings, *cf.* also Juvenal, *Sat.*, iii., 11, and long before Tertullian's day the Decree of Halicarnassus, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 10, 23, *cf.* Ps. cxxxvii. 1, Ezra viii. 15, 21, *cf.* Plumptre's note on Luke vi. 12.—**ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυν.**: "which were come together," R.V., *i.e.*, on this particular occasion; A.V. "resorted". It is noticeable that in the three Macedonian towns, Philippi, Thessalonica, Berœa, women are specially mentioned as influenced by the Apostle's labours, and, as in the case of Lydia, it is evident that the women of Philippi occupied a position of considerable freedom and social influence. See this picture fully borne out by extant Macedonian inscriptions, which assign to women a higher social position in Macedonia than was the case for instance in Athens, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, pp. 55, 56; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 224, 227, 252. In this lies an answer to the strictures of Hilgenfeld, who regards the whole of ver. 13 as an interpolation of the "author to Theophilus," and so also the expression πορ. ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν προσευχήν, whereas it was quite natural that Paul should go frequently to the Jewish house of prayer.

Ver. 14. **Λυδία**: she may have taken her name "a solo natali," as Grotius and others have thought, like many of the *libertinae*, Afra, Græca, Syra; but the name was a popular one for women, *cf.* its frequent use in Horace. Renan takes it as meaning "the Lydian," and compares Κορινθία in inscriptions, *St. Paul*, p. 116, *cf.* also Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., 375, but on the other hand, Nösgen, *in loco*.—**πορφυρόπωλις**: a seller of purple at Philippi of the purple dyed garments from Thyatira, which formed the finest class of her wares. It is evident that she must have possessed a considerable amount of capital to carry on this trade, and we may note that she was thus in a position to help Paul in the expenses connected with his trial, without endorsing Renan's view that she was his wife, *St. Paul*, p. 148; see below on xxiv. 26. The expression σεβ. τὸν Θεόν shows that she was "a proselyte of the gate"; she could easily have gained her knowledge of the Jewish religion as she was πόλεως Θυατείρων where a Jewish colony had been planted, and there is reason to believe that the Jews were specially devoted to the dyeing industry for which Thyatira and the Lydian land in general were noted. Thus the inscriptions make it certain that there was a guild of dyers οἱ βαφεῖς at Thyatira, *cf.* Spohn, *Miscell. erud. ant.*, p. 113; Blass *in loco;* Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i., p. 145; Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 146, note; Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 376. According to Strabo, Thyatira was a Mysian town, but Ptolemy, v. 2, describes it as belonging to Lydia.—**ἤκουεν**: imperfect, denoting continuous hearing; the baptism would naturally follow after a period of hearing and instruction, "quod evenit aor. διήνοιξεν declaratur" Blass, see also Bengel.—**διήνοιξε τὴν καρδίαν**, *cf.* xvii. 3, Eph. i. 18; in LXX, *cf.* Hos. ii.

καρδίαν, προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου. 15. ὡς δὲ ἐβαπτίσθη, καὶ ὁ οἶκος αὐτῆς, παρεκάλεσε λέγουσα, Εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ Κυρίῳ εἶναι, εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου [1] μείνατε· καὶ παρεβιάσατο ἡμᾶς. 16. Ἐγένετο δὲ πορευομένων ἡμῶν εἰς προσευχήν,[2] παιδίσκην τινὰ ἔχουσαν [3] πνεῦμα Πύθωνος ἀπαντῆσαι ἡμῖν, ἥτις ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρεῖχε τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς μαντευομένη.

[1] μειvατε—μενετε ℵABDE 13, 61, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.

[2] εις π., but ℵABCE 13, 18, 40, 61, 180, Or. insert art. before π., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt (not Hilg.).

[3] πνευμα Πυθωνος, but acc. ℵABC*D* 13, 33, 61, Vulg., Or., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; T.R. has in its favour C³D²EHLP, tol., Syr. H. mg. gr., Chrys., Eustath., Lucif., Gig.

15 (17), 2 Macc. i. 4. The verb is frequent in St. Luke, Luke xxiv. 31, 32, 45, and in ii. 23 quotation, Acts vii. 56, xvii. 3; only once elsewhere in N.T., Mark vii. 34. "To open is the part of God, to pay attention that of the woman," Chrysostom: ὥστε καὶ θεῖον καὶ ἀνθρώπινον ἦν.—τοῖς λ. ὑπὸ τοῦ Π.: C. and H. see an indication of St. Luke's own modesty: "*we* spake" in ver. 13, but now only Paul is mentioned.

Ver. 15. ὁ οἶκος: as in the case of Cornelius, so here, the household is received as one into the fold of Christ, *cf.* ver. 33 and xviii. 8. We cannot say whether children or not were included, although we may well ask with Bengel: "quis credat in tot familiis nullum fuisse infantem?" but nothing against infant baptism, which rests on a much more definite foundation, can be inferred from such cases, "Baptism," Hastings' B.D., p. 242. Possibly Euodia and Syntyche and the other women, Phil. iv. 2, 3, may have been included in the *familia* of Lydia, who may have employed many slaves and freed women in her trade.—εἰ κεκρίκατε: almost = since you have judged me, *viz.*, by my baptism; or εἰ if instead of ἐπεὶ chosen with delicate modesty.—μείνατε: this has been called the first instance of the hospitality which was afterwards so characteristic of the early Church, and enforced by the words of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John alike; 1 Pet. iv. 9, Rom. xii. 13, 1 Tim. v. 10, etc., 3 John 5, *cf.* Clement, *Cor.*, i., 17, and see Westcott on Heb. xiii. 2, Uhlhorn, *Charity in the Early Church*, pp. 91, 325, E.T.; "Hospitality" in B.D.², and Smith and Cheetham, *Dict. of Christ. Antiq.* Another trait is thus marked in the character of Lydia, the same generosity which afterwards no doubt made her one of the contributors to the Apostle's necessities, as a member of a Church which so frequently helped him.—παρεβιάσατο: only used by St. Luke, once in Luke xxiv. 29, in the same sense as here, *cf.* LXX, 1 Sam. xxviii. 23, Gen. xix. 9, 2 Kings ii. 17, v. 16 (A omits). The word expresses urgency, but not compulsion (in classical Greek it is used of violent compulsion). The word may imply that Paul and his companions at first declined, *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 9 (so Chrys., Bengel), although on occasion he accepted the aid of Christian friends, Phil. iv. 15, and the hospitality of a Christian host, Rom. xvi. 23; or it may refer to the urgent entreaty of Lydia in expression of her thankfulness.

Ver. 16. If we add the article τὴν, see critical note: "to the place of prayer," R.V.—πνεῦμα Πυθῶνος: in R.V., accusative, see critical note, "a spirit, a Python," margin, *i.e.*, a ventriloquist (Ramsay). The passage most frequently quoted in illustration is Plutarch, *De defectu Orac.*, ix., from which it appears that ventriloquists who formerly took their name from Εὐρυκλῆς a famous ventriloquist (*cf.* Arist., *Vesp.*, 1019) were called Πύθωνες. The word ἐγγαστρίμυθος, ventriloquist (Hebrew אוֹב), of which Πύθων is thus used as an equivalent, is the term employed in the LXX, Lev. xix. 31, xx. 6, 27, 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, etc., for those that have a familiar spirit (*cf.* also the use of the two words ἐγγαστρ. and Πύθων amongt the Rabbis, R. Salomo on Deut. xviii. 11, and instances in Wetstein), *i.e.*, a man or a woman in whom is the spirit of divination; Gesenius uses אוֹב for the divining spirit, the python, supposed to be present in the body of a sorcerer or conjurer,

17. αὕτη[1] κατακολουθήσασα τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ ἡμῖν, ἔκραζε λέγουσα, Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου εἰσίν, οἵτινες

[1] κατακολουθουσα is read by ℵBD 180, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Hilg.; but Blass in β follows T.R. ημιν (2)—υμιν is best supported, ℵBDE, Vulg., Syrr. P. and H., Arm., Aethpp., Theodt., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; Meyer and Lach. follow T.R. (AC²HLP, Sah., Boh., Aethro., Or., Chrys., Eusth.). ημιν would have been easily changed, as it seemed unfitting for the demons.

and illustrates from this passage in Acts, and adds that the LXX usually render אבות correctly by ἐγγαστρίμυθοι, *ventriloquists*, since amongst the ancients this power of ventriloquism was often misused for the purposes of magic. But in addition to ventriloquism, it would certainly seem from the narrative in Acts that some prophetic power was claimed for the maiden, μαντευομένη, so Blass in describing the ἐγγαστρ. "credebatur dæmon e ventre illorum loqui et vaticinari," *cf.* τὴν Εὐρυκλέους μαντείαν, Arist., *u. s.*); so too Suidas explains Πύθων as δαιμόνιον μαντικόν, connecting the word directly with the Pythian serpent or dragon, the reputed guardian of the oracle at Delphi, slain by Apollo, the successor to the serpent's oracular power. If therefore the girl was regarded as inspired by the Pythian Apollo, the expression in T.R. simply expresses the current pagan estimate of her state; this is the more probable as the physicians of the time, *e.g.*, Hippocrates, spoke of the way in which some symptoms of epilepsy were *popularly* attributed to Apollo, Neptune, etc.; article "Divination," B.D.², i., 490; C. and H., p. 231, smaller edition; Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 54; Plumptre and Wendt, *in loco*, and Page on the derivation of the word.—ἐργασίαν: only in Luke and Paul; A. and R.V. "gain," although primarily the word denotes work done, so Rendall, "business"; Wisdom xiii. 19 well illustrates its use here. The word is used of gain (*quæstus*), Xen., *Mem.*, iii., 10, 1.—τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς, ver. 19, seems to imply not successive but joint owners (on the plural in Luke see Friedrich, p. 21).—μαντευ.: if Luke had believed in her power he would more probably have used προφητεύειν. μαντευ. used only here in N.T., but it is significant that in LXX it is always employed of lying prophets or of divination contrary to the law, *e.g.*, Deut. xviii. 10, 1 Sam. xxviii. 8 (9), Ezek. xiii. 6, xxi. 29 (34), Micah iii. 11, etc. The Greeks themselves distinguished between the two verbs and recognised the superior dignity of προφητεύειν; *e.g.*, Plato contrasts the μάντις who more or less *rages* (*cf.* derivation μανία, μαίνομαι, thus fitly used of Pythonesses, Sibyls, and the like) with the προφήτης, *Timæus*, 71 E, 72 A, B, Trench, *Synonyms*, i., 26.

Ver. 17. κατακολουθήσασα, but if we follow R.V. the present participle denotes that she continuously followed after (κατά), and kept crying (ἔκραζε). The verb is only used by St. Luke in N.T., *cf.* Luke xxiii. 35; in LXX, Jer. xvii. 16, Dan., LXX, ix. 10, 1 Esd. vii. 1, Jud. xi. 6, 1 Macc. vi. 23, but not in same literal sense as here; used by Polyb., Plut., Jos.—οὗτοι: placed emphatically first (see also Friedrich, pp. 10, 89). If we turn to the Gospel narratives of those possessed with evil spirits, as affording an analogy to the narrative here, we recall how Jesus had found recognition, *cf.* Mark i. 24, iii. 11, Luke iv. 41 (where the same verb, κράζω, is used of the ἀκάθαρτα πνεύματα καὶ δαιμόνια).—τοῦ Θ. τοῦ ὑψ.: similar title used by the demoniacs in Mark v. 7, Luke viii. 28; see Plumptre's note on former passage. Both Zeller and Friedrich note that Luke alone employs ὁ ὑψ. of God without any word in apposition, Luke i. 32, 35, 76, vi. 35, Acts vii. 48, and that we have the title with τοῦ Θεοῦ, both in his Gospel and Acts. (Heb. vii. 1, probably from Gen. xiv. 18.)—ἡμῖν—ὑμῖν very strongly supported, see critical note. But ἡμῖν might easily have been altered into ὑμῖν, as the former would appear to be an unfitting expression for the evil spirit: but ἡμῖν may point to that disturbed and divided consciousness which seems to have been so characteristic of the possessed (Edersheim); at one time the girl was overmastered by the evil spirit who was her real Κύριος, at another she felt a longing for deliverance from her bondage, and in ἡμῖν she associates herself with those around her who felt a similar longing for some way of salvation, for we must by no means regard her as a mere impostor (Ramsay).

καταγγέλλουσιν ὑμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας. 18. τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας. διαπονηθεὶς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, καὶ ἐπιστρέψας, τῷ πνεύματι εἶπε, Παραγγέλλω σοι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξελθεῖν[1] ἀπ' αὐτῆς. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ. 19. Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ κύριοι αὐτῆς,[2] ὅτι ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενοι τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σίλαν εἵλκυσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας[3]·

[1] Instead of **εξελ.** D has **ινα εξελθῃς**; instead of **εξ. αυτῃ τῃ ωρᾳ** D has **ευθεως**; so Blass in **β**, and Hilg. Belser strongly supports D, see his remarks, *Beiträge*, p. 77; Blass retains changes in **β**.

[2] Instead of **οτι εξηλθεν η ελπις** Blass and Hilg. read **οτι απεστερηνται της εργ. αυτων**, and adds with D **ης ειχον δι' αυτης**; but this spoils the play on the **εξηλθεν**, see below.

[3] **αρχοντας**, but Gig., Lucif. (not D), Blass ("recte"), read **στρατηγους**, omitting **στρατηγοις** in ver. 20.

Ver. 18. **διαπονηθεὶς**, only here and in iv. 2 in N.T.; its use in LXX in two passages only does not help us much, see iv. 2, and in classics it is not used in the sense required here. Aquila uses it four times of the Hebrew עָצַב in passages which show that the word may combine the ideas of grief, pain, and anger, Gen. vi. 6, xxxiv. 7, 1 Sam. xx. 3, 34. It may be noticed that the word and other compounds of **πονεῖν** are frequent in medical writers.—**Παραγγέλλω**, see on i. 4. The same strong word is used of our Lord, Luke viii. 29, where He charged another unclean spirit to come out.—**ὀνόματι**, see above on iii. 6, "Demonology," Hastings' B.D., where reference is made to Sayce, *Hibbert Lect.*, pp. 302-347, as to the belief in the powerful efficacy of the *name*, the *name* meaning to an ancient Semite personal power and existence.—**ἐξελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῆς**: the phrase occurs in Luke much more frequently than in any other N.T. writer; nine times in his Gospel of the coming out of evil spirits, as here. Rendall sees in the phrase the medical accuracy of the writer in describing the process of the cure; the evil spirit must not only come out, but depart, pp. 104, 280; it must however be remembered that St. Matthew uses the same phrase twice of the departure of evil spirits from men, xii. 43, xvii. 18. Paul charges the evil spirit to depart; it departed, and with it *departed* the master's hope of gain (see also Weiss, *in loco*).—**αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ**: "that very hour," R.V., *cf.* xxii. 13, *eo ipso tempore;* peculiar to Luke, *cf.* Luke ii. 38, x. 21, xii. 12, xx. 19, xxiv. 33 (so too Friedrich, p. 37). We are not told anything further of the history of the girl, but we may well believe that she too would partake of the generous help of Lydia, and of the other Christian women at Philippi, who would see in her no longer a bondservant to the many lords who had had dominion over her, but a sister beloved in the One Lord.

Ver. 19. **ὅτι ἐξ. ἡ ἐλπὶς κ.τ.λ.**: "The most sensitive part of 'civilised' man is his pocket," Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 237, and we can see how bitter was the hostility excited both here and at Ephesus when the new faith threatened existing pecuniary profits.—**ἐπιλαβ.**: here with hostile intent, see above on ix. 27 and further on xvii. 19.—**εἵλκυσαν**: with violence, so **ἕλκω** in James ii. 4 (Acts xxi. 30), *cf.* Saul before his conversion, viii. 3, **σύρων**. "Everywhere money the cause of evils: O that heathen cruelty! they wished the girl to be still a demoniac, that they might make money by her!" Chrys., *Hom.*, xxx., 5.—**εἰς τὴν ἀγ.**: where the magistrates would sit, as in the Roman *forum*.—**ἄρχοντας . . . στρατηγοῖς**: it is of course possible that the two clauses mean the same thing, and that the expressions halt, as Lightfoot and Ramsay maintain, between the Greek form and the Latin, between the ordinary Greek term for the supreme board of magistrates in any city **ἄρχοντες**, and the popular Latin designation **στρατηγοί**, *prætores* ("non licet distinguere inter **ἀρχ.** et **στρατ.**," Blass, so O. Holtzmann, Weiss, Wendt). But the former may mean the magistrates who happened to be presiding at the time in the *forum*, whereas the milder verb **προσαγαγόντες** may imply that there was another stage in the case, and that it was referred to the **στρατηγοί**, the prætors (as they

20.[1] καὶ προσαγαγόντες αὐτοὺς τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, εἶπον, Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐκταράσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν, Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες· 21. καὶ καταγγέλλουσιν[2] ἔθη ἃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν παραδέχεσθαι οὐδὲ ποιεῖν, Ῥωμαίοις οὖσι. 22. καὶ συνεπέστη ὁ ὄχλος κατ' αὐτῶν· καὶ οἱ στρατηγοί, περιῤῥήξαντες αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια, ἐκέλευον ῥαβδίζ-

[1] Gig., Lucif. read at beginning of verse **και προσηνεγκαν αυτους λεγοντες**; see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 217.

εθη, D reads **τα εθνη**, but Blass and Hilg. reject.

called themselves), because they were the chief magisterial authorities, and the accusation assumed a political form. Meyer and Zöckler, H. Holtzmann distinguish between the two, as if **ἀρχ.** were the local magistrates of the town, *cf.* **πολιτάρχης**, xvii. 6. In the *municipia* and *coloniæ* the chief governing power was in the hands of *duoviri* who apparently in many places assumed the title of prætors, *cf.* Cicero, *De Leg. Agr.*, ii., 34, where he speaks with amusement of the *duoviri* at Capua who showed their ambition in this way, *cf.* Horace, *Sat.*, i., 5, 34. A *duumvir* of Philippi is a title borne out by inscriptions, Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 51, note; Felten, p. 315.

Ver. 20. **οὗτοι**, contemptuously **Ἰουδ. ὄντες**: If the decree of Claudius expelling the Jews from Rome had been enacted, it would have easily inflamed the minds of the people and the magistrates at Philippi against the Jews (*cf.* xviii. 2, so Holtzmann). Of the bad odour in which the Jews were held we have also other evidences, *cf.* Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, xxviii.; Juvenal, xiv., 96-106. On the attitude of the Romans towards the Jews see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. xix. ff. It was of this intense feeling of hatred and contempt felt by Romans and Greeks alike that the masters of the maiden availed themselves: "causa autem alia atque prætextus caussæ," Blass; the real cause was not a religious but a social and mercenary one, see above on ver. 19, and Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 131; where the accusation was brought on purely religious grounds, as, *e.g.*, at Corinth, xviii. 13, the Roman governor declined to be judge of such matters.—**ἐκταράσσουσιν**: "exceedingly trouble" (**ἐκ**), *cf.* LXX, Ps. xvii. 4, lxxxvii. 16, Wisd. xvii. 3, 4, see Hatch and Redpath, xviii., 7; Plut., *Cor.*, xix., more often in classical Greek, **συνταράσσω**.

Ver. 21. **ἔθη**: religious customs here; the charge ostensibly put forward was really that of introducing a *religio illicita*, *licita* as it was for the Jews themselves. No doubt the fact that they were Jews presented in itself no ground of accusation, but their Jewish nationality would suggest the kind of customs with the introduction of which it would be easy to charge them, *e.g.*, circumcision. The introduction of Jewish habits and mode of life included under **ἔθη**, *cf.* vi. 14, xxi. 21, would upset the whole social system, so that here, as on other occasions, the missionaries suffered from being identified with their Jewish countrymen.—**οὐκ ἔξ. παραδέχεσθαι**: Wetstein, *in loco*; Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, iii., 70, and see preceding verse, *cf.* xv. 5, xxi. 21. In LXX, *cf.* Exod. xxiii.—**Ῥωμαίοις οὖσι**: in natural contrast (at the end of the sentence) to the despised Jews: as inhabitants of a Roman *colonia* they could lay claim to the proud title. On the force of **ὑπάρχοντες** and **οὖσι** see Alford's note *in loco*.

Ver. 22. **συνεπέστη**: only here in N.T., *cf.* xviii. 12, not in LXX, but *cf.* Num. xvi. 3, used in classical Greek, but not in same sense. No reason is given, but the **ὄχλος** would have been easily swayed by hatred of the Jews, and further incensed perhaps at finding an end put to their love of the revelations of fortune-telling.—**περιῤῥήξ. αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια**, *i.e.*, they rent off the garments of Paul and Silas; just as there is no change of subject before **ἐπιθ.**, so here probably what was done by the lictors is said to have been done by the magistrates. There is no need to suppose with Bengel that the prætors tore off the prisoners' clothes with their own hands. Grotius (but see on the other hand Calvin's note *in loco*) takes the words as meaning that the prætors rent off their own clothes (reading **αὑτῶν**); so Ramsay speaks of the prætors rending their garments in horror at the **ἀσέβεια**, the impiety. But not only would such an act be strange on the part of Roman magistrates, but also

ειν· 23. πολλάς τε ἐπιθέντες αὐτοῖς πληγάς, ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακήν, παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι ἀσφαλῶς τηρεῖν αὐτούς· 24. ὃς παραγγελίαν τοιαύτην εἰληφώς, ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλακήν, καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν ἠσφαλίσατο εἰς τὸ ξύλον. 25. Κατὰ δὲ τὸ μεσονύκτιον Παῦλος καὶ Σίλας προσευχόμενοι ὕμνουν τὸν Θεόν·

the verb seems to make against the interpretation; it means in classical and in later Greek to rend all round, tear off, *cf.* the numerous instances in Wetstein, and so it expresses the rough way in which the lictors tore off the garments of the prisoners. In 2 Macc. iv. 38 the word is used of tearing off the garments of another, see Wendt's (1888) note *in loco*.—**ῥαβδίζειν**: to beat with rods: thrice St. Paul suffered this punishment, 2 Cor. xi. 25, grievous and degrading, of a Roman scourging, *cf.* his own words in 1 Thess. ii. 2, **ὑβρισθέντες ὡς οἴδατε ἐν Φιλίπποις.** Nothing can be alleged against the truthfulness of the narrative on the ground that Paul as a Roman citizen could not have been thus maltreated. The whole proceeding was evidently tumultuary and hasty, and the magistrates acted with the high-handedness characteristic of the fussy provincial authorities; in such a scene St. Paul's protest may well have been made, but would very easily be disregarded. The incident in xxii. 25, which shows us how the Apostle barely escaped a similar punishment amidst the tumult and shouts of the mob in Jerusalem, and the instances quoted by Cicero, *In Verr.*, v., 62, of a prisoner remorselessly scourged, while he cried "inter dolorem crepitumque plagarum" *Civis Romanus sum*, enables us to see how easily Paul and Silas (who probably enjoyed the Roman citizenship, *cf.* ver. 37) might have protested and yet have suffered.

Ver. 23. **δεσμοφύλακι**, Lucian, *Tox.*, 30; Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 5, 1, LXX **ἀρχιδεσμοφύλαξ**, Gen. xxxix. 21-23, xl. 3 A, xli. 10 A (*cf.* the word **ἀρχισωματοφύλαξ**, Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 93). Chrysostom and Oecumenius identify him with Stephanus, but he was the first-fruits of Achaia, 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

Ver. 24. **ἐσωτέραν**: comparative for superlative, as often in N.T. (Blass). Not necessarily underground, but a part of the prison which would have been further from such light and air as could be had.—**τὸ ξύλον**, Hebrew סַד, Job xxxiii. 11 (A **κυκλώματι**), *cf.* Arist., *Eq.*, 367, 393, 705; Herod., vi., 75; ix., 37; and instances in Wetstein, Liv., viii., 28, Plaut., *Capt.*, iii., 70, Latin *nervus*. So Eusebius uses the word of the martyrs in Gaul (see Alford). In Jeremiah's case another and equivalent word is used in the Heb. xxix. 26 = LXX **ἀπόκλεισμα**. The same Hebrew is used in 2 Chron. xvi. 10, where LXX has simply **φυλακή**.—**ἠσφαλίσατο**: only elsewhere in N.T. in Matt. xxvii. 64, 65, 66; in LXX and Polyb., *cf.* critical note, ver. 30 in **β**.

Ver. 25. **κατὰ δὲ τὸ μεσονύκτιον**: neuter of the adjective **μεσονύκτιος**, *cf.* xx. 7, Luke xi. 5, elsewhere only in Mark xiii. 35, often in medical writers, also in Arist., Strabo, Plutarch; in LXX, Judg. xvi. 3 A, Ruth iii. 8, Ps. cxviii. 62 (Isaiah lix. 10).—**προσευχόμενοι**, see on chap. xii. 12.—**ὕμνουν** with accusative Heb. ii. 12 only, *cf.* Ephes. v. 19, Col. iii. 16, Trench, *Syn.*, ii., 129. "Hoc erat *gaudium in Spiritu sancto:* in carcere ubi nec genua flectere, nec manus tollere poterant" Wetstein, *cf.* too the often-quoted words of Tertullian *Ad Martyres*, ii.: "Nihil crus sentit in nervo quum animus in cœlo est," and Chrys., *Hom.*, xxxvi., "This let us also do, and we shall open for ourselves—not a prison, but heaven. If we pray, we shall be able even to open heaven. Elias both shut and opened heaven by prayer."—**ἐπηκροῶντο**: used by Plato (Comicus), and referred to by Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 73, as one of the rare words mainly colloquial common to N.T. and the comic poets; it occurs also in Lucian, and in *Test.*, xii., *Patr.* Not found in LXX (but the cognate noun of hearing so as to obey in 1 Sam. xv. 22). But it is peculiar to St. Luke in N.T., and it was the technical word in medical language for auscultation; the word might therefore naturally be employed by him to denote attentive hearing as God "gave songs in the night". Both verbs **ὑμν.** and **ἐπηκ.** are in the imperfect; they were singing, and the prisoners were listening, when the earthquake happened.

Ver. 26. **ἄφνω**, see on ii. 2.—**σεισμὸς**, *cf.* iv. 31, where the divine nearness and presence were manifested in a similar manner; the neighbourhood and the period were conspicuous for such con-

ἐπηκροῶντο δὲ αὐτῶν οἱ δέσμιοι. 26. ἄφνω δὲ σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας, ὥστε σαλευθῆναι τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου [1]· ἀνεῴχθησάν τε παραχρῆμα αἱ θύραι πᾶσαι, καὶ πάντων τὰ δεσμὰ [2] ἀνέθη. 27. ἔξυπνος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ, καὶ ἰδὼν ἀνεῳγμένας τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς, σπασάμενος [3] μάχαιραν ἔμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν, νομίζων ἐκπεφευγέναι τοὺς δεσμίους. 28. ἐφώνησε δὲ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Παῦλος λέγων, Μηδὲν πράξῃς σεαυτῷ κακόν· ἅπαντες γάρ ἐσμεν ἐνθάδε.

[1] **ανεῳχθησαν**, but BCD 31, 33, 40, 180; so Lach., Alford, W.H., Blass, Weiss Hilg. have **ηνεῳχθησαν**, whilst ℵAE 13, 54, 61, Or., Tisch have **ηνοιχθησαν**; Wendt cannot decide. **παραχρημα** *om.* B, Lucif., Gig., so Blass; Hilg. retains

[2] **ανεθη**, ℵ[1]D[1] **ανελυθη**, so Hilg.

[3] **μαχαιραν**, BCD 61* prefix **την**, so Lach., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Blass, Hilg.

vulsions of nature, *cf.* Plumptre on Matt. xxiv. 7, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 221.—**παραχρῆμα**, see critical notes.—**ἀνεῴχθησάν τε . . . αἱ θύραι πᾶσαι**: any one who has seen a Turkish prison, says Prof. Ramsay, will not wonder at this; "each door was merely closed by a bar, and the earthquake, as it passed along the ground, forced the door-posts apart from each other, so that the bar slipped from its hold, and the door swung open," and see further description on same page.—**ἀνέθη**, *cf.* xxvii. 40, nowhere else in N.T. in same sense; in LXX we have the same collocation of words in Mal. iv. 2. See also for the phrase, Plut., *Alex.*, 73; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 101. If we ask, Why did not the prisoners escape? the answer is that a semi-Oriental mob would be panic-stricken by the earthquake, and there is nothing strange in the fact that they made no dash for safety; moreover, the opportunity must have been very quickly lost, for the jailor was not only roused himself, but evidently called at once to the guard for lights; see Ramsay's description, *u. s.*, and the comments of Blass, *in loco*, and Felten, note, p. 318, to the same effect as Ramsay, that the prisoners were panic-stricken, and had no time to collect their thoughts for flight.

Ver. 27. **ἔξυπνος**: only here in N.T., once in LXX, 1 Esd. iii. 3, of Darius waking from sleep.—**μάχαιραν**: article omitted in T.R., see critical note. Weiss thinks that the omission occurs since in xii. 2, and five times in Luke, no article is found with **μάχαιρα**. **τὴν** = his sword, *cf.* Mark xiv. 47.—**ἤμελλεν**, *cf.* iii. 3, v. 35, xii. 6, etc., characteristic Lucan word, see Friedrich, p. 12. The act was quite natural, the act of a man who had lost in his terror his self-control (Weiss).—**ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν**: to avoid the disgraceful fate which would be allotted to him by Roman law, according to which the jailor was subjected to the same death as the escaped prisoners would have suffered (Wetstein, *in loco*), *cf.* xii. 19, xxvii. 42.—**νομίζων**, see on vii. 25. It seems hyper-critical to ask, How could Paul have seen that the jailor was about to kill himself? That there must have been some kind of light in the outer prison is evident, otherwise the jailor could not have even seen that the doors were open, nor is there any difficulty in supposing that Paul out of the darkness of the inner prison would see through the opened doors any one in the outer doorway, whilst to the jailor the inner prison would be lost in darkness. Moreover, as Blass notes, Paul may have heard from the jailor's utterances what he meant to do: "neque enim tacuisse putandus est" (see also Ramsay, Felten, Hackett, Lumby, *in loco*).

Ver. 28. **μηδὲν πράξ. σεαυτῷ κακόν**: Blass remarks that the distinction between **πράσσειν** and **ποιεῖν** is not always precisely observed in N.T., and takes it as = Attic, **μ. ποιησῃς**. **πράσσειν** is not found in St. Matthew or St. Mark and only twice in St. John, whilst by St. Luke it is used six times in his Gospel, thirteen times in Acts, elsewhere in N.T. only by Paul. Philippi was famous in the annals of suicide (C. and H.); see also Plumptre's note *in loco*.—**ἅπαντες γάρ ἐ.**: "Multa erant graviora, cur non deberet se interficere; sed Paulus id arripit, quod maxime opportunum erat" Bengel.

Ver. 29. **φῶτα**: "lights," R.V., plural, and only in plural in later Greek, *cf.* 1 Macc. xii. 29, of fires in a military encampment; "the prisoners' chains were

29.[1] αἰτήσας δὲ φῶτα εἰσεπήδησε, καὶ ἔντρομος γενόμενος προσέπεσε τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σίλᾳ· 30. καὶ προαγαγὼν αὐτοὺς ἔξω,[2] ἔφη, Κύριοι, τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ; 31. οἱ δὲ εἶπον, Πίστευσον ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου. 32. καὶ ἐλάλησαν αὐτῷ τὸν λόγον[3] τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ. 33. καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς νυκτὸς ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν, καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες παραχρῆμα· 34. ἀναγαγών τε αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, παρέθηκε τράπεζαν, καὶ ἠγαλλιάσατο πανοικὶ πεπιστευκὼς τῷ Θεῷ.

[1] At beginning of verse Blass in β prefixes **ακουσας δε ο δεσμοφυλαξ** (*quo audito cust. carc.* Gig., Wer.).

[2] D, Syr. H. mg. add **(και) τους λοιπους ασφαλισαμενος** after **εξω**, see on this touch Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 222, who accepts it as most prob. genuine, retained by Blass and Hilg.; Syr. H. mg. adds "appropinquavit et" (**προσηλθεν** in β).

[3] **του K.**, W.H. text, R.V. marg., Blass, Wendt, Weiss, following ℵ*B, read **Θεου**; see Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 5.

loosed, and worse chains were loosed from himself; he called for a light, but the true heat was lighted in his own heart" Chrys., *Hom.*, xxxvi.—**εἰσεπήδησε**, *cf.* xiv. 14, **ἐκπ.**, both verbs only in Luke in N.T. In LXX, *cf.* Amos v. 19, Sus., ver. 26, especially the latter, found also in classical Greek.—**ἔντρομος γεν.**, see above.—**προσέπεσε**: he may have known of the words of the maiden, ver. 17, and recognised their truth in the earthquake, and in the calmness and demeanour of Paul; hence too his question.

Ver. 30. **Κύριοι**, in respect, *cf.* John xx. 15.—**ἵνα σωθῶ**; the word of the maiden **σωτηρία** and the occurrence of the night may well have prompted the question. The context, ver. 31, seems to indicate the higher meaning here, and the question can scarcely be limited to mere desire of escape from personal danger or punishment. On the addition in D see critical note.

Ver. 31. **ἐπὶ τὸν K.**: "non agnoscunt se *dominos*" Bengel—they point him to the One Lord.—**οἶκος . . . οἰκίᾳ**: the first word is most frequently used in Attic Greek, and in the N.T. for household, *cf.* ver. 15, but both words are used in Attic, and in the N.T., for *familia.* **σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου**: "and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house," R.V., not as if *his* faith could save his household, as A.V. might imply, but that the same way was open to him and to them (Alford, see also Meyer-Wendt, and Page).

Ver. 32. **καὶ ἐλάλησαν**: before baptism instruction.

Ver. 33. **ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς νυκτὸς**, *cf.* ver. 18, "at that hour of the night"; the jailor will not delay for a moment his first Christian duty, Matt. xxv. 36.—**ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν**: "and washed them of their stripes," Ramsay; *i.e.*, the stains of the wounds caused by the lictors (for similar construction of **λούειν ἀπό** see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 54). Hobart, p. 112, compares Galen's words, **τὸ αἷμα τοῦ τετρωμένου μέρους ἀποπλῦναι.**—**καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες**: for the bearing of the words on Infant Baptism, see on ver. 15. It may of course be said that the expression evidently implies the same persons who are instructed in ver. 32, but it cannot be said that the phrase may not include any other members of the household. The two washings are put in striking juxtaposition: the waters of baptism washed the jailor from deeper stains and more grievous wounds than those of the lictors' rods, Chrys., *Hom.*, xxxvi.—**παραχρῆμα**, emphatic, see above on p. 106.

Ver. 34. **ἀναγαγών τε αὐτοὺς**: **τε** closely connects this second proof of his thankfulness with the first **ἀναγ.**: "he brought them up into," R.V.; Blass thinks that the **ἀνά** means that he brought them up from underground, but it may simply mean that the house was built over the prison; see also Knabenbauer *in loco.*—**παρέθηκε τράπ.**: the phrase is a classical one, so in Homer, also in Polyb.; so in Homer a separate table is assigned to each guest, *Odys.*, xvii., 333; xxii., 74. But the word is also used as implying the meal on the table see L.

35. Ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης [1] ἀπέστειλαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ τοὺς ῥαβδούχους λέγοντες, Ἀπόλυσον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκείνους. 36. ἀπήγγειλε δὲ ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ τοὺς λόγους τούτους πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον, Ὅτι ἀπεστάλκασιν οἱ στρατηγοί, ἵνα ἀπολυθῆτε· νῦν οὖν ἐξελθόντες πορεύεσθε [2] ἐν εἰρήνῃ. 37. ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔφη πρὸς αὐτούς,[3] Δείραντες ἡμᾶς δημοσίᾳ, ἀκατακρίτους, ἀνθρώπους Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας, ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακήν, καὶ νῦν λάθρα ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλουσιν; οὐ γάρ· ἀλλὰ ἐλθόντες αὐτοὶ

[1] D, Syr. H. mg., after **γεν.**, add **συνηλθον οι στρατηγοι επι το αυτο εις την αγοραν και αναμνησθεντες τον σεισμον τον γεγονοτα εφοβηθησαν**, so Blass in β, and Hilg. Belser and Zöckler both defend this and subsequent additions in D as valuable in explanation of the sudden change of resolve on the part of the magistrates; but see also Weiss, Codex D, p. 86, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 223. After **εκεινους** D 137, Syr. Harcl. add **ους εχθες παρελαβες**.

[2] After **πορευεσθε** Blass and Hilg. omit **εν ειρηνῃ**, following D and Gig.

[3] At beginning of verse Blass, following D, prefixes **αναιτιους** (so Hilg.), but brackets **ακατακριτους**.

and S., *cf.* Tobit ii. 2, **παρετέθη μου ἡ τράπεζα**, S. Ps. lxxvii. 20. Paul makes no question about sitting at meat with the uncircumcised (Weiss).—**ἠγαλλιάσατο**: it is suggestive that St. Luke uses the cognate noun of this same verb to describe the intense exulting gladness of the early Church at Jerusalem in their social life, ii. 46—here was indeed an Agape, a Feast of Love, *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 6, 8, iv. 13 (Matt. v. 12, Rev. xix. 7); in St. Luke the word occurs twice in his Gospel, i. 47, x. 21, and in Acts ii. 26, quotation (see above); not found in classical Greek, but formed probably from **ἀγάλλομαι**, Hellenistic, often in LXX. At the same time the word **πεπιστευκώς**, perfect participle, shows that this fulness of joy was caused by his full profession of belief; it was the joy of the Holy Ghost which followed on his baptism: "rejoiced greatly with all his house, having believed on the Lord," *gaudebat quod crediderat*, Blass (reading imperfect **ἠγαλλιᾶτο**, see critical note). See also Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 194 (1893).—**πανοικὶ** (**-εὶ**, W.H., App., p. 154), *cf.* **παραπληθεί**, Luke xxiii. 18. In LXX the word is found, Exod. i. 1, but A has **-κίᾳ** 3 Macc. iii. 27, where A has also **-κίᾳ**. On St. Luke's fondness for **πᾶς** and its related forms see Friedrich, p. 6. The form preferred in Attic is **πανοικησίᾳ**. The word in text is found in Jos., Philo, and in Plato, *Eryx.*, p. 392 C., *cf.* Blass, *in loco*, and *Proleg.*, p. 19.

Ver. 35. **ἀπέσ. οἱ στρατηγοὶ**: we are not told the reason of this sudden change in the action of the prætors, and no doubt the omission may fairly account for the reading in D, see critical notes. At the same time it is quite characteristic of St. Luke to give the plain facts without entering upon explanations. Meyer thinks that they were influenced by the earthquake, while Wendt rather inclines to the view that they were incited to this action, so inconsistent with their former conduct, by fresh intelligence as to their own hasty treatment of the missionaries; Ramsay combines both views, and see also *St. Paul*, p. 224, on the contrast brought out by St. Luke, and also on the Bezan text; see to the same effect Zöckler, *in loco*. Blass accounts for the change of front on the part of the prætors by supposing that they saw in the earthquake a sign that they had insulted a foreign deity, and that they had therefore better dismiss his servants at once, lest further mischief should result.—**τοὺς ῥαβ.**: "the lictors" R.V. margin, apparently as the duoviri aped the prætors, so the lictors carried the *fasces* and not the *baculi*, *cf.* Cicero, *De Leg. Agr.*, ii., 34; Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 493; Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and references in Wetstein: **διὰ τί λικτώρεις τοὺς ῥαβδούχους ὀνομάζουσι**; Plut., *Quæst. Rom.* 67.

Ver. 36. **νῦν οὖν**, Lucan, *cf.* x. 33, xv. 10, xxiii. 15.—**ἐν εἰρήνῃ** (omitted by D): the jailor may well have used the words in a deeper sense after the instruction of Paul, and his own admission to citizenship in a kingdom which was "righteousness, peace, joy in the Holy Ghost".

Ver. 37. **Δείραντες ἡμᾶς δ.**: in flagrant violation of the Lex Valeria, B.C. 509, and the Lex Porcia, B.C. 248; see also Cicero,

ἡμᾶς ἐξαγαγέτωσαν. 38. ἀνήγγειλαν δὲ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς οἱ ῥαβδοῦχοι τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα· [1] καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν ἀκούσαντες ὅτι Ῥωμαῖοί εἰσι, 39. καὶ ἐλθόντες παρεκάλεσαν αὐτούς, καὶ ἐξαγαγόντες ἠρώτων

[1] D reads at beginning of verse **και παραγενομενοι μετα φιλων πολλων εις την φυλακην** (**εις τ. φ.** 137, Syr. H. mg.). After **εξελθειν** the same authorities continue **ειποντες Ηγνοησαμεν τα καθ' υμας οτι εστε ανδρες δικαιοι.** D then continues (137, Syr. H. mg., Ephr.) **και εξαγαγοντες παρεκαλεσαν αυτους λεγοντες· Εκ της πολεως ταυτης εξελθατε, μηποτε παλιν συστραφωσιν ημιν επικραζοντες καθ' υμων** (so practically the other authorities above, followed here by Blass in **β**, and Hilg.). Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 224, points out that the Bezan text hits off the situation with obvious truth, and the way in which in the Ægean cities the weak municipal government was always a danger to order, "one would gladly think this Lucan". Belser draws attention to the fact that **συστραφ.** has a parallel in Acts xxiii. 12; see Harris, *Four Lectures, etc.*, pp. 26, 27, for Ephraem's commentary on vv. 35-37, 39, and likenesses to the Bezan text. Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bibl.*, p. 52, regards this passage as plainly derived from a fusion of two texts, and as militating strongly against Blass.

In Verrem, v., 57, 66, it was the weightiest charge brought by Cicero against Verres. To claim Roman citizenship falsely was punishable with death, Suet., *Claud.*, xxv. — **ἀκατακρίτους**: "uncondemned" gives a wrong idea, *cf.* also xxii. 25, although it is difficult to translate the word otherwise. The meaning is "without investigating our cause," *res incognita*, "causa cognita multi possunt absolvi; incognita quidem condemnari nemo potest," Cicero, *In Verrem*, i., 9, see also Wetstein, *in loco*. The word is only found in N.T., but Blass takes it as = Attic, **ἄκριτος**, which might be sometimes used of a cause *not yet tried*. The rendering "uncondemned" implies that the flogging would have been legal after a fair trial, but it was illegal under any circumstances, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 224. —**δημοσίᾳ** contrasted with **λάθρα**, so a marked contrast between **ἔβαλον εἰς φυλ.** and **ἐκβάλλουσιν**.—**Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας**: "Roman citizens as we are," the boast made by the masters of the girl, ver. 21. St. Paul, too, had his rights as a Roman citizen, see below on xxii. 28. The antithesis is again marked in the Apostles' assertion of their claim to courtesy as against the insolence of the prætors — they wish **ἐκβάλλειν λάθρα**; nay, but let them come in person (**αὐτοί**), and conduct us forth (**ἐξαγαγέτωσαν**).—**οὐ γὰρ**: *non profecto;* Blass, *Grammatik*, pp. 268, 269, "ut sæpe in responsis," see also Page, *in loco*.—**ἐξαγ.**: not only his sense of justice, but the fact that the public disgrace to which they had been subjected would seriously impede the acceptance of the Gospel message, and perhaps raise a prejudice to the injury of his Philippian converts, would prompt Paul to demand at least this amount of reparation. Wetstein's comments are well worth consulting.

Ver. 38. **ἀνήγγειλαν**, see critical notes. —**ἐφοβήθησαν**, so the chief captain, xxii. 29; and no wonder, for the illegal punishment of Roman citizens was a serious offence. If convicted, the magistrates would have been degraded, and incapable in future of holding office; *cf.* Cicero, *In Verrem*, v., 66; *Rep.*, ii., 31; and see Blass, note on xxii. 29, Grotius, *in loco*, and O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 99. In A.D. 44 the Rhodians had been deprived by Claudius of their privileges for putting some Roman citizens to death (*Speaker's Commentary*, *in loco*).

Ver. 39. See addition in D, critical note. The fear of a further riot expressed by the magistrates is exactly what we should expect in the cities of the Ægean lands, which were always weak in their municipal government. D also expresses the naïve way in which the magistrates not only try to throw the blame upon the people, but wanted to get out of a difficulty by procuring the withdrawal from the city of the injured parties, Ramsay, *u. s.*, p. 224. The Greek pointedly and dramatically expresses the change in the whole situation: **ἐλθόντες—παρεκάλεσαν —ἐξαγαγόντες ἠρώτων**! (Wendt).

Ver. 40. **εἰς**, see critical notes; they would not leave the city without once more visiting the household out of which grew the Church dearest to St. Paul; see Lightfoot's remarks on the growth of the Church from "the Church in the house," *Philippians*, pp. 57, 58.—**ἐξῆλθον**: the third person indicates that the narrator of the

ἐξελθεῖν τῆς πόλεως. 40. ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν Λυδίαν· καὶ ἰδόντες τοὺς ἀδελφούς,[1] παρεκάλεσαν αὐτούς, καὶ ἐξῆλθον.

[1] After αδελφους D adds διηγησαντο οσα εποιησεν Κυριος αυτοις, so Blass in β, and Hilg.

"We" section, xvi. 9, 10, remained at Philippi, Timothy probably accompanying Paul and Silas. In xx. 5 we again have ἡμᾶς introduced, and the inference is that St. Luke remained at Philippi during the interval, or at least for a part of it; and it is reasonable to infer that he laboured there in the Gospel, although he modestly refrains (as elsewhere) from any notice of his own work. The Apostle's first visit to Philippi represented in epitome the universality of the Gospel, so characteristic of St. Luke's record of our Lord's teaching, and so characteristic of the mind of St. Paul. Both from a religious and social point of view the conversions at Philippi are full of significance. The Jew could express his thankfulness in his morning prayer that God had not made him a Gentile—a woman—a slave. But at Philippi St. Paul taught in action the principle which he enforced in his Galatian Epistle, iii. 28, and again in writing to the Colossians, iii. 11: "Christ was all and in all"; in Him the soothsaying slave-girl, the proselyte of Thyatira, the Roman jailor, were each and all the children of God, and fellow-citizens with the saints, Lightfoot, Introduction to *Philippians;* Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, pp. 15, 26, 137 (second edition).

The narrative of St. Paul's visit to Philippi has been made the object of attack from various quarters. Most of the objections have been stated and met by Professor Ramsay, and a summary of them with their refutation is aptly given in a recent article by Dr. Giesekke (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1898) described at length in the *Expository Times*, March, 1898, see also Knabenbauer, pp. 292, 293. The view that the narrative is simply a fiction modelled upon the escape of St. Peter in iv. 31 and xii. is untenable in face of the many differences in the narratives (see the points of contrast in Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 315, 316). (Schneckenburger in his list of parallels between Peter and Paul in Acts apparently makes no mention of the supposed parallel here.) Zeller's attempt to connect the narrative with the story in Lucian's *Toxaris*, c. 27, is still more absurd, *cf.* Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 262 (second edition), and Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 501, whilst more recently Schmiedel (1898) attempts to find a parallel in Euripides, *Bacchæ*, 436-441, 502, 602-628, see Wendt's note, p. 282 (1899). Weizsäcker boldly refuses to admit even the imprisonment as a fact, and regards only the meeting of Paul with the soothsayer as historical. But it should be noted that he allows the Apostle's intercourse with Lydia and his instruction of the women to be genuine historical incidents, and he makes the important remark that the name of Lydia is the more credible, since the Philippian Epistle seems to support the idea that women received Paul and contributed to the planting of the Church (*Apostolic Age*, i., 284, E.T.). Holtzmann represents in a general manner the standpoint of modern advanced criticism, when he divides the narrative of the events at Philippi into two parts, the one concerned with events transacted under the open heaven, belonging not only to the "We" source but bearing also the stamp of reality, whilst the other part is not guaranteed by the "We" source, and is full of legendary matter. Thus vv. 25-34 are dismissed as a later addition, and Ramsay's fresh and careful explanations are dismissed by Holtzmann as "humbug"! *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, No. 7, 1899.

Additional Note.—Chap. xvi. 12, "which is a city of Macedonia, the first of the district," R.V. This *might* mean, so far as πρώτη is concerned, that Philippi was the city nearest in the district, and the city which they first reached. Neapolis, which actually came first on the route, was not generally regarded as Macedonian but Thracian; so Lightfoot, Rendall, O. Holtzmann. Or it might also mean that it was "the chief" (A.V.), the leading city of its division of Macedonia (Ramsay). Here again Ramsay sees a proof of St. Luke's intimate acquaintance with the rivalries of the Greek cities, and of his special interest in Philippi. In B.C. 167 the province Macedonia had been divided by the Romans into four districts, μερίς, and even if this division were obsolete at the time, another would be

XVII. 1. ΔΙΟΔΕΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ δὲ τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν καὶ [1] Ἀπολλωνίαν, ἦλθον εἰς Θεσσαλονίκην, ὅπου ἦν ἡ συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

[1] την before Ἀπολ. ℵABE 13, 40, 61, 180, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss. η before συν. *om.* ℵABD 13, 40, 61, 180, Sah., Boh., Arm., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler, Blass, Hilg.

likely to succeed to it (so Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 158, as against Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 50, who takes πρώτη as denoting not the political but the geographical position of Philippi.) At this time Amphipolis was the chief (πρώτη) city of the district to which both it and Philippi belonged, but though Amphipolis held the rank, Philippi claimed the same title, a case of rivalry between two or even three cities which often occurred. This single passage Ramsay regards as conclusive of the claims of Philippi, see *St. Paul*, p. 207, and *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii., 429. As to whether μερίς can be used in the sense of a division of a province, *cf.* Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 158, and the instances quoted from Egypt, and also *Expositor*, October, 1897, p. 320, as against Hort's limitation of the term. Hort, W.H., App. 96 (to whose view Rendall inclines, *cf.* also Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 375), thinks that μερίδος must be a corruption, and proposes Πιερίδος, Pieria being an ancient name of that part of Macedonia; but he declines to draw any positive conclusion in its favour. Wendt, following Meyer, regards πρώτη as signifying rank, and so far he is in agreement with Ramsay. But as Amphipolis was really the chief town of the district, he contends that πόλις κολωνία might be taken as one phrase (see also Hackett, Overbeck, Weiss, Holtzmann), and so he regards the whole expression as signifying that Philippi is spoken of as the most considerable colony-town in that district of Macedonia, whilst he agrees with Hort and Lightfoot in maintaining that πρώτη is only classical as an absolute title of towns in Asia Minor. This Ramsay allows, but the title was frequent in Asia and Cilicia, and might easily have been used elsewhere, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 156; Holtzmann quite admits that the term may have been applied as in Asian towns to signify the enjoyment of certain privileges. For Ramsay's criticism of Codex D, which substitutes κεφαλὴ τῆς Μ. and omits μερίδος altogether, see *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 156, 157, and *Expositor*, *u. s.*, κεφαλή being evidently substituted because the term πρώτη is ambiguous, and so liable to be misunderstood. Blass himself finds fault with D, and also considers πρώτη wrong, not only because Amphipolis was superior in rank, but because Thessalonica was called πρώτη Μακεδόνων, *C. T. Gr.*, 1967. But this would not prevent the rivalry amongst other towns in the various subdivisions of the province. Blass reads in β πρώτης μερίδος (a reading which Lightfoot thinks might deserve some consideration, though unsupported, if the original Roman fourfold division of the provinces were still maintained, see above, p. 355), and takes it as referring to Philippi as a city of the first of the four *regiones*.

CHAPTER XVII.—Ver. 1. διοδεύσαντες δέ: "and they went along the *Roman* road" (Ramsay): verb only found in Luke, Luke viii. 1, and here, but frequent in LXX, and used also by Polyb. and Plut., *cf.* Gen. xiii. 17, etc., so in 1 Macc. three times. The famous road, the *Via Egnatia*, Horace, *Sat.*, i., 5, 97, extended for a distance of over five hundred miles from the Hellespont to Dyrrhachium; it was really the continuation through Macedonia of the *Via Appia*, and it might be truly said that when St. Paul was on the Roman road at Troas or Philippi, he was on a road which led to the gates of Rome; see some interesting details in C. and H., p. 244. The article "certam atque notam viam designat," Blass, *in loco*, and *Gram.*, p. 149, but see also Weiss, *in loco*.—Ἀμφ., thirty-two or thirty-three miles from Philippi. The *Via Egnatia* passed through it (*cf.* C. and H., and Hackett, *in loco*). The import of its name may be contained in the term applied to it, Thuc., iv., 102, περιφανής, conspicuous towards sea and land, "the all around [visible] city"; or the name may simply refer to the fact that the Strymon flowed almost round the town, Thuc., *u. s.* Its earlier name, "Nine Ways," Ἐννέα ὁδοί, Thuc., i., 100; Herod vii., 114, indicated its important position, and no doubt this occasioned its colonisation by the Athenians in B.C. 437. In the Peloponnesian War it was famous as the scene of the battle in which both Brasidas

2. κατὰ δὲ τὸ εἰωθὸς τῷ Παύλῳ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ ἐπὶ σάββατα τρία [1] διελέγετο αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν, 3. διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος, ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν ἔδει παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν, καὶ ὅτι

[1] διελεξατο (*pro* -λεγετο, which Meyer retains) ℵAB 13, 61, 103, Syrr. P. and H., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; διελεχθη, Hilg. with D.

and Cleon fell, Thuc., v., 6-11, whilst for his previous failure to succour the place Thucydides had himself been exiled (Thuc., i., 26). From the Macedonians it passed eventually into the hands of the Romans, and in B.C. 167 Æmilius Paulus proclaimed the Macedonians free and Amphipolis the capital of the *first* of the four districts into which the Romans divided the province (Liv., xlv., 18, 29). In the Middle Ages *Popolia*, now *Neochori*: B.D.[2] and Hastings' B.D., C. and H. The route may well have been one of the most beautiful of any day's journey in St. Paul's many travels, Renan, *St. Paul*, pp. 154, 155.—Ἀπολλωνίαν: to be carefully distinguished from the more celebrated Apollonia in Illyria—apparently there were three places in Macedonia bearing this name. The *Antonine Itinerary* gives it as thirty miles from Amphipolis, and thirty-seven from Thessalonica, but the other authorities, for example, the *Jerusalem Itinerary*, differ a little. The *Via Egnatia* passed through it, and the name is probably retained in the modern *Pollina*. It is quite possible that the two places are mentioned as having formed St. Paul's resting-place for a night, see references above.—Θεσσαλονίκην: *Saloniki;* formerly Therme; the name had been most probably changed by Cassander in honour of his wife Thessalonica, the sister of Alexander the Great, Polyb., xxiii., 4, 4. Under the Romans it became the capital of the *second* of the four districts of Macedonia Provincia (Liv., xlv., 29), and later it was made the metropolis of the whole when the four districts were united into one. It was the largest as well as the most populous city in Macedonia, and like Ephesus and Corinth it had its share in the commerce of the Ægean. From its geographical position it could not cease to be important; through the Middle Ages it may fairly be described as the bulwark of Christendom in the East, and it still remains the second city in European Turkey. St. Paul, with his usual wisdom, selected it as marking a centre of civilisation and government in the district: "posita in gremio imperii Romani," as Cicero says. C. and H., p. 247 ff.; Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 151; Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 253 ff.; Schaff-Herzog, *Encycl.*, iv.—ὅπου ἦν ἡ συν.: implying that there was no synagogue at Amphipolis or Apollonia, the former being a purely Hellenic town, and the latter a small place. ὅπου may = οὗ simply, but if distinguished from it implies *oppidum tale in quo esset* (as in distinction to the other places named); see Wendt and Blass. In Agrippa's letter to Caligula we have plain evidence of the existence of Jews in Macedonia, O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 180; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., E.T., pp. 222, 232. As the name remains in the modern *Saloniki, manent Judaei quoque* (Blass), C. and H., 250, see also in this connection, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 236.

Ver. 2. κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς: phrase peculiar to St. Luke, only here and in Luke iv. 16. St. Paul follows his usual principle: "to the Jew first".—ἐπὶ σάββατα τρία: "for three Sabbath days" or "weeks," R.V., margin, the latter strongly supported by Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., 152. This may be the exact period of work *within* the synagogue. For ἐπί *cf.* iii. 1, iv. 15, xiii. 31, xvi. 18, etc.; Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 152, used in the "We" sections, and also predominantly, though not exclusively, in the rest of Acts or Luke or either of them; see on Acts xxvii. 20, xxviii. 6; Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 53; see also Blass, *Gram.*, p. 133.—διελέγετο αὐτοῖς: he reasoned, rather than disputed, as the word is sometimes rendered—ten times in Acts, seven times rendered by R.V., "reasoned," *cf.* also Heb. xii. 5, and twice "discoursed," xx. 7, 9, once only "disputed," xxiv. 12, *cf.* Jude 9. Here the word may point to a conversational intercourse between St. Paul and his fellow-countryman (*cf.* ver. 17 and Mark ix. 34); so Overbeck, Holtzmann, Wendt, on the force of the verb with the dative or πρός. That such interchange of speech could take place in the synagogue we learn from John vi. 25, 29, Matt. xii. 9. In classical Greek with the dative or πρός the word means to converse with,

οὗτός ἐστιν[1] ὁ Χριστός, Ἰησοῦς, ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. 4. καί τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπείσθησαν, καὶ προσεκληρώθησαν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σίλᾳ, τῶν τε[2] σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος, γυναικῶν τε τῶν

[1] **ο Χρ. Ι.**, so HLP and most mins., Theophyl., but B has **ο Χρ. ο Ι.**, so W.H. text, Weiss, Wendt, R.V., Blass in **α**; ℵ, so Vulgclem., Syr. Pesh., Boh., Armcodd. have **Ι. Χρ.**; AD **Χρ. Ι.**, so Tisch., W.H. marg., so Hilg. with comma after **Χ.**; **Χρ. ο Ι.**, so E 32, 177, 180. Probably the many changes arose from the unusual description in B with the double article.

[2] **σεβ. Ελλ.**, AD 13, 40, 61, Vulg., Boh., Gig. have **σεβ. και Ελλ.**, so Lach. This reading is defended by Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 235, and Hilgenfeld, *Zw. Th.*, 1896, p. 198, so in 1899, *Acta Apost.* (but not by Blass in **β** text); see notes in comment. Wendt (1899) finds a solution of the reading in the wish to express that Paul won converts amongst other Gentiles than the proselytes. **γυναικων τε**, but D, Gig. **και γυναικες των πρ. ουκ ολιγ.** Probably the reviser took **πρωτων** as referring only to the men, and thought that the expression meant "wives of the chief men" (so too Weiss explains the words), and then altered above to bring out this sense more clearly. **πρωτων** of course could be taken as masc., but better to refer it to **γυν.** = **ευσχ.**, xiii. 50, xvii. 12 (Wendt, 1899). Belser, however, pp. 81, 82, strongly supports the originality of D; he points out that in Acts we never have the expression **των πρ.** used of women, and that the reading in D harmonises with the thought that the influence of these women as wives of the leading citizens may account for the mild treatment of the Apostles.

to argue, and thus in Xen., *Mem.*, i., 6, 1, ii., 10, 1, we have the construction **διαλ. π. τινι** or **πρός τινα** to discuss a question with another, so that the word might easily have the meaning of arguing or reasoning about a question, but not of necessity with any hostile intent; even in Heb. xii. 5 it is the fatherly **παράκλησις** which reasoneth with sons. Blass supports the imperfect as in T.R., *Gram.*, p. 186.—**ἀπὸ γραφῶν**, *i.e.*, drawing his proofs from them, or if a discussion is meant, starting from them; Winer-Moulton, xlvii., Grotius, so Overbeck, Kuinoel, Weiss, Wendt take the word with **διανοίγων**.

Ver. 3. **διανοίγων**, *sc.*, **αὐτάς**, a favourite word with St. Luke, *cf.* xvi. 14; here, as in Luke xxiv. 32, 45, he alone uses it of making plain to the understanding the meaning of the Scriptures, "opening their meaning".—**καὶ παρατιθ.** "and quoting to prove" (Ramsay), *i.e.*, bringing forward in proof passages of Scripture; so often amongst profane writers in a similar way, instances in Wetstein; lit., the word means "to set forth," and this was the older English meaning of *allege;* in middle voice, to set forth from oneself, to explain; to quote in one's own favour, as evidence, or as authority, "Non other auctour *allegge* I," Chaucer, *Hours of Fame*, 314.—**τὸν Χ. ἔδει παθεῖν**: "that it behoved the Christ to suffer," R.V., *cf.* Luke xxiv. 25, 46; now as ever "to the Jews a stumbling-block," see above on p. 113, and *cf.* xxvi. 23; so also in writing to the Thessalonian Church the Apostle insists on the same fundamental facts of Christian belief, 1 Thess. iv. 14.—**καὶ ὅτι οὗτος κ.τ.λ.**: "and that this Jesus whom, *said he*, I proclaim unto you is the Christ," R.V. adds ὁ before Ἰ. The words *said he* are inserted because of the change of construction, *cf.* i. 4, xxiii. 22, Luke v. 14, specially frequent in Luke. On St. Paul's preaching that "Jesus was the Christ," and what it involved, see *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 307 ff.

Ver. 4. **προσεκληρώθησαν**: "there were in addition gathered to them" (Ramsay), giving the verb a passive meaning answering to its form; or "these were allotted to them, associated with them, as disciples [by God]," *cf.* Ephes. i., 11. The verb is often used in Philo, also found in Plutarch, Lucian, but only here in N.T. Mr. Rendall, while pointing out that the A.V. and R.V. "consorted" gives the impression of outward association only, regards the passive aorist as a middle in meaning, and renders "threw in their lot with Paul and Silas". According to A.V. and R.V., W. H., Weiss, and Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 89, two classes seem to be mentioned besides the Jews, *viz.*, devout Greeks, and some of the chief women. According, however, to Ramsay, comparing A and D (see p. 235, *St. Paul*),

πρώτων οὐκ ὀλίγαι. 5. ζηλώσαντες δὲ οἱ[1] ἀπειθοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ προσλαβόμενοι τῶν ἀγοραίων τινὰς ἄνδρας πονηρούς, καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες, ἐθορύβουν τὴν πόλιν· ἐπιστάντες τε τῇ οἰκίᾳ Ἰάσονος,

[1] **απειθουντες** *om.* ℵABE, Vulg., Syr. P. H., Sah., Boh., Arm., Aethpp., so Tisch., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, W.H.; **προσλ. δε οι l. οι απειθ.** HLP; reading in T.R. very ill supported; and there are other variations. Probably **απειθ.** is an addition after xiv. 2. D reads **οι δε απειθ. l. συνστρεψαντες** (**συστροφη** occurs twice in Acts, not elsewhere in N.T., but not **συστρεφω** in sense demanded here), so Blass in β, and Hilg. **αγαγειν**, but **προ-** ℵAB, Vulg., Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, W.H., R.V., Blass in β; Meyer follows T.R. with HP; **προσαγ.** in E; **αναγαγ.** in L; **εξαγαγ.** in D, so Hilg.

we have three classes besides the Jews, *viz.*, proselytes, Greeks, chief women (added as a climax), see critical note, but also McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 247. The difficulty in T.R. and authorities first mentioned is that their rendering restricts St. Paul's work not only to three Sabbaths or weeks, but to the synagogue and its worshippers, whereas from 1 Thess. i. 9, ii. 14, it would appear that the Church contained a large number of converted heathens. McGiffert thinks it possible that St. Luke may have only recorded the least important of Paul's labours, just as he only mentions his work in three Macedonian towns, whereas he may easily have laboured over a wider area, 1 Thess. i. 7; but see Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, ix., 6, and on the reading, Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 152. In any case it would seem that a small minority of Jews is contrasted with a large number of born Gentiles, so that the Thessalonian Church may have been spoken of by St. Paul as one of Gentile Christians, who had been opposed not only to Christianity, but earlier still to Judaism, 1 Thess. i. 9, 10.—**γυν. τε τῶν πρώτων οὐκ ὀλίγαι**: here, as at Philippi and Berœa, the three Macedonian towns, the prominence assigned to women quite in accordance with what we know from other sources; see above. The mention both here and in ver. 12 that the women were the leading high-born women intimates that the poorer women would follow the men of the lower orders, ver. 5. Dr. Hort regards the women here as the Jewish wives of heathen men of distinction, as in xiii. 50, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 89, but in xiii. 50 the opposition to the Apostles proceeds from these women of the higher classes, and it seems much more likely that those mentioned here were Macedonian women.

Ver. 5. ἀπειθ., see critical note.—**ζηλώσαντες**: the jealousy is apparent, whether the word is read or not (*cf.* β), a jealousy aroused not only by the preaching of a Messiah, but also by the success of such preaching.—**προσλαβ.**, *cf.* xviii. 26 for similar sense of the verb, *cf.* 2 Macc. viii. 1, x. 15.—**τῶν ἀγοραίων . . . πον.**: "certain vile fellows of the rabble," R.V.; **πον.** translated in A.V. "lewd" (A.-S. loewede) means simply "people," hence (1) the common people and (2) the ignorant and rude among the people, *cf.* Spenser, *Shep. Kal. Feb.*, 245: "But little ease of thy *lewd* tale I tasted" (Skeat); and in the sense of vicious, Ezek. xvi. 27, A. and R.V. (see Lumby's note *in loco* — the German *Leute* is the word nearest akin to it.)—**ἀγορ.**: hangers-on in the market-place; Blass renders "tabernarii aliique in foro versantes," see instances in Wetstein (Aristophanes, Xen., Plut.), who compares "canalicolæ" hodie *canaille*. In Latin, subrostrani, subbasilicani; Germ. Pflastertreter, our *Loafer*, Grimm-Thayer, Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 513, and Nösgen, *in loco*. On the distinction sometimes but probably fancifully maintained between ἀγοραῖος and ἀγόραιος, see Alford on xix. 38; Wendt (1888), *in loco*; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 69; Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* For the accent of **πονηρός** see also Winer-Schmiedel, *u. s.*—**τῇ οἰκίᾳ Ἰ.**: in which the Apostles were lodging, or in which the Christian assemblies were held. We know nothing further for certain of this Jason, *cf.* Rom. xvi. 21 where a Jason is mentioned as a companion of Paul, and amongst his **συγγενεῖς**. If he was a Jew, as is most probable, we may infer that his Jewish name was Joshua or Jesus, but that he used the name Jason, the nearest Greek equivalent, in his intercourse with Greeks and Hellenists; *cf.* for a similar change of the two names 2 Macc. i. 7, iv. 7, and *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 5, 1, where we read that Jason's real name was Joshua, but that he changed it into the

ἐζήτουν αὐτοὺς ἀγαγεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον· 6. μὴ εὑρόντες δὲ αὐτούς, ἔσυρον τὸν Ἰάσονα καί τινας ἀδελφοὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς πολιτάρχας, βοῶντες, Ὅτι οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες, οὗτοι καὶ ἐνθάδε πάρεισιν, 7. οὓς ὑποδέδεκται Ἰάσων· καὶ οὗτοι πάντες ἀπέναντι τῶν δογμάτων

former, owing no doubt to his Hellenising; see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 184, note; Wendt and Zöckler express themselves doubtfully, and hold that the name may be here a Greek name, and its bearer not a Jew at all.—**ἐπιστάντες**, *cf.* iv. 1, vi. 12, Friedrich, p. 87.—**δῆμον**: to a public meeting, or to the crowd who shall inflict vengeance on them, there and then (so Weiss, Lumby); C. and H. take it of the free assembly of the people, so Ramsay. A true cause does not need such methods or supporters, "non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis".

Ver. 6. **ἔσυρον**: the word indicates the violence of the mob.—**πολιτάρχας**: the word is an excellent instance of the accuracy of St. Luke; it is not used by any classical author of the magistrates of any city (in classical Greek we have only the form **πολίαρχος** and **πολίταρχος**), but an inscription on an arch spanning a street of the modern city has been preserved containing the title (and also containing the names which occur among the names of St. Paul's converts, Sosipater, Gaius, Secundus), see Bœckh, *C. I. Gr.*, 1967. The arch is assigned to the time of Vespasian, and the entablature preserved by the British consul at the instance of Dean Stanley in 1876 is in the British Museum, see Blass, *in loco*, *Speaker's Commentary*, C. and H. (small edition), p. 258, Knabenbauer *in loco*, and for other inscription evidence, Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., 151. But more recently Burton (*Amer. Jour. of Theol.*, July, 1898, pp. 598-632) has collected no less than seventeen inscriptions on which the word **πολιτάρχαι** or **πολιταρχοῦντες** (**πολειταρχ-**), the latter more frequently, occurs: of these thirteen are referred to Macedonia, and of these again five to Thessalonica, extending from the beginning of the first to the middle of the second century, A.D. The number of the politarchs in Thessalonica varies from five to six (see *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1899, 2, for notice of Burton's article by Schürer), and on spelling, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 82 note.—**τὴν οἰκουμένην**: no doubt in the political sense "the Roman Empire" since the charge was a political one, and was naturally exaggerated through jealousy and excitement. There is therefore no need for the hypercritical remarks of Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, against the truthfulness or accuracy of the expression.—**ἀναστατώσαντες**: only in Luke and Paul, xxi. 38, Gal. v. 12, see LXX, Dan. vii. 23 (in a different sense), Deut. xxix. 27, Græc. Venet. (Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*), and several times in the O.T., fragments of Aquila, Symmachus, and in Eustathius, see also Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.*). **οὗτοι**, contemptuous.

Ver. 7. **ὑποδέδεκται**: no notion of secrecy as Erasmus and Bengel, but as in Luke x. 38, xix. 6; only found in these three passages in Luke, and in James ii. 25, *cf.* LXX, Tob. vii. 8, Jud. xiii. 13 (see Hatch and Redpath for both instances), 1 Macc. xvi. 15, and 4 Macc. xiii. 17, often in classical Greek without any notion of secrecy.—**οὗτοι πάντες**: the words may be taken as referring not only to Jason and the accused, but with Alford, "all these people," *i.e.*, Christians wherever found.—**ἀπέναντι**: only here in N.T. in this sense (common in LXX and Apocrypha, so also Polyb., i., 86, 3), *cf.* Ecclus. xxxvi. (xxxiii.) 14.—**δογμάτων**, see on xvi. 4. The word may here refer to the successive decrees of the emperors against treason, and there is no need to refer it in this passage to the decree of Claudius, see on xviii. 2, but rather to the Julian *Leges Majestatis*.—**β. λέγοντες ἕτερον εἶναι**: this was the charge, the political charge of high treason, brought against our Lord Himself by the Jews, Luke xxiii. 2, John xix. 12, 15. The nature of this charge may fairly point to a Jewish source, for the Jews thought of the Messiah as a king, and in their hostility to Paul they could easily accuse him of proclaiming Jesus or another king, another emperor (Ramsay), instead of Caesar; so McGiffert on this passage, "whose trustworthiness can hardly be doubted" (*Apostolic Age*, p. 246). The Epistles to the Thessalonians contain passages which might be as easily perverted in the same direction, 1 Thess. ii. 12, iv. 14, v. 2, 23; 2 Thess. i. 5-8, or the fact that Jesus was so often spoken of as **Κύριος**, "that deathless King Who lived and died for men," might have given colour to the charge, *cf.* on the

Καίσαρος πράττουσι, βασιλέα λέγοντες ἕτερον εἶναι,[1] Ἰησοῦν. 8. ἐτάραξαν δὲ τὸν ὄχλον καὶ τοὺς πολιτάρχας ἀκούοντας ταῦτα· 9. καὶ λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανὸν παρὰ τοῦ Ἰάσονος καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς. 10. Οἱ δὲ ἀδελφοὶ εὐθέως διὰ τῆς νυκτὸς ἐξέπεμψαν τόν τε Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σίλαν εἰς Βέροιαν· οἵτινες παραγενόμενοι, εἰς

[1] Before Ιησουν Blass reads τινα ποτε (*nescio quem*) with Gig., and cod. Lat. Sangermanensis ap. Berger. *Cf.* xxv. 19.

coincidence and accuracy of the Acts and 1 Thess. ii. 14-16, Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, ix., 5, and McGiffert, *u. s.*

Ver. 8. **ἐτάραξαν**: the people would be disturbed at intelligence which might point to a revolution, and the politarchs, lest they should themselves be liable to the same charge of treason for not defending the honour of the emperor. No charge would be more subtle in its conception, or more dangerous in the liabilities which it involved, *cf.* Tacitus, *Ann.*, iii., 38.

Ver. 9. **λαβόντες τὸ ἱκανὸν** = *satis accipere* (*cf.* Mark xv. 15, and Wetstein, *in loco*). Blass regards the phrase as a commercial one, due to the frequency of commercial intercourse, and *cf.* v. 31, xviii. 15, xix. 38 (xxiv. 24, β); properly a pecuniary surety, or sureties, here security for good behaviour from Jason and the others, that nothing illegal should be done by them, and certainly nothing against the majesty of the emperor. The words have been explained as meaning that securities were given for the production of the Apostles, and that thus Jason and his friend, by sending them off at night, ran a risk of their lives (Chrys., Grotius), or that the Apostles should not be sheltered any longer, or that they should be obliged to depart at once. Evidently the magistrates did not consider the evidence very weighty = **ἀπέλυσαν αὐτούς**.

Ver. 10. **εὐθέως . . . ἐξέπεμ.**: there was need of immediate action, either in obedience to the direct charge of the magistrates that Paul should not come again to Thessalonica, or from danger of a revival of the tumult. That St. Paul left Thessalonica with grief and pain is evident from 1 Thess. ii. 17-20, but he felt that the separation was necessary at least for a time. But still he looked back upon Thessalonica and his work with an ungrudging affection, and his converts were his glory and joy. In the opening words of his First Epistle, i. 7 (*cf.* 2 Thess. i. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 1), he speaks in a way which not only implies that his own work extended further in and from Thessalonica than the Acts alone enables us to learn, but that the furtherance of the Gospel was due to the Thessalonians themselves. See McGiffert, p. 255, on St. Paul's quiet hand-to-hand work at Thessalonica. For it was not only in the synagogue that St. Paul laboured, as if the message of the Gospel was formal and official, but amongst them who were working like himself for their daily bread, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8, see Ramsay's note, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 85, on St. Paul's work at Thessalonica. The phrase "night and day," 1 Thess. ii. 9, need not imply, as the *Speaker's Commentary*, that Paul had only the Sundays for preaching, because his other days were so fully occupied; but the phrase means that he started work before dawn, and thus was able to devote some of the later part of the day to preaching. On the striking parallel between the characteristics of the Thessalonians of St. Paul's Epistles and the Acts and the characteristics which were marked by St. Jerome in his day, see *Speaker's Commentary*, iii., 701.—**Βέροιαν** (or **Βέρροια**): in the district of Macedonia called Emathia, Ptol., iii., 12, originally perhaps Pherœa, from Pheres, its founder (see Wetstein): about fifty miles southwest of Thessalonica. It was smaller and less important than the latter, but still possessing a considerable population and commerce, owing to its natural advantages, now *Verria* or *Kara Feria*, see B.D.[2] and Hastings' B.D., Renan, *St. Paul*, p. 162, and C. and H., small edition, p. 261. According to the Itineraries, two roads led from Thessalonica to Berœa. Wetstein quotes a curious passage from Cicero, *In Pisonem*, xxvi., which may possibly indicate that Paul and Silas went to Berœa on account of its comparative seclusion (so Alford, Farrar, Felten): Cicero calls it "oppidum devium".—**εἰς τὴν συν.** The Jewish population was at least considerable

τὴν συναγωγὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπῄεσαν. 11. οὗτοι δὲ ἦσαν[1] εὐγενέστεροι τῶν ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ, οἵτινες ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας, τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφάς, εἰ ἔχοι ταῦτα οὕτως. 12. πολλοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπίστευσαν,[2] καὶ τῶν Ἑλληνίδων

[1] For ευγενεστεροι D, Par.[1] read ευγενεις, but not Blass or Hilg. Whether το is to be retained (W.H., Weiss, Blass) before καθ᾽ ημεραν or omitted is difficult to decide (Wendt); it may easily have fallen out, or may have been added, *cf.* Luke xi. 3, and at end of verse καθως Π. απαγγελλει is added by β, after 137, Gig., Syr. H. mg., so Hilg.

[2] After επιστ. D adds τινες δε ηπιστησαν, *cf.* xxviii. 24; see Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 160 (also Corssen, *u. s.*, p. 444, who thinks that the addition proceeded from anti-Jewish feeling). In the same verse D reads και των Ελληνων και των ευσχημονων α. και γ. ικανοι επιστευσαν. Here Ramsay holds that D misses a characteristic of Macedonia, *viz.*, the prominent part played by the women, *C. R. E.*, pp. 160, 161. Blass omits και after Ελλην. Hilg. follows D here and above.

enough to have a synagogue, and thither Paul, according to his custom, went first.—**ἀπῄεσαν**: only here in N.T., *cf.* 2 Macc. xii. 1, 4 Macc. iv. 8; here it may imply that on their arrival Paul and Silas left their escort, and went into the synagogue.

Ver. 11. **εὐγενέστεροι**: only in Luke and Paul in the N.T., so in classics the word is used of noble birth, Luke xix. 12, 1 Cor. i. 26 (Job i. 3), or of nobility of character as here, *cf.* also its use in 4 Macc. iii. 5, ix. 23, 27 (and **εὐγενῶς** in 2 Macc. xiv. 42, and several times in 4 Macc.). We may compare the wide and varying use of the Latin *ingenuus* in accordance with the context, its meaning here is that the Berœans were far from the strife and envy of the Thessalonian Jews; see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 154, 160, 163, on the less favourable attitude of Codex Bezæ to the Berœans than the T.R., and critical note; see also above on xiii. 50.—**προθ.**: another word only in Luke and Paul, *cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 11, 12, 19, ix. 2; not in LXX, but once in Ecclus. xlv. 23, frequent in classical Greek.—**τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν**: indicates that St. Paul made a lengthy stay at Berœa also, *cf.* Luke xi. 3, xix. 47, but elsewhere without the article, with the article peculiar to Luke (see Plummer's note on Luke xi. 3). On the frequency of **καθ᾽ ἡμέραν** in Luke's writings see Friedrich, p. 9, and above on Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 33. If **τό** is read, see critical note, it particularises the repetition or constancy of the act.—**ἀνακρ.**: "examining," R.V. (the word in St. John v. 39, which A.V. also renders "search," is **ἐρευνάω**), *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 25, 27, used elsewhere by St. Luke of a judicial inquiry or investigation, Luke xxiii. 14, Acts iv. 9, xii. 19, xxiv. 8, xxviii. 18. The word is only found in Luke and Paul, once in LXX, 1 Sam. xx. 12, in a general sense, and in Susannah, vv. 48, 51, where it is connected with a judicial inquiry, as elsewhere in Luke. In classical Greek used also in the general sense of examining closely, questioning, sifting.—**τὰς γραφάς**: Blass explains "locos a Paulo allatos," but although these were *ipso facto* included, the term can hardly be so limited, *cf.* xviii. 24, 28, and Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 22. "Character verae religionis, quod se dijudicari patitur," Bengel.—**εἰ ἔχοι**, Burton, p. 52, *cf.* Luke i. 29, iii. 15. Wendt rightly points out that the positive praise bestowed on the Jews of Berœa tends in itself to contradict the theory that Acts was written to emphasise the unbelief of the Jews, and to contrast their unbelief with Gentile belief.

Ver. 12. See critical note and Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, *u. s.* As at Thessalonica, so here the Apostles' work extended beyond the limits of the synagogue. **Ἑλληνίδων**: the term relates to the men as well as to the women—the Jewish men had already been included in the first word **πολλοί**, see Alford, Weiss, Wendt, Zöckler.—**εὐσχημόνων**, see above on xiii. 50. Blass refers the term to **ἀνδρῶν** also, and points out that Sopater of Berœa alone in Acts is named **πατρόθεν** according to Greek custom, *cf.* xx. 4 (R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt). See also Orr, *Neglected Factors in the Early Progress of Christianity*, p. 107.

Ver. 13. **οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Θ. Ἰ.**: as before in the first journey, the bitter and enduring malice of the Jews followed Paul

γυναικῶν τῶν εὐσχημόνων καὶ ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ὀλίγοι. 13. ὡς δὲ ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης Ἰουδαῖοι, ὅτι καὶ ἐν τῇ Βεροίᾳ κατηγγέλη ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἦλθον κἀκεῖ σαλεύοντες[1] τοὺς ὄχλους. 14. εὐθέως δὲ τότε τὸν Παῦλον ἐξαπέστειλαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πορεύεσθαι ὡς[2] ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν· ὑπέμενον δὲ ὅ τε Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐκεῖ. 15. Οἱ δὲ καθιστῶντες τὸν Παῦλον ἤγαγον αὐτὸν

[1] After σαλ. ℵABD 13, 40, 61, verss., except Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg., add και ταρασσοντες. Meyer thinks the words a gloss and *cf.* ver. 8. D also reads οτι (ο) λογος του Θεου κατηγγελη εις Βεροιαν και επιστευσαν, so Hilg. and Blass in β. The και επιστ., the reception of the Gospel, was the reason of this turbulent action. At end of verse D, Syr. Pesh. add ου διελιμπανον (*cf.* Acts viii. 24 β), so Blass and Hilg. In Luke vii. 45 we have διαλειπω, and only in that place in N.T. But διαλιμπανω occurs also, Tob. x. 7, ου διελιμπανε θρηνουσα Τωβιαν (but S *al.*). This *may* have suggested viii. 24. It may perhaps be noted that διαλιμπανω is a medical word = διαλειπω (Galen).

[2] Before επι read according to ℵABE 13, 40, 61, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, εως instead of ως; Meyer retains ως. In D, Sah., Aeth., word omitted. υπεμενον, but υπεμειναν ℵB 61, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; υπεμεινεν AD 27, 137, Sah., Syr. Pesh., so Lach, Hilg., and Blass in β. τε (for δε) ℵABE, Syr. P. and H., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

from one place to another, and the use of his name alone shows that he was their chief aim.—κἀκεῖ: the word is often taken with σαλεύοντες, for it was not their advent which had happened previously, but their incitement to risk against Paul, so Page, Weiss, Wendt, Rendall, etc.; on the word see above on xiv. 7.—σαλεύοντες, *cf.* also for its figurative use 2 Thess. ii. 2, very frequent in LXX, and sometimes in figurative sense, as often in the Psalms, *cf.* 1 Macc. vi. 8, see above on ii. 25, and critical note on D.

Ver. 14. εὐθέως δὲ τότε: evidently the same riot and danger followed as at Thessalonica; St. Luke often passes over the difficulties and dangers which drove Paul from place to place (Ramsay).—ὡς: if we read ἕως, R.V., see critical note, "as far as to the sea," but ὡς ἐπί might well mean *ad mare versus*, *ad mare*, so Alford, Blass, and instances in Wetstein. There is no need to suppose that the words express a feigned movement to elude pursuit, "as if towards the sea" (see this meaning supported by Rendall, p. 108).—ἐπὶ τὴν θ.: probably he would embark at Dium near the foot of Olympus, which was connected by a direct road with Berœa (Lewin, C. and H., but see, however, Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 166, note).—ὑπέμ. . . . ἐκεῖ, *i.e.*, remained behind at Berœa, probably to gain the first intelligence from Thessalonica as to the possibility of St. Paul's return, and to bring the news to the Apostle, whose next stage may not have been decided upon until he reached the coast.

Ver. 15. καθιστῶντες, see critical note, *i.e.*, the Berœan brethren. In N.T. only here in this sense, *cf.* Josh. vi. 23, 2 Chron. xxviii. 15, so also in classical Greek and in later Greek (instances in Wetstein); they accompanied Paul probably for protection as well as guidance (it has sometimes been supposed that disease of the eyes rendered the guidance necessary, but the word is used quite generally); see further additional note at end of chapter and critical note above, Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 159, 160. If we compare xviii. 5 it looks as if Timothy and Silas only overtook Paul at Corinth, and that he had left Athens before they reached that city. But from 1 Thess. iii. 1 it appears that Timothy was with Paul at Athens, and was sent from thence by him to Thessalonica, and this is quite in accordance with Paul's earnest wish that Timothy and Silas should come to him as quickly as possible (if we suppose that they only rejoined him in xviii. 5, they must have taken a much longer time than was necessary for the journey). But if Paul remained alone, as he states, 1 Thess. iii. 1, at Athens, Silas must also have been sent away; and we may well suppose that as Timothy was sent to comfort the Thessalonians for St. Paul's delay in returning to them, so Silas may have

ἕως Ἀθηνῶν[1]· καὶ λαβόντες ἐντολὴν πρὸς τὸν Σίλαν καὶ Τιμόθεον, ἵνα ὡς τάχιστα ἔλθωσι πρὸς αὐτόν, ἐξῄεσαν.

16. Ἐν δὲ ταῖς Ἀθήναις ἐκδεχομένου αὐτοὺς τοῦ Παύλου, παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θεωροῦντι[2] κατείδωλον οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν. 17. διελέγετο μὲν οὖν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς σεβομένοις, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν πρὸς τοὺς

[1] **καθισταvοντες** in AB 25, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; D **καταστανοντες**, so Hilg. Blass in β follows reading in T.R. After **Αθηνων** D adds **παρηλθεν δε την Θεσσαλιαν· εκωλυθη γαρ εις αυτους κηρυξαι τον λογον**, so Blass in β, and Hilg.; *cf.* also Ephraem (Harris, *Four Lectures, etc.*, pp. 28, 47, 83). Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 160, thinks that the reviser did not observe that Paul probably sailed direct from the coast of Macedonia to Athens; in other words, he mistook a sea voyage for a journey by land. But Harris, *u. s.*, p. 83, holds that Ramsay may be incorrect in this, and that the reviser meant to imply that St. Paul went to Athens by sea, but that he did not go through Thessaly, but *coasted by it.* It is also possible that **παρηλθεν** may mean "neglected" Thessaly in the sense that he did not preach to them, and in this sense Harris, p. 84, believes that Blass would find it possible to defend the Lucanity of the gloss; see also Wendt (1899), p. 288, note.

[2] **θεωρουντος**, instead of dat. as in T.R., ℵABE 40, 61, 180, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; D has the dat., so Blass in β, and Hilg., which seems conformity to **αυτῳ**.

been sent to Philippi, with which St. Paul was frequently in communication at this time, Phil. iv. 15. But after their return to Corinth from their mission, they found that St. Paul had already gone on to Corinth, and there they rejoined him. See on the whole subject, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 233, 240, as against McGiffert; Wendt (1899) and Felten, *in loco*; Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, ix., 4.

Ver. 16. **ἐκδεχομένου**, *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 33, xvi. 11, rare in classical Greek in this sense.—**παρωξύνετο**: "was provoked," R.V., only found elsewhere in N.T. in St. Paul's own description of **ἀγάπη**, 1 Cor. xiii. 5, and *cf.* xv. 39 (see note) and Heb. x. 24 for the cognate noun, see on the latter, Westcott, *in loco*. In LXX both verb and noun are used for burning with anger, or for violent anger, passion, Hos. viii. 5, Zech. x. 3, Deut. xxix. 28, Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 37; *cf.* Dem., 514, 10; **ὠργίσθη καὶ παρωξύνθη** (Meyer-Wendt).—**τὸ πνεῦμα**: expression principally used in Paul, *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 11, Rom. i. 9, viii. 16, etc. Blass calls it *periphrasis hebraica*, and *cf.* Luke i. 47.—**θεωροῦντες**: "beheld," R.V., as of contemplation in thought, Latin, *contemplari*.—**κατείδωλον**: "full of idols," R.V.—the rendering "wholly given to idolatry" was not true, *i.e.*, idolatry in the sense of worshipping the innumerable idols. If the city had been sincerely devoted to idol worship St. Paul might have had more to appeal to, "verum monumenta pietatis reperiebat Paulus, non ipsam, quæ dudum evanuerat," Blass. A.V. follows Vulgate, "idololatriæ deditum". The adjective is found only here, but it is formed after the analogy of **κατάδενδρος, κατάμπελος**, so Hermann, *ad Vig.*, p. 638 (1824), "**κατείδωλος πόλις** non est, uti quidam opinantur, *simulacris dedita urbs*, sed *simulacris referta*". No word could have been more fitly chosen to describe the aspect of Athens to St. Paul as he wandered through it, a city which had been described as **ὅλη βωμός, ὅλη θῦμα θεοῖς καὶ ἀνάθημα**, see below on ver. 17. Before he actually entered the city, as he walked along the Hamaxitos road, St. Paul would have seen altars raised at intervals to the unknown gods, as both Pausanias and Philostratus testify, see "Athens," F. C. Conybeare, in Hastings' B.D. "He took these incomparable figures for idols," writes Renan (*Saint Paul*, p. 172) as he describes the beautiful sculptured forms upon which the eyes of the Apostle would be fixed, but the man who could write Rom. i. must have been keenly alive to the dangers which followed upon "the healthy sensualism of the Greeks".

Ver. 17. **μὲν οὖν . . . τινὲς δὲ**, see Rendall, p. 162, Appendix on **μὲν οὖν**, for the antithesis; a simple instance of two parties acting in opposition. Page however finds the antithesis to **μὲν οὖν** in ver. 19. **ἐπιλαβ. δὲ** (so W. H.), and regards **τινὲς δὲ . . . συνέβαλλον αὐτῷ**

παρατυγχάνοντας. 18. τινὲς δὲ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων καὶ τῶν Στωϊκῶν[1] φιλοσόφων συνέβαλλον αὐτῷ· καί τινες ἔλεγον, Τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ

[1] After δε ℵBDHLP, Syr. Pesh., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. add και; instead of Επικουρειων W.H. read Επικουριων, and Weiss, W.H. alt., Hilg. Στοϊκων for Στωικων; see W.H., pp. 159, 161, *App.*

as almost parenthetical, see below on ver. 19.—διελέγετο: "he reasoned," R.V. (so Ramsay), see above on ver. 2. —ἐν τῇ συν.: on the synagogue see "Athens," F. C. Conybeare, in Hastings' B.D., but St. Paul did not confine himself to the synagogue, although undeterred by their hatred he went first to his own countrymen, and to the proselytes. But probably they were not numerous (see Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 533), and the Apostle carried the same method of reasoning into the market-place—as was natural in the city of Socrates, he entered into conversation with those whom he met, as the same philosopher had done four hundred years before. Thus he became an Athenian to the Athenians: see the striking parallel in the description of Socrates, "he was to be seen in the market-place at the hour when it was most crowded," etc., and the words used by Socrates of himself, Plato, *Apol.*, 31 A, quoted by Grote, viii., 211, 212, small edit., p. 212. F. C. Conybeare, *u. s.*, compares the experiences in Athens of the Apostle's contemporary Apollonius with those of St. Paul; he too reasoned διελέξατο with them on religious matters, Philostr., *Vit. Apollonii Tyanæ*, iv., 19. The words ἐν τῇ συν. are placed in brackets by Hilgenfeld, and referred by Clemen to his Redactor Antijudaicus, whilst Jüngst retains the words but omits 16b, and with Van Manen and Clemen regards the whole of Paul's subsequent speech to the philosophers as the interpolation of a Redactor, p. 161 ff.—ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ: not the market-place like that which fills a bare space in a modern town, but rather to be compared with its varied beauty and its busy crowd to the square of some Italian city, *e.g.*, the *Piazza di Marco* of Venice. There the Apostle's eye would fall on portico after portico, adorned by famous artists, rich in noble statues, see F. C. Conybeare, *u. s.*, and Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 180. On the west lay the *Stoa Pœcile*, whence the Stoics received their name, and where Zeno met his pupils, whilst the quiet gardens of Epicurus were probably not far distant (see on the site of the Agora to which St. Luke refers, "Athens," B.D.², i., 292, 293, and also C. and H., smaller edition, p. 273, Hackett, *in loco*, for different views as to its site).—κατὰ πᾶσαν ἡμέραν: every day, for he could take advantage by this method not only of the Sabbaths and days of meeting in the synagogues, but of every day, *cf.* the words of Socrates, Plato, *u. s.*, in describing his own daily work of conversation with every one τὴν ἡμέραν ὅλην πανταχοῦ προσκαθίζων. The phrase seems to denote some time spent at Athens.—παρατυγχάνοντας: "chance comers" (like another Socrates), used only here in N.T., but *cf.* Thuc., i., 22, not in LXX or Apocrypha. Athens was full not only of philosophers, but we can imagine from the one phrase applied to it, Tac., *Ann.*, ii., 55, what a motley group might surround the Apostle, *illa colluvies nationum.*

Ver. 18. συνέβαλλον αὐτῷ: a word peculiar to St. Luke; three times in his Gospel, four times in Acts; it need not have necessarily a hostile sense as in Luke xiv. 31, but simply means that amongst the chance comers in the Agora there were some who "engaged in discussions" with him (so Blass like Latin, *consilia conferre, sc.* λόγους), a meaning perhaps suggested by the imperfect. Grotius and others take it as "translatio de prœliis sumpta, ut apparet, Luc. xiv. 31. Utitur ita sæpe Polybius, quem sequi amat Lucas."—Ἐπικουρείων: so called from Epicurus, 342-270 B.C.; his disciples were known also as the School of the Garden, from the garden in Athens where the master instructed them, in distinction from the disciples of the Porch or the Academy. We must be careful to remember that as in numberless other cases, so the system of the founder suffered at the hands of his successors, and that the life of Epicurus himself was far removed from that of a mere sensualist, or "Epicure" in its later sense. But it was evident that a life which made pleasure and happiness the be-all and end-all of existence, however safeguarded by the conditions imposed at the outset by Epicurus, was liable to degenerate into a mere series of prudential calculations, or a mere indulgence of the senses and appetites. In his determination to rid men of the

σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; οἱ δέ, Ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι[1] · ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῖς εὐηγγελίζετο.

[1] **οτι τον Ι. . . . ευηγγελιζετο** *om.* by D, Gig., one of these places where explanatory clauses are omitted in D, and also by Blass in **β**, and Hilg. Blass, p. x., *cf.* xiv. 12, xvii. 18, "a scriptore potius in **α** adjecta puto, qui videret ea lectoribus vel omnibus vel quibusdam vel necessaria esse vel utilia". It is possible that the writer scrupled to appear to class **Ιησους** among the **δαιμονια**. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 242, thinks the clause foreign to Luke's fashion; apparently a gloss, suggested by ver. 32.

superstitious fears which were the chief cause of the miseries of humanity, Epicurus opposed the popular Polytheism, and regarded the gods as living a life of passionless calm far removed from mundane strifes and sorrows, "careless of mankind". The Stoics branded Epicurus as an Atheist, but the materialistic creed of Epicurus and his followers had at all events this merit, that its bold criticism of existing beliefs was serviceable in undermining the prevailing acceptance of a gross and crude mythology, whilst it helped to assert in contradistinction to a paralysing fatalism the doctrine of the freedom of man's will (see F. C. Conybeare, "Epicureans," Hastings' B.D.; Westcott, "Epicureans," B.D.[2]; Wallace, *Epicureanism*).—**Στωϊκῶν**: The Stoics, so called from the *Stoa Pœcile* at Athens where Zeno of Citium, the founder of the school, 340-260 B.C., met his pupils, and where his successors debated (Capes, *Stoics*, p. 30), spoke in their theology of a providence ruling the world, of a first cause and a governing mind. But their creed was essentially Pantheistic, although the verses of Cleanthes' Hymn ("the most important document of the Stoic theology," Ueberweg) seemed to breathe the accents of a higher and nobler belief. But no devotional phrases could disguise a Pantheism which regarded the world as the body of God, and God as the soul of the world, which held that apart from external nature the Supreme God had no existence which identified Him with fate and necessity, while the history of the universe was an unfolding of the providence of God, but a providence which was but another name for the chain of causation and consequences, inviolable, eternal. The leading maxims of the ethical system of the Stoics was the injunction to live according to nature, although the expression of the rule varied in the earlier and later schools. But as this life was best realised in conformity to the law of the universe, in conformity with reason as the highest element in man, the Stoic ideal, in spite of its recognition of virtue, became not merely stern and intellectual, but impassive and austere; in aiming at *apathy* the Stoic lost *sympathy* with the most ennobling and energetic emotions, and thus wrapped up in the cloak of his own virtue he justified, at least from an ethical point of view, the description which classed him as the Pharisee of Greek philosophy. In addressing an audience composed at all events in part of the representatives of these two great philosophic schools it may be said that St. Paul was not unmindful of his own former training in the early home of Stoicism (see on p. 235). And so in speaking of creation and providence, of the unity of nations in the recognition of all that was true even in Pantheism, St. Paul has been described as taking the Stoic side against the Epicureans, or at least we may say that he in his speech asserts against some of the cardinal errors of the Epicureans the creative and superintending power of God. But to the Stoic and Epicurean alike the Christian Creed would proclaim that *All's Love, yet all's Law*; to the Stoic and Epicurean alike, the Pharisee and Sadducee of the world of philosophy, the bidding came to repent and obey the Gospel, no less than to the crowd whom sages and philosophers despised: "Paulus summa arte orationem suam ita temperat, ut modo cum vulgo contra Philosophos, modo cum Philosophis contra plebem, modo contra utrosque pugnet," Wetstein; see Capes, *Stoicism*; Lightfoot, *Philippians*, "St. Paul and Seneca"; Zahn, *Der Stoiker Epiktet und sein Verhältniss zum Christenthum*; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.*, i., p. 185 ff.; Rendall, *Marcus Antoninus*, Introd. (1898); Gore, *Ephesians*, p. 253 ff.—**καί τινες ἔλεγον**: these are generally taken to include the philosophers, and the remarks following are referred to them; sometimes the first question to the Epicureans, and the second criticism to the Stoics. But it has recently been maintained that we

need not refer to the two sects of philosophers this unfavourable criticism on St. Paul; "Epicureans," Conybeare in Hastings' B.D. Certainly the οἱ δέ has no οἱ μέν as if two opposing schools were meant. The punctuation in R.V., which simply states the fact that amongst those in the Agora certain also τινὲς δὲ καὶ of the philosophers, etc., admits of this view that the criticisms were uttered not by the philosophers, but by the curious crowd which thronged the Agora. Ramsay however takes the verse as marking the opinions of the philosophers, and the use of the word σπερμολόγος by Zeno of one of his followers may help to confirm this.—τί ἂν θέλοι: "what would this babbler say?" R.V., not future as in A.V.; the ἂν with optative being used to express what would happen as the fulfilment of some supposed condition, Burton, p. 79, so Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 33 (1893), the condition being if we would listen to him, or if his words have any meaning; optative with ἂν only in Luke, see Burton, *u. s.*—σπερμολόγος: primarily an adjective, -ον; as a substantive ὁ σπερ. of a rook or crow, or some small bird, picking up seeds, *cf.* Arist., *Av.*, 233, 580. σπέρμα-λέγω: so far as derivation is concerned it is not connected with σπείρω-λόγους, Latin, *seminiverbius* (so Augustine, Wycliffe, "sower of words"). The accent shows that this latter derivation is incorrect. Hence a man hanging about the shops and the markets, picking up scraps which fell from the loads and thus gaining a livelihood, so a parasite, one who lives at the expense of others, a hanger-on, Eustathius on Hom., *Odys.*, v., 490; see in Grimm, *sub v.;* so Dem. speaks of Aeschines, 269, 19, as σπερ. περίτριμμα ἀγορᾶς. The word thus came to be used of a man who picked up scraps of information, and retailed them at second hand. So Eustathius speaks of rhetoricians who were mere collectors of words and consistent plagiarists δι' ὅλου σπερμολογοῦντες; so again he remarks that the word is applied to those who make a show in unscientific style of knowledge which they have got from misunderstanding of lectures (see for these quotations Ramsay, *Expositor*, September, 1899, p. 222, and the whole article "St. Paul in Athens"). Ramsay maintains therefore that there is no instance of the classical use of the word as a babbler or mere talker, and he sees in the word a piece of Athenian slang, caught up as the Athenians had themselves used it ("sine dubio hoc ex ipso ore Atheniensium auctor excepit" Blass), and applied to one who was quite outside any literary circle, an ignorant, vulgar plagiarist. At the same time it is perhaps difficult to find any single word more to the point than "babbler," A. and R.V. (Tyndall), for, as Alford urges, it both signifies one who talks fluently to no purpose, and hints also that his talk is not his own. We may, however, well owe this rendering to the fact that σπερμολόγος was wrongly derived, as if it meant *seminator verborum*, whereas its true derivation is given above. De Wette, Overbeck, Nösgen, Weiss, Holtzmann, Zöckler, Wendt, all so render it. An ingenious attempt has been made to connect the word with the Aretalogi (Juvenal, *Sat.*, xv., 16; Suet, *Aug.*, 74) or praters about virtue, who hired themselves as entertainers for the wealthy Roman nobles at their dinners: "mendax aretalogus," Juv., *u. s.;* Zöckler, *in loco*. For instances of the use of the word see Wetstein, Ramsay, Nösgen, Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden*, p. 77; Rendall (who agrees with Ramsay), and "Babbler," Hastings' B.D.—ξένων δαιμ. δοκεῖ καταγ.: The same kind of accusation had been already made against Socrates, Xen., *Mem.*, i., 1, as also against Anaxagoras and Protagoras, see Josephus, *C. Apion.*, ii., 38, who also tells us how a certain priestess had been condemned in Athens ὅτι ξένους ἐμύει θεούς. In Athens the introduction of strange gods was a capital offence, if by such an introduction the home deities were rejected and the state religion disturbed, but there is nothing to show that the Athenians regarded Paul's teaching in this light, and there is no evidence that the Areopagus had cognisance of serious charges of impiety or of the introduction of foreign religion (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 247).—ξένων: "strange," *i.e.*, foreign.—δαιμονίων used here like the Greek δαιμόνιον in a neutral sense which might refer to deities good or bad. In classical Greek we have καινὰ δαιμόνια, *cf.* the charge against Socrates, Xen., *Mem.*, i., 1; Plato, *Apol.*, 24 B. καταγγελεὺς: only here in N.T., not found in LXX or classical Greek, the verb καταγγέλλειν occurs twice in 2 Macc. viii. 36, ix. 17, of declaring abroad the power of the God of the Jews. In Plutarch we have κατάγγελος.—δοκεῖ, see Burton, p. 153; on the personal construction with δοκεῖ *cf.* Gal. ii. 9, Jas. i. 26, etc.—τὸν Ἰ. καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν, see critical note. It is possible that the Athenians thought that Paul was preaching two strange

19. ἐπιλαβόμενοί τε αὐτοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄρειον[1] πάγον ἤγαγον λέγοντες, Δυνάμεθα γνῶναι, τίς ἡ καινὴ αὕτη ἡ ὑπὸ σοῦ λαλουμένη διδαχή,

[1] In ℵADE, Sah., Boh. we have **Αριον**, but **Αρειον** in BHP, Weiss, W.H., Blass, Hilg. **η** after **αυτη** omitted in BD, Lach. [W.H.], Blass, Hilg., but retained in R.V. and by Weiss.

deities, Jesus and Resurrection (the latter as a female deity **Ἀνάστασις**), just as they had their own altars erected to Pity, Piety, Modesty, a view which gains support not only from the collocation of the words, but from the use of the article with both, and from the supposition that Paul was held to be a preacher of more than one strange God; so Chrys., Oecum., Selden, and list given by Wendt (1888), *in loco*. Wendt also (1899) inclines to this view, which is adopted by Renan, Overbeck, Holtzmann, Felten, McGiffert, Knabenbauer, *cf.* also the punctuation in R.V., which may imply this view (see Humphry on R.V., *in loco*). As against this view see Hackett's note, p. 213, who thinks it hardly conceivable that the Apostle could express himself so obscurely on the subject as to afford any occasion for this gross mistake (so also Farrar). The article before **ἀνάσ.** is taken by Nösgen as referring simply to the general resurrection, a view which he regards as agreeing with the prominence given to the doctrine in ver. 31. It is argued that if **ἀνάσ.** referred to the resurrection of Jesus we should have **αὐτοῦ** which has crept into some copies, but the address itself shows that the Apostle spoke of the resurrection of Jesus as affording a pledge of a general resurrection.

Ver. 19. **ἐπιλαβ.**: as to whether we regard this as done with hostile intent, or not, will depend upon the view taken of the meaning of the Areopagus. If the latter means "the Hill of Mars," to which the Apostle was taken for a quiet hearing and for unimportant discussion, then the former is clearly inadmissible; if, however, the Areopagus meant the *Council of* Areopagus, then that action would seem to have been indicative at least of malice and dislike. The verb in the N.T. is used only in the middle, with accusative or genitive, and most frequently by St. Luke, five times in his Gospel, seven times in Acts, twice by St. Paul, only once by St. Matthew and by St. Mark. In each case it can be determined by the context whether it is used in a favourable or unfavourable sense. So too in LXX (always with genitive), where it is frequently used, the context alone decides. Certainly ix. 27 presents a close verbal parallel in language, as the participle **ἐπιλ.** is followed as here by **ἤγαγον** (Weiss), but the context there expresses beyond all doubt a friendly action. Grotius (so Weiss, Wendt, Felten, Zöckler, Bethge) attributes friendliness to the action here, and renders "manu leniter prehensum," so too F. C. Conybeare, "Areopagus," Hastings' B.D., renders it "took Paul by the hand," but in three of the four parallels to which he refers **χείρ** is expressed, and for the fourth see above. But the view taken of the following words will help us to decide, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 245, and *Expositor*, September, 1895, pp. 216, 217.—**ἐπὶ τὸν Ἄ. πάγον**, Curtius, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., p. 528, note, and Ramsay, *Expositor*, *u. s.*, p. 217, point out that **ἐπί** with accusative would be the correct expression for taking any one before an official court, *cf.* ix. 21, xvi. 19, xvii. 6, xviii. 12—a regular Lucan preposition in this sense—*cf.* also Herod., iii., 46, 156; viii., 79. But it does not therefore follow that a regular trial was instituted, as Chrys., Theophylact and others have held, since there is nothing in the context to indicate this. But the form of expression certainly does seem to indicate that Paul was taken not *to* the Hill of Mars, as is generally held, but *before* a court or council. And there is substantial evidence for believing that the term Areopagus (as Blass admits) was not merely local, but that it was sometimes used as = the Council or Court of Areopagus, *cf.* Cicero, *Ad Atticum*, i., 14, 5; *De Nat. Deorum*, ii., 29; *Rep.*, i., 27. Moreover, there is good reason to believe that the council, although deriving its name from the hill, did not always meet on the hill, and also that it had the power of taking official action in questions bearing upon public teaching in the city (*cf.* Renan, *Saint Paul*, pp. 193, 194, and authorities cited). It is therefore not an improbable inference that Paul would be brought before such a court for inquiry into his teaching; beyond this inference perhaps we cannot go; even to call the inquiry a **προδικασία** (so Curtius) may be to apply a technical term unwarranted by the con-

20. ξενίζοντα γάρ τινα εἰσφέρεις εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς ἡμῶν· βουλόμεθα οὖν γνῶναι, τί ἂν θέλοι[1] ταῦτα εἶναι. 21. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ πάντες καὶ οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ξένοι εἰς οὐδὲν ἕτερον εὐκαίρουν,[2] ἢ λέγειν τι καὶ ἀκούειν καινότερον.

[1] τι αν θελοι DEHLP, Chrys., so Meyer; τινα θελει ℵAB 18, 36, 40, 61, 180, Tisch., R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt.

[2] ευκαιρουν, but ηυκ. ℵABDE 13, 40, 61, Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss. Instead of και ακου ℵABD 25, 44, Vulg., Sah., Syr. H., Arm., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass read η ακου.

text, which bears no trace of a criminal procedure, *cf.* Curtius, *u. s.*, pp. 528, 529; Ramsay, *u. s.*; Plumptre and Rendall, *in loco*. But where did the council meet for the discharge of such duties as inquiries into the qualification of teachers, as a public court for the maintenance of public order? Probably in the Stoa Basileios; here Demosthenes informs us that some of its duties were transacted (see *Expositor*, October, 1895, p. 272, and Curtius, *u. s.*, p. 528), and the scene before us is full of the life of the Agora with the *corona* of people thronging to listen, rather than of the sacred or solemn associations of the Hill of Mars, or of the quietude of a spot far removed from the busy life of the market-place. So too the name "Areopagus" might have been easily transferred to the council sitting in a place other than the hill, so that ἡ βουλὴ ἡ ἐξ Ἀ. π. might easily become Ἄρειος Πάγος informally and colloquially, and the word as used here by St. Luke may really be another proof that, as in σπερμολόγος, the author catches the very word which the Athenians would use, Ramsay, *Expositor*, September, 1895, p. 216, and Renan, *u. s.*, p. 194, note. But it has further been urged both by Curtius and Ramsay (so also Renan, *u. s.*) that the Hill of Mars would be a most inconvenient place for public assemblies and speakers, see Ramsay, *u. s.*, p. 213, and Curtius, *u. s.*, p. 529, and even if the spot had been suitable for such purposes, there would have been a want of fitness in the Athenians taking this σπερμολόγος to harangue them on a spot so inseparably associated with the dignity and glory of their city; see also below on vv. 22 and 33.—Δυναμεθα γνῶναι: like the Latin, *Possum scire?* the question may have been asked in courtesy, or in sarcasm, or ironically; in the repetition of the article the irony may be accentuated.—ἡ ὑπὸ σοῦ λαλ.: "which is spoken by thee," R.V., the Apostle was not speaking *about* the doctrine, A.V., his words were the doctrine (Lumby). Felten regards the question as courteously put, and sees in it a decisive proof that Paul was not put upon his trial, since a man could not be tried on a charge of which his accusers had no knowledge. But this would not prevent a preliminary inquiry of some kind before the court, prompted by dislike or suspicion.

Ver. 20. ξενίζοντα: rather perhaps startling or bewildering than strange—so too in Polyb., *cf.* 1 Peter iv. 12, but see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* Ramsay renders "some things of foreign fashion" as if the words were connected with the opinion that the Apostle was an announcer of foreign gods, *cf.* also 2 Macc. ix. 6, Diod. Sic., xii., 53.—τινα: the rhetorical use of the indefinite τις here strengthening the participle, *cf.* viii. 9, v. 6, Heb. x. 27.—εἰσφ. . . . ἀκοὰς: Blass suggests a Hebraism, but on the life of Greeks we must look no further than the parallel which the same writer adduces, Soph., *Ajax*, 147, *cf.* also Wetstein. The verb is only used here in this sense in N.T.—τί ἂν θέλοι, see critical note and Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 112: "de rebus in aliquem exitum tendentibus," Grimm; *cf.* ii. 12; so Bethge.

Ver. 21. Ἀθην. δὲ πάντες: "now all Athenians," without any article, a characteristic of the whole people, *cf.* xxvii. 4, but see Ramsay, *Expositor*, October, 1895, p. 274, and Blass, *Gram.*, p. 157.—ἐπιδημοῦντες: "sojourning there," R.V., A.V. takes no notice of the word = resident strangers: "*unde iidem mores*," Bengel; on the population of Athens see F. C. Conybeare, "Athens," Hastings' B.D.; Renan, *Saint Paul*, pp. 183, 185, 187.—εὐκαίρουν: "had leisure for nothing else," R.V. margin, *cf.* Mark vi. 21 (only elsewhere in N.T. in 1 Cor. xvi. 12), used by Polyb., Rutherford, *New Phrynichus*, p. 205. How fatally the more important

22 Σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀρείου πάγου, ἔφη, Ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ.

interests of life were sacrificed to this characteristic (note imperfect tense), restless inquisitiveness, their great orator, Demosthenes, knew when he contrasted this idle curiosity with the vigour and ability of Philip of Macedon, *Philippic I.*, p. 43. The words go to support the interpretation that there was no formal indictment, but they do not destroy the view that there may have been an examinaton into the Apostle's teaching, Curtius, *u. s.*, p. 529.—**καινότερον**: certainly there is, as Blass says, "mirus consensus" as to this characteristic of the Athenians; see instances in Wetstein: Dem., *Philippic I.*, 43, and *Philipp. Epist.*, 156, 157; Thuc., iii., 38; Theophr., *Char.*, iii., **περὶ λογοποιΐας μὴ λέγεταί τι καινότερον**; *cf.* Seneca, *Epist.*, 74. Lit., "some newer thing," something newer than that which had just preceded it as *new* up to the time of asking. The comparative may therefore indicate more vividly the voracious appetite of the Athenians for news, although it may be also said that the comparative was the usual degree used by the Greeks in the question *What news?* (usually **νεώτερον**); indeed their fondness for using the comparative of both **νέος** and **καινός** is quite singular (Page, see also Winer-Moulton, xxxv., 4; Blass, *Gram.*, p. 138). The words of Bengel are often quoted, "nova statim sordebant, *noviora* quærebantur," but it should be noted that he adds "*Noviora* autem quærebant, non modo in iis quæ gentilia accidunt; sed, quod nobilius videtur, in philosophicis," see for a practical and forcible lesson on the words, F. D. Maurice, *Friendship of Books*, pp. 84, 85.

Ver. 22. **σταθεὶς**, Lucan, see i. 15. —**ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Ἀ. π.**, *i.e.*, in the midst of the Council or Court of Areopagus, see above on ver. 19, *cf.* iv. 7, Peter stood in the midst of the Sanhedrim. Ramsay pertinently remarks that the words "in the middle of Mars' hill" are far from natural or clear, and those who adopt them usually omit the word "midst," and say that Paul stood on Mars' hill, justifying the expression by supposing that **ἐν μέσῳ** is a Hebraism for **ἐν**, i. 15, ii. 22. But whilst a Hebraism would be natural in the earlier chapters referred to, it would be quite out of place here in this Attic scene, *cf.* also ver. 33, Ramsay, *Expositor*, September, 1895, so too Curtius, *u. s.*, p. 529, in support of the rendering adopted by Ramsay.—**Ἄνδρες Ἀθην.**: usual way of beginning a speech; strange to allege it as a proof that the speech is not genuine: "according to the best MS. evidence, Demosthenes habitually, at least in some speeches, said **ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι** without **ὦ**. It is therefore a mistake to note as unclassical the use of the vocative here without **ὦ**, *cf.* i. 14, xix. 35," Simcox, *Language of the New Testament*, p. 76, note.—**κατὰ πάντα**: "in all things I perceive that ye are," R.V., meaning that wherever he looked he had evidence of this characteristic—the A.V. would imply that in all their conduct the Athenians were, etc. The phrase which is common in classics is only found here, in iii. 22, Col. iii. 20, 22, Heb. ii. 5, iv. 15, in N.T.—**ὡς**, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, i., d., Winer-Moulton, xxxv., 4.—**δεισιδαιμ.**: "somewhat superstitious," R.V., but in margin, "somewhat religious," so in xxv. 19 the noun is rendered "religion," R.V. (in margin, "superstition"), where Festus, in speaking to Agrippa, a Jew, would not have been likely to call the Jewish religion a superstition. R.V. gives a better turn to the word than A.V. with Tyndale, "too superstitious," *cf.* Vulgate, *superstitiosiores*, as it is incredible that St. Paul should have commenced his remarks with a phrase calculated to offend his hearers. The R.V. has modified the A.V. by introducing "somewhat" instead of "too," according to the classical idiom by which the comparative of an adjective may be used to express the deficiency or excess (slight in either case) of the quality contained in the positive. But the quality in this case may be good or bad, since the adjective **δεισιδαίμων** and the cognate noun may be used of reverence or of superstition, *cf.* for the former Xen., *Cyr.*, iii., 3, 58; Arist., *Pol.*, v., 11; *cf. C. I. Gr.*, 2737b; Jos., *Ant.*, x., 32; Polyb., vi., 56, 7, and for the latter, Theoph., *Char.*, xvi.; Plut., *De Superstit.*, 10; Jos., *Ant.*, xv., 8, 2; M. Aurelius, vi., 30, and instances in Philo, *cf.* also Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i., 2 (see Hatch, *Biblical Essays*, p. 43). Ramsay renders: "more than others respectful of what is divine"; so Renan, "le plus religieux"; Holtzmann, "Gottesfürchtige," so Weiss, so Zöckler, "religiosiores ceteris Græcis" (Horace, *Sat.*, i., 9, 70), *cf.* Winer-Moulton, xxxv., 4. In thus emphasising the religious spirit of the Athenians, St. Paul was speaking in

23. διερχόμενος γὰρ καὶ ἀναθεωρῶν[1] τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν, εὗρον καὶ βωμὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο,[2] Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ. ὃν οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες

[1] For **αναθεωρων** D (Clem.) has **διιστορων** (nowhere found in N.T., not used in LXX or classical Greek).

[2] For **επεγεγραπτο** D (Gig.) has **ην γεγραμμενον**, so Hilg., and reads **Αγνωστων Θεων**, see Blass, *in loco*, for authorities who think this reading original, although in β text he follows T.R. **ον . . . τουτον** ℵcA²EHLP, Arm., Clem., Ath., Chrys., Cosm., Aug.; **ο . . . τουτο** ℵ*A*BD¹, Vulg., Or., Hier., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass; **ο . . . τουτον** 61.

strict accordance with similar testimonies from various quarters, *cf.* Thuc., ii., 40; Soph., *O. C.*, 260; Jos., *C. Apion.*, ii., 11; Pausanias, *In Attic.*, 24; Petronius, *Sat.*, c. 17. The context, ver. 24, where **εὐσεβεῖτε**, *religiose colitis* (Wetstein), is one result of this **δεισιδαιμονία**, strengthens the view that the adjective is used here in a good sense; *cf.* the comment on its good use here by St. Chrys., *Hom.*, xxxviii., and Theophylact. There is therefore no reason to suppose that Paul's words were an accommodation to the usual practice of Athenian orators to commence with a mere compliment. At the same time it is possible that with delicate tact the Apostle made use of a word of doubtful meaning, *verbum per se* **μέσον**, which could not possibly provoke hostility at the outset, while it left unexpressed his own judgment as to the nature of this reverence for the divine "with kindly ambiguity," Grimm-Thayer.

Ver. 23. **διερχόμενος γὰρ**: "for as I passed along," R.V., through the streets, or perhaps "was wandering through"—Renan has *passant dans vos rues*, see also on ver. 16 above, and also on viii. 40. A.V., "as I passed by" does not give the force of the word, and apparently means "passed by the objects of your devotion".—**ἀναθεωρῶν**: *accurate contemplari*, "observed," R.V., only in later Greek, and in N.T. only in Heb. xiii. 7, "*considering* with attentive survey again and again," see Westcott, *in loco:* Weiss renders it here „immer wieder betrachtend," *cf.* critical notes, *cf.* Diod. Sic., xiv. 109, and references in Grimm.—**τὰ σεβάσματα**: "the objects of your worship," R.V., Vulgate, *simulacra*, the thing worshipped, not the act or manner of worshipping. The A.V. margin gives "gods that ye worship," *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 4, where A. and R.V. both render "that is worshipped," **σέβασμα** in text, and R.V. in margin, "an object of worship"; Bel and the Dragon, ver. 27, Wisdom xiv. 20, xv. 17.—**καὶ βωμὸν**: "I found also an altar," R.V., *i.e.*, in addition to those with definite dedications; only here in N.T., often in LXX, sometimes of heathen altars, Exod. xxxiv. 13, Numb. xxiii. 1, Deut. vii. 5.—**ἐπεγέγραπτο**, *cf.* Luke xvi. 20; on the pluperfect with augment, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 37, see critical note: Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 542, takes the word as implying permanence, and perhaps antiquity, so in *Speaker's Commentary* as of an ancient decayed altar, whose inscription had been forgotten; Mark xv. 26, Rev. xxi. 12 (Heb. viii. 10, x. 16).—**Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ**: "to an unknown God," R.V.: all previous versions like A.V., but there is no definite article, although in inscriptions it was often omitted. For the existence of altars of this kind the testimony of Pausanias and Philostratus may be fairly quoted; Pausan., i., 1, 4 (*cf.* v. 14, 6), **βωμοὶ θεῶν τε ὀνομαζομένων ἀγνώστων καὶ ἡρώων**, and Philost., *Vit. Apollon.*, vi., 2, **σωφρονέστερον περὶ πάντων θεῶν εὖ λέγειν, καὶ ταῦτα Ἀθήνησιν, οὗ καὶ ἀγνώστων θεῶν βωμοὶ ἵδρυνται**, see references in Wetstein, and *cf.* F. C. Conybeare, *u. s.;* Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 173; Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, ii., 32 ff.; Wendt, etc. Baur, Zeller, Overbeck have maintained that there could have been no such inscription in the singular number as the plural is so much more in harmony with polytheism, although the last named admits that the authorities cited above admit at least the possibility of an inscription as in the text. To say nothing of the improbability that Paul would refer before such an audience to an inscription which had no existence, we may reasonably infer that there were at Athens several altars with the inscription which the Apostle quotes. A passage in Diog. Laert., *Epim.*, 3, informs us how Epimenides, in the time of a plague, brought to the Areopagus and let loose white and black sheep, and wherever the sheep lay down, he bade the Athenians

εὐσεβεῖτε, τοῦτον ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. 24. ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς κύριος ὑπάρχων,

to sacrifice τῷ προσήκοντι θεῷ, and so the plague ceased, with the result that we find in Athens many βωμοὺς ἀνωνύμους, see the passage quoted in full in Wetstein; from this it is not an unfair inference that in case of misfortune or disaster, when it was uncertain what god should be honoured or propitiated, an altar might be erected ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ. (It is curious that Blass although he writes ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ in β thinks that the true reading must have been the plural.) To draw such an inference is much more reasonable than to suppose with Jerome, *Tit.*, i., 12, that the inscription was not as Paul asserted, but that he used the singular number because it was more in accordance with his purpose, the inscription really being "Diis Asiæ et Europæ et Africæ, Diis ignotis et peregrinis," *cf.* the inscription according to Oecumenius θεοῖς Ἀσίας καὶ Εὐρώπης καὶ Λιβύης Θεῷ ἀγνώστῳ καὶ ξένῳ. But at the very commencement of his speech the Apostle would scarcely have made a quotation so far removed from the actual words of the inscription, otherwise he would have strengthened the suspicion that he was a mere σπερμολόγος. St. Chrysostom, *Hom.*, xxxviii., sees in the inscription an indication of the anxiety of the Athenians lest they should have neglected some deity honoured elsewhere, but if we connect it with the story mentioned above of Epimenides, it would be quite in accordance with the religious character of the Athenians, or perhaps one might rather say with the superstitious feeling which prompted the formula so often employed in the prayer of Greeks and Romans alike *Si deo si dea*, or the words of Horace (*Epod.*, v., 1), "At deorum quidquid in coelo regit". There is no reason for the view held amongst others by Mr. Lewin that the inscription refers to the God of the Jews. But in such an inscription St. Paul wisely recognised that there was in the heart of Athens a witness to the deep unsatisfied yearning of humanity for a clearer and closer knowledge of the unseen power which men worshipped dimly and imperfectly, a yearning expressed in the sacred Vedic hymns of an old world, or in the crude religions of a new, *cf.* Max Müller, *Selected Essays*, i., p. 23 ff.; Zöckler, *in loco*, "Altar," B.D.[2]; Plumptre, *Movements of Religious Thought*, p. 78 ff.—ὃν οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες, see critical notes. If we read ὃ for ὅν, we may render with R.V., "what therefore ye worship in ignorance": Vulgate, *quod colitis.* The mere fact of the erection of such an inscription showed that the Athenians did reverence to some divine existence, although they worshipped what they knew not, St. John iv. 22; not "ignorantly worship," as in A.V., this would have been alien to the refinement and tact of St. Paul.—εὐσεβεῖτε: used here as elsewhere of genuine piety, which St. Paul recognised and claimed as existing in the existence of the altar—the word throws light on the meaning which the Apostle attached to the δεισιδαιμονία of ver. 22; in N.T. only in Luke and Paul, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 4, of filial piety (*cf. pietas*), *cf.* Susannah, ver. 64 (LXX), and 4 Macc. xi. 5, 8, 23, xviii. 2. "That *divine nature* which you worship, not knowing *what it is*" (Ramsay).—τοῦτον ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν: in these words lay the answer to the charge that he was a σπερμ. or a καταγγελεύς of strange gods. ἐγὼ, emphatic; I whom you regard as a mere babbler proclaim to you, or set forth, the object which you recognise however dimly, and worship however imperfectly. Since the days of St. Chrysostom the verse has been taken as a proof that the words of St. Paul were addressed not to a select group of philosophers, but to the *corona* of the people.

Ver. 24. ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας: "the God Who made all," R.V., the definiteness of the words and the revelation of God as Creator stand in marked contrast to the imperfect conception of the divine nature grasped by the Athenian populace, or even by the philosophers: ἐφθέγξατο φωνὴν μίαν, δι' ἧς πάντα κατέστρεψε τὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων. οἱ μὲν γὰρ Ἐπικούρειοι αὐτόματά φασιν εἶναι τὰ πάντα, καὶ ἀπὸ ἀτόμων συνεστάναι· οἱ δὲ Στωϊκοὶ σῶμα καὶ ἐκπύρωσιν· ὁ δὲ ἔργον Θεοῦ λέγει κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ. Ὁρᾷς συντομίαν, καὶ ἐν συντομίᾳ σαφήνειαν. St. Paul's language is that of a Jew, a Monotheist, and is based upon Gen. i. 1, Exod. xx. 11, Isa. xlv. 7, Neh. ix. 6, etc., but his use of the word κόσμος (only here in Acts, only three times in St. Luke's Gospel) is observable. The word is evidently not used in the moral sense, or in the sense of moral separation from God, which is so common in St. John, and which is sometimes employed by the Synoptists, and it may well have been

οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κατοικεῖ, 25. οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος, αὐτὸς διδοὺς πᾶσι ζωὴν καὶ πνοὴν

chosen by Paul as a word familiar to his hearers. Both by Aristotle and Plato it had been used as including the orderly disposition of the heaven and the earth (according to some, Pythagoras had first used the word of the orderly system of the universe), and in this passage **οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς** may perhaps both be taken or included in the **κόσμος**, *cf.* iv. 24, xiv. 15. In the LXX **κόσμος** is never used as a synonym of the world, *i.e.*, the universe (but *cf.* Prov. xvii. 6, Grimm, *sub v.*), except in the Apocryphal books, where it is frequently used of the created universe, Wisdom vii. 17, ix. 3; 2 Macc. vii. 23, viii. 18; 4 Macc. v. 25 (24), etc., Grimm, *sub v.*, and Cremer, *Wörterbuch.*—**οὗτος**: "He being Lord of heaven and earth," R.V., more emphatic and less ambiguous than A.V., "seeing that".—**ὑπάρχων** "being the natural Lord" (Farrar), "He, Lord as He is, of heaven and earth" (Ramsay); see Plummer's note on Luke viii. 41; the word is Lucan, see above on **οὐρ. καὶ γῆς κ.**, *cf.* Isa. xlv. 7, Jer. x. 16, and 1 Cor. x. 26.—**οὐκ ἐν χειροποιήτοις ναοῖς κ.**: as the Maker of all things, and Lord of heaven and earth, He is contrasted with the gods whose dwelling was in temples made with hands, and limited to a small portion of space, *cf.* 1 Kings viii. 27; Jos., *Ant.*, viii., 4, 2, and St. Stephen's words, vii. 48, of which St. Paul here as elsewhere may be expressing his reminiscence, *cf.* for the thought Cicero, *Leg.*, ii., 10, and in early Christian writers Arnobius and Minucius Felix (Wetstein), see also Mr. Page's note.

Ver. 25. **οὐδὲ . . . θεραπεύεται**: used in LXX and in classical Greek of the service of the Gods, significantly twice in *Epist. Jer.*, vv. 27, 39, of the worshippers and priests of the idols overlaid with silver and gold, which are contrasted with the true God in that they can save no man from death, or show mercy to the widow and the fatherless, before which the worshippers set offerings and meat as before dead men. "Non quærit ministros Deus. Quidni? ipse humano generi ministrat," Seneca, *Epist.*, 95, and instances in Wetstein; but St. Chrysostom's comment must also be noted, **λέγων δέ, μὴ ὑπὸ χ. ἀνθ. θεραπεύεσθαι τὸν θεόν, αἰνίττεται ὅτι διανοίᾳ καὶ νῷ θεραπεύεται.**—**προσδεόμενός τινος**: only here in N.T., to need in addition, as if necessary to perfection, "qui habet quidem aliquid, sed non satis, qui insuper eget," Wetstein, so "cum . . . nullius boni desideret *accessionem*," Erasmus; a close parallel is found in 2 Macc. xiv. 35 (3 Macc. ii. 9); in both passages the word **ἀπροσδεής** is used of God, and in the former reference is made to the fact that God was pleased that the temple of His habitation should be amongst the Jews, *cf.* also Ecclus. lii. 21. Blass and Wetstein both quote a striking Pythagorean saying from Hierocles, see *in loco*, and to this **αὐτάρκεια** of the divine nature both the Jewish philosopher Philo and the Roman Epicurean Lucretius from their varying standpoints bore witness, see the instances in Wetstein (*cf.* Psalm li. 9).—Luther takes **τινος** as masculine, which as Wendt admits corresponds well to the preceding and also to the following **πᾶσι**, but it seems best to take it as neuter, of the service which men render, *cf.* Clem., *Cor.*, lii., 1, **ἀπροσδεής, ἀδελφοί, ὁ δεσπότης ὑπάρχει τῶν ἁπάντων, οὐδὲν οὐδενὸς χρῄζει εἰ μὴ τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι αὐτῷ**, and *Epist. ad Diognetum*, iii., 5.—**αὐτὸς διδοὺς**: "seeing he himself giveth," R.V., so Vulgate *ipse*, but although **αὐτός** is so emphatic it was unfortunately ignored in Wycl., Genevan and A.V. The best commentary on the words is in David's words, 1 Chron. xxix. 14, *cf.* the striking passage in *Epist. ad Diognetum*, iii., 4.—**πᾶσι**: taken as neuter or masculine, but perhaps with Bengel "omnibus viventibus et spirantibus, summe **προσδεομένοις** *indigentibus*. De homine speciatim, v. seq."—**ζωὴν καὶ πνοήν**, *cf.* Gen. ii. 7, not a mere hendiadys, vitam animalem, or spiritum vitalem, but the first word = life in itself, existence; and the second the continuance of life, "per spiritum (halitum) continuatur vita," Bengel: on the paronomasia, see Winer-Moulton, lxviii., 1. For **πνοή** LXX, Ps. cl. 6, Job xxvii. 3, Isa. xlii. 5, Ecclus. xxx. 29 (xxxiii. 20), 2 Macc. iii. 31, and vii. 9, etc.—**τὰ πάντα**: *omnia quæcumque*, Rom. viii. 32, the expression need not be limited with Bethge to all things necessary for the preservation of life and breath.

Ver. 26. "And he hath made of one every nation of men for to dwell," R.V., so also A.V. takes **ἐποίησε** separately from **κατοικεῖν**, not "caused to dwell"; **ἐποίησε**, *cf.* ver. 24, he made, *i.e.*, created of one; see Hackett's note.—**κατοικεῖν**: infinitive of purpose.—**ἐξ ἑνὸς**

καὶ τὰ πάντα· 26. ἐποίησέ τε ἐξ ἑνὸς αἵματος[1] πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων, κατοικεῖν ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς, ὁρίσας προτεταγμένους[2]

[1] **αιματος** ℵAB 13, 40, 61, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aethpp., Clem., so Tisch., W.H., R.V. [Blass], Wendt; Meyer retains with DEHLP, Syrr. P. and H., Arm., Irint., Theodt., Chrys., Cosm., Hilg. Alford brackets like Blass, see his note. For **παν το προσ.** ℵABD, R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt read **παντος προσωπου**; Meyer follows T.R.

[2] **προστεταγμενους**, overwhelming support ℵABD²EHLP, Clem., Chrys., Theodt., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; D* 13 has **προτεταγ.**, so Blass in β. Lach. wrote **προς τεταγμ.**

(**αἵματος**), see critical note. Rendall renders "from one father" as the substantive really understood, the idea of offspring being implied by **ἐξ**, *cf.* Heb. ii. 11, xi. 12: Ramsay, "of one *nature*, every race of men," etc. Such teaching has often been supposed to be specially directed against the boast of the Athenians that they were themselves **αὐτόχθονες** (so recently Zöckler, and see instances in Wetstein, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Arist., *Vesp.*, 1076; Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, xxvi.); but whilst the Apostle's words were raised above any such special polemic, yet he may well have had in mind the characteristic pride of his hearers, whilst asserting a truth which cut at the root of all national pride engendered by polytheism on the one hand, by a belief in a god of this nation or of that, or of a philosophic pride engendered by a hard Stoicism on the other. When Renan and others speak of Christianity extending its hand to the philosophy of Greece in the beautiful theory which it proclaimed of the moral unity of the human race (*Saint Paul*, p. 197) it must not be forgotten that Rome and not Greece manifested the perfection of Pagan ethics, and that, even so, the sayings of a Seneca or an Epictetus wanted equally with those of a Zeno "a lifting power in human life". The cosmopolitanism of a Seneca no less than that of a Zeno failed; the higher thoughts of good men of a citizenship, not of Ephesus or elsewhere, but of the world, which were stirring in the towns where St. Paul preached, all these failed, *Die Heraklitischen Briefe*, p. 91 (Bernays); it was not given to the Greek or to the Roman, but to the Jew, separated though he was from every other nation, to safeguard the truth of the unity of mankind, and to proclaim the realisation of that truth through the blood of a Crucified Jew (Alford). On the Stoic cosmopolitanism see amongst recent writers G. H. Rendall, *Marcus Antoninus*, Introd., pp. 88, 118, 137 (1898).—**ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς**, *cf.* Gen. ii. 6, xi. 8, etc.; Winer-Moulton, xviii., 4, *cf.* in Latin, *maris facies*, Æn., v., 768, *naturæ vultus*, Ovid, *Met.*, i., 6.—**ὁρίσας προτεταγ. καιροὺς**: if we read **προστεταγ.** see critical note, "having determined *their* appointed seasons," R.V. **καιρ.** not simply seasons in the sense used in addressing the people of Lystra, xiv. 17, as if St. Paul had in mind only the course of nature as divinely ordered, and not also a divine philosophy of history. If the word was to be taken with **κατοικίας** it would have the article and **χρόνος** would be more probably used, *cf.* also **πρόσταγμα**, Jer. v. 24, Ecclus. xxxix. 16. It is natural to think of the expression of our Lord Himself, Luke xxi. 24, **καιροὶ ἐθνῶν**, words which may well have suggested to St. Paul his argument in Rom. ix.-xi., but the thought is a more general one. In speaking thus, before such an audience, of a Providence in the history of mankind, assigning to them their seasons and their dwellings, the thought of the Stoic **πρόνοια** may well have been present to his mind; but if so it was by way of contrast ("sed non a Stoicis Paulo erat discenda **πρόνοια**," Blass, *in loco*). St. Paul owed his doctrine of Providence to no school of philosophy, but to the sacred Scriptures of his nation, which had proclaimed by the mouth of lawgiver, patriarch, psalmist, and prophet alike, that the Most High had given to the nations their inheritance, that it was He Who had spread them abroad and brought them in, that it was His to change the times and the seasons, Deut. xxxii. 8, Job xii. 23, Ps. cxv. 16, Dan. ii. 21, see further the note on **πρόνοια**, Wisdom of Solomon xiv. 3 (xvii. 2), *Speaker's Commentary* (Farrar).—**τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας**: the first noun is not found elsewhere either in classical or biblical Greek, but *cf.* Blass, *Gram.*, p. 69. **κατοικία**: only here in N.T., but frequent in LXX; found also in Polyb., of a dwelling; so in

καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν· 27. ζητεῖν τὸν Κύριον,[1] εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν[2] αὐτὸν καὶ εὕροιεν, καίτοιγε[3] οὐ

[1] Θεον for Κυριον ℵABHL 61, Vulg., Syrr. P. H., Boh., Sah., Arm., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss; D, Gig., Iren., Clem. read το Θειον; and Syr. H. mg. adds τι; and D, Syr. H. mg. add εστιν (Iren.). Blass omits; Weiss thinks arbitrarily.

[2] ψηλαφησειαν, -σειεν (*cf.* Luke vi. 11) Winer-Schmiedel, p. 114, -σαισαν Hilg.; W.H., *App.*, 174.

[3] καιτοιγε ℵP², Chrys., Cosm., so Meyer; but και γε BD² (D* και τε), HLP* 13, 61, 137, 180, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass; AE, Clem. have καιτοι. Instead of ημων A*L 31, 180 read υμων.

Strabo, of a settlement, a colony. Here, as in the former part of the verse, we need not *limit* the words to the assertion of the fact that God has given to various nations their different geographical bounds of mountain, river or sea; as we recognise the influence exerted upon the *morale* of the inhabitants of a country by their physical surroundings, St. Paul's words teach us to see also in these conditions "the works of the Lord"—the words of the most scientific observer perhaps of Palestine, Karl Ritter, are these: "Nature and the course of history show that here, from the beginning onwards there cannot be talk of any chance": G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, pp. 112, 113, and 302, 303 ff.; Curtius, "Paulus in Athen.," *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., 531, 536.

Ver. 27. ζητεῖν = ὅπως ζητῶσι, telic infinitive, Winer-Moulton, xliv. 1.—Κύριον, see critical note. Θεόν: the more fitting word before this audience—Ramsay renders "the God".—εἰ ἄρα γε: "if haply," A. and R.V., ἄρα strengthened by γε; in classical Greek we have ἄρα followed by γε, but not ἄρα. This ἄρα and ἄρα γε are generally regarded as = Latin *si forte* (Blass, *Grammatik*, p. 211), although Simcox, *Language of the New Testament*, pp. 180, 181, in admitting this, is careful to point out that it is misleading to regard ἄρα as = *forte*. Alford (so Page) maintains that the expression here, as in viii. 22, indicates a contingency which is apparently not very likely to happen. On the other hand Rendall holds that the particle here, as in viii. 22, should be rendered not *perhaps* or *haply*, but *indeed*: "if they might *indeed* feel after him," etc., expressing a very real intention of God's providence, the optative pointing to the fact that this intention had not yet been realised (pp. 66, 110), *cf.* also Mark xi. 13, and in 1 Cor. xv. 15, εἴπερ ἄρα (see further Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 254, 267; Burton, pp. 106, 111). With the whole passage, Wisdom xiii. 6 should be compared. On St. Paul's study of the Book of Wisdom at some time in his life see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 52.—ψηλαφήσειαν, Æolic aorist, the verb is used several times in LXX for the act of groping in the dark, Deut. xxviii. 29, Job v. 14, xii. 25; Isa. lix. 10; *cf.* its use also in classical Greek, *Odys.*, ix., 416; so Plato, *Phædo*, 99 B, where it is used of vague guesses at truth (Wendt, Page). The word would therefore fitly express the thought of men stretching lame hands of faith and groping, and calling to what they feel is Lord of all. Weiss finds the idea of the word as used here, not in the LXX as above, but in 1 John i. 1, of some palpable assurance, which was everywhere possible in a world made by God, ver. 24, Rom. i. 20, and where men's dwellings had been apportioned by Him. But the word might still be used in the above sense, since the recognition of God in His Creation is after all only a partial recognition, and not the highest knowledge of Him; and the inscription "To an Unknown God" testified in itself how imperfect that recognition had been. For the meaning of the verb in modern Greek see Kennedy, p. 156.—καίτοιγε, see critical note. καί γε, *cf.* ii. 18, *quin etiam* (*quamvis* καίτοιγε "vix aptum," Blass). The word ψηλαφ. had intimated "et proximum esse Deum et oculis occultum" (Blass, Knabenbauer), and the Apostle now proclaims the nearness of God, not only in creation, in its maintenance and preservation, but in the spiritual being of man: "Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet".—οὐ μακρὰν: the word implies not mere local nearness, but spiritual, *cf.* Jer. xxiii. 23, and Ephes. ii. 13. With this we may compare Seneca, *Ep. Mor.*,

μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντα. 28. ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καί ἐσμεν· ὡς καί τινες τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιητῶν

xli., 1. "God is near thee; He is with thee; He is within" (quoted by Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 290). The relation of man to God is a personal relationship: God is not "careless of the single life": ἀπὸ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν, "from each one of us," R.V. The words may well have struck a responsive chord in the hearts, not only of some in the crowd, but of some of the Stoics who were listening, contradictory and incongruous as their system was, with its strange union of a gross material pantheism, and the expression of belief in the fatherly love and goodness of God (see further Lightfoot, *u. s.*, p. 298, and Curtius, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., 530, 531).

Ver. 28. St. Chrysostom comments (*Hom.*, xxxviii.): Τί λέγω μακράν; οὕτως ἐγγύς ἐστιν, ὡς χωρὶς αὐτοῦ μὴ ζῆν. ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν κ.τ.λ. . . . καὶ οὐκ εἶπε, δι' αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὃ ἐγγύτερον ἦν, ἐν αὐτῷ. In the three verbs it has been sometimes maintained there is an ascending scale; in God we possess the gift of life, in Him we move, in Him we *are* (not "have our being" simply), *i.e.*, we are what we are, personal beings. Bethge and Plumptre may be named as two chief supporters of some such view as this, whilst others regard the words (Bengel, Weiss) as merely expressing what had been already expressed in ver. 25, or as referring simply (so Overbeck, Wendt, Felten) to our physical life and being.—τῶν καθ' ὑμᾶς π.: "of your own poets," see Grimm., *sub v.* κατά, with the accusative as a periphrasis for the possessive pronoun; see also Winer-Moulton, xxii., 7, xlix. d. Blass takes it as = ὑμέτεροι., on the reading see W. H. marg. καθ' ἡμᾶς, though the limited range of attestation prevents them from reading this in the text: "there would be a striking fitness in a claim by St. Paul to take his stand as a Greek among Greeks, as he elsewhere vindicates his position as a Roman (xvi. 37; xxii. 25, 28), and as a Pharisee (xxiii. 6)": W. H., ii., p. 310.—τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν: half of an hexameter, the γὰρ καί has nothing to do with the meaning of the quotation in the N.T., but see Winer-Moulton, liii. 10. The words are found in Aratus, B.C. 270, *Phænom.*, 5, and Cleanthes, B.C. 300, *Hymn to Jove*, 5; for other parallels see Blass, *in loco*, and Wetstein, so that Zöckler may go too far in saying that St. Paul quoted from the former as his fellow-countryman, Aratus being of Soli in Cilicia. Both poets named were Stoics, and the words may have been well known as a familiar quotation, see on Tarsus, chapter ix. 11. In Cleanthes the actual words are rather different, ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν, where origin rather than kinship may be meant. No doubt it is possible to exaggerate, with Bentley, St. Paul's knowledge of classical literature, but on the other hand it is not perhaps an unfair inference that a man who could quote so aptly from the poets as here in 1 Cor. xv. 35, and in Tit. i. 12, could have done so at other times if occasion had required, *cf.* Curtius, *ubi supra*, Blass, *in loco*, and Farrar, "Classical Quotations of St. Paul," *St. Paul*, ii., *Exc.*, iii. As the words of the hymn were addressed to Zeus, a difficulty has been raised as to the Apostle's application of them here, and it has been questioned whether he was acquainted with the context of the words, or whether he was aware of their application. But he must at least have known that they were not originally written of the God Whom he revealed. If so, however, there seems no more difficulty in supposing that he would apply such a hemistich to a higher purpose, than that he should make the inscription on a heathen altar a text for his discourse.

Ver. 29. γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες: for ὑπάρχειν, see above on ver. 24; is the inference simply that because we are dependent upon God for all things, it is absurd to suppose that the divine nature can be like to the work of men's hands? This is correct so far as it goes, but is not the further thought implied that as men are the offspring of God, they ought not to think that man is the measure of God, or that the divine nature, which no man hath seen at any time, can be represented by the art of man, but rather as conscious of a sonship with a Father of spirits they ought to worship a Father in spirit and in truth? see quotations from Seneca in Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 290: "The whole world is the temple of the immortal gods. Temples are not to be built to God of stones piled on high . . . ." *Fragm.* 123 in Lactant. *Div. Inst.*, vi., 25: "God is near thee; He is with thee; He is within," *Ep. Mor.*, xcv., 47: "Thou shalt not form Him of silver and gold, a true likeness of

εἰρήκασι, "Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν".[1] 29. γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομίζειν χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ[2] ἢ λίθῳ, χαράγματι

[1] **καθ υμας,** see note in comment., B 33, W.H. mg. read **ημας.** After **εσμεν** D adds **το καθ ημεραν,** so Blass in **β**, and Hilg. **ποιητων** *om.* D, Gig., Aethro., Irint, Ambr., Blass in **β**.

[2] Blass reads (**β**) **χρυσιῳ η αργυριῳ**; **χρ.** ℵAE, Theodt.; **αργ.** AE 13, 15, 18, **χρυσος** et **αργυρος** materiem denotant; **χρυσια** et **αργυρια** sunt ex auro argentove facta (Blass, *in loco*).

God cannot be moulded of this material," *Ep. Mor.*, xxxi., 11. See also the striking parallels from *Letters of Pseudo-Heracleitus*, Gore, *Ephesians*, p. 254. For a recent view of the possible acquaintance of Seneca with the Christian teaching of St. Paul see Orr, *Some Neglected Factors in Early Christianity*, pp. 178 ff.—**τὸ θεῖον**: not "godhead," but "that which is divine," R.V. margin, "the divine nature"; probably the word which the Athenians themselves used, Xen., *Mem.*, i., 4, 18, see instances in Grimm, *sub v.*, of its use in Philo and Josephus, who employ it in the neuter of the one God, Grimm thinks, out of regard for Greek usage.—**χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργ. ἢ λίθῳ**: (on the form of the word see Blass and critical notes) including, we may suppose, the chryselephantine statues of Phidias in the Parthenon, and a reference to the silver mines of Laurium, and the marble hewn from Pentelicus, *cf. Epist. ad Diognetum*, ii., 2.—**χαράγματι**: in apposition to **χρύσῳ. χαράσσω**, Latin, *sculpo, insculpo*, only here in N.T. in this sense. Polyb. uses the words of coins stamped (so in Anth. P., v., 30) **τὸ χαραχθὲν νόμισμα.—τέχνης καὶ ἐνθ.**: "artis externæ, cogitationis internæ". **ἐνθ.**: a rare word (in the plural, *thoughts*, *cf.* Matt. ix. 4, etc.), but used by Thuc., Eur., and also by Hippocrates. See the remarks of Curtius (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., 535) on the words, as indicating that Paul was acquainted with the phrases of Greek authors. The passage in Wisdom xiii. 6 should be carefully noted (see ver. 27 above), and also ver. 10, in which the writer speaks of gods which are the work of men's hands, gold and silver to show art in, *i.e.*, lit., an elaboration of art, **ἐμμελέτημα τέχνης.** In the words Bethge further sees an intimation that the Apostle had an eye for the forms of beauty represented in the carved statues and idols which met his gaze in Athens; but for a very different view of St. Paul's estimate of art see Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 172, Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 525, McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 260.—**ἀνθρώπου**: stands contrasted with **τὸ θεῖον**; it is the device of man which forms the material into the idol god, and thus human thought becomes the measure of the divine form; Xenophanes (570 B.C.) had ridiculed the way in which the Thracians represented *their* gods, with blue eyes and fair complexions, whilst the Æthiopians had represented *their* gods as flat-nosed and swarthy. Zeno had renewed the protest, but some of the best of the heathen philosophers had spoken in inconsistent language on the subject; St. Paul's plain and direct words were the utterances of a man who had in mind the severe and indignant protests of the Hebrew prophets, *cf.* Isa. xliv. 12.—**οὐκ ὀφείλομεν**: at the same time the use of the 1st person plural again points to the conciliatory tone of the speech, "clemens locutio" (so Bengel, Wendt); or possibly the words may mean that he is referring in a general way to the beliefs of the people, to the crowd and not to the philosophers: **πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ὁ λόγος ἦν αὐτῷ,** Chrys. But Nestle has lately called attention to the question as to whether we should not translate: "we are not obliged, not bound to think, we are at liberty not to think so," and thus, instead of a reproof, the words become a plea for freedom of religious thought. The first shade of meaning, he adds, *i.e.*, "clemens locutio," as above, comes nearer to **ὀφειλ. μὴ νομίζειν,** the second agrees with the other passage in the N.T., 2 Cor. xii. 14, where the negative particle is connected with **ὀφείλειν**; see Nestle's note in *Expository Times*, March, 1898, p. 381.

Ver. 30. **τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρ.**: a contrast drawn between the past times of ignorance, and the present times with God's summons to repentance, but instead of a finite verb we have the participle **ὑπεριδών,** and so **δέ** is omitted in the apodosis; see Rendall, *in loco*, and Appendix on **μὲν οὖν,** p. 163, and to the same effect, Blass, *in loco*.—**τῆς ἀγνοίας**: simply "the times of ignorance," R.V.

τέχνης καὶ ἐνθυμήσεως ἀνθρώπου, τὸ θεῖον εἶναι ὅμοιον. 30. Τοὺς μὲν οὖν χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ Θεός, τανῦν παραγγέλλει[1]

[1] παραγγελλει ℵcADEHLP, so Blass in β, and Hilg.; απαγγελλει ℵ*AB, Tisch., W.H., R.V. marg., Weiss, Wendt. πασι, but παντας ℵABD²E, Ath., Cyr., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt. For υπεριδων D has παριδων, "recte," Blass (β); neither word occurs elsewhere in N.T.

not "this," as in Vulgate and all E.V. "*Ignorantia* objicitur Atheniensibus? Hanc ipsi sunt fassi. **ἀγνώστῳ**, *ignoto; ἀγνοοῦντες*, *ignorantes*, v. 23."—**ὑπεριδὼν**: "overlooked," R.V., "winked at," A.V. The latter rendering occurs three times in LXX, Wisdom xiii. 23, Ecclus. xxviii. 7, and xxx. 11 R.; for the verb **παροpᾶν** Skeat quotes Lever, *Serm.*, p. 81: "For if ye *winke at* such matters, God wyl scoull upon you," when the word evidently means to connive at, but not the sense required here, *cf.* also Chapman, *Il.*, iv., 66. The verb **ὑπεροpᾶν** is frequent in the LXX, but rather in the sense of despising, neglecting, Gen. xlii. 21, Deut. xxii. 3, 4, Ps. liv. (lv.) 1, Job xxxi. 19, and Ecclus. ii. 10, etc. But here it is used rather as the opposite of **ἐφορᾶν**, a verb used in classical Greek of overseeing, observing, as of the divine providence of the gods (*cf.* in N.T. Luke i. 25, Acts iv. 29); so **ὑπεροpᾶν** = (1) to look over, (2) to overlook, *i.e.*, not attend to, to let pass (*cf.* the use of **ὑπεριδεῖν** in LXX, Lev. xxvi. 44 and 3 Macc. vi. 15). Tyndale rendered "regarded not," with which we may compare: "et cum videas perinde te gerere quasi non videas," Erasmus. Both Chrys. and Oecum. comment on the words, pointing out that it is not **παρεῖδεν** or **εἴασεν**, but **ὑπερεῖδεν, τουτέστιν, οὐκ ἀπαιτεῖ κόλασιν ὡς ἀξίους ὄντας κολάσεως.** With the statement of St. Paul here *cf.* Acts xiv. 16, Rom. iii. 25. But it must be remembered that **πάρεσις**, Rom. iii. 25, is by no means the same as **ἄφεσις** ("idem paene est **παριέναι** quod **ὑπεριδεῖν**, Acts xvii. 30," Bengel); in considering the strictures of Overbeck against the use of the passage in Romans as a parallel to our present passage, it is not alleged, let it be noted, either here or there that God inflicted no punishment upon the sins of the heathen. Rom. i. 19 is a decided proof of the contrary in the case of the very sin of idolatry which St. Paul condemns in Athens; see the words of Chrys. and Oecum. above, and *cf.* the comments of Weiss, Wendt, Felten, Plumptre, and McGiffert's note, pp. 260, 261.—**τὰ νῦν**, see above p. 135; "hic dies, haec hora, inquit Paulus," Bengel, in contrast to the "overlooking" on account of ignorance, and so relatively of excuse (*cf.* **ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ**, Rom. iii. 26, *i.e.*, from the N.T. times of salvation to the final judgment).—**παραγγέλλει**: "commandeth," but in margin, R.V., **ἀπαγ.**, "he declareth": *cf.* Friedrich, p. 29, on the constant use of the latter in St. Luke's writings, but used twice by St. Paul elsewhere, 1 Cor. xiv. 25, 1 Thess. i. 9.—**πᾶσι πανταχοῦ**: on this and other collocations with **πᾶς** as frequent in Luke see Friedrich, p. 5. **πανταχοῦ** is used in the N.T. four times by St. Luke, *cf.* Luke ix. 6, Acts xxiv. 3, xxviii. 22 (elsewhere in the Gospels, Mark i. 28, xvi. 20), but it is also used, although only once, by St. Paul, 1 Cor. iv. 17. Wetstein quotes instances of the same collocation in Dem., Philo, and adds: "ex toto terrarum orbe plurimi Athenas advenerant, adeoque hac ipsa Pauli oratione omnibus prædicatur doctrina Evangelii".—**μετανοεῖν**: for all had sinned, and all would be judged; infinitive after verbs *dicendi*, expressing what they must do, *cf.* xiv. 15, iv. 18, v. 28, 40. The context requires something more than a reference of the words to the turning from idol worship to the true God (Holtzmann), it points to the change of mind which was demanded of those whose consciences by sin were accused. To both Stoic and Epicurean the counsel would appear not merely needless, but objectionable. To the latter because it would conflict not only with his denial of immortality, but with his whole idea of the gods, and to the Stoic because the wise man was himself a king, self-sufficing, who stood in no need of atonement, who feared no judgment to come; the famous picture of Josephus was so far realised, and the Epicurean might be called the Sadducee, and the Stoic the Pharisee of ancient philosophy; but in one respect both Stoic and Epicurean were at one—whether they were just persons or not, they "needed no repentance," Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden*, p. 115; Lightfoot, "Paul and Seneca" (*Philippians*, pp. 280, 296, 305); Plumptre, *in loco*; Zahn, *Der Stoiker Epiktet, und sein Verhältniss zum Christenthum*, pp. 26, 33, etc.

τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πᾶσι πανταχοῦ μετανοεῖν· 31. διότι[1] ἔστησεν ἡμέραν, ἐν ᾗ μέλλει κρίνειν[2] τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὥρισε, πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν, ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν. 32. Ἀκού-

[1] καθοτι for διοτι is supported by ℵABDE, Ath., Bas., Cyr., Theodt., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. For εν ῃ μελλει κρινειν D, Gig., Iren. simply κριναι, so Blass in β, and Hilg.

[2] Tisch., R.V., W.H., Weiss read περι τουτου και παλιν, so ℵAB.

Ver. 31. **διότι—καθότι**, R.V., see critical note, only found in St. Luke = *quia* (Blass) in Luke i. 7, xix. 9, Acts ii. 24, ii. 45, iv. 35 = according as: see Plummer on Luke i. 7, and Blass, *Gram.*, p. 268.—**ἔστησεν ἡμέραν**: hence the command to repent, *cf.* 1 Macc. iv. 59 and Blass, *in loco*.—**μέλλει κρίνειν**, LXX, Ps. ix. 8, xcv. (xcvi.) 13, xcvii. (xcviii.) 9; its form here may = xii. 6, "on the point of judging" (Weiss).—**τὴν οἰκ.**, so often in LXX, as in instances above.—**ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ** = **δικαίως** (as of the moral element in which the judgment will take place), *cf.* 1 Peter ii. 24 and Rev. xix. 11, *cf.* Psalms as above, and Ecclus. xlv. 26. —**ἐν ἀνδρί**: in *the person of* the man (so Ramsay, Meyer, Alford), not **ἄνθρωπος** but **ἀνήρ**, *in viro* (*cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 12, **ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται**); above we have **ἀνθρώποις**, but here the nobler appellation. We may compare with the Christian doctrine *Book of Enoch*, xli., 9, although according to other Jewish statements it would seem that God, and not the Messiah, was to judge the dead.—**ᾧ ὥρισε**: **ᾧ** attraction, *cf.* ii. 22, see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 225, *cf.* x. 42, Rom. i. 4. The whole statement, as indeed the general tenor of the address, is entirely in line with the preaching to the Thessalonians in the Epistles written some few months later, *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 9, 10, iii. 13, iv. 6, v. 2, 2 Thess. i. 7, ii. 12; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 259, and Plumptre, *in loco*. "Pour un juif, dire que Jésus présidera au jugement, c'était à peu près dire qu'il est créateur. Aussi je ne sais pas de preuve plus éclatante de l'immense impression produite par le Galiléen que ce simple fait . . . après qu'il eut été crucifié, un pharisien, comme l'avait été Paul, a pu voir en lui le juge des vivants et des morts," Colani, *J. C. et les Croyances Messianiques de son temps*.—**πίστιν παρασχών**: in classical Greek to afford assurance, a guarantee, see instances in Wetstein. But it is difficult to say how much St. Paul included in the words—to a Jewish audience he would no doubt, like St. Peter, have insisted upon the resurrection of Christ as a final proof given by God that the claims of Christ were true; but to an audience like that at Athens he might well insist upon the fact of the resurrection of the Man ordained by God as a guarantee that all men would be raised; R.V., "whereof he hath given assurance," "whereof" implied in the Greek: marginal rendering in A.V. "offered faith" is omitted in R.V.; "and He hath given all a guarantee in that He hath raised Him from the dead": so Ramsay. Others have taken the words to mean that God thus affords assurance that He will judge the world righteously in that He hath shown His righteousness by raising Christ, others again connect **πίστιν** closely with **ἐν ἀνδρί** (so Bethge). If at this point the Apostle was interrupted he may have intended to pursue the theme further, if not then, on some other occasion. But the fact that the speech contains so little that is distinctively Christian is a strong proof of its genuineness; none would have invented such a speech for Paul, any more than they could have invented his discourse at Lystra, see below on p. 381, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 150 and 250, 251. Yet in this short address at Athens the Apostle had preached both Jesus and the Resurrection.

Ver. 32. **οἱ μὲν ἐχλ. . . . οἱ δέ**: verb only here in N.T., implies outward gesture as well as words of scorn (**χλεύη, χεῖλος**, *cf.* **μυκτηρίζω, μυκτήρ**). We usually think of the **οἱ μέν** as the Stoics, and the **οἱ δέ** as the Epicureans; *e.g.*, Wetstein *after* describing the Epicureans adds **οἱ δέ** = Stoici: *cf.* Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, ii., 17, and Plutarch, *De Or. Def.*, 32. But if the Epicureans ridiculed a resurrection and judgment to come, the Stoics also were separated by a wide gulf from the teaching of St. Paul. Even if it may be said that in general they approximated towards the doctrine of personal existence after death, some of their most famous representatives departed from it; Capes, *Stoicism*, p. 173; Wallace, *Epicureanism*, p. 121; Ueberweg, *Hist. of Phil.*, i., p. 196; E.T.

σαντες δὲ ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν, οἱ μὲν ἐχλεύαζον· οἱ δὲ εἶπον, Ἀκουσόμεθά σου πάλιν περὶ τούτου. 33. καὶ οὕτως ὁ Παῦλος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ

Rendall, *Marcus Antoninus*, Introd., pp. 107, 108. "On one point alone were the professors of this school [Stoic] agreed; an *external* existence of the human soul was out of the question," Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 323. The idea of retribution beyond the grave would have been equally alien to the Stoic as to the Epicurean, and both Stoic and Epicurean alike would have ridiculed the idea of a resurrection of the body. Zöckler, *in loco*, while referring the **οἱ μέν** without hesitation to the Epicureans, thinks that possibly Platonists rather than Stoics may be represented by the **οἱ δέ.** If St. Paul was addressing not only a philosophical but a popular audience, as we have seen reason to believe, it is quite possible that while the majority would laugh at his closing words, Juvenal, *Sat.*, ii., 149, there may have been others who clung to the popular mythology and its crude conceptions, and the Apostle's prediction of a judgment to come may have sufficiently interested them to prompt a desire for further disclosures. — **ἀκουσόμεθά σου πάλιν** (**περὶ τούτου,** R.V., neuter, we can hardly refer it to the **αὐτόν** of ver. 31). The words are often taken to imply a polite rejection of the Apostle's appeal, a courteous refusal to hear anything further; or at all events to express a very cold interest in his announcement. But if we adopt the reading **καὶ πάλιν** (see critical note) "yet again," R.V., the words rather indicate that a real interest had been excited in some of the hearers (so Calvin, Grotius, Weiss, Alford) and that the marked and defined division of opinion was not merely a dramatic device of the author.

Ver. 33. **οὕτως**: may mean, with this scanty result, or simply, after these events, in this state of the popular mind, with an expectation of being heard again (Alford); "ancipiti auditorum obsequio; nullo edito miraculo': Bengel. — **ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν**: at the opening Paul stood **ἐν μέσῳ,** ver. 22, **τοῦ Ἀ. π.**: "the two expressions correspond to and explain each other, . . . he that 'went forth from the midst of them' must have been standing 'in the midst of them'"; *cf.* Ramsay, *Expositor*, September, 1895, and for the bearing of the words see above on ver. 22. For similar phrase with **μέσου** as frequent in St. Luke's writings, Friedrich, p. 22. Ramsay thinks that some danger is indicated, but nothing is said of this; the words apparently refer to no trial, although, perhaps, to some kind of preliminary inquiry, see above, ver. 22.

Ver. 34. **τινὲς δὲ**: may contrast the favourable with the unfavourable, or perhaps merely continuous.—**κολληθέντες,** see above on v. 13, implies close companionship upon which their conversion followed, see additional note.—**Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀ.**: "quam doctrinam scurræ rejecerunt, Areopagita vir gravis accipit". Dionysius was a member of the Council, the words can mean nothing less—it is evident, therefore, that this convert must have been a man of some distinction, as an Areopagite would previously have filled the office of Archon. On the honour attached to the term *cf.* Cicero, *Pro Balbo*, xii., and instances cited by Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 209, note. It is not improbable that St. Luke may have received from him the draft of St. Paul's address. On the other hand the conversion of a man occupying such a position has excited suspicion, and Baur, *Paulus*, i., 195, considers that the whole scene on the Areopagus is unhistorical, and owes its origin to the tradition that an Areopagite named Dionysius was converted. So Holtzmann holds that the whole scene was placed on the Areopagus, because, according to report, a member of the Areopagus was converted, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 393, similarly Weizsäcker. See further, "Dionysius," B.D.[2], Hastings' B.D., Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i., p. 846; Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 337 and notes below. — **Δάμαρις**: perhaps **Δάμαλις,** a heifer, a name popular amongst the Greeks, so Grotius, Wetstein, and Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 209, note; see critical note above. We know nothing certain about her, but Ramsay makes the interesting conjecture that as the woman is not described as **εὐσχήμων** (*cf.* the description of the women at Thessalonica, Berœa, and Pisidian Antioch, xiii. 50, xvii. 4, 12), she may have been a foreign woman (perhaps one of the educated *Hetairai*), as at Athens no woman of respectable position would have been present amongst St. Paul's audience. St. Chrysostom (so St. Ambrose and Asterius) thought that she was the wife of Dionysius, but St. Luke calls her **γυνή,** not **ἡ γυνή αὐτοῦ.** No mention is made of her in D (but see above

μέσου αὐτῶν. 34. τινὲς δὲ ἄνδρες κολληθέντες αὐτῷ ἐπίστευσαν· ἐν οἷς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεοπαγίτης, καὶ γυνὴ ὀνόματι Δάμαρις,[1] καὶ ἕτεροι σὺν αὐτοῖς.

[1] Before και ετερ. D (Flor.) add ευσχημων. The words και γυνη ονομ. Δ. are omitted in D (retained by Blass in β), see comment., and also by Hilg., who adds ευσχημων after Αρεοπ.

critical note), and Ramsay accounts for this by the view that the reviser of Codex Bezæ was a Catholic, who objected to the prominence given to women in Acts, and that under the influence of this feeling the changes occurred in xvii. 12 (see above) and 34: this prominence assigned to women was, in Ramsay's view, firstly, pagan rather than Christian, and, secondly, heretical rather than Catholic; *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 160, 161; see "Damaris," Hastings' B.D., and Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 337.—**καὶ ἕτεροι**: a significant contrast to the precise results of the Apostle's preaching elsewhere, and yet a contrast which carries with it an evidence of truth. Spitta, p. 242, justly remarks that he knows not how the author of the "We" sections, who was not present at Athens, could have represented the activity of St. Paul in that city better than he has done; the idle curiosity of the Athenians, ver. 21, and after a speech received with ridicule and indifference, a scanty result, graphically represented by two names, of which it is a mere assertion to say that they refer to the sub-apostolic age. Spitta thus refuses to allow any justification for Weizsäcker's rejection of the historical worth of the narrative. Thus in the simple notice of the results of St. Paul's preaching we gain an indication of the historical truthfulness of the narrative. If anywhere, surely at Athens a forger would have been tempted to magnify the influence of St. Paul's intellectual power, and to attribute an overwhelming victory to the message of the Gospel in its first encounter with the philosophic wisdom of the world in a city which possessed a university, the greatest of any of that time, which was known as "the eye of Greece, mother of arts," whose inhabitants a Jewish philosopher (Philo) had described as the keenest mentally of all the Greeks. In answer to the earlier criticism of Zeller and Overbeck, we may place the conclusion of Weiss that the result of St. Paul's labours is plainly not described after a set pattern, but rests upon definite information, whilst Wendt, who refers the composition of the speech, as we have it, to St. Luke, and regards it as derived from information of a speech actually delivered at Athens, insists equally strongly upon the difficulty of supposing that such slender results would be represented as following, if the speech had been composed with a view of exalting Jewish and Christian monotheism against polytheism. Moreover the narrative bears the stamp of truthfulness in its picture of the local condition of Athens, and also in its representation of St. Paul's attitude to the philosophical surroundings of the place and its schools. "One must be at home in Athens," writes Curtius, "to understand the narrative rightly," and no one has enabled us to realise more fully the historical character and vividness of the scene than Curtius himself in the essay to which reference is made above, of which the concluding words are these, that "he who refuses to accept the historical value of the narrative of Paul in Athens, tears one of the weightiest pages out of the history of humanity" (*Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ii., p. 543, "Paulus in Athens": see further, Knabenbauer, pp. 308, 309). The character of the people, the moving life of the Agora, the breadth of view which could comprehend in one short speech the crude errors of the populace and the fallacious theology of the schools, "the heart of the world" too generous to ignore all that was best in men's thoughts of God's providence and of human brotherhood, and yet too loving to forget that all men had sinned, and that after death was the judgment—we recognise them all. If we turn to the speech itself we find abundant evidence of characteristic Pauline thoughts and teaching (*cf.*, *e.g.*, ver. 27 and Rom. i. 19, ii. 14; ver. 26 and Rom. v. 12, 1 Cor. xv. 45; ver. 30 and Rom. iii. 25, etc., Zöckler, p. 268, and instances in notes above, McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 259), and it is worthy of note that Weizsäcker, while rejecting with Baur, Zeller, Schwegler, and Overbeck the account of St. Paul's visit to Athens as unhistorical, fully recognises, after an examination of the Apostle's method of

XVIII. 1. ΜΕΤΑ δὲ ταῦτα χωρισθεὶς ὁ Παῦλος[1] ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἦλθεν εἰς Κόρινθον· 2. καὶ εὑρών τινα Ἰουδαῖον ὀνόματι Ἀκύλαν,

[1] ℵAB 13, 69, Vulg., Boh., Arm., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, omit δε. ℵBD, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt omit ο Παυλος.

dealing with idolatry and polytheism in Rom. i. 20, that if we compare with the Apostle's own indications the fine survey of the world, and especially of history from a monotheistic standpoint, ascribed to him by the Acts at Lystra, xiv. 15, and afterwards at Athens, xvii. 24, the latter, whatever its source, also gives us a true idea of Paul's method and teaching, *Apostolic Age*, i., p. 117, E.T. On the whole tone of the speech as incredible as a later composition, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 147 ff., whilst no one perhaps has drawn up more clearly than Wetstein, see on Acts xvii. 25, the consummate skill of the speech addressed to an audience comprising so many varieties of culture and belief. (To the strange attempt of Holtzmann to reproduce at some length the argument of Zeller, who maintains that the scene at Athens was a mere counterpart of the scene of Stephen's encounter with his foes at Jerusalem, a sufficient answer may be found in Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 240.)

If we ask from whom the report of the speech was received, since Luke, Silas, Timothy all were absent, it is possible that a Christian convert like Dionysius the Areopagite may have preserved it (Zöckler); but a speech so full of Pauline thoughts, and so expressive of Athenian life and culture, may well have been received at least in substance from St. Paul himself, although it is quite conceivable that the precise form of it in Acts is due to St. Luke's own editing and arrangement (see for an analysis of the language of the speech Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 82). The results of St. Paul's work at Athens were small if measured by the number of converts, although even amongst them it must not be forgotten that it was something to gain the allegiance to the faith of a man holding the position of Dionysius the Areopagite (see further an interesting account of the matter in *Expository Times*, April, 1898). But in addition to this, it is also important to remember that St. Paul has given us "an invaluable method of missionary preaching" (Lechler, *Das Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 275), that to the Church at Athens Origen could appeal against Celsus as a proof of the fruits of Christianity (Bethge, p. 116), that its failing faith was revived in time of persecution by its bishop Quadratus, the successor of the martyr-bishop Publius; that in the Christian schools of Athens St. Basil and St. Gregory were trained; and that to an Athenian philosopher, Aristides, a convert to Christ, we owe the earliest *Apology* which we possess (Athenagoras too was an Athenian philosopher), see Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., p. 551; Humphry, *Commentary on the Acts*. It is significant that St. Paul never visited Athens again, and never addressed a letter to the Saints at Athens, although he may well have included them in his salutation to "the Saints which are in the whole of Achaia," 2 Cor. i. 1.

CHAPTER XVIII.—Ver. 1. **μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα**: in continuation of the narrative, *cf.* Luke x. 1.—**χωρισθεὶς**: in i. 4 with **ἀπό**, and so usually—only here with **ἐκ**, departure from Athens emphasised, because events had compelled the Apostle to alter his intended plan (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 240, and Blass, *in loco*), *cf.* 1 Chron. xii. 8 (A *al.*); 2 Macc. v. 21, xii. 12, with an accusative of place.—**Κόρινθον**: Corinth from its position as the capital of the Roman province Achaia was the centre of government and commerce, while Athens was still the great educational centre of Greece. St. Paul, with his keen eye for the most important and prominent stations of Roman government and the meeting points of East and West, might be expected to choose a place from whence the influence of the Gospel could spread over the whole province. Like Ephesus, Corinth lay on the great highway between East and West; like Ephesus it was, as Professor Ramsay terms it, one of the knots on the line of communication, the point of convergence for many subordinate roads. But Corinth, with all its external beauty, its wealth and fame, had become a byword for vice and infamy, *cf.* **Κορινθιάζεσθαι, Κορινθιάζειν**, Wetstein, 1 Cor. i. 2, and references in Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 557 ff., and it has not been unfairly termed the Vanity Fair of the Roman empire: at once the London and the Paris of the first century after Christ

Ποντικὸν τῷ γένει, προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,[1] διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι

[1] Instead of Π. γυναικα αυτου Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor., Gig., Blass in β read συν Π. γυναικι αυτου, and Flor. adds ησπασατο αυτους, so Blass in β. After αυτους Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor., so Blass in β, add ουτοι δε εξηλθον απο της Ρωμης (*urbe* Flor.), (Blass brackets απο της Ρ. after Ιουδαιους). D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor. insert after Ρωμης οι και κατωκησαν εις την Αχαιαν (Blass in β brackets οι). διατεταχεναι ℵcABH, Chrys., so Lach., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, following T.R.; τεταχεναι ℵ*DELP, so Tisch. απο instead of εκ in ℵABDEL, Vulg., Tisch. W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass.

(Farrar, *u. s.*, p. 556). To this infamous notoriety not only the cosmopolitanism of the city contributed, but the open consecration of shameless impurity in its temple service of Venus, see Ramsay, "Corinth," Hastings' B.D.; C. and H., small edition, p. 324 ff.; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 262, and notes below.

Ver. 2. Ἀκύλαν, *cf.* ver. 18, Rom. xvi. 3, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, 2 Tim. iv. 19: the Latin *Aquila* in its Greek form; the name may have been assumed, as often the case, in place of the Jewish name. It is altogether unreasonable to suppose that Luke made a mistake and that this Aquila's name was Pontius Aquila, which he bore as a freedman of the Gens Pontia, a distinguished member of which was called by the same two names, Pontius Aquila, Cic., *Ad Fam.*, x., 33; Suet., *Jul. Cæs.*, 78. The fact that another Aquila, who is famous as giving us the earliest version A.D. of the O.T. in Greek, is also described as from Pontus goes far to show that there is nothing improbable in St. Luke's statement (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 226, E.T.). The name, moreover, was also a slave name (Ramsay, p. 269), as a freedman of Mæcenas was called (C. Cilnius) Aquila. But it is probable that as the greater part of the Jews in Rome were freedmen, Aquila may also have belonged to this class, see Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 234, and also further, Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. xxvii., 418; Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 173.—τῷ γένει: "by race," R.V., *cf.* iv. 36, of Barnabas, and xviii. 24, of Apollos; the word need not mean more than this.—Ἰουδαῖον: The word has been pressed sometimes to indicate that Aquila was still unconverted to Christianity. But the fact that he is called a Jew may simply refer to the notice which follows "that all Jews," etc. Whether Aquila was a Christian before he met St. Paul is very difficult to determine. He is not spoken of as a disciple, and similarity of employment rather than of Christian belief may account for the Apostle's intercourse with him and Priscilla, Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., 189. But the suspicion with which most of his countrymen regarded St. Paul rather indicates that Aquila and Priscilla must at least have had some leanings towards the new faith, or they would scarcely have received him into their lodgings. It is quite possible that, as at the great Pentecost Jews from Rome had been present, *cf.* ii. 10, Christianity may have been carried by this means to the imperial city, and that such tidings may have predisposed Aquila and Priscilla to listen to St. Paul's teaching, even if they were not Christians when they first met him. If they were converted, as has been supposed, by St. Paul at Corinth, it is strange that no mention is made of their conversion. That they were Christians when St. Paul left them at Ephesus seems to be beyond a doubt. Renan describes them as already Christians when they met the Apostle, so too Hilgenfeld, on the ground that their conversion by St. Paul could scarcely have been passed over, see further "Aquila," B.D.[2], and Hastings' B.D.; Wendt, *in loco*; Lightfoot, *Phil.*, pp. 16 and 17, Hort, *Rom.* and *Ephes.*, p. 9.—προσφάτως: here only, lit., lately slaughtered or killed; hence recent, fresh; Latin, *recens* (Grimm). In LXX, Deut. xxiv. 5, Ezek. xi. 3, Jud. iv. 3, 5, 2 Macc. xiv. 36, so too in Polybius, Westcott on Heb. x. 20 πρόσφατος regards all derivations from σφάω (σφάζω) φάω (φένω) φάω (φημί) as unsatisfactory.—Πρίσκιλλαν: in Epistles, Rom. xvi. 3, 1 Cor. xvi. 19, 2 Tim. iv. 9, Prisca, R.V., W.H., Priscilla, perhaps the diminutive, *cf.* Lucilla, Domitilla. Probably St. Luke used the language of conversation, in which the diminutive forms were usually employed, *St. Paul*, p. 268. On Bezan text see critical note, Ramsay, *u. s.*, and *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 158. In vv. 18 and 26 we have Priscilla mentioned before her husband, and so by

πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης, προσῆλθεν αὐτοῖς· 3.[1] καὶ διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον εἶναι, ἔμενε παρ' αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰργάζετο· ἦσαν γὰρ

[1] At the commencement of the verse Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor. (Aug.) add **ο δε Π. εγνωσθη τῳ Ακυλᾳ**, and before **ομοτεχνον** Syr. Harcl. mg., Aug. add **ομοφυλον και**, so Blass in **β** (*cf.* Flor. in ver. 2, *salutavit eos*); see Belser, Beiträge, p. 84, on the bearing of this reading on the conversion of Aquila and Priscilla. For **ειργαζετο** ℵ*B, Boh. Orig., Tisch,, W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt read **ηργαζοντο**. **τῃ τεχνῃ** (for acc.), so ℵABELP, Chrys., Lach., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. D. Gig. (not Flor.) omit the clause **ησαν γαρ σκη. τῃ τεχνῃ**, and so Blass in **β**, and see Blass, p. **x.**, and note above on xvii. 18. Ramsay follows Western text in supporting omission, **see** *St. Paul*, p. 253, and, on the other hand, Weiss, Codex D, p. 43.

St. Paul, except in 1 Cor. xvi. 19. The reason may be that she was of higher social status, and indeed not a Jewess at all, as this seems the best way of accounting for the curious arrangement of the sentence here, the point being to emphasise the fact that *Aquila* was a Jew. Her name may indicate some connection with the Priscan Gens; whilst Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 420, in an interesting discussion find reasons to connect both her (and possibly her husband) with the Acilian *Gens*. That she was a woman of education is evident from ver. 26, and it is possible that her marriage with Aquila may afford us another proof amongst many of the influence of the Jewish religion over educated women in Rome, Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 3, 5. But many commentators from St. Chrysostom have referred the precedence of Priscilla not to social rank, but to her greater fervency of spirit or ability of character; or it may be simply due to the fact that she was converted first.—**διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι**: St. Luke's statement is fully corroborated by Suet., *Claudius*, 25: "Judæos impulsore Christo assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit". But Dio Cassius, lx. 6, in referring to what is most probably the same edict, states that the Jews were not expelled, because of the difficulty in carrying such an order into effect on account of their great numbers. Another passage in Suet., *Tiberius*, 36, gives us the probable explanation: "expulit et mathematicos sed deprecantibus veniam dedit": an instance of a contemplated expulsion, afterwards abandoned. If we thus interpret the meaning of Suetonius with reference to the edict of Claudius by giving the same force to "expulit," it explains the silence of Tacitus and Josephus, who do not mention the edict, while the words of Dio Cassius emphasise the fact that although no expulsion took place the assemblies of the Jews were prohibited, and on that account, we may fairly suppose, that many Jews would leave the city, Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 237. On any view the edict could not have remained in force very long, *cf.* xxviii. 15, and also the return of Aquila and Priscilla to Rome, Rom. xvi. 3. Ramsay dates the edict at the end of 50 A.D. on the ground that although Orosius, *Hist.*, vii., 6, 15, states that it occurred in the ninth year of Claudius, 49 A.D., the historian here, as elsewhere (*e.g.*, *cf.* the famine) in connection with the events of this reign, is a year too early. Wendt (1899), p. 59, gives 49-50 as the year of the edict. But it must be remembered that the authority of Orosius is not altogether reliable in this case, as there is no proof that he had any direct reference to Josephus, to whom he appeals for his date; see O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 129; Blass, *Proleg.*, 23, and Turner, "Chronology of the New Testament" Hastings' B.D. McGiffert, p. 362, maintains that as the date of the edict is thus unknown, we cannot base any chronological conclusions upon it, *cf.* Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 634. Meyer maintained that by Chrestus Suetonius meant a Jewish agitator so called, but it is more probable that the historian confused Christus with Chrestus—an unfamiliar name with one in use among both Greeks and Romans. This Chrestus Suetonius speaks of as actually living, as the historian might have heard enough to lead him to regard the commotions between Jews and Jewish Christians in Rome as instigated by a leader bearing this name, commotions like those excited in the Pisidian Antioch, in Thessalonica, and elsewhere; or it may be that he thus indicates the feverish hopes of the Messiah amongst the Jews resident in Rome, hopes so often raised by some pretentious deliverer. But Lightfoot makes the important remark that even in this case we may fairly suppose that the true Christ held a prominent place in

σκηνοποιοὶ τὴν τέχνην. 4. διελέγετο [1] δὲ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον, ἔπειθέ τε Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλληνας. 5. Ὡς δὲ κατῆλθον

[1] After διελεγετο (δε) D, Flor. Gig., Vulgcl., Syr. Harcl. mg., Blass in β, so Hilg. add εντιθεις το ονομα του κυριου I. If in contrast to ver. 5 it is difficult to see why omitted, nor does the introduction of the name of Jesus seem likely in itself (*interponens*, Flor.) to have persuaded both Jews and Greeks, unless we take επειθε as conative only. εντιθημι is not found elsewhere in the N.T. Belser thinks that here εντιθεις means "insinuating" (p. 85), and that the passage in β reminds us of Paul's own description of his preaching in 1 Cor. ii. 3 (so Blass). ου μονον I. αλλα και Ελλ., so D and Flor., Blass in β, supported by Belser, *u. s.*

these reports, for He must have been not less known at this time than any of the false Christs (*Philippians*, p. 16, note). Such indifference on the part of a Roman of the period is surely not surprising, and the probability is more generally maintained that this Chrestus was really Christ, the leader of the Christians, see Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 227; Wendt (1899), *in loco;* Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 47, 254; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 362, note, but, on the other hand, Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 306.

Ver. 3. διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον: the word is peculiar to St. Luke, and although it is found in classical Greek and in Josephus, it is not used in the LXX, and it may be regarded as a technical word used by physicians of one another; the medical profession was called ἡ ἰατρικὴ τέχνη, physicians were ὁμότεχνοι; thus Dioscorides in dedicating his work to Areus speaks of his friendly disposition towards fellow-physicians (ὁμοτέχνους), Hobart, p. 239, Weiss in Meyer's *Kommentar*, Luke i. 6, and also Vogel, *Zur Charakteristik des Lukas*, p. 17 (1897). On the dignity of labour as fully recognised by Judaism at the time of the Advent, see Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, chapter xi.; *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, pp. 18, 19, 141 (Taylor, 2nd edit.).—ἔμενε παρ' αὐτοῖς: "In Alexandria the different trades sat in the synagogue arranged into guilds; and St. Paul could have no difficulty in meeting in the bazaar of his trade with the like-minded Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 2, 3), with whom to find a lodging," Edersheim, *u. s.*, p. 89, and see passage from T. B. *Sukkah*, 51 b, quoted by Lumby, *in loco*, and on vi. 9.—ἠργάζετο: "at Corinth St. Paul's first search seems to have been for work," *cf.* Acts xx. 34, 35, 1 Thess. ii. 9, 2 Thess. iii. 8, 1 Cor. iv. 11, 12, 2 Cor. xi. 9, Phil. iv. 12. In close connection with this passage *cf.* "St. Paul a Working Man and in Want," *An Expositor's Note-Book*, pp. 419-438 (the late Dr. Samuel Cox), see also Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 34-36.—σκηνοποιοὶ: only here in N.T. (σκηνοποιεῖν, Symm., Isa. xiii. 20, xxii. 15); much has been said about the word, but there seems no reason to depart from the translation "tent-makers," *i.e.*, σκηνοῤῥάφος, Aelian, *V.H.*, ii., 1, and so St. Paul is called by Chrysostom and Theodoret, although Chrysostom also calls him σκυτοτόμος, 2 Tim. ii., *Hom.*, iv., 5, 3. It is no doubt true that tents were often made of a rough material woven from the hair of the goats in which Cilicia abounded, and that the name κιλίκιον (Lat. *cilicium*, Fr. *cilice*, hair-cloth) was given to this material; but the word in the text does not mean "makers of materials for tents". There is no ground for rendering the word with Renan *tapissier*, or with Michaelis "Kunst-Instrumentenmacher". On the curious notion that St. Paul was a landscape painter, which appears to have arisen from a confusion between σκηνοῤῥάφος and σκηνογράφος, and the fact that he is described as ἡνιοποιός, probably a confusion with σκηνοποιός, see *Expository Times*, and notes by Ramsay, Nestle, Dec., 1896, Jan. and March, 1897. As it was often enjoined upon a son not to forsake the trade of his father, perhaps from respect, perhaps because a similar trade might be more easily learnt at home, it is likely that Saul followed his father's trade, which both father and son might easily have learnt at Tarsus. Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 44, E.T. In a commercial city like Corinth the material would be easily obtainable, see critical note.

Ver. 4. διελέγετο δὲ . . . ἔπειθέ τε: "and he used to discourse . . . and tried to persuade," so Ramsay, marking the imperfects, see also Hackett's note.—Ἕλληνας: proselytes, since they are represented as in the synagogue, *cf.* xiv. 1. The heathen are not addressed until

ἀπὸ τῆς Μακεδονίας ὅ τε Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος, συνείχετο τῷ πνεύματι [1] ὁ Παῦλος, διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. 6.[2] ἀντιτασσομένων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ βλασφημούντων, ἐκτιναξάμενος τὰ ἱμάτια, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν·

[1] Instead of πνευματι ℵABDE 13, 40, verss., Bas., Theodt., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Wendt, R.V. read λογῳ. Blass reads συνειχε in β. After Ιουδ. ℵABD 13, 36, Vulg., verss., Bas. insert ειναι, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt.

[2] D, Syr. Harcl. mg., Flor. prefix πολλου δε λογου γενομενου και γραφων διερμηνευομενων. Flor. continues (so Blass in β) αντετασσοντο Ιουδαιοι τινες καὶ εβλασφημουν, see especially Corssen, *G. G. A.*, p. 431. For πορευσομαι D[1]H[1]L, Flor. πορευομαι. For απο του νυν D[1], not D[2], reads αφ' υμων νυν, "nunc vado ad (gentes) ab vobis," Flor.; Blass rejects in β.; Hilg. retains.

ver. 6. McGiffert considers that this notice of work in the synagogue is untrustworthy (p. 268) and at variance with the fact that in St. Paul's own Epistles there is no hint of it, but *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 20, words which we may reasonably suppose had a special application to Corinth, or the Apostle would scarcely have so expressed himself. It would have been strange if in such a commercial centre there had been no Jewish synagogue.

Ver. 5. See note on xvii. 15; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 269, recognises this among the striking points of contact between Acts and the Epistles to the Corinthians. Here Silas and Timothy are said to have been with St. Paul in Corinth, *cf.* St. Paul's own statement in 2 Cor. i. 19, to the fact that the same two names occur in the salutations of 1 and 2 Thess., both of which were written from Corinth, see also Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, iv., 6, 7, and viii. 4.—**συνείχετο τῷ πνεύματι**: "he was wholly absorbed in preaching," **λόγῳ**, so Ramsay; "in teaching the word," Grimm-Thayer, *cf.* Wisdom xvii. 11 (*cf.* 2 Cor. v. 14). The verb occurs frequently in Luke, six times in his Gospel, three times in Acts, twice in St. Paul, only once elsewhere in N.T., but nowhere as in the particular phrase here. It looks as if St. Paul's preaching in Corinth was specially characterised by "greater concentration of purpose and simplicity of method," *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 2. The philosophic style in which he had addressed the Athenians is now abandoned, and so too, at least primarily, the proclamation of the living and true God, and of the coming of His Son to save His people in the day of wrath, with which apparently he had commenced at Thessalonica, 1 Thess. i. 9, 10. Such methods and truths had their place, but in Corinth "Jesus Christ and Him crucified" was to be preached as the power of God and the wisdom of God, and in both his Epistles all that the Apostle says about the duties of the Christian life is brought into relation with this fundamental truth (see McGiffert, *u. s.*, p. 266). Silas and Timothy found him wholly possessed by and engrossed in the word (so the imperfect, Page, Alford, Wendt). On the other hand it has been maintained that the arrival of Silas and Timothy brought St. Paul help from Macedonia, and that on the account, Phil. iv. 15, 2 Cor. xi. 9, he was able to give himself up to preaching, as he was thus relieved from the strain of working for his bread (so Wordsworth, Lewin, Rendall). But 1 Cor. ix. 1 seems to imply that St. Paul still continued to work for his livelihood at Corinth. Blass seems to find in the uniqueness of the phrase a reason for its alteration; see critical note for his view. Plumptre refers the words to the Apostle's desire to see Rome, which the Apostle cherished for many years, and which had been further kindled by finding himself in company with those who came from Rome; and the announcement of a journey to Rome, xix. 21, after the Apostle had been some time in the company of Aquila and Priscilla both at Corinth and Ephesus, is emphasised by Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 255. But on the whole, Ramsay's interpretation is very striking, p. 252, *cf.* the remarks of McGiffert much to the same effect, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 263-266.—**διαμαρτ.**, see above on p. 92.—**τὸν Χ. Ἰ.**: "that the Anointed One is Jesus," *cf.* xvii. 3, so Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 226. So far the message was evidently for Jews. See critical note for reading in D.

Ver. 6. **ἀντιτασσ.**: classical use, of an army ranged in hostile array, or of those opposed to each other in opinion, Thuc., iii., 83. So in later Greek, in Polyb.

καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύσομαι. 7. καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθεν εἰς οἰκίαν τινὸς ὀνόματι Ἰούστου,[1] σεβομένου τὸν Θεόν, οὗ ἡ οἰκία ἦν συνομοροῦσα τῇ συναγωγῇ. 8.[2] Κρίσπος δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος ἐπίστευσε τῷ Κυρίῳ σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ· καὶ πολλοὶ

[1] B*D², Syr. H.; Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt have **Τιτιου Ι.** ℵE, Vulg., Boh., Arm. have **Τιτου Ι.**, so R.V. Instead of **εκειθεν** D* 137, Flor. read **απο του Ακυλα**, not Blass in **β**, but Hilg.; see Corssen, *u. s.*, p. 428.

[2] For doublets in D in this verse, so in Flor., Blass in **β**, see Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 60.

generally to oppose, to resist. Ramsay renders "and when they began to form a faction against him," but *cf.* Rom. xiii. 2, James iv. 6, v. 6, 1 Pet. v. 5, Prov. iii. 34.—**βλασφ.**, *cf.* xiii. 45, or it may be used generally as in xix. 9, and 2 Peter ii. 2.—**ἐκτιναξ.**, *cf.* xiii. 51, note; *cf.* Matt. x. 14, and LXX, Neh. v. 13, "undoubtedly a very exasperating gesture," Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 256; but we must remember that the opposition at Corinth seems to have been unusally great, as Ramsay himself points out, *u. s.*, pp. 143, 256.—**τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν**, *cf.* xx. 26, Hebraistic, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Matt. xxvii. 25, and in LXX, Lev. xx. 16, 2 Sam. i. 16, 1 Kings ii. 37, Ezek. iii. 18, etc., *i.e.*, **ἐλθέτω**, Matt. xxiii. 35. Both here and in xx. 26 we can scarcely doubt that St. Paul had in mind the words of the prophet, Ezek. xxxiii. 6.—**ἐπὶ τὴν κεφ.**, *i.e.*, upon yourselves, the head being used for the person—for other ideas of the word see Wendt (1888), *in loco*. De Wette interprets of moral ruin, and others of the eternal **ἀπωλεία**, but we cannot refine so much upon a figurative phrase. In vv. 5ᵇ and 6 Spitta and Jüngst see the hand of a Reviser, the former holding that the whole passage runs smoothly with these omissions, whilst Jüngst ascribes also the word **ἐκεῖθεν**, ver. 7, to the Reviser. According to Clemen, 4 and 5ᵇ, the preaching in the synagogue belongs to Redactor Judaicus, the Jewish persecution in ver. 6 to the Redactor Antijudaicus. Hilgenfeld agrees with Spitta in so far that he ascribes 5ᵇ and 6ᵇ to "the author to Theophilus".—**καθαρὸς ἐγὼ**: scarcely enough to say "I am pure," have discharged my duty with a clear conscience, *cf.* xx. 26, the same idea here, better to punctuate at **ἐγώ**, but see Blass, *in loco*.—**ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν**: from henceforth, *i.e.*, so far as he is concerned. It is evident that the words did not apply to other places, for in xix. 8 St. Paul goes to the synagogue according to his wont. The phrase is found five times in St. Luke's Gospel, but only here in Acts. It is used once elsewhere in N.T, and there by St. Paul, 2 Cor. v. 16 (*cf.* John viii. 11). See Friedrich, p. 16, and Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 29.

Ver. 7. **μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν**, *i.e.*, from the synagogue, *cf.* Luke x. 7, "he removed," Rendall; "he changed his place *from the synagogue*," Ramsay: the verb is found three times with **ἐκεῖθεν** in St. Matthew, and in each place "departed" R.V., this gives perfectly good sense: *cf.* Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 158, and critical note.—**Ἰούστου**: if the addition **Τίτου** or **Τιτίου** is correct, there is no need to discuss the possible identification with the companion of St. Paul in Gal. ii. 1, etc.; see Alford and Page, *in loco*, and critical note. The identification was adopted by Chrysostom and Grotius, and for a statement of the evidence on either side see Plumptre, *in loco*. It should be remembered that we have Barsabbas Justus, i. 23, and Jesus Justus, Col. iv. 11, see also Lightfoot "Acts of the Apostles," B.D.², i., 32. The house of a proselyte may have been chosen because it offered easy access to those who wished to come, whether Greeks or Hebrews (see Chrysostom's comment), but in Paul's thus going into the house of a proselyte hard by the synagogue we may see how his spirit had been stirred. But further: this Titus Justus was evidently a Roman citizen, one of the *coloni* in Corinth, and thus St. Paul would gain access through him to the more educated class in the city, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 256, and "Corinth," Hastings' B.D., i. 480.—**συνομοροῦσα**: there is no need to suppose that he left his lodgings with Aquila—this house became Paul's place of meeting (so in Ephesus, *cf.* xix. 9, 10); he had his own synagogue there (Blass); in classics simple verb **ὁμορέω, ὁμουρέω**; compound only found here; **συνόμορος**, Eccl. writers.

τῶν Κορινθίων ἀκούοντες ἐπίστευον καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο. 9. Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος δι' ὁράματος ἐν νυκτὶ τῷ Παύλῳ, Μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσῃς· 10. διότι ἐγώ εἰμι μετὰ σοῦ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιθήσεταί σοι τοῦ κακῶσαί σε· διότι λαός ἐστί μοι πολὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ.

Ver. 8. **Κρίσπος**, *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 14, coincidence with, admitted by McGiffert, p. 269 (so too by Holtzmann), "no reason to doubt that he is the man whose conversion Luke reports," according to tradition he became Bishop of Ægina, *Const. Apost.*, vii., 46. Though a Jew he bore a Latin name, *cf.* for a parallel case J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, *in loco*.—**ὁ ἀρχισ.**, if we *cf.* ver. 17 it looks as if in the Corinthian synagogue there was only one person bearing this title, and that Sosthenes succeeded Crispus when the latter became a Christian, see "Corinth" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., i., p. 482, and see also Ramsay, *Expositor*, April, 1895, and above on xiii. 15: on the reason of St. Paul's baptism of Crispus, Gaius, Stephanas, see B.D.², and Hastings' B.D., *u. s.* There is certainly no ground for supposing that St. Paul depreciated baptism although he baptised so few in Corinth with his own hands, *Speaker's Commentary* on 1 Cor. i. 17. It is evident from this notice that St. Paul's preaching had not been without its effect on the Jewish residents, and probably one reason why the feeling against the Apostle was so strong, xx. 3, was because this influence extended to persons of importance in Corinth; the next words show good results among the Gentile population of the city.—**σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ**, *cf.* xvi. 15, 1 Cor. i. 16.—**τῶν Κ.**, not **Ἰουδαῖοι**, who are always so called, but **Ἑλληνες**, ver. 4, including for the most part "proselytes of the gate".—**ἀκού. ἐπίστευον καὶ ἐβαπτ.**: "used to hear, and believe, and receive baptism," imperfects; the spread of the new faith was gradual but continuous. **ἀκού.** is taken by some to refer to the hearing of the fact that Paul had separated himself from the synagogue (so Wendt, Weiss); see critical note.

Ver. 9. So at other crises in the Apostle's life, *cf.* xxii. 17, xxvii. 23.—**ὁ Κ.**, *i.e.*, Jesus.—**μὴ φοβοῦ**, *cf.* Isa. xlii. 6, xliii. 2, and for the phrase Luke i. 13, ii. 10, v. 10, viii. 50, xii. 7, 32, Acts, *in loco*, and xxvii. 24, characteristic of the Evangelist; Friedrich, p. 35, and Plummer on Luke i. 13. *Cf.* xx. 3 for the continued malignity of these Corinthian Jews; the Apostle's apprehension as expressed here is confirmed by the statements in 1 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 7, which describe the Jewish opposition as existing at the time he wrote (see this fully acknowledged by McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 270). Hilgenfeld sees no reason to refer vv. 9 and 10 to the Reviser (with Jüngst). He finds them in his source C of which they are characteristic, *cf.* xvi. 9, 10; the vision refers not to what had preceded, but to what follows, and explains the stay of Paul at Corinth mentioned in ver. 11.—**ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπ.**, *i.e.*, "continue to speak," "speak on," *cf.* Isa. lviii. 1, affirmation and negation; solemnity in the double form; see too Jer. i. 6-8, xv. 15-21; on the form of the tenses see Weiss, *in loco*. In 1 Cor. ii. 3, 4 we have a proof of the effect of this assurance, and of the confidence with which the Apostle was inspired.

Ver. 10. **διότι ἐγώ**: *fundamentum fiduciæ*, Bengel.—**ἐπιθ.**: only here in this sense, but so in LXX, *aggrediri*, *cf.* Gen. xliii. 18, Exod. xxi. 14, 2 Chron. xxiii. 13, Jud. xvi. 7.—**τοῦ κακῶσαι**: infinitive with **τοῦ**, probably to express conceived or intended result, Burton, p. 157 and also p. 148, *i.e.*, an event indicated by the context not to have actually taken place.—**λαός**: "qui mei sunt et mei fient": Bengel—even in Corinth, proverbial for its vice, Christ has His "chosen people," and in Cenchreae, where all the vices of a seafaring population found a home, "Christianity wrought its miracle," so Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 219, *cf.* the Apostle's own description, 1 Cor. vi. 9-11: "in Corinth the Gospel had been put to a supreme test, and nowhere had it triumphed more gloriously". No wonder that in facing this stronghold of the powers of darkness St. Paul needed an assurance similar to that which cheered the heart of an Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 18. But whilst the new faith thus gained adherents chiefly from the lowest social grade, *cf.* also 1 Cor. i. 26, which indicates that there were some in the higher social ranks and some versed in the learning of the schools who welcomed the Gospel; to a Crispus, a Gaius, a Stephanas, we may add Erastus, the public treasurer of the city, Rom. xvi. 23, an office which in a place like Corinth carried with it considerable influence and position (as even

11. ἐκάθισέ τε ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, διδάσκων ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.

12. Γαλλίωνος δὲ ἀνθυπατεύοντος[1] τῆς Ἀχαΐας, κατεπέστησαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Παύλῳ, καὶ ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα,

[1] ℵABD 15, 18, 36, 40, Tisch., Alford, W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. read ανθυπατου οντος. Meyer follows T.R., so Blass. D and Flor. expand as follows in 12 and 13, so Blass in β, κατεπ. οι Ι. συλλαλησαντες μεθ' εαυτων επι τον Π. και επιθεντες τας χειρας ηγαγον αυτον επι το βημα καταβοωντες και λεγ.

Renan admits, although he regards him as the only adherent won from the upper classes), and the readiness with which the Corinthian Church responded to St. Paul's appeal for the poor saints indicates that many of its members had some means at their disposal (*cf.* the striking account of Paul's work at Corinth by McGiffert, p. 267, and Orr, *Some Neglected Factors in Early Christianity*, p. 108).

Ver. 11. **ἐκάθισε**, see critical note, "he dwelt," R.V., *cf.* Luke xxiv. 49, but not elsewhere in N.T. in this sense, but constantly in LXX, 1 Macc. ii. 1, 29. Rendall renders "he took his seat," *i.e.*, as a teacher, a Rabbi, and see also the remarks of Ramsay on the way in which St. Paul was evidently regarded at Corinth as one of the travelling lecturers on philosophy and morals so common in the Greek world, "Corinth," Hastings' B.D.[1], p. 482. The word may be purposely used here instead of the ordinary **μένειν** to indicate the quiet and settled work to which the Apostle was directed by the vision which had calmed his troubled spirit, and had taught him that his cherished plan of revisiting Macedonia must be postponed to preaching the Word in Corinth. During this period 1 and 2 Thess. were probably written. The year and a half is taken to include the whole subsequent residence in Corinth, ver. 18, in which vv. 12-17 form an episode. Men attacked him with a view of injuring him, but without success, and his continuous abode in Corinth was a fulfilment of the promise in ver 10 (indicated perhaps more clearly by **τε** than by **δέ** in ver. 11). On **ἡμέρας ἱκανὰς**, ver. 18, see below—the words are taken to mark simply a note of the time spent between the incident of vv. 12-17 and the departure of Paul from the city. In this period the Apostle would have founded the Church at Cenchreae, and his labours seem to have extended still further, for in 2 Cor i. 1 we read of the saints in the whole of Achaia (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 10) and the household of Stephanas is spoken of as the firstfruits not of Corinth but of Achaia.

Ver. 12. **ἀνθ.**, *cf.* xiii. 7, another proof of St. Luke's accuracy, Achaia from B.C. 27 (when it had been separated from Macedonia, to which it had been united since B.C. 146, and made into a separate province) had been governed by a proconsul. In A.D. 15 Tiberius had reunited it with Macedonia and Mysia, and it was therefore under an imperial legatus as an imperial province, Tac., *Ann.*, i., 76. But a further change occurred when Claudius, A.D. 44, made it again a senatorial province under a proconsul, Suet., *Claudius*, 25. On subsequent changes in its government see Ramsay, "Achaia," Hastings' B.D. Corinth was the chief city of the province Achaia, and so probably chosen for the residence of the governors.—**Γαλλίωνος**: we have no direct statement save that of St. Luke that Gallio governed Achaia. Gallio's brother Seneca tells us that Gallio caught fever in Achaia, *Ep. Mor.*, 104, and took a voyage for change of air (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 258) (see also the same reference in Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 634, and as against Clemen, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 260), a remark which Ramsay justly regards as a corroboration of St. Luke; on the date see Ramsay *St. Paul*, p. 258, and *Expositor* March, 1897, p. 206; "Corinth," Hastings' B.D.[1], p. 481; Turner, "Chronology of the New Testament," *ibid.* Gallio could not have entered on the proconsulship of Achaia *before* 44 A.D., and probably not before 49 or 50: Ramsay thinks during the summer of A.D. 52 (Renan and Lightfoot, A.D. 53), whilst recently Schürer (so Wendt, 1899) places the proconsulship of Gallio between 51-55 A.D., *Zw. Th.*, 1898, p. 41 f. (as against O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, who places it before 49 A.D.). The description of Gallio in Acts is quite consistent with what we know of his personal character, and with his attitude as a Roman official.

13. λέγοντες, Ὅτι παρὰ τὸν νόμον οὗτος ἀναπείθει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σέβεσθαι τὸν Θεόν. 14. μέλλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα, εἶπεν ὁ Γαλλίων πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, Εἰ μὲν οὖν [1] ἦν ἀδίκημά τι ἢ ῥᾳδιούργημα πονηρόν, ὦ Ἰουδαῖοι, κατὰ λόγον ἂν ἠνεσχόμην ὑμῶν·

[1] **ουν** *om.* ℵABDE, Chrys., verss., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. D Flor., Vulg. read **ω ανδρες Ιουδ.**

Statius, *Silv.*, ii., 7, 32, speaks of him as "dulcis Gallio," and his brother Seneca writes of him: "Nemo mortalium uni tam dulcis est quam hic omnibus," *Quæst. Nat.*, iv., Præf., and see other references and testimonies, Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 221, and "Gallio," B.D.². It is quite possible that the Jews took advantage of his easy-going nature and affability, or, if he had recently arrived in the province, of his inexperience. Gallio's Hellenic culture may have led to his selection for the post (Renan, *u. s.*, p. 222). The notion that as a Stoic he was friendly disposed towards the Christians, and on that account rejected the accusations of the Jews, is quite without foundation, see Zöckler, *in loco*. The name of Junius Gallio was an assumed one; its bearer, whose real name was Marcus Annæus Novatus, had been adopted by the rhetorician, L. Junius Gallio, a friend of his father.—**κατεπέστησαν,** *cf.* xvi. 22, verb, only found here. Rendall, *in loco*, renders "made a set assault upon Paul," expressing the culmination of the Jewish hostility in a set assault (not *against*, as in A. and R.V.).—**ὁμοθ.**, as in xv. 25.—**τὸ βῆμα**: of the proconsul, probably erected in some public place, a movable seat o judgment.

Ver. 13. **λέγοντες**: in the set accusation which follows there is probably an indication that the Jews could not stir up the crowd against Paul as at Philippi and Thessalonica, for already he had gained too good an influence over the common people (Weiss).—**ἀναπείθει**: only here in N.T., "persuadendo excitare, sollicitare," it is used of evil persuasion in LXX, Jer. xxxvi. (xxix.) 8 and in 1 Macc. i. 11.—**παρὰ τὸν νόμον**: "contrary to the law": what law? Roman or Jewish? in a certain sense the expression might include both, for as a *religio licita* the Jewish law was under the protection of the Roman law, and Josephus tells us how leave had been granted to the Jews to worship according to their own law, *Ant.*, xiv., 10, 2 ff. But Paul's teaching was to these Jews the introduction of something illegal, contrary to the religion which they were allowed to practise, and so they sought to bring his teaching under the cognisance of the proconsul (see Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 190). They may therefore have designedly used a phrase which had a double meaning. But whatever their design, Gallio saw through it, and drew a hard and fast distinction between a charge of illegality against the state and of illegality against Jewish, **νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς,** not Roman law. In this reply Gallio showed that he knew more about the matter than the Jews supposed, and he may have had some intelligence of the Jewish disturbances at Rome about "Chrestus". Both **ἀνθρώπους** and **σέβ. τὸν Θεόν** point to the general nature of the charge, as including Paul's efforts to convert not only Jews but proselytes. At least the Jews would try to give their accusation a colour of illegality against the Roman law, for they would themselves have dealt with it if it had been simply connected with their own religious observances, see "Corinth," Hastings B.D., i., 481.

Ver. 14. **μέλλοντος**: Lucan; see Burton, p. 71, on **οὖν,** see critical note and Alford, *in loco*, for its retention.—**ἀδίκημα,** *cf.* xxiv. 20, only once elsewhere in N.T., Rev. xviii. 5, here it may perhaps mark a legal wrong, a wrong against the state — the word is used in classical Greek of a breach of law **ἀδίκ. τῶν νόμων,** Dem., 586, 11, while **ῥᾳδιούργημα** marks rather the moral wrong. **ῥᾳδ.,** *cf.* xiii. 10, not elsewhere either in classical Greek or LXX, but *cf.* Plut., *Pyrrh.*, 6, "if a misdemeanour or a crime": so Ramsay.—**κατὰ λόγον**: *ut par est, merito*; *cf.* use of the phrase in Polyb. and 3 Macc. iii. 14 (**παρὰ λ.,** 2 Macc. iv. 46, 3 Macc. vii. 8).—**Ἰουδαῖοι** without **ἄνδρες** perhaps in contempt (so Knabenbauer), but see critical note. — **ἠνεσχόμην,** *cf.* Luke ix. 41, and so several times in St. Paul's Epistles, 2 Cor. xi. 1, 4; on the augment and construction see Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 39, 102, Simcox, *Language of the New Testament*, p. 34, note, and Burton, p. 103.

15. εἰ δὲ ζήτημά[1] ἐστι περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς, ὄψεσθε αὐτοί· κριτὴς γὰρ[2] ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι. 16. καὶ[3] ἀπήλασεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος. 17. ἐπιλαβόμενοι δὲ πάντες[4] οἱ Ἕλληνες Σωσθένην τὸν ἀρχισυνάγωγον ἔτυπτον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος· καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίωνι ἔμελεν.

[1] The plur. **ζητηματα** read by ℵABD²E, verss., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss Wendt, Blass.

[2] γαρ after **κριτης** *om.* ℵABD 13, Vulg., Boh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt Blass.

[3] For **απηλασεν**, D¹, Flor., Hilg. **απελυσεν**, but not Blass.

[4] ℵAB Vulg., Boh., Arm. *om.* **οι Ελληνες**, so R.V., W.H., Wendt, Weiss; Blass retains (Flor. *om.* **παντες**), so Belser and Hilg. Blass in β reads **και ο Γαλλιων προσεποιειτο αυτον μη βλεπειν**. Flor. "simulat se non videre" (d); Belser holds that this is original, p. 87. Some later MSS. read **Ιουδαιοι**.

Ver. 15. If we read the plural **ζητήματα** we may regard it as expressing contempt: "a parcel of questions," Alford; but if they are questions of word (teaching) not deed (opposite **ἔργον**, *factum*) and of names not things, *verba*, opposite **πράγματα** (Blass); *i.e.*, the arguments as to whether Jesus could rightly or not claim the title of Messiah, see also Page's note.—**νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς**: of your law—not Roman law; with the phrase *cf.* xvii. 28 (xvi. 39 β), xxiv. 22. It is used only once elsewhere in N.T., by St. Paul, Eph. i. 15 (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 3).—**ὄψεσθε αὐτοί**, *cf.* Matt. xxvii. 4, 24; pronoun emphatic, xiii. 18, 19; so in LXX, Num. xiii. 19, Judg. vii. 17, xxi. 21, etc. Blass quotes two passages from Epictetus, ii., 5, 30, and iv., 6, 41.—**κριτὴς γὰρ ἐγὼ**: omit **γάρ**; pronoun more emphatic; they could determine their matters according to their own law; so Lysias, xxiii., 29, Festus, xxv., 19.—**οὐ βούλομαι**: "I am not minded," R.V.; the decision while it testifies to the strength of Gallio's character, since unlike Pilate he would not allow himself to be influenced against his better judgment, expresses at the same time his sovereign contempt for the Jews and their religion; to him as to his brother Seneca the Jews were only *sceleratissima gens* (Aug., *De Civ. Dei*, vi., 10). The decision shows no favourable inclination to Christianity itself, but this does not take away from its importance as proving that so far as the Roman authorities were concerned the freedom of speech thus granted would enable the religion of the Christ to make its way through the civilised, *i.e.*, the Roman world; *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 260, who sees in his residence at Corinth an epoch in Paul's life not only as regards his doctrine and his presentation of it but also as regards his aim that Christianity should be spread throughout the empire, an aim made more clear by the imperial policy of which Gallio was the exponent.

Ver. 16. **ἀπήλασεν**: probably by his lictors who would be commanded to clear the court. This interpretation of the word is in accordance with the next verse, which describes the crowd of Greeks as prepared to follow up the decision of Gallio by similar treatment of a leading Jew on their own account. See critical note.

Ver. 17. **ἐπιλαβ. δὲ**: of hostile action, xvii. 19, xvi. 19.—**οἱ Ἕλληνες**, see critical note. If **πάντες** alone is read it seems clear from the context that only the Jews could be meant, and Weiss supposes that when they had failed so ignominiously they vented their rage on their own leader, Sosthenes, who as head of the synagogue would naturally have been prominent in presenting the complaint to Gallio. Some of the later MSS. insert **οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι** after **πάντες** to make the meaning clearer. Probably confusion arose in the MSS. from identifying Sosthenes either rightly or wrongly with the Sosthenes in 1 Cor. i. 1, and therefore **οἱ Ἕλληνες** was omitted on the supposition that the Jews were allowed to console themselves by beating a Christian. But not only is it difficult to conceive that Gallio would have allowed them to do this, but there is no occasion to suppose that the Sosthenes here is the same as in 1 Cor. i. 1 (for the name was common), and even if so, he may have become a Christian at a later date. It is much more conceivable that the Corinthians in their hatred of the Jews proceeded to

18. Ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔτι προσμείνας ἡμέρας ἱκανάς, τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἀποταξάμενος ἐξέπλει εἰς τὴν Συρίαν, καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Πρίσκιλλα καὶ

second as it were the supercilious treatment dealt out to them by Gallio, and they would naturally fix upon Sosthenes as the leading spirit in the Jewish community. So far as he cared at all, Gallio may have been pleased rather than otherwise at the rough and ready approval of his decision by the populace, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 250, and "Corinth," Hastings' B.D.[1], p. 482; Plumptre, *in loco*, and Wendt (1899). The whole of the section, vv. 12-17, is regarded by Clemen, p. 126, Jüngst, p. 165, as an interpolation, but Hilgenfeld puts aside their varying grounds of rejection as unconvincing, and finds it very conceivable that the Jews attempted to hinder the preaching of Paul as is here described (1 Thess. ii. 16). With regard to the whole narrative of Paul at Corinth, vv. 1-17, Spitta, p. 244, concludes, as against Weizsäcker's attack on its historical character, that we may regard it as scanty or even one-sided, but that there is no valid reason to regard it as unhistorical.—**ἔτυπτον**: Hackett interprets the imperfect as showing how thorough a beating Sosthenes received; but "exitus rei quæ depingitur (imperf.) non indicatur, quia nihil gravius secutum est," Blass; the imperfect may simply mean "began to strike".—**οὐδὲν . . . ἔμελεν**, *cf.* Luke x. 40, a Gallio has become a proverbial name for one indifferent to religion, but there is nothing in St. Luke's statement to support such a view. All the words show is that Gallio was so little influenced by the accusations of the Jews against Paul that he took no notice of the conduct of the Greeks (?) in beating Sosthenes. And if the beating was administered by the Jews, Gallio might well overlook it, as he would regard it as the outcome of some question which only concerned *their* religion (Weiss).

Ver. 18. **ἔτι προσμείνας**: this may be an addition to the year and a half, or may be included in it; on **ἔτι** see critical note.—**ἱκανάς**, Lucan, see on viii. 11, etc. the expression shows how little the attack upon the Apostle had injured his prospects of evangelising the city and neighbourhood.—**ἀποταξ.**, Vulgate, *valefacio*, used by Luke and Paul only, except Mark vi. 46, Luke ix. 61, xiv. 33, Acts, *in loco*, and ver. 21, 2 Cor. iii. 13; in this sense only in middle voice in N.T., in classical Greek not used in this sense, but **ἀσπάζεσθαί τινα** (Grimm, *sub v.*); *cf.* also its use in Jos., *Ant.*, xi., 6, 8 (so too in Philo), like Latin, *renuntio*, to forsake (*cf.* Luke xiv. 33), and in Eccl. writers, Ignatius, *Ad Philadelph.*, xi., 1; Euseb., *H.E.*, ii., 17, 5 (2 Clem., vi., 4, 5).—**ἐξέπλει**: "he set about the voyage," in xx. 6, aorist, not imperfect as here; "recte impf., nam de perfecta navigatione, ver. 22, demum agitur," Blass.—**κειρ. . . . εὐχήν**: in the interpretation of this passage it is undoubtedly best to refer the vow to Paul; grammatically it would refer to Aquila, but it is difficult to see what point there would then be in the statement. If it is urged that Aquila's name placed after Priscilla's indicates that he is the subject of the following verb, we have clearly seen that this is not the only occasion on which Priscilla's name preceded her husband's, see above, and ver. 26, and Rom. xvi. 3. The argument that the notice is intended by St. Luke to show that Paul counselled observance of the law, and did not tempt him to break it, as he was afterwards accused of doing, xxi. 21, is still more irrelevant, for so far nothing has been definitely said as to Aquila's conversion. And if the vow involved any obligation to appear at Jerusalem, it is quite evident that Paul and not Aquila went up to the Holy City. A list of the names on either side is given by Alford, Felten, Wendt. Amongst recent writers we may add Wendt, Zöckler, Blass, Jüngst, Matthias as favouring the view that Aquila is the subject, whilst Weiss, Felton, Ramsay, Hort, Rendall, Page, Knabenbauer, Luckock take the opposite view. What then was the nature and occasion of the vow? Those who connect this vow with the journey to Jerusalem, as if the latter was obligatory in the fulfilment of the former, are justified in regarding the vow as a modified form of the Nazirite vow, Num. vi. 1-21. The man under the Nazirite vow was to drink no wine or strong drink, and to let no razor pass over his head or face. At the end of the time during which the vow lasted, his hair was shaven at the door of the Tabernacle (the Temple), and burnt in the fire of the altar as an offering. But it is to be observed that in this passage the word is **κειράμενος**, whilst of thus completing the Nazirite vow, xxi. 24, the word **ξυρήσωνται** is used (*cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 6), and there is evidence (Wordsworth, *in loco*) that a man who had taken a

Ἀκύλας,[1] κειράμενος τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς· εἶχε γὰρ εὐχήν. 19. κατήντησε[2] δὲ εἰς Ἔφεσον, κἀκείνους κατέλιπεν αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς δὲ

[1] After Ακυλας Blass in β reads ος ευχην εχων εν Κεγχρεαις την κεφαλην εκειρατο, following Flor.; see Belser, pp. 89-92, who strongly opposes Blass, and *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 263, and comment.

[2] κατηντησαν, plur. in ℵABE 13, 40, d, tol., Sah., Boh., Syrr., Arm., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. Blass omits κακεινους κατελιπεν αυτον, so Flor., which ends "cum venisset Ephesum in se". Blass, with D, Flor., reads καταντησας δε εις Σ., and continues with D 137, Syr. H. mg., Sah., τῳ επιοντι σαββατῳ εισελθων. διελεχθη EHLP; διελεξατο ℵAB 13, 68, 69, 105, Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, W.H.; διελεγετο D, Gig., Vulg., so Blass in β.

Nazirite vow in a foreign land was allowed to poll or cut his hair shorter (κείρω), provided that the hair so polled was taken to the Temple and burnt there as an offering together with the hair shorn off at the completion of the vow. That the Jews took upon themselves a modified form of the Nazirite vow is proved from Josephus, *B. J.*, ii., 15, 1, when they were afflicted by disease or any other distress. Possibly therefore the vow followed upon St. Paul's deliverance from an attack of sickness, and the warm praise bestowed upon Phœbe, the deaconess of the Church at Cenchreae (Rom. xvi. 1), for her personal aid to himself may be taken as some confirmation of this. But if we thus place St. Paul's vow here under the category of the vows mentioned by Josephus, the journey to Jerusalem must be immediately connected with it, as the description given by the Jewish historian plainly shows that the vows in question were modified forms of the regular Nazirite vow. It is a very reasonable conjecture that the vow may be connected with St. Paul's danger at Corinth, and with his safe deliverance from it. As one consecrated to the service of the Lord, he would allow his hair to grow until the promise of his safety had been fulfilled and his embarkation from Corinth was assured. The vow was thus analogous to the Nazirite vow, inasmuch as the same idea of consecration lay at the root of each; but it was rather a private vow (Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 91, and Weiss, *in loco*), and in this case the journey of the Apostle to Jerusalem would not be conditioned by the vow, but by his desire to be present at some great festival, beyond doubt that of the Passover. On the custom amongst other nations to cut off the hair, and to let it grow in votive offering to the gods, see Holtzmann, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 395, and Page, *in loco.* Hilgenfeld ascribes the narrative of the incident to his "author to Theophilus," whether the vow refers to Paul or Aquila, and considers that the story is intended to connect St. Paul as much as possible with Judaism. One of the most curious instances of perverse interpretation is that of Krenkel, who thinks that the κειρ. may be referred to Paul, who shaved his head to counteract the epileptic fits with which he was afflicted, 2 Cor. xiii. 7, see Zöckler's note.—Κεγχρεαῖς, see notices of the place in Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 218, and Hastings' B.D., modern *Kalaniki* (in Thuc. Κεγχρειαί): the eastern harbour of Corinth, about nine miles distant, connecting the trade with Asia; Lechæum, the other port ("bimaris Corinthi," Horace, *Odes*, i., 7, 2), connecting it with Italy and the West. Τούτῳ μὲν οὖν χρῶνται πρὸς τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἰταλίας τῷ Λεχαίῳ, Strabo, viii., 6, p. 380.

Ver. 19. κατήντησε, see critical note.—εἰς Ἔφεσον: a voyage of two or three days with unfavourable wind. Cicero mentions two occasions when the voyage from Ephesus to Athens took two weeks, *Ad Attic.*, vi., 8, 9; iii., 9, but in both instances extraordinary delays were the cause of the lengthy voyage; on Ephesus see xix. 1.—κἀκείνους κατέλ. αὐτοῦ: Ephesus, famous for its commerce, where they might carry on their trade, although it is perhaps somewhat hazardous to regard the city as the centre of the particular trade in which they were engaged. Lewin quotes two passages in support of this, but they both refer to one event, the presentation of a tent by the Ephesians to Alcibiades, "Ephesus" B.D.².—αὐτὸς δὲ: this does not mean that Paul for his part (in contradiction to Aquila and Priscilla) went into the synagogue; such an interpretation seems unnatural. Others explain that Aquila and Priscilla were left in the town, and that the synagogue was *outside* the town (so Alford), but this does not seem satisfactory as a full explanation,

εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν διελέχθη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις. 20. ἐρωτώντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον μεῖναι παρ' αὐτοῖς,[1] οὐκ ἐπένευσεν· 21. ἀλλ' ἀπετάξατο αὐτοῖς, εἰπών,[2] Δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· πάλιν δὲ ἀνακάμψω πρὸς ὑμᾶς,

[1] **παρ' αυτοις** *om.* ℵAB 36, 40, Vulg., Syr. H. text, Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass.

[2] After **ειπων** ℵABE 13, 15, 105, 180, Vulg. (*exc.* demid.), Sah., Boh., Arm., Aethro. *om.* **δει . . . ιεροσ.**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; retained by T.R., so Meyer, after (D)HLP 36, 40, Syrr., demid., Chrys., Oec., Thl., Gig., Wer.; D has **την εορτην ημεραν**, omitting the second **την**. Blass, p. xx., thinks D here affected by the corresponding Latin, "sollemnem diem advenientem". The reading may have arisen from a desire to give a reason for St. Paul's urgency in making a brief journey to Jerusalem, a journey to which the **αναβας** of ver. 22 was regarded as referring (*cf.* xx. 16). But whether we follow the Bezan text or not, Ramsay holds that the shorter reading of the great MSS. still implies a hurried visit to Jerusalem, which could only be for some great occasion—the Feast of the Passover close at hand (so Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 263). Possibly the performance of his vow may have occasioned this urgent desire (Belser). But in xix. 1 D has a further expansion of the text, and speaks of a purposed but unaccomplished journey of St. Paul to Jerusalem, so that we cannot find in xviii. 22 an intimation of the accomplishment of this journey (*cf.* Corssen, *G. G. A.*, p. 440, 1896; Hilgenfeld, *Zw. Th.*, 1896, p. 82), and **αναβας**, xviii. 22, does not refer to a journey to Jerusalem at all on this view. But the reference of **β** in xix. 1 to the proposed journey in xviii. 21 has been doubted: Paul may have visited Jerusalem, xviii. 22, then travelled through Galatia and Phrygia, ver. 23, and have formed anew an intention to pay another visit to Jerusalem (so Belser, strongly against Blass, *Beiträge*, p. 97, and also *Die Selbstvertheidigung des heiligen Paulus*, p. 140 ff., App. I.; the visit in xviii. 22 having been already accomplished for the performance of his vow). But if xix. 1 does refer back to the journey of xviii. 21, Wendt maintains that the original occasion for the addition in that verse may still have been the fact that **αναβας** was understood of a journey to Jerusalem. For the two additions may proceed from different hands; that in xviii. 21 has much better attestation than that in xix. 1, and may owe its origin to the correct reference of **αναβας** in ver. 22 to a journey to Jerusalem; whilst the later addition in xix. 1 may have been occasioned by that of xviii. 21, because the reference in ver. 22 to a journey to Jerusalem was no longer recognised (Wendt, 1899, note, p. 306); see further on xix. 1.

especially after xvi. 13. It seems most probable that St. Luke uses the words in an anticipatory way, and passes on to the doings of the chief figure, Paul. In spite of all that he had suffered at the hands of his countrymen, St. Paul is still an Israelite, yearning for the hope of Israel, and desirous that others should participate in his hope, see critical note on **β** and Wendt (1899), note, p. 305.—**διελέχθη**: aorist, not imperfect as in ver. 4; "delivered a discourse to the Jews," so Ramsay, in contrast to the continued stay at Corinth marked by the imperfect; so Alford.

Ver. 20. **ἐπένευσεν**: only here in N.T., but *cf.* 2 Macc. iv. 10, xi. 15, xiv. 20, frequent in classical Greek. St. Paul must have had some very pressing reason for refusing such an invitation from his own countrymen.

Ver. 21. See critical note. The Feast, as Ramsay maintains, *St. Paul*, p. 264 (so Ewald, Renan, Zöckler, Rendall, Blass and others), was the Passover, the one which seems most reconcilable with the chronology; others maintain Pentecost, so Anger, Alford, Wieseler, Plumptre—see Alford, *in loco*, and Turner, *Chron. of the N. T.*, p. 422; Lewin favours Tabernacles.—**ἀνακάμψω**, *cf.* xix. 1: used by St. Luke, Luke x. 6, Matt. ii. 12, Heb. xi. 15; used also several times in LXX, Jud. xi. 39 A, 2 Sam. viii. 13, 1 Kings xii. 20, Job xxxix. 4, Sus. 14, and other instances, so in classical Greek, to return to a place, Herod., ii., 8.—**τοῦ Θ. θέλ.**, *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 19, xvi. 17, James iv. 15. Not only amongst Jews and Arabs but amongst Greeks and Romans similar phrases were in vogue, see Meyer's note on James iv. 15; see critical note on **β**.—**ἀνήχθη**, see above on xiii. 13.

Ver. 22. **κατελθὼν εἰς Κ.**, *i.e.*, Cæsarea Stratonis, *i.e.*, came down from the

τοῦ Θεοῦ θέλοντος. καὶ ἀνήχθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφέσου· 22.[1] καὶ κατελθὼν εἰς Καισάρειαν, ἀναβὰς καὶ ἀσπασάμενος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κατέβη εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν. 23. καὶ ποιήσας χρόνον τινὰ ἐξῆλθε, διερχόμενος καθεξῆς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, ἐπιστηρίζων πάντας τοὺς μαθητάς.

[1] 137, Syr. Harcl. mg., Pesh. read **τον δε Ακυλαν ειασεν εν Εφεσῳ· αυτος δε αναχθεις ηλθεν εις Καισ.**, so as to bring in the words omitted above, **κατελιπεν αυτους εκει**—no mention of Priscilla; this would be characteristic of the Bezan reviser, *cf.* ver. 26, etc.

high sea to the coast, the shore, *cf.* xxvii. 5 (xxi. 3), so in Homer, and also of coming down from the high land to the coast, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*—**ἀναβὰς**, *i.e.*, to Jerusalem, the usual expression for a journey to the capital, *cf.* xi. 2, xv. 2 (*b*), xxv. 1, 9, Matt. xx. 18, Mark x. 32, see Luke ii. 42, xviii. 31, xix. 28, John ii. 13, vii. 8, Gal. ii. 1; *cf.* xxiv. 1, 22, xxv. 6, where "to go down" is used of the journey from Jerusalem to Cæsarea. To suppose that the word is used to indicate simply that they landed in the harbour, or because the town lay high up from the shore, or because the place of assembly for the Church was on high ground, is quite arbitrary, and cannot be set against the usage of the term "going up" and "going down" in relation to Jerusalem; see Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 96; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 264; so Bengel, Neander, Meyer, Hackett, Zöckler, Rendall, Page, Weiss, Weizsäcker, Spitta, Jüngst, Hilgenfeld, Wendt, Knabenbauer, and Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 89, who opposes here the position of Blass (and if the T.R. in ver. 21 is retained in **β** certainly "the going up" to Jerusalem seems naturally to follow). Blass maintains that Cæsarea is meant, but he is evidently led to adopt this view by his desire to retain the reading in D, xix. 1, see Zöckler, *in loco*, and Ramsay, p. 264, and Belser, *u. s.*, for a criticism of Blass's view. Amongst the more recent critics, Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 343, 350, combats the reasons alleged by Belser, and takes the going up and the Church mentioned to refer to Cæsarea and the Church there, not to Jerusalem. This visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem is disputed by McGiffert, although he does not deny with Weizsäcker the whole journey, but admits that the Apostle went as far as Antioch. So too Wendt is not prepared to follow Weizsäcker entirely, although he holds that as the Apostle went to Syria, Luke concluded that he must have gone up to Jerusalem (so McGiffert). On the other hand, the historical truthfulness of the journey to Jerusalem is stoutly defended by Spitta (pp. 246-248). The silence of the Galatian Epistle is admitted by Wendt to be in itself no proof against its occurrence, and still less objection can be based on the supposed variance at this time between St. Paul and the Jewish Christians of the capital. See Zöckler's note, p. 272, and also Alford, *in loco*.—**τὴν ἐκκ.**: the Church at Jerusalem may be fairly regarded as indicated, the **ἐκκ. κατ' ἐξοχὴν**: "primariam, ex qua propagatæ sunt reliquæ," Bengel. If St. Luke had meant the Christians in Cæsarea, he would probably have said that Paul saluted the brethren or the disciples, *cf.* xxiv. 7 (see Belser, *u. s.*, p. 90). This visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem would probably be his fourth, ix. 26, xi. 30 (xii. 25), xv. 4, and if he went on this fourth occasion to complete a vow, this fact alone would prove that the visit was not wanting in an object: see however note on ver. 18.—**ἀσπασ.**: the word indicates a short stay. Blass interprets that the Apostle went up from the harbour to the city of Cæsarea, and then "went down to Antioch". But Ramsay, p. 264, urges that it is impossible to use the term **κατέβη** of a journey from the coast town Cæsarea to the inland city Antioch; on the contrary, one regularly "goes down" to a coast town, xiii. 4, xiv. 25, xvi. 8, etc. At the Syrian Antioch, the mother of the Gentile churches, St. Paul would find a welcome after his second journey, as after his first—this so far as we know was his last visit to a place which was now no longer an effective centre for the Apostle's work, or for the supervision of his new churches.

Ver. 23. **ποιήσας χρόνον τινὰ**: St. Paul would naturally have spent some time in a place so associated with the origin of Gentile Christianity, and with his own labours, the starting place of each of his missionary journeys; on the phrase in St. Luke see Friedrich, *cf.*

24. Ἰουδαῖος δέ τις Ἀπολλῶς[1] ὀνόματι, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, κατήντησεν εἰς Ἔφεσον, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. 25. οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, καί, ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου,[2] ἐπιστάμενος

[1] D reads **Απολλωνιος**, possibly correct, so Blass in **β**, and Hilg., but *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 268, *C. R. E.*, p. 151, and see below; see also Wendt (1899), p. 308, note, who thinks with Blass that orig. in Acts **Απελλης** as in ℵ*.

[2] For **Κυριου** ℵABDEL 13, 36, 40, verss., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. read **Ιησου**. After **κατηχ.** D (Gig.) reads **εν τῃ πατριδι.** For **την οδον** D has **τον λογον**, but not Blass. For **ελαλει** D[1] has **απελαλει** (d, *eloquebatur*), so Blass in **β**, and Hilg.; see also below.

xv. 33, xx. 3, James iv. 13, Rev. xiii. 5, St. Matt. xx. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 25.—The stay was probably not lengthy, especially if advantage was to be taken of the travelling season for the highlands of Asia Minor, Turner, *Chronology of N. T.*, p. 422, Hastings' B.D. On the connection of the Galatian Epistle with this stay in Antioch see Ramsay, especially *St. Paul*, pp. 190, 265.—**ἐξῆλθε,** on his third missionary journey.—**καθεξῆς,** see above on p. 118.—**διερχόμενος,** see above on xiii. 6.

Ver. 24. **Ἀλεξ.,** *cf.* vi. 9, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 226, E.T. At Alexandria the LXX was written and Philo lived; here too was the magnificent mosque of which it was said that he who had not worshipped in it had not witnessed the glory of Israel, Edersheim, *History of the Jewish People*, pp. 67, 186, 405, 409; on the contact of Jewish and Greek thought in Alexandria, "Alexandria," B.D.[2] (Westcott). What was the exact influence of his Alexandrian training upon Apollos we are not told, but as a cultured Jew of such a centre of Hellenistic influence, it is quite possible that Aquila and Priscilla chose him for the work at Corinth because they thought that his training and learning would attract the attention of a Corinthian audience. Possibly his preaching may have included some Philonian speculations, but the difference between him and St. Paul in their teaching at Corinth may have consisted in outward form and delivery rather than in substance; see Canon Evans, *Speaker's Commentary*, iii., p. 240. No doubt the subtle Corinthian would admire the eloquence of Apollos and pervert his words, but there is no reason to suppose that Apollos encouraged any such party spirit. On his work at Corinth and the last notice of him, Titus iii. 13, see "Apollos," B. D.[2], and Hastings' B.D., *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 12, for his unambitious and peaceful character, and Plumptre, *in loco*. The Book of Wisdom was attributed to Apollos by Dean Plumptre, but see on the other hand "Wisdom of Solomon," B.D.[2] (Westcott), and *Speaker's Commentary*, "Apocrypha," vol. i., p. 413.—**λόγιος**; "learned," R.V., "eloquent," margin; A.V., "eloquent"; the word may include both learning and eloquence. In classical Greek of a man learned, as, *e.g.*, in history (Herod.), but in Plutarch **λογιότης,** eloquence, and so **λόγιος,** eloquent. Meyer rendered the word "eloquent," so Weiss, Zöckler, Page, Alford, Hackett, Felten, Blass (*doctus ap. antiquos*), **δυνατός** referring rather to his learning and acquaintance with the Scriptures: "a good speaker and well read in the Scriptures" (Ramsay). Rendall however takes **δυνατός** as conveying the idea of eloquence, but in vii. 22 the word cannot mean eloquent as applied to Moses, but rather denotes the wise and weighty nature of his utterances, see Lobeck, *Phryn.*, p. 198.

Ver. 25. See critical note on the proposed omission of the verse and reading also in D.—**κατηχ.,** *cf.* Luke i. 4, "taught by word of mouth," R.V., margin; D. adds **ἐν τῇ πατρίδι,** and Blass holds that we may learn from this that some form of Gospel teaching had already been known in Egypt. But how far had Apollos been instructed? It is commonly held that he only knew the Baptism of John and nothing further, and that he was imperfectly acquainted with the facts of our Lord's life. But he is said to have taught accurately (**ἀκριβῶς**) "the things concerning Jesus" (see critical note), and not only so, but, as Blass also points out, the mention of the twelve disciples at Ephesus has previously been taken to mean literally that these men were disciples of the Baptist, and had never

μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου· 26. οὗτός τε ἤρξατο παῤῥησιάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ. ἀκούσαντες δὲ αὐτοῦ [1] Ἀκύλας καὶ Πρίσκιλλα,

[1] Ακυλας και Πρισκιλλα, so DHLP, Syrr. P. and H., Sah., Arm., Chrys., Gig.; but Πρ. και Ακ. ABE 13, Vulg., Boh., Aeth., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, so Blass, although in β we might have expected the other order, as characteristic of the Bezan text; see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 268, and see below on verse 2.

heard of Jesus, whereas the words used to describe them, μαθηταί and πιστεύσαντες, are never used except of Christians. What is the conclusion? That whilst Apollos, like these twelve men, was acquainted with no other *Baptism* than John's, he may have known quite as much of our Lord's words and deeds as was contained in the Gospel of St. Mark in its mutilated form, xvi. 8, which tells us nothing of *Christian* Baptism. And if we further ask from what source did Apollos gain this accurate information, Blass answers: "videlicet non sine scripto aliquo Evangelio". If, he urges, it had been otherwise, and Apollos had been instructed by some disciple of the Apostles and not through a written Gospel, the position of things in the text would be reversed, and Apollos would have been imperfectly acquainted with our Lord's life and teaching, whilst he could not have failed to know of *Christian* Baptism as the admission to Christian churches. Blass therefore believes that before the year 50 (he places the Conference in 45 or 46) written Gospels were in existence, and he evidently leans to the belief that St. Mark's Gospel, or some first edition of it, was the Gospel from which Apollos was instructed (see *in loco*, and *cf.* also *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 30). But the word κατηχ. on this view must be taken not to include but to exclude, at all events mainly, a reference to catechetical teaching, and this from the use of the word in the N.T. is most unlikely. In the majority of the cases, as Blass admits, the word denotes oral teaching, although he maintains that this meaning is not always strictly kept. In the N.T. the word is used only by Luke and Paul, altogether eight times, in six of which it is used with reference to oral instruction, according to Mr. Wright: "Apollos: a study in Pre-Pauline Christianity," *Expository Times*, October, 1897 (but see also in answer, Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 31). Mr. Wright suggests that Apollos may have derived his knowledge of "the facts concerning Jesus" from one of the many Catechists who were sent out from Jerusalem, and visited in large numbers the capital of Egypt, and by him Apollos like Theophilus was instructed in the way of the Lord. This view certainly gives an adequate meaning to κατηχ., but still it seems strange that a Catechist, even if his chief business was to catechise or instruct in the facts of the Gospel history, should say nothing about *Christian* Baptism; surely a Catechist would himself be a baptised member of Christ. It is possible that Apollos may have deliberately decided to abide as he was; he may have said that as the Master Himself had fulfilled all righteousness in John's Baptism, so that Baptism was sufficient for the servant. But on this view one has to suppose that no news of the events of Pentecost had reached Alexandria, although Egyptian Jews had been present at the feast. But the news which Apollos may have received had been imperfect, *cf.* xix. 2, 3, and he had not therefore abandoned his position as a follower of the Baptist, who accepted the teaching that Jesus was the Messiah without knowing fully how that claim had been fulfilled, who had been baptised with the Baptism of the Baptist unto repentance without knowing the higher blessings conferred by membership in the Body of the Risen and Ascended Lord: see further *Expository Times*, vol. vii., pp. 564, 565; *Hermathena*, xxi. (1895); Weiss and Zöckler, *in loco*.—ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν: Blass prefers D ἀπελάλει, which Wright, *u. s.*, p. 11, renders "repeated by rote".—ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, *cf.* Rom. xii. 11, this fervency was shown not only in speaking what he knew, but in teaching it to others, *cf.* ver. 11, where the same word is used of Paul's instructions. We can scarcely take ἐλάλει as *privatim*, ἐδίδασκεν *publice* (Bengel).—ἀκριβῶς: "accurately," so often in classics, and as agreeing best here with this verse and the comparative in ver. 26; on the use of the word in medical writers see Hobart, p. 251; Weiss, Meyer's *Kommentar*, Luke i. 3, also compares the similarity between St. Luke's phrase and Galen's dedication of his work to a friend (he also finds a parallel in Jos., *C. Apion*, i., 10); see also below on

προσελάβοντο αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁδόν. 27.[1] βουλομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ διελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν, προτρεψά-

[1] In D, Syr. Harcl. mg. **εν δε Εφεσῳ επιδημουντες τινες Κορινθιοι και ακουσαντες αυτου παρεκαλουν διελθειν συν αυτοις εις την πατριδα αυτων. συγκατανευσαντος δε αυτου οι Εφεσιοι εγραψαν τοις εν Κορινθῳ μαθηταις, οπως αποδεξωνται τον ανδρα, ος επιδημησας εις την Αχαΐαν πολυ συνεβαλλετο εν ταις εκκλησιαις.** If the work of a reviser, object seems to be to show more clearly why Apollos came to Corinth. **επιδημειν** is Lucan; **συγκατανευειν** occurs nowhere in N.T. Belser, pp. 87, 88, argues for the value of the **β** text here, esp. in the addition **εν ταις εκκλησιαις**, which shows St. Paul had not confined his attention to Corinth. But if original, why omitted? See Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 267; W.H. marg.; Holtzmann, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 396. **δια της χαριτος** *om.* D 137, Gig., Par., Vulg., Syr. Harcl., so Blass in **β**.

ἀκριβέστερον and its employment by Dioscorides. The word occurs in Luke twice, Luke i. 3, Acts xviii. 25, and elsewhere in Matt. ii. 8, and twice in St. Paul, 1 Thess. v. 2, Eph. v. 15, whilst **ἀκριβέστερον** occurs four times in N.T., and each time in Acts, *cf.* ver. 26, xxiii. 15, 20, xxiv. 22.

Ver. 26. **παῤῥησιάζεσθαι,** see above on p. 242; whatever was the exact form of the belief of Apollos, he had at all events the courage of his convictions. — **ἀκούσαντες** showing that Priscilla and Aquila had not separated themselves from their fellow-countrymen.—**προσελάβοντο,** *cf.* xvii. 5, *i.e.*, for instruction in private.—**ἀκριβέστερον**: on its use by St. Luke see above on ver. 25. The word is used by Dioscorides in his preface to his *De Materia Medica*: see Weiss-Meyer's *Kommentar* on Luke i. 1, and Vogel, p. 17, as an instance of medical language. — **ἐξέθεντο**: we are not told whether he was baptised, but xix. 5 makes it probable that he was; see Zöckler's note. "Qui Jesum Christum novit, potentes in Scriptura docere potest," Bengel, and Vogel *u. s.*

Ver. 27. **διελθεῖν εἰς,** *cf.* Luke viii. 22, Mark iv. 35, Latin, *trajicere*.—**προτρεψ. . . . ἔγραψαν**: "encouraged him and wrote," R.V., so Chrysostom, Erasmus, Grotius, Bengel, Felten, Lumby, Rendall, Knabenbauer: "currentem incitantes" Bengel. But others refer it to the disciples, "wrote exhorting the disciples," *i.e.*, wrote letters of commendation, 2 Cor. iii., so Luther, De Wette, Ewald, Zöckler, Alford, Wendt, Weiss, Nösgen, Hackett. Blass thinks that the word can be referred to neither in the sense of *cohortari*, and prefers the rendering in accordance with the Syriac *anteverterunt*, but *cf.* Wisdom xiv. 18, 2 Macc. xi. 7 for the former sense, so in classical Greek; only here in N.T., classed not only by Hobart, but also by Vogel, as amongst the medical words in St. Luke, *u. s.*, p. 17.—**συνεβάλετο**: only here in N.T. in middle, with dative of the person, *profuit*, so often in Greek authors, especially Polybius; Wisdom v. 8, Xen., *Cyr.*, i., 2, 8; *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 6, "rigavit A. non plantavit" Bengel.—**διὰ τῆς χ.**: "helped much through grace them which had believed" R.V., margin. This connection of the words seems preferable, as stress is laid upon the fact that the gifts and eloquence of Apollos were only available when God gave the increase—the position of the words is not against this, as they may have been so placed for emphasis. Blass, who joins the phrase with **πεπιστ.**, adds "quamvis ibi abundat". It does not seem natural to explain the word **χάρις** here as the Gospel, or to refer it to the grace of the eloquence of Apollos.

Ver. 28. **εὐτόνως**: "powerfully," only in Luke, *cf.* Luke xxiii. 10, "vehemently," like Latin, *intente*, *acriter*, Josh. vi. (7), 8 (**-νος**, 2 Macc. xii. 23, 4 Macc. vii. 10, A R); found also in classical Greek, and may be one of the "colloquial" words common to the N.T. and Aristophanes, *cf.* *Plutus*, 1096 (Kennedy, p. 78). But as the word is used only by St. Luke, it may be noted that it is very frequently employed by medical writers, opposed to **ἄτονος**.—**διακατηλέγχετο**: "powerfully confuted," R.V. The word does not prove that Apollos convinced them (A.V. "mightily convinced"), lit., he argued them down; but to confute is not of necessity to convince. The double compound, a very strong word, is not found elsewhere, but in classical Greek **διελέγχω**, to refute utterly (in LXX, middle, to dispute), **κατελέγχω**, to convict of falsehood, to belie. — **ἐπιδεικνὺς**: only once elsewhere in N.T., Heb. vi. 17, and in classical Greek as in Plato, to prove, to demonstrate.

μενοι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἔγραψαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀποδέξασθαι αὐτόν· ὃς παραγενόμενος συνεβάλετο πολὺ τοῖς πεπιστευκόσι διὰ τῆς χάριτος·

Additional note on Acts xviii. 23 (see on xvi. 6).

In a brief attempt to refer to a few difficulties connected with this verse, it is well to bear in mind at the outset that St. Luke never uses the noun **Γαλατία** (which is twice used by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, Gal. i. 2), but the adjective **Γαλατικός**, xviii. 23 and xvi. 6, in both cases with the noun **χώρα**; St. Paul in each case is speaking of the "Churches of Galatia"; St. Luke in each case is speaking of the Apostle's journeys. How may we account for this different phraseology? If St. Luke had meant Galatia proper, we may believe that he would have used the word **Γαλατία**, but as he says **Γαλατικὴ χώρα** he speaks as a Greek and indicates the Roman province Galatia, or the Galatic province; a name by which the Greek-speaking natives called it, whilst sometimes they enumerated its parts, *e.g.*, Pontus Galaticus, Phrygia Galatica, *Expositor*, pp. 126, 127, August, 1898 (Ramsay), and Hastings' B.D., "Galatia" (Ramsay), pp. 87-89, 1899; *cf.* the form of the derived adjective in **-ικός** in the pair **Λακωνικὴ γῆ** and **Λακωνία**. St. Paul on the other hand, speaking as a Roman citizen, used the word **Γαλατία** as = the Roman province, for not only is there evidence that **Γαλ.** could be so employed in current official usage (the contrary hypothesis is now abandoned by Schürer, one of its former staunch supporters, see *Expositor*, *u. s.*, p. 128, and Hastings' B.D., ii., 86), but it seems beyond all dispute that St. Paul in other cases classified his Churches in accordance with the Roman provinces, Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, *Expositor*, *u. s.*, p. 125; Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., 124; Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 51; Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, iii., p. 135; Clemen, *Chron. der Paulinischen Briefe*, p. 121. Why then should the Churches of Galatia be interpreted otherwise? Ramsay ("Questions," *Expositor*, January, 1899) may well appeal to Dr. Hort's decisive acceptance of the view that in 1 Peter i. 1 (*First Epistle of St. Peter*, pp. 17, 158) the Churches are named according to the provinces of the Roman empire (a point emphasised by Hausrath, *u. s.*, in advocating the South-Galatian theory), and that in provincial Galatia St. Peter included at least the Churches founded by St. Paul in Galatia proper, *i.e.*, in Phrygia and Lycaonia, although it must be remembered that Dr. Hort still followed Lightfoot in maintaining that the Galatians of St. Paul's Epistle were true Galatians, and not the inhabitants of the Roman province. "But if St. Peter, as Hort declares, classed Antioch, Iconium, Derbe and Lystra among the Churches of Galatia, must not Paul have done the same thing? Is it likely that 1 Peter, a letter so penetrated with the Pauline spirit, so much influenced by at least two Pauline Epistles, composed in such close relations with two of Paul's coadjutors, Silas and Mark, should class the Pauline Churches after a method that Paul would not employ?" (Ramsay, *Expositor*, January, 1899.) The Churches which in this view are thus included in the province Galatia, *viz.*, Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, would be fitly addressed as Galatians by a Roman citizen writing to provincials proud of Roman names and titles (although Wendt (1899) urges this mode of address, Gal. iii. 1, as one of two decisive points against the South Galatian theory). For we must not forget that two of the four Churches in South Galatia were Roman *coloniæ*, Antioch and Lystra, whilst the two others mentioned in Acts xiv. bore an emperor's name, Claudio-Iconium, Claudio-Derbe. That the title "Galatians" might be so applied to the people of Roman "Galatia" has been sufficiently illustrated by Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 130, and Ramsay, *Expositor*, August, 1898, *cf.* Tac., *Ann.*, xiii., 35, xv., 6; *Hist.*, ii., 9; and it is very noteworthy that in Phil. iv. 15 St. Paul in addressing the inhabitants of a Roman *colonia* addresses them by a Latin and not a Greek form of their name, **Φιλιππήσιοι** = Latin, *Philippenses*, so that in addressing the four Churches of South Galatia, so closely connected with Rome as we have seen, St. Paul would naturally address them by the one title common to them all as belonging to a Roman province, *Galatæ*, Galatians; Ramsay, *Expositor*, August, 1898; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 177-179.

St. Paul then uses the term Galatia as a Roman citizen would use it, while St. Luke employs the phraseology common in the Ægean land amongst his contemporaries; he does not speak of Galatia, by which term he would as a Greek mean North Galatia, but of the "Galatic territory" or of the region or regions with which he was concerned; see on

28. εὐτόνως γὰρ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διακατηλέγχετο[1] δημοσίᾳ, ἐπιδεικνὺς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν.

[1] **δημοσια επιδεικνυς**, D 137 has **δημ. διαλεγομενος και**, so Blass in **β**, and Hilg., but apparently superfluous after **διακατηλεγχετο** (Weiss).

this *Expositor*, August, 1898, pp. 126, 127, and Hastings' B.D., "Galatia". In xvi. 6 he writes of a missionary tour (see on **διῆλθον**, note, *l. c.*) through the Phrygo-Galatic region; in xviii. 23 he speaks of a missionary tour through the Galatic region (Derbe and Lystra) and the Phrygian (Iconium and Antioch). It is, moreover, important to note that whether we take **Φρυγία**, xviii. 23, as an adjective, **χώρα** being understood, or as a noun, the same sense prevails, for we have evidence from inscriptions of Antioch that Galatic Phrygia was often designated by the noun, "and St. Luke may be allowed to speak as the people of Antioch wrote," Ramsay, Hastings' B.D., ii., p. 90, 1899. See further the same writer's reference to the testimony of Asterius, Bishop of Amasia in Pontus Galaticus, A.D. 400, in favour of the above view, who paraphrases xviii. 23, **τὴν Λυκαονίαν καὶ τὰς τῆς Φρυγίας πόλεις**, and places the journey through Lycaonia and Phrygia immediately before the visit to Asia, xix. 1; see especially Ramsay, *Studia Biblica*, iv., p. 16 ff. and p. 90; Hastings' B.D., *u. s.*, as against Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 136.

But further: if the Phrygo-Galatic district thus lay on the road to Ephesus, it is difficult to see how St. Paul could be conceived of as going to a distance of some 300 miles out of his route to Galatia in the narrower ethnical sense of the word; and this is one of the many points which influences Mr. Turner to regard the South Galatia view as almost demonstrably true, *Chron. of the N.T.;* Hastings' B.D., i., 422 (see also to the same effect, Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 52; and Rendall, *Acts*, p. 275; Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 377). McGiffert (so too Renan, Hausrath) maintains that if the North Galatian theory is correct, and St. Paul is not addressing the Churches founded on his first missionary journey, but only those founded, as we must suppose, during a period of missionary labour in North Galatia, a period inserted without a hint from St. Luke in xvi. 6, it seems incomprehensible why Barnabas should be mentioned in the Galatian Epistle. The Churches in North Galatia could scarcely have known anything about him, especially as *ex hypothesi* they had been evangelised after the rupture between Paul and Barnabas, Acts xv. 36 ff. If, however, the Churches of the Epistle = the Churches founded in Acts xiii., xiv., then we can at once understand the mention of Barnabas. But Mr. Askwith has lately pointed out with much force (*Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 77, 1899) that this argument must not be pressed too far. The introduction of Barnabas in the Galatian Epistle does not prove that he was known *personally* to the Galatians (although it may reasonably warrant the inference that he was known by *name*) any more than the allusion to him, 1 Cor. ix. 6, proves that he was personally known to the Corinthians, *cf.* also Lightfoot, *Colossians*, p. 28.

One more significant and weighty fact deserves mention. In St. Paul's collection for the poor Saints (on the importance of which see xxiv. 17) there is every reason to believe that all the Pauline Churches shared; in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 appeal is made to the Churches of Galatia and Achaia, and the Churches of Macedonia and Asia subsequently contributed to the fund. If by Galatia we understand Galatia proper, and not the Roman province, then the four South Galatian Churches are not included in the list of subscribers, and they are not even asked to contribute. This appears inconceivable; whereas, if we look at the list of delegates, Acts xx. 4, whilst Macedonia and Asia are represented, and Gaius and Timothy represent the Churches of South Galatia, no delegate is mentioned from any North Galatian community (see Rendall: "Pauline collection for the Saints," *Expositor*, Nov., 1898, and "The Galatians of St. Paul," *Expositor*, April, 1894; also Weizsäcker, *Apostolic Age*, i., 272, E.T., and McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 180, Askwith, *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 88 ff. (1899)). For the literature of the question see Ramsay, "Galatia," Hastings' B.D., ii., p. 89, 1899; Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., pp. 129, 130; Wendt (1899), p. 276, and "Galatians, Epistle to the," Marcus Dods, Hastings' B.D., ii., 94. To the list given in the last reference may be added the names of Wendt, O. Holtzmann, Clemen, V. Weber (Würsburg), Page, Rendall, McGiffert,

XIX. 1.[1] ἘΓΕΝΕΤΟ δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπολλὼ εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ, Παῦλον, διελθόντα τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη, ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἔφεσον· 2. καὶ

[1] D, Syr. Harcl. mg. read at commencement of verse θελοντος δε του Παυλου κατα την ιδιαν βουλην πορευεσθαι εις Ιεροσολυμα, ειπεν αυτῳ το πνευμα υποστρεφειν εις την Ασιαν. διελθων δε τα ανωτερικα μερη. See above on xviii. 21, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 266—the supposed failure to pay the visit to Jerusalem is explained by the interpolation of the above statement; *cf.* Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 48, who quotes Ephrem, *in loco*. The omission of the notice about Apollos is explained by Weiss, Codex D, p. 93, on the ground that it had no meaning for the reviser, but it may have been accidental because of the other changes. Απολλω ℵc, so W.H., Weiss, Wendt; Απολλων A²L 40; Απελλην ℵ¹ 180. ευρειν instead of ευρων, so ℵAB, Vulg., Boh., Arm.; Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, W.H., R.V. adding τε after ειπεν.

in favour of the South Galatian view, and most recently Askwith, *Epistle to the Galatians* (1899); whilst to the other side may be added Volkmar, Schürer, Holsten, who has examined the whole subject closely in his *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, p. 35 ff. (chiefly in reply to Hausrath's strong support of the opposing view), Zöckler, Jülicher, Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.*, p. 186 ff. and p. 353, 1896, Schmiedel, and amongst English writers, Findlay, *Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 288 ff., and very fully Dr. Chase, *Expositor*, 1893, 1894.

We can only make a passing allusion to the date or possible date of the Galatian Epistle. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 189 ff., places it at the close of the Apostle's second missionary journey during his stay at Antioch, xviii. 22 (A.D. 55), whilst McGiffert also places it at Antioch, but *before* the Apostle started on this same journey, not at its close, *Apostolic Age*, p. 226. Rendall, *Expositor*, April, 1894, has assigned it an earlier date, 51, 52, and places it amongst the earliest of St. Paul's Epistles, and more recently Zahn has dated it almost equally early in the beginning of 53, and upon somewhat similar grounds, *Einleitung*, i., p. 139 (the three oldest Epistles of St. Paul according to him being the group of Galatians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, all written in the same year). But on the other hand, Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 43 ff., and Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 376, not only place the Epistle later than any of the dates suggested above, but assign it a place between 2 Corinthians and Romans, arguing from the similarity of subject and style between the three Epistles. Most of the continental critics would place it in the same group, but as the earliest of the four great Epistles written in the earlier period of the Apostle's long residence at Ephesus, Acts xix. 1.

Lightfoot places it apparently on the journey between Macedonia and Achaia, Acts xx. 2, 2 Corinthians having been previously written during the Apostle's residence in Macedonia (so Zahn), Romans being dated a little later whilst St. Paul stayed in Corinth, Acts xx. 2, 3 (*Galatians*, pp. 39, 55). Dr. Clemen has since defended at great length his view, first put forward in *Chronol. der Paul. Briefe*, p. 199 ff., that Romans preceded Galatians, in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1897, 2, pp. 219-270; but see as against Clemen, Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 142; Zöckler, *Die Briefe an die Thess. und Galater*, p. 71; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. xxxviii. Mr. Askwith has recently discussed the points at issue between Ramsay and Lightfoot as to the date of Galatians, and in accepting the latter's position as his own, he has shown that this is not incompatible with a firm recognition of the South Galatian theory, *Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 98 ff. Harnack, *Chronol.*, p. 239, declines to commit himself to any definite date for Galatians, and perhaps this conclusion is not surprising in relation to an Epistle of which it may be truly said that it has been placed by different critics in the beginning, in the close, and in every intermediate stage of St. Paul's epistolary activity, *cf.* Dr. Marcus Dods, "Galatians," Hastings' B.D.

CHAPTER XIX.—Ver. 1. See critical note for Bezan reading.—**Ἀπολλὼ**, *cf.* xxi. 1; see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 31, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 95.—**τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη**: The main road to Ephesus which passed through Colosse and Laodicea was not apparently taken by Paul, but a shorter though less frequented route running through the Cayster valley. This route leads over higher ground than the

εὑρών τινας μαθητάς, εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς, Εἰ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες; οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν, Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰ Πνεῦμα Ἅγιόν

other, and St. Paul in taking it would be passing through the higher-lying districts of Asia on his way from Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus. According to Col. ii. 1 the Apostle never visited Colosse and Laodicea, which seems to confirm the view taken above (but see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 94, on Mr. Lewin's view of Col. ii. 1). The expression **τὰ ἀνωτ. μέρη** is really a description in brief of the same district, "the region of Galatia and Phrygia," mentioned in xviii. 23. If the journey passed through North Galatia, Ramsay contends with great force that the expressions in xviii. 23 **καθεξῆς** and **πάντας τοὺς μαθητάς** would be meaningless, as **καθ.** would apply not to Churches already known to us, but to Churches never mentioned in the book, and if St. Paul did not visit the South Galatian Churches, how could St. Luke mention "all the disciples"? Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte* (second edition), *in loco*, as a supporter of the North Galatian theory, takes the term as the equivalent of the places referred to in xviii. 23, but he does not include in these places as far north as Tavium or Ancyra, and a route through Cappadocia is not thought of; so here Pessinus, Amorion, Synnada, Apameia, Philadelphia, and Sardis would be visited by the Apostle, and from Sardis he would go down to Ephesus; the expression **τὰ ἀνωτ. μέρη** would thus in Zöckler's view include churches founded on the second missionary journey, but the most northerly are excluded as lying too far away, p. 273; see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 93; "Ephesus," Hastings' B.D., and *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii., 715; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 275. Blass takes the words to mean districts more remote from the sea; Rendall (so Hackett) explains them as referring to the land route through the interior of Asia Minor by way of distinction to the sea route which Paul had before pursued on his way from Ephesus to Jerusalem. Grimm explains as the parts of Asia Minor more remote from the Mediterranean, farther east, and refers only to Hippocrates and Galen for the use of the adjective, which was evidently a very rare one (see Hobart, p. 148); see also Zöckler on xix. 1 and illustrations of Latin expressions similarly used. R.V. renders "the upper country," lit., the upper parts, *i.e.*, inland; A.V., "coasts," *i.e.*, borders, as in Matt. ii. 16, etc., Humphry, *Commentary on R. V.*—**εἰς Ἔφεσον**: Ephesus and Athens have aptly been described as two typical cities of heathendom, the latter most Hellenic, the heart and citadel of Greece, the former the home of every Oriental quackery and superstition in combination with its Hellenism; the latter inquisitive, philosophical, courteous, refined, the former fanatical, superstitious, impulsive. And yet *Acts* portrays to the life the religious and moral atmosphere of the two cities, no less than their local colouring (Lightfoot, "Acts of the Apostles," B.D.[2], p. 36). Under the empire it was a regulation that the Roman governor should land at Ephesus, and from all quarters of the province the system of Roman roads made Ephesus easily accessible. St. Paul with his wonted judgment fixed upon it as a fitting centre for the message and for the spread of the Gospel. Like Corinth, with which close intercourse was maintained, Ephesus is described as one of the great knots in the line of communication between Rome and the East; see further notes in commentary, Ramsay, "Ephesus," Hastings' B.D.; "Ephesus," B.D.[2]; E. Curtius, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, i., 233 ff.

Ver. 2. **μαθ. . . . πιστεύσαντες**: Blass points out that both these words are used only of Christians. From St. Chrysostom's days the men have often been regarded merely as disciples of the Baptist (so McGiffert, p. 286), and Apollos has been named as the person to whom they owed their conversion, whilst amongst recent writers Mr. Wright, *u. s.*, argues that they had been baptised by the Baptist himself. But if we realise the force of the remark made by Blass on the two words, they were men simply in the same position as Apollos, *i.e.*, "ignorabant illi ea quæ post resurrectionem facta erant" (Blass)—their knowledge was imperfect like that of Apollos. There may have been many who would be called **μαθηταί** in the same immature stage of knowledge. Much difficulty has arisen in insisting upon a personal connection of these men with Apollos, but St. Luke's words quite admit of the supposition that the twelve men may not have come to Ephesus until after Apollos had left for Corinth, a consideration which might answer the question of Ramsay, p. 270 as to how the Twelve had escaped the

ἐστιν[1] ἠκούσαμεν. 3. εἶπέ τε πρὸς αὐτούς, Εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον, Εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα. 4. εἶπε δὲ Παῦλος, Ἰωάννης μὲν[2] ἐβάπτισε βάπτισμα μετανοίας, τῷ λαῷ λέγων, εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον μετ' αὐτὸν ἵνα πιστεύσωσι, τουτέστιν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. 5. ἀκούσαντες δὲ ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 6. καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Παύλου τὰς χεῖρας, ἦλθε[3] τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον

[1] Instead of **εστιν** D[1], Syr. Harcl. mg., Sah. read **λαμβανουσιν τινες**, so Blass and Hilg. **εστιν** very likely misunderstood; it seems impossible that **λαμβ. τινες** should be replaced by the difficult **εστιν**.

[2] **μεν** *om.* ℵABD, Vulg., Sah., Arm., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. **Χριστον** *om.* ℵABE 13, 25, 40, Vulg., Boh., Syr. H., Aeth[ro]., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass; although Sah., Gig., Pesh. read **εις τον Ι. Χ.**, and D (so Hilg.) has **εις Χ.**

[3] D, Jer., instead of **ηλθεν**, have **ευθεως επεπεσεν.** After **γλωσσαις**, Sah., Syr. H. mg. add **ετεραις**, and Syr. H. mg. (Par.) continue **και επεγινωσκον εν εαυτοις, ωστε και ερμηνευειν αυτας εαυτοις, τινες δε και επροφητευον.** Both Wendt (1899) and Weiss regard as interpolations after 1 Cor. xiv. Blass, on the other hand, accepts in **β**, *cf.* also p. xxviii., and speaks of this as "locus gravissimus".

notice of Apollos (see Felten, p. 351, note).—**εἰ**, *cf.* i. 6.—**πιστεύσ.**: "when ye became believers," or "when ye believed," R.V., in contrast with A.V.—the question was whether they had received the Holy Ghost at their Baptism, and there is no allusion to any subsequent time. The two aorists, as in R.V., point to one definite occasion.—**εἰ Π. Ἅ. ἐστιν**: "whether the Holy Ghost was *given*," R.V. (*cf.* John vii. 39): (the spirit was not yet *given*), A.V., but in margin, R.V. follows A.V. in the passage before us: **ἐστιν**, *accipitur*, Bengel. There could not be any question as to the *existence* of the Holy Ghost, for the Baptist had pointed to the future Baptism of the Spirit to be conferred by the Messiah, and the O.T. would have taught the existence of a Holy Spirit—the meaning is that they had not heard whether their promised Baptism of the Spirit by the Messiah had been already fulfilled or not. So **δοθέν**, **ἐκχυνόμενον** may be understood. Alford holds that the stress should be laid on **ἠκούσαμεν**—when we received Baptism we did not even *hear* of a Holy Ghost.

Ver. 3. **οὖν**: presupposes that if they had been baptised into the name of Jesus, they would have received the Spirit at Baptism.—**εἰς**: "to baptise into" (R.V.) may have been suggested by the original practice to baptise by dipping or plunging, see Humphry, *Comment. on R. V.*, *in loco*.—**εἰς τὸ Ἰ. βάπτισμα**, *i.e.*, into or unto repentance. For the strange notion that they were baptised into John as the Messiah see Hackett's note.

Ver. 4. **εἰς τὸν ἐρχ.**: placed first before **ἵνα**, perhaps for emphasis. The phrase had been a favourite one with the Baptist (*cf.* Matt. iii. 1). John's own words showed that his Baptism was insufficient. **ἵνα** may express both the purport and the purpose (so Alford).

Ver. 5. **ἀκούσαντες δὲ**: neither grammatical nor in accordance with fact can these words be regarded (as by Beza and others) as part of St. Paul's words, as if they meant, "and the people when they heard him," *i.e.*, John.

Ver. 6. **καὶ ἐπιθ. αὐτοῖς τοῦ Π. τὰς χ.**, see above on viii. 16.—**ἐλάλουν τε γλ. καὶ προεφ.**: the imperfects may mean that they began to speak, or that the exercise of the gifts mentioned continued. The two gifts are discussed in 1 Cor. xii. 10, xiv., in an Epistle which was written probably during this stay at Ephesus—no doubt the gifts are specially mentioned because the bestowal of such gifts distinguished Christian Baptism from that of John. McGiffert, p. 286, while admitting the accuracy of the account as a whole, thinks that its representation is moulded, as in viii., in accordance with the work of Peter and John in Samaria; so too Hilgenfeld refers the account to his "author to Theophilus," who also, in viii. 16, narrates that the baptised Samaritans received the Holy Ghost by the laying on of Peter's hands. This is in some respects not unlike the older view of Baur, who held that the narrative was introduced to parallel Paul's dignity and work with that of Peter in x. 44—the first speaking with tongues in

ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἐλάλουν τε γλώσσαις καὶ προεφήτευον. 7. ἦσαν δὲ οἱ πάντες ἄνδρες ὡσεὶ[1] δεκαδύο. 8. Εἰσελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐπαῤῥησιάζετο,[2] ἐπὶ μῆνας τρεῖς διαλεγόμενος καὶ πείθων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ. 9. Ὡς δέ τινες ἐσκληρύνοντο καὶ ἠπείθουν, κακολογοῦντες τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους, ἀποστὰς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀφώρισε τοὺς μαθητάς, καθ' ἡμέραν διαλεγόμενος ἐν τῇ σχολῇ

[1] For **δεκαδυο** (T.R., so Meyer, HLP, Chrys.), ℵABDE, Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt read **δωδεκα**.

[2] Before **επαρρησιαζετο** D, Syr. H. mg. read **εν δυναμει μεγαλῃ**; see Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., pp. 60, 61. **τα** before **περι** ℵAEHLP 13, 36, Chrys., retained by T.R., Tisch., but om. by Lach., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass (*cf.* viii. 12), in accordance with BD.

ii. is narrated in relation to Jews, the second in relation to Gentiles, x., and the third in relation to a kind of middle class, half-believers like the Samaritans! (so Zeller and Schneckenburger). But not only does this require us to identify ii. with x. and xix., the speaking of tongues at Pentecost with subsequent bestowal of the gift, but it seems strange that a narrative should not have been constructed more free from liability to misconception and misinterpretation if the leading purpose of its introduction had been as supposed above.

Ver. 7. **ὡσεί**, as Weiss admits, excludes any special significance attaching to the number twelve on account of which the narrative would be constructed. See also Knabenbauer, *in loco*. We know so little about these men that it seems hazardous to attempt to define them more clearly (see Plumptre, *in loco*).

Ver. 8. The Apostle follows his usual method—to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. **διαλεγ.**, see above; *cf.* xvii. 2, "reasoning," R.V. ("discoursing," Rendall).

Ver. 9. **ἐσκληρύνοντο**: only here and in Rom. ix. 18, but four times in Hebrews, three times as a quotation from Ps. xcv. 8, and once in direct reference to that passage, iii. 13, *cf.* Exodus vii. 3, Deut. ii. 30, etc. In Ecclus. xxx. 12 it is found as here with **ἀπειθέω**, *cf.* also Clem. Rom., li., 3, 5.—**ἠπείθ.**: "were disobedient," R.V., unbelief is manifested in disobedience, Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 87, 97, *cf.* Ign., *Magn.*, viii., 2; Polyc., *Phil.*, ii., 1.—**τὴν ὁδὸν**: "the Way," see on ix. 2.—**κακολ.**, Mark ix. 39, used by our Lord of speaking evil of Him, Matt. xv. 4, and Mark vii. 10, as a quotation from Exod. xxi. 17; in LXX five times, and once in same sense in 2 Macc. iv. 1.—**ἀποστὰς**: as in xviii. 7, at Corinth; verb only in Luke and Paul, except Heb. iii. 12, see Friedrich, p. 7, and above on xv. 38, seven times in N.T. with **ἀπό** and a genitive as here.—**ἀφώρισε**: except Matt. xiii. 49, xxv. 32 (2), only in Luke and Paul, *cf.* Luke vi. 22, Acts xiii. 2, Rom. i. 1, 2 Cor. vi. 17, quotation, Gal. i. 15, ii. 12; *cf.* Grimm-Thayer for different shades of meaning, both in a good and bad sense, in classical Greek and also in LXX frequently. It is evidently presupposed that as in xviii. 26 there were still disciples who held fast to the common worship of a Jewish community in the synagogue.—**καθ' ἡμέραν**: on the days when synagogue worship was held, and so the separation was complete.—**ἐν σχολῇ Τυράννου τινός**, see critical note. We cannot tell whether reference is made to the lecture-hall of some heathen sophist hired by Paul or to the *Beth Hammidrash* kept by a Jew. Others have thought that Tyrannus, like Titius Justus, xviii. 7, may have been "a proselyte of the gate," but if so, one might expect it to be signified as in the case of Justus. The name was common enough, Jos., *Ant.*, xvi., 10, 3; *B. J.*, i., 26, 3; 2 Macc. iv. 40, and see Plumptre's note, *in loco*. Overbeck's view is quite possible, that the expression referred to the standing name of the place, so called from its original owner, *cf.* Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 93. Probably, if we take the first-mentioned view, in teaching in such a school or lecture-hall the Apostle himself would appear to the people at large as one of the rhetors or travelling sophists of the time, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 246, 271 (so McGiffert, p. 285, who regards the notice as taken from a trustworthy source). For instances of the use of **σχολή** as a school of the philosophers for teaching and lecturing see Wetstein,

Τυράννου[1] τινός. 10. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο, ὥστε πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου[2] Ἰησοῦ, Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας. 11. Δυνάμεις τε οὐ τὰς τυχούσας ἐποίει ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τῶν χειρῶν Παύλου, 12. ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας[3] ἐπιφέρεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ σουδάρια ἢ σιμικίνθια, καὶ ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν τὰς νόσους, τά τε πνεύματα

[1] **τινος** *om.* ℵAB 13, 27, 29, 81, Sah., Boh., Syr. Pesh., Vulg. fu.-tol., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. After T. D, Gig., Wer., Syr. H. mg. add **απο ωρας πεμπτης εως δεκατης**. The addition is accepted by Blass, Belser, Nestle, Zöckler as original, whilst even Wendt sees in it a passage in which D has retained some elements of the original text otherwise lost, p. 313 (1899), and Weiss, Codex D, p. 110, thinks that it may have been added according to an old oral tradition, *cf.* xii. 10. Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 152, and *St. Paul*, p. 271, maintains that the tradition is probably true, and he gives proofs from Martial, ix., 68, xii., 57, and Juv., vii., 222-6, that the schools opened at daybreak; so that by eleven o'clock the scholars would be dismissed, and Paul could use the school.

[2] **Ιησου** after K. *om.* ℵABDE, Vulg., Syrr: P.H., Boh., Sah., Arm., Aeth., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt.

[3] **επιφ.**, but **αποφ.** ℵABE 13, 36, 40, Vulg., Arm., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. Blass in β has **επιφ.**

in loco, *cf.* Latin, *auditorium*, Zöckler compares St. Augustine's lecture-hall in Rome before his conversion.

Ver. 10. **ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο**: exclusive of the quarter of a year in ver. 8 and in xx. 31 the Apostle speaks of three years' residence in Ephesus, "in the usual ancient style of reckoning an intermediate period by the superior round number," Turner, "Chron. of N. T.," Hastings' B. D., see also Page and Wendt, *in loco*.—**πάντας**: not only the position of Ephesus, but the fact that it was just the place which would be frequented for its famous temple and festivals by crowds of strangers, both Jew and Greek, from all parts of proconsular Asia, "Ephesus," Hastings' B. D., i., 720. Nor must we suppose that St. Paul and his fellow-workers confined themselves literally to Ephesus. The seven Churches of Asia may reasonably be referred for their foundation to this period—all of which were centres of trade, and all within reach of Ephesus. Timothy, moreover, may well have been working at Colosse, since in the Epistle to the Colossians he is mentioned with Paul in the inscription of the letter, although the latter had not been personally known to the Churches of Colosse and Laodicea, Ramsay, "Colossæ," Hastings' B.D., and *St. Paul*, p. 274.—**Ἕλληνας**: comprising no doubt Hellenists and Greeks, *cf.* xi. 20.

Ver. 11. **οὐ τὰς τυχ.**, *cf.* xxviii. 2, the phrase is peculiar to St. Luke, "not the ordinary," *i.e.*, extra-ordinary, with which the deeds of the Jewish exorcists could not be compared, see Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 52, for the same phrase *cf.* 3 Macc. iii. 7, and also Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 83; so too in classical Greek.—**ἐποίει**: "continued to work," or *ex more*, Blass.

Ver. 12. **ὥστε καὶ**: so that even to the sick, *i.e.*, to those who could not be reached by the hands of the Apostle.—**χρωτὸς**: the **σουδ.** and **σιμικ.** had been in contact with the body of the Apostle, and thence derived their healing power; so in LXX used for both בָּשָׂר, and עוֹר (twice), see Hatch and Redpath; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 435, sees in its use here the use of a medical term, so Hobart, p. 242.—**σουδάρια**: Latin, *sudaria*, used for wiping off sweat, as the noun indicates, *cf.* Luke xix. 20, John xix. 44, xx. 7.—**σιμικίνθια**: Latin, *semicinctium*, only here in N.T., aprons worn by artisans at their work, *cf.* Martial, xiv., 153. Oecumenius and Theophylact apparently regarded the word as simply = *handkerchiefs*, but the meaning given is far more likely both from the etymology of the word and its use in Martial. For other Latinisms see Blass, *in loco*, and Wetstein.—**ἀπαλ. ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν**, *cf.* Luke xii. 58, Heb. ii. 15, here in connection with sickness, and this use is very frequent in medical writers, Hobart, p. 47; the word is found with **ἀπὸ** both in classical writers and in the LXX.

τὰ πονηρὰ [1] ἐξέρχεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν. 13. Ἐπεχείρησαν δέ τινες [2] ἀπὸ τῶν περιερχομένων Ἰουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν ὀνομάζειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰ πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, λέγοντες,

[1] Instead of εξερ. απ' αυτων, (HLP (Sah.), Chrys.), ℵABDE, Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, R.V., W.H., Blass in α and β have one word εκπορευεσθαι.

[2] After τινες ℵABE add και and omit απο, so Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, W.H., R.V., Blass in β. HP have και απο, D 43 εκ, so Hilg. ορκιζω ℵABDE, Vulg., Boh., Arm., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V., Blass, Hilg.

It should also be noted that here as elsewhere St. Luke distinguishes between natural diseases and the diseases of the demonised, and that he does so more frequently than the other Evangelists, Hobart, pp. 12, 13, so "Demon," Hastings' B.D., i., p. 593, *cf.* especially Luke vi. 17, viii. 2, xiii. 32, which have no parallels in the other Gospels.—**πονηρὰ**: is applied to evil spirits by St. Luke three times in his Gospel and four times in this passage, and only once elsewhere, St. Matt. xii. 45, although the word is very frequent in St. Matthew's Gospel and in the Epistles; the word was constantly used by medical writers in connection with disease, Hobart, *u. s.* Blass quotes as a parallel to the present passage εἰ αἱ νόσοι ἀπαλλαγείησαν ἐκ τῶν σωμάτων (Plat.) *Eryx*, 401 C.—**τά τε πνεύματα . . .** Were the aprons brought for the healing of the diseases and the banishing of the demons equally? The **τε** seems to indicate that this was the case (Weiss, Wendt); Blass on the other hand holds that it is not said that the demons were driven out by the *sudaria*. According to some interpretations of the verse the carrying of the aprons to the sick is only to be regarded as a result of the wonderful impression made by St. Paul's miraculous power; the writer says nothing of the effect of these aprons, although he places both the healing of the diseases and the expulsion of the demons amongst the δυνάμεις of St. Paul. From this point of view the carrying of the σουδάρια would only illustrate the superstitious practices which showed how often, in the homes of culture, quackery was also found, and the Evangelist gives them no word of commendation, see also note on v. 15. On the other hand we must remember that the miracles are distinctly spoken of as οὐ τὰς τυχ., and even in the means employed we may perhaps see a possible appeal to the populace, who would recognise that these charms and amulets in which they put such confidence had not the same potency as the handkerchiefs and aprons of the Apostle. But in this accommodation to special forms of ignorance we are never allowed to forget that God is the source of all power and might.

Ver. 13. If we read **καὶ** after **ἀπὸ** (see critical note), it contrasts the Jewish exorcists who endeavoured to gain this power with those like St. Paul who really possessed it.—**περιερχ.**: "vagabond," A.V., the word as it is now used colloquially does not express the Greek; R.V. "strolling," Vulgate, *circumeuntibus*; Blass renders *circumvagantes*. The word "vagabond" is used only here in N.T.: in the O.T. we have it in Gen. iv. 12, 14, R.V. "wanderer," and in Ps. cix. 10, R.V. "vagabonds," *cf.* Milton, *Paradise Lost*, xi., 16.—**ἐξορκιστῶν**: the word points to a class of Jews who practised exorcisms as a profession, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, viii., 2, 5. The usual method of exorcism was the recitation of some special name or spell, and these Jewish exorcists having seen the power which Paul wielded by his appeal to the name of Jesus endeavoured to avail themselves of the same efficacy. It would be difficult to say how far these Jewish exorcists would employ the incantations so widely in vogue in a place like Ephesus, but there is a notable passage in Justin Martyr in which, whilst admitting that a Jew might exorcise an evil spirit by the God of Abraham, he complains that as a class the Jewish exorcists had adopted the same superstitions and magical aids as the heathen, "Exorcist," B.D.[2], i., 1028. In the *Didaché*, iii., 4, the use of charms and sorceries is expressly forbidden since they led to idolatry.—**ὁρκίζομεν**: with double accusative = of the one adjured and of the one by whom he is adjured, *cf.* Mark v. 7 (1 Thess. v. 27), see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, *cf.* Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 25 ff., for the constant use of the verb in inscriptions in formulæ of adjuration as here, see further "Demon" and "Exorcist" for examples of such formulæ, Hastings' B.D., i., pp. 593, 812, and for the absurdities involved in them.

Ὁρκίζομεν ὑμᾶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὁ Παῦλος κηρύσσει. 14. ἦσαν δέ τινες[1] υἱοὶ Σκευᾶ Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἑπτὰ οἱ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες.

[1] τινες ℵAHLP, Vulg., Syr. H., Chrys., so Alford, but Lach., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilg., R.V. after B (D), E 36, 180, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Arm. read τινος (τινες in connection with the following επτα υιοι is very difficult), υιοι om. after τινες, but placed by ℵABE 13, 15, 18, 40, Vulg., Arm., after επτα; Meyer follows T.R. In D, Syr. H. mg. εν οις και υιοι (Syr. H. mg. has υιοι επτα) Σκευα τινος ιερεως ηθελησαν το αυτο ποιησαι, (οι) εθος ειχαν τους τοιουτους εξορκιζειν. Και εισελθοντες προς τον δαιμονιζομενον ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες· παραγγελλομεν σοι εν Ιησου ον Π. κηρυσσει εξελθειν, so Hilg. and so Blass in β, but with αρχοντος, Gig.[2], instead of ιερεως. Blass considers that this was orig. both in α and β, then ιερεως was written over αρχοντος, hence ιερεως D, Syr. H. mg., Gig., and in most αρχιερεως; but why should ιερεως be inserted at all? No doubt the omission of επτα removes much difficulty. Belser thinks that the omis. is orig., and argues strongly in favour of β text, pp. 103, 104, so also Zöckler, and Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 153, speaks of D as giving a reading here which is intelligent, consistent, and possible. Overbeck conjectured δυο (Gig. has δυο) instead of επτα with reference to ver. 16, on the ground that the numerical signs B and Z might be confused, but as Wendt (1888) points out, it is difficult to explain how a mistake so troublesome for the understanding of the passage could be perpetuated. The greatest difficulty is to explain how επτα came in if not original, and it is easy to understand that it might be omitted because of αμφοτερων, ver. 16, see Weiss, Codex D, p. 95.

Ver. 14. See critical note. Σκευᾶ: probably a Latin name adapted to Greek, see Blass, *in loco*, who gives instances of its occurrence, see also *Gram.*, p. 13, and Winer-Schmeidel, p. 75. Ewald refers it to the Hebrew שְׁכַבְיָה.—ἀρχ.: the description is difficult, as it seems incredible if we take it in its strictest sense; it may have denoted one who had been at the head of one of the twenty-four courses of priests in Jerusalem, or perhaps used loosely to denote one who belonged to the high-priestly families (*cf.* iv. 6). We cannot connect him with any special sacred office of the Jews in Asia Minor, as Nösgen proposes, for the Jews in the Diaspora had no temple, but synagogues; see reading in D, critical note. Nothing further is known of Sceva, but there is no reason to suppose that he was an impostor in the sense that he pretended to be a high priest.—ἦσαν . . . ποιοῦντες, Lucan, see above on i. 10.

Ver. 15. γινώσκω . . . ἐπίσταμαι: "I know," R.V. for both verbs, but for the former "I recognise," margin, as a distinction is drawn between Paul and Jesus in the formula of adjuration, it is natural to expect a distinction in the reply; γιν. probably denotes a more personal knowledge, ἐπίστ., I know as of a fact. "Jesus I know and about Paul I know," Rendall; Lightfoot would render "Jesus I acknowledge and Paul I know": *On a Fresh Revision of N. T.*, p. 60. Wordsworth also, *in loco*, holds that ἐπίστ. denotes knowledge of a lower degree such as acquaintance with a *fact*, and compares the distinction between the two verbs in Jude ver. 10. ἐπίστ. is only once used in the Gospels, Mark xiv. 68. But see also Page, *in loco*, as to the difficulty in making any precise distinction.—ὑμεῖς placed first here in a depreciatory sense, τίνες indicating contempt.

Ver. 16. ἐφαλλόμενος; only here in N.T.; in LXX, 1 Sam. x. 6, xi. 6, xvi. 13.—κατακυρ.; only here in Luke; Matt. xx. 25, Mark x. 42, 1 Pet. v. 3; frequent in LXX.—αὐτῶν, see critical note. There is no real difficulty if we read ἀμφοτέρων after ἑπτά, ver. 14; St. Luke had mentioned that seven of the sons of Sceva made the attempt to imitate Paul, but the incident which he describes introduces two of them only. ἀμφ. cannot be taken distributively, or with Ewald, neuter, as if = ἀμφοτέρωθεν.—γυμνοὺς: may mean with torn garments, not literally naked, so Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and Alford.—ἐκείνου: the pronoun seems to imply that the writer had a definite place before his eyes, although it is not fully described. But it is surely a mark of truthfulness that the narrative ends where it does; a forger, we may well believe, would have crowned the story by a picture of the man, after baffling the impostors, healed by the word

15. ἀποκριθὲν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπε, Τὸν[1] Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω, καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνες ἐστέ; 16. καὶ[2] ἐφαλλόμενος ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐν ᾧ ἦν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρόν, καὶ κατακυριεύσας[3] αὐτῶν, ἴσχυσε κατ' αὐτῶν, ὥστε γυμνοὺς καὶ τετραυματισμένους ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου ἐκείνου. 17. τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο γνωστὸν πᾶσιν Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησι τοῖς κατοικοῦσι τὴν Ἔφεσον, καὶ[4] ἐπέπεσε φόβος ἐπὶ πάντας αὐτούς, καὶ ἐμεγαλύνετο τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 18. Πολλοί τε τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἤρχοντο ἐξομολογούμενοι

[1] After τον (1), ℵcBE 40, 73, 137, Syr. H. Cass. read μεν [W.H.], so Weiss.

[2] εφαλλ., but εφαλ. ℵ*AB 104, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V., Blass in β, but D εναλλομενος.

[3] αμφοτερων (not αυτων), ℵABD 13, 36, 40, Vulg., Boh., Arm., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.

[4] επεσεν AD, so Hilg., but not Gig. or Blass in β.

or touch of Paul (see Plumptre's remarks, *in loco*). The marked contrast between the New Testament in its description of the demonised and their healing, and the notions and practices which meet us in the Jewish Rabbi, may be seen in Edersheim's valuable appendix, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 770 ff., and the same decisive contrast is also seen between the N.T. and the prevailing ideas of the first century in the cures of the demonised attributed to Apollonius of Tyana in this same city Ephesus and in Athens; Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of the Christian Biography*, i., 136. Ramsay is very severe on the whole narrative, *St. Paul*, p. 273, and regards it as a mere piece of current gossip; so, too, very similarly, Wendt (1899), note, p. 313, who refers, as so many have done, to the analogy between the narrative in ver. 11 and that in v. 12, 15; in other words, to the parallel between Peter and Paul (which the writer of Acts is supposed to draw on every possible occasion; see introd.). So too Hilgenfeld ascribes the whole section vv. 11-20 to his "author to Theophilus," and sees in it a story to magnify St. Paul's triumph over sorcery and magic, as St. Peter's over Simon Magus in viii. 13. Clemen with Spitta, Van Manen, and others regard the whole section as interrupting the connection between vv. 10 and 21—but even here, in ver. 14, Clemen sees in addition the hand of his Redactor Antijudaicus, as distinct from the Redactor to whom the whole narrative is otherwise attributed.

Ver. 17. **φόβος ἐπέπ.**: characteristic phrase in St. Luke; see above on Luke i. 12, and Friedrich, pp. 77, 78.—**καὶ ἐμεγαλύνετο**: "continued to be magnified," imperfect, as in Luke vii. 16, praise follows upon fear, Luke xxiii. 47; *cf.* with Matt. xxvii. 54, Friedrich, p. 78.—**τὸ ὄνομα Ἰ.**: "jam cuncta illa nomina inania irritaque pro Iesu nomine putabantur" (Blass), see on ver. 19.

Ver. 18. **πολλοί τε**: the **τε** shows another immediate result in the fact that those who were already believers were now fully convinced of the pre-eminence of the name of Jesus, and were all the more filled with a reverential fear of His holy name: "many also of those who had believed," R.V. So Wendt in latest edition. —**ἤρχοντο** *ultro*, Bengel.—**ἐξομολ.**: Rendall renders "giving thanks" to God for this manifestation of His power. But it is usually taken, not absolutely, but as governing **πράξεις**, *cf.* Matt. iii. 6, Mark i. 5, James v. 16; Jos., *Ant.*, viii., 4, 6; *B. J.*, v., 10, 5, so in Plutarch several times, "confessing," *cf.* also Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, li., 3; Barn., *Epist.*, xix., 12; Kennedy, *Sources of N. T. Greek*, p. 118, and Mayor on James v. 16; Felten, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 361.—**πράξεις**, *cf.* Luke xxiii. 51; also in a bad sense. So too in Rom. viii. 13, Col. iii. 9, so often in Polyb. (3 Macc. i. 27). Deissmann *Bibelstudien*, p. 5, maintains that the passage before us shows acquaintance with the technical terminology of magic, and instances **πράξεις** as a *terminus technicus* for a magic prescription; see also Knabenbauer's note *in loco*.—**ἀναγγέλλοντες**: instead of continuing secretly practising or approving of the deeds of magic, they declared their wrongdoings. Rendall takes it as meaning that they reported the deeds of those men, *i.e.*,

καὶ ἀναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν. 19. ἱκανοὶ δὲ τῶν τὰ περίεργα πραξάντων, συνενέγκαντες τὰς βίβλους κατέκαιον ἐνώπιον πάντων· καὶ συνεψήφισαν τὰς τιμὰς αὐτῶν, καὶ εὗρον ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε. 20. οὕτω κατὰ κράτος [1] ὁ λόγος τοῦ Κυρίου ηὔξανε καὶ ἴσχυεν.

21. ῾ΩΣ δὲ ἐπληρώθη ταῦτα, ἔθετο ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, εἰπών, Ὅτι μετὰ τὸ γενέσθαι με ἐκεῖ, δεῖ με καὶ Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν.

[1] D has after **κρατος**, **ενισχυσεν και η πιστις του Θεου ηυξανε και επληθυνετο.** Syr. Pesh. has **ενισχυεν** et crescebat fides Dei (only). Blass reads **ενισχυεν η πιστις του Θεου και (ηυξανεν και) επληθυνετο.** Weiss, Codex D, p. 96, objects that Blass omits the **και** necessary before **η πιστ. του Θ.**, and adds an impossible **και** after **Θεου**. Belser defends and points out that **ενισχυεν** is Lucan, only found in Luke's writings; but on the other hand, whilst no doubt **η πιστις** is used objectively in Acts, we never have **η πιστις του Θεου** in Luke's writings.

the magicians; but can the Greek bear this?

Ver. 19. **ἱκανοὶ δὲ**: to be referred probably to the magicians, as the previous verse refers to their dupes: a Lucan word, see above on viii. 11.—**τὰ περίεργα**: "curious," Wyclif and A. and R.V. ("magical," R.V., margin), *cf.* Vulgate, *curiosa* (Latin, *curiosus*, inquisitive, prying), of a person who concerns himself with things unnecessary and profitless to the neglect of the duty which lies nearest, *cf.* 1 Tim. v. 13, 2 Thess. iii. 11, so in classical Greek, Xen., *Mem.*, i., 3, 1. The word is also used of *things* over and above what is necessary, and so of magical arts, arts in which a man concerns himself with what has not been given him to know, *cf.* Aristaenetus, *Epist.*, ii., 18, and the striking passage in Plat., *Apol.*, 19 B, where **περιεργάζεσθαι** is used of Socrates in an accusatory sense (Wendt, Page); the verb is found in Ecclesiast. iii. 23, and **περιεργασία**, Ecclesiast. xli. 22 S[2], but the adjective does not occur either in LXX or Apocrypha. But see especially Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, *u. s.*, who finds here another instance of acquaintance with the terminology of magic, and illustrates from the papyri. The R.V. margin gives best sense, as "curious" in the passive sense as here need not have a bad or depreciatory meaning, *cf.* for a good parallel for "curious" = "magical," Bacon, *Essays*, 35; and see "Curious," Hastings' B.D.; Skeat, *Glossary of Bible Words*.—**συνενέγκαντες**: only here in N.T. in this sense, elsewhere frequently, as **συμφέρει** it is expedient, profitable.—**τὰς βίβλους**: parchments containing the magical formulæ. For these Ephesus, with its **Ἐφέσια γράμματα** worn as amulets and cherished as charms, was famous; "Ephesus" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., i., p. 723; Wetstein, *in loco*; amongst other references, Plut., *Sympos.*, vii., 5; Clement of Alex., *Strom.*, v., 8, 46, and also in Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 344; Blass, *in loco*; C. and H., small edition, p. 371; and see also Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, *u. s.*—**κατέκαιον**: imperfect, "describes them as throwing book after book into the burning fire," Hackett, see also Blass, *in loco*. Plumptre recalls a parallel scene when the artists and musicians of Florence brought their ornaments, pictures, dresses, and burnt them in the Piazza of St. Mark at the bidding of Savonarola.—**συνεψήφισαν**: only here in this sense, not in LXX (*cf.* i. 26).—**ἀργ. μυρ. πέντε**, *sc.*, **δραχμῶν ἀργ.**: the sum is very large, nearly £2000, but probably such books would be expensive, and we must take into account in estimating it the immense trade and rich commerce of Ephesus, and the fact that we need not suppose that all the Christian converts were to be found only amongst the slaves and poorer classes (Nösgen). Such books would certainly fetch a fancy price. It may no doubt be maintained that their measuring all things by money value indicates the Oriental popular tale (Ramsay), but may we not see in the statement the knowledge of a writer who thus hits off the Oriental standard of worth, especially in a chapter otherwise so rich and exact in its description of Ephesian localities and life?

Ver. 20. **κατὰ κράτος**: adverbial, so only here in N.T., *cf.* Judg. iv. 3, and Jos., *Ant.*, viii., 11, 3, in classical Greek, Xen., *Cyr.*, i., 4, 23, etc.—**ηὔξ. καὶ ἴσ.**: in contrast to the empty superstitions and vanities the continuous growth (imperfect) of the Church.

Ver. 21. **διελθὼν**, see on the force of

22. ἀποστείλας δὲ εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν δύο τῶν διακονούντων αὐτῷ, Τιμόθεον καὶ Ἔραστον, αὐτὸς ἐπέσχε χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν. 23. Ἐγένετο δὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ. 24. Δημήτριος γάρ τις[1] ὀνόματι, ἀργυροκόπος, ποιῶν ναοὺς ἀργυροῦς[2] Ἀρτέμιδος, παρείχετο τοῖς τεχνίταις ἐργασίαν οὐκ ὀλίγην·

[1] ην *pro* ονοματι, so D, Syr. P., Blass, Hilg.

[2] αργυρους *om.* B, Gig. [W.H.], but retained by Blass in β; παρειχετο ℵBHLP, so W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; παρειχεν A*DE 65, 67, 133, so Blass in β, who inserts ο before παρειχε for ος in D, και in Pesh.

the word Ramsay, *Expositor*, May, 1895, and above on xiii. 6. Ramsay regards this as perhaps the most conclusive of the ten cases he cites of the use of the verb as denoting missionary travel. There is no reason to suppose that Paul paid a visit to Corinth during his stay at Ephesus; vv. 9, 10 intimate that he resided at Ephesus through the whole period. Wendt thinks that the notice of this second visit to Corinth was omitted by Luke because it did not fit in with his representation of the ideal development of the Church. But is there any real argument to be found for it in the Epistles? The passages usually quoted are 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, xiii. 1. But τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι may well express "I am meaning to come," so that Paul would mean that this was the third time he had purposed to come to them, not that he had come for the third time; and this rendering is borne out by the Apostle's own words, 2 Cor. xii. 14, Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, iv., 11, whilst with regard to 2 Cor. ii. 1 the words may simply mean that he resolves that his new, *i.e.*, his second visit, πάλιν ἐλθεῖν, should not be ἐν λύπῃ, for we are not shut up to the conclusion that πάλιν must be connected with ἐν λύπῃ as if he had already paid one visit in grief; and this interpretation is at all events in harmony with 2 Cor. xiii. 2, R.V. margin, and with i. 23, R.V., see especially "II. Cor." (Dr. A. Robertson) Hastings' B.D., p. 494, and compare "Corinth" (Ramsay), *ibid.*, p. 483; see also Farrar, *Messages of the Books*, pp. 211, 216; *St. Paul*, ii. 101, 118; Felten, note, p. 364; Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 450, note; and in favour of the second visit to Corinth, McGiffert, p. 310, following Alford, Neander, Weizsäcker (so too in early days St. Chrysostom). In 1 Cor. xvi. 5-9 Paul speaks of his intention to go through Macedonia to Corinth, but previously, 2 Cor. i. 16, he had intended to sail from Ephesus to Corinth, then to go to Macedonia, and afterwards to return to Corinth. Why had he changed his plans? Owing to the bad news from Corinth, 2 Cor. i. 23. But although he did not go to Corinth in person, he determined to write to reprove the Corinthians, and this he did in 1 Cor. It is possible that the Apostle's determination to see Rome—the first notice of the desire so long cherished, Rom. i. 13, xv. 23—may be closely connected with his friendship with Aquila and Priscilla (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 255, and Plumptre, *in loco*, Hort, *Rom. and Ephes.*, p. 11).

Ver. 22. ἀποστείλας . . . Τιμ. καὶ Ἔρ., *cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10, 11, Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, iii., 3, 4; McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 297, note.—διακ. αὐτῷ: for a few instances of διακονεῖν and cognate words used of ministrations rendered to Paul himself, see Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 205, *cf.* Philem., ver. 13.—Ἔραστον: here, as in 2 Tim. iv. 20, the person bearing this name appears as an itinerant companion of St. Paul, and it therefore seems difficult to identify him with the Erastus of Rom. xvi. 23, who is described as "treasurer" of the city, *i.e.*, Corinth, since the tenure of such an office seems to presuppose a fixed residence. That the identification was not impossible is maintained by Wendt as against Meyer, but see "Erastus," Hastings' B.D. The name, as Meyer remarks, Rom. xvi. 23, was very common.—ἐπέσχε χρόνον: verb, only used by Luke and Paul, and only here in this sense. ἑαυτόν: supplied after the verb; LXX, Gen. viii. 10, 12; in classical Greek, Xen., *Cyr.*, v., 4, 38.—εἰς pro ἐν, Blass; but see on the other hand, Alford, *in loco*. As Asia, not Ephesus, is mentioned, the word may well include work outside Ephesus itself.

Ver. 23. ἐγένετο δὲ: on the frequency of the formula in Luke's writings see Friedrich, p. 13, and above on iv. 5.—τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος: the same phrase as in xii. 18, nowhere else in N.T., for οὐκ ὀλίγος as Lucan see above, xii. 18.

25.[1] οὓς συναθροίσας, καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐργάτας, εἶπεν, Ἄνδρες, ἐπίστασθε ὅτι ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἐργασίας ἡ εὐπορία ἡμῶν

[1] Blass (so Hilg.) reconstructs in β text, according to Syr. Pesh., **ουτος συναθροισας παντας τους τεχνιτας και τους συνεργατας αυτων εφη προς αυτους**; this was shortened in α, **τεχν.** and **συνεργ.** being combined under one word **εργαται**, **ουτος** being still read instead of **ους** and **και** omitted; see further Blass, p. vii. and *in loco*. After **ανδρες** D, Sah., Syr. H. mg. add **συντεχνιται**, but if original, it is not easy to see why omitted. For **ημων** ℵABDE, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Arm., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. read **ημιν**.

—**τῆς ὁδοῦ**: as in ix. 2, xix. 9, xxiv. 22; much better than to refer it with Weiss merely to the method adopted by Paul in ver. 26.

Ver. 24. **Δημ.**: a sufficiently common name, as St. Luke's words show (Blass). There is no ground for identifying him with the Demetrius in 3 John, ver. 12, except the fact that both came from the neighbourhood of Ephesus; see, however, "Demetrius," Hastings' B.D.—**ἀργυροκόπος**, LXX, Judg. xvii. 4 (A *al.*), Jer. vi. 29; on the trade-guilds in Asia Minor *cf.* Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i., p. 105, and "Ephesus," Hastings' B.D.; *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 128; Demetrius may have been master of the guild for the year.—**ναοὺς ἀργ. Ἀρτέμιδος**: "silver shrines of Diana," R.V., *i.e.*, representing the shrine of Diana (Artemis) with the statue of the goddess within (**ὡς κιβώρια μικρά**, Chrys.). These miniature temples were bought up by Ephesians and strangers alike, since the worship of the goddess was so widely spread, and since the "shrines" were made sufficiently small to be worn as amulets on journeys, as well as to be placed as ornaments in houses. There is no need to suppose that they were coins with a representation of the temple stamped upon them, and there is no evidence of the existence of such coins; Amm. Marc., xxii., 13, Dio Cass., xxxix., 20, *cf.* Blass and Wendt, *in loco.* They were first explained correctly by Curtius, *Athenische Mittheilungen*, ii., 49. Examples of these **ναοί** in terra-cotta or marble with dedicatory inscriptions abound in the neighbourhood of Ephesus. No examples in silver have been found, but they were naturally melted down owing to their intrinsic value, "Diana" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., and *Church in the Roman Empire*, *u. s.* On the interesting but apparently groundless hypothesis (as Zöckler calls it, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 277, second edition) that Demetrius should be identified with Demetrius, the **νεοποιός** of an inscription at Ephesus which probably dated from a considerably later time, the very close of the first century, **νεοποιός** being really a temple warden, the words **νεοποιὸς Ἀρτέμιδος** being mistaken by the author of Acts and rendered "making silver shrines of Diana," see Zöckler, *u. s.*; and Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 112 ff.; and Wendt (1899), p. 317. As Ramsay puts it, there is no extant use of such a phrase as **νεοπ. Ἀρτ.** in any authority about A.D. 57, **νεοποιοί** simply being the term used in inscriptions found at Ephesus—as Hicks himself allows (*Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 122, 123).—**παρείχετο**, see critical note or reading in Blass. Rendall distinguishes between active voice, xvi. 16, where the slave girl finds work for her masters, whilst here, middle voice, Demetrius finds work for himself and his fellow-craftsmen in their joint employment.—**ἐργασίαν** "business," R.V., in xvi. 16, 19, "gain"; here the two meanings run into each other, in ver. 25 "business," R.V., is perhaps more in accordance with the context **οὐκ ὀλίγην**, Lucan, see on ver. 23.—**τεχνίταις . . . ἐργάταις**: "alii erant **τεχνῖται**, artifices nobiliores; alii **ἐργάται**, operarii," so Zöckler and Grimm-Thayer following Bengel. But Blass regards them as the same, *cf.* reading in D, and Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 128, note. There were no doubt shrines of widely differing value, for the rich of silver made by the richer tradesmen, for the poorer classes of marble and terracotta, so that several trades were no doubt seriously affected, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 278, and "Ephesus," *u. s.*, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 128, and to the same effect Wendt (1899), p. 317. The word **ἐργάται** occurs in one of the inscriptions at Ephesus, **ἐργ. προπυλεῖται πρὸς τῷ Ποσειδῶνι**, "Ephesus," *u. s.*, p. 723, note.

Ver. 25. **περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα**, *cf.* Luke x. 40, 41, for a similar use of **περί** with accusative, but see W. H., *l. c.*, and 2 Macc. xii. 1.—**εὐπορία**: wealth, or gain,

ἐστι· 26. καὶ θεωρεῖτε καὶ ἀκούετε ὅτι οὐ μόνον[1] Ἐφέσου, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος πείσας μετέστησεν ἱκανὸν ὄχλον, λέγων ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ θεοὶ οἱ διὰ χειρῶν γινόμενοι. 27. οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο κινδυνεύει ἡμῖν τὸ μέρος εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν ἐλθεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν εἰς οὐδὲν[2] λογισθῆναι, μέλλειν τε καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τὴν μεγαλειότητα αὐτῆς, ἣν ὅλη ἡ Ἀσία

[1] Before **Εφεσου** D prefixes **εως**, so Blass in **β** (comparing xxiii. 23), and Hilg. After **ουτος** D[1] adds **τις ποτε**, Gig., "nescio quem," so Blass in **β**, comparing xvii. 7, where we have the same addition in Gig. and **β** text.

[2] **λογισθηναι** ℵBHLP, Chrys., so not only T.R., but Alford, R.V., Weiss, Wendt; **μελλειν** ℵA[2]BD[2]EHLP, Chrys.; **τε** ℵABEP, Sah., Boh., Syrr., P.H., Arm., in both cases R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, as in T.R. Blass following ADE, Vulg. reads in **β**, **λογισθησεται**, and **μελλει** with A*D*, Vulg. But in D the whole passage is confused. **την μεγαλειοτητα**, but the gen. in ℵABE 13, 15, 18, 40, R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt. In **β** text Blass reads **μελλει τε και καθαιρεισθαι η μεγαλειοτης αυτης ην ολη η A.** following Gig., Par., Vulg., "sed et destrui incipiet majestas ejus quam," etc.; D reading "lacunose et corrupte," in the first part: **αλλα καθερισθαι μελλει** (-**ειν** D[b]) **η ολη A.**

only here in N.T., in classical Greek "in different senses in different authorities," Grimm-Thayer; in LXX, 2 Kings xxv. 10, but in a different sense (see Hatch and Redpath's references to its use by Aquila, Symm., and others). Rendall takes it of comfort and well-being, in the old English sense *weal*.

Ver. 26. **οὐ μόνον . . . ἀλλὰ**: *non modo . . . sed*.—**σχεδὸν**, xiii. 44, we cannot take the genitive with **ὄχλον**, as Hackett suggests.—**Ἀσίας**: the Roman province, so Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 278, where he corrects his former interpretation of the word in this passage in *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 166; see above on Paul's work outside Ephesus.—**οὗτος**: contemptuous. — **μετέστησεν**, *cf.* Josh. xiv. 8. The testimony thus borne to the wide and effective influence of the Apostles even by their enemies is well commented on by St. Chrys., *Hom.*, xlii., and see also below.

Ver. 27. **τοῦτο . . . τὸ μέρος**, *sc.*, **τῆς ἐργασίας ἡμῶν**, ver. 25, Grimm-Thayer—this branch of their trade, which was concerned with the making of the shrines. Others take **μέρος** = *trade*, the part assigned to one.—**κινδυνεύει**: "the most sensitive part of 'civilised' man is his pocket," Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 277, and the opposition thus naturally came not from the priests as instigators of the riot against Paul, but from the fact that trade connected with the Artemis-worship was endangered; so at Philippi, "when the masters saw that the hope of this was gone," xvi. 19; see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 129 ff., as against Hicks. "See how wherever there is idolatry, in every case we find money at the bottom of it, both in the former instance it was for money, and in the case of this man for money; it was not for their religion, because they thought that in danger; no, it was for their lucrative craft, that it would have nothing to work upon," Chrys., *Hom.*, xlii.—**εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν ἐλθεῖν**: noun, not found either in classical Greek or in the LXX; the verb **ἀπελέγχειν** is found in 4 Macc. ii. 11 (*cf.* Symm., Ps. cxix. 118), and **ἐλεγμός** is not uncommon in LXX, *confutatio*, *repudiatio* (for the phrase *cf.* Mark v. 26), *in contemptum venire*, Wetstein; but *in redargutionem venire*, Vulgate.—**ἀλλὰ καὶ**: the utilitarian aspect of the appeal stands first, but speciously seconded by an appeal to religious feelings ("non tam pro aris ipsos quam pro focis pugnare," Calvin).—**τῆς μεγ. θεᾶς Ἀ.**: St. Luke appears to have retained the precise title of the goddess, according to the witness of the inscription; "Diana" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., p. 605, so Blass, *in loco*.—**τὸ . . . ἱερὸν**: the Temple of Artemis was burnt to the ground by the fanatic Herostratus in B.C. 356 on the night of the birth of Alexander the Great, but its restoration was effected with great magnificence, and it was regarded as one of the seven wonders of the world. Its dimensions are given by Pliny, xxxvi., 95. For references, and a description of its worship, see C. and H., p. 422, small edition; Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 427; Ramsay, "Diana," *u. s.*; Wood's *Ephesus*, pp. 4-

καὶ ἡ οἰκουμένη σέβεται. 28. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ καὶ γενόμενοι πλήρεις θυμοῦ,[1] ἔκραζον, λέγοντες. Μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων. 29. καὶ[2] ἐπλήσθη ἡ πόλις ὅλη συγχύσεως· ὥρμησάν τε ὁμοθυμαδὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον, συναρπάσαντες Γάϊον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον Μακεδόνας, συνεκδή-

[1] After θυμου D 137, Syr. H. mg. add δραμοντες εις την αμφοδον, so Blass, Hilg.; see Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 153. Μεγ. η Αρ. *om.* η D[1], Ramsay emphasises, *St. Paul*, p. 274; *C. R. E.*, *u. s.*, see note in comment.

[2] After και, β reads after D[1], Gig., Syr. Pesh. συνεχυθη ολη η πολις (αισχυνης); D reads αισχ., which Blass rejects; apparently for Lat. "confusione," see Blass, p. xx.; "confusio," common rendering of αισχυνη, Harris, *Study in Codex Bezæ*, p. 106; D prob. conflate; see also Corssen, *G. G. A.*, p. 430, 1896. αισχ. = confusio, Phil. iii. 19, Heb. xii. 12.

45; *Greek Inscrip. at British Museum*, iii., 1890, and for a complete account of the temple, its structure, and literature relating to its history and site, B.D.[2], "Ephesus". So sumptuous was the magnificence of this sanctuary that it could be said ὁ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ναὸς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ μόνος ἐστὶ θεῶν οἶκος, Philo Byz., *Spect. Mund.*, 7, and the sun, so the saying ran, saw nothing in his course more magnificent than Diana's temple.—εἰς οὐδὲν λογ., *cf.* for a similar phrase LXX, Isa. xl. 17, Wisdom iii. 17 and ix. 6 (εἰς *om.* S[1]), and Dan. Theod., iv., 32. The verb λογίζομαι is also frequent in St. Paul with εἰς and the accusative.—τε καί, *cf.* xxi. 28, not correlative, but: "*and* that she should *even*," etc., Simcox, *Language of the New Testament*, p. 163.—τὴν μεγαλειότητα, see critical note, if we read the genitive, "and that she should even be deposed from her magnificence," R.V., *cf.* Winer-Schmiedel, xxx., 6. Grimm-Thayer regards the genitive as partitive, *aliquid de majestate ejus*, as if it was inconceivable that all her magnificence should be lost: so Meyer, Zöckler, Weiss, *cf.* Xen., *Hellen.*, iv., 4, 13; Diod. Sic., iv., 8. But Wendt (as against Meyer) regards τὸ ἱερόν as the subject; *cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 5. The word is used, Luke ix. 43, of the majesty of God, *cf.* 2 Pet. i. 16 (Friedrich, p. 30); in LXX, Jer. xl. (xxxiii.) 9; 1 Esd. i. 5, iv. 40, Dan. vii. 27.—ὅλη ἡ Ἀσία: "multitudo errantium non efficit veritatem": Bengel. The temple was built by contributions from the whole of Asia, *tota Asia exstruente*, Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xvi., 40, so that the goddess was evidently held in veneration by the whole province, *cf. ibid.*, xxxvi., 21; Liv., i., 45. According to the testimony of Pausanias, iv., 31, 8; *cf.* Xen., *Anab.*, v., 3, 4, no deity was more widely worshipped by private persons (Wetstein, Ramsay, Blass), see also *Apuleius*, 2, quoted by Mr. Page from Wordsworth. For the way in which the imperial government allied itself with the Artemis worship and the revival of paganism in the second century, and the universal honour paid to Artemis by Greek and barbarian alike, *cf. Greek Inscriptions of the British Museum* (Hicks), iii., pp. 135, 145.—οἰκουμένη, see above on xi. 28. Plumptre points out that the language is almost identical with that of Apuleius (perhaps from this passage): "Diana Ephesia cujus nomen unicum . . . totus veneratur orbis".

Ver. 28. ἔκραζον: "they cried continuously," imperfect, see addition in D. —Μεγάλη ἡ Ἄ.: omitting ἡ we have apparently the popular cry, or rather invocation: Great Artemis! as it was actually used in the *cultus*—the cry was not an argument against Paul's doctrine, but rather a prayer to the goddess and queen of Ephesus, and so regarded it gives a vividness and naturalness to the scene, Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 135 ff., and "Diana," *u. s.*, p. 105; see D, critical note.

Ver. 29. συγχύσεως: the noun only here in N.T. (συγχέω: only in Luke, see above p. 238), in LXX, Gen. xi. 9, 1 Sam. v. 11, 1 Sam. xiv. 20, used in classical Greek in the sense of confusion, disturbance; τε, the immediate result was that they rushed (Weiss), ὁμοθυμαδὸν, see above i. 14, "with one accord," *uno animo*, Vulgate (not *simul*).—τὸ θέατρον: no doubt the great theatre explored by Mr. Wood, *Ephesus*, pp. 73, 74, *App.* vi.; Lightfoot, *Contemp. Rev.*, xxxii., p. 293; the theatre was the usual place for public assemblies in most towns, *cf.* Jos., *B. J.*, vii. 3, 3; Tac., *Hist.*, ii., 80; Blass, *in loco*, and Wetstein, and also Pseudo-Heraclitus, Letter vii., 47, condemning the Ephesians for submitting grave and weighty matters to the decision

μους τοῦ Παύλου. 30. τοῦ δὲ Παύλου βουλομένου εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον, οὐκ εἴων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί. 31. τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἀσιαρχῶν ὄντες αὐτῷ φίλοι, πέμψαντες πρὸς αὐτόν, παρεκάλουν μὴ δοῦναι

of the mobs in the theatre, *Die Heraklitischen Briefe*, p. 65; Gore, *Ephesians*, p. 255. The theatre was capable of holding, it is calculated, 24,500 people, its diameter was 495 feet, and it was probably the largest in the world (Renan). Wetstein remarks that the position of the places tended in no small degree to increase and foment the tumult, since the temple was in full view of the theatre.—**συναρπάσαντες**, *cf.* vi. 12, *i.e.*, being carried off with them in their rush; we are not told whether they met Gaius and Aristarchus by chance, and seized them as well-known companions of Paul, **συνεκδήμους**, or whether they searched for them in their lodgings, and seized them when they could not find the Apostle. — **Ἀρίσταρχον**: a native of Thessalonica, *cf.* xx. 4; he accompanied Paul on his last journey to Jerusalem, and hence to Rome, xxvii. 2. It is possible, as Lightfoot thinks, that the words "Aristarchus, a Macedonian of Thessalonica, being with us" in the latter passage intimate that Aristarchus accompanied Luke and Paul on the former part of this route because he was on his way home, and that leaving Paul at Myra he may have returned to Thessalonica, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 35. But however this may be, it is evident from Col. iv. 10, Philem., ver. 24, that he was with the Apostle at Rome, probably sharing his captivity. **ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου**, Col., *u. s.*, can hardly refer to this incident at Ephesus, Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 11, "Aristarchus," B.D.[2], or to a captivity in a spiritual sense, as bound and captive to Christ together with Paul; see also Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 383.—**Μακεδόνας**: nothing was more natural than that devoted Christians from Thessalonica should be among St. Paul's companions in travel when we consider his special affection for the Thessalonian Church. With this reading the Gaius here is of course to be distinguished from the Gaius of xx. 4, of Derbe, and from the Gaius of Rom. xvi. 23, 1 Cor. i. 14, a Corinthian. But if we could read **Μακεδόνα**, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 280, the Gaius here may be identified with the Gaius of xx. 4. In xx. 4 Blass connects **Δερβαῖος** with Timothy, making Gaius a Thessalonian with Aristarchus, Secundus, see *in loco;* but against this we must place the positive statement of xvi. 1, that Timothy was a Lystran.—**συνεκδήμους**: used only by Luke and Paul, 2 Cor. viii. 19, not in LXX, but in Plut. and Josephus. The word may look forward to xx. 4 (so Ramsay, *u. s.*), or we may take it with Blass as referring to the part which the two men played as representatives of the Thessalonians, who were carrying with St. Paul the contribution to the Church at Jerusalem (2 Cor. ix. 4). These two men, as Weiss points out, may be our informants for some of the details which follow.

Ver. 30. **τοῦ δὲ Π. βουλ.**: St. Paul was not the man to leave his comrades in the lurch, and he would have followed them with his life in his hands to face the mob of Ephesus; if we may depend upon the picture of Ephesian life given us in Pseudo-Heraclitus, Letter vii., we can understand the imminent danger in which St. Paul was placed at the mercy of men who were no longer men but beasts, **ἐξ ἀνθρώπων θηρία γεγονότες** (*Die Heraklitischen Briefe*, p. 65 (Bernays), and Ramsay, *u. s.*, p. 280).—**δῆμον**, ver. 33, xii. 22, xvii. 5, so sometimes in classical Greek of the *plebs*, *vulgus*—in N.T. only in Acts. Both before and after the riot the passions of the vulgar mob were no doubt a real and serious danger to St. Paul, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 32, xvi. 9, 2 Cor. i. 8-10. In the former passage the word **ἐθηριομάχησα** is generally referred to this danger in Ephesus, the multitude in its ferocious rage being compared to wild beasts, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 230, "Ephesus," Hastings' B.D., and Plumptre's note, *in loco*. With the expression used in 1 Cor. xv. 32 we may compare Ignat., *Rom.*, v., 1, and *cf. Ephes.*, vii., 1; *Smyrn.*, iv., 1; so too Pseudo-Heraclitus, *u. s.*, and Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 351, note; Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* McGiffert, p. 280 ff., maintains that the word **ἐθηριομάχησα** refers to an actual conflict with wild beasts in the arena (so Weizsäcker), and that 2 Cor. i. 9 more probably refers to the danger from the riot of Demetrius; but if the literal interpretation of the verb in 1 Cor. is correct, it is strange that St. Paul should have omitted such a terrible encounter from his catalogue of dangers in 2 Cor. xi. 23; see also below at end of chapter.

ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον. 32. ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν ἄλλο τι ἔκραζον· ἦν γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη, καὶ οἱ πλείους οὐκ ᾔδεισαν τίνος ἕνεκεν συνεληλύθεισαν. 33. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὄχλου[1] προεβίβασαν Ἀλέξανδρον, προβαλόντων αὐτὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων· ὁ δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος, κατασείσας

[1] Instead of προεβιβασαν ℵABE, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V. read συνεβιβασαν, whilst D²HLP, Chrys. have προεβ. (so T.R.). προεβ. adds nothing to προβαλλοντων and the difficulty of συνεβ. might easily lead to change. D* reads κατεβιβασαν, so Blass in both texts, *cf.* Hilgenfeld, *Zw. Th.*, pp. 364, 366, 1896, and note in comment. Gig., Vulg., "detraxerunt".

Ver. 31. Ἀσιαρχῶν: "the chief officers of Asia," R.V., *cf.* Γαλατάρχης, Βιθυνιάρχης, Συριάρχης, etc.; Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.*, v., 318 (Knabenbauer), officers, *i.e.*, of the province of Asia, and so provincial, not merely municipal officers. Each province united in an association for the worship of Rome and the Empire, hence Κοινὸν Ἀσίας, of which the Asiarchs would probably be the high priests. But in addition to their religious office the Asiarchs were called upon to provide games, partly if not solely at their own expense, and to preside over them. These festivals were called Κοινὰ Ἀσίας ἐν Σμύρνῃ, Λαοδικείᾳ, κ.τ.λ. It is doubtful whether the office was annual, or whether it was held for four years; but as an Asiarch still retained his title after his term of office had expired, there may evidently have been in Ephesus several Asiarchs, although only one was actually performing his duties (*cf.* the title ἀρχιερεῖς amongst the Jews, iv. 6, 23). If there were a sort of Council of Asiarchs, this Council may well have assembled when the Κοινὰ Ἀσίας were being held, and this might have been the case at Ephesus in the narrative before us; such a festival would have brought together a vast crowd of pilgrims and worshippers actuated with zeal for the goddess, and ready to side with Demetrius and his followers. The title was one of great dignity and repute, as is evident from inscriptions which commemorate in various cities the names of those who had held the office. Whether the Asiarchs were in any sense high priests has been disputed, but see Polycarp, *Mart.*, *cf.* xii. 2 and xxi.; on the whole subject "Asiarch" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D. and B.D.²; *St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp*, ii., p. 987, Lightfoot; Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 353; Wendt, p. 318; O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 102.—φίλοι: not only does the notice show that St. Paul had gained at least the toleration of some of the leading men of the province, but that the attitude of the imperial authorities was not unfriendly. We cannot of course suppose with Zimmermann that the Asiarchs were friendly because the Apostle had been less opposed to the imperial *cultus* than to that of Diana, and that so far the Asiarchs stood with him on common ground. See Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, on the probable attitude of the priests, and *cf.* chap. xiv.—δοῦναι ἑαυτὸν: only here in N.T., *cf.* Polyb., v., 14, 9, the expression involves the thought of danger, so in A. and R.V.

Ver. 32. ἄλλοι μὲν οὖν: μὲν οὖν probably as often in Acts without any opposition expressed, but see Rendall, *App.*, p. 162; the antithesis may be in δὲ of ver. 33.—ἔκραζον: "kept on crying," imperfect.—ἐκκλησία, see below on ver. 39; here of an unlawful tumultuous assembly.—συγκεχ., see above ver. 29.—οἱ πλείους: "sensu vere comparativo" Blass = *major pars*.

Ver. 33. ἐκ δὲ τοῦ ὄ., *sc.*, τινές, *cf.* xxi. 16. If we read συνεβίβασαν (see critical note), and render "instructed Alexander," R.V., margin; *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 16, and often in LXX, it seems to mean that the Jews instructed Alexander, a fellow-Jew, to come forward and dissociate himself and them from any coalition with Paul and his companions against the Diana worship (ἀπολογεῖσθαι). Erasmus takes the word to mean that the Jews had instructed him beforehand as their advocate. συμβιβάζω in Col. ii. 19, Ephes. iv. 16 = to join together, to knit together, in Acts xvi. 10, to consider, to conclude, so Weiss thinks here that it = concluded that Alexander was the reason why they had come together; but the sentence and the context does not seem to bear out this rendering. Meyer retains T.R., and holds that Alexander was a Jewish Christian who was put forward by the Jews maliciously, hoping that he might be sacrificed to the popular tumult — hence ἀπολογεῖσθαι.

τὴν χεῖρα, ἤθελεν ἀπολογεῖσθαι τῷ δήμῳ. 34. ἐπιγνόντων[1] δὲ ὅτι Ἰουδαῖός ἐστι, φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων, ὡς ἐπὶ ὥρας δύο κραζόντων, Μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις Ἐφεσίων. 35. Καταστείλας δὲ ὁ γραμματεὺς τὸν ὄχλον, φησίν, Ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι, τίς γάρ ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὃς οὐ γινώσκει τὴν Ἐφεσίων πόλιν νεωκόρον οὖσαν τῆς μεγάλης[2] θεᾶς

[1] Instead of **επιγνοντων**, ℵABDEHLP, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. read **επιγνοντες**, and instead of **κραζοντων** (Hilg.), BDEHLP, which Lach., W.H., Blass retain in, Tisch., Weiss, Wendt read **κραζοντες**, following ℵA.

[2] **θεας** *om.* ℵABDE, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.

This latter view seems to be adopted practically by Blass (so by Knabenbauer), although he reads **κατεβίβασαν** (Luke x. 15), *descendere coegerunt, i.e.*, into the theatre, as he cannot see that **συνεβίβ.** is intelligible; in which Grimm-Thayer agrees with him, and renders with R.V., margin, as above (see *sub v.*).—**ὁ δὲ Ἀ.**: if **ὁ χαλκεὺς** in 2 Tim. iv. 14 is taken in a wider sense to mean a worker in any metal, it is, of course, possible that Alexander might be so described as one of the craftsmen of Demetrius. But the name was very common, although the omission of **τις** may be taken to imply that Alexander in ver. 33 was well known in Ephesus (*cf.* ver. 9 above). We cannot pass beyond conjecture, especially as the notice in Acts, when compared with 2 Tim., contains no further mark of identification than the similarity of name, although the Alexander in the latter passage was no doubt in some way connected with Ephesus, or the warning to Timothy against him would be without force. Against the identification see Meyer-Weiss, *Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus*, p. 347, and so also Holtzmann, *Pastoralbriefe, in loco* (who identifies the Alexander in 2 Tim. iv. 14 with the Alexander in 1 Tim. i. 20). Holtzmann's view is that the author of the Pastoral Epistles, whoever he may have been, mistook the notice in Acts, and concluded that the Alexander there mentioned was a Christian, and a treacherous one, who allowed himself to be utilised by the Jews against Paul. The pseudonymous author of 2 Tim. therefore names Alexander **χαλκεύς**, and refers also to him the **βλασφημεῖν** of 1 Tim. i. 20.—**κατασείσας τὴν χεῖρα**, see on xii. 17.—**ἀπολ.**: peculiar to Luke and Paul, twice in St. Luke's Gospel, and six times in Acts, so in Rom. ii. 15, 2 Cor. xii. 19. In the last-named passage with same construction as here (see for various constructions Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*).

Ver. 34. **ἐπιγνόντων**: "when they recognised" by his dress and his features, "when they perceived," R.V. If we read **ἐπιγνόντες**, see critical note, **φωνὴ ἐγέν.** = "anacoluthon luculentissimum" *cf.* Mark ix. 20 (Blass).—**μία ἐκ πάντων**: *callida junctura*, arresting the reader's attention (Hackett). Alexander was thus unable to obtain a hearing because he was a Jew, a fact which sufficiently justifies the apprehension for Paul entertained by his friends.—**Μεγάλη κ.τ.λ.**, see on ver. 28, the cry in B, and **β** text is doubled, which marks its continuance and its emphatic utterance (Weiss).—**ὡς ἐπὶ ὥρας δύο κραζ.**: probably they regarded this as in itself an act of worship, *cf.* 1 Kings xviii. 26, and Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 142, "Diana," Hastings' B.D., p. 605. "A childish understanding indeed! as if they were afraid lest their worship should be extinguished, they shouted without intermission:" Chrys., *Hom.*, xlii.

Ver. 35. **καταστείλας**: only here in N.T. and in ver. 36, "had quieted," R.V., *cf.* 2 Macc. iv. 31, 3 Macc. vi. 1, Aquila, Ps. lxiv. (lxv.) 8, also in Josephus and Plutarch.—**ὁ γραμματεὺς**: "the secretary of the city" Ramsay; Lightfoot was the first to point out the importance of the officer so named—called also **ὁ Ἐφεσίων γραμ.** or **γραμ. τοῦ δήμου**; he was the most influential person in Ephesus, for not only were the decrees to be proposed drafted by him and the Strategoi, and money left to the city was committed to his charge, but as the power of the Ecclesia, the public assembly, declined under imperial rule, the importance of the secretary's office was enhanced, because he was in closer touch with the court of the proconsul than the other city magistrates, and acted as a medium of communication between the imperial and municipal government, "Ephesus" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., p. 723, *Cities and*

Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ τοῦ Διοπετοῦς; 36. ἀναντιῤῥήτων[1] οὖν ὄντων τούτων, δέον ἐστὶν ὑμᾶς κατεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν, καὶ μηδὲν προπετὲς πράττειν. 37. ἠγάγετε γὰρ τοὺς ἄνδρας τούτους, οὔτε ἱεροσύλους

[1] αναντιρητων B*L, so W.H. (not Weiss).

Bishoprics of Phrygia, i., 66; *St. Paul*, pp. 281, 304; Hicks, *Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, iii., p. 154, and Wood's *Ephesus*, *App.*, p. 49, often with Asiarchs and proconsul; Lightfoot, *Contemp. Review*, p. 294, 1878. St. Luke's picture therefore of the secretary as a man of influence and keenly alive to his responsibility is strikingly in accordance with what we might have expected. —**τίς γάρ ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος**: "what man is there then?" etc. Rendall: the **γάρ** looks back to the action of the speaker in quieting the crowd, as if he would say that there is no need for this excitement, for all that you have said about your goddess is universally acknowledged. — **νεωκόρον**: "temple-keeper," R.V., "a worshipper," A.V., *cultricem*, Vulgate, lit., "a temple-sweeper" (on derivation see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*), and so found in classical Greek, a sacristan, a verger, Lat., *æditus*, *cf.* Jos., *B. J.*, v., 9, 4, where = *worshippers*, **οὓς ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτῷ νεωκόρους ἦγεν**. The title "Warden of the Temple of Ephesus" was a boast of the city, just as other cities boasted of the same title in relation to other deities. It would seem that the title at Ephesus was generally used in connection with the imperial *cultus*; in the period of this narrative, Ephesus could claim the title as Warden of one Temple of this *cultus*, and later on she enjoyed the title of **δὶς, τρὶς νεωκόρος**, as the number of the temples of the imperial *cultus* increased. But there is ample justification from inscriptions for the mention of the title in the verse before us in connection with the Artemis worship. For references, Ramsay, "Ephesus," Hastings' B.D., p. 722; *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, i., 58; Wendt, Blass, *in loco*; Lightfoot, *Cont. Rev.*, p. 294, 1878; Wood, *Ephesus*, *App.*, p. 50.—**τοῦ Δ.**, *sc.*, **ἄγαλμα**: or some such word; the image was believed to have fallen from the sky (heaven, R.V. margin), like that of the Tauric Artemis, *cf.* Eur., *Iph. T.*, 977, 1384, where we find **οὐρανοῦ πέσημα** given as the equivalent and explanation of **διοπετὲς ἄγαλμα** (Herod., i., 11). The worship of Diana of the Ephesians was entirely Asian and not Greek, although the Greek colonists attempted to establish an identification with their own Artemis on account of certain analogies between them. According to Jerome, *Præfat. ad Ephesios*, the Ephesian Artemis was represented as a figure with many breasts, *multimammia* ("quam Græci **πολύμαστον** vocant"), symbolising the reproductive and nutritive powers of Nature which she personified. This description is fully borne out by the common representations of the goddess on coins and statues. No one could say for certain of what the **ἄγαλμα** was made: according to Petronius it was made of cedar wood, according to Pliny of the wood of the vine, according to Xen. of gold, and according to others of ebony. For a fuller description of the image, and for some account of the wide prevalence of worship of the goddess and its peculiar character, Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, "Diana of the Ephesians," Hastings' B.D., B.D.[2]; Wendt, 1888, *in loco*; Farrar, *St. Paul*, ii., p. 13, and references in Wetstein.

Ver. 36. **ἀναντιῤῥήτων**: only here in N.T., but the adverb in x. 29, not in LXX but Symm., Job xi. 2, xxxiii. 13; Polyb., xxiii., 8, 11; on spelling see critical note.—**δέον ἐστὶν**, 1 Peter i. 6 (1 Tim. v. 13), *cf.* Ecclus., *Prol.*, vv. 3, 4, 1 Macc. xii. 11, 2 Macc. xi. 18, also in classical Greek.—**προπετὲς**: only in Luke and Paul in N.T., 2 Tim. iii. 4, of thoughtless haste (Meyer-Weiss); in LXX of rash talk, *cf.* Prov. x. 14, xiii. 3, Ecclus. ix. 18, Symm., Eccles. v. 1, Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, i., 1, of persons.—**κατεσταλμένους**, see also on ver. 35; only in these two verses in N.T.

Ver. 37. **γὰρ**: "for," *i.e.*, they had done something rash.—**τοὺς ἄνδρ. τούτους**: Gaius and Aristarchus, **ἱεροσύλους**, "robbers of temples," R.V., in A.V. "of churches," the word "church" being applied as often in the Elizabethan age to pagan temples. Ramsay however renders "guilty neither in act nor in language of disrespect to our goddess," *i.e.*, to the established religion of our city, **ἱεροσυλία** = Latin, *sacrilegium*, and here for emphasis the speaker uses the double term **οὔτε ἱεροσ. οὔτε βλασφ.**, "Churches, Robbers of," Hastings' B.D., Ramsay, and *St. Paul*, pp. 260, 282, 401.

οὔτε βλασφημοῦντας τὴν[1] θεὰν ὑμῶν. 38. εἰ μὲν οὖν Δημήτριος[2] καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ τεχνῖται πρός τινα λόγον ἔχουσιν, ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται, καὶ ἀνθύπατοί εἰσιν· ἐγκαλείτωσαν ἀλλήλοις. 39. εἰ δέ τι περὶ

[1] For την θεαν ℵABD²E*HL, Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass read την θεον, and for υμων ℵABD, Syr. P., Sah., Arm., Aeth., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt read ημων.

[2] After Δημ. D, Syr. Pesh., Ephr., Blass, Hilg. add ουτος.

In 2 Macc. iv. 42 we have the same word **ἱερόσυλος**, R.V., "Author of the sacrilege," "Church-robber," A.V., used of Lysimachus, brother of Menelaus the high priest, who perished in a riot which arose from the theft of the sacred vessels by his brother and himself (quoted by Ramsay, *u. s.*). Canon Gore, *Ephesians*, p. 41, note, however, points out that the word is used in the former sense of "robbers of temples," in special connection with Ephesus by Strabo, xiv. 1, 22, and Pseudo-Heraclitus, Letter vii., p. 64 (Bernays); *cf.* Rom. ii. 22. The cognate noun is found in inscriptions at Ephesus, describing a crime involving the heaviest penalties, Wood, *Ephesus*, vi., 1, p. 14; Lightfoot, *Cont. Rev.*, p. 294, 1878.

Ver. 38. **λόγον ἔχουσιν**: no exact equivalent elsewhere in N.T., but Grimm (so Kypke) compares Matt. v. 32 (see also Col. iii. 13).—**ἀγοραῖοι ἄγονται**: "the courts are open," R.V., perhaps best to understand **σύνοδοι**, "court-*meetings* are now going on," *i.e.*, for holding trials (in the forum or agora); Vulgate, *conventus forenses aguntur*, the verb being in the present indicative. Or **ἡμέραι** may alone be supplied = court days are kept, *i.e.*, at certain intervals, not implying at that particular time, but rather a general statement as in the words that follow: "there are proconsuls," see Page, *in loco*. For **ἄγειν**, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 21, Matt. xiv. 6, 2 Macc. ii. 16, *cf.* Strabo, xiii., p. 932, Latin, *conventus agere*. Alford, so Wendt (1888), speaks of the distinction drawn by the old grammarians between **ἀγοραῖος** and **ἀγόραιος** as groundless, but see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 69.—**ἀνθύπατοί εἰσιν**: the plural is used: "de eo quod nunquam non esse soleat," Bengel (quoted by Blass and Wendt), although strictly there would be only one proconsul at a time. There is no need to understand any assistants of the proconsul, as if the description was meant for them, or, with Lewin, as if there were several persons with proconsular power. It is quite possible that in both clauses the secretary is speaking in a mere colloquial way, as we might say, "There are assizes and there are judges". Lightfoot calls it "a rhetorical plural" *Cont. Rev.*, p. 295, 1878, and quotes Eur., *I. T.*, 1359, **κλέπτοντες ἐκ γῆς ξόανα καὶ θυηπόλους**, though there was only one image and one priestess.—**ἐγκαλείτωσαν ἀλλήλοις**: "accuse," R.V. The verb need not have a technical legal sense as is implied by "implead" in A.V. So in LXX it may be used quite generally, or of a criminal charge, and so in classical Greek, *cf.* Wisd. xii. 12 and Ecclus. xlvi. 19. In the N.T. it is used six times in Acts with reference to judicial process, and only once elsewhere by St. Paul in Rom. viii. 33 in a general sense. The verb only occurs in the second part of Acts in accordance no doubt with the subject-matter; see Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 147, note, and Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 570, note.

Ver. 39. **εἰ δέ τι περὶ ἑτέρων**: if we read **περαιτέρω**, *cf.* Plato, *Phædo*, p. 107 B, the meaning is anything further than an accusation against an individual, a public and not a personal matter: if they desired to get any resolution passed with regard to the future conduct of citizens and of resident non-citizens in this matter, see Ramsay, *Expositor*, February, 1896, reading **περαιτ.**—**ἐπιλυθήσεται** (*cf.* Mark iv. 34), nowhere else in N.T. (the verb is found in LXX, Aquila, Gen. xl. 8, xli. 8, 12; Th., Hos., iii. 4; Philo., Jos.).—**τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ**: "the regular assembly," R.V. Mr. Wood, *Ephesus*, *App.*, p. 38, quotes an inscription in which it was enjoined that a statue of Minerva should be placed in a certain spot, **κατὰ πᾶσαν ἔννομον ἐκκλησίαν**. But A.V. has "the lawful assembly": which is the better rendering? "regular" seems to restrict us to **νόμιμοι ἐκκλησίαι** held on stated customary days, and to exclude from the secretary's statement any reference to extraordinary meetings, meetings summoned for special business, whereas he would be likely to use a term which would cover all legal

ἑτέρων[1] ἐπιζητεῖτε, ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται. 40. καὶ γὰρ κινδυνεύομεν[2] ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως περὶ τῆς σήμερον, μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὑπάρχοντος περὶ οὗ δυνησόμεθα ἀποδοῦναι λόγον τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης. 41. Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἀπέλυσε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

[1] **περι ετερων**, so ℵADHLP, so Tisch., R.V., Hilg., but B (d Gig., Vulg.), so Lach., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt have **περαιτερω**, see further Harris, *Four Lectures*, p. 29, on Ephrem's text. The **περι ετερων** is the correction of a word not found elsewhere in N.T. (so Wendt, p. 320 (1899)). E has **περ ετερον**.

[2] D has **σημερον εγκαλεισθαι στασεως**, *argui seditionis hodiernæ*, Vulg., *accusari quasi seditiosi hodie*, Gig., but these look like paraphrases. **περι ου ου** in W.H. and R.V. is supported by ℵBHLP, Syrr., P.H., Arm., Chrys.; and after **λογον** the addition of **περι** is supported by ℵBE, Arm., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. DE omit negative **ου**, and **περι** after **λογον** is omitted by D*HLP d, so T.R. (Meyer and Lach.), Hilg. and Blass in both texts; see Wendt (1899), note p. 321. W.H., see *App.*, p. 97, thinks some primitive error probable, perhaps **αιτιοι υπαρχοντες** instead of **αιτιου υπαρχοντος**. D has **οντος** instead of **υπαρ.**, so Blass in **β**.

meetings. But on the other hand Blass quotes the phrase given above from the inscriptions, and explains **ἔννομοι ἐκκλησίαι** *sunt, quæ ex lege certis diebus fiebant* (so too Wendt, Lightfoot); and if this is correct, "regular" would be the more appropriate rendering, **ἔννομος = νόμιμος**. But in Ephesus we have to consider how far the old Greek assembly **ἐκκλησία** was or was not under the control of the imperial government. In considering this with reference to the special incident before us, Ramsay, with whom Wendt agrees, p. 321 (1899), gives good reason for regarding the "regular" as equivalent to the "lawful" assemblies: *i.e.*, extraordinary assemblies which in the Greek period had been legal, but were now so no longer through the jealous desire of Rome to control popular assemblies, abroad as at home. The **ἐκκλησία** could not be summoned without the leave of the Roman officials, and it was not at all likely that that sanction would be extended beyond a certain fixed and regular number, Ramsay, *Expositor*, February, 1896: "The Lawful Assembly," and "Ephesus," Hastings' B.D., p. 723.

Ver. 40. **ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως περὶ τῆς σήμερον**, A.V., "to be called in question for this day's uproar," but R.V., "to be accused concerning this day's riot," rendering **ἐγκαλ.**, as in ver. 38, and **στάσεως**, as in Mark xv. 7. **θόρυβος** being rather the word for uproar or tumult, *cf.* Vulgate: "argui seditionis hodiernæ". But a further question arises from the marginal rendering of R.V., "to be accused of riot concerning this day": so Page, Meyer-Wendt, Zöckler. But Blass, Weiss, Rendall, so Ramsay: "to be accused of riot concerning this day's assembly," *sc.*, **ἐκκλησία**, although Blass thinks it still better to omit **περὶ τῆς** altogether, and to connect **σήμερον** with **ἐγκαλ.**, *cf.* iv. 9.—**μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὑπάρχοντος**: with this punctuation R.V. renders "there being no cause *for it*," taking **αἰτίου** as neuter, and closely connecting the phrase with the foregoing, so W.H. Overbeck (so Felten, Rendall) takes **αἰτίου** as masculine: "there being no man guilty by reason of whom," etc., and Wendt considers that the rendering cannot be altogether excluded. Vulgate has "cum nullus obnoxius sit". But **αἰτίου** may be strictly a noun neuter from **αἴτιον = αἰτία**, and not an adjective as the last-mentioned rendering demands, *cf.* Plummer on Luke xxiii. 4, 14, 22, and nowhere else in N.T., so Moulton and Geden, who give the adjective **αἴτιος** only in Heb. v. 9.—**περὶ οὗ δυνησόμεθα**: Ramsay (so Meyer and Zöckler) follows T.R. and Bezan text in omitting the negative **οὐ** before **δυν.**, but see on the other hand Wendt (1899), p. 322; and critical note. R.V. (introducing negative **οὐ**, so Weiss and Wendt) renders "and as touching it we shall not be able to give account of this concourse".—**συστροφῆς**, Polyb., iv., 34, 6, of a seditious meeting or mob. In xxiii. 12 used of a conspiracy; *cf.* LXX, Ps. lxiii. 2, Amos vii. 10.

Ver. 41. **τὴν ἐκκλησίαν**: the word may imply, as Ramsay thinks, that the secretary thus recognised the meeting as an **ἐκκλησία** to shield it, as far as he could, from Roman censure. The attitude of the secretary is that of a man

XX. 1. ΜΕΤΑ δὲ τὸ παύσασθαι τὸν θόρυβον,[1] προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ Παῦλος τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ ἀσπασάμενος ἐξῆλθε πορευθῆναι εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν. 2. διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα, καὶ[2] παρακαλέσας αὐτοὺς

[1] For προσκαλ. ℵBE, Sah., Boh., Aethro., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Blass read μετακαλ.; Lach. follows T.R. according to ADHLP, Chrys. After και AB 13, 33, Boh. add παρακαλεσας (και παρακ. και ασπασ. ℵE), Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss; T.R., so Meyer, *om.* παρακαλ. D, Gig. read εξηλθεν εις Μακεδ., so Blass in β.

[2] παρακαλ. χρησαμενος λ. π., so D (and Blass in β) *om.* αυτους.

altogether superior to, and almost contemptuous of, the vulgar mob (*cf.* οὗτος in D, ver. 38), and there is no apparent desire on his part to deny Paul's right to preach, provided that the Apostle respected the laws and institutions of the city.

On the historical character of the incidents narrated at Ephesus, the graphic description and the intimate knowledge of the life of the city, see Ramsay, *Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 143, and the same writer "Ephesus," Hastings' B.D. Every detail tends to confirm the faithfulness of the picture drawn of Ephesian society A.D. 57 (*cf.* Knabenbauer, p. 340). Wendt also is so impressed with the vividness of the scene as it is narrated, that he considers that we are justified in referring the narrative to a source which we owe to an actual companion of St. Paul, and in regarding it as an historical episode, and he refers in justification to Lightfoot, *Cont. Rev.*, p. 292 ff., 1878; see Wendt's edition, 1888, pp. 429, 430, and also edition 1899, p. 316, note. Whilst Baur and Overbeck give an unfavourable verdict as to the historical truthfulness of the Ephesian tumult, a verdict which Wendt condemns, Zeller is constrained to acknowledge the very minute details which tell in favour of the narrative, and for the invention of which there is no apparent reason. Amongst more recent critics, Weizsäcker can only see in the story the historian's defence of Paul and the same tendency to make events issue in the success of his missionary propaganda: 1 Cor. xv. 32 he takes literally, and the tumult recorded in Acts gives us only a faint and shadowy outline of actual reminiscences: nothing is left of the wild beasts except a tumult in the theatre, and the Apostle against whom the violence is mainly directed is himself absent. But as Wendt rightly maintains, 1 Cor. xv. 32 is much rather to be taken as referring figuratively to a struggle with men raging against the Apostle's life; nor are we shut up of necessity to the conclusion that 1 Cor. xv. 32 and Acts xix. 23 ff. refer to one and the same event (so Hilgenfeld, Zöckler), see note on p. 414. McGiffert, whilst taking 1 Cor. xv. 32 literally (although he inclines to identify Acts xix. with 2 Cor. i. 8, so too Hilgenfeld), admits as against Weizsäcker the general trustworthiness of St. Luke's account, since it is too true to life, and is related too vividly to admit any doubt as to its historic reality (p. 282). Hilgenfeld too, *Zw. Th.*, p. 363, 1896, agrees that the whole narrative is related in a way true to life, and refers it with the possible exception of ὡς ἐπὶ ὥρας δύο in ver. 34 to his good source C: it could not possibly have been invented by the "author to Theophilus". Even here Clemen and Jüngst can only see an interpolation, referred by the former to Redactor, *i.e.*, vv. 15-41 with the possible exception of ver. 33 to Redactor Antijudaicus; and by the latter also to his Redactor, *i.e.*, vv. 23-41.

CHAPTER XX.—Ver. 1. μετὰ δὲ τὸ παύσ.: the words may indicate not only the fact of the cessation of the tumult, but that Paul felt that the time for departure had come.—θόρ., *cf.* Matt. xxvi. 5, xxvii. 24, Mark xiv. 2; three times in Acts, xxi. 34, xxiv. 18, and several times in LXX. In xxi. 34 it is used more as in classics of the confused noise of an assembly (*cf.* Mark v. 38), but in the text it seems to cover the whole riot, and may be translated "riot". — ἀσπασάμενος: "non solum salutabant osculo advenientes verum etiam discessuri," Wetstein, and references; so in classical Greek, *cf.* also xxi. 6, 7, 19.

Ver. 2. διελθὼν δὲ, see above on xiii. 6, "and when he had gone through," in a missionary progress τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα, *i.e.*, of Macedonia, the places where he had founded Churches, Thessalonica, Berœa, Philippi. From Rom. xv. 19 it would appear that his work continued some time, and that round about even unto Illyricum he fully preached the Gospel.

λόγῳ πολλῷ, ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα· 3. ποιήσας τε μῆνας τρεῖς, γενομένης αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλῆς ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων [1] μέλλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι εἰς

[1] D, Syr. H. mg., Ephr. read after **ιουδαιων ηθελησεν αναχθηναι εις Σ.**, which gives rather a different idea, *viz.*, that a plot of the Jews induced Paul to leave Corinth (so Belser, p. 108; Hilgenfeld also adopts, *Zw. Th.*, 1896, p. 368); but Blass transposes the clauses and reads in β: **ποιη. τε μ. τ. ηθελ. αναχθηναι εις Σ. και γενηθεισης αυτω επιβουλης υπο των Ι.**; see as against this transposition by Blass, Wendt (1899), p. 50. For **εγενετο γνωμης του υπο.** D, Syr. H. mg., Gig. read **ειπεν δε το πνευμα.** Blass omits **δε** in β, and so the antithesis is not maintained. Weiss, p. 98 (note), condemns Blass for making **ειπεν το πν.** the equivalent of **εγεν. γνωμης**, whilst in xix. 1 a distinction is decisively drawn between the **ιδια βουλη** (= **γνωμη**) of the Apostle and the guidance of the Spirit. **γνωμη**, but gen. **γνωμης** is read by ℵAB*E 13, 15, 18, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt.

On the connection of 2 Cor. with this part of Acts, see "II. Corinthians" (Robertson), Hastings' B.D., i., pp. 493, 495; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 286; and on the coincidence between Acts and Romans, *l. c.*, see Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, ii., 4.—**τὴν Ἑλλάδα**, *i.e.*, Achaia in its Roman sense (approximately at all events); the stay might have included a visit to Athens, but at all events Corinth was visited. A wider sense of the epithet "Greek" would comprise Macedonia also, and Macedonia and Achaia are thus spoken of in close connection as forming the Greek lands in Europe, *cf.* xix. 21, and Rom. xv. 26, 2 Cor. ix. 2, 1 Thess. i. 8, "Achaia" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D.

Ver. 3. **ποιήσας τε μῆνας τρεῖς**, *cf.* xv. 33, xviii. 23.—**ἐπιβουλῆς**: only in Acts in N.T., see above on ix. 24; the plot may have been formed in the anticipation that it would be easy to carry it through on a pilgrim ship crowded with Jews of Corinth and Asia, hostile to the Apostle; or it may have been the purpose of the conspirators to kill Paul in a crowded harbour like Cenchreæ before the ship actually started.—**μέλλ. ἀνάγ.**, see on xiii. 13. If we read **ἐγέν. γνώμης** (genitive) (*cf.* 2 Peter i. 20), nowhere else in N.T., *cf.* Thuc., i., 113, **ὅσοι τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης ἦσαν**, see also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 269.—**τοῦ ὑποσ.**, *i.e.*, the return journey to Jerusalem (Ramsay), but see also Wendt (1899), p. 323.

Ver. 4. **συνείπετο δὲ αὐτῷ**: only here in N.T., *cf.* 2 Macc. xv. 2, 3 Macc. v. 48, vi. 21, but frequent in classics.—**ἄχρι τῆς Ἀ.**: among more recent writers Rendall has argued strongly for the retention of the words, whilst he maintains, nevertheless, that all the companions of the Apostle named here accompanied him to Jerusalem. In his view the words are an antithesis to **Ἀσιανοὶ δέ**, so that whilst on the one hand one party, *viz.*, six of the deputies, travel with Paul to Philippi, on the other hand the other party consisting of two, *viz.*, the Asian representatives, waited for them at Troas. At Philippi the six deputies and Paul were joined by St. Luke, who henceforth speaks of the deputation in the first person plural, and identifies himself with its members as a colleague. Then from Troas the whole party proceed to Jerusalem (*Acts*, pp. 119, 303). In this way **οὗτοι** in ver. 5 is restricted to Tychicus and Trophimus (see also Ramsay, as below), whereas A. and R.V. refer the pronoun to all the deputies, so too Weiss and Wendt. If this is so, the **ἡμᾶς**, ver. 5, *might* refer (but see further below) only to Paul and Luke, as the latter would naturally rejoin Paul at Philippi where we left him, *cf.* xvi. 17. Ramsay explains (*St. Paul*, p. 287) that the discovery of the Jewish plot altered St. Paul's plan, and that too at the last moment, when delegates from the Churches had already assembled. The European delegates were to sail from Corinth, and the Asian from Ephesus, but the latter having received word of the change of plan went as far as Troas to meet the others, **οὗτοι** thus referring to Tychicus and Trophimus alone (but see also Askwith, *Epistle to the Galatians* (1899), pp. 94, 95).

Wendt also favours retention of **ἄχρι τῆς Ἀ.** and prefers the reading **προσελθόντες**, but he takes **ἡμᾶς** in ver. 5 to exclude St. Paul, and refers it to other friends of the Apostle (as distinct from those who accompanied him through Macedonia "as far as Asia"), *viz.*, the author of the "We" sections and others who only now meet the Apostle and his company at Troas. But this obliges us to make a somewhat artificial distinction between **ἡμᾶς** in ver. 5 with **ἡμεῖς** in ver. 6, and **ἐξεπ.** and **ἤλθομεν** on the one hand, and **διετρίψαμεν**, ver. 6, on the other, as the latter must be taken to include St.

τὴν Συρίαν, ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας. 4. συνείπετο δὲ αὐτῷ[1] ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας[2] Σώπατρος[3] Βεροιαῖος. Θεσσα-

[1] συνειπετο δε αυτῳ, Blass follows D and also inserts προηρχοντο, whilst D omits verb altogether, Syr. H. mg. reads συνειποντο. Apparently D takes μεχρι της A. with εξιεναι, and the names may have been taken with προηρχοντο if Blass is right in regarding this as original; see his *Proleg.*, p. 27.

[2] αχρι της Ασιας *om.* ℵB 13, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aethpp., so Tisch., W.H. text, R.V. marg., Weiss; but retained ADEHLP, Syr. P. and H., Arm., Chrys.; (Gig., Wer.) Blass in β (μεχρι); see also W.H., *App.*, p. 97. Wendt also considers that it is probably to be retained, see note in comment.; *cf.* προελθ., *u. s.*

[3] After Σωπατρος ℵABDE, Vulg., Boh., Syr. H. mg., Arm., Origint., so Tisch., Alford, W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass add Πυρρου.

Paul, St. Luke, and the whole company, although Wendt justifies the distinction by pointing out that in ver. 13 ἡμεῖς is used exclusive of Paul (*cf.* xxi. 12).

Mr. Askwith, *u. s.*, p. 93 ff., has recently argued that ἡμεῖς in ver. 6 includes not only St. Luke and St. Paul, but with them the representatives of Achaia (who are not mentioned by name with the other deputies) who would naturally be with St. Paul on his return from Corinth, vv. 2, 3, and he would not travel through Macedonia unaccompanied. In 2 Cor. viii. St. Luke, "the brother," according to tradition, whose praise in the Gospel was spread through all the Churches, had been sent to Corinth with Titus and another "brother," and so naturally any representatives from Achaia would come along with them, pp. 93, 94. No names are given because St. Luke himself was amongst them, and he never mentions his own name, p. 96. The fact that Timothy and Sopater who had been with the Apostle at Corinth when he wrote to the Romans (chap. xvi. 21, if we may identify Σωσίπατρος with the Σώπατρος Πύρρου Βεροιαῖος, Acts xx. 4) are amongst those who waited at Troas is accounted for on the supposition that Timothy and others might naturally go across to inform the Asiatic delegates of Paul's change of plan, and would then proceed with these Asian representatives to Troas to meet the Apostle (p. 94). The presence of Aristarchus and Secundus at Troas is accounted for on the ground that St. Paul, on his way to Achaia, did not expect to return through Macedonia, and so would naturally arrange for the Macedonian delegates, who were not accompanying him into Greece, to meet him somewhere. And the delegates from Thessalonica would naturally cross to Troas with the intention of proceeding to Ephesus (or Miletus), where St. Paul would have touched even if he had sailed for Palestine from Cenchreæ (*cf.* Acts xviii. 18, 19), p. 95. But against this it may be fairly urged that there is no reason to assume that the Macedonian delegates did *not* accompany Paul into Greece; Timothy and Sosipater had evidently done so, and all the delegates mentioned seem to have been together in St. Paul's company, συνείπετο αὐτῷ, ver. 4. In the uncertain state of the text it is difficult to come to any decision on the passage. The words ἄχρι τῆς Ἀσίας may easily have been omitted on account of the supposed difficulty connected with the fact that two at least of St. Paul's companions who are named, Trophimus and Aristarchus, went further than Asia, *cf.* xxi. 29, xxvii. 2, while on the other hand it is somewhat hard to believe that the words could be inserted by a later hand.

On "The Pauline Collection for the Saints and its importance," and the representatives of the Churches in the different provinces, see Rendall, *Expositor*, November, 1893; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 287, and "Corinth," Hastings' B.D.; Wendt, p. 325 (1899); Hort, *Rom.* and *Ephes.*, pp. 39 ff. and 173. Nothing could more clearly show the immense importance which St. Paul attached to this contribution for the poor saints than the fact that he was ready to present in person at Jerusalem the members of the deputation and their joint offerings, and that too at a time when his presence in the capital was full of danger, and after he had been expressly warned of the peril, *cf.* Acts, xxiv. 17, Rom. xv. 25. On the suggestion for the fund and its consummation see 1 Cor. xvi. 1-8, Acts xx. 16, 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2; A.D. 57-58, Rendall, Lightfoot; 56-57, Ramsay. Such a scheme would not only unite all the Gentile Churches in one holy bond of faith and charity, but it would mark their solidarity with the Mother Church

λονικέων δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος καὶ Σέκουνδος,[1] καὶ Γάϊος Δερβαῖος καὶ Τιμόθεος[2]· Ἀσιανοὶ δέ, Τυχικὸς καὶ Τρόφιμος. 5.[3] οὗτοι προελθόντες ἔμενον ἡμᾶς ἐν Τρωάδι· 6. ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐξεπλεύσαμεν μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν ἀζύμων ἀπὸ Φιλίππων, καὶ ἤλθομεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα

[1] **και Γαιος Δ.**, Blass reads **Δερβαιος δε Τιμοθεος**, but against this we have the "insurmountable" statement in xvi. 1, so Ramsay, p. 280, so too Wendt (1899), p. 323.

[2] **Ασιανοι**, D, Syr. H. mg. read **Εφεσιοι**, so Blass; Wendt approves; see Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 154.

[3] **ουτοι**, add **δε** ℵABE, Boh., Syr. H., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; omit Blass, with DHLP, Vulg., Gig. **προελθοντες**, this reading of T.R. is retained by Lach., Tisch., Weiss, R.V., W.H. mg.; Blass in text following B³D; and it corresponds with the omission of **αχρι της Α.** in ver. 4 and the view that Paul was included in the **ημας** of ver. 5. If, however, the words **αχρι της Α.** are retained, Wendt argues that **προσελθοντες** is quite intelligible, and that this verb, which he regards as best supported, ℵAB*EHLP [so W.H.], becomes thus an indirect confirmation of the former disputed words in ver. 4. According to Wendt's view Paul is not included in the **ημας** of ver. 5, but the **ημας** refers to the writer of the "We" sections with one or two companions who had not journeyed with Paul through Macedonia to Asia, but only met him in Troas. But a difficulty connected with Wendt's solution would seem to lie in the fact that he is obliged to refer the **ημεις** in ver. 6 only to the writer of the "We" sections and those with him, whilst the first person in **διετριψαμεν** includes Paul and his party who have been hitherto excluded from the **ημεις** and **ημας**. After **εμενον** D reads **αυτον**, so Blass in **β**, thus plainly separating Paul from the **ουτοι**.

at Jerusalem; it would be a splendid fulfilment by their own generous and loyal effort of the truth that if one member of the body suffered all the members suffered with it. We know how this vision which St. Paul had before his eyes of a universal brotherhood throughout the Christian world seemed to tarry; and we may understand something of the joy which filled his heart, even amidst his farewell to the elders at Miletus, as he anticipated without misgiving the accomplishment of this **διακονία** to the saints, a "ministry" which he had received from the Lord Jesus, Acts xx. 24. On the coincidence between the narrative of the Acts *cf.* xx. 2, 3, xxiv. 17-19, and the notices in St. Paul's Epistles given above, see especially Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, chap. ii., 1.—**Σώπατρος Πύρρου Β.**, see critical note; whether he is the same as the Sopater of Rom. xvi. 21 who was with St. Paul at Corinth we cannot say—possibly the name of his father may be introduced to distinguish him, but perhaps, as Blass says, added in this one case "quod domi nobilis erat".—**Γάϊος Δ. καὶ Τ.**, see above on p. 414, and Knabenbauer's note as against Blass.—**Τυχικὸς**: Ephes. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7 show that Timothy was in Rome at the time of St. Paul's first imprisonment. He is spoken of as a beloved and faithful minister, and it would appear that as St. Paul was about to send him to Ephesus, he was presumably the bearer of the Epistle which at all events *included* the Ephesian Church. In Tit. iii. 12 we have another reference which shows the high place Timothy occupied amongst St. Paul's trusted confidential friends, and from 2 Tim. iv. 12 we learn that he had been a sharer in the Apostle's second and heavier captivity, and had only left him to fulfil another mission to Ephesus.—**Τρόφιμος**: probably like Tychicus an Ephesian. In xxi. 29 he was with St. Paul at Jerusalem, and from 2 Tim. iv. 20 we learn that he was at a later stage the companion of the Apostle after his release from his first imprisonment, and that he had been left by him at Miletus sick. On the absurd attempt to connect this notice of Miletus in the Pastoral Epistles with Acts xx. 4 see Weiss, *Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus*, p. 354; Salmon, *Introd.*, fifth edition, p. 401.

Ver. 5. **προελθόντες**, see critical note. If we read **προσελ.** render as in R.V. (margin), "these came, and were waiting for us at Troas," *cf.* Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 287, and Rendall, *in loco*.—**ἡμᾶς**: the introduction of the word is fatal to the idea that Timothy could have been the author of this "We" section.

ἄχρις[1] ἡμερῶν πέντε, οὗ διετρίψαμεν ἡμέρας ἑπτά. 7. Ἐν δὲ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων, συνηγμένων[2] τῶν μαθητῶν τοῦ κλάσαι ἄρτον, ὁ Παῦλος διελέγετο αὐτοῖς, μέλλων ἐξιέναι τῇ ἐπαύριον, παρέτεινέ τε τὸν λόγον μέχρι μεσονυκτίου· 8. ἦσαν δὲ[3] λαμπάδες ἱκαναὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπερῴῳ οὗ

[1] D has πεμπταιοι instead of αχ. η. π., so Blass in β. It may be simply explanatory of the difficult αχ. η. π. (Weiss).

[2] των μαθητων, according to ℵABDE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass ημων.

[3] λαμπαδες, D (not Blass in β) reads υπολαμπαδες. According to *Phylarch. ap. Ath.* υπολ. seems to be a sort of window or look-out (L. and S., edit. 7). This reading is suggestive, but Blass is of opinion that υπολ. "nusquam exstat".

Ver. 6. **μετὰ τὰς ἡμ. τῶν ἀ.**, *cf.* xii. 3, *i.e.*, the Passover. 1 Cor. v. 7 shows us how they would "keep the Feast". Ramsay's "fixed date in the life of St. Paul," *Expositor*, May, 1896, depends partly on the assumption that Paul left Philippi the very first day after the close of the Paschal week, but we cannot be sure of this, see Wendt's criticism on Ramsay's view, p. 326, edition 1899, and also Dr. Robertson "I. Corinthians" Hastings' B.D., p. 485.—**ἄχρις ἡμ. πέντε**: "in five days," *i.e.*, the journey lasted until the fifth day, so D πεμπταῖοι, *cf.* δευτεραῖοι, xxviii. 13. In xvi. 11 the journey only lasted two (three?) days, but here probably adverse winds must be taken into account; or the five days may include a delay at Neapolis, the port of Philippi, or the land journey to the port; on ἄχρις see above i. 2.—**ἡμέρας ἑπτά**, so as to include a whole week, and so the first day of the week, *cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13, which shows how reluctantly Paul left Troas on his former visit, but see on the other hand, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 295, who thinks that St. Paul would not have voluntarily stayed seven days at Troas.

Ver. 7. **τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σ.**, "on the first day of the week," μιᾷ being used, the cardinal for the ordinal πρῶτος, like Hebrew אֶחָד, in enumerating the days of the month, see Plummer's note on Luke xxiv. 1 and *cf.* xviii. 12 (so Blass). We must remember that 1 Cor. had been previously written, and that the reference in 1 Cor. xvi. 2 to "the first day of the week" for the collection of alms naturally connects itself with the statement here in proof that this day had been marked out by the Christian Church as a special day for public worship, and for "the breaking of the bread". On the significance of this selection of the "first day," see Milligan, *Resurrection*, pp. 67-69; Maclear, *Evidential Value of the Lord's Day*, "Present Day Tracts" 54; and for other references, *Witness of the Epistles*, pp. 368, 369; Wendt (1899), p. 326.—**μέλλων**: Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, p. 71.—**παρέτεινε**, see μῦθον, Arist., *Poet.*, xvii., 5, λόγους, and ix. 4, μῦθον.—**μεσονυκτίου**, *cf.* xvi. 25.

Ver. 8. **λαμπάδες ἱκαναί**, see critical note and reading in D. The words have been taken to indicate clearly that the accident was not due to darkness coming on through Paul's lengthy discourse (so Weiss and Wendt), whilst Meyer regards them as introduced to show that the fall of the young man was not perceived at once. Others (so Felten) hold that the words mark the joy at the Sacramental Presence of the Lord and Bridegroom of the Church (Matt. xxv. 1), and Nösgen sees in them a note of joy in the celebration of the Christian Sunday (see also Kuinoel). But it is also allowable to see in this notice the graphic and minute touch of one who was an eye-witness of the scene, and who described it, as he remembered it, in all its vividness (Hackett, Blass). We can scarcely see in the words with Ewald an intention on the part of the narrative to guard against any suspicion attaching to the night meetings of the Christians (so Calvin, Bengel, Lechler); the date, as Nösgen says, is too early (so too Overbeck). Lewin also takes Ewald's view, but with the alternative that the lights may have been mentioned to exclude any suspicion in the reader's mind of any deception with regard to the miracle.

Ver. 9. **Εὔτυχος**: we are not told what position he occupied, but there is no hint that he was a servant.—**ἐπὶ τῆς θυρ.**: on the window sill—there were no windows of glass, and the lattice or door was open probably on account of the heat from the lamps, and from the number present—the fact that Eutychus thus sat

ἦσαν συνηγμένοι. 9. καθήμενος δέ τις νεανίας ὀνόματι Εὔτυχος ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος, καταφερόμενος ὕπνῳ[1] βαθεῖ, διαλεγομένου τοῦ Παύλου ἐπὶ πλεῖον, κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου, ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ τριστέγου κάτω, καὶ ἤρθη νεκρός. 10. καταβὰς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ συμπεριλαβὼν εἶπε, Μὴ θορυβεῖσθε· ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστιν. 11. ἀναβὰς δὲ καὶ κλάσας[2] ἄρτον καὶ γευσάμενος, ἐφ' ἱκανόν

[1] D, Gig., so Blass in β, βαρει pro βαθει.

[2] Before αρτον ℵ*ABCD* 13, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt add τον.

at the window points to the crowded nature of the assembly, *cf.* 2 Kings i. 2, where a different word is used in LXX, although **θυρίς** is also frequently found.—**καταφερ. ὕ. β.**: the two participles are to be carefully distinguished (but R.V. does not); "who was gradually oppressed," or "becoming oppressed with sleep," present participle; "being borne down by his sleep," *i.e.*, overcome by it, aorist. Rendall takes **ἐπὶ πλεῖον** with **κατενεχθεὶς** (so W.H. margin), "and being still more overcome with the sleep," but the words are usually taken with **διαλεγ.** See Bengel, Nösgen, Alford, Holtzmann, Weiss, Ramsay, Page on the force of the participles: "sedentem somnus occupavit . . . somno oppressus cecidit," Bengel. **καταφέρεσθαι**: used only in Luke in N.T., and in no corresponding sense in LXX; a medical term, and so much so that it was used more frequently absolutely than with **ὕπνος** in medical writings, and the two participles thus expressing the different stages of sleep would be quite natural in a medical writer.—**βαθεῖ**: one of the epithets joined with **ὕπνος** by the medical writers, see Hobart, pp. 48, 49, and his remarks on Luke xxii. 45, p. 84. The verb is also used in the same sense by other writers as by Aristotle, Josephus, see instances in Wetstein, but Zahn reckons the whole phrase as medical, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 436.—**καὶ ἤρθη νεκρός**: the words positively assert that Eutychus was dead—they are not **ὡσεὶ νεκρός**, *cf.* Mark ix. 26, and the attempt to show that the words in ver. 10, "his life is in him," indicate apparent death, or that life is still thought of as not having left him (so apparently even Zöckler, whilst he strongly maintains the force of the preceding words), cannot be called satisfactory; see on the other hand Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 290, 291, and Wendt, *in loco*.

Ver. 10. **καταβὰς**: by the outside staircase common in Eastern houses.—**ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ συμ.**, *cf.* 1 Kings xvii. 21, 22; 2 Kings iv. 34; there as here the purport of the act was a restoration to life.—**Μὴ θορ.**: "make ye no ado," R.V., *cf.* Mark v. 39 (Mark ix. 23), where the word is used of the loud weeping and wailing of the mourners in the East; see above on ix. 39.—**ἡ γὰρ ψ.**, see above.

Ver. 11. **κλάσας ἄρτον**: if we read **τὸν ἄρ.**, see critical note, "the bread," so R.V., *i.e.*, of the Eucharist; so Syriac. The words evidently refer back to ver. 7, see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 148.—**γευσ.**: often taken to refer not to the Eucharist, but to the partaking of the *Agape* or common meal which followed. If so, it certainly appears as if St. Paul had soon taken steps to prevent the scandals which occurred in Corinth from the Holy Communion being celebrated during or after a common meal, 1 Cor. ix. 23, since here the Eucharist precedes, Luckock, *Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke*, ii., 199. Wendt, who still identifies the breaking of the bread with the *Agape* (so Holtzmann, Weiss), protests against the view of Kuinoel and others that reference is here made to a breakfast which St. Paul took for his coming journey. Dean Plumptre refers to the use of **γεύομαι** in Heb. vi. 4 as suggesting that here too reference is made to the participation of the Eucharist; but, on the other hand, in Acts x. 10 (see Blass, *in loco*) the word is used of eating an ordinary meal, and Wendt refers it to the enjoyment of the *Agape* (*cf.* also Knabenbauer, *in loco*). Weiss urges that the meaning of simply "tasting" is to be adopted here, and that **τε** shows that Paul only "tasted" the meal, *i.e.*, the *Agape*, and hurried on with his interrupted discourse, whilst Lewin would take **γευσ.** absolutely here, and refer it to a separate ordinary meal; although he maintains that the previous formula **κλάσ. τὸν ἄρτον** must refer to the Eucharist. In LXX the verb is

τε ὁμιλήσας ἄχρις αὐγῆς, οὕτως ἐξῆλθεν. 12.[1] ἤγαγον δὲ τὸν παῖδα ζῶντα, καὶ παρεκλήθησαν οὐ μετρίως. 13. Ἡμεῖς δὲ[2] προελθόντες ἐπὶ τὸ πλοῖον, ἀνήχθημεν εἰς τὴν Ἄσσον, ἐκεῖθεν μέλλοντες ἀναλαμβάνειν τὸν Παῦλον· οὕτω γὰρ ἦν διατεταγμένος, μέλλων αὐτὸς

[1] Instead of ηγαγον D has ασπαζομενων δε αυτων ηγαγεν τον νεανισκον ζωντα. Blass and Hilgenfeld, however, read ηγαγον in the β text. But Wendt thinks that ηγαγεν may not be a mere error, and that Paul is conceived of in D as himself bringing the boy alive at the scene of departure, and thus conferring comfort, Wendt (1899), p. 327.

[2] προελθοντες ℵB²CL, Tisch., W.H. text, Weiss, Wendt; but προσ- AB*EHP, W.H. marg. D has κατελθοντες. επι for εις ℵABCE, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt.

frequent, but there is no case in which it means definitely more than to taste, although in some cases it might imply eating a meal, *e.g.*, Gen. xxv. 30; for its former sense see, *e.g.*, Jonah iii. 7. In modern Greek γευματίζω = to dine, so γεῦμα = dinner.—ἐφ' ἱκανόν τε ὁμιλ.: on St. Luke's use of ἱκανός with temporal significance see above on p. 215, *cf.* with this expression 2 Macc. viii. 25. ὁμιλ.: only in Luke in N.T., *cf.* Luke xxiv. 14, 15, Acts xxiv. 26; here, "talked with them," R.V., as of a familiar meeting, elsewhere "communed," R.V.; so in classical Greek, and in Josephus, and also in modern Greek (Kennedy); in LXX, Dan. i. 19: ὡμίλησεν αὐτοῖς ὁ β., "the king communed with them". In the passage before us the alternative rendering "when he had stayed in their company" is given by Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*—ἄχρις αὐγῆς, *cf.* Polyaen., iv., 18, κατὰ τὴν πρώτην αὐγὴν τῆς ἡμέρας (Wetstein); only here in N.T., found in Isa. lix. 9, 2 Macc. xii. 9, but not in same sense as here.—οὕτως, *cf.* xx. 7, after a participle, as often in classical Greek, Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 175, see also xxvii. 17, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 190 (1893).

Ver. 12. ἤγαγον: the subject must be supplied; probably those who had attended to the boy, and who, now that he was sufficiently recovered, brought him back to the room. Rendall thinks that the expression means that they took the lad home after the assembly was over. The comfort is derived from the recovery of the boy, as is indicated by ζῶντα, and it is forced to refer it to the consolation which they received from the boy's presence, as a proof which the Apostle had left behind him of divine and miraculous help (so Wendt, Weiss); see also D, critical note, and Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 291.—ζῶντα: the word is pointless unless on the supposition that the accident had been fatal. It is in fact impossible to deny that a miracle is intended to be narrated; otherwise the introduction of the whole story is meaningless, as Overbeck insists against Baur and Renan. The word νεκρός, the action of Paul, the word ζῶντα all point to an actual death, whilst the vivid details in the narrative also indicate the presence of an eye-witness as an informant. Schneckenburger has shown exhaustively, as Zeller admits, that an actual raising of the dead is intended; but we are asked to see in the narrative only an attempt to set off the raising of Eutychus against the raising of Tabitha at Joppa, a parallel between Paul and Peter; so Baur, and recently Overbeck and Weizsäcker. But the conclusion of Overbeck is disappointing in face of the fact that he dwells (p. 333) most pointedly upon the difference between the narrative here and in ix. 36—how in this latter case we have the expectation of the miracle emphasised, whilst here it is entirely wanting; how too the laudatory description of Tabitha may be contrasted with the simple mention of the name, Eutychus here.—οὐ μετρίως: often in Plutarch, *cf.* 2 Macc. xv. 38. On Luke's use of οὐ with an adjective, to express the opposite, see Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 62; Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 52; and four times in "We" sections (twelve times in rest of Acts, rare in rest of N.T.), xx. 12, xxvii. 14, 20, xxviii. 2; Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 153.

Ver. 13. ἡμεῖς, *i.e.*, without Paul.—Ἄσσον: south of Troas in the Roman province of Asia, and some miles east of Cape Lectum. The opposite coast of Lesbos was about seven miles distant. Its harbour gave it a considerable importance in the coasting trade of former days. A Roman road connected it with

πεζεύειν. 14. ὡς δὲ[1] συνέβαλεν ἡμῖν εἰς τὴν Ἄσσον, ἀναλαβόντες αὐτὸν ἤλθομεν εἰς Μιτυλήνην· 15. κἀκεῖθεν ἀποπλεύσαντες, τῇ ἐπιούσῃ κατηντήσαμεν ἀντικρὺ Χίου[2]· τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον·

[1] συνεβαλεν CDH², Blass, Hilg.; this is more fitting to the sense than the imperfect (Wendt), but the latter tense, συνεβαλλεν, is read in ℵABEP 40, 100, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss.

[2] Instead of ετερᾳ B 15, 19, 73, has the remarkable reading εσπερᾳ, which Weiss accepts, W.H. marg. But Wendt (1899), p. 428, discusses and rejects, on the ground that the charge was introduced by a scribe who did not take κατην. αντικρυ Χιου as meaning a station for the night at Chios, and therefore represented the next station as the stopping place for the night of the same day.

Troas and the Troad coast. The sculptures from the Temple of Athena erected on the hill on which Assos itself was built form some of the most important remains of archaic Greek art: most of them are now in Paris. "Assos" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., B.D.². Steph. Byz. describes Assos as situated ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ὀξέος καὶ δυσανόδου τόπου.—ἀναλαμβάνειν: *assumere in navem; cf.* Polyb., xxx., 9, 8. The only other instance at all parallel in N.T. is 2 Tim. iv. 11, where we might render "to pick him up on the way," Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, p. 437.—διατεταγ.: with middle significance, *cf.* vii. 44, xxiv. 23; Winer-Moulton, xxxix., 3.—πεζεύειν: "to go by land," R.V. (margin, "on foot"): "de terrestri (non necessario pedestri) itinere," Blass; a much shorter route than the sea voyage round Cape Lectum. The land journey was about twenty miles, *Itin. Anton.*, B.D.². Probably Paul took the journey in this way for ministerial purposes; others suggest that he did so for the sake of his health, others to avoid the snare of the Jews, or from a desire for solitude. But it may be questioned whether this somewhat lengthy foot journey would be accomplished without any attendant at all. It does not follow, as has been supposed, that the ship was hired by Paul himself, but that he used its putting in at Assos for his own purpose.

Ver. 14. συνέβαλεν, *cf.* xvii. 18. The verb is peculiar to St. Luke; its meaning here is classical, *cf.* also Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 7, 5. Rendall thinks that the imperfect (see critical note) may mean that Paul fell in with the ship while still on his way to Assos, and was taken on board at once; he therefore renders "as he came to meet us at Assos".—Μιτυλήνην: the capital of Lesbos, about thirty miles from Assos, and so an easy day's journey; Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 84, *cf.* Hor., *Od.*, i., 7, 1; *Ep.*, i., 11, 17. Its northern harbour into which the ship would sail is called by Strabo, xiii., 2, μέγας καὶ βαθύς, χώματι σκεπαζόμενος (Wetstein).

Ver. 15. κἀκεῖθεν, see on xvi. 12, xiv. 26.—κατηντήσαμεν, *cf.* xvi. 1, xviii. 19, 24, "we reached *a point on the mainland*," Ramsay, ἀντικρὺ Χ. over against, *i.e.*, opposite Chios; often in Greek writers, only here in N.T., but W.H., Weiss, ἄντικρυς, 3 Macc. v. 16 (Neh. xii. 8, see Hatch and Redpath). On καταντᾶν εἰς, and καταντᾶν ἀντ. as here, see on xvi. 1, xviii. 19; Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 49.—Χίου: The island Chios (*Scio*) in the Ægean was separated from the Asian coast by a channel which at its narrowest was only five miles across. The ship carrying St. Paul would pass through this picturesque channel on its way south from Mitylene. An interesting comparison with the voyage of St. Paul may be found in Herod's voyage by Rhodes, Cos, Chios and Mitylene, towards the Black Sea (Jos., *Ant.*, xvi., 2, 2). Amongst the seven rivals for the honour of being the birthplace of Homer, the claims of Chios are most strongly supported by tradition. On the legendary and historic connections of the places named in this voyage see Plumptre, *in loco*, and "Chios" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D.—τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ: (see critical note). Wetstein calls attention to the variety of phrases, τῇ ἑτ., τῇ ἐπιούσῃ, τῇ ἐχομ. The phrase before us is found in xxvii. 3, so that it only occurs in the "We" sections and nowhere else in Acts, but the expression "the next day" occurs so much more frequently in the "We" sections than in any other passages of the same length that we might expect a larger variety of phrases to express it, Hawkins, *Horæ Synop.*, pp. 153, 154; and Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 50.—παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σ.: "we struck across to Samos," Ramsay, *cf.* Thuc., iii., 32, where the verb means "to cross over to Ionia" (see Mr. Page's note, and

καὶ[1] μείναντες ἐν Τρωγυλλίῳ, τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἤλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον. 16. ἔκρινε[2] γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος παραπλεῦσαι τὴν Ἔφεσον, ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ· ἔσπευδε γάρ, εἰ δυνατὸν[3] ἦν αὐτῷ, τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς γενέσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

[1] **και μειναντες εν Τ.**, so DHLP, Syr. P. H., Sah., Chrys., so Meyer, Alford, Blass in **β**, and even by Weiss (not by Wendt), Introd., p. 57, and Codex D, p. 109; *cf.* xxi. 1. Corssen, too, regards favourably, *G. G. A.*, p. 441, 1896, supported by Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 294, Belser and Zöckler. Weiss cannot see any reason for its omission, and therefore retains it. The words may, however, have been omitted because in the text Trogyllium seems to be placed in Samos, but see also Wendt, note, p. 328 (1899). For the omission, ℵABCE, Vulg., Boh., Arm., Aethpp., Tisch., R.V. only in marg., W.H. describe as Western and Syrian; these authorities read in text **τῃ δε εχομ.** Ramsay's interesting note, *C. R. E.*, p. 155, should also be consulted in favour of the retention of the words. **Τρωγιλιᾳ**, so Blass in **β**, see note *in loco;* **Τρωγυλιῳ** W.H. and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 47.

[2] **κεκρικει** is read for **εκρινε** in ℵAB*DE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Blass. Instead of **οπως μη γενηται α. χρονοτριβ.** D (Gig.) has **μηποτε γενηθη αυτῳ κατασχεσις τις**—Weiss considers this as a mere explanation of the rare **χρονοτριβ.** **κατασχεσις** is used twice in N.T., Acts vii. 5, 45, but not in the sense required here; "mora" in Gig. Blass accepts in **β** text, and there is much better authority for **χρονοτριβ.** in classical Greek than for **κατασχεσις** in the sense of this passage.

[3] **ην**, but **ειη** is supported by ℵABCE 13, 15, 18, 36, 180, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. Meyer and Alford regard as gram. corr., but too well supported (Wendt).

the passage quoted also in Wetstein, and L. and S.). On the frequency of this and other nautical terms in Acts *cf.* Klostermann, *u. s.*, p. 49.—**καὶ μείν. ἐν Τρω.**, see critical note.—**Μίλητον**: practically the port of Ephesus. The latter city had long gained the pre-eminence once enjoyed by Miletus, the former capital of Ionia, Pliny, *N. H.*, v., 31; *cf.* Herod., v., 28-36, for the revolt of Miletus against Persia and its disastrous consequences. Miletus had been the mother of some eighty colonies. Here Thales and Anaximander were born. The silting up of the Menander had altered its position even in St. Paul's day, and now it is several miles from the sea; Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 90; Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 501; Ramsay, ***Church in the Roman Empire***, p. 480.

Ver. 16. **ἔκρινε** (see critical note) . . . **παραπλεῦσαι τὴν Ἔ.**: "to sail past Ephesus," R.V., *i.e.*, without stopping there. The words have sometimes been interpreted as if St. Paul had control over a ship which he had hired himself, and could stop where he pleased, so Alford, Hackett, Rendall. But if so, there seems no definite reason for his going to Miletus at all, as it would have been shorter for him to have stopped at Ephesus, or to have made his farewell address there. According to Ramsay the probabilities are that Paul experienced at Troas some delay in continuing his journey. In starting from Troas he had therefore to choose a vessel making no break in its voyage except at Miletus, or a vessel intending to stop at Ephesus, perhaps as its destination, perhaps with a previous delay elsewhere. He determined for the former by the shortness of the time, and his desire to reach Jerusalem. He may no doubt have been also influenced to some extent by the thought that it would be difficult to tear himself away from a Church which had so many claims upon him, and by the reflection that hostilities might be aroused against him and his progress further impeded (*cf.* McGiffert, p. 339, who thinks that the author's reason for St. Paul's desire not to visit Ephesus "is entirely satisfactory"). — **χρονοτριβ.**: nowhere else in N.T. or in LXX, but in Arist., Plut.—**γένηται αὐτῷ**, *cf.* xi. 26 for construction. —**ἔσπευδε γὰρ**: if the verb expresses as the imperfect intimates the whole character of the journey (Blass, *Gram.*, p. 216), the repeated long delays at first sight seem inexplicable, but we know nothing definitely of the special circumstances which may have occasioned each delay, and we must not lose sight of the fact that the Apostle would have to guard against the constant uncertainty which would be always involved in a coasting voyage. Whether St. Paul reached

17. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μιλήτου πέμψας εἰς Ἔφεσον, μετεκαλέσατο τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας. 18. ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτόν,[1] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε, ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἐπέβην εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν,[2] πῶς μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον ἐγενόμην, 19. δουλεύων τῷ Κυρίῳ μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πολλῶν δακρύων καὶ πειρασμῶν, τῶν συμβάντων μοι ἐν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων·

[1] After αυτον (A)D (E, Gig., Vulg.) add ομοσε οντων αυτων, so Blass in β text. Harris, *Four Lectures*, etc., p. 61, thinks conflation here of α and β, so Gig. is double and reads "cum convenissent ad eum simulque essent".

[2] After Ασιαν D adds ως τριετιαν η και πλειον, the form of the phrase does not look original; τριετια occurs in xx. 31 and nowhere else in N.T. Vogel, it may be noted, classes it as one of the medical words in Luke's writings; see on ver. 31. For πως D has ποταπως, nowhere else in N.T.; but ποταπος six times in N.T., twice in Luke, only once in LXX.

Jerusalem in time we are not told. St. Chrysostom maintained that he did, see also Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 296, 297; McGiffert, p. 340 (on the other hand, Weiss, Renan, Felten). Mr. Turner, *Chron. of N. T.*, p. 422, holds that the Apostle probably reached Jerusalem just in time, while Farrar sees in xxiv. 11 an intimation that he arrived on the very eve of the Feast. The Pentacostal Feast was the most crowded, most attended by foreigners, *cf.* ii. 1.

Ver. 17. Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μ. π.: Apparently the Apostle could reckon on a stay of some days at Miletus. If we take into account the landing, the despatching a messenger to Ephesus, and the summoning and journeying of the elders to Miletus, probably, as Ramsay thinks, the third day of the stay at Miletus would be devoted to the presbyters.—μετεκαλέσατο: "called to him," R.V., *cf.* ii. 39 (and see on vii. 14, only in Acts), indicating authority or earnestness in the invitation.—τοὺς πρεσβ., see on xii. 25, and also below on ver. 28. For Pauline words and phraseology characterising the addresses, see following notes.

When Spitta remarks (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 252 ff.) that the speech at Miletus is inferior to no part of Acts, not even to the description of the voyage in chap. xxvii., in vividness of expression and intensity of feeling, he expresses the opinion of every unbiassed reader. He justly too lays stress upon the fact that while criticism admits the forcible and direct impression derived from the speech, it fails to account for it in the most natural way, *viz.*, by the fact that whilst for the addresses delivered in the Pisidian Antioch and in Athens we are dependent upon a report derived from hearsay, we are here in possession of the testimony of an eyewitness, and of a hearer of the speech (p. 252). Spitta (p. 254) defends the speech against the usual objections. It is disappointing to find that Hilgenfeld is content to regard the whole speech as interpolated by his "author to Theophilus". Clemen refers the whole speech to his R. or to R.A.; thus whilst ver. 19a is referred to R., 19b with its reference to the plots of the Jews is ascribed to R.A. (Redactor Antijudaicus); Jüngst ascribes ver. 19b from the words καὶ δακρύων . . . Ἰουδ. to the Redactor, but the previous part of the chap. xxi. to ταπεινοφροσύνης, ver. 19, to his source A. So ver. 38 with its reference to ver. 25 is referred to the Redactor; whilst Clemen refers ver. 38a to his R.A., 38b to R.

Ver. 18. ὑμεῖς: "ye yourselves," R.V., *ipsi*, emphatic, *cf.* x. 37, xv. 7.—ἀπὸ π. ἡ.: to be connected with what follows, although it is quite possible that the word may hold a middle place (Alford), connected partly with ἐπίσ. and partly with ἐγεν.—ἐπέβην: "set foot in Asia," R.V., only in Acts, except Matt. xxi. 5, also with the dative of place, Acts xxv. 1, but the local meaning is doubtful (LXX, Josh. xiv. 9). Rendall renders "I took ship for Asia," but although the expression elsewhere refers to a voyage, *cf.* xxi. 2, 4, 6, xxvii. 2, it is not always so used, *e.g.*, xxv. 1.—πῶς μεθ᾽ ὑ. . . . ἐγεν., *cf.* vii. 38 (*versor cum*), ix. 19, Mark xvi. 10. Bethge points out that the phrase is always used of intimate association and contrasts the less intimate significance of σύν. See also critical note and reading in D.

Ver. 19. δουλεύων: the word occurs

20. ὡς οὐδὲν ὑπεστειλάμην τῶν συμφερόντων, τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν καὶ διδάξαι ὑμᾶς δημοσίᾳ καὶ κατ' οἴκους, 21. διαμαρτυρόμενος

six times in St. Paul's Epistles of serving God, the Lord, Christ, 1 Thess. i. 9, Rom. xii. 11 (R., margin, **τῷ καιρῷ**), xiv. 18, xvi. 18, Ephes. vi. 7, Col. iii. 24 (once in Matthew and Luke, of serving God, Matt. vi. 24, Luke xvi. 13), and *cf.* St. Paul's expression **δοῦλος** of himself, Rom. i. 1, Gal. i. 10, Phil. i. 1, Tit. i. 1.—**μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφ.**: this use of **πᾶς** may be called eminently Pauline, *cf.* Ephes. i. 3, 8, iv. 2, vi. 18, 2 Cor. viii. 7, xii. 12, 1 Tim. iii. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 2, Tit. ii. 15, iii. 2 (see Hackett's note). **ταπειν.**, a word which may justly be called Pauline, as out of seven places in the N.T. it is used five times by St. Paul in his Epistles, and once in his address in the passage before us; Ephes. iv. 2, Phil. ii. 3, Col. ii. 18, 23, iii. 12 (elsewhere, only in 1 Peter v. 5). It will be noted that it finds a place in three Epistles of the First Captivity, although used once disparagingly, Col. iii. 18. In pagan ethics **ταπεινός** was for the most part a depreciatory characteristic, although some few notable exceptions may be quoted, Trench, *Synonyms*, i., 171 ff. In the LXX and Apocrypha it has a high moral significance and is opposed to **ὕβρις** in all its forms. The noun is not found either in LXX or Apocrypha, and the adjective **ταπεινόφρων** (1 Peter iii. 8) and the verb **ταπεινοφρονεῖν** (not in N.T.), although each found in LXX once, the former in Prov. xxix. 23 and the latter in Ps. cxxx. 2 (*cf.* instances in Aquila and Symmachus, Hatch and Redpath), cannot be traced in classical Greek before the Christian era, and then not in a laudatory sense. The noun occurs in Jos., *B. J.*, iv., 9, 2, but in the sense of pusillanimity, and also in Epictet., *Diss.*, iii., 24, 56, but in a bad sense (Grimm-Thayer). But for St. Paul as for St. Peter the life of Christ had conferred a divine honour upon all forms of lowliness and service, and every Christian was bidden to an imitation of One Who had said: **πραΰς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ**, Lightfoot on Phil. ii. 3; "Ethics" (T. B. Strong), Hastings' B.D., i., 786; Cremer, *Wörterbuch*, *sub v.* **ταπεινός**.—**δακρύων**, *cf.* ver. 31, 2 Cor. ii. 4, Phil. iii. 18. "Lachrymæ sanctæ . . . cum his tamen consistit *gaudium*": Bengel. St. Paul was no Stoic, for whom **ἀπάθεια** was a virtue, the accompaniment of wisdom and the passport to perfection; see Rom. xii. 15: "in every age the Christian temper has shivered at the touch of Stoic apathy". Here the word refers not to the Apostle's *outward* trials which were rather a source of joy, but to his sorrow of heart for his brethren and for the world, **ἔπασχε γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπολλυμένων**, Chrysostom.—**πειρασμῶν**, *cf.* St. Paul's own words, 1 Thess. iii. 3, Phil. i. 27, 2 Cor. i. 6, vi. 4-10, 2 Cor. xi. 26, **κινδύνοις ἐκ γενους** (Gal. iv. 14). In our Lord's own life and ministry there had been "temptations," Luke iv. 13, xxii. 28; and a beatitude rested upon the man who endured temptation, James i. 12 and 2. The noun is found no less than six times in St. Luke's Gospel, but only here in Acts. It occurs four times in St. Paul's Epistles, and may be fairly classed as Lucan-Pauline (Bethge). On its use in N.T. and LXX see Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 71 ff., and compare Mayor, *Epistle of St. James*, i., 2.—**ἐπιβ. τῶν 'Ι.**: evidently classed amongst the **πειρασμῶν**, Hatch, *u. s.*, although we must not suppose that St. Luke tells us of all the Apostle's dangers, trials and temptations here any more than elsewhere. Nothing of the kind is mentioned in connection definitely with the Ephesian Jews, "sed res minime dubia, xxi. 27," Blass. The noun has not been found in any classical author, but it occurs in Dioscorides, *Præf.*, i., see Grimm, *sub v.*, and several times in LXX, six times in Ecclus. and in 1 Macc. ii. 52.

Ver. 20. **ὑπεστειλάμην**: "how that I shrank not from declaring unto you anything that was profitable," R.V., *cf.* ver. 27, where **βουλήν** follows the same verb **ἀναγγέλλειν**, here followed by **οὐδέν**; on the construction see Page's note, *in loco*. The verb means to draw or shrink back from, out of fear or regard for another. In the same sense in classical Greek with **οὐδέν** or **μηδέν**: "locutio Demosthenica." Blass and Wendt, *cf.* also Jos., *B. J.*, i., 20, 21; *Vita*, 54; in LXX, Deut. i. 17, Exod. xxiii. 21, Job xiii. 8, Wisd. vi. 7, Hab. ii. 4; see Westcott on Heb. x. 38. It is used once in Gal. ii. 12 by Paul himself. It is possible that the verb may have been used metaphorically by St. Paul from its use in the active voice as a nautical term to reef or lower sail, and there would be perhaps a special appropriateness in the metaphor, as St. Paul had just landed, and the sails

Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησι τὴν εἰς[1] τὸν Θεὸν μετάνοιαν, καὶ πίστιν τὴν εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν. 22. καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ συναντήσοντά μοι μὴ εἰδώς, 23. πλὴν ὅτι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον κατὰ πόλιν διαμαρτύρεται λέγον, ὅτι δεσμά με καὶ θλίψεις μένουσιν.

[1] τον Θεον, *om.* art. ℵBCE, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass; after πιστιν ℵBCD 18, 36, Arm. *om.* την, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. At end of verse BHLP, Sah., Syr. H., Aethro., Lucif., so W.H., Weiss, Wendt (probably), read simply Ιησουν; but Tisch., R.V. text, W.H. marg. (Blass) Ι. Χριστον with ℵAC(D)E, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Boh., Arm., Aethpp. Blass reads gen. with D, δια του Κυριου; *cf.* iii. 16.

of the ship may have been before his eyes in speaking, to say nothing of the fact that the word would become familiar to him day by day on the voyage (see Humphry, Plumptre, Farrar); but it is not well to press this special metaphorical usage too far here, especially as the word is frequently used elsewhere of military rather than nautical matters (see Lightfoot's note on Gal ii. 12, and the use of the verb in Polybius).—τῶν συμφ., *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 35, x. 33; Pauline: "the things profitable for their salvation," a message not always agreeable, but which nevertheless the Apostle spoke with the same παῤῥησία (ὑποστέλλεσθαι is the opposite of παῤῥησιάζεσθαι, Page) which characterised him. Blass compares also the whole phrase ὑποστείλασθαι περὶ ὧν ὑμῖν συμφέρειν ἡγοῦμαι, Dem., i., 16.—δημ. καὶ κατ' οἴκους: *publice et privatim*, another and a further glimpse of the Apostle's work at Ephesus: publicly in the synagogue and in the school of Tyrannus, privately as in the Church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

Ver. 21. διαμαρτ., see above on p. 92; Lucan - Pauline. — μετάν. καὶ πίστιν, *cf.* the earliest notes in the preaching of Jesus, Mark i. 15, and these were equally the notes of the preaching of St. Peter and St. Paul alike. Whether Paul was preaching to Jews or Gentiles, to philosophers at Athens or to peasants at Lystra, the substance of his teaching was the same under all varieties of forms, *cf.* xiv. 15, xvii. 30, xxvi. 20. It is quite arbitrary to refer μετάνοια to the Gentile and πίστις to the Jew.—Ἰουδ. τε καὶ Ἕλλησι, Pauline, *cf.* Rom. i. 16, ii. 9, 10, iii. 9, 12, 1 Cor. i. 24.

Ver. 22. καὶ νῦν ἰδού: the exact phrase occurs again in ver. 25, and only once elsewhere in words ascribed to Paul, xiii. 11 (ἰδοὺ νῦν, twice in Paul only, 2 Cor. vi. 2).—δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι: "bound in the spirit," *compulsus animo*, Blass; so δέω in classical Greek, Xen., *Cyr.*, viii., 1, 12; Plato, *Rep.*, viii., p. 567 *e*, *cf.* xix. 21, xviii. 25, 1 Cor. v. 3. The fact that the Holy Spirit is specifically so called in ver. 23 seems to decide for the above rendering in this verse; but see Weiss on ver. 23; Ramsay also renders "constrained by the Spirit". Possibly πνεῦμα is named as that part of the man in closest union with the Spirit of God, *cf.* Rom. viii. 16, so that the sense is not affected. If we compare with xix. 21 the expression presents an advance in the Apostle's thought—his purpose becomes plainer, and the obligation more definite, as the Spirit witnesses with his spirit. The expression may mean that the Apostle regarded himself as already bound in the spirit, *i.e.*, although not outwardly bound, he yet knows and feels himself as one bound. For St. Paul's frequent use of πνεῦμα *cf.* Rom. i. 9, viii. 16, xii. 11, 1 Cor. ii. 11, v. 3, 4, xiv. 14, etc. Oecumenius and Theophylact take πνεύματι with πορεύομαι, *i.e.*, bound, as good as bound, I go by the leading of the Spirit to Jerusalem; but this seems forced. Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, ii., 5, remarks on the undesigned coincidence with Rom. xv. 30.—συναντήσοντά μοι: the verb is found only in Luke in N.T. (except Heb. vii. 10 as a quotation, Gen. xiv. 17), and only here in this sense, *cf.* Eccles. ii. 14, ix. 11, also Plut., *Sulla*, 2; Polyb., xx., 7, 14; middle, τὰ συναντώμενα. On the rarity of the future participle in Greek, and its use in this passage "an exception which proves the rule," see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 126.

Ver. 23. πλὴν ὅτι: The collocation is found nowhere else in N.T. except in Phil. i. 18, *only that* (so Alford, Lightfoot, W.H., see Lightfoot, *l. c.*, for parallels), *i.e.*, knowing one thing only, etc., "I do not ask to see the distant scene;

24.[1] ἀλλ' οὐδενὸς λόγον ποιοῦμαι, οὐδὲ ἔχω τὴν ψυχήν μου τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ, ὡς τελειῶσαι τὸν δρόμον μου μετὰ χαρᾶς, καὶ τὴν διακονίαν ἣν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ. 25. καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ οἶδα, ὅτι οὐκέτι ὄψεσθε τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ὑμεῖς πάντες, ἐν οἷς διῆλθον κηρύσσων τὴν[2] βασιλ-

[1] T.R. is supported by EHLP; Lachmann's reading, which is the same as Blass in β text, **αλλ' ουδενος λογον εχω ουδε ποιουμαι την ψυχην τιμιαν εμ.** (= D, with add. of **μοι** after **εχω** and **μου** after **ψυχην**), is found in ℵ^{c}A 13, 40, 43, 68, Vulg. But R.V. is supported by Tisch., W.H., Weiss, following ℵ*BCD^2, so Sah., Boh., Syr. P., Arm., Gig., Lucif., Or. See also Field., *Ot. Norv.*, iii., p. 85; Weiss, Codex D, p. 100. **ως τελειωσαι,** but W.H. (Weiss, Rendall) **ως τελειωσω** (-**σαι** W.H. mg.); see comment. Blass in **α** conjectures **ωστε τελειωσαι**; **τε** could easily drop out before the **τελ.** In β Blass reads **του τελειωσαι** with D; **ωστε** E; **ως το** C. **μετα χαρας** *om.* ℵABD 13, 40, 81, Vulg., several verss., Tisch., Blass, W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. After **διαμαρτ.** D, Sah., Gig., Lucif., Ephr. insert **Ιουδαιοις τε και Ελλησι,** see ver. 21.

[2] After **βασ.** ℵABC 13 omit **του Θ.**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. D, Sah., Hilg. read **του Ιησου** (Gig., Lucif. *domini I.*); Blass rejects—contrary to usage of Acts (Weiss).

one step enough for me," so from step to step **κατὰ πόλιν,** on his journey, St. Paul was warned and guided, *cf.* xxi. 4, 11.—**κατὰ πόλιν,** Lucan-Pauline; **κατά** used several times by Luke, alone amongst the synoptists, in his Gospel and in the Acts with this distributive force in connection with **πόλις**; Luke viii. 1, 4, xiii. 22, *cf.* xv. 21; in the text, as also in Titus i. 5; the only other passage in which the collocation occurs in N.T., the phrase is adopted by St. Paul.—**δεσμὰ καὶ θλίψεις**: **δεσμά** in St. Luke; Luke viii. 29, Acts xvi. 26, but it is noticeable that the two nouns are found together in Phil. i. 17, and in 2 Cor. i. 8. **θλίψις** is used of the affliction which befel the Apostle in Asia, including that of public danger, as well as illness and mental distress. On the variation between masculine and neuter in **δεσμός** and in other nouns see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 28.—**μένουσιν**: only twice in N.T., with accusative of the person, here and in ver. 5.

Ver. 24. See critical note. "But I hold not my life of any account, as dear unto myself," R.V., reading **λόγου** for **λόγον**, omitting **οὐδὲ ἔχω** and **μου**. Both verbs **ἔχω** and **ποιοῦμαι** are found in similar phrases in LXX, Tobit vi. 16, Job xxii. 4, so also in classical Greek (Wetstein). The former verb is used in N.T. as = *habere*, *æstimare*, *cf.* Luke xiv. 18 and by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 29.—**ὡς τελειῶσαι,** see critical note. "So that I may accomplish my course," R.V., "in comparison of accomplishing my course," margin. Difficulty has arisen because this is the only case in the N.T. in which **ὡς** appears in a final clause, Burton, p. 85 (but see W.H., Luke ix. 52, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N. T.*, p. 74 (1893)). The whole phrase is strikingly Pauline, *cf.* Phil. iii. 12, where the same verb immediately seems to suggest the **δρόμος** (Alford), Gal. ii. 2, 1 Cor. ix. 24, 2 Tim. iv. 7.—**μετὰ χαρᾶς,** see critical note, *cf.* Phil. i. 4, Col. i. 11, Heb. x. 34. The words are strongly defended by Ewald.—**τὴν διακονίαν,** see above on p. 422 "saepe apud Paulum," *cf.* Rom. xi. 13. Apostleship is often so designated, Acts i. 17, 25, xxi. 19, 2 Cor. iv. 1, and other instances in Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 204.—**διαμαρτ.**, *cf.* vi. 4, where the **διακ. τοῦ λόγου** is the highest function of the Apostles.

Ver. 25. **καὶ νῦν,** see on ver. 22.—**οἶδα**: no infallible presentiment or prophetic inspiration, but a personal conviction based on human probabilities, which was overruled by subsequent events. The word cannot fairly be taken to mean more than this, for in the same context the Apostle himself had distinctly disclaimed a full knowledge of the future, ver. 23. And if **οἶδα** is to be pressed here into a claim of infallible knowledge, it is difficult to see why it should not be also so pressed in Phil. i. 25, where the Apostle expresses his sure conviction **πεποιθὼς οἶδα** of a release from his Roman imprisonment, *cf.* xxvi. 27 where Paul uses the same verb in expressing his firm persuasion of Agrippa's belief, but surely not any infallible knowledge of Agrippa's heart. For a full discussion of the word

είαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. 26.[1] διὸ μαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ, ὅτι καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων· 27.[2] οὐ γὰρ ὑπεστειλάμην τοῦ

[1] For διο ℵABEP read διοτι, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt; but Blass as T.R. But in β text Blass reads (instead of διο . . . οτι) αχρι ουν της σημερον ημερας with D[1] (possibly point not grasped—Weiss). After καθαρος ℵBCDE, Vulg., Syr. H., Sah., Ir[int.], Lucif. read ειμι, so Tisch., R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt; T.R. = xviii. 6 (Wendt).

[2] Instead of ου γαρ υπεστ. του μη αναγ. υμιν Gig., Lucif., so Blass in β, read και ου διελιπον κηρυσσων. Gig., Lucif. also omit υμιν, but Blass retains with emphasis as last word in verse, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Alford, following ℵ*BC(D) 13, 81, Vulg.

see amongst recent writers Steinmetz, *Die zweite römische Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus*, p. 14 ff. (1897); Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 436.—οὐκέτι ὄψεσθε: "shall no longer see," see Rendall, whereas A. and R.V. rendering "no more," οὐκέτι, give the impression that St. Paul definitely affirms that he would never return. Rendall compares Rom. xv. 23, but on the other hand Acts viii. 39 seems to justify the usual rendering. The Apostle's increasing anxiety is quite natural when we remember how even in Corinth he had thought of his journey to Jerusalem with apprehension, Rom xv. 30, Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, ii., 5. On the inference drawn by Blass from this passage as to the early date of Acts, see his remarks *in loco*, and *Proleg.*, p. 3, and to the same effect, Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 407, fifth edition.—διῆλθον: the word taken in the sense of a missionary tour, see xiii. 6, indicates that representatives not only of Ephesus but of other Churches were present, hence ὑμεῖς πάντες, διῆλθον κηρύσσων, coalescing into a single idea; the Apostle could not say διῆλθον ὑμᾶς, and so we have ἐν ὑμῖν substituted. If the word is Lucan it is also Pauline, and that too in this particular sense, *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 5.—κηρ. τὴν βασ.: if Lucan, also Pauline—*cf.* Col. iv. 11. As our Lord had sent His first disciples to preach (κηρύσσειν) the kingdom of God, and as He Himself had done the same, Luke viii. 1, ix. 2, we cannot doubt that St. Paul would lay claim to the same duty and privilege; in his first Epistle, 1 Thess. ii. 12, as in his latest, 2 Tim. iv. 18, the kingdom of God, its present and its future realisation, is present to his thoughts; in his first journey, xiv. 22, no less than in his third it finds a place in his teaching and exhortation; in his first Epistle, 1 Thess. ii. 9, as in his latest, 2 Tim. i. 11, iv. 17, he does the work of a herald, κῆρυξ. No less than five times in 1 Corinthians, one of the Epistles written during his stay at Ephesus, the phrase βασιλεία Θεοῦ occurs (it is not found at all in 2 Corinthians).

Ver. 26. If we read διότι, critical note, we have a word which is not used by the other Evangelists, but three times in Luke's Gospel and five times in Acts; in each passage in Acts it is referred to Paul, xiii. 35, xviii. 10 (2), xx. 26, xxii. 18, and it occurs nine or ten times in Paul's Epistles. On account of the Apostle's approaching departure, such a reckoning is demanded.—μαρτύρομαι: only in Luke and Paul, and in both cases in Acts referred to Paul, here and in xxvi. 22, Gal. v. 3, Ephes. iv. 17, 1 Thess. ii. 12, "I protest," properly "I call to witness," but never = μαρτυρῶ in classical Greek; in Judith vii. 28 we have the fuller construction, of which this use of the dative here is a remnant, Lightfoot, *Gal.*, v., 3. The verb occurs once more in 1 Macc. ii. 56 S (but AR, *al.*).—ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ: Attic, τήμερον, *i.e.*, ἡμ. with pronom. prefix (*cf.* Matt. xxviii. 15 but ἡμέρας [W. H.]), the very day of my departure; the exact phrase occurs twice elsewhere, but both times in Paul's writings, 2 Cor. iii. 14, W. H., Rom. xi. 8 (quotation); "Hoc magnam declarandi vim habet," Bengel. Several times in LXX, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xiii., 2, 3, found frequently in classical Greek.—καθαρὸς ἀπὸ, *cf.* xvii. 6, where a similar phrase is used by St. Paul; the adjective is found seven times in St. Paul's Epistles, but only here and in xvii. 6 in Luke's writings. In LXX, *cf.* Job xiv. 4, Prov. xx. 9, Tobit iii. 14, Susannah, ver. 46; in *Psalms of Solomon*, xvii. 41, and, for the thought, Ezek. iii. 18-20. In classics for the most part with genitive, but in later Greek with ἀπό, see however Blass, *Gram.*, p. 104, and instances from Demosthenes; and Deissmann for instances from papyri, *Neue Bibelstudien*, pp. 24, 48; Ramsay, "Greek of the Early Church," etc.; *Expository Times*, December, 1898, p. 108. Only a Paul

μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ. **28.** προσέχετε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν[1] τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο

[1] **του Θεου**, so ℵB 68, Vulg., Syr. H. (Syr. Pesh. MSS.), Epiph., Bas., Ps.-Ath., Theod.-Mops., Cyr.-Al.: **του κυριου** AC*DE, 13, 15, 36, 40, 69, 110, 118 (eight others), Gig., Sah., Boh., Syr. H. mg., Arm., Ir[int]., Const., Ath., Did., Chrys., Jer., Lucif. Here W.H., Weiss have **Θεου**, so Bengel, Alford in later editions; Tisch., R.V. marg., Blass, Wendt, Hilg. **κυριου**; **του κυριου και Θεου** C[3]HLP, most mins., Slavonic, Theophl.; and there are other variations. Against **Θεου** it is objected that St. Paul would not apply the word to Christ, although we have in Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, ii., 1; Ignat., *Ephes.*, i., 1; *Rom.*, vi., 3; Tert., *Ad Uxor.*, ii., 3; Clem. Alex., *Quis dives salv.*, xxxiv., similar language; but there are also passages in the N.T., *e.g.*, Rom. ix. 5, Tit. ii. 13, in which there is at least a very considerable amount of evidence for referring **Θεος** to Jesus, "and when it is objected that these are disputed passages, it is just to remind the objector that this will exclude his original statement as well as the rebuttal of it" (Warfield). The evidence in its favour comes to us afforded by a strong combination (*cf.* too the intrinsic evidence in its favour from Ps. lxxiv. 2, W.H., *App.*, 99); so far from the unusual nature of the phrase being regarded as fatal to its genuineness, it might be fairly maintained that **Θεου** as it is the more difficult reading is also on that very ground recommended to our confidence. We should also give weight to the fact that the words **εκκλησια του θ.**, which find a place in this address full of Pauline expressions, are found no less than eleven times in St. Paul's Epistles, but that **εκκ. του κυριου** is not found at all in the N.T. (we have **αιμα του Κ.** once in 1 Cor. xi. 27). Weiss endeavours to solve the difficulty by taking **ιδιου**, masc., the blood of his own; *cf.* Rom. viii. 32. But while disagreeing with this solution, Hort, in W.H., *App.*, 99, thinks it by no means impossible that **υιου** dropped out after **του ιδιου** (its insertion solves every difficulty (so too Rendall)). Hort, reading **δια του αιματος του ιδιου**, renders "through the blood that was His own," *i.e.*, His Son's, following ℵABCDE 13, 36, 40, Vulg., so too Weiss, R.V.; *cf.* the language which finds repeated expression in the *Apost. Const.*, and embodies a conception familiar to us in one of our Ember Collects (1662). See further W.H., *u. s.;* Dr. Ezra Abbot, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, p. 313 ff. (1876); Page, *in loco;* Wendt (1899), p. 335; Warfield, *Textual Criticism*, pp. 184-189, 5th edit. Mr. Page, *Classical Review*, p. 317, 1897, warmly approves of the note of Dr. Blass on Acts xx. 28, and of his support of the reading **Κυριου**, on the ground that **Θεος** would be easily substituted for it in days when "moris factum erat ut **Θεος** Jesus diceretur"; but is this explanation so certain? Dr. Hort indicates that the prevalent instinct would be to change **του Θεου** into **του κ.**, and not *vice versâ*, as the fear of sanctioning "Monarchian," or (in later times) "Monophysite" language would outweigh any other doctrinal impulse.

could say this with fitness; we could not dare to say it, Chrys., *Hom.*, xliv.

Ver. 27. **ὑπεστ.**, see above on ver. 20.—**τὴν β. τοῦ Θεοῦ**, see on ii. 23, and *cf.* especially Ephes. i. 11 for the phrase, and iii. 4 for the thought. No Epistle excels that to the Ephesians in the richness of its thoughts, and in its conception of a divine purpose running through the ages; no Epistle dwells more fully upon the conception of the Church as the Body of Christ, or exhorts more touchingly to diligence in keeping the unity of the Spirit, or insists more practically upon the sanctifying power of the One Spirit, and the sense of a divine membership in every sphere of human life. The rich and full teaching of the Epistle is addressed to men who are able to understand the Apostle's knowledge of the mystery of Christ; in other words, to those to whom he had announced more fully than to others the counsel of God. The Ephesian Epistle may have been an encyclical letter, but it was addressed principally to the Ephesians as the representatives of the leading Church of the province of Asia. See amongst recent writers Gore, *Ephesians*, pp. 42, 43; and Lock, "Ephesians," Hastings' B.D., p. 718.—**ὑμῖν**: emphatically at the end, W.H.; this revelation had been made to the presbyters before him, and the responsibility would rest with them of communicating it to others when their spiritual father had left them.

διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος. 29. ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα τοῦτο, ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ

Ver. 28. **προσέχετε . . . ἑαυτοῖς** (*cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 16), Luke xvii. 3, xxi. 34, Acts v. 35, viii. 6. In LXX with **ἐμαυτῷ**, Gen. xxiv. 6, Exod. x. 28, Deut. iv. 9. "Non tantum jubet eos gregi attendere, sed primum sibi ipsis; neque enim aliorum salutem sedulo unquam curabit, qui suam negliget . . . cum sit ipse pars gregis," Calvin, *in loco*, and also *Chrys.* (Bethge, p. 144).—**ποιμνίῳ**: the figure was common in the O.T. and it is found in St. Luke, xii. 32, in St. John, in St. Peter, but it is said that St. Paul does not use it, *cf.* however Ephes. iv. 11, where, and nowhere else, he writes **καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκε . . . τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας.**—**ἐν ᾧ**: "in the which," R.V., not "over which".—**ὑμᾶς** is again emphatic, but the presbyters were still part of the flock, see Calvin, *u. s.*—**ἔθετο**, *cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 28, 1 Tim. i. 12, ii. 7, 2 Tim. i. 11. There is no ground whatever for supposing that the **ἐπισκόποι** here mentioned were not ordained, as the words **τὸ Π. τὸ Ἅγ. ἔθετο** may be used without any reference whatever to the actual mode of appointment. Dr. Hort allows that here the precedent of vi. 3-6 may have been followed, and the appointment of the elders may have been sealed, so to speak, by the Apostle's prayers and laying-on-of-hands, *Ecclesia*, pp. 99, 100. The thought of appointment by the Holy Spirit, although not excluding the ordination of Apostles, may well be emphasised here for the sake of solemnly reminding the Presbyters of their responsibility to a divine Person, and that they stand in danger of losing the divine gifts imparted to them in so far as they are unfaithful to their office.—**ποιμαίνειν**: "to tend" as distinct from **βόσκειν** "to feed," although the act of feeding as well as of governing is associated also with the former word; see on John xxi. 16. The figurative pastoral language in this passage was probably not unknown as applied to Jewish elders, Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 282; Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 101.—**ἐπισκόπους**: the word, which occurs five times in the N.T., is applied four times to officers of the Christian Church: in this passage, again at Ephesus in 1 Tim. iii. 2, at Philippi in Phil. i. 1, at Crete in Titus i. 7; and once to our Lord Himself, 1 Peter ii. 25 (*cf.* the significant passage, Wisdom i. 6, where it is applied to God). In the LXX it is used in various senses, *e.g.*, of the overseers of Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12, 17; of taskmasters or exactors, Isa. lx. 17; of minor officers, Neh. xi. 9, 14; of officers over the house of the Lord, 2 Kings xi. 18; and in 1 Macc. i. 51 of overseers or local commissioners of Antiochus Epiphanes to enforce idolatry, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 5, 4. In classical Greek the word is also used with varied associations. Thus in Attic Greek it was used of a commissioner sent to regulate a new colony or subject city like a Spartan "harmost," *cf.* Arist., *Av.*, 1032, and Boeckh, *Inscr.*, 73 (in the Roman period **ἐπίμεληταί**); but it was by no means confined to Attic usage. In another inscription found at Thera in the Macedonian period mention is made of two **ἐπίσκοποι** receiving money and putting it out at interest, and again at Rhodes, in the second century B.C., **ἐπίσ.** are mentioned in inscriptions, but we do not know their functions, although Deissmann claims that in one inscription, *I. M. A. e.*, 731, the title is used of a sacred office in the Temple of Apollo, but he declines to commit himself to any statement as to the duties of the office: *cf.* also Loening, *Die Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums*, pp. 21, 22; Gibson, "Bishop," B.D.[2]; Gwatkin, "Bishop," Hastings' B.D.; Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 57; Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 95. M. Waddington has collected several instances of the title in inscriptions found in the *Haurân*, *i.e.*, the south-eastern district of the ancient Bashan (see the references to Le Bas-Waddington in Loening, *u. s.*, p. 22, note, and Gore, *Church and the Ministry*, p. 402), but none of these give us precise and definite information as to the functions of the **ἐπίσκοποι.** But it is important to note that M. Waddington is of opinion that the comparative frequency of the title in the *Haurân* points to the derivation of the Christian use of the word from Syria or Palestine rather than from the organisation of the Greek municipality (*Expositor*, p. 99, 1887). It has been urged that the officers of administration and finance in the contemporary non-Christian associations, the clubs and guilds so common in the Roman empire, were chiefly known by one or other of two names, **ἐπιμελητής** or **ἐπίσκοπος**, Hatch, *B.L.*, p. 36, and hence the inference has been drawn that the primary function of the primitive **ἐπίσκοποι** in the Christian Church was

ποιμνίου· 30. καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσονται ἄνδρες λαλοῦντες διεστραμμένα, τοῦ ἀποσπᾷν τοὺς μαθητὰς ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. 31. διὸ

the administration of finance; but Dr. Hatch himself has denied that he laid any special stress upon the financial character of the **ἐπίσκοποι**, although he still apparently retained the description of them as "officers of *administration and* finance," see *Expositor*, *u. s.*, p. 99, note, thus adopting a position like that of Professor Harnack, who would extend the administration duties beyond finance to all the functions of the community. But however this may be (see below), there is certainly no ground for believing that the title **ἐπίσκοπος** in the Christian Church was ever limited to the care of finance (see the judgment of Loening on this view, *u. s.*, p. 22), or that such a limitation was justified by the secular use of the term. If indeed we can point to any definite influence which connects itself with the introduction of the title into the Christian Church, it is at least as likely, one might say more likely when we consider that the Apostles were above all things Jews, that the influence lies in the previous use in the LXX of **ἐπίσκοπος** and **ἐπισκοπή**, and the direct appeal of St. Clement of Rome, *Cor.*, xlii., 5, to Isaiah (LXX) lx. 17 in support of the Christian offices of **ἐπίσκοποι** and **διάκονοι** may be fairly quoted as pointing to such an influence. But whatever influences were at work in the adoption of the term by the early believers, it became, as it were, baptised into the Christian Church, and received a Christian and a higher spiritual meaning. This one passage in Acts xx. 28 is sufficient to show that those who bore the name were responsible for the spiritual care of the Church of Christ, and that they were to feed His flock with the bread of life (see the striking and impressive remarks of Dr. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 266). This one passage is also sufficient to show that the "presbyter" and "bishop" were at first practically identical, *cf.* vv. 17 and 28, Steinmetz, *Die zweite römische Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus*, p. 173, 1897, and that there is no room for the separation made by Harnack between the two, see his *Analecta zu Hatch*, p. 231, or for his division between the "patriarchal" office of the **πρεσβύτεροι** and the "administrative" office of the **ἐπίσκοποι** (Loening, *u. s.*, pp. 23-27; Sanday, *Expositor*, *u. s.*, pp. 12, 104; Gwatkin, *u. s.*, p. 302). In the Pastoral Epistles the identity between the two is even more clearly marked, although Harnack cannot accept Tit. i. 5-7 as a valid proof, because he believes that vv. 7-9 were interpolated into the received text by a redactor; *cf.* also for proof of the same 1 Tim. iii. 1-7, 8-13, v. 17-19; 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, although in this last passage Harnack rejects the reading **ἐπισκοποῦντες** (and it must be admitted that it is not found in ℵB, and that it is omitted by Tisch. and W. H.), whilst he still relegates the passages in the Pastoral Epistles relating to bishops, deacons and Church organisation to the second quarter of the second century, *Chron.*, i., p. 483, note. In St. Clement of Rome, *Cor.*, xlii., 4, xliv., 1, 4, 5, the terms are still synonymous, and by implication in *Didaché*, xv., 1 (Gwatkin, *u. s.*, p. 302, and Gore, *u. s.*, p. 409, note). But if we may say with Bishop Lightfoot that a new phraseology began with the opening of a new century, and that in St. Ignatius the two terms are used in their more modern sense, it should be borne in mind that the transition period between Acts and St. Ignatius is exactly marked by the Pastoral Epistles, and that this fact is in itself no small proof of their genuineness. In these Epistles Timothy and Titus exercise not only the functions of the ordinary presbyteral office, but also functions which are pre-eminent over those of the ordinary presbyter, although there is no trace of any special title for these Apostolic delegates, as they may be fairly called. The circumstances may have been temporary or tentative, but it is sufficiently plain that Timothy and Titus were to exercise not only a general discipline, but also a jurisdiction over the other ministers of the Church, and that to them was committed not only the selection, but also the ordination of presbyters (Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 151 ff.; Bright, *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life*, p. 28 ff., 1898; *Church Quarterly Review*, xlii., pp. 265-302).—**τὴν ἐκκ. τοῦ Θεοῦ**, see critical note.—**περιεποιήσατο**, *cf.* Psalm lxxiv. 2. It has been thought that St. Paul adopts and adapts the language of this Psalm; in comparing his language with that of the LXX we can see how by the use of the word **ἐκκλησία** instead of **συναγωγή** in the Psalm he connects the new Christian Society with the ancient

γρηγορεῖτε, μνημονεύοντες ὅτι τριετίαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν οὐκ ἐπαυσάμην μετὰ δακρύων νουθετῶν ἕνα ἕκαστον. 32. καὶ τανῦν παρατίθεμαι ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί,[1] τῷ Θεῷ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, τῷ δυναμένῳ ἐποικοδομῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι ἡμῖν κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις

[1] τῳ Θεῳ, but B 33, 68, Sah., Boh., so Gig., W.H. text, R.V. marg., and Weiss read τῳ Κυριῳ (Wendt doubtful), Alford, Tisch., Blass, R.V. text follow T.R., so W.H. marg. For εποικοδ. ℵABCDE 18 read οικοδ., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, so Blass in β; DE, Gig. οικοδ. υμας.

ἐκκλησία of Israel, whilst in employing περιεποιήσατο instead of ἐκτήσω (LXX), and retaining the force of ἐλυτρώσω, LXX, by reference to the λύτρον of the new Covenant, a deeper significance is given to the Psalmist's language: a greater redemption than that of Israel from the old Egyptian bondage had been wrought for the Christian Ecclesia (Hort, *Ecclesia*, pp. 14 and 102). The verb περιποιεῖσθαι only in St. Luke and St. Paul in N.T., but in a different sense in the former, Luke xvii. 33. In 1 Tim. iii. 13 (1 Macc. vi. 44) it is found in the sense of "gaining for oneself," so in classical Greek. But it is to be noted that the cognate noun περιποίησις is associated by St. Paul in his Ephesian letter with the thought of redemption, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποίησεως "unto the redemption of *God's* own possession," R.V.—τοῦ ἰδ. τοῦ αἵμ., see critical note.

Ver. 29. ἐγὼ γὰρ οἶδα, see critical note. Baur and Zeller could only see in this assertion a *vaticinium post eventum*—the heresiarchs are portrayed in the general expressions in vogue in the second century; so too Renan thinks that the writer gives us the ideas of a later date, although he does not carry us further than 75-80 A.D. But if we accept the early date of the *Didaché*, that document is quite sufficient to show us that similar phraseology to that in the address before us was current in the Church at an earlier date than Baur and Zeller supposed. If St. Paul had been engaged all his life in struggling with false teachers, it would have been inconceivably short-sighted if he had thought that such dangers would cease after his departure, and still more inconceivable if with such presentiments he had neglected to warn the Church. The vagueness of the description of the heretical teachers is in itself a proof of genuineness, and a writer of a later date would have made it far less general, and more easily to be identified with some current error. It has been further objected by Zeller and Overbeck, and even by Wendt, that it is strange that with present opponents before him, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9, St. Paul should speak only of the future; but whilst he had himself been present among them he had been their protector against their enemies, but now that he was about to withdraw from them nothing was more natural than that he should warn them against the subtle attacks which might be more easily made when his own careful superintendence was no more.—εἰσελεύσονται: so men outside the fold—the *when* of their entrance is not specified precisely, but the words were amply fufilled in the presence of the emissaries of the Judaisers, creeping in from the Jewish communities into the Churches of Asia, as they had slunk into the Churches of Galatia, *cf.* Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 130-146, on the teaching of the Judaisers and its evil influence in the Pastoral Epistles. There is at all events no need to refer the words with Grotius to outward persecution, such as that of Nero.—ἄφιξιν, *i.e.*, his departure from amongst them (not necessarily including his death), not arrival, although the latter meaning attaches to the word in classical Greek, so too 3 Macc. vii. 18; Jos., *Ant.*, iv., 8, 47 (but see both Alford and Blass, *in loco*).—λύκοι: continuing the imagery of ver. 28, *cf.* Matt. vii. 15, Luke x. 3, John x. 12; so in the O.T. λύκοι of presumptuous and cruel rulers and judges, Ezek. xxii. 27, Zeph. iii. 3. The similar kind of language used by Ignat., *Philadelph.*, ii., 1, 2; Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i., 58; Iren., *Adv. Hær.*, i., Præf. 2, may well have been borrowed from this, not *vice versâ* as Zeller maintained; but such imagery would no doubt be widely known from its employment in O. and N.T. alike.—βαρεῖς, *cf.* for the sense of the adjective, Hom., *Il.*, i., 89; Xen., *Ages.*, xi., 12; so too Diog. Laert., i., 72.—μὴ φειδ.: *litotes*, *cf.* John x. 12. The verb occurs six times in St. Paul's Epistles, twice in Romans and four

πᾶσιν. 33. ἀργυρίου ἢ χρυσίου ἢ ἱματισμοῦ οὐδενὸς ἐπεθύμησα· 34. αὐτοὶ[1] δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι ταῖς χρείαις μου καὶ τοῖς οὖσι μετ' ἐμοῦ

[1] δε omit. after αυτοι, W.H., R.V. on overwhelming evidence. After χρειαις μου Blass adds πασαις in β; D has πασιν.

times in the Corinthian Epistles (only twice elsewhere in N.T. in 2 Pet.).

Ver. 30. **καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν**: αὐτῶν adds emphasis, "from your own selves". The Pastoral Epistles afford abundant evidence of the fulfilment of the words, *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. i. 15, ii. 17, iii. 8, 13. To some extent the Apostolic warning was effectual at all events in Ephesus itself, *cf.* Rev. ii. 2; Ignat., *Ephes.*, vi., 2.—**ἀναστήσονται**: common word in Acts, see on v. 17, used here perhaps as in v. 36.—**διεστραμμένα**, *cf.* LXX, Deut. xxxii. 5. The verb is found twice in Luke ix. 41 (Matt. xvii. 17), xxiii. 2, three times in Acts xiii. 8, 10, and once again by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 15, in a similar sense, *cf.* Arist., *Pol.*, iii., 16, 5, viii., 7, 7; Arrian, *Epict.*, iii., 6, 8.—**ἀποσπᾷν τοὺς μαθητάς**: "the disciples," R.V. with art. meaning that they would try and draw away those that were already Christians, **μαθ.** always so used in Acts. **ἀποσ.** to tear away from that to which one is already attached; used by St. Matt. xxvi. 51, and elsewhere only by St. Luke xxii. 41, Acts xxi. 1; compare with the genitive of purpose after ἀνίστημι, 2 Chron. xx. 23.—**ὀπίσω αὐτῶν**, "after themselves," *cf.* v. 37, not after Christ, Matt. iv. 19.

Ver. 31. **γρηγ.**: the pastoral metaphor continued; verb used four times by St. Paul, and it may well have passed into familiar use in the early Church by the solemn injunction of our Lord on the Mount of Olives to watch, *cf.* also Luke xii. 37, 1 Pet. v. 8, Rev. iii. 2, 3, xvi. 15, and the names *Gregory*, *Vigilantius*, amongst the early converts.—**τριετίαν**: the three years may be used summarily *i.e.*, as speaking in round numbers, or literally. It would have seemed out of place in such an appeal to say "two years and three months," or whatever the exact time may have been. The intention was to give a practical turn to this watchfulness: *triennium celeste*, Bengel. The word is regarded by Vogel as a decided employment of a medical term by Luke from Dioscorides, see also to the same effect Meyer-Weiss, *Evangelium des Lukas*, note on i., 1. The word is found only here in N.T., not at all in LXX, but used by Theophr., Plut., Artem.—**νύκτα**: perhaps placed first because it corresponded more closely to the idea of watching against attacks, or perhaps because it emphasised the ceaselessness of the Apostle's labours, *cf.* xxvi. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10, 1 Tim. v. 5, 2 Tim. i. 3.—**μετὰ δακρύων**, *cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 4, Chrys., *Hom.*, xliv. "Quod cor tamen saxatum, ut hisce lacrimis non emolliatur? qui non fleat flente Paulo?" Corn. à Lapide; see also Farrar, *St. Paul*, ii., 283.—**νουθετῶν**: only here in Acts, but seven times in St. Paul's Epistles, but nowhere else in N.T., "admonish," R.V. In classical Greek it is joined both with παρακαλεῖν and κολάζειν; St. Paul too used it in gentleness, or "with a rod". In LXX, Job iv. 3; Wisd. xi. 10, xii. 2.—**ἕνα ἕκαστον**, 2 Cor. xi. 29 and John x. 3; **εἷς ἕκαστος** twice in St. Luke's Gospel, iv. 40, xvi. 5, six times in Acts, five times in St. Paul's Epistles (only once elsewhere in N.T., Matt. xxvi. 22, but not in T.R.).

Ver. 32. **καὶ τὰ νῦν**, see above on iv. 29.—**παρατίθ.**, *cf.* xiv. 23.—**τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χ. αὐτοῦ**: as in the fourth Gospel, John i. 14-17, so here and in the Epistle to the Ephesians, we find great stress laid on χάρις, but we cannot conclude with Stier and others that in the word λόγος we have any reference here to the Word of St. John's Gospel, although the similarity between St. John's doctrine of the Word and St. Paul's conception of our Lord's Person is very close elsewhere; the thought here is however closely akin to that of St. James i. 21 (Heb. iv. 12). In his earliest Epistle the Apostle had spoken of the Word, 1 Thess. ii. 13, ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν. The Word here is able to build up and to give, etc., which certainly seems to ascribe to it a quasi-personal character, even more so than in 2 Tim. iii. 15, where the Apostle uses a somewhat similar phrase of the O.T. Scriptures, **τὰ δυνάμενά** (the same verb as here) **σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν κ.τ.λ.** The same phrase as here occurs in Acts xiv. 3, which points to its derivation from one imbued with Paul's words and habits of thought, if not from the Apostle himself (Alford). Weiss and others refer **τῷ δυν.** to **τῷ Θεῷ** (**Κυρίῳ**, see critical note), *cf.* Rom. xvi. 25, Ephes. iii. 20, Gal. iii. 21, on the ground that although **ἐποικοδομῆσαι** (**οἰκοδ.**) may re-

ὑπηρέτησαν αἱ χεῖρες αὗται. 35.[1] πάντα ὑπέδειξα ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὕτω κοπιῶντας δεῖ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων, μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπε, "Μακάριόν ἐστι διδόναι

[1] Lach. and Blass add παντα to the previous verse, so Overbeck, Nösgen, Bethge (Wendt doubtful). For των λογων LP read τον λογον; Bengel του λογου; no doubt changes made because only one saying is quoted. D[1], Gig. read μακαριος εστι μαλλον διδ. η λαμβ.; Blass in β reads μακαριον μαλλον τον διδοντα υπερ τον λαμβανοντα; *cf.* Const. Apost., iv., 3, μακαριον ειπεν ειναι τον διδοντα ηπερ (υπερ Anastas. Sin.) τον λαμβανοντα.

fer to λόγος, yet the λόγος cannot be said δοῦναι κληρ. To the latter phrase Bethge, p. 158, strives to find some Scriptural analogies in the work attributed to ὁ λόγος, *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 18, John xii. 48. But it is best and simplest on the whole to regard the entire phrase τῷ Θ. καὶ τῷ λ. as one, "quasi una notio sunt; agit enim Deus per verbum suum," Blass; so Page.—ἐποικοδ., Ephes. ii. 20, in the passive, see critical note. Whether we read the compound or the simple verb, the metaphor of building is prominent in the Ephesian Epistle ii. 21, iv. 12, 16, 29, as also in 1 Cor., *cf.* iii. 10 (2), 12, 14; iii. 9, xiv. 3, 5, 12, 26, and *cf.* 2 Cor. v. 1, x. 8, xii. 19, xiii. 10. See note above on ix. 31. τὴν κληρ., vii. 5, see note; nowhere else in Acts, *cf.* for the thought Ephes. iii. 18, i. 11; and words elsewhere spoken by St. Paul, Acts xxvi. 18; the word itself occurs three times in Ephesians, i. 14, 18, v. 5. In Ephes. iii. 18 we have closely conjoined with κληρ. the ἡ βασιλ. τοῦ χ., *cf.* St. Paul's words ver. 25 above. The word is frequent in *Psalms of Solomon*, *cf.* xiv. 6, 7, where the inheritance of the saints is contrasted with the inheritance of sinners in the Messianic consummation, and also xv. 11, 12, xvii. 26; see further on the word, Kennedy, p. 100.

Ver. 33. *Cf.* 1 Sam. xii. 3, ἱματ., frequent in LXX, in N.T. only in Luke and Paul (except John xix. 24, quotation); Luke vii. 25, ix. 29, 1 Tim. ii. 9. In 1 Macc. xi. 24 we have silver, gold and raiment, joined together as in this verse, describing Eastern riches, *cf.* James v. 2, 3.—ἐπεθ., "he takes away that which is the root of all evil, the love of money"; he says not "I have not taken," but "not even *coveted*," Chrys., *Hom.*, xlv.

Ver. 34. αὐτοὶ: placed first for emphasis, so too emphasised in ii. 22, xvi. 37, xviii. 15. In 1 Cor. iv. 12 we may see an undesigned coincidence, and *cf.* the word κοπιῶντας in ver. 35, Paley, *H.P.*, iii., 6.—ταῖς χρείαις μου καὶ τοῖς οὖσι μετ' ἐμοῦ: so the work of the Christian convert ἐργαζ. τὸ ἀγ. ταῖς χερσίν is to be done ἵνα ἔχῃ μεταδιδόναι τῷ χρείαν ἔχοντι, Ephes. iv. 28, and for the word χρεία as used by St. Paul elsewhere in same sense, *cf.* Rom. xii. 13, Phil. ii. 25, iv. 16, Tit. iii. 14.—ὑπηρέτησαν: only in Acts xiii. 36, used by Paul, xxiv. 23, used of Paul (*cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 1); Wisd. xvi. 24.—αὗται: "callosæ, ut videtis," Bengel, so Blass; quite in Paul's manner, *cf.* xxvi. 29, xxviii. 20; so also πάντα, 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33, xi. 2, Ephes. iv. 15. Paul pursued his trade at Ephesus probably with Aquila and Priscilla, possibly with Philemon, Philem. ver. 17.

Ver. 35. πάντα ὑπέδ.: "in all things I gave you an example," R.V., see also critical note. The verb and the cognate noun are both used in Greek in accordance with this sense, Xen., *Oec.*, xii., 18, Isocr., v., 27, see Plummer on Luke iii. 7, etc., so ὑπόδειγμα, Xen., *De re eq.*, ii., 2, and for other instances of the similar use of the word see Westcott on Heb. viii. 5, Ecclus. xliv. 16, 2 Macc. vi. 28, 31, 4 Macc. xvii. 23, *cf.* also Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, v., 1, xlvi., 1. οὕτως, *i.e.*, as I have done, *cf.* Phil. iii. 17.—κοπιῶντας: not of spiritual labours, but of manual, as the context requires. No doubt the verb is used in the former sense, 1 Cor. xvi. 16, Rom. xvi. 12, 1 Thess. v. 12, but also in the latter, 1 Cor. iv. 12, Ephes. iv. 28, 2 Tim. ii. 6 (so also κόπος by Paul). In St. Paul's writings it occurs no less than fourteen times, in St. Luke only twice, Luke v. 5 (xii. 27). In classical Greek, so in Josephus, it has the meaning of growing weary or tired, but in LXX and N.T. alone, *laboro viribus intentis* (Grimm).—δεῖ, see above on p. 63.—ἀντιλαμβ.: only in Luke and Paul, Luke i. 54, 1 Tim. vi. 2, *cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 28. The verb = to take another's part, to succour (so too cognate noun), in LXX, Isa. xli. 9, Ecclus. ii. 6, iii. 12, xxix. 9, 20, of helping the poor, *cf.* also *Psalms of Solomon*, xvi. 3, 5, vii. 9, see further *Psalms*

μᾶλλον ἢ λαμβάνειν". 36. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπών, θεὶς τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ, σὺν πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς προσηύξατο. 37. Ἱκανὸς δὲ ἐγένετο κλαυθμὸς πάντων· καὶ ἐπιπεσόντες ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τοῦ Παύλου κατεφίλουν αὐτόν· 38. ὀδυνώμενοι μάλιστα ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἰρήκει, ὅτι οὐκέτι μέλλουσι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ θεωρεῖν. προέπεμπον δὲ αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.

of Solomon, Ryle and James edit., p. 73; on **ἀντίληψις**, H. and R., *sub. v.* In classical Greek used in middle voice with genitive as here.—**τῶν ἀσθενούν.**, *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 14, for a similar precept. The adjective need not be limited to those who sought relief owing to physical weakness or poverty, but may include all those who could claim the presbyters' support and care, bodily or spiritual, *cf.* Rom. xii. 13. The usage of the gospels points to those who are weak through disease and therefore needing help, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Matt. x. 8, Mark vi. 56, Luke ix. 2, John v. 3, so also by St. Paul, Phil. ii. 26, 27, 2 Tim. iv. 20, although there are instances in LXX where the word is used of moral rather than of physical weakness. When the word is used of moral or spiritual weakness in the N.T., such a meaning is for the most part either determined by the context, or by some addition, *e.g.*, **τῇ πίστει**, Rom. xiv. 1.—**μνημονεύειν τε**: the verb is used seven times by St. Paul in his Epistles, once by St. Luke in his Gospel, Luke xvii. 32, and twice in Acts in the words of St. Paul, *cf.* ver. 31. Twice in the Epistle of St. Clement of Rome we find a similar exhortation in similar words, chap. xiii. 1 and xlvi. 7, and in each case the word may refer to a free combination of our Lord's words (*cf.* Luke vi. 30, xiv. 14), so too in St. Polycarp, *Epist.*, ii., 3. From what source St. Paul obtained this, the only saying of our Lord, definitely so described, outside the four Gospels which the N.T. contains, we cannot tell, but the command to "remember" shows that the words must have been familiar words, like those from St. Clement and St. Polycarp, which are very similar to the utterances of the Sermon on the Mount. From whatever source they were derived the references given by Resch, *Agrapha*, pp. 100, 150, show how deep an impression they made upon the mind of the Church, Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, ii., 1, *Did.*, i., 5, *Const. Ap.*, iv., 3, 1; *cf.* also Ropes, *Die Sprüche Jesus*, p. 136. In thus appealing to the words of the Lord Jesus, St. Paul's manner in his address is very similar to that employed in his Epistles, where he is apparently able to quote the words of the Lord in support of his judgment on some religious and moral question, *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11, 12, 25, and the distinction between his own opinion, **γνώμη**, and the command of Christ, **ἐπιταγή** (*Witness of the Epistles*, p. 319). **τε**: Weiss (so Bethge) holds that the word closely connects the two clauses, and that the meaning is that only thus could the weak be rightly maintained, *viz.*, by remembering, etc., **ὅτι** being causal. But however this may be, in this reference, **ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν**, "how he *himself* said," R.V. (thus implying that the fact was beyond all doubt), we may note one distinctive feature in Christian philanthropy, that it is based upon allegiance to a divine Person, and upon a reference to His commands. The emphatic personal pronoun seems to forbid the view that the Apostle is simply giving the sense of some of our Lord's sayings (see above). Similar sayings may be quoted from pagan and Jewish sources, but in Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.*, iv., 1, it is the part **τοῦ ἐλευθερίου** to give when and where and as much as he pleases, but only because it is beautiful to give; even in friendship, generosity and benevolence spring from the reflection that such conduct is decorous and worthy of a noble man, *Eth. Nicom.*, ix., 8. In Plato's *Republic* there would have been no place for the **ἀσθενεῖς**. Even in Seneca who sometimes approaches very nearly to the Christian precept, when he declares, *e.g.*, that even if we lose we must still give, we cannot forget that pity is regarded as something unworthy of a wise man; the wise man will help him in tears, but he will not weep with him; he helps the poor not with compassion, but with an impassive calm.—**μακάριον**: emphatic in position, see critical note. Bengel quotes from an old poet, *cf.* Athenæus, viii., 5, **μακάριος, εἴπερ μεταδίδωσι μηδενί . . . ἀνόητος ὁ διδούς, εὐτυχὴς δ' ὁ λαμβάνων.** The lines are by no means to be regarded as the best expression of pagan ethics, but the **μακάρ.**, which occurs more than thirty

XXI. 1. Ὡς δὲ ἐγένετο ἀναχθῆναι ἡμᾶς[1] ἀποσπασθέντας ἀπ' αὐτῶν, εὐθυδρομήσαντες ἤλθομεν εἰς τὴν Κῶν, τῇ δὲ ἑξῆς εἰς τὴν

[1] W.H. in marg., following BE²L, read αποσπασθεντες, placing a comma after ημας; Weiss here is uninfluenced by B, and reads as in text. Κων, but Κω ℵABCDE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss. At beginning of sentence β text αποσπασθεντων δε ημων απ' αυτων επιβαντες ανηχθημεν; D¹ has και επιβαντες ανηχθημεν αποσπασθεντων δε ημων απ' αυτων. Either from next verse, or from the usual desire of reviser to take nothing for granted (Weiss).

times on the lips of our Lord, bids us aim at something altogether higher and deeper and fuller than happiness—blessedness. In Judaism, whilst compassion for the poor and distressed is characteristic of a righteous Israelite, we must still bear in mind that such compassion was limited by legality and nationality; the universality of the Christian precept is wanting, Uhlhorn, *Christian Charity*, pp. 1-56, E.T., instances in Wetstein, and Bethge and Page, *in loco*.

Ver. 36. **θεὶς τὰ γόν.**, see above on p. 203.

Ver. 37. **ἱκανὸς**, *cf.* viii. 13.—**ἐπιπεσόντες**: an exact parallel only in Luke xv. 22 (*cf.* also **κατεφίλησεν** in same verse), *cf.* above on **ἐπιπίπτειν** and in LXX, Gen. xxxiii. 4, xlv. 14, xlvi. 29, Tobit xi. 8, 3 Macc. v. 49.—**κατεφίλουν**, imperfect, *i.e.*, repeatedly and tenderly. The verb occurs three times in St. Luke's Gospel, vii. 38, 45, xv. 20, and once in Matthew and Mark of the kiss of Judas, *cf.* Xen., *Mem.*, ii., 6, 33.

Ver. 38. **ὀδυνώμενοι**: common in Luke and Acts, only three times elsewhere in N.T., Luke ii. 48, xvi. 24, 25.—**θεωρεῖν**, Lucan, *cf.* xvii. 16, 22, "to behold," R.V., to gaze with reverence upon his face.—**μέλλουσι**, see above p. 157.—**προέπεμπον δὲ αὐτὸν**: "and they brought him on his way," R.V., *cf.* xv. 3 (see note), xxi. 5; the harbour was some little distance from the town.

Chapter XXI.—Ver. 1. **ἀναχθῆναι**, see above on xiii. 13.—**ἀποσ.**, *cf.* xx. 30, "were parted from them," R.V. The word expresses a separation difficult and painful; it adds to the pathos of the scene, and marks the close affection which could not bear the thought of a parting, "divulsi ab eorum complexu," Blass (see Chrys., comment. *in loco*).—**εὐθυδ.**, see on xvi. 11.—**Κῶν**, *Stanchio* or *Stanko*, an island of great trading importance off the coast of Caria, south of Miletus and Samos, and north of Rhodes. Historically it had several points of connection with the Jews, *cf.* 1 Macc. xv. 23, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 7, 2, and 10, 15, *B. J.*, i., 21, 11, and owing to its commerce it became one of the centres of Jewish life in the Ægean. It lay about forty nautical miles from Miletus, and it was famous as the birthplace not only of Hippocrates, but of Apelles, and as being one of the great medical schools of the ancient world. See further "Cos" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D., and B.D.²; Farrar, *Saint Paul*, ii., 284; Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 96; *cf.* Strabo, xiv., 2, Hor., *Od.*, iv., 13, 13, Tac., *Ann.*, xii., 61. C. and H. think that the chief town of the same name at the east of the island is referred to in the narrative before us. The place must have had, as C. and H. note, a special interest for St. Luke.—**Ῥόδον**: off the south coast of Caria. According to the proverb the sun shone every day on Rhodes, and it might well be called the sunny island of roses. Her coins, stamped on one side with Apollo's head radiated, and on the other with the rose-flower, bear their witness to the brightness and fertility of the island. Moreover, it was a seat not only of commerce but of learning. St. Paul does not appear to have landed, but only to have touched at the island. The great Colossus representing the sun, counted as one of the wonders of the world, lay prostrate, having been broken down by an earthquake, Pliny, *N. H.*, xxxiv., 18; Strabo, xiv., 2. In the time of the Peloponnesian War Rhodes had been famous for its strong navy, as its timber was abundant. A notice of Jewish residents in Rhodes meets us in 1 Macc. xv. 23. On subsequent history see the excellent account in C. and H., small edit., p. 357; Farrar, *Saint Paul*, ii., p. 285.—**Πάταρα**: a seaport on the Lycian coast, now in ruins, but probably a place of some importance and splendour. C. and H. say that Patara was to the city Xanthus what the Piræus was to Athens. On the modern discoveries in Patara see C. and H., small edit., note p. 560, *cf.* Herod., i., 182, Hor., *Od.*, iii., 4, 64, Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 99, O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 101. "The voyage may be taken as typical of the course which hun-

Ῥόδον, κἀκεῖθεν εἰς Πάταρα.[1] 2. καὶ εὑρόντες πλοῖον διαπερῶν εἰς Φοινίκην ἐπιβάντες ἀνήχθημεν. 3.[2] ἀναφανέντες δὲ τὴν Κύπρον, κα καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐώνυμον, ἐπλέομεν εἰς Συρίαν, καὶ κατήχθημεν εἰς Τύρον· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον. 4. καὶ ἀνευρόντες τοὺς μαθητάς, ἐπεμείναμεν αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας ἑπτά· οἵτινες τῷ Παύλῳ ἔλεγον διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος, μὴ[3] ἀναβαίνειν εἰς

[1] After Παταρα D (Gig., Wer., Sah.) add και Μυρα, so Blass in β, and Hilg., another accurate geographical touch; *cf.* xx. 15 and Ramsay, *C. R. E.*, p. 153, and *St. Paul*, p. 297; but after a long discussion of the passage in *Expositor*, March, 1895, Ramsay decides against the originality of the reading, but see also Zöckler, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 138, who declines to be persuaded by these recent arguments urged by R. Wendt thinks that it may be original, p. 338 (1899), so Corssen, *G. G. A.*, p. 441. Weiss, Codex D, p. 109, while accepting D in xx. 15, finds here assimilation to xxvii. 5. On the other hand the words may have been omitted in view of Paul's haste in xx. 16 (Wendt). See also Schmiedel, *Enc. Bibl.*, i., 54.

[2] αναφαναντες ℵB* 66, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass, but -φανεντες AB³CEHLP, Lach., Treg., Alford. κατηλθομεν for κατηχ. ℵABE, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Syr. H., Aeth., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss.

[3] For αναβ. ℵABC, mins., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, read επιβ.

dreds of ships took every year," Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 297, and *cf.* the illustrations from Roman history in C. and H., p. 560 note.

Ver. 2. They went at Patara on board a ship about to start on the direct Syrian course, **ἐπιβ.**, *cf.* xx. 18.

Ver. 3. **ἀναφ.**: "when we had come in sight of," R.V., Doric form of 1st aorist active, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112, here a technical word (only in Luke, *cf.* Luke xix. 11, but in a different sense), *i.e.*, after we had rendered Cyprus visible (to us) = *facere ut appareat* (Blass); Virgil, *Æneid*, iii., 275, 291, see also Rendall's note *in loco* (for the opposite idiom, **ἀποκρύπτειν**, *cf.* Thuc., v., 65).—**καταλιπόντες αὐτὴν εὐώ.**: sailing south-east they would have passed close to Paphos in Cyprus.—**ἐπλέομεν**: "imperf. cursum, aorist. **κατήλθομεν** finem denotat" (Blass).—**εἰς Τύρον**: now a free town of the R. province of Syria, Strabo, xvi., 2, in honour of its ancient greatness; it is still a place of considerable commerce and consequence, still famous for its fabrics and its architecture. At present it numbers amongst its five thousand inhabitants a few Jews, the rest being Mohammedans and Christians. Besides O.T. references, see 1 Macc. xi. 59, 2 Macc. iv. 18, 44, and further for its history, C. H., small edit., p. 563, Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 7, 998, Schaff-Herzog, *Encyclopædia*, iv., "Tyre".—**ἐκεῖσε**: the adverb may be used here with something of its proper force, but in xxii. 5, the only other place in which it occurs in N.T., simply = **ἐκεῖ**, Simcox, *Language of the New Testament*, p. 179. Page (*in loco*) renders "for there the ship was unlading her cargo," **ἐκεῖσε** being used because of the idea of movement and carrying into the town contained in the "unloading".—**ἦν ἀποφ.**: taken sometimes as the present for the future, Burton, p. 59, but see also Winer-Moulton, xlv., 5, and Wendt (1888) *in loco* (Philo, *De Præm. et Pæn.*, 5; and Athenæus, ii., 5, of lightening a ship in a storm).—**γόμον** (**γέμω**): so in classical Greek, Herod., Dem., etc., in LXX of the load of a beast of burden, Exod. xxiii. 5, 2 Kings v. 17; in N.T. only elsewhere in Rev. xviii. 11, of any merchandise.

Ver. 4. **ἀνευρόντες τοὺς μ.**: more than simply to find, *quærendo reperire*, Blass; "having found out," as colloquially "having looked up"; only in Luke, *cf.* Luke ii. 16, but in middle, 4 Macc. iii. 14.—**τοὺς μαθ.**: W. H. The article indicates that the existence of the disciples was known, but it was difficult to find out their whereabouts in a great town, *cf.* xv. 3, 41.—**ἐπεμείναμεν**, see on x. 48.—**ἡμέρας ἑπτά**: the period would at all events enable Paul to enjoy a first day of the week with the Church. Apparently he and his went on in the same ship, ver. 6, evidently it was a trading vessel of the larger size, as it took this time to unload; on the genuineness of the narration here see Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 300.—**διὰ τοῦ Π.**: there is no contradiction between this state-

Ἱερουσαλήμ. 5. ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο[1] ἡμᾶς ἐξαρτίσαι τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐξελθόντες ἐπορευόμεθα, προπεμπόντων ἡμᾶς πάντων σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις ἕως ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, καὶ θέντες τὰ γόνατα ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν προσηυξάμεθα. 6. καὶ[2] ἀσπασάμενοι ἀλλήλους, ἐπέβημεν εἰς τὸ

[1] ημας εξαρτισαι ℵ(*or)2, CHLP, so Tisch., W.H. marg.; but εξαρ. ημας AB*E 68, W.H. text, Weiss. At beginning of verse, instead of οτε . . . τας ημερας d, so Blass in β, has *sequenti die*—τῃ δε εξης ημερᾳ.

[2] προσευξαμενοι απησπασαμεθα in R.V., Tisch., W.H., Blass. Instead of T.R., ℵ*AC, Tisch. have ανεβημεν, so Wendt (probably); but ℵcBE 68, 73, Chrys., so Lach., W.H., R.V., Weiss ενεβημεν.

ment and St. Paul's assertion that he was proceeding to Jerusalem under the same divine guidance. That the prophets at Tyre should foresee the Apostle's danger was only in accordance with his own words in xx. 23, and their affectionate regard for him might well prompt them to dissuade him from such perilous risks. There is therefore no occasion to suppose that the clause has been interpolated into the "We" source. Hilgenfeld refers οἵτινες . . . Ἱερ. (ver. 4), as also the whole of ver. 9, τούτῳ δὲ . . . προφ. to his "author to Theophilus," on the ground that this writer had already spoken of Paul's tribulations as awaiting him in city by city, xx. 23, and that the notices in vv. 4 and 9 here are added by him in confirmation. But Hilgenfeld (with Clemen and Jüngst) retains vv. 10-14, the episode of Agabus, as belonging to the "We" source, and sees a fitness in the prophecy of Agabus foretelling, after the manner of the O.T. prophets, in the last station before Jerusalem, the imprisonment of the Apostle, whilst Paul in spite of all entreaties is unmoved in his determination. But (1) it is quite arbitrary to refer the whole speech at Miletus (see above, chap. xx.) to the "author to Theophilus," and (2) although it was quite fitting that the warning of danger should be more vivid on its approach, yet one fails to see why the more definite symbolical act of Agabus should exclude previous intimations of danger on the part of affectionate friends speaking of the Holy Ghost. In ver. 9 nothing is said as to the prophecies of the daughter of Philip and Paul's imprisonment, but see below.

Ver. 5. **ἐξαρτίσαι**: here in the sense of accomplishing the days, *i.e.*, finishing the time, the seven days during which we had to remain for the cargo to be unloaded or for other business = ἀπαρτίζειν (and *cf.* Luke xiv. 28), Vulgate, "expletis diebus," Chrys., πληρῶσαι, so Oecum., Theoph. The verb is only used once elsewhere in N.T., and there by St. Paul, 2 Tim. iii. 17 = furnishing, completing, so Jos., *Ant.*, iii., 2, 2, where the verb is used as in 2 Tim., *l. c.*, and some have thought that here the verb means that the ship was completely prepared for the continuance of her voyage. So Rendall who takes ἡμᾶς (reading ἐξαρ. ἡμᾶς) as the object, and renders "and when it proved that the days furnished us"; on St. Paul's stay and its reason see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 300, and for other explanations, Nösgen and Weiss, *in loco*. There is no reason to interpret the words as meaning that the Apostle found that his desire, xx. 16, could not be fulfilled, and that so he was content to remain the seven days.—**προπεμ.**, see above: **πάντων**. The clause has been taken (Wendt) to intimate that the number of disciples at Tyre was small; this was probably the case, but it is not clear from the words here. **σὺν γυν. καὶ τέκ.**, a descriptive touch of an eyewitness (Zöckler); on this local use of ἕως as characteristic of Luke, *cf.* Friedrich, p. 20.—**θέντες . . . αἰγ.**, see xx. 36. **αἰγ.**, a smooth shore in distinction to one precipitous and rocky, xxvii. 39, also found in Matt. xiii. 2, 48, John xxi. 4. In LXX, Judg. v. 17, Ecclus. xxiv. 14 (S² *al.*, and *cf.* note in *Speaker's Commentary*, *in loco*). See Hackett's note on this accurate description of the beach on both sides of the site of the ancient Tyre, and also a parallel to the scene described in this passage from modern missionary life.

Ver. 6. R.V. **ἀπησπασάμεθα ἀλλ.** "bade each other farewell," see critical note. **ἀπασπάζομαι**: only here in N.T., in Tobit x. 13 S (AR *al.*); Himerius, p. 194; here of salutations at departure as simple verb in ver. 7, of salutations on arrival (1 Macc. xii. 17).—**τὸ πλοῖον**: article indicates that it was the same ship (ver. 2 without the article) which

πλοῖον, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὰ ἴδια. 7. Ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν πλοῦν διανύσαντες ἀπὸ Τύρου κατηντήσαμεν εἰς Πτολεμαΐδα, καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐμείναμεν ἡμέραν μίαν παρ' αὐτοῖς. 8. τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐξελθόντες [1] οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἤλθομεν εἰς Καισάρειαν· καὶ εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ, τοῦ ὄντος ἐκ

[1] οι περι τον Π. *om.* ℵABCE, Vulg., and other verss.; Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass.

was going on to Ptolemais.—**εἰς τὰ ἴδια**, *cf.* John xvi. 32, xix. 27, *cf.* β text v. 18, xiv. 18 (τὰ ἴδια not in Synoptists, but *cf.* Luke xviii. 28), in LXX, Esther v. 10, vi. 12, 3 Macc. vi. 27, 37, vii. 8.

Ver. 7. **διανύσαντες**: "and when we had finished the voyage from Tyre we arrived at Ptolemais," R.V. (so in effect A.V.), but Page (so Wendt) renders "but we having (thereby) completed our voyage (*i.e.*, from Macedonia, xx. 6), came from Tyre to Ptolemais," on the ground that **διανύω** would not be used of the short journey to Ptolemais from Tyre.—**Πτολεμαΐδα**: the ancient Accho and the modern *Acre*, Arab. *Akka; St. Jean d'Acre*, mentioned here for the last time in Scripture. About thirty miles south of Tyre. In Judg. i. 31 it was assigned to Asher, but it was never taken by Israel, and was always reckoned as belonging to the Philistine towns, and later by the Greeks as belonging to Phœnicia. In its stormy history it was held in succession by Babylonians and Persians (Strabo, xvi., 2, 25), and on the first division of Alexander's kingdom it was assigned to Ptolemy Soter (Ptolemy I.), from whom it may have derived its name (so Hamburger). Schürer however refers the name to Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus), and others to Ptolemy Lathurus. In the Syro-Egyptian wars its importance as a military station was manifested, since the power which held it could close the road down the Syrian coast to Egypt. To the Jews it was always hostile, 1 Macc. v. 15, Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 8, 2, 1 Macc. xii. 45, Jos., *Ant.*, xiii., 6, 2, and later in history when the Jewish War broke out against Rome, the Jews, two thousand in number, were slaughtered in Ptolemais, Jos., *B.J.*, ii., 18, 5. After falling to the Parthians, it finally passed under the dominion of Rome, but although it was called *colonia Ptolemais* under the Emperor Claudius, Pliny, v., 19, it does not seem to have possessed the actual privileges of a colony (Schürer). See on its earlier and modern history, Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, i., 1, p. 41; "Acco," Hastings' B.D., "Accho," B.D.[2]; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 90, E.T. It was only separated from Tyre by a short day's voyage, if the wind was favourable. Here Herod landed on his return from Italy to Syria, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 15, 1.—**τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς**: a Christian Church at Ptolemais; founded perhaps by Philip the Evangelist. It is also very possible that a Church may have existed there ever since the dispersion after the death of St. Stephen, Acts xi. 19. On the times which St. Paul probably visited it see "Ptolemais" B.D.[1].

Ver. 8. **Φ. τοῦ εὐαγγ.**: the title, as Wendt and Hilgenfeld think, may have been given to Philip on account of his evangelising work, *cf.* viii., 12, 40; "*the* Evangelist": the honourable title gained by some signal service to the Gospel; and the two incidents noted in his career, his preaching to the Samaritans, and to the Ethiopian eunuch, each mark an advance in the free development of the Church (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 299). He had originally been set apart for other work, vi. 2, but both he and St. Stephen had been called to higher duties, and it is not sufficient to say that he was called an "evangelist" to distinguish him from Philip the Apostle, for that would have been done sufficiently by calling him "one of the Seven". The word only occurs twice elsewhere in the N.T., Ephes. iv. 11, 2 Tim. iv. 5. In the former passage the Evangelists are placed between the Apostles and Prophets on the one hand, and the Pastors and Teachers on the other. The latter two offices suggested those who were attached to a settled community, whilst the Apostles and Prophets were non-local. Between the two pairs stood the Evangelists, whose work like that of Philip was to preach the Word. But it is to be carefully noted that as the title is used of the work of Philip, "one of the Seven," and of that of Timothy, an Apostolic delegate, 2 Tim. iv. 5, it may have denoted an employment rather than an office, "a work rather than an order," and it

τῶν ἑπτά, ἐμείναμεν παρ' αὐτῷ. 9. τούτῳ δὲ ἦσαν θυγατέρες παρθένοι τέσσαρες προφητεύουσαι. 10. ἐπιμενόντων δὲ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας πλείους, κατῆλθέ τις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας προφήτης ὀνόματι

might be truly said that every Apostle was an Evangelist, but that not every Evangelist was an Apostle. At the same time their work may well have been more restricted locally than that of the Apostles, *cf.* Theodoret on Ephes. iv. 11, and also Eusebius, *H.E.*, ii., 3, iii. 37, itinerant work of an Evangelist, "Evangelist," B.D.[2]. The title is not found in the Apostolic Fathers or in the *Didaché*, and the latter omission Harnack would explain on the ground that the "Apostles" in the *Didaché* were just Evangelists; but it would seem, if we admit the reference to 2 Tim. iv. 5, that the title was already in general use, and that it was not limited to Apostles. Meyer sees in the Evangelists those who transmitted orally the facts of our Lord's life and teaching, before the existence of written Gospels; but however tempting this view may be, we can scarcely define the Evangelists' work so precisely, and still less thus distinguish it from that of the Apostles; but see, however, as favouring Meyer's view, "Evangelist," Hastings' B.D. Ewald's remarks on Philip as an Evangelist are still of interest, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i., 48 ff.; on the mistake which confused this Philip with Philip the Apostle, see Salmon, *Introd.*, 313.—**εἰς Κ.**: on two occasions St. Paul had already visited Cæsarea, ix. 30, xviii. 22, and he would probably have met Philip previously; but we have no knowledge of any previous meeting between St. Luke and Philip. We can conceive something of the importance of such a meeting when we remember the advantage which the latter's knowledge of the events in the early history of the Church would possess for the future historian. Philip's presence in Cæsarea at once connects itself with the notice in viii. 40, and thus indicates a unity of authorship in the whole book.—**ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά**: the notice shows us how the early part of the book is taken for granted by the writer of the latter part (so Lightfoot and Salmon). This is surely more intelligible and satisfactory than to refer the words to the "author to Theophilus," or to regard it with Clemen as a later addition perhaps by his R., who already betrayed, xiv. 8, a knowledge of the sources of the first part of the book, or perhaps by R.J., who then connected *Historia Petri* and *Historia Pauli*. Jüngst refers the notice in viii. 40 to a Reviser who thus seeks to connect the Philip of chap. viii. with Cæsarea, and so to identify him with the Philip here.

Ver. 9. **παρθένοι**: an unwedded life might enable them to wait on the Lord without distraction, and thus to be more free for the exercise of their gift of prophecy, but nothing is said of any separate order, or anything to lead us to suppose that they did not share the home life of their father, or that they had devoted themselves to God by any special vow (see however in support of this latter view Felten, Knabenbauer, Plumptre, C. and H.). St. Jerome, *Epist.*, v., 8, cviii., 8, in relating the story of Paula mentions how she saw at Cæsarea the house of Cornelius now turned into a Christian church, and the humble abode of Philip, and the chambers of his daughters, the four virgins "which did prophesy".—**προφητεύουσαι**, *cf.* Joel ii. 28, 29, Acts ii. 17, xix. 6, 1 Cor. xi. 5, xiv. 24, although nothing is said of their possessing the power of *prediction*, or foretelling anything concerning Paul. Since women were forbidden to teach it would seem that the prophet as such was not a teacher; Bigg, *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*, p. 29. But whilst there is no reason to suppose that they prophesied in the church, although even Felten supposes that in Churches not founded by Paul different rules might have prevailed, they would be able to speak and to teach in private or at home especially amongst the women both Jews and Gentiles, to whom in the East men would have had no access (Luckock, *Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke*, ii., p. 214). This verse is regarded by Hilgenfeld as an addition made by the "author to Theophilus" (so Renan). Spitta however thinks that something ought to have been said as to the nature of the prophecies uttered by the four daughters, but that instead of this we have the notice of Agabus in ver. 10. He therefore believes that the "We" section was interrupted at ver. 10, and that the verses following are interpolated from his inferior source B. The reference to weeping in ver. 13 is much more natural if we presuppose the presence of women, so he therefore reads

῞Αγαβος· 11. καὶ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἄρας τὴν ζώνην τοῦ Παύλου, δήσας[1] τε αὐτοῦ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας, εἶπε, Τάδε λέγει τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ῞Αγιον· Τὸν ἄνδρα οὗ ἐστιν ἡ ζώνη αὕτη, οὕτω δήσουσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ παραδώσουσιν εἰς χεῖρας ἐθνῶν. 12. ὡς δὲ ἠκούσαμεν ταῦτα, παρεκαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἐντόπιοι, τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. 13.[2] ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, Τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθρύπτοντές μου τὴν καρδίαν; ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ μόνον δεθῆναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ

[1] Instead of **τε αυτου** ℵABCDE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt read **εαυτου** (HLP **αὑτοῦ**, others **αὐτοῦ**), see W.H., *App.*, p. 151.

[2] ℵABC*E, Tisch., W.H. (omit **ο**). ℵAE add **και ειπεν**, so Tisch. (Wendt perhaps); but *om.*, W.H., R.V., Weiss, after BCHLP, Bas., Chrys., D has **ειπεν δε προς ημας ο Π.**, so Blass and Hilg. Instead of **συνθ.** D has **θορυβουντες**; D also reads **δεθηναι βουλομαι**, but not Blass.

"they prophesied with tears over the fate of Paul" (p. 339); so somewhat similarly Jüngst (p. 177).

Ver. 10. **ἡμέρας πλείους**: "many days," R.V., "some" margin; literally "more days," the phrase is used vaguely with what Ramsay calls Luke's usual defective sense of time, *cf.* xiii. 31, xxv. 14. The phrase is also found in xxvii. 20, so that it occurs twice in the "We" sections and twice in the rest of Acts, but nowhere else in N.T., see Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 151, Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 53. Often in LXX. Weiss thinks that the phrase here, *cf.* ver. 4, shows that Paul had given up all idea of reaching Jerusalem for Pentecost; but see on the other hand Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 297, and Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 300: probably the Apostle had several days to spare when he reached Cæsarea, and he would naturally calculate his time differently when he had made a prosperous voyage, so that there is no contradiction with xx. 16.—**προφ. ὀνόμ. ῞Α.**: probably the same who is mentioned in xi. 25, since he too came from Jerusalem. It has seemed strange to Blass and to others that St. Luke mentions Agabus here so indefinitely, but in this "We" section it would seem that St. Luke refers to Agabus in this vague way because this was the first time that he had seen the prophet (unless we accept D in xi. 28). It is therefore quite unnecessary to regard the mention of his name in xi. 28 as an interpolation. Agabus is evidently enabled not only to declare the will of God, but also to predict the future.

Ver. 11. **ἄρας τὴν ζώνην**: the symbolic action by Agabus reminds us of the O.T. prophets, *cf.* 1 Kings xxii. 11, Isa. xx. 2, Jer. xiii. 1, Ezek. iv. and v. Agabus as a dweller in Jerusalem would know something of that bitter feeling against Paul, and would wish to warn him.—**παραδώσ. εἰς χ.**, *cf.* the words of our Lord, Luke ix. 44, xxiv. 7; phrase frequent in LXX both in Psalms and Prophets, *cf.* Ecclus. iv. 19, xi. 6; 1 Macc. iv. 30.

Ver. 12. **παρεκ. ἡμεῖς**: St. Luke joins in the entreaty.—**ἐντόπ.**, *i.e.*, the Christians of Cæsarea, including of course the inmates of Philip's house; not in LXX or Apocr., but in classical Greek.—**τοῦ μὴ ἀναβ.**, Burton, p. 159.

Ver. 13. **τί ποιεῖτε κλαί.**: what do ye, weeping? (as we might say "what are you about?" etc.), *cf.* Mark xi. 5 (Acts xiv. 15).—**συνθ.**: in Attic Greek, to break, to break in pieces, and so **ἀποθρύπτω** is used of (1) breaking in pieces, (2) breaking in spirit, enervating **τὰς ψυχάς**, *cf.* Plat., *Rep.*, 495 E.; here **συνθ.** means to weaken the Apostle's purpose rather than to break his heart in sorrow. —**ἐγὼ**, emphatic, I for my part.—**οὐ μόνον** in N.T., rather than **μὴ μόνον** with the infinitive, Burton, p. 183.—**ἑτοίμως ἔχω**: the exact phrase only once elsewhere in N.T., and there used by St. Paul, 2 Cor. xii. 14 (*cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 5): "qui paratus est, ei leve onus est," Bengel. Ewald compares this firm determination and courage of St. Paul with our Lord's last journey to Jerusalem, *cf.* Luke ix. 51.

Ver. 14. **ἡσυχάσαμεν**: only in Luke and Paul, *cf.* Luke xiv. 3, Acts xi. 18. In LXX, Job xxxii. 6, Neh. v. 8.—**τὸ θέλ. τοῦ Κ.**, *cf.* Matt. vi. 10, Luke xxii. 42, and also St. Paul's own expression in

ἑτοίμως ἔχω ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. 14. μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ, ἡσυχάσαμεν εἰπόντες, Τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Κυρίου γενέσθω.

15. Μετὰ δὲ τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας [1] ἀποσκευασάμενοι ἀνεβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. 16. συνῆλθον δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀπὸ Καισαρείας σὺν ἡμῖν,[2] ἄγοντες παρ᾽ ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν, Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ, ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ.

[1] Instead of αποσ. ℵABELP, Tisch., Wendt, Weiss, R.V., W.H. read επισ. D has αποταξαμενοι, so Blass in β, and Hilg. Blass proposed απασπασαμενοι, but did not put in text; see Ramsay's criticism of Blass on this passage, *Expositor*, March, 1895.

[2] Instead of αγοντες κ.τ.λ. Blass in β text (following D, Syr. H. mg.) ουτοι δε ηγον ημας προς ους ξενισθωμεν, και παραγενομενοι εις τινα κωμην εγενομεθα παρα Μνασονι Κ. μαθητῃ αρχ. κακειθεν εξιοντες ηλθομεν εις I. From the trans. given in comment. it would appear that the Cæsarean disciples accompanied Paul on a journey of no less than sixty-four miles to Jerusalem to introduce him to Mnason, who lived in the Holy City. But the improbability of this has been justly urged by Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 128 (so too Salmon, *Hermathena*, xxi., p. 239; Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 343), not only on account of the long distance, too long for one day, but also because Paul might presumably have relied upon the hospitality of private friends, already known in Jerusalem, to say nothing of the brethren referred to in ver. 17. But the β text makes Paul rest at the house of Mnason, not at Jerusalem, but at some village on the way, and the Cæsarean disciples might naturally accompany Paul to a village known to them, but not to Paul, where their fellow-disciple (Mnason) dwelt. The originality of the β text is supported not only by Belser and Zöckler, but by Holtzmann, *Th. Zz.*, p. 81, 1896, and Hilgenfeld; but, on the other hand, see Corssen, *G. G. A.*, p. 438, 1896, and Weiss, Codex D, p. 101; Page, *Classical Review*, pp. 318, 319 (1897), Wendt (1899), p. 342, and Schmiedel, *u. s.* Wendt cannot see why, if β text was original, it could have been altered into T.R., whereas if we note that the arrival of Paul at Jerusalem is only notified in ver. 17, the lodging with Mnason might well have been placed previously at some village on the route. But if we give the proper force to ανεβαινομεν, ver. 15, the α text properly understood (as Zahn admits) implies the same fact as is brought out in β, *viz.*, that Mnason entertained the company, not at Jerusalem, but on the evening of the first day of their journey thither; ver. 15, they set about the journey; ver. 16, they lodged with Mnason on the introduction of the Cæsarean disciples; ver. 17, they came to Jerusalem, see especially Ramsay, *Expositor*, March, 1895, and his preference for the "Eastern" as against the "Western" reading (although Zöckler is still unpersuaded by Ramsay's arguments, *Greifswalder Studien*, p. 138).

xviii. 21, 1 Cor. iv. 19, xvi. 7 (Heb. vi. 3), *cf.* Mayor's note on James iv. 15 for similar phrases amongst Greeks and Romans, as also amongst Jews and Arabians, Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, pp. 29, 95, 128, 2nd edit.

Ver. 15. ἀποσ.: A.V., "took up our carriages," but the latter word is not used now in a passive sense for luggage or *impedimenta*, as in O.T., Judg. xviii. 21, 1 Sam. xvii. 22, Isa. x. 18, *cf.* Shakes., *Tempest*, v. 1, 3: "Time goes upright with his carriage" (burden); see also Plumptre's interesting note on the word. R.V., reading ἐπισ., renders "we took up our baggage," margin "made ready our baggage," τὰ πρὸς τὴν ὁδοιπορίαν λαβόντες, Chrys., Ramsay renders "having equipped *horses*," Xen., *Hell.*, v., 3, 1, and see *St. Paul*, p. 302: the journey on foot, some sixty-four miles, was scarcely probable for Paul, especially if, as it would seem from D, it was accomplished in two days. Grotius took it as = "sarcinas jumentis imponere," as if ὑποζύγια, Xen., *Hell.*, vii., 2, 18. Hackett and Rendall refer the word to the packing up of the valuable alms which St. Paul was carrying to Jerusalem, but this interpretation seems fanciful, although Hackett supposes that the contribution might have consisted in part of raiment or provisions. Belser still more curiously refers it to getting change in the current money of Palestine for the alms collected in the coin of various lands.—ἀνεβ.: imperfect,

17. ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΩΝ δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἀσμένως[1] ἐδέξαντο ἡμᾶς οἱ ἀδελφοί. 18. τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ εἰσῄει ὁ Παῦλος σὺν ἡμῖν πρὸς Ἰάκωβον, πάντες τε παρεγένοντο οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. 19. καὶ ἀσπασάμενος αὐτούς, ἐξηγεῖτο καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον ὧν ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι διὰ τῆς διακονίας αὐτοῦ. 20. οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐδόξαζον τὸν[2] Κύριον· εἶπόν τε αὐτῷ, Θεωρεῖς, ἀδελφέ, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν[3] Ἰουδαίων τῶν πεπιστευκότων· καὶ πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου

[1] **εδεξαντο**, but ℵABCE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt **απεδ.**

[2] **Κυριον**, but **Θεον** ℵABCEL, Syr. Pesh., Boh., Aeth., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss.

[3] After **μυριαδες εισιν** ABCE, Vulg., Boh., Aeth. 13, 36, 40, W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt **εν τοις Ιουδαιοις**; *om.* in Tisch. with ℵ* 34*, 95*, 97. D, Syr. Pesh., Par., Sah., Aug. read **εν τῃ Ιουδαιᾳ**, so Blass in **β** text.

to denote the start on the journey (*cf.* viii. 25: ὑπέστρεφον, R.V.). Both A. and R.V. here render "went up," but it should be rendered "we set about the journey to Jerusalem," end of third m. j.

Ver. 16. **ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισ.**: A. and R.V. render "bringing with them Mnason with whom we should lodge," but Meyer-Wendt, so Page and Rendall, render "bringing us to *the house of* Mnason," etc., *cf.* also Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 234. This is more in accordance with Codex D, on which see critical note = **ἄγ. πρὸς Μνάσ. ἵνα ξενισθῶμεν παρ' αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.**, see Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 171, 213, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 229. Vulgate (so Erasmus, Calvin) renders "adducentes secum apud quem hospitaremur Mnasonem," but harsh, and presupposes that Mnason was at Cæsarea.—**Μνάσωνι,** Att. **Μνήσων,** in late MS., **Νάσων** and **Ἰάσων,** a name common among the Greeks, and Mnason was probably a Hellenist.—**ἀρχαίῳ,** *cf.* xv. 7, may mean that he was an early disciple, R.V., or even from the beginning, the great Pentecost, xi. 15 (Humphrey), see also Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 303; he may have been converted by his fellow-countryman Barnabas. If Blass is right in β, Acts xi. 2, he may have been a convert instructed by St. Peter (and in this sense **ἀρχαῖος**).

Ver. 17. There is no good reason to doubt that they were in time for the Feast; it is a legitimate inference from their tarrying at Cæsarea that they were easily able to reach Jerusalem: possibly the presence of Jews from Asia may be taken, as Rendall points out, to indicate that the time of the Feast was near at hand.—**ἀσμένως**: only here, significantly; omitted in ii. 41 (R.V., W.H.); 2 Macc. iv. 12, x. 33 A, 3 Macc. iii. 15, v. 21, so in classical Greek. Even if the welcome only came, as Wendt supposes, from those who were comparatively few amongst many in Jerusalem, St. Paul found himself a brother amongst brethren.—**ἐδέξ.**, see on xviii. 27, **ἀποδέχομαι.**

Ver. 18. **τῇ ἐπιούσῃ**, three times in "We" sections, twice in rest of Acts; nowhere else in N.T. (in vii. 26 with **ἡμέρᾳ**), Hawkins, *u. s.*—**σὺν ἡμῖν**: the writer thus again claims to be an eye-witness of what passed; it may well have been the occasion for the reception of the alms collected from the Churches.—**Ἰάκωβον**: on the authoritative position of St. James as further shown here see Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 105, and Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, p. 147. Nothing is said of the Apostles, and they may have been absent from Jerusalem on missionary work, or at least the chief of them. They would scarcely have been included under the term **πρεσβ.** as Wendt supposes.

Ver. 19. **ἀσπαζ.**: used of farewell greetings, xx. 1, xxi. 6, and of greetings on arrival, xviii. 22, xxi. 7, for its use here *cf.* 1 Macc. xi. 6.—**ἐξηγ.**, see on x. 8, etc.—**καθ' ἓν ἕκαστον**: "one by one," R.V., *cf.* Ephes. v. 33.—**διακονίας,** see note on vi. 1, 2.

Ver. 20. **ἐδόξ.**: "recte imperf. quia finis verbo **εἶπαν** indicatur," Blass.—**θεωρεῖς**: the word seems to imply that Paul had already become cognisant of the fact by his own observations in his ministerial work.—**ἀδελφέ**: St. Paul is recognised as an **ἀδελφός** not only by St. James but by the assembled elders (see also Weiss, *in loco*).—**Ἰουδ.**, see critical note.—**μυριάδες**, *cf.* Luke xii. 1, of a large but indefinite number (*cf.* 1

ὑπάρχουσι. 21.[1] κατηχήθησαν δὲ περὶ σοῦ, ὅτι ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μωσέως τοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη πάντας Ἰουδαίους, λέγων μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα, μηδὲ τοῖς ἔθεσι περιπατεῖν. 22. τί οὖν ἐστι; πάντως[2] δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν· ἀκούσονται γὰρ ὅτι ἐλήλυθας. 23. τοῦτο οὖν ποίησον ὅ σοι λέγομεν· εἰσὶν ἡμῖν ἄνδρες τέσσαρες εὐχὴν ἔχοντες[3] ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν· 24. τούτους παραλαβὼν ἁγνίσθητι σὺν αὐτοῖς, καὶ δαπάνησον[4] ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ἵνα[5] ξυρήσωνται τὴν κεφαλήν, καὶ γνῶσι πάντες ὅτι ὧν κατήχηνται περὶ σοῦ οὐδέν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ στοιχεῖς καὶ

[1] D[1], Gig. κατηκησαν, *diffamaverunt*, instead of κατηχηθησαν, not Blass.

[2] δει πληθος συνελθειν *om.* BC* 15, 36, 137, 180, several verss., W.H., R.V. Weiss, but retained by Tisch., Blass, with ℵAC[2]DEHLP, Vulg., Chrys. γαρ. *om.* R.V., W.H., Weiss.

[3] εφ' εαυτων W.H. marg., in text αφ', following ℵB, but Weiss reads εφ'.

[4] επ' αυτοις ℵAcorr.BCEHLP, επ' αυτους, A* 13, 27, Theodrt.; Blass in β reads εις αυτους with D.

[5] ξυρησωνται AB[3]CHL, so Lach., Weiss, Blass; ξυρησονται ℵB*D[2], EP, Tisch. W.H., R.V. γνωσι HLP, Chrys.; γνωσονται ℵABCDE, W.H., Blass, Weiss Wendt, R.V.

Cor. iv. 15), referring to the number of believers not only in Jerusalem but in Judæa present in large numbers for the Feast. The word cannot refer to Jewish Christians in a wider sense, as Overbeck took it, because they would not need to be informed of Paul's teaching relative to the Mosaic law.—ζηλωταὶ τοῦ ν., *cf.* Gal. i. 14, Tit. ii. 14, 1 Pet. iii. 13 (2 Macc. iv. 2, we have the same phrase, *cf.* 4 Macc. xviii. 12). The extreme party of the Pharisees prided themselves on the title "zealots of the law, zealots of God"; it was a title which St. Paul himself had claimed, Lightfoot, Gal. i. 14.

Ver. 21. κατηχήθησαν: the word seems to imply definite instruction, not merely *audierunt*, Vulgate. Hort refers to the term as implying here assiduous talking and lecturing, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 107.—ἀποστασίαν, *cf.* 1 Macc. ii. 15 (S ἀπόστασιν) when the officers of Antiochus Epiphanes, in the time of Mattathias, tried to compel the people of Modin to forsake the law and to sacrifice upon the idol altar.—μὴ περιτέμνειν: these words and those which follow were an entire perversion of St. Paul's teaching, just as his enemies gave a perverted view of the Apostle's supposed intrusion with Trophimus into the temple, ver. 29. The exemption from the Mosaic law was confined to Jewish converts, xvi. 3, 1 Cor. vii. 18.—τοῖς ἔθεσι, *cf.* vi. 14, xv. 1. —περιπατεῖν: only here in Luke, but often in the Epistles in this sense, *cf.* Mark vii. 5.

Ver. 22. τί οὖν ἐστι; *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 26, *cf.* vi. 3 in β text.—δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν, see critical note.—ἀκούσονται, *i.e.*, the Judaising Christians referred to in κατηχήθησαν, ver. 26. The words refer, not to an assembly of the whole Church, or to a tumultuary assembly, ver. 27, but to an assembly of the Judaising Christians as above.

Ver. 23. εἰσὶν ἡμῖν, *cf.* xviii. 10. The four men certainly seem to have been members of the Church at Jerusalem, *i.e.*, Jewish Christians.—εὐχὴν ἔχοντες: a temporary Nazirite vow, Num. vi. 1 ff. The length of time was optional, but thirty days seems to have been the shortest time, Jos., *B.J.*, ii., 15, 1.—ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν, see critical note, the Nazirite vow lies upon them as an unfulfilled obligation. If we read ἀφ' it would mean him to affirm that the vow had been taken by them of their own will, on their own initiation, *cf.* Luke xii. 57, 2 Cor. iii. 5, John v. 19, 30, etc., see further Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* ἀπό, ii., 2 d, aa; and Rendall, *in loco.* Blass however renders ἐφ' "quia votum *in se* receperunt," so that it is difficult to distinguish very definitely.

Ver. 24. παραλαβὼν, *cf.* ver. 26, xv. 39 (xvi. 33): take in a friendly way, associate thyself with them as a companion.—ἁγνίσθητι σὺν αὐτοῖς: the advice is characteristic of the Apostle who had lived as St. James had lived, Eusebius, *H.E.*, ii., 23, and it certainly seems to demand that St. Paul should place him-

αὐτὸς τὸν νόμον φυλάσσων. 25. περὶ δὲ τῶν πεπιστευκότων ἐθνῶν ἡμεῖς[1] ἐπεστείλαμεν, κρίναντες μηδὲν τοιοῦτον τηρεῖν αὐτούς, εἰ μὴ φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς τό τε εἰδωλόθυτον καὶ τὸ αἷμα καὶ πνικτὸν καὶ πορνείαν. 26. Τότε ὁ Παῦλος παραλαβὼν τοὺς ἄνδρας, τῇ[2] ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἁγνισθεὶς εἰσῄει εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, διαγγέλλων τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἁγνισμοῦ, ἕως οὗ προσηνέχθη ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς

[1] **επεστειλαμεν** ℵACEHLP, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Chrys., Tisch., W.H. marg., R.V. text, Weiss (*cf.* xv. 20); **απεστειλαμεν** BD 40, Syr. H., Arm., W.H. text, R.V. marg., Wendt, Blass; see Wendt, p. 346 (1899). After **εθνων** D, Gig., Sah. add **ουδεν εχουσι λεγειν προσ σε· ημεις γαρ**, so Blass in **β**, Hilgenfeld, *Zw. Th.*, p. 382 (1896). The words in T.R. (after **κριναντες**) **μηδεν . . . ει μη** are supported by DCEHLP, Gig., Syr. H., Chrys., so Meyer, Alford, Blass, but *om.* ℵAB 13, 81, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Sah., Boh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss (Codex D, p. 103), **και πνικτον** *om.* D, Gig., Sah., Jer., Aug.

[2] **εχομενῃ**, D has **επιουσῃ**; for **εως ου** D has **οπως**, but not Blass.

self on a level with the four men and take upon himself the Nazirite vow, *cf.* Num. vi. 3. The **σὺν αὐτοῖς** can hardly be explained otherwise. But how far the obligation of the vow extended in such a case is not clear (Edersheim, *Temple and its Services*, p. 326), and the time specified does not seem to allow for the commencement and completion of a vow on the part of the Apostle, although we cannot satisfactorily explain such expressions as the one before us, *cf.* **ἡγνισμένον**, xxiv. 18, on the supposition that St. Paul only associated himself with the company of the four votaries and incurred the expenses of their sacrifices. Dr. Hort suggests that the Apostle may have been himself about to offer sacrifices in the Temple in connection with some previous vow, or that in connection with the Gentile offerings which he had brought to Jerusalem and safely delivered (as it would seem) he may have proposed to offer a solemn peace-offering in the Temple, *cf.* **καὶ προσφοράς**, xxiv. 17, and Rom. xv. 16, *Judaistic Christianity*, pp. 109, 110; on the verb **ἁγνίζω** see also Hort's *First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 87.—**δαπάνησον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς**: "be at charges for them," R.V., spend money upon them. It was considered a meritorious act thus to defray the expenses of their sacrifices for poor Nazirites; Josephus, *Ant.*, xix., 6, 1, how King Agrippa on his arrival at Jerusalem acted thus with a view to conciliate popular favour, Edersheim, *u. s.*, p. 326, Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 519, Kypke, *Observ.*, ii., 113; *cf.* Mishna, *Nazir*, ii., 6. J. Weiss supposed that the money would have been furnished out of the contributions brought by Paul, and that such employed for the poor members of the Jerusalem Church would have been quite in accordance with the objects for which the contributions were made; but on the other hand, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 310.—**ἵνα ξυρήσ.**, see critical note; at the conclusion of their vow, Num. vi. 18, when the sacrifice was offered by the Nazirites, Num. vi. 14.—On the future indicative with **ἵνα** in N.T. in pure final clauses see Burton, p. 86, if we adopt R.V. If we read **γνώσονται,** see critical note, the future is not dependent on **ἵνα,** "and all shall know," R.V., *viz.*, by this act of thine. On this independent future see Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 81 (1893).—**καὶ αὐτὸς,** *i.e.*, as well as other Jewish Christians.—**στοιχεῖς**: a neutral word, as the walk might be right or wrong, but here to be taken with **φυλάσσων,** "so walkest as to keep the law," Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, no need for "orderly".

Ver. 25. **ἡμεῖς,** *cf.* reading in **β** text, but in any case **ἡμεῖς** is emphatic, intimating that St. James and the Church at Jerusalem could not condemn St. Paul's attitude towards Gentile Christians, since they had themselves consented to place these Gentile Christians on a different footing from that of the born Jews who became Christians.—**ἐπεστείλαμεν,** see critical note, *cf.* xv. 20 (Zöckler).—**μηδὲν τοιοῦτον τηρ.,** see critical note.—Wendt with Schürer objects to the whole reference to the Apostolic Conference, and sees in the verse the hand of a Redactor, as in xvi. 4 (see note, p. 346, edit. 1899). But the reference may well imply that St. James on his part was quite prepared to adhere to the compact entered into at the Conference with regard to

ἑκάστου αὐτῶν ἡ προσφορά. 27. ὡς δὲ ἔμελλον[1] αἱ ἑπτὰ ἡμέραι συντελεῖσθαι, οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι, θεασάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ,[2] συνέχεον πάντα τὸν ὄχλον, καὶ ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτόν,

[1] **αι επτα ημ.**, art. om. in E (in **α** text Blass brackets), D has **συντελουμενης δε της εβδομης ημερας** (so Blass in **β** text, Hilg.).

[2] **συνεχεαν** is preferred by Blass with C and some mins., who thinks that the 1st aor. is to be read here, because usually **χυνω** is pres. in N.T., but see, on the other hand, Wendt (1899), p. 350 (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 111). **επεβαλαν** ℵ[1]A, so W.H., Weiss (Winer-Schmiedel, p. 112). Blass in **β** reads **επιβαλλουσιν** with D, so Hilg.

Gentile Christians, and that he expects St. Paul on his side to show that he has no desire to disparage the law in the eyes of Jewish Christians.

Ver. 26. **τότε ὁ Παῦλος**: St. Paul's conduct was another illustration of the rule laid down for himself when writing to Corinth, *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 20. This is in itself an answer to the captious criticism which doubts the truth of his action on this occasion, so amongst recent writers Hilgenfeld (1896). The vow of Acts xviii. 18 is sufficient to show us that there is no reason to suppose that the Apostle was merely acting a part in following the advice of St. James. McGiffert discusses the question at length, p. 340 ff., and concludes that the Apostle may well have done just what he is reported to have done; and further, that as a simpler explanation of Paul's arrest would have answered every purpose, the explanation given may fairly be assumed to be the true one. Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 517, also accepts the narrative as an illustration of St. Paul's own principle referred to above in 1 Cor. ix. 20, so too Wendt, J. Weiss, Pfleiderer. It seems strange that Wesley should have gone so far in the opposite direction as to believe that the Apostle actually suffered for his compliance with the wishes of James, ver. 33, *cf. Speaker's Commentary*, *in loco*.—**τῇ ἐχομ. ἡμέρᾳ**, taken either with **παραλ.** or with **σὺν αὐτοῖς ἁγν.**, so R.V.; only in Luke, *cf.* Luke xiii. 33, Acts xx. 15, without ἡμέρᾳ (so in Polybius); *cf.* xiii. 44, W. H. margin. In LXX 1 Chron. x. 8; 2 Macc. xii. 39 (1 Macc. iv. 28).—**εἰσῄει**: according to our interpretation of the passage, the word means that Paul entered into the Temple, and stayed there for seven days with the four poor men until the period of their vow was fulfilled, Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 520; but the expression need not mean more than that he entered into the Temple to give notice, or rather, giving notice, for the convenience of the priests of the day when the vow would be ended, and the necessary offerings brought.—**διαγγέλλων**: "declaring," R.V., *i.e.*, to the priests, not *omnibus edicens* (Grotius, so Grimm), "to signify" as in A.V., makes the participle future; verb only used by St. Luke in N.T. (Rom. xi. 17, quotation from LXX), 2 Macc. i. 33 (*cf.* its use in the sense of publication, Ps. ii. 7, lviii. 13, *cf.* 2 Macc. i. 33, iii. 34, Ecclesiast. xliii. 2).—**τὴν ἐκπ. τῶν ἡ. τοῦ ἁγ.**, *i.e.*, the seven days, ver. 27, which remained until the period of the vow was fulfilled, when the sacrifice was offered. Others however take **ἕως οὗ** with **εἰσῄει**, "he entered in . . . (and remained) until the offering," etc.—**ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου αὐτῶν**: there is no need to suppose with Nösgen that these words mean that the period of the full accomplishment of the vow was different in each of the four cases—at all events the whole period of "purification" did not extend over more than seven days.

Ver. 27. **αἱ ἑπτὰ ἡμέραι**: it does not appear that the seven days were enjoined by the law—not even in Num. vi. 9; indeed it would appear from Jos., *B.J.*, ii., 15, that a period of thirty days was customary before the sacrifice could be offered. The seven days cannot therefore include the whole period of the vow, although they might well include the period of the Apostle's partnership with the four men. Wendt and Weiss suppose that a reference is here made to a rule that the interval between the announcement to the priest and the conclusion of the Nazirite vow should include a period of seven days, but as there is admittedly no reference to any such ordinance elsewhere, it is precarious to depend too much upon it. It seems impossible to refer the expression to the seven days observed as the Feast of Pentecost; the article before **ἑπτὰ ἡμ.** refers to the "days of purification" just mentioned, see further critical note and Knabenbauer for summary of different views.—**οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀ. Ἰ.**: "the Jews from Asia," R.V., *cf.* vi. 9, where we

28. κράζοντες, Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται, βοηθεῖτε· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ τόπου τούτου πάντας[1] πανταχοῦ διδάσκων· ἔτι τε καὶ Ἕλληνας εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, καὶ[2] κεκοίνωκε τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον. 29. (ἦσαν γὰρ προεωρακότες Τρόφιμον τὸν Ἐφέσιον ἐν τῇ πόλει σὺν αὐτῷ, ὃν[3] ἐνόμιζον ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν εἰσήγαγεν ὁ Παῦλος.) 30. ἐκινήθη τε ἡ πόλις ὅλη, καὶ ἐγένετο συνδρομὴ τοῦ λαοῦ· καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενοι τοῦ Παύλου, εἷλκον αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἱεροῦ·

[1] πανταχη ℵABCDE (W.H. and Blass in β -χῇ), so Weiss; var. often in classical Greek.

[2] For κεκοινωκε D[1] has εκοινωνησεν, D[2] εκοινωσεν, but Blass follows T.R.

[3] ενομιζον, D has ενομισαμεν, not Blass.

read of the Jews of Cilicia, etc., who disputed with Stephen.—**θεασάμ.**, *cf.* xxiv. 18, where St. Paul tells us how these Jews had found him in the Temple purified, *i.e.*, with the Nazirite vow upon him, and in the act of presenting offerings—not of creating a disturbance, as his enemies alleged. These Jews, who were of course not believers, may have come from Ephesus, and were full of enmity against the Apostle for escaping them there, *cf.* xx. 3—they had come up to worship at Pentecost.—**συνέχεον**, see on ix. 22.—**ἐπέβ. τὰς χ.**, *cf.* xii. 1.

Ver. 28. **Ἄνδρες Ἰσ.**: the title which would remind them of the special dignity and glory of their nation, of its hopes and obligations.—**βοηθεῖτε**: as if against some outrage, or perhaps as if to apprehend Paul, or to attack him—in doing *anything* to admit the Gentiles, **ἔθνη**, to God's fold, St. Paul was exposing himself to the hatred of these unbelievers amongst his countrymen, 1 Thess. ii. 16, Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 107.—**οὗτός**: contemptuous.—**κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ**: the name for Israel, see on iv. 25, the same charge in almost the same words had been brought against St. Stephen, vi. 13; "before the Jewish authorities blasphemy was alleged, before the Roman, sedition".—**πάντας πανταχοῦ, πανταχῇ** or -ῇ, W.H., *cf.* xvii. 30, 1 Cor. iv. 17.—**πανταχῇ**: only here. The three words show the exaggerated nature of the charge; on St. Luke's characteristic use of **πᾶς** and kindred words see p. 51.—**ἔτι τε καὶ**, connecting thus closely the alleged act of introducing Gentiles into the Temple with the foregoing, as an illustration that Paul did not confine himself to preaching against the Holy Place, but had proceeded to defile it by his action; but *cf.* Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 163, "and further hath brought Greeks *also*," *cf.* xix. 27.—**Ἕλληνας**: only one man, Trophimus, had been actually seen with Paul, so that we again note the exaggerated charge, and even with regard to Trophimus, **ἐνόμιζον**, they only conjectured—they had no positive proof.—**κεκοίνωκε**: perfect, "sed manet pollutio," Blass, *in loco*, see also *Gram.*, p. 194.

Ver. 29. **τὸν Ἐφέσ.**: if some of these Jews, as is very probable, came from Ephesus, they would have recognised Trophimus. The latter had not only come "as far as Asia," xx. 4, but had evidently accompanied Paul to Jerusalem; on the statement and its bearing upon 2 Tim. iv. 20, see Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 401, and Weiss, *Die Briefe Pauli an Timotheus und Titus*, p. 354.—**προεωρακότες**: *antea videre;* in classical Greek nowhere as here, but referring to future, or space, not to past time; Blass, *in loco*, compares 1 Thess. ii. 2, Rom. iii. 9, for **πρό**.—**εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν**, *i.e.*, from the Court of the Gentiles (into which the uncircumcised Greeks like Trophimus and others might enter) into the inner Court, open to Jews only. The punishment for such transgression by a Gentile was death, even if he was a Roman citizen, Jos., *B.J.*, vi., 2, 4. At the foot of the stair by which "the Court" in the strict sense of the word was approached there was a railing bearing notice in Greek and Latin with the prohibition and the punishment due to its violation. For one of these inscriptions discovered and published in 1871 by Clermont-Ganneau see *Revue archéologique*, xxiii., 1872, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 74, and div. ii., vol. i., p. 266. E.T. (where other references are given), Edersheim, *Temple and its Services*, p. 24, Plumptre, *Acts, in loco*, Blass, *in loco*, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xv., 11, 5, *B.J.*, v., 5, 2.

καὶ εὐθέως ἐκλείσθησαν αἱ θύραι. 31. ζητούντων δὲ αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ἀνέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης, ὅτι ὅλη[1] συγκέχυται Ἱερουσαλήμ· 32. ὃς ἐξαυτῆς[2] παραλαβὼν στρατιώτας καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους, κατέδραμεν ἐπ' αὐτούς. οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες τὸν χιλίαρχον καὶ τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἐπαύσαντο τύπτοντες τὸν Παῦλον. 33. τότε ἐγγίσας ὁ χιλίαρχος ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκέλευσε δεθῆναι ἁλύσεσι δυσί·

[1] συγκεχυται ℵcEHLP; συνχυννεται ℵ*AB* (συγχ.), D 13 (συγχυνεται), Vulg., Tisch., W.H., Weiss; συγχυννεται Wendt; συγχυνεται R.V., Blass (*cf.* Winer-Schmiedel, p. 111, W.H., *App.*, p. 172). Blass in β, so Hilg., adds after Ιερου. ορα ουν μη ποιωνται επαναστασιν with Syr. H. mg.; noun not in N.T., but επανιστημι, although not in Luke.

[2] παραλ. ℵADEHLP, Tisch., W.H. text, R.V., Blass, Weiss, but λαβων B, W.H. marg.

Ver. 30. ἐκινήθη, as in vi. 12, *cf.* xxiv. 5.—συνδρομὴ τοῦ λ., Jud. iii. 18, 3 Macc. iii. 8, used of a tumultuous concourse of people, Arist., *Rhet.*, iii., 10, 7, Polyb., i., 67, 2.—ἐπιλ. τοῦ Π.: see p. 368, here of violent seizing; they wanted to get Paul outside the Temple precincts, so that the latter might not be polluted with his blood, ver. 31.—ἐκλείσθησαν αἱ θ.: no doubt by the Levitical guard, perhaps lest Paul should return, and so gain a place of safety in the Temple, or more probably to save the sacred precincts from any further pollution and uproar.

Ver. 31. ἀνέβη φάσις: "tidings came up," R.V., vividly, of the report which would reach the Roman officer in the tower of Antonia, overlooking and connected with the Temple at two points by stairs. The ἀνέβη seems to indicate that the writer was well acquainted with the locality. Stier supposes that a report was brought to the Roman authorities by the Christians, or the word may refer to an official report. The troops would be in readiness as always during the Festivals in case of riot, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 5, 3, *B.J.*, v., 5, 8, etc. φάσις: only here in N.T. Blass and Grimm derive it from φαίνω (in classical Greek, especially of information against smugglers, and also quite generally), but in Susannah ver. 55 (Theod.) φάσις is derived by some from φημί, see *Speaker's Commentary*, *in loco*, while Grimm classes it there also under the same derivation as here.—τῷ χιλ.: "military tribune," R.V. margin; his thousand men consisted of 760 infantry and 240 cavalry, *cf.* xxiii. 23, Blass, *in loco*. This officer who was evidently in command at Fort Antonia is called by Josephus φρούραρχος, *Ant.*, xv., 11, 4, xviii., 4, 3; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 55, E.T.—τῆς σπείρης, *cf.* x. 1, "cohort," R.V. margin.—συγκέχυται, see p. 238, and also critical note, "was in confusion," R.V., lit. (so Rhem.).

Ver. 32. ἐξαυτῆς, *cf.* x. 33.—παραλ. στρ. καὶ ἑκατοντ., indicating that he thought the tumult considerable.—κατέδραμεν ἐπ' αὐτούς, "ran down upon them" from Antonia, so R.V. vividly; verb found only here in N.T. In Job xvi. 10 (11) A we have the verb with accusative and ἐπί.—ἐπαύσαντο τύπτοντες after παύομαι: the act or state desisted from, indicated by the addition of a present participle, frequent in Luke, *cf.* Luke v. 4, Acts v. 42, vi. 13, xiii. 10, xx. 31; *cf.* also Ephes. i. 16, Col. i. 9, so in LXX, Grimm, *sub v.*, Winer-Moulton, xlv. 4.

Ver. 33. ἐπελ. αὐτοῦ: with a hostile intention, see xvii. 19.—δεθ. ἁλύσεσι δυσί: as a malefactor and seditious person, ver. 38, to be guarded securely as the cause of the tumult, *cf.* xii. 6.—τίς ἂν εἴη, καὶ τί ἐστι πεποιηκώς: the difference in the moods in dependent sentences after τις may be noted: the centurion had no clear idea as to who Paul was, but he feels sure that he had committed some crime, Winer-Moulton, xli., 4c, Weiss, Wendt, *in loco*, on the other hand Page. On Luke's thus mingling the optative obliqua with direct narrative alone among the N.T. writers, Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 225 (1893).

Ver. 34. ἐβόων: if we read ἐπεφώνουν, see critical note, a verb peculiar to St. Luke, Luke xxiii. 21, Acts xii. 22, xxii. 24 = "shouted," R.V., *cf.* xix. 31.—μὴ δυνάμ., see critical note.—τὸ ἀσφαλὲς: adjective, three times in St. Luke with this same shade of meaning, xxii. 30, xxv. 26 (*cf.* ii. 36, and Wisd. xviii. 6, ἀσφαλῶς).—παρεμ.: the word may mean an army, Heb. xi. 34, or

καὶ ἐπυνθάνετο τίς[1] ἂν εἴη, καὶ τί ἐστι πεποιηκώς. 34. ἄλλοι δὲ ἄλλο τι[2] ἐβόων ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ· μὴ δυνάμενος δὲ γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλὲς διὰ τὸν θόρυβον, ἐκέλευσεν ἄγεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν. 35. ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο[3] ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀναβαθμούς, συνέβη βαστάζεσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν στρατιωτῶν διὰ τὴν βίαν τοῦ ὄχλου. 36. ἠκολούθει γὰρ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ[4] κράζον,[5] Αἶρε αὐτόν.

37. Μέλλων τε εἰσάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ὁ Παῦλος λέγει τῷ χιλιάρχῳ, Εἰ ἔξεστί μοι εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς σέ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη, Ἑλληνιστὶ

[1] **τις αν ειη** *om.* **αν** ℵABD 18, 36, 105, 180, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt.

[2] **εβοων** HLP, Chrys.; **επεφωνουν** ℵABDE, Tisch., W.H., etc., as above. **δυναμενου δε αυτου** (instead of **δυναμενος δε** HLP), ℵAB(D)E 13, 31, 40, 68, same auth.

[3] **επι τους αναβ.**, D has **εις** (*adhuc esset in gradus* d).

[4] Instead of **κραζον** (DHLP, Syr. H., Chrys.), which seems to be a gram. emend., ℵABE, Syr. Pesh., Theophl., same auth. as in ver. 34 have **κραζοντες**.

[5] D *pro* **αιρε** has **αναιρεισθαι** (Gig., Sah. add **τον εχθρον ημων**, *cf.* xxiv. 18, xxviii. 19).

the camp which it occupies (so in LXX = Heb. מַחֲנֶה Judg. iv. 16, viii. 10, 1 Macc. v. 28). In this passage may = the castle itself, as A. and R.V., or perhaps the barracks in the castle. A Macedonian word according to Phryn., but see Kennedy, *Sources of N.T. Greek*, pp. 15, 16, and also for its meaning here, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 55, E.T.

Ver. 35. **ἐγέν. ἐπὶ**, *cf.* ver. 17, and Luke xxiv. 22, Grimm, *sub* **γίν.**, 5, g. **ἀναβ.**: the steps which led up to the fortress from the Temple area. *B.J.*, v., 5, 8, describes the surroundings of the scene vividly, and the **καταβάσεις** which led down from Antonia to the Temple; see above on ver. 31, and O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 138.—**συνέβη βαστάζ.**: the **σύν** is not superfluous (see Meyer-Wendt and Hackett), it indicates the peril of the situation; the pressure of the people became increasingly violent as they saw that St. Paul would escape them, and compelled the soldiers to carry him, that he might not be torn from them altogether, so that the carrying was not merely "propter angustias loci". **βαστάζ.**, *cf.* iii. 2, see Schürer, *u. s.*

Ver. 36. **ἠκολούθει**, imperfect, "kept following".—**Αἶρε αὐτόν**: the cry was continuous; it was the same cry which had been raised against another and a greater prisoner Who had been delivered to the Romans as a malefactor, *cf.* Luke xxiii. 18, John xix. 15, and also Polycarp, *Martyr*, iii., 19.

Ver. 37. **παρεμβ.**, see on ver. 34.—**εἰ**, *cf.* i. 6.—**Ἑλλη. γινώσκεις**; no need to supply **λαλεῖν**, *cf.* Xen., *Cyr.*, vii., 5, 31; so in Latin, *Græcè nescire*, Cic., *Pro Flacco*, iv., Vulgate, literally, *Græcè nosti?*

Ver. 38. **οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ**: *mirantis est*, *cf.* Arist., *Av.*, 280 (Blass). Vulgate, Eras. render *Nonne tu es . . . ?* but emphasis on **οὐκ** "Thou art not then" (as I supposed). No doubt the false prophet to whom reference is made by Josephus. Whilst Felix was governor he gathered the people around him on the Mount of Olives to the number of 30,000, and foretold that at his word the walls of the city would fall. But Felix attacked him and the impostor fled although the majority (**πλεῖστοι**) of his followers were captured or slain, Jos., *B.J.*, ii., 13, 5. In another account, *Ant.*, xx., 8, 6, Josephus states that 400 were killed and 200 wounded, so that he evidently contradicts himself and his numbers are untrustworthy. For the various attempts to reconcile these different notices, *cf.* Krenkel, *Josephus und Lukas*, p. 243. But apart from this, there is no positive discrepancy with St. Luke. It is possible that the chiliarch as a soldier only reckoned those who were armed, whilst Josephus spoke of the whole crowd of followers. Evidently the Roman officer thought that the Egyptian had returned after his flight, and that he

γινώσκεις; 38. οὐκ ἄρα σὺ εἶ ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ὁ πρὸ τούτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἀναστατώσας καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον τοὺς τετρακισχιλίους ἄνδρας τῶν σικαρίων; 39. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, Ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος μέν εἰμι Ἰουδαῖος[1] Ταρσεύς, τῆς Κιλικίας οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης· δέομαι δέ σου, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν λαόν.

[1] Instead of **Τ. της Κ. ουκ ασημ. πολεως πολ.** D has **εν Ταρσῳ δε της Κ. γεγεννημενος**, so Blass in **β** text, and Hilg.; instead of **επιτρεψον** D has **συγχωρησαι** (*cf.* Gig.), so Blass in **β** text, and Hilg.

was now set upon by the people as an impostor (so also Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 180, note, E.T.). There is no sign whatever that St. Luke was dependent upon Josephus, as Krenkel maintains, but it is of course quite possible that both writers followed a different tradition of the same event. But St. Luke differs from Josephus in his numbers, there is no connection in the Jewish historian, as in St. Luke, between the Egyptian and the Sicarii, and whilst Josephus mentions the Mount of Olives, St. Luke speaks of the wilderness; Belser, *Theol. Quartalschrift*, pp. 68, 69, Heft i., 1896, "Egyptian, The" (A. C. Headlam), Hastings' B.D.—**ὁ . . . ἀναστ. καὶ ἐξαγ.**: "stirred up to sedition and led out," R.V., this rendering makes the first verb (used only in Luke and Paul) also active, as in other cases in N.T. where it occurs, Acts xviii. 6, Gal. v. 12. The verb is not known in classical writers, but *cf.* LXX, Dan. vii. 23, and also in the O.T. fragments, Aquila and Symm., Ps. x. 1, lviii. 11, Isa. xxii. 3 (Grimm-Thayer).—**τοὺς**: "the 4000," R.V., as of some well-known number.—**τῶν σικαρίων**: "of the Assassins," R.V. The word *sicarius* is the common designation of a number, A.V., *cf.*, *e.g.*, the law passed under Sulla against murderers, "*Lex Cornelia de Sicariis et Veneficis*"; so in the Mishna in this general sense, but here it is used of the Sicarii or fanatical Jewish faction (and we note that the writer is evidently aware of their existence as a political party) which arose in Judæa after Felix had rid the country of the robbers of whom Josephus speaks, *Ant.*, xx., 8, 5, *B.J.*, ii., 13, 2, so called from the short daggers, *sicæ*, which they wore under their clothes. They mingled with the crowds at the Festivals, stabbed their political opponents unobserved, and drew suspicion from themselves by apparent indignation at such crimes, "Assassin" (A. C. Headlam), Hastings' B.D., Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 178, E.T.

Ver. 39. **Ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος μέν εἰμι Ἰ. . . . δέομαι δέ . . .**: there is no strict antithesis, "I am indeed a Jew of Tarsus" (and therefore free from your suspicion); but without speaking further of this, and proceeding perhaps to demand a legal process, the Apostle adds "but I pray you," etc. Mr. Page explains, from the position of **μέν**: "I (**ἐγώ**) as regards your question to me, am a man (**ἄνθρωπος μέν**), etc., but, as regards my question to you, I ask (**δέομαι δέ . . .**)," see reading in **β**. On St. Paul's citizenship see note below on xxii. 28. St. Paul uses **ἄνθρωπος** here, but **ἀνήρ**, the more dignified term, xxii. 3, in addressing his fellow-countrymen; but according to Blass, "vix recte distinguitur quasi illud (**ἄνθρωπος**) ut ap. att. sit humilius," *cf.* Matt. xviii. 23, and xxii. 2.—**λαλῆσαι**: Blass has a striking note on Paul's hopefulness for his people, and the proof apparent here of a man "qui populi sui summo amore imbutus nunquam de eo desperare potuit," Rom. ix.-xi.—**Ἰουδ.** not only **Ταρ.**, which would have distinguished him from **Αἰγ.**, but **Ἰουδ.**, otherwise the chiliarch from his speaking Greek might have regarded him as no Jew, and so guilty of death for profaning the Temple.—**οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως**: *litotes*, xx. 29, on Tarsus see ix. 11. The city had on its coins the titles **μητρόπολις αὐτόνομος**. For **ἄσημος**, *cf.* 3 Macc. iii. 1, and in classical Greek, Eurip., *Ion.*, 8. **οὐκ ἄσ. Ἑλλήνων πόλις**, *i.e.*, Athens (Wetstein), see further xxii. 27. Hobart (so too Zahn) mentions **ἄσημος** as one of the words which show that Luke, when dealing with unprofessional subjects, shows a leaning to the use of professional language; **ἄσημος** is the technical term for "a disease without distinctive symptoms," and Hippocrates, just as Luke, says, **μία πόλεων οὐκ ἄσημος**, *Epis.*, 1273. So again in xxiii. 13, **ἀναδιδόναι**, a word applied to the distribution of nourishment throughout the body, or of blood throughout the veins, is used by Hippocrates, as by

40. Ἐπιτρέψαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ, ὁ Παῦλος ἑστὼς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν κατέσεισε[1] τῇ χειρὶ τῷ λαῷ· πολλῆς δὲ σιγῆς γενομένης, προσεφώνησε

[1] D has και σεισας instead of κατεσεισε, not Blass; so D has ησυχιας instead of σιγης, see note in comment.

Luke, *l.c.*, of a messenger delivering a letter, *Epis.*, 1275 (see Hobart and Zahn); but it must be admitted that the same phrase is found in Polybius and Plutarch. Still the fact remains that the phraseology of St. Luke is here illustrated by a use of two similar expressions in Hippocrates, and it should be also remembered that the verb with which St. Luke opens his Gospel, ἐπιχειρεῖν, was frequently used by medical men, and that too in its secondary sense, just as by St. Luke, *e.g.*, Hippocrates begins his treatise *De Prisca Med.*, ὁκόσοι ἐπειχείρησαν περὶ ἰατρικῆς λέγειν ἢ γράφειν (see J. Weiss on Luke i. 1); so too Galen uses the word similarly, although it must be admitted that the same use is found in classical Greek and in Josephus, c. *Apion.*, 2.

Ver. 40. ἐπιτρέψ.: because he no doubt saw that Paul's purpose was to inform and pacify the people, so that there is nothing strange in such permission to speak.—κατέσεισε, see on xii. 17. "What nobler spectacle than that of Paul at this moment! There he stands bound with two chains, ready to make his defence to the people. The Roman commander sits by to enforce order by his presence. An enraged populace look up to him from below. Yet in the midst of so many dangers, how self-possessed is he, how tranquil!" Chrys., *Hom*, xlvii. —πολλῆς δὲ σιγῆς γεν., *cf.* Virg., *Aen.*, i., 148-152, ii., 1; but probably the phrase means not "a great silence," but rather "aliquantum silentii" (Blass), xxii. 2, *cf.* Xen., *Cyr.*, vii., 1, 25.—Ἑβραΐδι: in W.H. Ἐβ., see *Introd.*, 408; so as to gain the attention, and if possible the hearts, of the people, by using the language of the people, the Aramaic dialect of Palestine (Grimm-Thayer however points out that this is not rightly described as Syro-Chaldaic, it was rather Chaldee): see also Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., E.T., pp. 47, 48.

Chapter XXII.—Ver. 1. ἄνδρες ἀ. καὶ π., *cf.* vii. 2. So St. Stephen had addressed a similar assembly, in which had been Saul of Tarsus, who was now charged with a like offence as had been laid to the charge of the first Martyr. Those whom he addressed were his brethren according to the flesh, and his fathers, as the representatives of his nation, whether as Sanhedrists, or priests, or Rabbis. The mode of address was quite natural, since St. Paul's object was conciliatory: τοῦτο τιμῆς, ἐκεῖνο γνησιότητος, Chrys., *Hom.*, xlvii.—ἀκούσατε: "hear from me," *cf.* John xii. 47, a double genitive of the person and thing, as in classical Greek, or "hear my defence," *cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 16.—ἀπολογίας: five times in St. Paul's Epistles, once elsewhere in Acts xxv. 16, in a strictly legal sense (*cf.* 1 Peter iii. 15). Used with the verb ἀπολογέομαι of defending oneself against a charge, Wisd. vi. 10, Xen., *Mem.*, iv., 8, 5. In 2 Macc. xiii. 26 the verb is also used of Lysias ascending the *rostrum* and addressing the people in defence.

Ver. 2. προσεφώνει: only in Luke and Paul, except Matt. xi. 16, *cf.* Luke vi. 13, vii. 32, xiii. 12, xxiii. 20, xxi. 40, see Friedrich, p. 29, for the frequency of other compounds of φωνεῖν in Luke.—μᾶλλον παρ. ἡσυχ: the phrase is used similarly in Plut., *Coriol.*, 18, Dion Hal., ii., 32, and LXX, Job xxxiv. 29; on the fondness of St. Luke for σιγή, σιγᾶν, ἡσυχάζειν, and the characteristic way in which silence results from his words and speeches, or before or during the speech, see Friedrich, p. 26, *cf.* Luke xiv. 4, xv. 26, Acts xi. 18, xv. 12, Acts xii. 17, xxi. 40, and for ἡσυχάζειν, 1 Thess. iv. 11, Luke xiv. 4, Acts xi. 18, xxi. 14, so too παρέχειν with accusative of the thing offered by any one, xix. 24, xxviii. 2 (xvi. 16). The verb is used only in Matt. xxvi. 10, and parallel, Mark xiv. 6, except in Luke and Paul, Luke vi. 29, vii. 4, xi. 7, xviii. 5, Acts xvi. 16, xvii. 31, and as above, and five times in St. Paul's Epistles.

Ver. 3. γεγενν. ἐν Τ., see above p. 202.—ἀνατεθ. δὲ: although by birth a foreign Jew, yet brought up in Jerusalem, and so belonging to his hearers. It was important for the Apostle to emphasise this, as his close association with Jerusalem had a significant bearing on his future life.. The comma best after Γαμ., so that each clause begins with a participle, but Weiss places comma after

τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ λέγων, XXII. 1. Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, ἀκούσατέ μου τῆς πρὸς ὑμᾶς νῦν[1] ἀπολογίας. 2. Ἀκούσαντες δὲ ὅτι τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ προσεφώνει[2] αὐτοῖς, μᾶλλον παρέσχον ἡσυχίαν. 3. καί φησιν, Ἐγὼ μέν[3] εἰμι ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος, γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιήλ, πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῴου νόμου, ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρχων τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθὼς πάντες ὑμεῖς ἐστε σήμερον. 4. ὃς ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐδίωξα ἄχρι θανάτου, δεσμεύων καὶ παραδιδοὺς εἰς φυλακὰς

[1] **νυν**, but all good authorities **νυνι**.

[2] **προσεφωνει** ℵABP, most verss., Tisch., R.V., W.H., Wendt, Weiss; L, Syr. Harcl. have **προσεφωνησεν**; whilst DEH **προσφωνει**, so Blass in β, and Hilg.

[3] **μεν** *om.* ℵABDE, Vulg., Sah., Arm., Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, W.H., Blass, R.V.; Meyer retains with HLP, Boh., Syr. H., Aeth^utr., but it may have been added after xxi. 39. The punctuation of the verse varies considerably; W.H. have **ανατεθ. . . . Γαμ., πεπαιδ. . . . νομου, ζηλ. . . . σημερον·**; Blass has **ανατεθ. . . . ταυτῃ, παρα . . . ακριβειαν, του πατ. νομου ζηλ. (του Θεου)**; and Tisch. has **ανατεθ. . . . ταυτῃ, παρα . . . νομου, ζηλωτης . . . σημερον·**. T.R. = W.H., except comma after **Θεου**.

ταύτῃ (so De Wette, Hackett). Probably Paul went to Jerusalem not later than thirteen, possibly at eleven, for his training as a teacher of the law. **ἀνατεθ.**: only in Luke, *cf.* Acts vii. 20, 21, Luke iv. 16 (W.H. margin), "educated," so in classical Greek, 4 Macc. x. 2, xi. 15, but in latter passage AR **τραφ.** In Wisd. vii. 4 we have **ἐν σπαργάνοις ἀνετράφην** (A **ἀνεστρ.**).—**παρὰ τοὺς πόδας**: the more usual attitude for teacher and taught according to the N.T. and the Talmud; according to later Talmudic tradition the sitting on the ground was not customary until after the death of Gamaliel I., J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*, on Luke ii. 46; *cf.* also Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. 1, p. 326, E.T., and Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, pp. 14, 15, 2nd edit.; even if the later tradition was true, the scholar standing would still be at the feet of his teacher on his raised seat.—**κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν**: noun only here in N.T., but *cf.* xxvi. 5, "according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers," R.V., and so practically A.V. For a comment on the words *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xvii., 2, 4, *Vita*, 38, and *B.J.*, ii., 8, 18. **Φαρισαῖοι οἱ δοκοῦντες μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα**: Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., 314, note on **ἀκρίβεια** as used by Josephus and St. Paul, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 54, E.T. Whether therefore **τοῦ πατ. νόμου** (3 Macc. i. 23) included anything besides the Mosaic law or not, the words before us at least refer to the strictness upon which the Pharisees prided themselves in the observance of the law. In Gal. i. 14 St. Paul speaks of being a zealot of the traditions handed down from his fathers, **πατρικῶν**, where the traditions are apparently distinguished from the written law, Jos., *Ant.*, xiii., 16, 2, and 10, 6; but the "oral law" which the scribes developed was apparently equally binding with the written Thorah in the eyes of the Pharisees, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 10, 11, E.T., but *cf.* also Lightfoot, *u. s.* The word **πατρῴου** would appeal to the hearts of the people, who loved the Thorah as the chief good, but St. Chrysostom's words are also to be remembered: "all this seems indeed to be spoken on their side, but in fact it told against them, since he, knowing the law, forsook it" *Hom.*, xlvii.—**ζηλωτὴς ὑπάρ. τοῦ Θεοῦ**: St. Paul might have called himself a zealot of the law, or a zealot of God (Lightfoot, *u. s.*), *cf.* 2 Macc. iv. 2, **ζηλ. τῶν νόμων**, sued of Phinehas, 4 Macc. xviii. 12.—**καθὼς πάντες . . . σήμερον**: he recognises that their present zeal was a zeal for God, as his own had been, **ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν**, Rom. x. 2: *argumentum concilians*, Bengel.

Ver. 4. **ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν**, see above ix. 2.—**ἄχρι θανάτου**: sometimes taken to mean not that he prosecuted the Christians "unto death" (for if this was the meaning the following participles would sound feeble), but that this was his aim; ver. 20 and xxvi. 10, however, seem fully to justify the former meaning.—**φυλακὰς**:

ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, 5. ὡς καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς[1] μαρτυρεῖ μοι, καὶ πᾶν τὸ πρεσβυτέριον· παρ᾽ ὧν καὶ ἐπιστολὰς δεξάμενος πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς εἰς Δαμασκὸν ἐπορευόμην, ἄξων καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας δεδεμένους εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἵνα τιμωρηθῶσιν. 6. ἐγένετο δέ μοι πορευομένῳ καὶ ἐγγίζοντι τῇ Δαμασκῷ περὶ μεσημβρίαν ἐξαίφνης ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ περιαστράψαι φῶς ἱκανὸν περὶ ἐμέ· 7.[2] ἔπεσόν τε εἰς τὸ ἔδαφος, καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι, Σαούλ, Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; 8. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπεκρίθην, Τίς εἶ, Κύριε; εἶπέ τε πρός με, Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὃν σὺ διώκεις. 9. οἱ δὲ σὺν ἐμοὶ ὄντες τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθεάσαντο,[3] καὶ ἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο· τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι. 10. εἶπον δέ, Τί ποιήσω, Κύριε; ὁ δὲ Κύριος εἶπε πρός με, Ἀναστὰς πορεύου εἰς Δαμασκόν· κἀκεῖ σοι λαληθήσεται περὶ πάντων ὧν τέτακταί σοι ποιῆσαι. 11. ὡς δὲ[4] οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτὸς ἐκείνου, χειραγωγούμενος ὑπὸ

[1] D has **μαρτυρησει**, so Blass in β, and Hilg.; B has **εμαρτυρει** (but Weiss and W.H. reject).

[2] For **επεσον** ℵABEHP have **επεσα**, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, but Blass in β has **επεσον** with DL, so Hilg.

[3] ℵABH, Syr. P., Boh., Arm. *om.* **και εμφ. εγενοντο**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, but the reading is retained by DELP, Sah., Syr. H., Gig., so Blass in β, and Hilg.; on **εμφ. εγεν.** see x. 40. See Alford's note (he brackets the words).

[4] Blass reads **ως δε ανεστην ουκ εβλ.** with d, Syr. H. mg., Gig. **ουκ ενεβλεπον**, but B has **ουδεν εβλεπον**, so W.H. marg., Blass in β; **εμβλεπειν** not used absolutely elsewhere, B may therefore be original (Wendt).

plural, perhaps in relation to xxvi. 11, where Paul's persecuting fury extends to strange cities; usually singular.

Ver. 5. **ὡς καὶ ὁ ἀρχ.**: not the high priest at the time he was speaking, for that was Ananias, xxiii. 2, but rather to the high priest Caiaphas who gave him his commission to Damascus, and who may have been still alive, hence **μαρτυρεῖ**, present.—**τοὺς ἀδελ.**: the word was used by the Jews of each other, Exod. ii. 14, Deut. xv. 3, and St. Paul uses it here to show that he regarded the Jews as still his brethren, *cf.* Rom. ix. 3.—**τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας**, *cf.* xxi. 3, the adverb may imply those who had come thither only, so that refugees, not residents in Damascus, are meant, but the word may simply = **ἐκεῖ**, see on xxi. 3, and Winer-Moulton, liv. 7. In Hipp., *Vict. San.*, ii., 2, p. 35, we have **οἱ ἐκεῖσε οἰκέοντες.**—**τιμωρηθῶσιν**: only here and in xxvi. 11 in N.T.: used as here in classical Greek, but in this sense more frequent in middle.

Ver. 6. **περὶ μεσημ.**, *cf.* xxvi. 12, not mentioned in ix., note of a personal recollection.—**ἐξαίφνης**: only here in Acts and in ix. 3, see note; twice in Luke's Gospel, only once elsewhere in N.T.; see further on xxvi. 12 note, on the three accounts of St. Paul's Conversion.—**περιαστράψαι**: so also in ix. 3, nowhere else in N.T., see note above, *cf.* xxvi. 13, **περιλάμπειν** (note); the supernatural brightness of the light is implied here in **δόξης**, ver. 11.

Ver. 7. **ἔπεσον**: on the form **ἔπεσα** W.H. see Kennedy, *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 159, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 111.—**ἔδαφος**: only here in N.T. (in LXX, 1 Kings vi. 15, Wisd. xi. 5, etc., and in 4 Macc. vi. 7, **πίπτων εἰς τὸ ἔδ.**), but the verb **ἐδαφίζειν** is found in Luke xix. 44, and there only in N.T.—**ἤκουσα φωνῆς**, see on ix. 4 and 7, *cf.* Dan. x. 6-9.—**Σαοὺλ, Σαοὺλ**, as in ix. 4, see note on xxvi. 14 (and *cf.* reading in β text).

Vv. 8 and 9. See on ix. 5 and ix. 4, 7, 9.—**ἔμφ. ἐγέν.**, see critical note.

Ver. 11. **οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον**, *cf.* Xen., *Mem.*, iii., 11, 10, here absolute, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*: chap. ix., 8, gives the fact of the blindness, here we have its cause as from St. Paul's personal remini-

τῶν συνόντων μοι ἦλθον εἰς Δαμασκόν. 12. Ἀνανίας δέ τις, ἀνὴρ εὐσεβὴς[1] κατὰ τὸν νόμον, μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν κατοικούντων Ἰουδαίων, 13. ἐλθὼν πρός με καὶ ἐπιστὰς εἶπέ μοι, Σαοὺλ ἀδελφέ, ἀνάβλεψον. κἀγὼ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ[2] ἀνέβλεψα εἰς αὐτόν. 14. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν προεχειρίσατό σε γνῶναι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ· 15. ὅτι ἔσῃ μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ὧν ἑώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας. 16. καὶ νῦν τί μέλλεις; ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπό-

[1] **ευλαβης** for **ευσ.** ℵBHLP, Chrys., Theophl., Tisch., W.H., Wendt, Weiss, Blass.

[2] After **ανεβλεψα** Blass in **β** omits **εις αυτον**, so d, Sah., Hilg. (Schmiedel also omits), but see Wendt, note, p. 355 (1899).

scence.—**δόξης**: Heb. כָּבוֹד *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 40, 2 Cor. iii. 7, and Luke ix. 31.

Ver. 12. **Ἀναν.**, ix. 10. The description is added, **ἀνὴρ εὐ. Ἰ.**, manifestly fitting before a Jewish audience, and a proof that the brother who came to Saul was no law-breaker, Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 146. On the reading **εὐλαβής**, *cf.* ii. 5.—**τῶν κατοικ.**: seems to imply that Ananias had dwelt for some time in Damascus, ix.

Ver. 13. **ἐπιστὰς**: "standing over one," used frequently in Acts of the appearance of an angel, or of the intervention of a friend (or of an enemy), see Luke ii. 9, iv. 39, x. 40, xii. 7, xxiv. 4, only found in Luke and Paul, Friedrich, p. 42, see above xii. 7. **μαρτ.**, vi. 3. **ἀδελφέ**, ix. 17.—**ἀνάβλεψον . . . ἀνέβλ. εἰς αὐτόν**: "receive thy sight, and in that very hour I recovered my sight *and looked* upon him," R.V. margin. **ἀναβλέπειν** may mean (1) to recover sight, ix. 17, 18, or (2) to look up, Luke xix. 5, but used frequently as if combining both meanings, Humphry on R.V., and Page, *in loco*. Meyer and Zöckler render "to look up" in both clauses.—**αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ**, see note on xvi. 18.

Ver. 14. **ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πατ. ἡμῶν**: again a conciliatory phrase, *cf.* vii. 32, so St. Peter in iii. 13, v. 30.—**προεχειρ.**: "hath appointed," only in Acts in N.T., iii. 20, and in xxvi. 16, again used by Paul in narrating his conversion and call. In LXX, *cf.* Exod. iv. 13, Josh. iii. 12, 2 Macc. iii. 7, viii. 9, always with the notion of some one selected for an important duty (Lumby): to which may be added Dan., LXX, iii. 22 (see H. and R.), *cf.* note on iii. 20.—**τὸν δίκαιον**, see on iii. 14, and vii. 52.—**φ. ἐκ τοῦ στ.**: "a voice from his mouth," R.V., so Rhem., as the Apostle heard it at his conversion. **στ.** is often used in phrases of a Hebraistic character, so here fitly by Ananias, *cf.* xv. 7.

Ver. 15. **μάρτυς αὐτῷ**: "a witness for him," R.V., *cf.* i. 8.—**πάντας ἀνθ.**: we may see another evidence of the Apostle's tact in that he does not yet employ the word **ἔθνη**.—**ὧν ἑώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας**, Blass well compares for the former verb the Apostle's own words, 1 Cor. ix. 1; perfect tense, marks what was essential in giving him enduring consecration as an Apostle, *cf.* Blass, *Gram.*, p. 237.

Ver. 16. **καὶ νῦν**: so by St. Paul in xx. 22, 25, xxvi. 6, xvi. 37, xiii. 11; also found in iii. 17, x. 5, but no instances in Luke's Gospel of **καὶ νῦν** beginning a sentence, Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 145.—**τί μέλλεις**: only here in this sense in N.T., *cf.* 4 Macc. vi. 23, ix. 1, and so often in classical Greek, Aesch., *Prom.*, 36, etc.—**ἀναστὰς**, see v. 17.—**βάπτισαι**: middle voice (so perhaps in 1 Cor. x. 2, W.H. text, but passive in margin, as Blass), as a rule naturally in the passive, "to be baptised," *cf.* ix. 18, but the convert in "getting baptised" was conceived as doing something for himself, not merely as receiving something (Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, pp. 97, 98), so apparently Blass, *Gram.*, p. 182, or the middle may mean that he submitted himself to Christian Baptism, Bethge, p. 197, and Alford.—**ἀπόλουσαι**: also middle, *cf.* ii. 38, and 1 Cor. vi. 11, the result of the submission to Baptism, Tit. iii. 5, Ephes. v. 26.—**ἐπικαλ.**, *cf.* p. 81, on the significance of the phrase. This calling upon the name of Christ, thus closely connected with Baptism and preceding it, necessarily involved belief in Him, Rom. x. 14. There is no contradiction in the fact that the commission to the Apostleship here and in ix. comes from Ananias, whilst in xxvi. he is not men-

λουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου, ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα[1] τοῦ Κυρίου. 17. ἐγένετο δέ μοι ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ προσευχομένου μου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει, 18. καὶ[2] ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν λέγοντά μοι, Σπεῦσον καὶ ἔξελθε ἐν τάχει ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ· διότι οὐ παραδέξονται σου τὴν μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ. 19. κἀγὼ εἶπον, Κύριε, αὐτοὶ ἐπίστανται, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἤμην φυλακίζων καὶ δέρων κατὰ τὰς συναγωγὰς τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ σέ· 20. καὶ ὅτε[3] ἐξεχεῖτο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤμην ἐφεστὼς καὶ συνευδοκῶν τῇ[4] ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ, καὶ φυλάσσων τὰ ἱμάτια τῶν ἀναιρούντων

[1] Instead of K. ℵABE, verss., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. have **αυτου**.

[2] **ιδειν** ABEHLP, Vulg., Chrys., Lach., W.H., Weiss; Tisch. after ℵ 18, 36, 180, d has **ιδον** (**ειδον**, so Blass in **β**, and Hilg.).

[3] Instead of **εξεχειτο** ℵAB*. W.H., Weiss, Wendt have **εξεχυννετο**; Blass **-υνετο** with B³E. **Στεφ.** *om.* A 68, but no other authorities.

[4] **τῃ αναιρεσει αυτου** *om.* ℵABE 40, Vulg., Sah., Boh., Aethutr.; Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; *cf.* viii. 1.

tioned at all, and the commission comes directly from the mouth of the Lord. It might be sufficient simply to say "quod quis per alium facit id ipse fecisse putatur," but before the Roman governor it was likely enough that the Apostle should omit the name of Ananias and combine with the revelation at his conversion and with that made by Ananias other and subsequent revelations, *cf.* xxvi. 16-18. Festus might have treated the vision to Ananias with ridicule, Agrippa would not have been influenced by the name of a Jew living in obscurity at Damascus (*Speaker's Commentary*).

Ver. 17. **ἐγέν. δέ μοι ὑποσ.**: refers to the first visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem after his Conversion, Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 84, 93, 125. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 60, refers it to the second visit, (1) because the reason for Paul's departure from Jerusalem is given differently here and in ix. 29. But may not St. Luke be describing the occurrence in relation to the Jews and the Church, and St. Paul in relation to his own private personal history, St. Luke giving us the outward impulse, St. Paul the inner motive (Hackett), so that two causes, the one natural, the other supernatural, are mentioned side by side? *cf.* Acts xiii. 2-4 (so Lightfoot, Felten, Lumby). (2) Ramsay's second reason is that Paul does not go at once to the Gentiles, but spends many years of quiet work in Cilicia and Antioch, and so the command of the vision in vv. 20, 21. is not suitable to the first visit. But the command to go to the Gentiles dates from the Apostle's Conversion, quite apart from the vision in the Temple, *cf.* ix. 15, xxvi. 17, and the same commission is plainly implied in xxii. 15; the words of the command may well express the ultimate and not the immediate issue of the Apostle's labours. On **ἐγέν. δέ,** Luke seventeen times, Acts twenty-one, and **ἐγέν.** followed by infinitive, see Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 30, and Plummer's *St. Luke*, p. 45. For the reading in xii. 25, **ὑπέστ. εἰς Ἰ.,** and its bearing on the present passage see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 63, 64, and also above, xi. 29, xii. 25.—**προσευχ. . . . τῷ ἱερῷ**: there was a special reason for the mention of the fact before St. Paul's present audience; it showed that the Temple was still for him the place of prayer and worship, and it should have shown the Jews that he who thus prayed in the Temple could not so have profaned it, Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., p. 146.—**ἐν ἐκστάσει,** x. 10. For the construction see Burton, p. 175, Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 58, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 247.

Ver. 18. **σπεῦσον καὶ ἔξ.**: implying danger, *cf.* ix. 29.—**σου μαρτ.**: grounded upon the occurrence before Damascus, and so a striking testimony.

Ver. 19. **Κύριε,** ix. 5.—**αὐτοὶ ἐπίσ.**: Paul seems as it were to plead with his Lord that men cannot but receive testimony from one who had previously been an enemy of Jesus of Nazareth; the words

αὐτόν. 21. καὶ εἶπε πρός με, Πορεύου, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἐξαποστελῶ[1] σε.

22. Ἤκουον δὲ αὐτοῦ ἄχρι τούτου τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν λέγοντες, Αἶρε ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τὸν τοιοῦτον· οὐ γὰρ καθῆκον[2] αὐτὸν ζῆν. 23. κραυγαζόντων δὲ[3] αὐτῶν, καὶ ῥιπτούντων

[1] **εξαποστειλω**, but W.H. marg. **αποστελω**, so B; D has **εξαποστελλω**, but Blass in β = T.R.

[2] **καθηκον**, D², but **καθηκεν** ℵABCDEHLP (Blass). Other var. **καθηκει, καθηκαν** in minsc. show imperf. not understood.

[3] After **κραυγαζ. τε** is read by Lach., W.H., Weiss, Wendt with ABC, Syr. P., Aeth., but Tisch. with T.R. keeps **δε**, so ℵDEHLP, Vulg., Boh., Syr. H., Arm., Chrys.

too are directed to his hearers, so that they may impress them with the strength of the testimony thus given by one who had imprisoned the Christians.—**δέρων**: on the power of the Sanhedrim outside Jerusalem see on p. 151.—**κατὰ τὰς συν.**, *cf.* viii. 3, xx. 20, and for such punishments in the synagogues *cf.* Matt. x. 17, xxiii. 34, Mark xiii. 9, Luke xxi. 12, *cf.* Luke xii. 11, Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 374.

Ver. 20. **τοῦ μ. σου**: he identifies himself with Stephen, his testimony like that of the martyr is borne to Christ; on the word see p. 67; the term is here in a transition stage from "witness" to "martyr," *cf.* also Rev. xvii. 6: Hackett quotes the Christians of Lyons, towards the close of the second century, refusing to be called "martyrs" because such an honourable name only belonged to the true and faithful Witness, or to those who had sealed their testimony by constancy to the end, and they feared lest they should waver: Euseb., *Hist.*, v., 2.—**καὶ αὐτὸς**, *cf.* viii. 13, xv. 32, xxi. 24, xxiv. 15, 16, xxv. 22, xxvii. 36, here it is placed in sharp contrast to the preceding words about Stephen (with whose witness he was now identified). On **καὶ αὐτὸς** as characteristic of Luke in his Gospel and Acts see Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 33, as compared with its employment by the other Synoptists, sometimes it is inserted with emphasis, Plummer on Luke i. 16.—**συνευδ.**, see note on viii. 1.

Ver. 21. **εἰς ἔθνη**: the mere mention of the Gentiles roused their fury, and they saw in it a justification of the charge in xxi. 28; the scene closely resembled the tumultuous outburst which led to the murder of St. Stephen.

Ver. 22. **ἐπῆραν τὴν φ.**, see on ii. 14. —**αἶρε**, *cf.* xxi. 36, emphasised here by **ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς**; present tense, a continuous cry.—**καθῆκον**: only used by St. Paul elsewhere in N.T., *cf.* Rom. i. 28. The imperfect, **καθῆκεν**, see critical note, implies that long ago he ought to have been put to death "for it was not fit," etc., *non debebat* (or *debuerat*) *vivere*, Winer-Moulton, xli. 2. **καθ- = προσῆκον** Att. In LXX, Deut. xxi. 17, Ezek. xxi. 27 (32), and other passages, also several times in Books of Macc. (see H. and R.). For construction *cf.* Burton, p. 15.

Ver. 23. **κραυγαζόντων δὲ** (**τε**, Weiss, Wendt, W.H.), only here in Acts (*cf.* Luke iv. 41, but doubtful: W.H. read **κράζοντα**), six times in St. John, and four times in his narrative of the Passion of the cries of the Jewish multitude, *cf.* especially xix. 15, so too in 2 Esdras iii. 13, in classical Greek rare (Dem.), used by Epict., *Diss.*, iii., 4, 4, of the shouts in the theatres.—**ῥιπτ. τὰ ἱμάτια**: not throwing off their garments as if preparing to stone Paul (for which Zöckler compares vii. 58, and see Plato, *Rep.*, 474 A), for the fact that the Apostle was in the custody of the Romans would have prevented any such purpose. The verb may be used as a frequentative, **ῥιπτεῖν**, *jactare*, **ῥίπτειν**, *jacere*, while some of the old grammarians associate with it a suggestion of earnestness or effort, others of contempt, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* (for the form in LXX *cf.* Dan., Theod., ix., 18, 20). The word here rather means "tossing about their garments," a manifestation of excitement and uncontrollable rage, *cf.* Ovid, *Am.*, iii., 2, 74, and also instances in Wetstein, *cf.* Chrys., who explains **ῥιπτάζοντες, ἐκτινάσσοντες**. Dean Farrar refers to *Pal. Expln. Fund*, 1879, p, 77, for instances of the sudden excitability of Oriental crowds, and for similar illustrations see Hackett, *in loco.*—**κονιορτὸν βαλλ.**: best taken as

τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ κονιορτὸν βαλλόντων εἰς τὸν[1] ἀέρα, 24. ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ χιλίαρχος ἄγεσθαι εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, εἰπὼν μάστιξιν ἀνετάζεσθαι αὐτάν, ἵνα ἐπιγνῷ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὕτως ἐπεφώνουν αὐτῷ. 25. ὡς δὲ[2] προέτεινεν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱμᾶσιν, εἶπε πρὸς τὸν ἑστῶτα ἑκατόνταρχον ὁ Παῦλος, Εἰ ἄνθρωπον Ῥωμαῖον καὶ ἀκατάκριτον ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν μαστίζειν; 26. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος, προσελθὼν ἀπήγγειλε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ λέγων,[3] Ὅρα τί μέλλεις ποιεῖν· ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος Ῥωμαῖός ἐστι. 27. προσελθὼν δὲ ὁ χιλίαρχος

[1] Instead of αερα D, Gig., Syr. P., Cassiod. have ουρανον, so Blass in β. ριπτοντων in DEHL, Blass, Hilg., but text ℵABC, all edd.

[2] προετειναν ℵBL, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass in β, Hilg.; AE 68 have προετεινον; CD 40, 137, προσετειναν; P 31, προετεινεν, plural changed into sing. ο χ. λ. regarded as still the subject.

[3] ορα before τι *om.* ℵABCE, Vulg., Syrr. P.H., Boh., Arm., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, but retained by Blass with DHLP. After εκατον. Blass in β, and Hilg. add οτι Ρωμαιον εαυτον λεγει with D, Gig., Wern.

another sign of the same rage and fury, a similar demonstration; this is preferable to the supposition that they threw dust into the air to signify that they would throw stones if they could. εἰς τὸν ἀέρα seems to imply the interpretation adopted; the dust could scarcely have been aimed at Paul, for he was out of reach; but see 2 Sam. xvi. 13.

Ver. 24. ὁ χιλ., see xxi. 31.—παρεμ., xxi. 34.—εἰπὼν: whether the chiliarch understood Paul's words or not, he evidently saw from the outcries of the mob that the Apostle was regarded as a dangerous person, and he probably thought to obtain some definite information from the prisoner himself by torture.—μάστιξιν, *cf.* 2 Macc. vii. 1, 4 Macc. vi. 3, ix. 12, etc., and 1 Kings xii. 11, Prov. xxvi. 3, and in N.T., Heb. xi. 36; the Roman scourging was a terrible punishment; for its description *cf.*, *e.g.*, Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii., p. 390 (for Jewish scougings see Farrar, *St. Paul*, ii., Excurs., xi.).—ἀνετάζεσθαι: not found in classical Greek, but ἐξετάζεσθαι used specially of examination by torture. It is found in the active voice in Judg. vi. 29 A, and Susannah, ver. 14.—ἐπεφ.: "shouted against him," R.V., see on xxi. 34, and 3 Macc. vii. 13—only here with dative.

Ver. 25. προέτειναν: "and when they had tied him up with the thongs," R.V., *i.e.*, with the ligatures which kept the body extended and fixed while under flogging; Vulgate, "cum astrinxissent eum loris"; but προέ. is rather "stretched him forward with the thongs," *i.e.*, bound him to a pillar or post in a tense posture for receiving the blows, see critical note. Blass takes προέτειναν as an imperfect, *cf.* xxviii. 2.—τοῖς ἱμᾶσιν: referring to the thongs usually employed for so binding, and this seems borne out by ver. 29 δεδεκώς: not "for the thongs," as in R.V. margin, so Lewin, Blass, Weiss and others, as if = μάστιξ. Grimm admits that the word may be used either of the leathern thongs with which a person was bound or was beaten, but here he prefers the latter.—τὸν ἑστῶτα ἑκατόν.: the centurion who presided over the scourging, just as a centurion was appointed to be in charge over the execution of our Lord; on the form ἑκατόν., only here in Acts, see Simcox, *Lauguage of the N.T.*, p. 30, and see Moulton and Geden, *sub v.* -άρχης, and above on x. 1.—εἰ: "interrogatio subironica est, confidentiæ plena," Blass (so Wendt).—καὶ: "and that too," δύο τὰ ἐγκλήματα· καὶ τὸ ἄνευ λόγου καὶ τὸ Ῥωμαῖον ὄντα, Chrys., *cf.* xvi. 37. The torture was illegal in the case of a Roman citizen, although it might be employed in the case of slaves and foreigners: Digest. Leg. 48, tit. 18, c. 1. "Et non esse a tormentis incipiendum Div. Augustus constituit." At Philippi St. Paul had probably not been heard in his protests on account of the din and tumult: "nunc quia illi negotium est cum Romanis militibus, qui modestius et gravius se gerebant, occasione utitur" Calvin.

Ver. 26. ὅρα, see critical note.—τί μέλλεις ποιεῖν, *cf.* 2 Macc. vii. 2 R, τί μέλλεις ἐρωτᾶν;—ὁ γὰρ ἄν. οὗτος, on St. Luke's fondness for οὗτος in similar phrases, Friedrich, pp. 10, 89.

Ver. 28. πολλοῦ κεφ., *cf.* LXX, Lev.

εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Λέγε μοι,[1] εἰ σὺ Ῥωμαῖος εἶ; ὁ δὲ ἔφη, Ναί. 28. ἀπεκρίθη[2] τε ὁ χιλίαρχος, Ἐγὼ πολλοῦ κεφαλαίου τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην ἐκτησάμην. ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔφη, Ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγέννημαι. 29. εὐθέως οὖν ἀπέστησαν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ οἱ μέλλοντες αὐτὸν ἀνετάζειν. καὶ ὁ χιλίαρχος δὲ ἐφοβήθη, ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστι, καὶ ὅτι ἦν αὐτὸν[3] δεδεκώς.

[1] ει before συ *om.* ℵABCDEH, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.

[2] In ver. 28 D reads και αποκριθεις ο χ. ειπεν· εγω οιδα ποσου κεφ., so Blass in β, with Bede, so Hilg. (adding γαρ after εγω). Alford thinks possibly original, πολλου being a gloss. After ειπεν above, Blass in β adds (before εγω γαρ οιδα) ουτως ευχερως Ρωμαιον σεαυτον λεγεις; on the authority of Bede *tam facile dicis civ. R. esse?* Cod. Dubl. (Berger) *quam facile*, so Boh. (Tisch.); Belser, p. 126, defends for vividness and clearness, but neither ευχερως or ευχερης occur in N.T although both are classical, and each occurs in LXX.

[3] After δεδ. 137, Syr. H. mg., Sah. add και παραχρημα ελυσεν αυτον, so Blass and Hilg. (but see Wendt, p. 51 (1899), regards as secondary).

v. 24 (vi. 4), Num. v. 7; Jos., *Ant.*, xii., 2, 3 (used by Plato of capital (*caput*) as opposed to interest). Mr. Page compares the making of baronets by James I. as a means of filling the exchequer.—**τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην**: "this citizenship," R.V., *jus civitatis*, *cf.* 3 Macc. iii., 21, 23, so in classical Greek. Probably A.V. renders "freedom" quite as we might speak of the freedom of the city being conferred upon any one. On the advantages of the rights of Roman citizenship see Schürer, div. ii., vol. ii., pp. 277, 278, E.T., and "Citizenship," Hastings' B.D. —**ἐκτησάμην**: Dio Cassius, lx., 17, tells us how Messalina the wife of Claudius and the freedmen sold the Roman citizenship, and how at one time it might be purchased for one or two cracked drinking-cups (see passage in full in Wetstein, and also Cic., *Ad Fam.*, xii., 36). Very probably the Chiliarch was a Greek, Lysias, xxiii. 26, who had taken the Roman name Claudius on his purchase of the citizenship under the emperor of that name.—**ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ γεγέννημαι**: "but I am a Roman even from birth": "item breviter et cum dignitate," Blass. St. Paul's citizenship of Tarsus did not make him a Roman citizen, otherwise his answer in xxi. 39 would have been sufficient to have saved him from the present indignity. Tarsus was an *urbs libera*, not a *colonia* or *municipium*, and the distinction made in Acts between the Roman and Tarsian citizenship of Paul is in itself an additional proof of the truthfulness of the narrative. How his father obtained the Roman citizenship we are not told; it may have been by manumission, Philo *Leg. ad C.*, 23, or for some service rendered to the state, Jos., *Vita*, 76, or by purchase, but on this last supposition the contrast here implied would be rendered less forcible. However the right was obtained, it is quite certain that there is nothing strange in St. Paul's enjoyment of it. As early as the first century B.C. there were many thousands of Roman citizens living in Asia Minor; and the doubts raised by Renan and Overbeck are pronounced by Schürer as much too weak in face of the fact that it is precisely in the most trustworthy portion of Acts that the matter is vouched for.

Ver. 29. **καὶ . . . δέ**, *cf.* iii. 24, Luke ii. 35, Matt. x. 18, xvi. 18, John vi. 51, xv. 27, Rom. xi. 23, 2 Tim. iii. 12, and other instances, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, δέ, 9. —**ἐφοβήθη**, *cf.* xvi. 38, and the magistrates of Philippi. He seems to have broken two laws, the *Lex Porcia* and the law mentioned above, ver. 26.—**ἐπιγ. ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστι**: the punishment for pretending to be a Roman citizen was death, and therefore St. Paul's own avowal would have been sufficient, Suet., *Claudius*, 25.—**ὅτι ἦν αὐτὸν δεδεκώς**: on the construction usual in Luke see i. 10. The words may be best referred to the binding in ver. 25 like a slave; this is more natural than to refer them to xxi. 33. If this latter view is correct, it seems strange that Paul should have remained bound until the next day, ver. 30. No doubt it is quite possible that the Apostle's bonds were less severe after the chiliarch was aware of his Roman

30. Τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον βουλόμενος γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλές, τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται[1] παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἔλυσεν αὐτὸν[2] ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμῶν, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν[3] ἐλθεῖν τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ[4] ὅλον τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν· καὶ

[1] **παρα**, but **υπο** ℵABCE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass.

[2] **απο των δεσμων**, explanatory gloss, *om.* ℵABCE, verss., Chrys., W.H., R.V.

[3] **συνελθειν** ℵABCE, Vulg., Sah., Chrys., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Blass; **συν** prob. lost after **-σεν**.

[4] **παν το συνεδρ.** (instead of **ολον τ. σ. αυτων**), so ℵABCE, verss., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss.

citizenship, and that the later notices, xxiii. 18, xxiv. 27, xxvi. 29, xxvii. 42, may contrast favourably with xxi. 33.

Ver. 30. **τὸ τί κατηγ. παρὰ τῶν Ἰ.**: epexegetical of **τὸ ἀσφαλὲς**, *cf.* iv. 21 for the article, and Luke i. 62, ix. 46, xix. 48, xxii. 2, 4, 23, 24, 37, also 1 Thess. iv. 1, Rom. viii. 26, Matt. xix. 18, Mark ix. 10, 23. The usage therefore is more characteristic of St. Luke than of the other Evangelists, Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 67 (1893), Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 38.—**παρὰ**, if retained, *cf.* Winer-Moulton, xlvii., 5 b, who takes it to mean "on the part of the Jews," *i.e.*, they had not as yet presented any accusation.—**ἔλυσεν αὐτὸν**: according to ver. 29 it looks as if the chiliarch immediately he knew of St. Paul's Roman citizenship released him from his severe bondage. Overbeck, Weiss, Holtzmann therefore refer **τῇ ἐπαύριον** only to **βουλ. γνῶναι**, and not to **ἔλυσεν** and **ἐκέλευσεν**, but the order of the words cannot be said to favour this, and Wendt (1899) rejects this interpretation. The words may possibly mean that he was released from the *custodia militaris* in which he had been placed as a Roman citizen, although he had been at once released from the chains, *cf.* xxi. 33. In ver. 10 of the next chapter he apparently stands before the Council not in any way as a prisoner, but as one who stood on common ground with his accusers.—**καταγ.**, *i.e.*, from Antonia. — **συν(ελθεῖν) . . . τὸ συν.** Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 190, E.T., contends that the Council probably met upon the Temple Mount itself; it could not have been within the Temple, or we could not account for the presence of Lysias and his soldiers (see also Schürer, *u. s.*, p. 191, note), but *cf.* on the other hand for the place of meeting, O. Holtzman, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 176, and also the remarks of Edersheim, *Hist. of the Jewish Nation*, p. 131. Hilgenfeld, *Zw. Th.*, p. 517 ff. (1896), so Wendt, Clemen, Jüngst, J. Weiss and Spitta regard the whole scene before the Sanhedrim as an interpolation extending from xx. 30-xxiii. 10. But most of the objections to the passage may be classed as somewhat captious, *e.g.*, objection is taken to the fact that on the second night of his imprisonment St. Paul is assured by Christ that he should testify at Rome, xxiii. 11; why should such a communication be delayed to the second night of the imprisonment? it belongs to the first night, just as we reckon dreams significant which occur in the first night of a new dwelling-place! So again it is urged that the vision of the Lord would have had a meaning after the tumult of the people in xxii., but not after the sitting of the Sanhedrim in xxiii. But if ver. 10 is retained there was every reason for Paul to receive a fresh assurance of safety. In xxiii. 12-35 we have again Hilgenfeld's source C, and in this too Hilgenfeld finds a denial of the preceding narrative before the Sanhedrim, on the ground that Paul's trial is not represented as having taken place, but as only now in prospect. But vv. 15, 20 may fairly be interpreted as presupposing a previous inquiry, unless we are to believe, as is actually suggested, that **ἀκριβέστερον** may have prompted the author of Acts to introduce the account of a preceding hearing.

Chapter XXIII.—Ver. 1. **ἀτενίσας**, see on chap. i. 10, "looking stedfastly," R.V. The word denotes the fixed stedfast gaze which may be fairly called a characteristic of St. Paul. On this occasion the Apostle may well have gazed stedfastly on the Council which condemned Stephen, and although many new faces met his gaze, some of his audience were probably familiar to him. There is no need to suppose that the word implied weakness of sight (Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 38).—**ἄνδ. ἀδελ.**: the omission of **πατέρες** suggests that he

καταγαγὼν τὸν Παῦλον ἔστησεν εἰς αὐτούς. XXIII. 1. Ἀτενίσας δὲ ὁ Παῦλος τῷ συνεδρίῳ εἶπεν, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ πάσῃ συνειδήσει ἀγαθῇ πεπολίτευμαι τῷ Θεῷ ἄχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας. 2. ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀνανίας ἐπέταξε τοῖς παρεστῶσιν αὐτῷ τύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ

addressed the assembly not as judges but as fellow-countrymen. On ἀδελ. see on i. 15. It is of course possible, as Chrysostom observes, that he did not wish to appear εὐκαταφρόνητος before the chiliarch.—συνειδήσει: the word occurs no less than thirty times in N.T., R.V., so also in John viii. 9, but 1 Cor. viii. 7, συνηθείᾳ, R.V., and of these no less than twenty times in St. Paul's Epistles, twice in Acts, on both occasions by St. Paul, three times in 1 Peter, and five times in Hebrews. It may therefore be almost reckoned as a Pauline word. It does not occur at all in the Gospels (but *cf.* John viii. 9), but it need hardly be said that our Lord distinctly appeals to its sanction, although the word is never uttered by Him. The N.T. writers found the word ready to their use. In Wisd. xvii. 10 (11) we have the nearest anticipation of the Christian use of the word, whilst it must not be forgotten that it first appears at least in philosophical importance amongst the Stoics. (In Eccles. x. 20 it is used but in a different sense, and in Ecclus. xlii. 18, but in the latter case the reading is doubtful, and if the word is retained, it is only used in the same sense as in Eccles. x. 20.) It is used by Chrysippus of Soli, or Tarsus, in Cilicia, Diog. Laert., vii., 8, but not perhaps with any higher meaning than self-consciousness. For the *alleged* earlier use of the word by Bias and Periander, and the remarkable parallel expression ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις attributed to the latter, see W. Schmidt, *Das Gewissen*, p. 6 (1889), and for two quotations of its use by Menander, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*; *cf.* also Davison, *The Christian Conscience* (Fernley Lectures), 1888, sec. ii. and vi.; Cremer, *Wörterbuch*, *sub v.*; Sanday and Headlam, Rom. ii. 15, and for literature "Conscience," Hastings' B.D. For the scriptural idea of the word *cf.* also Westcott, additional note, on Heb. ix. 9.—πεπολ.: however loosely the word may have been used at a later date, it seems that when St. Paul spoke, and when he wrote to the Philippians, it embraced the public duties incumbent on men as *members of a body*, Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 137, Lightfoot on Phil. i. 27 (iii. 20), *cf.* Jos., *Vita*, ii. St. Paul was a covenant member of a divine πολιτεία, the commonwealth of God, the laws of which he claims to have respected and observed. The word is also found in LXX, Es. viii. 13 (H. and R.), 2 Macc. vi. 1, xi. 25, and four times in 4 Macc. Lightfoot, *u. s.*, parallels the use of the verb in Phil. by St. Paul from Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xxi., 1, and Polycarp, *Phil.*, v., 5. But Clem. Rom., *u. s.*, vi., 1, has the phrase τοῖς ἀνδράσιν ὁσίως πολιτευσαμένοις, referring to the O.T. Saints, and so St. Peter and St. Paul. To this latter expression Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, i., p. 211, finds a parallel in the fragment of a letter dating about 164 B.C. (Pap., *Par.*, 63, *coll.* 8 and 9), τοῖς θεοῖς πρὸς οὓς ὁσίως καὶ . . . δικαίως (πολι)τευσάμενος.—τῷ Θεῷ: in another moment of danger at the close of his career, 2 Tim. i. 3, the Apostle again appeals to a higher tribunal than that of the Sanhedrim or of Caesar. For the dative of the object *cf.* Rom. xiv. 18, Gal. ii. 19.—ἄχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμ., emphatic, because the Apostle wished to affirm that he was still in his present work for Christ a true member of the theocracy, *cf.* Rom. ix. 1 ff.

Ver. 2. Ἀναν.: not the Ananias of iv. 7, Luke iii. 2, John xviii. 13, but the son of Nebedæus, appointed to his office by Herod of Chalcis, high priest from *c.* 47-59. He was sent to Rome on account of the complaints of the Samaritans against the Jews, but the Jewish cause prevailed, and there is no reason to suppose that Ananias lost his office. The probabilities are that he retained it until he was deposed shortly before the departure of Felix. Josephus gives us a terrible picture of his violent and unscrupulous conduct, *Ant.*, xx., 9, 2. But his Roman sympathisers made him an object of hatred to the nationalists, and in A.D. 66, in the days of the last great revolt against the Romans, he was dragged from a sewer in which he had hidden, and was murdered by the weapons of the assassins whom in his own period of power he had not scrupled to employ, Jos., *B.J.*, ii., 17, 9, "Ananias," B.D.², and Hastings' B.D., O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 130,

στόμα. 3. τότε ὁ Παῦλος πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπε, Τύπτειν σε μέλλει ὁ Θεός, τοῖχε κεκονιαμένε· καὶ σὺ κάθῃ κρίνων με κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ παρανομῶν κελεύεις με τύπτεσθαι; 4. οἱ δὲ παρεστῶτες εἶπον, Τὸν[1] ἀρχιερέα τοῦ Θεοῦ λοιδορεῖς; 5. ἔφη τε ὁ Παῦλος, Οὐκ ᾔδειν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεύς· γέγραπται γάρ, "Ἄρχοντα τοῦ λαοῦ

[1] Blass reads in β text (with approval of Belser) **ουτως εμπαιζεις τῳ αρχιερει του Θεου λοιδορων;** *sic insilis in sacerdotem Dei male dicendo*, Cypr.

146.—**τύπτειν**: because Paul had forgotten that he was before his judges, and ought not to have spoken before being asked, *cf.* Luke vi. 29, John xviii. 22, 2 Cor. xi. 20, 1 Tim. iii. 3, Titus i. 7. The act was illegal and peculiarly offensive to a Jew at the hands of a Jew, Farrar, *St. Paul*, ii., p. 323.

Ver. 3. Wetstein sees in the words the customary formula of malediction among the Jews. But we need not regard Paul's words as an imprecation of evil on the high priest, but only an expression of the firm belief that such conduct would meet with punishment, *cf.* Knabenbauer, *in loco*. The terrible death of Ananias was a fulfilment of the words. On the paronomasia and other instances of the same figure see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 292.—**τοῖχε κεκον.**, *cf.* Matt. xxiii. 27, Luke xi. 44, the expression may have been proverbial, in LXX, *cf.* Prov. xxi. 9. A contrast has been drawn between St. Paul's conduct and that of our Lord under provocation, as, *e.g.*, by St. Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.*, iii., 1, but there were occasions when Christ spoke with righteous indignation, and never more severely than when He was condemning the same sin which St. Paul censured—hypocrisy. —**καὶ σύ**, emphatic, *cf.* Mark iv. 13, Luke x. 29. **καὶ** at the commencement of a question expressing indignation or astonishment (Page).—**κάθῃ κρίνων**, later form for **κάθησαι**, *cf.* for the phrase Luke xxii. 30.—**παρανομῶν** : only here in N.T., but *cf.* LXX, Ps. lxxv. 4, cxviii. 51; the verb also occurs several times in 4 Macc.

Ver. 4. **τὸν ἀρχ. τοῦ Θεοῦ**: of God, emphatic, *i.e.*, sitting on the judgment-seat as God's representative, *cf.* Deut. xvii. 8 ff., and also the name Elohim, by which the priestly and other judges were sometimes known, Exod. xxi. 6, xxii. 8, 9, Psalm lxxxi. 1.

Ver. 5. **οὐκ ᾔδειν**: the subject of **ἐστιν** is not expressed as in A. and R.V., in the Greek it is simply "I wist not that it was the high priest (who spoke)". If it be said that St. Paul could scarcely have been ignorant that Ananias was high priest, we must bear in mind that not even the high priest wore a distinctive dress when not engaged in actual service (Edersheim, *Temple and its Services*, p. 67, with reference to this same passage), if we are not prepared to accept the view of Chrysostom and Oecumenius amongst others, that the Apostle, owing to his long absence from Jerusalem, did not know the high priest by sight, or to suppose that his weakness of eyesight might have prevented him from seeing clearly (so Lewin, Plumptre). The interpretation that St. Paul spoke ironically, or by way of protest, as if such behaviour as that of Ananias on his nomination to office by Herod of Chalcis was in itself sufficient to prevent his recognition as high priest, is somewhat out of harmony with the Apostle's quotation of Scripture in his reply, nor are the attempts to translate **οὐκ ᾔδειν** as = *non agnosco* or *non reputabam* successful. See further Zöckler's summary of the different views, *Apostelgeschichte*, 2nd edition, *in loco*.—**ἀδελφοί**: the word indicates St. Paul's quick recovery from his moment of just anger to a conciliatory tone.—**γέγ. γὰρ**: in this appeal to the law, St. Paul showed not only his acquaintance with it, but his reverence for it—another proof of his wisdom and tact. —**ἄρχοντα τοῦ λαοῦ σου κ.τ.λ.**: LXX, Exod. xxii. 28, the Apostle apparently only quotes the latter part of the verse; in the Hebrew we have "thou shalt not revile God (*margin*, the judges), nor curse a ruler of thy people". *Cf.* the ruling principle of the Apostle's conduct Rom. xiii. 1-7 (1 Pet. ii. 13-17).

Ver. 6. **γνοὺς . . . τὸ ἓν . . . τὸ δὲ ἕτερον.** On **ἓν . . . ἕτερον**: see Simcox *Language of the N.T.*, pp. 71, 72. That Pharisees and Sadducees alike had seats in the Sanhedrim during this period is borne out not only by the N. T., but by Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 9, 1, *B.J.*, ii., 17, 3, *Vita*, 38, 39. It is possible that the Pharisees might have attracted the attention of the Apostle by their protest against the be-

σου οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς". 6. Γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ὅτι τὸ ἓν μέρος ἐστὶ Σαδδουκαίων, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον Φαρισαίων,[1] ἔκραξεν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ Φαρισαῖός εἰμι, υἱὸς Φαρισαίου· περὶ ἐλπίδος

[1] εκραξεν, but imperf. εκραζεν ℵBC 36, Syr. Pesh.; so Tisch., W.H., R.V. Weiss, Wendt (see note ed. 1899). Blass has εκραξεν, so Hilg. Φαρισαιου, but plural Φαρισαιων in ℵABC, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Tert., and other authorities as above, with Blass also, perhaps altered into sing., because one only thought of the relation of father and son (Wendt). B, Sah. Boh., Tert. omit εγω before κρινομαι; Lach. and Tisch. retain, but other authorities above with Blass omit (but W.H. in marg.); it may have been added in accordance with xxiv. 21.

haviour of Ananias and their acceptance of the words of apology (so Felten, Zöckler), but it is equally probable that in St. Luke's apparently condensed account the appeal to the Pharisees was not made on a sudden impulse (see below), but was based upon some manifestation of sympathy with his utterances. In ver. 9 it is evidently implied that the story of Paul's conversion on the road to Damascus had been narrated, and his acceptance of the Messiahship of the Risen Jesus carried with it his belief in a resurrection.—ἔκραξεν: the word may here as sometimes elsewhere, *cf.* John vii. 37, xii. 44, indicate no isolated cry, but a reference to something previously said, and it is probable that St. Luke may have passed over here as elsewhere some portions of the Apostle's speech, which were less intimately connected with the development and issue of events. It must however be noted that the verb may mean that the Apostle cried aloud so that all might hear him amidst the rising confusion.—ἐγὼ Φαρι. εἰμι κ.τ.λ.: the words have been severely criticised, but in a very real sense they truthfully expressed the Apostle's convictions. Before Felix St. Paul made practically the same assertion, although he did not use the word Φαρ. (*cf.* also xxvi. 5), Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 111. Moreover it is difficult to see why the Apostle should not describe himself as a Pharisee in face of the statement, xv. 5, that many members of the sect were also members of the Christian Church. They, like St. Paul, must have acknowledged that Jesus was the Messiah. But that Messiahship was attested by the avowal of the resurrection of Jesus, and the resurrection was a prominent article of the Pharisees' creed. In the acceptance of this latter doctrine St. Paul was at one not only with the "Pharisees who believed," but with the whole sect, and that he used the title in this limited way, *viz.*, with relation to the hope of the resurrection, is plain from the context, which fixes the limitation by the Apostle's own words. But because the declaration shows the tact of St. Paul, because it is an instance of his acting upon the maxim *Divide et impera*, has it no higher side in relation to his character and purpose? May we not even say that to the Pharisees he became as a Pharisee in order to save some, to lead them to see the crown and fulfilment of the hope in which he and they were at one, in the Person of Jesus, the Resurrection and the Life? That the Apostle's action met with Divine approval seems evident, ver. 11. See "Paul" (Dr. Llewellyn Davies), B.D.[1], iii., 754, 755, and amongst recent writers, Luckock, but on the other hand Gilbert, *Student's Life of Paul*, p. 187 ff. Bethge attributes to the Apostle an apologetic aim, *viz.*, to show the chiliarch that Christianity should be protected by the State, since it was no new religion, but really proceeded from Judaism; and in support he refers to the words of Lysias, xxiii. 29; but although the Apostle's appeal may have helped Lysias to form his judgment, it seems somewhat strained to attribute to the Apostle the motive assigned by Bethge. —υἱὸς Φαρ.: "a son of Pharisees," R.V. plural, which is the best reading, *i.e.*, his ancestors, 2 Tim. i. 3, Phil. iii. 5, possibly including his teachers by a familiar Hebraism.—περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀνασ.: generally taken as a hendiadys (so Page), "hope of a resurrection of the dead" (see, however, Winer-Moulton, lxvi. 7). In xxvi. 6 ἐλπίς is used of the hope of a future Messianic salvation—the hope of Israel—but in xxiv. 15 St. Paul distinctly makes mention of the hope of a resurrection of the dead, and his own words again in xxiv. 21 seem to exclude anything beyond that question as under discussion on the present occasion.

Ver. 7. στάσις: There is no difficulty

καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι. 7. Τοῦτο δὲ αὐτοῦ[1] λαλήσαντος, ἐγένετο στάσις τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, καὶ ἐσχίσθη τὸ πλῆθος. 8. Σαδδουκαῖοι[2] μὲν γὰρ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, μητὲ ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα· Φαρισαῖοι δὲ ὁμολογοῦσι τὰ ἀμφότερα. 9. ἐγένετο δὲ κραυγὴ μεγάλη· καὶ ἀναστάντες[3] οἱ γραμματεῖς τοῦ μέρους τῶν Φαρισαίων διεμάχοντο λέγοντες, Οὐδὲν κακὸν εὑρίσκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ· εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος,

[1] Instead of **λαλησαντος** W.H., Weiss, Wendt, following B, read **λαλουντος**; Tisch., Meyer, Blass have **λαλησαντος** with T.R., following CHLP, Syr. H.; R.V. (W.H. marg.), with Lach. and Hilgenfeld, has **ειποντος**, so ℵcAE, Vulg., Syr. Pesh.; ℵ* reads **ειπαντος**. For **εγενετο** B* (Syr. H.) has **επεπεσεν**, so W.H. marg. Blass brackets **και εσχισθη το πληθος**, see below on ver. 9.

[2] After **Σαδδ.** B, Vulg., Sah. omit **μεν**, so W.H. (text), Weiss, Blass; but retained by Tisch., R.V., W.H. marg., Hilg. Instead of **μηδε** as in T.R. (so Meyer, Wendt, Blass), **μητε** in ℵABCE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Hilgenfeld. In edit. 1899 Wendt decides to follow T.R., and to read **μηδε**, although he admits that MS. authority is against him. **μηδε** is supported by HLP, Chrys., Theophyl. But **μητε** may have been altered to **μηδε** to suit **τα αμφοτερα**. Instead of **τα αμφ.** Blass in β (Sah., Flor.) reads **ειναι αναστασιν και αγγελον και πνευμα.**

[3] Instead of **οι γραμματεις** ℵBC, Sah., Arm. read **τινες των γραμματεων**, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.; AE 13, Vulg., Boh. read simply **τινες**, so Lach., T.R. very little support; HLP, Aeth. read **γραμματεις** (om. **οι**). **του μερους** *om.* AE 13, Vulg., Boh., but retained in ℵBCHLP, Syr. P. and H., Arm., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. In β at commencement of verse Blass reads **και κραυγης γενομενης εν εαυτοις** (*inter eos*, Flor.) **εσχισθησαν** with Flor.; **ανασταντες** omit. in β text with Flor. **μη θεομαχωμεν** *om.* ℵABCE 13, 40, 66, verss. Instead of **ουδεν κακον κ.τ.λ.** Blass in β text (Flor.) reads **τι δε κακον εν τῳ ανθρωπῳ τουτῳ ευρισκομεν;**

in supposing that this dissension took place in the Assembly; it may have been no sudden result, because the Apostle had evidently said much more than is mentioned in the preceding verse (see above), and there is good evidence that one of the fundamental differences between the two sects was concerned with the question which St. Paul had raised, Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i., 315; Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 1, 4; *B.J.*, ii., 8, 14.—**ἐσχίσθη τὸ πλ.**, *Æn.*, ii., 39, and instances in Wetstein.

Ver. 8. **ἄγγελον . . . πνεῦμα**: are joined together by the speaker as one principal conception, so that the following **ἀμφότερα** presents no difficulty, see Winer-Moulton, lv., 6, Page, *in loco.* **πνεῦμα** would include the spirits of the dead, to one of which Paul would appear to have appealed, xxii. 7, 18 (Weiss). On the denial see Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 13, E.T., *cf.* also the remarks of Dr. A. B. Davidson, "Angel," Hastings' B.D., as to the possible sense of this denial and its possible limitation, with which we may compare Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 7, 1046.—**ὁμολ.**, *i.e.*, as part of their religious creed, their confession and open profession of faith: "but the faith of the Sadducees is well described by negations".

Ver. 9. **κραυγὴ μεγ.**: "there arose a great clamour," R.V., so A.V. in Ephes. iv. 31; the noun also denotes not only the loud cry of partisan applause as here, but of joyful surprise, Luke i. 42, of grief, Rev. xxi. 4, of anger, Ephes. *u. s.*, Westcott on Heb. v. 7, *cf.* LXX, Exod. xii. 30, Judith xiv. 19, 2 Macc. xv. 29.—**ἀναστάντες**, characteristic, see on v. 17.—**γραμματεῖς**, the professional lawyers exercised considerable influence in the Sanhedrim, belonging chiefly to the Pharisees, but also numbering in their ranks some Sadducean scribes, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., pp. 178, 319, E.T. The notice may therefore be placed to the writer's accuracy.—**διεμάχοντο**: only here in N.T., *cf.* LXX, Dan. x. 20, Ecclesiast. viii. 1, 3, li. 19 R., frequent in classics. Overbeck and Holtzmann can only see in this scene a repetition of chap. v. 33.—**εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα**: "And what if a spirit hath

μὴ θεομαχῶμεν. 10. πολλῆς δὲ[1] γενομένης στάσεως, εὐλαβηθεὶς ὁ χιλίαρχος μὴ διασπασθῇ ὁ Παῦλος ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἐκέλευσε τὸ στράτευμα καταβὰν ἁρπάσαι αὐτὸν ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν, ἄγειν τε[2] εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν.

11. ΤΗι δὲ ἐπιούσῃ νυκτὶ ἐπιστὰς αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος εἶπε, Θάρσει, Παῦλε[3]· ὡς γὰρ διεμαρτύρω τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, οὕτω σε δεῖ καὶ εἰς Ῥώμην μαρτυρῆσαι. 12. γενομένης δὲ ἡμέρας,[4] ποιήσαντές τινες τῶν Ἰουδαίων συστροφὴν ἀνεθεμάτισαν ἑαυτούς, λέγοντες

[1] Instead of γεν. ℵB 98*, read γιν.; Lach., Alford, Hilg. follow T.R., but Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, W.H., R.V., Blass read γιν. ευλαβηθεις retained by Meyer as the rarer word in N.T., but φοβηθεις ℵABCE, Chrys., and authorities above, so Hilgenfeld.

[2] After αγειν, W.H., following B, Boh., 31, omit τε in text (not in marg.), but Weiss retains in spite of B. If omitted, αρπασαι would depend upon καταβαν, and αγειν upon εκελευσε.

[3] Παυλε *om.* ℵABC*E, verss., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass (although retained in Flor. and by Hilg.).

[4] Instead of T.R., ℵABCE 13, 61, Boh., Arm., Aeth. read -τες συστροφην οι Ιουδαιοι; so authorities in ver. 11 except Blass. The latter reads with T.R. συστροφην τινες των Ιουδ., so L(HP), Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Gig., Flor., Lucif. (see also Hilg.).

spoken to him, or an angel?" R.V. reading after ἄγγελος a mark of interrogation. Often explained as *aposiopesis* (so Weiss), *cf.* W.H. reading—John vi. 62, Rom. ix. 22, but see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 288, Burton, pp. 109-110. The words may have been followed by a significant gesture or look towards the Sadducees, or by some such words as St. Chrysostom suggests: ποῖον ἔγκλημα! or, without any real *aposiopesis*, the words may have been interrupted by the tumult, Winer-Moulton, lxiv., ii. πνεῦμα: the word evidently refers back to St. Paul's own statements, xxii. 6, 7, while at the same time it indicates that the Pharisees were far from accepting Paul's account of the scene before Damascus as an appearance of Jesus of Nazareth.

Ver. 10. εὐλ., see critical note.—μὴ: after verbs of *fear* and *danger* in classical Greek, with subjunctive after primary tenses, with optative (more usually) after secondary tenses, but in N.T. only the subjunctive, Burton, p. 95, and Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 83 (1893), Acts xxvii. 17, 2 Cor. xi. 3, xii. 20, Heb. iv. 1.—διασπασθῇ, *cf.* LXX, Hos. xiii. 8, for use in same sense as here, to tear like a wild beast tears its prey in pieces (elsewhere in N.T., Mark v. 4, *cf.* LXX, Jer. ii. 20), *cf.* in classical Greek, Herod., iii., 13, Dem., 58, 8.—καταβὰν from Antonia.—ἁρπάσαι ἄγειν τε = ἁρπάσαν ἄγειν (Blass), see critical note.

Ver. 11. τῇ ἐπι. νυκτί, see Knabenbauer's note, p. 385, on Hilgenfeld's strictures; and below on the need and fitness of the appearance of the Lord on this night.—ἐπιστὰς, *cf.* xii. 7, and xviii. 9.—ὁ κ., evidently Jesus, as the context implies.—θάρσει: only in the imperative in N.T. (seven times); the word on the lips of Christ had brought cheer to the sick and diseased, Matt. ix. 2, 22, Mark x. 49; to the disciples sailing on the sea, Matt. xiv. 27, Mark v. 50; to the same disciples in an hour of deeper need, John xvi. 33, *cf.* its use in LXX as a message of encouragement (elsewhere we have the verb θαρρεῖν, so in Paul and Heb., but *cf. Apoc. of Peter*, v., Blass, *Gram.*, p. 24). The Apostle might well stand in need of an assurance after the events of the day that his labours would not be cut short before his great desire was fulfilled. The words of the Lord as given to us by St. Luke intimate that the Evangelist regarded Paul's visit to Rome as *apex Evangelii*, so far as his present work was concerned.—διεμαρτύρω: the word seems to imply the thoroughness of the Apostle's testimony, and to show that his method of bearing it was approved by his Lord, see on ii. 40.

Ver. 12. συστροφήν, xix. 40.—ἀνεθεμάτισαν ἑαυτούς: literally "they placed themselves under an anathema," *i.e.*, declared themselves liable to the direst punishments of God unless, etc. In N.T. the verb is only used in this passage, *cf.*

μήτε φαγεῖν μήτε πιεῖν ἕως οὗ ἀποκτείνωσι τὸν Παῦλον· 13. ἦσαν δὲ πλείους τεσσαράκοντα οἱ ταύτην τὴν συνωμοσίαν[1] πεποιηκότες· 14. οἵτινες προσελθόντες τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι[2] καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις εἶπον, Ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν ἑαυτούς, μηδενὸς γεύσασθαι[3] ἕως οὗ ἀποκτείνωμεν τὸν Παῦλον. 15. νῦν οὖν ὑμεῖς ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ, ὅπως[4] αὔριον αὐτὸν καταγάγῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὡς μέλλοντας διαγινώσκειν ἀκριβέστερον τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ· ἡμεῖς δέ,

[1] Instead of πεποι. ℵABCE have ποιησαμενοι, so R.V. and authorities above, except Blass in β text, εαυτους αναθεματισαντες, following Flor.

[2] Blass in β brackets και τοις πρεσβ. Lucif. "recte ut videtur" (Blass).

[3] After γευσ. Blass in β (Flor., Gig.) adds καθολου.

[4] αυριον *om.* ℵABCE 18, 36, 61, verss., and authorities above, so Hilg. ℵABE 61 have εις, so R.V. and as above.

14, 21, and once by St. Mark, xiv. 71, *cf.* the use of the verb in LXX, Josh. vi. 21, 1 Macc. v. 5. In N.T. the noun **ἀνάθεμα** is only found in Luke and Paul, see Lightfoot on Gal. i. 8, Sanday and Headlam on Rom. ix. 3. For instances of similar bindings by oath, Jos., *Vita*, liii., and a similar combination of ten men to murder Herod, *Ant.*, xv., 8, 3, 4. Of whom the band consisted we are not told, although probably Ananias would not have scrupled to employ the Sicarii, Jos., *Ant.*, ix. 2. The conspirators seem to have affected to be Sadducees, ver. 14, but Edersheim evidently holds that they were Pharisees, and he points out that the latter as a fraternity or "guild," or some of their kindred guilds, would have furnished material at hand for such a band of conspirators, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 227 ff.—**πεποι.** see critical note, **ἕως οὗ**, *cf.* Matt. v. 25, xiii. 33, John ix. 18; Burton, p. 128.

Ver. 14. **τοῖς ἀρχ.**, *cf.* iv. 23, see critical note on reading in β (Blass).—**ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεμ.**: "we have bound ourselves under a great curse," thus representing the emphatic Hebrew idiom, *cf.* v. 28, and for the same phrase *cf.* Deut. xiii. 15, xx. 17. The conspirators may have been instigated by the knowledge that the Sanhedrim could no longer inflict capital punishment, and from despair of obtaining the sanction of the Roman authorities for violence against Paul. It is quite certain that sentence of death must at all events be ratified by the procurator. Another serious restriction of the Jewish powers lay in the fact that the Roman authorities could step in at any moment and take the initiative, as in the case of Paul. Moreover the incidents before us illustrate the strange fact that even the chiliarch of the Roman force stationed in Jerusalem seems to be able to summon the Sanhedrim for the purpose of submitting to it any question upon which the Jewish law had to be learnt, *cf.* xxii. 30, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 188 ff., with which, however, should be compared O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 175, 176.—**γεύσασθαι**: "to taste nothing," R.V. "Hoc certe tam præposterum concilium nunquam probassent sacerdotes, si qua in illis fuisset gutta pii rectique affectus, imo sensus humani," Calvin. Edersheim quotes a curious illustration of the rash vow before us, which shows how easily absolution from its consequences could be obtained, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 229, J. Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.*

Ver. 15. **νῦν οὖν**: only in Acts in N.T., where it occurs four times, frequent in LXX.—**ἐμφανίσατε**: "signify" in A. and R.V.; this rendering apparently conveys a wrong idea, for it implies that the Council had the authority, whereas this lay with the Roman officer, *cf.* xxiv. 1, xxv. 2, 15. In LXX, Esther ii. 22, 2 Macc. iii. 7, xi. 29.—**σὺν τῷ συν.**: with the whole Council, including both those who had previously inclined to favour Paul as well as his opponents; the former could not object to the pretext that further inquiries were to be made into Paul's position, especially when the Sadducees urged such an inquiry.—**ὅπως**, Burton, p. 87.—**ὡς μέλλοντας**: this use of **ὡς** with the participle expressing the pretext alleged by another, often in Luke, *cf.* Luke xvi. 1, xxiii. 14, Acts xxiii. 20, xxvii. 30, Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 189 (1893), but we may also

πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσαι αὐτόν, ἕτοιμοί[1] ἐσμεν τοῦ ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν. 16. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀδελφῆς Παύλου τὴν ἐνέδραν, παραγενόμενος καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀπήγγειλε τῷ Παύλῳ. 17. προσκαλεσάμενος δὲ ὁ Παῦλος ἕνα τῶν ἑκατοντάρχων, ἔφη, Τὸν νεανίαν τοῦτον ἀπάγαγε πρὸς τὸν χιλίαρχον· ἔχει γάρ τι ἀπαγγεῖλαι αὐτῷ. 18. ὁ μὲν οὖν παραλαβὼν αὐτὸν ἤγαγε πρὸς τὸν χιλίαρχον, καί φησιν, Ὁ δέσμιος Παῦλος προσκαλεσάμενός με ἠρώτησε τοῦτον τὸν νεανίαν ἀγαγεῖν πρὸς σέ, ἔχοντά τι λαλῆσαί σοι. 19. ἐπιλαβόμενος δὲ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ χιλίαρχος, καὶ ἀναχωρήσας κατ᾿ ἰδίαν, ἐπυν-

[1] Blass in β reads **εσομεθα** instead of **εσμεν** with Flor., and at end of verse **εαν δεῃ και αποθανειν** with 137, Syr. H. mg., Flor.

compare 1 Cor. iv. 18 (Burton).—**διαγ.**: "as though ye would judge of his case more exactly," R.V., *accurate cognoscere;* the word need not be used here in the forensic sense as in xxiv. 22 (xxv. 21), Grimm, Blass; the "inquiry" is expressed by the usual word in ver. 20. The verb is used in 2 Macc. ix. 15.—**πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσαι**: so that the crime could not be imputed to the priests.—**ἕτοιμοί ἐσμεν τοῦ**: for genitive of the infinitive after a noun or an adjective, in Luke and Paul (1 Pet. iv. 17), (Viteau, *u. s.*, p. 169, Burton, p. 158. In LXX, *cf.* Mich. vi. 8, Ezek. xxi. 10, 11 (15, 16), 1 Macc. iii. 58, v. 39, xiii. 37.—**ἀνελεῖν αὐτὸν**, *cf.* Hackett's note, which gives a formal justification from Philo for the assassination of apostates.

Ver. 16. **ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀδελφῆς**: whether he and his mother lived in Jerusalem, as Ewald conjectured, we are not told. Probably not, as the mother is not otherwise mentioned. Paul's nephew may have been a student in Jerusalem, as the Apostle had been in his earlier days. Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 227, gives an interesting account of the way in which the young man as a member of the Pharisaic "Chabura," or guild, might have gained his knowledge of the conspiracy. At the same time nothing is told us in the text, and we cannot wonder at the comment "quis is fuerit, unde rescierit, ignoratur" (Blass).—**παραγεν.**: "having come in upon *them*," R.V. margin, "and he entered into the castle," etc. **παραγεν.** is thoroughly Lucan, and often gives a graphic touch to the narrative, but it is doubtful whether we can press it as above, although the rendering is tempting.—**ἀπήγγειλε τῷ Π.**: evidently Paul's friends were allowed access to him, and amongst them we may well suppose that St. Luke himself would have been included. On the different kinds of Roman custody see below, xxiv. 23, note.

Ver. 17. **τὸν νεανίαν τοῦτον**, see on vii. 58 and previous note above. The narrative gives the impression that he was quite a young man, if we look at his reception by the chiliarch and the charge given to him.

Ver. 18. **ὁ δέσμιος Π.**: used by Paul five times of himself in his Epistles, here for the first time in Acts with reference to him.

Ver. 19. **ἐπιλαβ.**: "ut fiduciam adolescentis confirmaret," Bengel, so Knabenbauer; on **ἐπιλ.** see note, xvii. 19.—**τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ**, *cf.* Luke viii. 54, Winer-Moulton, xxx. 8 d; see Calvin's note on the *humanitas* (as he calls it) of the centurion in thus receiving the young man.—**ἀναχ.**: used also in xxvi. 31, but not by Luke in his Gospel, although found in the other Evangelists.—**κατ᾿ ἰδίαν ἐπυν.**: "asked him privately," R.V., as suggested by the order of the Greek.

Ver. 20. **συνέθεντο**, Luke xxii. 5, John ix. 22, so in classical Greek in middle, *cf.* 1 Sam. xxii. 13, Dan. (Th.) ii. 9.—**τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαι**: the word certainly points to a certain equality with the person asked (not **αἰτέω**), see above on ver. 15—but still a request, not a demand.—**μέλλοντες**, see critical note; if plural, the clause intimates the pretext put forward by the conspirators; if singular, it is perhaps more in accordance with the deference of the youth, who would refer the control of the proceedings to the chiliarch.

Ver. 21. **ἐνεδρ.**: only in Luke in N.T., Luke xi. 54, with the accusative also in classical Greek, and several times in LXX, 1 Macc. v. 4, Jos., *Ant.*, v., 2, 12.—**καὶ νῦν**, see on xx. 22.—**προσδεχ.**:

θάνετο, Τί ἐστιν ὃ ἔχεις ἀπαγγεῖλαί μοι; 20. εἶπε δέ, Ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συνέθεντο τοῦ ἐρωτῆσαί σε, ὅπως αὔριον εἰς τὸ συνέδριον καταγάγῃς τὸν Παῦλον, ὡς μέλλοντές[1] τι ἀκριβέστερον πυνθάνεσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ. 21. σὺ οὖν μὴ πεισθῇς αὐτοῖς· ἐνεδρεύουσι γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρες πλείους τεσσαράκοντα, οἵτινες ἀνεθεμάτισαν ἑαυτοὺς μήτε φαγεῖν μήτε πιεῖν ἕως οὗ ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν· καὶ νῦν ἕτοιμοί εἰσι προσδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν. 22. ὁ μὲν οὖν χιλίαρχος ἀπέλυσε τὸν νεανίαν, παραγγείλας μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρός με. 23. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος[2] δύο τινὰς τῶν ἑκατοντάρχων εἶπεν, Ἑτοιμάσατε στρατιώτας διακοσίους, ὅπως πορευθῶσιν ἕως Καισαρείας, καὶ ἱππεῖς ἑβδομήκοντα, καὶ δεξιολάβους

[1] **μελλοντες** minscl. verss., so Blass, Hilg., with Gig., Flor. (as in ver. 15); **μελλων** ABE, Boh., Aeth., Tisch., W.H., Weiss; **μελλον**, so Wendt, with ℵ* 13, *sc.* **το συνεδρ.**

[2] ℵB 13, 61, Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt read **τινας** before **δυο**. Blass (so Flor.) brackets **διακ.** and **και** before **ιππεις**, and instead of **εβδομηκοντα** he reads **εκατον** with 137, Flor., Syr. H. mg., Sah., so Hilg.

only once elsewhere in Acts, xxiv. 15, probably in same sense as here, so R.V. text. In the Gospels, the word is found once in Mark xv. 43 (= Luke xxiii. 51), and five times in Luke, four times translated in R.V. as here; Luke ii. 25, 38, xii. 36, xxiii. 51, *cf.* also Tit. ii. 13, Jude ver. 21, and Wisd. xviii. 7, 2 Macc. viii. 11. In classical Greek two meanings as in N.T.: (1) to accept, receive favourably, (2) to wish for or expect a thing.—**ἐπαγγελίαν**: only here in N.T. of a human promise, see above on i. 4, *cf.* 1 Esd. i. 7, Esther iv. 7, 1 Macc. x. 15.

Ver. 22. **ἐκλαλῆσαι**, Judith xi. 9 (but S *al.*), "to divulge," here only in N.T., but in classical Greek, and in Philo. As in i. 4, transition to *oratio recta*, *cf.* Luke v. 14, Mark vi. 9, etc., very common in Greek prose, Winer-Moulton, lxiii., ii., 2, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 280.

Ver. 23. See critical note; if we place **τινάς** before **δύο**, Blass, Weiss, Knabenbauer take it of two centurions whom he could specially trust, see their notes *in loco*, and Blass, *Gram.*, p. 174. In Luke vii. 19 the order is different, Blass compares Herman, *Vis.*, i., 4, 3, **δύο τινὲς ἄνδρες** (but see on the other hand Page's note, and Wendt, edit. 1899).—**ἑτοιμάσατε**: here only in Acts, but frequent in Luke's Gospel, more so than in Matthew or Mark, in John only twice. On the aorist imperfect see Winer-Moulton, xliii., 3, "have immediately . . . in readiness to march".—**στρατ. διακ.**: *milites gravis armaturæ.* Blass brackets the first **διακ.**, and **καὶ** before **ἱππεῖς**, so that **στρατ.** includes under it both **ἱππεῖς** and **δεξιολάβους**, see critical note.—**δεξιολ.**: apparently a special class of light-armed soldiers (javelin-throwers, Livy, xxii., 21, or slingers), Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 56, E.T., who says that this much only is certain. The word only occurs elsewhere twice, and that in later Greek literature of the seventh and tenth century (see references in Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and Meyer-Wendt, *in loco*), where they are distinguished from the **τοξοφόροι** and **πελτασταί**. Probably from **δεξιός** and **λαμβάνω**, grasping their weapons by the right hand, so here of those who carried their light weapon, a lance, in their right hand, Vulgate, *lancearios*. This is more probable than the derivation from **λαβή**, a sword-hilt, as if the word referred to *spiculatores cum lanceis*, who wore their swords fastened not on the left but on the right (so Ewald). Still more fanciful is the derivation of Egli who accented thus **δεξιολάβοι**, and took the word to refer to those who were unable to use the right hand, Judg. iii. 15, xx. 16, so "left-handed" slingers. Others interpret as if the word meant military lictors who guarded captives bound by the right hand, but their large number here seems to conflict with such an interpretation (Grimm-Thayer), see the full notes of Meyer-Wendt, 1888, 1899, and *cf.* Renan,

διακοσίους, ἀπὸ τρίτης ὥρας τῆς νυκτός· 24.[1] κτήνη τε παραστῆσαι, ἵνα ἐπιβιβάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον διασώσωσι πρὸς Φήλικα, τὸν ἡγεμόνα· 25. γράψας ἐπιστολὴν[2] περιέχουσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον· 26. Κλαύδιος Λυσίας τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι Φήλικι, χαίρειν. 27. τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλληφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, καὶ μέλλοντα ἀναιρεῖσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἐπιστὰς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι[3] ἐξειλόμην αὐτόν, μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός

[1] In β text Blass reads κτηνος, Par.², Syrr. P. and H., Prov., and before διασωσωσι the words δια νυκτος, so Flor., Syr. H. mg. Belser approves as precise notes of exact information. Blass adds (so Hilg.) after τον ηγεμονα the words εις Καισ. with 137, and continues εφοβηθη γαρ, μηποτε αρπασαντες αυτον οι Ιουδαιοι αποκτεινωσιν, και αυτος μεταξυ εγκλημα εχῃ ως χρηματα ειληφως, 137, Gig., Wer., Par.², Vulgcl., Syr. H. mg.

[2] περιεχουσαν, so Meyer, Blass, Hilgenfeld, with AHLP; but εχουσαν ℵBE 61, 137, so R.V., and other authorities as above.

[3] εξειλαμην ℵABE, Tisch., W.H., Blass, Weiss. Instead of μαθων Blass in β reads (Gig.) βοωντα και λεγοντα εαυτον ειναι Ρωμαιον.

Saint Paul, p. 532, Overbeck for various interpretations, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 69. A reads δεξιοβόλους (Syr. Pesh. *jaculantes dextra*, Arᵉ *jaculatores*), which would be a correct interpretation if we understood the word of javelin-throwers or slingers.—ἀπὸ τρίτης ὥρας: about nine in the evening; the journey was to commence *from* that time, so that by daybreak Paul would be in safety, *cf.* x. 30. The number of the escort was meant to guard against surprise.

Ver. 24. παραστῆσαι: depending on ειπεν, ver. 23; a change to indirect speech, *cf.* references in ver. 22.—κτήνη (κτάομαι): *jumenta*, Vulgate, almost always in plural, property in general, herds or flocks, cattle; in LXX, where it is very frequent, and in N.T. it is used of beasts of burden or for riding, *cf.* Luke x. 34, Rev. xviii. 13, sometimes quite generally in LXX, as in 1 Cor. xv. 39.—ἐπιβ.: only in Luke and Acts in N.T., Luke x. 34, xix. 35, in each case in same sense; so in classical Greek and LXX. The reason why the plural κτήνη is used *vix satis perspicitur* (Blass); the word has sometimes been taken to apply to the soldiers, as if they were all mounted, but taking the word in relation to Paul, one or more beasts might be required for relays or for baggage, so Weiss, Wendt, Hackett, or, as the prisoner was chained to a soldier, another κτῆνος would be required (Kuinoel, Felten).—διασώσωσι: five times in Acts, once in Luke's Gospel, only twice elsewhere in N.T., "ut P. salvum perducerent," Vulgate, frequent in LXX, *cf.* its use in Polyb. and Jos., see further on xxvii. 44.—Φήλικα, see on xxiv. 3.—τὸν ἡγεμόνα: used of a leader of any kind, or of an emperor or king; in N.T. of the procurator, of Pilate, Felix, Festus, so by Josephus of Pilate, *Ant.*, xviii., 3, 1, of governors more generally, Luke xxi. 12, 1 Pet. ii. 14, etc.

Ver. 25. περιέχουσαν, see critical note above.—τύπον: "form," R.V., a précis or summary of the contents of a letter, 3 Macc. iii. 30. Such a letter would be called *elogium*, Alford, *in loco*, Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 532. It is quite true that τύπος does not demand that the letter should have been given verbally, and in an oft-quoted passage, Plato, *Polit.*, 3, p. 414, ἐν τύπῳ is contrasted with δι' ἀκριβείας, but the letter bears the marks of genuineness, *e.g.*, the part which Lysias claims to have played, and the expression "questions of their law" (see below). Moreover St. Luke might have easily learnt its contents, as there is reason for supposing that the letter would have been read in open court before Felix, as containing the preliminary inquiry, and that a copy may have been given to Paul after his appeal, see Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden Apostelgeschichte*, p. 226.

Ver. 26. κρατίστῳ, see note on i. 1.—χαίρειν (λεγει or κελεύει), *cf.* xv. 23.

Ver. 27. ἄνδρα, not ἄνθρωπον: Bengel and Wendt take the word to indicate a certain degree of respect.—συλλ.: used in various senses, but in all four Gospels of the capture of Jesus, and in Luke, where the word is frequent, often of the capture of prisoners, Acts i. 16, xii. 3, xxvi. 21, Luke xxii. 54 (Plummer) so in LXX.—μέλλοντα ἀναι.: "was about to be killed," R.V.—ἐπιστὰς: the word seems

ἐστι. 28. βουλόμενος δὲ[1] γνῶναι τὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν ἐνεκάλουν αὐτῷ, κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν· 29. ὃν εὗρον ἐγκαλούμενον περὶ[2] ζητημάτων τοῦ νόμου αὐτῶν, μηδὲν δὲ ἄξιον θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν ἔγκλημα ἔχοντα. 30. μηνυθείσης δέ μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα μέλλειν[3] ἔσεσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐξαυτῆς ἔπεμψα πρὸς σέ, παραγγείλας καὶ τοῖς κατηγόροις λέγειν[4] τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ σοῦ.[5] Ἔῤῥωσο.

[1] **επιγνωναι** ℵAB 13, other authorities as in ver. 27, so also in R.V. and Wendt. **κατηγαγον . . . αυτων** B* 61 *om.* [W.H.], R.V. marg. *om.*

[2] **ζητηματων**, Blass in β *om.* (Gig.); **περι του νομου Μωυσεως και Ιησου τινος**, so Blass in β, with 137, Gig., Syr. H. mg.; β text continues: **μηδεν δε αξιον θανατου πρασσοντα** (Gig.), **εξηγαγον αυτον μολις τῃ βιᾳ**, 137, Syr. H. mg. (Gig.), so Hilgenfeld.

[3] **μελλειν** *om.* ℵABE, so R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. **υπο των Ι.** *om.* ℵABE, and other authorities as above. **εξαυτης** BHLP, Syr. Pesh., Sah., Boh., so W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt; but Lach., Tisch. read **εξ αυτων** with ℵAE, Syr. H., Arm.

[4] **τα προς αυτον**, *om.* **τα** B, Syr. Pesh., Arm., so W.H., R.V., Weiss. For the three words Lach., Tisch., with ℵA 13, 40, Vulg., read **αυτους**, whilst EHP insert **τα** before **προς αυτον** (not seeing that the phrase was taken as in xix. 38); see Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 37. Blass in β text (Gig.) reads (instead of **λεγειν . . . σου**) **εκει ερχεσθαι προς την σην διαγνωσιν.**

[5] **ερρωσο** *om.* AB 13, Sah., Boh., Aeth$^{ro.}$, Gig., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, R.V. in text; Blass brackets in β; ℵEL d, Syrr. P. H., Arm., Aeth$^{pp.}$ retain, so Hilg.; HP read **ερρωσθε**, xv. 29.

to intimate that he was ready at the right moment to rescue the prisoner.—**τῷ στρατ.**: "with the soldiers," R.V., those under his command.—**ἐξειλόμην**, vii. 10.—**μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥ.**: "qua ratione id compererit, tacere satius erat," Blass. The chiliarch wishes to put the best interpretation on his own conduct after his hastiness in xxi. 33, xxii. 24, see reading in β text. Overbeck and Wendt (and even Zöckler) defend the chiliarch from a crafty misrepresentation, and compare the condensed explanation of the letter and the facts given in the narrative to the different accounts of Saul's conversion, but the chiliarch had a motive for dissembling his real part in the transaction, *viz.*, fear of punishment.

Ver. 28. **δέ**: if we read **τε** Weiss regards it as closely connecting the wish of the chiliarch with the previous rescue affected by him, and as hoping to veil his conduct in the interim which was so open to censure.—**ἐνεκάλουν αὐτῷ**, xix. 38, with dative of the person as here, and in classical Greek, *cf.* Ecclus. xlvi. 19. In N.T. only in Luke and Paul, *cf.* Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 148.—In the letter of Lysias Hilgenfeld omits vv. 28, 29, as an addition of the "author to Theophilus". Vv. 26, 30, are quite sufficient, he thinks, for "military brevity," whilst ver. 28 could not have been written by Lysias since he would have written an untruth. But it is quite conceivable that the Roman would not only try to conceal his previous hastiness, but to commend himself to the governor as the protector of a fellow-citizen. Spitta omits ver. 28 in the letter, and Jüngst also ver. 29. But Jüngst equally with Hilgenfeld declines to omit the *whole* letter as Clemen proposes.

Ver. 29. **ζητημάτων**, *cf.* xviii. 14, 15, "a contemptuous plural" (Page).—**ἔγκλημα ἔχοντα**: phrase only here in N.T., *criminis reum esse, accusari*, as in classical Greek, *cf.* Thuc., i., 26; the noun occurs again in xxv. 16, but not elsewhere in N.T., not found in LXX.

Ver. 30. A mingling of two constructions, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 247, Winer-Moulton, lxiii., 1, 1. **ἔσεσθαι**: on the future infinitive denoting time relatively to the time of the principal verb see Burton, pp. 48, 52.—**ἔπεμψα**: epistolary aorist, *cf.* 1 Cor. v. 11, Phil. ii. 28, Ephes. vi. 22, Col. iv. 8, Philem., ver. 11; Burton, p. 21. **ἐξαυτῆς**, see critical note.—**λέγειν τὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν**, *cf.* xix. 38, omitting **τὰ**, see critical note.—**ἐπὶ σοῦ**: *coram*, *cf.* xxiv. 20, 21, xxv. 9, 26, xxvi. 2, 1 Cor. vi. 1 (1 Tim. vi. 13), Winer-Moulton, xlvii.

31. Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιῶται, κατὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον αὐτοῖς, ἀναλαβόντες τὸν Παῦλον ἤγαγον διὰ [1] τῆς νυκτὸς εἰς τὴν Ἀντιπατρίδα. 32.[2] τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἐάσαντες τοὺς ἱππεῖς πορεύεσθαι σὺν αὐτῷ, ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν· 33. οἵτινες εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὴν Καισάρειαν, καὶ ἀναδόντες τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τῷ ἡγεμόνι, παρέστησαν καὶ τὸν Παῦλον αὐτῷ. 34. ἀναγνοὺς δὲ [3] ὁ ἡγεμών, καὶ ἐπερωτήσας ἐκ ποίας [4] ἐπαρχίας ἐστί, καὶ πυθόμενος ὅτι ἀπὸ Κιλικίας, 35.[5] Διακούσομαί σου, ἔφη, ὅταν καὶ οἱ κατήγοροί σου παραγένωνται. ἐκέλευσέ τε αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ τοῦ Ἡρώδου φυλάσσεσθαι.

[1] ℵABE *om.* art. before νυκτος, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, R.V.

[2] At the beginning of the verse Blass in β reads (Gig.) τῃ δε επαυριον εασαντες τους στρατιωτας (υποστρεφειν) εις την παρεμβολην μετα μονων των ιππεων ηλθον εις την K. Instead of πορευεσθαι ℵABE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. read απερχεσθαι.

[3] ο ηγεμων *om.* ℵABE; other authorities above.

[4] επαρχειας ℵAB*, so W.H., Weiss, Wendt; Blass has -ιας, so Hilg.

[5] ακουσ., so Blass in β for διακ. with other, but slight variations, after 137, Syr. H. mg. For T.R., R.V. reads παραγενωνται· κελευσας, so ℵcABE 40, 61 (ℵ* κελευσαντος), so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. After φυλασσ. ℵABE add αυτον, so R.V., and other authorities above.

Ver. 31. **οἱ μὲν οὖν . . . τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον**: Rendall, appendix on **μὲν οὖν**, p. 162. Page finds the antithesis in **μετὰ δὲ**, xxiv. 1, referring the five days there not to Paul's arrival in Cæsarea, but to his despatch from Jerusalem by Lysias, "so then the soldiers, etc. . . . but after five days . . ." (see also note below).—**ἀναλαβόντες**, *cf.* xx. 13.—**διὰ (τῆς) νυκτὸς**: "by night," this use of **διά** with genitive of time passed through (*cf.* i. 3) is comparatively rare, Luke v. 5, Heb. ii. 15, except in almost adverbial phrases as here, *cf.* v. 19, xvi. 9, xvii. 10, Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 140.—**εἰς τὴν Ἀντιπατρίδα**: founded by Herod the Great, on the road from Jerusalem to Cæsarea, not apparently as a fortress but as a pleasant residence, giving it its name in honour of his father, most probably on the site now called *Rás el 'Ain*, "the spring-head," and not where Robinson placed it, on the site of the present *Kefr Saba*. The more modern site, the discovery of which is due to Conder, is more in accordance with the abundant supply of water referred to by Josephus. It is to be noted that while Josephus in one passage identifies Antipatris with Kefr Saba, in another his description is more general, and he places it in the Plain of Kefr Saba (for notices *cf. Ant.*, xiii., 15, 1, xvi. 5, 2, *B.J.*, i., 21, 9). They were now more than half way to Cæsarea, and the road traversed the open plain so that they were no longer in danger of surprise, G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography*, p. 165, B.D.², Hastings' B.D. (Conder). On the Greek article in notices of stations on journeys, peculiar to Acts, see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 149, *cf.* xvii. 1, xx. 13, xxi. 1, 3 (but xx. 14 no article).

Ver. 32. **τῇ δὲ ἐπ.**: not necessarily the morrow after they left Jerusalem, but the morrow after they arrived at Antipatris. In this interpretation **διὰ νυκτὸς** might be taken to mean *by night* in distinction to *by day*, so that they may have occupied two nights on the road, see Hackett's note, *in loco*.—**ἐάσαντες**, Lucan, see xxvii. 32, 40; xxviii. 4.—**εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν**, here "to the castle" A. and R.V., the barracks in Antonia.—**ὑπέστρεψαν**, Lucan (Friedrich, p. 8), *cf.* i. 12.

Ver. 33. **οἵτινες**: "and they when they . . ." R.V., *sc.* **ἱππεῖς**.—**ἀναδόντες**: not elsewhere in N.T., or in LXX in this sense, of delivering a letter. Zahn, following Hobart, sees in the phrase **ἀναδ. τὴν ἐπιστολήν** a phrase characteristic of a medical man, since Hippocrates, *Epis.*, 1275, uses the verb instead of **διδόναι** or **ἀποδιδόναι** of a messenger delivering a letter, and thus shows a leaning common to the Greek medical writers of employing a verb already

XXIV. 1. ΜΕΤΑ δὲ πέντε ἡμέρας κατέβη ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς Ἀνανίας μετὰ [1] τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ῥήτορος Τερτύλλου τινός, οἵτινες ἐνεφάνι-

[1] Instead of των πρεσβ. ℵABE, Vulg., Sah., Syr. H. read πρεσβ. τινων, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.; Meyer follows T.R.

familiar to them in a professional way; but it must be remembered that both Polybius and Plutarch use the verb in a similar sense.

Ver. 34. **ἀναγνοὺς**, see reading in β text. **ποίας**: of what kind of province, imperial or senatorial, as the governor desired to complete the report, *cf.* ver. 27. Blass takes it as simply = **τίνος**, as in iv. 7.—It appears that during the first century, although perhaps with variations from time to time, Cilicia formed part of the great Roman province Syria-Cilicia-Phœnice, *cf.* "Cilicia" (Ramsay), Hastings' B.D. A procurator of Judæa like Felix was only subordinate to the governor of Syria inasmuch as the latter could bring his supreme power to bear in cases of necessity. The military command and the independent jurisdiction of the procurator gave him practically sole power in all ordinary transactions, but the governor could take the superior command if he had reason to fear revolutionary or other serious difficulties. Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 44 ff., E.T.—**ἐπαρχίας**: the word is used to describe either a larger province, or an appendage to a larger province, as Judæa was to that of Syria, see Schürer, *u. s.*, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*

Ver. 35. **διακούσομαί σου**: "I will hear thy cause," R.V., the word implies a judicial hearing (*cf.* LXX, Deut. i. 16 (Job ix. 33)), and so in classical Greek of hearing thoroughly. The word is used of a judicial hearing, Dio Cassius, xxxvi., 53 (36), and Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 57, gives examples of similar usages on Egyptian papyri, 2nd to 3rd century A.D. — **πραιτωρίῳ**: "palace," R.V., Herod's palace at Cæsarea, where the procurator resided; it was not only a palace but also a fortress, and would contain a guard-room in which Paul would be confined. The word "palace" might well express its meaning in all the passages in which it occurs in the Gospels and Acts (but on Phil. i. 13 see Lightfoot, *in loco*). The Romans thus appropriated palaces already existing, and formerly dwelt in by kings or princes, *cf.* Cicero, *Verr.*, ii., 5, 12, 30, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision of N.T.*, p. 49. It seems from the context that the place could not have been far from the quarters occupied by Felix, since Paul could be easily sent for.—**φυλάσσεσθαι**: the kind of *custodia* depended on the procurator, and no doubt the *elogium* had its effect; *custodia satis levis* (Blass).

CHAPTER XXIV.—Ver. 1. **πέντε ἡμέρας**: most probably to be reckoned from the arrival of St. Paul at Cæsarea, not from his apprehension in Jerusalem, or from his start from Jerusalem on the way to Cæsarea. This latter view is that of Mr. Page, who takes **οἱ μὲν οὖν**, xxiii. 31, as answered by the **δέ** in this verse. But **δέ**, xxiii. 32, seems quite sufficiently to answer to **μέν** in the previous verse. Wendt reckons the days from the arrival of Paul at Cæsarea, and regards the day of the arrival of the high priest as the fifth day, *cf.* Mark viii. 31. **μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας** = Matt. xvi. 21, Luke ix. 22, **τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμ.**, see below, ver. 11. On the truthfulness of the narrative see also on same verse.—**κατέβη**: "came down," R.V., *i.e.*, from the capital.—**Ἀνανίας**, see on xxiii. 2. If we read **πρεσ. τινῶν**, see critical note, "with certain elders," R.V., *i.e.*, a deputation of the Sanhedrim.—**ῥήτορος Τ. τινὸς**: "an orator, one Tertullus," R.V., **ῥη.** here = *causidicus*, a barrister; here the prosecuting counsel **συνήγορος** (as opposed to **σύνδικος** the defendant's advocate), see note, Blass, *in loco*. **Τερτ.**: a common name, diminutive of Tertius; but it does not follow from the name that he was a Roman, as both Greeks and Jews often bore Roman names. Blass speaks of him as a Jew "erat Judæus et ipse" (so Ewald, Bethge), whilst Wendt (1899) inclines against this view, although if the words in ver. 6, **κατὰ τὸν ἡμετερον νόμον**, are retained, he admits that it would be correct; in addition to this the expression **ἔθνος τοῦτο**, ver. 3, seems in Wendt's view to indicate that the speaker was not a Jew (so too Wetstein). Tertullus was apparently one of the class of hired pleaders, often employed in the provinces by those who were themselves ignorant of Roman law. The trial may have been conducted in Greek, Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 684, Felten, *in loco*. —**ἐνεφάνισαν**, *cf.* xxv. 2, 15, the verb appears to be used in these passages as

σαν τῷ ἡγεμόνι κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου. 2. κληθέντος δὲ [1] αὐτοῦ, ἤρξατο κατηγορεῖν ὁ Τέρτυλλος, λέγων, 3. Πολλῆς εἰρήνης τυγχάνοντες διὰ σοῦ, καὶ [2] κατορθωμάτων γινομένων τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ διὰ τῆς σῆς προνοίας πάντῃ τε καὶ πανταχοῦ, ἀποδεχόμεθα, κράτιστε Φῆλιξ, μετὰ πάσης εὐχαριστίας. 4. ἵνα δὲ μὴ ἐπὶ πλεῖόν σε [3] ἐγκόπτω,

[1] **αυτου** *om.* B, so Weiss [W.H.], Wendt perhaps.

[2] **κατορθ.** HLP; **διορθ.** ℵABE 13, 61, 137, 180; Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[3] For **εγκοπτω** ℵAB¹E have **ενκοπτω**, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilgenfeld (see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 54), Blass reads **κοπτω** (fatigans, Syr^utr.; molestus sim, Sah., Boh.), A* 13, 19, 31.

a kind of technical term to indicate laying formal information before a judge, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 10, 8, in LXX, Esther, ii., 22. Blass takes it here = **χάρτην ἔδωκαν**, see also Wetstein.

Ver. 2. **ἤρξατο**: he began with a *captatio benevolentiæ* after the usual oratorical style, *cf.* Cicero, *De Oratore*, ii., 78, 79, on the *exordium* and its rules.—If obtaining such artificial support was not as Calvin calls it "signum malæ conscientiæ," it may well indicate the weakness of the Jews' cause, and their determination to leave nothing untried against Paul.

Ver. 3. **πολλῆς εἰρ. τυγχ.**: the governors specially prided themselves on keeping peace in their provinces (Wetstein). On the phrase see 2 Macc. iv. 6, xiv. 10.—**κατορθωμάτων**: "very worthy deeds," A.V., the word might mean "successes," *cf.* Polyb., i., 19, 12, or it might mean *recte facta*, *cf.* Cic., *De Fin.*, iii., 14 (see also in Wetstein; the word is found in 3 Macc. iii. 23, R); but **διορθώματα**, see critical note, in Arist., Plut. = corrections, reforms (*cf.* R.V.), so **διόρθωσις** in Polyb., Vulgate, *multa corrigantur*. In LXX **διορθοῦν** is used of amending, Jer. vii. 3, 5.—**προνοίας**: foresight, *cf.* Rom. xiii. 14, nowhere else in N.T.; *cf.* for a close parallel to its use here 2 Macc. iv. 6, referred to above (Lumby). It is possible that the word may be a further proof of the sycophancy of the orator; twice the Latin *providentia*, A. and R.V. "providence," was used of the emperors on coins, and also of the gods (Humphry on R.V.), "hoc vocabulum sæpe diis tribuerunt," Bengel, *in loco*.—**πάντῃ τε καὶ πανταχοῦ ἀποδεχ.**, so A. and R.V., "non in os solum laudamus" (Wetstein); but Meyer joins **πάν. τε κ. παντ.** with what precedes (Lach.), and in this he is followed by Weiss, Wendt, Page and Blass. For similar phrases in Plato, Artistotle, Philo, Josephus, see Wetstein. **πάντῃ**: only here in N.T., but *cf.* Ecclus. l. 22, 3 Macc. iv. 1, *cf.* Friedrich, p. 5, on Luke's fondness for **πᾶς** and kindred words.—**τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ**, see above on ver. 1 and also ver. 10. If he had been a Jew Wetstein thinks that he would have said **τῷ ἔθνει τῷ ἡμετέρῳ**, but see Blass, *in loco*, on **ἔθνος** "in sermone elegantiore et coram alienigenis".—**ἀποδ.**: only in Luke and Acts; for its meaning here *cf.* ii. 41, 1 Macc. ix. 71 (S *al.*), so in classical Greek.—**εὐχ.**: except Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12, elsewhere in N.T. only in St. Paul's Epistles (frequent); the word is also found in Esth. (LXX) viii. 13, Ecclus. xxxvii. 11, Wisd. xvi. 28, 2 Macc. ii. 27, and for other references see Kennedy, *Sources of N.T. Greek*, p. 73, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*—There was very little, if anything, to praise in the administration of Felix, but Tertullus fastened on the fact of his suppression of the bands of robbers who had infested the country, Jos., *B.J.*, ii., 13, 2, *Ant.*, xx., 8, 5, "ipse tamen his omnibus erat nocentior" (Wetstein). His severity and cruelty was so great that he only added fuel to the flame of outrage and sedition, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 8, 6, *B.J.*, ii., 13, 6, whilst he did not hesitate to employ the Sicarii to get rid of Jonathan the high priest who urged him to be more worthy of his office. In the rule of Felix Schürer sees the turning-point in the drama which opened with the death of Herod and terminated with the bloody conflict of A.D. 70. The uprisings of the people under his predecessors had been isolated and occasional; under him rebellion became permanent. And no wonder when we consider the picture of the public and private life of the man drawn by the hand of the Roman historian, and the fact that

παρακαλῶ ἀκοῦσαί σε ἡμῶν συντόμως τῇ σῇ ἐπιεικείᾳ. 5. εὑρόντες γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον λοιμόν, καὶ κινοῦντα στάσιν[1] πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, πρωτοστάτην τε τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἱρέσεως, 6. ὃς καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπείρασε βεβηλῶσαι· ὃν καὶ ἐκρατήσαμεν

[1] The plural **στασεις** for **στασιν** is supported by ℵABE 13, 40, 61, 68, Vulg., Boh., Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. Blass in β text with Gig. adds **ου μονον τῳ γενει ημων αλλα σχεδον παση τη οικουμενη**.

trading upon the influence of his infamous brother Pallas he allowed himself a free hand to indulge in every licence and excess, Tac., *Hist.*, v., 9, and *Ann.*, xii., 54, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 177-181, E.T.

Ver. 4. **δέ**: *autem*, "innuit plura dici potuisse in laudem Felicis," Bengel.—**ἐγκόπτω**, *impedire*, as if Felix was so busy in his reforms that Tertullus would not interrupt him, but see critical note, *cf.* Rom. xv. 22, Gal. v. 7.—**ἐπὶ πλεῖον**, *cf.* iv. 17, xx. 9; in 2 Tim. ii. 16, iii. 9, with the opposite verb **προκόπτω**.—**συντόμως**: so in classical Greek, with **λέγειν**, **εἰπεῖν**; in Jos., *c. Apion.*, i., 1, 6, with **γράψαι** and **διδάσκειν**, see Wetstein on Rom. ix. 28, *cf.* 2 Macc. ii. 31, for the adjective and for the adverb, Prov. xiii. 23, 3 Macc. v. 25; "est hæc communis oratorum promissio" (Blass).—**ἐπιεικείᾳ**: only in Luke and Paul, see 2 Cor. x. 1, "pro tua clementia," Vulgate, derived from **εἴκω**, *cedo*, it properly might be rendered *yieldingness;* equity as opposed to strict law; so Aristotle sets the **ἐπιεικής** against the **ἀκριβοδίκαιος**, *Eth. Nic.*, v., 10, 6. It is often joined with **φιλανθρωπία, πραότης**. Its architype and pattern is to be found in God, *cf.* Wisd. xii. 18, 2 Macc. ii. 22, x. 4 R., Ps. lxxxv. 5, and so also in *Psalms of Solomon*, v., 14. The word also occurs, Baruch ii. 27, Song of the Three Children, ver. 19 (Dan., LXX and Theod. iii. 42), where it is used of God, also in Wisd. ii. 19, 3 Macc. iii. 15, vii. 6. For a valuable account of the word see Trench, *Synonyms*, i., p. 176 ff.

Ver. 5. **εὑρόντες γὰρ τὸν ἄνδρα . . . ὃς καὶ . . . ὃν καὶ ἐκρατ.**: on the anacolouthon, Blass, *Gram. des N.G.*, p. 277, Winer-Moulton, xlv., 6 *b*. Blass remarks that Luke gives no address so carelessly as that of Tertullus, but may not the anacolouthon here be the exact expression of the orator's invective? see critical note.—**λοιμόν**: 1 Sam. ii. 12, x. 27, xxv. 17, 25, Ps. i. 1 (plural), 1 Macc. xv. 21; 1 Macc. x. 61, xv. 3 R, **ἄνδρες λοιμοί** (*cf.* Prov. xxiv. 9, xxix. 8 A). So in classical Greek Dem., and in Latin *pestis*, Ter., Cic., Sallust. In 1 Macc. x. 6 A, **ἄνδρες παράνομοι** is a further description of "the pestilent fellows" (so 1 Sam. ii. 12, **υἱοὶ λοιμοί = ἀνὴρ ὁ παράνομος**, 2 Sam. xvi. 7).—**κινοῦντα στάσιν**, *cf.* Jos., *B.J.*, ii., 9, 4. **κιν. ταραχήν.**: not against the Romans but amongst the Jews themselves—such a charge would be specially obnoxious to Felix, who prided himself on keeping order.—**τὴν οἰκ.**: the Roman empire, see on p. 270, *cf.* xvii. 6, and xxi. 28; see addition in β text.—**πρωτοστάτην**: the **τε** closely connecting the thought that the prisoner does all this as the leader, etc., literally one who stands in the front rank, so often in classical Greek, in LXX, Job xv. 24, AB.—**τῶν Ναζ.**: "the disciple is not above his Master," and the term is applied as a term of contempt to the followers of Jesus, as it had been to Jesus Himself, Who was stamped in the eyes of the Jews as a false Messiah by His reputed origin from Nazareth, John i. 46, vii. 41, 42; see for the modern employment of the name amongst Jews and Mohammedans Plumptre, *in loco*, and further, Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i., 301, E.T. Blass compares the contemptuous term used by the Greeks, **Χρηστιανοί**, xi. 26.—**αἱρέσεως**, see above on v. 17, all references to the question of law, xxiii. 6, 29, were purposely kept in the background, and stress laid upon all which threatened to destroy the boasted "peace" (Weiss).

Ver. 6. **ἐπείρασε**: the charge could not be proved, *cf.* xxi. 28, but the verb here used is an aggravation not a modification of the surmise (**ἐνόμιζον**, ver. 29) of the Jews.—**βεβ.**, *cf.* Matt. xii. 5 (**βαίνω, βηλός**, threshold), Judith ix. 8, 1 Macc. ii. 12, iv. 38, 44, 54, 2 Macc. x. 5, etc., and frequent in LXX, *cf. Psalms of Solomon* i. 8, and **βέβηλος** four, **βεβήλωσις** three times.—Probably Tertullus wanted to insinuate that the prisoner was punishable even according to Roman law, see above on xxi. 29; but Trophimus as a Greek and not Paul would have been exposed to the death penalty,

καὶ[1] κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον νόμον ἠθελήσαμεν κρίνειν, 7. παρελθὼν δὲ Λυσίας ὁ χιλίαρχος μετὰ πολλῆς βίας ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν ἀπήγαγε, 8. κελεύσας τοὺς κατηγόρους αὐτοῦ ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ σέ· παρ' οὗ δυνήσῃ αὐτὸς ἀνακρίνας περὶ πάντων τούτων ἐπιγνῶναι ὧν ἡμεῖς κατηγοροῦμεν αὐτοῦ. 9.[2] συνέθεντο δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, φάσκοντες ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχειν.

[1] T.R. και . . . επι σε (ver. 8) is supported by E, Vulg., Gig., Syr. P. and H.; Blass retains, R.V. marg. But the whole is omit. by ℵABHLP 61 (many others), Sah., Boh., so Lach., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt; Alford places in dark brackets. The words, however, have been recently defended by Zöckler, H. Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, and Belser, following Blass in his two texts. It is possible that the abruptness of εκρατησαμεν may have prompted a desire for additions and completeness, and it is difficult to understand the omission of the disputed words if they were original. If we retain them, παρ' ου refers to Lysias, but not only is it somewhat strange that a professional orator should throw blame upon the Roman chiliarch, but it is also difficult to see how Lysias could in any way bear testimony against Paul in relation to accusations with regard to which he had professed himself ignorant, and after the hearing of which he had concluded that the prisoner had done nothing worthy of death or bonds. Moreover, the omission of any reference on Paul's part to Lysias in ver. 20 raises another difficulty, if Tertullus had appealed to the evidence which the Roman could give (Wendt, 1899). On the other hand the decision of Felix in ver. 22, and the postponement for the arrival of Lysias, have been held to prove the genuineness of the doubtful words. It is possible that there may be some antecedent corruption or abridgment in the text. For further variations see W.H., *App.*, p. 100.

[2] συνεπεθεντο R.V., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass (instead of συνεθεντο), with ℵABEHLP.

to say nothing of the fact that the charge was only one of suspicion. Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 74, note, and references in chap. xxi., ver. 29.—**ἐκρατήσαμεν**: the word could be used "de conatu vel mero vel efficaci," and so Bengel adds "aptum igitur ad calumniam". The orator identifies himself with his clients, and ascribes to the hierarchy the seizing of Paul, as if it was a legal act, whereas it was primarily the action of the mob violence of the people, xxi. 30; frequently used *in same sense* as here by Matthew and Mark, but not at all by St. John, and only in this passage by Luke, *cf.* Rev. xx. 2, LXX, Ps. lv., *tit.*, Judg. viii. 12, xvi. 21 (A *al.*).—**καὶ κατὰ . . . ἐπὶ σέ**, ver. 8, see critical note, omitted by R.V. in text, retained by Blass and Knabenbauer, so in Vulgate. Zöckler amongst others has recently supported Blass, and for the same reason, *viz.*, because if the words are retained the judge is asked to inquire of Paul, and thus the Apostle becomes a witness as well as a prisoner. But, on the other hand, Paul though still a prisoner is allowed to speak for himself before both Felix and Festus. If the words are retained, **παρ' οὗ** would refer to Lysias, and this would be in agreement with the remarks of Felix in ver. 22. Certainly **ἐκρατήσαμεν** seems very bald without any sequel, and this may have caused the insertion of the words; but the insertion was a bold one, although we can understand that the Jews would have been incensed against Lysias, who had twice protected Paul from their violence. The omission of the words if they formed part of the original text is no doubt difficult to explain.—**ἠθελ. κρίνειν**, *cf.* xxi. 31, 36, xxii. 22, xxiii. 12, passages which give us a very different idea of the wishes of the Jews.

Ver. 7. **μετὰ π. βίας**: another statement directly at variance with the facts, xxi. 32.

Ver. 8. **ἀνακ.**: not an examination by torture, which could not be legally applied either to Paul or to Lysias as Roman citizens, but in the sense of a judicial investigation—in this sense peculiar to Luke, *cf.* iv. 9, and Plummer on Luke xxiii. 14, *cf.* xxv. 26 below. A.V., "by examining of whom thyself," etc., which is quite misleading whether we retain the words omitted above in R.V. or not, because this rendering reads as if Felix was to examine the accusers, whereas the relative pronoun is in the singular, **παρ' οὗ**.

Ver. 9. **συνέθεντο**: in R.V. **συνεπεθ.**,

10. Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, νεύσαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος λέγειν, Ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ὄντα σε κριτὴν τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ ἐπιστάμενος,[1] εὐθυμό-

[1] ευθυμοτερον HLP, Chrys. (Meyer); ευθυμως ℵABE, Vulg., Ath., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.

"joined in the charge," *cf.* xviii. 10, so in classical Greek; in LXX (Deut. xxxii. 27), Ps. iii. 6 AS, Zach. i. 15, here only in N.T.—**φάσκοντες**, *cf.* xxv. 19, Rom. i. 22, *dictitantes*, but sometimes with the notion of alleging what is untrue, to pretend, *cf.* LXX, Bel and the Dragon, ver. 8. The verb is found elsewhere, Gen. xxvi. 20, 2 Macc. xiv. 27, 32, 3 Macc. iii. 7.

Ver. 10. On the language of the speech see Bethge, p. 229.—This short apology before Felix is not without its traces of Paul's phraseology, *e.g.*, **ἐλπίδα ἔχων**, ver. 15, with which we may compare Rom. xv. 4, 2 Cor. iii. 12, x. 15, Ephes. ii. 12, 1 Thess. iv. 13, in all of which we have the phrase **ἐλπ. ἔχειν** (only once elsewhere in N.T., 1 John iii. 3); **προσδέχονται** in ver. 15, with which we may compare Tit. ii. 13; **προσφοράς**, ver. 17, *cf.* Rom. xv. 16; **δι' ἐτῶν**, ver. 17, with Gal. ii. 1 (διά with genitive of time, only once elsewhere in N.T., Mark ii. 1), and more especially **ἀπρόσκοπον συνειδ.**, *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 32, Phil. i. 10, and for **συνείδησις**, see xxiii. 1 (*cf.* Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 54, and Alford, *Acts*, Introd., p. 14). Wendt regards the *whole* speech as a free composition of the author of Acts, and even this view contrasts favourably with what Wendt himself calls the wilful attempts to refer different words and phrases in the speech to various Redactors, see for illustrations of this arbitrariness his note on p. 369 (1899).—**νεύσαντος**: in N.T., elsewhere only John xiii. 24. Friedrich draws attention to the frequent mention of beckoning, or making signs, as characteristic of Luke's writings, p. 29, *cf.* Luke i. 22 and 62 (**διανεύω, ἐννεύω**), v. 7 (**κατανεύω**); Acts xiii. 16, xxvi. 1, xxiv. 10, etc.—**Ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν**: in view of the constant change of procurators a period of five to seven years would quite justify St. Paul's words. Ewald argued for ten years from the statement, Tac., *Ann.*, xii., 54, that Felix had been joint procurator with Cumanus before he had been appointed sole procurator of Judæa, Samaria, Galilee, Peræa. But no mention is made of this by Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 7, 1. If, however, so it is argued, Felix had occupied a position of importance in Samaria in the time of the rule of Cumanus without being himself actually joint procurator, this would perhaps account for Jonathan the high priest asking that he might be appointed procurator after the departure of Cumanus (Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 8, 5, *B.J.*, ii., 12, 6); such a request is difficult to understand unless Jonathan had some ground for supposing that Felix would be acceptable to the Jews. But the description of Tacitus, *l.c.*, is also difficult to understand, since we naturally ask what was the relative rank of Felix and Cumanus? or were there two procuratorial districts? and the statement of Josephus seems clearly to intimate that Felix was first appointed to the province after the deposition of Cumanus, and that he went to Palestine as his successor, *B.J.*, ii., 12, 6, *cf. Ant.*, xx., 8, 5, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 173 ff., and "Felix," Hastings' B.D.—Both Tacitus and Josephus are taken to imply that Felix succeeded Cumanus in 52 A.D. as procurator, *Ann.*, xii., 54, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 7, 1. But if O. Holtzmann and McGiffert are right in placing St. Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea in 53-55 A.D., it seems scarcely intelligible that St. Paul should speak of the "many years" of the rule of Felix, unless on the supposition that Tacitus is right and that Felix had ruled in Samaria and Judæa whilst Cumanus had ruled in Galilee. Harnack, *Chron.*, i., 236, following Eusebius, assigns the eleventh year of Claudius, 51 A.D., as the year in which Felix entered upon office, and thinks that a procuratorship lasting from 51-54 might be described in St. Paul's words, but, as Wendt justly points out (1899), the expression **πολλὰ ἔτη** is much more fitting if spoken some years later. Schürer follows Josephus, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 173 ff., and so more recently Dr. A. Robertson, "Felix," Hastings' B.D., and Dr. Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 635 (so also article, *Biblical World*, Nov., 1897), whilst Wendt, p. 58 (1899), would appear to incline to the same view.—But it is to be noted that St. Paul speaks of Felix as **κριτής**, and in this expres-

τερον τὰ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ ἀπολογοῦμαι· 11. δυναμένου σου[1] γνῶναι ὅτι οὐ πλείους εἰσί μοι ἡμέραι ἢ δεκαδύο, ἀφ' ἧς ἀνέβην προσκυνήσων

[1] For γνωναι ℵABE, Tisch., W.H., and other authorities in ver. 10 read επιγνωναι. η om. with all better authorities, *cf.* iv. 22. δωδεκα (instead of δεκαδυο) ℵABE, and other authorities above. εις for εν ℵABEH, and other authorities, as above.

sion it may be possible to find a point of reconciliation between the divergencies resulting from a comparision of Josephus and Tacitus. Felix may have held an office during the procuratorship of Cumanus which may have given him some judicial authority, although of course subordinate to the procurator, whilst on the other hand his tenure of such an office may well have prompted Jonathan's request to the emperor that Felix should be sent as procurator (a request upon which both Schürer and Zahn lay such stress). The phrase πόλλα ἔτη may thus be further extended to include the tenure of this judicial office which Felix held earlier than 52 A.D., see also Turner, "Chronology," Hastings' B.D., i., 418, 419, McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 358, O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 128, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 313, Gilbert, *Student's Life of Paul*, p. 249 ff., 1899.—κριτὴν, see above, p. 480; on the addition δίκαιον, defended by St. Chrysostom (so E, Syr. H.), Blass remarks "continet adulationem quæ Paulum parum deceat, quidquid dicit Chrysostomus".—τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ: St. Paul is speaking of the Jews as a *nation* in their *political* relationship, in addressing a Roman governor, not as God's people, λαός.—εὐθυμότερον: adverb only here in N.T., not in LXX, but in classical Greek, for the adjective see xxvii. 36 (2 Macc. xi. 26), and the verb εὐθυμεῖν, ver. 22.—St. Paul also begins with a *captatio benevolentiæ*, but one which contains nothing but the strict truth; he might fairly appeal to the judicial experience of Felix for the due understanding of his case.—τὰ περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ: for the phrase τὰ περί τινος as characteristic of St. Luke, three times in Gospel, eight times in Acts (six times in St. Paul's Epistles and not in other Gospels, except Mark v. 27, R.V.), *cf.* Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 38, Friedrich, p. 10 (so Lekebusch and Zeller).—ἀπολογοῦμαι: only in Luke and Paul, Luke xii. 11, xxi. 14, Acts xix. 33, xxv. 8, xxvi. 1, 2, 24; Rom. ii. 15, 2 Cor. xii. 19, each time in Acts, except xix. 38, with reference to Paul: R.V. "I make my defence"; see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, for the construction of the verb, in classical Greek as here, Thuc., iii., 62, Plat., *Phædo*, 69 D. In LXX, *cf.* Jer. xii. 1, 2 Macc. xiii. 26.

Ver. 11. δυν. σοῦ γνῶναι: "seeing that thou canst take knowledge" (ἐπιγ.), R.V., the shortness of the time would enable Felix to gain accurate knowledge of the events which had transpired, and the Apostle may also imply that the time was too short for exciting a multitude to sedition.—οὐ πλείους εἰσί μοι ἡμ. ἢ δεκαδύο: on οὐ πλείους see ver. 1 and critical note.—The number is evidently not a mere round number, as Overbeck thinks, but indicates that Paul laid stress upon the shortness of the period, and would not have included incomplete days in his reckoning. It is not necessary therefore to include the day of the arrival in Jerusalem (ἀφ' ἧς points to the day as something past, Bethge), or the day of the present trial; probably the arrival in Jerusalem was in the evening, as it is not until the next day that Paul seeks out James (Wendt). The first day of the twelve would therefore be the entry in to James, the second the commencement of the Nazirite vow, the sixth that of the apprehension of Paul towards the close of the seven days, xxi. 27; the seventh the day before the Sanhedrim, the eighth the information of the plot and (in the evening) Paul's start for Cæsarea, the ninth the arrival in Cæsarea; and, reckoning from the ninth five days inclusively, the day of the speech of Tertullus before Felix would be the thirteenth day, *i.e.*, twelve full days; *cf.* xx. 6, where in the seven days are reckoned the day of arrival and the day of departure (Wendt, *in loco*). Meyer on the other hand reckons the day of St. Paul's arrival in Jerusalem as the first day, and the five days of xxiv. 1 from his departure from Jerusalem for Cæsarea. For other modes of reckoning see Wendt's note, Farrar, *St. Paul*, ii., 338, Alford, Rendall, and Lumby, *in loco*. Weiss points out that it is simplest to add the seven days of xxi. 27 and the

ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· 12. καὶ οὔτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὗρόν με πρός τινα διαλεγόμενον ἢ [1] ἐπισύστασιν ποιοῦντα ὄχλου, οὔτε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, οὔτε κατὰ τὴν πόλιν· 13.[2] οὔτε παραστῆσαί με δύνανται περὶ ὧν νῦν κατηγοροῦσί μου. 14. ὁμολογῶ δὲ τοῦτό σοι, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν, οὕτω λατρεύω τῷ πατρῴῳ Θεῷ, πιστεύων πᾶσι

[1] For επισυστασιν HLP, Chrys. (Meyer), ℵABE 13, 40, and other authorities as above read επιστασιν.

[2] For ουτε ℵB 61 read ουδε; R.V. with other authorities as above, but not Hilgenfeld. For νυν ℵAB read νυνι, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilgenfeld.

five days of xxiv. 1, but we cannot by any means be sure that xxi. 27 implies a space of full seven days: "varie numerum computant; sed simplicissimum est sine dubio, e septem diebus, xxi. 27, et quinque, xxiv. 1, eum colligere," so Blass, but see his note on the passage.—**προσκυνήσων**, *cf.* xx. 16, the purpose was in itself an answer to each accusation—reverence not insurrection, conformity not heresy, worship not profanity. "*To worship I came*, so far was I from raising sedition," Chrys. There were other reasons no doubt for St. Paul's journey, as he himself states, ver. 17, *cf.* Rom. xv. 25, but he naturally places first the reason which would be a defence in the procurator's eyes. Overbeck and Wendt contend that the statement is not genuine, and that it is placed by the author of Acts in St. Paul's mouth, but see on the other hand Weiss, *in loco*. It seems quite captious to demand that Paul should explain to the procurator all the reasons for his journey, or that the fact that he came to worship should exclude the fact that he also came to offer alms.

Ver. 12. **οὔτε ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε**: step by step he refutes the charge.—**οὔτε εὗρον**, *cf.* ver. 5, **εὑρόντες**, a flat denial to the allegation of Tertullus; R.V. reads more plainly: both acts, the disputing and the exciting a tumult, are denied with reference to the Temple, the synagogue, the city. In **διαλ.** there would have been nothing censurable, but even from this the Apostle had refrained.—**ἢ ἐπισύστασιν ποι. ὄχ.**: R.V. reads **ἐπίστασιν**; the Apostle had been accused as **κινοῦντα στάσεις**, ver. 5; here is his answer to the charge, they had not found him "stirring up a crowd," R.V. This rendering however seems to make **ἐπίστασις** almost = **ἐπισύστασις**, a stronger word, *cf.* Numb. xxvi. 9, 1 Esdras v. 73, *conjuratio*. In 2 Macc. vi. 3 we have **ἐπίστασις τῆς κακίας**, *incursio malorum*, Vulgate, but its meaning here would seem to be rather *concursus*, in the sense of a concourse, an assembly, not an onset or attack; and the phrase expresses that the Apostle had not been guilty of even the least disturbance; not even of causing the assembling of a crowd (see Wendt and Weiss, *in loco*), "aut concursum facientem turbæ," Vulgate.—In 2 Cor. xi. 28 it is possible that **ἐπισύστασις** may be used of the presence of a multitude, almost like **ἐπίστασις**, see Grimm-Thayer.—**συναγωγαῖς**: plural, because so many in Jerusalem, *cf.* vi. 9.—**κατὰ τὴν πόλιν**: Alford renders "up and down the streets," *cf.* Luke viii. 39, xv. 14.

Ver. 13. **οὔτε**: **οὐδέ**, R.V. (so Blass, *Gram.*, p. 260, Simcox, *Z. N. T.*, p. 165); the Apostle after denying the specific charges made against him in Jerusalem, now proceeds further to a general denial of the charge that he had been an agitator amongst the Jews throughout the empire.—**παραστῆσαι**: *argumentis probare*, only here in N.T. in this sense, but in classical Greek, Philo, Jos., Epictet.—**νῦν**, see critical note.

Ver. 14. **ὁμολ.**: "verbum forense idemque sacrum," Bengel. "Unum crimen confitetur," *viz.*, that of belonging to the sect of the Nazarenes, "sed crimen non esse docet".—**κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγ. αἵρεσιν**: "according to the way which they call a sect," R.V. For **ὁδὸν** see ix. 2, and for the reading in **β** text critical note. **αἵρεσιν**: a word of neutral significance, which Tertullus had used in a bad sense. For St. Paul Christianity was not **αἵρεσις**, a separation from the Jewish religion, but was rather **πλήρωσις**, *cf.* xiii. 32.—**τῷ πατρ. Θεῷ**, *cf.* xxii. 3. The Apostle may have used the expression here as a classical one which the Roman might appreciate, *cf.* **θεοὶ πατρῷοι**, Thuc., ii., 71; *Æn.*, ix., 247, and instances in Wetstein. (On the distinctions between **πατρῷος** and **πατρι-**

τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ[1] ἐν τοῖς προφήταις γεγραμμένοις, 15. ἐλπίδα ἔχων εἰς τὸν Θεόν, ἣν καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι προσδέχονται, ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι[2] νεκρῶν, δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων· 16. ἐν τούτῳ[3] δὲ αὐτὸς ἀσκῶ, ἀπρόσκοπον συνείδησιν ἔχειν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τοὺς

[1] After και ℵ*BE read τοις εν, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.; Blass in β text follows T.R. (Steph.) and omits ἐν. (On the force of κατα and εν see Wendt (1899), *in loco*.)

[2] After εσεσθαι, νεκρων is om. by ℵABC 13, 40, 61, 68, Vulg., Sah. Boh., Arm., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass (but retained by Hilg.).

[3] και (for δε) ℵABCEL, Vulg., Syr. P. and H., Sah., Aeth., R.V., and other authorities as in ver. 15.

κός, Gal. i. 14, see *Syn.*, Grimm-Thayer.) Moreover St. Paul could appeal to the fact that liberty had been given to the Jews by the Romans themselves to worship the God of their fathers (see Alford's note, *in loco*).—λατρεύω: "so serve I," R.V., see on vii. 42; if it is true that the word always describes a divine service like λατρεία, and that this idea appears to spring from the conception of complete devotion of powers to a master which lies in the root of the word (Westcott), no verb could more appropriately describe the service of one who called himself δοῦλος of God and of Christ.—πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν ν. κ.τ.λ.: "all things which are according to the law," R.V., "iterum refutat Tertullum, ver. 6," Bengel; "and which are written in the prophets," R.V. The mention of the prophets as well as of the law shows that a reference to the Messianic hopes is intended.

Ver. 15. ἐλπίδα ἔχων, *cf.* xxiii. 6: St. Paul speaks of the hope as a present possession, "*habens* id plus quam προσδ. *expectant*," Bengel; in LXX very frequent with ἐπί, but for εἰς *cf.* Isa. li. 5, Ps. cxviii. 114 S[1], so here, a hope supporting itself upon God.—καὶ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι: the Apostle makes no distinction between Sadducees and Pharisees, but regards the Jews who were present as representing the nation.—προσδ., xxiii. 21, *cf.* St. Paul's words in Tit. ii. 13, Gal. v. 5.—μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι, see above on xi. 28, and *cf.* xxvii. 10, future infinitive with μέλλειν only in this one phrase in N.T.—ἀνάστασιν . . . δικ. τε καὶ ἀδίκων: the belief was firmly held in all circles where the teaching of the Pharisees prevailed. But was this belief a belief in the resurrection of Israelites only? Was it a belief in the resurrection of the righteous only? The book of Daniel plainly implies a resurrection of the just and the unjust, xii. 2, but we cannot say that this became the prevailing belief, *e.g.*, in *Psalms of Solomon*, although iii. 16 may probably be based upon the passage in Daniel, yet in ver. 13 there is no thought of the resurrection of the sinner (*cf.* 2 Macc. vii. 14, σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν οὐκ ἔσται, addressed to Antiochus Epiphanes). So Josephus, in giving an account of the ordinary Pharisaic doctrine, speaks only of the virtuous reviving and living again, *Ant.*, xviii., 1, 3. So too in the Talmudic literature the resurrection of the dead is a privilege of Israel, and of righteous Israelites only—there is no resurrection of the heathen. On the other hand there are passages in the Book of Enoch where a resurrection of all Israelites is spoken of, *cf.* xxii., with the exception of one class of sinners, i.-xxxvi., xxxvii.-lxx., lxxxiii.-xc., Apocalypse of Baruch l.-li. 6, but in Enoch xli.-liv. we have a resurrection of the righteous Israelites only, *cf.* Apoc. of Baruch xxx. 1 (*cf.* with this verse in Acts). See further Charles, *Book of Enoch*, pp. 139, 262, and *Apocalypse of Baruch*, *l.c.*, *Psalms of Solomon*, Ryle and James, *Introd.*, li., pp. 37, 38, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 179, Weber, *Jüdische Theol.*, p. 390 ff. (1897). Enoch xci.-civ. is placed by Charles at 104-95 B.C., and Baruch xxx. is ascribed to B[2], written after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Ver. 16. ἐν τούτῳ: "herein" is rather ambiguous, A. and R.V.; the expression may be used as = *propterea*, as the result of the confession of faith in vv. 14, 15, *cf.* John xvi. 30 (Xen., *Cyr.*, i., 3, 14). Rendall takes it = meanwhile (so apparently Wetstein), *sc.* χρόνῳ, *i.e.*, in this earthly life; "hanc spem dum habeo," Bengel. If we read καί, not δέ, perhaps best explained "non minus quam illi," Blass, "I also exercise myself," R.V., ἀσκῶ, *cf.* 2 Macc. xv. 4; ἄσκησις, 4 Macc. xiii. 22; ἀσκητής, 4 Macc. xii. 11; so in classical Greek, *laborare*, *studere*, Soph., *Elect.*, 1024.—ἀπρόσκοπον: only by Paul

ἀνθρώπους διαπαντός. 17. δι' ἐτῶν δὲ πλειόνων[1] παρεγενόμην ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου καὶ προσφοράς· 18.[2] ἐν οἷς εὗρόν με ἡγνισμένον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, οὐ μετὰ ὄχλου οὐδὲ μετὰ

[1] R.V. transposes παρεγ., placing it after μου, with ℵ*BC, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass (but not Hilg.), who places it after προσφορας; A omits.

[2] εν οις HLP, so Blass, but εν αις ℵABCE, Blass in β text, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. οις may have been changed into αις on account of the immediately preceding προσφοραις; but the fem. may also have been changed into οις, because no definite reference is made to offerings in xxi. 27, where the tumult took place, and the expression εν οις would express a more general reference to ver. 17. See note below, and also Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 193, 228; Wendt (1899), note, *in loco*.

in N. T., *cf.* 1 Cor. x. 32, where used actively, and *cf.* Ecclus. xxxii. (xxxv.) 21, 3 Macc. iii. 8. In Phil. i. 10 Lightfoot points out that the word may be taken either transitively or intransitively, although he prefers the latter. Mr. Page in his note on the word in this passage commends A.V. "void of offence" as including the two images, not offending, upright, ἀπροσ. πρὸς τὸν Θεόν; not causing offence, ἀπροσ. πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. "*Ad Deum et homines* congruit quod sequitur *eleemosynas* et *oblationes*," Bengel.—διὰ παντός, see Plummer on Luke xxiv. 53, *cf.* Acts ii. 25, x. 2, Matt. xviii. 10, Mark v. 5, Heb. ii. 15, emphatic here at the end of sentence, implying that the Apostle's whole aim in life should free him from the suspicion of such charges as had been brought against him.

Ver. 17. πλειόνων: "many," R.V., but margin, "some," so Rendall: if xviii. 22 refers to a visit to Jerusalem (see note) at the close of the Apostle's second missionary journey, the number expressed by πλειόνων would not exceed four or five.—ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων, see above on collection for the Saints at Jerusalem. ἐλεη.: not elsewhere used by Paul, who speaks of κοινωνία, διακονία εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, see on x. 2.—παρεγενόμην, Lucan, but *cf.* also 1 Cor. xvi. 3, for the word again used by St. Paul.—εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου: quite natural for St. Paul to speak thus of the Jewish nation, for the Jewish-Christian Church naturally consisted of Jews, *cf.* Rom. ix. 3. For this allusion in Acts to the great work of the collection, and its evidential value, as corroborating the notices in the Epistles, see above on p. 422, and Paley, *H.P.*, chap. ii., 1. On this use of εἰς *cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 13, Rom. xv. 26, and see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 113.—καὶ προσφοράς: no mention is made of offerings as part of the purpose of St. Paul's visit to Jerusalem, but we know that he came up to Jerusalem to worship, ver. 11, and to be present at the Feast of Pentecost, xx. 16, and even if he did not present some offering in connection with that Feast (a thank-offering as Bethge supposes), Dr. Hort's view may well commend itself that the Apostle wished to make some offering on his own account, or it may be a solemn peace-offering in connection with the Gentile contribution for the Jewish Christians, and its acceptance, see on xxi. 26, and also Weiss, *in loco*. The position of προσφ. seems against the supposition that we can take it simply with ἐλεη., and in combination with it, as if both words referred to the collection for the Saints. Jüngst would omit the words καὶ προσφ. . . . ἱερῷ altogether, whilst even Hilgenfeld regards vv. 17-21 as an addition of his "Author to Theophilus".

Ver. 18. ἐν οἷς, see critical note. If we read ἐν αἷς = "amidst which," R.V., "in presenting which," margin, with reference to προσφοράς, including not only the offerings in connection with the Apostle's association of himself with the poor men in the Nazirite vow, but also offerings such as those referred to in ver. 17. ἐν οἷς = *inter quæ* (Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 193, 228), *i.e.*, in reference to these matters generally, *cf.* xxvi. 12.—εὗρον, *cf.* ver. 5: "they found me," indeed, as they have said, but οὐ μετὰ ὄχλου κ.τ.λ.; a direct answer to the charge of profaning the Temple: he had gone there for worship and sacrifice, "then how did I profane it?" Chrys., *Hom.*, L.—ἡγνισμένον: the expression is generally taken to refer to the offerings involved in the association with the vow, xxi. 26, but it may also include other acts of worship and purification in the Temple.

θορύβου, τινὲς[1] ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι, 19. οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρός με. 20. ἢ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι εἰπάτωσαν,[2] εἴ τι εὗρον ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀδίκημα, στάντος μου ἐπὶ τοῦ συνεδρίου· 21. ἢ περὶ μιᾶς ταύτης φωνῆς, ἧς[3] ἔκραξα ἑστὼς ἐν αὐτοῖς, Ὅτι περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι σήμερον[4] ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν.

[1] After τινες ℵABCE 13, 40, 61, Sah., Boh., Syr. H.; Tisch., W.H., Weiss, R.V., Wendt [Blass] add δε; omitted by HLP.

[2] Instead of τι ευρ. W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, T.R. has ει τι ευρ. with very slight attestation; *cf.* ver. 19. εν εμοι *om.* ℵAB 13, 40, 61, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, but not Hilg.

[3] For εκραξα (Lach., Hilgenfeld) the form εκεκραξα is found in ℵABC 13, 40, 61, Chrys., Tisch.; W.H., Blass, Weiss; redupl. form only here in N.T., but often in LXX; see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 104.

[4] Instead of υφ᾽ ABC 13, 40, 61, Syr. Pesh., Aeth utr. read εφ᾽, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass in β; υφ᾽ is supported by ℵEHLP, Chrys. (so Vulg., Gig., Boh., Syr. H., a vobis, and Hilg.).

—τινὲς: in A.V. the word is simply referred to εὗρον and there is no difficulty; but if we insert δέ after it (see critical note). R.V. renders "but *there were* certain Jews from Asia," etc. The sentence breaks off, and the speaker makes no direct reference to xxi. 27, but implies that these Asiatic Jews should have been present to accuse him if they had any accusation to make—their absence was in the prisoner's favour; "the passage as it stands (*i.e.*, with this break) is instinct with life, and seems to exhibit the abruptness so characteristic of the Pauline Epistles," *cf.* xxvi. 9, see Page's note *in loco*. Others take δέ though less forcibly as more strictly in opposition to the preceding words, meaning that his accusers had not found him as they alleged, and as Tertullus alleged, ver. 5, but that certain Jews of Asia had found him. Hackett retains δέ, and sees in the words a retort of the charge of riot upon the true authors of it: "but certain Jews from Asia"—it is they who excited a tumult, not I; the verb could be omitted, a true picture of the Apostle's earnestness, because so readily suggested from θορύβου, but this interpretation seems hardly borne out by the context.

Ver. 19. ἔδει without ἄν, *cf.* Luke xi. 42, xv. 32; on the force of this imperfect, see Burton, p. 14, Winer-Moulton, xli. 2.—εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρός με: the optative of *subjective* possibility, representing the subjective view of the agent—if they had anything against me (in their own belief), Winer-Moulton, xli. *b* 2, Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 111 (1893), Burton, p. 106.—κατηγορεῖν: "to make accusation," R.V., *cf.* ver. 2.

Ver. 20. ἢ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι: "quandoquidem absunt illi, hi dicant," Blass; as the Jews from Asia are not present as accusers, he appeals to those Jews who are—he cannot demand speech from the absent, but he claims it from the present (Weiss): "or else let these men themselves say," R.V., since they are the only accusers present. Kuinoel refers the words to the Sadducees, and thinks this proved from the next verse, but the context does not require this reference, nor can the words be referred with Ewald to the Asiatic Jews, since στάντος μου ἐπὶ τοῦ συν. is against such an interpretation.—τι, see critical note.

Ver. 21. ἢ = ἄλλο ἢ after ἀδίκημα (Rendall); St. Paul, of course, uses the word (ἀδίκημα) of his accusers. St. Paul is taken by some to speak ironically . . . strange ἀδίκημα, a question of belief with regard to which the Jews themselves were at variance, and which the procurator would regard as an idle contention! Weiss renders "or let them say, if in other respects they have found nothing wrong, concerning this one utterance," etc.—"in what respect they regard it as an ἀδίκημα," supplying εἰπάτωσαν from the previous verse. On the whole verse see further Blass, *Gram.*, p. 168, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 187; and also p. 225 on ἧς ἔκραξα—ἧς probably not for ἣ (*cf.* Matt. xxvii. 50), but here φωνή is used in the sense of a loud cry, so that the construction resolves itself into φωνὴν κράζειν, *cf.* Rev. vi. 10, *v. l.* (and for the expression in LXX.

22.[1] Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα ὁ Φῆλιξ ἀνεβάλετο αὐτούς, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, εἰπών, Ὅταν Λυσίας ὁ χιλίαρχος καταβῇ, διαγνώσομαι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς· 23. διαταξάμενός τε τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον, ἔχειν τε ἄνεσιν, καὶ μηδένα κωλύειν τῶν ἰδίων αὐτοῦ ὑπηρετεῖν[2] ἢ προσέρχεσθαι αὐτῷ.

24. Μετὰ δὲ ἡμέρας τινὰς παραγενόμενος ὁ Φῆλιξ σὺν Δρουσίλλῃ τῇ[3] γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ οὔσῃ Ἰουδαίᾳ, μετεπέμψατο τὸν Παῦλον, καὶ

[1] The words ακουσας δε ταυτα *om.*; ανεβαλ. δε αυτ. ο Φ. with ℵABCE, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] η προσερχ. *om.* ℵABCE 13, 61, Vulg., Syr. P. and H., Boh., Arm., Tisch., R.V., and other authorities in ver. 22.

[3] Instead of T.R. BC² 36, Syr. H. mg., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss [Blass] have τῃ ιδιᾳ γυν. (*om.* αυτου). T.R. as ℵ*E, τῃ γυναικι in C*HLP (Meyer, Hilgenfeld); ℵᵃA, 13, 18, 6, have τῃ ιδ. γυν. αυτου. At the beginning of verse Blass in β text after ημ. τινας reads Δρουσιλλα η γυνη του Φηλικος ουσα Ιουδαια ηρωτα ιδειν τον Παυλον και ακουσαι τον λογον. βουλομενος ουν το ικανον ποιησαι αυτῃ (Cassiod. Compl., p. 205 (1402, Mign.) and Syr. H. mg.).

Isa. vi. 4). Farrar, *St. Paul*, ii., 328, thinks that he sees in this utterance some compunction on St. Paul's part for his action in dividing the Sanhedrim, and for the tumult he had caused, but see above, p. 467.

Ver. 22. ἀνεβάλετο: *ampliavit eos*, a technical expression, only here in N. T., the judges were wont to say *Amplius* in cases where it was not possible to pass at once a judgment of condemnation or acquittal before further inquiry, Cic., *In Verr.*, i., 29.—ἀκριβ.: "having more exact knowledge concerning the Way" than to be deceived by the misrepresentation of the Jews; he may have learnt some details of the Christian sect during his years of office from his wife Drusilla, or possibly during his residence in Cæsarea, where there was a Christian community and the home of Philip the Evangelist, and where Cornelius had been converted. This knowledge, the writer indicates, was the real reason: the reason which Felix alleged was that he required the evidence of Lysias in person. Wendt, Zöckler, Bethge, Nösgen take the words to mean that the address of Paul had offended Felix's more accurate knowledge, and on this account he put off any decision. On the comparative see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 139.—τὰ περὶ: characteristic of Luke and Paul, see p. 481.—διαγ. τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς: "I will determine your matter," R.V., *cf.* xxv. 21, and see above on xxiii. 15. τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς: probably refers to both accusers and accused. On τὰ before κατά characteristic of Luke see instance in Moulton and Geden, and Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 38.

Ver. 23. τηρεῖσθαι: that he should be kept in charge as a prisoner; not middle as in A.V.—ἔχειν τε ἄνεσιν: "and should have indulgence," R.V., not "liberty," A.V., word only elsewhere in Paul in N.T., 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 5, viii. 13, 2 Thess. i. 7, *cf.* also Ecclus. xxvi. 10, 1 Esd. iv. 62. From ver. 27 it appears that the prisoner was still bound, but the indulgence involved a *custodia liberior*, and extended to food, and the visits of friends, and remission from the severer form of custody, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 6, 7, 10, where Agrippa has similar indulgence in his imprisonment at Rome, but is still chained.—μηδένα κωλύειν τῶν ἰδίων, *cf.* iv. 23, Luke, Aristarchus, perhaps Trophimus, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., *u. s.*, for the same indulgence; change of subject to centurion in κωλύειν.—ὑπηρετεῖν, xiii. 36, xx. 34.

Ver. 24. Δρουσίλλῃ: of the three daughters of Agrippa I. Drusilla was the youngest, her sisters being Bernice (see below) and Mariamne. Married, when about fourteen, to Azizus king of Emeza, she had been seduced from her husband by Felix, who had employed for his evil purpose a certain impostor and magician, Simon by name, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 7, 2. The account in Josephus implies that she was unhappy in her marriage with Azizus, and asserts that she was exposed on account of her beauty to the envious ill-treatment of her sister Bernice. She married Felix ("trium reginarum mari-

ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς εἰς[1] Χριστὸν πίστεως. 25. διαλεγομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τοῦ κρίματος[2] τοῦ μέλλοντος ἔσεσθαι, ἔμφοβος γενόμενος ὁ Φῆλιξ ἀπεκρίθη, Τὸ νῦν ἔχον πορεύου· καιρὸν δὲ μεταλαβὼν μετακαλέσομαί σε· 26. ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἐλπίζων, ὅτι χρήματα δοθήσεται αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου,[3] ὅπως

[1] After Χριστον ℵ*BEL 61, Vulg., Gig., Boh., Syr. H., Chrys. add Ιησουν, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, but *om.* by Blass in β text, so by Meyer.

[2] C 15, 31, 40, 180, Arm., Chrys. read του μελλ. κριματος, but text retained as in T.R. by all edd. εσεσθαι *om.* ℵABCE, W.H., R.V., Blass. Instead of text Blass in β, so Hilg. with E. Gig., Vulg. (Cassiod.) read καιρῳ δε επιτηδειῳ μετακαλεσομαι σε.

[3] οπως λυσῃ αυτον *om.* ℵABCE, Vulg., Syr. P. and H., Arm., Aeth^ro., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilgenfeld. After μεταπεμπ. Gig. adds "secrete," but not Blass in β. Instead of χαριτας ℵ*ABC 13, 61, Vulg., Syr. P. and H., Boh. read χαριτα, so Tisch., and authorities as above (see note below). χαριν ℵ^cEL.

tus," as Suetonius calls him, *Claud.*, 28), and her son by him, Agrippa by name, perished under Titus in an eruption of Vesuvius, Jos., *u. s.* It has been sometimes thought that his mother perished with him, but probably the words σὺν τῇ γυναικί in Josephus refer not to Drusilla, but to the wife of Agrippa (so Schürer); "Herod" (Headlam), Hastings' B.D., *The Herods* (Farrar), p. 192 ff.—τῇ γυν. αὐτοῦ, see critical note, the addition of ἰδίᾳ before γυν. (omit. αὐτοῦ) perhaps to emphasise that Drusilla, though a Jewess, was the wife of Felix, or it may point to the private and informal character of the interview, due to the request of Drusilla. Possibly both ἰδίᾳ and αὐτοῦ were additions to intimate that Drusilla was really the wife of Felix, but the article before γυναικί would have been sufficient to indicate this.—οὔσῃ Ἰουδαίᾳ, *cf.* β text, which states how Felix acted thus to gratify Drusilla, who as a Jewess wished to hear Paul, as her brother Agrippa afterwards, *cf.* xxv. 22, see Knabenbauer, *in loco.*—μετεπέμψατο, see on x. 5.—Χριστὸν, see critical note.

Ver. 25. περὶ δικαι.: Paul does not gratify the curiosity of Felix and Drusilla, but goes straight to the enforcement of those great moral conditions without which, both for Jew and Greek, what he had to say of the Messiahship of Jesus was unintelligible; how grievously Felix had failed in righteousness the events of his period of government proved, *cf.* Tac., *Ann.*, xii., 54, "cuncta malefacta sibi impune ratus," through the evil influence of Pallas, Tac., *Hist.*, v., 9.—ἐγκρατ.: R.V. margin "self-control," Latin, *temperantia*, Vulgate, *castitate*. The presence of Drusilla by his side was in itself a proof how Felix had failed in this virtue also, ἐγκρ. being specially applicable to continence from sensual pleasures (Wetstein); opposed to it is ἀκρασία, 1 Cor. vii. 5 (= ἀκράτεια), "incontinence," Arist., *Eth.*, vii., 4, 2. In N.T., Gal. v. 23, 2 Pet. i. 6 (*bis*), *cf.* Tit. i. 8. The word is found in Ecclesiast. xviii. 15 S, 30, 4 Macc. v. 34. St. Paul gives a double proof of his courage in reasoning thus not only before Felix but before his wife, for like another Herodias her resentment was to be feared.—τοῦ κρίματος τοῦ μέλλ.: "the judgment to come," R.V., preserving the force of the article omitted in all E.V. except Rhem.: "ubi etiam illi, qui nunc judices sedent, judicandi erunt" (Wetstein).—ἐμφ. γεν., see on x. 4, *cf.* the attitude of Antipas with regard to the Baptist, Mark vi. 30.—Τὸ νῦν ἔχον, *cf.* Tob. vii. 11 (B[1] ἔχων), and for instances in Greek writers see Wetstein.—καιρὸν δὲ μεταλ., *cf.* Polyb., ii., 16, 15. μεταλαβόντες καιρ. ἁρμόττοντα (Alford, Blass). So far as we know, no more convenient season ever came, see reading in β text.

Ver. 26. ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἐλπ.: connected by some with ἀπεκ. (*cf.* xxiii. 25), so Weiss, Wendt, Hackett; others punctuate as W.H., R.V., and render it as a finite verb.—ὅτι: on the construction with ἐλπίζειν see Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 121, and Blass, *in loco:* Luke xxiv. 31, 2 Cor. i. 13, xiii. 6, Philem. ver. 22 (not in Attic Greek).—On ἅμα *cf.* Blass, *Gram.*, p. 247, Col. iv. 3, Philem. ver. 22, 1 Tim. v. 13. ἅμα καί: only in Luke and Paul; on its use

λύσῃ αὐτόν· διὸ καὶ πυκνότερον αὐτὸν μεταπεμπόμενος ὡμίλει αὐτῷ. 27. Διετίας δὲ πληρωθείσης ἔλαβε διάδοχον ὁ Φῆλιξ Πόρκιον

by them see further Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 187 (1893).—χρήματα: the mention of "alms," ver. 17, had perhaps suggested the thought that Paul was in a position to purchase his freedom with money, and it was also evident to Felix that the prisoner was not without personal friends, ver. 23. Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 280, points to ver. 17, and to the fact that Felix could not be unaware that Paul was a man of wide influence and supported by many friends, as a sufficient answer to the supposed improbability urged by Pfleiderer that Felix could hope for money from a poor tent-maker and missionary. Spitta thinks that *Philippians* may have been written from Cæsarea, and that therefore (Phil. iv. 10) Felix had double cause to suppose that the poor missionary had command of money; but without endorsing this view as to the place of writing of *Philippians*, it may be suggested that St. Paul's friends at Philippi might have helped to provide financial help for the expenses of his trial: Lydia, *e.g.*, was not only ready with large-hearted hospitality, but her trade in itself required a considerable capital: see on the other hand the view of Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 312. It is urged, moreover, that a poor man would never have received such attention or aroused such interest. But St. Luke himself has told us how Herod desired to see the Son of Man, Who had not where to lay His head, and the same feeling which prompted Herod, the feeling of curiosity, the hope perhaps of seeing some new thing, may have prompted the desire of an Agrippa or a Drusilla to see and to hear Paul.—ἐλπιζ. . . . δοθ.: "sic thesaurum evangelii omisit infelix Felix," Bengel. When Overbeck expresses surprise that Felix did not deliver Paul to the Jews for money, he forgets that Paul's Roman citizenship would make such an action much more dangerous than his detention.—διὸ καὶ: characteristic of Luke and Paul, and common to Luke's Gospel and Acts, *cf.* Luke i. 35, Acts x. 29, Rom. iv. 22, xv. 22, 2 Cor. i. 20, iv. 13, v. 9, Phil. ii. 9, only twice elsewhere in N.T., Heb. xi. 12, xiii. 12; "ut illiceret eum ad se pecunia temptandum," Blass, Knabenbauer.—πυκνότερον, *cf.* Luke v. 33, 1 Tim. v. 23; and LXX, Esther viii. 13, 2 Macc. viii. 8, 3 Macc. iv. 12. The comparative here is "verus comparativus": *quo sæpius*, Blass. Nothing could more plainly show the corruption of the Roman government than the conduct of Felix in face of the law: "Lex Julia de repetundis præcepit, ne quis ob hominem in vincula publice conjiciendum, vinciendum, vincirive jubendum, exve vinculis dimittendum; neve quis ob hominem condemnandum, absolvenduum . . . aliquid acceperit," *Digest.*, xl., 11, 3 (Wetstein); see further on ver. 3.—ὡμίλει: only in Luke, see above xx. 11; imperfect denoting frequent occurrence.

Ver. 27. **διετίας δὲ πληρ.**: on the question of chronology see below, *cf.* xx. 30, and for **τριετία**, xx. 31; on **διετία** in inscriptions see two instances in Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 86. **πληρ.**: perhaps indicating that two full years are meant. Weizsäcker throws doubt upon the historical character of this imprisonment, and thinks that the episode is merely introduced by the writer of Acts, who in his ignorance of the name of the procurator doubles the incident before Felix and Festus; but Wendt declines to value so lightly the definite notices and accounts in Acts, and adds that the delay of the trial under a procurator devoid of a sense of duty was no improbable event. The recall of Felix has been assigned to very varying dates, Lightfoot naming 60, Wendt (1899) 61, Schürer, at the earliest 58, at the latest 61, probably 60, Ramsay 59, whilst McGiffert, following the Chronology recently advocated by O. Holtzmann (with a few earlier writers), places it as early as 55 (Harnack 55-56, following Eusebius, whilst Blass has also defended the Eusebian date). Both McGiffert and Holtzmann fix upon 55 because before the end of this year Pallas, the brother of Felix, was in disgrace; and yet, according to Josephus, Felix escaped the accusations brought against him by shielding himself behind his brother Pallas, whom Nero was then holding in special honour, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 8, 9, Tac., *Ann.*, xiii., 14. "Either Josephus is in error," says O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 128, "or Festus went to Palestine in 55". But there is good reason for thinking that Josephus was in error in stating that Felix escaped by his brother's influence, then at its height, Jos., *u. s.* It is no doubt true that the influence of Pallas may have been very substantial

Φῆστον[1]· θέλων τε χάριτας καταθέσθαι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὁ Φῆλιξ, κατέλιπε τὸν Παῦλον δεδεμένον.

[1] Instead of θελων τε χαρ. Blass in β text with 137, Syr. H. mg. reads τον δε Παυλον ειασεν εν τηρησει δια Δρουσιλλαν, so Zöckler, Belser, Hilg., and J. Weiss, who thinks that T.R. is simply conformed to xxv. 9; but see on the other hand Schmiedel, *Enc. Bibl.*, i., 53.

long after his fall from court favour; but if the intervention of Pallas was subsequent to his fall, what becomes of the synchronism between his disgrace and the recall of Felix? But further, Pallas, according to the statement of Tacitus, *Ann.*, xiii., 14, was disgraced before the fourteenth birthday of Britannicus, in Feb. 55, but, if so, how could Felix have reached Rome at such an early period of that year? Nero came to the throne on 13th Oct., 54, and we have to suppose that the order for recall was sent and the return journey of Felix to the capital accomplished in spite of the winter season which made a sea voyage impossible (Ramsay, Zahn, Bacon); "one can therefore no longer base the chronology of an Apostle's life upon the dismissal of a court favourite". But are there no chronological data available? Albinus, the successor of Festus, was already procurator in 62. How long he had been in office we cannot say, but he was certainly procurator in the summer of that year (Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 188, E.T.; *Biblical World*, p. 357, 1897). From Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 9, 1, we learn that there was an interval of some few months full of disturbance and anarchy between the death of Festus and the arrival of Albinus in Jerusalem, so that we seem justified in inferring that Festus died probably in the winter of 61-62; and whilst the events of his procuratorship can scarcely have extended over five years (as would be demanded by the earlier chronology)—for in this case Josephus would surely have given us more information about them—it seems equally difficult to suppose that the events which Josephus does record could have been crowded into less than a year, or portions of two (Schürer). The entrance of Festus upon his office might thus be carried back to 59-60, and St. Paul's departure for Rome would fall probably in 60. But a further contribution to the subject has been made by Mr. Turner, "Chronology of the N.T.," Hastings' B.D., pp. 418, 419, and he argues for the exclusion of a date as late as 60 for the accession of Festus, and for placing the recall of Felix in 57-59, *i.e.*, between the earlier and later dates mentioned above; or, more definitely still, in 58, *cf.* p. 420. With this date Dr. Gilbert agrees, *Student's Life of Paul*, p. 252, 1899. See further Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 634; Wendt (1899), p. 56; *Expositor*, March, 1897, Feb., 1898; "Festus" (A. Robertson), Hastings' B.D. and B.D.².—ἔλαβε διάδοχον, Ecclus. xlvi. 1, xlviii. 8. In 2 Macc. iv. 29, xiv. 26, the meaning of successor is doubtful, and it would seem that the title rather denoted a high office about the court of the Ptolemies, *cf.* Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, p. 111. In classical Greek it is used as here for successor, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 8, 9, so *successorem accepit*, Plin., *Epist.*, ix., 13.—Φῆστον: we know nothing of him except from the N.T. and Josephus. The latter, however, contrasts him favourably with his successor Albinus: "et Albinum cum ei dissimillimum fuisse tradit, scelestum hominem, simul illum laudat" (Blass). So far as our information goes, Festus also contrasts favourably with his predecessor; he acted with promptness to rid the country of robbers and *sicarii*, and amongst them of one impostor whose promises were specially seductive, *Ant.*, xx., 8, 9, 10, and *B.J.*, ii., 14, 1. But although, as Schürer says, he was disposed to act righteously, he found himself unable to undo the mischief wrought by his predecessor, and after a short administration death prevented him from coping further with the evils which infested the province. For his attitude towards St. Paul as his prisoner see notes below. Two other events marked his procuratorship: (1) the quarrel between the priests and Agrippa, because the latter built on to his palace so as to overlook the Temple, and the priests retaliated by building so as to shut off his view. Festus sided with Agrippa, but allowed the priests to appeal to Rome. (2) The decision of the emperor in favour of the Syrian against the Jewish inhabitants of Cæsarea, which caused a bitterness provoking in A.D. 66 the disturbances in which Josephus marked the beginnings of the great War, *Ant.*, xx., 8, 9.—θέλων τε χάριτας καταθέσθαι τοῖς Ἰ.: "desiring to gain favour with

XXV. 1. ΦΗΣΤΟΣ οὖν, ἐπιβὰς[1] τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπὸ Καισαρείας. 2. ἐνεφάνισαν δὲ[2] αὐτῷ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου, καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτόν, 3. αἰτούμενοι χάριν κατ' αὐτοῦ, ὅπως μεταπέμψηται αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἐνέδραν ποιοῦντες ἀνελεῖν αὐτὸν κατὰ τὴν

[1] **επαρχιᾳ**, so also Lach., Hilgenfeld, Blass, W.H. text. **επαρχειᾳ**, so B; but Tisch., Weiss, and W.H. marg. (so Wendt probably) following ℵ*A have **επαρχειῳ**. Weiss regards **επαρχιᾳ** (-**ειᾳ**) as a thoughtless emendation in accordance with xxiii. 34. See also Winer-Schmiedel, p. 44, and note below.

[2] For **δε** ℵABC, Vulg., Syr. Pesh., Aeth. read **τε**, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, R.V., Wendt, Blass. **ο αρχ.**, but instead of the sing. ℵABCEL read the plural, so Tisch. and authorities above. For T.R. *cf.* xxiv. 1.

the Jews," R.V., literally to lay down or deposit a favour with the Jews as a deposit for which a due return might be expected, *cf.* 1 Macc. x. 23 R.; Jos., *Ant.*, xi., 6, 5, so too in classical Greek, Thuc., i., 33, 128; Herod., vi., 41, etc. The policy of Felix was to gain popularity with the Jews in view of the accusations which followed him on his return to Rome, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 8, 9. That the pursuit of such a policy was not alien to the character of Roman officials see Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 9, 5, where we learn that Albinus, desiring to gain the gratitude of the Jews, took money of all those in prison for some trifling fault, by which means the prisons indeed were emptied, but the country was full of robbers. In *B.J.*, ii., 14, 1, we learn that the same system was pursued by Albinus, the successor of Festus, until no one was left in the prisons but those who gave him nothing. According to β text Felix leaves Paul in prison to please his wife, but, as Blass points out, both reasons may be true.—**χάριτα** (W.H., R.V.) only (in N.T.) in Jude, ver. 4, *cf.* xxv. 9 A; found in classics, though rarer than **χάριν**, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 88; in LXX, Zech. vi. 14.—**δεδεμ.**: this does not at all imply that Paul had been quite free, and was now rebound, *cf.* ver. 23. **ἄνεσις** did not mean perfect freedom, and the *custodia militaris* might still continue. Nösgen thinks that the word in its position at the end of the verse indicates a severer form of custody, but this is by no means necessary, although as the last word of the episode, and as the result of all the intercourse with Felix, it has a dramatic force and pathos. Zeller, *Acts*, ii., p. 83, E.T., although he thinks it remarkable that Felix and Festus are represented as acting from the same motive, as Pilate for a similar reason had consented to the execution of Jesus, is constrained to admit that conduct such as that of the two procurators is too natural for its repetition to be surprising; unscrupulous officials are always ready by complaisance at the expense of others to appease those to whom they have given just cause for complaint.

CHAPTER XXV.—Ver. 1. **ἐπιβὰς**: "having come into the province," A. and R.V., or, "having entered upon his province," R.V. margin. If we read **τῇ ἐπαρχείῳ** with Weiss and W.H. margin, the word is an adjective of two terminations, *sc.* **ἐξουσίᾳ**, *i.e.*, having entered on his duties as governor of the province (see Weiss, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 8), and *cf.* xxiii. 34. For the adjective in inscriptions see Blass, *in loco.*—**μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμ.**: "sat cito," Bengel.—**ἀνέβη**: went up to Jerusalem officially as the capital; the visit had nothing necessarily to do with St. Paul, but the close-connecting **τε** may indicate that the action of the priests in again bringing up their case was to be expected.

Ver. 2. **ἐνεφάνισαν**, *cf.* xxiii. 15, xxiv. 1: here the context evidently implies that legal and formal information was laid against Paul.—If we read **οἱ ἀρχ.**, *cf.* iv. 5. **οἱ πρῶτοι**: sometimes taken as = **πρεσβ.** in ver. 15, *cf.* xxiii. 14, xxiv. 1, but in Luke xix. 47 we have **οἱ ἀρχ. καὶ οἱ γράμμ. καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ**. The difference of designation seems to indicate that they were not identical with the **πρεσβ.**, although perhaps including them, or possibly as their chief representatives: see also Plummer on Luke, *l. c.* Blass seems to identify **πρῶτοι** with **ἀρχιερεῖς**, *cf.* iv. 5, **ἄρχοντες**.—**παρέκαλουν**: the word and the tense mark their importunity.

Ver. 3. **αἰτουμ.**, *cf.* ver. 15. "Postulantes gratiam non justitiam," Corn

ὁδόν.[1] 4. ὁ μὲν οὖν Φῆστος ἀπεκρίθη, τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον[2] ἐν Καισαρείᾳ, ἑαυτὸν δὲ μέλλειν ἐν τάχει ἐκπορεύεσθαι· 5. Οἱ οὖν δυνατοὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, φησί, συγκαταβάντες, εἴ τί ἐστιν[3] ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ τούτῳ, κατηγορείτωσαν αὐτοῦ. 6. Διατρίψας δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἡμέρας[4] πλείους ἢ δέκα, καταβὰς εἰς Καισάρειαν, τῇ ἐπαύριον καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ

[1] After οδον Syr. H. mg. adds *illi qui votum fecerant se pro virili (facturos esse) ut in manibus suis esset;* but not β text.

[2] For εν Καισ. ℵABCE 13, 40, 61, read εις, so Tisch., W.H., and authorities above. R.V., Weiss, Blass, Hilg. have Καισαρειαν with BC 13, 40; whilst W.H. read Καισαριαν.

[3] Instead of T.R. (so Meyer) ℵABCE, Vulg., Boh., Arm., Lucif. read εν τῳ ανδρι ατοπον, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.

[4] R.V., following ℵABC, Vulg., Arm., reads ου πλειους οκτω η δεκα instead of T.R., so too W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilgenfeld. Other variations, *e.g.*, 137, Syr. P.H., Sah. omit ου πλειους. See Alford's note and Meyer-Wendt on probable confusion between οκτω of the more ancient MSS. and η of later ones, the former η representing the numeral being absorbed in the second η.

à Lapide. — **ἐνέδραν ποιοῦντες,** not ποιήσοντες, they were making and contriving the ambush *already* (Alford): priests and elders were willing as before to avail themselves of the assassin. — **κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν,** *cf.* Luke x. 4, and three times in Acts, viii. 36, xxvi. 13, nowhere else in N. T. Syr. H. mg. adds a distinct reference to the forty conspirators previously mentioned, xxiii. 12, but Blass omits in β text—doubtless, as he says, there were many others ready for the deed at the service of the Sanhedrim.

Ver. 4. **μὲν οὖν**: no antithesis expressed; but Rendall, Appendix on μὲν οὖν, *Acts*, p. 162, holds that two phases of events are here contrasted: Festus refused to bring Paul away from Cæsarea, but he undertook to hear the charges of the Jews there.—**ἐν Και.,** see critical note, perhaps here εἰς simply = ἐν, so Blass, and Simcox, *cf.* Mark xiii. 9, Acts xix. 22. On the other hand *cf.* Weiss on the frequent force of εἰς peculiar to Acts, viii. 40, ix. 21 (where he reads εἰς), intimating that Paul had been brought to Cæsarea with the purpose that he should be kept there. The Jews had asked Festus ὅπως μεταπέμψ. α. εἰς Ἰ., but Festus intimates that the prisoner was in custody at Cæsarea, and that as he was himself going there, the prisoner's accusers should go there also; in other words, he returns a refusal to their request, *cf.* ver. 16.—**ἐν τάχει,** Luke xviii. 8, and three times in Acts, xii. 7, xxii. 18, not in the other Evangelists; Rom. xvi. 20, 1 Tim. iii. 14, Rev. i. 1, xxii. 6.—**ἐκπορ.**: for the verb used absolutely as here *cf.* Luke iii. 7.

Ver. 5. **φησί**: change to the *oratio recta*, *cf.* i. 4. For other instances of the insertion of the single words ἔφη or φησίν, rare in N. T., see Simcox, *Language of the New Testament*, p. 200; *cf.* xxiii. 35, xxvi. 25, 1 Cor. vi. 16, 2 Cor. x. 10, Heb. viii. 5.—**οἱ . . . δυνατοί**: "Let them therefore, saith he, which are of power among you," R.V.; not simply "which are able," A.V., "qui in vobis potentes sunt," Vulgate. The word may be used by Festus, because he was not acquainted with the Jewish official terms, or it may be used in a general way as in 1 Cor. i. 26. In Jos., *B.J.*, i., 12, 5, we have the expression, ἧκον Ἰουδαίων οἱ δυνατοί, *cf.* Thuc. i. 89, Polyb., ix., 23, 4; but in addition to this general use of the word Jos. frequently conjoins the ἀρχιερεῖς with the δυνατοί as members of the Sanhedrim, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 178, E.T. This interpretation of the word is more natural than that adopted by Bengel: "*qui valent* ad iter faciendum: ἦθος urbanum Festi respondentis Judæis molestiam viae causantibus;" for other explanations see Wendt-Meyer, *in loco*.—**συγκαταβάντες**: "go down with me," R.V., *mecum;* only here in N. T., in LXX, Ps. xlviii. 17, Wisd. x. 13, Dan. iii. 49 (Theod. iii. 49) = Song of the Three Children, ver. 26.—**ἄτοπον,** see critical note, and further on xxviii. 6.

Ver. 6. **ἡμέρας πλ.,** see critical note, "not more than eight or ten days," R.V., *i.e.*, the whole period of Festus'

βήματος ἐκέλευσε τὸν Παῦλον ἀχθῆναι. 7. παραγενομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ, περιέστησαν[1] οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβεβηκότες Ἰουδαῖοι, πολλὰ καὶ βαρέα[2] αἰτιάματα φέροντες κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου, ἃ οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀποδεῖξαι· 8. ἀπολογουμένου αὐτοῦ, Ὅτι οὔτε εἰς τὸν νόμον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, οὔτε εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, οὔτε εἰς Καίσαρά τι ἥμαρτον. 9. ὁ Φῆστος δέ, τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις θέλων χάριν καταθέσθαι, ἀποκριθεὶς τῷ Παύλῳ εἶπε, Θέλεις, εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀναβάς, ἐκεῖ περὶ τούτων

[1] ℵABCL, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Blass, Hilg. read **αυτον** after **περιεστησαν**; E has **αυτῳ**; Meyer follows T.R.

[2] For **αιτιαματα** ℵABCEHLP, so Tisch. and authorities above read **αιτιωματα**, a word which does not occur elsewhere, although Eustath. has **αιτιωσις** for **αιτιασις**. ℵABC 13, 40, 61, so Tisch. and authorities above read **καταφεροντες** instead of **φεροντες κατα τον Π.**

stay **ἐν αὐτοῖς**. Blass sees in the words an indication of the vigour of action characterising Festus. The expression may, however, be used from the standpoint of Paul and his friends at Cæsarea, who did not know how much of his absence Festus had spent in Jerusalem, or how much on the journey (so Weiss and Wendt).—**τῇ ἐπαύριον**: ten times in Acts, but nowhere in Luke's Gospel, *cf.*, however, **ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον**, Luke x. 35 and Acts iv. 5 only (Hawkins). This evidently implies that the accusers had come down with Festus, and it may again indicate his promptness, *cf.* ver. 17. There does not seem any indication that this immediate action shows that he had been prejudiced against Paul in Jerusalem (Chrys.).—**ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος**, xii. 21, xviii. 12, and ver. 10 below: seven times in Acts in this sense (Matt. xxvii. 19, John xix. 13), but nowhere in Luke's Gospel; twice by St. Paul, Rom. xiv. 10, 2 Cor. v. 10.—**καθ. ἐπὶ τοῦ β.**: a necessary formality, otherwise no legal effect would be given to the decision, *cf.* Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 15, E.T., for this and other instances.—**ἀχθῆναι**, *cf.* **προσάγεσθαι**, Polyc., *Mart.*, ix., 1 and 2.

Ver. 7. **περιέστησαν**: if we add **αὐτόν**, see critical note, "stood round about him," *i.e.*, Paul, R.V., "periculum intentantes," Bengel. (*Cf.* John xi. 42, Judith v. 22, omit S[1].)—**πολλὰ καὶ βαρέα**: "many and (indeed) heavy," etc., Winer-Moulton, lix., 3, perhaps as in Matt. xxiii. 23, weighty, of great moment.—**αἰτιάματα φέρ.**, see critical note. **αἰτίαμ.** in Æschylus and Thucydides. For **καταφέροντες**, xxvi. 10, *cf.* Deut. xxii. 14.

Ver. 8. Evidently the charges classed as before under three heads, (1) the Law, (2) the Temple, (3) the Empire. In this verse Hilgenfeld ascribes **ὅτι . . . ἥμαρτον** to his "author to Theophilus" (Jüngst, too, omits the words). But, not content with this, he concludes that the whole narrative which follows about Agrippa is to ratify the innocence of Paul before a crowned head of Judaism, *cf.* ix. 15, where **υἱῶν τε Ἰσ.** is also ascribed to the "author to Theophilus," and perhaps also **τε καὶ βασιλέων**; we are therefore to refer to this unknown writer the whole section xxv. 13-xxvi. 32.—**ἥμαρτον** with **εἰς** only here in Acts, three times in Luke's Gospel, three times in 1 Cor., only once elsewhere in N.T., Matt. xviii. 21.

Ver. 9. **χάριν καταθέσθαι**, xxiv. 27.—**τοῖς Ἰ.**, best placed emphatically before **χάριν κατ.** (W.H.), so as to show that it was the compliance of Festus to the Jews which caused the turn which things took (Weiss).—**θέλεις εἰς Ἱ.**: "injustum videbatur condemnare, incommodum absolvere," Blass.—**ἐκεῖ**: he makes himself the same proposal to the prisoner which had previously been suggested by the accusers, ver. 3.—**ἐπ' ἐμοῦ**: "me præsente," for the Sanhedrists would be the judges; otherwise, where would be the favour to the Jews? Felix may have added the words *speciose*, so as to reassure Paul and to obtain his acquiescence to the proposal; in ver. 20 omitted, but evidently from their close connection with **περὶ τούτ. κρίν.** they indicate that Festus would play some judicial part in the matter; *cf.* xxiv. 21 and 1 Cor. vi. 1. But Paul's answer plainly shows that he thought from the words of Felix that a Jewish and not a Roman tribunal awaited him: **ἐπ' ἐμοῦ** would therefore seem to mean that the

κρίνεσθαι[1] ἐπ' ἐμοῦ; 10. εἶπε δὲ ὁ Παῦλος, Ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος Καίσαρος[2] ἑστώς εἰμι, οὗ με δεῖ κρίνεσθαι. Ἰουδαίους οὐδὲν[3] ἠδίκησα, ὡς καὶ σὺ κάλλιον ἐπιγινώσκεις· 11. εἰ μὲν[4] γὰρ ἀδικῶ καὶ ἄξιον θανάτου πέπραχά τι, οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν· εἰ δὲ οὐδέν ἐστιν ὧν οὗτοι κατηγοροῦσί μου, οὐδείς με δύναται αὐτοῖς

[1] For κρινεσθαι ℵABCE, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. read κριθηναι.

[2] ℵ* has εστως at commencement of verse, B has it in both places, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Wendt place it at commencement.

[3] For ηδικησα (T.R. Lach.) ℵB have ηδικηκα, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass.

[4] For γαρ ℵABCEgr. 61 read ουν, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. but [Blass].

Sanhedrim would judge, whilst Festus would ratify their judgment or not as seemed good to him, as Pilate had acted in the case of Christ. On the other hand it is possible that Festus may have been quite sincere in his proposal: his words at least showed that in his judgment there was no case against Paul of a political nature, and he may have thought that religious questions could be best decided before the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem, whilst he could guarantee a safe-conduct for Paul as a Roman citizen.

Ver. 10. ἑστώς εἰμι: "I am standing," used rhetorically, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 198; on the position of ἑστ. see critical note.—**Καίσαρος**: because the procurator was the representative of Cæsar: "quæ acta gestaque sunt a procuratore Cæsaris sic ab eo comprobantur, atque si a Cæsare ipso gesta sint," Ulpian, *Digest.*, i., 19, 1.—**δεῖ**: because a Roman citizen, no need to suppose that the word has reference here to any divine intimation.—**Ἰουδ. . . .**: "to Jews have I done no wrong," the omission of the article in translation makes Paul's denial more forcible and comprehensive; for ἀδικεῖν with οὐδέν and the double accusative *cf.* Luke x. 19.—**ὡς καὶ σὺ κάλλιον ἐπιγ.**: "as thou also art getting to know better," Rendall (see also Page and Weiss): this rendering, it is said, saves us from the ungracious and unjust retort which A. and R.V. ascribe to Paul. But ver. 18 seems to show us by the confession of Festus himself that the Apostle might fairly have imputed to him a keeping back of his better and fairer judgment, whilst in the expression χαρίσασθαι, ver. 11, there seems to be an intimation that the Apostle felt that Festus might make him a victim. Zöckler sees in the comparative "a gentle reproach," as if St. Paul would intimate to Festus that he really knew better than his question (ver. 9) would imply.

Ver. 11. **εἰ μὲν γὰρ**, see critical note, "if then (οὖν) I am a wrongdoer," referring to his standing before Cæsar's judgment-seat, and not to the ἠδίκησα in ver. 10.—**ἀδικεῖν**: only here absolutely in N.T.; the verb occurs five times in Acts, once in Luke's Gospel, and once in St. Matthew, but not elsewhere in the Gospels (Friedrich, p. 23).—**ἄξιον θαν.**, *i.e.*, according to Roman law.—**οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν**: *non recuso*, Vulgate, so Blass; the verb is only used here in Acts, but it occurs three times in St. Luke's Gospel, three times in Hebrews, once in Mark xv. 6, W.H. —In the present passage, and in 1 Tim. iv. 7, v. 11, 2 Tim. ii. 23, Tit. iii. 10, Heb. xii. 25 (twice), the word is rendered "refuse," R.V. text; but in Luke xiv. 18, 19, the word is rendered "to make excuse"; "excused": Jos., *Ant.*, vii., 8, 2; but in each case the Greek verb literally means "to beg off from," and the Latin *deprecor* might well express the verb both here and in Luke xiv., *l.c.*, *cf.* Esth. iv. 8 in the sense of supplicating, and for the sense as above 2 Macc. ii. 31, 3 Macc. vi. 27; see also Grimm *sub v.* for different shades of meaning. In Jos., *Vita*, 29, we have the phrase θανεῖν οὐ παραιτοῦμαι: upon which Krenkel insists as an instance of dependence upon Josephus, but not only is the phrase here somewhat different verbally, οὐ παραι. τὸ ἀποθ., the article expressing more emphatically, as Bengel says, *id ipsum agi*; but *cf.* the instances quoted by Wetstein of the use of similar phrases in Greek, and of the Latin *deprecor*, *e.g.*, Dion. Hal., *A.V.*, 29. τὸν μὲν οὖν θάνατον . . . οὐ παραιτοῦμαι. See

χαρίσασθαι· Καίσαρα ἐπικαλοῦμαι. 12. τότε ὁ Φῆστος, συλλαλήσας μετὰ τοῦ συμβουλίου, ἀπεκρίθη, Καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι, ἐπὶ Καίσαρα πορεύσῃ.

further *Introd.*, p. 31.—**χαρίσασθαι**: "to grant me by favour," R.V. margin, *cf.* iii. 14, xxv. 16, xxvii. 24 (Philem. ver. 22), only in Luke and Paul in N.T.; see on its importance as marking the "We" section, xxvii. 24, and other parts of Acts, Zeller, *Acts*, ii., 318, E.T. Paul must have known what this "giving up" to the Jews would involve.—**Καίσαρα ἐπικ.**: *Appello: provoco ad Cæsarem*: "Si apud acta quis appellaverit, *satis* erit si dicat: Appello." *Digest.*, xlix., 1, 2, except in the case of notorious robbers and agitators whose guilt was clear, *ibid.*, 16. But we must distinguish between an appeal against a sentence already pronounced, and a claim at the commencement of a process that the whole matter should be referred to the emperor. It would appear from this passage, *cf.* vv. 21, 26, 32, that Roman citizens charged with capital offences could make this kind of appeal, for the whole narrative is based upon the fact that Paul had not yet been tried, and that he was to be kept for a thorough inquiry by the emperor, and to be brought to Rome for this purpose, *cf.* Pliny, *Epist.*, x., 97, quoted by Schürer, Alford, and others, and similar instances in Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 543, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. 1., vol. ii., p. 59, and div. ii., vol. ii., p. 278, E.T., and also "Appeal," Hastings' B.D., and below, p. 514.—This step of St. Paul's was very natural. During his imprisonment under Felix he had hoped against hope that he might have been released, but although the character of Festus might have given him a more reasonable anticipation of justice, he had seen enough of the procurator to detect the vacillation which led him also to curry favour with the Jews. From some points of view his position under Festus was more dangerous than under Felix: if he accepted the suggestion that he should go up to Jerusalem and be tried before the Sanhedrim, he could not doubt that his judges would find him guilty; if he declined, and Festus became the judge, there was still the manifest danger that the better judgment of the magistrate would be warped by the selfishness of the politician. Moreover, he may well have thought that at a distant court, where there might be difficulty in collecting evidence against him, he would fare better in spite of the danger and expense of the appeal. But whilst we may thus base St. Paul's action upon probable human motives, his own keen and long desire to see Rome, xix. 21, and his Lord's promise of the fulfilment of that desire, xxiii. 11, could not have been without influence upon his decision, although other motives need not be altogether excluded, as St. Chrysostom, Ewald, Neander and Meyer (see Nösgen, 435). It has been maintained that there was every reason to suppose that St. Paul would have obtained his acquittal at the hands of the Roman authorities, especially after Agrippa's declaration of his innocence, xxvi. 32. But St. Paul's appeal had been already made before Agrippa had heard him, and he may well have come to the conclusion that the best he could hope for from Festus was a further period of imprisonment, whilst his release would only expose him to the bitter and relentless animosity of the Jews. Two years of enforced imprisonment had been patiently borne, and the Apostle would be eager (can we doubt it?) to bear further witness before Gentiles and kings of his belief in Jesus as the Christ, and of repentance and faith towards God.

Ver. 12. **μετὰ τοῦ συμβ.**, *i.e.*, his assessors, *assessores consiliarii*, with whom the procurators were wont to consult in the administration of the law. They were probably composed, in part at all events, of the higher officials of the court, *cf.* Suet., *Tiber.*, 33, Lamprid., *Vita Alex. Sev.*, 46, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 10, 2, Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 60, E.T.; and see further on the word Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 65, and references in Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* It would seem that the procurator could only reject such an appeal at his peril, unless in cases where delay might be followed by danger, or when there was manifestly no room for an appeal, *Dig.*, xlix., 5, and see Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden*, p. 252, and Blass, *in loco*.—**Κ. ἐπικ.**: no question, W.H., R.V., Weiss (as in A.V.); "asynd. rhetoricum cum anaphora," Blass, *cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 18, 21, 27. The decision of the procurator that the appeal must be allowed, and the words in which it was

13. Ἡμερῶν δὲ διαγενομένων τινῶν, Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασιλεὺς Βερνίκη κατήντησαν εἰς Καισάρειαν,[1] ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον. 14. ὡς δὲ πλείους ἡμέρας διέτριβον ἐκεῖ, ὁ Φῆστος τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀνέθετο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Παῦλον, λέγων, Ἀνήρ τίς ἐστι[2] καταλελειμμένος ὑπὸ

[1] For ασπασαμενοι (instead of -ομενοι) ℵABEgr.HLP 13, 31, 68, 105, Boh., Aeth., so Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, R.V. Hort (not Westcott) says the authority for -αμενοι is absolutely overwhelming, and as a matter of transmission -ομενοι can be only a correction. But he adds that it is difficult to remain satisfied that there is no prior corruption of some kind. Blass, *Gram.*, p. 193, rejects -αμενοι as impossible, and reads, -ομενοι, so Hilg. Wendt (1899), p. 386 strongly supports -αμενοι, and explains the aor. part. after the anal. of i. 24, x. 13, xiii. 27.

[2] καταλελειμμ., W.H. have -λιμμ.; *cf.* Winer-Schmiedel, p. 45.

announced were not meant to frighten Paul, as Bengel supposed, but at the same time they may have been uttered, if not with a sneer, yet with the implication "thou little knowest what an appeal to Cæsar means". Moreover, Festus must have seen that the appeal was based upon the prisoner's mistrust of his character, for only if the accused could not trust the impartiality of the governor had he any interest in claiming the transference of his trial to Rome.

Ver. 13. Ἀγρ. ὁ βασιλεὺς: this was Herod Agrippa II., son of Agrippa I., whose tragic end is recorded in chap. xii. At the time of his father's death he was only seventeen, and for a time he lived in retirement, as Claudius was persuaded not to entrust him with the kingdom of Judæa. But on the death of Herod, king of Chalcis, A.D. 48, Claudius not only gave the young Agrippa the vacant throne, A.D. 50, but transferred to him the government of the Temple, and the right of appointing the high priest. His opinion on religious questions would therefore be much desired by Festus. Subsequently he obtained the old tetrarchies of Philip and Lysanias, and the title of king was bestowed upon him. We have thus a proof of St. Luke's accuracy in that he calls him βασιλεύς, *cf.* xxvi. 27, but not king of Judæa, although he was the last Jewish king in Palestine. Bernice and Drusilla were his sisters. He offended the Jews not only by building his palace so as to overlook the Temple, but also by his constant changes in the priesthood. In the Jewish war he took part with the Romans, by whom at its close he was confirmed in the government of his kingdom, and received considerable additions to it. When Titus, after the fall of Jerusalem, celebrated his visit to Cæsarea Philippi—Herod's capital, called by him *Neronias* in honour of Nero—by magnificent games and shows, it would seem that Agrippa must have been present; and if so, he doubtless joined as a Roman in the rejoicings over the fate of his people, Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*, ii., 1, 30, "Agrippa II."; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 191 ff., "Herod' (6), Hastings' B.D., Farrar, *The Herods*, p. 193 ff. (1898).—Βερνίκη (Βερεν. = Macedonian form of Φερενίκη, see Blass, *in loco*, and *C.I.G.*, 361; *C.I. Att.*, iii., i., 556, Headlam in Hastings' B.D.): the eldest of the three daughters of Agrippa I. She was betrothed, but apparently never married, to Marcus, son of Alexander, the Alabarch of Alexandria (see Schürer for correct reading of Jos., *Ant.*, xix., 5, 1, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 342, note). On his death at the age of thirteen she was married to her uncle, Herod of Chalcis, Jos., *u.s.*, but after a few years she was left a widow, and lived in the house of her brother Agrippa II. In order to allay the worst suspicions which were current as to this intimacy, she married Polemon, king of Cilicia, *Ant.*, xx., 7, 3 (Juv., *Sat.*, vi., 156 ff.), but she soon left him and resumed the intimacy with her brother. Like Agrippa she showed openly at least a certain deference for the Jewish religion, and on one occasion, says Schürer, *u.s.*, p. 197, we find even her, a bigot as well as a wanton, a Nazirite in Jerusalem, *B.J.*, ii., 15, 1. This was in A.D. 66, and she endeavoured while in the capital to stay the terrible massacre of Florus—"the one redeeming feature of her career," B.D.². But later on, exasperated by the Jewish populace who burnt her palace, she became, like her brother, a partisan of the Romans, and in turn the mistress of Vespasian and of Titus, Tac., *Hist.*, ii., 81; Suet., *Tit.*, 7; Jos., *B.J.*, ii., 17, 6. O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 83,

Φήλικος δέσμιος, 15. περὶ οὗ, γενομένου μου εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἐνεφάνισαν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Ἰουδαίων, αἰτούμενοι κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ[1] δίκην· 16. πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίθην, ὅτι οὐκ εστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαί τινα ἄνθρωπον[2] εἰς ἀπώλειαν, πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχοι τοὺς κατηγόρους, τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι περὶ τοῦ ἐγκλήματος. 17. συνελθόντων οὖν[3] αὐτῶν ἐνθάδε, ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν ποιησάμενος, τῇ ἑξῆς καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἐκέλευσα ἀχθῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα· 18. περὶ οὗ σταθέντες οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν[4] ἐπέφερον ὧν ὑπενόουν ἐγώ· 19. ζητήματα δέ τινα περὶ τῆς ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας εἶχον πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ περί τινος

[1] For δικην ℵABC read καταδικην, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass. Meyer explains καταδ. as an interpretation of δικην, but more probably καταδ. was altered into δικην on account of ver. 3 (Wendt).

[2] εις απωλ. *om.* ℵABCE, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, but retained by Blass, Hilg., with HLP, Syr. P. and H., Chrys., Gig.

[3] αυτων *om.* B 40, so Weiss, W.H., Blass in β text; retained by Lach., Tisch., R.V., Hilg.; Wendt doubtful.

[4] For επεφερον ℵABCEL 13, 40, 61, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilgenfeld, R.V. read εφερον. At end of verse ℵ^{c}BE 61, 100, add πονηρων, so R.V., Weiss, W.H. text, Blass; AC read πονηραν, so Lach., Tisch., Hilgenfeld, W.H. margin; ℵ*C^2 read πονηρα.

speaks of Drusilla as a worthy sister of Bernice: he might have said the same of the other sister, Mariamne, since she too left her husband for the wealth of Demetrius, the Jewish Alabarch of Alexandria, Jos., *Ant.*, xx., 7, 3.—ἀσπασόμενοι, see critical note. No doubt an official visit of congratulation paid by Agrippa as a Roman vassal upon the procurator's entry on his office. The future participle makes the sense quite easy, but if we read the aorist it looks as if Agrippa and Bernice had previously saluted Felix, and afterwards came to his official residence, Cæsarea. Rendall includes in κατήντησαν not only the notion of arrival but also of settling down for a stay short or long: "came to stay at Cæsarea and saluted Felix" (aorist), but see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 125.

Ver. 14. ἀνέθετο: only in Luke and Paul, *cf.* Gal. ii. 2. "Laid Paul's case before the king," R.V., *cf.* 2 Macc. iii. 9, and instances in Wetstein, Gal. ii. 2. In the middle voice the idea is that of relating with a view to consulting, so here (*cf.* vv. 20, 26, Lightfoot on Gal. ii. 2); it was natural for Festus thus to consult Agrippa, see above on ver. 13.

Ver. 15. ἀρχ. καὶ οἱ πρεσβ., see on ver. 2.—ἐνεφάνισαν, see ver. 21.—δίκην, see critical note. If we read καταδίκην = "sentence," R.V., *i.e.*, of condemnation; LXX, Symm., Ps. lxxxix. 3, Wisd. xii. 27; so in Polyb., xxvi., 5, 1.

Ver. 16. ἔθος, see vi. 14.—χαρίζ., p. 489.—πρὶν ἢ . . . ἔχοι, *cf.* Luke ii. 26, the only two passages where a finite verb occurs after πρίν in N. T., see further Burton, pp. 52, 129, 133, and Plummer, Luke, *l. c.*—κατὰ πρόσωπον, see on iii. 13.—τόπον: "opportunity," Rom. xv. 23, Ephes. iv. 27, Heb. xii. 17, Ecclus. iv. 5, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, xvi., 8, 5 (Polyb., i., 88, 2).

Ver. 17. ἀναβ. μηδ. ποιησάμενος, xxiv. 22, for the phrase see Thuc., ii., 42; Plut., *Camill.*, 35, and Wetstein, *in loco.*

Ver. 18. οὐδ. αἰτίαν ἐπέφ.: classical, *cf.* Thuc., v., 76; Herod., i., 26, so in Polyb. and Jos., but see critical note.—αἰτίαν: *criminis delatio*, *accusatio*, and so in ver. 27; see for various meanings Grimm, *sub v.*—ὑπενόουν: possibly he supposed that there were to be some charges of political disturbance or sedition like that which had recently given rise to such bloody scenes and a conflict between Greeks and Jews in the streets of Cæsarea. St. Chrys., *Hom.*, well emphasises the way in which the charges against Paul had repeatedly broken down.

Ver. 19. ζητήματα . . . τινα: plural contemptuously (Weiss). — δεισιδαιμονίας, see on xvii. 22, "religion," R.V.: in ad-

Ἰησοῦ τεθνηκότος, ὃν ἔφασκεν ὁ Παῦλος ζῆν. 20. ἀπορούμενος δὲ ἐγὼ[1] εἰς τὴν περὶ τούτου ζήτησιν, ἔλεγον, εἰ βούλοιτο πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, κἀκεῖ κρίνεσθαι περὶ τούτων. 21. τοῦ δὲ Παύλου ἐπικαλεσαμένου τηρηθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ διάγνωσιν, ἐκέλευσα τηρεῖσθαι αὐτόν, ἕως οὗ[2] πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς Καίσαρα.

[1] **εις** *om.* ℵABHP, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, but retained by Blass, Hilgenfeld. Although **απορ.** not elsewhere in N.T. with simple acc., but as this is good Greek no need to read the prep. For **τουτου** ℵABCEL read **τουτων**, so Tisch. and authorities above, so Blass, but brackets **περι τουτων** at end of verse.

[2] For **πεμψω** ℵABCE 13, 31, 40, 61, 137, read **αναπεμψω**, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg., R.V. After **διαγνωσιν** Blass in β with Gig. adds **επειδη τε αυτον ουκ εδυναμην κριναι.**

dressing a Jewish king Felix would not have used the term offensively, especially when we consider the official relation of Agrippa to the Jewish religion (see above, ver. 13), but he may well have chosen the word because it was a neutral word (*verbum* **μέσον,** Bengel) and did not commit him to anything definite.—**περί τινος Ἰ.**: we note again the almost contemptuous, or at least indifferent, tone of Festus. At the same time this and the similar passage xviii. 15 are proofs of the candour of St. Luke in quoting testimonies of this kind from men of rank: in this "aristocratic ignorance of the Roman" Zeller sees a trait taken from life, so in Agrippa's answer to Paul's urgency, xxvi. 28. Festus does not even deign to mention the kind of death (but he accepts the fact of the death as certain); "*crucem* aut nescivit, aut non curavit," Bengel; see further Luckock, *Footsteps of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke*, ii., p. 269.—**ἔφασκεν**: with the notion of groundless affirmation, "alleging"; see Page, *in loco*, and Meyer on Rom. i. 22 (Rev. ii. 2). Blass and Knabenbauer take it as = *dictitabat*.

Ver. 20. **ἀπορούμενος δὲ**: "being perplexed how to inquire concerning," R.V., omitting **εἰς**, the verb **ἀπορ.** talking a direct accusative. See above on ii. 12. Festus might have truly said that he was perplexed, as he still was, concerning Paul, and it is possible that the positive motive assigned for his action in ver. 9 was an honest attempt on his part to get more definite information at Jerusalem than he would obtain in Cæsarea—but we know how St. Paul viewed his question. On the other hand he may have wished to conceal his real motive (Weiss).

Ver. 21. **ἐπικ. τηρηθῆναι αὐτὸν**: on the construction after words of request or command of the infinitive *passive* see Simcox, *Language of the N. T.*, p. 121, and also Blass, *Gram.*, p. 222.—**εἰς τὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ διάγνωσιν**: "for the decision of the Emperor," R.V., "the Augustus," *margin*; *cf.* xxiv. 22, and for the noun Wisd. iii. 18.—**Σεβ.**: here and in ver. 25 rendered "Emperor," R.V.—the title Augustus, A.V., might lead to confusion. The Cæsar Augustus in Luke ii. 1 was Octavian, upon whom the title of Augustus was first conferred, Suet., *Aug.*, 7, B.C. 27. The title was inherited by his successors, and thus it is ascribed to Nero here and in ver. 25. The divine sacredness which the title seemed to confer (*cf.* its Greek form, and the remark of Dio Cassius, liii., 16, 18, that Augustus took the title as being himself something more than human) excited the scruples of Tiberius, but succeeding emperors appear to have adopted it without hesitation.—**πέμψω,** see critical notes; the reading **ἀναπέμψω** would mean, literally, "till I should send him up," *i.e.*, to a higher authority, *cf.* Luke xxiii. 7, where it is used of "referring" to another jurisdiction, and in vv. 11, 15, of "sending *back*" (Philem. ver. 12); see Plummer's note. For the use of this word in its technical sense of sending to a higher authority (as it is used in Plut., Phil., Jos., Polyb.) see further instances from inscriptions, Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, ii., 56. The verb is only used by Luke and Paul.—**Καίσαρα**: in N.T. the name is always official, never personal. It was first assumed as an official title by Octavius, the nephew of Julius Cæsar (see above), who doubtless took it on account of the fame of his uncle, and as a name not likely to be hated and despised by the Romans like that of "king". After the death of Gaius Cæsar, the last of the Julian stock,

22. Ἀγρίππας δὲ πρὸς τὸν Φῆστον[1] ἔφη, Ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι. ὁ δέ, Αὔριον, φησίν, ἀκούσῃ αὐτοῦ.

23. Τῇ οὖν ἐπαύριον ἐλθόντος τοῦ Ἀγρίππα καὶ τῆς Βερνίκης μετὰ πολλῆς φαντασίας, καὶ εἰσελθόντων εἰς τὸ ἀκροατήριον, σύν τε τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ ἀνδράσι[2] τοῖς κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν οὖσι τῆς πόλεως,

[1] εφη *om.* ℵAB 13, so Tisch. and other authorities as in ver. 21, except Hilg. ο δε *om.* ℵAB, Vulg., Boh., so Tisch. and other authorities as above.

[2] For τοις . . . πολεως Syr. H. mg. reads *qui descendissent de provincia;* in β text Blass *adds* the words after πολεως (και). τοις *om.* before χιλ., so ℵABCE, so Tisch. and other authorities as above.

it was adopted by Claudius and by succeeding emperors, Tac., *Hist.*, ii., 80, until the third century, when the title Augustus was reserved for the supreme ruler, and that of Cæsar was adopted for those who shared his government as his possible heirs, as earlier still it had been conferred upon the heir presumptive: "Cæsar," Hastings' B.D. and B.D.².

Ver. 22. **ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς**: "I also was wishing to hear the man myself," R.V., margin, imperfect, as of a wish entertained for some time; it was probable from Agrippa's position, and his official relationship to Judaism, that he would have been already interested in Paul. Bethge takes it as if it meant that a strong desire had been already awakened by the governor's statement to hear Paul, see also Winer-Moulton, xli. *a*, 2; but it is most usual to explain the imperfect here (without ἄν) rather than the direct present as used out of politeness, softening the request, "I should like," Burton, p. 16, Page, *in loco;* Lightfoot, *On a Fresh Revision*, *etc.*, p. 16. Calvin strangely takes the imperfect to mean that Agrippa had long cherished the wish to hear Paul, but had checked it hitherto, lest he should seem to have come with any other motive than to see Festus.—**αὔριον**: emphatic (and emphasised by φησίν), indicating the immediate compliance with Agrippa's wish.

Ver. 23. **φαντασίας**, Polyb., xv., 25, 15, etc.; Diod. Sic., xii., 83, and instances in Wetstein, *cf.* Herod., vii., 10. **φαντάζεσθαι** (Page); "in eadem urbe, in qua pater ipsorum a vermibus corrosus ob superbiam perierat" (Wetstein). The word here in the description may point to the presence of an eyewitness (Plumptre).—**τὸ ἀκροατήριον**: *auditorium*, but the article need not be pressed, as here the word may simply imply the chamber used on this occasion; it would scarcely have been the place of formal trial, as this was not in question.—**χιλιάρχοις**: there were five cohorts stationed at Cæsarea, Jos., *B.J.*, iii., 4, 2, but see the remarks of Belser, *Beiträge*, pp. 138-140.—**ἀνδράσι τοῖς κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν**: evidently from the context to be regarded as heathen. Both Jew and heathen in Cæsarea had equal civil rights, and had to conduct the public affairs in common; the expression here used does not mean that Jews were excluded from the government, although it is quite in accordance with the fact of the preponderating Gentile element mentioned by Josephus, *B.J.*, iii., 9, 1; Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. i., p. 86, note, E.T.—**κατ᾽ ἐξοχήν**: here only in N.T., not in classical Greek in this sense; primarily of any prominence, *cf.* LXX, Job xxxix. 28, ἐξόχως, 3 Macc. v. 31; *cf.* for its meaning here Cic., *Ad Att.*, iv., 15, 7, in classical Greek ἔξοχος; for the phrase, Winer-Moulton, li., 2, *g*.

Ver. 24. **βασιλεῦ**, see above on p. 495.—**συμπαρόντες**: only here in N.T., *cf.* Wisd. ix. 10, Tobit xii. 12 AB.—**πᾶν τὸ πλ.**: the statement is not in the least inconsistent with vv. 2, 7, 15. In Jerusalem at all events it is easily intelligible that a noisy crowd would second the actual accusers, *cf.* xvii. 5, 6, while in connection with Cæsarea we know from the latter years of the government of Felix how bitter the Jews were against the Gentiles, and how natural it would be for them to oppose the Apostle of the Gentiles, Jos., *B. J.*, ii., 13, 7; *Ant.*, xx., 8, 7.—**ἐνέτυχόν μοι**: "made suit to me," R.V., Wisd. viii. 20, 3 Macc. vi. 37, so in Plut., *Pomp.*, 55, *cf.* Polyc., *Martyr.*, xvii., 2, with dative only; it is used also of those making complaint before some authority, 1 Macc. viii. 32, x. 61, xi. 35, 2 Macc. iv. 36, see Westcott on Heb. vii. 25. The verb with the exception of Heb. vii. 25 and text is only found in

καὶ κελεύσαντος τοῦ Φήστου, ἤχθη ὁ Παῦλος. 24. καί φησιν ὁ Φῆστος, Ἀγρίππα βασιλεῦ, καὶ πάντες οἱ συμπαρόντες ἡμῖν ἄνδρες, θεωρεῖτε τοῦτον, περὶ οὗ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἰουδαίων [1] ἐνέτυχόν μοι ἔν τε Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ ἐνθάδε, ἐπιβοῶντες μὴ δεῖν ζῆν αὐτὸν μηκέτι. 25. ἐγὼ δὲ [2] καταλαβόμενος μηδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου αὐτὸν πεπραχέναι, καὶ [3] αὐτοῦ δὲ τούτου ἐπικαλεσαμένου τὸν Σεβαστόν, ἔκρινα πέμπειν αὐτόν. 26. περὶ οὗ ἀσφαλές [4] τι γράψαι τῷ κυρίῳ οὐκ ἔχω· διὰ προήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐφ᾽ ὑμῶν, καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ σοῦ, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ὅπως τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης σχῶ τι γράψαι. 27. ἄλογον γάρ μοι δοκεῖ, πέμποντα δέσμιον, μὴ καὶ τὰς κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ αἰτίας σημᾶναι.

[1] ενετυχον ℵCAEHLP, Tisch., W.H. marg., Weiss, but in text W.H. read ενετυχεν (so Blass in β text), with B.H. 40, 105. For επιβοωντες ℵAB 61, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt read βοωντες. After ενετυχον μοι Blass in β text omits τε and και ενθαδε (retained by Hilgenfeld) with Cod. Dublin, Berger, and proceeds with the same Codex, and Vers. Bohem. (Tisch.), and especially with Syr. H. mg. to reconstruct the text in β (see also Hilgenfeld's reconstruction). οπως παραδω αυτον εις θανατον. (εν) ακατηγορητον δε ουκ ηδυναμην παραδουναι αυτον δια τας εντολας ας εχομεν παρα του Σεβαστου. εαν δε τις αυτου κατηγορειν θελη, ελεγον ακολουθειν μοι εις Καισαρειαν, ου φυλασσεται. ελθοντες δε εβοησαν αιρεισθαι αυτον. ακουσας δε αμφοτερων κατελαβομην εν μηδενι αυτον ενοχον θανατου ειναι. λεγοντος δε μου· θελεις κρινεσθαι μετ' αυτων εν Ιεροσολυμοις; Καισαρα επεκαλεσατο. Belser sees in this, as compared with the shortened form in α, a weighty confirmation of Blass's theory, p. 140, and *cf.* Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 150.

[2] For καταλαβ. ℵcABCE 40, 61, 68, Vulg., Boh., Syr. P., read κατελαβομην; so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V., Hilg.

[3] και before αυτου *om.* ℵABCE 13, 40, 68, Vulg., Boh., and other authorities as above.

[4] For τι γραψαι ℵABC 5, Syr. H., Tisch., and other authorities above; so Blass, τι γραψω, but Hilg., γραψαι.

Rom. viii. 27, 34, xi. 2, in each place of making supplication to God. For its use *cf.* ἔντευξις and ἐντυχία, of making request to one in authority, *cf.* Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, i., pp. 117, 118, 143, 144, *e.g.*, the frequent formula on the papyri, ἔντευξις εἰς τὸ τοῦ βασιλέως ὄνομα. Clemen regards the whole speech of Festus to Agrippa, vv. 24-27, as an interpolation on account of the repetition of ver. 21 in ver. 25, and of the contradiction supposed to exist between vv. 27 and 19. But Jüngst differs from him with regard to the latter point, and although admitting the hand of a reviser freely in the first speech, and also in vv. 14-21, he hesitates to define the revision too exactly in the latter speech.

Ver. 25. καταλαβόμενος, *cf.* iv. 13 and x. 34; Ephes. iii. 18.—τὸν Σ.: "sanctius hoc nomen erat quam *Cæsar*," Blass.—αὐτοῦ δὲ τούτου, *cf.* xxiv. 15, Thuc., vi., 33 (Wetstein).

Ver. 26. ἀσφαλές τι γράψαι, *Dig.*, xlix., 6. "Post appellationem interpositam litteræ dandæ sunt ab eo, a quo appellatum est, ad eum qui de appellatione cogniturus est, sive principem, sive quem alium, quas litt. dimissorias sive Apostolos appellant" (Wetstein and Blass).—τῷ κυρίῳ: title refused by Augustus and Tiberius because it savoured too much of the relationship between a master and a slave, and perhaps because it seemed a title more fitting to God (as Wetstein explains it), *cf.* Suet., *Aug.*, 53, *Tiber.*, 27, and Tacitus, *Ann.*, ii., 87. It was accepted by Caligula and succeeding emperors (*cf.* Pliny's Letter to Trajan with the frequent *Dominus*), although Alexander Severus forbade it to be applied to him; for other instances, and instances on inscriptions, see Wetstein, *in loco*, Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, 44, and *Bibelstudien*, 77, 78, and Tert., *Apol.*, 34, Polyc., *Martyr.*, viii., 2, ix. 2, who refused to utter it with reference to Cæsar. For the due significance of the word in St. Luke, who uses it more fre-

XXVI. 1. ʼΑΓΡΙΠΠΑΣ δὲ πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον ἔφη, Ἐπιτρέπεταί σοι ὑπὲρ[1] σεαυτοῦ λέγειν. τότε ὁ Παῦλος[2] ἀπελογεῖτο, ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα, 2. Περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ἥγημαι ἐμαυτὸν μακάριον[3] μέλλων ἀπολογεῖσθαι ἐπὶ σοῦ σήμερον, 3. μάλιστα γνώστην ὄντα σε πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν τε καὶ ζητημάτων[4]· διὸ δέομαί σου μακροθύμως ἀκοῦσαί μου.

[1] υπερ, so BLP, W.H., Weiss, but W.H. marg. have περι, so Tisch., Wendt undecided, but apparently preferring περι.

[2] After Παυλος Blass in β adds θαρρων και εν τῳ αγιῳ πνευματι παρακλησιν λαβων with Syr., Harcl., mg.

[3] R.V. reads επι σου μελλων σημερον απολογεισθαι, with ℵABC, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Blass.

[4] After ζητηματων ℵcAC add επισταμενος, so Blass and Hilgenfeld to avoid the anacoluthon; for the same purpose after οντα σε, 6, 29, 31, insert ειδως, but neither part. is retained by W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss.

quently of Christ than the other Evangelists, see especially Wetstein, *in loco*.—ἀνακρίσεως: here not in its strictly legal and judicial sense of a preliminary inquiry, but an inquiry into the case, *cf.* ver. 22 (iv. 9), with a view to sending a report to the emperor as judge, Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 544, and Zöckler, *in loco*. Festus knew what the charges were, but not their significance, and he hoped to obtain some definite information from Agrippa or Paul—he wanted something ἀσφαλές; Paul had contradicted the charge of treason, and what was left, ver. 19, seemed full of obscurity and absurdity.

Ver. 27. ἄλογον, *cf.* Thuc., vi., 85, Xen., *Ages.*, xi., 1 (elsewhere in N.T., 2 Pet. ii. 12, Jude ver. 10, *cf.* Wisd. xi. 15, 16, 3 Macc. v. 40 (A *om.*), 4 Macc. xiv. 14, 18). It would seem from the verse that the procurator was not bound to send the *litteræ dimissoriæ* (O. Holtzmann).—πέμποντα: for construction *cf.* Heb. ii. 10, or the expression may be quite general "that any one sending," etc.—σημᾶναι: here *per litteras significare*, as in classical Greek (Wetstein). This decisive turn given to events by Paul's appeal is regarded by Weizsäcker (*Apostolic Age*, ii., 124, E.T.) as the most certain event in the whole history of the case; Paul as a prisoner could only be taken to Rome if he was to be brought before the emperor's court, and this had to be done if he invoked such intervention. On Zeller's and Weizsäcker's attempt to see in the appearance of Paul before Agrippa a mere repetition of the episode of our Lord before Annas *cf.* Spitta's reply, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 281.

CHAPTER XXVI.—Ver. 1. ἐπιτρέπεται, Burton, p. 9, on "the aoristic present". Agrippa as a king and as a guest presides; and Paul addresses himself specially to him, *cf.* vv. 2, 7, 13, 19, 27; *cf.* xxviii. 16, 1 Cor. xiv. 34, for the passive with infinitive, and for other instances of the word in the same sense as here xxi. 39, 40, xxvii. 3; the verb is similarly used in all of the Gospels (three times in Luke), and in 1 Cor. xvi. 7, 1 Tim. ii. 12, Heb. vi. 3.—ἐκτείνας: not the same as in xii. 17, xiii. 16; here not to ensure silence, but *gestus est oratorius*, *cf.* ver. 29. — ἀπελογεῖτο, see above, xxiv. 10, although not formally on trial, the word shows that the Apostle was defending himself.

Ver. 2. ἐπὶ σοῦ, *cf.* xxiv. 19.—ἐγκαλοῦμαι, see on xix. 38.—ὑπὸ Ἰουδ.: "by Jews" simply (*cf.* xxv. 10), and therefore he is glad to address one acquainted with Jewish customs, but see on ver. 4.—ἥγημαι ἐμαυτὸν μακ.: only here by Luke in this sense, but frequently so used by St. Paul in his Epistles eleven times, *cf.*, *e.g.*, Phil. iii. 7, 1 Tim. vi. 1. St. Paul too commences with a "captatio benevolentiæ," "sed absque adulatione," Blass: "and yet had he been conscious of guilt, he should have feared being tried in the presence of one who knew all the facts; but this is a mark of a clear conscience, not to shrink from a judge who has an accurate knowledge of the circumstances, but even to rejoice and to call himself happy," Chrys., *Hom.*, lii.

Ver. 3. μάλιστα: (1) "especially because thou art expert," R.V. (so Blass, Felten, Weiss), or (2) "because thou art specially expert," margin, R.V. (so Wendt, Rendall, Bethge, Zöckler). See

4. τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου[1] τὴν ἐκ νεότητος, τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένην ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἴσασι πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, 5. προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν, (ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν,) ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας[2] θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος·

[1] την before εκ νεοτ., retained by Tisch., Blass and Hilg., is omitted by Weiss, W.H., Wendt, with BC*H. την απ' αρχης om. by Blass in β, with Gig. After εν ℵABEgr 40, Syr. P., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss, Hilg. add τε, Blass omits in β text.

[2] θρησκειας, so W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilg., with ABHLP; Tisch. with ℵCE read θρησκιας, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 44.

critical notes, and for construction Winer-Moulton, lxiii., 2, *a*, and xxxii. 7, Wendt (1899), p. 389.—γνώστην ὄντα: an anacoluthon, as if an accusative had been previously used, πρός σε . . . ἀπολ., *cf.* xxii. 1. Zöckler takes it as an accusative absolute, following A. Buttmann (see Winer-Moulton., *u. s.*), but no clear example (*cf.* Ephes. i. 18, and Hackett's note, *in loco*).—γνώστην, *cf.* Susannah, ver. 42 (Theod., not LXX), with genitive as here.—ἐθῶν τε καὶ ζητ.: "*consuetudinum* in practicis, *quæstionum* in theoreticis," Bengel, on ver. 32 see above, xxv. 19.—μακροθύμως, only here in N.T., but μακροθυμία frequent in St. Paul's Epistles (*cf.* Ecclus. v. 11).

Ver. 4. μὲν οὖν: with no formal antithesis, but as marking the opposition between his present and former mode of life, a contrast dropped for the moment, and resumed again in ver. 9; see Rendall, Appendix on μέν οὖν, but also Page, *in loco*, and notes below on ver. 9.—βίωσιν: *vivendi et agendi ratio*, Grimm; *cf.* the same word used in the description of a life very similar to that of Paul before he became a Christian, Ecclus., *Prol.*, 12, διὰ τῆς ἐννόμου βιώσεως (Symm., Ps. xxviii. (xxxix.) 6).—νεότητος, 1 Tim. iv. 12, only elsewhere in N.T. in Luke xviii. 21, and in parallel passage, Mark x. 20, in LXX Gen. xliii. 33, Job xxxi. 18, etc. From its use with reference to Timothy it is evident that the word did not imply the earliest years of life, and although Paul may probably have removed to Jerusalem at an early age, the context does not require a reference to the years he had lived before his removal.—τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γεν.: explanatory of preceding,—the commencement of his training, which was not only amongst his own nation, but also specially τε, at Jerusalem, *cf.* xxii. 3. The Apostle presses the point to show that he was most unlikely to act in violation of Jewish feeling—he is still a Jew.—ἴσασι: only here in N.T., perhaps a conscious classicism, Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 33; on the classical forms in this speech see Blass, *Proleg.*, p. 14, and *Gram.*, p. 49, and especially p. 5, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 9. These literary forms are what we should have expected the Apostle to employ before an audience so distinguished.—Ἰουδαῖοι: Blass gives a further reason for the omission of article, "abest ut 2, 3, 7, 21, sec. usum Atticorum, *cf.* xvii. 21".

Ver. 5. προγιν. με: knowing me beforehand, *i.e.*, ἄνωθεν, from the beginning of my public education in Jerusalem. προγ.: twice elsewhere by Paul, Rom. viii. 29, xi. 2, also in 1 Pet. i. 20, 2 Pet. iii. 17. For ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ἄνωθεν *cf.* Luke i. 2, 3, and for the former also 2 Thess. ii. 13.—ἀκριβ.: "the straitest sect," R.V., on the double accusative in A.V. see Humphry, *Commentary on R.V.* For this classical form, the only instance of a superlative in -τατος in N.T., see especially Blass, *u. s.*, *cf.* ver. 4; on the term in its close connection with Pharisaism *cf.* Jos., *B.J.*, i., 5, 2; *Ant.*, xvii., 2, 4, and references above on xxii. 3. Their "straitness" included not only observance and interpretation of the Mosaic law, but also of the whole παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.—αἵρεσιν, see on v. 17, the word in the sense of "a sect" was rightly applied to the exclusiveness of Pharisaism as in the N.T., *cf.* xv. 5, and in Jos., *cf. Vita*, 38.—θρησκείας: "*cultus religionis*, potissimum *externus*," Grimm, so here and in the other places where it occurs in N.T., Col. ii. 18, James i. 26, 27; twice in Wisdom, xiv. 18, 27, of the worship of idols; in Ecclus. xxii. 5 the reading is doubtful; in 4 Macc. v. 6, 13, of the religion of the Jews. The instances of its use both in Philo and Josephus show that it was plainly distinguished from εὐσέβεια and ὁσιότης. Thus it is contrasted with the latter by Philo, *Quod det. potiori insid.*, c. 7: θρησκείαν ἀντὶ

6 καὶ νῦν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς[1] πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίας γενομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἕστηκα κρινόμενος, 7. εἰς ἣν τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν λατρεῦον ἐλπίζει[2] καταντῆσαι· περὶ ἧς ἐλπίδος ἐγκαλοῦμαι, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 8. τί;

[1] For **προς** ℵABE have **εις**; so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilgenfeld; for T.R., *cf.* xiii. 32. After **πατερας** ℵABCE 61, Vulg., Syr. P.H., Boh. add **ημων**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg., but Blass brackets.

[2] For **καταντησαι** B has **καταντησειν**, so W.H. marg., Weiss, **βασ.** at end of verse ℵBCEI, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. After **υπο**, **των** is omitted by ℵABCEHLP, so by Tisch and other authorities above.

ὁσιότητος ἡγούμενος; and in Josephus it is frequently used of the public worship of God, worship in its external aspect, *cf. Ant.*, ix., 13, 3; xii., 5, 4; v., 10, 1; xii., 6, 2. It was therefore a very natural word for St. Paul to use, and it is not necessary to suppose that he did so merely for the sake of Festus and the Romans (Blass), although the word was used of one mode of worship when contrasted with another; see further Hatch, *Essays in B.G.*, p. 55; Trench, *Synonyms*, i., p. 200, and Mayor on James i. 26.—**Φαρισαῖος**: emphatic at the end, expressing the "straitest sect" by name, *cf.* Gal. i. 14, Phil. iii. 5, 6.

Ver. 6. **καὶ νῦν**: the expression does not indicate any contrast with ver. 4: this hope for which he stands to be judged is in full accord with his whole past life.—**ἐπ' ἐλπίδι**: phrase only found elsewhere in St. Paul's Epistles, where it is frequent; Rom. viii. 20, 1 Cor. ix. 10, Tit. i. 2. A hope not merely of the resurrection of the dead, but of the Messiah's kingdom with which the resurrection was connected, as the context points to the national hope of Israel; *cf.* Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 175, E.T., see also pp. 137, 148, 149, and Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i., pp. 75, 79, on the strong bond of the common hope of Israel.—**πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας**, see critical note. With either preposition we have a Pauline expression; on the force of **εἰς** see Alford and Weiss, *in loco*. If we read **ἡμῶν** after **πατ.** perhaps including Agrippa with himself as a Jew.

Ver. 7. **εἰς ἣν**: unto which promise, not *spem* (Grotius, Bengel), **καταντῆσαι εἰς**, *cf.* the same construction with the same verb, Phil. iii. 11, Ephes. iv. 13, only in Luke and Paul, but never by the former elsewhere in metaphorical sense; in classical Greek after verbs of hoping we should have had a future, but in N.T. generally aorist infinitive, Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 154 (1893).—**τὸ δωδεκάφυλον**: here only in biblical Greek; perhaps used after the mention of the fathers, as the heads of the tribes; for the word *cf. Prot. Jac.*, i., 3, Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, lv., 6 (*cf.* xxxi. 4), and *Orac. Syb.*, **λαὸς ὁ δωδεκάφυλος**; the expression was full of hope, and pointed to a national reunion under the Messiah; for the intensity of this hope, and of the restoration of the tribes of Israel, see on iii. 21 (p. 115), and references in ver. 6, Edersheim, *Jewish Social Life*, p. 67, and especially *Psalms of Solomon*, xviii., 28, 30, 50.—**ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ**, *cf.* xii. 5, 2 Macc. xiv. 38, 3 Macc. vi. 41, Jud. iv. 9 (twice?); Cic., *Ad Att.*, x., 17, 1. See Hatch, *u. s.*, p. 12.—**νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν**, *cf.* xx. 31, also used by Paul; elsewhere in his Epistles five times, and once in Mark v. in genitive, 1 Thess. ii. 9, iii. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 5; 2 Tim. i. 3; Mark v. 5. The precise phrase in the accusative also occurs in Luke ii. 37, Mark iv. 25.—**λατρεῦον**, *cf.* Luke ii. 37, joined with **νύκτα καὶ ἡμ.** as here, and in both places of the earnest prayer for the Messiah's coming; same phrase elsewhere in N.T. only in Rev. vii. 15. For the force of the expression here and its relation to the Temple worship see Blass, *in loco*, and Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 174, E.T.—**ὑπὸ Ἰουδ.**: by Jews, O King! Agrippa knew that this hope, nowever misdirected, was the hope of every Israelite, and the Apostle lays stress upon the strange fact that Jews should thus persecute one who identified himself with their deepest and most enduring hopes.

Ver. 8. R.V. gives more clearly the significance of the original, "Why is it judged incredible with you, if God (as He does) raises the dead?" **εἰ** with indicative assumes that the hypothesis is true, Vulgate "si Deus mortuos suscitat?" *cf.* Luke xvi. 31. It has sometimes been thought that St. Paul

ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν, εἰ ὁ Θεὸς νεκροὺς ἐγείρει; 9. ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἔδοξα ἐμαυτῷ πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου δεῖν πολλὰ ἐναντία πρᾶξαι· 10. ὃ καὶ ἐποίησα ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, καὶ πολλοὺς τῶν ἁγίων ἐγὼ φυλακαῖς κατέκλεισα, τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων

here makes a special appeal to the Sadducean part of his audience—**παρ' ὑμῖν**—including among them Agrippa, with his indifference and practical Sadduceism (Alford), with his policy favouring the Sadducees in the appointment of the high priests (Felten): others have seen in the words a reference to the general resurrection with which the Apostle's Messianic belief was connected, or to cases of resurrection in the history of Israel, as, *e.g.*, 1 Kings xvii., 2 Kings iv., as if the speaker would ask: Why is it judged a thing incredible in your judgment when you have instances before you in the sacred books accepted by Agrippa and the Jews? But it is far better to consider the words in connection with the great truth to which the whole speech was meant to lead up, ver. 23, *viz.*, that Jesus, although crucified, had risen again, that He was at this moment a living Person, and by His resurrection had been proved to be the Messiah, the fulfiller of the hope of Israel. Zöckler regards the question as forming a kind of transition from the general hope of the Jews in a Messiah to the specific Christian hope in Jesus. —**ἄπιστον**: only here in Acts, twice in Luke's Gospel, but frequent in St. Paul's Epistles of those who believed not. See further Nestle, *Philologica Sacra*, p. 54, 1896, and Wendt, p. 391 and note (1899). Nestle proposes to place the verse as out of connection here between vv. 22 and 23, with a full stop at the end of the former; and Wendt commends this view.

Ver. 9. **ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν**: the words may be taken as simply resuming the narrative of the Apostle's life which he had commenced in vv. 4 and 5, the three succeeding verses forming a parenthesis, or as an answer to the question of ver. 8, the real antithesis to **μὲν οὖν**, ver. 9, and the narrative, vv. 9-11, being found in ver. 12 and what follows. On **μὲν οὖν** see Rendall, *Acts*, Appendix, p. 163, and also Page on ii. 41, *Acts*, pp. 94, 95; see also critical note above.—**ἔδοξα ἐμαυτῷ**: *mihi ipsi videbar;* so in classical Greek. If with Weiss, Wendt, Bethge we lay stress on **ἐμαυ.**, the Apostle explains the fact that this obligation was his own wilful self-delusion. In classical Greek instead of the impersonal construction we have frequently the personal construction with the infinitive as here, *cf.* 2 Cor. x. 9—only in Luke and Paul, indication of literary style, Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 152 (1893).—**τὸ ὄνομα Ἰ. τοῦ Ν.**, see on iv. 10, 12.—**ἐναντία πρᾶξαι**, *cf.* xxviii. 17, and also 1 Thess. ii. 15, Tit. ii. 8.

Ver. 10. **ὃ καὶ ἐποίησα**, *cf.* Gal. ii. 10 (Bethge, p. 272), on the distinction between **πράσσειν** and **ποιεῖν** Westcott on St. John iii. 22.—**ἐγὼ**: emphatic.—**τῶν ἁγίων**, see above ix. 13, *cf.* its use in ix. 32; the word aggravates St. Paul's own guilt. Agrippa too would know of pious Jews by the same designation.—**ἀναιρ. τε αὐτῶν**: probably pointing to more deaths, not as expressing the death of Stephen alone, *cf.* viii. 1, ix. 1, xxii. 4. The state of affairs which rendered the murder of St. Stephen possible in the capital would easily account for similar acts of outrage in other places, so that there is no need to suppose with Weiss that the notice here is unhistorical.—**κατήνεγκα ψῆφον**: "I gave my vote," R.V., the **ψῆφος**, literally the pebble used in voting, *calculum defero* sc. *in urnam* (Grimm), *i.e.*, *addo calculum*, *approbo*, *cf.* **ψῆφον φέρειν**, **ἐπιφ.** or **ἐκφ.** If the phrase is taken quite literally, it is said to denote the vote of a judge, so that Paul must have been a member of the Sanhedrim, and gave his vote for the death of St. Stephen and other Christians. On the other hand the phrase is sometimes taken as simply = **συνευδοκεῖν τῇ ἀναιρέσει** (so amongst recent writers, Knabenbauer), xxii. 20. (C. and H. think that if not a member of the Sanhedrim at the time of Stephen's death, he was elected soon after, whilst Weiss holds that if the expression does not imply that the writer represents Paul by mistake as a member of the Sanhedrim, it can only be understood as meaning that by his testimony Paul gave a decisive weight to the verdict in condemnation of the Christians.) Certainly it seems, as Bethge urges, difficult to suppose that Paul was a member of such an august body as the Sanhedrim, not only on account of his probable age at the time of his conversion, but also because of his comparatively obscure circumstances. The Sanhedrim was an

ἐξουσίαν λαβών. ἀναιρουμένων τε αὐτῶν κατήνεγκα ψῆφον. 11. καὶ κατὰ πάσας τὰς συναγωγὰς πολλάκις τιμωρῶν αὐτούς, ἠνάγκαζον βλασφημεῖν· περισσῶς τε ἐμμαινόμενος αὐτοῖς, ἐδίωκον ἕως καὶ εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις. 12. ἐν οἷς[1] καὶ πορευόμενος εἰς τὴν Δαμασκὸν μετ' ἐξουσίας καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων, 13. ἡμέρας μέσης κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἶδον, βασιλεῦ, οὐρανόθεν ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα

[1] και *om.* ℵABCEI, 13, 40, 61, so Tisch. and other authorities in ver. 7. For T.R. read της των αρχ. ℵ*B, Tisch., Weiss, Wendt, R.V., Blass; της παρα *om.* AEI 40, 68, Lach.

assembly of aristocrats, composed too of men of mature years and marked influence, and the question may be asked how Saul of Tarsus, who may not even have had a stated residence in the Holy City, could have found a place in the ranks of an assembly numbering the members of the high priestly families and the principal men of Judæa: see *Expositor*, June, 1897, and also for the bearing of the statement on the question of Paul's marriage, with Hackett's note, *in loco*. For the voting in the Sanhedrim see Schürer, div. ii., vol. i., p. 194. E.T. Rendall, p. 336, meets the difficulty above by referring the expression under discussion to a kind of popular vote confirming the sentence of the court against Stephen, for which he finds support in the language of the law and in the narrative of the proto-martyr's condemnation.

Ver. 11. **τιμωρῶν** (*cf.* xxii. 5), more usually in the middle voice in this sense, although the active is so used sometimes in classical Greek, Soph., *O. T.*, 107, 140, Polyb., ii., 56, 15. For ecclesiastial censures and punishments see Edersheim, *History of the Jewish Nation*, p. 374, *cf.* Matt. x. 17, xxiii. 34.—**ἠνάγκαζον**: "I strove to make them blaspheme," R.V., all other E.V. render "I compelled them to blaspheme," but the imperfect leaves it quite doubtful as to whether the persecutor succeeded in his attempts or not. The imperfect may thus be regarded as conative, Burton, p. 12, *cf.* Luke i. 59, Matt. iii. 14. Blass points out that it may have the force of repeated action (*cf.* **ἐδίωκον**), but even if so, it does not say that the compulsion was effectual, *Gram.*, p. 186. See further Page, *in loco*, for the rendering of R.V., which he regards as correct. A striking parallel may be adduced from Pliny's Letter to Trajan, x., 97, where the Christians are urged to call upon the gods, to worship the emperor, and to blaspheme Christ, "quorum nihil cogi posse dicuntur qui sunt revera Christiani," *cf.* Polycarp, *Martyr.*, ix., 2, 3.—**βλασφημεῖν**, *i.e.*, Jesus, "maledicere Christo," Pliny, *u. s.*, James ii. 7; *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 13 with this passage, and Paul's later reflections on his conduct.—**ἕως καὶ εἰς τὰς ἔξω π.**: "even unto foreign cities," R.V., so that other cities besides Damascus had been included in the persecution, or would have been included if Saul's attempt had been successful.—**ἐδίωκον**: "I set about persecuting them". The imperfect **ἐδίωκ.** may however denote repeated action, and may indicate that Saul had already visited other foreign cities. Weiss regards the **τε** as connecting the two imperfects *de conatu* together—the latter imperfect being regarded as a continuation of the former, in case the victims sought to save themselves by flight.—**ἐμμαιν.**: only in Josephus once, *Ant.*, xvii., 6, 5, but **ἐμμανής** in Wisd. xiv. 23, and in classical Greek, so also **ἐκμαίνεσθαι**.

Ver. 12. **ἐν οἷς**, *i.e.*, as I was thus engaged, *inter quæ*, "on which errand," R.V. margin, see xxiv. 18.—**ἐπιτροπῆς**, 2 Macc. xiii. 14, Polyb., iii., 15, 7, "commission," A. and R.V. "Paulus erat *commissarius*," Bengel, the two nouns show the fulness of the authority committed to Paul.

Ver. 13. **ἡμέρας μέσης**: temporal genitive, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 107 (in classical Greek **ἡμ. μεσοῦσα**). The expression is perhaps stronger than in xxii. 6, in the bright full light of day.—**κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν**: "on the way," and so foreboding nothing (Weiss).—**βασιλεῦ**: "advertitur rex ad miraculum rei," Blass, *cf.* ver. 7, so Weiss.—**ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπ.**: here only expressly, but implied in ix. 3, xxii. 6, indicating the supernatural nature of the light; noun only here in N.T., *cf.* Dan. xii. 3.—**περιλάμψαν**: only in Luke, *cf.* Luke ii. 9, where the word is also used for a light from heaven; nowhere else in N.T., but the verb is found in Plutarch,

τοῦ ἡλίου περιλάμψαν με φῶς καὶ τοὺς σὺν ἐμοὶ πορευομένους. 14. πάντων δὲ[1] καταπεσόντων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἤκουσα φωνὴν λαλοῦσαν πρός με, καὶ λέγουσαν τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, Σαούλ, Σαούλ, τί με διώκεις; σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. 15. ἐγὼ δὲ εἶπον,

[1] For δε ℵABEI, Syrr. H.P., Vulg. read τε, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilgenfeld. For T.R. φωνην λ. . . . και λεγ. ℵBCI, Vulg., Syrr. P.H., Boh., read φ. λεγουσαν προς με, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, R.V. After γην Blass in β adds δια τον φοβον εγω μονος, 137 Syr. H. mg. (Gig.), so Hilg.

Josephus. The fact that the light shone round about Paul and his companions is at any rate not excluded by ix. 7 or xxii. 9, as Weiss notes. It is quite in accordance with the truth of the facts that the more vivid expression should occur in Paul's own recital.

Ver. 14. See notes on ix. 7 and xxii. 7, and reading above in β.—**τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλ.**: this is intimated in ix. 4 and xxii. 7 by the form **Σαούλ**, but here the words are inserted because Paul was speaking in Greek, or perhaps he spoke the solemn words, indelible in his memory, as they were uttered, in Hebrew, for Agrippa (Alford). — **σκληρόν σοι κ.τ.λ.**: a proverb which finds expression both in Greek and in Latin literature (see instances in Wetstein): *cf.* Scholiast on Pind., *Pyth.*, ii., 173: ἡ δὲ τροπὴ ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν· τῶν γὰρ οἱ ἄτακτοι κατὰ τὴν γεωργίαν κεντριζόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀροῦντος, λακτίζουσι τὸ κέντρον καὶ μᾶλλον πλήττονται. *Cf.* also Aesch., *Agam.*, 1633 (*cf. Prom.*, 323), Eur., *Bacch.*, 791, and in Latin, Terence, *Phorm.*, i., 2, 27; Plautus, *Truc.*, iv., 2, 59; and there may have been a similar proverb current among the Hebrews. Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 5, 6, thinks that the introduction of the proverb on this occasion before Festus and Agrippa points to the culture which Paul possessed, and which he called into requisition in addressing an educated assembly. It is not wise to press too closely a proverbial saying with regard to Saul's state of mind before his conversion; the words may simply mean to intimate to him that it was a foolish and inefficacious effort to try to persecute Jesus in His followers, an effort which would only inflict deeper wounds upon himself, an effort as idle as that described by the Psalmist, Ps. ii. 3, 4. At all events Paul's statement here must be compared with his statements elsewhere, 1 Tim. i. 13; see *Witness of the Epistles*, p. 389 ff., and Bethge, *Die Paulinischen Reden*, p. 275.

Ver. 15. Evidently the following verses contain a summary of what in the other two accounts of the Conversion is spoken to Paul by Ananias, and revealed by the Lord in a vision, *cf.* ix. 15, xxii. 14 (so Alford, Felten, Zöckler). This is far more satisfactory than to suppose that the two narratives in ix. and xxii. are really dependent upon xxvi., the author having employed in them an oral tradition relating to Ananias, without being at all aware that by introducing such an account he was really contradicting a point upon which Paul lays special stress, *viz.*, the fact that he had received his apostleship neither from man nor through man, Gal. i. 1 (so Wendt (1899), p. 189, and McGiffert, pp. 120 and 355). But in the first place nothing is said as to the Apostle receiving his Apostleship from Ananias; he receives recovery of sight from him, but his call to his Apostleship commences with his call before Damascus: "epocha apostolatus Paulini cum hoc ipso conversionis articulo incipit," Bengel; and see specially Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 220, 1864, on Gal. i. 15 (*Witness of the Epistles*, p. 379, 1892); and, further, the introduction and omission of Ananias are in themselves strong corroborations of the naturalness of the three accounts of the Conversion. Thus in chap. xxii., ver. 12, *cf.* ix. 10, "non conveniebat in hunc locum uberior de An. narratio, ix. 10 ff., sed conveniebat præconium ejus, quod non est illic" (Blass); so too it was natural and important to emphasise before a Jewish audience the description of Ananias (in ix. 10 he is simply τις μαθητής) as εὐλαβὴς κατὰ τὸν νόμον, well reported of by all *the Jews*, whereas in xxvi. "tota persona Ananiæ sublata est, quippe quæ non esset apta apud hos auditores" (Blass). The three narratives agree in the main facts (see notes in comment., and Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, 2nd edit., p. 216), and "the slight variations in the three accounts do not seem to be of any consequence," Ramsay, *Saint Paul*, p. 379, *cf.* also

Τίς εἶ, Κύριε; ὁ δὲ[1] εἶπεν, Ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς ὃν σὺ διώκεις. 16. ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι, καὶ στῆθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες[2] ὧν τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι, 17. ἐξαιρούμενός σε ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ[3] τῶν ἐθνῶν, εἰς οὓς

[1] ο δε, *add* Κυριος ℵABCEIL, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] After ειδες BC* 105, 137, Syrr. P.H., Arm., Ambr., Aug. add με, so W.H., Weiss, Hilg., R.V. text, but R.V. marg. Blass and Wendt omit; see the latter's note, p. 394 (1899), as against Weiss.

[3] Before των εθνων ℵABE^gr.I 13, 40, 61, repeat εκ, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Hilg., Weiss, Wendt. For νυν ℵABCEHILP read εγω, so other authorities above.

Renan, *Apostles*, p. 13, E.T., Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 121. Clemen, who agrees in the main with Wendt in regarding xxvi. as the original narrative, refers chap. ix. to his Redactor Antijudaicus, and chap. xxii. to his Redactor Judaicus; he sees evidences of the hand of the former in ix., 10, 15, 17, and of the latter in xxii. 12, 14. If xxii. 17 f., and the words in ver. 15, πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, do not fit in with this theory, they are ascribed by Clemen to the later Redactor Antijudaicus; but the latter expression πρὸς π. ἀνθ. is already contained in the meaning of the original source, xxvi. 17, 20 a and c (20b belonging, according to Clemen, to the Redactor Judaicus). Space forbids any further examination of passages in the three narratives with regard to which the partition critics, Clemen and Jüngst, are again hopelessly at variance with each other, but *cf.* Jüngst, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 84, 87, 89, 94, and the strictures of Knabenbauer, *Actus Apostolorum*, p. 11 (1899). But it is strange to find that Clemen should be prepared to fall back upon the view of Baur, *Paulus*, ii., 13, that the narrative of Paul's blindness was derived from the spiritual blindness referred to in xxvi. 17, and that *therefore* this narrative is evidently older than the other accounts in ix. and xxii., which introduce a tragical blindness. As Wendt points out, there is no hint in the text that Paul's blindness was symbolical, and there is nothing to suggest the circumstantial narratives relating to Ananias in the phrase xxvi. 17, which relates not to the Apostle's own conversion, but to his power of converting others.

Ver. 16. **ἀλλὰ ἀνάστηθι**: "Prostravit Christus Paulum ut eum humiliaret; nunc eum erigit ac jubet bono esse animo," Calvin; for the expression *cf.* Ezek. ii. 1, 2.—**προχειρ.**, *cf.* iii. 14, xxii. 14, ix. 15, σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς.—**ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα ὧν τε εἶδες**, so like the Twelve, and *cf.* also αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου, Luke i. 1; in Cor. iv. 1 St. Paul speaks of himself as ὑπηρέτης.—**ὧν τε εἶδές με**, see critical note, "wherein thou hast seen me," R.V., *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 1, quite in harmony with the stress which the Apostle there lays upon "seeing the Lord".—**ὧν τε ὀφθ.** = τούτων ἅ: "and of the things wherein I will appear to thee," so A. and R.V. *Cf.* Acts xviii. 9, xxii. 18, 21, xxiii. 11, 2 Cor. xii. 2. ὀφθ., future passive (Grimm-Thayer), cannot be rendered "I will make thee to see," or "I will communicate to thee by vision," as if = ἐγὼ ὑποδείξω, ix. 16. For construction see Page, and Blass, *in loco*.

Ver. 17. **ἐξαιρούμενός σε**: "delivering," A. and R.V. Vulgate, *eripiens*, and so the word is elsewhere rendered in N.T., *cf.* vii. 10, 34, xii. 11, xxiii. 27, Gal. i. 4, and below, ver. 22; so very frequently in LXX (although twice in the sense below, Job xxxvi. 21, Isa. xlviii. 10). It may be called a Lucan-Pauline word (only twice elsewhere in N.T.; in St. Matt. v. 29, xviii. 9, but in an entirely different signification). Blass renders it as above, and points out that there is no reason for rendering it "choosing" in this one passage, a sense which is not at all fitted to the context; for the language *cf.* 1 Chron. xvi. 35, Jer. i. 8, so Wendt (1899, but in the sense below previously), Weiss, Felten, Hackett, Bethge, Knabenbauer. It is no objection to say that Paul was not delivered, but was persecuted all his life long, for he was delivered in the sense of deliverance to proclaim the message for which he was sent as an Apostle. On the other hand Overbeck, Rendall, Page, so C. and H. take it in the sense of "choosing," *cf.* ix. 15, σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς. Grimm-Thayer is

νῦν σε ἀποστέλλω, 18. ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, καὶ κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις,

doubtful. Rendall urges that the word cannot mean "delivering" without some phrase such as **ἐκ χειρός**, as common in the LXX, but *cf.* on the other hand LXX, Judg. x. 15, xviii. 28 A, Ps. xxx. 2, xlix. 15, Hosea v. 14, etc. But how could Paul be said to be chosen **ἐξ ἐθνῶν**? The phrase would certainly sound strange to him as a description of his own position. Rendall also objects that in 1 Chron. xvi. 35 the word means to gather the scattered exiles from among the heathen as the context shows, but the Hebrew verb נָצַל means to deliver, and is so rendered, *l. c.*, in A. and R. V. It is also urged that **λαός** is always the name of honour, and that elsewhere the enemies of the Apostle were named **Ἰουδαῖοι**; but not only is the collocation "the people and the Gentiles" a common one, *cf.* ver. 23, Rom. xv. 10, but **λαός** is used of the unbelieving Jews in describing hostility to the Gospel, *cf.* iv. 27, xii. 4. Agrippa would understand the distinction between **λαός** and **ἔθνη**. **ἐγὼ** "denotat auctoritatem mittentis," Bengel.—**ἀποστέλλω**: Paul receives his Apostolic commission direct from Christ as much as the Twelve; Gal. i. 1, 16, 17, Rom. i. 5 (Matt. x. 16, John xx. 21-23); *cf.* Acts i. 25.

Ver. 18. **ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθ. αὐτῶν**, *cf.* Acts ix. 8, 40, and also Matt. ix. 30; so too Isai. xxxv. 5, xlii. 7. Both Jews and Gentiles were blinded (**οὖς** above, referring to both), the former because seeing they saw not, Matt. xiii. 13, Rom. xi. 8; the latter in that knowing God in His creation they glorified Him not as God, and their senseless heart was darkened, Rom. i. 21; and to both St. Paul proclaimed the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. iv. 6, Ephes. i. 18. The infinitive of purpose depending on **ἀποστέλλω**, Burton, p. 157; Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 169 (1893).—**ἐπιστρέψαι**: "that they may turn," R.V. ("to turn them," margin, so A.V.); in St. Luke, who uses the verb more frequently than any other N.T. writer, it is nearly always intransitive, except in Luke i. 16, 17, Moulton and Geden, while Grimm adds ver. 20 below; so here all E.V. before the authorised, *cf.* Vulgate, "ut convertantur" (Humphry). If we thus take **ἐπισ.** as intransitive, it is subordinate to the previous infinitive of purpose, **ἀνοῖξαι**, and **τοῦ λαβεῖν** again subordinate to **ἐπιστ.**, expressing the final result aimed at (Page, and see also Wendt's note, *in loco* (1899)).—**ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς**: throughout St. Paul's Epistles the imagery was frequent with reference not only to Gentiles but also to Jews, *cf.* Rom. ii. 19, xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 5, Ephes. v. 18, Col. i. 12. The words gain in interest here if we think of them as corresponding with the Apostle's own recovering from blindness, spiritual and physical (Plumptre).—**τοῦ Σατανᾶ**, Blass, *Gram.*, pp. 32, 144; no less than ten times by St. Paul in his Epistles; *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 4, Ephes. ii. 2, vi. 12 (Col. i. 13. **ἐξουσία σκότους**, Luke xxii. 53). There is no reason to suppose with Bengel that St. Paul is here referring to Gentiles rather than to Jews, for whilst the Jews no doubt would regard the Gentiles as loving **σκότος** and in the power of Satan, *cf.* also Luke xiii. 16, xxii. 31, Acts v. 3. For current ideas with regard to Satan and the teaching of the N.T. *cf.* Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., p. 775; Charles, *Book of Enoch*, Introd., p. 52, and *Assumption of Moses*, x., 1, where Satan is apparently represented as the head of the kingdom of evil; *cf.* in the N.T. Ephes. i. 21, vi. 12, Col. ii. 15, for the whole hierarchy of evil spirits at the disposal of Satan, and 2 Thess. ii. 9; *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 14 for his supernatural powers of deceiving or preventing men; see especially Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 145.—**τοῦ λαβεῖν**: expressing the ultimate object of **ἀνοῖξαι** (see above, and Weiss, *in loco*).—**ἄφεσιν ἁμαρ.**, iii. 16, the language here is quite Pauline, *cf.* Col. i. 12-14, where also deliverance out of the power of darkness and forgiveness of sins in the Son of God's love are connected as here.—**τῇ πίστει εἰς ἐμέ**: may be connected with **λαβεῖν**, faith in Christ as the condition of forgiveness placed emphatically at the end; *cf.* x. 43, A. and R.V. connect the words with **ἡγιασμένοις**, so Vulgate.—**κλῆρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασ.**, *cf.* xx. 32, Col. i. 12.

Ver. 19. **ὅθεν**: "wherefore," R.V., so in Heb. ii. 17, iii. 1, vii. 25, viii. 3, ix. 18 (locally in Luke xi. 24, Acts xiv. 26, xxviii. 13); probably best taken here as

πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ. 19. Ὅθεν, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, οὐκ ἐγενόμην ἀπειθὴς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασίᾳ, 20. ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν Δαμασκῷ πρῶτον[1] καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις, εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἀπήγγελλον μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν, ἄξια

[1] After πρωτον ℵAB 25, 61, add τε, so Tisch. and other authorities in ver. 17, except Hilg. Before Ιερ. AE read εν. Hilg. has και τοις εν Ιερ. εις *om.* ℵAB, so Tisch., R.V., W.H., but retained by Weiss, Hilg. and Wendt, may easily have dropped out after the preceding -οις. Blass reads in α and β εις πασαν τε (την) χωραν Ιουδαιοις και τοις εθνεσιν, with support by Par.[2] "Judæis," see note below, and Wendt (1899), p. 396. Clemen, p. 144, regards τε και Ιερ. . . . Ιουδαιας as a gloss of R. Judaicus (ver. 21 being added by R. Antijudaicus), and both Wendt and McGiffert view the whole reference as added to the original source.

referring to the whole revelation from ver. 12, marking the natural result of what had gone before; not used in St. Paul's Epistles.—βασ. Ἀ.: "cum ad sua facta redeat, apte regem denuo compellat," Blass, marking the commencement of his real defence.—ἀπειθὴς: only in Luke and Paul in N.T., *cf.* Luke i. 17; Rom. i. 30, 2 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 16, iii. 3; in LXX and in classical Greek.—ὀπτασίᾳ: here and here only Paul himself apparently speaks of the appearance of Christ vouchsafed to him before Damascus by this word, but ὀπτασία, as Beyschlag shows, is not confined to appearances which the narrators regard as visions, *cf.* Luke i. 22, xxiv. 23, and its meaning must be explained from the entire "objectivity" with which St. Paul invests the whole narrative of his Conversion, *cf. Witness of the Epistles*, p. 383 (1892), and p. 380 for further reference to Beyschlag in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1864, 1890, and his *Leben Jesu*, i., p. 435. In modern Greek ὀπτασία = a vision (Kennedy).

Ver. 20. ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν Δ.: "both to them of Damascus first, and at Jerusalem," reading τε (see critical note) after πρῶτον, thus closely connecting Damascus and Jerusalem as the scenes of Paul's first activity, *cf.* ix. 20, 28.—εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰ., see critical note. If we read accusative simply without εἰς = accusative of space marking the extension of the preaching. Blass solves the difficulty by regarding εἰς = ἐν, *ut sæpe*. The statement seems to contradict Gal. i. 22, and there is no mention of such a widely extended preaching at this time in Acts. It has therefore been held by some that reference is made to the preaching at the time of Saul's carrying relief with Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem, xi. 30, xii. 25 (Zöckler and Rendall), while others refer the passage to Rome xv. 10 (Weiss), and others combine xi. 29, 30, xv. 3 = Rom. xv. 10. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 382, regards the statement as so directly contradictory to all other authorities that he practically follows Blass in β text, and reads εἰς πᾶσαν χώραν Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι, "in every land to both Jews and Gentiles". The text he regards as not Lucan and hardly Greek, see also Blass, *in loco;* ἡ χώρα τῆς Ἰουδαίας ought to be τῶν Ἰουδ., as in x. 39, etc. But see in defence of reading in T.R. as against Blass, and the reference of the words to the journeys in xi. 30, xv. 3, Wendt, *in loco* (1899). The general meaning given to the words by Blass is at all events in accordance with the view of the speech as a summary, and not as an account in detail, of the Apostle's work (C. and H., p. 620). Dr. Farrar, *St. Paul*, i., 228, ingeniously supposes that Paul may have preached on his way from Damascus to Jerusalem in the guest chambers of the Jewish synagogues, so that he may not have come into contact with any Christian communities, and he would thus explain Gal. i. 22.—ἀπήγγελλον: imperfect, denoting continuous preaching; here only of preaching the Gospel, but *cf.* xvii. 30 W.H., where God announces to men everywhere to repent, μετανοεῖν, a striking similarity in language with Paul's words here (*cf.* 1 John i. 2, 3).—ἐπιστρέφειν, *cf.* for the expression xiv. 15, and see above on ver. 18.—ἄξια τῆς μετανοίας ἔργα: "worthy of their repentance," R.V. margin, *i.e.*, of the repentance which they profess. In the Gospels καρπούς, καρπόν, here ἔργα, but *cf.* Ephes. ii. 10, v. 11, Col. i. 10, Tit. iii. 8, and ἀξίους with genitive *rei*, more frequent in St. Luke and St. Paul than in any other N.T. writers.—πράσσοντας: used in N.T. sometimes of good, sometimes of evil, actions; in

τῆς μετανοίας ἔργα πράσσοντας. 21. ἕνεκα τούτων με[1] οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι συλλαβόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐπειρῶντο διαχειρίσασθαι. 22. ἐπικουρίας οὖν τυχὼν τῆς[2] παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἕστηκα, μαρτυρούμενος μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ, οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ

[1] The art. before **Ιουδ.** *om.* ℵ*BL 13, 61, 105, so Tisch., R.V., Hilgenfeld, W.H., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, but Lach. and Meyer follow T.R. After **συλλ.** Tisch., Hilgenfeld, with ℵcE, Vulg. Chron. reads **οντα**, but the word may easily have been added to express more clearly that the temple, xxi. 30, was the place where they found Paul, not where they sought to kill him (Wendt).

[2] For **παρα** ℵABE, Chron. read **απο**, so Tisch., R.V., W.H., Hilgenfeld, Blass, Weiss, Wendt. ℵABHLP, Chrys., so Tisch. and authorities in **ver. 21**, read **μαρτυρομενος**.

classical Greek **ποιεῖν** is more frequent *de inhonestis*, *cf.* Xen., *Mem.*, iii., 9, 4, see Grimm, *sub v.*

Ver. 21.—**ἕνεκα τούτων**: because I preached to Jews and Gentiles alike, proclaiming one Gospel to both, and placing both on an equality before God (not for profaning the Temple), *cf.* xxi. 28. On **ἕνεκα** see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 21. This Attic form of the word is read here by all authorities, and Blass notes it as characteristic of the literary style of this address before Agrippa, see above on ver. 4.—**συλλαβόμενοι**, i. 16, xii. 3. So also in each of the Gospels in the active voice, of a violent arrest; in passive see above, xxiii. 27, and frequent in same sense in LXX, and 1 and 2 Macc.—**ἐπειρῶντο**: here only in N.T. in middle, but see critical note on ix. 26. *Cf.* 1 Macc. xii. 10, 2 Macc. x. 12, 3 Macc. i. 25, ii. 32, 4 Macc. xii. 3. Imperfect because the attempt was not actually made.—**διαχειρ.**, see on v. 30. The whole description ranks as a summary without giving all the details of the events which led up to the Apostle's imprisonment.

Ver. 22. **ἐπικουρίας . . . τῆς παρὰ (ἀπὸ) Θεοῦ**: "the help that is from God," R.V., *i.e.*, the help which cometh from God only; only here in N.T., *cf.* Wisdom xiii. 18 (**ἐμπειρίας**, S²), for the use of the same phrase *cf.* instances in Wetstein from Polybius; the word is found in Josephus, but also frequently in classical Greek, of succour against foes.—**τυχὼν**: no idea of chance, *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 10; the aid was divine, not human.—**οὖν**, see Wendt, and references, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 267, Winer-Moulton, liii., 10, 4.—**ἕστηκα**: *sto salvus*, Bengel, after these repeated dangers. The A.V. hardly gives the force of the word; it is a Pauline expression, *cf.* Ephes. vi. 13, 14, Col. iv. 12, so Knabenbauer, *subsisto incolumis.*—**μαρτυρούμενος**: "testifying," A.V., yet **μαρτυρόμενος**, see critical note, would rather signify "testifying," so R.V., see on vi. 3. Grimm-Thayer, if the reading in T.R. is retained, evidently considers that it should be rendered as passive, "testified to both by small and great". But **μαρτυρόμενος** marks most appropriately the office of bearing testimony to which Paul was appointed.—**μικρῷ τε καὶ μεγάλῳ**: if taken to mean "both small and great," the words would have a special force in thus being spoken before Festus and Agrippa, but if = young and old, *i.e.*, before all men, *cf.* viii. 10, Heb. viii. 11; *cf.* Gen. xix. 4, 11, etc., but in Rev. xi. 18, xiii. 16, xix. 5, reference is made rather to rank than to age, and the latter meaning may well be included here; *cf.* Deut. i. 17, Job iii. 19, Wisd. vi. 7.—**οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λ. ὧν τε οἱ πρ. . . . μελλόντων = οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς τούτων ἃ . . . ἐλάλησαν μέλλοντα**, *cf.* Rev. xvii. 8 Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 135. **μελλ. γίγ.**, *cf.* Luke xxi. 36; **ἐκτὸς**, *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 27; the word is only used by St. Paul elsewhere in N.T. (except Matt. xxiii. 26), *cf.* 1 Kings x. 13, 2 Chron. ix. 12, xvii. 19.—**οἱ προφ. . . . καὶ M.**: more naturally Moses and the prophets, Luke xvi. 29, 31, and *cf.* xxviii. 23, but Moses may have been mentioned to influence the Sadducean element in the audience: the historical Christ was always the subject of St. Paul's preaching "Jesus is the Christ," and the historical Christ was also the ideal Christ; *cf.* iii. 13, 1 Cor. xv. 3. See on this verse critical note, and Wendt (1899), p. 397, note.

Ver. 23. **εἰ** = Heb. vii. 15, *i.e.*, as is most certain from the authority of Scripture, "how that the Christ," R.V.—**παθητὸς**: "must suffer," R.V. ("although is subject to suffering," margin), *cf.* Vulgate, *passibilis* (not *patibilis*); no question here of the abstract possibility of, or

προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελλόντων γενέσθαι [1] καὶ Μωσῆς, 23.[2] εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι. 24. Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀπολογουμένου, ὁ Φῆστος μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ ἔφη,[3] Μαίνῃ, Παῦλε· τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα

[1] For **και Μωσης** Flor. and Gig. have "scriptum est in Moysen". Blass regards this as the remaining fragment of the original **β** text, which ran somewhat as follows: **γεγραπται γαρ εν Μωυσει και τοις προφ. πολλα περι τουτων, τοις ερευνησασιν** (1 Pet. i. 11).

[2] **ει παθητος κ.τ.λ.**, Corssen, *G. C. A.*, 1896, p. 429, points out that Tert., *De resurr. carn.*, 39, presupposes the reading of Flor. and Gig., and regards the passage, Gen. ix. 5, in support of bodily resurrection, as quoted by Paul. According to Corssen's view, this passage was noted in the margin of the Western text. Flor. and Gig. make Paul refer to some particular passage of the Pentateuch, instead of generally to Moses and the prophets, but in Corssen's view Blass has not helped the recovered reading, but rather destroyed its force by his conjectured additions (see further Wendt (1899), p. 397). But Blass in his **β** text leaves a lacuna: **γεγραπται γαρ εν Μωυσει (και τοις προφηταις) . . .**

[3] Blass reads in **β** text **Εμανης Παυλε εμανης** with Flor., so **περιετρεψεν** with Flor. (ut videtur), so **ηγεμων** for **Φηστε** on the same authority.

capacity for, suffering, although primarily the Greek word implies this, but of the divine destination to suffering, *cf.* Luke xxiv. 26, 44, 1 Cor. xv. 2, 3, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.;* Justin Martyr, *c. Tryph.*, c. 89, **παθητὸν τὸν Χριστόν, ὅτι αἱ γραφαὶ κηρύσσουσι, φανερόν ἐστι.** But the same dialogue, c. 90, enables us to realise that even where the idea of a suffering Messiah was entertained, nothing was more abhorrent than the idea of the cross as the outward expression of such sufferings: "If the Messiah can suffer," cries the Jew Trypho, "yet he cannot be crucified; he cannot die such a shameful, dishonourable death". See also cc. 36, 76. For the incompatibility of the idea of a suffering Messiah with the ideas current in the time of Jesus see Dalman, *Der Leidende und der Sterbende Messias*, p. 30, and references may be made to *Witness of the Epistles*, pp. 360, 361, for other authorities to the same effect; *cf.* Matt. xvi. 22, Luke xviii. 34, xxiv. 21, John xii. 34, 1 Cor. i. 23, Gal. v. 11; see above on iii. 18 (p. 113). If we render **εἰ** *if* or *whether* it does not indicate that there was any doubt in Paul's mind; but he simply states in the hypothetical form the question at issue between himself and the Jews.—**εἰ πρῶτος**: "that he first by the resurrection of the dead," R.V., closely connected with the preceding; the Messiah was to suffer, but "out of his resurrection from the dead" assurance was given not only that the Suffering Messiah and the Triumphant Messiah were one, but that in Him, the true Messiah, all the O.T. prophecies of the blessings of light and life, to Jew and Gentile alike, were to be fulfilled, *cf.* Isai. xlix. 6, Acts xiii. 47 (Isai. ix. 1, 2, lx. 1). This on the whole seems better than to limit the words to the fact that life and immortality had been brought to light by the resurrection of the Christ: **φῶς** means more than the blessing of immortality in the future, it means the present realisation of the light of life, *cf.* ver. 18, and Luke ii. 32, of a life in the light of the Lord. **πρῶτος** closely connected with **ἐξ ἀναστ.**, as if = **πρωτότοκος ἐκ νέκρων**, Col. i. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23, or as if the Apostle would emphasise the fact that Christ first rose in the sense of rising to die no more, Rom. vi. 9, and so proclaimed light, etc.—**καταγγέλλειν**: "to proclaim," R.V., *cf.* xvi. 17, xvii. 3, 23. —**λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσι,** see above ver. 17; even in the Pharisaic hope expressed in *Psalms of Solomon*, xvii., *cf.* ver. 32, we see how far the Gentiles would necessarily be from sharing on an equality with the Jews in the Messianic kingdom, see Ryle and James, Introd., liii., and also for later literature, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, lxxii., Edersheim on Isaiah lx., *Jesus the Messiah*, ii., pp. 728, 729.

Ver. 24. **ἀπολ.**: the present participle, indicating that Festus broke in upon the speech, *cf.* iv. 1.—**μεγ. τῇ φ.**: raising his voice, because interrupting in surprise and astonishment, and no doubt with something of impatience if not of anger (Chrysostom). — **Μαίνῃ**: a hyperbolic, but not a jesting expression; the mention

εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει. 25. ὁ δέ, Οὐ μαίνομαι, φησί, κράτιστε Φῆστε, ἀλλ' ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι. 26. ἐπίσταται γὰρ περὶ τούτων ὁ βασιλεύς, πρὸς ὃν καὶ[1] παῤῥησιαζόμενος λαλῶ[2]· λανθάνειν γὰρ αὐτόν τι τούτων οὐ πείθομαι οὐδέν· οὐ γάρ

[1] και after προς ον is omitted by W.H., following B, Boh., Arm., but retained by W.H. marg., Weiss, Hilg.

[2] λανθ. γαρ αυτον κ.τ.λ., Wendt decides in favour of T.R. here, with ℵHLP. In B 36, 69, 137, 180, τι is omitted, so by W.H. text, Weiss, Blass; in ℵcAE 13, ουδεν is omitted, so by Lach. ℵB read ουθεν, see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 61. Blass in β text, following Flor., reads ουδεν γαρ τουτων αυτον λανθανει, and omits ου γαρ . . . τουτο.

not only of a resurrection, but the expressed belief that this Christ Whom Festus could only describe as "one who was dead," xxv. 19, should bring light not only to Jews but even to Gentiles, to Romans like himself, was too much—such a belief could only result from a disturbed brain, *cf.* xvii. 32 for the effect of the announcement of a resurrection and a judgment on the polished Athenians, *cf.* St. John x. 20, where our Lord's words provoked a similar pronouncement by the Jews, the learned Jews of the capital. **μαίνεσθαι**: "qui ita loquitur ut videatur mentis non compos esse," Grimm, *cf.* xii. 15, 1 Cor. xiv. 23, opposite to **σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθ.** (see also Page's note); *cf.* the passage in Wisd. v. 3, 4, and Luckock, *Footsteps of the Apostles*, etc., ii., p. 263.—**τὰ πολλά σε γράμματα**: "thy much learning," R.V., giving the force of the article perhaps even more correctly, "that great learning of thine". It is possible that the words may refer simply to the learning which Paul had just shown in his speech, of which we may have only a summary, and **γράμμ.** may be used of the sacred writings from which he had been quoting, and to which in his utterances he may have applied the actual word, and so Festus refers to them by the same term, *cf.* 2 Tim. iii. 15. Others refer the word to the many rolls which St. Paul had with him, and which he was so intent in studying. It is possible that the word may be used here as in John vii. 15, of sacred learning in general, of learning in the Rabbinical schools, and perhaps, as it is employed by a Roman, of learning in a more general sense still, although here including sacred learning = **μαθήματα**, *cf.* Plat., *Apol.*, 26 D. If books alone had been meant **βιβλία** or **βίβλοι** would have been the word used.—**περιτρέπει εἰς μανίαν**: "doth turn thee to madness," R.V., *cf.* our English phrase "his head is turned," literally "turn thee round" (Humphry), *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, ix., 4, 4, ii., 4, 1. It is possible that Festus used the expression with a certain delicacy, since in using it he recognises how much wisdom Paul had previously shown (Weiss, Bethge). After such an expression of opinion by Festus, and owing to the deference of Agrippa to the Romans, Knabenbauer thinks that the king could not have expressed himself seriously in the words which follow in ver. 28.

Ver. 25. **Οὐ μαίνομαι κ. Φ.**: whatever may have been the sense in which Festus addressed Paul, there is no doubt as to the courtesy of the Apostle's answer, **μετὰ ἐπιεικείας ἀποκρινόμενος**, Chrys. **κράτιστε**: "most excellent," R.V., see above, i. 1.—**ἀληθ. καὶ σωφροσ.**: *veritas* not *veracitas*, objective truth; no suspicion had been raised against St. Paul's truthfulness of character (*cf.* John xviii. 37); as our Lord stood before Pilate as a witness for the truth, so His Apostle stands face to face with a Roman sceptic as a witness to the existence of a world of real existences and not of mere shadows and unrealities (Bethge, p. 294). **σωφρ.**: the opposite of madness, *cf.* Plato, *Protag.*, 323 B (Xen., *Mem.*, i., 1, 16), **ὃ ἐκεῖ σωφροσύνην ἡγοῦντο εἶναι τἀληθῆ λέγειν, ἐνταῦθα μανίαν.** The two nouns are only found here in St. Luke's writings, but *cf.* **σωφρονεῖν**, Luke viii. 35, Rom. xii. 3, 2 Cor. v. 13; *cf.* **ῥήματα ζωῆς**, chap. v. 20.—**ἀποφθ.**, *cf.* ii. 4 and 14, of the Pentecostal utterances, and of the solemn utterances of St. Peter; "aptum verbum," Bengel. St. Paul was speaking with boldness like St. Peter, and under the same divine inspiration; in LXX of the utterances of the prophets, *cf.* 1 Chron. xxv. 1, of philosophers, and of oracular responses; like the Latin *profari* and *pronuntiare*, see above on ii. 4, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*

ἐστιν ἐν γωνίᾳ πεπραγμένον τοῦτο. 27. πιστεύεις, βασιλεῦ Ἀγρίππα, τοῖς προφήταις; οἶδα ὅτι πιστεύεις. 28. ὁ δὲ Ἀγρίππας πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον ἔφη,[1] Ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι.

[1] εν ολιγῳ με πειθεις Χριστ. ποιησαι ℵB 13, 17, 40, 61, Syr. H., mg., Boh., Tisch., Weiss. Instead of πειθεις A, so Lach., Blass (Nösgen, Belser, Alford) πειθῃ, but prob. this was an attempt to solve the difficulty of the reading given above, and with the same purpose EHLP, Vulg., Syr. P. Harcl. text, Cyr.-Jer., Chrys. have γενεσθαι for ποιησαι, so Meyer and Hilg. Both Alford and Blass, while adopting πειθῃ, read ποιησαι. W.H. (and to this view apparently Wendt inclines, 1899) think that there must be some corruption in text, see *App.*, p. 100. Hort adds that possibly πεποιθας should be read for με πειθεις, for the personal με loses no force by being left to implication, and the changes of letters are inconsiderable, but at the same time he thinks it equally possible that the error may lie elsewhere.

Ver. 26. ἐπίσταται γὰρ: here only with περί: in proof that his words were words of soberness, and that he was basing his statements on facts, St. Paul appeals to the knowledge of Agrippa, a knowledge which he would have gained from his close connection with the Jewish religion, but also to some extent perhaps from the events of his father's reign, for Herod Agrippa had beheaded James with a sword, and had cast Peter into prison: "patet hoc," says Bengel, "nam etiam *Christianum* nomen sciebat".—If καὶ is retained, "to whom also," *i.e.*, because of his knowledge just mentioned.—παῤῥησιαζ.: "freely," R.V., everywhere else R.V. renders "boldly"; verb only in Luke and Paul, see on ix. 27; the Apostle spoke freely because of the king's full knowledge, but his boldness is also shown in his question to the king, and to the reply which he makes to it in the king's name, ver. 27.—λανθάνειν γὰρ αὐτόν κ.τ.λ.: if οὐδέν and τι are both retained, see critical note, τι may be taken adverbially, "in any degree," but see Winer-Moulton, lv., 9, b., and Wendt's note, *in loco*, p. 399 (1899).—ἐν γωνίᾳ πεπραγ., *cf.* Luke vii. 17, xxiii. 8. Blass notes this expression, *Gram.*, p. 4, as a proof that Paul used more literary expressions than usual in addressing his audience, and no doubt the expression was used by classical writers, *cf.* Plato, *Gorg.*, 485 D; Epict., *Diss.*, ii., 12, 17, and other instances in Wetstein, *cf. angulus*, Ter., *Adelph.*, v., 2, 10.

Ver. 27. πιστεύεις; the question and answer were quite natural as addressed to a Jewish king; it was a belief which St. Paul could justly presuppose in every Jew, even in one like Agrippa, educated amongst the Romans. The question may well have been asked as a proof that the words which had preceded were words of truth and soberness, and that the king could so regard them, even if Festus could not; if Agrippa believed the prophets—as Paul affirmed—he could not regard the fulfilment of their prophecies as irrational. Or we may view the question as taking up, after the interruption of Festus, the statement of vv. 22, 23, and as a forcible appeal to Agrippa, as to one who could judge whether in the death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth there was anything really contrary to the picture of the Messiah drawn by the Hebrew prophets. It is possible that the Apostle meant to add a second ground for the knowledge of the king; not only were these events not done in a corner, but they had been prophesied by the prophets, in whom Agrippa believed; but instead of thus stating a fact, he addresses the king with increasing urgency and emotion, as one specially interested in religious questions, ver. 3 (Zöckler, Meyer).

Ver. 28. ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χ. γένεσθαι, see critical note, "with but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian," R.V. reading ποιῆσαι, and πείθεις being used *de conatu* (so Zockler in his 2nd edition); *cf.* προσήλυτον ποιεῖν, Matt. xxiii. 15. Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bibl.*, i., 754, inclines to explain the phrase Χ. ποιῆσαι as a Latinism: *Christianum agere*, to play the part of a Christian. Weiss sees in the words a gentle irony, as if Agrippa would answer St. Paul's appeal to his belief in the prophets by intimating that it was not so simple a matter to become a Christian, even if one, as a Jew, believed in the prophets. Or we may regard Agrippa as rejecting, not so much in banter as in cold disdain, the enthusiasm of the orator, and adopting the tone of a certain Jewish orthodoxy (Zockler), not, *i.e.*, the indifference of

29. ὁ δὲ Παῦλος[1] εἶπεν,[2] Εὐξαίμην ἂν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ οὐ μόνον σέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἀκούοντάς μου σήμερον, γενέσθαι τοιούτους ὁποῖος κἀγώ εἰμι, παρεκτὸς τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων.

[1] After ο δε Π. ℵAB, Vulg., Syr. Harcl. *om.* ειπεν, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] ευξαιμην ℵcAB, so Lach., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.; but ℵ*HLP 61, so Tisch. ευξαμην. For πολλῳ (HLP, Chrys.) ℵAB 13, 40, 61, Vulg., Syrr. P. H., Boh., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. have μεγαλῳ.

the Roman, but that of the Sadducees to the prophets. The A.V. "almost" must be abandoned, even if we retain γενέσθαι, for ἐν ὀλίγῳ cannot be so rendered, either here or elsewhere in the N.T.; παρ' ὀλίγον, or ὀλίγου or ὀλίγον δεῖ would be required as the classical expression for "almost". The best parallel is Ephes. iii. 3, ἐν ὀλίγῳ: "in a few words": so A. and R.V. (*cf.* 1 Pet. v. 12). But if in the next verse we read μεγάλῳ instead of πολλῷ, so R.V. (see critical note), it seems best to understand πόνῳ with ὀλίγῳ, as this noun could fitly stand with both μεγάλῳ and ὀλίγῳ = with little trouble, with little cost. The R.V. rendering of the two verses reads as if πολλῷ was retained in ver. 29, whereas μεγάλῳ is the reading adopted in R.V. text. So far as N.T. usage is concerned, ἐν ὀλίγῳ might be rendered "in a short time" (*cf.* James iv. 14, 1 Pet. i. 6, Rev. xvii. 10, so in classical Greek), but this rendering also is excluded by ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῳ in the next verse. Wendt maintains that ἐν ὀλίγῳ may still be rendered "almost"; the phrase is instrumental, as if expressing the thought contained in ὀλίγου δεῖ, and meaning that a little was wanted to attain the aim = almost; so St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril of Jerusalem; Luther, Beza, Grotius = *propemodum*. The answer of Agrippa, therefore, need not be taken ironically, as by most moderns, but in earnest (*cf.* ver. 32, where his favourable opinion supports this view), although Wendt acknowledges that his confession was only half-hearted, as is seen by his desire to conclude the interview (Wendt, 1888, note, p. 530, and 1899, p. 400, to the same effect, so too Schürer, *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 198, note). If we read πείθῃ, see critical note, we render "with but little thou art persuading thyself that thou canst make me a Christian," taking up πείθομαι of ver. 26. This reading is adopted by Blass and Belser, but the former takes ἐν ὀλίγῳ as meaning *brevi tempore* in this verse (so in Plato, *Apol.*, 22 B), but in ver. 29 he takes it as = *facile*, whilst ἐν μεγάλῳ (which he reads) = *difficile*. Belser, however, takes the phrase ἐν ὀλίγῳ in the same sense in both verses, "with little trouble or pains". St. Chrysostom thought that the phrase ἐν ὀλίγῳ was used by Agrippa in one sense and by St. Paul in another (so too Lewin, *cf.* Grimm-Thayer and Plumptre); Blass apparently obliges us to adopt the same view, but there is nothing in the context to support it (Wendt, Belser).—Χριστ.: there is nothing strange in this use of the word by Agrippa; he may have become acquainted with it in his knowledge of the Christian movement (see above), and the term could easily have spread from Antioch over the district which he ruled. It is difficult to say in what sense he used the term; and no doubt the shade of meaning which we attach to his employment of it will depend upon the meaning which we give to the rest of his answer—a meaning earnest or contemptuous. Thus on the former supposition it is possible that he may have used the word instead of the despised "Nazarene," to indicate his half-friendly attitude towards Christianity, and his relative recognition of it by connecting it with the name which was cherished by every Jew, although the context shows that he had no intention whatever of allowing Paul's persuasive powers further scope; see Wendt (1899), who points out as against Lipsius that there is nothing unhistorical in the introduction of the name here, as if the writer presupposed that it would be familiar to every Jew. On the other hand, although a Jew, Agrippa, before such an audience, might well have used a term with which the Romans also would probably have been familiar, and if he spoke contemptuously (so Blass, Rendall) he would naturally employ a title which had been given in scorn, and which apparently at this period even the Christians themselves had not accepted; see below, and note on xi. 26.

Ver. 29. εὐξαίμην ἄν: on the optative with ἄν, Burton, p. 80, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 202, Viteau, *Le Grec du N.T.*, p. 40

30.[1] Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ, ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμών, ἥ τε Βερνίκη, καὶ οἱ συγκαθήμενοι αὐτοῖς, 31. καὶ ἀναχωρήσαντες ἐλάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες, Ὅτι οὐδὲν θανάτου ἄξιον[2] ἢ δεσμῶν πράσσει ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος. 32. Ἀγρίππας δὲ τῷ Φήστῳ ἔφη, Ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύνατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος, εἰ μὴ[3] ἐπεκέκλητο Καίσαρα.

[1] **και ταυτα ειπ. αυτου** HLP (137), Syr. H., Flor., so Blass in **β** text, and Hilg.; but otherwise unsupported, R.V. omit.

[2] After **αξιον** Wendt is inclined to retain with Tisch. and W.H. marg. **τι**, so ℵA 13, 31, 40, 61, 68, Vulg., Boh.; BHLP *om.*, so T.R., Lach., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilg.

[3] **επεκ.**, but AL; Blass **επικ.**, but in **β** text Blass has **επεκ.**, so ℵBHP, etc.

(1893); with dative only here in N.T.—**καὶ ἐν ὀλ. καὶ ἐν μεγ.**: "whether with little or with much," R.V. See critical note and ver. 28, *i.e.*, with little or much trouble, and cost.—**σήμερον**: to be joined not with **γενέσθαι** (as Chrysostom, Bengel), but with **τοὺς ἀκούοντάς μου.**—**οὐ μόνον**, Burton, pp. 183, 184, **μὴ μόνον** with infinitive only in Gal. iv. 18.—**τοιούτους ὁποῖος κἀγώ εἰμι**, he does not repeat the word "Christian," which perhaps he would not recognise (Blass): "tales qualis ego sum, sive Chr. appellare vis, sive alio vel contemptiore nomine". **γενέσθαι . . . εἰμι**: "might become such as I am," R.V., thus giving the difference between **γέν.** and **εἰμι**; by whatever name he might be called, the Apostle knew what he actually was (1 Cor. ix. 9).—**παρεκτὸς τῶν δεσμῶν τούτων**; not figurative but literal; although the plural may be used rhetorically (Weiss), *cf.* Tac., *Ann.*, iv., 28. **παρεκτὸς**: Matt. v. 32, xix. 9 (see W.H.) (2 Cor. xi. 28, adv.), *Didachê*, vi., 1, *Test.*, xii., *Patr.*, *Zab.*, 1; "suavissima **ἐπιθεραπεία** et exceptio," Bengel. Faith and Hope—of these the Apostle had spoken, and his closing words reveal a Love which sought not its own, was not easily provoked, and took no account of evil: "totum responsum et urbanissimum et Christiano nomine dignissimum," Blass.

Ver. 30. **καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ**: if these words are not retained, see critical note, their omission seems to make the rising up more abrupt (*subito consurgit*, Blass), and probably this is the meaning of the passage, although the order of rank is maintained in leaving the chamber. For the vividness of the whole narrative see Zöckler and Wendt, and *cf.* McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 355.—**ἀνέστη**, Lucan, see on **ἀναχωρ.** Suet., *Nero*, 15; *cf.* xxiii. 19, and note on xxv. 12.

Ver. 31. **πράσσει**, present tense: "agit de vitæ instituto" (Grotius, Blass).

Ver. 32. **ἐδύνατο**: a true affirmative imperfect of verbs denoting obligation or possibility, when used to affirm that a certain thing could or should have been done under the circumstances narrated; therefore not correct to speak of an omitted **ἄν**, since the past necessity was not hypothetical or contrary to fact, but actual, Burton, p. 14, but *cf.* Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 114; *cf.* xxiv. 19, xxvii. 21.—**εἰ μὴ ἐπεκ. Καίσαρα**: the appeal had been made and accepted and Paul must be sent to Rome, but doubtless the decision of Agrippa would have great weight with Festus, and would greatly modify the letter which he would send to Rome with the prisoner (see above, p. 499), and we may thus account for the treatment of Paul on his arrival in the capital, xxviii. 16. The circumstance that the innocence of Paul is thus established at the mouth of various personages, and now by Agrippa, himself a Jew, as well as by Festus, a Roman, has been made the ground of objection to the narrative by Baur, Zeller, Overbeck, Weizsäcker, Schmiedel. But whilst we may frankly admit that St. Luke no doubt purposely introduced these varied testimonies to Paul's innocence, this is no proof of the incorrectness of his statements (Wendt, Matthias). If we grant, as St. Luke affirms, that the primary cause of the Apostle's imprisonment was the fanatical rage of the Jews against him as a despiser and enemy of the national religion, it is quite conceivable that those who were called to inquire into the matter without such enmity and prejudice should receive a strong impression of his innocence, and should give expression to their impressions. On the other hand, the description in Acts enables us to see how Paul, in spite of

XXVII. 1.[1] ῾ΩΣ δὲ ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ᾿Ιταλίαν, παρεδίδουν τόν τε Παῦλον καί τινας ἑτέρους δεσμώτας ἑκατοντάρχῃ,

[1] With Flor., Gig., Syr. H. mg., Blass reconstructs the β text: **ουτως ουν ο ηγεμων πεμπεσθαι αυτον Καισαρι εκρινεν, και τῃ επαυριον προσκαλεσαμενος εκατονταρχην τινα σπειρης Σεβαστης ονοματι Ιουλιον, παρεδωκεν αυτῳ τον Παυλον συν τοις λοιποις δεσμωταις**, so Hilgenfeld, 1899.

such declarations in his favour, might find himself compelled to appeal to Cæsar. Had he acted otherwise, and if release had followed upon the verdict of his innocence, he was sure that sooner or later the implacable Jews would make him their victim. McGiffert, *u. s.*, p. 356, observes that even if both Agrippa and Festus were convinced of the Apostle's innocence, this would not prevent Festus from seeing in him a dangerous person, who would stir up trouble and cause a riot wherever he went; such a man could not have been set at liberty by Festus as a faithful Roman official; but see above on xxv. 12. On the whole narrative see Zöckler, p. 311; Bethge, p. 260 (for phraseology). Zöckler supposes as a foundation for the narrative a written account by Luke himself, perhaps an eyewitness, at an early period after the events. Wendt (1899) also takes the view that the writer of the narrative had probably been in the personal company of St. Paul at Cæsarea before the start on the journey for Rome, xxvii. 1, and that the reason that he does not employ the first person in the narrative of xxv., xxvi., is because the facts narrated in these two chapters did not immediately concern him, although he was in Cæsarea during their process. In referring to the account of St. Paul's conversion as given in ch. xxvi. it is noteworthy that McGiffert, p. 120, speaks of it as occurring "in a setting whose vividness and verisimilitude are unsurpassed".

CHAPTER XXVII.—Ver. 1. Blass at the outset speaks of this and the next chapter as "clarissimam descriptionem" of St. Paul's voyage, and he adds that this description has been estimated by a man skilled in nautical matters as "monumentum omnium pretiosissimum, quæ rei navalis ex tota antiquitate nobis relicta sint". He refers to *Die Nautik der Alten* by Breusing, formerly Director of the School of Navigation in Bremen, 1886; a book which should be read side by side with J. Smith's well-known *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 4th edit., 1880 (*cf.* also J. Vars, *L'Art Nautique*, 1887, and see also Introd., p. 8).—**ὡς**: *particula temporalis*, often so used by St. Luke in Gospel and Acts, and more frequently than by the other Evangelists; in St. Matthew not at all, in St. Mark once; often in O.T., Apoc., and especially in 1 Macc.—**ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπ.**: common construction in LXX with kindred words, *e.g.*, **βουλεύομαι**, but no other instances of the genitive with infinitive after **κρίνω** (except 1 Cor. ii. 2, T.R.) in N.T., Lumby; see also Burton, p. 159. **ἀποπ.**: St. Luke stands alone amongst N.T. writers in the number of compounds of **πλεῖν** which he employs, no less than nine, J. Smith, *u.s.*, p. 28, 61.—**ἡμᾶς**: "with this section we tread the firm ground of history, for here at Acts xxvii. 1 the personal record of the book again enters, and that in its longest and fullest part" (Weizsäcker): see also on **ἡμᾶς**, as intimating by its recurrence the narrative of an eyewitness, Hilgenfeld, *Zw. Th.*, iv., p. 549 (1896), Wendt (1899), p. 402, note. The **ἡμᾶς** included Paul, Luke, Aristarchus; Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 315, maintains that both Luke and Aristarchus must have accompanied Paul as his slaves, and that they would not have been permitted to go as his friends, but see Gilbert, *Student's Life of Paul*, p. 201; and Wendt (1899) in reply to Ramsay points out that as the ship was not sailing as a transport vessel with the prisoners direct to Rome, but that a vessel engaged in private enterprise and commerce was employed, it is quite possible that Paul's friends may have travelled on the same ship with him as independent passengers. But see further Ramsay, p. 323. So far as Luke is concerned, it is possible that he may have travelled in his professional capacity as a medical man, Lekebusch, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 393.—**παρεδίδουν**: assimilated to form of contracted verbs, so most certainly in Acts, *cf.* iii. 2, iv. 33, 35, Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 37. Winer-Schmiedel, p. 121.—**δεσμώτας**, see below, p. 516.—That Paul commanded respect is implied by the whole narrative: some of the other prisoners may also have been sent to Rome on the ground of an appeal, *cf.* Josephus, *Vita*, 3, but others may have been already condemned, Ramsay, p.

ὀνόματι Ἰουλίῳ, σπείρης Σεβαστῆς. 2. ἐπιβάντες δὲ πλοίῳ Ἀδραμυττηνῷ, μέλλοντες πλεῖν[1] τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους, ἀνήχθημεν,

[1] After πλειν ℵAB add εις, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt. Instead of μελλοντες ℵAB, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt read μελλοντι; perhaps changed into plural after επιβαντες. Blass reconstructs with Flor., Gig., Syr. P. μελλοντες δε πλειν επεβημεν πλοιῳ Αδραμυττηνῳ, omitting μελλοντι πλειν . . . τοπους with Flor., retained, however, by Hilgenfeld, 1899, with Gig. and Syr. P. Blass continues in β text, so Hilgenfeld, επεβη δε συν ημιν Αρισταρχος Μακεδων Θεσσαλονικευς with the same authority, except that Flor. omits Θεσσ. AB*, so Weiss, W.H. read Αδραμυντηνῳ; see further Winer-Schmiedel, p. 58, and W.H., p. 313 (for aspirate Ἁδρα.), and *App.*, p. 167.

314.—ἑτέρους: Meyer and Zöckler take the word to indicate prisoners of a character different from Paul, *i.e.*, heathen, not Christians; but Wendt (so Hackett) points out that Luke in Acts uses ἕτερος in singular and plural as simply = another, or other, additional; vii. 18, viii. 34, xv. 35, xvii. 34. As against this Zöckler quotes Luke xxiii. 32, Gal. i. 7. —Ἰουλίῳ: name far too common for any identification; Tacitus speaks of a Julius Priscus, *Hist.*, ii., 92, iv., 11, a centurion of the prætorians, but see below on xxviii. 16.—σπείρης Σ.: "of the Augustan band," R.V. It is suggested that the term is here used is a popular colloquial way by St. Luke, and that it is not a translation of a correct Roman name, but rather "the troops of the emperor," denoting a body of legionary centurions who were employed by the emperor on confidential business between the provinces and the imperial city, the title Augustan being conferred on them as a mark of favour and distinction. If this is so we gather from this notice in *Acts* a fact which is quite in accordance with what is known from other sources, although nowhere precisely attested. But can any connection be established between such a body and any branch of the imperial service which is actually known to us? There were certain legionary centurions who went by the name of *frumentarii*, who were employed not only, as their name implied, on duties connected with the commissariat, but also with the custody of prisoners and for purposes of police. In xxviii. 16, A.V. and R.V. margin, we have the remarkable reading: "and the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the [prætorian] guard" (see on *l.c.*). But it is urged that we cannot understand by this expression the Prefect of the Prætorian Guard, who would not be concerned with the comparatively humble duty of receiving and guarding prisoners. But in the Old L.V. called Gigas (unfortunately the only representative of the Old Latin for this passage) we have for a translation of the Greek στρατοπεδάρχης, in itself a very rare word, *princeps peregrinorum*. Now the legionary centurions who formed the *frumentarii* were regarded in Rome as being on detached duty, and were known as *peregrini;* on the Cælian Hill they occupied the camp known as the *castra peregrinorum*, and their commander bore the name of *princeps peregrinorum*. If therefore we may identify the Stratopedarch in Acts xxviii. 16 with this commanding officer, we may also infer that Julius was one of the *Peregrini*, and that he hands over his prisoners to his superior officer, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 315, 347, Mommsen, *Sitzungsberichte d. Berl. Akad.*, 1895, p. 495 ff., Rendall, *Acts*, p. 340. But see on the other hand Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 389 (1897), Knabenbauer, *Actus Apostolorum*, p. 448, Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 147 ff., who point out amongst other reasons (1) that there is no clear evidence of the title *princeps peregrinorum* before the reorganisation of Sept. Severus, (2) that we have evidence that prisoners were sent from the provinces and committed to the care of the *præfectus prætorio*, *cf.* Traj., *Ad Plin.*, 57, with reference to one who had appealed: "vinctus mitti ad præfectos prætorii mei debet," and other instances in Zahn, *u. s.*, and Knabenbauer. See further for the value of the Old Latin reading in Gigas "Julius" (Headlam), Hastings' B.D., and below on xxviii. 16. But whether we adopt the explanation suggested by Prof. Ramsay or not, it is still open to us to maintain that the title "Augustan" was a title of honour and not a local title; not connected with Sebaste the chief town of Samaria, or with Cæsarea Sebaste. Schürer in answer to Mr. Headlam's criticism ("Julius," Hastings' B.D.) is still of opinion, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*,

ὄντος σὺν ἡμῖν Ἀριστάρχου Μακεδόνος Θεσσαλονικέως. 3. τῇ τε ἑτέρᾳ κατήχθημεν εἰς Σιδῶνα· φιλανθρώπως τε ὁ Ἰούλιος τῷ Παύλῳ χρησάμενος, ἐπέτρεψε πρὸς φίλους [1] πορευθέντα ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν.

[1] Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt read πορευθεντι with ℵAB 13, 36, 68. Blass in β text follows Flor. according to which Paul's friends come to him, "permisit amicis qui veniebant (ad eum) uti curam ejus agerent".

20, 1899, that reference is here made to one of the five cohorts of Cæsareans and Sebasteni mentioned by Josephus (for references see *Jewish People*, div. i., vol. ii., p. 53, E.T., and Schmiedel, *Encyclop. Biblica*, i., 909, 1899), and therefore a σπεῖρα Σεβαστηνῶν; but he maintains that this same cohort was distinguished by the title Augusta from the other four cohorts, and that the writer of Acts is rendering this title in the word Σεβαστή (see also below). It is *possible* (as Wendt admits, although he prefers Schürer's view, 1899) that Julius might have belonged to the *cohors Augusta, cf. C. I. L.*, iii., 66, 83, Augustiani, Suet., *Nero*, 25, Augustani, Tac., *Ann.*, xiv., 15, etc. (Belser, *Beiträge*, p. 154, Knabenbauer, p. 425), a select number of Roman knights who formed a kind of body-guard for the emperor, instituted about 59 A.D., and that he may have been in Cæsarea on some temporary special duty; but on the other hand see Page's note, *in loco* (*cf.* note on x. 1). Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* Σεβαστός (2), describes it as (an adj.) a title of honour given to certain legions, or cohorts, or battalions, for "valour": "Ala Augusta ob virtutem appellata," *C. I. L.*, vii., 340, 341, 344, but there is no inscriptional *proof* that this title was given to any Cæsarean cohort; see "Augustan Band" (Barnes), Hastings' B.D., and Wendt can only refer to the bestowal of the title as "probable".

Ver. 2. πλοίῳ Ἀδραμ.: a boat which belonged to Adramyttium in Mysia, in the Roman province Asia, situated at the top of the gulf *Sinus Adramyttenus*, to which it gives its name (Ramsay, Hastings' B.D., *sub v.*). It was of considerable importance as a seaport and commercial centre, and under Roman rule it was the metropolis of the north-west district of Asia. Not to be confounded as by Grotius and others with Adrumetum on the north coast of Africa. For the spelling see critical note.—μέλλοντες· the usual route to Rome would have been by way of Alexandria, *cf.* the route taken by Titus from Judæa to the capital, Suet., *Tit.*, 5. But apparently there was no ship sufficiently large at hand. From some of the great harbours of the Asian coast the centurion might have passed to Italy, or probably from Adramyttium (if the ship was going home) he intended to go to Neapolis, and take the great high road to Rome, if no ship could be found in the Asian harbours so late in the season.—τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀ. τόπους: "to sail by the coasts of Asia," A.V.; but with εἰς after πλεῖν see critical note, "to sail unto the places on the coast of Asia," R.V., *cf.* for the phrase, xi. 1, Polyb., i., 3, 6. In xvi. 3 τόποι is similarly used. See J. Smith's note, *u.s.*, p. 63.—ἀνήχ., see above on xiii. 13; in the preceding verse we have the corresponding nautical term κατάγεσθαι, to come to land.—Ἀριστ., *cf.* xix. 39, xxi. 4. Perhaps the expression σὺν ἡμῖν may mean that he was with them, but only for a time, not being actually one of them, *i.e.*, of Paul's company; he may have gone in the Adramyttian ship on his way to his native home, and left Paul at Myra. On the other hand, Col. iv. 10, he is named as one of Paul's companions in Rome, and as his "fellow-prisoner," see Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 383. Whether he made the journey as an actual fellow-prisoner with Paul cannot be proved, although Col., *u. s.* (Philem. ver. 24), may point to it, see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 35, 36, Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii. 183; "one Aristarchus," A.V., as if otherwise unknown; R.V. gives simply his name. Jüngst refers Μακεδ. Θεσσ. to his Redactor.

Ver. 3. τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ: an easy journey to Sidon—distance 69 sea miles (Breusing).—κατήχ.: technical nautical term, opposite of ἀνάγειν in ver. 2, see above.—φιλανθ. τε ὁ Ἰούλιος . . . χρησ.: "and Julius treated Paul kindly," R.V., *cf.* xxviii. 2. Bengel says "videtur audisse Paulum," xxv. 32. Hobart, so also Zahn, sees in φιλανθ., which is peculiar to Luke in N.T., the word a medical man might be likely to use. See also on φιλανθρωπία, xxviii. 2, below, but in Dem., 411, 10, we have the phrase φιλανθ. τινὶ χρῆσθαι, so in Plutarch, and the adverb occurs in 2 Macc. ix. 27, 3 Macc. iii. 20. χρησ. only in Luke and Paul, *cf.* 2 Cor.

4. κἀκεῖθεν ἀναχθέντες ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κύπρον, διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀνέμους εἶναι ἐναντίους. 5.[1] τό τε πέλαγος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κιλικίαν καὶ Παμφυλίαν διαπλεύσαντες, κατήλθομεν εἰς Μύρα τῆς Λυκίας. 6. Κἀκεῖ εὑρὼν ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος πλοῖον[2] Ἀλεξανδρινὸν πλέον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, ἐνεβίβασεν ἡμᾶς εἰς αὐτό· 7. ἐν ἱκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέραις βραδυπλοοῦντες, καὶ μόλις γενόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον, μὴ[3] προσεῶντος

[1] At the beginning of verse Blass in β text, with Flor., reads **και μετα ταυτα διαπλευσαντες τον Κιλικιον κολπον και το Παμφυλιον πελαγος**, and with 137, Syr. H. c*, Flor. adds **δι' ημερων δεκαπεντε**, which Wendt (1899) seems inclined to retain, and which is read by Hilg. (1899), W.H. marg. **Μυρα**, neut. plur.; in B **Μυρρα**, so Tisch., W.H., Weiss, but the reading in T.R. is supported by inscriptions, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 58, so Hilg., Blass, Wendt; ℵA have **Λυστραν**, and see further W.H., *App.*, p. 167.

[2] Blass accentuates **Ἀλεξανδρῖνον**.

[3] Blass corrects, on his own authority, **προεωντος** for **προσ.**

xiii. 10, in LXX Gen. xxvi. 29.—**πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντα**: probably with the soldier to whom he was chained, but see also β text, critical note.—**ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν**: "to receive attention," R.V. margin, *cf.* Isocr., 113 D. The noun is found in Prov. iii. 8, 1 Macc. xvi. 14, 2 Macc. xi. 23, 3 Macc. v. 1, and also in classical Greek; it was also frequently employed in medical language for the care bestowed upon the sick, and it may be so here; so Hobart, Zahn, Felten, Vogel, Luckock. St. Luke alone uses the word in the N.T., and he alone uses the verb **ἐπιμελεῖσθαι** in the sense of caring for the needs of the body, Luke x. 24, 35, another word frequently employed with this meaning by medical writers (Zahn). A delay would be made at Sidon, no doubt, for merchandise to be shipped or unladen. There is no occasion to regard the verse, with Overbeck, as an interpolation; see Wendt's note in favour of its retention, p. 543 (1888)).

Ver. 4. **ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κ.**: "we sailed under the lee of Cyprus," R.V. So Wetstein with whom James Smith is in agreement, *i.e.*, to the east of the island, as was usual for ships westward bound, to avoid the prevalent west winds. Otherwise the direct course would have been to make for Patara in Lycia across the open sea to the south-west of Cyprus (*cf.* xxi. 1-3, where Paul makes a direct run from Patara to the Syrian coast (Ramsay, Goerne)).

Ver. 5. **τό τε πέλαγος τὸ κατὰ τὴν Κ. καὶ Π. διαπλ.**: the ship in its northerly course would reach the coast of Cilicia, and then creep slowly along from point to point along the Cilician and Pamphylian coast, using the local land breezes when possible, and the current constantly running to the westward along the southern coast (Ramsay, J. Smith, Breusing). Blass takes **πέλαγος** as "mare vaste patens" and thinks that the ship did not coast along the shore, but J. Smith gives several instances of ships following St. Paul's route. On the additional reading in β text see critical note.—**Μύρα τῆς Λυκίας**: two and a half miles from the coast of Lycia; on the spelling see critical notes. On its importance as one of the great harbours in the corn trade between Egypt and Rome see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 298, 318, Lewin, *Saint Paul*, ii., 186, and for later notices Zöckler, *in loco*. As a good illustration of the voyage of the Adramyttian and Alexandrian ship see Lucian's dialogue, **Πλοῖον ἢ Εὐχαί**, 7-9; Ramsay, p. 319; Breusing, 152.

Ver. 6. **πλοῖον**: St. Luke does no mention what kind of ship, but the fact that it was on its way from Egypt to Italy, and that in ver. 38 the cargo was evidently grain, makes it a reasonable inference that the ship was carrying corn for conveyance to Rome. On this trade to Rome, Seneca, *Epist.*, 77, and for the large size of the ships (*cf.* ver. 37) so employed *cf.* references in Wetstein to Lucian and Plutarch, and Breusing, p. 157, Goerne, and also for the reputation of the Alexandrian ships and sailors.—**εὑρὼν**: there was nothing unlikely in this, if Myra was situated as above described. The ship, therefore, Ramsay holds, had not been blown out of her

ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου, ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κρήτην κατὰ Σαλμώνην· 8. μόλις τε παραλεγόμενοι αὐτήν, ἤλθομεν εἰς τόπον τινὰ καλούμενον Καλοὺς Λιμένας, ᾧ ἐγγὺς ἦν πόλις[1] Λασαία. 9. Ἱκανοῦ δὲ χρόνου διαγενομένου, καὶ ὄντος[2] ἤδη ἐπισφαλοῦς τοῦ πλοός, διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν νηστείαν ἤδη παρεληλυθέναι, παρῄνει ὁ Παῦλος, λέγων αὐτοῖς,

[1] **Λασαια**, so HLP, Chrys., Arm., Blass in **β** text, Weiss, Hilgenfeld, but א* **Λασσαια**; B, so W.H., **Λασεα**; **Λαἵσσα** א^c; A 40, 96, **Αλασσα** (Lach.), Syr. H. mg., Alasa; Vulg., Thalassa; see further W.H., *App.*, p. 167, and Winer-Schmiedel, pp. 47, 58.

[2] **ηδη** omit. in **β** text by Blass with Flor., Gig.

course, and the westerly winds, prejudicial to the run of the Adramyttian ship from Sidon to Myra, were favourable for the direct run of a ship from Alexandria, *cf.* ver. 9, and the course taken by the Alexandrian ship was probably a customary one during a certain season of the year for the voyage from Alexandria to Italy. Blass, on the other hand, quoting from Lucian, maintains that the ship was obliged to quit the usual course owing to the winds, but Ramsay has here the entire support of J. Smith, *u. s.*, p. 73.—**ἐνεβίβασεν**: *vox nautica*, Holtzmann, *cf.* Thuc., i., 53.

Ver. 7. **ἐν ἱκαναῖς ἡμέραις** or **ἱκανός**: in temporal sense only in Luke in N.T., see Hawkins, p. 151, and *cf. Vindiciæ Lucanæ* (Klostermann), p. 51.—**βραδυπλοοῦντες**: Artemid., *Oneir.*, iv., 30; **ταχυπλοεῖν**, Polyb. (Blass), evidently on account of the strong westerly winds; the distance was about a hundred and thirty geographical miles to Cnidus.—**καὶ μόλις γεν. κατὰ τὴν Κ.**: "and were come with difficulty off Cnidus," R.V., to this point the course of the two ships would be the same from Myra; here they would no longer enjoy the protection of the shore, or the help of the local breezes and currents; "so far the ship would be sheltered from the north-westerly winds, at Cnidus that advantage ceased" (J. Smith).—**Κνίδον**: the south-west point of Asia Minor, the dividing line between the western and southern coast; a Dorian colony in Caria having the rank of a free city like Chios; see 1 Macc. xv. 23.—**μὴ προσεῶντος**: "as the wind did not permit our straight course onwards," Ramsay, so Blass, J. Smith, p. 79: the northerly wind in the Ægean effectually prevented them from running straight across to the island of Cythera, north of Crete; *cf.* Wendt's note (1899), *in loco*, inclining to agree with Ramsay, see critical note; others take the words to mean "the wind not permitting us unto it," *i.e.*, to approach Cnidus (Hackett), so too R.V., margin. But there does not seem to have been any reason why they should not have entered the southern harbour of Cnidus. They might have done so, and waited for a fair wind, had they not adopted the alternative of running for the east and south coast of Crete. The verb **προσεῶντος** does not occur elsewhere, and the same must be said of the conjecture of Blass, **προεῶντος**.—**ὑπεπλεύ.**: "we sailed under the lee of Crete off Cape Salmone" (Ramsay), *i.e.*, a promontory on the east of the island, and protected by it from a north-westerly wind (Ramsay). Strabo has **Σαλμώνιον** and **Σαμώνιον** (Pliny, *Sammonium*); **Σαλμώνις** is also found; **Σαλμώνιον** (or **Σαμμ.**) may be explained, *sc.* **ὄρος**, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 65.

Ver. 8. **μόλις τε παραλεγ. αὐτὴν**: "and with difficulty coasting along it," *i.e.*, Crete on the southern side—with difficulty because under the same conditions as in their journey along the coast of Asia Minor (Breusing) (this is better than to refer **αὐτήν** to **Σαλμώνην**, and render to work past, to weather, *cf.* Grimm-Thayer); **παραλέγομαι**, *oram legere*, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo.—**Καλοὺς Λιμένας**: a small bay two miles east of Cape Matala, in modern Greek, **Λιμεῶνας Καλούς**, J. Smith, p. 82, and Appendix, p. 251 ff., 4th edition; not mentioned, however, elsewhere. This harbour would afford them shelter for a time, for west of Cape Matala the land trends suddenly to the north, and they would have been again exposed to the north-westerly winds; see further for a description of the place Findlay's *Mediterranean Directory*, p. 66, quoted by Breusing and Goerne, who also have no doubt that the place is identical with that mentioned by St. Luke (see also Wendt, 1898 and 1899).—**Λασαία**, see critical note; like the Fair Havens not mentioned by name in any ancient writer.

10. Ἄνδρες, θεωρῶ ὅτι μετὰ ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τοῦ[1] φόρτου καὶ τοῦ πλοίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν, μέλλειν

[1] ℵABHLP, Chrys., and Tisch., W.H.. R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt read φορτιου.

but since 1856 it may be fairly said that its identification has been established with a place some four miles to the east of Fair Havens, or rather the ruins of a place to which the name Lasea was still given, see J. Smith, 4th edition, p. 82, and p. 268 (Appendix); Alford, *Proleg.* to Acts, p. 27. If Lasea was one of "the (ninety or) hundred towns of Crete," and one of the smaller amongst them, it ceases to be strange that no precise mention of it should occur in ancient writers (Grimm).

Ver. 9. **ἱκανοῦ δὲ χρ. γεν.**: not since the commencement of the voyage (as Meyer), but since they lay weather-bound. Wendt (1899) agrees with Meyer as against Weiss and Ramsay, on the ground that there is no **ἐκεῖ**, so Hackett.—**ἐπισ. τοῦ πλοός**: "terminus proprie nauticus," Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, J. Smith, p. 84, who refers to Jul. Pollux, i., 105, although the adjective was not distinctively so. It is only used by St. Luke, and although it is frequently employed by medical writers, it is found also in Plato, Polybius, Plutarch (*cf.* also Wisd. ix. 14, and for the adverb iv. 4). **τοῦ πλοός**: "the voyage," R.V., but perhaps "sailing," A.V., is best, so Ramsay—the dangerous season for *sailing* had commenced; in the next verse = "voyage," *i.e.*, to Rome (Alford); only in Luke, *cf.* xxi. 7, on the form of the genitive see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 84, *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 19, 2 Thess. ii. 2. The dangerous season was reckoned from 14th September to 11th November, and from 11th November to 5th March all navigation was discontinued; see Blass, *in loco*, and Ramsay, *Saint Paul*, p. 322; according to Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 619, navigation ceased after the setting of the Pleiades about 20th October. The Jewish period for navigation ended 28th September.—**διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν νηστείαν ἤδη παρεληλυθέναι**: the mention of the fact that the Fast, *i.e.*, the Great Day of Atonement, Lev. xvi. 29, Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 16, 4, was over, Tisri the 10th, made the danger more apparent. According to Mr. Turner, "Chronology," Hastings' B.D., the great Fast on Tisri 10 in 58 A.D. fell *circa* 15th September, so that the dangerous sailing season would have just commenced. In A.D. 59, the date preferred by Ramsay, the Fast would be on 5th October. Starting from the view that a considerably later point of time than Tisri 10 is implied, *cf.* xxviii. 11, various attempts have been made to interpret **νηστεία** differently, and it has been referred to the Athenian festival of the Thesmophoria, the third day of which was so called; or to some nautical mode of expression not elsewhere employed equivalent to *extremum autumni*, but all such attempts are based upon no authority (Zöckler, *in loco*), and there can be no doubt that the expression "the Fast" **κατ' ἐξοχήν** refers to the Jewish Fast as above. St. Paul usually reckoned after the Jewish calendar, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, and as Wendt observes there is nothing strange in the fact that his travel-companion should also so reckon, *cf.* xx. 6 above, even if he was a Gentile Christian, an observation to be noted in face of Schmiedel's recent arguments against the Lucan authorship, *Encycl. Biblica*, p. 44, 1899. The indication that St. Paul kept the Jewish Fast Day is significant. —**παρῄνει**: "admonished," R. and A.V., in N.T. only here, and in ver. 22, see note. The Apostle had sufficient experience to justify him, 2 Cor xi. 25 (Weiss), his interposition is all an indication of the respect which he had secured: "the event justified St. Paul's advice," J. Smith.

Ver. 10. **θεωρῶ**: here used of the result of experience and observation, not of a revelation, *cf.* xvii. 22, xix. 26, xxi. 20.—**θεωρῶ ὅτι . . . μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι**: anacoluthon. **ὅτι**: forgotten by the number of words intervening in the flow of speech—a vivid dramatic touch; *cf.* Xen., *Hell.*, ii., 2, 2, see Blass, *Gram.*, p. 279, Winer-Moulton, xliv., 8, A 2. **μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι**, *cf.* xi. 28, xxiv. 15, 25, only in Luke, Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 120. **μετὰ ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας**, *cf.* ver. 21: "with injury and much loss," A. and R.V. **ὕβρις**: used of the injury inflicted by the elements, *injuria tempestatis*, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, iii., 6, 4. **τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ὄμβρων ὕβριν**: *Anthol.*, vii., 291, 3. **δείσασα θαλάττης ὕβριν**: Grimm-Thayer renders "injury inflicted by the violence of a tempest," and this well combines the active and passive shades of meaning;

ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν. 11.[1] ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος τῷ κυβερνήτῃ καὶ τῷ ναυκλήρῳ ἐπείθετο μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένοις. 12. ἀνευθέτου δὲ τοῦ λιμένος ὑπάρχοντος πρὸς παραχειμασίαν, οἱ πλείους ἔθεντο βουλὴν ἀναχθῆναι κἀκεῖθεν, εἴ πως δύναιντο καταντήσαντες εἰς Φοίνικα παραχειμάσαι, λιμένα τῆς Κρήτης βλέποντα κατὰ

[1] Blass in β text reconstructs with Flor.: ο δε κυβ. και ο ναυκ. εβουλευοντο πλειν ει πως δυναιντο καταντ. εις Φ. λιμενα της Κ. (και) επειθετο εκεινοις μαλλον ο εκατονταρχης η τοις υπο Π. λεγ.; all the rest of ver. 12 omitted by Flor., see especially Blass, *Præf.* to β text, pp. x., xi.

for the passive signification of ὕβρις *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 10. **ζημίαν**: only elsewhere in Paul, *cf.* Phil. iii. 7, 8. **οὐ μόνον**: occurs regularly with the infinitive in the N.T. instead of **μὴ μόνον**, Burton, p. 183. **φόρτου**, see critical note, if we read **φορτίου** the word which is dim. in form not in significance is often found of the freight of a ship; but see also Blass and Wetstein, *in loco*, for distinction between **φορτίον** and **φόρτος**.

Ver. 11. **ὁ δὲ ἑκατόν.**: the centurion evidently presides at the Council as the superior officer, see Ramsay, *St. Paul*, pp. 324, 325, but, as Wendt notes (and so Blass), the majority decide, not the centurion alone.—**τῷ κυβερ. καὶ τῷ ναυκλ.**: "to the master and to the owner of the ship," A. and R.V., better "to the pilot and the captain"; **ναύκληρος** was not the owner, although the word might denote ownership as well as command of the ship, for the ship if it was a corn ship would belong to the imperial service, and would form a vessel of the Alexandrian fleet. In Breusing's view, p. 160, **ναύκληρος** is owner of the ship, but **κυβερνήτης** is better rendered, he thinks, "captain" than "pilot," *cf.* Plut., *Mor.*, 807 B (Wetstein and Blass).—**ἐπείθετο μᾶλλον τοῖς λεγ.**: "locutio Lucana," *cf.* xxviii. 24, the centurion's conduct was natural enough; what would be said of him in Rome, where provision ships for the winter were so eagerly expected, if out of timidity he, though a soldier, had hindered the captain from continuing his voyage? Breusing, pp. 161, 162, and quotations from Suet., *Claudius*, 18, as to the compensation offered by the emperor to merchants for losses in winter and storm. Goerne points out that it may have been also to their interest to proceed on the voyage, rather than to incur the responsibility of providing for the keep of the large crew during a long stay at Fair Havens.

Ver. 12. **ἀνευθέτου**: here only, but in later Greek we have **δύσθετος**, so in Jos. St. Luke, however, uses **εὔθετος** in his Gospel, ix. 62, xiv. 35 (found only once elsewhere in N.T., Heb. vi. 7). We may compare J. Smith's 1st and 4th edition, p. 85. In the latter he points out that recent surveys show that Fair Havens may have been a very fair winter harbour, and that even on nautical grounds St. Paul's action may have been justified, but Blass, *in loco*, adheres to the view that the harbour was only fit for use during the summer.—**πρὸς παραχειμασίαν**: noun only here in N.T., not found in LXX, but in Polyb. and Diod. Sic. **παραχειμάσαι**: only in Luke and Paul in N.T., 1 Cor. xvi. 6, *cf.* Acts xxviii. 11, Tit. iii. 12, not in LXX, but used by Dem., Polyb., Plut., Diod. Sic.—**οἱ πλείονες**: **πλείονες** (**πλείους**) with the article only by Luke and Paul in N.T., *cf.* xix. 32; by St. Paul seven times in his Epistles. Bengel well says, "plura suffragia non semper meliora".—**ἔθεντο βουλὴν**: on the noun and its use by St. Luke see above, ii. 23, and for the phrase *cf.* Luke xxiii. 51, in LXX, Ps. xii. 2 (Judg. xix. 30, A *al.*); so also in classical Greek.—**ἀναχθῆναι**: "to put to sea," R.V., see on xiii. 13.—**εἴ πως δύναιντο**: on the optative see Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 172; and Burton, p. 111; *cf.* Mark xi. 13, Acts viii. 22, xviii. 27, Rom. i. 10, xi. 14, Phil. iii. 11.—**καταντήσαντες**: Lucan and Pauline, see above, xvi. 1.—**εἰς Φοίνικα**, Strabo, x., 4; Ptolemy, iii., 17. Generally taken as = modern *Lutro*, so Ramsay, Alford, Renan, Rendall, Blass, J. Smith (pp. 87, 88), Lewin, Rendall, Plumptre, and Muir in Hastings' B.D., "Fair Havens"; so amongst recent German writers on this voyage, *cf.* Breusing, p. 162, and Goerne, *u. s.*, p. 360, both of whom quote Findlay, *Mediterranean Directory*, p. 67, "Port Lutro, the ancient Phœnix, or Phœnice, is the only bay on the south coast where a vessel could be quite secure in winter"; but on the other hand Hackett, *in loco*, Wordsworth,

λίβα καὶ κατὰ χῶρον. 13. ὑποπνεύσαντος δὲ νότου,[1] δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι, ἄραντες[2] ἆσσον παρελέγοντο τὴν Κρήτην.

[1] Flor. om. δοξ. . . . κεκρατ., so Blass in β.

[2] For ασσον Blass in β with Flor. reads θασσον, so Hilg. (1899); Vulg., so Erasmus, "cum sustulissent de Asson," taking Assos as Ασος (Asus, Pliny) as the name of one of the Cretan towns; Luther takes it as acc., "cum sustulissent Assum". Wycl. and Rhem. follow the Vulg., and Tynd. and Cranm. follow Luther, but there is no clear trace of the existence of a town so called in Crete, and Assos lay far to the north, xx. 13 (Plumptre).

Humphry and Page (whose full note should be consulted) suppose the modern Phineka to be meant; so also C. H. Prichard in Hastings' B.D., "Crete"; see below. Alford, *Acts*, Proleg., p. 28, quotes from J. Smith's Appendix (2nd edition) the words from Mr. G. Brown's Journal (1855, 1856) stating that Lutro is the only secure harbour *in all winds* on the south coast of Crete, words quoted by Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 326, and Muir, Hastings' B.D., "Fair Havens".—λιμένα τῆς Κ. κ.τ.λ.: "a harbour of Crete which faces south-west and north-west," so Ramsay, and so A.V. and Vulgate. But R.V. so Rendall, "looking north-east and south-east," which is a correct description of the entrance of the harbour of Lutro, so J. Smith, Alford, Lumby and Plumptre, who interpret "looking down the south-west and north-west winds," literally translated as = in the direction of these winds, *i.e.*, the direction *to* which they blew, and so north-east and south-east, κατά indicating the line of motion, *cf.* R.V. margin, and so Rendall and Knabenbauer, *in loco*. C. and H., so Ramsay and Farrar, find an explanation of the rendering in A.V. in the subjectivity of the sailors, who describe a harbour from the direction in which they sail into it; and thus by transmission from mouth to mouth the wrong impression arose that the harbour itself looked south-west and north-west. As against Rendall's interpretation and that of R.V., see Page and Hackett's learned notes *in loco*. Both lay stress upon the phrase, βλέπειν κατά τι, as used only of that which is *opposite*, and which you *face*. *Cf.* Luke's own use of κατά, iii. 13, viii. 26, xvi. 7, xxvii. 7. Page, and so C. H. Prichard, Hastings' B.D., "Crete," would adopt A.V. reading, but would apply it to the harbour Phineka, opposite Lutro, which does look south-west and north-west. λίψ, (prob. λείβω) Herod., ii., 25, Polyb., x., 103, etc., south-west wind *Africus*, χῶρος, north-west wind *Corus* or *Caurus*.

Ver. 13. ὑποπνεύσαντος: *leniter aflante*, *aspirante*, *cf.* ὑποκινέω, ὑπομειδιάω, a moderate breeze from the south arose which would favour their westerly course. *Cf.* Luke xii. 55, not in LXX or Apocrypha, but see Heliod., iii., 3 (Wetstein). — δόξαντες, xii. 9, τῆς προθ. κεκρατηκέναι: their purpose, *i.e.*, of starting from Fair Havens for the more desirable anchorage of Lutro some forty miles distant. προθέσεως, *cf.* xi. 23; in N.T. only in Luke and Paul in this sense; *cf.* 2 Macc. iii. 8. κεκρατ.: only here in this sense in N.T., *cf.* Diod. Sic., xvi. 20, κεκρατηκότες ἤδη τῆς προθέσεως (Grimm-Thayer, Page), and for instances of the same collocation of words in Galen, and in Polyb. (κατακρατεῖν), see Wetstein and Blass, *in loco*. Breusing, p. 164, takes the phrase to refer here to their purpose of continuing their voyage to the end (so too Goerne).—ἄραντες: "they weighed anchor," R.V. So Ramsay, J. Smith, pp. 65, 97; only here in N.T. in this sense, *sc.* τὰς ἀγκύρας, *cf.* Thuc., i., 52, and ii., 23, but the word may imply simply *profecti*, of movement, whether by sea or by land, of armies or ships; so Breusing takes it intransitively, no need of any noun, Thuc., iv., 129; vii., 26 (p. 164): see also ver. 17. For aorist participle of an action antecedent in time to that of the principal verb *cf.* xiv. 19: Burton, pp. 63, 64.—ἆσσον παρελ. τὴν Κ.: "sailed along Crete, close in-shore," R.V., *i.e.*, as they rounded Cape Matala, about six miles west of Fair Havens; the statement so emphatically introduced by St. Luke seems to imply that their ability to weather the point was for some time doubtful, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 326. ἆσσον: "if the wind went round a point towards the west they would fail; and the anxious hour has left its record in the single word of ver. 13, 'ἆσσον,'" Ramsay, *u. s.* See critical note, and

14. μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἔβαλε κατ' αὐτῆς ἄνεμος τυφωνικός, ὁ καλούμενος[1] Εὐροκλύδων. 15. συναρπασθέντος δὲ τοῦ πλοίου, καὶ μὴ

[1] Ευρακυλων ℵAB*, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, HLP, Chrys. have Ευροκλυδων, so Hilg. (1899); B³ 40, 133; Ευρυκλυδων (Griesbach, Meyer, Nosgen); *i.e.*, a wind causing broad waves, the Wide-washer (Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, "der Breitspülende" supported "by respectable authorities"). Vulg., Cassiod. have "Euro-aquilo," see Hastings' B.D., *sub v.*, and comment. below.

above on ver. 8. **ἆσσον**, an adverb comparative of **ἄγχι**; the comparative degree makes it more emphatic (see above), as they had been coasting for weeks, and they now went "closer" in shore (see R.V.); Wendt (1899) takes it, however, not as a comparative with reference to ver. 8 (so Meyer, Weiss), but as a superlative, *cf.* xxiv. 22, xxv. 10.

Ver. 14. **μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ**, *cf.* xx. 12. **οὐ μετρίως**, Luke xv. 15, Acts i. 5, "observe the 'Litotes' of **οὐ** with an adjective or adverb, four times in 'We' sections, twelve in rest of Acts, twice in Luke vii. 6, xv. 13, rare in rest of N.T.," Hawkins, p. 153.—**ἔβαλε κατ' αὐτῆς**: intransitive, as often in classical Greek since Homer: "there beat down from it," R.V., *i.e.*, from Crete and its mountains over 7,000 feet in height; so also Blass, Holtzmann, Ramsay, Zöckler, Page, Rendall, Wendt, Weiss, Knabenbauer, and J. Smith, in later editions, see p. 100, 4th edition; a graphic description of a common experience in the Cretan waters; as the ship crossed the open bay between Cape Matala and Phœnice, the wind suddenly shifting to the north, a violent hurricane (strictly from east-north-east) burst upon them from Mount Ida, *cf.* St. Luke's **κατέβη**, Luke viii. 23, of a squall descending from the hills on the Lake of Gennesaret, and **κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ**, Luke viii. 33, *cf.* Matt. viii. 32 (J. Smith, Weiss, Zöckler). Breusing, p. 164 (so Hackett, Lewin, Farrar), takes **κατ' αὐτῆς** as = against the ship, but the word **πλοῖον** is used for ship, and not **ναῦς** until ver. 41. Luther regarded **αὐτῆς** as agreeing with **προθέσεως** (so Tyndale and Cranmer).—**τυφωνικός**: formed from **τυφώς**, *turbo*, denoting not the direction, but the vehemence of the wind (Breusing, Page), a heavy, eddying squall (J. Smith, Ramsay), *vorticosus* (Bentley).—**Εὐροκλύδων**, see critical note. If we read with ℵAB* **Εὐρακύλων**, render "which is called Euraquilo," R.V. Perhaps the irregularly formed Euraquilo occasioned the corrections. V. Euroaquilo. Blass calls it *vox hybrida* from **εὖρος** and Aquilo (*qui* Latin = **κυ**, ut **Ἀκύλας**, xviii. 2), strictly the "East-north-east" wind (Breusing thinks "North-east" sufficient; so Wycliffe and Tyndale in their translations). Such a wind would drive the ship into the African Syrtis as the pilot feared, ver. 17, and the word is apposite to the context, to all the circumstances, and is so well attested as to fairly claim admission as the word of St. Luke. The Latin had no name for the Greek **Καικίας** blowing between Aquilo and Eurus, and it is quite possible that the Roman seamen, for want of a specific word, might express this wind by the compound Euro-Aquilo; *cf.* **ὁ καλούμενος**, which seems to point to some popular name given to the wind; for similar compounds *cf.* **Εὐρόνοτος** and Euro-Auster, and Gregalia, the name given to the same wind by the Levantines, as Euripus has become Egripou (Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 551); see Bentley, *Remarks on a late Discourse on Freethinking*, p. 97, quoted at length by Breusing, "Euraquilo," Hastings' B.D. and B.D.², i.

Ver. 15. **συναρπασθέντος δὲ τοῦ πλοίου**: "and when the ship was caught by it" (Ramsay), a graphic word as if the ship was seized in the grasp of the wind; only in Luke, *cf.* Luke viii. 29, Acts vi. 12, xix. 29; in LXX *cf.* Prov. vi. 25, 2 Macc. iii. 27, iv. 41, 4 Macc. v. 4; so in classical Greek, *e.g.*, Soph., *Electr.*, 1150.—**ἀντοφθαλμεῖν**: "and could not face the wind," R.V., "look at the wind eye to eye": eyes were painted on the prows of vessels, but Alford thinks that the word was not originally a nautical term derived from this practice, but that more probably the expression was transferred to a ship from its usage in common life; it is used in Polybius of facing an enemy, Polyb., i., 17, 3, of resisting temptation, xxviii. 17, 18, with **δύνασθαι** as here, and also with **δύνασθαι** in Wisd. xii. 14, *cf.* Acts vi. 11, **β** text. For the fit application of the word to a ship see Breusing, p. 168.—**ἐπιδόντες ἐφερόμεθα**: "we gave way *to it* (to the wind), and were driven," or **τὸ πλοῖον** may be regarded as the object, "we gave up the ship to the winds," "data nave fluctibus

δυναμένου ἀντοφθαλμεῖν τῷ ἀνέμῳ, ἐπιδόντες[1] ἐφερόμεθα. 16. νησίον δέ τι ὑποδραμόντες καλούμενον[2] Κλαύδην, μόλις ἰσχύσαμεν περικρατεῖς γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης· 17. ἣν ἄραντες, βοηθείαις ἐχρῶντο,

[1] After επιδ. Blass in β text, so Hilg. (1899) add τῳ πνεοντι και συστειλαντες τα ιστια with 137, Syr. H. (*cf.* Cassiod., Bede), and before εφερ. Blass has κατα το συμβαινον (Hilg. τυχον) with Syr. H.

[2] Κλαυδην HLP d; ℵ* Κλαυδα Syr. H., Arm., Boh., so Tisch., Weiss; A has first three letters Κλα; but ℵcB, Vulg. have Καυδα, W.H., Blass, so R.V. text (Κλαυδα marg.), Hilg. (1899), and the form Κλαυδα is supported by Κλαυδος in Ptolem., iii., 15, 8, and other authorities in Hastings' B.D., "Cauda" (Ramsay). See note in comment., and Wendt, p. 408 (1899). The variation cannot be accounted for by the mere dropping out of Λ before Α as Weiss maintains, for the difference of spelling occurs in other than MS. authorities. But see further Winer-Schmiedel, p. 65, note.

ferebamur," Vulgate, so Holtzmann, Zöckler, Hackett, Wordsworth, and J. Smith, p. 106. The instances in Wetstein justify either rendering, see also references in Blass, *in loco*. ἐφερόμεθα: "and let the ship drive," Ramsay and A.V., others render as passive, so Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*; in classical Greek it is often used passively for being borne along by wind, or storm, or wave, *cf.* Hom., *Odys.*, v., 343 (Page); Diod. Sic., xx., 16.

Ver. 16. ὑποδραμόντες: "and running under the lee of a small island," R.V. J. Smith calls attention to the nautical accuracy of St. Luke's terms; they ran before the wind to leeward of Cauda; ὑποδραμ., they sailed with a side wind to leeward of Cyprus and Crete, ὑπεπλεύσαμεν, ver. 4, see also Ramsay, *Saint Paul*, p. 328, to the same effect; here was calmer water, and the island (see below) would afford them a refuge for a time from the gale. Breusing, pp. 167, 168, 181, thinks that the great sail had been struck at once, and that the artemon or small foresail was kept up as a storm sail; otherwise the ship would have been simply the plaything of the waves. But Ramsay and others (see Farrar) think, on the contrary, that the one huge sail, in comparison with which all others were of little importance, was kept up, but that the strain of this great sail on the single mast was more than the hull could sustain; the timbers would have started, and the ship foundered, had she not gained the smooth water to the lee of Cauda.—μόλις ἰσχύσ.: "we were able with difficulty to secure the boat," R.V., the boat had not been hauled in, as the storm was so sudden; and now as it was nearly filled with water, and battered by the waves and storm, it was hard work to haul it in at all (J. Smith), as Luke himself experienced (pressed into this service of hauling in the boat; note first person, Hackett, Ramsay, p. 327); clearly they could not afford to lose such a means of safety; even as it was, the boat was dragging along as a heavy weight retarding the ship (Breusing, p. 169).—περικ., *cf.* Susannah, ver. 39, A, for ἐγκρατεῖς in B.—σκάφης: a small boat towed behind, only in this passage in N.T., *cf.* vv. 30, 32, Latin, *scapha*; Cic., *De Invent.*, ii., 51 (Humphry).—Κλαύδην, see critical note, an island twenty-three miles from Crete, nearly due south of Phœnice. Ramsay (but see on the other hand Wendt, p. 408, 1899) maintains that preference be given to the forms of the name in which the letter L is omitted, *cf.* the modern *Gavdho* in Greek, and *Gozzo* in Italian; not to be confounded with *Gozzo* near Malta (Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 551), and see further on its present name, J. Smith, pp. 95, 259, 4th edition.

Ver. 17. ἣν ἄραντες: "and when they had hoisted it up" into the ship, see on ver. 13.—βοηθ. ἐχρῶντο: they used helps ὑποζ. τὸ πλοῖον undergirding the ship, A. and R.V., on ἐχρῶντο see ver. 3, *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 12, 15; often compared to the custom called in modern language *frapping*, or undergirding the ship with cables to prevent the timbers from being strained, or to hold them together during a storm, Plato, *Rep.*, 616, C, Polyb., xxvii., 3, 3, Horace, *Od.*, i., 14, 6. The difficult point to decide is whether the girders were put longitudinally round the ship, *i.e.*, passed from stem to stern, or under the ship transversely. Breusing, p. 670 (so Goerne and Vars), defends the former at great length, following Böckh. The passage from Plato, *u. s.*, he admits may possibly make for the latter view, but it is evident that the description is not

ὑποζωννύντες τὸ πλοῖον· φοβούμενοί τε μὴ εἰς τὴν σύρτιν ἐκπέσωσι, χαλάσαντες[1] τὸ σκεῦος, οὕτως ἐφέροντο. 18. Σφοδρῶς δὲ χειμαζο-

[1] For χαλασ. το σκευος Blass has in β text εχαλασαν τι σκευος φερεσθαι following Gig. "vas quoddam dimiserunt, quod traheret," so Hilg. (1899), χαλασ. τι σκ. εφελκυστικον; see note below.

very definite or precise, and the passage in Isidore of Seville, *Orig.*, xix., 4, 4, "tormentum (ὑπόζωμα) funis in navibus longus, qui a prora ad puppim extenditur, quo magis constringantur," which Bōckh quotes (so also Vars, *L'Art Nautique*, p. 219) is much clearer. Moreover, the girding was often performed when the ships were on land, on the stocks, and it is not likely that the operation in the circumstances under discussion could have meant passing a cable under the keel. Further, by girding the ship transversely, *i.e.*, underneath the ship (p. 175), only the timbers in the middle of the ship would be held together, whilst a girding longitudinally was needed to secure the whole plankage of the ship. But see on the other hand Ramsay, p. 329, who agreeing with Smith holds that the cables were passed underneath round the ship transversely. Either operation, one would suppose, would have been difficult during a storm. For instances of this practice in modern times, see Smith, and C. and H., small edit., p. 645. Wendt (1899) refers to Naber's conjecture of βοείαις for βοηθ. as very plausible.—μὴ εἰς τὴν Σ.: "on the great quicksands," Ramsay; "the Syrtis," R.V., not merely "the quicksands," as A.V., but the *Syrtis Major*, "the Goodwin Sands of the Mediterranean" (Farrar), lying at a distance to the south-west of Clauda; upon them the sailors knew that they would be cast, unless they could manage by some means to alter their course.—ἐκπέσωσι: a regular nautical term, to fall off, ἐκ, *i.e.*, from a straight course, εἰς—Eur., *Hel.*, 409, Herod., viii., 13, others supply "from deep water" and render ἐκπ. *to be cast away*, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, *cf.* vv. 26, 29.—χαλάσ. τὸ σκεῦος: "lowered the gear," R.V., "they reduced sail," Ramsay; here and in ver. 30 used as a nautical term; the tempting reference to Isa. xxxiii. 23, LXX, cannot be sustained, for the meaning of the words is very doubtful. The article with the singular (in ver. 19, the plural) seems to indicate "*the* gear," the mainyard carrying the mainsail (so Page, Wordsworth, Humphry). Of the A.V., J. Smith says that no more erroneous translation could be imagined, as "they struck sail" would imply that the ship had no means of escaping danger, but was left to flounder hopelessly in the storm, although Meyer-Wendt take the words to mean that they preferred to let the ship drift without any mast or sail than to be driven on upon the Syrtis, as was inevitable with the ship kept in full sail. Chrysostom explains τὸ σκ. as = τὰ ἱστία, but some sail was necessary, and they had still the artemon or storm sail, so J. Smith, who thinks that they lowered the great sail and mainyard *some way*, but not apparently entirely. The aim of the sailors was not merely to delay their course (which would only bring them upon the Syrtis), but to alter it, and it is therefore quite possible that χαλάσ. τὸ σκεῦος may denote a series of operations, slackening sail, lowering as much of the gear as they could, but leaving enough sail spread to keep the ship's head to the wind, *i.e.*, to the north instead of drifting to south-west upon the quicksand (Ramsay). Breusing, p. 177 ff., who thinks that the mainsail had been lowered at the commencement of the storm, adopts quite a different meaning for the words, and interprets them as implying that weights and great stones were let down by ropes into the sea for the purpose of retarding the progress of the vessel, and with this view Blass and Knabenbauer are in agreement (Wendt, 1899, evidently inclines to it, and Goerne adopts it); this curious view, which Ramsay finds it difficult to regard seriously, Breusing supports by a passage in Plut., *Moral.*, p. 507, A (so Hesychius' explanation, ἄγκυρα τὸ ναυτικὸν σκεῦος), which intimates that σπεῖραι and ἄγκυραι were frequently employed to check the course of a ship in a storm; but even if the Greek words admit of this explanation, the object of the sailors was nothing less than to alter the course of the vessel, and Breusing's supposition would not conduce to this.—οὕτως ἐφέροντο: "so were driven," R.V., *i.e.*, in this state, "and drove on so," Rendall; meaning that we let the ship drift in that position, *viz.*, undergirded, with storm sail set and on the starboard tack; J. Smith, so Ramsay, not simply "were driven hopelessly". For οὕτως, xvii. 33, xx. 11.

Ver. 18. σφοδρῶς δὴ χειμαζ. ἡμῶν:

μένων ἡμῶν, τῇ ἑξῆς ἐκβολὴν ἐποιοῦντο· 19. καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου[1] ἐῤῥίψαμεν· 20.[2] μήτε δὲ ἡλίου μήτε ἄστρων ἐπιφαινόντων ἐπὶ πλείονας ἡμέρας, χειμῶνός τε οὐκ ὀλίγου ἐπικει-

[1] Instead of 1st pers. pl. ℵAB*C, Vulg., Arm., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass in β, Weiss, Wendt have 3rd pers. (W.H., so Tisch., with one ρ with ℵB*, while AB³C have double ρ); HLP, Syr. H. and P., Boh. have 1st pers. pl., and so Hilg. (1899) with one ρ. 137 Syr. H., Wern. add **εις την θαλασσαν**, so Blass in β text, and Hilg.; Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56.

[2] At beginning of verse Blass in β and Hilg. (1899) add **επιμενοντος δε του χειμωνος και** with Gig., Syr. P. (the latter with **επι πλ. ημ.** after **χειμωνος**), whilst **χειμ. . . .** to **λοιπον** is omitted.

"and as we laboured exceedingly with the storm," R.V., Ramsay, Rendall, a regular nautical and classical term; *cf.* Thuc., ii., 25; iii., 69; viii., 99; Plato, *Ion*, 540 B. In Attic Greek usually **σφόδρα**, but *cf.* LXX, Josh. iii. 16, Ecclus. xiii. 13, 4 Macc. vi. 11; only here in N.T. Weiss thinks that it is used to express how severely they were distressed by the storm.—**τῇ ἑξῆς . . . καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ**, *cf.* Luke xiii. 32, connected with the words which follow in R.V. and by Ramsay. For **τῇ ἑξ.** *cf.* Luke vii. 11 (but see W.H.), ix. 37, and above on xxi. 1, xxv. 17; nowhere else in N.T.—**ἐκβολὴν ἐποιοῦντο**: "they began to throw the freight overboard," R.V., Ramsay, Felten, a technical term, so in classical Greek, for throwing out cargo to lighten a ship; Latin *jactura*, LXX, Jonah i. 5, with **τῶν σκευῶν**, and Julius Pollux, i., 99, who also has the phrase **κουφίσαι τὴν ναῦν**, *cf.* ver. 38 below. The imperfect marks that they began by throwing away the cargo, probably what was on deck, so that the vessel would ship less water; and in ver. 19 they cast out (**ἔῤῥιψαν**, aorist) the furniture of the ship, its fittings and equipment, anything movable lying on the deck upon which the passengers could lay their hands (**αὐτόχειρες** only here in N.T. representing the haste, Weiss). Others include under the word the actual baggage of the passengers, but we should have expected **ἡμῶν** instead of **τοῦ πλοίου**, whilst others explain of beds and crockery, tables, etc., furniture in this sense (Zöckler and Felten, exclusive of beds which were not in use). Breusing rejects this interpretation as "too silly," and he thinks that the expression really means that by thus throwing overboard the poles and tackling, room was found for the crowd of passengers on the deck, as the hatchways could not be kept open, since the heavy sea would have swamped the ship, p. 186. J. Smith takes **σκεύη** to mean the mainyard, but the word is here apparently used in a more general sense, as above, R.V., margin, "furniture of the ship".

Ver. 19. **ἐῤῥίψαμεν**, see critical note. Ramsay prefers the first person, although not well supported, because it increases the effect; but in any case the scene is graphically described, **ἔῤῥιψαν** may be due to **ἐποιοῦντο**, but, as Wendt notes, **ἐῤῥίψαμεν** may have been equally due to **αὐτόχειρες**. Breusing rejects the first person, p. 187, from a seaman's point of view; the sailors would have kept the passengers in their places, and not have allowed them to engage in a work in which they might perchance have done more harm than good.

Ver. 20. **μήτε δὲ ἡλίου μήτε ἄστρων**: the omission of the article here intensifies the meaning, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 143, "weder etwas von Sonne".—**ἐπιφαινόντων**, *cf.* Luke i. 79; only in Luke and Paul, Tit. ii. 11, iii. 4; "shone upon us," R.V., thus their only guidance, humanly speaking (for, of course, they had no compass), was taken from them, *cf.* *Æneid*, i., 88; iii., 195; Horace, *Epod.*, x., 9, and for the phrase, Polyb., v., 6, 6.—**ἐπὶ πλείονας**: often in Luke **ἐπί** with acc. of time, *cf.* xxviii. 6, and for instances in Luke and other parts of Acts of the same usage as predominant (though not exclusive) in Luke see Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 152; Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 53; Luke x. 35, xviii. 4, Acts iii. 1, iv. 5, xiii. 31, xvi. 18, xvii. 2, xviii. 20, xix. 8, 10, 34.—**οὐκ ὀλίγου**: only in Luke, eight times in Acts; see above on ver. 14.—**ἐπικειμ.**, *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 16, Heb. ix. 10, Luke v. 1, xxiii. 23 (John xi. 38, xxi. 9, literal sense), and for its use here, Plut., *Timol.*, 28, **τέλος δὲ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐπικειμένου.** In LXX, Job xix. 3, Wisd. xvii. 21 S, 1 Macc. vi. 57, 3 Macc. i. 22, etc.—

μένου, λοιπὸν περιῃρεῖτο πᾶσα ἐλπὶς τοῦ σώζεσθαι ἡμᾶς. 21. πολλῆς δὲ[1] ἀσιτίας ὑπαρχούσης, τότε σταθεὶς ὁ Παῦλος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἶπεν, Ἔδει μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες, πειθαρχήσαντάς μοι μὴ ἀνάγεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς Κρήτης, κερδῆσαί τε τὴν ὕβριν ταύτην καὶ τὴν ζημίαν.

[1] For δε ℵABC have τε, so Tisch., W.H., Blass, R.V., Hilg., Weiss, Wendt.

λοιπὸν (*cf.* Matt. xxvi. 45), "now," R.V., *jam*, Blass; often = ἤδη, L. and S.; others render it: for the future (2 Tim. iv. 8), finally, at last.—**περιῃρεῖτο**: "was gradually taken away," Ramsay, "imperf. quod in dies magis," Blass; Page renders "was being gradually stripped from us," a very vivid word, *cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 16, Heb. x. 11 (ver. 40, see below), and its use in LXX and *Psalms of Solomon*, ii. 22; *cf.* Westcott's note on Heb., *l.c.*, but on the other hand Blass, *in loco*, regards the force of **περί** as lost in the word in N.T. J. Smith (so Breusing) sees in the expression more than the hopelessness arising from the force of the storm—we have also to consider the fact that they could not see their course, and the increasing leakage of the vessel.

Ver. 21. **δέ**: if we read **τε**, see critical note, the word closely connects what follows as the result of the hopelessness.—**πολλῆς δὲ (τε) ἀσιτίας ὑπαρχ.**: "and when they had been long without food," R.V.; "abstinence" A.V. and Tyndale, "fasting" in Wycl., Rhem., imply rather a voluntary refraining which is not in the Greek; disinclination for food may have resulted from their anxiety (Humphry), and to the same effect Breusing, Goerne, "and little heart being left for food," Rendall. But the storm may also have prevented the preparation of food (so Smith, Ramsay, Page, Farrar); the former gives instances to show that **ἀσιτία** was one of the most frequent concomitants of heavy gales, owing to the impossibility of cooking food, and to the destruction of provisions by leakage. **ἀσιτίας**, see below, ver. 33, for the adjective: both noun and adjective peculiar to St. Luke, and much employed in medical language, both so noted by Hobart and Zahn, the noun often meaning "want of appetite," see instances in Hobart, p. 276, Hipp., Galen, Aret. The word was no doubt similarly used in classical Greek, so in Jos., but *cf.* the striking parallel in ver. 33 in medical phraseology. For the genitive absolute *cf. locutiones Lucanæ* (Klostermann, p. 53), xv. 7, xix. 40, xxi. 40. xxiii. 10. Felten, Zöckler, Bethge (and so Wendt, 1888, but *cf.* p. 410 (1899)), rightly refuse to regard vv. 21-26 or ver. 10 as interpolations in the "We" section, or a "vaticinium post eventum," and no one has contended more forcibly than Weizsäcker that the narrative is to be taken as an indivisible whole, and that it is impossible to disentangle the mere history of travel from it, or to strip away the miraculous additions, see especially *Apostolic Age*, ii., pp. 126, 127, E.T.—**τότε**: in this state of things, at this juncture,—hungry, and thirsty, and their soul fainting in them; *cf.* xxviii. 1, so also in classical Greek.—**σταθεὶς ὁ Π. ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν**, *cf.* i. 15, ii. 14, xvii. 22; vividness and solemnity of the scene (**αὐτῶν**, not **ἡμῶν**), characteristically marked by Luke; Mr. Page well says that it is impossible not to recall Horace, *Od.*, iii., 3, 1, "vir justus et propositi tenax," unmoved amidst the storms "inquieti Adriæ".—**ἔδει μὲν**: antithesis, not strictly expressed. . . . **καὶ τὰ νῦν**, ver. 22, "modestiam habet," Bengel. For **μέν** answered not by **δέ**, but occasionally by other particles, as here by **καί**, *cf.* Luke xxii. 22, Acts iv. 16; see Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 168, and for **τὰ νῦν**, see iv. 29, v. 38, xvii. 30, xx. 32, and note on p. 135. On the imperfect **ἔδει** *cf.* Burton, p. 14; Winer-Moulton, xli., 2.—**ὦ ἄνδρες**: "gentlemen," "*viri* quos decet virtus," Bengel, the word may thus mark St. Paul's courtesy, and also his firmness; in counsel, ver. 10, he had been prudent and confident; in danger he was equally so; *cf.* especially Weizsäcker, *u. s.*—**πειθαρχ.**: only in Acts in N.T., v. 29, 32, except once again as used by St. Paul, Tit. iii. 1.—**ἀνάγ.**, see above, xiii. 13, and Blass, *in loco*, on the tense.—**κερδῆσαι**: "and have gotten this injury and loss," R.V., carrying on **μή**; Page on the other hand prefers the combination **ἔδει τε κερδῆσαι** ("hoc non pendet a μή," Bengel), *i.e.*, you ought not to have put to sea, and (you ought by so not putting to sea) to have gained this loss, *i.e.*, not suffered it; with nouns signifying loss, injury, the verb **κερδαίνειν** is used of the gain arising from shunning or escap-

22. καὶ τανῦν παραινῶ ὑμᾶς εὐθυμεῖν· ἀποβολὴ γὰρ ψυχῆς οὐδεμία ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν, πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου. **23.** παρέστη γάρ μοι τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ ἄγγελος τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὗ εἰμι,[1] ᾧ καὶ λατρεύω, **24.** λέγων, Μὴ φοβοῦ, Παῦλε· Καίσαρί σε δεῖ παραστῆναι· καὶ ἰδού, κεχάρισταί σοι ὁ Θεὸς πάντας τοὺς πλέοντας μετὰ σοῦ. **25.** διὸ εὐθυμεῖτε, ἄνδρες· πιστεύω γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ ὅτι οὕτως ἔσται καθ' ὃν τρόπον λελάληταί μοι. **26.** εἰς νῆσον δέ τινα δεῖ ἡμᾶς ἐκπεσεῖν. **27.** Ὡς δὲ τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτη νὺξ ἐγένετο, διαφερομένων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ Ἀδρίᾳ, κατὰ μέσον

[1] After **ειμι** Tisch. reads **εγω**, but om. W.H., Weiss, Wendt, etc., with B*CHLP. **αγγελος** best after **λατρ.** with ℵABC, so W.H., Weiss, Blass, Wendt, R.V., Hilgenfeld instead of before **του Θεου.**

ing from the evil, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, see Eur., *Cycl.*, 312, with ζημίαν, to escape a loss, and *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, ii., 3, 2, and the Latin *lucrifacere*, Pliny, *N.H.*, vii., 40, "lucri fecit injuriam". The Genevan Version adds an explanatory note, "that is, ye should have saved the losse by avoyding the danger"; see also ver. 10. **κερδῆσαι = κερδᾶναι, -δῆναι**; almost always in N.T., *cf.* Winer-Schmiedel, p. 110.

Ver. 22. **καὶ τὰ νῦν,** see on ver 21, Paul would spare their reproaches, and rather awaken hope in their hearts (Bethge).—**παραινῶ**: only in Luke, here and in ver. 9. Hobart speaks of it as the verb employed for a physician giving his advice, and although the word is common in classical Greek, *cf.* also 2 Macc. vii. 25, 26 R, 3 Macc. v. 17, vii. 12 A, its frequency in medical usage may account for its occurrence in this "We" section only; see also Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, p. 153.—**εὐθυμεῖν,** *cf.* vv. 25, 36, and xxiv. 10, elsewhere in N.T. only in James v. 10, but in classical Greek, and **εὔθυμος** in 2 Macc. xi. 26. The verb, adjective, and adverb **εὐθύμως** are used in medical language of the sick keeping up spirit, opposed to **ἀθυμία** and **δυσθυμία; εὐθυμεῖν παραινῶ** might therefore well be a medical expression, Hobart, p. 280, although the verb **εὐθ.** is used intransitively, as here, in classical Greek, and in Plutarch.—**ἀποβολὴ**: only here in N.T., "there shall be no loss of life among you, but *only* of the ship," R.V., Winer-Moulton, lxvii. *I.e.*, **πλὴν** with the genitive, Acts viii. 1, xv. 28 (once elsewhere in N.T., Mark xii. 32).

Ver. 23. **παρέστη . . . ἄγγελος**: on this Lucan phrase and description of angelic appearances *cf.* Luke ii. 9, xxiv. 4, Acts xii. 7 (xxiii. 11), and see above, i. 10.—**τοῦ Θεοῦ**: "of the God whose I am, whom also I serve," R.V., Ramsay, Rendall, not "an angel of God," as A.V.; the R.V. rendering gives the force of the Greek more naturally in addressing a heathen; see also critical note.—**λατρεύω,** see on xxiv. 14; *cf.* Rom. i. 9, and LXX, Jonah i. 9.

Ver. 24. **μὴ φοβοῦ,** see above, xviii. 9.—**παραστῆναι,** *cf.* Rom. xiv. 10, the words emphatically bear out the prominence already laid upon the Apostle's witness in Rome.—**καὶ ἰδού,** see on i. 10.—**κεχάρισταί σοι**: "hath granted them as a favour"; see on iii. 14, no doubt Paul had prayed for this, *cf.* especially Philemon ver. 22. The statement in ver. 24 looks back to xxiii. 11, which, as Wendt allowed (1888), is only to be rejected if one presupposes that Paul could not have confidently looked forward to a visit to Rome, or at least if we suppose that the confidence could not have been created and sustained by a heavenly vision. Wendt, however, in 1899 edition, speaks much more doubtfully as to the existence of vv. 21-26 as part of the original source; see also on ver. 21.

Ver. 25. **πιστεύω γὰρ τῷ Θ. ὅτι οὕτως ε. καθ' ὃν τρόπον,** *cf.* xv. 11, and also i. 11, Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 53.

Ver. 26. **εἰς νῆσον δέ κ.τ.λ.**: the words do not form part of the message of the angel as they stand, but they may be considered as forming part of the contents of that message, and the Apostle may himself be regarded as speaking **μαντικῶς.** With Jüngst's question "How could Paul know anything of an island?" and his dismissal of the statement here as a *vaticinium ex eventu*, *cf.* Weizsäcker, *u. s.*, see ver. 21; in the section, vv. 33-36, which Jüngst defends and refers to his source A, the element of prophecy is equally present, ver. 34, as in the verse

τῆς νυκτὸς ὑπενόουν οἱ ναῦται[1] προσάγειν τινὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν· 28. καὶ βολίσαντες, εὗρον ὀργυιὰς εἴκοσι· βραχὺ δὲ διαστήσαντες, καὶ πάλιν

[1] προσαγειν ℵcACHLP Chrys., Tisch., W.H. text, Weiss, Blass in β text; προσαγαγειν ℵ*; προσαχειν B*, *cf. resonare*, Gig., which suggests an earlier Greek reading προσηχειν (Ramsay, Harris, Rendall): Hilgenfeld (1899) reads προσεγγιζειν, so 137 c^scr., Syr. P.; B³ has προσανεχειν, Vulg. *apparere;* Winer-Schmiedel, p. 52.

before us.—ἐκπεσεῖν, *cf.* ver. 17, and further instances in Wetstein, see also vv. 29, 32, below.

Ver. 27. τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτη νύξ, *i.e.*, since their departure from Fair Havens, *cf.* vv. 18, 19, see also the reckonings of mileage in Breusing, p. 189, and Goerne, who reckons from the departure from Cauda.—διαφερομένων ἡμῶν: "as we were driven to and fro," R.V., so Ramsay; "huc illuc ferri," Blass, *cf.* for a similar meaning of the verb Philo, *De Migr. Abr.*, 27, Strabo, 3, p. 144, and other instances as in Plutarch, see Wetstein, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* But J. Smith (so Breusing, Goerne, Rendall) takes the word as signifying that they were driven through the waters of the Adria uniformly in the same direction, *i.e.*, right across from Cauda to Malta, and not as moving up and down, or to and fro. Ramsay (so Farrar) holds that St. Luke writes as a landsman who supposes that they drifted to and fro, whilst a sailor would have known that they drifted in a uniform direction (an explanation which Page describes as easy but unsatisfactory, but he thinks that the Greek word cannot be used as J. Smith believes); Rendall however maintains that throughout the Acts the habitual force of διά in composition, *e.g.*, διέρχεσθαι, διαπλεῖν, διαφεύγειν, διαπερᾶν, διοδεύειν, whether governing an accusative or used absolutely is to express continuous movement onwards over an intervening space.—ἐν τῷ Ἀδρίᾳ: "in the *sea of* Adria," R.V. (on the form of the word see Hastings' B.D., more properly "Adrias"); not in the narrower sense of the Adriatic, the Gulf of Venice, or as we now speak of "the Adriatic," but as including the whole sea which lay between Malta, Italy, Greece and Crete; St. Luke probably used the term as it was colloquially used by the sailors in this wider sense. For Mommsen's objection to the term here see above, Introd., p. 8. The passage in Strabo, ii., 123 (*cf.* vii., 187), where the Ionian sea is spoken of as a part of what is now called Adria plainly justifies a wider use of the term in St. Paul's day than had been originally attached to it, *cf.* Ptolemy, *Geogr.*, iii., 4, 14, 15, 16, who applies it to the sea extending from Sicily to Crete, and thus represents, although living some sixty or seventy years after him, what was no doubt the current usage in St. Luke's day; so J. Smith, Breusing, Goerne, Vars, Ramsay, Renan, Blass, etc. Josephus, *Vita*, 3, speaks of being taken up in the middle of Adria, κατὰ μέσον τὸν Ἀδρίαν, when his ship foundered, by a vessel sailing from Cyrene to Puteoli. See further "Adria," Hastings' B.D., where a full criticism of the attempt made by W. Falconer (and others), *Dissertation on St. Paul's Voyage*, 1817, republished with additions in 1870, to limit the term to the branch of the sea between Italy and Illyria, and to identify Melita with an island off its Illyrian shore, will be found; see further on xxviii. 1, and C. and H., small edition, p. 660 ff., for other references to the meaning of the term "Adria," and Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 552, J. Smith, p. 280 ff., 4th edit. (editor's note), and *Encycl. Bibl.*, i., 72, 1899.—κατὰ μέσον τῆς ν., *cf.* xvi. 25 for a similar expression, only in Luke.—ὑπενόουν: only in Luke; "surmised," R.V., less decided than "deemed," A.V., see on xiii. 25 (*cf.* 1 Tim. vi. 4).—προσάγειν τινὰ αὐτοῖς χ.: "that some land was approaching them," R.V., so Breusing and Ramsay; intransitive in LXX, Josh. iii. 9, 1 Sam. ix. 18, Jer. xxvi. (xlvi.) 3, etc., "Lucas optice loquitur, nautarum more," Kypke; the opposite verb would be ἀναχωρεῖν, *recedere*, see Wetstein and Blass for illustrations. J. Smith thinks that probably they heard the breakers on the shore, but Breusing and Goerne (so Blass) think that the anchor or whatever weight was dragged behind the ship appeared to strike the ground, see above on ver. 17, *cf.* critical note for προσαχεῖν, Doric for προσηχεῖν.—χώραν: the point of Koura, east of St. Paul's Bay, J. Smith; the ship would pass within a quarter of a mile of it, and while the land is too low to be seen when the night is stormy, the breakers can be heard for a considerable distance; *cf.* the description of the wreck of the *Lively* in 1810, Smith, p. 123, 4th edition.

Ver. 28. βολίσαντες: having let down

βολίσαντες, εὗρον ὀργυιὰς δεκαπέντε· 29. φοβούμενοί τε[1] μήπως εἰς τραχεῖς τόπους ἐκπέσωσιν, ἐκ πρύμνης ῥίψαντες ἀγκύρας τέσσαρας, ηὔχοντο ἡμέραν γενέσθαι. 30. τῶν δὲ ναυτῶν ζητούντων φυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου, καὶ χαλασάντων τὴν σκάφην εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν,[2] προφάσει

[1] For μηπως, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss read μηπου with ℵBC 13, 40, 61. Hilgenfeld (1899) retains μηπως with HLP (A μηπω). Instead of εις ℵABC have κατα, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, but Hilgenfeld has εις (Vulg., Gig., *in*). εκπεσωμεν ℵABCHLP Vulg., Syr. P. and H., Boh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. After γενεσθαι Blass in β text (so Hilg.) adds του ειδεναι ει σωθηναι δυναμεθα with Gig.

[2] After θαλ. Blass in β text adds ευκαιριαν ζητουντων, so Hilgenfeld (1899) with Gig., and after εκτ. both add on the same authority του ασφαλεστερον το πλοιον εσταναι.

the sounding-lead (βολίς), elsewhere only in Eustath., in active voice, but see also Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*—ὀργυιὰς: five or six feet, a fathom, Grimm; Breusing compares Herod., iv., 41, and gives six feet; on the accent see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 72. "The ancient fathom so nearly agrees with the English that the difference may be neglected," J. Smith, p. 131.—βραχὺ δὲ διαστήσαντες: "and after a little space," so Ramsay, Rendall; the phrase may refer to space or time; if we understand τὸ πλοῖον or ἑαυτούς we should take it of the former (Grimm); but if we explain = βραχὺ διάστημα ποιήσαντες (Blass), it may be taken of either. διΐστημι is only found in Luke for signifying any space of time, Luke xxii. 59, *cf.* Acts v. 7; but Luke xxiv. 51, διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν. J. Smith shows how exactly the geographical details in the traditional St. Paul's Bay correspond with the description here. Before a ship drifting from Cauda could enter the bay it would not only pass within a quarter of a mile of Point Kaura, north-east of Malta, but the measurements of 20 and 15 fathoms exactly correspond to ascertained soundings according to the vessel's average of speed.

Ver. 29. φοβούμενοι: the diminution of the depth of water increased the danger of running aground, perhaps on some hidden reef of rocks.—τραχεῖς τόπους, *cf.* Luke iii. 5, in quotation Isa. xl. 4; nowhere else in N.T., *cf.* Bar. iv. 26 (3 Macc. i. 23), so in Diod. Sic., xii., 72, of rocks, Polyb., i., 54. It was evidently a hydrographic term, and classed with δύσορμος, ἀλίμενος, etc., Jul. Pollux, i., 101; J. Smith, p. 132.—ἐκπέσωμεν, see ver. 17, "to cast ashore," R.V., or simply "cast on rocky ground," which is more indefinite than the former rendering, and perhaps correctly so, as there were possible dangers from sunken reefs as well as from a rocky coast. On the subjunctive after verbs of fear and danger *cf.* Burton, p. 15.—ἐκ πρύμνης: this was unusual, but to anchor was their only chance of safety, and four anchors would make the vessel more secure: ancient vessels carried as a rule several anchors. Athenæus speaks of a ship which had eight iron anchors, *cf.* for the number here, and the security which they gave, Cæsar, *Bell. Civ.*, i., 25, "naves quaternis anchoris destinabat, ne fluctibus moverentur"; anchorage from the prow would have caused the ship to swing round from the wind, whereas anchorage from the stern would enable the sailors to manage the ship far more easily, and to bring her under control of the helm when they wished to run her aground (see the description in Ramsay, Rendall, Farrar, and J. Smith). On the interesting parallels of anchoring ships from the stern in our own naval engagements see C. and H., small edition, p. 653, and J. Smith, p. 133, 4th edition.—ηὔχοντο: "prayed," R.V. margin, the Greek sailors might pray at such a crisis (Rendall).—ἡμέραν γενέσθαι, *cf.* vv. 33, 39, characteristic of Luke, *cf.* Luke iv. 42, vi. 13, xxii. 26, Acts xii. 18, xvi. 35, xxiii. 12.

Ver. 30. ζητούντων: "and as the sailors were seeking," R.V.; "about to flee," A.V. is incorrect, for they were planning possible means of escape, and could scarcely be said to be about to escape, *cf.* β text—if they succeeded the passengers and the soldiers would thus be left to their fate.—προφ. ὡς: under colour, under pretence, *specie*, *cf.* Mark xii. 40, Luke xx. 47, John xv. 22, Phil. i. 18, 1 Thess. ii. 5. *Cf.* for its use here Thuc., v., 53, vi., 76. For ὡς *cf.* xvii. 14, xxviii.

ὡς ἐκ πρώρας μελλόντων ἀγκύρας ἐκτείνειν, 31. εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος τῷ ἑκατοντάρχῃ καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις, Ἐὰν μὴ οὗτοι μείνωσιν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ, ὑμεῖς σωθῆναι οὐ δύνασθε. 32. τότε οἱ στρατιῶται ἀπέκοψαν τὰ σχοινία τῆς σκάφης, καὶ εἴασαν αὐτὴν ἐκπεσεῖν. 33. ἄχρι δὲ οὗ ἔμελλεν ἡμέρα γίνεσθαι, παρεκάλει ὁ Παῦλος ἅπαντας μεταλαβεῖν τροφῆς, λέγων, Τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην σήμερον ἡμέραν προσδοκῶντες,

19, Luke xxiii. 14, and **ὡς μέλλων** with present infinitive active as here, Acts xxiii. 15, 20, Klostermann, *Vindiciæ Lucanæ*, p. 54.—**ἐκτείνειν**: "lay out anchors," R.V., Ramsay, *i.e.*, at the full length of the cable. The sailors pretended that more anchors from the prow would help to steady the ship, and that they must go off in a boat to carry them out to cable's length, rather than drop them out as in ver. 29.—**ἐκτ.**: a technical expression (*cf. élonger*, Vars, p. 248, and so **ῥίπτειν** in ver. 29, *mouiller*), Breusing, p. 195. It seems impossible to suppose with Breusing, p. 194, and Vars, p. 248 (so also Goerne), that the sailors may have been actuated by an honourable motive, and that they wished to put off in the boat to see if the soundings and the nature of the ground allowed the ship to get nearer shore, for although St. Paul's words do not expressly accuse them of treachery, yet the narrative of his companion does so, *cf.* **προφάσει**, etc. But, as Breusing himself points out, St. Paul's words issued in the best result, for the centurion's counsel prevented a terrible scene of *sauve qui peut* (as in the stranding of the *Cimbria*, Goerne).

Ver. 31. **ὑμεῖς** not **ἡμεῖς**: St. Paul appeals to the law of self-preservation, and the centurion acts promptly on his advice; although safety had been divinely promised, human means were not excluded, and it is altogether hypercritical to find any contradiction here with vv. 24-26, as Holtzmann supposes.

Ver. 32. **τότε οἱ στρ. ἀπέκ.**: Lewin, *Saint Paul*, ii., 202, sees in this the absolute ascendency which St. Paul had gained; he had said that their lives should be spared, and although, humanly speaking, the boat offered the best prospect of reaching land, yet at a word from St. Paul the soldiers deprived themselves even of this last resource.—**σχοινία**: only elsewhere in N.T. in John ii. 15; in classical Greek, and also frequently in LXX. For the terrible scene which would doubtless have ensued if the soldiers had not thus acted, Breusing and Vars (so Wetstein, *in loco*) strikingly compare the description of a shipwreck in Achilles Tatius, iii., 3; the whole passage is cited by Breusing, p. 194.

Ver. 33. **ἄχρι δὲ οὗ**: only used by Luke in the historical books of the N.T., *cf.* Luke xxi. 24, Acts vii. 18; in St. Paul's Epistles three or four times, Heb. iii. 13, Rev. ii. 25. Ramsay renders "and while the day was coming on," so A. and R.V.; *dum* with imperfect, Heb. iii. 13 (Blass). But Rendall takes it as = *until*, as if Paul had continued his entreaties until close on dawn (imperfect).—**μεταλαβεῖν τροφῆς**, *cf.* ii. 46 for the same phrase, only in Luke in N.T.—**τεσσαρεσκ. . . . προσδοκῶντες κ.τ.λ.**: "this is the fourteenth day that ye wait (A.V. 'tarry,' Ramsay, 'watch') and continue fasting". Rendall renders "this is the fourteenth day that ye have continued fasting on the watch for the dawn"—**προσδ.** *sc.* **ἡμέραν**, as if St. Paul did not mean a fourteenth day of continuous fasting, but fourteen successive nights of anxious watching for the dawn, all alike spent in restless hungry expectation of what the day might reveal (*Acts*, p. 347), but **προσδοκᾶν** is here without an object as in Luke iii. 15 (Weiss). For the word see further xxviii. 6, and *cf.* **προσδοκία** only in Acts xii. 11 and Luke xxi. 26. On the accusative of time, as expressed here, *cf.* Blass, *Gram.*, p. 93.—**ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε**: precisely the same collocation of words occur in Galen, **εἴ ποτε ἄσιτος διετέλεσεν**, so also **καὶ ἄδιψοι διατελοῦσιν**, and Hippocrates speaks of a man who continued suffering **πάσχων διατελέει** for fourteen days (see Hobart and Zahn). It must however be admitted that the same collocation as in this verse **ἄσιτοι** and **διατελεῖν** is found in Dion. Hal. (Wetstein, *in loco*). For the construction see Winer-Moulton, xlv., 4; *cf.* Thuc., i., 34.—**μηδὲν προσλ.**, *i.e.*, taking no regular meal, so Weiss, Blass, Zöckler, Alford, Plumptre, Felten, Bethge, Wendt. Breusing, p. 196, and Vars, p. 250, both explain the word as meaning that in their perilous and hopeless condition those on board had not gone to fetch their regular food and rations, but had subsisted on any bits of

ἄσιτοι διατελεῖτε, μηδὲν[1] προσλαβόμενοι. 34. διὸ παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς προσλαβεῖν[2] τροφῆς· τοῦτο γὰρ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει· οὐδενὸς γὰρ ὑμῶν θρὶξ[3] ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς πεσεῖται. 35. εἰπὼν δὲ ταῦτα, καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον, εὐχαρίστησε τῷ Θεῷ ἐνώπιον πάντων, καὶ κλάσας ἤρξατο ἐσθίειν.[4] 36. εὔθυμοι δὲ γενόμενοι πάντες, καὶ αὐτοὶ

[1] Instead of προσλαβ. Lach. with A 40 reads προσλαμβανομενοι, prob. change to suit προσδοκωντες.

[2] Instead of προσλ. ℵABC, Chrys., so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt read μεταλ. For υμετ. ALP have ημετ., so Hilg.

[3] For εκ ABC minusc., Tisch., W.H. and other authorities above read απο, but Hilg. has εκ with ℵHLP. For πεσειται ℵABC Vulg., Syr. P., Boh., Arm., Aethpp. have απολειται, so Tisch., W.H. and other authorities above; but πεσ. is supported by HLP, Sah., Syr. H., so Hilg. and Meyer who suppose that απολ. is from Luke xxi. 18; but see on the other hand Alford's note. After υπαρχει Blass in β text and Belser, so Hilg., add ελπιζω γαρ εν τῳ Θεῳ μου οτι with Gig.

[4] After εσθιειν Blass and Hilgenfeld add επιδιδους και ημιν with 137 Sah., Syr. H., c*.

food they might have by them; in ancient ships there were no tables spread, or waiters to bring food to the passengers, and each one who wanted refreshment must fetch it for himself. Plumptre takes **πρός** as meaning no extra food, only what would keep body and soul together, but it is doubtful whether the Greek will bear this or Breusing's interpretation.

Ver. 34. **διὸ**: so that they might be ready for the work which would be necessary.—**προσλαβεῖν**, see critical note. —**πρὸς**: here only with genitive in N.T., *cf.* Blass, *Gram.*, p. 136; *i.e.*, stands, so to speak, on the side of our deliverance, Latin *a parte*, *cf.* Thuc., ii., 86; iii., 59; Plat., p. 459 C; Winer-Moulton, xlviii. f. —**ὑμετ.**, emphatic. — **σωτ.**: "safety," R.V., only used here and in Heb. xi. 7 of the preservation of physical life, safety, so in classical Greek and in Greek medical writers, see on xvi. 17; "health," A.V., not limited formerly as now to the condition of body and mind, *cf.* Luke i. 77, "science of health" Wycliffe = "knowledge of salvation," and *cf.* also Ps. lxvii. 2, "thy saving health," literally "thy salvation" (Humphry). Effort on their part was necessary, and yet no hair of their heads should perish; what a significant union of faith in God and self-help! (Bethge.)—**οὐδενὸς γὰρ . . . πεσεῖται**, see ver. 22, *cf.* Luke xxi. 18, nowhere else in N.T., but the proverbial phrase, as it apparently was, is found in 1 Sam. xiv. 45, 2 Sam. xiv. 11, 1 Kings i. 52 (*cf.* Matt. x. 29), see critical note, and *cf.* Shakespeare, *Tempest*, Act i., Scene 2.

Ver. 35. **λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαρίστησε τῷ Θ.**, *cf.* Luke xxii. 19, xxiv. 30, with intentional solemnity (Weiss, Weizsäcker). The words are sometimes taken to mean that Paul simply encourages them by his own example to eat. But Blass, see critical note, who comments "et oratione confirmat et exemplo," adds in β text **ἐπιδιδοὺς καὶ ἡμῖν**, *i.e.*, to Luke and Aristarchus, in which he sees a distinct reference to the *cœna sacra* (so Belser). But quite apart from this reading in β the peculiar language of St. Luke seems to intimate such a reference. Olshausen and Ewald (so Plumptre) take the words to refer to the *Agape*, whilst Meyer (so Hackett) sees a reference to the act of the Jewish house-father amidst his household; but Wendt simply refers it to the act of a pious Jew or Christian giving thanks before eating a meal and sharing it, so Zöckler. Bethge, more specifically, sees in the act a thanksgiving of a Christian to God the Father, an instance of what St. Paul himself recommends, Ephes. v. 20, Col. iii. 17, and both Felten and Knabenbauer apparently prefer to interpret the words as marking Paul's reverence towards God before the Gentiles around him. Breusing shows, p. 196, that **ἄρτος** might = *panis nauticus*, but in the passage which he quotes from Lucian we have **ἄρτους ναυτικούς**.

Ver. 36. **τροφῆς**: with a partitive meaning; *cf.* **γεύσασθαι**, xxiii. 14, **μεταλαβεῖν**, ver. 33, **κορέννυσθαι**, ver. 38. *Cf.* Herod., viii., 90. Luckock points out that St. Luke distinguishes between the bread of which the Apostle partook and

προσελάβοντο τροφῆς· 37. ἦμεν δὲ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχαὶ διακόσιαι[1] ἑβδομηκονταέξ. 38. κορεσθέντες δὲ τροφῆς, ἐκούφιζον τὸ

[1] For διακοσιαι W.H. read in text ως (so R.V. marg.) (in marg. διακ.) with B, Sah. Epiph., so Hilgenfeld; Weiss however declines here to follow B, and speaks of "the impossible" ως before 76 which is no round number, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 34 (so Blass); the mistake seems best explained by supposing that the last letter of πλοιῳ was read as if Σ = 200, and thus = ΩΣ. Or, to explain it more fully, by supposing that the sign for 200, Σ, was misunderstood, and with the double reading of the ω in πλοιω easily became ως; this is of course if we read with W.H. αι πασαι ψ. εν τῳ πλοιῳ, a different order from T.R. (see also Hilgenfeld's note, where explanation of the reading διακ. from ως is certainly not so obvious). For εξ A has πεντε.

the food, τροφῆς, taken by the rest, and certainly the expression κλάσας is remarkable, *cf.* Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24; but it is perhaps noteworthy that the Romanist Felten (see above) sees no reference to the Eucharist, although he fully admits that this act of Paul in thus giving thanks must have made a great impression at such a moment.—εὔθυμοι, ver. 22, *cf.* 2 Macc. xi. 26.—καὶ αὐτοί: "also themselves," following his example. For the second time Paul had restored their courage by his faith and prudence; the event had already shown that he deserved confidence, and it is evident that he inspired it; see the testimony of Breusing, pp. 198, 199.

Wendt, so too Jüngst, and Clemen see no reason to regard vv. 33-36 as an interpolation in the "We" source, as vv. 21-26 above. Overbeck regards both sections as standing or falling together, and treats them both as interpolations, but Ramsay, whilst regarding the two sections as inseparably connected, treats them both as belonging to the original "We" source, and he rightly expresses surprise at those who accept ver. 33 ff., and refuse to accept vv. 21-26 (*Saint Paul*, p. 337); much more intelligible is the judgment of Weizsäcker than that of the other German critics in question when he describes the narrative as an indivisible whole, and considers it impossible to disentangle the mere history of travel from it, or to strip away the miraculous additions.

Ver. 37. The number was large, but nothing is told us of the size and manning of the Alexandrian ship, and Josephus, *Vita*, 3, mentions that there were about 600 in the ship which took him to Italy. On the large size of the ships engaged in a traffic similar to that of the corn ship in this chapter see Breusing, p. 157; Vars, p. 191; Hackett and Blass, *in loco*, and ver. 6; Lucian, Πλοῖον ἢ Εὐχαί., 5. The number may be mentioned at this point that they might know afterwards that all had been saved. But Breusing thinks that it would have come perhaps more naturally at the end of the narrative, and that it is given here because the rations were distributed to each on board at this juncture. For the phrase *cf.* xix. 7.

Ver. 38. κορεσθ., 1 Cor. iv. 8, nowhere else in N.T., with genitive of the thing with which one is filled, as in classical Greek. Alford refers to LXX, Deut. xxxi. 20, but see Hatch and Redpath, *sub v.*—ἐκούφιζον: *de nave*, Polyb., i., 60, 8; LXX, Jonah i. 5.—τὸν σῖτον: "the wheat," A. and R.V., Vulgate, *triticum;* so Ramsay, Breusing, Vars, J. Smith, Page, and so too Erasmus, Bengel, etc., *i.e.*, the cargo, *cf.* ver. 6. Blass thinks that the word used is decisive in favour of this interpretation; otherwise we should have had σιτία or ἄρτοι if merely food had been meant; not only was the cargo of sufficient weight really to lighten the ship, but there was need for the ship being as clear as possible for the operations in ver. 40. Wendt 1899 appears also to favour this view, *cf.* his comments with those in 1888 edition, where he adopts the view of Meyer and Weiss, that the word means provisions of food, as at first sight the context seems to indicate. But the latter would not have made much appreciable difference in weight, nor would those on board have been likely to throw them away, since they could not tell on what shore they might be cast, whether hospitable or not, or how long they would be dependent on the food which they had in the ship. In ver. 18 the reference may be to the cargo on deck, or at all events only to a part of the cargo (Holtzmann). Naber conjectured ἱστόν, but no such emendation is required (Wendt).

πλοῖον, ἐκβαλλόμενοι τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. 39. Ὅτε δὲ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο,[1] τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἐπεγίνωσκον· κόλπον δέ τινα κατενόουν ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν, εἰς ὃν[2] ἐβουλεύσαντο, εἰ δύναιντο,[3] ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον. 40. καὶ τὰς ἀγκύρας περιελόντες εἴων εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἅμα ἀνέντες τὰς ζευκτηρίας τῶν πηδαλίων· καὶ ἐπάραντες τὸν[4] ἀρτέμονα τῇ

[1] Before **την γην** Gig., Syr. P. add **οι ναυται**, so Blass in **β** and Hilg.

[2] For **εβουλευσαντο** ℵBC, Vulg., Syrr. P. and H., Boh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilgenfeld read **εβουλευοντο**; A 40, 61 have **εβουλοντο.**

[3] For **εξωσαι** B*C, Boh., Aeth., Arm. have **εκσωσαι,** so W.H. text, R.V. marg., but Tisch., W.H. mg., R.V. text, Blass, Weiss, Hilgenfeld read **εξωσαι** (Wendt doubtful).

[4] **αρτεμονα** LP, Chrys., but **-ωνα** W.H., Weiss, Blass with ℵABCH, B¹ has **αρτομωνα,** see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 86.

Ver. 39. **τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἐπεγ.**: "they did not recognise the land," Ramsay; the sailors probably knew Malta, since, xxviii. 11, there was evidently nothing unusual in eastern ships touching at the island on their way to Rome. But they did not know St. Paul's Bay, which is remote from the great harbour, and was not distinguished by any marked features to secure recognition, Ramsay, J. Smith; see also note on xxviii. 1. C. and H. lay stress on the imperfect, "they tried to recognise . . ., but could not"; but in xxviii. 1 we have the aorist indicating that the land was recognised immediately on landing.—**κατενόουν**: "perceived," R.V., *cf.* Matt. vii. 3, Luke vi. 41, xx. 23.—**κόλπον τινα**: a sort of bay or creek, "a bay," R.V., the word means a bay either small or large, and St. Paul's Bay may be described as a small bay or creek (Rendall); **ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν** "with a sandy beach," Ramsay, with a beach, R.V., *i.e.*, smooth and fit for a vessel's landing-place, *cf.* xxi. 5, Matt. xiii. 2, 48, John xxi. 4; *cf.* Xen., *Anab.*, vi., 4, 4 (see Page's note); in LXX, Judg. v. 17 A, Ecclus. xxiv. 14 S², *al.* J. Smith adds that St. Luke here again employs the correct hydrographical term, frequently used by Arrian in this sense. The traditional St. Paul's Bay may certainly well have been the place meant (so Wendt, 1899, and Blass). On the smooth, sandy beach see Hackett, note, p. 334, who has also visited the spot, and confirmed Smith's view, although both admit that the former sandy beach has been worn away by the action of the sea; Smith, p. 247, 4th edition, and see also Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 341.—**ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον**: "to drive the ship upon it," R.V., *i.e.*, the beach, so Ramsay, Rendall, Breusing, Vars, Goerne, J. Smith (4th edit., p. 142); the object was not to save the ship from being destroyed, but the crew from perishing; under like circumstances the same would be done to-day (so Breusing, Vars), *cf.* Arrian, *Peripl. Pont. Eux.*, 6. **ἐξῶσαι**: so in Thuc., ii., 90; viii., 104 (and see Wetstein); see also critical note on **ἐκσῶσαι εἰ δύναιντο,** and Burton, p. 106, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub* **εἰ**, i., 7, *c.*, with optative, where the condition represents the mind and judgment of others . . ., as if the sailors had said amongst themselves **ἐξώσομεν εἰ δυνάμεθα**, *cf.* xxiv. 19.

Ver. 40. **καὶ τὰς ἀγκ. περιελόντες**: "and casting off the anchors," R.V., *cf.* ver. 20 for the same verb, so that the meaning cannot be as A.V., following Vulgate, "having taken up"; in fact it is the very reverse. The sailors loosed the cables of the anchors which were fastened within the ship, that they might fall off into the sea (Blass); Breusing and Vars compare Xen., *Hell.*, xvi., 21, **τὰς ἀγκύρας ἀποκόπτοντες = τὰ σχοινία τῶν ἀγκυρῶν.**—**εἴων εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν**: "they left them (the anchors) in the sea," R.V., *relinquebant*, Blass; so Breusing, Vars, Goerne, as against A.V., and Vulgate, *committebant se*, or Luther's rendering (Beza and Grotius), **εἴων τὸ πλοῖον ἰέναι εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν.** Grimm-Thayer renders "they let down into the sea," *i.e.*, abandoned, which gives better the force of **εἰς** than regarding it simply as = **ἐν.**—**ἅμα**: "at the same time," R.V., "simul laxantes," Vulgate, "loosing withal," Rhem., but in no other E.V. (*Speaker's Commentary*).—**τὰς ζευκτ. τῶν πηδαλίων**: the bands of the rudders, the fastenings of the rudders, *i.e.*, the two paddle-rudders with which Greek and Roman ships were supplied, one on each quarter, C. and H. and J. Smith, p. 183, 4th edition,

πνεούσῃ κατεῖχον εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν. 41. περιπεσόντες δὲ εἰς τόπον διθάλασσον,[1] ἐπώκειλαν τὴν ναῦν· καὶ ἡ μὲν πρῶρα ἐρείσασα ἔμεινεν

[1] For **επωκειλαν** (B³LP, Chrys., Meyer, Hilgenfeld), ℵAB*C 13, 40, 61, 73 have **επεκειλαν**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, see note below (and Wendt's note in both edit., 1888 and 1899), and Blass, *in loco*. After **την ναυν** Blass in β and Hilgenfeld adds **εις συρτιν** with Syr. H. c* (so Hilg.).

these rudders had been lifted from the water and lashed up while the ship was anchored by the stern (see Breusing's description, p. 98, *cf.* Eur., *Hel.*, 1536: **πηδάλια ζεύγλαισι παρακαθίετο**), but the rudders were wanted when the ship again got under weigh.—**τῇ πνεούσῃ**, *sc.* **αὔρᾳ**.—**ἐπάραντες**: technical word for spreading out the sail, opposite to **ὑφίεσθαι**.—**κατεῖχον εἰς τὸν αἰγ.**: "they made for the beach," R.V., in order to land, *cf.* Xen., *Hell.*, ii., 1, 29; others take it as meaning to check the ship's headway, but better, to *hold* or *head* the ship, Herod., vii., 59, 188, so Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, *sc.* **τὴν ναῦν**, whilst others take the verb intransitively as above in R.V.—**τὸν ἀρτέμονα**: "the foresail," R.V., Ramsay, J. Smith. The word has been interpreted by various writers as meaning nearly every sail which a vessel carries. If the interpretation of ver. 17 is correct, it could not mean the mainsail as A.V. Others apply it to the stern-sail, which bears the name to-day (Italian, *artimone;* French, *voile d'artimon*), but to set this sail would have been the most foolish thing they could have done, so Vars, Breusing. The word is found only here for the foresail, and its meaning is fixed by the fact that no other sail could be so well used by sailors under the circumstances, see Breusing, p. 79, J. Smith, pp. 141 and 193 ff., 4th edit. In his edition, 1899, Wendt thinks it probable that the sail here meant is otherwise called **δόλων**, but see J. Smith, p. 200, 4th edit. In his former edition he preferred to interpret it of the topsail (Meyer, Weiss, Zöckler, Baumgarten), but Breusing, p. xii., points out that only in the sixteenth century were topsails introduced; see also Vars, p. 93.

Ver. 41. **περιπ. δὲ εἰς τ. διθ.**: Luke x. 30, James i. 2, with the dative, as generally, but Arrian, **περιπίπτειν εἰς τόπους πετρώδεις** (Wetstein), 2 Macc. vi. 13, x. 4, Polyb., i., 37, 1. **εἰς τόπον διθ.**: a bank or a ridge between two seas, which has sea on both sides; *cf.* Dio Chrys., 5, p. 83, where reference is made to the dangers of the sea: **βραχέα καὶ διθάλαττα καὶ ταινίαι μακραὶ . . . ἄπορον . . . παρέχουσι τὸ πέλαγος** (Wetstein and Blass). Breusing, Vars and Goerne (so Blass) take the words **εἰς τ. δ.** to refer to a hidden ridge beneath the water, and the aorist **περιπ.** in contrast to the imperfect **κατεῖχον** seems to favour this, as expressing that they came upon a **τόπ. διθ.** unexpectedly, *cf.* Page's note and Ramsay's translation, "chancing on a bank between two seas". But the latter writer adds that the **περιπ.** does not imply want of purpose, as **ἐπώκειλαν** shows, and the meaning is that while at anchor they could not see the exact character of the spot (see also C. and H.), but as they approached they found that they had lighted on the channel not more than a hundred yards in breadth between the island of Salmonetta and the mainland; this might very properly be called "a place where two seas meet," A. and R.V., as it formed a communication between the sea within the bay and the sea outside. The adjective **διθ.** is as applicable to *water* uniting two seas, *e.g.*, the Bosphorus, *cf.* Strabo, ii., 5, 12 (quoted by Smith), as to *land* like the Isthmus of Corinth; see J. Smith, pp. 142, 178, 4th edit., Hackett, C. and H., Lumby, Rendall, and note in *Speaker's Commentary*. Breusing, p. 204, Goerne, Wendt (1899) take it of St. Paul's Bank which lies just in front of St. Paul's Bay, so too Vars, p. 258, for the same view and its support.—**ἐπώκειλαν τὴν ναῦν**: "they ran the vessel aground" (*cf.* J. Smith, p. 143, 4th edit.), see critical note. **ἐποκέλλω** and **ἐπικέλλω** are both used in classical Greek, but the latter is "altogether poetical" (Blass), and more usually intransitive. In Homer, *Odys.*, ix., 148, however, we have **νῆας . . . ἐπικέλσαι**, and 546, **νῆα ἐκέλσαμεν** (*cf. adpellere navem*). Blass, *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 186, sees in this sudden introduction of the phrase **ἐπώκειλαν τὴν ναῦν** an indication that St. Luke had read his Homer, since in no other passage in the N.T. do we find the obsolete word **ἡ ναῦς**, the commoner expression **τὸ πλοῖον** occurring in this chapter no less than thirteen times. R.V. renders **τὴν ναῦν** "the vessel." all other E.V. "the ship," and

ἀσάλευτος, ἡ δὲ πρύμνα ἐλύετο ὑπὸ τῆς βίας τῶν κυμάτων.[1] 42. τῶν δὲ στρατιωτῶν βουλὴ ἐγένετο ἵνα[2] τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνωσι, μήτις ἐκκολυμβήσας[3] διαφύγοι. 43. ὁ δὲ[4] ἑκατόνταρχος, βουλόμενος διασῶσαι τὸν Παῦλον, ἐκώλυσεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ βουλήματος, ἐκέλευσέ τε τοὺς δυναμένους κολυμβᾷν,[5] ἀποῤῥίψαντας πρώτους ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἐξιέναι, 44. καὶ τοὺς λοιπούς, οὓς μὲν ἐπὶ σανίσιν, οὓς δὲ ἐπί τινων τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου. καὶ οὕτως[6] ἐγένετο πάντας διασωθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

[1] **των κυμ.**, but ℵ*AB, so Tisch., W.H., R.V. have only **υπο τ. βιας**. The words **των κυμ.** are, however, retained here by Weiss, Blass, Hilg.; Vulg., Gig. have *maris*.

[2] Before **τους δεσμ.** Blass (not Hilg.) with Gig. in β text adds **παντας**.

[3] **διαφυγοι**, but very slight authority. Tisch., W.H., Blass, Hilg., Weiss, Wendt **διαφυγῃ** ℵABCHLP 61, Chrys.

[4] After **εκατον.** Blass adds with Gig. **εκωλυσεν τουτο γενεσθαι, μαλιστα δια τον Π. ινα διασωσῃ αυτον.**

[5] **αποῤῥ.** for the one ρ W.H., see ver. 19, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 56.

[6] After **ουτως** Blass with Gig. reads **πασαι αι ψυχαι διεσωθησαν (επι την γην)**.

it has been thought that the word is so changed here because that which had hitherto been a **πλοῖον** capable of sailing was now reduced to a mere hulk (Wordsworth, Humphry).—**καὶ ἡ μὲν πρῴρα ἐρείσασα**: "and the prow struck," R.V., Ramsay, this is accounted for by the peculiar nature of the bottom in St. Paul's Bay, see J. Smith, Ramsay, Hackett, Alford, "a bottom of mud graduating into tenacious clay, into which the fore part would fix itself, and be held fast while the stern was exposed to the force of the waves". For the verb in intransitive sense as here *cf.* Prov. iv. 4, *cf.* *Æneid*, v., 206 (Wetstein).—**ἀσάλ.**: only in Heb. xii. 8 in N.T., but **σαλεύειν** several times in Luke, in Gospel and Acts; in classical Greek and LXX; adverb **-τως**, Polyb., ix., 9, 8, *cf.* also Ecclus. xxix. 18.—**ἡ δὲ πρύμνα ἐλύετο ὑπὸ τῆς βίας**: "but the stern began to break up," R.V., marking the imperfect as distinguished from aorist **ἔμεινεν**, Blass, *Gram.*, p. 186; *Æn.*, x., 303, Cic., *Att.*, xv., 11 (Wetstein).—**βίας τῶν κυμ.**, see critical note. **βία**: four times in Acts, see on v. 26, nowhere else in N.T., but frequent in LXX, Vulgate, "a vi maris," which Breusing, p. 203, strongly endorses.

Ver. 42. **τῶν δὲ στρατ.**: only the soldiers, since they and not the sailors were responsible for the safety of the prisoners, *cf.* xii. 7, xvi. 27; C. and H., small edit., p. 236.—**ἐκκολ.**: "swim away" (Ramsay), literally "out," Eur., *Hel.*, 1609, Dion H., v., 24.—**διαφ.**: only here in N.T., LXX, Josh. viii. 22, Judg. vii. 19, Prov. xix. 5, 1 Macc. xv. 21, 2 Macc. xii. 35, etc., so absolutely in Herod., i., 10.

Ver. 43. **βουλόμενος**: "desiring," R.V.; the centurion had from the first, ver. 3, treated Paul with respect, and the respect had no doubt been deepened by the prisoner's bearing in the hour of danger, and he would naturally wish to save the man to whom he owed his own safety, and that of the whole crew. **διασῶσαι**, even if he cared little for the rest he was determined "to save Paul to the end," literally, so C. and H. There is no reason whatever to regard the words **βουλ. . . . τὸν Π.** as an interpolation.—**ἐκώλυσεν αὐτοὺς τοῦ β.**: only here with this construction, accusative of person and genitive of thing, but similar usage in Xenophon, Polybius. For the resultative aorist, *i.e.*, the aorist of a verb whose present implies effort or intention, commonly denoting the success of the effort, *cf.* also Matt. xxvii. 20, Acts vii. 36, Burton, p. 21.—**τοὺς δυν. κολυμβᾷν**: probably Paul was amongst the number; he had thrice been shipwrecked, and had passed a day and a night in the open sea, 2 Cor. xi. 25 (Felten, Plumptre).—**ἐξιέναι**: four times in Acts, nowhere else in N.T., xiii. 42, xvii. 15, xx. 7.—**ἀποῤῥίψαντας**: "should cast themselves overboard and get first to the land," R.V., where they could help the others to safety, so Breusing, Goerne, Renan; A.V. not so expressive. **ἀποῤῥίπτειν**: here used reflexively, see instance in Wetstein.

XXVIII. 1. ΚΑΙ διασωθέντες, τότε[1] ἐπέγνωσαν ὅτι Μελίτη ἡ νῆσος καλεῖται. 2. Οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι παρεῖχον οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν φιλανθρωπίαν ἡμῖν· ἀνάψαντες γὰρ πυράν,[2] προσελάβοντο πάντας ἡμᾶς, διὰ τὸν

[1] Instead of **επεγνωσαν** ℵABC* 13, 61, 68, 137, Syrr. P. and H., Boh. read **επεγνωμεν**, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg. **διασ.** om. by Blass with Gig., Syr. Pesh., but retained by Hilg. Instead of **Μελιτη** (Tisch., R.V. text, Weiss, Blass, Hilg.), W.H., R.V. marg. read **Μελιτηνη** with B*, Syr. H. mg. Gk., Arm., Boh., Gig.

[2] ℵ* has **προσανελαμβανον**, so Blass and Hilg.; 137 has **προσελαμβανον**; Vulg., Par. *reficiebant*; Gig. *refecerunt*, and Blass takes the word in his text as = *reficiebant*. Wendt thinks that this may have been the original reading. For **αναψ.** (Meyer) ℵABC 61, 68, Tisch., W.H., Blass, Hilg., Weiss read **αψαντες**.

Ver. 44. **τοὺς λ.**, *sc.* **ἐξιέναι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.—οὓς μὲν . . . οὓς δὲ**, Luke xxiii. 33, and in classical Greek.—**ἐπὶ σανίσιν**: "some on planks and some on pieces from the ship," Ramsay; the planks which were in use in the ship as distinguished from actual parts or fragments of the ship in the next clause; in LXX, Ezek. xxvii. 5, the word is used of planks for the deck of a ship (Cant. viii. 9, 2 Kings xii. 9 (?)). Breusing, pp. 45, 203 (so Blass), takes it of the boards or planks which were used for keeping the cargo firmly in its place. The furniture of the vessel had already been thrown overboard, so that we can only think of the pieces broken away as the ship stranded, or perhaps broken off by the escaping crew. **ἐπί**: here used promiscuously with dative and genitive in the same sense.—**ἐγένετο**: with infinitive following, characteristic of St. Luke, Friedrich, p. 13.—**διασωθῆναι**: on its use by St. Luke here and in xxviii. 1, 4 (Luke vii. 3), see Hobart, pp. 9, 10, 284. For the remarkable correspondence between the details of the scene of the shipwreck and the topography of St. Paul's Bay see not only J. Smith and Ramsay, but Goerne, p. 374, Breusing, p. 204, and Vars, p. 257. Breusing and Vars both admit that it is not safe to trust too much to tradition, but in this case, as they both point out, it was only likely that St. Paul would have won loyal adherents in the island who would have handed down every detail of his visit to their children, and the local tradition is in striking accordance with the description of the sacred narrative; see further *Introd.*, p. 8.

CHAPTER XXVIII.—Ver. 1. **διασωθέντες**, see on xxvii. 43. Used by Josephus of his own shipwreck and escape, *Vita*, 3, and in Xen. and Thuc. of coming safely to a place.—**τότε ἐπέγ.**: not imperfect as in xxvii. 39; here denoting the immediate recognition of the place after they had once gained safety (Weiss, Rendall, C.H.). St. Paul's Bay is several miles distant from Valetta, the harbour which the sailors doubtless knew previously, see also Breusing, p. 190, Vars, p. 243, and J. Smith, pp. 140 and 148, 4th edition.—**Μελίτη**, see critical note; Malta, *cf.* Diod. Sic., v., 12, Strabo, vi., 2, Ovid, *Fasti*, iii., 567, Sicula Melita as distinct from Melita Illyrica (*Meleda*). There is no need here to refute the view that the latter, in the Adriatic Sea on the coast of Dalmatia, is meant. This view depends chiefly upon the narrow view of the meaning of the Adria xxvii. 27, see also below on vv. 2, 3. It was first put forward in the tenth century by Constantine the Porphyrogenite, and was advocated in the last century by a Dalmatian monk, Padre Georgi, himself a native of Meleda, no doubt jealous for the honour of his birthplace and his monastery. Its chief champion may be said to be W. Falconer, in his *Dissertation on St. Paul's Voyage*, 1817, republished in 1870 by his nephew, Judge Falconer. This last was an unsuccessful attempt to controvert the arguments of J. Smith in favour of Malta, who may be said to have established his case to demonstration (see for a candid description of Falconer's view "Adria" (Dickson), Hastings' B.D.). More recent nautical authorities have most decisively confirmed the view of J. Smith, *cf.* Breusing, p. 190, and Vars, p. 242. Quite apart from the strong local tradition in favour of Malta, and the testimony of the Apocryphal *Acta Petri et Pauli* in favour of **Γαυδομελέτη** (*Gosso-Malta*) (for references to Lipsius' edition, Wendt and Zöckler, *in loco*), it is not too much to say that Meleda could not have been reached without a miracle under the

ὑετὸν τὸν ἐφεστῶτα, καὶ διὰ τὸ ψῦχος. 3. Συστρέψαντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου φρυγάνων[1] πλῆθος, καὶ ἐπιθέντος ἐπὶ τὴν πυράν, ἔχιδνα[2] ἐκ

[1] After φρυγ. ℵABC 61, Vulg., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass add τι, but Hilg. omits (so Gig.).

[2] The authorities for απο instead of εκ are overwhelming, ℵABCHLI, and other authorities above with Hilg. For εξελ., which is strongly supported by ℵABC 61, and so other authorities above, except Hilg., HLP (Meyer, Alford) read διεξ.

circumstances of weather described in the narrative, *cf.* Dean Howson's "Melita," B.D.[1], ii., pp. 315-317, and Zahn (in answer to Mommsen), *Einleitung*, ii., p. 422.

Ver. 2. **βάρβαροι,** *i.e.*, they were not a Greek-speaking population, *cf.* Rom. i. 14 (not barbarians in the modern sense of rude and uncivilised); they were of Phœnician descent, and came under the Roman dominion in the second Punic War, Livy, xxi., 51. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 343, sees in the title an indication that the writer was himself of Greek nationality. For the use of the term in classical Greek, and by Philo and Josephus, see "Barbarian" (F. C. Conybeare), Hastings' B.D., Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and Mr. Page's note. (In 2 Macc. ii. 21 the writer describes Judas Maccabæus as chasing "barbarous multitudes," **τὰ βάρβαρα πλήθη,** retorting on the Greeks the epithet habitually applied by them to all nations not their own, *Speaker's Commentary*.) See further the evidence of coins and inscriptions in Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., 422, proving as against Mommsen that the Phœnician tongue had not died out in the island, and *cf.* above, Introd., p. 8.—**οὐ τὴν τυχ.**, *cf.* xix. 11, "no common kindness," R.V. (and so A.V. in xix. 11).—**φιλαν.**: see note on xxvii. 3. The word is found in LXX, Esther viii. 13, 2 Macc. vi. 22, xiv. 9, 3 Macc. iii. 15, 18, and in classical Greek, but it was a word which a physician would be very likely to employ, for Hippocrates speaks of "philanthropy" in a physician as ever accompanying a real love of his profession. Galen distinguishes between those who healed through "philanthropy" and those who healed merely for gain, and even a more generous diet for the sick was called **φιλανθρωποτέρα τροφή**, Hobart, p. 296. The word is used here only and in Tit. iii. 4 in N.T.—**ἀνάψ. γὰρ πυράν**, Luke xii. 49, James iii. 5; if we read the simple verb (see critical note) we have it three times with **λύχνον** in Luke viii. 16, xi. 33, xv. 8, and nowhere else in N.T. (except with meaning "to touch"). **πυράν**: only here and in ver. 3 in N.T., *cf.* Judith vii. 5, 1 Macc. xii. 28, 2 Macc. i. 22, x. 36 (see H. and R.), and similar phrases in classical Greek.—**προσελάβοντο,** *cf.* xvii. 5, xviii. 26 for similar use, and five times by St. Paul; *cf.* 2 Macc. x. 15, see critical note.—**ἐφεστῶτα,** *cf.* Polyb., xviii. 3, 7; in N.T. 2 Tim. iv. 6, only in Luke and Paul, *præsentem*, Wetstein, "present," A. and R.V. Weiss and De Wette take it as meaning that the rain suddenly came upon them.—**ψῦχος**: this and the mention of the rain prove that St. Paul's ship could not have encountered a sirocco wind, *i.e.*, from the south-east, for this only blows for two or three days, and even in November is hot and sultry (Hackett). W.H. read **ψύχος,** but Weiss, Wendt, Blass as above, see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 68.

Ver. 3. **συστρέψαντος**: here only in Acts, but *cf.* xi. 27, xvi. 39, in **β** text; = exemplum **αὐτουργίας**, Bengel. *Cf.* Matt. xvii. 22, W.H., R.V. margin; of collecting men, 2 Macc. xiv. 30.—**φρυγάνων**: brushwood, copse; the furze still growing near St. Paul's Bay would well afford material for a fire (Lewin), and it may be quite true that wood is found nowhere else but in a place at a distance from the Bay; in classical Greek used in plural for dry sticks, especially firewood; here only in N.T., but several times in LXX, for straw, stubble, and bramble.—**τι** before **πλῆθος,** see critical note: implying as much as he could carry, Weiss; **πλ.** used elsewhere of persons.—**ἔχιδνα**: the objection that no poisonous serpents are found to-day in Malta, like that based on the absence of wood in ver. 2, may well be dismissed as "too trivial to deserve notice; such changes are natural and probable in a small island, populous and long civilised," Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 343, Breusing, p. 191, Vars, p. 243; so too J. Smith, p. 151, 4th edition, refers to the gradual disappearance of the viper in Arran as the island became more frequented, and *cf.*

τῆς θέρμης ἐξελθοῦσα καθῆψε τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ. 4. ὡς δὲ εἶδον οἱ βάρβαροι κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, Πάντως φονεύς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος, ὃν διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ δίκη ζῆν οὐκ εἴασεν. 5. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀποτινάξας τὸ θηρίον εἰς τὸ πῦρ, ἔπαθεν οὐδὲν κακόν. 6. οἱ δὲ προσεδόκων αὐτὸν μέλλειν[1] πίμπρασθαι ἢ καταπίπτειν ἄφνω νεκρόν· ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ αὐτῶν προσδοκώντων, καὶ θεωρούντων μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν

[1] πιμπρασθαι ℵcBHLP, Chrys., so Lach., W.H., Weiss, Wendt, Blass, Hilg.; Tisch. has εμπιπρασ. with ℵ*; πιπρασθ. A.

Hackett's note for similar proof. Mr. Lewin, as late as 1853, believed that he saw a viper near St. Paul's Bay, *St. Paul*, ii., 208.—ἐκ: "out of," but if ἀπό "by reason of," R.V. margin, "from the heat," the viper numbed by the cold felt the sudden heat, and was restored to activity, *cf.* on its habits (Hackett), ἀπό "in causæ significatu sæpe apud Græcos," Grotius, Bengel. *Cf.* xx. 9, and Luke xxi. 26.—ἐξελθοῦσα, see critical note. διεξ. supported by Meyer and Alford, as if the serpent glided out *through* the sticks.—θέρμης: only in Luke in N.T., but in classics and in LXX, Job vi. 17, Ps. xviii. (xix.) 6, Eccl. iv. 11, Ecclus. xxxviii. 28; often used in medical writers instead of θερμότης (Hobart), but the latter is also used in Hipp.—καθῆψε: only here in N.T., but frequent in classical Greek, and usually in middle, although not found in LXX, *cf.* however Symm., καθάπτεσθαι, Cant. i. 6, *cf.* Epict., *Diss.*, iii., 20, 10, *i.e.*, τοῦ τραχήλου: (Grimm): Blass, Page, Felten render "bit," *momordit*. So Nösgen and Zöckler, who think that this is evidently meant from the context, although not necessarily contained in the verb itself; Dioscorides used it of poisonous matter introduced into the body (Hobart, p. 288). Blass thus expresses the force of the aorist, "momento temporis hoc factum est, priusquam P. manum retraxisset".

Ver. 4. τὸ θηρίον: "the beast," R.V. Although this is the meaning of the Greek word, it is to be noted that St. Luke uses it here exactly as the medical writers, who applied it to venomous serpents—in particular, to the viper, ἔχιδνα (so Aristotle), and an antidote made chiefly from the flesh of vipers went by the name ἡ θηριακή (Hobart, Zahn, Knabenbauer), and those bitten by a viper were called θηριόδηκτοι.—κρεμ. ἐκ: "hanging from," R.V., it clung by its mouth to the hand of Paul, construction as in classical Greek, *cf.* 2 Macc. vi. 10.—πάντως: only in Luke and Paul, expressing strong affirmation, *cf.* xxi. 22, and Luke iv. 23; *cf.* Tob. xiv. 8, 2 Macc. iii. 13.—φονεύς, a murderer, and therefore justice demands his life, death for death; they saw that he was a prisoner perhaps from his chains (Bengel); at all events the solders would have guarded him, as we may infer from xxvii. 42.—ἡ Δίκη: "justice," R.V., *cf.* Hesiod, *Theog.*, 902; so in Soph., *Ant.*, 544; *Œd. Col.*, 1384; for the personification *cf.* Wisdom i. 8, xi. 20, and several instances in 4 Macc., see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* The Maltese may have heard the name from the Greeks or Romans, or they may have honoured a goddess of their own, whose name Luke here represents by ἡ Δ., "debile lumen naturæ . . . nec quis sit ὁ Δίκαιος *Justus Ultor* norunt," Bengel.—διασωθέντα, see on xxvii. 43.—οὐκ εἴασεν: "hath not suffered," they thought of him as already dead, as if the deadly bite had already done its work; not *sinit*, as Vulgate, but *sivit*.

Ver. 5. ἀποτ.: only in Luke, Luke ix. 5, in parallel in Matt. and Mark, ἐκτ., *cf.* Lam. ii. 7, and in classical Greek, Eur., *Bacch.*, 253.—ἔπαθεν οὐδὲν κακόν, *cf.* Mark xvi. 18, Luke x. 19.

Ver. 6. οἱ δέ . . .: Paul shook off the viper—the natives looked for a fatal result. They knew the deadly nature of the bite, and their subsequent conduct shows that they regarded it as nothing short of miraculous that Paul escaped. So St. Luke evidently wishes to describe the action, see on μέν οὖν, ver. 5, and δέ, Rendall, *Acts*, p. 161, Appendix.—προσεδόκων, see below.—πίμπρασθαι, from the form πίμπρημι, present infinitive passive, see critical note, and Winer-Schmiedel, p. 122; *cf.* in LXX, Numb. v. 21, 22, 27, πρήθειν, H. and R., of parts of the body becoming swollen. In classical Greek πίμπρασθαι means "to take

γινόμενον,[1] μεταβαλλόμενοι ἔλεγον θεὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. 7. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς περὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκεῖνον ὑπῆρχε χωρία τῷ πρώτῳ τῆς νήσου, ὀνόματι Ποπλίῳ, ὃς ἀναδεξάμενος ἡμᾶς τρεῖς ἡμέρας[2] φιλοφρόνως ἐξένισεν.

[1] Instead of μεταβαλλ. (ℵHL, so Tisch., Hilg.) ABP have the aorist μεταβαλ., so W.H., Weiss, Blass, Wendt.

[2] After ημερας τρεις Hilg. adds εν τῃ οικιᾳ αυτου, but not Blass.

fire," and πρήθειν "to cause to swell," and those two ideas are combined, as in the word πρηστήρ, "a venomous snake, the bite of which caused both inflammation and swelling" (Page, *in loco*), *cf.* Lucan, ix., 790. In the N.T. the verb is peculiar to St. Luke, and it is the usual medical word for inflammation (Hobart, Zahn) in Hipp., Aret., Galen.—καταπίπτειν: only in Luke in N.T., *cf.* Luke viii. 6, Acts xxvi. 14, it was used by medical writers of persons falling down suddenly from wounds, or in epileptic fits; Hipp., Galen (Hobart, Zahn), *cf.* the asp-bitten Charmian in *Ant. and Cleo.* (Shakespeare), Act v., Scene 2.—ἄφνω: only in Acts ii. 2, xvi. 26.—προσδ. . . . ἄτοπον: the two words are described by Hobart as exactly those which a medical man would use (so too Zahn), and he gives two instances of the latter word from Galen, in speaking of the bite of a rabid dog, or of poison, p. 289. The word is used elsewhere in N.T. of something morally amiss; *cf.* Luke xxiii. 41, Acts xxv. 5, 2 Thess. iii. 2, but here evidently of something amiss physically. In R.V. it is rendered in each passage "amiss". The word in N.T. is confined to Luke and Paul, but it is found several times in LXX in an ethical sense (as in N.T., except *in loco*), *cf.* Job iv. 8, xi. 11, xxvii. 6, xxxiv. 12, xxxv. 13, Prov. xxiv. 55 (xxx. 20), *cf.* 2 Macc. xiv. 23; so too in Thucydides, Josephus, Plutarch, etc.; but it is used of any harm happening to a person as here, *cf.* Jos., *Ant.*, viii., 14, 4; xi., 5, 2; Herodian, iv., 11. προσδοκία, peculiar to St. Luke in N.T.; *cf.* Luke xxi. 26, Acts xii. 11, and προσδοκάω, in Luke six times, in Acts five, was, no doubt, frequently used in medical language (Hobart, Zahn) for the expectation of the result of a disease or paroxysm "when they were long in expectation," R.V.), but in Jos., *Ant.*, viii., 14, 4, we have καὶ μηδὲν τῶν ἀτόπων προσδοκᾷν, and in Herodian, iv., 11, μηδὲν ἄτοπον προσδοκοῦντες· εἰς αὐτὸν γιν., *cf.* Luke iv. 23 (Klostermann, Weiss).—μεταβαλλόμενοι, so frequently in classics without τὴν γνώμην, *cf.* Jos., *B. J.*, v., 9, 3.—θεὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι: it is perhaps fanciful to suppose with Grotius and Wetstein that they compared him to the infant Hercules, or to Æsculapius represented with the serpent, but the latter is undoubtedly right in adding, "eleganter autem hic describitur vulgi inconstantia"; we naturally compare with Chrysostom the startling change in the people of Lystra, xiv., 11, 19, "Aut latro inquiunt aut deus . . . datur tertium: homo Dei" (Bengel).

Ver. 7. χωρία: "lands," R.V. Vulgate, *prædia.* In this passage τόπος and χωρίον occur together, but whilst the former is used of place indefinitely, the latter is used of a definite portion of space enclosed or complete in itself; *cf.* John iv. 5; Grimm-Thayer's Syn., *sub v.*, τόπος.—τῷ πρώτῳ: an official title technically correct in Malta, Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 343, *honoraria appellatio*, so too Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bibl.*, i., 47, 1899; as his father was alive, he would not have been called from his estates (see, however, O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 106), but the inscriptional authorities confirm the first view, a Greek inscription giving πρῶτος Μελιταίων καὶ Πάτρων, applied to a Roman Knight, Prudens by name, ἱππεὺς Ῥ., so that Publius may well have been of the same rank, and in a Latin inscription we have *municipii Melitensium primus omnium*, see Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 422; Blass, *in loco;* Zöckler, Holtzmann, Knabenbauer, also Alford, Lewin, Hackett, Renan; possibly the conjecture may be correct that the Greek and Latin inscriptions give a translation of a title which the Romans already found in vogue in the island. Publius would be naturally the chief authority in the island under the Roman prætor of Sicily, Cic., *Verr.*, iv., 18.—Ποπλίῳ: Greek form for the *prænomen* Publius, "nomen a *populus* derivatum," Blass; Ramsay, p. 343, thinks that Poplius may = the Greek rendering of the *nomen Popilius*, but that the peasantry may have spoken of him familiarly by his *prænomen* Publius. Tradition makes him bishop of Malta (Felten, Knaben-

8. ἐγένετο δὲ τὸν πατέρα τοῦ Ποπλίου πυρετοῖς καὶ[1] δυσεντερίᾳ συνεχόμενον κατακεῖσθαι· πρὸς ὃν ὁ Παῦλος εἰσελθὼν καὶ προσευξάμενος, ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ, ἰάσατο αὐτόν. 9. τούτου οὖν γενομένου, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ ἔχοντες ἀσθενείας ἐν τῇ νήσῳ προσήρχοντο καὶ

[1] For δυσεντεριῳ 61, Chrys. have the older fem. form, -ιᾳ, Winer-Schmiedel, p. 85.

bauer).—ἀναδεξ.: only here of hospitable reception = ὑποδέχεσθαι, xvii. 7; φιλοφ., 2 Macc. iii. 9, 4 Macc. viii. 5; in the former passage φιλοφ. ἀποδεχθείς, so in Jos., *Ant.*, xiv., 8, 5, φιλοφ. ὑποδέχεσθαι, and instances in Wetstein, see above on ver. 2.—ἡμᾶς: some take the word as referring to Paul and his companions, Luke and Aristarchus (as it seems to lead on to what follows), perhaps including Julius, whilst others point out that he may have entertained the whole crew for the short space of time mentioned, as the ἡμέρας τρεῖς indicates that the entertainment was only provisional; probably he had a large number of slaves (Nösgen, Weiss). Publius may well have been officially responsible for the needs of the Roman soldiers and their prisoners, but φιλοφ. indicates that the duty was performed with generous courtesy.—ἐξένισεν: entertained (as his guests), *cf.* x. 6, 23, etc., Heb. xiii. 2. The traditional site was at Civita Vecchia, the old capital of the island, where St. Paul spent the three months, and another tradition places it on the way from St. Paul's Bay to the capital.

Ver. 8. πυρετοῖς: the use of the plural for a fever is peculiar to St. Luke in N.T., and quite medical, Hobart, J. Smith, Zahn (*cf.* Luke iv. 38, 39); although the plural is found in Dem., Lucian in the sense of "intermittent attacks of fever," but Hobart shows that the term was very common in Hipp., and he also quotes from Aretæus and Galen. Each of the other Evangelists uses πυρετός, but in the singular, never in the plural. The disease was common in Malta (J. Smith and C. and H.).—δυσεντερίᾳ, see critical note, "dysentery," R.V.; "Lucas medicus morbos accuratius describere solet," Wetstein; another medical term, peculiar to St. Luke in N.T., often joined with πυρετός by Hippocrates (Hobart, Zahn).—συνεχ., *cf.* Luke iv. 38, συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ, where St. Luke not only speaks of πυρ. μέγας, where Matthew and Mark (viii. 14 and i. 30) have simply πυρετός, but also introduces the term συνεχ. where they have πυρέσσουσα; ἔχεσθαι and συνέχ. are both used by the medical writers as in these passages, although no doubt συνέχεσθαι is sometimes found with a word like νοσήματι in classical Greek (*cf.* Grotius. *in loco*, Hobart, Zahn, Weiss), so in Hippocrates, ὑπὸ δυσεντερίης ἐχομένῳ, and τοῖσιν ὑπὸ τῆς ἡρακλείης νόσου συνεχομένοισιν; nine times in St. Luke, elsewhere only three times in N.T., and once in St. Matt. iv. 24, in a way similar to St. Luke, but joined there not only with νόσοις, but with a word (βασάνοις) which the medical writers (so St. Luke) never employ of bodily disease.—ἰάσατο αὐτόν, *cf.* Mark xvi. 18, the word is more frequently used by the medical writers for "healing" than any other (Hobart), and it occurs in St. Luke's writings fourteen times and once figuratively, in St. Matthew four times and once figuratively, once in St. Mark, three times in St. John, once figuratively, and in the rest of the N.T. three times, but in each case figuratively. In answer to the attempts to regard the miraculous element as an addition to the narrative here, as in the previous chapter, it may be sufficient to quote the remarks of Weizsäcker: "The stormy voyage and shipwreck form the central point of the narrative: to this is appended the residence at Malta. In the former, Paul reveals himself as a prophet; in the latter, as the possessor of miraculous power. We should make a vast mistake, however, if we were to infer from this that the simple travel-record had here been revised by a writer intent upon artificially glorifying the Apostle as a worker of miracles. The narrative is an indivisible whole; it is impossible to disentangle the mere history of travel from it, or to strip away the miraculous additions," *Apostolic Age*, ii., p. 126, E.T.

Ver. 9. ἐθεραπεύοντο: "were cured," R.V. Lekebusch, pp. 382, 393, and Holtzmann, *in loco*, think that the medical skill of St. Luke may also have been instrumental in effecting these cures, and this is urged on the ground that ἡμᾶς, ver. 10, intimates that not only St. Paul received honour in return for the cures

ἐθεραπεύοντο· 10. οἳ καὶ πολλαῖς τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἀναγομένοις ἐπέθεντο τὰ πρὸς [1] τὴν χρείαν.

11. Μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς μῆνας ἀνήχθημεν ἐν πλοίῳ παρακεχειμακότι ἐν τῇ νήσῳ, Ἀλεξανδρινῷ,[2] παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις· 12. καὶ καταχθέντες

[1] For the sing. την χρ. ℵABI 13, 40, 137 have the plural, so Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg.

[2] Blass reads ῳ ην παρασημον Διοσκουρων (Vulg., Syr. P., Gig.).

effected. But such a conjecture must remain quite uncertain, although it is no doubt quite possible that as we have here a verb which properly denotes medical treatment (*cf.* θεραπεία, Luke ix. 11) for the restoration of health, the care (*cura*) of medical skill was freely added by St. Luke, and enhanced the debt which the sick owed.

Ver. 10. πολλαῖς τιμαῖς: "with many honours," A. and R.V., used quite generally, so in Vulgate, "multis honoribus"; even in the expression "honos habendus medico," Cic., *Ad Div.*, xvi., 9, we need not limit the word to the *honorarium;* so in 1 Tim. v. 17 τιμῆς is used quite generally, and in Ecclus. xxxviii. 1 it is very doubtful whether in the expression "honour a physician," τίμα ἰατρόν, the verb refers to payment. There is therefore no need to take the word as referring to a physician's fee in money, as Wordsworth, Humphry, Plumptre, although the word may have been so used by a physician; but it was scarcely likely that St. Paul would have received such a reward for his services, to say nothing of the fact that it was contrary to Christ's commands, Matt. x. 8.—καὶ ἀναγ. ἐπέθεντο: "and when we sailed they put on board," R.V., so Ramsay, ἀναγ., technical term, xxvii. 2, 3.—τὰ πρὸς τὴν χ., see critical note, frequently in Luke and Paul, both in singular and plural, and often in LXX, *cf.* Acts xx. 34, Rom. xii. 13, used here quite generally; it may have included money, but no doubt things needful, *post naufragium*, Bengel.

Ver. 11. τρεῖς μῆνας: no account is given of St. Paul's doings in Malta, or of his preaching or founding a Church, but the writer's interest is centred on the Apostle's journey to Rome, and what immediately concerns it.—ἀνήχ., see above on xiii. 13; in the earlier part of February, as the shipwreck took place probably before the middle of November (Ramsay), but Blass thinks March, as he places the shipwreck about the commencement of December, but with a favourable wind the ship would risk the voyage, even before the regular sailing season commenced (so Wendt and Ramsay).—Ἀλεξ.: very likely a corn ship, driven for refuge by the same gale; on the accent here and in xxvii. 6 see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 73.—παρακεχειμακότι: only in Luke and Paul in N.T., *cf.* xxvii. 12, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, Tit. iii. 12, and in classical Greek.—παρασήμῳ Διοσκ.: "whose sign was the Twin Brothers," R.V., *i.e.*, Castor and Pollux; or perhaps in a ship "marked with the image or figure of the Dioscuri," or the latter word in the dative may be a dedicatory inscription—marked "To the Dioscuri," *i.e.*, in honour of them, so Wendt, Holtzmann, Grimm-Thayer. Others take παρασ. as a noun, so Alford, Page, quoting from an inscription found near Lutro and given by J. Smith, in which reference is made to a Dionysius of Alexandria as *gubernator navis parasemo Isopharia.* Phryn. prefers the form Διόσκοροι. Blass has ᾧ ἦν παράσημον Διοσκούρων, see critical note and Blass, *in loco; cf.* for the word 3 Macc. ii. 29. Castor and Pollux were best known as the tutelary gods of sailors, and probably at this date they were both the *insigne* and the *tutela* of the ship. St. Cyril of Alexandria tells us that it was always the Alexandrian method to ornament each side of the prow with the figures of deities, probably in this case Castor and Pollux, one on each side of the vessel; and we may further note that the twin brothers were specially honoured in the district of Cyrenaica, not far from Alexandria (*Schol.*, Pind., *Pyth.*, v., 6). For other classical notices *cf.* Hor., *Od.*, i., 3, 2; iii., 29, 64; *Catull.*, iv., 27; lxviii., 65; Eur., *Helen.*, 1663, and "Castor and Pollux," B.D.[2], and "Dioscuri," Hastings' B.D. The mention of the ship's sign shows the minuteness of the information of an eye-witness, and the fact that an Alexandrian ship thus wintered in the island is a strong piece of incidental evidence in favour of the identification of the island with Malta; the latter would be a natural

εἰς Συρακούσας, ἐπεμείναμεν ἡμέρας τρεῖς· 13. ὅθεν[1] περιελθόντες κατηντήσαμεν εἰς Ῥήγιον, καὶ μετὰ μίαν ἡμέραν ἐπιγενομένου νότου

[1] For περιελθ. R.V. marg. has περιελοντες with ℵ*B (Gig. *tulimus*), and so W.H., but Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. follow T.R.; Weiss maintains with Wendt that περιελοντες is simply a mistake, Θ having fallen out before O, but see below. J. Smith, p. 156, follows T.R. Blass in β has και εκειθεν αραντες.

harbour for a ship of Alexandria on the way to Italy, but Meleda would be altogether out of the course (see J. Smith, p. 278, fourth edit.).

Ver. 12. καταχ.: "touching at," R.V., Ramsay, *cf.* xxvii. 3. We are not told that St. Paul landed, but the local tradition makes him the founder of the Sicilian Church, C. and H., p. 663, small edit.—Συρ.: (*Siragosa*) about 100 miles distant from Malta, the capital of Sicily, and a Roman colony; in a mercantile city St. Paul would find countrymen and Jewish proselytes; it was moreover a city of great historical interest, and a usual stopping-place for Alexandrian ships on their voyage to Italy; see C. and H., p. 662, *u. s.*, and notices in Strabo, vi., p. 270 (but see also Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, Συρ.); Cicero, *Verr.*, iv., 53; Pliny, *N.H.*, iii., 8, and B.D., *sub v.* For accentuation *cf.* also Grimm-Thayer. —τρεῖς ἡμέρας: probably to wait for a favouring breeze from the south.—ἐπεμείναμεν: with accusative of time, *cf.* x. 48, xxi. 4, 10, ver. 14 below, 1 Cor. xvi. 7.

Ver. 13. περιελθόντες: so A. and R.V., but latter in margin περιελόντες, see critical note. Ramsay also following T.R. points out that the latter reading could hardly signify more than "cast off" ("cast loose," margin, R.V.), unnecessary here although important information in xxvii. 40, where τὰς ἀγκ. is added, and the meaning is evidently different. Ramsay renders "by tacking" (the verb referring to the frequent alteration of the ship's course); they worked up to Rhegium by good seamanship as they could not go straight across, J. Smith, C. and H., p. 663, small edit. Mr. Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., p. 736, takes a different view, and thinks that they were obliged to stand out to sea to fill their sails, and so to come to Rhegium by a circuitous sweep. R.V. renders simply "made a circuit," so Grimm-Thayer. W.H., ii., p. 226, explain their rendering "weighed anchor" by the use of the verb in xxvii. 40 (but see Blass above), the elliptic employment of transitive verbs being common in Greek nautical language as in English, and by the opinion that the run from Syracuse to Rhegium could not be described as circuitous, unless the ship was thrown out by contrary winds (but see above); Mr. Rendall supports W.H., Mr. Page the opposite, following T.R., so Smith, p. 156, fourth edit., and see critical note above, and Wendt (1899), p. 418. A.V. "fetched a compass," so Tyndale, which formerly meant that they made a circuit, but the phrase is now obsolete, *cf.* 2 Sam. v. 23, 2 Kings iii. 9, same Greek verb in LXX.—Ῥήγιον: *Reggio*, Titus put in here on his way from Judæa to Puteoli bound for Rome, Suet., *Tit.*, 5; and we learn from Jos., *Ant.*, xix., 2, 5, that Caligula began to construct a harbour for the corn-ships of Egypt, although he never finished it. The place was situated at the southern entrance to the Straits of Messina, here little more than a few miles in breadth between it and the city Messina (on its name from ῥήγνυμι, because Sicily was at this point rent away from Italy, see Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*, and Wetstein). St. Paul was said to have visited Messina, and to have given the Christians a bishop, *Acta Petri*, *Acta Pauli*, Lipsius, p. ix. (Zöckler). The coins show us that here too the Dioscuri were the patron deities. —κατην. only in Luke and Paul, see xvi. 1, *cf.* 2 Macc. iv. 44.—ἐπιγ.: "a south wind sprang up," R.V., here only in N.T., *cf.* Thuc., iii., 74, iv., 30; Xen., *Hell.*, iii., 2, 17, *oborto Austro*, Blass, or it may mean coming after or in succession to, ἐπί, the previous adverse wind. —δευτεραῖοι, *cf.* πεμπταῖοι, xx. 6, Blass in β, John xi. 39, Phil. iii. 5, so in classical Greek. The distance is about 180 miles, and J. Smith, p. 217, 4th edit., points out that if we suppose the ship to sail at seven knots an hour the voyage would take about twenty-six hours, and St. Luke's account is shown to be very accurate; see also Ramsay and Hackett for examples of the ancient rate of sailing quite in accordance with the facts before us.—Ποτιόλους (*Pozzuoli*), in earlier days Dicaearchia; its new name was Latin, probably from the mineral springs in the neighbourhood *a puteis*, or perhaps *a putendo* (C. and H.). It was

δευτεραῖοι ἤλθομεν εἰς Ποτιόλους. 14. οὗ εὑρόντες ἀδελφούς, παρεκλήθημεν[1] ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἐπιμεῖναι ἡμέρας ἑπτά· καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὴν

[1] For επ' ℵABI Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Wendt have παρ', Hilg. retains επ'. Instead of επιμειναι H 3, 33, 68, 95*, 137, Syr. H., Gig., Theoph. have επιμειναντες, so Blass, Hilg., Ramsay (Wendt admits as possible), and the meaning will then be "we were comforted among them (xx. 12) while we remained among them for seven days".

not only a great landing-place for travellers from the East, but the great harbour for Alexandrian corn-ships, as also for the trade from Syria and Spain (Renan, *Saint Paul*, p. 558). Seneca, *Epist.*, 77, gives us a vivid description of the interest taken in the arrival of the corn-ships, since the people of Rome depended so much upon this cargo for food. The importance gained by the place is shown by the fact that it gave its name to the bay, once the Bay of Cumæ, now the Bay of Naples, but in St. Paul's day *Sinus Puteolanus*. Here St. Ignatius desired to land that he might follow the footsteps of St. Paul to Rome (*Martyr.*, v.), see further Jos., *Ant.*, xvii., 12, 1, xviii., 7, 2; Strabo, xvii., 1, 7, and Wetstein's references. For modern writers *cf.* also Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 218, and Farrar, ii., 386; their description shows how the Apostle's eyes now rested upon "one of the loveliest of earthly scenes".

Ver. 14. ἀδελφούς, see on i. 15, they may have been from Alexandria, as the commerce between it and Puteoli was so considerable; the absence of the article indicates that the writer knew nothing of their presence previously, but at all events Blass is right when he says, "non magis mirum est Puteolis Christianos ante Paulum fuisse quam Romæ". Probably after Rome itself Puteoli was the most ancient Jewish community in Italy. Jews were there as early as B.C. 4, after the death of Herod the Great, Jos., *Ant.*, xvii., 12, 1; *B. J.*, ii., 7, 1, and Schürer accepts the notice of the existence of a Christian Church as in the text, *Jewish People*, div. ii., vol. ii., p. 241, E.T., so too O. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 108; see also Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 26. Rhegium and Puteoli are the only two Italian towns mentioned in the N.T. (except, of course, Rome itself), and when we consider that Puteoli was the most important port, not only for ships from Alexandria, but also from Syria, there is nothing surprising in the fact that Christianity found an early and an easy entrance; at Pompeii, not far from Puteoli, Christianity had made its way, and before 79 A.D. it was discussed by the gossiping loungers in the street (Ramsay).—παρεκ.: "we were entreated to tarry," R.V. Ramsay (so Blass), rendering "we were consoled among them, remaining seven days" (see critical note), thinks that R.V., although strongly supported, is irreconcilable with St. Paul's situation as a prisoner. Julius was a Roman officer, and discipline was natural to him, however friendly he was towards Paul. Blass compares xx. 12, and Zöckler also prefers the inferior reading on account of this more usual meaning of παρακαλεῖν. Probably the seven days' delay was needful for Julius to report his arrival at Rome, and to receive further orders from the capital, perhaps with regard to the disposal of the prisoners, but St. Paul must have been rejoiced at the opportunity of celebrating a Sunday with the little Christian Church at Puteoli, *cf.* xx. 6, xxi. 4.—καὶ οὕτως: "and so we came to Rome," about 140 miles, *cf.* xxvii. 25, "destinatum itineris terminum," Blass, *cf.* the article before Ῥ., Blass, *Gram.*, p. 149, so Bengel (but see Page's note). Others take οὕτως as simply = after the stay of seven days, a notice which leads on to ver. 15, and makes us to understand how the brethren came to meet us, since news would easily have reached Rome, and a deputation of the brethren have arrived at Appii Forum. On the former view the writer marks the conclusion and the aim of the long journey (*cf.* εἰς τὴν Ῥ. before the verb; in vv. 12, 13, names of places follow the verb without any article, Weiss), and there is a kind of triumph in the words: like an emperor who has fought a naval battle and overcome, Paul entered into that most imperial city; he was nearer now to his crown; Rome received him bound, and saw him crowned and proclaimed conqueror: *cf.* Chrys. Others take ἤλθ. as = ἐπορευόμεθα, the actual end of the journey following in ver. 16 (see on the other hand Wendt, *in loco*, 1888). But ver. 15 may possibly be taken as adding an episode which com-

Ῥώμην ἤλθομεν. 15. κἀκεῖθεν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἀκούσαντες τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν, ἐξῆλθον[1] εἰς ἀπάντησιν ἡμῖν ἄχρις Ἀππίου Φόρου καὶ Τριῶν Ταβερνῶν· οὓς ἰδὼν ὁ Παῦλος, εὐχαριστήσας τῷ Θεῷ, ἔλαβε θάρσος.

[1] For ἐξηλθον (so Hilg.) A 17, 40, 61, R.V. have ηλθον; ℵBI so Tisch., W.H. Blass, Wendt have ηλθαν.

mences, as it were, a new section of the Apostle's work in the meeting with the brethren from Rome, the journey itself being regarded as completed in ver. 14 (Nösgen). If we read εἰσήλθομεν in ver. 16, see critical note, the word emphasises apparently the actual entry into the city, "and when we entered into," R.V., or it may simply take up the conclusion of ver. 14 (so Wendt, who sees no difficulty in the words). Ramsay, however, draws another distinction between vv. 14 and 16 (to which Wendt (1899) refers, without endorsing it), and thinks that the double expression of arrival is due to the double meaning which the name of a city-state bears in Greek (*St. Paul*, pp. 111, 347, and *Expositor*, Jan., 1899); thus Rome might be restricted to the walls and buildings, or it might include the whole *ager Romanus*, and so in ver. 14, "we reached the State Rome," we passed through two points in the *ager Romanus*, ver. 15, and in ver. 16, "we entered the (walls of) Rome".

Ver. 15. **κἀκεῖθεν**, see on xiv. 26.—**τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν**: phrase only in Luke and Paul, see above on p. 481. The natural supposition is that there were two companies; one met them in advance at Appii Forum, and the other nearer Rome at the Tres Tabernæ.—**εἰς ἀπάντησιν**, *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 17, Matt. xxv. 6, xxvii. 32 (W.H. margin), frequent in LXX, *cf.* Polyb., v., 26, 8. See Plumptre's note on the meeting of Cicero on this same road on his return from exile, Senate and people going out to meet him; for St. Paul's friends in Rome see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, Introd., and p. 171 ff.; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, xviii., xxvii., xxxiv., xl., etc., Godet, *L'Épître aux Romains*, ii., 599 ff. Aquila and Priscilla would be amongst them.—**Ἀππίου Φόρου**: situated on the great Appian Way, near the modern *Treponti*, 43 miles from Rome, Cic., *Ad Att.*, ii., 10; Hor., *Sat.*, i., 5, 3, and for the distance, *Itin. Ant.*, p. 107, *Itin. Hier.*, p. 611 (see however on this point *Encycl. Bibl.*, p. 267, 1899). Probably its name was due to Appius Claudius as the constructor of this part of the road, Livy, ix., 29, and even in the time of St. Paul it seems to have been connected in some way with the Appian family. It was situated at the northern end of a canal which ran thither from a few miles apparently above Terracina through the district of the Pomptine Marshes. The boatmen of whom Horace speaks in his lively description, *u. s.*, were employed in conveying passengers in boats towed by mules along this canal. The Appian Way itself was parallel with the canal, so that the centurion and the Apostle might have travelled by either, and this uncertainty as to the route no doubt made the Roman Christians wait at Appii Forum. Night travellers apparently preferred the boat. The R.V. renders "The Market of Appius" (really the Greek is a transliteration of the Latin Appii forum, as the words stood in 1611, "forum" (not Forum), Hastings' B.D.). The word apparently implied what we should call a borough or assize town, *cf.* Forum Julium, etc. The picture drawn by Horace suggests a sharp contrast between the holy joy of the Christian meeting and the coarse vice and rude revelry which so often filled the wretched little town (Plumptre, C. and H.).—**Τριῶν Ταβ.**: *Tres Tabernæ*, frequent halting-place, *deversorium*, about 33 miles from Rome on the Via Appia, probably at the point where the road from Antium crosses it, near the modern *Cisterna*. At this time it was a place of some importance, *cf.* Cic., *Ad Att.*, ii., 12. The Latin *tabernæ* = a shop of any kind, and would require an adjective like *deversoria* (*sc. taberna*) to be equivalent to a tavern in the modern sense, Lewin, *Saint Paul*, ii., 224.—**εὐχ. τῷ Θεῷ ἔλαβε θάρσος**, *cf.* Job xvii. 9, whether Ramsay is correct in connecting this encouragement with the chronic disorder of the Apostle, which would often occasion fits of depression, it is evident that St. Paul, who was so full of sympathy, "the heart of the world," and craved for sympathy from others, may well have felt that he was still a prisoner, and the recent perilous voyage may also have left its mark upon him. Anyhow, the meeting with Christian friends, and the thought that these Christians were not ashamed

16. ὍΤΕ δὲ[1] ἤλθομεν εἰς[2] Ῥώμην, ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ· τῷ δὲ Παύλῳ ἐπετράπη μένειν καθ' ἑαυτόν, σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ.[3] 17. Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς συγκαλέσασθαι τὸν Παῦλον τοὺς ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων πρώτους· συνελθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν, ἔλεγε πρὸς αὐτούς, Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ οὐδὲν ἐναντίον ποιήσας τῷ λαῷ ἢ τοῖς ἔθεσι τοῖς πατρῴοις, δέσμιος ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων παρεδόθην εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τῶν Ῥωμαίων·

[1] For ηλθ. (so Hilg.) ℵBI, Tisch., R.V., Blass, Weiss have **εισηλθομεν**; A so W.H. **εισηλθαμεν**. Before Ῥ. ℵ*L, Tisch., Hilg. read **την**.

[2] After Ῥ. T.R. adds **ο εκατονταρχος παρεδωκε τους δεσμιους τῳ στρατοπεδαρχῃ**. R.V. om. in text, not marg. The words are supported by HLP 137, Syr. H. c*, Gig., Par. Prov., Blass in **β**, Hilg., Zöckler. They are om. by ℵABI 13, 40, 61, Vulg., Syr. P., Syr. H. text, Boh., Arm., Chrys., Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt (read simply **επετραπη τῳ Π.**, if words are omitted); see further below.

[3] Before **συν τῳ φυλασσ. κ.τ.λ.** 137 Gig., Par., Prov read **εξω της παρεμβολης**; Blass in **β**, Hilg. (see Wendt's note, p. 420, 1899).

either of the Gospel of Christ, or of Paul the prisoner, even in Rome, may well have endued his soul with much strength. Bishop Lightfoot, *Phil.*, pp. 16, 17 (so too Hort, *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 113), thinks that the words may intimate that it was a relief to St. Paul to find that some members at least of the Roman Church were favourably disposed towards him; but, as Zöckler points out, there is certainly no proof here, at least, that the Church was composed preponderatingly of Jewish Christians, or that Paul was glad that he received a welcome in a Church so composed, and we have no direct evidence of the existence of an anti-Pauline Jewish party among the Roman Christians; but in the presence of the brethren St. Paul would see a proof that this love was not merely in word or in letter, but in deed and in truth: "videbat Christum etiam Romæ esse," Bengel.

Ver. 16.—**ἤλθομεν**, see critical note. They would enter by the Porta Capena. On the words which follow see critical note. They are retained by Blass and Ramsay, although these writers differ as to their interpretation, while Lightfoot, *Phil.*, pp. 7, 8, admitting that the balance of existing authorities is against them, inclines to see in the words a genuine tradition, even if no part of the original text. For Ramsay's view see above on xxvii. 1. Blass takes the expression **τῷ στρατ.** to refer to Afranius Burrus (and to this identification Lightfoot attaches much probability). It is striking that both before and after Burrus there were two "prefects," Tac., *Ann.*, xii., 42, xiv., 51, whereas Luke writes **τῷ στρατ.**, "*the* captain of the guard"; but on the other hand we can scarcely draw any decisive argument from this, because the writer may refer merely to the "prefect" in charge of this particular case, whether he had a colleague or not.—**καθ' ἑαυτόν**, see critical note for addition in **β** text. Not only the goodwill of the centurion, and the services which St. Paul had rendered, but also the terms in which Festus had reported the case in the *elogium*, would combine to secure this favour. The words do not imply that Paul was kept in prison in the camp apart from the other prisoners, but, as in vv. 23, 30, that he was allowed to have a house or lodging in the city (Ramsay); he could scarcely have summoned the Jews to the camp, ver. 17 (Bethge), see also Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 103.—**τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατ.**: *custodia militaris*, he was still bound to a soldier by a light chain, so that he could not go in and out as he pleased, but the form which his custody took has been well compared to that which Herod Agrippa underwent, who was confined at one time in Rome, Jos., *Ant.*, xviii., 6, 5, at first in the camp, and afterwards on the accession of Gaius in a house of his own, although still under military custody, *cf.* xxiv. 27.

Ver. 17. The whole section vv. 17-28 is referred by Hilgenfeld to the "author to Theophilus". In ver. 20 the Paul bound for the hope of Israel belongs only to the "author to Theophilus," *cf.* xxiii. 6, xxvi. 6; it is only the same author who still supposes him to bear

18. οἵτινες ἀνακρίναντές με ἐβούλοντο ἀπολῦσαι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου ὑπάρχειν ἐν ἐμοί. 19. ἀντιλεγόντων δὲ τῶν Ἰουδαίων,[1] ἠναγκάσθην ἐπικαλέσασθαι Καίσαρα, οὐχ ὡς τοῦ ἔθνους μου ἔχων τι

[1] After Ιουδαιων 137, Syr. H. c*, add και επικραζοντων· αιρε τον εχθρον ημων (*cf.* xxi. 36, xxii. 22, xxv. 24), so Blass in β, Hilg., Zöckler; and after κατηγορειν (ℵAB) the same authorities with Gig., Par., Prov. add αλλ' ινα λυτρωσωμαι τ. ψυχην μου εκ θανατου.

the chain, xxvi. 29, which according to xxii. 29, 30, had been long removed. A reference to the passages in question is sufficient to show the unreasonableness of this criticism. In this same section Clemen can only see his two redactors, Judaicus and Antijudaicus, at work again, the latter in vv. 25-28, and the former in vv. 16-24. But it will be noticed that Wendt (1899) still allows that an historical kernel lies at the foundation of the narrative, and although he does not speak so unhesitatingly as in 1888, he still allows that it is not inconceivable that Paul soon after his arrival in Rome should seek to enter into relations with the Jews there, to convince them if possible of his innocence, and to prevent any unfavourable influences on their part upon his trial.—**μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς**: an intimation of Paul's continuous energy; the previous days may well have been employed in receiving his own friends, and in making his summons known.—**τῶν Ἰου.**: the edict of Claudius, *cf.* xviii. 2, had evidently been very transient in its effects, and the Jews soon returned; possibly they may only have emigrated to the neighbourhood, *e.g.*, to Aricia (Schürer).—**πρώτους**, *cf.* xiii. 50, xxv. 2, Luke xix. 47, here including the ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, the γερουσιάρχαι, the ἄρχοντες and others, Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. xxiii., or the word may perhaps be used of social distinction, including the officers named. The Jews in Rome were divided into no less than seven synagogues. It does not of course follow that all came in answer to the Apostle's characteristic summons, as he always turned to his countrymen first. Rendall renders "those that were of the Jews first," as if Paul invited first the members of the synagogues who were Jews, intending to reserve the devout Gentiles for the second place; see R.V. renderings *in loco*.—**συνελθ.**: it was natural that Paul should thus assemble them, and that he should then endeavour to show that although a prisoner he was guiltless of any offence against the Jewish nation; otherwise he could not expect the representatives of his people to listen to his message; so far it would be difficult to find an intimation of anything unhistorical (see Blass, *in loco*).—**ἐγὼ**: the word probably occurring first, W.H., R.V. Weiss, seems to indicate from its emphatic position that the Apostle's chief concern on this occasion was to vindicate himself.—**ἔλεγε**: imperfect, "quia expectatur responsum," Blass, see note on iii. 3.—**ἀδελφοὶ . . . λαῷ . . . πατρῴοις**: all indicate the same conciliatory spirit: "mira certe Pauli mansuetudo" (Calvin).—**ποιήσας**: "though I had done," R.V., *i.e.*, at the time he was taken prisoner there had been nothing done by him to merit such treatment.—**τῷ λαῷ**, *cf.* xxi. 28. The man who could write Rom. ix. 1 ff. and 1 Cor. vii. 18 (*cf.* ix. 21) might justly use such words.—**παρεδόθην**, *cf.* xxi. 11. The words ascribe primarily to the Jews a share in the imprisonment of which they appear as only the indirect cause, *cf.* xxi. 33, but Paul summarises the chief points and does not enter into minute details; moreover his words were strictly true, for he would have been freed by the Romans in Jerusalem had not the outcry of the Jews stamped him as a malefactor. For similar instances of a main summary *cf.* ii. 23, xiii. 29, xxi. 11, xxiii. 27.

Ver. 18. **ἀνακ.**, *cf.* xxiv. 8, xxv. 6, 26, referring here to the judicial inquiries of Felix and Festus.

Ver. 19. **ἀντιλ.**: the word is a mild one to describe the bitter enmity of the Jews ("clementer dicit," Bengel); they are not actually represented as speaking against Paul's acquittal, although they are evidently presupposed as doing so by the proposal of Festus, xxv. 9, and by the belief that sooner or later he would fall a victim to their plots the Apostle was no doubt compelled (ἠναγκάσθην) to appeal. Holtzmann seems to forget the part played by the Jews, and their bitter enmity, when he says that in reality Paul was compelled to appeal not by the Jews, but by Festus; see also critical note.—**τοῦ ἔθνους μου**: they were still his nation,

κατηγορῆσαι. 20. διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν παρεκάλεσα ὑμᾶς ἰδεῖν καὶ προσλαλῆσαι[1]· ἕνεκεν γὰρ τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν ἅλυσιν ταύτην περίκειμαι. 21. οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπον, Ἡμεῖς οὔτε γράμματα περὶ σοῦ ἐδεξάμεθα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, οὔτε παραγενόμενός τις[2] τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀπήγγειλεν ἢ ἐλάλησέ τι περὶ σοῦ πονηρόν. 22. ἀξιοῦμεν δὲ παρὰ σοῦ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ φρονεῖς. περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς αἱρέσεως

[1] **εινεκεν** the Ionic form is supported by ℵ*A, W.H., Weiss, Blass.

[2] After **τις** Blass in β, so Hilg. add **απο Ιεροσολυμων** with Gig., Syr. Pesh.

and he was not ashamed to call them so, as a true patriot, when he stood before a foreign tribunal; *cf.* xxiv. 17, xxvi. 4, "see what friendliness of expression, he does not hold them in odium," Chrysostom.

Ver. 20. **διὰ ταύτην . . . προσλαλῆσαι**: "for this cause therefore did I intreat you to see and to speak with *me*," R.V. text; in margin a comma is placed after **ὑμᾶς**, "call for you, to see and to speak with *you*": but the former seems the more likely, for as a prisoner St. Paul would hardly go out into the synagogue.—**ἕνεκεν**, see critical note; if **εἵνεκεν**, the word is only used by St. Luke amongst the Evangelists; *cf.* Luke iv. 18 (quotation), xviii. 29, and elsewhere only by St. Paul, 2 Cor. iii. 10; Ionic form (see Winer-Schmiedel, p. 50).—**τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ Ἰ.**, *cf.* xxvi. 6.—**περίκειμαι**: for construction, Winer-Moulton, xxxii., 5; *cf.* 4 Macc. xii. 3; Clem. Rom., 2 *Cor.*, i., 6 (*bis*). Nothing could be more pathetic than this reference to the chain, *cf.* Ephes. iii. 1, iv. 1, vi. 20; the words might well serve as an introduction to what was to follow, the Christian prisoner and the Jewish leaders all had "one hope of their calling," and in that hope they and he were one.

Ver. 21. **πρὸς αὐτὸν**: the emphatic position of the words may indicate, as Weiss suggests, that as Paul had spoken to them up to this point of a personal matter, so they in reply spoke with a like reference.—**οὔτε γράμματα**, *i.e.*, no official letters from the Sanhedrim—this was practically impossible, for it is not likely that any ship had left Cæsarea before Paul's departure with such intelligence (so Weiss, Blass, Hackett).—**τῶν ἀδελ.**, *i.e.*, of the Jewish nation, *cf.* ver. 17. The Jews do not assert that they know nothing of Paul, but only that with reference to the statement which he had just made they had received no report (**ἀπήγ.**, *cf.* R.V., so iv. 23), or had any of his countrymen spoken evil of him. The aorists point to this limitation of the assertion (Page's note, and Nösgen, *in loco*), and this view prevents us from seeing any contradiction between vv. 21 and 22, for if the statement in the former verse be taken quite generally of Paul's work, the Jews contradicted themselves in ver. 22, where they evidently include Paul in this sect (**ταύτης**), of which they knew that it was everywhere spoken against.—**πονηρόν**: the stress need not be laid on this word, as if the sentence meant that they had heard something about Paul, but nothing evil; it may well have been chosen with reference to the Apostle's own expression, **οὐδὲν ἐναντίον**.

Ver. 22. **ἀξιοῦμεν δὲ**: "but we think good," *cf.* xv. 38. They acknowledge that no report had reached them to invalidate the statements which Paul had just made as to the causes of his imprisonment, but (**δέ**) they would hear not from others, but from himself (**παρὰ σοῦ**).—**ἃ φρονεῖς**: evidently no reference to any special view of Christianity as characterising St. Paul's own teaching, but a reference to his claim to be imprisoned for the hope of Israel.—**αἱρ.** . Christianity was for them only a sect, and therefore they could not understand the Apostle's identification of it with the Jewish national hope. See note on ver. 17.—**γνωστόν . . . ἡμῖν**: if the view is correct that the edict of Claudius, see chap. xviii. 2, was occasioned by the early preaching of Christianity in Rome, it is possible that the dislocation of the Jewish community then caused may help at all events to explain why the Christian Church in Rome did not grow out of the Jewish synagogue in the capital to the same context as elsewhere, see Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, pp. xxi, xxii. It may no doubt be urged that the Christian Church in Rome was not entirely a heathen-Christian Church, and that, as the names in Rom. xvi. indicate, it contained a Jewish element. But it is quite con-

ταύτης γνωστόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν ὅτι πανταχοῦ ἀντιλέγεται.[1] 23. Ταξάμενοι δὲ αὐτῷ ἡμέραν,[2] ἧκον πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξενίαν πλείονες· οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, πείθων τε αὐτοὺς τὰ[3] περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἀπό τε τοῦ νόμου Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, ἀπὸ πρωῒ ἕως ἑσπέρας. 24. καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐπείθοντο τοῖς λεγομένοις,

[1] At the end Blass in β with Gig., Par. adds **εν ολῃ τῃ οικουμενῃ**.

[2] For **ηκον** ℵAB (A **ηλθαν** so W.H.) have **ηλθον**.

[3] **τα** before **περι** *om.* ℵABH Vulg., Boh., Syr. P. and H., Tisch., W.H., R.V. Weiss, Blass, Hilg.

ceivable that in the capital, with its two million inhabitants, the Jews, who had only recently returned to the city, should know nothing beyond what is here indicated in such general terms of a poor and obscure sect who dwelt no longer in the Jewish quarter. It is also worthy of consideration that the Jews of Rome, whilst not guilty of any untruth in what they had just said as to their knowledge of the Christian sect, may have expressed themselves in this guarded manner from political reasons. If St. Paul's statement in ver. 18 as to the favourable bearing of the Roman authorities towards him was true, it was but natural that the Jews should wish to refrain from hasty or hostile action towards a prisoner who was evidently treated with consideration in his bonds; they would rather act thus than revive an old quarrel which might again lead to their own political insecurity, see especially Lightfoot, *Philippians*, pp. 15, 16; Felten, *in loco;* and, further, Rendall, p. 352. Nothing said by the Jews contradicts the existence of a Christian community in Rome, nor is it said that they wished to learn the Christian tenets from Paul, as if they knew nothing of them from their own knowledge, or as if they knew nothing of the causes of the opposition to the Christian faith; motives of curiosity and of policy might well have prompted a desire to hear Paul speak for himself, and with such motives there was apparently mingled a tone of contempt for a sect of which they might fairly say, from the experience of their countrymen, and from their own experience in Rome, **πανταχοῦ ἀντιλέγεται**: **ἀντιλ.** Lucan-Pauline; only once elsewhere; *cf.* John xix. 12. See β text above.

Ver. 23. **ταξάμενοι**: *cf.* Matt. xxviii. 16, and Polyb., xviii., 36, 1, for a similar phrase; a mutual arrangement between the two parties; only here in the middle voice in Acts.—**τὴν ξενίαν**: may = **τὸ μίσθωμα**, ver. 30 (Weiss, Holtzmann), or it may refer to entertainment in the house of a friend, *cf.* xxi. 16, and Philem., ver. 22. Lewin urges that although we can well understand that Paul's friends would wish to entertain him, we have no evidence that the strictness of the military guard was thus far relaxed, and he also presses the fact that Suidas and Hesychius explain **ξενία** = **κατάλυμα, καταγώγιον,** as if it meant a place of sojourn for hire; see especially for the whole question Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 238; but see on the other hand Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 9, who lays stress on N.T. passages quoted above, and Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.*—**πλείονες**: more than at the first time; Blass takes it as = *plurimi*, *cf.* ii. 40, xiii. 31.—**ἐξετίθετο,** *cf.* xi. 4, xviii. 26, and in vii. 21 in a different sense, nowhere else in N.T. J. Weiss and Vogel both lay stress upon the recurrence of the word in the medical writer Dioscorides; for other references, Grimm-Thayer, *sub v.* It is possible that the middle here, as in xi. 4, gives it a reflexive force, the Apostle vindicates his own conduct (Rendall).—**Μωσέως**: from the law of Moses, whose enemy he was represented to be, no less than from the Prophets.—**πείθων** *suavissime*, Bengel; on the conative present participle see Burton, p. 59, but here the word is used not simply *de conatu;* it refers here to the persuasive power of St. Paul's words, although it does not say that his words resulted in conviction.—**ἀπὸ πρωῒ ἕως ἑσπέρας,** *cf.* for similar expressions Exod. xviii. 13, 14 A, Job iv. 20 AS, and other passages where **πρωῒθεν** is similarly used (H. and R.).

Ver. 24. **οἱ μὲν . . . οἱ δὲ . . .**, *cf.* xiv. 4, xvii. 32, whether the verb means simply listened to what was said (Rendall), or simply denotes an attitude of receptivity (Nösgen), the fact that Paul addresses to both classes his final words indicates that the degree of belief to

οἱ δὲ ἠπίστουν. 25.[1] ἀσύμφωνοι δὲ ὄντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀπελύοντο, εἰπόντος τοῦ Παύλου ῥῆμα ἕν, "Ὅτι καλῶς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐλάλησε διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας[2] ἡμῶν, λέγον, 26. "Πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπέ, Ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε, καὶ

[1] After ασυμ. ℵ*, Vulg., Syr. Pesh. read τε, so Tisch., but Lach., W.H., Weiss, Blass, Hilg. follow T.R. (Wendt doubtful).

[2] For ημων ℵAB Syr. Pesh., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass in β, Hilg., Weiss, Wendt read υμων. Instead of λεγον (so Blass, Hilg.) ℵBLP, Tisch., W.H., Weiss, Wendt have λεγων.

which they attained was not sufficient to convince even the well-disposed Jews to throw in their lot with Paul. Perhaps it is best to remember that the tenses are in the imperfect: "some were being persuaded of the things, etc.," and this also keeps up the reference to the previous πείθων, *persuadere studens* (Blass, Plumptre).—οἱ δὲ ἠπίσ.: "and some disbelieved," R.V., or "continued in their disbelief". The verb only here in Acts, but *cf.* Luke xxiv. 11, 41, Mark xvi. 11, 16, 1 Pet. ii. 7, Wisd. x. 7, xii. 17, xviii. 13 (see H. and R.), etc.

Ver. 25. ἀσύμφωνοι, *cf.* Wisd. xviii. 19 and Dan., LXX, Bel., ver. 15; *cf.* for the phrase Diod. Sic., iv., 1, the word is found in Josephus, but also in classical Greek.—δέ: the best attested reading marks sharply and emphatically the turn of affairs; there may have been Pharisees among the well-disposed Jews, and to these Paul may have made an appeal when the hope of Israel, now as formerly, was in question, *cf.* xxiii. 6; but if so, they would not decide to rank themselves amongst "the Pharisees that believed" however imperfectly, and of them as well of the unbelievers the writer can only say ἀπελύοντο, *cf.* for middle Exod. xxxiii. 11, and so Polyb., iii., 34, 12.—εἰπόντος τοῦ Π.: the words do not mean that they departed because Paul so spoke, but almost = ἀπολυομένων εἶπεν (so Blass, Nösgen). It may be that Paul's words of censure were partly directed against the spirit which prompted the Jews to depart all together; in other words to suppress the differences which had evidently arisen amongst them, for the sake of an outward show of fellowship, lest they should again be charged as *tumultuantes* (Nösgen); but beyond all this, in their absence of brotherly love for one who still claimed them as his ἀδελφοί, in the unbelief of some, in the want of the courage of their convictions in others, St. Paul saw a fulfilment of that hardness and dulness of heart of which the prophet had spoken.—ῥῆμα ἕν: "*one* word," emphatically drawing attention to the prophetical utterance which followed; it was evening, the night was drawing on, and (ver. 23) so too for the disbelieving nation: the day was far spent, the night was at hand (Bethge).—καλῶς, *cf.* Matt. xv. 7, Mark vii. 6, 9 (as in these two passages placed first with strong indignation, Page), xii. 28, Luke xx. 39, the word often occurs in St. Paul's Epistles. It is remarkable that the same prophetic quotation with which the Christ had opened His teaching by parables, which is cited in all four of the Evangelists, should thus form the solemn close of the historical books of the N.T. See above on Matt. xiii. 14, Mark iv. 12, Luke viii. 10, and John xii. 40, where the same words are quoted by St. John to explain the rejection of Christ's own teaching, just as here by St. Paul to explain the rejection of the teaching about Christ. "Est hoc extremum dictum Pauli in Actis, neque fortuito esse videtur; totius enim fere libri summam continet ad gentis evangelium a Judæis jam translatum esse, quippe spretum ab eis" (Blass), *cf.* the course of events in Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, xiii. 42, xviii. 6, xix. 9.—τὸ Π. τὸ Ἅ.: the solemnity of the words is intensified by thus introducing the Holy Ghost, rather than merely the human agent, as Himself speaking (see also critical note); and not only so, but by thus intimating that they were resisting not man but God, *cf.* vii. 51.—ἡμῶν: if we read ὑμῶν the word indicates that St. Paul would not identify himself with the unbelieving Jews, *cf.* vii. 52, the indignant words of St. Stephen, which the speaker had himself heard.

Ver. 26. πορεύθητι . . . εἰπέ: the quotation is accurately taken from the LXX, Isai. vi. 9, 10, and the first line is additional to the words otherwise given in full by St. Matthew; as the speaker is the messenger to the Jews who condemns

οὐ μὴ συνῆτε· καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε. 27. ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶ βαρέως ἤκουσαν, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν· μήποτε ἴδωσι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσι, καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσι καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσι, καὶ ἰάσωμαι[1] αὐτούς." 28. γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν, ὅτι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη[2] τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται.[3] 29. καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος, ἀπῆλθον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, πολλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς συζήτησιν.

[1] For ιασωμαι (so Lach.) ℵABHLP, Sev. Theophl., so Tisch., Weiss, W.H., Wendt, Blass, Hilg. read ιασομαι.

[2] After απεσταλη ℵ*AB Vulg., Syr. P. and H., Aethpp., Tisch., W.H., R.V., Blass, Weiss, Wendt, Hilg. read τουτο.

[3] The whole of the verse is wanting in ℵABE 13, 40, 61, 68, so in W.H., Weiss, but retained by Blass in β, Hilg., with HLP, Syr. H. c*, Vulg.Clem., Gig., Par. Wendt describes it as an interpolation, *cf.* ver. 25, see also Lightfoot *On a Fresh Revision*, etc., p. 29; Blass, *Phil. of the Gospels*, p. 92.

this hardness of heart, he applies to himself the word πορ.

Ver. 27. ἰάσωμαι, see critical note; the indicative future as in R.V. adds to the force and vigour of the passage; after μή it represents the action of the verb as more vividly realised as possible and probable than is the case when the subjunctive is used (Page), see also Winer-Moulton, lvi., 2*a*; Bethge, p. 331; *cf.* Luke xii. 58, Acts xxi. 24 (Blass). It is significant that Luke the physician should thus cite as almost the last words of his record a prophecy ending with ἰάσομαι (Plummer, *St. Luke*, Introd., p. lxvi.).

Ver. 28. γνωστὸν οὖν: for the word similarly used *cf.* ii. 14, iv. 10; xiii. 38.—τοῦτο τὸ σωτ., see critical note; *cf.* LXX, Ps. lxvi. 2, xcvii. 2, 3. σωτ., adjective, neuter of σωτήριος, used substantively (as in classical Greek), so often in LXX of the Messianic salvation; *cf.* Luke ii. 30, iii. 6, Ephes. vi. 17, and Clem. Rom., *Cor.*, xxxv., 12, xxxvi., 1. The word is used only by St. Luke and St. Paul, see Plummer, note on Luke iii. 6. For the whole expression here *cf.* xiii. 26, where words very similar are used by Paul, and with very similar results, ver. 46. τοῦτο, emphatic this, the very message of God's salvation, this is what I am declaring to you.—αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται: "they will also hear," R.V. The words thus rendered may not convey so plainly a reproach to the Jews as in A.V., but at the same time they express something more than the mere fact that Gentiles as well as Jews will now hear the message; that message will not only be sent (ἀπεστάλη), but *also* heard; the καί may well indicate that whilst the Jews will hear with the ear only as distinct from the understanding, the Gentiles will not only hear, but really (καί) listen (see Rendall and Weiss, *in loco*). At the same time we must remember that as a background to what the Apostle here says we have his words in Rom. ix.-xi., and the thought which he had expressed to the Roman Church that God had not really cast away His people, but whilst through their unbelief the Gentiles had been called, yet that inclusion of the heathen in the Messianic kingdom would rouse the Jews to jealousy, and that thus all Israel would be saved, Rom. xi. 11; *cf.* x. 19; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 341 ff. We can scarcely doubt that the words are uttered not merely to condemn, but to lead to repentance; at all events it would not be possible to find stronger words against his own countrymen than those written by St. Paul in his earliest Epistle, 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16; and yet we know how St. Paul, for those same countrymen, could wish himself accused; so Bethge, as against Overbeck, who can only see that in Acts the belief of the Gentiles results not in a noble jealousy, but in the bitter envy of the Jews. But there blends with the tone of sadness a note of triumph in the words αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται, the future of his message is assured, and we may borrow two words as an inscription for these closing pages of St. Luke's second treatise—the last word of the Apostle, and the last of the historian

30.[1] Ἔμεινε δὲ ὁ Παῦλος διετίαν ὅλην ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι, καὶ ἀπεδέχετο πάντας τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους[2] πρὸς αὐτόν, 31. κηρύσσων

[1] For εμεινε (Lach., Blass, Hilg.) ℵ*B 13, 61, Tisch., W.H., R.V., Wendt, Weiss have ενεμεινε; Blass in β has μενων with Par. ο Π. *om.* W.H., R.V., Weiss (not Blass, Hilg.), *cf.* αυτον for τον Π. in ver. 17, R.V., W.H.

[2] After προς αυτον 137 Syr. H. c*, Gig., Par. add Ιουδαιους τε και Ελληνας explanatory of παντας, so Blass in β text, Hilg.; Blass also adds και διελεγετο προς before the inserted words just mentioned, with Gig., Par. Χριστου *om.* by Tisch., Hilg., with ℵ* Syr. H.

—ἀκούσονται . . . ἀκωλύτως—the word of God was heard and welcomed, and that word was not bound, see the suggestive remarks of Bethge, p. 335, and Zöckler on ver. 31.

Ver. 29. See critical note.—συζήτησιν, *rixa*, Blass; possibly this may have helped to delay the Apostle's trial, as apparently some of the Jews would not have moved in the matter.

Ver. 30. ἔμεινε δὲ: Blass (so also Hackett, Lekebusch) makes the important remark that the aorist shows that Paul's condition was changed after the two years, *cf.* ἐκάθισε, xviii. 11 (see also Burton, pp. 19, 20). When, therefore, Luke wrote his history, the inference is that the Apostle had been liberated either from prison or by death. Blass indicates another change, *viz.*, that he may have been removed into the prætorium, and that his trial was just coming on.—ἰδίῳ μισθ., see above on ver. 23. That the Apostle should have been able to hire a house at his own expense receives confirmation from the coincidence with Phil. iv. 10, 14, 18; others have suggested (Wendt, 1899, Knabenbauer) that he may have gained the means of hiring it by his own work. See in this connection Rendel Harris, *Four Lectures, etc.*, pp. 50, 51, and the extract from the Armenian Version of Ephrem's Commentary on the Acts. It would seem that Ephrem imagined that the rent of the lodging was paid by the proceeds of the cloak and books (2 Tim. iv. 13). Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 9, holds that ἰδίῳ certainly distinguishes the μίσθωμα here from the ξενία above, see his note, and Grimm-Thayer, *in loco*. It is quite true that μίσθωμα is not used in this sense of a hired house elsewhere (indeed it is used especially of the wages of hire in a bad sense, Deut. xxiii. 18, Mic. i. 7, Ezek. xvi. 31), but Lightfoot admits that it may be used here exceptionally as a translation of the Latin *conductum*, meaning here a suite of apartments only, not the whole house (Lewin), the Latin *meritoria* (*sc. loca*) seems to be used very much in this same double sense of μίσθωμα.—διετίαν ὅλην, *cf.* xxiv. 27, only in Luke, not in classical Greek, but in Philo (see also Grimm-Thayer, and Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, p. 86), so too τριετίαν only in Luke; see on xx. 31. The two years were spent not only in preaching, but in writing, as we may fairly believe, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians.—ἀπεδέχετο, see above, xv. 4, xxi. 7, apparently greater freedom than in Cæsarea, xxiv. 23; if it was not for the notice in Phil. i. 13, 17, we might almost suppose that the Apostle was liberated on security or on bail; *cf.* the account of the imprisonment of Agrippa I. in Rome; see p. 486.—πάντας: all, both Jews and Gentiles; not only the latter, as Bengel thought: "neminem excludebat Dei exemplo," Grotius.—εἰσπορ., see on ix. 28, most frequent in Luke, Friedrich, p. 7; see critical note.

Ver. 31. τὰ περὶ: on the phrase see p. 481.—τοῦ Κ. Ἰ. Χ., see critical note, and *cf.* xi. 17, xv. 26, the full phrase corresponds with the solemn conclusion of the book.—μετὰ π. παῤῥ.: the phrase with or without πάσης four times in Acts, and nowhere else in N.T., see on p. 128. In Jerusalem by the Twelve, iv. 29, and in Rome no less than in Jerusalem by St. Paul, the witness was given "with all boldness," *cf.* Phil. i. 14; and so the promise in the vision vouchsafed to the Apostle of the Gentiles was verified, xxiii. 11, and the aim of the Gentile historian fulfilled when the Gospel was thus preached boldly and openly, ἕως ἐσχ. τῆς γῆς, see note on i. 8.—ἀκωλύτως: "eadem plane dicuntur in ep. ad Phil. Roma data, i. 12 sqq.," Blass, and the word of God had free course and was glorified. The adverb is found in Plato, Epict., Herodian, and also in Josephus. In LXX the adjective is found in Wisd. vii. 22, and the adverb is used by Symm., Job xxxiv. 31. There is a note of triumph in the word, Bengel, Zöckler,

τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,[1] καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μετὰ πάσης παῤῥησίας ἀκωλύτως.

[1] Blass with Syr. H., demid. tol., Par., Wern., Prov. reconstructs β text after του Θεου: διισχυριζομενος και λεγων ακωλυτως, οτι ουτος εστιν ο Χ. ο υιος του Θεου, δι' ου μελλει πας ο κοσμος κρινεσθαι, and *cf.* Hilg. with variations in former part, but identical after ακωλ.

and we may note with Wordsworth and Page the cadence of these concluding words, μετα π. π. ἀκωλ. But all this does not forbid the view that the writer intended to give a third book to complete his work. This latter view is strongly insisted upon by Prof. Ramsay, *St. Paul*, p. 23 ff., while Bishop Lightfoot, B.D.[2], i., 27, can see no conceivable plea for any third treatise, if the purpose of the narrative is completed by Paul coming to Rome and there delivering his message, so, although less strongly, Harnack, *Chron.*, i., p. 248, see note on i. 8. But Prof. Ramsay has received the strong support not only of Zöckler, and curiously enough of Spitta, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 318, but still more recently amongst English writers of Rendall, and in Germany of Dr. Zahn. Just as in St. Luke's Gospel xxiv. 44 forms not merely a starting-point for, but an anticipation of, the succeeding history, or just as xxiv. 44-53 contain in a summary what is afterwards related in greater detail, Acts i. and ii., so in vv. 30, 31 of Acts xxviii. we have, as it were, a brief sketch of what succeeded the events hitherto recorded, and an anticipation of what followed upon them. This probability remains quite apart from the additional force which is given to it if Ramsay is right in regarding πρῶτος, Acts i. 1, as signifying not simply πρότερος, but the first of a series, a view strongly supported by Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii., p. 371. Certainly the aorist, ver. 30 (see above), and the expression διετίαν ὅλην seem to show that some fact was known to the writer which followed the close of the two years, and we can therefore hardly say that he wrote no more because he knew no more, unless we also suppose that he wrote his history at the conclusion and not during the course of the two years. This he may have done while the result of St. Paul's first trial was still unknown, although Phil. i. 25-27, ii. 24, Philem. ver. 22, show us plainly with what confidence the Apostle awaited the issue. At all events almost any conjecture seems more probable than that the writer should have concluded so abruptly if he had nothing more to chronicle than the immediate and tragic death of his hero! Zöckler, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 162, Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, I., 15, 16. To say with Jülicher, *Einleitung*, p. 27, that he refrained from doing this because in such an event he would chronicle not the triumph but the defeat of the Gospel is certainly a strange argument, and no one has given a better answer to it than Harnack by asking, Since when did the early Christians regard martyrdom as a defeat? Is the death of Christ, or of Stephen, in the mind of the author of Acts a defeat? is it not rather a triumph? *Chron.*, i., 247. The elaborate discussion of the abrupt conclusion in Acts by Wendt, 1899, pp. 31, 32, is entirely based upon the assumption that Luke was not the author of Acts, and that therefore this author, whoever he was, wrote no more because his information failed him, and he knew no more. This could not have been so in the case of Luke, who was with the Apostle at Rome, as we have from undoubted testimony quite apart from Acts. See further Introd. For the release of St. Paul, his subsequent journeys to Spain and to the East, and his second imprisonment, see in support, Zahn, *Einleitung*, i., p. 435 ff., Harnack, *Chron.*, i., 239, Spitta, *u. s.*, Salmon, *Introd.*, p. 403 ff., *Die zweite römische Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus*, Steinmeyer (1897), and *Critical Review* (July), 1898. There were many possible reasons why the hearing of St. Paul's appeal was so long delayed. The record of the previous proceedings forwarded by Festus may have been lost in the wreck, and it was therefore necessary to wait for fresh official information, as the prisoner's accusers had not arrived. And when they arrived, it is very possible that they may have been glad to interpose fresh obstacles, and that they would be content to keep Paul bound as before; as evidence was probably wanted, not only from Jerusalem, but from various parts of the empire, the interposition of these fresh delays was easy. St. Paul had

himself suggested that the Jews in Asia ought to be summoned, or to be present, xxiv. 19. That such delays would not be unusual we may learn from Tacitus, *e.g.*, *Ann.*, xiii., 43; *cf.* Suet., *Nero*, 15. When we remember how long a delay occurred in the case of the Jewish priests, the friends of Josephus, *Vita*, 3, who were sent to Rome by Felix to plead their cause, it ceases to be surprising that St. Paul was detained so long without a trial; see on the whole question Lewin, *St. Paul*, ii., 277 ff.; Lightfoot, *Phil.*, p. 4; Knabenbauer, *Actus Apostolorum*, pp. 453, 454, 1899.

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE

TO THE

ROMANS

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

Of the beginnings of Christianity in Rome nothing whatever is known on direct evidence. The tradition which assigns the founding of the Church there to Peter cannot possibly be maintained. In one form it assumes that Peter, on the occasion referred to in Acts xii. 17, travelled to Rome, and there propagated the Church from the synagogue as a centre. As this departure of Peter from Jerusalem took place, on the usual reckoning, about 42 A.D., there would be time for his twenty-five years' episcopate of Rome, which was once the accepted Romish idea, though now given up even by Romish scholars. But it is clear from the book of Acts (chap. xv.) that Peter was in Jerusalem ten years after this, and it is equally clear from the Epistle to the Romans that he had not been in Rome when this letter was written, seven years later still. In face of a passage like chap. xv. 20 it is impossible to suppose that the Church of Rome had already been the scene of another Apostle's labours. Three years later, when Paul at length arrived in Rome, it had still been unvisited by Peter, to judge from what we read in Acts xxviii.; and even when he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, towards the close of his first imprisonment, there is no indication that his brother Apostle had yet seen the capital. The earliest tradition represents Peter and Paul as in Rome together, and, indeed, as suffering together, in the Neronian persecution. All the evidence for this will be found in Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, II., xxv. What the worth of it is, it is not easy to say. It is not incredible that Peter may have been in Rome about the date in question, especially if Babylon in 1 Peter v. 13 means Rome, as it does in the Apocalypse. But in any case Peter can have had no direct part in founding the Church. In Iren., iii., 1, 2, Peter and Paul are spoken of as "preaching the Gospel in Rome, and founding the Church," at the time that Matthew published his gospel,

That Christianity was there long before this time is indubitable, but the Roman Christians, it has been suggested (see Harvey's note on Iren. *ad loc.*), "appear neither to have had an ecclesiastical polity nor to have been under the regular regimen of the Church. . . . Several expressions in the epistle seem to indicate a crude, unsettled state of things there. . . . They are spoken of as depending rather upon mutual exhortation and instruction than upon any more authoritative communication of evangelical truth (xv. 14) . . . and the Apostle expresses his intention to visit them, according to a purpose entertained ἀπὸ πολλῶν ἐτῶν [ἱκανῶν is the true reading] with the hope that he might come ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *i.e.*, in the collation of spiritual gifts which as yet they had not, and in the establishment of that Apostolical order and government among them which should complete their incorporation with the Body Catholic of Christ's Church." It is quite true that the epistle reveals nothing of the organisation of the Church at Rome, but it reveals just as little of any intention on Paul's part to bestow on the Church the supposed benefits of "Apostolical order and government". The assumption underlying this expression is quite unhistorical. There was no uniform legal organisation of the Church in the apostolic age; and the Christians in Rome not only depended upon mutual exhortation and instruction, but, as Paul acknowledges, were well able to do so. They had χαρίσματα differing according to the grace given to them, and if they had no legal organisation, they had a vital and spiritual differentiation of organs and functions, for which the other is but a makeshift (chap. xii. 3-8). Sanday and Headlam think that though the Church did not, in the strict sense, owe its origin to Peter and Paul, it may well have owed to them its first existence as an organised whole (Commentary, p. xxxv.). This may be, for it was Paul's habit to appoint elders in all the churches he planted (Acts xiv. 23, Tit. i. 5); but, as the gospel was known at Rome, and believers were baptised there, and no doubt observed the Lord's Supper, it is clear that no particular organisation was wanted either to ensure or to perfect their standing as Christians.

Where tradition fails, we can only fall back on conjecture—conjecture to be verified by its coherence with what the epistle itself reveals. In this connection it has long been customary to refer to Acts ii. 10 (οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες Ῥωμαῖοι). There were Roman Jews in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and even if they were domiciled there and did not return to Rome, there must have been many visitors who did. The Jews in Rome were numbered by thousands; they occupied a large ward of the city, beyond the

Tiber, by themselves, and they had ceaseless communications with Jerusalem. Hence many have supposed that Christianity came to Rome by some such channel as this. If it did, we should expect it to have originated in the synagogues, the existence of nine of which is definitely attested (Sanday and Headlam, p. xxiv.). The epistle itself gives no direct evidence of any such connection : if the Church originated in the synagogue at Rome, the connection had been completely severed by the time Paul wrote. It has been supposed that the well-known sentence in Suetonius, *Claud.*, 25 ("Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit": see also Acts xviii. 2) refers to conflicts which arose in the synagogues over the alleged Messiahship of Jesus, and that the separation of the Church and the synagogue, and even a change in the prevailing complexion of the Church, which from Jewish-Christian became mainly Gentile-Christian, date from this event; but no stress can be laid on this. It is clear from Acts xxviii. 17-22 that when Paul came to Rome the leaders of the synagogue either knew nothing or affected to know nothing about the new sect which was growing up beside them. This makes it at least improbable, whatever its actual origin, that the Christian Church at Rome can have had strongly Jewish sympathies. Besides, even if the Church had originated in the synagogue, it is practically certain, from the analogy of other places whose history is known, that the mass of the members would not be Jews by birth, but of the class of proselytes (εὐσεβεῖς, φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν), whose attachment to Judaism was less rigid, and whose spiritual receptivity was as a rule greater.

Many scholars, impressed by these considerations, have sought rather a Gentile-Christian origin for the Church. Communication, they point out, was constant, not only between Rome and Jerusalem, but between Rome and all the East, and especially all the great towns. There was constant coming and going between Rome and such cities as Antioch, Corinth and Ephesus, not to mention others which had been the scene of Paul's labours. Early Christianity, too, was largely self-propagating. "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts viii. 4). Hort (*Romans and Ephesians*, p. 9) speaks of "a process of quiet and as it were fortuitous filtration"; and it was probably by such a process, initiated, suspended, and renewed on different occasions, that the new religion was introduced to Rome. To conceive the matter in this way is no doubt to conceive it very indefinitely, but it is hardly possible to go further. Attempts have been made to do so. Assuming, for instance, that chap. xvi. is in its right place, and really formed part of

the Epistle to the Romans, it has been argued that the large number of friends and acquaintances Paul had in the Church, and especially the conspicuous place given to his old associates Prisca and Aquila, prove that the Christianity of the Romans was essentially of the Pauline type, and that the Church therefore owed its origin and its character, indirectly no doubt, to him. The epistle certainly does not bear this on its face; Paul never says a word which implies that the Romans owed anything, even remotely, to him; there is rather an impression of regret that they did not. Besides, it is a mistake to assume that all Paul's friends were necessarily "Paulinists"—an expression which neither he nor they could have understood. Among those at Rome, and among the most important, as we should judge by the honourable terms in which they are mentioned (xvi. 7), were some who had been Christians longer than he; and "the quiet and as it were fortuitous filtration" was that of Christianity, undoubtedly of some universal type, but not distinctively of Paulinism.

CHAPTER II.

CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

HARDLY any question in New Testament criticism has been more elaborately discussed than this. The traditional opinion was that the Church consisted of Gentile Christians. The idea that it consisted of Jewish Christians, first broached apparently by Koppe in 1824, gained currency through Baur, and for a generation after his essay (1836) commanded wide assent among critics. A strong protest in favour of the old opinion was kept up all the time, but it was not till 1876 that Weizsäcker produced a decisive reaction in its favour. The great mass of the Church, he argued, must have been Gentile-Christian, though there was no doubt a Jewish-Christian minority. An attempt to construct a theory answering more closely to the facts presented by the epistle is that of Beyschlag. He supposes that the Church consisted mainly of proselytes—that is, of persons who were Gentiles by birth, but had passed through the Jews' religion. This would explain the great difficulty of the epistle, that Paul addresses his readers as if they were Gentiles, but argues with them as if they were Jews. Schürer, again, conceives of the Church as non-Jewish, and at the same time non-Pauline; the Hellenistic Jews of the *diaspora* would make Christians comparatively free in their relations to the ceremonial law, but with no adequate comprehension of the Pauline freedom, in principle, from law in every sense; it is an audience like this Paul is trying to elevate to his own standpoint. That such an audience could be found is not to be denied; whether it is to be found here we can only ascertain by comparing this theory with the facts of the epistle. Finally, Holtzmann gives up the attempt to realise the character of the Church. St. Paul had never been in Rome, did not really know the situation there, and has no distinct idea of his audience. When he finds it necessary to explain why he writes to them at all he thinks of them as Gentiles; when their previous culture and spiritual history, their sympathies, antipathies, and mode of reacting toward the Gospel generally, are in question, they are Jews. All this

shows that the problem is a complex one; and there is no means of doing anything to solve it but to examine the facts once more. They are all contained in the epistle itself, and it will be convenient to adduce the evidence (1) for the Gentile-Christian character of the readers; (2) for the Jewish-Christian character; and then to ask what conception covers and combines all the facts.

1. Evidence for the Gentile-Christian character of the Church.

(*a*) Chap. i. 5 f. Paul writes: "We received grace and Apostleship, with a view to obedience of faith ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν . . . ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς". Paul's conception of himself as Apostle of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 8), and his appeal to this vocation in the salutation of his letter, put it beyond doubt that ἔθνη here means Gentiles, as opposed to Israel, and not nations generally. He is exercising his calling as Apostle to the Gentiles in writing to the Romans; for they, too, are in that class. Those who take the Jewish-Christian view argue that Paul would have had no need to tell a Church consisting of Romans by birth that they were included within the scope of his calling as Apostle to the Gentiles. But surely the Apostle's expression is perfectly natural; whereas if ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν means "among all the nations," it becomes perfectly meaningless.

(*b*) Chap. i. 13. "I purposed often to come to you, . . . ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν." This case is quite unambiguous. The Roman Christians are put on a level with the rest of the ἔθνη, and it agrees with this that the distinction of classes in ver. 14 (Greek and barbarian, wise and unintelligent) belongs to the pagan world.

Of course it is not meant here that Paul was Apostle of the Gentiles in such a sense that he would not have preached the Gospel to the Jews; but as far as he has a special vocation—and it is on a special vocation, and not on the duty of preaching the Gospel to every creature, that he bases his right to address the Romans—it is to the Gentile world. The Roman Church, therefore, belonged to that world.

(*c*) Chap. xi. 13. ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Here the whole Church is addressed in its character as Gentile. To this it has been replied that the whole Church is not addressed here; with ὑμῖν δὲ Paul expressly turns aside to address only a part of the Church. If the words stood alone, this might be maintained, but the context is decisive in favour of the former meaning. In the continuation of the passage (see especially xi. 25-28) the Church as a whole is warned against contempt for the Jews; it is addressed in the second person (xi. 25, 28, 30 f.), without any suggestion of distinctions in it, whereas the

Jews are spoken of throughout in the third. Further, when Paul speaks of the Jews in chaps. ix.-xi., it is as "*my* brethren," "*my* kinsmen according to the flesh," not *ours* nor *yours*, as would have been the case had the bulk of the Church been of Jewish origin.

(*d*) Chap. xv. 15 f. τολμηροτέρως δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ. Here Paul justifies himself, in closing, for writing as he has done—especially, perhaps, for writing so decidedly in chap. xiv.-xv. 13 — to the Romans. The reason he gives is unmistakable. He is a minister of Jesus Christ, a priest in the service of the Gospel; the offering he has to lay on the altar is the Gentiles, and he writes to the Romans because they are Gentiles, to further them in their faith, that when they are presented to God it may be an acceptable offering, sanctified in the Holy Spirit. There is no evading this argument; to say that in vers. 17-20 Paul's justification of this presentation of himself as minister of Jesus Christ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη is directed against Jewish-Christian suspicions and insinuations (*cf.* 2 Cor. x. 12-18, xii. 11, 12) may or may not be true, but is quite irrelevant; even if there were such suspicions, and even if they had begun to find acceptance in Rome, the Gentile character of the Church at Rome as a whole is here put beyond question.

(*e*) Less stress can be laid on passages like vi. 17 f. (ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας), though they have undoubtedly something which recalls the ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοὶ of Gal. ii. 15. By the time he has reached chap. vi. Paul is quite entitled to assume that his readers were once slaves of sin, without suggesting anything about their nationality. Neither do the suggestions of particular sins (*e.g.*, in vi. 12-14) throw any real light on the question. All kinds of bad things are done both by Gentiles and Jews. But discounting weak and uncertain arguments, there is a plain and solid case for maintaining that the great bulk of the Church at Rome was of Gentile origin.

2. Evidence for the Jewish-Christian character of the Church.

(*a*) There are passages in which Paul includes himself and his readers in the first person plural; now no one, it is to be observed, is included with him in the superscription, so that "we" must mean "you and I". Thus iii. 9 προεχόμεθα; are we (Jews) surpassed? But it is very natural to suppose that Paul here, as is his rule, allows his opponents (real or imaginary) to state their own objections in their own person, the "we" neither including himself nor his readers; or if he speaks in his own person, it is the *national* consciousness of the Jew, which Paul of course shared, and not the *joint* consciousness of Paul and his readers, which is conveyed by the plural. Another passage of the same kind is iv. 1: Ἀβραὰμ τὸν

προπάτορα ἡμῶν κατὰ σάρκα. Here also the explanation is the same. Paul says "our" forefather because he has no choice. He could speak of his fellow-countrymen as "*my* kinsmen according to the flesh"; but it would have been obviously absurd for him to speak of Abraham as "my" forefather. It is only through his relation to the nation that he can claim a connection with Abraham, and hence the "our" in iv. 1 is national, not individual, and has nothing to do with the Romans. *Cf.* the precisely similar case in ix. 10 (Isaac *our* father). The same use of the first person plural is found in 1 Cor. x. 1 (All *our* fathers were under the cloud), which no one doubts was written to a thoroughly Gentile Church. As far therefore as passages like these are concerned, they do not invalidate in the least the evidence adduced for the Gentile character of the Church at Rome.

(*b*) Not so simple are those passages which speak either in the first or second person plural of the relation of the readers, or of Paul and his readers alike, to the law. The most important of these is chap. vii. 1-6. Paul here speaks to his readers as persons γινώσκουσι νόμον, knowing what law is. Even if we admit—which is not necessary, nor I believe right—that the reference is to the Mosaic law, it does not follow that the readers were Jews. Indeed the explicit recalling of the law to mind, while he assumes it to be known, might plausibly be alleged as an argument against a Jewish origin. But to pass that by, does not vii. 4, it is argued—So then, my brethren, *ye also were made dead to the law* by the body of Christ—imply that the persons addressed had lived under the law as well as the writer?—in other words, that they were Jews? And is this not confirmed, when we read in ver. 5 f., "When we were in the flesh, the sinful passions, which were *through the law*, wrought in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now *we have been discharged from the law*"? Have we not here, in relation to the law, an experience common to Paul and those whom he addressed, and does not this imply that antecedent to their conversion they and he had lived under the law—that is, were Jews by birth? It is natural, at first sight, to think so, but it is certainly wrong. There *is* an experience common to Paul and to all Christians, whatever their birth; if it were not so, they would not be Christians. It is possible also for him to describe that experience in relation to the law; once *all* Christians were under it, now they are so no more. *All* Christians were under it, for all were under sin, and to the Apostle sin and law are correlative terms. The law, indeed, did not take precisely the same form for Jew and Gentile; the one had an objective revelation, the other had a substitute, if not an equiva-

lent for this, written on his heart; but in both it wrought to the same issues. There is nothing in the world less Jewish, there is nothing more human, than Rom. vii. 7-24; but that is Paul's description of life under the law, and of the working of the law in that life. We understand it only too well, though we are not Jews; and so, no doubt, did those to whom it was first addressed. Hence Paul could quite well say to a Gentile Church: Ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; and could associate himself with them to say, We were discharged from the law by dying to that in which we were held. A perfectly clear case of this is to be found in Gal. iii. 13-iv. 9. No one imagines that the Galatians were Jews, yet Paul vindicates for them the very thing which he says of the Romans here. God sent forth His Son, he writes, made of a woman, made under law, *to redeem those that are under law*, that *we* might receive the adoption of sons. And because *ye* are sons, God sent forth the spirit of His Son into *our* hearts, etc. The alternation of the first and second persons here shows how Paul could conceive of Jew and Gentile alike as under law in their pre-Christian days, and how in their emancipation from this in Jesus Christ one experience was common to them all. In truth, "sin," "the law," "the curse of the law," "death," are names for something which belongs not to the Jewish but to the human conscience; and it is only because this is so that the Gospel of Paul is also a Gospel for us. Before Christ came and redeemed the world, all men were at bottom on the same footing: Pharisaism, legalism, moralism, or whatever it is called, it is in the last resort the attempt to be good without God, to achieve a righteousness of our own without an initial all-inclusive immeasurable debt to Him; in other words, without submitting, as sinful men must submit, to be justified by faith apart from works of our own, and to find in that justification, and in that only, the spring and impulse of all good. It was because Paul's Jewish experience was digested into a purely and perfectly human experience that he was able to transcend his Judaism, and to preach a universal gospel; and the use of such expressions as we have in vii. 1-6 is no proof that those to whom they applied were Jews too. They apply to us.

(*c*) The character of the argumentation in the epistle has been adduced in support of the Jewish origin of the readers. It is quite true that in the dialectical development of his gospel in Romans Paul often states and answers such objections as would naturally occur to one representing the historical and legal standpoint of the Jews' religion. *Cf.* iii. 1 (What advantage then hath the Jew?), vi. 1 (Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound?), vi. 15

(Are we to sin, because we are not under law, but under grace?) vii. 7 (What shall we say then? Is the law sin?), xi. 1 (I say then, Hath God cast off His people?). There are two obvious reasons why Paul should have developed his gospel by this dialectical process apart from the assumption that he is meeting the anticipated objections of his readers. One is, that he was a Jew himself, and justified his gospel instinctively, as he went along, against the *primâ facie* objections to it which arose in his own mind. Here, again, however we must remember that though Paul was a Jew he was a man; and it does not strike one as rigorously historical, but as somewhat absurd, to characterise as Jewish or as Jewish-Christian the criticism of grace which comes natural to every human being. The other reason is, that Paul had heard already in other places most of the objections to his gospel which he answers in this epistle. There is only one express reference to this, in iii. 8 (As we are slandered, and as some affirm that we say, Let us do evil that good may come: for τινες here, *cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 1, Gal. ii. 12); but that Paul's gospel was assiduously and energetically counterworked we know quite well, and he may have heard (through some of his friends in the city) that his adversaries were forestalling him at Rome. These reasons fully explain the nature of his arguments; and in view of the direct evidence for the Gentile character of the Church they prove nothing on the other side.

(*d*) Great stress was laid by Baur on chaps. ix.-xi. in this connection. These, it was argued, were the real kernel of the epistle—the part for the sake of which it was really written, and by relation to which the rest has to be explained; and these, moreover, have no interest, or none worth speaking of, for a Gentile Church. It was only to a Jewish-Christian consciousness that this vindication of God's wonderful ways in the history of redemption required to be or could be addressed. Plausible as this may sound, the facts are against it. For whatever reason, it is precisely and unambiguously to the Gentiles that all this section is addressed. In ix. 1 f., x. 1 f. Paul speaks of the Jews in the third person (my prayer to God for *them*, etc.). He calls them *my* kinsmen, not *yours* or *ours*. He quotes himself, but not his readers (xi. 1), as proof that God has not cast off His people, which he would hardly have done had they also been Christian Jews (but see note on this verse). He uses the fate of the Jews, the natural branches, to warn his readers, grafted into the tree of life contrary to nature, against contempt, pride, and unbelief. Whatever the motive of these chapters may have been, it cannot have been that the bulk of the Romish Church was Jewish in

origin, or strongly Jewish in sympathy. The apostle's own application of their teaching in xi. 17-24 proves exactly the reverse.

(*e*) Still less can anything be made of an appeal to xiii. 1-7. The Jews were certainly a rebellious and turbulent race, and inherited theocratic ideas which might make them doubt the lawfulness of paying tribute to Cæsar (Deut. xvii. 15, Mark xii. 13-17); but Christianity too in all its forms is an idealism which necessarily raises the question of the relation of God's Kingdom to the kingdoms of this world, and so gives occasion to such explanations as those of Paul in chap. xiii. 1-7. It has been pointed out, too, that echoes of this passage occur in the public prayer of the Roman Church in Clem., *ad. Cor.*, I., lxi., at a period when the Gentile character of the Church is not questioned.

(*f*) As for the use of the Old Testament in this epistle, it has no bearing whatever on the nationality of the readers. To all the New Testament writers the Old Testament was revelation, and in a sense Christian revelation; and they used it in the same way no matter to whom they wrote.

None of these passages is sufficient to prove that the Church as a whole was Jewish-Christian, or even that it was strongly influenced by Jewish ideas. On the other hand, the passages quoted under 1 prove conclusively that the bulk of the Church was Gentile, so that one writing to it as a body thought of it as a Gentile Church. This, of course, would not preclude the existence in it of a minority of Jewish origin. We can hardly conceive, in the lifetime of the Apostles, a Church without such an element. The Apostles themselves were all Jews, and it was their rule—it was even Paul's rule—to preach to the Jew first. But apart from this general presumption, we have a distinct indication in the epistle itself that there was in the Roman Church a Jewish-Christian element. In chap. xiv. Paul speaks of dissensions between "the strong" and "the weak," and though it would be wrong simply to identify these with Gentile and Jewish Christians, it is a safe inference from xv. 7-13, taken in connection with what precedes, that the difference between "strong" and "weak" was not unrelated to that between Gentile and Jew (see notes *ad loc.*). Hence the prevailing tendency of scholars is to recognise that the Church was Gentile as a whole, but had a minority of Jewish origin. To what extent the Gentile mass was influenced by Jewish ideas—how far the Gentile members of the Church had been originally proselytes, and were therefore appreciative of the Jewish-Christian consciousness or in sympathy with it—is another question. As we have seen above, under 2, *b*, *c*, no special assumption of this kind is needed to explain the manner in which Paul vindicates his gospel to them.

CHAPTER III.

CHARACTER OF THE EPISTLE—ITS OCCASION AND PURPOSE.

THE character of the epistle has been a subject of as much discussion as the character of the readers, and the discussion is less likely ever to be closed. A writing of such vitality, which is always being in part lost, and always rediscovered in new power—a writing of such comprehensive scope and such infinite variety of application—a writing at once so personal and historical, and so universal and eternal, is not easily reduced to a formula which leaves nothing to be desired. The definitions of its purpose which have been given by scholars strike one rather as all right than as all wrong. But before entering on an examination of these it will be proper to investigate the occasion of the letter, as it may have some bearing on its purpose.

Paul's intention to visit Rome is first mentioned in Acts xix. 21, and, as Hort remarks, it is expressed with curious emphasis. "After these things were ended, Paul *purposed in the spirit* (ἔθετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι), when he had passed through Macedonia, and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome." He passed through Macedonia and Achaia, as he proposed, and it was during his stay in Corinth (which, according to the usual chronology, was in the winter of 58-59), and towards the close of it, that he wrote this letter. This is a point on which all scholars are agreed. When he wrote, he was on the point of starting, or perhaps had started, on his journey to Jerusalem, with the collection for the poor saints there which had been made in the Churches of Galatia, Macedonia and Achaia (chap. xv. 25 ff., 1 Cor. xvi. 1-4, 2 Cor. viii. ix.). He had with him Timothy and Sosipater, or Sopater (chap. xvi. 21), whom we know otherwise to have been in his company (Acts xx. 4), when he started on that journey. Gaius, his host at the moment (xvi. 23), is probably the same as the Gaius whom he had himself baptised at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 14). The time and place, therefore, at which the Epistle to the Romans was written are beyond question. But we ought to notice these not only formally, as points of geography and chronology, but in their significance in Paul's life. The time was one at which he felt that his work in the

East was done. From Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum he had fully preached the gospel of Christ. He had no more place in these parts (xv. 19, 23). His eye was turned westward, and rested inevitably on Rome. He had wished to visit it for a good many years (xv. 23), perhaps ever since he had first met Prisca and Aquila in Corinth (Acts xviii. 2), and he had often formed the purpose, though it had been as often disappointed (i. 13). But now it had a definiteness which it had never had before. He did not indeed look on Rome as the goal of his journey; he meant only to stay there till he had been somewhat satisfied with the Church's fellowship, and then to be convoyed by them toward Spain (xv. 24). But he was a Roman citizen, and must have been conscious, as an expression in i. 8 shows ("Your faith is proclaimed in all the world"), of the supreme importance of the Church which had its seat in the capital of the empire. He would not only wish a point of support there for his further operations in the West; he must have been more than commonly anxious that Christianity there should appear as what it truly was, and that the Romans should be firmly established in it. If Paul was going to write to the Romans at all, no matter from what immediate impulse—though it should only have been to announce his approaching visit—it would be natural that his communication, in proportion as he realized the place and coming importance of the Church at Rome, should assume a catholic and comprehensive character. We can hardly imagine the man who was conscious of his own vocation as Apostle of the Gentiles, and conscious at the same time of the central significance of this Church, writing anything of a merely formal character to such a community. When *he* introduced himself to *them*, it was a great occasion, and the epistle is the best evidence that he was sensible of its greatness.

There are other considerations which would tell on Paul's mind in the same direction. When he wrote, he was setting out on a journey the issue of which was doubtful and perilous. At the very outset he had to change his course, because of a plot formed against him by the Jews (Acts xx. 3). He dreaded what these same relentless enemies might do in Judæa; he was not sure that even the Christians in Jerusalem would receive graciously the offering which his love and zeal had raised among the Gentiles on their behalf (chap. xv. 31). He was setting out in readiness not only to be bound, but to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus (Acts xxi. 13). In a sense, therefore, this epistle might be called his testament (Weiss). He puts into it, not merely what is suggested to him by special circumstances of which he is aware in the Church at Rome—*e.g.*, the discussion of the relations between "the strong" and "the weak"—but all that his

own situation and that of the Church, looking at both in the largest aspect, determine to be of interest. He has achieved a great work in the East. By carrying the charity of the Gentile Christians to Jerusalem, and fraternising once more with the primitive Church, he hopes to secure and perfect that work, and to effect a more cordial union between the two great branches of Christendom, which so imperfectly understood each other. He has passed through great conflicts, but his mind has only been made clearer by them, and established in firmer possession of the fundamental principles of the Christian life ; he can define it without misgiving in relation to all previous modes of human experience and all earlier stages of religion, whether in Greek or Jew. His heart is set on further labours, but he is profoundly conscious of the uncertainties of the future. Such are the outward and the spiritual conditions under which Paul writes. Is it not manifest that when we give them all the historical definiteness of which they are capable, there is something in them which rises above the casualness of time and place, something which might easily give the epistle not an accidental or occasional character, but the character of an exposition of principles ? Be the immediate motive what it may, it is not incredible that the epistle should have something in it which is rather eternal than historical, and that it should require for its interpretation, not a minute acquaintance with opinion in the apostolic age, but some sense of God and man.

The various opinions as to the purpose of the letter have been classified by almost all writers on Introduction under similar heads: it is only necessary to premise that such opinions do not in fact (whatever their authors may think) necessarily exclude one another.

1. The purpose of the letter, according to some, is *dogmatic*. It is a systematic and formal exposition of the Gospel according to Paul. It is a doctrinal treatise, to which only accident gave the form of a letter ; in other circumstances it might have been a book. This was the opinion which ruled at the time of the Reformation. Luther calls the epistle *absolutissima epitome evangelii*. Melanchthon calls it *doctrinæ Christianæ compendium*. No one can say that these descriptions are inept. Luther did find the Gospel in Romans, and found it in a power which made him the greatest conductor of spiritual force since Paul, which directly regenerated one half of Christendom, and indirectly did much to reform the other half. Melanchthon made the epistle the basis of his Loci. He was delighted to find a theology which did not philosophise about the mysteries of the Trinity, or the modes of incarnation, or active and passive creation ; but through sin and law and grace gave the know-

ledge of Christ and His benefits. The dogmatic conception of the epistle has held its ground even in modern times, and among writers who pride themselves in giving the historical its due. Thus Hausrath describes it as "the essential content of what he otherwise preached by word of mouth". Hilgenfeld calls it "a complete presentation of the Gospel which Paul preaches among the Gentiles". Pfleiderer, more dogmatically still, speaks of it as "an objective development of the truth of the Gospel, drawn from the nature of the Gospel itself". And certainly, whatever the writer's motive may have been, the letter *has* a systematic character. There is no analogy in any other of his epistles to the connected train of thought which runs from i. 16 to viii. 39 or even to xi. 36. There is indeed a break between chaps. viii. and ix., but there is no unbridgeable gulf. Holtzmann gives, as specimens of the way in which they can be connected, the opinions of Mangold (in i.-viii. Paul justifies his doctrine of salvation, in ix.-xi. his action as a missionary), of Holsten (in i.-viii. he justifies the content, in ix.-xi. the result, of his preaching), and of Pfleiderer (in i.-viii. there is the dogmatic, in ix.-xi. the historical aspect of his gospel). This last agrees pretty much with Godet, who makes the subject of the whole eleven chapters salvation by faith, chaps. i.-viii. treating this in relation to the individual, and chaps. ix.-xi. in relation to its development in history. The systematic character of this part, therefore, is beyond doubt. Those who insist upon it are not of course blind to the parts of the epistle (chaps. xiv. and xv.) in which incidental matters affecting the Church at Rome are touched upon; but it is not in these, they would say, but in the formal presentation of the truth in chaps. i.-xi. that the purpose of the letter is revealed. Granting this, however, the question arises whether the systematic character of the epistle is equivalent to a dogmatic character. In other words, is Paul simply expounding, in a neutral, unprejudiced, objective fashion, the whole scope and contents of his gospel, or is he expounding it in relation to something present to his mind, and to the mind of his readers, which gives the exposition a peculiar character?

2. The latter alternative is affirmed by those who hold that the purpose of the epistle is *controversial*. It is an exposition of Paul's gospel indeed, but not a purely dogmatic one, which in an epistle would be gratuitous and out of place. The exposition is throughout conducted with reference to an attack such as would be made on Pauline Christianity from the point of view of Judaism, or even of Jewish Christianity. It is not so much an exposition as a defence and a vindication. Practically this idea governs many interpretations. *e.g.*, that of Lipsius. That there is

an element of truth in it is not to be denied. Paul does not write *in vacuo*, in no concrete relations at all. In iii. 8 there is a hint of actual adversaries and their criticisms on the Pauline gospel; in xvi. 17-20 there is another hint of at least possible ones. It may be, as has been noticed above (p. 566), that Jews or Jewish Christians were attempting to create prejudice against the Apostle in Rome; but we cannot, on the ground that this is a letter, and must therefore have its character explained by the circumstances of the readers, conclude for certain (with Weizsäcker), that this was the case. In expounding his gospel systematically to the Romans, Paul defines it, not necessarily against enemies who were forestalling him in Rome, but against the criticism which had followed him all through his missionary work. And we must remember, as has also been referred to already, that part of that criticism was not so much Jewish as human. It is not the Jewish or Jewish-Christian consciousness in particular—it is the consciousness of the natural man at a certain stage of moral development—which thinks that forgiveness is an immoral doctrine, and is shocked at the idea of a God "who justifies the ungodly," or on the other hand, indulges the idea that pardon procures licence to sin. Though the opposition Paul encountered everywhere was headed by Jews or by Christians of Jewish birth, what it represented was by no means exclusively Jewish; and in an epistle of this unique character, standing where it stands in the Apostle's life, and making so little express reference to actual Jewish adversaries (contrast it in this respect with Galatians or 2 Cor. x.-xiii.), we must not limit too narrowly the kind of opposition he has in view. He is stating the case of gospel against law—against all that is pre-Christian, infra-Christian, and anti-Christian; and his polemic has not a temporary but a permanent significance. It is addressed not to Jews of the first century, but to men, and to Christians, of all time. Nothing so conclusively proves its necessity as the fact that it so soon ceased to be understood. It is not easy to live at the spiritual height at which Paul lived. It is not easy to realise that religion begins absolutely on God's side; that it begins with a demonstration of God's love to the sinful, which man has done nothing and can do nothing to merit; and that the assurance of God's love is not the goal to be reached by our own efforts, but the only point from which any human effort can start. It is not easy to realise that justification, in the sense of an initial assurance of God's love, extending over all our life, is the indispensable presupposition of everything which can be called Christianity. It is not easy to realise that in the atoning death of Christ and the gift of the Holy Ghost there are the only and the adequate securities

for Christian morality; that the only good man is the forgiven man, and that he is good, not because he is under law, but because he is not under law but under grace. There must have been many men who were practically Christian, and that, too, in the broad sense, which gave no advantage to the Jew over the Gentile, but who were far from realising their Christianity in principle like Paul. In his heroic sense, indeed, Christianity hardly survived him; it was recovered in something like its native power, attested even by a recrudescence of its original perils, at the time of the Reformation; and it always requires to be rediscovered again. But this is only another way of saying that the polemic of the Epistle to the Romans is not narrowly anti-Jewish; it is anti-legal; and whenever legalism establishes itself in the Church anew, whether as mere custom, or as a dogmatic tradition, or as a clerical order claiming to be essential to the constitution of the Church, the Christian conscience will find in this polemic the sword of the spirit to strike it down. We admit, therefore, that the epistle has a controversial aspect; but probably the controversy is not so much with definite adversaries at work in Rome as with those principles and instincts in human nature which long experience as a preacher had made familiar to St. Paul.

3. A third view of the epistle defines its purpose as *conciliatory*. This, again, by no means excludes either of the views already commented on. Even controversy may be conducted in a conciliatory tone, and with a conciliatory purpose. When Paul wrote, he was extremely anxious about the unity of Jew and Gentile in the Church. His journey to Jerusalem had mainly that in view. In the epistle, while there is much that is trenchant in argument, there is nothing that is personal in feeling. There is no contemptuous irony, such as we have in 2 Cor. x.-xiii.; no uncontrolled passion such as flashes out here and there in Galatians. Although the law works wrath and stimulates sin, he describes it as holy, spiritual, and ordained unto life. He speaks with passionate affection of the Jews (ix. 1 ff.), always recognises their historical prerogatives (iii. 1 ff., ix. 1 ff.), warns the Gentiles against self-exaltation over them, and anticipates the salvation of Israel as a whole. In chaps. xiv.-xv. also his generosity to "the weak," though his judgment is unequivocally with the strong, may be regarded in the same light; the weak are certainly connected with the Jews, and his aim in the whole passage is the peace and unity of the Church. All this confirms us in thinking that the controversial aspect of the epistle should not be urged with special severity against Jewish Christians, or their modes of thought: Paul has no desire to exasperate any one, but in the position in which he stands, "the greatest moving power in the enlargement

and building up of the universal Church" (Hort), about to visit Jerusalem at once, and Rome, if he can, immediately afterwards, his desire is to win and to unite all.

From this point of view it is possible to form a conception of the purpose of the epistle which will do something like justice to it as a whole. It is an epistle, not a book. Paul wrote to Rome, not simply to clear up his own mind, not as a modern writer might do, addressing the world at large; he wrote to this particular community, and under a particular impulse. He knew something about the Church, as chaps. xiv. and xv. show; and while he might have acquired such information from members of it whom he met in Corinth, Ephesus, or elsewhere, it is quite probable, from chap. xvi., that he had friends and correspondents at Rome itself. He wrote to the Roman Christians because it was in his mind to visit them; but the nature of his letter is determined, not simply by consideration of their necessities, but by consideration of his own position. The letter is "occasional," in the sense that it had a historical motive—to intimate and prepare for the coming visit; but it is not occasional in the sense in which the first Epistle to the Corinthians is so. It is not a series of answers to questions which the Romans had propounded; it is not a discussion, relevant to them only, of points either in doctrine or practice which had incidentally come to be of critical importance in Rome. Its character, in relation to St. Paul's mind, is far more central and absolute than this would imply. It is in a real sense a systematic exposition of what he distinctively calls "my gospel" (ii. 16), such an exposition as makes him thoroughly known to a community which he foresaw would have a decisive importance in the history of Christianity. It is not an impromptu note, nor a series of unconnected remarks, each with a motive of its own; it is the manifesto of his gospel, by means of which the Apostle of the Gentiles, at a great crisis and turning point in his life, establishes relations with the Christian community in the capital of the Gentile world. It can be dated, of course, but no writing in the New Testament is less casual; none more catholic and eternal. It is quite true that in expounding his gospel Paul proceeds by a certain dialectical process; he advances step by step, and at every step defines the Christian truth as against some false or defective, some anti-Christian or infra-Christian view; in this sense it is controversial. But we have seen already the limitations under which alone a controversial character can be ascribed to it; Paul is not so much controverting anybody in particular as vindicating the truth he expounds against the assaults and misconstructions to which he had found it give rise. There is no animosity against the

Jews in it; no sentence such as 1 Thess. ii. 15 f. or Gal. v. 12. It is an establishment of principles he aims at; except in iii. 8, xvi. 17-20 there is no reference to persons. Even in chaps. ix.-xi. (see the introduction at chap. ix.) the whole tone is conciliatory; the one thing which tries our faith in them is Paul's assurance of the future of his own people. But as an interpretation of the actual working out in human history of that method of salvation which he has expounded in the first eight chapters—as an exhibition of the process through which the rejection of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles alike contribute eventually to the universality of the Gospel—these chapters are an essential part of the epistle. They are mainly but not exclusively apologetic: they belong to that whole conception of the Gospel, and of the mode in which it becomes the inheritance of the world, which was of one substance with the mind of St. Paul. No one who read the first eleven chapters of the epistle could meet the Apostle as a stranger on anything essential in Christianity as he understood it. No doubt, as Grafe has remarked, it does not contain an eschatology like 1 Cor. xv. or 2 Cor. v., nor a Christology like Col. i. But it establishes that which is fundamental beyond the possibility of misconception. It vindicates once for all the central facts, truths and experiences, without which Christianity cannot exist. It vindicates them at once in their relation to the whole past of mankind, and in their absolute newness, originality and self-sufficiency. It is an utter misapprehension to say that "just the most fundamental doctrines—the Divine Lordship of Christ, the value of His death, the nature of the Sacraments—are assumed rather than stated or proved" (Sanday and Headlam, p. xli.). There can be only one fundamental doctrine, and that doctrine for Paul is the doctrine of justification by faith. That is not part of his gospel, it is the whole of it: there Luther is his true interpreter. If legalists or moralists object, Paul's answer is that justification regenerates, and that nothing else does. By its consistency with this fundamental doctrine, we test everything else that is put forward as Christian. It is only as we hold this, on principle, with the clearness with which Paul held it, that we can know what Christian liberty is in the sense of the New Testament—that liberty in which the will of God is done from the heart, and in which no commandments or ordinances of men, no definitions or traditions, no customs or "orders," have any legal authority for the conscience. And in the only legitimate sense of the word this liberty does not make void, but establishes the law. That is the paradox in the true religion which perpetually baffles those who would reduce it to an institution or a code.

CHAPTER IV.

INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

The integrity of the Epistle to the Romans has been called in question mainly in connection with chaps. xv. and xvi. Partly on the ground of textual phenomena, partly on internal grounds, the authenticity of these chapters has been denied, in whole or in part; and even among those who recognise chap. xvi. as Pauline, many are unable to recognise Rome as the place to which it was addressed. It will be convenient to consider (1) the questions raised by the position of the doxology, and the various endings; (2) questions raised by the internal character of chap. xv.; and (3) questions connected with the character and destination of chap. xvi.

1. The position of the doxology, and the various endings. The facts in regard to the doxology are as follows:—

(*a*) It is given at xvi. 25-27, and there only, by ℵBCDE, Vulgate, Syriac, Memphitic, Aethiopic and Latin Fathers. This is by far the best attested position for it, and that which, owing to the respect of Erasmus for the Vulgate, it occupies in the received text.

(*b*) At xiv. 23, and there only, it is found in L, most cursives, Greek lectionaries, and Greek commentators except Origen. Possibly the lectionaries explain its appearance at this point. The matter in chaps. xv. and xvi. being of a more personal or temporary interest was not likely to be chosen for reading in church. But in order that the great doxology, which was too short for a lesson by itself, might not be lost in public worship, it was appended to the last lesson before chap. xv.

(*c*) It is found both after xiv. 23 and at xvi. 25-27 in AP 17 arm.

(*d*) It is omitted in both places in FG, but F has space left after xvi. 24, in which f (the Latin of this bi-lingual MS.) has the doxology, while G has space left between chaps. xiv. and xv.

Besides this variety of MS. attestation, there are certain other facts to take into consideration. (*a*) There is the evidence of Origen (in his translator Rufinus) to the text in his time. It runs as follows (ed. Lommatzsch, vii., p. 453): *Caput hoc Marcion, a quo*

Scripturæ evangelicæ et apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc sed et ab eo loco, ubi scriptum est: omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est: *usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in his quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus; in nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus hoc est:* omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est: *statim cohærens habetur:* ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare. *Alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum, continent.* This remark is made at xvi. 25, and *caput hoc* means, of course, this passage, *i.e.*, the doxology. Marcion wholly omitted it there. But what do the following words mean? What strikes one at first is that he not only omitted it there, but omitted everything standing after "whatsoever is not of faith is sin"—in other words, not only the doxology, but the whole of chaps. xv. and xvi. But Dr. Hort (*vide* Appendix, p. 112), who reads (with what he says seems to be the best MS.) *in eo loco* instead of *ab eo loco,* and changes *hoc* into *hic*, only finds the statement that Marcion cut off the whole of the doxology at xiv. 23, as well as at xvi. 25. But *usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit* is a very misleading way to express this to readers whose copies of the epistle would all contain chaps. xv. and xvi., and it is hardly open to doubt that the first impression of the meaning is the correct one, and that Marcion ended his Epistle to the Romans at xiv. 23. Thus, as Gifford puts it, "we have evidence of a *diversity of position* before Origen's time, and regarded by him as independent of Marcion's mutilated copies. But we have no evidence of *omission* before Marcion, who was at Rome propagating his views about A.D. 138-140."

(*b*) There is the evidence of the "capitulations," or division of the epistle into sections, in some MSS. of the Latin Bible, especially the two best codices of the Vulgate, Codex Amiatinus and Codex Fuldensis, both sixth century MSS. In Codex Amiatinus there are fifty-one sections. The fiftieth, entitled *De periculo contristante fratrem suum esca sua, et quod non sit regnum Dei esca et potus sed iustitia et pax et gaudium in Spiritu Sancto*, evidently answers to chap. xiv. 15-23; the fifty-first, which is entitled *De mysterio Domini ante passionem in silentio habito, post passionem vero ipsius revelato,* as plainly corresponds to the doxology. The capitulations therefore were drawn up for a Latin MS. which omitted chaps. xv. and xvi. In another way the capitulations in Codex Fuldensis point to the same conclusion.

(*c*) There is the appearance, at least, of different endings. 1. When the doxology stands at xiv. 23, it indicates an ending at that

point, though otherwise it is a very unnatural one, as the subject and sense of chap. xiv. run on unbroken to xv. 13. 2. There is at xv. 33 what has sometimes been taken as another ending: "The God of peace be with you all. Amen." 3. There is the benediction at xvi. 20: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you". This is genuine, and is an ordinary Pauline formula at the close of a letter. 4. There is the benediction at xvi. 24: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen." Most editors regard this as spurious; it has been transferred in Western texts from verse 20 to this place, and finally established itself in both. Gifford, however, regards it as genuine in both places. 5. There is the doxology at xvi. 25-27.

(*d*) In G all mention of Rome is wanting: see critical note on i. 7, 15.

This complicated combination of facts has not yet been clearly explained, and perhaps never will be. Renan's theory was that Romans is really a circular letter, and that it was sent in various directions, with different endings, which were afterwards combined. Lightfoot thought the facts adduced amounted to irresistible evidence that in early times shorter copies of the epistle existed, containing only chaps. i.-xiv., with or without the doxology; and the theory by which he explained these facts was this, that "St. Paul, at a later period of his life, reissued the epistle in a shorter form with a view to general circulation, omitting the last two chapters, obliterating the mention of Romans in the first chapter, and adding the doxology, which was no part of the original epistle". This tempting theory was expounded in the *Journal of Philology*, 1871, in a review of M Renan; and this review, along with a minute criticism of Dr. Hort, and a reply by Lightfoot, can be studied in Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, pp. 285-374. An acute statement of the objections to it is also given by Gifford in the introduction to his commentary (p. 23 f.); yet when all is said, it remains the most satisfying hypothesis that has yet been suggested for the colligation of the facts. Sanday and Headlam think that Paul could not possibly have made the break at xiv. 23—he must have been too conscious that the sense ran on unbroken to xv. 13; it was probably to Marcion, therefore, to whom the references to the Jews and the Old Testament in xv. 1-13 were objectionable, that the imperfect copies of the epistle owed their existence. This is hardly convincing. If there is not a break at xiv. 23, there is at least a pause in the thought, and Paul may as easily have made a division there as the author of our present division into chapters. Besides, as Gifford points out (see above,

p. 577), there is evidence that the doxology stood in different positions (at xiv. 23 for one) before Origen's time, and independently of Marcion's mutilated copies. Hence some one must have felt that xiv. 23 was not an impossible place to stop at, and that for other than Marcion's reasons; and if some one, why not Paul himself? But in the absence of any direct evidence as to how the textual phenomena originated, it is very improbable that any certainty on the subject will ever be attained.

2. Questions raised by the internal character of chap. xv.

The Tübingen school, or at least some of its more vigorous adherents, followed Baur in finding chap. xv. too moderate in tone for Paul. Baur regarded the last two chapters as the work of some one "writing in the spirit of the Acts of the Apostles, seeking to soothe the Judaists and to promote the cause of unity, and therefore tempering the keen anti-Judaism of Paul with a milder and more conciliatory conclusion to the epistle". An argument like this rests on a general impression of what it was possible for Paul to write, and can only be met by another general impression of a different sort. It is sufficient to say that later scholars are practically at one in finding that there is nothing in the chapter inconsistent with Pauline authorship. The Paul by whom Baur measured all things in the epistles is really not the Paul of history, but of a more or less arbitrary theory; and his picture has to be corrected by taking into account precisely such revelations of his true attitude to the questions of his time as are found in this chapter. Lipsius, who thinks the fifteenth chapter as a whole genuine, nevertheless holds that it has been interpolated. He omits the latter part of verse 19—ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ—as inconsistent with Gal. i. 18-24, and unsupported by any accredited historical evidence. But he admits that it is supported by Acts ix. 28 f.; and if we compare i. 8, Col. i. 23, and remember that what we have before us is not sworn evidence but a broad rhetorical description of the Apostle's missionary labours, we shall probably think the expression characteristically Pauline rather than the reverse. In verse 20 Lipsius omits οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστός, ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ, ἀλλά. The words, he argues, are suggested by 2 Cor. x. 15; but the purpose expressed in them, of not preaching the Gospel in Rome, because Rome is a mission-field belonging to others (who have introduced Christianity there already), is incompatible with i. 5, 13-15, xii. 3, xv. 15. It is enough to answer that the purpose of not preaching the Gospel at Rome is not expressed here at all. Paul tells the principle on which he has always acted—the principle

of breaking new ground. It is the principle on which he will act still, for he takes Rome only *en route* for Spain; but that is not inconsistent with anything he purposes to do at Rome in the way of Christian work, nor with anything he does in this epistle. On the same principle Lipsius omits also verses 23 and 24; but with equal groundlessness. The very facts to which he refers, that the plan of travel announced in these verses is nowhere else referred to either in Acts or in the Epistles, and that it was (as he thinks) never carried out, are conclusive evidence of the genuineness of the passage What motive could a late interpolator have for putting into Paul's mind a projected voyage, of which there was no purpose on record, and which was never actually made? The unanimous testimony of all sources guarantees the integrity of the text; and there is nc reason whatever to doubt that it is Paul's.

3. Questions connected with the character and destination of chap. xvi.

When we come to this chapter the situation is changed. It is not its genuineness, but its destination, that is called in question. Since 1829, when David Schulz suggested that it was a fragment of an epistle to the Ephesians, this opinion has been widely received. The exact extent of the fragment, indeed, is disputed. Schulz made it consist of verses 1-20; Weizsäcker says verses 1-23; others, verses 3-20, or 1-15, or 1-16 and 21-23, or 3-16 only. Whatever its limits, the arguments on behalf of it can only be estimated by going over the chapter, and considering them as they emerge.

(*a*) The suggestion is made that Phoebe, sailing from Cenchreæ, would naturally have Ephesus rather than Rome as her goal. But there is no reason to believe that she was sailing from Cenchreæ, though she lived there. Paul may have met her in Corinth on her way to Rome.

(*b*) At first sight there may seem more reason to believe that Aquila and Priscilla point to Ephesus. They had gone thither with Paul at an earlier date (Acts xviii. 19), and they had a church in their house there, which joined them in a greeting to Corinth, when Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19); and they were there also some years later (2 Tim. iv. 19). The question is whether these facts, in the circumstances, outweigh the fact that the greeting is found here in a letter addressed to Rome. If we look at the whole situation, this is at least doubtful. As fellow-workers of Paul, it is plain that they shared to a large extent his wandering life, and we know that they had originally a connection with Rome (Acts xviii. 2). There is nothing in the least improbable

in the idea that though they were in Ephesus, say in 54 and 57 A.D., and again say in 66, they should have been in Rome in 58. Paul must have had his information about the Church in Rome from some one; and nothing is so likely as that he had it from his old and intimate associates, Aquila and Priscilla, who had themselves a connection of old standing with the capital.

(*c*) There remains the case of Epænetus, who is described as the first fruits of Asia unto Christ. The received text has Achaia, but that is an error. One fails to see, however, why this Epænetus, though the first Christian convert in the province of Asia, should be bound to remain there always. There is no difficulty in supposing that he was at Rome, and that Paul, who knew him, was aware of the fact, and introduced his name to multiply for himself points of contact with the Roman Church.

These are the only definite matters of fact on which the theory of an Ephesian destination of the chapter has been based. They do not amount to anything against the weight of all the external evidence which makes them part of a letter to Rome. Nor is their weight increased by pointing out in the verses which follow the large number of persons with whom Paul had been in personal relations — persons whom he calls "my beloved," "my fellow-labourers," "my fellow-captives"; "who bestowed much labour on us"; "his mother and mine" Paul's life as a missionary brought him into contact with persons in all the great towns of the East, and though he had not yet visited Rome, it cannot be doubted that many of those with whom in the course of his twenty years' ministry he had established such relations as are referred to here, had for one cause or other found their way to the great city. Paul would naturally, in preparing for his own visit, make all that he could of such points of attachment with the Roman Church as he had. It is, as Gifford points out, a very strong, indeed a conclusive argument for the Roman destination of the letter, that of the twenty-two persons named in verses 6-15, not one can be shown to have been at Ephesus; while (1) Urbanus, Rufus, Ampliatus, Julia and Junia are specifically Roman names, and (2) besides the first four of these names, "ten others, Stachys, Apelles, Tryphaena, Tryphosa, Hermes, Hermas, Patrobas (or Patrobius), Philologus, Julia, Nereus are found in the sepulchral inscriptions on the Appian Way as the names of persons connected with 'Cæsar's household' (Phil. iv. 22), and contemporary with St. Paul". Hence, in spite of the difficulty of Paul's knowing so many people in a Church he had never visited, and the equally great

difficulty that none of all these people are mentioned in the letters the Apostle afterwards wrote from Rome (see Col. iv. 10 f.), scholars like Lightfoot, Gifford and Sanday find no reason to give up the historical tradition which makes this chapter an integral part of the epistle addressed to Rome. There is really more reason to question verses 17-20 than any other part of the chapter. Words like those in verse 19—ἐφ' ὑμῖν οὖν χαίρω, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.—certainly strike one as in better keeping if addressed to a Church with which Paul had had such previous relations as entitled him to take a personal tone than if addressed to strangers. But we cannot tell *a priori* how the consciousness of an Apostle towards a Christian community he had never yet seen was determined; it may, with all the disclaiming of titles to interfere, have involved precisely that authoritativeness and sense of responsibility to and for the Church which is expressed in this passage.

As for the doxology, it stands by itself. Lightfoot thought it no part of the original epistle. Neither did Alford. "Probably," says the latter, "on reperusing his work either at the time, or, as the altered style seems to import, in after years at Rome, he subjoins the fervid and characteristic doxology with which it closes." Opinions on the genuineness of the doxology vary in part (but not exclusively) as opinions vary on the genuineness of the pastoral epistles. In spite of the vindication of the style word by word, the impression it leaves on the mind is hardly Pauline. It seems artificial rather than inspired. It is defended by Gifford, Hort, and Sanday and Headlam; by Weiss (who thinks Paul may have added it with his own hand), Godet, and many others: rejected by Delitzsch, Pfleiderer, Schultz and Lipsius. In substance it recapitulates the main ideas of the epistle.

Text.

The text printed in this commentary is the *Textus Receptus*, but that which is commented upon is practically that of Westcott and Hort. Various readings, of any importance, have been carefully noted in the *apparatus criticus*, with such an indication of the authorities for them as will be sufficient for those who do not aspire to be experts in this department: care has been taken to give the evidence for those readings in which critical editors depart from the received text. It is impossible here to do more than note the MSS. and other authorities which have been cited; information as to their characteristics and value must be sought from such sources as the *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graecum*,

or Scrivener's *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, or Westcott and Hort's *Introduction*, vol. ii. An easier book to begin with is Hammond's *Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament.* In Sanday and Headlam's *Commentary* (pp. lxiii.-lxxiv.), there is a lucid account of the chief sources of evidence for the text of Romans, and of their relations to one another; while B. Weiss, in his great work, *Das Neue Testament: Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung*, gives weight to considerations of a kind that more purely "diplomatic" constructors of texts are apt to overlook.

The principal MSS. of Romans are those which also contain the gospels, *viz.*, ℵABC. ℵ and B belong to the fourth century, A and C to the fifth. The MSS. next in importance, DEFG, are different from those which are called by the same names in the gospels: they are all Graeco-Latin MSS. D is the Codex Claromontanus which Tischendorf assigns to the sixth century. It wants Romans i. 1-7, 27-30. Tregelles describes it as "one of the most valuable MSS. extant". E is the Codex Sangermanensis, now at St. Petersburg. It is probably not older than the ninth or tenth century, and is described by Sanday and Headlam as "nothing more than a faulty copy of D". F is the Codex Augiensis, now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. It is of the ninth century, and wants Romans i. 1-iii. 19 ἐν τῷ νό[μῳ]. G is the Codex Boernerianus, now in Dresden, and is a little later than F. It wants Romans i. 1 ἀφωρισμένος . . . i. 5 πίστεως, and ii. 16 τὰ κρυπτὰ . . . ii. 25 νόμου ᾖς. These four all belong to the type of text which Westcott and Hort call Western. Other uncials of less importance are K, Codex Mosquensis; L, Codex Angelicus; and P, Codex Porphyrianus, all of about the same age, *i.e.*, the ninth century. Of cursive MSS. those quoted in this work are 17 (the same as 33 in the Gospels, and 13 in Acts), "the queen of cursives"; 47, of the eleventh or twelfth century, now in the Bodleian Library; and 67, of the eleventh century, now at Vienna. The marginal corrector of this MS., quoted as 67 **, gives many peculiar and ancient readings. The versions referred to are the Latin Vulgate, especially as given in Codex Amiatinus *circa* 514 A.D. and Codex Fuldensis, also of sixth century; the old Latin contained in DEFG (see above); the Syriac versions, one of which (the Peshitto) was "certainly current much in its present form early in the fourth century" (Sanday and Headlam), while the other dates from the sixth: an occasional reference is also made to the Egyptian versions, and to the Armenian: the last was made in the fifth century.

To estimate the value of any reading it is necessary to consider the relations to each other of the authorities which support it. In the Epistle to the Romans, as elsewhere in the New Testament, these authorities tend to fall into groups. Thus ℵB form one; DEFG a second; and ℵACLP a third. ℵB form what Westcott and Hort describe as "neutral" authorities; DEFG are "Western"; ℵACLP include what they call "Alexandrian," but are not identical with it. Sanday and Headlam, after giving an account of the authorities for the text, define the "specific characteristics of the textual apparatus of Romans" as these: (i.) the general inferiority in boldness and originality of the Western text; (ii.) the fact that there is a distinct Western element in B, which therefore when it is combined with authorities of the Western type is diminished in value; (iii.) the consequent rise in importance of the group ℵAC; (iv.) the existence of a few scattered readings either of B alone or of B in combination with one or two other authorities which have considerable intrinsic probability, and may be right. By a little practice on the readings for which the authority is given in the *apparatus criticus*, the student can familiarise himself with the facts, and exercise his own judgment on them.

In the notes, Winer means Moulton's edition of Winer's Grammar; W. and H. stands for Westcott and Hort; S. and H. for Sanday and Headlam's Commentary on Romans.

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ δοῦλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[a] κλητὸς ἀπόστολος, ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, 2. (ὃ προεπηγγείλατο διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ

a 1 Cor. i. 1, 2.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1-7. The usual salutation of the Apostle is expanded, as is natural in writing to persons whom he has not seen, into a description both of himself and of his Gospel. . Both, so to speak, need a fuller introduction than if he had been writing to a Church he had himself founded. The central idea of the passage is that of the whole epistle, that the Gospel, as preached by Paul to the Gentiles, was not inconsistent with, but the fulfilment of, God's promises to Israel.

Ver. 1. Paul's description of himself. **δοῦλος Ἰ. Χ.** The use of the same expression in James, Jude, 2 Pet., shows how universal in the Church was the sense of being under an obligation to Christ which could never be discharged. It is this sense of obligation which makes the **δουλεία**, here referred to, perfect freedom. **κλητὸς ἀπόστολος** is an Apostle by vocation. No one can take this honour to himself, any more than that of a saint (ver. 7), unless he is called by God. In the N.T. it is always *God* who calls. It is as an Apostle—*i.e.*, with the sense of his vocation as giving him a title to do so—that Paul writes to the Romans. **ἀπόστολος** is here used in the narrower sense, which includes only Paul and the twelve, see on xvi. 7. **ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ**: for **καλεῖν** and **ἀφορίζειν** similiarly combined, see Gal. i. 15. The separation is here regarded (as in Gal.) as God's act, though, as far as it had reference to the Gentile mission, it was carried out by an act of the Church at Antioch (Acts xiii. 2, **ἀφορίσατε δή μοι κ.τ.λ.**). What it means is "this one thing I do". **εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ** is the Gospel which comes from God, the glad tidings of which He is the source and author. As a name for the Christian religion, or the proclamation of it, it had a great fascination for an evangelist like Paul, who uses it out of all proportion oftener than any other N.T. writer.

Ver. 2. **ὃ προεπηγγείλατο.** The Gospel is not in principle a new thing, a subversion of the true religion as it has hitherto been known to the people of God. On the contrary, God promised it before, through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures. It is the fulfilment of hopes which God Himself inspired. **διὰ τῶν προφητῶν** does not restrict the reference to the prophets in the strict sense of the word. The O.T., as a whole, is prophetic of the New, and it is in the law (Abraham) and the Psalms (David), as much as in the prophets (Isaiah, Hosea), that Paul finds anticipations and promises of the Gospel: see chap. iv. The omission of the article with **ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις** (*cf.* xvi. 26) is probably significant, for as against these two passages there are over forty in which **αἱ γραφαὶ** or **ἡ γραφὴ** occurs: it emphasises the Divine character of these as opposed to other writings. That is **ἅγιον** which belongs to God, or is connected with Him: **ἅγιαι γραφαὶ** is the O.T. as God's book.

Ver. 3 f. **περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ**: the subject of the Gospel of God is His Son. For the same conception, see 2 Cor. i. 19: **ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γὰρ υἱὸς Χ. Ἰ. ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν δι' ἡμῶν κηρυχθείς.** Taken

ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις,) 3. περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, (τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ [b] σάρκα, 4. τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν,) Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, 5. (δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν [c] εἰς ὑπακοὴν

b Ch. ix. 5.
c Acts i. 25; 1 Cor. ix. 2; Gal. ii. 8.

by itself, "the Son of God" is, in the first instance, a title rather than a name. It goes back to Ps. ii. 7; the person to whom it is applied is conceived as the chosen object of the Divine love, God's instrument for accomplishing the salvation of His people. (Weiss.) The description which follows does not enable us to answer all the questions it raises, yet it is sufficiently clear. "The Son of God" was born of the seed of David according to the flesh. For γενομένου, *cf.* Gal. iv. 4; for David, 2 Tim. ii. 8, where, as here, the Davidic descent is an essential part of the Pauline Gospel. That it was generally preached and recognised in the primitive Church is proved by these passages, as well as by Heb. vii. 14 and the genealogies in Matthew and Luke; yet it seems a fair inference from our Lord's question in Mk. xii. 35 ff. that for Him it had no real importance. Those who did not directly see in Jesus one transcendently greater than David would not recognise in Him the Saviour by being convinced of His Davidic descent. This person, of royal lineage, was "declared Son of God, with power, according to the spirit of holiness, in virtue of resurrection from the dead". The word ὁρισθέντος is ambiguous; in Acts x. 42, xvii. 31, it is used to describe the appointment of Christ to judge the living and the dead, and is rendered in A.V. "ordained". If to be Son of God were merely an office or a dignity, like that of judge of the world, this meaning might be defended here. There is an approximation to such an idea in Acts xiii. 33, where also Paul is the speaker. "God," he says, "has fulfilled His promise by raising up Jesus; as it is written also in the second Psalm, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee." Here the resurrection day, strictly speaking, is the birthday of the Son of God; sonship is a dignity to which He is exalted after death. But in view of passages like Gal. iv. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 5 f., it is impossible to suppose that Paul limited his use of Son of God in this way; even while Jesus lived on earth there was that in Him which no connection with David could explain, but which rested on a relation to God; the resurrection only declared Him to be what He truly was—just as in the Psalm, for that matter, the bold words, This day have I begotten Thee, may be said to refer, not to the right and title, but to the coronation of the King. In virtue of His resurrection, which is here conceived, not as *from* the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν), but of the dead (ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν—a resurrection exemplifying, and so guaranteeing, that of others), Christ is established in that dignity which is His, and which answers to His nature. The expression κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης characterises Christ ethically, as κατὰ σάρκα does physically. Not that it makes the sonship in question "ethical" as opposed to "metaphysical": no such distinctions were in the Apostle's thought. But the sonship, which was declared by the resurrection, answered to (κατὰ) the spirit of holiness which was the inmost and deepest reality in the Person and life of Jesus. The sense that there is that in Christ which is explained by his connection with mankind, and that also which can only be explained by some peculiar relation to God, is no doubt conveyed in this description, and is the basis of the orthodox doctrine of the two natures in the one Person of the Lord; but it is a mistake to say that that doctrine is formulated here. The connection of the words ἐν δυνάμει is doubtful. They have been joined to ὁρισθέντος (*cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 4: ζῇ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ): declared to be Son of God "by a miracle," a mighty work wrought by God; and also with υἱοῦ θεοῦ = Son of God, not in humiliation, but "in power," a power demonstrated by the gift of the Spirit and its operations in the Church. "Jesus, Messiah, Our Lord," summarises all this. "Our Lord" is the most compendious expression of the Christian consciousness. (A. B. Bruce, *Apologetics*, 398 ff.) "The whole Gospel of Paul is comprehended in this historical Jesus, who has appeared in flesh, but who, on the ground of the πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, which constitutes His essence, has been exalted as Christ and Lord." (Lipsius.)

Ver. 5. Through Christ Paul received χάριν κ. ἀποστολήν. The plural, ἐλάβομεν, may mean no more than the

πίστεως πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος [d] αὐτοῦ, 6. ἐν οἷς ἐστε καὶ ὑμεῖς, κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ·) 7. πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ,[1] κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

d Ch. xvi. 26; Acts vi. 7.
e Acts v. 41, ix. 16, xv. 26.

8. Πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ[2] πάντων ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ [f] κόσμῳ·

f 1 Thess. i. 8.

[1] For πασιν τοις ουσιν εν Ρωμῃ αγαπητοις θεου G reads πασι τοις ουσιν εν αγαπῃ θεου. The same MS. also omits τοις εν Ρωμῃ in ver. 17. This is part of the evidence on which Lightfoot relied to show that Paul had issued chaps. i.-xiv. of this Epistle as a circular letter with all local allusions (such as these, and the many in chaps. xv. and xvi.) omitted. See Introduction, p. 578.

[2] For υπερ read περι with ℵBACD[1], etc.

singular, or may proceed from the latent consciousness that the writer is not the only person entitled to say this; it is not expressly meant to include others. χάρις, grace, is common to all Christians; ἀποστολὴ rests upon a specialised χάρις and implies competence as well as vocation. But in the N.T. these are hardly distinguished; it is a man's χάρισμα which constitutes his "call" to any particular service in the Church. εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως: the object of the apostleship received through Christ is obedience of faith, *i.e.*, the obedience which consists in faith (but *cf.* Acts vi. 7) among all the Gentiles. *Cf.* chap. x. 16, 2 Thess. i. 8. The meaning of ἔθνεσιν (Gentiles, not nations) is fixed by ver. 13 and by Paul's conception of his own vocation, Gal. i. 16, ii. 8, Eph. iii. 1 ff. ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ: the final purpose of his vocation is that Christ's name may be above every name.

Ver. 6. The Romans, as well as others, are included among the Gentiles, and described as Jesus Christ's called. They belong to Him, because they have heard and obeyed the Gospel. "Calling" in Paul always includes obedience as well as hearing. It is effectual calling, the κλητοὶ being those who have accepted the Divine invitation.

Ver. 7. The salutation proper. It is addressed to *all* who are in Rome, etc., to include Christians of Jewish as well as Gentile origin. They are ἀγαπητοὶ θεοῦ, God's beloved, because they have had experience of His redeeming love in Jesus Christ; and they are κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, saints, in virtue of His calling. See on κλητὸς ἀπόστολος above. The word ἅγιος did not originally describe character, but only a certain relation to God; the ἅγιοι are God's people. What this means depends of course on what God is; it is assumed in scripture that the character of God's people will answer to their relation to Him. It is worth mentioning that, as a synonym for Christian, it is never applied in the N.T. to an individual: no person is called ἅγιος. Phil. iv. 21 (ἀσπάσασθε πάντα ἅγιον ἐν Χ. Ἰ.) is not an exception. The ideal of God's people cannot be adequately realised in, and ought not to be presumptuously claimed by, any single person. (Hort's *Christian Ecclesia*, 56.) Paul wishes the Romans grace and peace (the source and the sum of all Christian blessings) from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. The greeting is followed by a thanksgiving, which passes over insensibly into an introduction of a more personal character, in which Paul explains his desire to visit the Romans and to work among them (vers. 8-15).

Ver. 8. πρῶτον μέν. Nothing can take precedence of thanksgiving, when Paul thinks of the Romans, or indeed of any Christian Church in normal health. πρῶτον μὲν suggests that something is to follow, but what it is we are not told; Paul's mind unconsciously leaves the track on which it started, at least so far as the linguistic following out of it is concerned. Perhaps the next thing was to be the prayer referred to in ver. 10. (Weiss.) διὰ Ἰ. Χ. Jesus Christ must be conceived here as the mediator through whom all our approaches to God are made (Eph. ii. 18), not as He through whom the blessings come for which Paul gives thanks. περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν: the "all" may have a certain emphasis when we remember the divisions to which reference is made in chap. xiv. ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν is "the fact that you are Christians". The very existence of a Church at Rome was

g Phil. iii. 3. h Eph. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2. i 1 Thess. ii. 8. k 1 Cor. xii. 1, 4. l ἄχρι τ. δ. here only. m Phil. i. 22.

9. μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστιν ὁ Θεός, ᾧ [g] λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι, πάντοτε ἐπὶ τῶν [h] προσευχῶν μου δεόμενος, 10. εἴ πως ἤδη ποτὲ εὐοδωθήσομαι ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· 11. ἐπιποθῶ γὰρ ἰδεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἵνα τι [i] μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν [k] πνευματικόν, εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, 12. τοῦτο δέ ἐστι, συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν ἀλλήλοις πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ. 13. οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, (καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ [l] δεῦρο,) ἵνα [m] καρπόν τινα σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς

something to be thankful for. **ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ** is, of course, hyperbole, but a Church in Rome was like "a city set on a hill".

Ver. 9 f. **μάρτυς γάρ μού ἐστιν ὁ θεός** (Phil. i. 8): at a distance the Apostle cannot directly prove his love, but he appeals to God, who hears his ceaseless prayers for the Romans, as a witness of it. **λατρεύω** in the LXX is always used of religious service—worship, whether of the true God or of idols. **ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου**: Paul's ministry is spiritual and rendered with his spirit—not like that of the ministers in the **ἅγιον κοσμικὸν** at Jerusalem. **ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ**: in preaching the glad tidings of His Son. **ὡς ἀδιαλείπτως**: the **ὡς** may either be "how" or "that": looking to 1 Thess. ii. 10, "how" seems more probable. **μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμαι**: I remember you. *Cf.* Job xiv. 13 (O that Thou wouldst appoint me **χρόνον ἐν ᾧ μνείαν μου ποιήσῃ**). **ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου**: at my prayers. (Winer, p. 470.) For **εἴ πως**, see Acts xxvii. 12 and Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 276. **ἤδη** is "now at length," "now, after all this waiting". (S. and H.) The **ποτὲ**, which can hardly be conveyed in English, marks the indefiniteness which even yet attaches in the writer's mind to the fulfilment of this hope. **εὐοδωθήσομαι**: the R.V. gives "I may be prospered"; the A.V. "I might have a prosperous journey". The latter brings in the idea of the **ὁδὸς**, which was no doubt present to consciousness when the word **εὐοδοῦσθαι** was first used; but it is questionable whether any feeling for the etymology remained in the current employment of the word. The other N.T. examples (1 Cor. xvi. 2, 3 John ver. 2), as well as the LXX, suggest the contrary. Hence the R.V. is probably right. **ἐν τῷ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ**: his long cherished and often disappointed hope had taught Paul to say, "if the Lord will" (Jas. iv. 15).

Ver. 11. **ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα πνευματικόν**. The **χαρ. πν.** may be understood by reference to 1 Cor. chaps. xii.-xiv. or Rom. chap. xii. No doubt, in substance, Paul imparts his spiritual gift through this epistle: what he wished to do for the Romans was to further their comprehension of the purpose of God in Jesus Christ—a purpose the breadth and bearings of which were yet but imperfectly understood.

Ver. 12. **τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν**: an explanatory correction. Paul disclaims being in a position in which all the giving must be on his side. When he is among them (**ἐν ὑμῖν**) his desire is that he may be cheered and strengthened with them (the subject of **συνπαρακληθῆναι** must be **ἐμὲ** in the first instance, though widening, as the sentence goes on, into **ἡμᾶς**) by the faith which both they and he possess (**ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ**), and which each recognises in the other (**ἐν ἀλλήλοις**). The **ἐν** here is to be taken as in 2 Tim. i. 5.

Ver. 13. **οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν**: a phrase of constant recurrence in Paul, and always with **ἀδελφοί** (1 Thess. iv. 13, 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1, 2 Cor. i. 8). Some emphasis is laid by it on the idea that his desire or purpose to visit them was no passing whim. It was grounded in his vocation as Apostle of the Gentiles, and though it had been often frustrated he had never given it up. **ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο**: probably the main obstacle was evangelistic work which had to be done elsewhere. *Cf.* chap. xv. 22 f. The purpose of his visit is expressed in **ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ**: that I may obtain some fruit among you also. **καρπὸς** denotes the result of labour: it might either mean new converts or the furtherance of the Christians in their new life. **καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν**: nothing could indicate more clearly that the Church at Rome, as a whole, was Gentile.

καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν. 14. Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί· 15. [n] οὕτω τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ [1] εὐαγγελίσασθαι. 16. Οὐ γὰρ ἐπαισχύνομαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ [2]· [o] δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ

n Rev. iii. 16.
o 1 Cor. i. 18, 24.

[1] **τοις εν Ρωμῃ** om. G; see on ver. 7.

[2] **του Χριστου** om. ℵABCD, etc. **πρωτον** is omitted here in BG g and Tert. It is inserted in ℵACDKL. The combination of B with "Western" authorities lessens its weight in Paul's epp., where B itself has an infusion of Western readings to which this omission may belong; possibly it may be due to Marcion, who is known to have omitted both **πρωτον** and the quotation in ver. 17. Weiss retains it; W. and H. bracket.

Ver. 14 f. These verses are naturally taken as an expansion of the thought contained in the preceding. Paul's desire to win fruit at Rome, as among the rest of the Gentiles, arises out of the obligation (for so he feels it) to preach the Gospel to all men without distinction of language or culture. If it depended only on him, he would be exercising his ministry at Rome. The Romans are evidently conceived as Gentiles, but Paul does not indicate where they would stand in the broad classification of ver. 14. It is gratuitous, and probably mistaken, to argue with Weiss that he meant to describe them as **βάρβαροι**, when we know that the early Roman Church was Greek speaking. In **τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον**, the simplest construction is to make **τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ** subject and **πρόθυμον** predicate, supplying **ἐστι**: all that depends on me is eager, *i.e.*, for my part, I am all readiness. But it is possible to take **τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον** together, and to translate: the readiness, so far as I am concerned, (is) to preach the Gospel to you also who are in Rome. The contrast implied is that between *willing* (which Paul for his part is equal to) and *carrying out* the will (which depends on God (ver. 10)). With this Paul introduces the great subject of the epistle, and, in a sense, of the Gospel—that which he here designates **δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ**. The connection is peculiar. He has professed his readiness to preach the Gospel, even at Rome. Anywhere, no doubt, one might have misgivings about identifying himself with a message which had for its subject a person who had been put to death as a criminal; anywhere, the Cross was to Jews a stumbling block and to Greeks foolishness. But at Rome, of all places, where the whole effective force of humanity seemed to be gathered up, one might be ashamed to stand forth as the representative of an apparently impotent and ineffective thing. But this the Gospel is not; it is the very reverse of this, and therefore the Apostle is proud to identify himself with it. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel; for it is a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. It is such because there is revealed in it **δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ**—the very thing men need to ensure salvation; and that in such a manner—from faith to faith—as to make it accessible to all. And this, again, only answers to what stands in the O.T.—It is written, the righteous shall live by faith."

Ver. 16 f. **δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστιν**: for it is a power of God. It does no injustice to render "a Divine power". The conception of the Gospel as a force pervades the epistles to the Corinthians; its proof, so to speak, is dynamical, not logical. It is demonstrated, not by argument, but by what it does; and, looking to what it can do, Paul is proud to preach it anywhere. **εἰς σωτηρίαν**: **σωτηρία** is one of a class of words (to which **ζωή, δόξα, κληρονομία** belong) used by Paul to denote the last result of the acceptance of the Gospel. It is the most negative of them all, and conceives of the Gospel as a means for rescuing men from the **ἀπώλεια** which awaits sinners at the last judgment. In **παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι** another of the main interests of the writer in this epistle is brought forward; the Gospel is for all, the same Gospel and on the same terms, but without prejudice to the historical prerogative of the Jew. Ver. 17 shows how the Gospel is a Divine saving power. It is such because there is revealed in it **δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ**. Plainly, **δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ** is something without which a sinful man cannot be saved; but what is it? The expression itself is of the utmost generality, and the various definite

τῷ πιστεύοντι, Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνι. 17. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ [p] Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ [q] ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται, "Ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως [r] ζήσεται."

p 2 Cor. v. 21.
q Ch. xvi. 25 f.
r Hab. ii. 4.

meanings which have been assigned to it attempt to justify themselves as relevant, or inevitable, by connecting themselves with the context as a whole. There can be no doubt that the fundamental religious problem for the Apostle—that which made a Gospel necessary, that the solution of which could alone *be* Gospel—was, How shall a sinful man be righteous before God? To Luther, who had instinctive experimental sympathy with the Pauline standpoint, this suggested that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ meant a righteousness valid before God, of which a man can become possessed through faith; for such a righteousness (as the condition of salvation) is the first and last need of the sinful soul. In support of this view reference has been made to ver. 18, where ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία ἀνθρώπων are represented as the actual existing conditions which the δικ. θεοῦ has to replace. No one can deny that a righteousness valid before God is essential to salvation, or that such a righteousness is revealed in the Gospel; but it is another question whether δικ. θεοῦ is a natural expression for it. The general sense of scholars seems to have decided against it; but it seems quite credible to me that Paul used δικ. θεοῦ broadly to mean "a Divine righteousness," and that the particular shade of meaning which Luther made prominent can be legitimately associated even with these words. Until lately, scholars of the most opposite schools had agreed in finding the key to the expression δικ. θεοῦ in two other Pauline passages, where it is contrasted with something else. Thus in chap. x. 3 δικ. θεοῦ is opposed to man's ἰδία δικαιοσύνη; and in Phil. iii. 9 the opposition is more precisely defined: μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει. If this contrast were allowed to tell here, the righteousness of which Paul speaks would be one of which God is the source or author; we do not bring it to Him, He reveals it for our acceptance. And this also, of course, answers to the facts: Gospel righteousness *is* a gift, not an achievement. But then, it is said, there is nothing in the passage to suggest such a contrast; there is not any emphasis whatever on θεοῦ to bring before the mind the idea of a righteousness *not* due to God, but a work of man's own. To this it may fairly be answered that the contrast did not *need* to be specially suggested; if it had not presented itself instinctively to those to whom Paul wrote, they would not only have missed the point of this expression, they would not have understood three lines anywhere. We must assume, upon the whole, in the recipients of Paul's epistles, a way of conceiving the Gospel answering broadly to his own; the invisible context, which we have to reproduce as best we can, may be more important sometimes than what we have in black and white. The broad sense of "a Divine righteousness" covers this second, which may be called the historical Protestant interpretation, as well as Luther's; and the fact seems to me an argument for that broader rendering. In view, however, of the undoubted difficulty of the phrase, new light would be welcome, and this has been sought in the O.T. use of δικαιοσύνη (צְדָקָה), especially in the Psalms and in Is. xl.-lxvi. See, *e.g.*, Ps. xxxv. 24, 28, li. 14; Is. lvi. 1, lxii. 1; Ps. xcviii. 2. In the last of these passages we have a striking analogy to the one before us: ἐγνώρισε κύριος τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, ἐναντίον τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀπεκάλυψε τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ; and in others we cannot but be struck with the parallelism of "righteousness" and "salvation," sometimes as things which belong to God (Ps. xcviii. 2), sometimes as things which belong to His people. On the strength of facts like these, Theod. Häring, in a stupendous programme entitled Δικ. θεοῦ *bei Paulus* (Tübingen, 1896), argues that δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ means the judicial action of God in which He justifies His people and accomplishes their salvation. This fits into the context well enough. Put as Paul puts it—how shall man be just with God?—the religious problem is a judicial one, and its solution must be judicial. If the Gospel shows how God justifies (for of course it must be God, the only Judge of all, who does it), it shows everything: salvation is included in God's sentence of justification. Häring himself admits that this interpretation is

18. ἈΠΟΚΑΛΥΠΤΕΤΑΙ γὰρ ὀργὴ Θεοῦ ἀπ᾿ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ [s] κατεχόν- [s 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7.]

rather of philological than of religious import; this "rechtfertigendes Walten Gottes" cannot but have as its consequence "the justification of man, a righteousness which proceeds from God and is valid before God" (Δικ. θεοῦ *bei Paulus*, S. 68); that is, this meaning leads by immediate inference to the other two. But it can by no means be carried through (any more than either of the other two) in all places where the phrase occurs; in iii. 5, *e.g.*, Häring himself admits this; in iii. 25, 26, where he insists on the same sense as in i. 17, he does not so much as refer to the clause διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ αὐτοῦ, which, it is not too much to say, necessitates a different shade of meaning for δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ there: see note. The advantage of his rendering is not so much that it simplifies the grammar, as that it revives the sense of a connection (which existed for the Apostle) between the Gospel he preached, and even the language he preached it in, and the anticipations of that Gospel in the O.T., and that it gives prominence to the saving character of God's justifying action. In substance all these three views are Biblical, Pauline and true to experience, whichever is to be vindicated on philological grounds. But the same cannot be said of another, according to which righteousness is here an attribute, or even the character, of God. That the Gospel *is* the supreme revelation of the character of God, and that the character of God is the source of the Gospel, no one can question. Certainly Paul would not have questioned it. But whether Paul conceived the righteousness which is an eternal attribute of God (*cf.* iii. 5) as essentially self-communicative—whether he would have said that God justifies (δικαιοῖ) the ungodly because he is himself δίκαιος—is another matter. The righteousness of God, conceived as a Divine attribute, may have appeared to Paul the great difficulty in the way of the justification of sinful man. God's righteousness in this sense is the sinner's condemnation, and no one will succeed in making him find in it the ground of his hope. What is wanted (always in consistency with God's righteousness as one of His inviolable attributes—the great point elaborated in chap. iii. 24-26) is a righteousness which, as man cannot produce it, must be from God, and which, once received, shall be valid before God; and this is what the Apostle (*on the ground of Christ's death for sin*) announces. But it introduces confusion to identify with this the conception of an eternal and necessarily self-imparting righteousness of God. The Apostle, in chap. iii. and chap. v., takes our minds along another route. See Barmby in *Expositor* for August, 1896, and S. and H. *ad loc.* ἀποκαλύπτεται intimates in a new way that the Divine righteousness spoken of is from God: man would never have known or conceived it but for the act of God in revealing it. Till this ἀποκαλύπτειν it was a μυστήριον: *cf.* xvi. 25 f. ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. Precise definitions of this (*e.g.*, Weiss's: the revelation of the δικ. θεοῦ *presupposes faith* in the sense of believing acceptance of the Gospel, *i.e.*, it is ἐκ πίστεως: and it *leads to faith* in the sense of saving reliance on Christ, *i.e.*, it is εἰς πίστιν) strike one as arbitrary. The broad sense seems to be that in the revelation of God's righteousness for man's salvation everything is of faith from first to last. *Cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 18. This N.T. doctrine the Apostle finds announced before in Hab. ii. 14. ἐκ πίστεως in the quotation is probably to be construed with ζήσεται. To take it with δίκαιος (he who is righteous by faith) would imply a contrast to another mode of being righteous (*viz.*, by works) which there is nothing in the text to suggest. The righteous who trusted in Jehovah were brought by that trust safe through the impending judgment in Habakkuk's time; and as the subjective side of religion, the attitude of the soul to God, never varies, it is the same trust which is the condition of salvation still.

The Gospel of God's righteousness is necessary, because the human race has no righteousness of its own. This is proved of the whole race (i. 18-iii. 20), but in these verses (18-32) first of the heathen. The emphasis lies throughout on the fact that they have sinned against light.

Ver. 18 f. The revelation of the righteousness of God (ver. 17) is needed in view of the revelation of His wrath, from which only δικ. θεοῦ (whether it be His justifying sentence or the righteousness which He bestows on man) can deliver. ὀργὴ in the N.T. is usually

t Neuter in N.T. here and in Acts only (11 times).
u Only here and Jude vers. 6.
v Here only in N.T.
w 1 Cor. iii. 20.
x 1 Cor. i. 20.

των. 19. διότι τὸ [t] γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς · ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφανέρωσε · 20. τὰ γὰρ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται, ἥ τε [u] ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ [v] θειότης, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους. 21. διότι γνόντες τὸν Θεόν, οὐχ ὡς Θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ εὐχαρίστησαν, ἀλλ' ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς [w] διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία · 22. φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ [x] ἐμωράνθησαν, 23. καὶ ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ

eschatological, but in 1 Thess. ii. 16 it refers to some historical judgment, and in John iii. 36 it is the condemnation of the sinner by God, with all that it involves, present and to come. The revelation of wrath here probably refers mainly to the final judgment: the primary character of Jesus in Paul's Gospel being ὁ ῥυόμενος ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης, 1 Thess. i. 10, Rom. v. 9; but it is not forcing it here to make it include God's condemnation uttered in conscience, and attested (ver. 24) in the judicial abandonment of the world. The revelation of the righteousness of God has to match this situation, and reverse it. ἀσέβεια is "positive and active irreligion": see Trench, *Syn.*, § lxvi. τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων may mean (1) who possess the truth, yet live in unrighteousness; or (2) who suppress the truth by, or in, an unrighteous life. In the N.T. ἀλήθεια is moral rather than speculative; it is truth of a sort which is held only as it is acted on: *cf.* the Johannine expression ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Hence the latter sense is to be preferred (see Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, II., S. 203 Anm.). διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. There is no indisputable way of deciding whether γνωστὸν here means "known" (the usual N.T. sense) or "knowable" (the usual classic sense). Cremer (who compares Phil. iii. 8 τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως, Heb. vi. 17 τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς, Rom. ii. 4 τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, and makes τοῦ θεοῦ in the passage before us also gen. poss.) favours the latter. What is meant in either case is the knowledge of God which is independent of such a special revelation as had been given to the Jews. Under this come (ver. 20) His eternal power, and in a word His (eternal) divinity, things inaccessible indeed to sense (ἀόρατα), but clear to intelligence (νοούμενα), ever since creation (ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου: for ἀπὸ thus used, see Winer, 463), by the things that are made. God's power, and the totality of the Divine attributes constituting the Divine nature, are inevitably impressed on the mind by nature (or, to use the scripture word, by creation). There is that within man which so catches the meaning of all that is without as to issue in an instinctive knowledge of God. (See the magnificent illustration of this in Illingworth's *Divine Immanence*, chap. ii., on The religious influence of the material world.) This knowledge involves duties, and men are without excuse because, when in possession of it, they did not perform these duties; that is, did not glorify as God the God whom they thus knew.

Ver. 21 ff. εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀναπολογήτους would naturally express purpose: to make men inexcusable is one, though not the only or the ultimate, intention of God in giving this revelation. But the διότι almost forces us to take the εἰς τὸ as expressing result: so that they are inexcusable, because, etc. (see Burton's *Moods and Tenses*, § 411). In vers. 21-23 the wrong course taken by humanity is described. Nature shows us that God is to be glorified and thanked, *i.e.*, nature reveals Him to be great and good. But men were not content to accept the impression made on them by nature; they fell to reasoning upon it, and in their reasonings (διαλογισμοί, "perverse self-willed reasonings or speculations," S. and H.) were made vain (ἐματαιώθησαν); the result stultified the process; their instinctive perception of God became confused and uncertain; their unintelligent heart, the seat of the moral consciousness, was darkened. In asserting their wisdom they became fools, and showed it conspicuously in their idolatries. They resigned the glory of the incorruptible God (*i.e.*, the incorruptible God, all glorious as He was, and as He was seen in nature to be), and took instead

πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἑρπετῶν. 24. διὸ καὶ [1] [y] παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· 25. οἵτινες μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει, καὶ [z] ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα, ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν. 26. διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας· αἵ τε γὰρ θήλειαι αὐτῶν μετήλλαξαν τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν· 27. ὁμοίως τε [2] καὶ οἱ ἄρσενες, ἀφέντες τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν τῆς θηλείας, ἐξεκαύθησαν ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους, ἄρσενες ἐν ἄρσεσι τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην κατεργαζόμενοι, καὶ τὴν [a] ἀντιμισθίαν ἣν ἔδει τῆς πλάνης αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἀπολαμβάνοντες. 28. Καὶ καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν Θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ [b] καθήκοντα,

y Eph. iv. 19.
z Here only, *cf.* Acts xvii. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 4.
a 2 Cor. vi. 13.
b Acts xxii. 22.

[1] διο και: om. και ℵABC; insert DGKL. εαυτοις D³EGK; αυτοις ℵABC [1].
[2] For τε which is found in ℵBD³KL, δε is read by AD¹G; C has neither.

of Him some image of a corruptible, even of a vile creature. The expression ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν κ.τ.λ. is borrowed in part from Ps. cv. 20 (LXX): ἠλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μόσχου ἔσθοντος χόρτον. The reduplication of the same idea in ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος shows the indignant contempt with which the Apostle looked on this empty and abject religion in which God had been lost. The birds, quadrupeds and reptiles could all be illustrated from Egypt.

With ver. 24 the Apostle turns from this sin to its punishment. Because of it (διὸ) God gave them up. To lose God is to lose everything: to lose the connection with Him involved in constantly glorifying and giving Him thanks, is to sink into an abyss of darkness, intellectual and moral. It is to become fitted for wrath at last, under the pressure of wrath all the time. Such, in idea, is the history of humanity to Paul, as interpreted by its issue in the moral condition of the pagan world when he wrote. Exceptions are allowed for (ii. 10), but this is the position as a whole. παρέδωκεν in all three places (ver. 24, εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν; ver. 26, εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας; ver. 28, εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν) expresses the judicial action of God. The sensual impurity of religions in which the incorruptible God had been resigned for the image of an animal, that could not but creep into the imagination of the worshippers and debase it, was a Divine judgment. τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, in accordance with the conception of a judicial act, expresses the Divine purpose—that their bodies might be dishonoured among them. For gen. of purpose, see Winer, 408 ff. (where, however, a different construction is given for this passage, τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι being made to depend immediately on ἀκαθαρσίαν).

Ver. 25. οἵτινες μετήλλαξαν κ.τ.λ.: being as they were persons who exchanged the truth of God for the lie. "The truth of God" (*cf.* ver. 23, "the glory of God") is the same thing as God in His truth, or the true God as He had actually revealed Himself to man. τὸ ψεῦδος, abstract for concrete, is the idol or false God. The ἐν (*cf.* ver. 23) answers to Hebrew בְּ. παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα: to the passing by, *i.e.*, disregard or contempt of the Creator. For this use of παρὰ, see Winer, 503 f. ὅς ἐστιν εὐλογητός: the doxology relieves the writer's feelings as he contemplates such horrors.

Ver. 26 f. With the second παρέδωκεν the Apostle proceeds to a further stage in this judicial abandonment of men, which is at the same time a revelation of the wrath of God from heaven against them. It issues not merely like the first in sensuality, but in sensuality which perverts nature as well as disregards God. The πλάνη, error or going astray (ver. 27), is probably still the original one of idolatry; the ignoring or degrading of God is the first fatal step out of the way, which ends in this slough.

29. πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, πορνείᾳ,[1] πονηρίᾳ, πλεονεξίᾳ, κακίᾳ· μεστοὺς φθόνου, φόνου, ἔριδος, δόλου, κακοηθείας· 30. ψιθυριστὰς, καταλάλους, θεοστυγεῖς, ὑβριστὰς, ὑπερηφάνους, ἀλαζόνας, ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, 31. ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους, ἀστόργους, ἀσπόνδους,[2] ἀνελεήμονας· 32. οἵτινες τὸ [c] δικαίωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες, ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν, οὐ μόνον αὐτὰ ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ [d] συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσι.[3]

c Ch. ii. 26; Luke i. 6.
d Acts viii. 1, xxii. 20.

[1] πορνεια om. with ℵABCK.

[2] ασπονδους CD³KL, vulg., Syr., is omitted by ℵ¹ABD¹G fuld.[1] Probably a gloss on ασυνθετους.

[3] Westcott and Hort suppose some primitive error probable here; see their *N. T.*, vol. 2, Appendix, p. 108. For ποιουσιν . . . συνευδοκουσιν B reads ποιουντες . . . συνευδοκουντες; and the construction is then completed by various additions, such as ουκ ενοησαν D, ουκ εγνωσαν G, *non intellexerunt* Orig. int.

Ver. 28 ff. In vers. 28-30 we have the third and last παρέδωκεν expanded. As they did not think fit, after trial made (ἐδοκίμασαν), to keep God in their knowledge, God gave them up to a mind which cannot stand trial (ἀδόκιμον). The one thing answers to the other. Virtually, they pronounced the true God ἀδόκιμος, and would have none of Him; and He in turn gave them up to a νοῦς ἀδόκιμος, a mind which is no mind and cannot discharge the functions of one, a mind in which the Divine distinctions of right and wrong are confused and lost, so that God's condemnation cannot but fall on it at last. νοῦς is not only reason, but conscience; when this is perverted, as in the people of whom Paul speaks, or in the Caananites, who did their abominations *unto their Gods*, the last deep of evil has been reached. Most of the words which follow describe sins of malignity or inhumanity rather than sensuality, but they cannot be classified. τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα covers all. καθήκοντα is the Stoic word which Cicero renders *officia*. κακοηθία, the tendency to put the worst construction on everything (Arist. Rh. ii. 13), and κακία are examined in Trench's *Synonyms*, § xi., and ὑβριστής, ὑπερήφανος, ἀλάζων in § xxix. θεοστυγεῖς appears to be always passive in the classics, not God hating, but God hated: *Deo odibiles*, Vulg. The characters are summed up, so to speak, in ver. 32: οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες κ.τ.λ.: such persons as, though they know the sentence of God, that those who practise such things are worthy of death, not only do them, but give a whole-hearted complacent assent to those who follow the same practice. τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ is that which God has pronounced to be the right, and has thereby established as the proper moral order of the world. θάνατος is death, not as a natural period to life, but as a Divine sentence executed on sin: it is not to be defined as physical, or spiritual, or eternal; by all such abstract analysis it is robbed of part of its meaning, which is as wide as that of life or the soul. ἀλλὰ καὶ συνευδοκοῦσιν: to be guilty of such things oneself, under the impulse of passion, is bad; but it is a more malignant badness to give a cordial and disinterested approval to them in others.

It is a mistake to read these verses as if they were a scientific contribution to comparative religion, but equally a mistake to ignore their weight. Paul is face to face with a world in which the vices he enumerates are rampant, and it is his deliberate judgment that these vices have a real connection with the pagan religions. Who will deny that he was both a competent observer and a competent judge? Religion and morality in the great scale hang together, and morality in the long run is determined by religion. Minds which accepted the religious ideas of Phenicia, of Egypt or of Greece (as represented in the popular mythologies) could not be pure. Their morality, or rather their immorality, is conceived as a Divine judgment upon their religion; and as for their religion, nature itself, the Apostle argues, should have saved them from such ignorance of God, and such misconceptions of Him, as deformed every type of heathenism. A converted pagan (as much as Paul) would be filled with horror as he re-

II. 1. ΔΙΟ [a] ἀναπολόγητος εἶ, ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν κατακρίνεις· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων. 2. οἴδαμεν δὲ [1] ὅτι τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας. 3. Λογίζῃ δὲ τοῦτο, ὦ ἄνθρωπε ὁ κρίνων τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας καὶ ποιῶν αὐτά, ὅτι σὺ ἐκφεύξῃ τὸ κρίμα τοῦ Θεοῦ; 4. ἢ τοῦ [b] πλούτου τῆς χρηστότητος αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀνοχῆς καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας καταφρονεῖς, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει; 5. κατὰ δὲ τὴν [c] σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ

a Ch. i. 20.
b Ch. ix. 23, xi. 33.
c Here only.

[1] δε ABDGKL, γαρ ℵC d, vulg. A full statement of the evidence in S. and H. whose verdict is: "an even balance of authorities, both sides drawing their evidence from varied quarters".

flected on the way in which he had once thought of God; he would feel in himself that he ought to have known better, and that everything in the world cried shame upon him. Now to recognise this fact is to accept the premises of the Apostle's argument, and the use to which he puts it. "Once we went after dumb idols; our very worship led us into sin, and sometimes even consecrated it; now we can only see in this our own blindness and guilt, and God's judgment upon them"—so we can fancy the converted pagan speaking. Such a world, then, as the Apostle describes in this chapter, with this terrible principle of degeneration at work in it, and no power of self-regeneration, is a world which waits for a righteousness of God.

For an interesting attempt to show Paul's indebtedness for some of the ideas and arguments of vers. 18-32 to the book of Wisdom, see S. and H., p. 51 f.

Chapter II.—Vers. 1-16. The Apostle has now to prove that the righteousness of God is as necessary to the Jew as to the pagan; it is the Jew who is really addressed in this chapter from the beginning, though he is not named till ver. 9. In vers. 1-10 Paul explains the principle on which God judges all men, without distinction.

Ver. 1. **διό**: The Jew is ready enough to judge the Gentile. But he forgets that the same principle on which the Gentile is condemned, *viz.*, that he does evil in spite of better knowledge (i. 32), condemns himself also. His very assent to the impeachment in chap. i. 18-32 is his own condemnation. This is the force of **διὸ**: therefore. **ἐν ᾧ** = in that in which. **τὰ αὐτὰ πράσσεις**, not, you do the identical actions, but your conduct is the same, *i.e.*, you sin against light. The sin of the Jews was the same, but their sins were not.

Ver. 2. **κατὰ ἀλήθειαν** is predicate: God's judgment squares with the facts—this is the whole rule of it. **τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντας**: those whose conduct is such as has been described. For the text, see critical note.

Ver. 3. **σὺ** has strong emphasis. The Jew certainly thought, in many cases, that the privilege of his birth would of itself ensure his entrance into the kingdom (Mt. iii. 8, 9): this was his practical conviction, whatever might be his proper creed. Yet the **σὺ** indicates that of all men the Jew, so distinguished by special revelation, should least have fallen into such an error. He is "the servant who knew his Lord's will," and whose judgment will be most rigorous if it is neglected.

Ver. 4. **ἢ** states the alternative. Either he thinks he will escape, or he despises, etc. **χρηστότης** is the kindliness which disposes one to do good; **ἀνοχὴ** (in N.T. only here and in iii. 26) is the forbearance which suspends punishment; **μακροθυμία** is patience, which waits long before it actively interposes. **τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ** summarises all three in the concrete. It amounts to contempt of God's goodness if a man does not know (rather, *ignores*: *cf.* Acts xiii. 27, 1 Cor. xiv. 38, Rom. x. 3) that its end is, not to approve of his sins, but to lead him to repentance.

Ver. 5. The **δὲ** contrasts what happens with what God designs. **θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργήν**: contrast our Lord's many sayings about "treasure in heaven" (Mt. vi. 19 ff., xix. 21). **ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς** = in the day of wrath. The conception was quite definite: there was only one day in view, what is elsewhere called "the day of the Lord" (2 Cor. i. 14), "the

d Here only. e 1 Cor. xv. 42; 2 Tim. i. 10. f Phil. ii. 3; Jas. iii. 14, 16.

ἀποκαλύψεως [d] δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, 6. ὃς ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ· 7. τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ [e] ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι, ζωὴν αἰώνιον· 8. τοῖς δὲ ἐξ [f] ἐριθείας, καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι μὲν [1] τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή, 9. θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν, Ἰουδαίου τε πρῶτον καὶ Ἕλληνος· 10. δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν,

[1] **απειθουσι μεν** AD³KLN³; om. **μεν** ℵ¹BDG¹.

day of judgment" (Mt. xi. 22), "the last day" (John vi. 39), "the day of God" (2 Pet. iii. 12), "that day" (2 Tim. i. 12), even simply "the day" (1 Cor. iii. 13, Heb. x. 25). This great day is so defined in the Apostle's imagination that the article can be dispensed with. But see Ps. cx. 5. (cix. LXX.) It is a day when God is revealed as a righteous judge, in the sense of Psalm lxi. 13 (LXX).

Ver. 6. The law enunciated in the Psalm, that God will render to every one according to his works, is valid within the sphere of redemption as well as independent of it. Paul the Christian recognises its validity as unreservedly as Saul the Pharisee would have done. The application of it may lead to very different results in the two cases, but the universal moral conscience, be it in bondage to evil, or emancipated by Christ, accepts it without demur. Paul had no feeling that it contradicted his doctrine of justification by faith, and therefore we are safe to assert that it did not contradict it. It seems a mistake to argue with Weiss that Paul is here speaking of the *Urnorm* of the Divine righteousness, *i.e.*, of the way in which the destiny of men would be determined *if there were no Gospel*. The Gospel does not mean that God denies Himself; He acts in it according to His eternal nature; and though Paul is speaking to men as under the law, the truth which he is insisting upon is one which is equally true whether men are under the law or under grace. It is not a little piece of the leaven of a Jewish or Pharisaic conception of God, not yet purged out, that is found here; but an eternal law of God's relation to man.

Ver. 7. **καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ**: *cf.* the collective **ἔργον**—"life-work": S. and H.—in ver. 15: "by way of stedfastness in well-doing". **δόξαν** = the glory of the future life, as revealed in the Risen Saviour. **τιμήν** = honour with God. **ἀφθαρσίαν** "proves that the goal of effort is nothing earthly" (Lipsius). **ζωὴ αἰώνιος** comprehends all these three: as its counterpart, **θάνατος** in ver. 31, involves the loss of all. **ζωὴν** is governed by **ἀποδώσει.**

Ver. 8. **τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας**: for the use of **ἐκ**, *cf.* iii. 26, **τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ**; Gal. iii. 7, **οἱ ἐκ πίστεως**; Ch. iv. 14, **οἱ ἐκ νόμου.** Lightfoot suggests that it is better to supply **πράσσουσιν,** and to construe **ἐξ ἐριθείας** with the participle, as in Phil. i. 17 it is construed with **καταγγέλλουσιν**: but it is simpler not to supply anything. By "those who are of faction" or "factiousness" (Gal. v. 20, 2 Cor. xii. 20, Phil. i. 16 f., ii. 3, Jas. iii. 14, 16) the Apostle probably means men of a self-willed temper, using all arts to assert themselves against God. The result of this temper—the temper of the party man carried into the spiritual world—is seen in disobedience to the truth and obedience to unrighteousness. See note on **ἀλήθεια,** i. 18. The moral import of the word is shown by its use as the counterpart of **ἀδικία.** *Cf.* the same contrast in 1 Cor. xiii. 6. To those who pursue this course there accrues indignation and wrath, etc.

Ver. 9. **ὀργὴ** is wrath within; **θυμός** wrath as it overflows. **θλίψις** and **στενοχωρία,** according to Trench, *Synonyms*, § 55, express very nearly the same thing, under different images: the former taking the image of pressure, the latter that of confinement in a narrow space. But to draw a distinction between them, based on etymology, would be very misleading. In both pairs of words the same idea is expressed, only intensified by the reduplication. Supply **ἔσται** for the changed construction. **κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν**: who works at evil and works it out or accomplishes it. The Jew is put first, because as possessor of an express law this is conspicuously true of him.

Ver. 10 f. **εἰρήνη** is probably =

Ἰουδαίῳ τε πρῶτον καὶ ʹἝλληνι· 11. οὐ γάρ ἐστι προσωποληψία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. 12. ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον, διὰ νόμου κριθήσονται, 13. (οὐ γὰρ οἱ ᵍ ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου[1] δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. 14. ʹΟταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα ʰ φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῇ,[2] οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσι νόμος· 15. οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου ⁱ γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως, καὶ μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων

g Jas. i. 22 f., 25, iv. 11.
h Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8; Eph. ii. 3.
i Here only in N.T.

[1] **ακροαται του νομου** KL 17, other cursives, Marcion; om. **του** ℵABDG. **παρα τῳ θεῳ** ℵAD³GKL; om. **τῳ** BD¹. W. and H. bracket **τῳ**. **ποιηται του νομου** D³KL 17, other cursives, Marcion; om. **του** ℵABD¹G.

[2] For **ποιῃ** D³ (a grammatical correction) **ποιωσιν** is found in ℵAB.

שָׁלוֹם, a comprehensive term, rather = salvation, than peace in any narrower sense. The Jew still comes first, but it is only order that is involved: the same principle underlies the judgment for Jew and Gentile. It would amount to **προσωποληµψία** in God, if He made a difference in the Jew's favour because of his birth, or because he possessed the law. This is expanded in vers. 12-16: mere possession of the law does not count. Men are judged according to their works, whether they have or have not had such a special revelation of the Divine will as was given to Israel.

Ver. 12. **ἀνόμως** means "without law," not necessarily "without *the* law". In point of fact, no doubt, there was only one law given by God, the Mosaic, and Paul is arguing against those who imagined that the mere possession of it put them in a position of privilege as compared with those to whom it was not given; but he expresses himself with a generality which would meet the case of more such revelations of God's will having been made to man. As many as sin "without law" shall also perish "without law". Sin and perdition are correlative in Paul. **ἀπώλεια** (ix. 22, Phil. i. 28, iii. 19) answers to **ζωὴ αἰώνιος**: it is final exclusion from the blessedness implied in this expression; having no part in the kingdom of God. Similarly, as many as sin "in law" shall be judged "by law". The expression would cover any law, whatever it might be; really, the Mosaic law is the only one that has to be dealt with. The use of the aorist **ἥμαρτον** is difficult. Weiss says it is used as though the writer were looking back from the judgment day, when sin is simply past. Burton compares iii. 23 and calls it a "collective historical aorist": in either case the English idiom requires the perfect: "all who have sinned".

Ver. 13. This is the principle of judgment, for not the hearers of law (the Mosaic or any other) are just with God, but the law doers shall be justified. **ἀκροαταὶ** tends to mean "pupils," constant hearers, who are educated in the law: see ver. 10. But no degree of familiarity with the law avails if it is not done. The forensic sense of **δικαιοῦσθαι** is apparent in this verse, where it is synonymous with **δίκαιοι εἶναι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ**: the latter obviously being the opposite of "to be condemned". Whether there are persons who perfectly keep the law, is a question not raised here. The futures **ἀπολοῦνται, κριθήσονται, δικαιωθήσονται** all refer to the day of final judgment.

Ver. 14. There is, indeed, when we look closely, no such thing as a man absolutely without the knowledge of God's will, and therefore such a judgment as the Apostle has described is legitimate. Gentiles, "such as have not law" in any special shape, when they do by nature "the things of the law"—*i.e.*, the things required by the law given to Israel, the only one known to the Apostle—are in spite of not having law (as is the supposition here) a law to themselves. **ἔθνη** is not "the Gentiles," but "Gentiles as such"—persons who can be characterised as "without law". The supposition made in **τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα** is that of the Jews; and the Apostle's argument is designed to show that though formally, it is not substantially true.

Ver. 15. **οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται**: the relative is qualitative: "inasmuch as

τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων,) 16. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε [1] κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν [k] μου, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

k Ch. xvi 25; 2 Tim. ii. 8.

[1] εν ημερᾳ οτε ℵDGKL, vulg., Syr. εν ῃ ημερᾳ B (this is one of the cases in which W. and H. suppose that B unsupported has preserved the true reading, though they give a place in their margin both to εν ημερᾳ οτε and to εν ημερᾳ ῃ, which is found in A and the Memph. (Egyptian) version).

they shew". **τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου** is the work which the law prescribes, collectively. "Written on their hearts," when contrasted with the law written on the tables of stone, is equal to "unwritten"; the Apostle refers to what the Greeks called **ἄγραφος νόμος**. To the Greeks, however, this was something greater and more sacred than any statute, or civil constitution; to the Apostle it was less than the great revelation of God's will, which had been made and interpreted to Israel, but nevertheless a true moral authority. There is a triple proof that Gentiles, who are regarded as not having law, are a law to themselves. (1) The appeal to their conduct: as interpreted by the Apostle, their conduct evinces, at least in some, the possession of a law written on the heart; (2) the action of conscience: it joins its testimony, though it be only an inward one, to the outward testimony borne by their conduct; and (3) their thoughts. Their thoughts bear witness to the existence of a law in them, inasmuch as in their mutual intercourse (**μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων**) these thoughts are busy bringing accusations, or in rarer cases (**ἢ καί**) putting forward defences, *i.e.*, in any case, exercising moral functions which imply the recognition of a law. This seems to me the only simple and natural explanation of a rather perplexed phrase. We need not ask for what Paul does not give, the object to **κατηγορούντων** or **ἀπολογουμένων**: it may be any person, act or situation, which calls into exercise that power of moral judgment which shows that the Gentiles, though without the law of Moses, are not in a condition which makes it impossible to judge them according to their works. The construction in ix. 1 suggests that the **συν** views the witness of conscience, reflecting on conduct, as something added to the first instinctive consciousness of the nature of an action. **συνείδησις** does not occur in the Gospels except in John viii. 9; twice only in Acts, xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16, both times in speeches of St. Paul; twenty times in the Pauline epistles. It occurs in the O.T. only in Ecc. x. 20 (curse not the King, **ἐν συνειδήσει σου** = ne in cogitatione quidem tua): the ordinary sense is found, for the first time in Biblical Greek, in Sap. xvii. 11. It is a quasi-philosophical word, much used by the Stoics, and belonging rather to the Greek than the Hebrew inheritance of Paul.

Ver. 16. The day meant here is the same as that in ver. 5. Westcott and Hort only put a comma after **ἀπολογουμένων**, but a longer pause is necessary, unless we are to suppose that only the day of judgment wakes the conscience and the thoughts of man into the moral activity described in ver. 15. This supposition may have some truth in it, but it is not what the Apostle's argument requires. The proof he gives that Gentiles are "a law to themselves" must be capable of verification now, not only at the last day. Hence ver. 16 is really to be taken with the main verbs of the whole paragraph, **ἀπολοῦνται, κριθήσονται, δικαιωθήσονται**: the great principle of ver. 6—**ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ**—will be exhibited in action on the day on which God judges the secret things of men through Christ Jesus. A final judgment belonged to Jewish theology, and perhaps, though this is open to question, one in which the Messiah acted as God's representative; but what Paul teaches here does not rest merely on the transference of a Jewish Messianic function to Jesus. If there is anything certain in the N.T. it is that this representation of Jesus as judge of the world rests on the words of our Lord Himself (Mt. vii. 22 f., xxv. 31 ff.). To assert it was an essential part of the Gospel as preached by Paul: *cf.* Acts xvii. 31. (Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, S. 85 f., thinks that in the circles of Jewish Pietism, in the century before Christ, the Messiah was already spoken of as the Divine judge, and as sharing the titles and attributes of Jehovah.)

In vers. 17-24 the Apostle brings to a point the argument for which he has been clearing the way in vers. 1-16.

17. Ἴδε[1] σὺ Ἰουδαῖος [l]ἐπονομάζῃ, καὶ ἐπαναπαύῃ τῷ νόμῳ, καὶ καυχᾶσαι ἐν Θεῷ, 18. καὶ γινώσκεις τὸ θέλημα, καὶ δοκιμάζεις τὰ [m]διαφέροντα, [n]κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου· 19. πέποιθάς τε σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, 20. [o]παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς

l Here only in N.T.
m Phil. i. 10.
n 1 Cor. xiv. 19.
o Heb. xii. 9.

[1] ει δε ℵABD[1]K; ιδε D[3]L Syr. ει δε has probably been changed into ιδε (Alford) to avoid the anacoluthon. **επαναπαυῃ τῳ νομῳ** D[3]KL 17; om. τω ℵABD[1].

The Jew makes much of the possession of the law, but when we pass from possession to practice, he is not a whit better than the "lawless" Gentile. The construction is not quite regular, but the meaning is clear. The natural order would be: If thou bearest the name of Jew, and restest upon the law, *and yet in thy conduct settest the law at nought*, art not thou equally under condemnation with sinners of the Gentiles? But the construction is interrupted at the end of ver. 20, and what ought in logic to be part of the protasis—*if in thy conduct thou settest the law at nought*—is made a sort of apodosis, at least grammatically and rhetorically: *dost thou, in spite of all these privileges, nevertheless set the law at nought?* The real conclusion, which Paul needs for his argument, Art not thou then in the same condemnation with the Gentiles? is left for conscience to supply.

Ver. 17. **Ἰουδαῖος ἐπονομάζῃ**: bearest the name of "Jew". The **ἐπὶ** in the compound verb does not denote addition, but direction: **Ἰουδαῖος** is not conceived as a surname, but a name which has been imposed. Of course it is implied in the context that the name is an honourable one. It is not found in the LXX, and in other places where Paul wishes to indicate the same distinction, and the same pride in it, he says **Ἰσραηλεῖται** (ix. 4, 2 Cor. xi. 22). The terms must have had a tendency to coalesce in import, though **Ἰουδαῖος** is national, and **Ἰσραηλείτης** religious; for the religion was national. **ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ**: grammatically **νόμῳ** is law; really, it is the Mosaic law. The Jew said, We have a law, and the mere possession of it gave him confidence. *Cf.* Mic. iii. 11, **ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον ἐπανεπαύοντο. καυχᾶσαι ἐν θεῷ**: boastest in God, as the covenant God of the Jews, who are His peculiar people. **καυχᾶσαι** = **καυχᾷ**: the longer form is the usual one in the **κοινή**.

Ver. 18. **τὸ θέλημα** is God's will. Lipsius compares the absolute use of **ὁδός, θύρα** and **ὄνομα**. *Cf.* Acts ix. 2, xix. 9, 23, xiv. 27, v. 41. Also 1 Cor. xvi. 12, where God's will is meant, not the will of Apollos. The words **δοκιμάζεις τὰ διαφέροντα κατηχούμενος ἐκ τοῦ νόμου** are to be taken together. In virtue of being taught out of the law (in the synagogue and the schools) the Jew possesses moral discernment: he does not sink to the **νοῦς ἀδόκιμος**, the mind which has lost all moral capacity (i. 28). But a certain ambiguity remains in **δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα**: it may mean either (1) to distinguish, by testing, between things which differ—*i.e.*, to discriminate experimentally between good and evil; or (2) to approve, after testing, the things which are more excellent. There are no grounds on which we can decide positively for either.

Ver. 19 f. **πέποιθάς τε κ.τ.λ.** The **τε** indicates that this confidence is the immediate and natural result of what precedes: it is not right, in view of all the N.T. examples, to say that **πέποιθας** suggests an unjustifiable confidence, though in some cases, as in the present, it is so. *Cf.* 2 Cor. x. 7, Lk. xviii. 9. The blind, those in darkness, the foolish, the babes, are all names for the heathen: the Jew is confident that the Gentiles must come to school to him. **παιδευτὴς** has reference to moral as well as intellectual discipline: and **ἄφρονες** are, as in the O.T. (Ps. xiii. 1, LXX), persons without moral intelligence. For the other figures in this verse, *cf.* Mt. xv. 14, Is. xlix. 6, 9, xlii. 6. The confidence of the Jew is based on the fact that he possesses in the law "the outline of knowledge and truth". Lipsius puts a strong sense upon **μόρφωσιν**—die leibhaftige Verkörperung: as if the Jew conceived that in the Mosaic law the knowledge and the truth of God were incorporated bodily. Possibly he did, and in a sense it was so, for the Mosaic law was a true revelation of God and His will: but the only other instance of **μόρφωσις** in the N.T. (2 Tim. iii. 5

ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. 21. ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις; ὁ κηρύσσων μὴ κλέπτειν, κλέπτεις; 22. ὁ λέγων μὴ μοιχεύειν, μοιχεύεις; ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἴδωλα, ἱεροσυλεῖς; 23. ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν Θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις; 24. "τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι," καθὼς [p] γέγραπται. 25. Περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ, ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾖς, ἡ περιτομή σου

p Is. lii. 5.

ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας) rather suggests the same disparaging note which here belongs to **πέποιθας.** The **μόρφωσις τῆς γνώσεως** is in point of fact only a form: valuable as the outline or definition of truth was, which the Jew possessed in the law, it was in reality ineffective, so far as the practical authority of the law in the Jew's conduct was concerned.

Ver. 21. Here the grammatical apodosis begins, the **οὖν** resuming all that has been said in vers. 17-20. **κηρύσσων** and **λέγων** are virtually verbs of command: hence the infinitives. The rhetorical question implies that the Jew does *not* teach himself, and that he *does* break the law he would enforce on others.

Ver. 22. **βδελυσσόμενος** properly expresses physical repulsion: thou that shrinkest in horror from idols. *Cf.* Dan. ix. 27, Mk. xiii. 14. **ἱεροσυλεῖς**: dost thou rob temples, and so, for the sake of gain, come in contact with abominations without misgiving? This is the meaning, and not, Dost thou rob the temple, by keeping back the temple dues? as has been suggested. The crime of **ἱεροσυλία** is referred to in Acts xix. 37, and according to Josephus, *Ant.*, iv., 8, 10, it was expressly forbidden to the Jews: **μὴ συλᾶν ἱερὰ ξενικά, μηδ' ἂν ἐπωνομασμένον ᾖ τινὶ θεῷ κειμήλιον λαμβάνειν.**

Ver. 23. Here again the construction is changed, and probably the use of the relative instead of the participle suggests that the sentence is to be read, not as interrogative, but as declaratory. "Thou who makest it thy boast that thou possessest a law, by the transgressing of that law dishonourest God: that is the sum of the whole matter, and thy sole distinction in contrast with the heathen."

Ver. 24. And this is only what Scripture bids us expect. The Scripture quoted is Is. lii. 5, LXX. The LXX interpret the Hebrew by inserting **δι' ὑμᾶς** and **ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.** Both insertions are in the line of the original meaning. It was owing to the misery and helplessness of the people of God, in exile among the nations, that the heathen scoffed at the Divine name. "The God of Israel is not able to deliver His people: He is no God." Paul here gives the words quite another turn. God, he says, is now blasphemed among the nations because of the inconsistency between the pretensions of the Jews and their behaviour. As if the heathen were saying: "Like God, like people; what a Divinity the patron of this odious race must be". It is surely not right to argue (with Sanday and Headlam) that the throwing of the formula of quotation to the end shows that Paul is conscious of quoting freely: "it is almost as if it were an after-thought that the language he has just used is a quotation at all". The quotation is as relevant as most that the Apostle uses. He never cares for the context or the original application. When he can express himself in Scripture language he feels that he has the Word of God on his side, and all through this epistle he nails his arguments so, and insists on the confirmation they thus obtain. What the closing of the sentence with **καθὼς γέγραπται** suggests is not that it occurred to Paul after he had finished that he had almost unconsciously been using Scripture: it is rather that there is a challenge in the words, as if he had said, Let him impugn this who dare contest the Word of God.

In vers. 25-29 another Jewish plea for preferential treatment in the judgment is considered. The **μὲν** in ver. 25 (**περιτομὴ μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ**) implies that this plea has no doubt something in it, but it suggests that there are considerations on the other side which in point of fact make it inapplicable or invalid here. It is these considerations which the Apostle proceeds to explain, with a view to clenching the argument that the wrath of God revealed from heaven impends over Jew and Gentile alike.

Ver. 25. **περιτομή**: the absence of the article suggests that the argument may

ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν. 26. ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσῃ, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται; 27. καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον [q] τελοῦσα σὲ τὸν [r] διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου. 28. οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή· 29. ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ γράμματι. οὗ ὁ [s] ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ

q Jas. ii. 8.
r Ch. iv. 11, xiv. 20.
s 1 Cor. iv. 5.

be extended to everything of the same character as circumcision. **ὠφελεῖ**: Circumcision was the seal of the covenant, and as such an assurance given to the circumcised man that he belonged to the race which was the heir of God's promises. That was undeniably a great advantage, just as it is an advantage now to be born a Christian; but if the actual inheriting of the promises has any moral conditions attached to it (as Paul proceeds to show that it has), then the advantage of circumcision lapses unless these are fulfilled. Now the persons contemplated here have not fulfilled them. **ἐὰν νόμον πράσσῃς**: the habitual practice of the law is involved in this expression: as Vaughan says, it is almost like a compound word, "*if thou be a law doer*". Similarly **παραβάτης νόμου** a law-transgressor. The law, of course, is the Mosaic one, but it is regarded simply in its character as law, not as being definitely this law: hence the absence of the article. **γέγονε**: by the very fact becomes and remains.

Ver. 26 f. Here the inference is drawn from the principle laid down in ver. 25. This being so, Paul argues, if the uncircumcision maintain the just requirements of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be accounted circumcision, *sc.*, because it has really done what circumcision pledged the Jew to do? *Cf.* Gal. v. 3. **ἡ ἀκροβυστία** at the beginning of the verse is equivalent to the Gentiles (ἔθνη of ver. 14), the abstract being put for the concrete: in **ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ**, the **αὐτοῦ** individualises a person who is conceived as keeping the law, though not circumcised. As he has done what circumcision bound the Jew to do, he will be treated as if in the Jew's position: his uncircumcision will be reckoned as circumcision. **λογισθήσεται** may be merely a logical future, but like the other futures in vers. 12-16 it is probably more correct to refer it to what will take place at the last judgment. The order of the words in ver. 27 indicates that the question is not continued: "and thus the uncircumcision shall judge thee," etc. **κρινεῖ** is emphatic by position: the Jew, in the case supposed, is so far from being able to assert a superiority to the Gentile that the Gentile himself will be his condemnation. *Cf.* Mt. xii. 41 f. **ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία** should properly convey one idea—"those who are by nature uncircumcised". But why should nature be mentioned at all in this connection? It seems arbitrary to say with Hofmann that it is referred to in order to suggest that uncircumcision is what the Gentile is born in, and therefore involves no guilt. As far as that goes, Jew and Gentile are alike. Hence in spite of the grammatical irregularity, which in any case is not too great for a nervous writer like Paul, I prefer to connect **ἐκ φύσεως**, as Burton does (*Moods and Tenses*, § 427), with **τελοῦσα**, and to render: "the uncircumcision which by nature fulfils the law": *cf.* ver. 14. **τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου.** The **διὰ** is that which describes the circumstances under which, or the accompaniment to which, anything is done. The Jew is a law-transgressor, in spite of the facts that he possesses a written revelation of God's will, and bears the seal of the covenant, obliging him to the performance of the law, upon his body. He has an outward standard, which does not vary with his moral condition, like the law written in the pagan's heart; he has an outward pledge that he belongs to the people of God, to encourage him when he is tempted to indolence or despair; in both these respects he has an immense advantage over the Gentile, yet both are neutralised by this—he is a law-transgressor.

Ver. 28 f. The argument of the foregoing verses assumes what is stated here, and what no one will dispute, that what constitutes the Jew in the true sense of the term, and gives the name of Jew its proper content and dignity, is not anything outward and visible, but something inward and spiritual. And

τοῦ Θεοῦ. III. 1. Τί οὖν τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου, ἢ τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς περιτομῆς; 2. πολὺ, κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ[1] ὅτι

[1] γαρ om. BD¹G vulg.; ins. ℵAD³KL Syr. It is bracketed by Westcott and Hort, omitted by Lachmann and Tregelles, inserted by Tischdf.

the same remark applies to circumcision itself. The most natural way to read the Greek seems to me to be this. "Not he who is so outwardly (ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ) is a Jew (in the true sense), nor is that which is outward, in flesh, the true circumcision; but he who is inwardly a Jew (is the true Jew), and heart circumcision, in spirit, not in letter (is the true circumcision)." Thus in the first pair of clauses there is not anything, strictly speaking, to be supplied; the subject is in each case involved in the article. But in the second pair the predicate has in both cases to be supplied from the first—in the one case, Ἰουδαῖος; in the other, περιτομή. Heart circumcision is an idea already familiar to the O.T. From the Book of Deuteronomy (x. 16, for the meaning comp. xxx. 6) it passed to the prophetic writings: Jer. iv. 4. The contrary expression—uncircumcised in heart and in flesh—is also found: Jer. ix. 26, Ez. xliv. 7. A difficulty is created by the expression ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι. After ver. 28 we rather expect ἐν πνεύματι οὐ σαρκί: the circumcision being conceived as in one and not another part of man's nature. Practically it is in this sense most commentators take the words: thus Gifford explains them by "a circumcision which does not stop short at outward conformity to the law, but extends to the sphere of the inner life". But there is no real correspondence here, such as there is in ἐν πνεύματι οὐ σαρκί; and a comparison of 2 Cor. iii., a chapter pervaded by the contrast of πνεῦμα and γράμμα, suggests a different rendering. πνεῦμα and γράμμα are not the elements in which, but the powers by which, the circumcision is conceived to be effected. "Heart circumcision," without any qualifying words, expresses completely that contrast to circumcision in the flesh, which is in Paul's mind; and what he adds in the new words, ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι is the new idea that heart circumcision, which alone deserves the name of circumcision, is achieved by the Spirit of God, not by the written law. Whether there is such a thing as this heart circumcision, wrought by the Spirit, among the Jews, is not explicitly considered; but it is not a refutation of this interpretation to point out that πνεῦμα in 2 Cor. is characteristically the gift of the New Covenant. For the very conclusion to which Paul wishes to lead is that the New Covenant *is* as necessary for the Jew as for the Gentile. οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος κ.τ.λ. The οὗ is masculine, and refers to the ideal Jew. The name Ἰουδαῖος (from Judah = praise, Gen. xxix. 35) probably suggested this remark. οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων: the love of praise from each other, and religious vanity, are Jewish characteristics strongly commented on by our Lord (John v. 44, xii. 42 f.).

CHAPTER III.—Vers. 1-8. It might easily seem, at this point, as if the Apostle's argument had proved too much. He has shown that the mere possession of the law does not exempt the Jew from judgment, but that God requires its fulfilment; he has shown that circumcision in the flesh, seal though it be of the covenant and pledge of its promises, is only of value if it represent inward heart circumcision; he has, it may be argued, reduced the Jew to a position of entire equality with the Gentile. But the consciousness of the Jewish race must protest against such a conclusion. "Salvation is of the Jews" is a word of Christ Himself, and the Apostle is obliged to meet this instinctive protest of the ancient people of God. The whole of the difficulties it raises are more elaborately considered in chaps. ix.-xi.; here it is only discussed so far as to make plain that it does not invalidate the arguments of chap. ii., nor bar the development of the Apostle's theology. The advantage of the Jew is admitted; it is admitted that his unbelief may even act as a foil to God's faithfulness, setting it in more glorious relief; but it is insisted, that if God's character as righteous judge of the world is to be maintained—as it must be—these admissions do not exempt the Jew from that liability to judgment which has just been demonstrated. The details of the interpretation, especially in ver. 7 f., are somewhat perplexed.

Ver. 1 f. τὸ περισσὸν τοῦ Ἰουδαίου is that which the Jew has "over and above" the Gentile. τίς ἡ ὠφέλεια τῆς

ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ [a] λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3. τί γάρ, εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες; μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταργήσει; 4. μὴ γένοιτο· γινέσθω δὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἀληθής, πᾶς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, καθὼς[1] γέγραπται, "[b]Ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου, καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ

[a] Acts vii. 48; Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11.

[1] For **καθως** ℵB read **καθαπερ**. **νικησῃς** BGKL, etc., **νικησεις** ℵADE. For the distribution of authorities here, see note on **πρωτον**, page 589, note [2]. The combination of B with such later Western authorities as G here also lessens its weight; its reading is probably part of that Western element which it contains, *i.e.*, B and G here represent practically one authority. But the other group of MSS. represents at least two groups of witnesses, the "neutral" in ℵA, and the Western in D, and its reading is therefore to be preferred. Weiss, however (*Textkritik der paulinischen Briefe*, S. 46), would reject the indicative both here and in 2 Cor. xii. 21. The change of **ει** and **η** he regards as accidental; in KLP it occurs some sixty times.

περιτομῆς; = "What good does his circumcision do him?" **πολὺ** goes with **τὸ περισσόν**. **κατὰ πάντα τρόπον**: however you choose to view the position. **πρῶτον μὲν** suggests that such an enumeration of Jewish prerogatives might have been made here as is given at length in ix. 4 f. In point of fact, Paul mentions one only, in which the whole force of the Jewish objection to the arguments of chap. ii. is contained, and after disposing of it feels that he has settled the question, and passes on. The first, most weighty, and most far-reaching advantage of the Jews, is that "they were entrusted with the oracles of God". They were made in His grace the depositaries and guardians of revelation. **τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ** must be regarded as the contents of revelation, having God as their author, and at the time when Paul wrote, identical with the O.T. Scriptures. In the LXX the word **λόγιον** occurs mainly as the equivalent of אִמְרָה, which in various passages (*e.g.*, Ps. cxix. 38) has the sense of "promise"; in ordinary Greek it means "oracle," the Divine word given at a shrine, and usually referring to the future; hence it would be natural in using it to think of the prophetic rather than the statutory element in the O.T., and this is what is required here. The O.T. as a whole, and as a revelation of God, has a forward look; it anticipates completion and excites hope; and it is not too much to say that this is suggested by describing it as **τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ**. The sum of it was that God had promised to His people "a future and a hope" (Jer. xxix. 11: see margin, R.V.), and this promise seemed threatened by the argument of the last chapter.

Ver. 3 f. **τί γάρ**; For how? *i.e.*, Well then, how stands the case? *Cf.* Phil. i. 18. **εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες** = if some *did* disbelieve. It is not necessary to render this, with reference to **ἐπιστεύθησαν** in ver. 2, "if some proved faithless to their trust". What is in Paul's mind is that "the oracles of God" have had their fulfilment in Christ, and that those to whom they were entrusted have in some cases (whether few or many he does not here consider) refused their faith to that fulfilment. Surely it is no proper inference that their unbelief must make God's faithfulness of no effect. *He* has kept His promise, and as far as it lay with Him has maintained the original advantage of the Jews, as depositaries and first inheritors of that promise, whatever reception they may have given to its fulfilment. Away with the thought of any reflection upon Him! When the case is stated between God and man there can only be one conclusion: let God come out (**γινέσθω**) true, and every man a liar; let Him be just, and every man condemned. This agrees with the words of Scripture itself in Ps. li. (l.) 6, which Paul quotes exactly after the LXX: the Hebrew is distinctly different, but neither it nor the original context are regarded. **ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου** is a translation of Hebrew words which mean "when Thou speakest," *i.e.*, apparently, when Thou pronouncest sentence upon man; here the sense must be, "that Thou mayest be pronounced just in respect of what Thou hast spoken," *i.e.*, the **λόγια**, the oracles or promises entrusted to Israel. **νικήσεις**: win thy case (see note on text). Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, §§ 198, 199. **ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε**: Probably the infinitive is passive: "when thou art judged"; not middle, "when thou submittest thy case to the

b Ch. v. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 4, vii. 11; Gal. ii. 18.

c 1 Cor. x. 30.

κρίνεσθαί σε". 5. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην [b] συνίστησι, τί ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω. 6. μὴ γένοιτο· ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὸν κόσμον; 7. εἰ γὰρ [1] ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, τί ἔτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; 8. καὶ μὴ καθὼς [c] βλασφημούμεθα, καὶ [2] καθώς φασί τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν, Ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακὰ ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθά; ὧν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστι.

[1] **ει γαρ** BDEGKLP, etc.; **ει δε** ℵA vulg. (some MSS., though others *si enim*). This case is to be decided by the same considerations as the last. Tischdf. and W. and H. put **ει δε** in their text; W. and H. put **ει γαρ** in marg. On the strange but frequent exchange of **δε** and **γαρ** see Weiss, *Textkritik*, 66 f.

[2] **και καθως**; om. **και** BK. W. and H. bracket.

judge". The quotation from Ps. cxvi. 11, **πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης**, is not important: the main thing, as the formal quotation which follows shows, is the vindication of God from the charge of breach of faith with the Jews in making Christianity the fulfilment of His promises to them.

Ver. 5 f. Here another attempt is made to invalidate the conclusion of chap. ii., that the Jew is to be judged "according to his works," exactly like the Gentile. If the argument of ver. 3 f. is correct, the unbelief of the Jews actually serves to set off the faithfulness of God: it makes it all the more conspicuous; how then can it leave them exposed to judgment? This argument is generalised in ver. 5 and answered in ver. 6. "If our unrighteousness" (in the widest sense, **ἀδικία** being generalised from **ἀπιστία**, ver. 3) demonstrates (*cf.* v. 8) God's righteousness (also in the widest sense, **δικαιοσύνη** being generalised from **πίστις**, ver. 3), what shall we say? *i.e.*, what inference shall we draw? Surely not that God, He who inflicts the wrath due to unrighteousness at the last day (i. 18), is Himself unrighteous, to speak as men speak. Away with the thought! If this were so, how should God judge the world? That God *does* judge the world at last is a fixed point both for Paul and those with whom he argues; hence every inference which conflicts with it must be summarily set aside. God could not judge at all if He were unjust; therefore, since He does judge, He is not unjust, not even in judging men whose unrighteousness may have served as a foil to His righteousness. It is not thus that the conclusions of chap. ii. can be evaded by the Jew. **ὁ ἐπιφέρων τὴν ὀργήν**: the "attributive participle equivalent to a relative clause, may, like a relative clause, convey a subsidiary idea of cause, purpose, condition or concession" (Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 428, who renders here: is God unrighteous, who (because He) visiteth with wrath?). **κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω**: *cf.* Gal. iii. 15, Rom. vi. 19, 1 Cor. ix. 8. There is always something apologetic in the use of such expressions. Men forget the difference between God and themselves when they contemplate such a situation as that God should be unrighteous; obviously it is not to be taken seriously. Still, in human language such suppositions are made, and Paul begs that in his lips they may not be taken for more than they really mean.

Ver. 7 f. These verses are extremely difficult, and are interpreted variously according to the force assigned to the **τί ἔτι κἀγὼ** of ver. 7. Who or what supplies the contrast to this emphatic "I also"? Some commentators, Gifford, for instance, find it in God, and God's interest in the judgment. If my lie sets in relief the truth of God, and so magnifies His glory, is not that enough? Why, after God has had this satisfaction from my sin, "why further am *I* also on my side brought to judgment as a sinner?" It is a serious, if not a final objection to this, that it merely repeats the argument of ver. 5, which the Apostle has already refuted. Its very generality, too—for any man, as Gifford himself says, may thus protest against being judged,—lessens its relevance: for Paul is discussing not human evasions of God's judgment, but Jewish objections to his previous arguments. Lipsius finds the contrast to **κἀγὼ** in the Gentile world. A Jew is the speaker, or at all events the Apostle speaks in the character of one: "if my unbelief does magnify His faithfulness,

9. Τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως· προῃτιασάμεθα γὰρ Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας πάντας [d] ὑφ᾽ ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι, καθὼς γέγραπται, 10.

d Ch. vi. 14, 15; Gal. iii. 10.

is not that all that is required? Why am I, too, like the rest of the world, whose relation to God is so different, and whose judgment is so necessary, still brought into judgment?" This would be legitimate enough, probably, if it were not for what follows. But the slander of ver. 8, which forms part of the same question as τί ἔτι κἀγὼ κ.τ.λ., and to which reference is made again in chap. vi. 1, 15, had not the Jews, but the Apostle in his Christian character, for its object; hence it seems preferable to take the κἀγὼ as referring strictly to himself. That *Paul* would come into judgment, in spite of the fact that *his* faithlessness in becoming a Christian had only set off the faithfulness of God to Israel, no unbelieving Jew questioned: and Paul turns this conviction of theirs (with which, of course, he agrees, so far as it asserts that he will be judged) against themselves. If he, for his part, cannot evade judgment, on the ground that his sin (as they think it) has been a foil to God's righteousness, no more can they on their part: they and he are in one position, and must be judged together: to condemn him is to expose themselves to condemnation; that is his point. The argument of ver. 7 is both an *argumentum ad hominem* and an *argumentum ad rem:* Paul borrows from his opponents the premises that he himself is to be judged as a sinner, and that his lie has set off God's truth: there is enough in these premises to serve his purpose, which is to show that these two propositions which do not exclude each other in his case do not do so in their case either. But, of course, he would interpret the second in a very different way from them. The question is continued in ver. 8, though the construction is changed by the introduction of the parentheses with καθὼς and the attachment to λέγειν ὅτι of the clause which would naturally have gone with τί μή; If judgment could be evaded by sinning to the glory of God, so Paul argues, he and other Christians like him might naturally act on the principle which slander imputed to them—that of doing evil that good might come. No doubt the slander was of Jewish origin. The doctrine that righteousness is a gift of God, not to be won by works of law, but by faith in Jesus Christ, can always be misrepresented as immoral: "sin the more, it will only the more magnify grace" Paul does not stoop to discuss it. The judgment that comes on those who by such perversions of reason and conscience seek to evade all judgment is just. This is all he has to say.

Vers. 9-20. In these verses the Apostle completes his proof of the universality of sin, and of the liability of all men, without exception, to judgment. The τί οὖν of ver. 9 brings back the argument from the digression of vers. 1-8. In those verses he has shown that the historical prerogative of the Jews, as the race entrusted with the oracles of God, real and great as it is, does not exempt them from the universal rule that God will reward every man according to his works (ii. 6): here, according to the most probable interpretation of προεχόμεθα, he puts himself in the place of his fellow-countrymen, and imagines them asking, "Are we *surpassed?* Is it the Gentiles who have the advantage of us, instead of our having the advantage of them?"

Ver. 9. Τί οὖν; What then? *i.e.*, how, then, are we to understand the situation? It is necessary to take these words by themselves, and make προεχόμεθα a separate question: the answer to τί could not be οὔ, but must be οὐδέν. The meaning of προεχόμεθα has been much discussed. The active προέχειν means to excel or surpass. Many have taken προεχόμεθα as middle in the same sense: So the Vulg. *praecellimus eos?* and the A.V. "Are we better than they?" But this use, except in interpreters of this verse, cannot be proved. The ordinary meaning of the middle would be "to put forward on one's own account, as an excuse, or defence". This is the rendering in the margin of the R.V. "Do we excuse ourselves?" If τί οὖν προεχόμεθα could be taken together, it might certainly be rendered, What then is our plea? but it is impossible to take προεχόμεθα in this sense without an object, and impossible, as already explained, to make this combination. The only alternative is to regard προεχόμεθα as passive: What then? are we excelled? This is the meaning adopted in the R.V. "Are we in worse case than they?" It is supported by Lightfoot. Wetstein quotes one example from Plut. *de Stoic.contrad.*, 1038 D.: τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς πᾶσι προσήκει,

"Ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς· 11. οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνιῶν,[1] οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ ἐκζητῶν τὸν Θεόν. 12. πάντες ἐξέκλιναν, ἅμα ἠχρειώθησαν[2]· οὐκ

[1] **ο συνιων**; om. **ο** ABG vulg.; ins. ℵDKL. The **ο** before **εκζητων** is also omitted BG, and in both places, in text though not in marg., by W. and H. (marg., **ο** ζητων). This **ζητων** is the reading in B.

[2] ηχρεωθησαν ℵAB[1]D[1]G. **ουκ εστιν ποιων**, so ABG; but ℵD have **ο ποιων.** W. and H. put the former in text, the latter in marg. The second **ουκ εστιν** is om. in B 67[2] and in the marg. of W. and H.

κατ᾽ οὐδὲν προεχομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός: "who are in nothing surpassed by Zeus". The word would thus express the surprise of the Jew at seeing his prerogatives disappear; "if this line of argument be carried further," he may be supposed to say, "the relative positions of Jew and Gentile will turn out to be the very reverse of what we have believed". This is the idea which is negatived in **οὐ πάντως.** Strictly speaking, the **οὐ** should modify **πάντως,** and the meaning be "not in every respect": in some respects (for instance, the one referred to in ver. 2), a certain superiority would still belong to the Jew. But to allude to this seems irrelevant, and there is no difficulty in taking the words to mean, "No: not in any way". See Winer, p. 693 f. "We are not surpassed at all, we who are Jews, for we have already brought against Jews and Greeks alike the charge of being all under sin." **ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν**, *cf.* vii. 14, Gal. iii. 22. The idea is that of being under the power of sin, as well as simply sinful: men are both guilty and unable to escape from that condition.

Ver. 10. The long series of quotations, beginning with this verse, has many points of interest. The **καθὼς γέγραπται** with which it is introduced, shows that the assertion of indiscriminate sinfulness which the Apostle has just made, corresponds with Scripture testimony. It is as if he had said, I can express my opinion in inspired words, and therefore it has God upon its side. The quotations themselves are taken from various parts of the O.T. without distinction; no indication is given when the writer passes from one book to another. Thus vv. 10-12 are from Ps. xiv. 1-3; ver. 13 gives the LXX of Ps. v. 9; ver. 14 corresponds best to Ps. x. 7; in vv. 15-17 there is a condensation of Is. lix. 7 f.; and in ver. 18 we have part of the first verse of Ps. xxxvi. No attention whatever is paid to the context. The value of the quotations for the Apostle's purpose has been disputed. It has been pointed out that in Ps. xiv., for instance, there is mention of a people of God, "a generation of the righteous," as well as of the godless world; and that in other passages only the contemporaries of the writer, or some of them, and not all men in all times, are described. Perhaps if we admit that there is no possibility of an empirical proof of the universality of sin, it covers the truth there is in such comments. Paul does not rest his case on these words of Scripture, interpreted as modern exegetical science would interpret them. He has brought the charge of sin against all men in chap. i. 17, in announcing righteousness as the gift of the Gospel; in chap. i. 18-32 he has referred to the facts which bring the charge home to Gentile consciences; in chap. ii. he has come to close quarters with evasions which would naturally suggest themselves to Jews: and in both cases he has counted upon finding in conscience a sure ally. Hence we do not need to lay too heavy a burden of proof on these quotations: it is enough if they show that Scripture points with unmistakable emphasis in the direction in which the Apostle is leading his readers. And there can be no doubt that it does so. As Gifford well says on ver. 18: "In the deep inner sense which St. Paul gives to the passage, 'the generation of the righteous' would be the first to acknowledge that they form no exception to the universal sinfulness asserted in the opening verses of the Psalm".

Ver. 10. **Οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς.** There is something to be said for the idea that this is Paul's thesis, rather than a quotation of Ps. xiv. 3. Ps. xiv. 3 is correctly quoted in ver. 12, and the Apostle would hardly quote it twice: **δίκαιος,** too, seems chosen to express exactly the conclusion to which he means to come in ver. 20. Still, the words come after **καθὼς γέγραπται**: hence they must be Scripture, and there is nothing they resemble so much as a free rendering of Ps. xiv. 3.

ἔστι ποιῶν χρηστότητα, οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός." 13. "τάφος ἀνεῳγμένος ὁ λάρυγξ αὐτῶν, ταῖς γλώσσαις αὐτῶν ἐδολιοῦσαν"· "ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη αὐτῶν". 14. "ὧν τὸ στόμα [1] ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας γέμει." 15. "ὀξεῖς οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἐκχέαι αἷμα· 16. σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν· 17. καὶ ὁδὸν [e] εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν." 18. "οὐκ ἔστι φόβος Θεοῦ ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν." 19. οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει, τοῖς [f] ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ· ἵνα πᾶν στόμα [g] φραγῇ, καὶ [h] ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος

e Luke i. 79.
f Ch. iv. 10.
g Heb. xi. 33.
h Here only.

[1] **στομα**; after **στομα** B 17 read **αυτων**. This Hebr. idiom may be right, and W. and H. put **αυτων** in marg.

Ver. 11. **οὐκ ἔστιν συνίων.** For the form (**συνίων** or **συνιῶν**), see Winer, p. 97. If we read **ὁ συνίων** the meaning is, There is no one to understand: if the article (as in the LXX) be omitted, There is no one who has sense.

Ver. 12. **ἠχρεώθησαν** is the LXX rendering of נֶאֱלָחוּ, which means "to become sour," "to turn" (of milk): one and all they have become good for nothing. **χρηστότητα** usually signifies kindness, and so it is rendered in 2 Cor. vi. 6, Eph. ii. 7, Col. iii. 12, Tit. iii. 4 (*cf.* Rom. ii. 4, xi. 22: goodness): here it answers to Hebrew טוֹב and means "good". **οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός,** *non est usque ad unum* (Vulg.), which may be even more exactly given in the Scottish idiom: there is not the length of one.

Ver. 13. **τάφος . . . ἐδολιοῦσαν** is an exact quotation of Ps. v. 10 (LXX). The original seems to describe foreign enemies whose false and treacherous language threatened ruin to Israel. For the form **ἐδολιοῦσαν,** see Winer, p. 91 (f.). The termination is common in the LXX: Wetstein quotes one grammarian who calls it Boeotian and another Chalcidic; it was apparently widely diffused. The last clause, **ἰὸς ἀσπίδων κ.τ.λ.,** is Ps. cxxxix. 4, LXX.

Ver. 14. Ps. ix. 28, LXX, freely quoted: (Ps. x. 7, A.V.). **αὐτῶν** after **στόμα** (W. and H., margin) is a Hebrew idiom which the LXX has in this passage, only in the singular: **οὗ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.**

Vers. 15-17. These verses are rather a free extract from, than a quotation of, Is. lix. 7, 8. They describe the moral corruption of Israel in the age of the prophet. According to Lipsius, **σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπωρία** refer to the spiritual misery which comes upon the Jews in the path of self-righteousness. But it is much more natural to suppose that the Apostle is pointing to the destruction and misery which human wickedness inflicts on others, than to any such spiritual results of it. It is as if he had said, "Wherever they go, you can trace them by the ruin and distress they leave behind". The same consideration applies to ver. 17. It does not mean, "They have failed to discover the way of salvation," but "they tread continually in paths of violence".

Ver. 18. Ps. xxxv. 2, LXX, with **αὐτῶν** for **αὐτοῦ.** This verse at once sums up and explains the universal corruption of mankind.

Ver. 19. At this point the first great division of the epistle closes, that which began with chap. i. 18, and has been occupied with asserting the universal prevalence of sin. "We know that whatever the law says, it says to those who are in the law," *i.e.*, to the Jews. For the distinction of **λέγειν** (in which the object is the main thing) and **λαλεῖν** (in which the speaker and the mode of utterance are made prominent), see Trench, *Synonyms*, § lxxvi., and commentary on John viii. 43. It is most natural to suppose that by "the things the law says" Paul means the words he has just quoted from the O.T. These words cannot be evaded by the very persons to whom the O.T. was given, and who have in it, so to speak, the spiritual environment of their life. In this case, **ὁ νόμος** is used in the wider sense of the old revelation generally, not specifically the Pentateuch, or even the statutory part of Scripture. For this use of the word, *cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 21, where **ἐν τῷ νόμῳ** introduces a quotation from Is. xxviii. 11: and John x. 34 (*your* law), xv. 25 (*their* law), both prefacing quota-

τῷ Θεῷ. 20. διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας.

tions from Psalms (lxxxii. 6, xxxv. 19). At first sight there seems a disparity between the two parts of the verse. How does the fact that those who are under the law are impeached and condemned by such utterances of the law as those just quoted subserve the Divine intention to stop *every* mouth and make *all the world* answerable to God? We must suppose that all other men—that is, the Gentiles, who are not under the law—are convicted already; and that what is needed to prepare the way for the universal Gospel of grace is that those who have been under law should admit concerning themselves, what they are prompt enough to assert of all others ("sinners of the Gentiles": Gal. ii. 15), that they have not a word to say, and are liable to God's judgment. **ὑπόδικος** is a classical word, found here only in the N.T. Sanday and Headlam remark its "forensic" character.

Ver. 20. **διότι** means "because," not "therefore," as in A.V. The rendering "therefore" is perhaps due to the difficulty which the translators had in putting an intelligible meaning into "because". The sense seems to be: Every mouth must be stopped, and all the world shown to be liable to God's judgment, because by works of law no flesh shall be justified before Him. This last proposition—that no flesh shall be justified in this way—is virtually an axiom with the Apostle: it is a first principle in all his spiritual thinking, and hence everything must be true which can be deduced from it, and everything must take place which is required to support it. *Because* this is the fundamental certainty of the case, every mouth *must* be stopped, and the strong words quoted from the law stand where they do to secure this end. The explanation of this axiom is to be found in its principal terms—flesh and law. Flesh primarily denotes human nature in its frailty: to attain to the righteousness of God is a task which no flesh has strength to accomplish. But flesh in Paul has a moral rather than a natural meaning; it is not its weakness in this case, but its strength, which puts justification out of the question; to justify is the very thing which the law cannot do, and it cannot do it because it is weak owing to the flesh (*cf.* viii. 3). But the explanation of the axiom lies not only in "flesh," but in "law". "By the law comes the full knowledge of sin." (**ἐπίγνωσις**, a favourite Pauline word: fifteen times used in his epistles.) This is its proper, and indeed its exclusive function. There is no law given with power to give life, and therefore there are no works of law by which men can be justified. The law has served its purpose when it has made men feel to the full how sinful they are; it brings them down to this point, but it is not for it to lift them up. The best exposition of the passage is given by the Apostle himself in Gal. ii. 15 f., where the same quotation is made from Ps. cxliii. 2, and proof given again that it applies to Jew and Gentile alike. In **ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, νόμος**, of course, is primarily the Mosaic law. As Lipsius remarks, no distinction is drawn by the Apostle between the ritual and the moral elements of it, though the former are in the foreground in the epistle to the Galatians, and the latter in that to the Romans. But the truth would hold of every legal dispensation, and it is perhaps to express this generality, rather than because **νόμος** is a technical term, that the article is omitted. Under no system of statutes, the Mosaic or any other, will flesh ever succeed in finding acceptance with God. Let mortal man, clothed in works of law, present himself before the Most High, and His verdict must always be: Unrighteous.

Vers. 21-26. The universal need of a Gospel has now been demonstrated, and the Apostle proceeds with his exposition of this Gospel itself. It brings what all men need, a righteousness of God (see on i. 17); and it brings it in such a way as to make it accessible to all. Law contributes nothing to it, though it is attested by the law and the prophets; it is a righteousness which is all of grace. Grace, however, does not signify that moral distinctions are ignored in God's procedure: the righteousness which is held out in the Gospel is held out on the basis of the redemption which is in Christ Jesus. It is put within the sinner's reach at a great cost. It could never be offered to him—it could never be manifested, or indeed have any real existence—but for the propitiatory virtue of the blood of Christ. Christ a propitiation is the inmost soul of the Gospel for sinful men. If God had not set Him forth in this character, not only must we

21. Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν [i] προφητῶν· 22. δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας [1] τοὺς πιστεύοντας· οὐ γάρ ἐστι [k] διαστολή. 23. πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον, καὶ ὑστεροῦνται

[i] Matt. v. 17; Acts xiii. 15.
[k] Ch. x. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 7.

[1] και επι παντας; so ℵ[3]DFGKL, but om. ℵ[1]ABC. The words are omitted by Lachm., Tischdf., Tregelles, W. and H., but retained by Weiss, who explains the omission by homœoteleuton. As επι παντας alone is found in very good MSS. of the vulg. and in John of Damascus, the received text may be a combination of this and the true reading.

despair for ever of attaining to a Divine righteousness; all our attempts to read the story of the world in any consistency with the character of God must be baffled. Past sins God seemed simply to ignore: He treated them apparently as if they were not. But the Cross is "the Divine theodicy for the past history of the world" (Tholuck); we see in it how seriously God deals with the sins which for the time He seemed to pass by. It is a demonstration of His righteousness—that is, in the widest sense, of His consistency with His own character,—which would have been violated by indifference to sin. And that demonstration is, by God's grace, given in such a way that it is possible for Him to be (as He intends to be) at once just Himself, and the justifier of those who believe in Jesus. The propitiatory death of Jesus, in other words, is at once the vindication of God and the salvation of man. That is why it is central and fundamental in the Apostolic Gospel. It meets the requirements, at the same time, of the righteousness of God and of the sin of man.

Ver. 21. **νυνὶ δὲ**: but now. All time is divided for Paul into "now" and "then". *Cf.* Eph. ii. 12 f., τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ . . . νυνὶ δέ; 2 Cor. v. 16, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν: the reception of the Gospel means the coming of a new world. **χωρὶς νόμου**: legal obedience contributes nothing to evangelic righteousness. It is plain that in this expression νόμος does not signify the O.T. revelation or religion as such, but that religion, or any other, conceived as embodied in statutes. It is statutory obedience which (as Paul has learned by experience) cannot justify. Hence νόμος has not exactly the same sense here as in the next clause, ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου κ. τῶν προφητῶν, where the whole expression is equal to the O.T., and the meaning is that the Gospel is not alien to the religion of Israel, but really finds attestation there. This is worth remarking, because there is a similar variation in the meaning of δικαιοσύνη between vv. 21 and 25, and in that of ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ between iii. 23 and v. 2. To deny that words which mean so much, and are applied so variously, can convey different shades of meaning, even within the narrow limits of a few verses, is to deny that language shares in the life and subtlety of the mind. **πεφανέρωται**: once for all the righteousness of God has been revealed in the Gospel. *Cf.* xvi. 26, Col. i. 26, 2 Tim. i. 10, 1 Peter i. 20, Heb. ix. 8, 26.

Ver. 22. **δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ.** The δὲ is explicative: "a righteousness of God (see on chap. i. 17) [ver. 21], and that a righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ". In the Epistle to the Hebrews Jesus Christ is undoubtedly set forth as a pattern of faith: ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, Heb. xii. 2. *Cf.* Heb. ii. 13; but such a thought is irrelevant here. It is the constant teaching of Paul that we are justified (not by sharing Jesus' faith in God, as some interpreters would take it here, but) by believing in that manifestation and offer of God's righteousness which are made in the propitiatory death of Jesus. **εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας**: the last three words are omitted by ℵABC and most edd. If genuine, they add no new idea to εἰς πάντας; see Winer, p. 521. For διαστολή, *cf.* x. 12. The righteousness of God comes to all on the terms of faith, for all alike need it, and can receive it only so.

Ver. 23. **ἥμαρτον** must be rendered in English "have sinned"; see Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 54. **ὑστεροῦνται** expresses the consequence = and so come short of the glory of God. To emphasise the middle, and render "they come short, and *feel* that they do so," though suggested by the comparison of Mt. xix. 20 with Lk. xv. 14 (Gifford), is not borne out by the use of the N.T. as a whole. The most one could say is that *sibi* is latent in

Matt. x. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 7; Rev. xxi. 6, xxii. 17.

τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ, 24. δικαιούμενοι [1] δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 25. ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς

the middle: to their loss (not necessarily to their sensible or conscious loss) they come short. The present tense implies that but for sin men might be in enjoyment of "ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ". Clearly this cannot be the same as the future heavenly glory of God spoken of in v. 2: as in John v. 44, xii. 43, it must be the approbation or praise of God. This sense of δόξα is easily derived from that of "reputation," resting on the praise or approval of others. Of course the approbation which God would give to the sinless, and of which sinners fall short, would be identical with justification.

Ver. 24. **δικαιούμενοι**: grammatically, the word is intractable. If we force a connection with what immediately precedes, we may say with Lipsius that just as Paul has proved the universality of grace through the universality of sin, so here, conversely, he proves the universal absence of merit in men by showing that they are justified freely by God's grace. Westcott and Hort's punctuation (comma after τοῦ θεοῦ) favours this connection, but it is forced and fanciful. In sense δικαιούμενοι refers to πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας, and the use of the nominative to resume the main idea after an interruption like that of ver. 23 is rather characteristic than otherwise of the Apostle. **δωρεὰν** is used in a similar connection in Gal. ii. 21. It signifies "for nothing". Justification, we are told here, costs the sinner nothing; in Galatians we are told that if it comes through law, then Christ died "for nothing". Christ is all in it (1 Cor. i. 30): hence its absolute freeness. **τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι** repeats the same thing: as δωρεὰν signifies that we contribute nothing, τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι signifies that the whole charge is freely supplied by God. αὐτοῦ in this position has a certain emphasis. **διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ.** The justification of the sinful, or the coming to them of that righteousness of God which is manifested in the Gospel, takes effect through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Perhaps "liberation" would be a fairer word than "redemption" to translate ἀπολύτρωσις. In Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, Heb. ix. 15, it is equal to forgiveness. Ἀπολύτρωσις itself is rare; in the LXX there is but one instance, Dan. iv. 29, in which ὁ χρόνος μου τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως signifies the time of Nebuchadnezzar's recovery from his madness. There is here no suggestion of price or cost. Neither is there in the common use of the verb λυτροῦσθαι, which in LXX represents גָּאַל and פָּדָה, the words employed to describe God's liberation of Israel from Egypt (Is. xliii. 3 does not count). On the other hand, the classical examples favour the idea that a reference to the cost of liberation is involved in the word. Thus Jos., *Ant.*, xii. 2, 3: πλειόνων δὲ ἢ τετρακοσίων ταλάντων τὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως γενήσεσθαι φαμένων κ.τ.λ.; and Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 17 (of a Spartan boy taken prisoner in war) ἀπογνοὺς ἀπολύτρωσιν ἄσμενος ἑαυτὸν διεχρήσατο, where it is at least most natural to translate "having given up hope of being held to ransom". In the N.T., too, the cost of man's liberation is often emphasised: 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, 1 Pet. i. 18 f., and that especially where the cognate words λύτρον and ἀντίλυτρον are employed: Mc. x. 45, 1 Tim. ii. 6. The idea of liberation as the end in view may often have prevailed over that of the particular means employed, but that some means—and especially some cost, toil or sacrifice—were involved, was always understood. It is implied in the use of the word here that justification is a liberation; the man who receives the righteousness of God is set free by it from some condition of bondage or peril. From what? The answer is to be sought in the connection of i. 17 and i. 18: he is set free from a condition in which he was exposed to the wrath of God revealed from heaven against sin. In Eph. i. 7, Col. i. 14, ἀπολύτρωσις is plainly defined as remission of sins: in Eph. i. 14, Rom. viii. 23, 1 Cor. i. 30, it is eschatological.

Ver. 25 f. But the question whether the word ἀπολύτρωσις involves of itself a reference to the cost at which the thing is accomplished is after all of minor consequence: that cost is brought out unambiguously in ver. 25. The ἀπολύτρωσις is in Christ Jesus, and it is in Him as One whom God set forth in propitiatory power, through faith (*or*, reading διὰ τῆς πίστεως, through the faith referred to), in His blood. **προέθετο** in Eph. i. 9 (*cf.* Rom. i. 13) is "purposed"; but here the other meaning, "set forth" (Vulg. *proposuit*) suits the context much

ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως[1] ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, εἰς [m] ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων

m 2 Cor. viii. 24; Phil. i. 28.

[1] δια της πιστεως; so BC³D³KL 17, but om. της ℵC¹D¹F, Origen. Most critical edd. omit, but W. and H. give it a place in marg. Weiss puts it in text, and emphasises it with ref. to ver. 22.

better. ἱλαστήριον has been taken in various ways. (1) In the LXX it is the rendering of כַּפֹּרֶת, (A.V.) "mercy-seat". In one passage at least, Ex. xxv. 16, כַּפֹּרֶת is rendered ἱλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα, which is possibly a combination of two translations—a literal one, a "lid" or "covering"; and a figurative or spiritual one, "a propitiatory". Many scholars argue that Paul's use must follow that of the LXX, familiarity with which on the part of his readers is everywhere assumed. But the necessity is not quite apparent; and not to mention the incongruities which are introduced if Jesus is conceived as the mercy-seat upon which the sacrificial blood—His own blood—is sprinkled, there are grammatical reasons against this rendering. Paul must have written, to be clear, τὸ ἱλαστήριον ἡ μ ῶ ν, or some equivalent phrase. *Cf.* 1 Cor. v. 8 (Christ *our* passover). A "mercy-seat" is not such a self-evident, self-interpreting idea, that the Apostle could lay it at the heart of his gospel without a word of explanation. Consequently (2) many take ἱλαστήριον as an adjective. Of those who so take it, some supply θῦμα or ἱερεῖον, making the idea of sacrifice explicit. But it is simpler, and there is no valid objection, to make it masculine, in agreement with ὅν: "whom God set forth in propitiatory power". This use of the word is sufficiently guaranteed by Jos., *Ant.*, xvi. 7, 1: περίφοβος δ' αὐτὸς ἐξῄει καὶ τοῦ δέους ἱλαστήριον μνῆμα . . . κατεσκευάσατο. The passage in 4 Macc. xvii. 22 (καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου [τοῦ] θανάτου αὐτῶν ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραὴλ προκακωθέντα διέσωσεν) is indecisive, owing to the doubtful reading.* Perhaps the grammatical question is insoluble; but there is no question that Christ is conceived as endued with propitiatory power, in virtue of His death. He is set forth as ἱλαστήριος(ν) ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. It is His blood that covers sin. It seems a mere whim of rigour to deny, as Weiss does, that the death of Christ is here conceived as sacrificial. It is in His blood that Christ is endued with propitiatory power; and there is no propitiatory power of blood known to Scripture unless the blood be that of sacrifice. It is not necessary to assume that any particular sacrifice—say the sin offering—is in view; neither is it necessary, in order to find the idea of sacrifice here, to make ἱλαστήριον neuter, and supply θῦμα; it is enough to say that for the Apostle the ideas of blood with propitiatory virtue, and sacrificial blood, must have been the same. The precise connection and purpose of διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως is not at once clear. Grammatically, it might be construed with ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι; *cf.* Eph. i. 15, Gal. iii. 26 (?), Mk. i. 15; but this lessens the emphasis due to the last words. It seems to be inserted, almost parenthetically, to resume and continue the idea of ver. 22, that the righteousness of God which comes in this way,—namely, in Christ, whom God has set forth in propitiatory power in virtue of His death—comes only to those who believe. Men are saved freely, and it is all God's work, not in the very least their own; yet that work does not avail for any one who does not by faith accept it. What God has given to the world in Christ, infinitely great and absolutely free as it is, is literally nothing unless it is

* Seeberg, *Der Tod Christi*, S. 185, adduces it with the reading τοῦ θανάτου, to support the view that in ἱλαστήριον (as a substantive) Paul is thinking not of the concrete *Kapporeth*, but only of that on account of which this sacred article received its name; in other words, of a covering by which that is hidden from God's eyes on account of which He would be obliged to be angry with men. It is possible to take ἱλαστήριον as a substantive = a means of propitiation (as this passage from 4 Macc. shows, if we read τοῦ θανάτου), without special allusion to the כַּפֹּרֶת. But see Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, S. 121 ff.

ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 26. πρὸς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν [n] καιρῷ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως

n Ch. viii. 18, xi. .

taken. Faith must have its place, therefore, in the profoundest statement of the Gospel, as the correlative of grace. Thus διὰ (τῆς) πίστεως, though parenthetic, is of the last importance. With εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. we are shown God's purpose in setting forth Christ as a propitiation in His blood. It is done with a view to demonstrate His righteousness, owing to the passing by of the sins previously committed in the forbearance of God. God's righteousness in this place is obviously an attribute of God, on which the sin of the world, as hitherto treated by Him, has cast a shadow. Up till now, God has "passed by" sin. He has "winked at" (Acts xvii. 30) the transgressions of men perpetrated before Christ came (προ-γεγονότων), ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ αὐτοῦ. The last words may be either temporal or causal: while God exercised forbearance, or because He exercised it, men sinned, so to speak, with impunity, and God's character was compromised. The underlying thought is the same as in Ps. l. 21: "These things hast Thou done, and I kept silence: *Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as Thyself*". Such had been the course of Providence that God, owing to His forbearance in suspending serious dealing with sin, lay under the imputation of being indifferent to it. But the time had now come to remove this imputation, and vindicate the Divine character. If it was possible once, it was no longer possible now, with Christ set forth in His blood as a propitiation, to maintain that sin was a thing which God regarded with indifference. Paul does not say in so many words what it is in Christ crucified which constitutes Him a propitiation, and so clears God's character of the charge that He does not care for sin: He lays stress, however, on the fact that an essential element in a propitiation is that it should vindicate the Divine righteousness. It should proclaim with unmistakable clearness that with sin God can hold no terms. (The distinction between πάρεσις, the suspension, and ἄφεσις, the revocation, of punishment, is borne out, according to Lightfoot, *Notes on Epp. of St. Paul*, p. 273, by classical usage, and is essential here.) In ver. 26 this idea is restated, and the significance of a propitiation more fully brought out. "Yes, God set Him forth in this character with a view to demonstrate His righteousness, that He might be righteous Himself, and accept as righteous him who believes in Jesus." The words ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ refer to the Gospel Age, the time in which believers live, in contrast to the time when God exercised forbearance, and men were tempted to accuse Him of indifference to righteousness. πρὸς, as distinguished from εἰς, makes us think rather of the person contemplating the end than of the end contemplated; but there is no essential difference. τὴν ἔνδειξιν: the article means "the ἔνδειξις already mentioned in ver. 25". But the last clause, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ., is the most important. It makes explicit the whole intention of God in dealing with sin by means of a propitiation. God's righteousness, compromised as it seemed by His forbearance, might have been vindicated in another way; if He had executed judgment upon sin, it would have been a kind of vindication. He would have secured the first object of ver. 26: "that He might be righteous Himself". But part of God's object was to justify the ungodly (chap. iv. 5), upon certain conditions; and *this* could not be attained by the execution of judgment upon sin. To combine both objects, and at once vindicate His own righteousness, and put righteousness within reach of the sinful, it was necessary that instead of executing judgment God should provide a propitiation. This He did when He set forth Jesus in His blood for the acceptance of faith. (Häring takes the ἔνδειξις of God's righteousness here to be the same as the "revelation" of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in i. 17, or the "manifestation" of it in iii. 21; but this is only possible if with him we completely ignore the context, and especially the decisive words, διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων.) The question has been raised whether the righteousness of God, here spoken of as demonstrated at the Cross, is His judicial (Weiss) or His penal righteousness (Meyer). This seems to me an unreal question; the righteousness of God is the whole character of God so far as it must be conceived as inconsistent with any indifference about sin. It is a more serious question if we ask what it is in Christ set forth by God in His blood which at once vindicates

Ἰησοῦ. 27. Ποῦ οὖν ἡ καύχησις; ἐξεκλείσθη. διὰ ° ποίου νόμου; o Acts iv. 7. τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. 28. λογιζόμεθα οὖν [1]

[1] ουν; so BCD³KL 17, but γαρ ℵAD¹F, Origen-interp. The division of authorities here is like that in ver. 25, and the edd. decide in the same way. W. and H. put γαρ in text, ουν in marg. Weiss puts ουν in text. πιστει δικαιουσθαι ℵ³KL 17, but δικαιουσθαι πιστει ℵ¹ABCD.

God's character and makes it possible for Him to justify those who believe. The passage itself contains nothing explicit—except in the words ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. It is pedantic and inept to argue that since God could have demonstrated His righteousness *either* by punishment *or* by propitiation, therefore punishment and propitiation have no relation to each other. Christ was a propitiation *in virtue of His death*; and however a modern mind may construe it, *death* to Paul *was the doom of sin*. To say that God set forth Christ as a propitiation *in His blood* is the same thing as to say that God *made Him to be sin* for us. God's righteousness, therefore, is demonstrated at the Cross, because there, in Christ's death, it is made once for all apparent that He does not palter with sin; the doom of sin falls by His appointment on the Redeemer. And it is possible, at the same time, to accept as righteous those who by faith unite themselves to Christ upon the Cross, and identify themselves with Him in His death: for in doing so they submit in Him to the Divine sentence upon sin, and at bottom become right with God. It is misleading to render εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον κ. δικαιοῦντα, "that He might be just and *yet* the justifier," etc.: the Apostle only means that the two ends have equally to be secured, not that there is necessarily an antagonism between them. But it is more than misleading to render "that He might be just *and therefore* the justifier": there is no conception of righteousness, capable of being clearly carried out, *and connected with the Cross*, which makes such language intelligible. (See Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*, iv., 14, English Translation.) It is the love of God, according to the consistent teaching of the New Testament, which provides the propitiation, by which God's righteousness is vindicated and the justification of the ungodly made possible. τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ is every one who is properly and sufficiently characterised as a believer in Jesus. There is no difficulty whatever in regarding Ἰησοῦ as objective genitive, as the use of πιστεύειν throughout the N.T. (Gal. ii. 16, *e.g.*) requires us to do: such expressions as τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ (iv. 16) are not in the least a reason to the contrary: they only illustrate the flexibility of the Greek language. See on ver. 22 above.

Vers. 27-31. In these verses the positive exposition of the righteousness of God as offered to faith through the redemption in Christ Jesus, is concluded. The Apostle points out two inferences which can be drawn from it, and which go to commend it to religious minds. The first is, that it excludes boasting. A religious constitution under which men could make claims, or assume anything, in the presence of God, must necessarily be false; it is at least one mark of truth in the Christian doctrine of justification that by it such presumption is made impossible. The second is, that in its universality and its sameness for all men, it is consistent with (as indeed it flows from) the unity of God. There can be no step-children in the family of God; a system which teaches that there are, like that current among the Jews, must be wrong; a system like the Christian, which excludes such an idea, is at least so far right. In ver. 31 an objection is raised. The whole system just expounded may be said to make Law void—to stultify and disannul all that has ever been regarded as in possession of Divine moral authority in the world. In reality, the Apostle answers in a word, its effect is precisely the reverse: it establishes law.

Ver. 27. ποῦ οὖν; where, since this is the case, is boasting? ἐξεκλείσθη: for the use of the tense, *cf.* ἐβλήθη and ἐξηράνθη in John xv. 6; it is equivalent to, "is peremptorily, or once for all, shut out". διὰ ποίου νόμου; By what kind of law? In other words, How is the "law," the divinely appointed spiritual order, or constitution, which excludes boasting, to be characterised? Is it by "the works" which it prescribes, and which those who live under it per-

πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι ἄνθρωπον, χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου. 29. ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ Θεὸς μόνον[1]; οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ ἐθνῶν; ναί, καὶ ἐθνῶν· 30. ἐπείπερ[2] εἷς ὁ [p] Θεός, ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως, καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. 31. νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ νόμον ἱστῶμεν.[3]

p 1 Tim. ii. 4 ff.

[1] μονον ℵACFKL 17; μονων B (W. and H. marg.). δε om. ℵABCDFK.

[2] For επειπερ ℵ¹ABCD² read ειπερ, and so most editors; but Weiss regards επειπερ (which is not found elsewhere in the N.T.) as the true reading.

[3] For ιστωμεν, ℵ¹ABCD²F, etc., read ιστανομεν.

form? No: its character is given when we call it a constitution or law of "faith". Νόμος in these brief questions is evidently used in a wide sense to denote the religious order or system under which men live, regarded as established by God, and having His authority; the O.T. religion and the N.T. religion, unlike, and in some ways opposed, as they are, are alike νόμος—divine institutes.

Ver. 28. λογιζόμεθα γάρ: see critical note. In λογιζόμεθα there is no idea of an uncertain conclusion: it rather suggests the confident self-consciousness of the reasoner. ἄνθρωπον is not "any human being," as if beings of another sort could be justified otherwise: it is like the German "man" or "one". *Cf.* 1 Cor. iv. 1, vii. 1, xi. 28, Gal. ii. 16. The sharp distinction drawn between faith and works of law, as characterising two different religious systems, shows that faith must not itself be interpreted as a work of law. In principle it is a renunciation of all such confidence as legal obedience inspires.

Ver. 29 f. ἢ Ἰουδαίων ὁ Θεὸς μόνον; The only way to evade the conclusion of ver. 28 would be to suppose—as is here presented by way of alternative—that God is a God of Jews only. But the supposition is impossible: there is only one God, and therefore He must be God of all, of Gentiles and Jews alike. This is assumed as an axiom by the Apostle. εἴπερ is the best attested reading, but the argument seems to require that it should "approximate to the sense of ἐπείπερ" (Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 171), which is a variant: "if, as is the fact".* It is simplest to read ver. 30 as explaining and confirming what precedes: He is God of the Gentiles also, if as is the fact God is one; and (consequently) He will justify the circumcision on the ground of faith and the uncircumcision by means of faith. δικαιώσει is probably logical, rather than temporal, whether the reference be made to the last judgment, or to each case, as it arises, in which God justifies. Lightfoot insists on drawing a distinction between ἐκ πίστεως and διὰ τῆς πίστεως in this passage. "The difference," he says, "will perhaps best be seen by substituting their opposites, οὐ δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ νόμου, οὐδὲ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τοῦ νόμου: when, in the case of the Jews, the falsity of their starting-point, in the case of the Gentiles, the needlessness of a new instrumentality, would be insisted on." (*Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 274.) But a comparison of ii. 26, v. 1, ix. 30, Gal. iii. 8 (Weiss), shows that Paul does not construe the prepositions so rigorously: and in point of fact, what he does insist upon here is that justification is to be conceived in precisely the same way for Jew and Gentile. The ἐκ πίστεως and διὰ τῆς πίστεως serve no purpose but to vary the expression.

Ver. 31. νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; Do we then annul "law" through the faith we have been discussing? Perhaps if Law were written with a capital letter, it would suggest the true meaning. The Apostle speaks as from the consciousness of a Jewish objector: is all that we have ever called Law—the whole Jewish religion—that divinely established order, and everything of the same nature—made void by faith? God forbid, he answers: on the contrary, Law is set upon a secure footing; for the first time it gets its rights. To prove this was one of the main tasks lying upon the Apostle of the New Covenant. One species of proof is given in chap iv.,

* But εἴπερ = *if* God is indeed one (which no Jew, the supposed interlocutor, would deny).

IV. 1. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν εὑρηκέναι κατὰ σάρκα[1]; 2. εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.[2] 3. τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; "Ἐπίστευσε δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 4. τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ [a] χάριν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ὀφεί- a Ver. 16.

[1] The T.R. Αβρααμ τον πατερα ημων ευρηκεναι is found in KLP, Theodoret and later fathers. For πατερα, προπατορα is read in ℵ[1]ABC[1], etc. ευρηκεναι stands before Αβρααμ in ℵACDFG lat. and Egypt. versions, etc. In B 47[1] ευρηκεναι is omitted. The omission (see commentary) gives the easiest and most suitable text. W. and H. omit it from their text but put it in marg. after ερουμεν. The R.V. omits it in marg., inserting it in text. Weiss retains it.

[2] προς τον θεον; om. τον ℵABCD[1]F.

where he shows that representative saints under the Old Dispensation, like Abraham, were justified by faith. That is the Divine order still, and it is securer than ever under the Gospel. Another kind of proof is given in chaps. vi.-viii., where the new life of the Christian is unfolded, and we are shown that "the just demands of the law" are fulfilled in believers, and in believers only. The claim which the Apostle makes here, and establishes in these two passages, is the same as that in our Lord's words: I came not to destroy (the law or the prophets), but to fulfil.

CHAPTER IV.—Vers. 1-8. The justification of Abraham, considered in relation to the doctrine just expounded in iii. 21-31. The point to be made out is that the justification of Abraham does not traverse but illustrates the Pauline doctrine.

Ver. 1 The force of οὖν seems to be that the case of Abraham, as commonly understood, has at least the appearance of inconsistency with the Pauline doctrine. "What, then, *i.e.*, on the supposition that vers. 21-31 in chap. iii. are a true exposition of God's method, shall we say of Abraham, our forefather according to the flesh? Does not his case present a difficulty? For if he was justified by works (as one may assume), he has ground for boasting (whereas boasting, according to the previous argument, iii. 27, is excluded)." This seems to me by far the simplest interpretation of the passage. The speaker is a Jewish Christian, or the Apostle putting himself in the place of one. κατὰ σάρκα goes with τὸν προπάτορα ἡμῶν, because the contrast with another kind of fatherhood belonging to Abraham is already in the Apostle's thoughts: see ver. 11. If the reading εὑρηκέναι be adopted (see critical note), no change is necessary in the interpretation. To take κατὰ σάρκα with εὑρηκέναι, as though the question were: What shall we say that our forefather Abraham found in the way of natural human effort, as opposed to the way of grace and faith? is to put a sense on κατὰ σάρκα which is both forced and irrelevant. The whole question is, What do you make of Abraham, with such a theory as that just described?

Ver. 2 f. With ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὸν θεόν the Apostle summarily repels the objection. "You say he has ground of boasting? On the contrary, he has no ground of boasting in relation to God, For what does the Scripture say? Abraham *believed* God, and it was imputed to Him for righteousness." The quotation is from Gen. xv. 6, and is exactly as in the LXX, except that Paul writes ἐπίστευσεν δὲ τῷ θεῷ instead of καὶ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ, which serves partly to bring out the contrast between the real mode of Abraham's justification, and the mode suggested in ver. 2, partly to give prominence to *faith*, as that on which his argument turned. The reading ἐπίστευσεν δὲ is also found in Jas. i. 23, Philo i., 605 (Mangey), as well as Clem. Rom., I., x., 6, and Just. Martyr, *Dial.*, 92: so that it was probably current, and not introduced by Paul. It is assumed that something not in itself righteousness was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness; only on this assumption is boasting in his case excluded.

Ver. 4 f. The faith of Abraham, in whatever way it may be more precisely determined by relation to its object, agrees with Christian faith in the essential characteristic, that it is not a work. To him who works—der mit Werken umgehet: Luther—the reward

b Ver. 24; Acts ix. 42. c Ch. ii. 26, ix. 8.

λημα· 5. τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ᵇἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ,[1] λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς ᶜδικαιοσύνην. 6. καθάπερ καὶ Δαβὶδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ᾧ ὁ Θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην, χωρὶς ἔργων, 7. "Μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι, καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι. 8. μακάριος ἀνὴρ ᾧ[2] οὐ μὴ

[1] ασεβη; for this ℵD¹FG have the form ασεβην, on which see Winer, p. 76.

[2] For ῳ ℵ³ACD³FKL ου is found in ℵ¹BD¹G (so LXX in ℵ¹AB). W. and H. put ου in text, ῳ in marg. ου is the better supported reading, but ῳ "naturally established itself as the more euphonious" (S. and H.).

is reckoned, not by way of grace (as in Abraham's case), but by way of debt. But to him who does *not* work, *i.e.*, who does not make works his ground of hope toward God—but believes on Him who justifies the ungodly, his *faith* is reckoned for righteousness. Ver. 5 describes the category under which Abraham falls, but is not a generalisation from his case. The ἀσεβὴς (Gen. xviii. 23, Prov. xi. 31, chap. v. 6) is a person who has no *claim* to justification: if he is justified, it must be not on the ground of works, but freely, by God's grace, on which he relies through faith. Of course to believe in this grace of God is to do something; in that sense it is a work; but it is to do something which involves a complete renunciation of hope in anything we can do without God. It excludes merit, boasting, justification ἐξ ἔργων. *Cf.* Philo, i., 486 (quoted in Mayor on Jas. i. 21): δίκαιον γὰρ οὕτως οὐδὲν ὡς ἀκράτῳ καὶ ἀμιγεῖ τῇ πρὸς θεὸν μόνον πίστει κεχρῆσθαι . . . τὸ ἐπὶ μόνῳ τῷ ὄντι βεβαίως καὶ ἀκλινῶς ὁρμεῖν . . . δικαιοσύνης μόνον ἔργον. The whole Pauline gospel could be summed up in this one word—God who justifies the ungodly. Under that device, what room is there for any pretensions or claims of man? It is sometimes argued (on the ground that all God's actions must be "ethical") that God can only pronounce just, or treat as just, those who actually are just; but if this were so, what Gospel would there be for sinful men? This "ethical" gospel is identical with the Pharisaism in which Paul lived before he knew what Christ and faith were, and it led him to despair. It leads all men either to despair or to a temper which is that of the Pharisee rather than the publican of Luke xviii. What it can never beget is the temper of the Gospel. The paradoxical phrase, Him that justifieth the ungodly, does not suggest that justification is a fiction, whether legal or of any other sort, but that it is a miracle. It is a thing that only God can achieve, and that calls into act and manifestation all the resources of the Divine nature. It is achieved through an unparalleled revelation of the judgment and the mercy of God. The miracle of the Gospel is that God comes to the ungodly, with a mercy which is righteous altogether, and enables them through faith, in spite of what they are, to enter into a new relation to Himself, in which goodness becomes possible for them. There can be no spiritual life at all for a sinful man unless he can get an *initial assurance* of an unchanging love of God deeper than sin, and he gets this at the Cross. He gets it by believing in Jesus, and it is justification by faith. The whole secret of New Testament Christianity, and of every revival of religion and reformation of the Church is in that *laetum et ingens paradoxon*, θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν τὸν ἀσεβῆ.

Ver. 6 ff. καθάπερ καὶ Δαβὶδ: David is not a new illustration of this doctrine, but a new witness to it. The argument just based on Gen. xv. 6 is in agreement with what he says in the 32nd Psalm. The quotation exactly reproduces the LXX. λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: "pronounceth blessing upon the man," etc. (R.V.): or, speaks the felicitation of the man. He does so in the exclamation with which the Psalm opens. Obviously to impute righteousness without works, and freely to forgive sins, are to Paul one and the same thing. Yet the former is not a merely negative idea: there is in it an actual bestowment of grace, an actual acceptance with God, as unlike as possible to the establishment of an unprejudiced neutrality between God and man, to which the forgiveness of sins is sometimes reduced.

Vers. 9-12. In these verses the justification of Abraham appears in a new light. In virtue of its ground in his faith, he is not only a forefather κατὰ

λογίσηται Κύριος ἁμαρτίαν." 9. Ὁ [d] μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος, ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν, ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκροβυστίαν; λέγομεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 10. πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη; ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι, ἢ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ; οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ· 11. καὶ σημεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς,[1] [e] σφραγῖδα τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ· εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων [f] δι᾽ ἀκροβυστίας, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν

d Gal. iv. 15.
e 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30.
f Ch. ii. 27.

[1] περιτομης ℵBC²DFKL, etc.; περιτομην AC¹, etc.

σάρκα (*i.e.*, the natural ancestor of the Jews), but he is the spiritual ancestor of all believers. The faith which was imputed to him for righteousness constitutes him such; it is the same in essence as Christian faith; and so it is a vital bond between him and all who believe, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. God's method has been the same through all history.

Ver. 9. **ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὖν οὗτος**: This felicitation, then, what is its extent? Does it apply to the circumcision only, or to the uncircumcision also? Just as vers. 1-8 correspond to iii. 27 f., so do vers. 9-12 correspond to iii. 29-31. God is not the God of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also, and the Apostle's purpose here is to show that the felicitation of the justified in Ps. xxxii. is not limited by circumcision. **λέγομεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: for our proposition is, that his *faith* was reckoned, etc.

Ver. 10. **πῶς οὖν ἐλογίσθη;** To say that his *faith* was reckoned as righteousness, without mentioning circumcision, suggests that the latter was at least not indispensable; still it is not decisive, and so the further question must be asked, How—*i.e.*, under what conditions—was his faith thus reckoned to him? Was it when he was circumcised or when he was uncircumcised? History enables Paul to answer, Not when he was circumcised, but when he was uncircumcised. Abraham's justification is narrated in Gen. xv., his circumcision not till Gen. xvii., some fourteen years later: hence it was not his circumcision on which he depended for acceptance with God.

Ver. 11 f. On the contrary, he received a *sign* in circumcision, a *seal* of the righteousness of the faith which he had while uncircumcised. Both sign (אוֹת) and seal (חוֹתָם) are frequently used by Rabbinical writers to describe circumcision as a symbol or pledge that one is in covenant with God. So even of heathens: "Og was circumcised, and Moses feared מפני אות ברית שלו, *propter signum foederis ejus*". But usually of Jews: "Jonah shewed Leviathan *sigillum* (חותמו) *Abrahami patris nostri*". See Schoettgen, Wetstein, or Delitzsch, *ad loc.* **περιτομῆς** (for which W. and H. have in margin **περιτομήν**) must be a genitive of apposition. With **εἰς τὸ εἶναι** the Divine purpose in this relation of circumcision to justification in the case of Abraham is explained. Things were ordered as has been described that he might be father of all that believe while uncircumcised (as he himself did)—that the righteousness in question might be imputed to them; and father of circumcision (*i.e.*, of persons circumcised) in the case of those who are not only circumcised, but also walk in the steps of the faith which he had while not circumcised. It was God's intention that Abraham should be the representative and typical believer, in whom all believers without distinction should recognise their spiritual father; the Divine method of justification was to be inaugurated and illustrated in him, as it should hold good for all who were to be justified: accordingly the whole process took place antecedent to his circumcision, and in no circumstances has circumcision any essential relation to this great blessing. For its true meaning and advantage see on ii. 25. On **οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον**, see Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, 184. The grammar in ver. 12 is faulty, and Westcott and Hort suspect a primitive error. Either **τοῖς** before **στοιχοῦσιν** must be omitted, or it must be changed, as Hort suggests, into **αὐτοῖς**, if we are to express the meaning correctly. The sense required by the context is not open to doubt. For

δικαιοσύνην· 12. καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσι[1] τοῖς ἴχνεσι τῆς ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ. 13. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ [g] ἐπαγγελία τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ἢ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ[2] κόσμου, ἀλλὰ διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως. 14. εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις, καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία· 15. ὁ γὰρ νόμος

g Ch. ix. 4; Gal. iii. 17 ff.; Eph. ii. 12; iii. 6.

[1] **τοις στοιχουσιν** is found in all MSS. but cannot be right; see note in commentary below. Om. **τῃ** before **ακροβυστιᾳ** ℵABCD[1]F.

[2] Om. **του** before **κοσμου** ℵABCD, etc.

δι᾽ ἀκροβυστίας *cf.* ii. 27. For the dative **τοῖς ἴχνεσιν** see Philipp. iii. 16, Gal. v. 16, 25. But *cf.* also Winer, p. 274.

Vers. 13-15. The argument of vers. 9-12 is reiterated and confirmed here in other terms. Abraham is the father of all believers: for it is not through law that the promise is given to him or his seed, that he should be heir of the world—a condition which would limit the inheritance to the Jews, but through the righteousness of faith—a condition which extends it to all who believe. We might have expected a quasi-historical proof of this proposition, similar to the proof given in 10 f. that Abraham's justification did not depend on circumcision. But the Apostle takes another and more speculative line. Instead of arguing from the O.T. narrative, as he does in Gal. iii. 14-17, that the promise was given to a justified man before the (Mosaic) law was heard of, and therefore must be fulfilled to all independently of law, he argues that law and promise are mutually exclusive ideas. For (ver. 14) if those who are of law, *i.e.*, Jews only, as partisans of law, are heirs, then faith (the correlative of promise) has been made vain, and the promise of no effect. And this incompatibility of law and promise in idea is supported by the actual effect of the law in human experience. For the law works wrath—the very opposite of promise. But where there is not law, there is not even transgression, still less the wrath which transgression provokes. Here, then, the other series of conceptions finds its sphere: the world is ruled by grace, promise and faith. This is the world in which Abraham lived, and in which all believers live; and as its typical citizen, he is father of them all.

Ver. 13. **ἡ ἐπαγγελία** is the Divine promise, which is identical with salvation in the widest sense. The word implies that the promise is held out by God of his own motion. The peculiar content here assigned to the promise, that Abraham should be heir of the world, is not found in so many words in the O.T. Schoettgen, on ver. 3, quotes *Mechilta*, fol. 25, 2. "Sic quoque de Abrahamo legimus, quod mundum hunc et mundum futurum non nisi ea de causa consecutus sit, quia in Deum credidit, *q.d.*, Gen. xv. 6. And Wetstein, *Tanchuma*, 165, 1: Abrahamo patri meo Deus possidendum dedit cælum et terram. These passages prove that the idea was not unfamiliar, and it may be regarded as an extension of the promises contained in Gen. xii. 7, xvii. 8, xxii. 17. But what precisely did it mean? Possibly participation in the sovereignty of the Messiah. Abraham and his seed would then be heirs of the world in the sense of 1 Cor. vi. 2, 2 Tim. ii. 12. So Meyer and many others. In the connection in which the words stand, however, this seems strained; and the "rationalising" interpretation, which makes the world Abraham's inheritance through the spread of Abraham's faith, and the multiplication of his spiritual children, is probably to be preferred. The religion which is conquering the world is descended from him, its power lies in that faith which he also had, and in proportion as it spreads he inherits the world. **τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ**: not Christ, as in Gal. iii. 16, but Abraham's descendants in the widest sense. **διὰ δικαιοσύνης πίστεως**: it was not as one under law, but as one justified by faith, that Abraham had the promise given to him. In the narrative, indeed, the promise (Gen. xii. 7) antedates the justification (Gen. xv. 6), but it is repeated at later periods (see above): and as ver. 14 argues, promise, faith and justification are parts of one spiritual whole.

Ver. 14. **κεκένωται** *cf.* 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 15, 2 Cor. ix. 3. **κατήργηται**: a

ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται· οὗ γὰρ[1] οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις. 16. διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ [h] χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι, οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ, ὅς ἐστι πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν, 17. (καθὼς [i] γέγραπται, "Ὅτι πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε,") κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε Θεοῦ, τοῦ [k] ζωοποιοῦντος τοὺς νεκροὺς, καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ

h Ver. 4.
i Gen. xvii. 5.
k Ch. viii. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 13.

[1] ου γαρ; so ℵ[3]DFKLP, but ℵ[1]ABC ου δε.

favourite word of Paul, who uses it twenty-five times.

Ver. 15. **ὀργήν**: wrath, *i.e.*, the wrath of God. See on i. 18. Under a legal dispensation sin is stimulated, and brought into clear consciousness: men come under the wrath of God, and know that they do. This is the whole and sole result of "the law," and hence law cannot be the means through which God administers His grace, and makes man the heir of all things. On the contrary, to attain this inheritance man must live under a regime of faith. **οὗ δὲ**: **δὲ** is the true reading (see critical note), not **γάρ**: *but* where law is not, neither is there **παράβασις**. It would not have been true to say **οὐδὲ ἁμαρτία**, for Paul in chap. ii. recognises the existence and guilt of sin even where men live **ἀνόμως**; but in comparison with the deliberate and conscious transgression of those who live **ἐν νόμῳ**, such sin is comparatively insignificant and venial, and is here left out of account. The alternative systems are reduced to two, Law and Grace (or Promise).

Vers. 16-22. The Apostle can now develop, without further interruption or digression, his idea of the representative (and therefore universal) character of Abraham's justification. The New Testament cannot be said to subvert the Old if the method of justification is the same under both. Nay, it establishes the Old (iii. 31). This is the point which is enforced in the closing verses of chap. iv.

Ver. 16 f. **Διὰ τοῦτο**: because of the nature of law, and its inability to work anything but wrath. **ἐκ πίστεως**: the subject is the promise, considered in reference to the mode of its fulfilment. **ἵνα κατὰ χάριν**: **χάρις** on God's part is the correlative of **πίστις** on man's. **εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν κ.τ.λ.** This is the Divine purpose in instituting the spiritual order of grace and faith: it is the only one consistent with universalism in religion. **οὐ τῷ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ**: there seems to be some inexactness in expression here. The seed which is "of the Law" ought to mean the Jews, as partisans of law in distinction from faith: then the seed which is "of the faith of Abraham" would mean the Gentiles. But the promise did not belong at all to the seed which was "of the law," *i.e.*, to the Jews, as Abraham's natural descendants; even in them, faith was required. And the seed which is "of the faith" of Abraham is not quite appropriate to describe Gentile believers exclusively; the very point of the argument in the passage is that the faith of Abraham is reproduced in all the justified, whether Gentile or Jew. Still there seems no doubt that the persons meant to be contrasted in the two clauses are Jewish and Gentile believers (Meyer), not Jews and Christians (Fritzsche, who supplies **σπέρματι** before **Ἀβραάμ**): the difficulty is that the words do not exactly suit either meaning.

ὅς ἐστιν πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν. The **πάντων** is emphatic, and **ἡμῶν** expresses the consciousness of one who has seen in Abraham the spiritual ancestor of the new Christian community, living (as it does), and inheriting the promise, by faith. *Opponuntur haec verba Judaeis, qui Abrahamum non nominant nisi cum adjecto* אבינו *pater noster* (Schoettgen). When Paul speaks out of his Jewish consciousness, he shares this pride ("whose are the fathers," ix. 5); when he speaks as a Christian, to whom the Church is "the Israel of God" (Gal. vi. 16), and who can even say "*we* are the circumcision," he claims all the Jews boasted of as in reality the property of believers: it is Christians, and not Jews by birth, who can truly say "We have Abraham to our father". The earliest indication (an indirect one) of the Jewish pride in Abraham is perhaps seen in Is. lxiii. 16. That Abraham is the father of us all agrees with Scripture: Gen. xvii. 5 LXX. The **ὅτι** belongs to the quotation. If there is any parenthesis, it should only

μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. 18. Ὃς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, "Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου". 19. καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει, [l]οὐ [1] κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα ἤδη [m]νενεκρωμένον, ἑκατονταέτης που ὑπάρχων, καὶ τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάῤῥας· 20. εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' [n]ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, δοὺς δόξαν τῷ Θεῷ, 21. καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὃ ἐπήγγελται, δυνατός

l Here only in Paul.
m Heb. xi. 12.
n Eph. vi. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 1; Heb. xi. 34.

[1] ου κατενοησεν; so DFKLP, Syr. and lat. Om. ου ℵABC, best MSS. of vulg., etc. All the critical edd. omit ου, though both readings are widely and early attested; though the sense is quite good either way, the authorities for the omission are undoubtedly stronger. ηδη ℵACDKLP; om. BF 47, etc. W. and H. bracket. Weiss omits.

be from καθὼς to σέ. As Abraham has this character in Scripture, so he has it before God: the two things are one and the same; it is his true, historical, Divine standing, that he is father of all believers. The attraction in κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ is most simply resolved into κ. θεοῦ ᾧ ἐπίστευσε: but see Winer, p. 204, 206. In characterising the God whom Abraham believed, the Apostle brings out further the correspondence between the patriarch's faith and that of Christians. He is "God who makes the dead alive and calls things that are not as though they were". Such a reference to Isaac as we find in Heb. xi. 19 (λογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν δυνατὸς ὁ θεός) is not suggested here (yet see ver. 24), and hence it is better to take ζωοπ. τοὺς νεκροὺς of restoring vitality to Abraham, whose body was as good as dead. In the application, the things that are not are the unborn multitudes of Abraham's spiritual children. God speaks of them (hardly, issues his summons to them) as if they had a being. Faith in a God who is thus conceived comes nearer than anything else in Paul to the definition given in Heb xi. 1. On τὰ μὴ ὄντα, see Winer, p. 608.

Ver. 18 ff. Abraham's faith described. It was both contrary to hope (as far as nature could give hope), and rested on hope (that God could do what nature could not). εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν πατέρα κ.τ.λ. (*cf.* ver. 11) is most properly taken to express the Divine purpose—that he might become father, etc. (see Moulton's note in Winer, p. 414); not result—so that he became. κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, Οὕτως κ.τ.λ., Gen. xv. 5: the passage is familiar, and the οὕτως is supposed to suggest its own interpretation—the stars of the heaven.

μὴ ἀσθενήσας . . . κατενόησεν, without becoming weak in faith, he considered his own body. "The participle ἀσθενήσας, though preceding the verb, is most naturally interpreted as referring to a (conceived) result of the action denoted by κατενόησεν." Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 145. This remark holds good only with the reading κατενόησεν: if we read οὐ κατ. the meaning is, He considered not his body *quippe qui non esset imbecillis* (Winer, p. 610). ἑκατονταετής που (circiter) ὑπάρχων: his great age was the primary and fundamental fact in the situation: this seems to be the suggestion of ὑπάρχων as distinct from ὤν. In ver. 20 (εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν) the δὲ contrasts with becoming weak, as he considered his body, the actual conduct of Abraham. "He did not waver in relation to the promise, in unbelief; on the contrary, he was strengthened in faith." On διεκρίθη, *cf.* Mt. xxi. 21, Jas. i. 6, Rom. xiv. 23. τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ: instrum. dative; because of unbelief. It is simplest to take τῇ πίστει as dative of respect, though Heb. xi. 11 can be adduced by those who would render: "he became strong, recovered his bodily vigour, by faith". The participles in ver. 21 are loosely attached to the principal verbs, and are really equivalent to co-ordinate clauses with καί. In his whole conduct on this occasion Abraham glorified God, and demonstrated his own assurance of His power. See Burton, § 145. δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ: for this Hebraism see Josh. vii. 19, Jer. xiii. 16, John ix. 24, Acts xii. 23. For πληροφορηθεὶς xiv. 5, Col. iv. 12.

Ver. 22. διὸ: because of this signal faith, evinced so triumphantly in spite of all there was to quell it. ἐλογίσθη: *i.e.*, his faith was reckoned to him as

ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι. 22. διὸ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. 23. Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον, ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ. 24. ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς, οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγεί-

righteousness. That which needs to be reckoned as righteousness is not in itself righteousness — on this the Apostle's argument rests in vers. 1-8; yet it is not arbitrarily that faith is so reckoned. The spiritual attitude of a man, who is conscious that in himself he has no strength, and no hope of a future, and who nevertheless casts himself upon, and lives by, the word of God which assures him of a future, is the necessarily and eternally right attitude of all souls to God. He whose attitude it is, is at bottom right with God. Now this was the attitude of Abraham to God, and it is the attitude of all sinners who believe in God through Christ; and to him and them alike it is reckoned by God for righteousness. The Gospel does not subvert the religious order under which Abraham lived; it illustrates, extends, and confirms it.

Vers. 23-25. Conclusion of the argument. **Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον**: *cf.* xiv. 4, 1 Cor. ix. 10, x. 6, 11, Gal. iii. 8. The formula for quoting Scripture is not **ἐγράφη** but **γέγραπται**: *i.e.*, Scripture conveys not a historical truth, relating to one person (as here, to Abraham), but a present eternal truth, with some universal application. **δι' ἡμᾶς**: to show the mode of *our* justification. **οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι**: to whom it (the act of believing) is to be imputed as righteousness. **μέλλει** conveys the idea of a Divine order under which things proceed so. **τοῖς πιστεύουσιν** is in apposition to **οἷς**: "believing as we do". (Weiss.) The object of the Christian's faith is the same as that of Abraham's, God that giveth life to the dead. Only in this case it is specifically God as He who raised Jesus our Lord. *Cf.* 1 Pet. i. 21, where Christians are described as those who through Christ believe in God who raised Him from the dead. In Abraham's case, "God that quickeneth the dead" is merely a synonym for God Omnipotent, who can do what man cannot. In Paul, on the other hand, while omnipotence is included in the description of God—for in Eph. i. 19, in order to give an idea of the greatest conceivable power, the Apostle can do no more than say that it is according to that working of the strength of God's might which He wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead—omnipotence is not the sole object of the Christian's faith. His spiritual attitude toward God is the same as Abraham's, but God is revealed to him, and offered to his faith, in a character in which Abraham did not yet know Him. This is conveyed in the description of the Person in relation to whom the Omnipotence of God has been displayed to Christians. That Person is "Jesus our Lord, who was delivered up for our offences, and raised for our justification". The Resurrection *of Jesus our Lord* entitles us to conceive of God's Omnipotence not as mere unqualified power, but as *power no less than infinite engaged in the work of man's salvation from sin.* In the Resurrection of Jesus, omnipotence is exhibited as *redeeming* power: and in this omnipotence we, like Abraham, believe. **παρεδόθη** is used in LXX, Is. liii. 12, and its N.T. use, whether God or Christ be the subject of the **παραδιδόναι** (Rom. viii. 32: Gal. ii. 20, Eph. v. 2), may be derived thence. There is considerable difficulty with the parallel clauses **διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν**, and **διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν.** It is safe to assert that Paul did not make an abstract separation between Christ's Death and His Resurrection, as if the Death and the Resurrection either had different motives, or served ends separable from each other. There is a sort of mannerism in the expression here, as there is in xiv. 9, which puts us on our guard against overprecision. This granted, it seems simplest and best to adopt such an interpretation as maintains the same meaning for **διὰ** in both clauses. This has been done in two ways. (1) The **διὰ** has been taken retrospectively. "He was delivered up because we had sinned, and raised because we were justified"—*sc.* by His death. But though Paul writes in v. 9, **δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ**, it is impossible to believe that he would have written—as this interpretation requires him to do—that we were justified by Christ's death, and that Christ was *therefore* raised from the dead by God. Justification is not only an act of God, but a spiritual experience; it is dependent upon faith (iii. 25); and it is realised in men as one by one, in

ραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν, 25. ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ o Ch. v. 18. παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν ° δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν.

the time determined by Providence, they receive the Gospel. Hence **διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν** at least must be prospective.* (2) The **διὰ** has been taken in both clauses prospectively. "He was delivered up on account of our offences—to make atonement for them; and he was raised on account of our justification—that it might become an accomplished fact." That this interpretation is legitimate, so far as the language goes, cannot be questioned; and if we avoid unreal separations between things that really form one whole, it is thoroughly Pauline. Paul does ascribe expiatory value to the death or the blood of Christ; in that sense it is true the work of Christ was finished on the Cross. But Paul never thought of that by itself; *he knew Christ only as the Risen One who had died, and who had the virtue of His atoning death ever in Him;* this Christ was *One*, in all that He did and suffered—the Christ who had evoked in him the faith by which he was justified, the only Christ through faith in whom sinful men ever could be justified; and it is natural, therefore, that he should conceive Him as raised with a view to our justification. But it would have been equally legitimate to say that He died for our justification. It is only another way of expressing what every Christian understands—that we believe in a living Saviour, and that it is faith in Him which justifies. But then it is faith in Him as One who not only lives, but was delivered up to death to atone for our offences. He both died and was raised for our justification; the work is one and its end is one. And it is a mistake to argue, as Beyschlag does (*Neutest. Theologie*, ii., 164), that this reference of faith to the Risen Christ who died is inconsistent with the vicarious nature of His expiatory sufferings. That His sufferings had this character is established on independent grounds; and to believe in the Risen Christ is to believe in One in whom the power of that propitiatory vicarious suffering abides for ever. It is indeed solely because the virtue of that suffering is in Him that faith in the Risen Lord does justify. For an exposition of the passage, in which the retrospective force is given to **διὰ**, see Candlish in *Expositor*, Dec., 1893. See also Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 160 ff. The identity in principle of Abrahamic and Christian faith is seen in this, that both are faith in God. But Abraham's is faith in a Divine promise, which only omnipotence could make good; the Christian's is faith in the character of God as revealed in the work of redemption wrought by Christ. That, too, however, involves omnipotence. It was the greatest display of power ever made to man when God raised Christ from the dead, and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places; and the Christ so raised was one who had been delivered to death for our offences. That is only another way of saying that the ultimate power in the world—the omnipotence of God—is in the service of a love which provides at infinite cost for the expiation of sin. The only right attitude for any human being in presence of this power is utter self-renunciation, utter abandonment of self to God. This is faith, and it is this which is imputed to men in all ages and under all dispensations for righteousness.

CHAP. V.—Vers. 1-11. The blessings of Justification. The first section of the epistle (chap. i. 18-iii. 20) has proved man's need of the righteousness of God; the second (chap. iii. 21-30) has shown how that righteousness comes, and how it is appropriated; the third (chap. iii. 31-iv. 25) has shown, by the example of Abraham, and the testimony of David, that it does not upset, but establishes the spiritual order revealed in the O.T. The Apostle now, like David, enlarges on the felicity of the justified, and especially on their assurance of God's love and of future blessedness. We may describe the contents of vers. 1-11 in the words which he himself applies (iv. 6) to the 32nd psalm: **λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων.**

Ver. 1. **δικαιωθέντες** takes up emphatically the **δικαίωσιν** of iv. 25: Christ's death and resurrection have not been in vain: there are those who have actually been justified in consequence.

---

* This, however, does not prevent us from conceiving of the resurrection of Christ as His public vindication, and the sign of God's acceptance of the work which He achieved in His death: in a certain sense, therefore, as His justification.

V. 1. ΔΙΚΑΙΩΘΕΝΤΕΣ οὖν ἐκ πίστεως, εἰρήνην ἔχομεν [1] πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 2. δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ πίστει [2] εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν·

[1] **εχομεν** is found in correctors of ℵ and B, in FG (not in the Latin of these bilingual MSS.) and many cursives; **εχωμεν** in ℵ¹AB¹CDKL cursives, vulg., Syr., etc. The authority for the latter seems therefore overwhelming; but besides the exegetical reasons which have led interpreters to prefer the former, and which are noticed in the commentary, we have to consider the frequency with which **ο** and **ω** are confused even in the best MSS. Thus Weiss (*Textkritik*, S. 44 f.) gives the following instances in which **ω** is certainly wrong, and is not adopted by any editor: **αφωρισας**, Gal. i. 15 in B; **ην ως αγκυραν εχωμεν**, Heb. vi. 19 in DE; **δι' ης εγγιζωμεν**, Heb. vii. 19 in A 31; **διαταξωμαι**, 1 Cor. xi. 34 in ADEFG 37, 44, 47; **προεχωμεθα**, Rom. iii. 9 in AL; **θερισωμεν**, 1 Cor. ix. 11 in CDEFGLP and many cursives; **αιρησωμαι**, Phil. i. 22 in B; **εισερχωμεθα**, Heb. iv. 3 in AC 17, 37; **συνβασιλευσωμεν**, 2 Tim. ii. 12 in ACLP 109; **θερισωμεν**, Gal. vi. 9 in ℵCFGLP cursives. These are only samples, and though the attestation is more divided in these and similar cases than in Rom. v. 1, they are quite enough to show that in a variation of this kind no degree of MS. authority could support a reading against a solid exegetical reason for changing **ω** into **ο**. That such solid reason can be given here I agree with the expositors named below.

[2] **τῃ πιστει** ℵ¹CKLP, vulg., Syr. Om. BDF old lat. W. and H. bracket.

Having, therefore, been justified (the Apostle says), **εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν.** The MSS. evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of **ἔχωμεν,** so much so that W. and H. notice no other reading, and Tischdf. says "**ἔχωμεν** cannot be rejected unless it is altogether inappropriate, and inappropriate it seemingly is not". But this last statement is at least open to dispute. There is no indication that the Apostle has finished his dogmatic exposition, and is proceeding to exhortation. To read **ἔχωμεν,** and then to take **καυχώμεθα** as subjunctive both in ver. 2 and ver. 3 (as the R.V.), is not only awkward, but inconsistent with **οὐ μόνον δὲ,** ver. 3. If the hortative purpose dominated the passage throughout, the Apostle must have written **μὴ**: see Gifford, p. 122. It is better (reading **ἔχωμεν**) to take **καυχώμεθα** in ver. 2 with **δι' οὗ,** and co-ordinate it with **τὴν προσαγωγήν**: "through whom we have had our access, and rejoice, etc". Then the **οὐ μόνον** is in place. But the uninterrupted series of indicatives afterwards, the inappropriateness of the verb **ἔχειν** to express "let us realise, let us make our own," the strong tendency to give a paraenetic turn to a passage often read in church, the natural emphasis on **εἰρήνη,** and the logic of the situation, are all in favour of **ἔχομεν,** which is accordingly adopted by Meyer, Weiss, Lipsius, Godet and others, in spite of the MSS., see critical note. The justified have peace with God: *i.e.*, His wrath (i. 18) no longer threatens them; they are accepted in Christ. It is not a change in their feelings which is indicated, but a change in God's relation to them.

Ver. 2. **δι' οὗ καὶ**: through whom *also.* To the fact that we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ corresponds this *other* fact, that through Him we have had (and have) our access into this grace, etc. **προσαγωγὴ** has a certain touch of formality. Christ has "introduced" us to our standing as Christians: *cf.* Eph. ii. 18, 1 Pet. iii. 18. **τῇ πίστει**: by the faith referred to in ver. 1. Not to be construed with **εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην**: which would be without analogy in the N.T. The grace is substantially one with justification: it is the new spiritual atmosphere in which the believer lives as reconciled to God. **καυχώμεθα,** which always implies the *expression* of feeling, is to be co-ordinated with **ἔχομεν. ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ**: on the basis of hope in the glory of God, *i.e.*, of partaking in the glory of the heavenly kingdom. For **ἐπ' ἐλπίδι,** *cf.* iv. 18: the construction is not elsewhere found with **καυχᾶσθαι.**

Ver. 3. **οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα**: and not only (do we glory on that footing), but we also glory in tribulations. *Cf.* Jas. i. 2 ff. **ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν** does not simply mean "when we are in tribulations," but also "because we are": the tribulations being the ground of the glorying: see ii. 17, 23, v. 11, 1 Cor. iii. 21, 2 Cor. xii. 9, Gal. vi. 14.

a Ch. viii. 18, 21. b 2 Cor. ii. 9, xiii. 3; Phil. ii. 22; c Acts ii. 17 f., 33, x. 45. d Matt. xxvi. 41.

καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς [a] δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ. 3. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα [1] ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, 4. ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ [b] δοκιμήν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα, 5. ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Θεοῦ [c] ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν. 6. Ἔτι γὰρ [2] Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν [d] ἀσθενῶν, κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανε.

[1] **καυχωμεθα** ℵADFKP; **καυχωμενοι** BC, Origen (twice). The participle is hardly open to suspicion on the ground of being conformed to ver. 11 (S. and H.); it is much rather the indicative (subjunctive ?) that is open to suspicion as a "mechanical repetition" (Alford) from the preceding verse. W. and H. put **καυχωμεθα** in text, **καυχωμενοι** in marg. By the rule *proclivi lectioni praestat ardua* Alf. and Treg. are rather justified for putting **καυχωμενοι** in the text.

[2] **ετι γαρ** ℵACD[1-3]KP; **εις τι γαρ** D[2]F; *ut quid enim* lat. Iren.-interp.; **ει δε** L Syr.; **ει γε** B. For a full discussion of the readings here, see S. and H. *ad loc.*, or W. and H., Appendix, p. 108. W. and H. suspect some primitive error; while holding the text of B to give a more probable sense than any of the other variants, Hort thinks **ειπερ** would better explain all the variations and be equally appropriate. **ετι** after **ασθενων** ℵABCD[1]F.

Ver. 4. **ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται**: has as its fruit, or effect, endurance. **ὑπομονὴ** has more of the sense of bravery and effort than the English "patience": it is not so passive. **ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμήν**: endurance produces approvedness—its result is a spiritual state which has shown itself proof under trial. *Cf.* Jas. i. 12 (**δόκιμος γενόμενος** = when he has shown himself proof). Perhaps the best English equivalent of **δοκιμή** would be *character*. This in its turn results again in hope: the experience of what God can do, or rather of what He does, for the justified amid the tribulations of this life, animates into new vigour the hope with which the life of faith begins.

Ver. 5. **ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει**: and hope, *i.e.*, the hope which has not been extinguished, but confirmed under trial, does not put to shame. Ps. xxii. 6. *Spes erit res* (Bengel). Here the *aurea catena* comes to an end, and the Apostle points to that on which it is ultimately dependent. All these Christian experiences and hopes rest upon an assurance of the love of God. **ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.** That the love of God to us is meant, not our love to Him, is obvious from ver. 6 and the whole connection: it is the evidence of God's love to us which the Apostle proceeds to set forth. **ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν** (*cf.* Joel iii. 1, ii. 28, LXX, Acts x. 45): has been poured out in, and still floods, our hearts. **διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν**: the aorist **τοῦ δοθέντος** can hardly refer to Pentecost, in which case **ἡμῖν** would express the consciousness of the Christian community: the spirit was given to Christians in virtue of their faith (Gal. iii. 2), and normally on occasion of their baptism (1 Cor. xii. 13, Acts xix. 1 ff.): and it is this experience, possibly this event, to which the participle definitely refers. What the spirit, given (in baptism) to faith, does, is to flood the heart with God's love, and with the assurance of it.

Ver. 6. The reading **εἴ γε** is well supported, and yields a good sense ("so surely as": Evans), though the suggestion is made in W. and H. that it may be a primitive error for **εἴ περ** (see note on iii. 30). The assurance we have of the love of God is no doubt conditioned, but the condition may be expressed with the utmost force, as it is with **εἴ γε**, for there is no doubt that what it puts as a hypothesis has actually taken place, *viz.*, Christ's death for the ungodly. Although he says **εἴ γε**, the objective fact which follows is in no sense open to question: it is to the Apostle the first of certainties. *Cf.* the use of **εἴ γε** in Eph. iii. 2, iv. 21, and Ellicott's note on the former. **ἀσθενῶν**: the weakness of men who had not yet received the Spirit is conceived as appealing to the love of God. **ἔτι** goes with **ὄντων ἡμ. ἀσθενῶν**: the persons concerned were no longer weak, when Paul wrote, but strong in their new relation to God. **κατὰ καιρὸν** has been taken with **ὄντων ἡ. ἀ. ἔτι**: "while we were yet without strength, as the pre-Christian era implied or required": but this meaning is remote, and must have been more clearly suggested. The anal-

7. [e] μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται· ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ [f] τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν· 8. συνίστησι δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεός,[1] ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανε. 9. πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον, δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι

e Acts xxvii. 7 f., 16; 1 Pet. iv. 18.
f Philem. 15.

[1] ο θεος om. B.

ogy of Gal. iv. 4, Eph. i. 10, supports the ordinary rendering, "in due time," *i.e.*, at the time determined by the Providence of God and the history of man as the proper time, Christ died. **ὑπέρ**: in the interest of, not equivalent to **ἀντί**, instead of: whether the interest of the ungodly is secured by the fact that Christ's death has a substitutionary character, or in some other way, is a question which **ὑπέρ** does not touch.

Ver. 7. Christ's death for the ungodly assures us of God's love; for the utmost that human love will do is far less. **ὑπὲρ δικαίου**: for a righteous man. Some make both **δικαίου** and **τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ** neuter: some who take **δικαίου** as masculine take **τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ** as neuter (so Weiss and Godet—"pour un juste, pour le bien"): but as Jowett says, the notion of dying for an abstract idea is entirely unlike the N.T., or the age in which the N.T. was written, while the opposition to Christ's dying for sinful persons requires that persons should be in question here also. The absence of the article with **δικαίου** corresponds to the virtually negative character of the clause: it is inserted before **ἀγαθοῦ** because the exceptional case is definitely conceived as happening. **ἀποθανεῖται**, gnomic; see Burton, § 69. Unless **ἀγαθὸς** is meant to suggest a certain advance upon **δίκαιος**, it is impossible to see in what respect the second clause adds anything to the first. Of course the words are broadly synonymous, so that often they are both applied to the same person or thing (Lk. xxiii. 50, Rom. vii. 12); still there is a difference, and it answers to their application here; it is *difficult* to die for a just man, it has been found *possible* (one may venture to affirm) to die for a good man. The difference is like that between "just" and "good" in English: the latter is the more generous and inspiring type of character. *Cf.* the Gnostic contrast between the "just" God of the O.T. and the "good" God of the N.T., and the passages quoted in Cremer, *s.v.* **ἀγαθός**. **καὶ τολμᾷ**: even prevails upon himself, wins it from himself.

Ver. 8. How greatly is this utmost love of man surpassed by the love of God. He commends, or rather makes good, presents in its true and unmistakable character (for **συνίστησιν**, *cf.* iii. 5, 2 Cor. vi. 4, vii. 11; Gal. ii. 18), His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, etc. **ἑαυτοῦ** is an emphatic *His*: His, not as opposed to Christ's (as some have strangely taken it), but as opposed to anything that we can point to as love among men: His spontaneous and characteristic love. **ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν**: they are no longer such, but justified, and it is on this the next step in the argument depends.

Ver. 9 f. **πολλῷ οὖν μᾶλλον**: The argument is from the greater to the less. The supreme difficulty to be overcome in the relations of man and God is the initial one: How can God demonstrate His love to the sinner, and bestow on him a Divine righteousness? In comparison with this, everything else is easy. Now the Apostle has already shown (iii. 21-30) how the Gospel meets this difficulty: we obtain the righteousness required by believing in Jesus, whom God has set forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood. If such grace was shown us *then*, when we were in sin, much more, justified as we have now been by His blood, shall we be saved from wrath through Him. **ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς**: the wrath to come: see note on i. 18. This deliverance from wrath does not exhaust Paul's conception of the future (see ver. 2), but it is an important aspect of it, and implies the rest. Verse 10 rather repeats, than grounds anew, the argument of ver. 9. **εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες**: this is practically equivalent to **ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν**. The state of sin was that in which we were **ἐχθροί**, and the whole connection of ideas in the passage requires us to give **ἐχθροί** the passive meaning which it undoubtedly has in xi. 28, where it is opposed to **ἀγαπητοί**. We were in a real sense objects of the Divine hostility. As sinners, we lay under the condemnation of God, and His wrath hung over us. This was the situation which had to be faced: Was

g 1 Thess. i. 10. h 1 Cor. i. 31. i 2 Cor. v. 18 f.

αὐτοῦ, σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς [g] ὀργῆς. 10. εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ· 11. οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ [h] Θεῷ διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν [i] καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν.

there love in God equal to it? Yes, when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son. **κατηλλάγημεν** is a real passive: "we" are the objects, not the subjects, of the reconciliation: the subject is God, 2 Cor. v. 19-21. Compare ver. 11: **τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν.** To represent **κατηλλάγημεν** by an active form, *e.g.*, "we laid aside our hostility to God," or by what is virtually one, *e.g.*, "we were won to lay aside our hostility," is to miss the point of the whole passage. Paul is demonstrating *the love of God*, and he can only do it by pointing to what *God* has done, not to what *we* have done. That we on our part are hostile to God before the reconciliation, and that we afterwards lay aside our enmity, is no doubt true; but here it is entirely irrelevant. The Apostle's thought is simply this: "if, when we lay under the Divine condemnation, the work of our reconciliation to God was achieved by Him through the death of His Son, much more shall the love which wrought so incredibly for us in our extremity carry out our salvation to the end". The subjective side of the truth is here completely, *and intentionally*, left out of sight; the laying aside of *our* hostility adds nothing to God's love, throws no light upon it; hence in an exposition of the love of God it can be ignored. To say that the reconciliation is "mutual," is true in point of fact; it is true, also, to all the suggestions of the English word; but it is not true to the meaning of **κατηλλάγημεν**, nor to the argument of this passage, which does not prove anything about the Christian, but exhibits the love of God at its height in the Cross, and argues from that to what are comparatively smaller demonstrations of that love. **ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ**: the **ἐν** is instrumental: *cf.* ver. 9 **ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ.** The Living Lord, in virtue of His life, will save us to the uttermost. *Cf.* John xiv. 19.

Ver. 11. **καυχώμενοι** is the best attested reading, but hard to construe. It is awkward (with Meyer) to supply **καταλλαγέντες** with **οὐ μόνον δὲ**, and retain **σωθησόμεθα** as the principal verb: and not only (as reconciled shall we be saved), but also rejoicing, etc. There is no proportion between the things thus co-ordinated, and it is better to assume an inexact construction, and regard **καυχώμενοι** as adding an independent idea which would have been more properly expressed by the indicative (**καυχώμεθα**). But see Winer, 441. The Christian glories in God; for though "boasting is excluded" from the true religion (iii. 27), yet to make one's boast *in God* is the perfection of that religion. Yet the believer could not thus glory, but for the Lord Jesus Christ; it is in Him, "clothed in the Gospel," that he obtains that knowledge of God's character which enables him to exult. **δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν.** Nothing could show more unmistakably that the **καταλλαγὴ** is not a change in our disposition toward God, but a change in His attitude toward us. We do not *give* it (by laying aside enmity, distrust, or fear); we *receive* it, by believing in Christ Jesus, whom God has set forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood. We take it as God's unspeakable gift. *Cf.* 2 Macc. ii. 50. **ὁ καταλειφθεὶς ἐν τῇ τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργῇ πάλιν ἐν τῇ τοῦ μεγάλου δεσπότου καταλλαγῇ μετὰ πάσης δόξης ἐπανωρθώθη.** For an examination of the Pauline idea of reconciliation, see especially Schmiedel on 2 Cor. v. 21, *Excursus*.

Vers. 12-21. The treatment of the righteousness of God, as a Divine gift to sinners in Jesus Christ, is now complete, and the Apostle might have passed on to his treatment of the new life (chaps. vi.-viii.). But he introduces at this point a digression in which a comparison—which in most points is rather a contrast—is made between Adam and Christ. Up to this point he has spoken of Christ alone, and the truth of what he has said rests upon its own evidence; it is not affected in the least by any difficulty we may have in adapting what he says of Adam to our knowledge or ignorance of human origins. The general truth he teaches here is that there is a real unity of the human race, on the one hand in sin and

12. Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας

death, on the other in righteousness and life; in the former aspect the race is summed up in Adam; in the latter, in Christ. It is a distinction, apparently, between the two, that the unity in Adam is natural, having a physical basis in the organic connection of all men through all generations; whereas the unity in Christ is spiritual, being dependent upon faith. Yet this distinction is not specially in view in the passage, which rather treats Adam and Christ in an objective way, the transition (morally) from Adam's doom to that of man being only mediated by the words **πάντες ἥμαρτον** in ver. 12, and the connection between Christ and the new humanity by **οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος λαμβάνοντες** in ver. 17.

Ver. 12. **διὰ τοῦτο** refers to that whole conception of Christ's relation to the human race which is expounded in chaps. iii. 21-v. 11. But as this is summed up in v. 1-11, and even in the last words of v. 11 (through Him we received the reconciliation) the grammatical reference may be to these words only. **ὥσπερ**: the sentence beginning thus is not finished; *cf.* Mt. xxv. 14. There is a virtual apodosis in the last clause of ver. 14: **ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος**; the natural conclusion would have been, "so also by one man righteousness entered into the world, and life by righteousness". *Cf.* Winer, p. 712 f. By the entrance of sin into the world is not meant that sin began to be, but that sin as a power entered into that sphere in which man lives. Sin, by Divine appointment, brought death in its train, also as an objective power; the two things were inseparably connected, and consequently death extended over all men (for **διῆλθεν**, *cf.* Ps. lxxxvii. 17, Ez. v. 17) **ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.** The connection of sin and death was a commonplace of Jewish teaching, resting apparently on a literal interpretation of Gen. iii. *Cf.* Sap. ii. 23 f. **ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ . . . φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον.** *Cf.* also Sir. xxv. 24, Rom. vi. 23, 1 Cor. xv. 56. Paul no doubt uses death to convey various shades of meaning in different places, but he does not explicitly distinguish different senses of the word; and it is probably misleading rather than helpful to say that in one sentence (here, for example) "physical" death is meant, and in another (chap. vii. 24, *e.g.*) "spiritual" death. The analysis is foreign to his mode of thinking. All that "death" conveys to the mind entered into the world through sin. The words **ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον**, in which the **πάντες** resumes **πάντας** of the preceding clause, give the explanation of the universality of death: it rests upon the universality of sin. **ἐφ' ᾧ** means *propterea quod* as in 2 Cor. v. 4 and perhaps in Phil. iii. 12. Winer, 491. But in what sense is the universality of sin to be understood? In other words, what precisely is meant by **πάντες ἥμαρτον**? Many interpreters take the aorist rigorously, and render: because all sinned, *i.e.*, in the sin of Adam. *Omnes peccarunt, Adamo peccante* (Bengel). This is supported by an appeal to 2 Cor. v. 14, **εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν· ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον**: the death of one was the death of all; so here, the sin of one was the sin of all. It seems to me a final objection to this (grammatically quite sound) interpretation, that it really makes the words **ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον** meaningless. They are evidently meant to explain how the death which came into the world through Adam's sin obtained its universal sway, and the reason is that the sin of which death is the consequence was also universally prevalent. The sense in which this was so has been already proved in chap. iii., and the aorist is therefore to be taken as in iii. 23: see note there. Because all men were, in point of fact, sinners, the death which is inseparable from sin extended over all. To drag in the case of infants to refute this, on the ground that **πάντες ἥμαρτον** does not apply to them (unless in the sense that they sinned in Adam) is to misconceive the situation: to Paul's mind the world consists of persons capable of sinning and of being saved. The case of those in whom the moral consciousness, or indeed any consciousness whatever, has not yet awakened, is simply to be disregarded. We know, and can know, nothing about it. Nothing has been more pernicious in theology than the determination to define sin in such a way that in all its damning import the definition should be applicable to "infants"; it is to this we owe the moral atrocities that have disfigured most

ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. 13. ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ· ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ [k] ἐλλογεῖται, μὴ ὄντος νόμου· 14. ἀλλ' [l] ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ 'Αδὰμ μέχρι Μωσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας[1] ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς

k Philem. 18.
l Vv. 17, 21; Ch. vi. 12.

[1] τους μη αμαρτησαντας, so ℵABCD²G³K²L²; the μη was wanting in some MSS. known to Origen and in "most Latin MSS." known to Augustine: see W. and H., Appendix. However the omission may have originated, μη is undoubtedly the true text.

creeds, and in great part the idea of baptismal regeneration, which is an irrational unethical miracle, invented by men to get over a puzzle of their own making.

Ver. 13 f. These two verses are rather obscure, but must be intended (γὰρ) to prove what has been asserted in ver. 12. ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου = ἀπὸ 'Αδὰμ μέχρι Μωυσέως, ver. 14, the law meant being the Mosaic. The sin which was in the world before the law is not the guilt of Adam's fall imputed to the race as fallen in him, but the actual sin which individuals had committed. Now if law has no existence, sin is not imputed. *Cf.* iv. 15. The natural inference would seem to be that the sins committed during this period could not be punished. But what was the case? The very opposite of this. Death *reigned* all through this period. This unrestrained tyranny of death (observe the emphatic position of ἐβασίλευσεν) over persons whose sins cannot be imputed to them, seems at variance with the explanation just adopted of πάντες ἥμαρτον. Indeed Meyer and others use it to refute that explanation. The reign of death, apart from imputable individual sin, implies, they argue, a corresponding objective reign of sin, apart from individual acts: in other words, justifies the interpretation of ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον according to which all men sinned in Adam's sin, and *so* (*and only so*) became subject to death. But the empirical meaning of ἥμαρτον is decidedly to be preferred, and we must rather fill out the argument thus: "all sinned. For there was sin in the world before Moses; and though sin is not imputed where there is no law, and though therefore no *particular* penalty—death or another—could be expected for the sins here in question, yet all that time death reigned, for in the act of Adam sin and death had been inseparably and for ever conjoined." καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι κ.τ.λ.—even over those who did not sin after the likeness of Adam's transgression. For ἐπὶ, *cf.* Winer, p. 492. This describes not some, but all of those who lived during the period from Adam to Moses. None of them had like Adam violated an express prohibition sanctioned by the death penalty. Yet they all died, for they all sinned, and in their first father sin and death had been indissolubly united. And this Adam is τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος *sc.* 'Αδάμ. In the coming Adam and his relations to the race there will be something on the same pattern as this. 1 Cor. x. 6, 11, Heb. ix. 14, 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45, 49. Parallels of this sort between Adam and the Messiah are common in Rabbinical writings: *e.g.*, Schöttgen quotes *Neve Schalom*, f. 160-2. "Quemadmodum homo primus fuit unus in peccato, sic Messias erit postremus, ad auferendum peccatum penitus;" and 9, 9 has "Adamus postremus est Messias". *Cf.* Delitzsch: *Brief an die Römer*, p. 82 f. The extent to which the thoughts of this passage on sin and death, and on the consequences of Adam's sin to his descendants, can be traced in Jewish writers, is not quite clear. As a rule (see above on ver. 12) they admit the dependence of death on sin, though Schöttgen quotes a Rabbi Samuel ben David as saying, "Etiamsi Adamus primus non peccasset, tamen mors fuisset". On the unity and solidarity of the race in sin and its consequences, they are not perfectly explicit. Weber (*Die Lehren des Talmud*, p. 217) gives the following summary: "There is an inherited guilt, but not an inherited sin; the fall of Adam has brought death upon the whole race, not however sinfulness in the sense of a necessity to commit sin; sin is the result of each individual's decision; it is, as far as experience goes, universal, yet in itself even after the Fall not absolutely necessary". This seems to agree very closely with the Apostle's teaching as interpreted above. It is the appeal to *experience* in Paul (πάντες ἥμαρτον),

παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ, ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος. 15. Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ χάρισμα. εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἡ [m] δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ [n] Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσε. 16. καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος, τὸ δώρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα. 17. εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς[1] παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε διὰ τοῦ ἑνός, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν [o] περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβά-

m John iv. 10; Eph. iii. 7, iv. 7.
n 1 Tim. ii. 5.
o 2 Cor. viii. 2; Jas. i. 21.

[1] **τω του ενος** ℵBCKLPD lat.; **εν τω ενι** D-gr.; **ἐν ενος** 47, W. and H. marg.; **εν ενι παραπτωματι** AFG and Weiss. **της δωρεας** om. B 49, Origen twice; W. and H. bracket. **Ιησου Χριστου**; but Χ. Ι. in B, Origen.

crossing with a transcendent view of the unity of the race in Adam, which gives rise to all the difficulties of interpretation; but without this appeal to experience (which many like Bengel, Meyer and Gifford reject) the whole passage would hang in the air, unreal. There must be something which involves the individual in Adam's fate; that something comes into view in **πάντες ἥμαρτον**, and there only; and without it our interest dies. A sin which we commit in Adam (and which never becomes ours otherwise) is a mere fancy to which one has nothing serious to say.

Ver. 15. At this point the parallel of Adam and Christ becomes a contrast: not as the **παράπτωμα** (the word implies the Fall), so also is the **χάρισμα** (the gift which is freely provided for sinners in the Gospel, *i.e.*, a Divine righteousness and life). **οἱ πολλοὶ** means "all," but presents the "all" as a great number. **πολλῷ μᾶλλον**: the idea underlying the inference is that God delights in mercy; if under His administration one man's offence could have such far-reaching consequences, much more reasonably may we feel sure of the universal influence of one Man's righteous achievement. This idea is the key-note of the whole chapter: see vers. 9, 10, 17. **ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι** is to be construed together: to repeat the article before **ἐν χάριτι** is not essential, and **ἡ δωρεὰ** is awkward standing alone. God's **χάρις** is shown in the gift of His Son, Christ's in His undertaking in obedience to the Father the painful work of our salvation. **εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς** like **οἱ πολλοὶ** is not opposed to "all," but to "one": it is indeed equivalent to "all," and signifies that the "all" are not few. The world is the subject of redemption; if the race suffered through the first Adam, much more may we argue that what has been done by the Second will benefit the race. **ἐπερίσσευσεν**: the word is prompted by Paul's own experience: the blessedness of the Christian life far outwent the misery of the life under condemnation.

Ver. 16. A fresh point of contrast. That which God bestows (for **δώρημα**, see Mayor on James i. 17) is not as through one that sinned: the analogy with Adam breaks down here. For the Divine judgment (**κρίμα** neutral) starting from one (person) resulted in condemnation (for all); whereas the free gift, starting from many offences (which appealed to the mercy of God), has resulted in a sentence of justification (for all). This abstract way of looking at the matter disregards what the Apostle insists on elsewhere, that this "sentence of justification" only takes effect for the individual on the condition of faith. The **ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων** in this verse is a decisive argument for the meaning given above to **πάντες ἥμαρτον**: redemption is not inspired merely by the fall of the race in Adam, but by its actual and multiplied offences, and this is its glory. **ἐξ ἑνὸς**: **ἑνὸς** is masculine, resuming the **ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος** of the previous clause; not neuter, with **παραπτώματος** anticipated from the following clause.

Ver. 17. This verse confirms the preceding. The argument is the same in kind as in ver. 15. The effects of the Fall are indubitable: still less open to doubt are the effects of the work of Christ. With **οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ [τῆς δωρεᾶς] τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες** we again touch experience, and an empirical condition is attached

νοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσι διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 18. Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι᾽ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς κατάκριμα· οὕτω καὶ δι᾽ ἑνὸς δικαιώματος, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους, εἰς [p] δικαίωσιν ζωῆς. 19. ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτω καὶ διὰ τῆς [q] ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς

p Ch. iv. 25. q Heb. v. 8.

to the abstract universality suggested by ver. 12. The abundance of the grace and of (the gift which consists in) righteousness has to be received by faith. But when by faith a connection is formed with Christ, the consequences of that connection, as more agreeable to what we know of God's nature, can be more surely counted upon than the consequences of our natural connection with Adam. Part of the contrast is marked by the change from "death reigned" to "*we* shall reign *in life*," not "life shall reign in or over us". The future in βασιλεύσουσιν is no doubt logical, but it refers nevertheless to the consummation of redemption in the Messianic kingdom in the world to come. *Cf.* viii. 17, 21, Col. iii. 3 f., 2 Tim. ii. 12.

Ver. 18. With ἄρα οὖν (*cf.* vii. 3, 25, and often in Paul) the conclusion of the argument is introduced. It is simplest to take ἑνὸς in both clauses as neuter. "As through one offence the result for all men was condemnation, so also through one righteous act the result for all men is justification of life." The result in both cases is mediated; in the former, by men's actual sin; in the latter, by their faith in Christ. It has been questioned whether δικαίωμα can mean a "righteous act,"—that which Christ achieved in His death, conceived as one thing commanding the approval of God. This sense seems to be required by the contrast with παράπτωμα, but Meyer and others argue that, as in ver. 16, the meaning must be "a sentence of justification". "Through one justifying sentence (pronounced over the world because of Christ's death) the result for all men is justification of life." But this justifying sentence *in vacuo* is alien to the realism of Paul's thinking, and no strain is put upon δικαίωμα (especially when we observe its correspondence with παράπτωμα) in making it signify Christ's work as a thing in which righteousness is, so to speak, embodied. Lightfoot (*Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 292) adopts this meaning, "a righteous deed," and quotes Arist., *Rhet.*, i., 13, τὰ ἀδικήματα πάντα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα, and *Eth. Nic.*, v., 7 (10): καλεῖται δὲ μᾶλλον δικαιοπράγημα τὸ κοινόν: δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος. This sense of an act by which an injustice is rectified is exactly suitable here. Through this the result for all men is δικαίωσις ζωῆς: for the genitive, see Winer, p. 235. Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, 85. When God justifies the sinner, he enters into and inherits life. But Lightfoot makes it *gen. appos.*

Ver. 19. The sense of this verse has been determined by what precedes. The γὰρ connects it closely with the last words of verse 18: "justification of *life;* for, as through, etc.". ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν: "were constituted sinners". For the word κατεστ. *cf.* Jas. iv. 4, 2 Pet. i. 8. It has the same ambiguity as the English word "constituted" (S. and H.); but we cannot say, from the word itself, whether the many constituted sinners, through the one person's disobedience, are so constituted immediately and unconditionally, or mediately through their own sin (to be traced back, of course, to him); this last, as has been argued above, is the Apostle's meaning. οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνός: the application of τῆς ὑπακοῆς has been disputed. By some (Hofmann, Lechler) it is taken to cover the whole life and work of Jesus conceived as the carrying out of the Father's will: *cf.* Phil. ii. 8. By others (Meyer) it is limited to Christ's death as the one great act of obedience on which the possibility of justification depended: *cf.* chap. iii. 25, v. 9. Both ideas are Pauline, but the last seems most congruous to the context and the contrast which pervades it. δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται: "shall be constituted righteous"; the futureshows again that Paul is dealing with experience, or at least with possible experience; the logic which finds the key to the passage in Bengel's formula, *Omnes peccarunt Adamo peccante*, would have written here also δίκαιοι κατεστάθησαν. It is because Paul conceives of this justification as conditioned in the case of each of the πολλοί by faith, and as in process of taking place in one after another that he uses the future. A reference to the Judgment Day (Meyer) is forced: it is

δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί. 20. Νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν, ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα. οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερ-επερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις· 21. ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτω καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

not then, but when they believe in Christ, that men are constituted δίκαιοι.

Ver. 20 f. "The comparison between Adam and Christ is closed. But in the middle, between the two, stood the law" (Meyer). Paul must refer to it in such a way as to indicate the place it holds in the order of Providence, and especially to show that it does not frustrate, but further, the end contemplated in the work of Christ. **παρεισῆλθεν**: see ver. 12 above. Sin entered into the world; the Law entered into the situation thus created as an accessory or subordinate thing; it has not the decisive signficance in history which the objective power of sin has. Words in which the same prepositions have a similar force are **παρεισάγω**, 2 Pet. ii. 1; **παρεισδύνω**, Jude 4; **παρεισφέρω**, 2 Pet. i. 5: *cf.* Gal. ii. 4. There is often in such words, though not necessarily, the idea of stealth or secrecy: we might render "the law slipped in". **ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα**: the purpose expressed by **ἵνα** is God's: Winer, p. 575. The offence is multiplied because the law, encountering the flesh, evokes its natural antagonism to God, and so stimulates it into disobedience. *Cf.* Gal. iii. 19 ff., and the development of this idea in chap. vii. 7 ff. As the offence multiplied, the need of redemption, and the sense of that need were intensified. **οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία**: **ἁμαρτία** seems used here, not **παράπτωμα**, because more proper to express the sum total of evil, made up of repeated acts of disobedience to the law. "Sin" bulked larger, as "offence" was added to "offence". **οὗ** might seem to refer to Israel only, for it was there that the law had its seat; but there is something analogous to this law and its effects everywhere; and everywhere as the need of redemption becomes more pressing grace rises in higher power to meet it. **ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν**: "the **ἐπλεόνασεν** had to be surpassed" (Meyer). *Cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 4. Paul is excessively fond of compounds with **ὑπέρ**. The purpose of this abounding manifestation of grace is, "that as sin reigned in death, so also should grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord". **ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ**: it is more natural to oppose this to **ζωὴ αἰώνιος**, and regard death as "a province which sin had won, and in which it exercised its dominion" (Gifford), than to make it parallel (with Meyer) to **διὰ δικαιοσύνης**, and render "in virtue of death" (*dat. instr.*). Grace has not yet attained to its full sovereignty; it comes to this sovereignty as it imparts to men the gift of God's righteousness (**διὰ δικαιοσύνης**); its goal, its limit which is yet no limit, is eternal life. Some, however, construe **εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον** with **διὰ δικαιοσύνης**: through a righteousness which ends in eternal life: *cf.* **εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς**, ver. 18. **διὰ Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν**: this full rhetorical close has almost the value of a doxology.

CHAPTER VI.—Vers. 1-14. In the fifth chapter, Paul has concluded his exposition of the "righteousness of God" which is revealed in the Gospel. But the exposition leaves something to be desired—something hinted at in iii. 8 ("Let us do evil that good may come") and recalled in v. 20 f. ("Where sin abounded, grace did superabound"). It seems, after all, as if the gospel *did* "make void the law" (iii. 31) in a bad sense; and Paul has now to demonstrate that it does not. It is giving an unreal precision to his words to say with Lipsius that he has now to justify his gospel to the moral consciousness of the Jewish Christian; it is not Jewish Christians, obviously, who are addressed in vi. 19 ff., and it is not the Jewish-Christian moral consciousness, but the moral consciousness of all men, which raises the questions to which he here addresses himself. He has to show that those who have "received the reconciliation" (v. 11), who "receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of righteousness" (v. 17), are the very persons in whom "the righteous requirement of the law" is fulfilled (viii. 4). The libertine argument is rather Gentile than Jewish, though when Paul speaks of the new religion as establishing Law, it is naturally the Mosaic law of which he thinks. It was the one definite embodiment of the concept. The justification, to the moral consciousness, of the

a Ch. xi. 22 f.; Col. i. 23; 1 Tim. iv. 16.
b Col. ii. 12.

VI. 1. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; [a] ἐπιμενοῦμεν[1] τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ; 2. μὴ γένοιτο. οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ; 3. ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν,[2] εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; 4. [b] συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον· ἵνα, ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν

[1] For **επιμενουμεν** read **επιμενωμεν** with ABCDF.

[2] **Ἰησουν** om. B and some cursives; W. and H. bracket. But this kind of omission is frequent; see Weiss, *Textkritik*, S. 88.

Gospel in which a Divine righteousness is freely held out in Jesus Christ to the sinner's faith, fills the next three chapters. In chap. vi. it is shown that the Christian, in baptism, dies to sin; in chap. vii., that by death he is freed from the law, which in point of fact, owing to the corruption of his nature, perpetually stimulates sin; in chap. viii., that the Spirit imparted to believers breaks the power of the flesh, and enables them to live to God.

Ver. 1. **Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν;** What inference then shall we draw, *i.e.*, from the relations of sin and grace expounded in v. 20 f.? Are we to continue in sin (*cf.* xi. 22 f.) that grace may abound? Lightfoot suggests "*the* sin" and "*the* grace" just referred to. The question was one sure to be asked by some one; Paul recognises it as a natural question in view of his doctrine, and asks it himself. But he answers it with an indignant negative.

Ver. 2. **μὴ γένοιτο**, *cf.* iii. 4. **οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ**: the relative is qualitative: "we, being as we are persons who died to sin". For the dative, see vers. 10, 11, and Winer, p. 263. To have died to sin is to be utterly and for ever out of any relation to it. **πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν**; how after that shall we live in it? impossible.

Ver. 3. But this death to sin, on which the whole argument turns, raises a question. It is introduced here quite abruptly; there has been no mention of it hitherto. *When*, it may be asked, did this all-important death take place? The answer is: It is involved in baptism. **ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι κ.τ.λ.**: the only alternative to accepting this argument is to confess ignorance of the meaning of the rite in which they had been received into the Church. **ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν**: we all, who were baptised into Christ Jesus, were baptised into His death. The **ὅσοι** is not partitive but distributive: there is no argument in the passage at all, unless all Christians were baptised. The expression **βαπτισθῆναι εἰς Χριστὸν** does not necessarily mean to be baptised into Christ; it may only mean to be baptised Christward, *i.e.*, with Christ in view as the object of faith. *Cf.* 1 Cor. x. 2, and the expression **βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.** In the same way **βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ** might certainly mean to be baptised with Christ's death in view as the object of faith. This is the interpretation of Lipsius. But it falls short of the argumentative requirements of the passage, which demand the idea of an actual union to, or incorporation in, Christ. This is more than Lipsius means, but it does not exclude what he means. The baptism in which we are united to Christ and to His death is one in which we confess our faith, looking to Him and His death. To say that faith justifies but baptism regenerates, breaking the Christian life into two unrelated pieces, as Weiss does—one spiritual and the other magical—is to throw away the Apostle's case. His whole point is that no such division *can* be made. Unless there is a *necessary* connection between justification by faith and the new life, Paul fails to prove that faith establishes the law. The real argument which unites chaps. iii., iv. and v. to chaps. vi., vii. and viii., and repels the charge of antinomianism, is this: justifying faith, looking to Christ and His death, really unites us to Him who died and rose again, as the symbolism of baptism shows to every Christian.

Ver. 4. This symbolism interpreted. **συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.**: Therefore we were buried with Him (in the act of immersion) through that baptism into His death—burial being regarded as the natural sequence of death, and a kind of seal set to its reality. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 3 f. It introduces a false abstraction to say

καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. 5. Εἰ γὰρ [c] σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ [d] ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα· 6. τοῦτο γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν [e] ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ. 7. ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται [f] ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 8. Εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ, 9. εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔτι ἀποθνήσκει· θάνα-

c Here only, *cf.* Luke viii. 7.
d Ch. i. 23, v. 14, viii. 3; Phil. ii. 7; Rev. ix. 7.
e Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 9.
f Acts xiii. 39.

(with Meyer) that **εἰς τὸν θάνατον** means "unto death," not "unto His death": death in the whole context is perfectly definite. **διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός**: in nothing was the splendour of God's power revealed so much as in the resurrection of Jesus, Eph. i. 19 f. **ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς**: in life of a new quality; *cf.* vii. 6, 1 Tim. vi. 17: the construction makes the new quality of the life prominent. Winer, p. 296.

Ver. 5. This verse proves the legitimacy of the reference to a new life in the preceding one: union with Christ at one point (His death) is union with Him altogether (and therefore in His resurrection). **εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ**: it is simplest to take **συμφ.** and **τῷ ὁμοιώματι** together—if we have become vitally one with the likeness of His death; *i.e.*, if the baptism, which is a similitude of Christ's death, has had a reality answering to its obvious import, so that we have really died in it as Christ died, then we shall have a corresponding experience of resurrection. **τῆς ἀναστάσεως** is also dependent on **ὁμοιώματι**: baptism, inasmuch as one emerges from the water after being immersed, is a **ὁμοίωμα** of resurrection as well as of death. It does not seem a real question to ask whether the **ἀνάστασις** is ethical or transcendent: one cannot imagine Paul drawing the distinction here. (On the word **ὁμοίωμα**, see Cremer.)

Ver. 6. All this can be asserted, knowing as we do that "our old man" = our old self, what we were before we became Christians—was crucified with Him. Paul says **συνεσταυρώθη** simply because Christ died on the *cross*, and we are baptised into that death, not because "our old man" is the basest of criminals for whom crucifixion is the proper penalty. The object of this crucifixion of the old man was "that the body of sin might be brought to nought". **τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας** is the body in which we live: apart from the crucifixion of the old self it can be characterised as "a body of sin". It may be wrong to say that it is necessarily and essentially sinful—the body, as such, can have no moral predicate attached to it; it would be as wrong to deny that it is invariably and persistently a seat and source of sin. The genitive is perhaps qualitative rather than possessive, though "the body of which sin has taken possession" (S. and H.) is a good paraphrase. See Winer, p. 235, 768. This body is to be reduced to impotence **τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.** "that we may no longer be slaves to sin". The body is the instrument we use in the service of sin, and if it is disabled the service must cease. For the gen. inf., see Burton, § 397.

Ver. 7. **ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν κ.τ.λ.** Here we have the general principle on which the foregoing argument rests: death annuls all obligations, breaks all ties, cancels all old scores. The difficulty is that by the words **ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας** Paul introduces one particular application of the principle—the one he is concerned with here—as if it were identical with the principle itself. "Death clears men of all claims, especially (to come to the case before us) it clears us, who have died with Christ, of the claim of sin, our old master, to rule over us still." Weiss would reject the introduction into this clause of the idea of dying *with Christ*, on the ground that the words **σὺν Χριστῷ** bring it in *as a new idea* in the following verse. But it is no new idea; it is the idea of the whole passage; and unless we bring it in here, the quittance *from sin* (and not from any obligation in general) remains inexplicable. Weiss, in fact, gives it up.

Ver. 8. The Apostle now resumes his main thought. **συνζήσομεν**: see note on **ἀνάστασις** ver. 5: there is no conscious separation of ethical and transcendent life with Christ—to Paul it is one life.

Ver. 9. **εἰδότες . . . οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει**: The new life with Christ will be the same which Christ Himself lives, a life inaccessible to death. The post-resurrection life of Jesus was not His old life over

τος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔτι κυριεύει. 10. ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ· ὃ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ Θεῷ. 11. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι[1] τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.[2] 12. Μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ

[1] **νεκρους μεν ειναι** ℵ³KLP; **ειναι νεκρους μεν** ℵ¹BC; om. ADF 17.

[2] **τω κυριω ημων**; om. ABDF, and edd.; ins. ℵCKLP.

again; in that life death had dominion over Him, because He made Himself one with us in all the consequences of sin; but now the dominion of death has expired. The principle of ver. 7 can be applied to Christ also: He has died, and the powers which in the old relations had claims upon Him—death, *e.g.*—have such claims no more.

Ver. 10. This is expanded in ver. 10. **ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανε, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ**: the **ὃ** is 'cognate' accus. Winer, p. 209. "The death that He died, He died to sin once for all." The dative **τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ** must be grammatically the same here as in vers. 2, 11, but the interpretation required seems different. While He lived, Christ had undoubtedly relations to sin, though sin was foreign to His will and conscience (2 Cor. v. 21); but after He died these relations ceased; sin could never make Him its victim again as at the Cross. Similarly while *we* lived (*i.e.*, before we died with Christ), we also had relations to sin; and these relations likewise, different as they were from His, must cease with that death. The difference in the reference of the dative is no doubt an objection to this interpretation, and accordingly the attempt has been made to give the same meaning to dying to sin in Christ's case as in ours, and indeed to make our dying to sin the effect and reproduction of His. "The language of the Apostle seems to imply that there was something in the mind of Christ in dying for us that was *the moral equivalent* [italics ours] to that death to sin which takes place in us when we believe in Him, something in its very nature fitted to produce the change in us." Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 100 f. He died, in short, rather than sin—laid down His life rather than violate the will of God; in this sense, which is an ethical one, and points to an experience which can be reproduced in others under His influence, He died to sin. "His death on the Cross was the final triumph of His holiness over all those desires of the flesh that furnish to man unregenerate the motive power of His life." But though this gives an ethical meaning to the words in both cases, it does not give exactly the same ethical meaning; a certain disparity remains. It is more in the line of all Paul's thoughts to say with Holtzmann (*N. T. Theol.*, ii., 118), that Christ by dying paid to sin that tribute to which in virtue of a Divine sentence (**κρίμα**, v. 16) it could lay claim, and that those therefore who share His death are like Himself absolved from all claims of sin for the future. For **ἐφάπαξ**, see Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10. The very idea of death is that of a summary, decisive, never-to-be-repeated end. **ὃ δὲ ζῇ κ.τ.λ.** "The life that He lives He lives to God".

Ver. 11. In this verse the application is made of all that precedes. The death with Christ, the life with Christ, are real, yet to be realised. The truth of being a Christian is contained in them, yet the calling of the Christian is to live up to them. We may forget what we should be; we may also (and this is how Paul puts it) forget what we *are*. We are dead to sin in Christ's death; we are alive to God in Christ's resurrection; let us regard ourselves as such *in Christ Jesus*. The essence of our faith is a union to Him in which His experience becomes ours. This is the theological reply to antinomianism.

Ver. 12 f. Practical enforcement of vers. 1-11. The inner life is in union with Christ, and the outer (bodily) life must not be inconsistent with it (Weiss). **ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι**: the suggestion of **θνητὸς** is rather that the frail body should be protected against the tyranny of sin, than that sin leads to the death of the body. **μηδὲ παριστάνετε . . . ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε**: and do not go on, as you have been doing, putting your members at the service of sin, but put them once for all at the service of God. For the difference between pres. and aor. imper., see Winer, p. 393 f. **ὅπλα ἀδικίας**: the gen. is of quality, *cf.* Luke xvi. 8, 9. **ὅπλα** in the N.T. seems always to mean weapons, not instruments: see

ὑμῶν [g] σώματι, εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν αὐτῇ ἐν[1] ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ· 13. μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ· ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ ὡς[2] ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας, καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα [h] δικαιοσύνης τῷ Θεῷ. 14. ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν.

g Ch. viii. 11.
h Ch. xiii. 12.

15. Τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσομεν,[3] ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ [i] νόμον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν; μὴ γένοιτο. 16. οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἤτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον, ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην; 17. χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ὅτι ἦτε

i 1 Cor. ix. 20.

[1] αυτη εν C[3]KLP; om. ℵABC[1] 47, vulg.; αυτη only, DF, Orig.-inter. The received reading is apparently an attempt to combine the other two.

[2] ως DFKLP 17; but ωσει ℵABC 47.

[3] For αμαρτησομεν ℵABCDKLP read αμαρτησωμεν.

2 Cor. x. 4, 6, 7, and *cf.* ὀψώνια, ver. 23. ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας: they were *really* such; the ὡσεὶ signifies that they are to think of themselves *as* such, and to act accordingly.

Ver. 14. They can obey these exhortations, for sin will not be their tyrant now, since they are not under law, but under grace. It is not restraint, but inspiration, which liberates from sin: not Mount Sinai but Mount Calvary which makes saints. But this very way of putting the truth (which will be expanded in chaps. vii. and viii.) seems to raise the old difficulty of iii. 8, vi. 1 again. The Apostle states it himself, and proceeds to a final refutation of it.

Ver. 15. ἁμαρτήσωμεν; deliberative: are we to sin because our life is not ruled by statutes, but inspired by the sense of what we owe to that free pardoning mercy of God? Are we to sin because God justifies the ungodly at the Cross?

Ver. 16. οὐκ οἴδατε: It is excluded by the elementary principle that no man can serve two masters (Matt. vi. 24). The δοῦλος is the exclusive property of *one*, and he belongs to that one εἰς ὑπακοήν, with obedience in view; nothing else than obedience to his master alone is contemplated. The masters here are ἁμαρτία whose service ends in death, and ὑπακοή (*cf.* v. 19) whose service ends in righteousness. δικαιοσύνη here cannot be "justification," but righteousness in the sense of the character which God approves. ἤτοι here only in N.T. = *of course* these are the *only* alternatives.

Ver. 17. Paul thanks God that his readers have already made their choice, and made it for obedience. ὅτι ἦτε . . . ὑπηκούσατε δὲ: the co-ordination seems to imply that Paul is grateful (1) that their servitude to sin is *past*—ἦτε having the emphasis; (2) that they have received the Gospel. Yet the two things are one, and it would have been more natural to subordinate the first: "that though ye were slaves of sin, ye obeyed," etc. ὑπηκούσατε εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς must be resolved into ὑ. τῷ τύπῳ τῆς διδαχῆς εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε. The alternative is εἰς τὸν τύπον τῆς διδαχῆς ὃς παρεδόθη ὑμῖν (Kypke). But ὑπακούειν εἴς τι only means to be obedient with respect to something, not to be obedient *to* some one, or some thing, which is the sense required here. A true parallel is Cyril of Jerus. Catechet. lect. iv., § iii.: πρὸ δὲ τῆς εἰς τὴν πίστιν παραδόσεως; the catechumens were handed over to the faith. But what is the τύπος διδαχῆς to which the converts at Rome were handed over? Many, in the line of these words of Cyril, conceive of it as a "type of doctrine," a special mode of presenting the Gospel, which had as catchwords, *e.g.*, "not under law but under grace," or "free from sin and slaves to righteousness," or more probably, "dying with Christ and rising with Him". In other words, Paulinism as modern theology conceives it. But this is an anachronism. It is only modern eyes that see distinct doctrinal types in the N.T., and Paul, as far as he knew (1 Cor. xv. 3-11), preached the same Gospel as the other Apostles. It is unnecessary, also, to the argument. In whatever form the Gospel won the obedience of men, it was inconsistent with their continuance in sin. Hence it seems nearer the truth to take τύπος διδαχῆς in a more general sense;

δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς. 18. ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. 19. Ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς [k] ὑμῶν. ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, οὕτω νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς [l] ἁγιασμόν. 20. ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. 21. τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε, ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε; τὸ γὰρ τέλος [1] ἐκείνων θάνατος. 22. νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ Θεῷ, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον. 23. τὰ γὰρ [m] ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος· τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ

k Matt. xxvi. 41.
l 1 Thess. iv. 3 f., 7; Heb. xii. 14.
m Luke iii. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 7; 2 Cor. xi. 8.

[1] το γαρ τελος ℵ[1]ACD[3]KLP; το μεν γαρ τελος ℵ[3]BD[1]F, Syr. As the reasons for omitting are obvious—the art. is already separated from the substantive, and there is really nothing to balance it—the μεν is probably original, and is retained by Lachmann, Weiss, and Tregelles (marg.), though omitted by W. and H.

it is teaching, of course in a definite form, but regarded chiefly in its ethical requirements; when received, or when men were handed over to it, it became a moral authority. *Cf.* Hort, *Romans and Ephesians*, p. 32 f. What is the time referred to in the aorists **ὑπηκούσατε** and **παρεδόθητε**? It is the time when they became Christians, a time really fixed by their acceptance of the Gospel in faith, and outwardly marked by baptism. Baptism is the visible point of separation between the two servitudes—to sin and to God.

Ver. 18. There is no absolute independence for man; our nature requires us to serve *some* master.

Ver. 19. **ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν.** *Cf.* iii. 5, Gal. iii. 15. Paul apologises for using this human figure of the relation of slave to master to convey spiritual truths. But what is "the weakness of the flesh" which makes him have recourse to such figures? Weiss makes it moral. The Apostle speaks with this unmistakable plainness and emphasis because he is writing to morally weak persons whose nature and past life really made them liable to temptations to libertinism. This seems to me confirmed by the reference, which immediately follows, to the character of their pre-Christian life. Others make the weakness rather intellectual than ethical, as if Paul said: "I condescend to your want of spiritual intelligence in using such figures". But this is not a natural meaning for "the weakness of your flesh," and does not yield so good a connection with what follows. **δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ**: **ἀκαθαρσία** defiling the sinner, **ἀνομία** disregarding the will of God. If **εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν** should remain in the text, it may suggest that this bad life never gets beyond itself. On the other hand, to present the members as slaves to righteousness has **ἁγιασμός** in view, which is a higher thing. **ἁγιασμὸς** is sanctification, primarily as an act or process, eventually as a result. It is unreal to ask whether the process or the result is meant here: they have no meaning apart.

Ver. 20. In every state in which man lives, there is a bondage and a liberty. In the old state, it was bondage to sin, and liberty in relation to righteousness. For **τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ** see Winer, 263.

Ver. 21 f. To decide which of the two lives, or of the two freedoms, is the true, Paul appeals to their fruits. The marked contrast between **τότε** and **νῦν** is in favour of those who put the mark of interrogation after **τότε**. "What fruit therefore had you *then*? Things of which you are *now* ashamed." The construction **ἐφ' οἷς ἐπαισχύνεσθε** is found also in Isa. i. 29: **ᾐσχύνθησαν ἐπὶ τοῖς κήποις**. If the point of interrogation is put after **ἐπαισχύνεσθε**, the answer "none" must be interpolated: and **ἐκείνων** supplied as antecedent to **ἐφ' οἷς**. **νυνὶ δέ**: But *now*, now that the situation is reversed, and you have been freed from sin and made slaves to God, you have your fruit **εἰς ἁγιασμόν**. He does not say what the fruit is, but we know what the things are which contribute to and result in **ἁγιασμός**: see ver. 19.

Ver. 23. The **γὰρ** introduces the

Θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. VII. 1. Ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε, ἀδελφοί (γινώσκουσι γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ,) ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ; 2. ἡ γὰρ ὕπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνήρ, κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρός. 3. ἄρα οὖν ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μοιχαλὶς χρηματίσει, ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνήρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα, γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ. 4. ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ, τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν

general truth of which what has been said of the Romans in ver. 21 f. is an illustration. "All this is normal and natural, for the wages of sin is death," etc. **ὀψώνια** 1 Macc. iii. 28, xiv. 32. The idea of a warfare (see **ὅπλα**, ver. 13) is continued. The soldier's pay who enlists in the service of sin is death. **τὸ δὲ χάρισμα**: but the free gift, etc. The end in God's service is not of debt, but of grace. Tertullian (quoted in S. and H.) renders **χάρισμα** here *donativum* (the largess given by the emperor to soldiers on a New Year's Day or birthday), keeping on the military association; but Paul could hardly use what is almost a technical expression with himself in a technical sense quite remote from his own. On **ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χ. Ἰ. τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν**, see on v. 21.

Chapter VII. The subject of chap. vi. is continued. The Apostle shows how by death the Christian is freed from the law, which, good as it is in itself and in the Divine intention, nevertheless, owing to the corruption of man's nature, instead of helping to make him good, perpetually stimulates sin. Vers. 1-6 describe the liberation from the law; vers. 7-13, the actual working of the law; in vers. 14-25 we are shown that this working of the law is due not to anything in itself, but to the power of sin in the flesh.

Vers. 1-6. For **ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε**, *cf.* vi. 3. Chap. vi. contains the argument which is illustrated in these verses, and the question alludes to it: not to accept the argument that the Christian is free from all legal obligations leaves no alternative but to suppose the persons to whom it is addressed ignorant of the principle by which the duration of all legal obligations is determined. This they cannot be, for Paul speaks **γινώσκουσι νόμον** = to people who know what law is. Neither Roman nor Mosaic law is specially referred to: the argument rests on the nature of law in general. Even in **ὁ νόμος**, though in applying the principle Paul would think first of the Mosaic law, it is not exclusively referred to.

Ver. 2 f. An illustration of the principle. It is the only illustration in which death liberates a person who yet remains alive and can enter into new relations. Of course there is an inexactness, for in the argument the Christian is freed by his own death, and in the illustration the wife is freed by the husband's death; but we must discount that. Paul required an illustration in which both death and a new life appeared. **κατήργηται ἀπό**: *cf.* ver. 6, Gal. v. 4: she is once for all discharged (or as R.V. in Gal. "severed") from the law of the husband: for the genitive **τοῦ ἀνδρός**, see Winer, 235. **χρηματίσει** = she shall be publicly designated: *cf.* Acts xi. 26. **τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτὴν μοιχαλίδα κ.τ.λ.**: grammatically this may either mean (1) *that she may not be* an adulteress, though married to another man; or (2) *so that she is not*, etc. Meyer prefers the first; and it may be argued that in this place, at all events, the idea of forming another connection is essential: *cf.* **εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ**, ver. 4 (Gifford); but it is difficult to conceive of innocent remarriage as being formally the purpose of the law in question, and the second meaning is therefore to be preferred. *Cf.* Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 398.

Ver. 4. **ὥστε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ**: the inference is drawn rather from the principle than from the example, but **καὶ ὑμεῖς** means "you as well as the woman in the illustration," not "you Gentiles as well as I a Jew". The last, which is Weiss's interpretation, introduces a violent contrast of which there is not the faintest hint in the context. The meaning of **ἐθανατώθητε** is fixed by reference to chap. vi. 3-6. The aorist refers to the definite time at which in their baptism the old life (and with it all its legal obligations)

a Matt. xiii. 23; Col. i. 6, 10. b Gal. v. 24.

ἐγερθέντι, ἵνα ᵃ καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ Θεῷ. 5. ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ ᵇ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ· 6. νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς[1] ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος, καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος.

7. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων, εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου· τήν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ

[1] ημας om. BFG. Most edd. (W. and H., Lachm., and Treg.) bracket it; Weiss omits, but allows that the case is disputable.

came to an end. **διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χτοῦ**: Weiss rejects as opposed to the context the "dogmatic" reference to the sacrificial death of Christ as a satisfaction for sin; all the words imply, according to him, is that the Christian, in baptism, experiences a **ὁμοίωμα** of Christ's death, or as it is put in vi. 6 is crucified with Him, and so liberated from every relation to the law. But if Christ's death had no spiritual content—if it were not a death "for our sins" (1 Cor. xv. 3), a death having the sacrificial character and atoning virtue described in iii. 25 f.—there would be no reason why a sinful man should be baptised into Christ and His death at all, and in point of fact no one *would* be baptised. It is because Christ's death is what it is, a sin-expiating death, that it draws men to Him, and spiritually reproduces in them a reflex or counterpart of His death, with which all their old relations and obligations terminate. The object of this is that they may belong to another, a different person. Paul does not say **ἑτέρῳ ἀνδρί**: the marriage metaphor is dropped. He is speaking of the experience of Christians one by one, and though Christ is sometimes spoken of as the husband or bridegroom of the Church, there is no Scripture authority for using this metaphor of His relation to the individual soul. Neither is this interpretation favoured by the use of **καρποφορήσωμεν**; to interpret this of the fruit of the new marriage is both needless and grotesque. The word is used frequently in the N.T. for the outcome of the Christian life, but never with this association; and a reference to vi. 21 shows how natural it is to the Apostle without any such prompting. Even the change from the second person (**ἐθανατώθητε**) to the first (**καρποφορήσωμεν**) shows that he is contemplating the end of the Christian life quite apart from the suggestions of the metaphor. Christ is described as **τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι**, because we can only belong to a living person. **τῷ θεῷ** is *dat. comm.* God is the person interested in this result.

Ver. 5. Contrast of the earlier life. "**ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ**" is materially the same as "**ὑπὸ τὸν νόμον**"; the same state of the soul is described more from within and more from without. The opposite would be **ἐν τῷ πνεύματι**, or **ὑπὸ χάριν**. **τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν** are the passions from which acts of sin proceed: Gal. v. 24. **τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου**: it is through the law that these passions become actualised: we would never know them for what they are, if it were not for the law. **εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ**: there is no allusion to marriage here any more than in ver. 4. Death is personified here as in v. 17: this tyrant of the human race is the only one who profits by the fruits of the sinful life.

Ver. 6. **νυνὶ δὲ** but as things stand, considering what we are as Christians. **κατηργήθημεν**: *cf.* ver. 2. We are discharged from the law, by our death to that in which we were held. But what is this? Most expositors say the law; Philippi even makes **τοῦ νόμου** the antecedent of **ἐν ᾧ**, rendering, we have been delivered, by dying, from the law in which we were held. This construction is too artificial to be true; and if we supply **τούτῳ** with **ἀποθανόντες**, something vaguer than the law, though involving and involved by it (the old life in the flesh, for instance) must be meant. **ὥστε δουλεύειν κ.τ.λ.**: "enabling us to serve" (S. and H.): for **ὥστε** with inf. in N.T., see Blass, *Gramm. des N.T. Griech.*, § 219. **ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος κ.τ.λ.** = in a new way, which only the possession of the spirit makes possible, not in the old way which alone was possible when we were under the letter of the law. For the Pauline contrast of **πνεῦμα** and **γράμμα**, see 2 Cor. iii.; for **οὐ** in this expression, see Burton, § 481.

ᾔδειν, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν, "Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις". 8. [c]ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο [1] ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν

c 2 Cor. xi. 12; Gal. v. 13; 1 Tim. v. 14.

[1] κατειργασατο ℵACFGKL; κατηργασατο B[1]DP. In chap. xv. 18 all editors with ℵABCP read κατειργασατο, and this is preferred here by Lachm., W. and H., and by Weiss in all places; but here Tischdf., Treg. and Alford read κατηργασατο. Variations in the treatment of the augment are very frequent in the MSS.

Vers. 7-13. The actual working of the law. A very close connection between the law and sin is implied in all that has preceded: especially in vi. 14, and in such an expression as **τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου** in vii. 5. This connection has to be examined more closely. The object of the Apostle, according to Weiss, is not to answer a false inference from his teaching, *viz.*, that the law is sin, but to conciliate for his own mind the idea of liberation from the law with the recognition of the O.T. revelation. But the difficulty of conciliating these two things is not peculiar to the Apostle; it is because we all feel it in some form that the passage is so real to us. *Our* experience of law has been as tragic as his, and we too ask how this comports with the idea of its Divine origin. The much discussed question, whether the subject of this passage (vers. 7-24) is the unregenerate or the regenerate self, or whether in particular vers. 7-13 refer to the unregenerate, and vers. 14-24 to the regenerate, is hardly real. The distinction in its absolute form belongs to doctrine, not to experience. No one could have written the passage but a Christian: it is the experience of the unregenerate, we may say, but seen through regenerate eyes, interpreted in a regenerate mind. It is the Apostle's spiritual history, but universalised; a history in which one stage is not extinguished by the next, but which is present as a whole to his consciousness, each stage all the time determining and determined by all the rest. We cannot date the things of the spirit as simply as if they were mere historical incidents. **τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν**, *cf.* vi. 1: What inference then shall we draw? *sc.* from the relations of sin and law just suggested. Is the law sin? Paul repels the thought with horror. **ἀλλὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων**: **ἀλλὰ** may continue the protest = On the contrary, I should not have known sin, etc.; or it may be restrictive, abating the completeness of the negation involved in the protest. The law is not sin—God forbid; but, for all that, there is a connection: I should not have known sin but by the law. The last suits the context better: see ver. 21. On **οὐκ ἔγνων** without **ἄν**, see Winer, 383: it is possible, however (Gifford), to render simply, I did not know sin except through the law; and so also with **οὐκ ᾔδειν**. **διὰ νόμου**: of course he thinks of the Mosaic law, but the absence of the article shows that it is the legal, not the Mosaic, character of it which is in view; and it is this which enables *us* to understand the experience in question. **τήν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν κ.τ.λ.**: the desire for what is forbidden is the first conscious form of sin. For the force of **τε** here see Winer, p. 561. Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, p. 160. In the very similar construction in 2 Cor. x. 8 Winer suggests an anacoluthon: possibly Paul meant here also to introduce something which would have balanced the **τε** (I should *both* have been ignorant of lust, unless the law had said, Thou shalt not lust, *and* ignorant of other forms of sin unless the law had prohibited them). But the one instance, as he works it out, suffices him. It seems impossible to deny the reference to the tenth commandment (Exod. xx. 17) when the words **οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις** are quoted from "the law"; but the special modes of **ἐπιθυμία** prohibited are of no consequence, and it is beside the mark to argue that Paul's escape from pharisaism began with the discovery that a feeling, not an outward act only, might be sinful. All he says is that the consciousness of sin awoke in him in the shape of a conflict with a prohibitive law, and to illustrate this he quotes the tenth commandment. Its generality made it the most appropriate to quote.

Ver. 8. **ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα** means "having received," not "having taken" occasion. **ἡ ἁμαρτία** is sin as a power dwelling in man, of the presence of which he is as yet unaware. How it "receives occasion" is not stated; it must be by coming face to face with something which appeals to **ἐπιθυμία**; but when it has received it, it avails itself of the commandment (*viz.*, the one prohibiting **ἐπιθυμία**) to work in us **ἐπιθυμία** of

ἐπιθυμίαν· χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά· 9. ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ· ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς, ἡ ἁμαρτία [d] ἀνέζησεν, 10. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον· καὶ εὑρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον. 11. ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία [e] ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἐξηπάτησέ με, καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀπέκτεινεν. 12. ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος, καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή. 13. Τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονε [1] θάνατος; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον, ἵνα γένηται καθ' [f] ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. 14. Οἴδαμεν γὰρ [2] ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν· ἐγὼ δὲ σαρκικός [3] εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ

d Luke xv. 24, 32.
e Ver. 8.
f 1 Cor. xii. 31; 2 Cor. i. 8; iv. 17; Gal. i. 13.

[1] **γεγονε** KL; **εγενετο** ℵABCD.

[2] **γαρ** ℵBCFK; **δε** AD (Greek) L. See note [1] page 604.

[3] **σαρκικος** ℵ[3]LP; but **σαρκινος** ℵABCDF. The two words are constantly confused (Alford), but the change may have been made intentionally here with the idea that an ethical word was wanted.

every sort. It really *is* the commandment which it uses, for without law sin is dead. *Cf.* iv. 15, v. 13: but especially 1 Cor. xv. 56. Apart from the law we have no experience either of its character or of its vitality.

Ver. 9. **ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ**: this is ideal biography. There is not really a period in life to which one can look back as the happy time when he had no conscience; the lost paradise in the infancy of men or nations only serves as a foil to the moral conflicts and disorder of maturer years, of which we are clearly conscious. **ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς κ.τ.λ.** In these words, on the other hand, the most intensely real experience is vividly reproduced. When the commandment came, sin "came to life again"; its dormant energies woke, and "I died". "There is a deep tragic pathos in the brief and simple statement; it seems to point to some definite period full of painful recollections" (Gifford). To say that "death" here means the loss of immortality (bodily death without the hope of resurrection), as Lipsius, or that it means only "spiritual" death, is to lose touch with the Apostle's mode of thought. It is an indivisible thing, all doom and despair, too simply felt to be a subject for analysis.

Ver. 10. The result is that the commandment defeats its own intention; it has life in view, but it ends in death. Here also analysis only misleads. Life and death are indivisible wholes.

Ver. 11. Yet this result is not due to the commandment in itself. It is indwelling sin, inherited from Adam, which, when it has found a base of operations, employs the commandment to deceive (*cf.* Gen. iii. 13) and to kill. "Sin here takes the place of the Tempter" in Genesis (S. and H.).

Ver. 12. The conclusion is that the law is holy (this is the answer to the question with which the discussion started in ver. 7: **ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία;**), and the commandment, which is the law in operation, holy and just and good. **ἁγία** means that it belongs to God and has a character corresponding; **δικαία** that its requirements are those which answer to the relations in which man stands to God and his fellow-creatures; **ἀγαθή** that in its nature and aim it is beneficent; man's weal, not his woe, is its natural end. There is no formal contrast to **ὁ μὲν νόμος**, such as was perhaps in the Apostle's mind when he began the sentence, and might have been introduced by **ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία**; but a real contrast is given in ver. 13.

Ver. 13. The description of the commandment as "good" raises the problem of ver. 7 in a new form. Can the good issue in evil? Did that which is good turn out to be death to me? This also is denied, or rather repelled. It was not the good law, but sin, which became death to the Apostle. And in this there was a Divine intention, *viz.*, that sin might appear sin, might come out in its true colours, by working death for man through that which is good. Sin turns God's intended blessing into a curse; nothing could more clearly show what it

τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. 15. ὃ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι, οὐ γινώσκω· οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω, τοῦτο πράσσω· ἀλλ' ὃ μισῶ, τοῦτο ποιῶ. 16. εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω, τοῦτο ποιῶ, [g] σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι καλός. 17. νυνὶ δὲ οὐκ- gHere only.

is, or excite a stronger desire for deliverance from it. The second clause with ἵνα (ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία) seems co-ordinate with the first, yet intensifies it: personified sin not only appears, but actually turns out to be, beyond measure sinful through its perversion of the commandment.

Vers. 14-25. The last section of the chapter confirms the argument in which Paul has vindicated the law, by exhibiting the power of sin in the flesh. It is this which makes the law weak, and defeats its good intention. "Hitherto he had contrasted himself, in respect of his whole being, with the Divine law; now, however, he begins to describe a discord which exists within himself" (Tholuck).

Ver. 14. **ὁ νόμος πνευματικός**: the law comes from God who is Spirit, and it shares His nature: its affinities are Divine, not human. **ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν**: I, as opposed to the law, am a creature of flesh, sold under sin. **σάρκινος** is properly material = *carneus*, consisting of flesh, as opposed to **σαρκικός**, which is ethical=*carnalis*. Paul uses it because he is thinking of human *nature*, rather than of human *character*, as in opposition to the Divine law. He does not mean that there is *no* higher element in human nature having affinity to the law (against this see vers. 22-25), but that such higher elements are so depressed and impotent that no injustice is done in describing human nature as in his own person he describes it here. Flesh has such an exclusive preponderance that man can only be regarded as a being who has no affinity for the spiritual law of God, and necessarily kicks against it. Not that this is to be regarded as his essential nature. It describes him only as **πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν**: the slave of sin. To speak of man as "flesh" is to speak of him as distinguished from God who is "Spirit"; but owing to the diffusion of sin in humanity, and the ascendency it has acquired, this mere distinction becomes an antagonism, and the mind of "the flesh" is enmity against God. In **σάρκινος** there is the sense of man's weakness, and pity for it; **σαρκικός** would only have expressed condemnation, perhaps a shade of disgust or contempt. Weiss rightly remarks that the present tense **εἰμι** is determined simply by the **ἐστιν** preceding. Paul is contrasting the law of God and human nature, of course on the basis of his own experience; but the contrast is worked out ideally, or timelessly, as we might say, all the tenses being present; it is obvious, however, on reflection, that the experience described is essentially that of his pre-Christian days. It is the unregenerate man's experience, surviving at least in memory into regenerate days, and read with regenerate eyes.

Ver. 15. Only the hypothesis of slavery explains his acts. For what I do **οὐ γινώσκω**, *i.e.*, I do not recognise it as my own, as a thing for which I am responsible and which I can approve: my act is that of a slave who is but the instrument of another's will. **οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω κ.τ.λ.** There is "an incomprehensible contradiction in his action". **κατεργάζεσθαι** is to effect, to bring about by one's own work; **πράσσειν** is to work at, to busy oneself with, a thing, with or without success, but with purpose; **ποιεῖν** is simply to make or produce.

Ver. 16. **ὃ οὐ θέλω** takes up **ὃ μισῶ** the negative expression is strong enough for the argument. In doing what he hates, *i.e.*, in doing evil against his will, his will agrees with the law, that it is good. **καλός** suggests the moral beauty or nobility of the law, not like **ἀγαθή** (ver. 12) its beneficial purpose.

Ver. 17. **Νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό. ἐγὼ** is the true I, and emphatic. As things are, in view of the facts just explained, it is not the true self which is responsible for this line of conduct, but the sin which has its abode in the man: contrast viii. 11 **τὸ ἐνοικοῦν αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ἐν ὑμῖν.** "Paul said, 'It is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me,' and 'I live, yet not I, but Christ that liveth in me'; and both these sayings of his touch on the unsayable" (Dr. John Duncan). To be saved from sin, a man must at the same time own it and disown it; it is this practical paradox which is reflected in this verse. It is safe for a Christian like Paul—it is not safe for everybody—to explain his failings by the watchword, Not I, but indwelling sin. That might be antinomian, or manichean, as well as evan-

ἔτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκοῦσα[1] ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. 18. Οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοὶ (τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου,) ἀγαθόν· τὸ γὰρ θέλειν [h] παράκειταί μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὐχ εὑρίσκω.[2] 19. οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν· ἀλλ' ὃ οὐ θέλω κακόν, τοῦτο πράσσω. 20. εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω ἐγώ,[3] τοῦτο ποιῶ, οὐκ ἔτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία. 21. Εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται. 22. [i] συνήδομαι γὰρ τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω

h Only here and ver. 21.

i Here only.

[1] For οικουσα ℵB read ενοικουσα, which is right.

[2] ουχ ευρισκω DFKLP; ου alone without ευρισκω ℵABC.

[3] θελω εγω ℵAKLP, Syr.; om. εγω BCDEFG. W. and H. omit εγω from text but put it in marg. Weiss thinks if it had been inserted after the apodosis had been written it would have been before ου θελω, and as it might easily be omitted to conform to ver. 16, the first clause of which is verbally the same, he counts it genuine, though admitting that the case is difficult.

gelical. A true saint may say it in a moment of passion, but a sinner had better not make it a principle.

Ver. 18. It is sin, and nothing but sin, that has to be taken account of in this connection, for "I know that in me, that is in my flesh, there dwells no good". For τοῦτ' ἔστιν see on i. 12. ἐν ἐμοὶ = ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου = in me, regarded as a creature of flesh, apart from any relation to or affinity for God and His spirit. This, of course, is not a complete view of what man is at any stage of his life. τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι: θέλειν is rather *wish* than *will:* the want of will is the very thing lamented. An inclination to the good is at his hand, within the limit of his resources, but not the actual effecting of the good.

Ver. 19. In this verse there is a repetition of verse 15, but what was there an abstract contrast between inclination and action is here sharpened into the moral contrast between good inclination and bad action.

Ver. 20. The same conclusion as in ver. 17. If the *first* ἐγὼ is right, it must go with οὐ θέλω: Paul distinguishes himself sharply, as a person whose inclination is violated by his actions, from the indwelling sin which is really responsible for them.

Vers. 21-23 summarise the argument. εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον . . . ὅτι: most commentators hold that the clause introduced by ὅτι is the explanation of τὸν νόμον. The law, in short, which Paul has discovered by experience, is the constant fact that when his inclination is to do good, evil is present with him. This sense of law approximates very closely to the modern sense which the word bears in physical science—so closely that its very modernness may be made an objection to it. Possibly Paul meant, in using the word, to convey at the same time the idea of an outward compulsion put on him by sin, which expressed itself in this constant incapacity to do the good he inclined to—authority or constraint as well as normality being included in his idea of the word. But ὁ νόμος in Paul always seems to have much more definitely the suggestion of something with legislative authority: it is questionable whether the first meaning given above would have occurred, or would have seemed natural, except to a reader familiar with the phraseology of modern science. Besides, the subject of the whole paragraph is the relation of "the law" to sin, and the form of the sentence is quite analogous to that of ver. 10, in which a preliminary conclusion has been come to on the question. Hence I agree with those who make τὸν νόμον the Mosaic law. The construction is not intolerable, if we observe that εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ. is equivalent to εὑρίσκεται ἄρα ὁ νόμος τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ. "This is what I find the law—or life under the law—to come to in experience: when I wish to do good, evil is present with me." This is the answer he has already given in ver. 7 to the question, Is the law sin? No, it is not sin, but nevertheless sin is most closely connected with it. The repeated ἐμοί has something tragic in it: *me*, who am so anxious to do otherwise.

Ver. 22 f. Further explanation: the

[k] ἄνθρωπον· 23. βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου, καὶ [l] αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με [1] τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσί μου. 24. ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου; 25. εὐχαριστῶ [2] τῷ Θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν. ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῒ [3] δουλεύω νόμῳ Θεοῦ· τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ

k 2 Cor. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 16.
l 2 Cor. x. 5. 2 Tim. iii. 6.

[1] αιχμαλωτιζοντα με εν τω νομω ℵBDFKP; om. εν ACL, most cursives, Syr. and many fathers. The omission, according to Weiss, is manifestly made to simplify the expression. Lachm. omits; W. and H. bracket.

[2] ευχαριστω ℵAKLP, most cursives and fathers; W. and H. in marg. χαρις B., Sah., Orig. 1. This is the reading adopted in all the crit. edd. as the one from which the variants are most easily deduced (*e.g.*, η χαρις του θεου D, vulg.; η χ. τ. κυριου F; χαρις δε τω θεω ℵ[1]C[2]).

[3] τω μεν νοι, om. μεν ℵ[1]FG, vulg., and Lat. fathers. The omission must be accidental, and all edd. except Tischdf. keep **μεν**.

incongruity between inclination and action has its roots in a division within man's nature. The law of God legislates for him, and in the inner man (Eph. iii. 16) he delights in it. The inner man is not equivalent to the new or regenerate man; it is that side of every man's nature which is akin to God, and is the point of attachment, so to speak, for the regenerating spirit. It is called inward because it is not seen. What *is* seen is described in ver. 23. Here also **νόμος** is not used in the modern physical sense, but imaginatively: "I see that a power to legislate, of a different kind (different from the law of God), asserts itself in my members, making war on the law of my mind". The law of my mind is practically identical with the law of God in ver. 22: and the **νοῦς** itself, if not identical with **ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος**, is its chief organ. Paul does not see in his nature two normal modes in which certain forces operate; he sees two authorities saying to him, Do this, and the higher succumbing to the lower. As the lower prevails, it leads him captive to the law of Sin which is in his members, or in other words to itself: "of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage". The end therefore is that man, as a creature of flesh, living under law, does what Sin enjoins. It is the law of Sin to which he gives obedience.

Ver. 24. **ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος· τίς με ῥύσεται;** "a wail of anguish and a cry for help". The words are not those of the Apostle's heart as he writes; they are the words which he knows are wrung from the heart of the man who realises that he is himself in the state just described. Paul has reproduced this vividly from his own experience, but **ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος** is not the cry of the Christian Paul, but of the man whom sin and law have brought to despair. **ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου**: "*This* death" is the death of which man is acutely conscious in the condition described: it is the same as the death of ver. 9, but intensely realised through the experience of captivity to sin. "The body of this death" is therefore the same as "the body of sin" in chap. vi. 6: it is the body which, as the instrument if not the seat of sin, is involved in its doom. Salvation must include deliverance from the body so far as the body has this character and destiny.

Ver. 25. The exclamation of thanksgiving shows that the longed-for deliverance has actually been achieved. The regenerate man's ideal contemplation of his pre-Christian state rises with sudden joy into a declaration of his actual emancipation as a Christian. **διὰ Ἰ. Χ. τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν**: Christ is regarded as the mediator through whom the thanksgiving ascends to God, not as the author of the deliverance for which thanks are given. With **ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγώ** the Apostle introduces the conclusion of this whole discussion. "So then I myself—that is, I, leaving Jesus Christ our Lord out of the question—can get no further than this: with the mind, or in the inner man, I serve a law of God (a Divine law), but with the flesh, or in my actual outward life, a law of sin." We might say *the* law of God, or of sin; but the absence of the definite article emphasises the

ἁμαρτίας. VIII. 1. Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα.[1] 2. ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [a] ἠλευθέρωσέ με[2] ἀπὸ τοῦ

a John viii. 32-36; Ch. vi. 18, 22; Gal. v. 1.

[1] μη κατα σαρκα περιπατουσιν αλλα κατα πνευμα om. ℵ¹BCD¹F 47, Egypt. and Ethiopic versions, Orig. and Athan. and all crit. edd. The first part of the addition, μη . . . περιπατουσιν, is found in AD², vulg., Syr.; the rest, αλλα κατα πνευμα, in ℵ³D³KLP and most later authorities.

[2] ηλευθερωσεν με ACDKLP, vulg., Syr. For με, σε is found ℵBFG, and also in Latin and Syriac authorities. ημας is supported by Egypt. and Aeth. versions. The case is a very difficult one. σε is the harder reading, and Weiss, who adopts it, argues that it was changed into με under the influence of the preceding paragraphs in which the first person rules. Sanday and Headlam think σε can hardly be right because it is nowhere suggested in the context. W. and H. suspect a primitive error. "The distribution of documents, combined with internal evidence, favours the omission of both pronouns, which is supported by some MSS. of Arm(enian version), and perhaps by Orig. *loc.*, Ruf. com.; σε, a very unlikely reading, is probably only an early repetition of -σε" (Appendix to N.T., p. 108).

character of law. αὐτὸς ἐγὼ: see 2 Cor. x. 1, xii. 13.

CHAPTER VIII. For the place of this chapter in the argument see chap. vi., *ad init.* The general subject is the life in the spirit, by which the power of sin is broken, and the believer enabled to live to God. It falls into three parts (1) vers. 1-11, in which the spirit as opposed to the flesh is described as the principle of righteousness and life; (2) vers. 12-27, in which it is regarded as a spirit of adoption, the first fruits of a heavenly inheritance for the children of God; and (3) vers. 28-39, in which Paul concludes the argument, glorying in the assurance of God's immutable love in Jesus Christ.

(1) Vers. 1-11. The Spirit as the principle of righteousness and life.

Ver. 1. οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. The οὐδὲν is emphatic: condemnation is in every sense out of the question. νῦν is temporal: it distinguishes the Christian from the pre-Christian period of life. The bold assertion is an inference (ἄρα) from what is implied in the thanksgiving to God through Jesus Christ (vii. 25). The description of Christians as "those who are in Christ Jesus" goes back to the words of Jesus Himself in John xv.

Ver. 2. There is no condemnation, for all ground for it has been removed. "The law of the spirit of the life which is in Christ Jesus made me [thee] free from the law of sin and death." It is subjection to the law of sin and death which involves condemnation; emancipation from it leaves no place for condemnation. For the meaning of "the law" see on vii. 23. The spirit which brings to the believer the life which is in Christ Jesus brings with it also the Divine law for the believer's life; but it is now, as Paul says in Gal. iii. 21, a "νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι," not an impotent law written on tables of stone, and hence righteousness comes by it; it proves more than a match for the authority exercised over man by the forces of sin and death. Paul would not have called the Divine law (even as a series of statutes) a law of sin and death, though he says τὸ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει; Sin and Death are conceived objectively as powers which impose their own law on unredeemed men.

Ver. 3. He now explains how this was done. It was not done by the law: that is the first point. If τὸ ἀδύνατον is active (= "the inability" of the law) we must suppose that Paul meant to finish the sentence, "was overcome," or "was removed" by God. If it is passive (= "that which is impossible" for the law), we must suppose he meant to finish it, "was achieved" or "accomplished" by God. There is really no way of deciding whether ἀδύνατον is active or passive, and the anacoluthon makes it impossible to tell what construction Paul had in his mind, *i.e.*, whether ἀδύνατον is nominative or accusative. For the best examination of the grammar see S. and H. ἐν ᾧ probably refers to ἀδύνατον: the point at which the law was impotent, *in which* it was weak through the flesh. This is better than to render ἐν ᾧ "in that," or "because". For the meaning *cf.* vii. 18. What the law could not do, God did by sending τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν *His own Son.* With the coming of so great a Person,

νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. 3. Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν [b] ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας κατέκρινε τὴν

[b] See Ch. vi. v.

uniquely related to God (for this is implied both here and in ver. 32, as contrasted with ver. 14), a new saving power entered the world. God sent His Son **ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας.** The connection implies that sending Him thus was in some way related to the end to be secured. But what do the words mean? **ὁμοίωμα** occurs in Rom. i. 23, v. 14, vi. 5, and also in Phil. ii. 7. This last passage, in which Christ is described as **ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος**, is the one which is most akin to Rom. viii. 3, and most easily illustrates it. There must have been a reason why Paul wrote in Philippians **ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθ. γενόμενος** instead of **ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος**, and it may well have been the same reason which made him write here **ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας** instead of **ἐν σαρκὶ ἁμαρτίας.** He wishes to indicate not that Christ was not really man, or that His flesh was not really what in us is **σάρξ ἁμαρτίας**, but that what for ordinary men is their natural condition is for this Person only an assumed condition (Holtzmann, *N.T. Theol.*, ii., 74). But the emphasis in **ὁμοίωμα** is on Christ's likeness to us, not His unlikeness; "flesh of sin" is one idea to the Apostle, and what he means by it is that God sent His Son in that nature which in us is identified with sin. This was the "form" (and "form" rather than "likeness" is what **ὁμοίωμα** signifies) in which Christ appeared among men. It does not prejudice Christ's sinlessness, which is a fixed point with the Apostle *ab initio;* and if any one says that it involves a contradiction to maintain that Christ was sinless, and that He came in a nature which in us is identified with sin, it may be pointed out that this identification does not belong to the essence of our nature, but to its corruption, and that the uniform teaching of the N.T. is that Christ is one with us—short of sin. The likeness and the limitation of it (though the former is the point here urged) are equally essential in the Redeemer. But God sent His Son not only **ἐν ὁμ. σ. ἁ.** but **καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας.** These words indicate the aim of the mission. Christ was sent in our nature "in connection with sin". The R.V. renders "*as an offering* for sin". This is legitimate, for **περὶ ἁμαρτίας** is used both in the LXX (Lev. iv. 33 and *passim*, Ps. xl. 6, 2 Chr. xxix. 24) and in the N.T. (Heb. x. 6, 8) in the sense of "sin-offering" (usually answering to Heb. חַטָּאת, but in Isa. liii. 10 to אָשָׁם); but it is not formally necessary. But when the question is asked, In what sense did God send His Son "in connection with sin"? there is only one answer possible. He sent Him to expiate sin by His sacrificial death. This is the centre and foundation of Paul's gospel (iii. 25 ff.), and to ignore it here is really to assume that he used the words **καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας** (which have at least sacrificial associations) either with no meaning in particular, or with a meaning alien to his constant and dearest thoughts. Weiss says it is impossible to think here of *expiating* sin, because only the removal of the *power* of sin belongs to the context. But we cannot thus set the end against the means; the Apostle's doctrine is that the power of sin cannot be broken *except by expiating it*, and that is the very thing he teaches here. This fixes the meaning and the reference of **κατέκρινεν.** It is sometimes interpreted as if Christ were the subject: "Christ by His sinless life in our nature condemned sin in that nature," *i.e.*, showed that it was not inevitable, and in so doing gave us hope; and this sense of "condemned" is supported by reference to Mt. xii. 41 f. But the true argument (especially according to the analogy of that passage) would rather be, "Christ by His sinless life in our nature condemned our sinful lives, and left us inexcusable and without hope". The truth is, we get on to a wrong track if we ignore the force of **περὶ ἁμαρτίας**, or fail to see that God, not Christ, is the subject of **κατέκρινεν.** God's condemnation of sin is expressed in His sending His Son in our nature, and in such a connection with sin that He died for it—*i.e.*, took its condemnation upon Himself. Christ's death exhibits God's condemnation of sin in the flesh. **ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ** is to be construed with **κατέκρινεν**: the flesh—that in which sin had reigned—was also that in which God's condemnation of sin was executed. But Paul does not mean that by His sinless life in our nature Christ had broken the power of

c Ch. ii. 26. ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί. 4. ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ [c] νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα. 5. Οἱ

d Ch. xii. 3, 16; Phil. ii. 5; Col. iii. 2. γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς [d] φρονοῦσιν· οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα, τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. 6. τὸ γὰρ [e] φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος· τὸ δὲ

e Only in this ch. φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη. 7. διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς Θεόν· τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται,

f 1 Thess. ii. 4; iv. 1; Gal. i. 10. οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται· 8. οἱ δὲ ἐν σακρὶ ὄντες Θεῷ [f] ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται. 9. Ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκί, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα

g 1 Cor. vii. 40. Θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ [g] ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. 10. εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν δι'

sin at one point for the human race; he means that in the death of His own Son, who had come in our nature to make atonement for sin, God had pronounced the doom of sin, and brought its claims and its authority over man to an end. This is the only interpretation which does not introduce elements quite alien to the Apostle's mode of thought.

Ver. 4. All this was done **ἵνα τὸ δικ. τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν**: that the just requirement of the law (*i.e.*, a righteous life) might be fulfilled in us. See note on iii. 31. **ἐν ἡμῖν** (not **ὑφ' ἡμῶν**), for it is not our doing, though done in us (Weiss). **τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα κ.τ.λ.** = inasmuch as we walk not, etc. This is the condition under which the Divine purpose is fulfilled: there is no physical necessity in it. **κατὰ σάρκα**: the flesh meant is our corrupt human nature. **κατὰ πνεῦμα**: the spirit is the Divine spirit which is given to those who are in Christ Jesus. It is in them "both law and impulse".

Ver. 5. The meaning of the sentence "is not contained in the repetitions of **γὰρ** by which it is hooked together" (Jowett). **οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες** are those whose nature is determined simply by the flesh; their "mind," *i.e.*, their moral interest, their thought and study, is upon **τὰ τῆς σαρκός**: for which see Gal. v. 19 f. **οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα** are those whose nature is determined by the spirit: for **τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος** see Gal. v. 22.

Ver. 6. **τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος**: this does not so much mean that a man living after the flesh is without the life of God, as that death is the end of this line of conduct, chap. vi. 23, Gal. vi. 8. **ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη**: these on the other hand are conceived as present results involved in "the mind of the spirit". It is not arbitrary to distinguish thus: **θάνατος** in Paul is essentially the doom awaiting a certain life, **ζωὴ** and **εἰρήνη** possessions and experiences of the believer.

Ver. 7 f. The reason why the mind of the flesh terminates so fatally: it is hostility to God, the fountain of life. Alienation from Him is necessarily fatal. It is the flesh which does not (for indeed it cannot) submit itself to God; as the seat of indwelling sin it is in permanent revolt, and those who are *in* it (a stronger expression, yet substantially identically with those who are *after* it, ver. 5) cannot please God.

Ver. 9. Paul applies to his readers what he has said in vers. 5-8. **ὑμεῖς** is emphatic. *You* can please God, for you are not in the flesh, etc. **εἴπερ** has its proper force: "if, as is the fact": *cf.* iii. 30, viii. 17; and the excellent examination of other N.T. instances in Simcox, *Language of the N.T.*, 171 f. Yet the possibility of the fact being otherwise in isolated cases, is admitted when he goes on: **εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει κ.τ.λ.** For **εἰ** followed by **οὐ** see Winer, 599 f. **οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ**: only the indwelling of Christ's spirit proves a real relation to Him.

Ver. 10. Consequences of this indwelling of Christ in the Christian. In one respect, they are not yet so complete as might be expected. **τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν**: the body, it cannot be denied, is *dead* because of sin: the experience we call death is inevitable for it. **τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωή**: but the spirit (*i.e.*, the human spirit, as is shown by the contrast with **σῶμα**) is life, God-begotten, God-sustained life, and therefore beyond the reach of death. As death is due to sin, so is this life to **δικαιοσύνη**. It is probably not real to distinguish here between "justification" and "moral righteousness of life," and to say that the word means either to the exclusion of the other. The

ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. 11. εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν[1] ἐκ νεκρῶν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν[h] ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν, διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν.

h Ch. iv. 17.

12. ἌΡΑ οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν οὐ τῇ σαρκί, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν· 13. εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς [i]πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε. 14. Ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι Θεοῦ [k]ἄγονται, οὗτοί εἰσιν υἱοὶ [l]Θεοῦ.[2] 15. οὐ

i Col. iii. 9. k Gal. v. 18. l Ver. 19; Gal. iii. 26, iv. 6 f.

[1] Ιησουν ℵ³CDFKLP. τον Ιησουν ℵ¹AB, W. and H., Weiss, Tdf., etc. τον before Χριστον is om. in ℵ¹ABCD¹, ²F and all edd. Χριστον is the reading of BD³FKLP, but Χριστον Ιησουν is found in ℵAD 31, 47, and many fathers, and is adopted by W. and H., not by Weiss. ζωοποιησει και; om. και ℵA 47; W. and H. bracket; Treg. brackets it in marg. δια το ενοικουν αυτου πνευμα BDEFGKLP it. vg. δια του ενοικουντος αυτου πνευματος ℵAC, many cursives, Copt., Arm., Aeth. This is a very old variant; Clem. Alex. has the gen., Iren., Tert. and Orig. the accus. The genitive (according to Weiss) probably owes its wide diffusion, though not its origin, to the interest taken in it by the orthodox in connection with the Macedonian controversy. It may have originated in an emendation conforming the structure to that of vi. 4 (δια της δοξης του πατρος). Edd. are divided. Lachm., Treg., and Weiss adopt the accusative, Tischdf. and W. and H. the genitive, but W. and H. put accusative in marg.

[2] For εισιν υιοι θεου ℵACD read υιοι θεου εισιν.

whole argument of chaps. vi.-viii. is that neither can exist without the other. No man can begin to be good till he is justified freely by God's grace in Christ Jesus, and no one has been so justified who has not begun to live the good life in the spirit.

Ver. 11. But though the present results of the indwelling of the spirit are not all we might desire, the future is sure. The indwelling spirit is that of Him who raised Jesus from the dead, and as such it is the guarantee that our mortal bodies also (as well as our spirits) shall share in immortality. The same argument, in effect, is used in Eph. i. 18-20. "The power that worketh in us" is the same with which "God wrought in Christ when He raised Him from the dead and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places"; and it will work to the same issue in us as in Him. The reading in the last clause is very doubtful, but whether we take the accus. (according to which the indwelling of the spirit is the ground on which God raises our mortal bodies to undying life) or the genit. (according to which the spirit is itself the agent in this resurrection—a conception not found elsewhere in Scripture), in either case a share in the Christian resurrection is conditioned by the possession of the Spirit of Christ. It is clear from the alternation of πνεῦμα θεοῦ and πνεῦμα χριστοῦ in ver. 9 that the Spirit of Christ is the same as the Spirit of God, and the use of χριστὸς alone in the next verse shows that this same spirit is the *alter ego* of Christ. *Cf.* Phil. i. 19; Gal. iv. 6; Eph. iii. 17. This is one of the passages in which the presuppositions of the Trinitarian conception of God come out most clearly.

(2) Vers. 12-27. The Spirit as a spirit of adoption, the first-fruits of the inheritance of the children of God.

Ver. 12 f. The blessed condition and hopes of Christians, as described in these last verses, lay them under obligations: to whom, or to what? Not (ver. 12) to the flesh, to live according to it; to it they owe nothing. If they live after the flesh they are destined to die—the final doom in which there is no hope; but if by the spirit (*i.e.*, God's Spirit) they put to death the doings of the body, they shall live—the life against which death is powerless. We might have expected τῆς σαρκὸς instead of τοῦ σώματος, but in the absence of the spirit the body in all it does is only the tool of the flesh: the two are morally equivalent.

Ver. 14. Ye shall live, for as many as are led by God's Spirit are God's sons, and life is congruous to such a dignity. υἱὸς suggests the rank and privileges of the persons in question; τέκνον (in ver. 16 f.) their kinship in nature to God. Yet

γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον, ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα [m] υἱοθεσίας, ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν, Ἀββᾶ, ὁ πατήρ. 16. αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα [n] συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν, ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα Θεοῦ. 17. εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν Θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ· εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ [o] συνδοξασθῶμεν. 18. Λογίζομαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν [p] καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν

m Ver. 23; Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5 (ch. ix. 4).
n Ch. ii. 15; ix. i.
o 2 Tim. ii. 11 f.
p Ch. iii. 26.

this cannot everywhere be urged in the N.T.

Ver. 15. Sons, **οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας.** The aorist refers to the time of their baptism, when they received the Spirit. It was not the Spirit proper to slaves, leading them again to shrink from God in fear as they had done when under the law of sin and death, but **πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας,** a spirit proper to those who were being translated from the servile to the filial relation to God. **υἱοθεσία** is a word used in the N.T. by Paul only, but "no word is more common in Greek inscriptions of the Hellenistic time: the idea, like the word, is native Greek" (E. L. Hicks, quoted in S. and H.), see Gal. iv. 5, Eph. i. 5. The word serves to distinguish those who are made sons by an act of grace from the only-begotten Son of God: **τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν** ver. 3, **τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ** ver. 32. But the act of grace is not one which makes only an outward difference in our position; it is accomplished in the giving of a spirit which creates in us a new nature. In the spirit of adoption we cry Abba, Father. We have not only the status, but the heart of sons. **κράζομεν** (often with **φωνῇ μεγάλῃ**) is a strong word: it denotes the loud irrepressible cry with which the consciousness of sonship breaks from the Christian heart in prayer. The change to the first person marks Paul's inclusion of himself in the number of those who have and utter this consciousness; and it is probably this inclusion of himself, as a person whose native language was "Hebrew" (Acts xxi. 40), to which is due the double form **Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ.** The last word certainly interprets the first, but it is not thought of as doing so: "we cry, Father, Father".

Ver. 16. The punctuation in W. and H. margin deserves notice. "In that we cry, Abba, Father, the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit," etc. Our own spirit tells us we are God's children, but the voice with which it speaks is, as we know, prompted and inspired by the Divine Spirit itself. For similar distinctions Gifford compares ii. 15 and ix. 1. **τέκνα θεοῦ**: **τέκνα,** not **υἱοί,** is used with strict propriety here, as it is the reality of the filial nature, not the legitimacy of the filial position, which is being proved.

Ver. 17. Yet this last is involved, for "if children, also heirs". *Cf.* Gal. iv. 7 where **κληρονόμος** is relative to **υἱός**; and all the passages in which the Spirit is regarded as "the earnest" of an inheritance: 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, Eph. i. 14. It is from God the inheritance comes, and we share in it with Christ (Mark. xii. 7). For what it is, see 1 Cor. ii. 9 f. The inheritance attached to Divine sonship is attained only on the condition expressed in the clause **εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν.** On **εἴπερ,** see ver. 9. "Rom. viii. 17 gains in pathos, when we see that the share of the disciples in the Master's sufferings was felt to be a fact of which there was no question." Simcox, *Language of N.T.*, p. 171. Paul was sure of it in his own case, and took it for granted in that of others. Those who share Christ's sufferings now will share His glory hereafter; and in order to share His glory hereafter it is necessary to begin by sharing His sufferings here.

Ver. 18. The passage extending from this verse to ver. 27 is described by Lipsius as a "threefold testimony to the future transfiguration which awaits suffering believers". In vers. 19-22 there is the first testimony—the sighing of creation; in vers. 23-25 the second, the yearning hope of Christians themselves, related as it is to the possession of the first fruits of the Spirit; and in vers. 26 f. the third, the intercession of the Spirit which helps us in our prayers, and lends words to our longing. **λογιζόμεθα γὰρ κ.τ.λ. λογίζομαι** is a favourite word with Paul: the instance most like this is the one in iii. 28. It does not suggest a more or less dubious result of calculation; rather by litotes does it express the strongest assurance. The insignificance of present suffering compared with future glory was a fixed idea with the Apostle, 2 Cor. iv. 17 f. For **οὐκ ἄξια . . . πρὸς** see Winer, 505 (d). With **τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι** *cf.* in Gal. iii. 23

μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. 19. Ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ [q]Θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται. 20. τῇ γὰρ [r]ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι,[1] 21. ὅτι[2] καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ

q Ver. 14.
r Eph. iv. 17.

[1] **επ ελπιδι.** In ℵBDFG we find **εφ ελπιδι,** and this is printed by Tischdf. and W. and H. The same mistake (?) occurs Rom. iv. 18 in CDFG, Rom. v. 2 in DFG, and Tit. i. 2 in D; *cf.* also **αφηλπικοτες** in FG Eph. iv. 19. In these circumstances it seems doubtful whether **εφ' ελπιδι** should be put in the text.

[2] For **οτι** ℵDFG read **διοτι.** The **δι** may easily have been omitted after **ελπιδι,** and therefore Tischdf. and Weiss read **διοτι,** though most edd. **οτι.**

τὴν μέλλ. πίστιν ἀποκαλ. The unusual order emphasises the futurity. **εἰς ἡμᾶς** = toward and upon us. The glory comes from without, to transfigure them. It is revealed at the **ἀποκάλυψις** (1 Cor. i. 7, 2 Th. i. 7, 1 Pet. i. 7, 13, iv. 13), the glorious second coming, of Christ, and is indeed His glory of which they are made partakers.

Ver. 19. First testimony to this glorious future: creation sighs for it. In some sense the hope and promise of it is involved in the present constitution of the world. For a fine speculative interpretation see E. Caird's *Evolution of Religion*, ii., 124 f. In Paul, however, the spirit of the passage is rather poetic than philosophical. Its affinities are with Gen. iii. 17, where the ground is cursed for man's sake: he conceives of all creation as involved in the fortunes of humanity. But this, if creation be personified, naturally leads to the idea of a mysterious sympathy between the world and man, and this is what the Apostle expresses. Creation is not inert, utterly unspiritual, alien to our life and its hopes. It is the natural ally of our souls. What rises from it is the music *of humanity*—not apparently so still and sad to Paul as to Wordsworth, but with a note of hope in it rising triumphantly above all the pain of conflict. **ἀποκαραδοκία** (Phil. i. 20) denotes absorbed, persistent expectation—waiting, as it were, with uplifted head. **ἡ κτίσις** is the world and all that it contains, animate and inanimate, as distinguished from man. **τὴν ἀποκ. τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ**: *cf.* 1 John iii. 2. With the revelation of the sons of God humanity would attain its end, and nature too.

Ver. 20. For creation was subjected to vanity, etc. **ματαιότης** is not classical, but is often used in the LXX, especially for הֶבֶל. The idea is that of looking for what one does not find—hence of futility, frustration, disappointment. **ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων** is the "vanity of vanities" in Eccl., the complaint of the utter resultlessness of life. Sin brought this doom on creation; it made a pessimistic view of the universe inevitable. **ὑπετάγη**: the precise time denoted is that of the Fall, when God pronounced the ground cursed for man's sake. Creation came under this doom **οὐχ ἑκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα**: the last words seem best referred to God: it was on account of Him—that His righteousness might be shown in the punishment of sin—that the sentence fell upon man, carrying consequences which extended to the whole realm intended originally for his dominion. The sentence on man, however, was not hopeless, and creation shared in his hope as in his doom. When the curse is completely removed from man, as it will be when the sons of God are revealed, it will pass from creation also; and for this creation sighs. It was made subject to vanity on the footing of this hope; the hope is latent, so to speak, in the constitution of nature, and comes out, in its sighing, to a sympathetic ear.

Ver. 21. Contents of the hope. It makes no difference in meaning, whether we read **ὅτι** or **διότι.** **αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις**: creation as well as man. **ἡ δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς**: a system in which nothing continues in one stay, in which death claims everything, in which there is not even an analogy to immortality, is a system of slavery—in subjection to "vanity," with no high eternal worth of its own. From such a condition creation is to be emancipated; it is to share in the liberty which belongs to the glory of the children of God. When man's redemption is complete, he will find himself in a new world matching with his new condition (Isa. lxv. 17, 2 Pet. iii. 13, Rev. xxi. 1): this is

[a] Mark xvi. 15; Col. i. 15, 23.

[t] 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5; Phil. iii. 20; Heb. ix. 28.

Θεοῦ. 22. οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ [a] κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν· 23. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἔχοντες, καὶ ἡμεῖς [1] αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν, υἱοθεσίαν [t] ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. 24. τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν. ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει [2]; 25. εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν,

[1] ημεις om. B 31, 73, 93, vulg. The rec. text is that of DFKLP. In ℵAC 47 the order of the words is εχοντες ημεις και αυτοι. This is followed by Tischdf. Lachm., Treg. and W. and H. bracket ημεις in this position; Weiss omits it altogether.

[2] The reading of B is ο γαρ βλεπει τις ελπιζει. This is adopted by W. and H., Weiss. Of the received text—ο γαρ βλεπει τις τι και ελπιζει—τι is wanting in ℵ, and και in DFG, vulg., Pesh. The reading of B is difficult, and seems to have been partially amended in different ways which are combined in the received text. For ελπιζει ℵ[1]A 47, marg., have υπομενει, and W. and H. give a place to this, as well as to the received text, in their margin.

Paul's faith, and the sighing of creation attests it.

Ver. 22. **οἴδαμεν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: How Christians know this Paul does not say. Perhaps we may say that the Christian consciousness of sin and redemption is in contact with the ultimate realities of the universe, and that no interpretation of nature can be true but one which, like this, is in essential harmony with it. The force of the preposition in **συστενάζει** and **συνωδίνει** is not that *we* sigh and are in pain, and creation along with us; but that the whole frame of creation, all its parts together, *unite* in sighing and in pain. Weiss is right in saying that there is no reference to the *dolores Messiae;* but in **συνωδίνει** there is the suggestion of the travail out of which the new world is to be born. **ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν** means up till now, without stopping, ever since the moment of **ὑπετάγη**.

Ver. 23. Second testimony to the glorious future. **οὐ μόνον δὲ** *sc.* **ἡ κτίσις**—not only all creation, but we Christians: we ourselves, **τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες**. **τοῦ πνεύματος** is gen. of apposition: the spirit which Christians have received is itself the first fruits (elsewhere, the earnest: see on ver. 17) of this glory; and *because* we have it (not *although:* it is the foretaste of heaven, the heaven begun in the Christian, which intensifies his yearning, and makes him more vehemently than nature long for complete redemption), we also sigh in ourselves **υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.** The key to these words is found in i. 4. Christ was Son of God always, but was only declared to be so in power **ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν**, and so it is with believers. They have already received adoption, and as led by the spirit are sons of God; but only when their mortal bodies have been quickened, and the corruptible has put on incorruption, will they possess all that sonship involves. For this they wait and sigh, and the inextinguishable hope, born of the spirit dwelling in them, guarantees its own fulfilment. *Cf.* Phil. iii. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 51; 2 Cor. v. 2; and for **ἀπολύτρωσις** in this sense, 1 Cor. i. 30.

Ver. 24 f. This sentence explains why Paul can speak of Christians as *waiting* for adoption, while they are nevertheless in the enjoyment of sonship. It is because salvation is essentially related to the future. "We wait for it: for we were saved *in hope*." The dat. **τῇ ἐλπίδι** is that of mode or respect. Our salvation was qualified from the beginning by reference to a good yet to be. Weiss argues that the sense of **ἐλπὶς** in the second clause (*res sperata*) makes it "absolutely necessary" to take it so in the first, and that this leaves no alternative but to make **τῇ ἐλπίδι** *dat. comm.* and translate: "for, for this object of hope—eternal life and glory—were we delivered from eternal destruction". But the "absolute necessity" is imaginary; a word with the nuances of **ἐλπίς** in a mind with the speed of Paul's need not be treated so rigorously, especially as the resulting construction is in itself extremely dubious. Hope, the Apostle argues, is an essential characteristic of our salvation; but hope turned sight is hope no more, for who hopes for what he sees? We do *not* see all the Gospel held out to us, but it is the object of our Christian hope nevertheless; it is as true

δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. 26. Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα [u] συναντιλαμβάνεται ταῖς ἀσθενείαις [1] ἡμῶν· τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ, οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα [v] ὑπερεντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις· 27. ὁ δὲ ἐρευνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδε τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτι κατὰ Θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων. 28. Οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ [2] εἰς ἀγαθόν,

u Luke x. 40.
v Here only in N.T.

[1] For ταις ασθενειαις ℵABCD have τῃ ασθενειᾳ. υπερ ημων CKLP; but om. ℵABDF.

[2] After συνεργει, ο θεος is found in AB. W. and H. bracket it, but Lachm. and Weiss regard it as the true text. It was omitted as cumbrous and unnecessary. *Cf.* i. 28, where ο θεος is omitted in ℵA in much the same way; here it is wanting in ℵACDFKL.

and sure as the love of God which in Christ Jesus reconciled us to Himself and gave us the spirit of adoption, and therefore we wait for it in patience. For **διὰ** *cf.* ii. 27. **ὑπομονή**: in 1 Thess. i. 3 we have **ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος ὑμῶν** used of a suffering but steadfast Church: **ὑπομονὴ** is the constancy which belongs to and characterises hope in dark days. In the pastoral epistles (1 Tim. vi. 11; Tit. ii. 2) instead of the **πίστις, ἀγάπη, ἐλπίς,** of earlier letters, Paul writes **πίστις, ἀγάπη, ὑπομονή,** as if he had discovered by experience that in this life "hope" has mainly to be shown in the form of "patience".

Ver. 26. Third testimony to the glorious future: the sighing of creation, our own sighing, and this action of the Spirit, point consistently to one conclusion. **συναντιλαμβάνεται,** *cf.* Luke x. 40. The weakness which the Spirit helps is that due to our ignorance: **τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ οὐκ οἴδαμεν.** The article makes the whole clause object of **οἴδαμεν**: Winer, p. 644. Broadly speaking, we do know what we are to pray for—the perfecting of salvation; but we do not know what we are to pray for **καθὸ δεῖ**—according as the need is at the moment; we know the end, which is common to all prayers, but not what is necessary at each crisis of need in order to enable us to attain this end. **ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις. ὑπερεντυγχάνει** is found here only in N.T., but **ἐντυγχάνειν** in this sense in vers. 27, 34, Heb. vii. 25. In Rom. xi. 2 with **κατὰ** = to make intercession *against*. **ἀλαλήτοις** does not mean "unspoken" but "unutterable". The **στεναγμοὶ** of believers find expression, adequate or inadequate, in their prayers, and in such utterances as this very passage of Romans, but there is a testimony to the glory awaiting them more profound and passionate than even this. It is the intercession of the Spirit with **στεναγμοὶ ἀλάλητοι**—groanings (or sighs) that baffle words. **αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα** is undoubtedly God's Spirit as distinguished from ours, yet what is here affirmed must fall within Christian experience, for Paul says in the next verse that He Who searches *the hearts* knows what is the mind of the Spirit in this unutterable intercession. It is in the heart, therefore, that it takes place. "The whole passage illustrates in even a startling manner the truth and reality of the 'coming' of the Holy Ghost—the extent to which, if I may venture to say it, He has separated Himself—as Christ did at His Incarnation—from His eternal glory and blessedness, and entered into the life of man. . . . His intercession for us—so intimately does He share all the evils of our condition—is a kind of *agony*" (R. W. Dale, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 140 f.).

Ver. 27. This intercession, with which our heart goes, though it is deeper than words, the Heart Searcher understands. **τί τὸ φρόν. τοῦ πνεύματος**: what the Spirit is set upon, the whole object of its thought and endeavour. **ὅτι,** *viz.*, that He intercedes **κατὰ θεόν** in agreement with God's will, see 2 Cor. vii. 9-11. **ὑπὲρ ἁγίων** on behalf of those who are God's. Both the intercession of Christ and the intercession of the Spirit are represented in the N.T. as made on behalf of those who are in Christ—saints, the Church, not mankind in general.

Vers. 28-39. Conclusion of the argument: the Apostle glories in the assurance of God's eternal and unchangeable love in Jesus Christ.

οἴδαμεν δὲ = further, we know: in a sense this is one ground more for be-

w Eph. i. 5, 11; 1 Cor. ii. 7.
x Phil. iii. 21 (10).

τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν. 29. ὅτι οὓς προέγνω, καὶ [w] προώρισε [x] συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς· 30. οὓς δὲ προώρισε, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσε· καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσε, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασε. 31. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ

lieving in the glorious future: God is ever with us, and will not abandon us at last. **πάντα συνεργεῖ (ὁ θεός)**: **συνεργεῖ** is naturally neuter, and if **ὁ θεός** is the true reading, it is probably best to render "God co-operates for good in all things (**πάντα** accus. of ref. as in 1 Cor. ix. 25, x. 33) with those," etc. **τοῖς ἀγαπ. τὸν θεὸν** describes the persons in question from the human side; **τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν** describes them from the Divine side. It is in pursuance of a purpose of God (for **πρόθεσις** with reference to the eternal purpose of redemption, see ix. 11, Eph. i. 11, iii. 11, 2 Tim. i. 9) that they are called. "Calling" in Paul never means "invitation"; it is always "effectual calling".

Ver. 29 f. These verses give the proof that God in all things co-operates for good with the called. They show how His gracious purpose, beginning with foreknowledge and foreordination perfects all that concerns them on to the final glory. **οὓς προέγνω**: those whom He foreknew—in what sense? as persons who would answer His love with love? This is at least irrelevant, and alien to Paul's general mode of thought. That salvation begins with God, and begins in eternity, are fundamental ideas with him, which he here applies to Christians, without raising any of the problems involved in the relation of the human will to the Divine. He comes upon these in chap. ix., but not here. Yet we may be sure that **προέγνω** has the pregnant sense that **γιγνώσκω** (יָדַע) often has in Scripture: *e.g.*, in Ps. i. 6, Amos iii. 2: hence we may render, "those of whom God took knowledge from eternity" (Eph. i. 4). **καὶ προώρισεν κ.τ.λ.**, "he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of His Son". This conformity is the last stage in salvation, as **προέγνω** is the first. The image is in import not merely spiritual but eschatological. The Son of God is the Lord who appeared to Paul by Damascus: to be conformed to His image is to share His glory as well as His holiness. The Pauline Gospel is hopelessly distorted when this is forgotten. **εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς**: the end in all this is the exaltation of Christ. It is implied in **πρωτότοκον** that He also is regarded as only having attained the fulness of His Sonship through the resurrection (*cf.* i. 4, and Col. i. 18 **πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν**). The idea of Christ's dignity as firstborn among many brethren who all owe their salvation to Him is sublimely interpreted in Heb. ii. 10-13. The Apostle now resumes the series of the Divine acts in our salvation. **οὓς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν.** The eternal foreordination appears in time as "calling," of course as effectual calling: where salvation is contemplated as the work of God alone (as here) there can be no breakdown in its processes. The next stages are summarily indicated. **ἐδικαίωσεν**: God in Jesus Christ forgave our sins, and accepted us as righteous in His sight; ungodly as we had been, He put us right with Himself. In that, everything else is included. The whole argument of chaps. vi.-viii. has been that justification and the new life of holiness in the Spirit are inseparable experiences. Hence Paul can take one step to the end, and write **οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν.** Yet the tense in the last word is amazing. It is the most daring anticipation of faith that even the N.T. contains: the life is not to be taken out of it by the philosophical consideration that with God there is neither before nor after.

Ver. 31. **τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα**; the idea underlying all that precedes is that of the suffering to be endured by those who would share Christ's glory (ver. 17). The Apostle has disparaged the suffering in comparison with the glory (ver. 18); he has interpreted it (vers. 19-27) as in a manner prophetic of the glory; he has in these last verses asserted the presence through all the Christian's life of an eternal victorious purpose of love: all this is included in **ταῦτα.** For **ὑπὲρ** and **κατὰ**, *cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

Ver. 32. The Christian's faith in providence is an inference from redemption. The same God who did not spare His own Son will freely give **us** all things.

ἡμῶν, τίς καθ' ἡμῶν; 32. ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν [y] χαρίσεται; 33. τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν Θεοῦ; Θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν· 34. τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Χριστὸς[1] ὁ ἀποθανών, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐγερθείς, ὃς καὶ ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ

y 1 Cor. ii. 12; Gal. iii. 18.

[1] **Χριστος** alone BDEK, most cursives, and Treg. **Χριστος Ιησους** ℵACFL 17, vulg., etc. Weiss puts Χ. Ι. in text, thinking the omission in B, etc., accidental; W. and H., and Lachm. bracket **Ιησους**. The **και** before **εγερθεις** is wanting in ℵABC. The **και** before **εστιν** is wanting in ℵAC but is found in ℵ[3]BDFKL. It is omitted by W. and H., and Tischdf., bracketed by Lachm., but retained by Weiss. After **εγερθεις** ℵ[1]AC insert **εκ νεκρων**; W. and H. bracket this, but all other crit. edd. omit, with ℵ[2]BDFGKL, etc.

οὐκ ἐφείσατο, *cf.* Gen. xxii. 12, **οὐκ ἐφείσω τοῦ υἱοῦ σου τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ δι' ἐμέ.** It vivifies the impression of God's love through the sense of the sacrifice it made. **ὑπὲρ πάντων ἡμῶν**: *none* were worthy of such a sacrifice (Weiss). **παρέδωκεν** *sc.* to death: iv. 25. **πῶς οὐχὶ καί**: the argument of selfishness is that he who has done so much need do no more; that of love, that he who has done so much is certain to do more. **σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα**: **τὰ πάντα** has a collective force. It is usually taken to mean *the whole* of what furthers the Christian's life, the whole of what contributes to the perfecting of his salvation; all this will be freely given to him by God. But why should it not mean "all things" without any such qualification? When God gives us His Son He gives us the world; there is nothing which does not work together for our good; all things are ours. *Cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 22 f.

Ver. 33 f. The punctuation here is a very difficult problem: see the text and margin of R.V. The reminiscence of Is. l. 8 f. in verse 33 makes it more difficult; for it suggests that the normal structure is that of an affirmation followed by a question, whereas Paul begins with a question to which the affirmation (with at least a trace of Isaiah's language in it) is an answer. It is even possible to read every clause interrogatively, though that is less effective. **τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ;** who shall bring a charge against persons who are God's chosen? The absence of the article (*cf.* **ὑπὲρ ἁγίων,** ver. 27) brings out the character in which the persons in question figure, not their individual personality. For the word see Col. iii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Tit. i. 1; for the thing *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 4; Eph. i. 4; John xv. 16. It describes Christians as persons who owe their standing as such to the act of God's grace. All Christians are conscious that this is the truth about their position: they belong to God, because He has taken them for His own. To say that the word designates "not those who are destined for final salvation, but those who are 'summoned' or 'selected' for the privilege of serving God and carrying out His will" (S. and H.), is to leave the rails of the Apostle's thought altogether. There is nothing here (vers. 28-30) about the privilege of serving God and carrying out His will; the one thing Paul is concerned with is the security given by the eternal love of God that the work of salvation will be carried through, in spite of all impediments, from foreknowledge to final glory. The **ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ** are those who ought to have such security: they should have a faith and an assurance proportioned to the love of God. Paul is one of them, and because he is, he is sure, not that he is called to serve God, but that nothing can ever separate him from God's love in Christ. The question **τίς ἐγκαλέσει** is best answered by taking both the following clauses together: "It is God that justifieth: who is he that shall condemn?" (*cf.* Is. l. 8 f.). But many make **τίς ὁ κατακρινῶν** a new question, and find the answer in verse 34: **Χριστὸς ['Ιησοῦς] ὁ ἀποθανών** = the only person who can condemn is the Judge, *viz.*, Christ, but He is so far from condemning that He has done everything to deliver us from condemnation. What Christian, Paul seems to ask, can speak of **κατάκριμα** with his eye on Christ, who died for our sins? **μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθεὶς [ἐκ νεκρῶν]**: *cf.* Gal. iv. 9; and chap. iv. 25. The correction in **μᾶλλον** is formal (Weiss): Paul does not mean that the resurrection is more important than the cross; he improves upon an expression which has not conveyed all that was in his mind.

z Ver. 27; Heb. vii. 25.

[z]ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν· 35. τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ[1]; θλίψις, ἢ στενοχωρία, ἢ διωγμός, ἢ λιμός, ἢ γυμνότης, ἢ κίνδυνος, ἢ μάχαιρα; 36. (καθὼς γέγραπται, "Ὅτι ἕνεκά σου θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν· ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφα-

[1] **του Χριστου**; so most MSS. But ℵB, with some cursives and fathers, have **του θεου**. This is usually regarded as a change made to agree with ver. 39, because B, after **του θεου**, adds **της εν Χριστω Ιησου**. But this may have been added, as Weiss remarks, for the very reason that B already read **του θεου**; and as ℵ has **του θεου** without this addition, and it was very natural to change it (with an eye to vv. 34 and 37) into **του Χριστου**, it seems probable that **του θεου** is the original reading. Weiss adopts it, and W. and H. put it in marg.

Our position depends upon Jesus Christ who died, nay rather, over whom death no more has dominion (vi. 9), who is at God's right hand (this phrase, which describes Christ's exaltation as a sharing in the universal sovereignty of God, is borrowed from Ps. cx. 1, and is oftener used in the N.T. than any other words of the Old), who also makes intercession on our behalf. **ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει**: a solemn climax is marked by the repetition of **ὅς**, and by the **καὶ** which deliberately adds the intercession to all that has gone before. The Christian consciousness, even in an apostle, cannot transcend this. This is Paul's final security—the last ground of his triumphant assurance: Jesus Christ, at God's right hand, with the virtue of His atoning death in Him, pleads His people's cause. *Cf.* Heb. ix. 24, vii. 25, 1 John ii. 1 f.

Ver. 35 f. **τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ;** If this verse is to be most closely connected with ver. 34, **τοῦ Χριστοῦ** will appear the more probable reading, for there Christ is the subject throughout; but at vers. 28, 31, 39 the love of *God* is the determining idea, and at this point it seems to be caught up again in view of the conclusion—facts which favour the reading **τοῦ θεοῦ**. In any case it is the Divine love for us which is meant. With the list of troubles *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 4-10, xi. 26 f., xii. 10. They were those which had befallen Paul himself, and he knew that the love of God in Jesus Christ could reach and sustain the heart through them all. The quotation from Ps. xliv. 23 is peculiar. It exactly reproduces the LXX, even the **ὅτι** being simply transferred. The **καθὼς** implies that such experiences as those named in ver. 35 are in agreement with what Scripture holds out as the fortune of God's people. Possibly the mention of the sword recalled to the Apostle's memory the **θανατούμεθα** of the psalm, and suggested the quotation. The point of it, both in the psalm and in the epistle, lies in **ἕνεκεν σοῦ**. This is what the Psalmist could not understand. That men should suffer for sin, for infidelity to God, was intelligible enough; but he and his countrymen were suffering because of their faithfulness, and the psalm is his despairing expostulation with God. But the Apostle understood it. To suffer for Christ's sake was to enter into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, and that is the very situation in which the love of Christ is most real, near, and sure to the soul. *Cf.* chap. v. 3, 2 Cor. i. 5, Col. i. 24. Instead of despairing, he glories in tribulations.

Ver. 37. **ὑπερνικῶμεν**: a word probably coined by Paul, who loves compounds with **ὑπέρ**. The Vulg. gives *superamus*, with which Lipsius agrees (*obsiegen*, like *over-power*): but Cyprian *supervincimus*. Later Greek writers distinguish **νικᾶν** and **ὑπερνικᾶν** (see Grimm, *s.v.*), and justify the happy rendering "we are more than conquerors". Perhaps it is a mistake to define in what the "more" consists; but if we do, the answer must be sought on the line indicated in the note on **ἕνεκεν σοῦ**: these trials not only do not cut us off from Christ's love, they actually give us more intimate and thrilling experiences of it. **διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς**: the aorist points to Christ's death as the great demonstration of His love: *cf.* Gal. ii. 20, also Rev. xii. 11.

Ver. 38 f. The Apostle's personal conviction given in confirmation of all that has been said, especially of ver. 37. **πέπεισμαι** *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 12. **οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ**: death is mentioned first, either with ver. 36 in mind, or as the most tremendous enemy the Apostle could conceive. If Christ's love can hold us in and through death, what is left for us to fear? Much of the N.T. bears on this

γῆς·") 37. ἀλλ' ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς. 38. πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωή, οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαὶ οὔτε δυνάμεις, οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα, 39. οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος, οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ, τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν.

very point, *cf.* John viii. 51, x. 28, xi. 25 f., 1 Thess. iv. 13-18, 1 Cor. xv., 2 Cor. iv. 16-v. 5, Rom. xiv. 8, Heb. ii. 14 f. The blank horror of dying is annihilated by the love of Christ. Neither death nor life is to be explained: explanations "only limit the flight of the Apostle's thoughts just when they would soar above all limitation" (Gifford). **οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαί**: this, according to the best authorities, forms a second pair of forces conceivably hostile to the Christian. As in every pair there is a kind of contrast, some have sought one here also: either making **ἄγγελοι** good and **ἀρχαὶ** evil powers, though both spiritual; or **ἄγγελοι** heavenly, and **ἀρχαὶ** (as in Lc. xii. 11, Tit. iii. 1) earthly powers, in which case either might be either good or bad. But this is arbitrary: and a comparison of 1 Cor. xv. 24, Eph. i. 21 favours a suggestion in S. and H. that possibly in a very early copy **οὔτε δυνάμεις** had been accidentally omitted after **οὔτε ἀρχαί**, and then added in the margin, but reinserted in a wrong place. The T.R. "neither angels nor principalities nor powers" brings together all the conceptions with which the Apostle peopled the invisible spiritual world, whatever their character, and declares their inability to come between us and the love of Christ. **οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα**: *cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 22. **οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος**: no dimensions of space. Whether these words pictured something to Paul's imagination we cannot tell; the patristic attempts to give them definiteness are not happy. **οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα**: nor any created thing of different kind. All the things Paul has mentioned come under the head of **κτίσις**; if there is anything of a different kind which comes under the same head, he includes it too. The suggestions of "another world," or of "aspects of reality out of relation to our faculties," and therefore as yet unknown to us, are toys, remote from the seriousness and passion of the Apostle's mind. Nothing that God has made, whatever be its nature, shall be able to separate us **ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χ. Ἰ. τοῦ κ. ἡμῶν.** The love of Christ is God's love. manifested to us in Him; and it is only in Him that a Divine love *is* manifested which can inspire the triumphant assurance of this verse.

Chapters IX.-XI. With the eighth chapter Paul concludes the positive exposition of his gospel. Starting with the theme of i. 16 f., he showed in i. 18-iii. 20 the universal sinfulness of men—Gentile and Jew; in iii. 21-v. 21 he explained, illustrated and glorified the gospel of justification by faith in Christ, set forth by God as a propitiation for sin; in vi. 1-viii. 39 he has vindicated this gospel from the charge of moral inefficiency, by showing that justification by faith is inseparably connected with a new life in the Spirit, a life over which sin has no dominion and in which the just demands of God's law are fulfilled. He has even carried this spiritual life on, in hope, to its consummation in glory: and no more remains to be said. With chap. ix. a new subject is introduced. There is no formal link of connection with what precedes. Structurally, the new division of the epistle stands quite apart from the earlier; it might have been written, and probably was written, after a break. But though no logical relation between the parts is expressed, a psychological connection between them is not hard to discover. The new section deals with a problem which presented great difficulty to the early Church, and especially to men of Jewish birth, a problem which haunted the Apostle's own mind and was no doubt thrust on his attention by his unbelieving countrymen, a problem all the more painful to him as he realised more completely the greatness and glory of the Christian salvation. This was the problem constituted by the fact that the Jews as a whole did not receive the Gospel. They were God's chosen people, but if the Christian Gospel brought salvation they had no share in it. The Messiah was to spring from them, but if Jesus was the Messiah this privilege meant not redemption but condemnation, for they rejected Him almost with one consent. In short, if the birth of the Christian Church and the gathering of

a 1 Tim. ii. 7.

IX. 1. ʼΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ [a] ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν Πνεύματι ʽΑγίῳ, 2. ὅτι λύπη μοι ἐστὶ

Gentiles into it represented the carrying out of God's purpose to bless and save men, God must have turned His back upon Himself; He must have broken His promise to Israel, and cast off His chosen people. But as this must seem impossible, the Jewish inference would be that the Gospel preached by Paul could not be of God, nor the Gentile Churches, as Paul asserted, God's true Israel. This is the situation to which the Apostle addresses himself in the ninth and the two following chapters. It is a historical problem, in the first instance, he has to deal with, not a dogmatic one; and it is necessary to keep the historical situation in view, if we are to avoid illegitimate inferences from the arguments or illustrations of the Apostle. After the introductory statement (ix. 1-5), which shows how deeply his heart is pledged to his brethren after the flesh, he works out a solution of the problem —or an interpretation of the position —along three lines. In each of these there are many incidental points of view, but they can be broadly discriminated. (1) In the first, chap. ix. 6-29, Paul asserts the absolute freedom and sovereignty of God as against any claim, made as of right, on the part of man. The Jewish objection to the Gospel, to which reference is made above, really means that the Jewish nation had a claim of right upon God, giving them a title to salvation, which God must acknowledge; Paul argues that all God's action, as exhibited in Scripture, and especially in the history of Israel itself—to say nothing of the essential relations of Creator and creature—refutes such a claim. (2) In the second, chap. ix. 30-x. 21, Paul turns from this more speculative aspect of the situation to its moral character, and points out that the explanation of the present rejection of the Jews is to be found in the fact that they have wilfully and stubbornly rejected the Gospel. Their minds have been set on a righteousness of their own, and they have refused to submit themselves to the righteousness of God. (3) In the third, chap. xi., he rises again to an absolute or speculative point of view. The present unbelief of the Jews and incoming of the Gentiles are no doubt, to a Jew, disconcerting events; yet in spite of them, or rather—which is more wonderful still —by means of them, God's promises to the fathers will be fulfilled, and all Israel saved. Gentile Christianity will provoke the unbelieving Jews to jealousy, and they too will enter the Messianic Kingdom. In the very events which seem to throw the pious Jewish mind out of its reckoning, there is a gracious providence, a depth of riches and wisdom and knowledge which no words can express. The present situation, which at the first glance is heart-breaking (ix. 2), is only one incident in the working out of a purpose which when completed reveals the whole glory of God's mercy, and evokes the loftiest and most heartfelt praise. "He shut up all unto disobedience that He might have mercy on all. . . . Of Him and through Him and to Him are all things. Unto Him be glory for ever." Since Baur's time several scholars have held that the mass of the Roman Church was Jewish-Christian, and that these three chapters, with their apologetic aim, are specially addressed to that community, as one which naturally felt the pressure of the difficulty with which they deal. But the Roman Church, as these very chapters show (*cf.* ix. 3, *my* kinsmen, not *our;* xi. 13, ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), was certainly Gentile, whatever influence Jewish modes of thought and practice may have had in it; and it was quite natural for the Apostle, in writing what he evidently meant from the first should be both a systematic and a circular letter, to include in it a statement of his thoughts on one of the most difficult and importunate questions of the time. The extraordinary daring of chap. xi. *ad fin.* is not unrelated to the extraordinary passion of chap. ix. *ad init.* The whole discussion is a magnificent illustration of the aphorism, that great thoughts come from the heart.

CHAPTER IX.—Vv. 1-5. The intense pain with which Paul contemplates the unbelief of his countrymen.

Ver. 1. **ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι.** The solemn asseveration is meant to clear him of the suspicion that in preaching to the Gentiles he is animated by hostility or even indifference to the Jews. Yet *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 31, Gal. i. 20. **ἐν Χριστῷ** means that he speaks in fellowship with Christ, so that falsehood is impossible. For **συμμαρτ.** *cf.* ii. 15, viii. 16. The **μοι** is governed by **συν**: conscience attests what he says, and that **ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ**—the spirit of

μεγάλη, καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος [b] ὀδύνη [c] τῇ καρδίᾳ μου, 3. ηὐχόμην γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι [1] ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα· 4. οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία, καὶ ἡ δόξα, καὶ αἱ διαθῆκαι,[2] [d] καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία,[e] καὶ ἡ λατ-

b 2 Tim. i. 3.
c 1 Tim. vi. 10.
d Gal. iv. 24; Eph. ii. 12.
e Cf. Heb. vii. 11, viii. 6.

[1] αυτος εγω αναθεμα ειναι, so CKL; but in ℵABDF αναθεμα ειναι αυτος εγω.

[2] αι διαθηκαι ℵCK and versions; η διαθηκη BDF; see note [2] (on πρῶτον), page 589. The plural is no doubt right here, and was mechanically changed as standing between two singulars. At the end of the verse DEFG also read η επαγγελια instead of αι επαγγελιαι.

God, in which all the functions of the Christian life are carried on: so that assurance is made doubly and trebly sure.

Ver. 2. The fact of Paul's sorrow is stated here; the cause of it is revealed in ver. 3. Weiss remarks on the triple climax: **λύπη** being intensified in **ὀδύνη**, **μεγάλη** in **ἀδιάλειπτος**, and **μοι** in **τῇ καρδίᾳ μου**. Paul cannot find words strong enough to convey his feeling.

Ver. 3. **ηὐχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι κ.τ.λ.** For I could wish that I myself were anathema, etc. For the omission of **ἂν** see Acts xxv. 22, Gal. iv. 20. Paul could wish this if it were a wish that could be realised for the good of Israel. The form of expression implies that the wish had actually been conceived, but in such sentences "the context alone implies what the present state of mind is" (Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 33). **ἀνάθεμα** is to be construed with **ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: the idea of separation from Christ, final and fatal separation, is conveyed. For the construction *cf.* Gal. v. 4 (**κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ**). **ἀνάθεμα** Gal. i. 8 f., 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22 is the equivalent of the Hebrew חֵרֶם, Deut. vii. 26, Josh. vii. 12—that which is put under the ban, and irrevocably devoted to destruction. It is beside the mark to speak of such an utterance as this as unethical. Rather might we call it with Dorner "a spark from the fire of Christ's substitutionary love". There is a passion in it more profound even than that of Moses' prayer in Ex. xxxii. 32. Moses identifies himself with his people, and if they cannot be saved would perish with them; Paul could find it in his heart, were it possible, to perish for them. **τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα** distinguishes *these* from his *Christian* brethren.

Ver. 4 f. The intensity of Paul's distress, and of his longing for the salvation of his countrymen, is partly explained in this verse. It is the greatness of his people, their unique place of privilege in God's providence, the splendour of the inheritance and of the hopes which they forfeit by unbelief, that make their unbelief at once so painful, and so perplexing. **οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλεῖται**: being, as they are, Israelites. Israelites is not the national but the theocratic name; it expresses the spiritual prerogative of the nation, *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 22, Gal. vi. 16. **ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία**: this is not the Christian sonship, but that which is referred to in such passages as Ex. iv. 22, Hos. xi. 1. Yet it may be wrong to speak of it as if it were merely national; it seems to be distributed and applied to the individual members of the nation in Deut. xiv. 1, Hos. i. 10 (ii. 1 Heb.). **ἡ δόξα**: *the* glory must refer to something definite, like the pillar of cloud and fire, the כְּבוֹד יהוה of the O.T., the שְׁכִינָה of later Jewish theology; there is probably reference to it in Acts vii. 2, Heb. ix. 5. **αἱ διαθῆκαι**: in other places Paul speaks of the O.T. religion as one covenant, one (legal) administration of the relations between God and man (*e.g.* in 2 Cor. iii.): here, where **αἱ διαθῆκαι** is expressly distinguished from **ἡ νομοθεσία** (the great Sinaitic legislation: 2 Macc. vi. 23), the various covenants God made with the patriarchs must be meant. *Cf.* Wisd. xviii. 22, Sir. xliv. 11, 2 Macc. viii. 15. **ἡ λατρεία** is the cultus of the tabernacle and the temple, the only legitimate cultus in the world. **αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι** are the Messianic promises: in the Israelitish religion "the best was yet to be," as all the highest minds knew. Ver. 5. **ὧν οἱ πατέρες**: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The greatness of its ancestry ennobled Israel, and made its position in Paul's time harder to understand and to endure. Who could think without the keenest pain of the sons of such fathers forfeiting everything for which the fathers had been called?

ρεία,[f] καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι,[g] 5. ὧν οἱ πατέρες,[h] καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστος τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς[i] εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

f Ch. xii. 1. g Ch. xv. 8; Gal. iii. 16, 21; Heb. vi. 12. h Ch. xi. 28. i Ch. i. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 31.

But the supreme distinction of Israel has yet to be mentioned. **ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν.** The only point in the interpretation of this verse, in which it can be said that interpreters are wholly at one, is the statement that of Israel the Messiah came, according to the flesh. The words **τὸ κατὰ σάρκα** define the extent to which the Messiah can be explained by His descent from Israel; for anything going beyond **σάρξ**, or ordinary humanity, the explanation must be sought elsewhere. The limitation suggests an antithesis, and one in which the spiritual or Divine side of the Messiah's nature should find expression, this being the natural counterpart of **σάρξ**: and such an antithesis has been sought and found in the words which follow. He who, according to the flesh, is of Israel, is at the same time over all, God blessed for ever. This interpretation, which refers the whole of the words after **ἐξ ὧν** to **ὁ Χριστὸς**, is adopted by many of the best scholars: Gifford, Sanday, Westcott (see *N.T.*, vol. ii., app., p. 110), Weiss, etc., and has much in its favour. (1) It *does* supply the complementary antithesis which **τὸ κατὰ σάρκα** suggests. (2) Grammatically it is simple, for **ὁ ὢν** naturally applies to what precedes: the person who is over all is naturally the person just mentioned, unless there is decisive reason to the contrary. (3) If we adopt another punctuation, and make the words **ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας** a doxology—"God Who is over all be blessed for ever"—there are grammatical objections. These are (*a*) the use of **ὤν**, which is at least abnormal. "God Who is over all" would naturally be expressed by **ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς** without **ὤν**: the **ὢν** suggests the reference to Christ. (*b*) The position of **εὐλογητὸς** is unparalleled in a doxology; it ought, as in Eph. i. 3 and the LXX., to stand first in the sentence. But these reasons are not decisive. As for (1), though a complementary antithesis to **τὸ κατὰ σάρκα** is suggested, it is not imperatively demanded here, as in i. 3 f. The greatness reflected upon Israel by the origin of the person in question is sufficiently conveyed by **ὁ Χριστός**, without any expansion. As for (2), it is true to say that **ὁ ὢν** naturally refers to what precedes: the only question is, whether the natural reference may not in any given case be precluded. Many scholars think it is precluded here. Meyer, for instance, argues that "Paul has *never* used the express **θεὸς** of Christ, since he has not adopted, like John, the Alexandrian form of conceiving and setting forth the Divine essence of Christ, but has adhered to the popular concrete, strictly monotheistic terminology, not modified by philosophical speculation even for the designation of Christ; and he always accurately distinguishes God and Christ". To this he adds the more dubious reasons that in the genuine apostolic writings (he excludes 2 Tim. iv. 18, 2 Pet. iii. 18, Heb. xiii. 21, and Rev.) there is no doxology to Christ in the form usual in doxologies referring to God, and that by **ἐπὶ πάντων** the Son's subordination is denied. To these last arguments it may be answered that if the words in question do apply to Christ they are not a doxology at all (Gifford), but a declaration of deity, like 2 Cor. xi. 31, and that Christ's subordination is not affected by His being described as **ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων** any more than by His own claim to have all authority in heaven and on earth. But the first of Meyer's arguments has a weight which it is impossible not to feel, and it becomes the more decisive the more we realise Paul's whole habit of thought and speech. To say with Dr. Gifford, "When we review the history of the interpretation it cannot but be regarded as a remarkable fact that every objection urged against the ancient interpretation rests ultimately on dogmatic presuppositions," hardly covers such a position as Meyer represents. For the "dogmatic presuppositions" are not arbitrary, but merely sum up the whole impression made on the mind by the study of Paul's writings, an impression by which we cannot but be influenced, especially in deciding delicate and dubious questions like this. If we ask ourselves point blank, whether Paul, as we know his mind from his epistles, would express his sense of Christ's greatness by calling Him God blessed for ever, it seems to me almost impossible to answer in the affirmative. Such an assertion is not on the same plane with the conception of Christ which meets us everywhere in the Apostle's writings; and though there is some irregularity in the grammar, and perhaps some

6. Οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν[k] ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ. οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ· 7. οὐδ᾽ ὅτι εἰσὶ σπέρμα[l] Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα, ἀλλ᾽ "ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα". 8. τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας[m] λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα. 9. ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος, "Κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον[n] ἐλεύσομαι, καὶ ἔσται τῇ

k Here only; Jas. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 24.
l Ch. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22; John viii. 33, 37.
m Gal. iv. 28.
n Gen. xviii. 10.

difficulty in seeing the point of a doxology, I agree with those who would put a colon or a period at **σάρκα**, and make the words that follow refer not to Christ but to the Father. This is the punctuation given in the margin by W. and H., and "alone seems adequate to account for the whole of the language employed, more especially when considered in relation to the context" (Hort, *N.T.*, vol. ii., app., p. 110). The doxology is, indeed, somewhat hard to comprehend; it seems at the first glance without a motive, and no psychological explanation of it yet offered is very satisfying. It is as if Paul, having carried the privileges of Israel to a climax by mentioning the origin of the Messiah as far as regards His humanity, suddenly felt himself face to face with the problem of the time, how to reconcile these extraordinary privileges with the rejection of the Jews; and before addressing himself to any study or solution of it expressed in this way his devout and adoring faith, even under the pressure of such a perplexity, in the sovereign providence of God. The use of **ὢν**, which is in itself unnecessary, emphasises **ἐπὶ πάντων**; and this emphasis is "fully justified if St. Paul's purpose is to suggest that the tragic apostasy of the Jews (vers. 2, 3) is itself part of the dispensations of Him Who is God over all, over Jew and Gentile alike, over past, present and future alike; so that the ascription of blessing to Him is a homage to His Divine purpose and power of bringing good out of evil in the course of the ages (xi. 13-16, 25-36)": W. and H., ii., app., p. 110. Full discussions of the passage are given in Meyer, S. and H., and Gifford; also by Dr. Ezra Abbot in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Exegesis*, 1883. With this preface Paul proceeds to justify the ways of God to men: see the introductory remarks above. The first section of his argument (ix. 6-29) is in the narrower sense a theodicy—a vindication of God's right in dealing as He has dealt with Israel. In the first part of this (vers. 6-13) he shows that the rejection of the mass of Israel from the Messianic Kingdom involves no breach or failure of the Divine promise. The promise is not given to all the natural descendants of Abraham, but only to a chosen seed, the Israel of God.

Ver. 6. **οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι**: this unique expression is explained by Buttmann (*Grammar*, p. 372, Thayer's Transl.) as a blending of two formulas—**οὐχ οἷον** followed by a finite verb, and **οὐχ ὅτι**, which is common in the N.T. The meaning is, But, in spite of my grief, I do not mean to say any such thing as that the Word of God has come to nothing. For not all they that are of Israel, *i.e.*, born of the patriarch, are Israel, *i.e.*, the people of God. This is merely an application of our Lord's words, That which is born of the flesh is flesh. It is not what we get from our fathers and mothers that ensures our place in the family of God. For the use of **οὗτοι** in this verse to resume and define the subject see Gal. iii. 7.

Ver. 7. Nor because they are Abraham's seed, are they all **τέκνα**, *i.e.*, children in the sense which entitles them to the inheritance, iv. 11, viii. 17. God from the very first made a distinction here, and definitely announced that the seed of Abraham to which the promise belonged should come in the line of Isaac—not of Ishmael, though he also could call Abraham father. **Ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα** = Gen. xxi. 12, LXX. The words literally mean that in the line of Isaac Abraham should have the posterity which would properly bear his name, and inherit the promises made to him by God. Isaac's descendants are the true Abrahamidae.

Ver. 8 f. **τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν**: the meaning of this action of God is now made clear. It signifies that not mere bodily descent from Abraham makes one a child of God—that was never the case, not even in Abraham's time; it is the children of the promise who are reckoned a seed to Abraham, for the word in virtue of which Isaac, the true son and heir, was born, was a word of promise. He was born, to use the language of the Gospel, from above; and something analogous to this is necessary, whenever a man (even a

Σάῤῥᾳ υἱός ".[o] 10. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ῥεβέκκα ἐξ ἑνὸς κοίτην[p] ἔχουσα, Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν· 11. μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων, μηδὲ πραξάντων τι ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν,[1] ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν[q] τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόθεσις μένῃ, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος,[r] 12. ἐῤῥήθη αὐτῇ, "Ὅτι

o Gen. xviii. 10.
p Ch. xiii. 13; Heb. xiii. 4; Luke xi. 7.
q Ch. xi. 5, 7, 28; Acts ix. 15; 1 Th. i. 4.
r Gal. v. 8.

[1] **κακον** DFKL; **φαυλον** ℵAB. **του θεου προθεσις**; all the best MSS., ℵABDFKL and edd. read **προθεσις του θεου.**

descendant of Abraham) claims to be a child of God and an heir of His kingdom. From Gal. iv. 28 (Now we, brethren, like Isaac, are children of promise) we see that the relation to God in question here is one open to Gentiles as well as Jews: if we are Christ's, then we too are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise. The argumentative suggestion in vers. 6-9 is that just as God discriminated at the first between the children of Abraham, so He is discriminating still; the fact that many do not receive the Gospel no more proves that the promise has failed than the fact that God chose Isaac only and set aside Ishmael.

Ver. 10 ff. But the argument can be made more decisive. A Jewish opponent might say, "Ishmael was an illegitimate child, who naturally had no rights as against Isaac; we are the legitimate descendants of the patriarch, and our right to the inheritance is indefeasible". To this the Apostle replies in vers. 10-13. Not only did God make the distinction already referred to, but in the case of *Isaac's* children, where there seemed no ground for making any distinction whatever, He distinguished again, and said, The elder shall serve the younger. Jacob and Esau had one father, one mother, and were twin sons; the only ground on which either could have been preferred was that of priority of birth, and this was disregarded by God; Esau, the elder, was rejected, and Jacob, the younger, was made heir of the promises. Further, this was done by God of His sovereign freedom: the decisive word was spoken to their mother while they were as yet unborn and had achieved neither good nor evil. Claims as of right, therefore, made against God, are futile, whether they are based on descent or on works. There is no way in which they can be established; and, as we have just seen, God acts in entire disregard of them. God's purpose to save men, and make them heirs of His kingdom—a purpose which is characterised as **κατ' ἐκλογήν**, or involving a choice—is not determined at all by consideration of such claims as the Jews put forward. In forming it, and carrying it out, God acts with perfect freedom. In the case in question His action in regard to Jacob and Esau agrees with His word in the prophet Malachi: Jacob I loved but Esau I hated; and further than this we cannot go. To avoid misapprehending this, however, it is necessary to keep the Apostle's purpose in view. He wishes to show that God's promise has not broken down, though many of the children of Abraham have no part in its fulfilment in Christ. He does so by showing that there has always been a distinction, among the descendants of the patriarchs, between those who have merely the natural connection to boast of, and those who are the Israel of God; and, as against Jewish pretensions, he shows at the same time that this distinction can be traced to nothing but God's sovereignty. It is not of works, but of Him Who effectually calls men. We may say, if we please, that sovereignty in this sense is "just a name for what is *unrevealed* of God" (T. Erskine, *The Brazen Serpent*, p. 259), but though it is unrevealed we must not conceive of it as arbitrary—*i.e.*, as non-rational or non-moral. It is the sovereignty of *God*, and God is not *exlex;* He is a law to Himself—a law all love and holiness and truth—in all His purposes towards men. So Calvin: "ubi mentionem gloriæ Dei audis, illic justitiam cogita". Paul has mentioned in an earlier chapter, among the notes of true religion, the exclusion of boasting (iii. 27); and in substance that is the argument he is using here. No Jewish birth, no legal works, can give a man a claim which God is bound to honour; and no man urging such claims can say that God's word has become of no effect though his claims are disallowed, and he gets no part in the inheritance of God's people.

οὐ μόνον δέ: *cf.* v. 11, viii. 23 = Not only is this so, but a more striking and convincing illustration can be given. **ἀλλὰ καὶ Ῥεβέκκα**: the sentence thus begun is never finished, but the sense is

ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι·" 13. καθὼς[1] γέγραπται, "Τὸν Ἰακὼβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἠσαῦ ἐμίσησα".

14. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ;ᵃ μὴ γένοιτο. 15. τῷ γὰρ Μωσῇ λέγει, "Ἐλεήσω ὃν ἂν ἐλεῶ, καὶ οἰκτειρήσω ὃν ἂν

a Ch. ii. 11.

[1] καθαπερ B, Orig. 1 (instead of καθως) is read by Weiss and W. and H., though the latter put καθως in marg. *Cf.* iii. 4, xi. 8, and 1 Cor. x. 10.

continued in ver. 12. Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν: Paul speaks here out of his own consciousness as a Jew, addressing himself to a problem which greatly exercised other Jews; and calls Isaac "father" as the person from whom the inheritance was to come. Ver. 11. μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων μηδὲ πραξάντων: "the conditional negatives (μήπω, μηδὲ) represent the circumstances not as mere facts of history, but as conditions entering into God's counsel and plan. The time of the prediction was thus chosen, in order to make it clear that He Who calls men to be heirs of His salvation makes free choice of whom He will, unfettered by any claims of birth or merit" (Gifford). πρόθεσις in this theological sense is a specially Pauline word. The purpose it describes is universal in its bearings, for it is the purpose of One who works all things according to the counsel of His will, Eph. i. 11; it is eternal, a πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων, Eph. iii. 11; it is God's ἰδία πρόθεσις, 2 Tim. i. 9, a purpose, the meaning, contents, and end of which find their explanation in God alone; it is a purpose κατ' ἐκλογήν, *i.e.*, the carrying of it out involves choice and discrimination between man and man, and between race and race; and in spite of the side of mystery which belongs to such a conception, it is a perfectly intelligible purpose, for it is described as πρόθεσις ἣν ἐποίησεν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, and what God means by Christ Jesus no one can doubt. God's eternal purpose, the purpose carried out κατ' ἐκλογὴν, yet embracing the universe, is clearly revealed in His Son. The permanent determining element, wherever this purpose is concerned, is not the works of men, but the will and call of God; and to make this plain was the intention of God in speaking as He did, and when He did, to Rebecca about her children. If we look to Gen. xxv. 23, it is indisputably the nations of Israel and Edom that are referred to: "Two nations are in thy womb, and two manner of peoples shall be separated from thy bowels; and the one people shall be stronger than the other people, and the elder shall serve the younger". The same is true also of Mal. i. 2: "I loved Jacob, but Esau I hated, and made his mountains a desolation," etc. Yet it would not be right to say that Paul is here considering merely the parts assigned by God to nations in the drama of providence; He is obviously thinking of Jacob and Esau as individuals, whose own relation to God's promise and inheritance (involving no doubt that of their posterity) was determined by God before they were born or had done either good or ill. On the other hand, it would not be right to say that Paul here refers the eternal salvation or perdition of individuals to an absolute decree of God which has no relation to what they are or do, but rests simply on His inscrutable will. He is engaged in precluding the idea that man can have claims of right against God, and with it the idea that the exclusion of the mass of Israel from the Messiah's kingdom convicts God of breach of faith toward the children of Abraham; and this He can do quite effectually, on the lines indicated, without consciously facing this tremendous hypothesis.

Vv. 14-21. In the second part of his theodicy Paul meets the objection that this sovereign freedom of God is essentially unjust.

Ver. 14. τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; *cf.* vi. 1, vii. 7, viii. 31. It is Paul who speaks, anticipating, as he cannot help doing, the objection which is sure to rise, not only in Jewish minds, though it is with them he is directly concerned, but in the mind of every human being who reads his words. Yet he states the objection as one in itself incredible. μὴ ἀδικία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; surely we cannot say that there is unrighteousness with God? This is the force of the μὴ, and Paul can answer at once μὴ γένοιτο: away with the thought! God says Himself that He shows mercy with that sovereign freedom which Paul has ascribed to Him; and the principle of action which God announces as His own cannot be unjust.

Ver. 15. τῷ Μωυσεῖ γὰρ λέγει. τῷ Μωυσεῖ is emphatic by position: the person to whom this declaration was

t Gal. v. 7. οἰκτείρω [t]. 16. ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος, οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος,[t] ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεοῦντος [1] Θεοῦ. 17. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραὼ, "Ὅτι εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι [u] ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου, καὶ ὅπως διαγγελῇ [v] τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ". 18. ἄρα οὖν ὃν θέλει, ἐλεεῖ· ὃν δὲ θέλει, σκληρύνει. 19. Ἐρεῖς οὖν μοι,[2] Τί ἔτι

u 1 Tim. i. 16.
v Luke ix. 60; Acts xxi. 26.

[1] For **ελεουντος** read **ελεωντος** with ℵAB[1]DF.

[2] For **ουν μοι** ℵABP 47 read **μοι ουν**. **τι ετι μεμφεται** ℵAKLP, but **τι ουν ετι μεμφεται** BDFG, Orig.-inter. This **ουν** is inserted by Lachm. and Weiss, bracketed in marg. by Treg., simply omitted (on the principle of judging referred to in note [2], page 589) by W. and H.

made, as well as the voice which made it, render it peculiarly significant to a Jew. The words (exactly as LXX, Exod. xxxiii. 19) occur in the answer to a prayer of Moses, and may have been regarded by Paul as having special reference to him; as if the point of the quotation were, Even one who had deserved so well as Moses experienced God's mercy solely because God willed that He should. But that is not necessary, and is not what the original means. The emphasis is on **ὃν ἄν**, and the point is that in showing mercy God is determined by nothing outside of His mercy itself. **οἰκτείρειν** is stronger than **ἐλεεῖν**; it suggests more strongly the emotion attendant on pity, and even its expression in voice or gesture.

Ver. 16. Conclusion from this word of God. It (namely, the experience of God's mercy) does not depend on man's resolve or effort (for **τρέχειν** *cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 24 ff.), but on God's merciful act. This, of course, merely repeats vers. 12, 13, buttressing the principle of God's sovereign freedom in the exercise of mercy by reference to His own word in Exod. xxxiii. 19.

Ver. 17 f. But Paul goes further, and explains the contrary phenomenon—that of a man who does not and cannot receive mercy—in the same way. **λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή**: it is on Scripture the burden of proof is laid here and at ver. 15. A Jew might answer the arguments Paul uses here if they were the Apostle's own; to Scripture he can make no reply; it must silence, even where it does not convince. **τῷ Φαραώ**: *All* men, and not those only who are the objects of His mercy, come within the scope of God's sovereignty. Pharaoh as well as Moses can be quoted to illustrate it. He was the open adversary of God, an avowed, implacable adversary; yet a Divine purpose was fulfilled in his life, and that purpose and nothing else is the explanation of his very being. **εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε.** The LXX in Exod. ix. 16 read: **καὶ ἕνεκεν τούτου διετηρήθης**, the last word, answering to the Hebrew הֶעֱמַדְתִּיךָ, being used in the sense of "thou wast kept alive"—the sense adopted by Dillmann for the Hebrew; probably Paul changed it intentionally to give the meaning, "for this reason I brought thee on the stage of history": *cf.* Hab. i. 6, Zec. xi. 16, Jer. xxvii. 41 (S. and H.). The purpose Pharaoh was designed to serve, and actually did serve, on this stage, was certainly not his own; as certainly it was God's. God's power was shown in the penal miracles by which Pharaoh and Egypt were visited, and his name is proclaimed to this day wherever the story of the Exodus is told.

Ver. 18. From the two instances just quoted Paul draws the comprehensive conclusion: So then on whom He will He has mercy, and whom He will He hardens. The whole emphasis is on **θέλει.** The two modes in which God acts upon man are showing mercy and hardening, and it depends upon God's will in which of these two modes He actually does act. The word **σκληρύνει** is borrowed from the history of Pharaoh, Ex. vii. 3, 22; viii. 19; ix. 12; xiv. 17. What precisely the hardening means, and in what relation God's hardening of Pharaoh's heart stood to Pharaoh's own hardening of it against God, are not unimportant questions, but they are questions which Paul does not here raise. He has one aim always in view here—to show that man has no claim as of right against God; and he finds a decisive proof of this (at least for a Jew) in the opposite examples of Moses and Pharaoh, interpreted as these are by unmistakable words of God Himself.

μέμφεται [w]; τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι [x] αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκε; 20. μενοῦνγε, ὦ ἄνθρωπε,[1] [y] σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος [z] τῷ Θεῷ; μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι, Τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως; 21. ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς [a] τοῦ πηλοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς

w Heb. viii. 8.
x Acts xxvii. 43; 1 Pet. iv. 3.
y Ch. ii. 1-3.
z Luke xiv. 6.
a Jer. c. 18; Isaiah xlv. 9; Sir. xxxvi. (xxxiii.) 13; Sap. xv. 7.

[1] **ω ανθρωπε** stands before **μενουνγε** in ℵ[1]AB (B omits **γε**), and so in all crit. edd.

It was through God, in the last resort, that Moses and Pharaoh were what they were, signal instances of the Divine mercy and the Divine wrath.

Ver. 19 ff. But human nature is not so easily silenced. This interpretation of all human life, with all its diversities of character and experience, through the will of God alone, as if that will by itself explained everything, is not adequate to the facts. If Moses and Pharaoh alike are to be explained by reference to that will—that is, are to be explained in precisely the same way—then the difference between Moses and Pharaoh disappears. The moral interpretation of the world is annulled by the religious one. If God is equally behind the most opposite moral phenomena, then it is open to any one to say, what Paul here anticipates will be said, **τί ἔτι μέμφεται;** why does he still find fault? For who withstands his resolve? To this objection there is really no answer, and it ought to be frankly admitted that the Apostle does not answer it. The attempt to understand the relation between the human will and the Divine seems to lead of necessity to an antinomy which thought has not as yet succeeded in transcending. To assert the absoluteness of God in the unexplained unqualified sense of verse 18 makes the moral life unintelligible; but to explain the moral life by ascribing to man a freedom which makes him stand in independence over against God reduces the universe to anarchy. Up to this point Paul has been insisting on the former point of view, and he insists on it still as against the human presumption which would plead its rights against God; but in the very act of doing so he passes over (in ver. 22) to an intermediate standpoint, showing that God has not in point of fact acted arbitrarily, in a freedom uncontrolled by moral law; and from that again he advances in the following chapter to do full justice to the other side of the antinomy—the liberty and responsibility of man. The act of Israel, as well as the will of God, lies behind the painful situation he is trying to understand.

Ver. 20. **ὦ ἄνθρωπε** is not used contemptuously, but it is set intentionally over against **τῷ θεῷ**: the objector is reminded emphatically of what he is, and of the person to whom he is speaking. It is not for a *man* to adopt this tone toward *God*. For **μενοῦνγε** *cf.* x. 18, Phil. iii. 8: the idea is, So far from *your* having the right to raise such objections, it is rather for me to ask, Who art thou? etc. Paul, as has been observed above, does not refute, but repels the objection. It is inconsistent, he urges, with the relation of the creature to the Creator. **μὴ ἐρεῖ κ.τ.λ.** Surely the thing formed shall not say, etc. The first words of the quotation are from Isa. xxix. 16: **μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα τῷ πλάσαντι αὐτό Οὐ σύ με ἔπλασας; ἢ τὸ ποίημα τῷ ποιήσαντι Οὐ συνετῶς με ἐποίησας;** The fact that the words originally refer to Israel as a nation, and to God's shaping of its destiny, does not prove in the least that Paul is dealing with nations, and not with individuals, here. He never pays any attention to the original application of the O.T. words he uses; and neither Moses nor Pharaoh nor the person addressed as **ὦ ἄνθρωπε** is a nation. The person addressed is one who feels that the principle enunciated in ver. 18 must be qualified somehow, and so he makes the protest against it which Paul attempts in this summary fashion to repress. A man is not a thing, and if the whole explanation of his destiny is to be sought in the bare will of God, he *will* say, Why didst Thou make me thus? and not even the authority of Paul will silence him.

Ver. 21. **ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ κ.τ.λ.** The **ἢ** puts this as the alternative. *Either* you must recognise this absoluteness of God in silence, *or* you must make the preposterous assertion that the potter has not power over the clay, etc. The power of the potter over the clay is of course undoubted: he takes the same lump, and makes one vessel for noble and another for ignoble uses; it is not the quality of the clay, but the will of the potter, that decides to what use each part of the lump is to be put. True, the objector might say, but irrelevant. For man is

b 2 Tim. ii. 20 f. τιμὴν σκεῦος, ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν; [b] 22. εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ Θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι [c]
c Verse 17. τὴν ὀργήν, καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατὸν [d] αὐτοῦ, ἤνεγκεν [e] ἐν πολλῇ μακρο-
d Here only; cf. ch. viii. 3. θυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν· [f] 23. καὶ [1] ἵνα γνωρίσῃ
e Heb. xii. 20. τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους, ἃ προητοίμασεν [g] εἰς
f Matt. vii. 13; John xvii. 12; Phil. iii. 19. g Eph. ii. 10.

[1] και ινα γνωριση; the και is omitted by W. and H. following B 37, 39, 47, vulg., Copt., etc. Treg. brackets it in marg. Weiss thinks it was omitted because the transcriber could not see the point of it, and felt it easy to connect ινα with the principal verb.

not clay, and the relation of God to man is not that of the potter to dead matter. To say that it is, is just to concede the objector's point—the moral significance is taken out of life, and God has no room any longer to pronounce moral judgments, or to speak of man in terms of praise or blame.

Vv. 22-29. Paul's argument, to speak plainly, has got into an *impasse.* He is not able to carry it through, and to maintain the sovereign freedom of God as the whole and sole explanation of human destiny, whether in men or nations. He does, indeed, assert that freedom to the last, against the presumptuousness of man; but in this third section of his theodicy, he begins to withdraw from the ground of speculation to that of fact, and to exhibit God's action, not as a bare unintelligible exercise of will, which inevitably provokes rebellion, but as an exercise of will of such a character that man can have nothing to urge against it. **εἰ δὲ**: the **δὲ** marks the transition to the new point of view. It is as if Paul said: You may find this abstract presentation of God's relations to man a hard doctrine, *but* if His actual treatment of men, even of those who are **σκεύη ὀργῆς κατ. εἰς ἀπώλειαν**, is distinguished by longsuffering and patience, what can you say against that? **θέλων** has been rendered (1) because it is His will; (2) although it is His will. In the former case, God bears long with the vessels of wrath in order that the display of His wrath and power may be more tremendous at last. But (*a*) such an idea is inconsistent with the contrast implied in **δέ**: it is an aggravation of the very difficulty from which the Apostle is making his escape; (*b*) it is inconsistent with the words **ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ**; it is not longsuffering if the end in view is a more awful display of wrath; there is no real longsuffering unless the end in view is to give the sinner place for repentance. Hence the other view (2) is substantially right. Although it is God's will to display His wrath and to show what He can do, still He does not proceed precipitately, but gives ample opportunity to the sinner to repent and escape. We are entitled to say "the sinner," though Paul does not say so explicitly, for **ἡ ὀργή**, the wrath of God, is relative to sin, and to nothing else: except as against sin, there is no such thing as wrath in God. In **σκεύη ὀργῆς** the word **σκεύη** is perhaps prompted by the previous verse, but the whole associations of the potter and the clay are not to be carried over: they are expressly precluded by **ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ.** Paul does not say how the **σκεύη ὀργῆς** came to be what they are, the objects upon which the wrath and power of God are to be revealed; he only says that such as they are, God has shown great patience with them. It seems a mistake in W. and H. to print **σκεύη ὀργῆς** as a quotation from Jer. l. (LXX xxvii.) 25; for there the words mean "the instruments *by* which God executes His wrath," *les armes de sa colère* (Reuss). **κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν**: **ἀπώλεια** (Phil. i. 28, iii. 19) means perdition, final ruin; by what agency the persons referred to have been fitted for it Paul does not say; what he does say is, that fitted for such a doom as they are, God has nevertheless endured them in much longsuffering, so that they at least cannot say, Why dost thou find fault? For **κατηρτισμένος** = perfected, made quite fit or ripe, see Luke vi. 40, 1 Cor. i. 10: *cf.* also 2 Tim. iii. 17.

Ver. 23 f. The sentence beginning with **εἰ δὲ θέλων** is not grammatically completed, but ver. 23 is an irregular parallel to ver. 22. God's purpose is regarded as twofold. It is on the one hand to show His wrath and make known His power; it is on the other hand to make known the riches of His glory (*cf.* Eph. iii. 16). The first part of it is carried out on those who are **σκεύη ὀργῆς**, the latter on those who are **σκεύη ἐλέους**; but, in carrying out both parts

δόξαν· 24. οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν· 25. (ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει, "Καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου, λαόν μου· καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην, ἠγαπημένην". 26. "Καὶ ἔσται, ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρήθη αὐτοῖς,[1] Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος." 27. Ἡσαΐας [h] δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ[1] τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, "Ἐὰν ᾖ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ [i]

h Is. x. 22 f.
i 2 Cor. i. 6 (end).

[1] αυτοις is wanting in BFG and the best MSS. of the vulg. As no reason can be suggested for its omission, if it were original, Weiss supposes it was added in conformity with the LXX. He therefore omits it altogether; W. and H. bracket.

alike, God acts in a way which is so far from giving man room to complain that it commands his wonder and adoration; for the σκεύη ὀργῆς there is much long-suffering, for the σκεύη ἐλέους a preparation and a calling in which God's free unmerited mercy is conspicuous. **καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ**: This is mentioned as a principal purpose of God. **ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους**: the glory is conceived as something shed upon the persons concerned; they are irradiated with the Divine brightness. *Cf.* 2 Thess. i. 10. **δόξα** in such connections has usually a supersensible eschatological meaning; its content was fixed for Paul by his vision of Christ as Lord of Glory. The end of God's ways with the vessels of mercy is to conform them to the image of His exalted Son. **ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν**: Paul does not shrink from introducing God as subject here. The vessels of mercy, in whom the Divine glory is to be revealed, are such as God prepared before for that destiny. That Paul is not speaking here abstractly, as in his discussion of the relations of creature and Creator in ver. 21 f., but on the basis of experience, is shown by the words which immediately follow: **οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς** = whom he also called *in us*. The **σκεύη ἐλέους**, in other words, are not a mere theological conception = "God's elect": they are the actual members of the Christian Church, Jew and Gentile; and it is not a deduction from the necessities of the Divine nature, but an account of real experiences of God's goodness, which is given both in **προητοίμασεν** and in **ἐκάλεσεν**. How much is covered by **προητοίμασεν** is not clear, but the text presents no ground whatever for importing into it the idea of an unconditional eternal decree. Those who are called know that the antecedents of their calling, the processes which lead up to and prepare for it, are of God. They know that in all these processes, even in the remote initial stages of them, to the significance of which they were blind at the time, glory was in view. The fact that both Jews and Gentiles are called shows that this preparation is not limited to any one nation; the fact that the called are *from among* both Jews and Gentiles shows that no one can claim God's mercy as a right in virtue of his birth in some particular race.

Ver. 25 f. This result of God's ways with man—His calling not only from the Jews but from the Gentiles—agrees with His own declarations in Scripture. Ver. 25 answers roughly to Hos. ii. 23, LXX: I will love her who was not beloved, and will say to that which was not My people, Thou art My people. Not My people (= Lo-ammi) and Not beloved (= Lo-ruhamah) were the names of a son and a daughter of Hosea, who symbolised the kingdom of Israel, rejected of God but destined to share again in His favour. Paul here applies to the calling of the Gentiles words which spoke originally of the restoration of Israel—an instance which shows how misleading it may be to press the context of the other passages quoted in this chapter. Ver. 26 is also a quotation from Hos. i. 10 (LXX): the **ἐκεῖ** is supplied by Paul. The application of it is similar to that of ver. 25. In Hosea the promise is that the Israelites who had lost their standing as God's people should have it given back to them, in all its dignity. This also Paul reads of the calling of the Gentiles. They were once no people of God's, but now have their part in the adoption. But what is the meaning of "in the place where . . . *there* shall they be called"? It is not certain that in Hosea there is any reference to a place at all (see margin of R.V.), and it is not easy to see what Paul can mean by the emphatic **ἐκεῖ**. The ordinary explanation—the Gentile lands—is as good as any, but seems hardly equal to the stress laid on **ἐκεῖ**.

k Here only (and so also of ὑπόλειμμα). Mark xiii. 4; Luke iv. 2, 13.
m Here only in N. T.

κατάλειμμα [1] [k] σωθήσεται· 28. λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν [1] καὶ συντέμνων [m] ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ· ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον [2] ποιήσει Κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς". 29. Καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας, "Εἰ μὴ Κύριος Σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν, καὶ ὡς Γόμοῤῥα ἂν

[1] For **καταλειμμα** (which is the reading of the LXX) DFKLP, read with ℵ[1]AB **υπολειμμα.**

[2] **εν δικαιοσυνη οτι λογον συντετμημενον** om. ℵ[1]AB 47. "Western and Syrian" authorities have the words, in agreement with the LXX. But the **γαρ** after the first **λογον** makes the whole sentence, in this case, untranslatable; and though Weiss and Alford defend the received text, and Treg. brackets the words in question in marg., most edd. omit them.

Ver. 27 f. From the calling of the Gentiles, as foretold in prophecy, Paul passes now to the partial, but only partial, calling of Israel, as announced by the same authority. The Jews cannot quarrel with the situation in which they find themselves when it answers so exactly to the Word of God. **ὑπὲρ** is here indistinguishable from **περί**: it is not a loud intercession on Israel's behalf, but a solemn declaration concerning Israel, that the prophet makes; see Grimm, *s.v.*, i., 5. The quotation in ver. 27 is from Isa. x. 22 f., but the opening words are modified by recollection of Hos. i. 10 just quoted. The LXX reads **καὶ ἐὰν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται. λόγον συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων [ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον] κύριος ποιήσει ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ.** The words bracketed are omitted by most editors, but the sense is not affected. **τὸ ὑπόλειμμα** has the emphasis: *only* the remnant shall be saved. This doctrine Paul apparently finds confirmed by the words **λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.** It is doubtful whether any one could assign meaning to these words unless he had an idea beforehand of what they ought to or must mean. Cheyne renders the Hebrew to which they answer, "For a final work and a decisive doth the Lord execute within all the land"; and there is the same general idea in Sanday and Headlam's version of Paul: "For a word, accomplishing and abridging it, that is, a sentence conclusive and concise, will the Lord do upon the earth". Weiss, who retains the words bracketed, makes **λόγον** = God's promise: God fulfils it indeed (**συντελῶν**), but He at the same time limits or contracts it (**συντέμνων**), *i.e.*, fulfils it to some of Israel, not to all. This, no doubt, is the sense required, but can any one say that the words convey it? We should rather say that Paul put his own thought into the words of the LXX, in which a difficult passage of Isaiah was translated almost at haphazard, and in doing so lent them a meaning which they could not be said to have of themselves.

Ver. 29. But his last quotation is in verbal agreement with the LXX Isa. i. 9, and transparently clear. The **σπέρμα** or seed which God leaves is the same as the **ὑπόλειμμα.** The figure is not to be pressed. The remnant is not the germ of a new people; Paul expects Israel as a whole to be restored.

With this the theodicy proper closes. The unbelief of the Jews was a great problem to the Apostolic age, and one which easily led to scepticism concerning the Gospel. The chosen people without a part in the kingdom of God —impossible. This chapter is Paul's attempt to explain this situation as one not involving any unrighteousness or breach of faith on the part of God. It is not necessary to resume the various stages of the argument as they have been elucidated in the notes. The point of greatest difficulty is no doubt that presented by vers. 22 and 23. Many good scholars, Meyer and Lipsius for example, hold that Paul in these verses is not withdrawing from, but carrying through, the argument from God's absoluteness stated so emphatically in ver. 21. They hold that the **σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν** would not be **σκεύη ὀργῆς** at all, if their repentance and amendment were conceivable; and although God bears long with them—that is, defers their destruction—it is only in order that He may have time and opportunity to manifest the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy. But the answer to this is plain. It assumes that human life, in its relation to God, *can* be inter-

ὡμοιώθημεν".) 30. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ὅτι ἔθνη τὰ μὴ [n] διώκοντα [o] δικαιοσύνην κατέλαβε [p] δικαιοσύνην, δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως· 31. Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης εἰς νόμον δικαιοσύνης [1] οὐκ ἔφθασε.[q] 32. διατί; ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὡς [r] ἐξ ἔργων νόμου [2].

n Ch. ii. 14.
o Ch. xii. 13, xiv. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 22.
p 1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 12, 17.
q Phil. iii. 16.
r Philem. ver. 14.

[1] Om. second δικαιοσυνης ℵ[1]ABDG, all edd.

[2] νομου om. ℵ[1]ABF 47, vulg., and most edd. Alf. is doubtful.

preted by the analogy of clay in its relation to the potter; in other words, that moral and spiritual experiences can be construed and made intelligible through what are merely physical categories. But this is not the case. And if it be said that justice is not done, by the interpretation given in this commentary, to the expression **σκεύη ὀργῆς**, it may also be said that justice is not done, by the interpretation of Meyer and Lipsius, to the expression **ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ**. Each of these allegations may be said to neutralise the other—that is, neither is decisive for the interpretation of the passage; and the Apostle's meaning remains to be determined by the general movement of his thought. In spite of the great difficulties of the section as a whole, I cannot hesitate to read it as above.

Chapter IX.—Ver. 30-X. 21. We come now to the second main division of that part of the epistle in which Paul discusses the problem raised by the relation of the Jews to the Gospel. He has shown in chap. ix. 6-29 that they have no claim as of right to salvation: their whole history, as recorded and interpreted in the Scriptures, exhibited God acting on quite a different principle; he now proceeds to show more definitely that it was owing to their own guilt that they were rejected. They followed, and persisted in following, a path on which salvation was not to be found; and they were inexcusable in doing so, inasmuch as God had made *His* way of salvation plain and accessible to all.

Ver. 30 f. **τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν;** usually, as in ver. 14, this question is followed by another, but here by an assertion. The conclusion of the foregoing discussion is—not that God has been faithless or unjust, but—this paradoxical position: Gentiles (**ἔθνη**, not **τὰ ἔθνη**) that did not follow after righteousness attained righteousness, the righteousness which comes of faith; while Israel, which followed after a law of righteousness, did not attain that law. **διώκειν** and **καταλαμβάνειν** are correlative terms: see Wetstein. The repetition of **δικαιοσύνη** is striking: it is the one fundamental conception on which Paul's gospel rests; the questions at issue between him and the Jews were questions as to what it was, and how it was to be attained. **τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην** is not an unfair description of the pagan races as contrasted with the Jews; how to be right with God was not their main interest. **δικαιοσύνην δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως** for the form of the explanatory clause with **δὲ** *cf.* iii. 22, 1 Cor. ii. 6. It is not surprising that a righteousness of this sort should be found even by those who are not in quest of it; its nature is that it is brought and offered to men, and faith is simply the act of appropriating it. **Ἰσραὴλ δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: this is the astonishing thing which does need explanation. **διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης.** The idea is not that Israel was in quest of a law of righteousness, in the sense of a rule by the observance of which righteousness would be attained: every Israelite believed himself to be, and already was, in possession of such a law. It must rather be that Israel aimed incessantly at bringing its conduct up to the standard of a law in which righteousness was certainly held out, but was never able to achieve its purpose. The **νόμος δικαιοσύνης**, the unattained goal of Israel's efforts, is of course the Mosaic law; but it is referred to, not definitely, but in its characteristic qualities, as law, and as exhibiting and enjoining (not bestowing) righteousness. **εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασεν**: did not attain to, arrive at, that law—it remained out of their reach. Legal religion proved a failure.

Ver. 32. **διὰ τί;** Why? A result so confounding needs explanation. **ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων**: it seems too precise to supply with Weiss **ἐδίωξεν νόμον δικαιοσύνης.** The reason of Israel's religious failure was that its whole religious effort and attitude was not of faith, but (so they conceived the case) of works. By inserting **ὡς** Paul dissociates himself from this conception, and leaves it to Israel; he does not believe (having

προσέκοψαν γὰρ[1] τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος, 33. καθὼς γέγραπται, "Ἰδού, τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον προσκόμματος, καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου· καὶ πᾶς[2] ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται".

[1] γαρ ℵ³D³KLP; om. ℵ¹ABD¹F. [2] πας om. ℵABDF 47 and all edd.

learned the contrary by bitter experience) that there is any outlet along this road. Everything in religion depends on the nature of the start. You may start **ἐκ πίστεως,** from an utter abandonment to God, and an entire dependence on Him, and in this case a righteousness is possible which you will recognise as **δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ,** God's own gift and work in you; or you may start **ἐξ ἔργων,** which really means in independence of God, and try to work out, without coming under obligation to God, a righteousness of your own, for which you may subsequently claim His approval, and in this case, like the Jews, all your efforts will be baffled. Your starting-point is unreal, impossible; it is not truly **ἐξ ἔργων,** but only **ὡς ἐξ ἔργων**; it is an idea of your own, not a truth on which life can be carried out, that you are in any sense independent of God. Such an idea, however, rooted in the mind, may effectually pervert and wreck the soul, by making the Divine way of attaining righteousness and life offensive to it; and this is what happened to the Jews. Because of that profoundly false relation to God **προσέκοψαν τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος.** The stone on which they stumbled was Christ, and especially His Cross. The **σκάνδαλον** of the Cross, at which they stumbled, is not simply the fact that it *is* a cross, whereas they expected a Messianic throne; the Cross offended them because, as interpreted by Paul, it summoned them to begin their religious life, from the very beginning, at the foot of the Crucified, and with the sense upon their hearts of an infinite debt to Him, which no "works" could ever repay.

Ver. 33. Yet paradoxical as this may seem, it agrees with the words of Scripture. The quotation is a mixture of Isa. xxviii. 16 and viii. 14: and it is interesting to remark that the same passages are quoted in conjunction, though they are not mixed as here, in 1 Pet. ii. 6-8. The original reference of them is not exactly Messianic. The stone laid in Zion (Isa. xxviii. 16) is indeed interpreted by Delitzsch of the kingdom of promise as identified with its Sovereign Head, but the stone of stumbling (Isa. viii. 14) is unequivocally God Himself: all who do not give Him honour are broken against His government as on a stone, or caught in it as in a snare. Paul inserts **ἐπ' αὐτῷ** after **ὁ πιστεύων** (as Peter also does), and applies the figure of the stone in both cases to Christ, and to the contrary relations which men may assume to Him. Some stumble over Him (as the Jews, for the reasons just given); others build on Him and find Him a sure foundation, or (without a figure) put their trust in Him and are not put to shame. *Cf.* Ps. cxviii. 22, Mt. xxi. 42, 1 Cor. iii. 11, Acts. iv. 12, Eph. ii. 20.

CHAPTER X.—Ver. 1. The Apostle cannot enlarge on this melancholy situation without expressing once more the deep grief which it causes him. Since the Jews are referred to in the third person (**ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν**) it is clear that the persons addressed are a Gentile Church. **ἀδελφοί**: Paul's heart seems drawn to his spiritual kindred as he feels the deep gulf which separates him meanwhile from his kinsmen according to the flesh. **ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας**: the meaning of **εὐδοκία** must be gathered from such examples as Mt. xi. 26, Eph. i. 5, 9, Phil. i. 15, ii. 13, 2 Thess. i. 11. His heart's **εὐδοκία** is that in which his heart could rest with complacency; that which would be a perfect satisfaction to it. This is virtually the same as "desire," and an "Etymologicum ineditum" quoted in Schleusner explains it by **βούλημα, γνώμη, προαίρεσις, ἐπιθυμία.** His inmost desire and his supplication to God are in their interest, with a view to their salvation. The **μὲν** has no corresponding **δέ**; the sad reality which answers to it does not need again to be expressed.

Ver. 2. Their good qualities compel his affection. **ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν**: they have a zeal for God, are intensely (though mistakenly) religious. *Cf.* Gal. i. 14. An unbelieving Jew could interpret his opposition to the lawless gospel of Paul as zeal for the divinely-given rule of life, and his opposition to the crucified Messiah as zeal for the divinely-given promises. It was God's honour for which he stood in refusing the Gos-

X. 1. ᾿ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ, ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας, καὶ ἡ δέησις ἡ[1] πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν. 2. μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι ζῆλον Θεοῦ[a] ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κατ᾽ ἐπίγνωσιν. 3. ἀγνοοῦντες[b] γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἰδίαν[c] δικαιοσύνην[2][d] ζητοῦντες στῆσαι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐχ ὑπετάγησαν. 4. τέλος[e]

a 2 Cor. xi. 2.
b Acts xvii. 23; 1 Tim. i. 13
c Gal. vi. 5.
d Phil. iii. 9.
e Mark iii. 26; Heb. vii. 3.

[1] η before προς τον θεον om. ℵABDF. For του Ισραηλ εστιν read αυτων with ℵABDFP 47, etc.

[2] την ιδιαν δικαιοσυνην ℵFGKL and most cursives, is adopted by Tischdf., but most edd. with ABDP 47, vulg. omit δικαιοσυνην.

pel. ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κατ᾽ ἐπίγνωσιν: this religious earnestness is not regulated by adequate knowledge. For ἐπίγνωσις see Eph. iv. 13, Phil. i. 9, Col. i. 9, 10, ii. 2, 1 Tim. ii. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 25; it is especially used of religious knowledge, and suggests attainment in it (ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι, 1 Cor. xiii. 12).

Ver. 3. This verse goes to the root of the matter, and explains the failure of the Gospel among the Jews. It was due to their ignorance of the righteousness of God. All men need and crave righteousness, and the Jews, in their ignorance of God's, sought to establish a righteousness of their own. *Their own* is the key to the situation. Their idea was that they could be good men without becoming God's debtors, or owing anything at all to Him. Such an idea, of course, shows complete ignorance of the essential relations of God and man, and when acted on fatally perverts life. It did so with the Jews. When the Gospel came, revealing the righteousness of God—that for which man must be absolutely indebted to God's grace, and which he can never boast of as "his own"—it cut right across all the habits and prejudices of the Jews, and they did not submit themselves to it. Paul interprets the position of his nation through the recollection of his own experience as a Pharisee — no doubt rightly on the whole. For ὑπετάγησαν in middle sense see viii. 7, xiii. 1, Heb. xii. 9, Jas. iv. 7, 1 Pet. ii. 13.

Ver 4. Further proof that the pursuit of a righteousness of one's own by legal observances is a mistake, the act of men "in ignorance". τέλος γὰρ νόμου χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι: For Christ is law's end, etc. The sense required—a sense which the words very naturally yield—is that with Christ in the field law as a means of attaining righteousness has ceased and determined. The moment a man sees Christ and understands what He is and what He has done, he feels that legal religion is a thing of the past: the way to righteousness is not the observance of statutes, no matter though they have been promulgated by God Himself; it is faith, the abandonment of the soul to the redeeming judgment and mercy of God in His Son. The meaning is virtually the same as that of our Lord's words in Luke xvi. 16. νόμου without the article is "law" in the widest sense; the Mosaic law is only one of the most important instances which come under this description; and it, with all statutory conceptions of religion, ends when Christ appears. It is quite true to say that Christ consummates or fulfils the law (hence Calvin would prefer *complementum* or *perfectio* to *finis* as a rendering of τέλος); quite true also that He is the goal of the O.T. dispensation, and that it is designed to lead to Him (*cf.* Mt. v. 17, Gal. iii. 24); but though both true and Pauline, these ideas are irrelevant here, where Paul is insisting, not on the connection, but on the incompatibility, of law and faith, of one's own righteousness and the righteousness of God. Besides, in limiting νόμος to the Mosaic O.T. law, this interpretation does less than justice to the language, and misses the point of παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι: there is *no* believer, *Gentile or Jew*, for whom law, *Mosaic or other*, retains validity or significance as a way to δικαιοσύνη, after the revelation of the righteousness of God in Christ.

In ver. 5 ff. Paul describes more fully, and in O.T. terms, the two ways of attaining δικαιοσύνη—law and faith. His aim is to show that they are mutually exclusive, but that the latter is open and accessible to all.

Ver. 5. Μωυσῆς γὰρ γράφει: Moses' authority is unimpeachable on this point. The righteousness that comes from law

γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. 5. Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου,[1] "Ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς". 6. ἡ δὲ ἐκ[f] πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτω λέγει, "Μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, Τίς ἀναβήσεται[g] εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν;" τοῦτ' ἔστι[h] Χριστὸν καταγαγεῖν· 7. "ἤ, Τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν

f Ch. ix. 30; Gal. iii. 8.
g Cf. Eph. iv. 8 f.
h Ch. ix. 8.

[1] την εκ του νομου DFKLP; om. του ℵB (A). οτι stands after γραφει, not before ὁ ποιησας, in ℵ[1]AD[1] 17, vulg. It stands as in the received text in ℵ[3]BD[3]FGKL, etc. Most edd. put it after γραφει, but not Weiss, who argues that it was removed from its proper place after νομου in order to provide an object for ποιησας after αυτα had been dropped. He reads Μ. γαρ γραφει την δ. τ. εκ νομου οτι ο π. αυτα α. ζ. εν αυτη. According to W. and H. the original text was οτι την δικαιοσυνην την εκ νομου ο ποιησας ανθρωπος ζησεται εν αυτη. Possibly this best explains the variants, but it strikes one as too artificially grammatical for Paul. αυτα om. ℵ[1]AD-gr., vulg. For εν αυτοις (from LXX), which is found in DFKLP, ℵ[1]AB 17, 47, vulg. read εν αυτη; and so all edd.

must be an achievement: the man who has *done* it shall live in it, Lev. xviii. 5. Paul writes ἐν αὐτῇ with reference to δικαιοσύνην: the ἐν αὐτοῖς of the LXX refers to πάντα τὰ κρίματα which precedes. Moses, of course, in writing thus did not mock his people; the O.T. religion, though an imperfect, was a real religion, under which men could be right with God. To keep the law of God and live by doing so (Mt. xix. 17) was the natural aim and hope of a true Israelite; only, in this case, the law was not a collection of statutes, but a revelation of God's character and will, and he who sought to keep it did so not alone, but in conscious dependence on God whose grace was shown above all things else by His gift of such a revelation. Paul, however, is writing with Pharisees and legalists in his eye, and with the remembrance of his own experience as a Pharisee in his heart; and *his* idea no doubt is that this road leads nowhere. *Cf.* Gal. iii. 10-12. To keep the law thus is an impossibility.

Ver. 6 f. **ἡ δὲ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη οὕτως λέγει.** It is remarkable that Paul does not make Moses his authority here, though he is about to express himself in words which certainly go back to Deut. xxx. 12-14. It is the righteousness of faith itself which speaks, describing its own character and accessibility in words with a fine flavour of inspiration about them. But it is not so much a quotation we find here, as a free reproduction and still freer application of a very familiar passage of the O.T. It is irrelevant to point out that what the writer in Deuteronomy means is that the law (ἡ ἐντολὴ αὕτη ἣν ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαί σοι σήμερον) is not oppressive nor impracticable (as Paul in ver. 5 tacitly assumes it to be); the Apostle is not thinking in the least what the writer of Deuteronomy meant; as the representative of the righteousness of faith, he is putting his own thoughts—his inspired conviction and experience of the Gospel—into a free reproduction of these ancient inspired words. **μὴ εἴπῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου**: = do not think, especially thoughts you would be ashamed to utter. **τίς ἀναβήσεται εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; . . . ἢ τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον;** There is no impossible preliminary to be accomplished before the true religion is got under way; we have neither to scale heaven nor descend into the abyss. ἄβυσσος (in N.T.) only in Lc. viii. 31 and seven times in Rev. But *cf.* Ps. cvi. 26, lxx. 20. The passage in Deuteronomy has εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης. These two indefinite proverbial expressions for the impossible are interpreted by Paul. With τοῦτ' ἔστιν (vers. 6, 7), he introduces a *midrash* upon each. The first means (in his mind) bringing Christ down; the second, bringing Christ up from the dead. Evidently the righteousness of faith is concerned with a Christ of whom both these things are true—a descent from heaven, and a rising from the dead, Incarnation and Resurrection. We could not bring about either by any effort, but we do not need to; Christ incarnate and risen is here already, God's gift to faith.

Ver. 8. **ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστιν . . . τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν.** What is in the lips of the preacher is near to all who hear. In Deut. the word is of course the Mosaic law; here it is the Gospel, the word which deals with that πίστις on which

ἄβυσσον;" τοῦτ' ἔστι Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν.[1] 8. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει; "Ἐγγύς σου τὸ ῥῆμά[k] ἐστιν, ἐν τῷ στόματί σου καὶ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου·" τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ ῥῆμα[l] τῆς πίστεως ὃ κηρύσσομεν· 9. ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς ἐν τῷ στόματί σου Κύριον Ἰησοῦν,[1] καὶ πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ· 10. καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν. 11. Λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, "Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ

[i] Heb. xiii. 20.
[k] Acts x. 37 verse 17
Eph. v. 26, vi. 17.
[l] Acts x. 37; 1 Pet. i. 25.

[1] **ομολογησης εν τω στοματι σου Κυριον Ιησουν**: this is the reading of most MSS., and is retained by Weiss and on the marg. by W. and H. For **Κυριον Ιησουν** B and Clem. Alex. have **οτι Κυριος Ιησους**, which W. and H. put in their text, and Lachm. and Treg. on margin. But B. and Clem. Alex. also insert **το ρημα** before **εν τω στοματι σου**, and this also W. and H. put in text. Weiss regards it as a thoughtless repetition from ver. 8, to give an object to **ομολογησης**; whether the further change of **Κυριον Ιησουν** into **οτι Κυριος Ιησους** (to conform to the parallel clause) took place before or after this can hardly be decided.

the righteousness of God depends. **τῆς πίστεως** is objt. gen. The whole idea of the verses is that righteousness has not to be achieved, but only appropriated.

Ver. 9. Apparently this verse gives the content of what the Apostle describes as "the word of faith which we preach". **ὅτι** = viz. The reference both to heart and mouth in Deut. suits his purpose, and he utilises it; the closing words in the LXX (**καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσί σου ποιεῖν αὐτό**) he disregards. **ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς τὸ ῥῆμα . . . ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς**: the putting of the confession before the faith which inspires it, and of which it is the confession, seems to be due simply to the fact that in the O.T. passage present to the Apostle's mind **ἐν τῷ στόματί σου** precedes **ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου. τὸ ῥῆμα** is virtually = the Gospel, as God's word concerning His Son and faith in Him. We confess it when we say, Jesus is Lord. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 3, Phil. ii. 11. The exaltation of Jesus is the fundamental Christian confession, and presupposes the resurrection; and it is this exaltation which here (as in the other passages referred to) is meant by His Lordship. It is mechanical to say that the first part of ver. 9 (Jesus is Lord) refers to the doubting question in ver. 6, and therefore means a confession of the incarnation; and the second part of it (God raised Him from the dead) to the doubting question of ver. 7. Paul nowhere connects the Lordship of Christ with His incarnation, and there is certainly no reference to His Divine nature here. The confession of the first part of the verse answers to the faith in the second; he who believes in his heart that God raised Christ from the dead can confess with his mouth (on that ground and in that sense) that Jesus is Lord. On the basis of such mutually interpreting faith and confession he is saved. This does not deprive the death of Christ of the significance which Paul ascribes to it elsewhere. Christ could not be raised unless He had first died, and when He is raised it is with the virtue of His sin-atoning death in Him. His exaltation is that of one who has borne our sins, and the sense of this gives passion to the love with which believers confess Him Lord.

Ver. 10. **καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν.** The parallelism is like that in the previous verse, though the order of the clauses is reversed. To be saved one must attain **δικαιοσύνη**, and this depends on heart-faith; such faith, again, leading to salvation, must confess itself. To separate the two clauses, and look for an independent meaning in each, is a mistake; a heart believing unto righteousness, and a mouth making confession unto salvation, are not really two things, but two sides of the same thing. The formalism which seems to contrast them is merely a mental (perhaps only a literary) idiosyncrasy of the writer. It is true to say that such a confession as is meant here was made at baptism; but to limit it to baptism, or to use this verse to prove baptism essential to salvation, is, as Weiss says, *unerhörter Dogmatismus*.

Ver. 11. This verse proves from Scripture the main idea in the preceding, *viz.*, that faith saves. It is a quotation from Is. xxviii. 16 (see ix. 33) with the addition of **πᾶς**, to which nothing corre-

m Ch. iii. 22. 1 Cor. xiv. 7.

καταισχυνθήσεται". 12. οὐ γάρ ἐστι διαστολὴ [m] Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνος· ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς Κύριος πάντων, πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν. 13. "Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσηται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου, σωθήσεται." 14. Πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται [1] εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; πῶς δὲ πιστεύσουσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; πῶς δὲ ἀκούσουσι

[1] επικαλεσονται KLP; επικαλεσωνται ℵABDF, all edd. So for πιστευσουσιν AKL, read πιστευσωσιν with ℵBDF. The received ακουσουσι of L has been corrected into the classical ακουσονται in ℵ[1]DFK; the true reading ακουσωσι is preserved only in B (with correctors of ℵ and A) and some cursives.

sponds either in Hebr. or LXX. Yet oddly enough it is on this πᾶς that the rest of the Apostle's argument turns. The way of righteousness and salvation by faith, he goes on to show, is meant for all.

Ver. 12. οὐ γάρ ἐστι διαστολὴ Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἕλληνος: this has been proved in one sense in chap. iii.—there is no distinction between them in point of sin; it is now asserted in another sense—there is no distinction between them in that the same Lord is waiting to save all on the same conditions. κύριος πάντων is best taken as predicate: the same Lord is Lord of all: *cf.* Acts x. 36, Phil. ii. 10 f. Christ is undoubtedly meant: in His presence, in view of His work and His present relation to men, all differences disappear; there can be only one religion. πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας: abounding in wealth toward all. Christ can impart to all men what all men need—the righteousness of God. *Cf.* v. 15-17, Eph. iii. 8, τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. τοὺς ἐπικαλουμένους αὐτόν: *cf.* 1 C. i. 2 where Christians are described as οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τ. Κ. ἡμῶν Ι. Χ. The formula, as the next verse shows, is borrowed from the Old Testament; and as Weiss remarks, verse 13 sets aside every idea of a distinction between the invocation of God and that of Christ. To a Christian, as Paul conceives him, Christ has at least the religious value of God; the Christian soul has that adoring attitude to Christ which (when shown in relation to Jehovah) was characteristic of O.T. religion, See Acts ix. 14, 21, Acts xxii. 16 (Paul's conversion), 2 Tim. ii. 22. It is a fair paraphrase of the words to say that salvation depends on this: whether a sinful man will make appeal for it to Christ in prayer, as to One in whom all God's saving judgment and mercy dwell bodily. It rests with Christ, so appealed to, to make a man partaker in the righteousness of God and eternal life.

Ver. 13. For every one who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved. The words are from Joel iii. 5 (= ii. 32 LXX). "The Lord" in the original is Jehovah; here, manifestly, Christ—a proof how completely Christ stands in God's place in all that concerns salvation.

Ver. 14 f. It is difficult to trace very clearly the line of the Apostle's thought here. Many scholars (including W. and H. and Lipsius) connect vers. 14 and 15 closely with what precedes, and mark a break between ver. 15 and ver. 16. It is as if Paul were expanding the πᾶς of ver. 13 and justifying that universal preaching of the Gospel which was itself a stumbling-block to the Jews. *Every one* who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved, and therefore the conditions of such invocation must be put within reach of *every one*. It is no argument against this interpretation that the ideas it introduces are not essential to the main purpose of the chapter, which is to prove the culpability of the Jews: the eager fulness of Paul's mind often carries him on thus. Others read vers. 14-21 continuously, and mark a break at vers. 13 (*e.g.*, Weiss, Sanday and Headlam). They lay stress on the οὖν in ver. 14 (*cf.* ix. 14, ix. 30, xi. 1, 11) as indicating that a paragraph has ended, and that the writer is facing the consequences which flow from it, the objections which can be made to it, etc. In this case the connection would be something like this. Salvation depends upon invoking Christ; but to invoke Christ depends upon certain conditions which *the Jews* may say it has been beyond their power to fulfil; let us inquire into the conditions, and see whether such a plea holds good. The first of these connections seems to me much the simpler, and it has the advantage of covering the second. For if the invocation of Christ, which is the sole and universal condition of salvation, has been made possible for *all* men, it

χωρὶς κηρύσσοντος; 15. πῶς δὲ κηρύξουσιν,[1] ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσι; καθὼς γέγραπται, "Ὡς ὡραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην,[2] τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων τὰ ἀγαθά". 16. Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες [n] ὑπήκουσαν [n Acts vi. 7. 2 Thess. i. 8.] τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει, "Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ [o] ἀκοῇ [o 1 Thess. ii. 13; Heb. iv. 2.] ἡμῶν;" 17. ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος Θεοῦ.[3]

[1] For κηρυξουσιν read κηρυξωσιν with ℵABDKLP. For καθως read καθαπερ with B. See note [1], page 598.

[2] ευαγγελιζομενων ειρηνην των om. ℵ[1]ABC 47; ins. ℵ[3]DFKLP. The omission may be due to homœoteleuton. Weiss thinks it is, and keeps these words in the text; Treg. thinks it possible, and brackets them in margin. On the other hand, they may have been inserted to make the quotation agree better (it does not even then agree closely) with the LXX. The MSS. authority by itself is decisive for the omission. τα αγαθα ℵ[1]D[2, 3]KL; om. τα ℵ[3]ABCD[1]F (and LXX). W. and H. read ως ωραιοι οι ποδες των ευαγγελιζομενων αγαθα.

[3] θεου AD[2, 3] (gr.) KL; Χριστου ℵ[1]BCD 47 and all edd.

has been made possible for the Jews. The special application to them, in which the argument of the chapter is clinched, is not made till ver. 19; here they are only involved with the rest of the world which has heard the Gospel. πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσωνται: *sc.* τοῦτον. πῶς δὲ πιστεύσωσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; It is simplest to render, How are they to believe on Him *Whom* they have not heard? identifying the voice of the preachers with that of Christ. Winer, p. 249. *Cf.* Eph. ii. 17. The rendering, Him *of Whom* they have not heard, would be legitimate in poetry. πῶς δὲ ἀκούσωσιν: this deliberative form is in all probability right: see critical note and Blass, *Gramm. des Neut. Griech.*, 205. ἐὰν μὴ ἀποσταλῶσιν: *viz.*, by the Lord Whom they preach, and Who is heard speaking when they speak. *Cf.* 1 Cor. i. 17, ἀπέστειλέν με Χριστὸς . . . εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. To find here the idea of an official ministry, as something belonging essentially to the constitution of the Church, is grotesque. "St. Paul argues back from effect to cause, through the series of Prayer, Faith, Hearing, Preaching, Sending; thus the last link in his argument must be the first in the realisation from which the rest follow; this one therefore he confirms by the prophetic announcement in Isa. lii. 7" (Gifford). ὡς ὡραῖοι: the true text of Romans greatly abbreviates the prophet's words, but the joy with which the deliverance from Babylon was foreseen is in keeping with that with which Paul contemplates the universal preaching of the Gospel.

Ver. 16. The fact remains, however, in spite of this universal preaching, that there has not been a universal surrender to the Gospel. οὐ πάντες: the Jews are present to the writer's mind here, though the words might apply more widely; hence the compassionate mode of statement. *Cf.* iii. 3: εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες. Yet this quantum of unbelief does not discomfit the Apostle; for it also, as well as the proclamation of the Gospel, is included in the prophecy. τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν is a lament over practically universal unbelief. ἡ ἀκοὴ ἡμῶν in Isaiah means "that which we heard," but who the "we" are is not clear. If a representative prophet speaks, ἀκοὴ will mean that which he and other prophets heard from God: = Who hath believed the revelation made to us? *Cf.* Isa. xxviii. 9, 19. If a representative of repenting Israel speaks, ἀκοὴ will mean that which he and his countrymen have heard from the prophets: = Who hath believed the message delivered to us? Assuming that Paul as a preacher instinctively used the words to express his own thought and experience in his vocation, they will mean here, Who has believed the message delivered by us Apostles?

Ver. 17. This verse is really parenthetic: Paul's logical mind cannot let slip the chance of showing how this quotation confirms the connection of ideas in ver. 14. ἄρα suits a rapid passing inference better than the more deliberate ἄρα οὖν which is much more frequent in Romans. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 18, 2 Cor. v. 14, Gal. ii. 17. So then faith comes from a message (that which is received by the hearer of the Gospel), and the message διὰ ῥήματος Χριστοῦ through the Word concerning Christ.

18. ἀλλὰ λέγω, Μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; μενοῦνγε "εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς οἰκουμένης τὰ ῥήματα αὐτῶν". 19. Ἀλλὰ λέγω, Μὴ οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰσραήλ [1]; πρῶτος Μωσῆς λέγει, "Ἐγὼ [p] παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνει, ἐπὶ ἔθνει

p Ch. xi. 14; 1 Cor. x. 22.

[1] Ισραηλ before ουκ εγνω ℵABCD[1, 2]F.

That which when heard is ἀκοή is when spoken ῥῆμα, and it is the condition of faith. The construction in ῥῆμα Χριστοῦ is the same as in τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως in ver. 8. The words could not signify Christ's command.

Ver. 18. The process of convicting the Jews is now under way, and ἀλλὰ λέγω introduces a plea on their behalf. It is Paul who speaks: hence the form of the question μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν suggests *his* opinion as to the answer. To *hear* is necessary in order to believe; you do not mean to say they did *not* hear? *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5, xi. 22. μενοῦνγε is *immo vero*. The contrary is so clearly the case that there is a touch of derision in the word with which Paul introduces the proof of it. *Cf.* ix. 20. The Gospel has been preached in all the world: the words of Ps. xix. 4 (exactly as in LXX) are at once the expression and the proof of this. Of course they refer to the revelation of God in nature, but their use will seem legitimate enough if we remember that Paul *knew* the extent to which the Gospel had been proclaimed in his day. *Cf.* Col. i. 6, 23. It was as widely diffused as the Diaspora, and the poetic inspired expression for this had a charm of its own.

Ver. 19. ἀλλὰ λέγω: another attempt to introduce a plea on behalf of Israel. You cannot say, "they did not hear"; surely you do not mean to say, then, *Israel did not understand?* At first sight there seems an unnatural emphasis here on *Israel*, but this is not the case. The generality of the argument must be abandoned now, for the passages next to be quoted, which are already present to Paul's mind, contrast Israel with the Gentiles, and so bring it into prominence; and it is in the case of Israel, of all nations, that the plea of not understanding is most out of place. Above all nations Israel ought to have understood a message from God: Israel, and inability to understand God's Word, ought to be incompatible ideas. πρῶτος Μωυσῆς λέγει, Deut. xxxii. 21. πρῶτος suggests the beginning of a line of witnesses to this effect: virtually it means, even Moses, at the very beginning of their history. The point of the citation is not very clear. Like the passages quoted in ix. 25, 26, it might have been adduced by Paul as a proof that the Gentiles were to be called into God's kingdom, and called in order to rouse the Jews to jealousy; but to be in place here, there must be also the latent idea that if peoples beyond the covenant (who were not peoples at all), and unintelligent peoples (*i.e.*, idol worshippers) could understand the Gospel, a privileged and religiously gifted people like the Jews was surely inexcusable if it failed to understand it. The same idea seems to be enforced again in ver. 20. Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ: "breaks out boldly" (Gifford). It was an act of great daring to speak thus to a nation with the exclusive temper of Israel, and Paul who needed the same courage in carrying the Gospel to the Gentiles was the man to see this. οἱ ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶντες means those who put no question to me, *sc.*, about the way of salvation. In Isa. lxv. 1 the clauses occur in reverse order. What the prophet has in view is God's spontaneous unmerited goodness, which takes the initiative, unsolicited, in showing mercy to faithless Jews who made no appeal to Him and never sought Him; the Apostle applies this, like the similar passages in ix. 25 f., to the reception of the Gospel by the Gentiles.* If God was found and recognised in His character and purposes, where all the conditions seemed so much against it, surely Israel must be inexcusable if it has missed the meaning of the Gospel. The very calling of the Gentiles, predicted and interpreted as it is in the passages quoted, should itself

* The part of Isa. lxv. 1 which is not quoted here (I said, Behold Me, behold Me, unto a nation that was not called by My name) is meant, as usually pointed, to refer to the Gentiles, and this tradition of its application Paul may have learned from Gamaliel (Cheyne); but the pointing is wrong: *see* Cheyne.

ἀσυνέτῳ παροργιῶ ὑμᾶς". 20. Ἡσαΐας δὲ [q] ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει, "Εὑρέθην τοῖς[1] ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν, ἐμφανὴς ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσι". 21. πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει, "Ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ [r] ἀντιλέγοντα".

q Here only.
r Luke ii. 34; Acts xiii. 45; xxviii. 22.

[1] ευρεθην τοις ℵACD[2], [3]LP; but εν τοις BD[1]FG. Sanday and Headlam call this "a Western reading which has found its way into B". W. and H. put εν in marg.

have been a message to the Jews, which they could not misunderstand; it should have opened their eyes as with a lightning flash to the position in which they stood—that of men who had forfeited their place among the people of God—and provoked them, out of jealousy, to vie with these outsiders in welcoming the righteousness of faith.

Ver. 21. **πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει**: That is what he says of the Gentiles, but as for Israel, he says, etc., Isa. lxv. 2. For **πρὸς** = with reference to, see Heb. i. 7 f., Luke xii. 41. The arms outstretched all the day long are the symbol of that incessant pleading love which Israel through all its history has consistently despised. It is not want of knowledge, then, nor want of intelligence, but wilful and stubborn disobedience, that explains the exclusion of Israel (meanwhile) from the Kingdom of Christ and all its blessings. This is not inconsistent with ver. 3, if we go to the root of the matter. For the ignorance there spoken of is one which has its root in the will, in the pride of a heart which is determined to have a righteousness of its own without coming under any obligation to God for it, and which therefore cannot assume the attitude to which the Gospel becomes credibly Divine; while the ignorance suggested as a plea for unbelief is that of men to whom the Gospel has never been presented at all. The latter ignorance might annul responsibility; the former gives its full significance to guilt.

CHAPTER XI. On the place of this chapter in the argument, see introduction to chap. ix. above. Briefly, the ninth chapter means, God is sovereign, and the tenth chapter means, Israel has sinned. Both of these are presented in relative independence as explanations of the perplexing fact which confronted the Apostle, namely, that the Jews did not receive the Gospel, while the Gentiles did; in this chapter, the two are brought into relation to each other, and we are shown (to some extent) how in the sovereign providence of God even the sin of Israel is made to contribute to the working out of a universal purpose of redemption—a redemption in which Israel also shares, in accordance with the inviolable promise of God. The chapter can be naturally divided into three sections: (1) vers. 1-10, in which the question immediately arising out of chap. x. is discussed, *viz.*, whether the unbelief of which Israel as a whole has been convicted involves God's rejection of the chosen people; (2) vers. 11-24, in which the result to be attained by the partial and temporary exclusion of the Jews from the Messianic kingdom is enlarged upon, and the Gentiles warned against self-exaltation; and (3) vers. 25-36, in which Paul magnifies the unsearchable wisdom, love and faithfulness of God, as revealed in securing by a common method the salvation alike of Israel and the Gentiles.

(1) Vv. 1-10. **λέγω οὖν**: the **οὖν** intimates that it is with the conclusion reached in chap. x. before his mind that Paul puts the following question: the unbelief of Israel naturally suggested it. **μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ;** For the words, *cf.* Ps. xciv. 14 (xciii. LXX), 1 Sam. xii. 22. In both places the promise is given **οὐκ ἀπώσεται ὁ Κ. τ. λ. αὐτοῦ**, and the familiar words give the effect of asking, Has God broken His express and repeated promise? **μὴ** suggests the negative answer, which is expressed more passionately in **μὴ γένοιτο.** *Cf.* iii. 6, ix. 14. Israel may be faithless to Him, but He abides faithful. **καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμί**: This is often read as if it were an argument in favour of the negative answer; as if Paul meant, God has *not* cast off His people, I myself am a living proof to the contrary. But this is hardly conciliatory, to say the least; and it is better to take the words as explaining why Paul puts the question with **μή** (suggesting the negative answer), and why he then gives the denial with such vehemence. "I, too, am an Israelite, to whom the very idea of God's rejection of His people is an impious and incredible idea, to be repelled with horror." **ἐκ σπέρ. Ἀβραάμ**:

XI. 1. ΛΕΓΩ οὖν, Μὴ ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ; μὴ γένοιτο· καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ Ἰσραηλίτης εἰμί, ἐκ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ, φυλῆς [a] Βενϊαμίν. 2. οὐκ ἀπώσατο ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃν προέγνω. ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἡλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή; ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ Θεῷ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, λέγων,[1] 3. "Κύριε, τοὺς προφήτας σου ἀπέκτειναν, καὶ[2] τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν· κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην μόνος, καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχήν μου". 4. ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; "Κατέλιπον ἐμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίους ἄνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ." 5. οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐν τῷ νῦν [b] καιρῷ λεῖμμα κατ' [c] ἐκλογὴν χάριτος

a Phil. iii. 5.
b Ch. iii. 26.
c Ch. ix. 11.

[1] λεγων ℵ[1]L; om. ℵ[3]ABCDF.
[2] και before τα θυσιαστηρια ℵ[3]DL; om. ℵ[1]ABCF 17.

no proselyte. **φυλῆς Βενιαμείν**: the one tribe which with Judah mainly represented the post-exilic theocratic people.

Ver. 2 f. **οὐκ ἀπώσατο**: formal denial of what the heart has indignantly protested against in ver. 1. **ὃν προέγνω** must contain a reason which makes the rejection incredible or impossible. This excludes the interpretation of Weiss, who thinks that Paul means to say that God *knew* what Israel was *before* He chose it, and therefore cannot cast it off as if its unbelief had disappointed Him; He knew from the first what it would be. To plead thus for God is too paltry. We must take **προέγνω** as in viii. 29: the meaning is, Israel stood before God's eyes from eternity as His people, and in the immutableness of the sovereign love with which He made it His lies the impossibility of its rejection. The idea is the same as in ver. 29 below. **ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε**: this is the alternative. He who says, God *has* cast off Israel, must be ignorant of what Scripture says **ἐν Ἡλίᾳ** in the passage which gives the history of Elijah. The sections of the Bible were designated, not as now by chapter and verse, but by some descriptive phrase: *cf.* **ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου**, Mark xii. 26: and in Philo **ἐν ταῖς ἀραῖς** = Gen. iii. 15. Many references are made in this form by Hebrew writers. For **ἐντυγχάνειν κατὰ** *cf.* 1 Macc. viii. 32: it means to plead (not intercede) with God against Israel. **τὰ θυσιαστήρια** is one of the indications that in Elijah's time there was no law requiring only one altar for Jehovah. The words are quoted from 1 Kings xix. ver. 10 or 14. In Elijah's mood, Paul might have said something similar of his own time, for their circumstances were not alike. The Apostle, like the prophet, was lonely and persecuted, and Israel as a whole seemed to have abandoned God or been abandoned by Him. But he understands God's way (and His faithfulness) better.

Ver. 4. **ὁ χρηματισμός**: the word is related to **χρηματίζω** (Mt. ii. 12, 22, Acts x. 22, Heb. viii. 5) as **χρησμὸς** to **χράω**: it means the oracle, or answer of God. Here only in N.T., but see 2 Macc. ii. 4, xi. 17. The quotation is from 1 Kings xix. 18 with **ἐμαυτῷ** added, by which Paul suggests God's interest in this remnant, and the fact that He has a purpose of His own identified with them. *God* has reserved the seven thousand; He has reserved them for *Himself*; it is on this the proof depends that He has not cast off His people. The seven thousand are Israel to Him. Yet His unchanging faithfulness in keeping a people is not represented as a merely unconditional decree, having no relation to anything but His own will, for the seven thousand are described by their character: **οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῇ Βάαλ.** **οἵτινες** is qualitative: *such* were those whom God reserved for Himself, men who never bowed knee to Baal. **Βάαλ** takes the fem. art. because it was often replaced in reading by בֹּשֶׁת (LXX **αἰσχύνη**).

Ver. 5. Application of the principle of ver. 4 to the present. **ὁ νῦν καιρὸς** is the present regarded not merely as a date, but as in some sense a crisis. **λεῖμμα γέγονεν**: a remnant has come to be—this is the fact which has emerged from the general unbelief of Israel. **κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος**: on these words the emphasis lies. The existence of the remnant is due to an election of grace, a choice on the part of God the motive of which is to be sought in His unmerited

γέγονεν. 6. εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκ ἔτι ἐξ ἔργων· ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκ ἔτι γίνεται χάρις. εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκ ἔτι ἐστὶ χάρις· ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκ ἔτι ἐστὶν ἔργον.[1] 7. Τί οὖν; ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ, τούτου[2] οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν, ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν 8. (καθὼς[3] γέγραπται, "Ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεος πνεῦμα κατανύξεως, ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ ὦτα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν"), ἕως τῆς σήμερον[d] ἡμέρας. 9. καὶ Δαβὶδ λέγει, "Γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς

d 2 Cor. iii. 14.

[1] ει δε εξ εργων ουκ ετι εστι χαρις επει το εργον ουκ ετι εστιν εργον. All this is omitted in ℵ[1]ACDEFG, vulg., Egypt. verss., Orig. lat. and Latin fathers; inserted with some variations (for the last εργον B has χαρις, by a slip, surely) in ℵ[3]BL and later MSS. According to Sanday and Headlam, there can be no doubt that the addition is a gloss; B is not sufficient to justify a Western addition of this kind against such preponderating authority. The words are omitted by most edd., but Alf. brackets them, and Weiss retains them in the text; the χαρις in B for εργον at end only makes the omission by homœot. easier.

[2] For τουτου read τουτο with ℵABCDFL.

[3] καθως; read with ℵB καθαπερ. See note [1], page 673.

love alone. The idea is the same as in chap. ix. 6-13: but *cf.* note on ver. 4.

Ver. 6. Expansion of χάριτος in ver. 5: grace and works are mutually exclusive. Nothing a man can do gives him a claim as of right against God to be included in the remnant. ἐπεὶ: otherwise. *Cf.* ver. 22, iii. 6. *Gratia nisi gratis sit gratia non est.* Aug. The fact that there is a remnant, and one owing its existence to God's grace, is the proof that (in spite of the wholesale defection of Israel) God has not cast off His people.

Ver. 7. τί οὖν; What then? How are we to describe the present situation, if not in the painful language of verse 1? Thus: ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραὴλ κ.τ.λ. What Israel is in quest of is δικαιοσύνη: the present conveys more sympathetically than the impft. of some MSS. the Apostle's sense of the ceaseless and noble (though misdirected) efforts of his countrymen. ἐπέτυχεν: Jas. iv. 2, Heb. vi. 15. ἡ δὲ ἐκλογή = οἱ ἐκλεκτοί = τὸ λεῖμμα. ἐπωρώθησαν: were hardened, 2 Cor. iii. 14, John xii. 40, Mc. vi. 52, viii. 17. Paul does not say how they were hardened or by whom: there is the same indefiniteness here as in κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν in ix. 22. It may be quite possible to give a true sense to the assertion that they were hardened *by God* (*cf.* the following verse), although the hardening in this case is always regarded as a punishment for sin, that is, as a confirming in an obduracy which originally was *not* of God, but their own; as if the idea were, first they would not, and then, in God's just reaction against their sin, they could not; but it is a mistake to import into the text a definiteness which does not belong to it. It is rather essential to Paul's argument that he should not be bound down to one-sided interpretations of what he has intentionally left vague.

Ver. 8 ff. This hardening (at the present day ver. 5) agrees with God's action toward Israel in the past, as exhibited in Scripture. The words from the O.T. can hardly be called a quotation; Deut. xxix. 4, Is. xxix. 10, Is. vi. 9, 10, all contributed something to them. The πνεῦμα κατανύξεως is from Is. xxix. 10, and answers to the Heb. רוּחַ תַּרְדֵּמָה, a spirit of deep sleep or torpor. Virtually it is defined by what follows—unseeing eyes, unhearing ears: a spirit which produces a condition of insensibility, to which every appeal is vain. κατάνυξις only occurs in LXX, Is. xxix. 10, Ps. lix. 4 (οἶνον κατανύξεως); but the verb κατανύσσομαι is used by Theod. in Dan. x. 15 to translate נִרְדַּם (cognate to תַּרְדֵּמָה), and in other places of any overpowering emotion: see Fritzsche *ad loc.* Winer, p. 117. It *is* God Who sends this spirit of stupor, but He does not send it arbitrarily nor at random: it is always a judgment. ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας: in Deut. xxix. 4 ἕως τῆς ἡ. ταύτης. The change emphasises the fact that what Israel had been from the beginning it was when Paul wrote,

θήραν, καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς· 10. σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς [e] σύγκαμψον [e]. 11. Λέγω οὖν, Μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσι; μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ τῷ αὐτῶν [f] παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, εἰς τὸ [g] παραζηλῶσαι αὐτούς. 12. εἰ δὲ τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμου, καὶ τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸ πλή-

e Ps. lxviii. 22 f. (LXX).
f Ch. iv. 25.
g Ch. x. 19.

and that God had acted toward it from the beginning on the same principle on which He was acting then. *Cf.* Acts vii. 51 f. **καὶ Δαυεὶδ λέγει**: another proof of **ἐπωρώθησαν**, though strictly speaking a wish or an imprecation cannot prove anything, unless it be assumed that it has been fulfilled, and so can be taken as the description of a fact. Paul takes it for granted that the doom invoked in these words has come upon the Jews. **γενηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ.** Their table in the psalm is that in which they delight, and it is this which is to prove their ruin. **παγίς, θήρα**, and **σκάνδαλον** are all variations of the same idea, that of snare or trap—*i.e.*, sudden destruction. What the Jews delighted in was the law, and the law misunderstood proved their ruin. In seeking a righteousness of their own based upon it they missed and forfeited the righteousness of God which is given to faith in Christ. **καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς**: this does not exactly reproduce either the Heb. or the LXX, but it involves the idea that the fate of the Jews is the recompense of their sin—not a result to be simply referred to a decree of God. Their perverse attitude to the law is avenged in their incapacity to understand and receive the Gospel. **τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν**: for this Gen. both in ver. 8 and ver. 10, see Buttmann, *Gram. of N.T. Greek*, p. 267 (E. tr.). **τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον**: keep them continually in spiritual bondage, stooping under a load too heavy to be borne: *cf.* Acts xv. 10.

This is the condition in which by God's act, requiting their own sins, and especially their self-righteous adherence to the law as a way of salvation, the Jews find themselves. It is a condition so grievous, and so remote from what one anticipates for a people chosen by God, that it confronts Paul again with the difficulty of ver. 1, and obliges him to state it once more—this time in a way which mitigates its severity, and hints that the fall of Israel is not the last thing concerning them to be taken into account. What if God's purpose includes and uses their fall? What if it is not final? It is with new ideas of this sort, introduced to take the edge from the stern utterances of vers. 8-10, that Paul deals in vers. 11-24.

Ver. 11. **λέγω οὖν**: I say then, taking up the problem again. **μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν**; surely they did not stumble so as to fall? The subject is the mass of the Jewish nation, all but the elect remnant. The contrast here between stumbling and falling shows that the latter is meant of an irremediable fall, from which there is no rising. This is one of the cases in which **ἵνα** is loosely used; it cannot possibly be translated "in order that". For similar examples *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 4, 1 Cor. vii. 29, Gal. v. 17. **ἀλλὰ**: on the contrary, by their (moral) fall salvation has come to the Gentiles to provoke them (the unbelieving Israelites) to jealousy. The fact stated here is illustrated at every point in Paul's own ministry; he turned to the Gentiles *because* the Jews would not hear him. See Acts xiii. 46 ff., xviii. 6, xxviii. 25-28. The end in view in it (*cf.* x. 19) is his proof that the stumbling of the Jews is not to be interpreted in the sense of a final fall. A recovery is in prospect.

Ver. 12. Both **ἥττημα** and **πλήρωμα** are difficult words, but it is not necessary to suppose that they answer mathematically to one another, though Wetstein explains them by − and +. **ἥττημα** may mean (as in Is. xxxi. 8) defeat, or (as in 1 Cor. vi. 7) loss; it can hardly mean *diminutio eorum*, or *paucitas Judæorum credentium;* **τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν** must mean the making up of them to their full numbers. There is an exhaustive study of the word **πλήρωμα** by Prof. J. Armitage Robinson in *The Expositor*, April, 1898. His paraphrase of this verse is very good. "If the Gentiles have been enriched in a sense through the very miscarriage and disaster of Israel, what wealth is in store for them in the great Return, when all Israel shall be saved—'when God hath made the pile complete!'" The enrichment referred to is in both cases that which comes through participating in the blessings of the Gospel.

ρωμα αὐτῶν; 13. Ὑμῖν γὰρ[1] λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν· ἐφ' ὅσον μέν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω, 14. εἴ πως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα, καὶ σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν. 15. εἰ γὰρ ἡ [h]ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, τίς ἡ πρόσληψις, εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν; 16. εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα· καὶ εἰ ἡ [i]ῥίζα

h Acts xxvii. 22.
i Ch. xiv. 3.

[1] υμιν γαρ DFL; υμιν ουν C; υμιν δε ℵABP 47, all edd. εφ οσον μεν L, vulg., D[3] lat. For μεν ℵABCP have μεν ουν, and so all edd.

Ver. 13 f. ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. Paul does not here address a new class of readers. He has been speaking all along to a Gentile church, and speaking to it in that character (see above, pp. 561 ff.); and he feels it necessary to show the relevance, in such circumstances, of bestowing so much attention on the condition and prospects of the Jews. His mission to the Gentiles has an indirect bearing on his own countrymen; the more successful he can make it, the greater is the prospect that some of the Jews also may be provoked to jealousy and saved. Every Jew, again, who is saved, goes to make up the πλήρωμα of ver. 12, and so to bring on a time of unimaginable blessing for the Gentile world. ἐφ' ὅσον Mt. xxv. 40. μὲν οὖν is printed in all the critical editions, but Sanday and Headlam would read μενοῦν as one word, and discount the restrictive force of the μέν, which suggests that apostleship to Gentiles was but one part of Paul's mission. ἐγὼ: the pronoun expresses not merely a noble consciousness of vocation, but Paul's feeling that in his particular case at all events a mission to the Gentiles could not but include this ulterior reference to the Jews. His devotion, accordingly, to his Gentile ministry, never let them fall out of view. "As far then as apostleship to Gentiles is represented by *me* (as no doubt it is) I glorify my ministry (by faithful discharge of it), if by any means I may save some of the Jews." For the interpretation of δοξάζω see 2 Thess. iii. 1, John xvii. 4. For εἴ πως see Buttmann, p. 255 f. τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν: disenchanting experience taught him to speak thus. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ix. 22.

Ver. 15 f. From the personal explanation of ver. 13 f., which interrupts the argument, Paul reverts to the ideas of ver. 12. To save *any* Jew was a great object, even with an apostle of the Gentiles: εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Their ἀποβολὴ is their rejection by God on the ground of unbelief. καταλλαγὴ κόσμου: a world's reconciliation. In 2 Cor. v. 19 the world's reconciliation is the act of God in Christ; but it was an act which for the mass of mankind only took effect when Jewish unbelief diverted the Gospel to the Gentiles. ἡ πρόσλημψις: the assumption of the Jews into God's favour. ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν. Modern expositors almost all find in these words a reference to the resurrection; the restoration of the Jews at once brings on the end; the dead are raised, and the Messiah's kingdom is set up, glorious and incorruptible. It is quite true that in Jewish apocalyptic literature the resurrection introduces the new era, and that Paul shared in the apocalyptic ideas current in his time; but it does not follow that he was thinking of the resurrection here. ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν would certainly be a singular way to describe it, and it is not enough to say with Weiss that Paul used this expression instead of ἀνάστασις in order to carry the mind beyond the fact of resurrection to the state which it introduced. It seems better to leave it undefined (*cf.* ἄπειρα ἀγαθά Theophyl.), and to regard it as an ordinary English reader regards "life from the dead," as a description of unimaginable blessing. This is more impressive than to bind the original and daring speculation of a passage like this by reference to apocalyptic ideas, with which Paul was no doubt familiar, but which are not suggested here, and could least of all control his thoughts when they were working on a line so entirely his own. "Words fail him, and he employs the strongest he can find, thinking rather of their general force than of their precise signification" (Jowett). εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα. This explains Paul's assurance that Israel has a future. For ἀπ. and φύρ. see Num. xv. 19-21. By the offering of the first fruits the whole mass, and the whole produce of the land, were consecrated. Both this figure, and that of the root and the branches, signify the same thing. As the application in ver. 28 proves, what is presented in both is the relation of the

ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι. 17. εἰ δέ τινες τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ [k] ἀγριέλαιος ὢν [l] ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ συγκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης καὶ τῆς πιότητος [1] τῆς ἐλαίας ἐγένου, 18. μὴ [m] κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων· εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι, οὐ σὺ τὴν ῥίζαν βαστάζεις, ἀλλ' ἡ ῥίζα σέ. 19. Ἐρεῖς οὖν, Ἐξεκλάσθησαν οἱ [2] κλάδοι, ἵνα ἐγὼ ἐγκεντρισθῶ. 20. καλῶς· τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν,[3] σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἕστηκας. μὴ

k Ver. 24 only in N.T. 1 Sep. xvi. 11.
l Jas. ii. 13, iii. 14.

[1] και της πιοτητος ℵ³ALD²˒³P; om. και ℵ¹BCD¹F. It is om. by W. and H., Weiss, Alf. and Tischdf.

[2] Om. οι before κλαδοι with ℵABCD³FLP.

[3] εξεκλασθησαν ℵACD³LP; εκλασθησαν BD¹F. Lachm. and Treg. prefer the latter, but all other edd. the former. Weiss (*Textkritik*, S. 34) gives many similar examples in which the preposition in compounds is dropped by oversight. For υψηλοφρονει ℵAB read υψηλα φρονει; and so most edd.

patriarchs to the people as a whole. As chosen by God, the fathers were **ἅγιοι**, *i.e.*, God's people, and this standing (in spite of the arguments in chap. ix., and in spite of the hard facts of the situation when Paul wrote) belongs inalienably to their children. They are God's, and it will yet become apparent that they are.

Vers. 17-24. In these verses, which in a sense are a long parenthesis, Paul anticipates an objection which Gentile readers might take to his use of the last figure, the root and the branches; and he draws from it two special lessons—one, of humility, for the objectors; the other, of hope, for Israel.

Ver. 17. A Gentile Christian might feel that the very fact that Jews were rejected and Gentiles accepted qualified the assurance with which Paul had just spoken of the future of Israel. It is the disposition to think so, and to presume on one's own favoured position, which the Apostle rebukes in **μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων. εἰ δέ τινες τῶν κ. ἐξεκλάσθησαν**: **τινες** puts the case mildly: *cf.* iii. 3. **ἐξεκλάσθησαν**, *sc.*, as fruitless. **σὺ δὲ ἀγριέλαιος ὤν**: **σὺ** is the presumptuous individual before the Apostle's mind, not the Gentile Church collectively. The **ἀγριέλαιος** is the olive in its natural uncultivated state. **ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς**, *sc.*, among the native branches of the cultivated olive. The process here supposed is one that in horticulture is never performed. The cultivated branch is always engrafted upon the wild stock, and not *vice versâ*. This Paul knew quite well (see **παρὰ φύσιν**, ver. 24), and the force of his reproof to the presuming Gentile turns on the fact that the process *was* an unnatural one. [*Ordine commutato res magis causis quam causas rebus aptavit* (Origen).] It gave the Gentile no room to boast over the rejected Jews. **συνκοινωνὸς τῆς ῥίζης τῆς πιότ. τῆς ἐλαίας**: there is an argument in **συν**. At the best, the Gentile only *shares* with Jews in the virtues of a root which is not Gentile, but Jewish: he has his part in the consecration of the patriarchs, the one historical root of the people of God, and in the blessings God attached to it. For **πιότης** *cf.* Jud. ix. 7. The accumulation of genitives is apparently an imitation of such Hebrew constructions as Isa. xxviii. 1, 16: the meaning is, a partaker in the root of the fat olive tree.

Ver. 18. **μὴ κατακαυχῶ τῶν κλάδων**: for the genitive see Buttm., 185. Between "if thou boastest," and "thou bearest not the root," there is no formal connection: for such breviloquence, which requires us to supply "consider" or "remember," see Winer, p. 773. The sense is, You owe all you are proud of to an (artificially formed) relation to the race you would despise.

Ver. 19. **ἐρεῖς οὖν**: the presumptuous Gentile persists. "It is not to the root I compare myself, but branches were broken off that I might be engrafted: that surely involves some superiority in me."

Ver. 20. **καλῶς**: "a form of partial and often ironical assent" (Gifford). Paul does not think it worth while to dispute the assertion of ver. 19, though as it stands it is by no means indisputable; he prefers to point out what it overlooks—the moral conditions of being broken off and of standing secure—and to urge them on the conscience. **τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ**: an account of unbelief, *cf.* Gal. vi. 12, Winer, p. 270. **τῇ πίστει**

ὑψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ· 21. εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο· μή πως [1] οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσηται. 22. Ἴδε οὖν χρηστότητα καὶ [n] ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομίαν· ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότητα,[2] ἐὰν ἐπιμείνῃς τῇ χρηστότητι· ἐπεὶ καὶ σὺ ἐκκοπήσῃ· 23. καὶ ἐκεῖνοι δὲ, ἐὰν μὴ ἐπιμείνωσι [3] τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἐγκεντρισθήσονται· δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ Θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς. 24. εἰ γὰρ σὺ ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἐξεκόπης ἀγριελαίου, καὶ παρὰ [o] φύσιν ἐνεκεντρίσθης εἰς [p] καλλιέλαιον, πόσῳ μᾶλλον οὗτοι οἱ κατὰ φύσιν ἐγκεν-

n Here only in N.T.

o Ch. i. 26.

p Here only.

[1] Om. μηπως ℵABCP 47. For φεισηται ℵBCDFL read φεισεται. All crit. edd. read φεισεται, but while most edd. omit μηπως it is retained by Weiss (with DEFGL, most majusc. and fathers) and bracketed by Alford. Weiss finds it impossible to regard it as an insertion, since it makes an easy text irregular and difficult; but its omission, he thinks, need not have been intentional; it may be a mere overlook of the transcriber's.

[2] χρηστοτητα the second time D³FL; but χρηστοτης θεου ABCD¹, and so all edd. For επιμεινης ℵBD¹ read επιμενης, and so most edd. but not Alf.

[3] For επιμεινωσιν ℵ¹BD¹ read επιμενωσιν; see also last verse.

ἕστηκας: the security of the Gentiles depended on faith, and it is the most elementary principle of a religion of faith (iii. 27) that it excludes boasting. μὴ ὑψηλὰ φρόνει: *cf.* xii. 16. 1 Tim. vi. 17 has μὴ ὑψηλοφρονεῖν. Neither is classical. φοβοῦ: consistent with πίστις. *Timor opponitur non fiduciæ sed supercilio et securitati* (Bengel).

Ver. 21. As far as comparisons can be made at all in such things, the Jews had been more securely invested in the kingdom than the Gentiles. They were, in the language of the figure, not artificially grafted, but native branches, on the tree of God's people; yet even that did not prevent Him from cutting off those who did not believe. And if He did not spare them, He will not spare Gentiles either, if in pride they fall from faith. On εἰ . . . οὐκ ἐφείσατο see Winer, 599 f. The true reading of the last word is φείσεται (not φείσηται), but Weiss would retain μήπως (see crit. note) even with this future, and supply the missing link of thought from φοβοῦ: one may fear that he will not, etc. The ironical reserve of this (though the future makes the thing to be feared as certain as possible) is quite Pauline, and the μήπως (DFGL) may be genuine.

Ver. 22. Behold then God's goodness and severity, *sc.*, in the case of the Gentiles and Jews as now before us. ἀποτομία: here only in N.T. The moral idea is that of peremptoriness, inexorableness; in Greek writers it is contrasted with ἡμερότης, τὸ ἐπιεικές, πρᾳότης. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 10. ἐὰν ἐπιμένῃς τῇ χρηστότητι: if you remain on in the goodness, *i.e.*, continue to be indebted to it, and to it alone, for your religious position. This excludes presumption, and in general all such temper as is betrayed in taking an attitude of superiority to the Jews. The Jews lost their standing because they had come to believe that it was indefectible, and independent of moral conditions; and if the Gentiles commit the same mistake they will incur the same doom. It is not to Israel only God may say, The kingdom is taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. ἐπεί, otherwise: see ver. 6.

Ver. 23. κἀκεῖνοι δέ: and they too, they on the other hand, *viz.*, the unbelieving Jews. ἐὰν μὴ κ.τ.λ., unless they remain on in their unbelief. It is assumed that they need not do this. The hardening spoken of in vers. 7-10, though it is a judgment upon sin, and may seem from the nature of the case to be irremediable, is not to be so absolutely taken. Even in the most hardened rejector of the Gospel we are not to limit either the resources of God's power, or the possibilities of change in a self-conscious, self-determining creature. All things are possible to him that believeth, and we are not to say that in this man or that, Jew or Gentile, unbelief is final, and belief an impossibility. If the Jews give up their unbelief ἐγκεντρισθήσονται they will be incorporated again in the true people of God. δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν

τρισθήσονται τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐλαίᾳ; 25. Οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο (ἵνα μὴ ἦτε παρ' ἑαυτοῖς[1] φρόνιμοι), ὅτι πώρωσις ἀπὸ [q] μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν, ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν

q Ch. xv. 15, 24; 2 Cor. i. 14; ii. 5.

[1] **παρ' εαυτοις** ℵCDL; **εν εαυτοις** AB. Weiss, W. and H., Treg. and Alf. put **εν** in text, apparently on the ground that **παρ'** has been conformed to xii. 16; but W. and H. give **παρ'** a place in marg.

ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ. The phrase implies not only the possibility but the difficulty of the operation. *Cf.* xiv. 4. With man it is impossible, but not with God. Nothing less than the thought of God could keep Paul from despairing of the future of Israel.

Ver. 24. God's power to engraft the Jews again into the stock of His people proved *a fortiori* by comparison with what He has done for the Gentiles. To restore His own is more natural, conceivable, and one may even say easy, than to call those who are not His own. The Gentile Christian (1) was cut **ἐκ τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἀγριελαίου,** from what is in its own nature an uncultivated olive, with no suitableness for the uses which the olive is intended to subserve, and (2) **παρὰ φύσιν** in violation of nature was engrafted into a good olive; in comparison with this doubly unnatural process one may well argue **πόσῳ μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.** how much more shall these, the Jews who **κατὰ φύσιν** (in their own nature) belong to the good tree, have their connection with it re-established? Weiss takes **ἐγκεντρισθήσονται** as a logical future, and it may be so; but Paul believes in his logic, and has probably in view in the word that actual restoration of the Jews of which he now proceeds to speak.

Vv. 25-32. In this concluding section Paul abandons the ground of argument for that of revelation. He has discussed the problems arising out of the rejection of Israel and the calling of the Gentiles, when taken in connection with the promises of God to His people; and he has tried to make it clear that in all His dealings with His people, God has acted righteously, that for all that has befallen them the Jews have full responsibility, and that a Divine purpose, with blessing in it to both Jew and Gentile, has indirectly been getting itself carried into effect through this perplexing history. The rejection of the Jews has led to the calling of the Gentiles, and the calling of the Gentiles, by provoking the Jews to jealousy, is eventually to lead to their conversion too. All this, it may be said, is matter of argument; it is more or less convincing as the argument appeals with less or greater force to our minds. It is Paul's construction and interpretation of the facts before him, and his anticipation of the result in which they are likely to issue; but it has no greater authority than the reasoning by which he supports it, or the motives which suggest one line of reasoning upon the facts rather than another. We can understand how patriotism, and religious faith in God's promise, and insight into the psychological influences which determine human conduct, all contribute some weight to his argument; but he is not content to rest upon argument alone the central truth he has been expounding—that the hardening of Israel is temporary as well as partial, and that when "the fulness of the Gentiles" has come in the hardening will cease, and all Israel be saved. He expressly puts this truth forward as a revelation (**μυστήριον,** ver. 25). What this means psychologically we cannot tell, but it is clear that for Paul it was an essential part of the true religion, so far as he could make out the manner of its working in the world. He might try to lead the mind up to it along various lines of argument, or to confirm it by considerations of various kinds; but for him it had a Divine authority, antecedent to argument and independent of it. He sought arguments to make it credible and intelligible, not for his own sake, but for the sake of others. How much a revelation of this kind will weigh with the modern reader depends on the extent to which on general grounds he can recognise in Paul an inspired interpreter of Christianity. History, it must be admitted, throws no light on his words. The Gentiles are not fully gathered in; the time to say whether Israel as a whole is to have any distinct or decisive place in the final fulfilment of God's gracious purpose is therefore not yet. One feels as if the nationalism of the passage fell short of Paul's great word, There is neither Greek nor Jew; but there the Jews are, a problem to unbelief as well as to faith; think what we will of it, it is

ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ· 26. καὶ οὕτω πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται, "Ἥξει ἐκ Σιὼν ὁ ῥυόμενος, καὶ[1] ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ

[1] και before αποστρεψει om. ℵABCD¹F.

of them salvation comes; and it is at least as credible as the reverse (without considering Paul's arguments at all) that Providence is not preserving them for nothing, and that in some such way as is here indicated there is a close connection between their salvation and the salvation of the world.

Ver. 25. **οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν**: *cf.* i. 13, 1 Cor. x. 1, xii. 1, 2 Cor. i. 8, but especially 1 Thess. iv. 13, where as here it is used to introduce a revelation. An often-repeated phrase tends to be formal, but the thing of which Paul would not have his readers ignorant is usually important. As the phrase is invariably followed by **ἀδελφοί**, the latter also tends to be formal: it is at least a mistake to see anything of peculiar intimacy or affection in it in such connections. As ver. 28 and ver. 30 prove, in which they are contrasted with the Jews, the **ἀδελφοί** are Gentiles, and they are practically identical with the Roman Church. **τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο**: the word **μυστήριον** only occurs once in the Synoptical Gospels (Mark iv. 11 and parallels) and not at all in John; but Paul uses it often (twenty-one times, including two in 1 Tim.). It always refers to something which though once hidden, or in its nature a secret, is now revealed. In some passages it is applied to the Christian revelation as a whole (*e.g.*, in Rom. xvi. 25, 1 Cor. ii. 1, Eph. i. 9, Col. ii. 2: in the last it is identified *simpliciter* with Christ). In others it is applied to the Christian revelation as a whole, but with some special aspect of it in view: thus in Eph. iii. 3 the special aspect of "revelation" or "mystery"—for it is all one—in the Gospel is the destined inclusion of the Gentiles among the people of God, while in Col. i. 26 f. it is the indwelling Christ, as the pledge of immortality. In others, again, any particular element in the great revelation is called a "mystery". Thus in 1 Cor. xv. 51 the truth communicated about those who live to see the second advent is described by this name, and it might have been used in the similar passage in 1 Thess. iv. 15, where Paul says instead that he speaks **ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου**. This is merely to claim for his words the authority of revelation in another way. The passage before us comes under this last head. It is a piece of revelation — something which has been communicated to Paul **ἐν ἀποκαλύψει** for the good of the Church —that hardening in part has come upon Israel until the fulness of the Gentiles has come in. The *new* ideas in this revelation are the limits in extent (**ἀπὸ μέρους**) and in time (**ἄχρι οὗ**). **ἵνα μὴ ἦτε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς φρόνιμοι**: it would tend to self-conceit if the Gentiles in ignorance of this Divine appointment concluded off-hand that the Jews could never be converted as a whole, and that they themselves therefore were in a place of permanent and exclusive privilege. For **ἐν ἑαυτοῖς** (AB) **παρ' ἑαυτοῖς** is found in ℵCDL, etc. Both occur in LXX but the former is much more likely to have been changed. **τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν** = the full number, totality, of the Gentiles. It does not mean a number pre-determined beforehand, which has to be made up, whether to answer to the blanks in Israel or to the demands of a Divine decree, but the Gentiles in their full strength. When the Gentiles in their full strength have come in, the power which is to provoke Israel to jealousy will be fully felt, with the result described in ver. 26.

Ver. 26. **καὶ οὕτως** = and thus; not merely temporal, but = under the influence of the jealousy so excited—under the impression produced on the Jews by the sight of the Gentiles in their fulness peopling the kingdom—all Israel shall be saved. This is an independent sentence. For **πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ** see 1 Kings xii. 1, 2 Chron. xii. 1. It means Israel as a whole. Paul is thinking of the historical people, as the contrast with Gentiles shows, but he is not thinking of them one by one. Israel a Christian nation, Israel as a nation a part of the Messianic kingdom, is the content of his thought. To make **πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ** refer to a "spiritual" Israel, or to the elect, is to miss the mark: it foretells a "conversion of the Jews so universal that the separation into an '*elect remnant*' and '*the rest who were hardened*' shall disappear" (Gifford). **καθὼς γέγραπται** Isa. lix. 20 f., but the last words **ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι κ.τ.λ.** from Isa. xxvii. 9. The prophet says **ἕνεκεν**

Ἰακώβ· 27. καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν". 28. Κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ʳ ἐχθροὶ δι' ὑμᾶς· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογήν, ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοὺς ˢ πατέρας. 29. ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλῆσις τοῦ Θεοῦ. 30. ῞Ωσπερ γὰρ καὶ [1] ὑμεῖς ποτε ἠπειθήσατε τῷ Θεῷ, νῦν δὲ ἠλεήθητε τῇ τούτων

r Ch. v. 10.
s Ch. ix. 5.

[1] και before υμεις om. ℵ$^{corr.}$ABCD[1]F. For νυν, which is found in ACDEFGL, νυνι is read in B. W. and H. put νυν in text, νυνι in marg. Weiss puts νυνι in text, thinking that the double νυν in ver. 31 may have induced the dropping of the ι. For other cases, see *Textkritik*, S. 62.

Σίων: Paul's ἐκ Σιὼν is probably a lapse of memory, due to the impression of passages like Ps. xiv. 7, liii. 7, Isa. ii. 3, though Philippi thinks it intentional—the object being to emphasise the title of the Jews, as against the Gentiles, to a share in the kingdom. It is then as if he said: Salvation is *of* the Jews, and surely therefore *for* them. It is impossible to say that ἥξει refers to the first or to the second advent: the distinction is not present to Paul's mind as he writes; all he is concerned with is the fact that in prophetic scripture language is used which implies that Israel as a people is to inherit the Messianic salvation. ὁ ῥυόμενος, Hebrew גֹּאֵל is the Messiah. ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας. *Cf.* Bar. iii. 7, 1 Macc. iv. 58.

Ver. 27. καὶ αὕτη κ.τ.λ. This is My covenant with them = this is the constitution which I give them to live under. Weiss interprets this by what follows, making the αὕτη prospective, but this is somewhat forced. The διαθήκη is not equivalent to the removal of sins, though it is based upon it: it covers the whole condition introduced by that removal. *Cf.* Jer. xxxi. 31 ff. The deliverance referred to in vers. 26 and 27, though promised to Israel as a whole, is a religious and ethical one. It has no political significance, and nothing to do with any assumed restoration of the Jews to Canaan. This is obvious even apart from the argument of Weiss that the deliverance in question is to be immediately followed by the resurrection; an argument which depends on a doubtful interpretation of ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν ver. 15.

Ver. 28. κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. In both clauses κατὰ defines the rule by which God's relation to Israel is determined. When He looks at the Gospel, which they have rejected, they are ἐχθροί, objects of His hostility, and that δι' ὑμᾶς, for the sake of the Gentiles, to whom the Gospel in this way comes; when He looks at the ἐκλογή, the choice which He made of Israel to be His people, they are ἀγαπητοί, objects of His love, and that διὰ τοὺς πατέρας, on account of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, with whom He made an everlasting covenant (*cf.* Gen. xvii. 19, Luke i. 54 f.). The passive meaning of ἐχθροὶ is fixed by the contrast with ἀγαπητοί, as well as by the logic of the passage: *cf.* v. 10.

Ver. 29. Proof that the Israelites, in virtue of their relation to the fathers, are objects of God's love. ἀμεταμέλητα *cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 10: it may mean either what is not or what cannot be repented of: here the latter. God's gifts of grace, and His calling, are things upon which there is no going back. The χαρίσματα are not the moral and intellectual qualifications with which Israel was endowed for its mission in the world (Godet), but the privileges of grace enumerated in chap. ix. 4 f. Neither is the κλῆσις of God a "calling" in the modern sense of a vocation or career assigned to any one by Him; it is His authoritative invitation to a part in the Messianic kingdom. From Israel these things can never be withdrawn.

Vv. 30-32. There is the less need, too, that they should be withdrawn, because God makes the very misuse of them contribute to the working out of His universal purpose of redemption. The past unbelief of the Gentiles and the mercy they presently enjoy, the present unbelief of the Jews and the mercy they are destined to enjoy in the future—these things not only correspond to each other, but they are interwoven with each other; they are parts of a system which God controls, and in which every element conditions and is conditioned by all the rest: there is a Divine necessity pervading and controlling all the freedom of men—a Divine purpose mastering all the random activity of human wills; a purpose which is read

ἀπειθείᾳ· 31. οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι νῦν ἠπείθησαν, τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ[1] ἐλεηθῶσι· 32. συνέκλεισε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ. 33. Ὦ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως Θεοῦ! ὡς ἀνεξερεύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ, καὶ

[1] After αυτοι ℵBD[1] ins. νυν; and so Tischdf. and W. and H., not Weiss, who regards it as a mere mechanical repetition. Some cursives have ὕστερον.

out by the Apostle in verse 32: God shut them all up into disobedience that He might have mercy upon them all. Ver. 30. ποτὲ: once, in the past, chap. i. 18-32. τῇ τούτων ἀπειθείᾳ = owing to their disobedience. *Cf.* vers. 11, 15. Ver. 31. τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει is to be construed with ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ νῦν ἐλεηθῶσιν. For the order *cf.* Gal. ii. 10, 2 Cor. xii. 7. It seems pedantic to make the construction strictly parallel to τῇ τούτων ἀπειθίᾳ, and to translate: "that owing to the mercy shown to you—*i.e.*, owing to the jealousy to which the Jews would be stirred at seeing the Gentiles the objects of Divine mercy—they also may obtain mercy"; the simpler construction is to take the dative as explanatory of the verb, and to translate: "that they may be made the objects of the very same mercy which has been shown to you". This is really the point which the Apostle wishes to be at; though the idea brought out in the former rendering is essential in the passage, it is not essential, nor obvious, in these particular words. The second νῦν (wanting in AD**FGL) is probably genuine (ℵB), but cannot be forced to mean more than "now in their turn". The imminence of the result is not in view. Ver. 32. συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθιαν: this is the nearest approach made in the N.T. to putting the sin of man into a direct and positive relation to the act and purpose of God. But it would be a mistake to draw inferences from the concrete historical problem before the Apostle—*viz.*, God's dealings with Jew and Gentile, and the mutual relations and influence of Jew and Gentile in the evolution of God's purpose—and to apply them to the general abstract question of the relation of the human will to the Divine. Paul is not thinking of this question at all, and his authority could not be claimed for such inferences. Salvation, he sees, as he looks at the world before him, is to come to Jew and Gentile alike by the way of free grace; and it answers to this, that in the providence of God, Jew and Gentile alike have been made to feel the need of grace by being shut up under disobedience. It is within Paul's thought to say that the sin of Jews and Gentiles, to whom he preached the Gospel, did not lie outside the control, or outside the redeeming purpose, of God; but it does not seem to me to be within his thought to say that God ordains sin in general for the sake of, or with a view to, redemption. This is a fancy question which an apostle would hardly discuss. God subordinates sin to His purpose, but it is not a subordinate element in His purpose. The same order of considerations ought to guide us in the interpretation of τοὺς πάντας. "Them all" certainly refers in the first instance to Jews and Gentiles. It is not the same as τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους, "both parties"; but it differs from it in its present connection only by giving emphasis to the fact that both parties consist of numbers, to all of whom the truth here stated applies. To find here a doctrine of universal salvation—a dogmatic assertion that every man will at last receive mercy—is simply to desert the ground on which the Apostle is standing. It is to leave off thinking about the concrete problem before his mind, and to start thinking about something quite different. It is gratuitous to contrast, as, *e.g.*, is done by Lipsius, this passage with others in which Paul speaks of ἀπολλύμενοι as well as σωζόμενοι, and to say that they represent irreconcilable view-points—the Apostle speaking in the present instance from the standpoint of Divine teleology; in the other, from that of actual experience. The truth is, as Weiss puts it, there is not a word here to show how far, when the history of man has reached its term, Paul conceived God's saving purpose to be realised. συνέκλεισεν answering to הִסְגִּיר is frequent in LXX: the συν does not refer to the fact that Jews and Gentiles are shut up *together*, but indicates that those who are shut up are shut up on all sides, so that they cannot escape: *cf. con-cludo* and examples in Gal. iii. 22, Ps. xxx. 9 LXX. ἐλεήσῃ:

t Eph. iii. 8. [t] ἀνεξιχνίαστοι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ. 34. "τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου; ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο;" 35. ἢ "τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ;" 36. ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα· αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

"to have mercy upon" means "to make partakers of that '*common salvation*' (Jude 3) which is emphatically a dispensation of mercy" (Gifford).

Ver. 33. **ὢ βάθος πλούτου κ.τ.λ.** In ver. 32 the content of the chapter is no doubt condensed, but it is more natural to regard the doxology as prompted by the view of God's Providence which pervades the whole discussion than by the one sentence in which it is summed up. **βάθος**: a universal figure for what is immeasurable or incalculable: *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 10, Apoc. ii. 24, Eph. iii. 18. The genitives **πλούτου, σοφίας** and **γνώσεως** are most simply construed as co-ordinate. For **πλοῦτος** used thus absolutely see Eph. iii. 8, Phil. iv. 19. Perhaps the key to the meaning here is to be found in x. 12: what Paul adores is the unsearchable wealth of love that enables God to meet and far more than meet the appalling necessities of the world; love less deep would soon be bankrupt at the task. In **σοφία** and **γνῶσις** the intellectual resources are brought into view with which God has ordered, disposed and controlled all the forces of the world and of man's history so as to make them subservient to His love. The world, with its conflict of races, religions, passions and even vices, may seem to be a realm of chaos; but when we see it in the light of God as Paul did, we see the signs of wisdom and knowledge, of a conscious purpose transcending human thought, and calling forth adoring praise. For the distinction of **σοφία** and **γνῶσις**, which especially in relation to God is to be felt rather than defined, see Trench, *N.T. Synonyms*, § lxxv. **τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ**: except 1 Cor. vi. 7 which is different, this is the only example of **κρίματα** (plural) in the N.T. It is probably used not in the narrower sense (which would be illustrated by reference, *e.g.*, to the "hardening" of Israel), but in the wider sense of the Hebrew מִשְׁפָּטִים, to which it often answers in the LXX. In Ps. xxxvi. 6 we have **τὰ κρίματά σου ἄβυσσος πολλή**: where Cheyne's note is, "Thy judgments—in their various effects of destruction and salvation". This is Paul's thought; hence **τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ** and **αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ** are practically the same. As Moses says (Deut. xxxii. 4), *All* His *ways* are *judgment*.

Ver. 34. Proof from Scripture of the unsearchableness of God's ways: He has had no confidant. Isa. xl. 13, 1 Cor. ii. 16. It is mere pedantry to refer half the verse to **σοφία** and the other half to **γνῶσις**.

Ver. 35. **ἢ τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ**; see Job xli. 11 (A.V.). The translation of Job xli. 3, Hebrew, is perhaps Paul's own, as the LXX is entirely different and wrong. The point of the quotation has been variously explained. If it continues the proof of ver. 33, the underlying assumption is that God's ways *would* be finite and comprehensible if they were determined by what men had done, so as merely to requite that. It seems better, however, to read the words in the largest sense, and then they express the fundamental truth of religion as Paul understood it—*viz.*, that the initiative in religion belongs to God; or as he puts it elsewhere, that we have nothing we did not receive, and that boasting is excluded. The relation of man to God in these conditions is one which naturally expresses itself in doxology.

Ver. 36. **ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.** Strictly speaking, the **ὅτι** confirms the last truth —man's absolute dependence on God— by making it part of a wider generalisation. **ἐξ αὐτοῦ**: from Him, as their source; **δι' αὐτοῦ**: through Him, as the power by whose continuous energy the world is sustained and ruled; **εἰς αὐτὸν**: unto Him, as their goal, for whose glory they exist. A reference of any kind to the Trinity is out of the question. It is a question, however, whether **τὰ πάντα** means "all things" in the sense of the universe (*cf.* 1 Cor. viii. 6, Col. i. 16, Heb. ii. 10) or whether it is not limited by the article to all the things which have just been in contemplation, the whole marvellous action of God's riches and wisdom and knowledge, as interpreted by the Apostle in regard to the work of redemption (for an example of **τὰ πάντα** in this sense see 2 Cor. v. 18). I incline to the last view. The universe of grace, with all that goes on in it for the common salvation of Jew and Gentile, is of God and through God and to

XII. 1. ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΩ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [a] διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον

a Ch. xv. 30; 2 Cor. x. 1.

God. To Him be the glory which such a display of wisdom and love demands.

CHAPTER XII. The distinction of doctrinal and practical is not one that can be pressed anywhere in the N.T., and as little in Paul as in any other writer. It is under practical compulsion of some kind that he develops most of his characteristic doctrines, and he has no doctrines which do not imply a corresponding practice. Yet the distinction does exist, and the remainder of this epistle, especially chaps. xii. 1-xv. 13, may be properly described as the practical part of it. Not that it is independent of the other. On the contrary, it is nothing but the application of it. (οὖν ver. 1.) Christian ethics are relative to the Christian revelation. It is the relations in which we stand that determine our duties, and the new relations in which we are set both to God and to other men by faith in Jesus Christ have a new morality corresponding to them. There is such a thing as a Christian ethic with a range, a delicacy, a flavour, all its own. There is no formal exposition of it here, though perhaps the nearest approach to such a thing that we have in the N.T., but a comprehensive illustration of it in a variety of bearings. Paul starts (xii. 1 f.) with a general exhortation, covering the whole Christian life. From this he proceeds to the spirit and temper which ought to characterise Christians as members of the same society, dwelling especially on the graces of humility and love (xii. 3-21). In the following chapter he discusses the duties of the individual to his legal superiors (xiii. 1-7); his duties to his neighbour, as comprehended in the love which fulfils the law (xiii. 8-10); and the urgent duty of sanctification in view of the Parousia. With chap. xiv. he comes to a different subject, and one apparently of peculiar interest in Rome at the time. It is one of those questions in which the claim of Christian liberty has to accommodate itself to the social necessity created by the weakness of brethren, and the discussion of it extends from xiv. 1-xv. 13, and concludes the "practical" part of the epistle.

Ver. 1. παρακαλῶ οὖν: the reference is to all that has been said since i. 16, but especially to what more closely precedes. *Cf.* Eph. iv. 1, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 1 Cor. iv. 16. The οὖν connects the two parts of the epistle, not formally but really, and shows the dependence of the "practical" upon the "doctrinal". It is the new world of realities to which the soul is introduced by the Christian revelation on which Christian morality depends. It is relative to that world, and would become unreal along with it. διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν: for the substantive see 2 Cor. i. 3 (= רַחֲמִים, which has no singular). διὰ in such expressions (*cf.* 1 Cor. i. 10, 2 Cor. x. 1) indicates that in which the motive is found: Winer, p. 477. The mercies are those which God has shown in the work of redemption through Christ. παραστῆσαι is not *per se* sacrificial: in chap. vi. 13, 16, 19 it is used of putting the body at the disposal of God or of sin: see also 2 Cor. iv. 14, xi. 2, Col. i. 22, 28, Eph. v. 27. τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν is not exactly the same as ὑμᾶς αὐτούς, yet no stress is to be laid on the words as though Paul were requiring the sanctification of the body as opposed to the spirit: the body is in view here as the instrument by which *all* human service is rendered to God, and the service which it does render, in the manner supposed, is not a bodily but a spiritual service. θυσίαν ζῶσαν: "living," as opposed to the slain animals offered by the Jews. This seems to be the only case in which the new life as a whole is spoken of by Paul as a sacrifice—a thank offering—to God. A more limited use of the idea of θυσίᾳ is seen in Phil. ii. 17, iv. 18; *cf.* also Heb. xiii. 15 f., 1 Pet. ii. 5. ἁγίαν: contrast i. 24. εὐάρεστον according to all analogy (see concordance) should go with τῷ Θεῷ, and this is secured by the order of the words in Aℵ vulg. τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν: in apposition not to τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν but to the presenting of the body as a living sacrifice. For other examples see Winer, 669. λατρεία (ix. 4, Heb. ix. 1, 6, John xvi. 2) is *cultus*, ritual service, worship; and such a presentation of the body, as the organ of all moral action, to God, is the only thing that can be characterised as λογικὴ λατρεία, spiritual worship. Any other worship, any retention of Jewish or pagan rites, anything coming under the description of *opus operatum*, is foreign to the Christian θυσίᾳ; it is λατρεία which is *not* λογική, not appropriate to a being whose essence is λόγος, *i.e.*, reason or spirit.

b 1 Pet. ii. 1.
c Ch. ix. 4.
d Matt. xvii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 18.

τῷ Θεῷ,[1] τὴν [b] λογικὴν [c] λατρείαν ὑμῶν· 2. καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ [d] μεταμορφοῦσθε [2] τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον. 3. Λέγω γάρ, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι, παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν, μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ᾽ ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς

[1] **τω θεω** before **ευαρεστον** ℵ[1]AP, vulg. So W. and H. text, but marg. as rec. Weiss. on the ground that **τω θεω** is to be construed with **παραστησαι**, keeps these words to the end.

[2] **συνσχηματιζεσθε . . . μεταμορφουσθε**; so BLP, W. and H. text; but **συνσχηματιζεσθαι** and **μεταμορφουσθαι** in AB[2]D[1] (gr.) F. The infin. is read by Lachm. and in marg. by Treg. and W. and H., but is obviously an alteration of the imperative to have it construed with **παρακαλω** (Weiss). **υμων** after **νοος** is om. by ABD[1] (gr.) F 47 and all edd.

Ver. 2. **καὶ μὴ συνσχηματίζεσθε**: the imperative is better supported (BLP) than the infinitive (ADFG). For the word *cf.* 1 Pet. i. 14. The distinctions that have been drawn between **συνσχηματίζεσθε** and **μεταμορφοῦσθε**—on the ground of other distinctions assumed between **σχῆμα** and **μορφή**—though supported by distinguished scholars, remind one of the shrewd remark of Jowett, that there is a more dangerous deficiency for the commentator than ignorance of Greek, namely, ignorance of language. In the face of such examples as are quoted by Weiss (Plut., *Mor.*, p. 719 B: **τὸ μεμορφωμένον καὶ ἐσχηματισμένον**: Eur., *Iph. T.*, 292, **μορφῆς σχήματα**) and Wetstein (Sext. Emp., **ἣ μένει μὲν ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ ὑποστάσει, εἰς ἄλλο δὲ εἶδος ἀντ᾽ ἄλλου μεταλαμβάνον γεννᾶται, ὡς ὁ μετασχηματιζόμενος κηρός, καὶ ἄλλοτε ἄλλην μορφὴν ἀναδεχόμενος**) it is impossible not to regard the distinctions in question as very arbitrary. For the best supported and most relevant, reflected in Sanday and Headlam's paraphrase ("do not adopt *the external and fleeting fashion* of this world, but be ye transformed *in your inmost nature*"), see Lightfoot on Phil. ii. 7, or Gifford on the same passage (*The Incarnation*, pp. 22 ff., 88 ff.). **τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ**: "This world" or "age" is opposed to that which is to come; it is an evil world (Gal. i. 4) of which Satan is the God (2 Cor. iv. 4). Even apparent or superficial conformity to a system controlled by such a spirit, much more an actual accommodation to its ways, would be fatal to the Christian life. By nature, the Christian is at home in this world (*cf.* Eph. ii. 2); such as it is, its life and his life are one; and his deliverance is accomplished as he is transformed **τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοός**, by the renewing of his mind. **νοῦς** in the Apostle's usage (see chap. vii.) is both intellectual and moral—the practical reason, or moral consciousness. This is corrupted and atrophied in the natural man, and renewed by the action of the Holy Spirit. The process would in modern language be described rather as sanctification than regeneration, but regeneration is assumed (Tit. iii. 5). **εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν**: this is the purpose of the transforming renewal of the mind. It is that Christians may prove, *i.e.*, discern in their experience, what the will of God is. *Cf.* ii. 18. An unrenewed mind cannot do this; it is destitute of moral discernment—has no proper moral faculty. **τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον**: these words may either qualify **τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ** as in A.V., or be in apposition to it, as in R.V. margin. The last agrees better with the rhythm of the sentence. The will of God is identified with what is **ἀγαθόν**, good in the moral sense; **εὐάρεστον** well pleasing, *sc.*, to God (so in all the nine cases of the adjective and three of the verb **εὐαρεστεῖν** which are found in the N.T.); and **τέλειον** ethically adequate or complete: Dt. xviii. 13, Mt. v. 48. No one discovers the line of action which from possessing these characteristics can be identified as the will of God unless he is transformed from his native affinity to the world by the renewing of his mind by the Holy Spirit.

Vers. 3-8. The duties of members of the Church as such: avoidance of self-exaltation, and mutual service in the measure of the gift bestowed on each. **λέγω γάρ**: the **γὰρ** indicates that "humility is the immediate effect of self-surrender to God" (Gifford). **διὰ τῆς χάριτος κ.τ.λ.** Paul illustrates in his own person, in giving this advice, the

τὸ ᵉσωφρονεῖν, ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ἐμέρισεᶠ μέτρον πί τεως. 4. Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι μέλη πολλὰ[1] ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ μέλη πάντα οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει πρᾶξιν· 5. οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ, ὁ[2] δὲ καθ' εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη, 6. ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα· εἴτ προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν

e 2 Cor. v. 13; Tit. ii. 6.
f Eph. iv. 7, 13, 16.

[1] For μελη πολλα ALP read πολλα μελη with ℵBDF latt. and most edd; but W. and H. give μελη πολλα a place in marg.

[2] For οι (altered to agree with εις ?) read το δε ℵABD¹F gr. P. 47.

rule he is laying down for the Church. He speaks "through the grace given him," and therefore without presumption;. but he does speak, and so puts his wisdom and love at the service of the Church. παντὶ τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν: everybody in the Church needed this word. To himself, every man is in a sense the most important person in the world, and it always needs much grace to see what other people are, and to keep a sense of moral proportion. μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν: ὑπερφρονεῖν here only in N.T., but a common word. παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν: beyond the mind or habit of thought one ought to have. For this use of παρὰ see xiv. 5, Lc. xiii. 2, Heb. i. 9. φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν: to cherish a habit of thought tending to sobriety of mind. σωφροσύνη is described by Jos., *Macc.* 2 f., as giving man dominion not only over bodily ἐπιθυμίαι but also over those of the soul, such as φιλαρχία, κενοδοξία, ἀλαζονεία, μεγαλαυχία, βασκανία. These are precisely the qualities to which Paul opposes it here. φρονεῖν and its cognates are favourite words with Paul: what they all suggest is the importance to character, especially to Christian character, of the prevailing mood of the mind—the moral temper, as it might be called. It should always tend to sobriety; but he gives a special rule for it in ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως. ἑκάστῳ is governed by ἐμέρισεν: its place makes it emphatic. *Cf.* 1 Cor. iii. 5. Whatever the characteristic of any individual may be, it is due to the discriminating act of God in measuring out faith to him in greater or less degree. Taken in connection with what precedes, the idea seems to be: There are *various* degrees of self-estimation proper, for God gives one more and another less; but all are fundamentally regulated by humility, for no one has anything that he has not received. 1 Cor. iv. 7.

Ver. 4 f. καθάπερ γὰρ: For language and figure *cf.* 1 Cor. xii. 12. Also Eph. iv. 15 f., Col. i. 18. The comparison of the community to a body—the social organism—is very common in classical writers: see Wetstein and Jowett here. πρᾶξιν: viii. 13. It is that at which the member works—in modern language, its function. Every member has its gift, but it is limited by the fact that it is no more than a member: it is not the whole body. 1 Cor. xii. 17. οἱ πολλοὶ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ: many as we are, we are one body in Christ; it is the common relation to Him which unites us. In the later passages in which Paul uses this figure (Eph., Col.), Christ is spoken of as the Head of the body; but both here and in 1 Cor. xii. it would agree better with our instinctive use of the figure to speak of Him as its soul. His own figure of the vine and the branches combines the advantages of both. τὸ δὲ καθ' εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη: this qualifies the unity asserted in ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν. It is not a unity in which individuality is lost; on the contrary, the individuals retain their value, only not as independent wholes, but as members one of another. Each and all exist only in each other. 1 Cor. xii. 27. For τὸ καθ' εἷς see Winer, 312.

Ver. 6 ff. At this point an application, apparently, is made of what has been said in vers. 4 and 5, but the grammar is very difficult. Both A.V. and R.V. supply what is needed in order to read the verses as an exhortation; thus in ver. 6, "*let us prophesy*"; in ver. 7, "*let us wait*"; and in ver. 8, answering to the change of construction in the Greek, "*let him do it*". This is the simplest way out of the difficulty, and is followed by many scholars (Meyer, Lipsius, Gifford). But it is not beyond doubt, and there is something to say for the more rigorous construction adopted by Weiss and others, who put only a comma after μέλη at the end of ver. 5, and construe ἔχοντες with ἐσμεν. In either case, there is an apo-

g Here only. [g] ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως· 7. εἴτε διακονίαν, ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ. εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων, ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ· 8. εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν, ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει· ὁ μεταδιδοὺς, ἐν ἁπλότητι· ὁ προϊστάμενος, ἐν σπουδῇ· ὁ ἐλεῶν, ἐν ἱλαρότητι.

dosis to be supplied; but while in the former case it is hinted at in the second half of every clause (as is seen in our English Bibles), in the latter it is simply forgotten. It is as if Paul had said, "We are members one of another, and have gifts differing according to the grace given to us; our gift may be prophecy, prophecy in the proportion of our faith; it may be **διακονία** in the sphere appropriate for that; another instance would be that of the teacher in *his* department, or of the exhorter in *his;* or again you may have the distributor, whose gift is in the form of **ἁπλότης**; or the ruler, who is divinely qualified for his function by the gift of **σπουδή**, moral earnestness; or the man who to show mercy is endowed with a cheerful disposition". All this *requires* an apodosis, but partly because of its length, partly because of the changes in construction as the Apostle proceeds, the apodosis is overlooked. Its import, however, would not vary, as in the A.V., from clause to clause, but would be the same for all the clauses together. Even with the ordinary punctuation, which puts a period at the end of ver. 5, I prefer this reading of the passage. The varying apodoses supplied in the English Bible to the separate clauses are really irrelevant; what is wanted is a common apodosis to the whole conception. "Now having gifts differing according to the grace given to us—as one may see by glancing at the phenomena of church life—let us use them with humility (remembering that they *are* gifts) and with love (inasmuch as we are members one of another)." It is easier to suppose that the construction was suspended, and gradually changed, with some general conclusion like this before the mind from the beginning, than that it broke down, so to speak, as soon as it began; which we must suppose if we insert **προφητεύωμεν** in ver. 6. But it is not a question which can be infallibly decided. It ought to be observed that there is no hint of anything official in this passage; *all* ministry is a function of membership in the body, and *every* member has the function of ministry to some intent or other. **χαρίσματα**: i. 11, 1 Cor. i. 7, xii. 4, 9, 31, 1 P. iv. 10. With the exception of 1 P. iv. 10 (which is not without relation to this passage) Paul alone uses **χάρισμα** in the N.T. Every **χάρισμα** is a gift of the Holy Spirit given to the believer for the good of the Church. Some were supernatural (gifts of healings, etc.), others spiritual in the narrower sense: this passage is the best illustration of the word. **τὴν δοθεῖσαν**, *sc.*, when we believed. **προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. προφητεία** is the highest of **χαρίσματα**, 1 Cor. xiv. 1 ff. When one has it, he has it **κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογ. τῆς πίστεως** = in the proportion of his faith. The faith meant is that referred to in ver. 3, the measure of which is assigned by God: and since this is the case, it is obviously absurd for a man to give himself airs—**ὑπερφρονεῖν**—on the strength of being a **προφήτης**: this would amount to forgetting that in whatever degree he has the gift, he owes it absolutely to God. The expression **προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως** implies that the more faith one has—the more completely Christian he is—the greater the prophetic endowment will be. [In theology, "the analogy of the faith" is used in quite a different sense, though it was supposed to be justified by this passage. To interpret Scripture, *e.g.*, according to the analogy of the faith meant to interpret the parts, especially difficult or obscure parts, in consistency with the whole. The scope of the whole, again, was supposed to be represented in the creed or rule of faith; and to interpret **κατὰ τ. ἀ. τ. πίστεως** meant simply not to run counter to the creed. In the passage before us this is an anachronism as well as an irrelevance. There was no rule of faith when the Apostle was thinking out the original interpretation of Christianity contained in this epistle; and there is no exhortation or warning, but only a description of fact, in the words.] **διακονία** as opposed to **προφητεία** and the other functions mentioned here probably refers to such services as were material rather than spiritual: they were spiritual however (though connected only with helping the poor, or with the place or forms of worship) because prompted by the Spirit and done in it. One who has this

9. Ἡ ἀγάπη [h] ἀνυπόκριτος. ἀποστυγοῦντες τὸ πονηρὸν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ· 10. τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλόστοργοι. τῇ τιμῇ

h 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Tim. i. 5; Jas. iii. 17.

gift has it ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, *i.e.*, in the qualities and in the sphere proper to it: it is in its own nature limited; it is what it is, and nothing else, and fits a man for this function and no other. This is not "otiose," and it provides a good meaning without importing anything. ὁ διδάσκων ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ: it is in his teaching that the διδάσκαλος possesses the gift peculiar to him: 1 Cor. xiv. 26. ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει: so again with the exhorter, the man who speaks words of encouragement: *cf.* xv. 4, 5; Acts iv. 36, ix. 31, xiii. 15. It is in his παράκλησις, and not in something else, that his χάρισμα lies. Thus far Paul has not defined the quality of the χαρίσματα, or shown in what they consist; the functionary is merely said to have his gift in his function—teaching, exhorting, or service. But in the cases which follow, he tells us what the gift, proper to the special functions in view, is; in other words, what is the spiritual quality which, when divinely bestowed, capacitates a man to do this or that for the Church. Thus there is ὁ μεταδιδούς (*cf.* Eph. iv. 28, Luc. iii. 11), the man who imparts of his means to those who need; he has his χάρισμα in ἁπλότης. *Cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 11, 13; James i. 5. It is not exactly "liberality," though in these passages it approaches that sense: it is the quality of a mind which has no *arrière-pensée* in what it does; when it gives, it does so because it sees and feels the need, and for no other reason; this is the sort of mind which *is* liberal, and God assigns a man the function of μεταδιδόναι when He bestows this mind on him by His Spirit. ὁ προϊστάμενος is the person who takes the lead in any way. He might or might not be an official (1 Thess. v. 12, 1 Tim. v. 17, 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12: *cf.* also πρόστατις xvi. 2, and Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 126 f.); but in any case he had the χάρισμα which fitted him for his special function in σπουδή, moral earnestness or vigour. A serious masculine type of character is the pre-supposition for this gift. Finally ὁ ἐλεῶν, he who does deeds of kindness, has his *charisma* in ἱλαρότης. A person of a grudging or despondent mood has not the endowment for showing mercy. He who is to visit the poor, the sick, the sorrowful, will be marked out by God for His special ministry by this endowment of brightness and good cheer. *Cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 7 = Prov. xxii. 8 and Sir. xxxii. (xxxv.) 11: ἐν πάσῃ δόσει ἱλάρωσον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου, καὶ ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ ἁγίασον δεκάτην.

Vv. 9-21. As far as any single idea pervades the rest of the chapter it is that of the first words in ver. 9: ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. The passage as a whole has a strong affinity to 1 Cor. xiii., and along with what may be a reminiscence of our Lord's words, it has something intensely and characteristically Christian. Whatever the grammatical construction may be—and all through the chapter Paul displays an indifference in this respect which is singular even in him—the intention must be supposed to be hortatory, so that it is most natural to supply imperatives (ἔστω or ἐστέ) with the numerous participles.

Ver. 9. ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος: see 2 Cor. vi. 6, 1 Pet. i. 22. Probably the following clauses ἀποστυγοῦντες . . . κολλώμενοι κ.τ.λ. are meant to explain this. Love is undissembled, it is the unaffected Christian grace, when it shrinks, as with a physical horror, from that which is evil (even in those whom it loves), and cleaves to that which is good. στυγεῖν according to Eustath. in *Il.* α, p. 58 (quoted by Wetstein) adds the idea of φρίσσειν to that of μισεῖν: the ἀπο intensifies the idea of aversion or repulsion. Love is not a principle of mutual indulgence; in the Gospel it is a moral principle, and like Christ Who is the only perfect example of love, it has always something inexorable about it. *He* never condoned evil. τῷ ἀγαθῷ is neuter, like τὸ πονηρόν, though κολλᾶσθαι can be used of persons (1 Cor. vi. 16 f.) as well as things.

Ver. 10. τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ = in point of brotherly love, *i.e.*, your love to each other as children in the one family of God. *Cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 9, Heb. xiii. 9, 1 Pet. i. 22, 2 Pet. i. 7, 1 Pet. iii. 8. ἀδελφὸς in the apostolic writings does not mean fellow-man, but fellow-Christian; and φιλαδελφία is the mutual affection of the members of the Christian community. In this they are to be φιλόστοργοι, "tenderly affectioned". The moral purity required in ver. 9 is not to be the only mark of Christian love; since they are members of one family, their love is to have the characters of strong natural

l Here only. k Matt. xxv. 26.

ἀλλήλους [l]προηγούμενοι· 11. τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ [k]ὀκνηροί, τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες, τῷ Κυρίῳ [1] δουλεύοντες· 12. τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες, τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες, τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες· 13. ταῖς χρείαις [2] τῶν

[1] For κυριω ℵABD[2,3]LP, etc., some Western authorities (D[1]F gr. G lat.) read καιρω, and this appears in the received text, though not in the A.V. The confusion may have arisen from a contraction of the one word being mistaken for that of the other; but was "probably supported by a sense of the difficulty of so comprehensive a clause as τῳ κυριῳ δουλευοντες in the midst of a series of clauses of limited sense" (W. and H., Appendix, p. 110).

[2] ταις χρειαις ℵABD[3]LP is no doubt the correct reading, but there is a curious variant ταις μνειαις in DFG, some MSS. known to Theod. Mops., and in the Lat. transl. of Origen, where, after *usibus* (= χρειαις) *sanctorum communicantes*, we read *Memini in latinis exemplaribus magis haberi, memoriis sanctorum communicantes* Evidently, as S. and H. remark, this must have arisen at a time when the αγιοι were no longer the members of the community and fellow-Christians whose bodily wants required to be relieved, but the "saints" of the past whose lives were to be commemorated.

affection (στοργή); it is to be warm, spontaneous, constant. τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι: "in honour preferring one another". This, which is the rendering of both our English versions, is a good Pauline idea (Phil. ii. 3), but gives προηγούμενοι a meaning not found elsewhere. Hence others render: "in showing honour—*i.e.*, to those whose χαρίσματα entitle them to respect in the Church—giving each other a lead": each, so to speak, being readier than the other to recognise and honour God's gifts in a brother. In this sense, however, προηγούμενοι would rather take the genitive (see Liddell and Scott, who seem, nevertheless, to adopt this rendering); and probably the former, which involves only a natural extension of the meaning of the word, is to be preferred.

Ver. 11. τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί: σπουδὴ occurs twelve times in the N.T., and is translated in our A.V. seven different ways. It denotes the moral earnestness with which one should give himself to his vocation. In this Christians are not to be backward: Acts ix. 38. τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες: the same figure is frequent in the classics, and we still speak of the blood "boiling". The spiritual temperature is to be high in the Christian community: *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 20, Acts xviii. 25. If we are to distinguish at all, the πνεῦμα meant is the Spirit of God, though it is that spirit as bestowed upon man. τῷ κυρίῳ δουλεύοντες: we can point to no special connection for this clause. Perhaps the thought is on the same lines as in 1 Cor. xii. 4 f.: there are spiritual gifts of all kinds, but one service in which they are all exhausted—the service of Christ—and in that we must be constantly engaged.

Ver. 12. τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες: the hope in which they are to rejoice is that of Christians: *cf.* v. 2. The meaning is practically the same as in that passage, but the mental representation is not. τῇ ἐλπίδι is not = ἐπ' ἐλπίδι there, but in a line with the other datives here: in point of hope, rejoicing. τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες: ὑπομ. might have been construed with the accusative (τὴν θλῖψιν), but the absolute use of it, as here, is common (see Mt. x. 22, Jas. v. 11, 1 Pet. ii. 20), and its employment in this instance enables the writer to conform the clause grammatically to the others. τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτεροῦντες: *cf.* Col. iv. 2, Acts i. 14, ii. 42. The strong word suggests not only the constancy with which they are to pray, but the effort that is needed to maintain a habit so much above nature.

Ver. 13. ταῖς χρείαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες: "the saints" as in viii. 27, 1 Tim. v. 10 are Christians generally. The curious variant ταῖς μνείαις—"taking part in the commemorations of the saints"—dates from an age at which "the saints" were no longer Christians in general, but a select few, as a rule martyrs or confessors in the technical sense. Weiss asserts that the active sense of κοινωνεῖν, to communicate or impart, is foreign to the N.T., but it is difficult to maintain this if we look to such examples as this and Gal. vi. 6, and also to the use of κοινωνία in 2 Cor. ix. 13 (where ἁπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς means the liberality of your *contribution* to them), and Heb. xiii. 16, where κοινωνία is a synonym of εὐποιία,

ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες, τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες. 14. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς· εὐλογεῖτε, καὶ μὴ [1] καταρᾶσθε. 15. Χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, καὶ [1] κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. 16. τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες· μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς· 17. μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδιδόντες. προνοούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρώπων·

l Luke vi. 28.

[1] και before κλαιειν om. ℵBD[1]F; ins. AD[3]LP 47. W. and H. put in marg.; Weiss in text, regarding its omission as merely accidental.

and certainly active. **τὴν φιλοξενίαν διώκοντες**: to devote oneself to entertaining them when they were strangers was one chief way of distributing to the needs of the saints. Hospitality, in the sense of the N.T. (Heb. xiii. 2, 1 Pet. iv. 9), is not akin to "keeping company," or "open house"; it is a form of charity much needed by travelling, exiled, or persecuted Christians. The terms in which it is spoken of in Clem. Rom. (quoted in S. and H.: διὰ πίστιν καὶ φιλοξενίαν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ—*i.e.*, Abraham—υἱὸς ἐν γήρᾳ: or, διὰ φιλοξενίαν καὶ εὐσέβειαν Λὼτ ἐσώθη) may seem extravagant; but the key to them, and to all the apostolic emphasis on the subject, is to be found in Matt. xxv. 34-36.

Ver. 14. **εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας, εὐλ. κ. μὴ καταρᾶσθε**: not a quotation of Mt. v. 44, but probably a reminiscence of the same saying of Jesus. The change in construction from participle to imperative, the participle being resumed in the next sentence, suggests that the form of the sentence was *given* to Paul—*i.e.*, he was consciously using borrowed words without modifying them to suit the sentence he had begun on his own account. It may be that when Paul said διώκοντες in ver. 13, the other sense of the word passed through his mind and prompted ver. 14; but even if we could be sure of this (which we cannot) we should not understand either verse a whit better.

Ver. 15. **χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων κ.τ.λ.** The infinites give the expression the character of a watchword (see Hofmann in Weiss). For the grammar see Winer, 397, n. 6. To weep with those that weep is easier than to rejoice with those who rejoice. Those who rejoice neither need, expect, nor feel grateful for sympathy in the same degree as those who weep.

Ver. 16. **τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες**: here the Apostle returns to his own grammar (or disregard of grammar), and holds to it till ver. 19, when he changes to the imperative (μὴ δότε) with which he concludes (ver. 21 μὴ νικῶ, νίκα). **τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν**, xv. 5, is a favourite expression, best explained by reference to Phil. ii. 2, iv. 2, 2 Cor. xiii. 11. The idea is that of loving unanimity, and the εἰς ἀλλήλους points to the active manifestation of this temper in all the mutual relations of Christians. "Let each so enter into the feelings and desires of the other as to be of one mind with him" (Gifford). It is a more abstract expression of the Golden Rule, Mt. vii. 12. The negatives which follow introduce explanatory clauses: they forbid what would destroy the unanimity of love. **μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες**: see on ver. 3 above and xi. 21. Selfish ambition in the Church is fatal to perfect mutual consideration. **τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι.** Elsewhere in the N.T. (seven times) ταπεινὸς is only found in the masculine, and so some would render it here: condescend to *men* of low estate; let yourself be carried along in the line of *their* interests, not counting such people beneath you. *Cf.* Gal. ii. 13, 2 Pet. iii. 17. The bad connotation of συναπάγεσθαι in both these places is due not to itself, but to the context. The contrast with τὰ ὑψηλὰ leads others to take τοῖς ταπεινοῖς as neuter: and so the R.V. has it, condescend to things that are lowly. Certainty on such points must always be personal rather than scientific; the first of the two alternatives impresses me as much more in harmony with the nature of the words used than the other. For the idea *cf.* Wordsworth's sonnet addressed to Milton . . . "and yet thy heart the lowliest duties on herself did lay". **μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι κ.τ.λ.** Prov. iii. 7. Be not men of mind in your own conceit. It is difficult to put our judgment into a common stock, and estimate another's as impartially as our own; but love requires it, and without it there is no such thing as **τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονεῖν.**

m Matt. xxiv. 24; Gal. iv. 15. n 2 Tim. iii. 6.

18. εἰ [m] δυνατὸν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες. 19. Μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ· γέγραπται γὰρ, "Ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω, λέγει Κύριος". 20. ἐὰν οὖν [1] πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν. ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν· τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν, ἄνθρακας πυρὸς [n] σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. 21. μὴ νικῶ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, ἀλλὰ νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν.

[1] **εαν ουν** D^3 gr. L, etc.; **εαν** alone D^1FD^3 lat.; **αλλα εαν** ℵABP vulg. and all edd. For **την κεφαλην** Weiss would read with B alone **της κεφαλης**.

Ver. 17. From this point the subject treated is chiefly the Christian's attitude to enemies. **μηδενὶ κακὸν ἀντὶ κακοῦ ἀποδ.** **μηδενὶ** is emphatic: to no one, Christian or un-Christian. Nothing can ever justify revenge. *Cf.* 1 Pet. iii. 9, but especially Matt. v. 38-48. **προνοούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον κ.τ.λ.** Prov. iii. 4, LXX. 2 Cor. viii. 21. What the words mean in Prov. iii. 4 is not clear; they are not a translation of the Hebrew. In 2 Cor. viii. 21 the idea is that of taking precautions to obviate possible slanders; here it is apparently that of living in such a way as not to provoke enmity, or give any occasion for breach of peace. **ἐνώπιον**: construed with **καλά**. **πάντων** has the same kind of emphasis as **μηδενί**: Requite evil to *no* one; let your conduct be such as *all* must approve.

Ver. 18. **εἰ δυνατόν**: *cf.* Matt. xxiv. 24. **τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν**: for what depends on you. *Cf.* i. 15. Over others' conduct we have no control; but the initiative in disturbing the peace is never to lie with the Christian.

Ver. 19. **μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀγαπητοί.** Even when the Christian has been wronged he is not to take the law into his own hand, and right or vindicate himself. For **ἐκδικεῖν** see Lc. xviii. 3, 5. **ἀγαπητοί** is striking, and must have some reason; either the extreme difficulty, of which Paul was sensible, of living up to this rule; or possibly some condition of affairs in the Church at Rome, which made the exhortation peculiarly pertinent to the readers, and therefore craved this affectionate address to deprecate, as it were, the "wild justice" with which the natural man is always ready to plead his cause. **ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ**: the wrath spoken of, as the following words show, is that of God; to give place to God's wrath means to leave room for it, not to take God's proper work out of His hands. For the expression *cf.* Lc. xiv. 9, Sir. xiii. 22, xix. 17, xxxviii. 12, Eph. iv. 27. For **ἡ ὀργὴ** used thus absolutely of God's wrath *cf.* v. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 16. The idea is not that instead of executing vengeance ourselves we are to abandon the offender to the more tremendous vengeance of God; but this—that God, not injured men or those who believe themselves such, is the maintainer of moral order in the world, and that the righting of wrong is to be committed to Him. *Cf.* especially 1 Pet. ii. 23. **γέγραπται γάρ**: Deut. xxxii. 35. Paul gives the sense of the Hebrew, not at all that of the LXX, though his language is reminiscent of the latter (**ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω**). It is singular that Heb. x. 30 has the quotation in exactly the same form as Paul. So has the Targum of Onkelos; but whether there is any mutual dependence of these three, or whether, independent of all, the verse was current in this form, we cannot tell. The **λέγει κύριος** (*cf.* xiv. 11) is supplied by Paul.

Ver. 20. **ἀλλὰ**: On the contrary, as opposed to self-avenging, and even to the merely passive resignation of one's case to God. **ἐὰν πεινᾷ κ.τ.λ.** Prov. xxv. 21 f. exactly as in LXX. The meaning of "heaping burning coals on his head" is hardly open to doubt. It must refer to the burning pain of shame and remorse which the man feels whose hostility is repaid by love. This is the only kind of vengeance the Christian is at liberty to contemplate. Many, however, have referred to 4 Esdr. xvi. 54 (*Non dicat peccator se non peccasse; quoniam carbones ignis comburet super caput ejus, qui dicit: non peccavi coram Domino Deo et gloria ipsius*), and argued that the coals of fire are the Divine judgments which the sinner will bring on himself unless he repents under the constraint of such love. But (1) there is nothing said here about the essential condition, "unless he repents"; this is simply imported; and (2) the aim of the Christian's love to his enemy is thus

XIII. 1. ΠΑΣΑ ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ[1] Θεοῦ· αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ἐξουσίαι ὑπὸ τοῦ

[1] ει μη απο θεου D[1]F, Orig. For απο ℵABD[3]LP read υπο; and so all edd. εξουσιαι after ουσαι om. ℵABD[1]F and all edd. υπο του θεου; om. του ℵ[1]ADFP and all edd.

made to be the bringing down of Divine judgment on him — which is not only absurd in itself, but in direct antagonism to the spirit of the passage.

Ver. 21. μὴ νικῶ: the absence of any connecting particle gives the last verse the character of a summary: in a word, be not overcome by evil. ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ = by the evil your enemy inflicts. The Christian would be overcome by evil if it were able to compel him to avenge himself by repaying it in kind. Wrong is not defeated but doubly victorious when it is repelled with its own weapons; we can only overcome it ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ through the good we do to our adversary, turning him so from an enemy into a friend. *Vincit malos*, says Seneca, *pertinax bonitas:* Wetst. accumulates similar examples from classical writers. The ἐν in ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ is probably = בְּ: it might be explained as instrumental, or rendered "at the cost of".

Chapter XIII. There is not a word to indicate how the transition is made from the discussion of the duties of Christians as members of one body, especially the duties of humility and love in chap. xii., to the special subject which meets us in chap. xiii. — the duty of Christians in relation to the civil authorities. There is nothing exactly like vers. 1-7 elsewhere in Paul's epistles, and it is difficult not to believe that he had some particular reason for treating the question here. The Christians in Rome, though mainly Gentile, as this epistle proves, were closely connected with the Jews, and the Jews were notoriously bad subjects. Many of them held, on the ground of Deut. xvii. 15, that to acknowledge a Gentile ruler was itself sinful; and the spirit which prompted Pharisees to ask, Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not? Shall we give or shall we not give? (Mark xii. 14) had no doubt its representatives in Rome also. As believers in the Messiah, "in another King, one Jesus" (Acts xvii. 7), even Christians of Gentile origin may have been open to the impulses of this same spirit; and unbalanced minds, then as in all ages, might be disposed to find in the loyalty which was due to Christ alone, an emancipation from all subjection to inferior powers. There is here an apparent point of contact between Christianity and anarchism, and it may have been the knowledge of some such movement of mind in the Church at Rome that made Paul write as he did. There is perhaps nothing in the passage which is not already given in our Lord's word, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's"; yet nothing can be more worthy of admiration than the soberness with which a Christian idealist like Paul lays down the Divine right of the state. The use made of the passage to prove the duty of "passive obedience," or "the right divine of kings to govern wrong," is beside the mark; the Apostle was not thinking of such things at all. What is in his mind is that the organisation of human society, with its distinction of higher and lower ranks, is essential for the preservation of moral order, and therefore, one might add, for the existence of the Kingdom of God itself; so that no Christian is at liberty to revolt against that organisation. The state is of God, and the Christian has to recognise its Divine right in the persons and requirements in which it is presented to him: that is all. Whether in any given case—say in England in 1642—the true representative of the State was to be found in the king or in the Commons, Paul, of course, does not enable us to say. Neither does he say anything bearing on the Divine right of insurrection. When he wrote, no doubt, Nero had not yet begun to rage against the Christians, and the imperial authorities had usually protected the Apostle himself against popular violence, whether Jewish or pagan; but even of this we must not suppose him to be taking any special account. He had, indeed, had other experiences (Acts xvi. 37, 2 Cor. xi. 25 ff.). But the whole discussion presupposes normal conditions: law and its representatives are of God, and as such are entitled to all honour and obedience from Christians.

Ver. 1. πᾶσα ψυχὴ is a Hebraism;

Θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν. 2. ὥστε ὁ ἀντιτασσόμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ [a] διαταγῇ ἀνθέστηκεν· οἱ δὲ ἀνθεστηκότες, ἑαυτοῖς κρῖμα λήψονται. 3. οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶ φόβος τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων, ἀλλὰ τῶν κακῶν.[1] θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποίει, καὶ ἕξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς· 4. Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστι σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ τὴν μάχαιραν φορεῖ· Θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν, ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ

a Acts vii. 53.

[1] των αγαθων εργων αλλα των κακων D^3 gr. L, etc.; τω αγαθω εργω α. τω κακω ℵABD¹F. The vulg. and lat. fathers have *non sunt timori boni operis*, from which W. and H. deduce another reading του αγαθου εργου. They suspect a primitive error, and Hort favours the correction τῳ αγαθοεργῳ, comparing 1 Tim. vi. 18.

cf. Acts ii. 43, iii. 23, and chap. ii. 9. For **ἐξουσίαις** *cf.* Luke xii. 11: it is exactly like "authorities" in English—abstract for concrete. **ὑπερεχούσαις** describes the authorities as being actually in a position of superiority. *Cf.* 1 P. ii. 13, and 2 Macc. iii. 11 (ἀνδρὸς ἐν ὑπεροχῇ κειμένου). **οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ὑπὸ θεοῦ**: ὑπὸ is the correct reading (ℵAB), not ἀπό. Weiss compares Bar. iv. 27. **ἔσται γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπάγοντος μνεία.** It is by God's act and will alone that there is such a thing as an authority, or magistrate; and those that actually exist have been appointed—set in their place—by Him. With **αἱ δὲ οὖσαι** the Apostle passes from the abstract to the concrete; the persons and institutions in which for the time authority had its seat, are before his mind—in other words, the Empire with all its grades of officials from the Emperor down. In itself, and quite apart from its relation to the Church, this system had a Divine right to be. It did not need to be legitimated by any special relation to the Church; quite as truly as the Church it existed *Dei gratia*.

Ver. 2. **ὥστε** *cf.* vii. 4, 12. The conclusion is that he who sets himself against the authorities withstands what has been instituted by God: **διαταγῇ** (Acts vii. 53) recalls **τεταγμέναι**, ver. 1. The **κρίμα**, *i.e.*, the judgment or condemnation which those who offer such resistance shall receive, is of course a Divine one—that is the nerve of the whole passage; but most commentators seem to regard it as coming through the human authority resisted. This is by no means clear; even a successful defiance of authority, which involved no human **κρίμα**, would according to Paul ensure punishment from God. For **λήψονται κρίμα** *cf.* Mark xii. 40, Jas. iii. 1: where also God's judgment alone is in view. But to say that it is God's judgment only is not to say that it is eternal damnation. There are many ways in which God's condemnation of sin is expressed and executed.

Ver. 3. **οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες κ.τ.λ.** The **γὰρ** can only be connected in a forced and artificial way with the clause which immediately precedes: it really introduces the reason for a frank and unreserved acceptance of that view of "authorities" which the Apostle is laying down. It is as if he said: Recognise the Divine right of the State, for its representatives are not a terror—an object of dread—to the good work, but to the bad. **φόβος** as in Isa. viii. 13. It is implied that those to whom he speaks will always be identified with the good work, and so have the authorities on their side: it is taken for granted also that the State will not act in violation of its own idea, and identify itself with the bad. **θέλεις δὲ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ.** This is most expressive when read as an interrogation, though some prefer to take it as an assertion: that is, to regard Paul as assuming that the reader does not want to be afraid of the magistrate, rather than as inquiring whether he does or not. To escape fear, **τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποίει**: do what is (legally and morally) good.

Ver. 4. **θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν.** **διάκονός** is feminine agreeing with **ἐξουσία**, which is "almost personified" (Sanday and Headlam). The **σοὶ** is not immediately dependent on **διάκονός**, as if the State were conceived as directly serving the person; the State serves God, with good in view as the end to be secured by its ministry, *viz.*, the maintenance of the moral order in society; and this situation is one the benefit of which redounds to the individual. **ἐὰν δὲ τὸ κακὸν ποιῇς, φοβοῦ**: only when the individual does that which

κακὸν πράσσοντι. 5. διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν [b] συνείδησιν. 6. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους τελεῖτε· λειτουργοὶ γὰρ Θεοῦ εἰσιν, εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο προσκαρτεροῦντες. 7. ἀπόδοτε οὖν [1] πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς· τῷ τὸν φόρον, τὸν φόρον. τῷ

b 1 Cor. x. 25, 27; 1 Pet. ii. 19.

[1] αποδοτε ουν ℵ³D³FLP; om. ουν ℵ¹ABD¹ and all edd.

is contrary to the end set before the State by God—commits τὸ κακὸν, which frustrates τὸ ἀγαθὸν—need he fear: but then he must fear. οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ: for not for nothing, but for serious use, does the ruler wear the sword. For εἰκῇ *cf.* 1 Cor. xv. 2, Gal. iii. 4. φορεῖ is wear, rather than bear: the sword was carried habitually, if not by, then before the higher magistrates, and symbolised the power of life and death which they had in their hands. "The Apostle in this passage," says Gifford, "expressly vindicates the right of capital punishment as divinely entrusted to the magistrate". But "expressly" is perhaps too much, and Paul could not deliberately vindicate what no one had assailed. He did, indeed, on a memorable occasion (later than this) express his readiness to die if his life had been forfeited to the law (Acts xxv. 11); but to know that if an individual sets himself to subvert the moral order of the world, its representatives can proceed to extremities against him (on the ground, apparently, that *it*, as of God's institution, is of priceless value to mankind, whereas he in his opposition to it is of no moral worth at all) is not to vindicate capital punishment as it exists in the law or practice of any given society. When the words θεοῦ γὰρ διάκονός ἐστιν are repeated, it is the punitive ministry of the magistrate which is alone in view. ἔκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν: an avenger for wrath. ὀργὴ in the N.T. almost always (as here) means the wrath of God. It occurs eleven times in Romans: always so. The exceptions are Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8, 1 Tim. ii. 8, Jas. i. 19 f. τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι = to him who works at evil. The process is presented in πράσσειν rather than the result. *Cf.* i. 32.

Ver. 5 f. διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι: there is a twofold necessity for submission—an external one, in the wrath of God which comes on resistance; an internal one, in conscience. Even apart from the consequences of disobedience conscience recognises the Divine right and function of the ἐξουσία and freely submits to it. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ φόρους τελεῖτε. διὰ τοῦτο seems to refer to the moral necessity to which appeal has been already made in διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. It is because conscience recognises the moral value of the State as an ordinance of God that we pay taxes. φόρος is often used of the tribute paid by a subject nation: Neh. v. 4, 1 Macc. viii. 4, Lc. xx. 22; but here is probably used indefinitely of any imposts made for the support of the Government. λειτουργοὶ γὰρ θεοῦ εἰσίν: the use of λειτουργοί here instead of διάκονοι emphasises *the official character* of the service which they render. In the LXX λειτουργεῖν is the regular rendering of שֵׁרֵת, and therefore refers frequently to the service of the priests and Levites, a usage the influence of which is seen in chap. xv. 16 and Phil. ii. 17; but this was by no means exclusively the case in the O.T. (2 Sam. xiii. 18, 2 Kings x. 5) nor is it so in the New (chap. xv. 27, Phil. ii. 25, 30). It is not a priestly character that the word assigns to the magistracy, but only an official character; they are in their place by God's appointment for the public good. εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο means "to this very end"—the end described in vers. 3 and 4. As προσκαρτεροῦντες is elsewhere construed with the dative (Acts i. 14, vi. 4, chap. xii. 12) it seems necessary here to take εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ with what precedes, and προσκ. by itself as, *e.g.*, in Num. xiii. 21: spending all their time on the work.

Ver. 7. At this point Weiss begins a new paragraph, but W. and H. make ver. 7 the conclusion of the first part of this chapter. In view of the close connection between vers. 7 and 8 (*cf.* ὀφειλάς, ὀφείλετε) it is better not to make too decided a break at either place. All the words in ver. 7, φόρος, τέλος, φόβος, τιμή, do indeed imply duties to superiors, and seem therefore to continue and to sum up the content of vers. 1-6; but ver. 8, in which μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε seems expressly written as the negative counterpart to ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς in ver. 7, introduces at the same time a wider subject—that of the duties of all

c Matt. xvii. 25. τὸ ͨτέλος, τὸ τέλος· τῷ τὸν φόβον, τὸν φόβον· τῷ τὴν τιμήν, τὴν τιμήν. 8. Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε,[1] εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀγαπᾷν ἀλλήλους· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον, νόμον πεπλήρωκε. 9. τὸ γάρ, "Οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις,[2] οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις," καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, ἐν τῷ, "᾿Αγαπήσεις τὸν ᵈπλησίον σου ὡς ἑαυτόν". 10. ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται· ᵉπλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.

d Ch. xv. 2; Gal. v. 14; Eph. iv. 25.
e Ch. xi. 12, 25.

[1] **οφειλετε** seems the only possible reading, yet is not given by any authority. **οφειλητε** ℵ[3]; **οφειλοντες** ℵ[1], Orig.; **οφιλειτε** B. For **αγαπαν αλληλους** ℵABDFP read **αλληλους αγαπαν**; so all edd.

[2] **ου ψευδομαρτυρησεις** om. ABDFL and all edd. The insertion is made by ℵP, etc., to complete the reference to the decalogue. **εν τω** before **αγαπησεις** is ins. by ℵADLP; om. by BF latt., Orig.-interp. It is bracketed by Lachm., Treg., Alf., and W. and H.; omitted entirely by Weiss. Instead of **εαυτον** FLP read **σεαυτον** with ℵABD.

individuals toward each other. **τῷ τὸν φόρον τὸν φόρον**: this is quite intelligible, but nothing can make it grammatical: see Winer, p. 737. For the distinction of **φόρος** and **τέλος** see Trench, *Syn.*, p. 392. For **φόβος** and **τιμή** 1 Pet. ii. 17.

Ver. 8. **εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾷν** = except mutual love. This is the *debitum immortale* of Bengel; *hoc enim et quotidie solvere et semper debere expedit nobis* (Origen). **ὁ γὰρ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἕτερον**: he who loves his neighbour, the other with whom he has to do. *Cf.* ii. 1, 21 (Weiss). **νόμον πεπλήρωκεν** = has done all that law requires. From what follows it is clear that Paul is thinking of the Mosaic law; it was virtually the only thing in the world to which he could apply the word **νόμος**, or which he could use to illustrate that word. The relation of chaps. xii. and xiii. to the Gospels makes it very credible that Paul had here in his mind the words of our Lord in Matt. xxii. 34 ff.

Ver. 9. **τὸ γὰρ Οὐ μοιχεύσεις.** *Cf.* viii. 26. The order of the commandments here is different from that in Exod. xx. or Deut. v. (Hebrew), but it is the same as in Luke xviii. 20, and (so far) in James ii. 11. This order is also found in Cod. B. of the LXX in Deut. v. **καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή**: this shows that the enumeration does not aim at completeness, and that the insertion in some MSS. of **οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις**, to complete the second table, is beside the mark. **ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται**: it is summed up—the scattered particulars are resumed and brought to one. The only other instance of this word in the N.T. (Eph. i. 10) illustrates the present one, though the meaning is not exactly the same. **ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου κ.τ.λ.** In Lev. xix. 18 this is given as a summary of various laws, mostly precepts enjoining humanity, in various relations; by our Lord (in Matt. xxii. 39) and by Paul (here and in Gal. v. 14) an ampler, indeed an unlimited range, is given to it. Its supreme position too seems to be what is indicated in James ii. 8 by calling it **νόμος βασιλικός**.

Ver. 10. **ἡ ἀγάπη . . . κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται.** This is all that is formally required by the law as quoted above (**οὐ μοιχεύσεις**, etc.): therefore love is **πλήρωμα νόμου**, law's fulfilment. Of course love is an inspiration rather than a restraint, and transcends law as embodied in merely negative commandments; but the form in which the law actually existed determines the form in which the Apostle expresses himself. It is apparent once more that **νόμος** is the Mosaic law, and not law in general; it is from it the prohibitions are derived on the ground of which the Apostle argues, and to it therefore we must apply his conclusion, **πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη.**

Vv. 11-14. In the closing verses of the chapter Paul enforces this exhortation to mutual love as the fulfilling of the law by reference to the approaching Parousia. We must all appear (and who can tell how soon?) before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in the body: if the awe and the inspiration of that great truth descend upon our hearts, we shall feel how urgent the Apostle's exhortation is. **καὶ τοῦτο**: *cf.* 1 Cor. vi. 6, 8. In classical writers **καὶ ταῦτα** is commoner. It

11. ΚΑΙ τοῦτο, εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν, ὅτι ὥρα ἡμᾶς[1] ἤδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι. νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία, ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν. 12. ἡ νὺξ προέκοψεν, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν· ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ [f]σκότους, καὶ ἐνδυσώμεθα[2] τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ [g]φωτός. 13. ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις, μὴ ἔριδι καὶ ζήλῳ· 14. ἀλλ᾽ ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν,[3] καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς [h]πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας.

f 1 Cor. v. 5; Eph. v. 8, 11 vi. 12; 1 Thess. v. 4 f.
g Eph. v. 8 f.; 13.
h Acts xxiv. 2.

[1] ημας DEFGL; but ℵ[1]ABCP give υμας. υμας is put in text by Weiss, W. and H., and Tischdf.; and by W. and H. and Treg. in margin. All put ηδη with ℵABC before the pronoun.

[2] For και ενδυσωμεθα read ενδυσωμεθα δε with ABC[1]D[1]P. W. and H. bracket δε; ℵ[1] and a MS. of Sah. have neither και nor δε. For οπλα AD read εργα. μη εριδι και ζηλω; B reads the plural ερισι κ. ζηλοις, which W. and H. put in margin, but it is probably a case of conforming instinctively to the other clauses; *cf.* the converse change of plural (αι διαθηκαι) into singular in note [2], page 657 (also in B).

[3] For κυριον Ι. Χ. B and Clem. give Χριστον Ιησουν without κυριον, which W. and H. print in margin, keeping κ. Ι. Χ. in text.

sums up all that precedes, but especially vers. 8-10. **εἰδότες τὸν καιρόν**: ὁ καιρὸς is not "the time" abstractly, but the time they lived in with its moral import, its critical place in the working out of God's designs. It is their time regarded as having a character of its own, full of significance for them. This is unfolded in **ὅτι ὥρα ἤδη κ.τ.λ.** **ἤδη** (without waiting longer) is to be construed with **ἐγερθῆναι**: "it is time for you at once to awake" (Gifford). No Christian should be asleep, yet the ordinary life of all is but drowsy compared with what it should be, and with what it would be, if the Christian hope were perpetually present to us. **νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία**: for now is salvation nearer us than when we believed. **ἡ σωτηρία** has here the transcendent eschatological sense: it is the final and complete deliverance from sin and death, and the reception into the heavenly kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. This salvation was always near, to the faith of the Apostles; and with the lapse of time it became, of course, nearer. Yet it has often been remarked that in his later epistles Paul seems to contemplate not merely the possibility, but the probability, that he himself would not live to see it. See 2 Cor. v. 1-10, Phil. i. 23. **ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν**: when we became Christians, 1 Cor. iii. 5, xv. 2, Gal. ii. 16.

Ver. 12. **ἡ νὺξ προέκοψεν**: the true day dawns only when Christ appears; at present it is night, though a night that has run much of its course. **ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους.** Things that can only be done in the dark—that cannot bear the light of day—are *therefore* to be put away by the Christian. For **ἀποθώμεθα** (properly of dress) *cf.* Jas. i. 21, 1. Pet. ii. 1, Heb. xii. 1. **τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός**: for **τὰ ὅπλα** see on chap. vi. 13, Eph. vi. 11, 1 Thess. v. 8. The idea is that the Christian's life is not a sleep, but a battle. **τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός** does not mean "shining armour"; but (on the analogy of **τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους**) such armour as one can wear when the great day dawns, and we would appear on the Lord's side in the fight. An allusion to the last great battle against the armies of anti-Christ is too remote, and at variance with Paul's use of the figure elsewhere.

Ver. 13. **ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ**: as one walks in the day, so let us walk **εὐσχημόνως**. The same adverb is found with the same verb in 1 Thess. iv. 2: A.V. in both places "honestly". The meaning is rather "in seemly fashion," "becomingly"; in 1 Cor. xiv. 40 it is rendered "decently," where also regard for decorum (the æsthetic side of morality) is in view. **κῶμοι** and **μέθαι** are again found conjoined in Gal. v. 21; **ἔρις** and **ζῆλος** in Gal. v. 20 and 1 Cor. iii. 3. W. and H. following B. put **ἔρισι καὶ ζήλοις** in margin; the plurals in this case as in the others would indicate the various acts or manifestations of excess, whether in self-indulgence or self-will.

Ver. 14. **ἀλλὰ ἐνδύσασθε τὸν Κ. Ἰ. Χριστόν.** **ἀλλὰ** emphasises the contrast between the true Christian life and that

[a] Acts xviii. 26; Ch. xv. 7; Philemon v. 12, 17. [b] Ch. i. 21.

XIV. 1. TON δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει [a] προσλαμβάνεσθε, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις [b] διαλογισμῶν. 2. [a]Ὃς μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα, ὁ δὲ

which has just been described. The Christian puts on the Lord Jesus Christ, according to Paul's teaching, in baptism (*cf.* Gal. iii. 27), as the solemn deliberate act in which he identifies himself, by faith, with Christ in His death and resurrection (chap. vi. 3). But the Christian life is not exhausted in this act, which is rather the starting-point for a putting on of Christ in the ethical sense, a "clothing of the soul in the moral disposition and habits of Christ" (Gifford); or as the Apostle himself puts it in vi. 11, a *reckoning* of ourselves to be dead to sin but alive to God in Christ Jesus. Every time we perform an ethical act of this kind we put on the Lord Jesus Christ more fully. But the principle of all such acts is the Spirit of Christ dwelling in us (chaps. vi.-viii.), and it is the essential antagonism of the spirit to the flesh which determines the form of the last words: **καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας.** It is to inquire too curiously if we inquire whether **σάρξ** here is used in the physiological sense = the body, or in the moral sense = *libidinosa caro* (as Fritzsche argues): the significance of the word in Paul depends on the fact that in experience these two meanings are indubitably if not inseparably related. Taking the flesh as it is, forethought or provision for it—an interest in it which consults for it, and makes it an object—can only have one end, *viz.*, its **ἐπιθυμίαι.** All such interest therefore is forbidden as inconsistent with putting on the Lord Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER XIV. 1-XV. 13. One subject is before the Apostle's mind throughout the whole of this section—the relations of "the strong" and "the weak" in the Church at Rome. It is connected in a variety of ways, which are felt rather than expressed, with what precedes. Thus it is pervaded by the same sense of the supreme importance of mutual love among Christians which characterises chaps. xii. and xiii. It makes use, in much the same way as chap. xiii. 11-14, of the impending judgment (xiv. 10), to quicken the sense of individual and personal responsibility. Possibly, too, there is a more formal connection with chap. xiii. Paul has been warning against the indulgence of the flesh (xiii. 14), and this prompts him, by contrast, to speak of those who by an inadequate appreciation of Christian liberty were practising an "over-scrupulous asceticism". There has been much discussion as to who "the weak" and "the strong" respectively were. The weakness is weakness in respect of faith; the weak man is one who does not fully appreciate what his Christianity means; in particular, he does not see that the soul which has committed itself to Christ for salvation is emancipated from all law but that which is involved in its responsibility to Him. Hence his conscience is fettered by scruples in regard to customs dating from pre-Christian days. The scruples in question here were connected with the use of flesh and wine, and with the religious observance of certain days (whether as fasts or feasts is open to question). Possibly the persons indulging such scruples were Jewish Christians, but they need not have been. They were certainly not legalists in principle, making the observance of the Jewish law or any part of it an essential condition of the Christian salvation; otherwise Paul, as the Epistle to the Galatians shows, would have addressed them in a different tone. Further, the Jewish law does not prescribe abstinence from wine or from animal food; and there is no suggestion here, as in 1 Cor. 8, that the difficulty was about food that had been offered in sacrifice to false gods. Hence the influence at work in the Roman Church in producing this scrupulosity of conscience was probably of Essene origin, and akin to that which Paul subsequently treats with greater severity at Colossae (Col. ii. 16). At Rome the scruples were only scruples, and though there was danger in them because they rested on a defective apprehension of Christianity, they could be tenderly dealt with; at Colossae they had grown into or adapted themselves to a philosophy of religion which was fatal to Christianity; hence the change of tone. But though "the weak" need not have been Jews, the scruples in which their weakness was expressed, had so far Jewish connections and Jewish affinities; and it is probable, from the way in which (chap. xv. 7-13) the discussion of the relations of the weak and the strong passes over into an exhortation to unity between Jew and Gentile in the Church, that the two classifications had a

ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει. 3. ὁ ἐσθίων τὸν μὴ ἐσθίοντα μὴ [c] ἐξουθενείτω, καὶ ὁ μὴ [1] ἐσθίων τὸν ἐσθίοντα μὴ κρινέτω· ὁ Θεὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν προσελάβετο. 4. σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην; τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει· σταθήσεται δέ· δυνατὸς γάρ ἐστιν [2] ὁ Θεὸς στῆσαι αὐτόν. 5. Ὃς μὲν κρίνει [3] ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν, ὃς δὲ κρίνει πᾶσαν

c 1 Cor. i. 28; vi. 4; xvi. 11.

[1] For και ο μη ℵ[3]D[3]LP, read with ℵ[1]ABCD[1] ο δε μη.

[2] For δυνατος γαρ εστιν ℵABCD[1]F and all edd. read δυνατει γαρ. ο θεος DFL; but ℵABCP (and all edd.) ο κυριος.

[3] ος μεν κρινει ℵ[3]BDFL; ος μεν γαρ κρινει ℵ[1]ACP latt. Weiss regards the γαρ as a mere interpolation (*cf.* the case in note [1], page 602); Tischdf. inserts; W. and H. bracket.

general correspondence; the weak would be Jews or persons under Jewish influence; the strong would be Gentiles, or persons at least who understood the Gospel as it was preached to the Gentiles by Paul.

Ver. 1. **τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα**: as Godet points out, the part. as opposed to **ἀσθενῆ**, denotes one who is for the time feeble, but who may become strong. **τῇ πίστει**: in respect of faith, *i.e.*—in Paul's sense of the word—in respect of his saving reliance on Christ and all that it involves: see above. One is weak in respect of faith who does not understand that salvation is of faith from first to last, and that faith is secured by its own entireness and intensity, not by a timorous scrupulosity of conscience. **προσλαμβάνεσθαι** is often used of God's gracious acceptance of men, but also of men welcoming other men to their society and friendship, 2 Macc. viii. 1, x. 15. **μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν**: not with a view to deciding (or passing sentence on) his doubts. The **διαλογισμοί** are the movements of thought in the weak man, whose anxious mind will not be at peace; no censure of any kind is implied by the word. The strong, who welcome him to the fellowship of the Church, are to do so unreservedly, not with the purpose of judging and ruling his mind by their own. For **διάκρισεις** see 1 Cor. xii. 10, Heb. v. 14.

Ver. 2. **ὃς μέν**: *cf.* ver. 5, ix. 21. **πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα**: has confidence to eat all things. See Winer, p. 405. Gifford quotes Demosthenes, p. 88: **προέσθαι δὲ τὴν προῖκ' οὐκ ἐπίστευσεν**: "he had not confidence, *i.e.*, was too cautious, to give up the dowry". This use of **πιστεύειν** shows that **πίστις** to Paul was essentially an ethical principle; the man who was strong in it had moral independence, courage, and originality. **ὁ δὲ ἀσθενῶν λάχανα ἐσθίει**: it is impossible to suppose that Paul here is "writing quite generally"; he must have had a motive for saying what he does, and it can only be found in the fact that he knew there were Christians in Rome who abstained from the use of flesh.

Ver. 3. **ὁ ἐσθίων . . . μὴ ἐξουθενείτω κ.τ.λ.** Paul passes no sentence on either party, but warns both of the temptations to which they are exposed. He who eats will be inclined to contempt—to sneer at the scruples of the weak as mere prejudice or obscurantism; he who does not eat will be inclined to censoriousness—to pronounce the strong, who uses his liberty, no better than he should be. This censoriousness is forbidden, because *God* (**ὁ θεὸς** is emphatic by position) has received the strong into the Church, and therefore his place in it is not to be questioned.

Ver. 4. **σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην**; the sharpness of this rebuke (*cf.* ix. 20) shows that Paul, with all his love and consideration for the weak, was alive to the possibility of a tyranny of the weak, and repressed it in its beginnings. It is easy to lapse from scrupulousness about one's own conduct into Pharisaism about that of others. **οἰκέτης** is rare in the N.T. Paul has no other example, and may have used it here for the suggestion (which **δοῦλος** has not) that the person referred to belonged to the house. **τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει**: for the verbs in the moral sense see 1 Cor. x. 12. The dative is *dat. comm.* It is his own Lord who is concerned—it is His interest which is involved and to Him (not to you) he must answer—as he stands or falls. **σταθήσεται δέ**: but he shall be made to stand, *i.e.*, shall be preserved in the integrity of his Christian character. **δυνατεῖ γὰρ ὁ Κύριος στῆσαι αὐτόν**: for the Lord has power to keep

d Ch. viii. 5.

ἡμέραν. ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῒ πληροφορείσθω. 6. ὁ [d] φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίῳ φρονεῖ, καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ.[1] ὁ ἐσθίων Κυρίῳ ἐσθίει, εὐχαριστεῖ γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων Κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐσθίει, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ τῷ Θεῷ. 7. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν

[1] **και ο μη φρονων την ημεραν Κυριω ου φρονει** om. ℵABC[1]DF, vulg., Copt., etc. Almost all crit. edd. follow these authorities and omit; but Alf. only brackets the words, holding that the omission may be due to homœoteleuton. The clause is found in C[3]LP, Syr., Chrys., Thdrt. There are other instances of homœoteleuton in the attestation of this passage, as Alf. points out. Thus 66[1] omits from **ημεραν** to **ημεραν**, 71 from **εσθιει** to **εσθιει**, and L from **τω θεω** to **τω θεω**. Insert **και** before **ο εσθιων** with ℵABCDFL.

him upright. Paul does not contemplate the strong man falling and being set up again by Christ; but in spite of the perils which liberty brings in its train—and the Apostle is as conscious of them as the most timid and scrupulous Christian could be—he is confident that *Christian* liberty, through the grace and power of Christ, will prove a triumphant moral success.

Ver. 5. The Apostle passes from the question of food to one of essentially the same kind—the religious observance of days. This is generally regarded as quite independent of the other; but Weiss argues from ver. 6, where the text which he adopts in common with most editors seems to contrast "him who *observes the day*" with "him who *eats*," that what we have here is really a subdivision of the same general subject. In other words, among those who abstained from flesh and wine, some did so always, others only on certain days. "To observe the day" might in itself mean to observe it by fasting—this would be the case if one's ordinary custom were to use flesh and wine; or it might mean to observe it by feasting—this would be the case if one ordinarily abstained. Practically, it makes no difference whether this reading of the passage is correct or not: Paul argues the question of the distinction of days as if it were an independent question, much as he does in Col. ii. It is not probable that there is any reference either to the Jewish Sabbath or to the Lord's Day, though the principle on which the Apostle argues defines the Christian attitude to both. Nothing whatever in the Christian religion is legal or statutory, not even the religious observance of the first day of the week; that observance originated in faith, and is not what it should be except as it is freely maintained by faith. For **ὃς μὲν** see ver. 2. **κρίνει ἡμ. παρ' ἡμέραν** means judges one day "in comparison with," or "to the passing by of" another: *cf.* i. 25, Winer, 503 f. Side by side with this, **κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν** can only mean, makes no distinction between days, counts all alike. In such questions the important thing is not that the decision should be this or that, but that each man should have an intelligent assurance as to his own conduct: it is, indeed, by having to take the responsibility of deciding for oneself, without the constraint of law, that an intelligent Christian conscience is developed. For **πληροφορείσθω** *cf.* iv. 21, and Lightfoot's note on Col. iv. 12. **νοῦς** (vii. 23) is the moral intelligence, or practical reason; by means of this, enlightened by the Spirit, the Christian becomes a law to himself.

Ver. 6. The indifference of the questions at issue, from the religious point of view, is shown by the fact that *both* parties, by the line of action they choose, have the same end in view—*viz.*, the interest of the Lord. **ὁ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν** *cf.* Col. iii. 2. The setting of the mind upon the day implies of course some distinction between it and others. The clause **καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν . . . οὐ φρονεῖ** is omitted by most editors, but its absence from most MSS. might still be due to *homœoteleuton*. **εὐχαριστεῖ**: thanksgiving to God consecrates *every* meal, whether it be the ascetic one of him who abstains from wine and flesh (**ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων**), or the more generous one of him who uses both (**ὁ ἐσθίων**): *cf.* Acts xxvii. 35, 1 Cor. x. 30, 1 Tim. iv. 3-5. The thanksgiving shows that in either case the Christian is acting **εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ** (1 Cor. x. 31), and therefore that the Lord's interest is safe.

Ver. 7 f. **οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἑαυτῷ ζῇ κ.τ.λ.** The truth which has been affirmed in regard to the Christian's use of food, and observance or non-observance of days, is here based on a larger

ἑαυτῷ ζῇ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἑαυτῷ ἀποθνήσκει. 8. ἐάν τε γὰρ ζῶμεν, τῷ Κυρίῳ ζῶμεν· ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκομεν. ἐάν τε οὖν ζῶμεν, ἐάν τε ἀποθνήσκωμεν, τοῦ Κυρίου [e] ἐσμέν. 9. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς καὶ[1] ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνέζησεν, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ. 10. Σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; ἢ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; πάντες γὰρ [f] παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ.[2] 11. γέγραπται γάρ, "Ζῶ ἐγώ, λέγει Κύριος, ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ, καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται[3] τῷ

e Ch. viii. 9; 1 Cor iii. 23.

f Acts xxvii. 24.

[1] Om. και before απεθανε with ℵ[1]ABC[1]D[1]FP. For ανεστη και ανεζησεν read only εζησεν with ℵABCDLP and all edd.

[2] του Χριστου ℵ[3]C[2]LP: του θεου ℵ[1]ABC[1]DF and all edd.

[3] εξομολογησεται πασα γλωσσα BD[1-3]F (and A of LXX); but πασα γλωσσα εξομολογησεται ℵACD[2]LP. The latter order is followed by Weiss, W. and H., and Tischdf. Probably the verb was put first in BF, etc., to conform to the parallel clause.

truth of which it is a part. His whole life belongs not to himself, but to his Lord. "No one of us liveth to himself," does not mean, "every man's conduct affects others for better or worse, whether he will or not"; it means, "no Christian is his own end in life; what is always present to his mind, as the rule of his conduct, is the will and the interest of his Lord". The same holds of his dying. He does not choose either the time or the mode of it, like a Roman Stoic, to please himself. He dies when the Lord will, as the Lord will, and even by his death glorifies God. In ver. 14 ff. Paul comes to speak of the influence of conduct upon others; but here there is no such thing in view; the prominence given to τῷ κυρίῳ (τοῦ κυρίου) three times in ver. 8 shows that the one truth present to his mind is the all-determining significance, for Christian conduct, of the relation to Christ. This (ideally) determines everything, alike in life and death; and all that is determined by it is right.

Ver. 9. εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ . . . ἵνα: *cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 9. ἔζησεν refers to the resurrection, as is shown by the order of the words, the connection elsewhere in Paul of Lordship with the resurrection (*cf.* Phil. ii. 9 ff.), and the aorist tense which describes an act, and not the continued existence of Christ on earth (Sanday and Headlam): *cf.* Rev. ii. 8 (ὃς ἐγένετο νεκρὸς κ. ἔζησεν), xx. 4 f. ἵνα denotes God's purpose in subjecting His Son to this experience. We must not suppose that ἀπέθανεν is specially connected with νεκρῶν and ἔζησεν with ζώντων; there is the same mannerism as in iv. 25. Rather is it through Christ's resurrection that His lordship over the realm of death is established, so that not even in that dark world do those who are His cease to stand in their old relation to Him. τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμὲν holds alike in the seen and the unseen.

Ver. 10. Σὺ δὲ: *thou*, in contrast with the one Lord and Judge of all. In face of our common responsibility to Him, how dare we judge each other? τὸν ἀδελφόν σου: another reason for not judging: it is inconsistent with a recognition of the brotherhood of believers. ἢ καὶ σὺ τί ἐξουθενεῖς κ.τ.λ. Or thou, again, why despisest thou? etc. This is addressed to the strong and free thinking, as the first question is to the weak and scrupulous Christian. Censoriousness and contempt are never anything but sins, not to be practised but shunned, and that all the more when we remember that we shall all stand at one bar. παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ God is the universal Judge. In 2 Cor. v. 10 we have τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ but here τοῦ θεοῦ is the correct reading We cannot suppose that by τοῦ θεοῦ here Paul means Christ in His Divine nature; the true way to mediate between the two expressions is seen in chap. ii. 16, Acts xvii. 31. When we all stand at *that* bar—and it should be part of our spiritual environment always—no one will look at his brother with either censoriousness or contempt.

Ver. 11. γέγραπται γάρ: the universal judgment proved from Scripture, Is. lv. 23. Paul follows the LXX, but very freely. For ζῶ ἐγὼ λέγει κύριος the LXX has κατ' ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνύω. The same passage is quoted more freely still

Θεῷ ᵐ. 12. ἄρα οὖν[1] ἕκαστος ἡμῶν περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δώσει τῷ Θεῷ. 13. Μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον, τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ ᵍ σκάνδαλον.[2] 14. οἶδα καὶ πέπεισμαι ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ·[3] εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν· 15. εἰ δὲ[4] διὰ βρῶμα ὁ ἀδελφός σου λυπεῖται, οὐκ ἔτι κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖς. μὴ τῷ

g Matt. xvi. 23; xviii. 7; Ch. xvi. 17; Rev. ii. 14.

[1] ουν ℵACEL, all cursives, is put in text by Tdf. and bracketed by Alf. and W. and H. It is omitted in BD¹FP¹, Syr. and by Weiss, who thinks it much more natural that the common Pauline formula αρα ουν should have been completed than mutilated. The authorities are divided in the same way between δωσει and αποδωσει: BDF supporting the latter, which is adopted by Weiss, and ℵAC the former which is adopted by W. and H. So also Weiss omits τω θεω with BF; but W. and H. bracket it, as it is found in ℵACDLP.

[2] το μη τιθεναι προσκομμα τω αδελφω η σκανδαλον. προσκομμα and η are both om. by B, Syr., Arm. Weiss thinks this gives the true reading, το μη τιθεναι τω αδελφω σκανδαλον, and W. and H. put it in margin.

[3] δι εαυτου ℵBC, followed by W. and H., Weiss, Alf.; δι αυτου ADEFGL, and of edd. Lachm. and Treg.

[4] For ει δε read ει γαρ with ℵABCDFP and all edd.

in Phil. ii. 10 f. to describe the exaltation of Christ. In Isaiah it refers to the coming of God's kingdom, when all nations shall worship Him. ἐξομολογήσεται τῷ θεῷ = shall give thanks or praise to God: xv. 9, Mt. xi. 25, and often in LXX = הוֹדָה. In the sense of "confess" it takes the accusative.

Ver. 12. ἄρα (οὖν): So then—conclusion of *this* aspect of the subject: *cf.* v. 18, vii. 25. Every word in this sentence is emphatic: ἕκαστος, περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, λόγον δώσει, τῷ θεῷ. For λόγον in this sense see 1 Pet. iv. 5, Heb. xiii. 17, Matt. xii. 36, Acts xix. 40.

Vv. 13-23. The Apostle now proceeds to argue the question of Christian conduct in things indifferent from another point of view—that of the influence which our conduct may have on others, and of the consideration which is due to them. μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν: thus much follows from what has been said already, and κρίνωμεν therefore forbids both the censorious and the contemptuous estimate of others. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον: be this your judgment rather. *Cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 2, vii. 37. τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ: this is of course addressed to the liberal party. For πρόσκομμα see 1 Cor. viii. 9. The word does not occur in the Gospels, but it is a remarkable fact that in most of our Lord's express teaching about sin, it is sin in the character of σκάνδαλον, a snare or stumbling-block to others, with which He deals. Paul develops his ideas quite freely from his conception of faith, but in all probability he was familiar with what Jesus taught (Matt. xviii.).

Ver. 14. In principle, the Apostle sides with the strong. He has no scruples about meats or drinks or days. ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ: it is as a Christian, not as a libertine, that Paul has this conviction; in Christ Jesus he is sure that there is nothing in the world essentially unclean; all things can be consecrated and Christianised by Christian use. κοινόν: *cf.* Acts x. 14, 28, Rev. xxi. 27. It is the opposite of ἅγιον, and signifies that which is not and cannot be brought into relation to God. εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ κ.τ.λ. Though there is nothing which in itself has this character, some things may have it subjectively, *i.e.*, in the judgment of a particular person who cannot help (from some imperfection of conscience) regarding them so; to *him* (ἐκείνῳ emphatic) they are what his conscience makes them; and his conscience (unenlightened as it is) is entitled to respect. For εἰ μὴ *cf.* Matt. xii. 14, Gal. ii. 16.

Ver. 15. Many expositors here supply something; *e.g.*, "You must have respect therefore for his scruples, although you may not share them, for if," etc. (Sanday and Headlam); but it seems simpler to connect the γὰρ with the leading idea in the writer's mind, Put no stumbling-block before a brother, for, etc. διὰ βρῶμα is contemptuous: "for the sake of food"

βρώματί σου ἐκεῖνον ἀπόλλυε, ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε. 16. Μὴ [h] βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. 17. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ [i] Θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ· 18. ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις [1] [k] δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ

h Ch. iii. 8. i 1 Cor. iv. 20. k Matt. vi. 24; Ch. xvi. 18; Eph. vi. 7; Col. iii. 24.

[1] For εν τουτοις ℵ[3]D[3]L read εν τουτω with ℵ[1]ABCD[1]F and all edd.

thy brother is grieved. **βρῶμα** is the food which the strong eats in spite of his brother's scruples. **λυπεῖται** need not imply that the weak is induced, against his conscience, to eat also (though that is contemplated as following); it may quite well express the uneasiness and distress with which the weak sees the strong pursue a line of conduct which his conscience cannot approve. Even to cause such pain as this is a violation of the law of Christ. He who does it has ceased to walk **κατὰ ἀγάπην**, according to love, which is the supreme Christian rule. In the sense of this, and at the same time aware that the weak in these circumstances may easily be cajoled or overborne into doing what his conscience disapproves, the Apostle exclaims abruptly, **μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκεῖνον ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν.** To tamper with conscience, it is here implied, is *ruin:* and the selfish man who so uses his Christian liberty as to lead a weak brother to tamper with his conscience is art and part in that ruin. The wanton contempt such liberty shows for the spirit and example of Christ is emphasised both here and in 1 Cor. viii. 11 f. *Ne pluris feceris tuum cibum quam Christus vitam suam.*

Ver. 16. **μὴ βλασφημείσθω οὖν ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν. τὸ ἀγαθόν** is somewhat in definite. It has been taken (1) as the good common to all Christians — the Messianic salvation—which will be blasphemed by the non-Christian, when they see the wantonness with which Christians rob each other of it by such conduct as Paul reprobates in ver. 15; and (2) as Christian liberty, the freedom of conscience which has been won by Christ, but which will inevitably get a bad name if it is exercised in an inconsiderate loveless fashion. The latter meaning alone seems relevant. For **βλασφ.** see 1 Cor. x. 30.

Ver. 17. Insistence and strife on such matters are inconsistent with Christianity: **οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.** Usually in Paul **ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ** is transcendent; the kingdom is that which comes with the second advent, and is the inheritance of believers; it is essentially (as it is called in 2 Tim. iv. 18) a **βασ. ἐπουράνιον.** See 1 Thess. ii. 12, 2 Thess. i. 5, 1 Cor. vi. 9 f., xv. 50, Gal. v. 21. This use of the expression, however, does not exclude another, which is more akin to what we find in the Gospels, and regards the Kingdom of God as in some sense also present: we have examples of this here, and in 1 Cor. iv. 20: perhaps also in Acts xx. 25. No doubt for Paul the transcendent associations would always cling to the name, so that we should lose a great deal of what it meant for him if we translated it by "the Christian religion" or any such form of words. It always included the reference to the glory to be revealed. **βρῶσις κ. πόσις**: eating and drinking—the acts, as opposed to **βρῶμα**, ver. 15, the thing eaten. **ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη κ. εἰρήνη κ. χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ**: are these words ethical or religious? Does **δικ.** denote "justification," the right relation of man to God? or "righteousness," in the sense of just dealing? Is **εἰρήνη** peace with God, the result of justification (as in v. 1), or peace among the members of the Church, the result of consideration for each other? The true answer must be that Paul did not thus distinguish ethical and religious: the words are religious primarily, but the ethical meaning is so far from being excluded by the religious that it is secured by it, and by it alone. That the religious import ought to be put in the forefront is shown by **χαρὰ ἐν πν. ἁγ.** which is a grace, not a virtue. In comparison with these great spiritual blessings, what Christian could trouble the Church about eating or drinking? For their sake, no self-denial is too great.

Ver. 18. **ἐν τούτῳ**: "on the principle implied by these virtues" (Sanday and Headlam). One may serve Christ either eating or abstaining, but no one can serve Him whose conduct exhibits indifference to righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. **δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις**: so that there can be no occasion given to any one to blaspheme. *Cf.* xvi. 10, 2 Tim. ii. 15, Jas. i. 12. A sound Christian character wins even the world's approval.

εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. 19. ἄρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης [1]διώκωμεν,[1] καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους. 20. Μὴ ἕνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Θεοῦ. πάντα μὲν [m] καθαρὰ, ἀλλὰ κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίοντι. 21. καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν [n] κρέα, μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον, μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφὸς

l Ch. xii. 13; 1 Cor. xiv. 1; 1 Thess. v. 15.
m Tit. i. 15.
n 1 Cor. viii. 13.

[1] διωκωμεν CDE, latt.; διωκομεν ℵABFLP. According to S. and H. διωκωμεν is a "somewhat obvious correction," and less expressive than διωκομεν. This is also the view of Weiss and Tischdf. But W. and H. put διωκωμεν in text and διωκομεν in marg.

Ver. 19. **ἄρα οὖν**: see ver. 12. **τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης** is not materially different from **τὴν εἰρήνην**: all that belongs to, makes for, peace: we cannot argue from its use here that the word must have exactly the same shade of meaning in ver. 17. **διώκωμεν**: the indicative **διώκομεν** is very strongly supported, and would indicate the actual pursuit of all true Christians: "Our aim is peace," and **τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους** = mutual upbuilding. *Cf.* 1 Thess. v. 11, 1 Cor. xiv. 26. The practical rule implied here is that, when anything is morally indifferent to me, before I act on that conviction, I must ask how such action will affect the peace of the Church, and the Christian growth of others.

Ver. 20. Paul repeats the rule of ver. 15. **μὴ κατάλυε**: the opposite of **οἰκοδομεῖν**. See Matt. xxvi. 61, Gal. ii. 18. **τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ** (1 Cor. iii. 9) what God has wrought, *i.e.*, the Christian Church (which is destroyed by such wanton conduct) or the Christian character and standing of an individual (which may be ruined in the same way). **πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ**: this is the principle of the strong, which Paul concedes (**μὲν**); the difficulty is to get the enlightened to understand that an abstract principle can never be the rule of Christian conduct. The Christian, of course, *admits* the principle, *but* he must act from love. To know that all things are clean does not (as is often assumed) settle what the Christian has to do in any given case. It does not define his duty, but only makes clear his responsibility. Acknowledging that principle, and looking with love at other Christians, and the effect of any given line of conduct on them, he has to define his duty for himself. All meat is clean, but not all eating. On the contrary (**ἀλλὰ**), **κακὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίοντι**; sin is involved in the case of the man who eats with offence. Some take this as a warning to the weak; but the whole tone of the passage, which is rather a warning to the strong, and the verse immediately following, which surely continues the meaning and is also addressed to the strong, decide against this. The man who eats with offence is therefore the man by whose eating another is made to stumble. For **διὰ προσκόμματος** see ii. 27, Winer, p. 475.

Ver. 21. A maxim for the strong. For **καλὸν** *cf.* Mark xiv. 6. Abstinence in order that others may not be made to stumble is morally noble. **ἐν ᾧ**: usually **προσκόπτειν** takes the Dat., ix. 32, 1 Pet. ii. 8. That there were those in the Church at Rome who had scruples as to the use of flesh and wine, see on ver. 2. Paul would not have written the chapter at all unless there had been scruples of some kind; and he would not have taken these examples if the scruples had concerned something quite different.

Ver. 22. The true text is **σὺ πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις**: "the faith that thou hast, have thou to thyself in the sight of God". The verse is still addressed to the strong. The faith he has is the enlightened faith which enables him to see that all things are clean; such faith does not lose its value though it is not flaunted in reckless action. On **κατὰ σεαυτὸν** Wetstein quotes Heliod. vii. 16: **κατὰ σαυτὸν ἔχε καὶ μηδενὶ φράζε.** *Cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 28 (**ἑαυτῷ δὲ λαλείτω καὶ τῷ θεῷ**). **ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ** reminds the strong once more (ver. 10) that the fullest freedom must be balanced by the fullest sense of responsibility to God. In another sense than that of 1 Cor. ix. 21 the Christian made free by faith must feel himself **μὴ ἄνομος θεοῦ ἀλλ' ἔννομος Χριστοῦ. μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει**: "a motive to charitable self-restraint addressed to the strong in faith" (Gifford). It is a rare felicity (this is always what **μακάριος** denotes) to have a conscience untroubled by scruples—in Paul's words, not to judge oneself in the matter which one approves (*sc.*, by his own practice);

σου προσκόπτει ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ.[1] 22. σὺ πίστιν[2] ἔχεις; κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ· μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἑαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ ° δοκιμάζει. 23. ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος, ἐὰν φάγῃ, κατακέκριται, ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως· πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.[3]

o 1 Cor. xvi. 3.

[1] η σκανδαλιζεται η ασθενει om. ℵ[1]AC, Syr., Copt., Aeth.; ins. ℵ[3]BDFLP, vulg., Sah. S. and H. call this a very clear instance of a Western reading in B, and therefore justify the omission with W. and H. and Tischdf.; but Weiss, who thinks η ασθενει is too difficult to be explained as a gloss, retains the words.

[2] After πιστιν ins. ην ℵABC; so most edd., omitting the mark of interrogation after εχεις. For σαυτον read σεαυτον with ℵABCDKLP, etc.

[3] After αμαρτια εστιν the great doxology of chap. xvi. 25-27 is inserted by ALP and most other MSS., though some, including AP, have it in both places; om. here ℵBCD[1], vulg., Syr.

and he who has this felicity should ask no more. In particular, he should not run the risk of injuring a brother's conscience, merely for the sake of exercising in a special way the spiritual freedom which he has the happiness to possess —whether he exercises it in that way or not.

Ver. 23. **ὁ δὲ διακρινόμενος ἐὰν φάγῃ κατακέκριται**: such, on the other hand, is the unhappy situation of the weak—a new motive for charity. For **διακριν.** *cf.* iv. 20, Jas. i. 6, Mark xi. 23. The weak Christian cannot be clear in his own mind that it is permissible to do as the strong does; it may be, he thinks one moment, and the next, it may not be; and if he follows the strong and eats in this state of mind, **κατακέκριται** he is condemned. The condemnation is absolute: it is not only that his own conscience pronounces clearly against him after the act, but that such action incurs the condemnation of God. It is inconsistent with that conscientiousness through which alone man can be trained in goodness; the moral life would become chaotic and irredeemable if conscience were always to be treated so. **ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως**, *sc.*, **ἔφαγεν**. The man is condemned because he did not eat **ἐκ πίστεως**: and this is generalised in the last clause **πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.** All that is not of faith is sin; and therefore this eating, as not of faith, is sin. It is impossible to give **πίστις** here a narrower sense than Christianity: see ver. 1. Everything a Christian man does that cannot justify itself to him on the ground of his relation to Christ is sin. It is too indefinite to render *omne quod non est ex fide* as Thomas Aquinas does by *omne quod est contra conscientiam*: it would need to be *contra Christianam conscientiam*. All a man cannot do remembering that he is Christ's —all he cannot do with the judgment-seat (ver. 10) and the Cross (ver. 15) and all their restraints and inspirations present to his mind—is sin. Of course this is addressed to Christians, and there is no rule in it for judging the character or conduct of those who do not know Christ. To argue from it that works done before justification are sin, or that the virtues of the heathen are glittering vices, is to misapply it altogether.

CHAPTER XV.—Vv. 1-13. The fourteenth chapter has a certain completeness in itself, and we can understand that if the Epistle to the Romans was sent as a circular letter to different churches, some copies of it might have ended with xiv. 23: to which the doxology, xvi. 25-27, might be loosely appended, as it is in A. L. and many other MSS. But it is manifestly the same subject which is continued in xv. 1-13. The Apostle still treats of the relations of the weak and the strong, though with a less precise reference to the problems of the Roman Church at the time than in chap. xiv. His argument widens into a plea for patience and forbearance (enforced by the example of Christ) and for the union of all Christians, Jew and Gentile, in common praise. It seems natural to infer from this that the distinction between weak and strong had some relation to that between Jew and Gentile; the prejudices and scruples of the weak were probably of Jewish origin.

Ver. 1. **ὀφείλομεν δὲ**: what constitutes the obligation is seen in chap. xiv. It arises out of our relation to others in Christ. Looking at them in the light of what He has done for them as well as for us, and in the light of our responsibility

a Acts xiv. 8.

XV. 1. Ὀφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν a ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν, καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν· 2. ἕκαστος γὰρ [1] ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. 3. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν, ἀλλά, καθὼς γέγραπται, "Οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέπεσον ἐπ' ἐμέ". 4. ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη,[2] εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν προεγράφη· ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ

[1] Om. γαρ with ℵABCDFLP.

[2] οσα γαρ προεγραφη ℵACD³LP; so most edd. B, latt., Aeth. give εγραφη. D¹ and F have προσεγραφη, which confirms the reading of ℵAC. προεγραφη ινα ℵ³ALP; but εγραφη ℵ¹BCDF, vulg. and all edd. After και ins. δια ℵABCL. After εχωμεν B adds της παρακλησεως, which W. and H. put in marg.; but the addition is as inept as that of λογων in the same MS. at ver. 18, and to be explained in the same way (an anticipation of a later word).

to the Judge of all, we cannot question that this is our duty. **ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοί**: Paul classes himself with the strong, and makes the obligation his own. **δυνατοὶ** is of course used as in chap. xiv.: not as in 1 Cor. i. 26. **τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων**: the things in which their infirmity comes out, its manifestations: here only in N.T. Paul says "bear" their infirmities: because the restrictions and limitations laid by this charity on the liberty of the strong are a burden to them. For the word **βαστάζειν** and the idea see Matt. viii. 17, Gal. vi. 2, 5, 17. **μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν**: it is very easy for self-pleasing and mere wilfulness to shelter themselves under the disguise of Christian *principle*. But there is only one Christian principle which has no qualification—love.

Ver. 2. **τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω**: this rule is qualified by **εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν**. Without such qualification it is "men-pleasing" (Gal. i. 10) and inconsistent with fidelity to Christ. *Cf.* 1 Cor. x. 33, where Paul presents himself as an example of the conduct he here commends. For **εἰς** and **πρὸς** in this verse *cf.* chap. iii. 25 f. According to Gifford **εἰς** marks the "aim"—the advantage or benefit of our neighbour—and **πρὸς** the standard of reference; the only "good" for a Christian is to be "built up" in his Christian character.

Ver. 3. **καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς κ.τ.λ.** The duty of not pleasing ourselves is enforced by the example of Christ: He did not please Himself either. If this required proof, we might have expected Paul to prove it by adducing some incident in Christ's life; but this is not what he does. He appeals to a psalm, which is in many places in the N.T. treated as having some reference to Christ (*e.g.*, John ii. 17 = Ps. lxix. 9, John xv. 25 = Ps. lxix. 4, Matt. xxvii. 27-30 = Ps. lxix. 12, Matt. xxvii. 34 = Ps. lxix. 21, Rom. xi. 9 = Ps. lxix. 22, Acts i. 20 = Ps. lxix. 25: see Perowne, *The Psalms*, i., p. 561 f.); and the words he quotes from it—words spoken as it were by Christ Himself—describe our Lord's experiences in a way which shows that He was no self-pleaser. If He had been, He would never have given Himself up willingly, as He did, to such a fate. It is hardly conceivable that **σε** in Paul's quotation indicates the man whom Christ is supposed to address: it can quite well be God, as in the psalm. Some have argued from this indirect proof of Christ's character that Paul had no acquaintance with the facts of His life; but the inference is unsound. It would condemn all the N.T. writers of the same ignorance, for they never appeal to incidents in Christ's life; and this summary of the whole character of Christ, possessing as it did for Paul and his readers the authority of inspiration, was more impressive than any isolated example of non-selfpleasing could have been.

Ver. 4. Here Paul justifies his use of the O.T. **ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη** = the whole O.T. **εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη**: was written to teach us, and therefore has abiding value. 2 Tim. iii. 16. **ἵνα** introduces God's purpose, which is wider than the immediate purpose of the Apostle. Paul meant to speak only of bearing the infirmities of the weak, but with the quotation of Ps. lxix. 9 there came in the idea of the Christian's sufferings generally, and it is amid them that God's purpose is to be fulfilled. **διὰ τῆς ὑπομ. κ. τῆς παρακλ. τῶν γραφῶν κ.τ.λ.**: "that through the patience and the comfort wrought by the

τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν. 5. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς [b]παρακλήσεως δῴη ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν· 6. ἵνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 7. Διὸ [c]προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ἡμᾶς [1] εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ. 8. λέγω δὲ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν [2] [d]διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς [e]ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς

b 2 Cor. i. 3-7; Heb. vi. 18; xii. 5.
c Ch. xiv. 1.
d Gal. ii. 17.
e Ch. i. 5; Phil. ii. 13.

[1] ημας, so BDP cursives; adopted by Weiss, W. and H. text. But υμας is put in marg. by W. and H., and by many edd. in text. It really seems to have arisen from ημας being changed to agree with the preceding context in which the readers are directly addressed. Yet it is strongly supported ℵACD[2,3]FL. Ins. του before θεου ℵABCDFP.

[2] For δε Ιησουν Χριστον read γαρ Χριστον with ℵABC and all edd. γεγενησθαι ℵAELP; γενεσθαι BCDF. The edd. are divided. Tischdf., W. and H., and Treg. marg. read γεγενησθαι; but W. and H. put γενεσθαι in marg., while Lachm. and Treg. have it in text. Weiss thinks the case can only be settled by analogy; and as ℵ, which is the strongest support of γεγενησθαι, quite arbitrarily changes γενεσθαι in Phil. i. 13 into γεγονεναι, he allows that to discredit it here, and reads γενεσθαι.

Scriptures we may have our hope". τὴν ἐλπίδα is the Christian hope, the hope of the glory of God; and the Christian has it as he is able, through the help of God's Word in the Scriptures, to maintain a brave and cheerful spirit amid all the sufferings and reproaches of life. *Cf.* v. 2-5. This is, if not a digression, at least an expansion of his original idea, and at

Ver. 5 Paul returns to his point in a prayer: the God of the patience and comfort just spoken of grant unto you, etc. τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν: *cf.* xii. 16, where, however, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν with εἰς ἀλλήλους is not quite the same. Paul wishes here that the minds of his readers — their moral judgment and temper—may all be determined by Jesus Christ (for κατὰ, expressing the rule according to which, see chap. viii. 27): in this case there will be the harmony which the disputes of chap. xiv. disturbed.

Ver. 6. ἵνα introduces the ultimate aim of this unanimity. ὁμοθυμαδόν here only in Paul, but eleven times in Acts. ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι: in Greek writers usually ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος. τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. The A.V. renders, "God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," making τοῦ Κυρίου depend on πατέρα only. This rendering does not make God the God of Christ, but defines the only true God as the Father of. Christ. It is defended by Weiss, who appeals to the passages in which "God and Father" is found with no genitive: 1 Cor. xv. 24, Eph. v. 20, Col. iii. 17, Jas. i. 27, iii. 9. The argument is not convincing, especially in view of Eph. i. 17 (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Κ. ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ., ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης) and John xx. 17: hence the R.V. is probably right ("the God and Father of our Lord"). When the Church glorifies such a God with one heart and one mouth it will have transcended all the troubles of chap. xiv. It is this accordant praise of all Christians which is the ruling idea in vers. 7-13.

Ver. 7. διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους: διὸ = that such praise may be possible. For προσλαμβ. see xiv. 1-3. καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς. ὑμᾶς covers both parties in the Church, however they are to be distinguished; if Christ received both, they are bound to receive each other. The last words, εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ, are probably to be construed with προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους; they resume the idea of ver. 6 (ἵνα . . . δοξάζητε); the διὸ with which ver. 7 begins starts from that idea of glorifying God, and looks on to it as the end to be attained when all Christians in love receive each other. But the clause has of course a meaning even if attached to what immediately precedes: ὁ Χριστὸς προσελ. ὑμᾶς. *Cf.* Phil. ii. 11, Eph. i. 12-14. Christ's reception of the Jews led to God's being glorified for His faithfulness; His reception of the Gentiles to God's being glorified for His mercy. So Weiss, who argues that in what follows we have the expansion and proof of the

ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων· 9. τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν Θεόν, καθὼς γέγραπται, "Διὰ τοῦτο [f] ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσι, καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ". 10. καὶ πάλιν λέγει, "Εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ". 11. καὶ πάλιν, "Αἰνεῖτε τὸν Κύριον, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,[1] καὶ ἐπαινέσατε αὐτόν, πάντες οἱ λαοί". 12. καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει, "Ἔσται ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν". 13. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρώσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης[2] ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου.

f Ch. xiv. 11.

[1] For τον κυριον παντα τα εθνη (so LXX), read παντα τα εθνη τον Κυριον ℵABDP and all edd. For επαινεσατε (so LXX, B) FLP read επαινεσατωσαν (LXX, A) ℵABCD.

[2] Against all edd., who keep the received text, Weiss finds himself compelled, instead of πληρωσαι υμας πασης χαρας και ειρηνης, to read πληροφορησαι υμας εν παση χαρα κ. ειρηνη. This is the reading of B, and is found with only the omission of εν in FG; Weiss thinks it quite inexplicable except as the original; πληροφ. has a point of attachment in xiv. 5, and the double εν (εν παση χαρα . . . εν τω πιστευειν) in this clause answers exactly to that in the next (εν τη ελπιδι, εν δυναμει πν. αγιου). The other reading is supported by ℵACDLP.

idea that God's glory (the glory of His faithfulness and of His mercy) is the end contemplated by Christ's reception alike of Jew and Gentile.

Ver. 8. **λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς** = what I mean is this—Christ has been made, etc. **διάκονον περιτομῆς** is usually understood as "a minister to the Jews, to circumcised people" (*cf.* iii. 30, iv. 9), and this seems to me the only intelligible explanation. In exercising this ministry (and He exercised directly no other: Matt. xv. 24) Christ was of course circumcised Himself and set from His birth (Gal. iv. 4 f.) in the same relation to the law as all who belonged to the old covenant; but though this is involved in the fact that Christ was sent to the Jews, it is not what is meant by calling Him **διάκονον περιτομῆς**. **ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ**: in the interest of God's truth (*cf.* i. 5: **ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ**). The truth of God, as the giver of the promises to the fathers, was vindicated by Christ's ministry; for in Him they were all fulfilled, 2 Cor. i. 20. **τὰς ἐπαγγ. τῶν πατέρων**: the promises belonged to the fathers, because they were originally made to them.

Ver. 9. **τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν**: Some expositors make this depend directly on **λέγω**, as if Paul had meant: "I say Christ has become a minister of circumcision, in the interest of the *truth* of God . . . and that the Gentiles have glorified God for His *mercy*," the only contrast being that between God's *faithfulness*, as shown to the descendants of Abraham, and His *mercy* as shown to those without the old covenant. But if **τὰ δὲ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ.** is made to depend on **εἰς τὸ**, as in the A.V., there is a double contrast brought out: that of *faithfulness* and *mercy* being no more emphatic than that of the *fathers* and the *Gentiles*. Indeed, from the passages quoted, it is clear that Paul is preoccupied rather with the latter of these two contrasts than with the former; for all the passages concern the place of the Gentiles in the Church. At the same time it is made clear—even to the Gentiles—that the salvation which they enjoy is "of the Jews". Hence the Gentiles must not be contemptuous of scruples or infirmities, especially such as rise out of any associations with the old covenant; nor should the Jews be censorious of a Gentile liberty which has its vindication in the free grace of God. **καθὼς γέγραπται**: the contemplated glorification of God answers to what we find in Ps. xviii. 50, LXX. Christ is assumed to be the speaker, and we may say that He gives thanks to God among the Gentiles when the Gentiles give thanks to God through Him (Heb. ii. 12).

Ver. 10. **καὶ πάλιν λέγει**: Deut. xxxii. 43, LXX. The Hebrew is different.

Ver. 11. **καὶ πάλιν, αἰνεῖτε**: Ps. cxvii. 1, LXX—only the order of the words varying.

Ver. 12. **καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει**: Isa.

14. Πέπεισμαι δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν, ὅτι [g] καὶ αὐτοὶ [g] μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης [1] γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νουθετεῖν. 15. τολμηρότερον [2] δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀπὸ [h] μέρους, ὡς ἐπαναμιμνήσκων ὑμᾶς, διὰ τὴν χάριν

g Ch. i. 29; Matt. xxiii. 28.
h Ver. 24; Ch. xi. 25; 2 Cor. i. 14; ii. 5.

[1] After πασης ins. της ℵBP, Clem.; om. ACDFL.

[2] τολμηροτερον ℵCDFLP; τολμηροτερως AB. The latter is read by Weiss, W. and H., and Treg. A similar change (from σπουδαιοτερως into σπουδαιοτερον) is made by DFG in Phil. ii. 28. αδελφοι om. ℵABC. υπο του θεου ACDLP; απο του θεου ℵBF and most edd.

xi. 10. Paul again follows the LXX, only omitting ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ after ἔσται. The words are meant to describe the Messianic kingdom and its Davidic head. It is a universal kingdom, and the nations set their hope in its King, and therefore in the God of salvation whose representative He is. Such a hope in God, the Apostle's argument implies, will result in the praise which glorifies Him for His mercy (ver. 9).

Ver. 13. Prompted by ἐλπιοῦσιν, the Apostle closes this section, and the body of the epistle, by calling on "the God of hope" to bless those to whom it is addressed. For the expression ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος *cf.* ver. 5: it means the God Who gives us the hope which we have in Christ. The joy and peace which He imparts rest on faith (ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν). Hence they are the joy and peace specially flowing from justification and acceptance with God, and the more we have of these, the more we abound in the Christian hope itself. Such an abounding in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost (Acts i. 8, Luke iv. 14), is the end contemplated in Paul's prayer that the God of hope would fill the Romans with all joy and peace in believing. For the kind of supremacy thus given to hope compare the connection of ver. 5 with ver. 2 in chap. v.

The rest of this chapter is of the nature of an epilogue. It falls into two parts: (1) vers. 14-21, in which Paul, while apologising for the tone which he has occasionally employed, justifies himself for writing to the Romans by appealing to his vocation as an Apostle; and (2) vers. 22, 33, in which he explains to them the programme of his future work, including his long-deferred visit to them, and begs their prayers for a successful issue to his visit to Jerusalem.

Ver. 14. πέπεισμαι δέ: the tone in which he has written, especially in chap. xiv., might suggest that he thought them very defective either in intelligence, or love, or both; but he disclaims any such inference from his words. ἀδελφοί μου has a friendly emphasis: *cf.* vii. 4. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ *cf.* vii. 25: it means "even I myself, who have taken it upon me to address you so plainly". ὅτι καὶ αὐτοὶ μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης: that even of yourselves ye are full of goodness, *i.e.*, without any help from me. ἀγαθωσύνη in all N.T. passages (Gal. v. 22, Eph. v. 9, 2 Thess. i. 11) seems to have an association with ἀγαθὸς in the sense of "kind": the goodness of which Paul speaks here is probably therefore not virtue in general, but the charity on which such stress is laid in chap. xiv. as the only rule of Christian conduct. πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως: filled full of all knowledge—"our Christian knowledge in its entirety" (Sanday and Headlam). This, again, may refer to the comprehension of Christianity shown by the strong of chap. xiv.: or it may be intended to apologise for the unusually doctrinal character of the epistle. Both μεστοί and πεπληρωμένοι occur also in i. 29. δυνάμενοι κ. ἀλλήλους νουθετεῖν: in a sense therefore self-sufficient.

Ver. 15 f. τολμηροτέρως . . . ἀπὸ μέρους: the description does not apply to the letter as a whole, but only to parts of it: Gifford refers to vi. 12-21, xi. 17 ff., xii. 3, and especially chap. xiv. throughout. ὡς ἐπαναμιμνήσκων ὑμᾶς: here only in N.T. There is the same courteous tone as in i. 11 f. He does not presume to teach them what they do not know, but only to suggest to their memory what they must know already but may be overlooking. διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι: this is the real justification of his writing. As in i. 5, xii. 3, the χάριν is that of Apostleship. It is not wantonly, but in the exercise of a Divine vocation, and a divinely-bestowed competence for it, that he writes. εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη: there is a certain emphasis on

τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, 16. εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, [i] ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵνα γένηται [1] ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. 17. ἔχω οὖν [2] καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τὰ πρὸς Θεόν· 18. οὐ γὰρ [k] τολμήσω [3] λαλεῖν τι ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο Χριστὸς δι' ἐμοῦ, εἰς ὑπακοὴν

i Here only. On the verse cf. Phil. ii. 17.
k Ch. v. 7; 2 Cor. x. 12; xi. 21.

[1] For γενηται Weiss, against all edd., reads γενηθη with B. The change of this into the commoner form γενηται is an emendation current in all the groups into which the MSS. can be classified.

[2] After ουν ins. την BCDF; om. ℵALP; W. and H. bracket. For προς θεον read προς τον θεον with ℵABCDFL and all edd.

[3] For τολμησω B has τολμω, which W. and H. put in margin. The fut. is retained by most edd. with ℵACDFGLP. For λαλειν τι read τι λαλειν with ℵABCDF.

εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, and the whole sentence would be inept, as a justification of Paul for writing to Rome, unless the Roman Church had been essentially Gentile. For λειτουργὸν see note on xiii. 6. The word here derives from the context the priestly associations which often attach to it in the LXX. But obviously it has no bearing on the question as to the "sacerdotal" character of the Christian ministry. The offering which Paul conceives himself as presenting to God is the Gentile Church, and the priestly function in the exercise of which this offering is made is the preaching of the Gospel. Paul describes himself as ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ *sacerdotis modo evangelium administrantem.* Fritzsche (on whose note all later expositors depend) explains the *sacerdotis modo* by *accurate et religiose;* just as a Levitical offering was not acceptable to God unless the prescribed ceremonial was precisely observed, so the offering of the Gentiles at God's altar would be unacceptable unless Paul showed a priestlike fidelity in his ministry of the Gospel. But this is to wring from a word what an intelligent appreciation of the sentence as a whole, and especially of its pictorial character, refuses to yield: the clause ἵνα γένηται . . . εὐπρόσδεκτος depends not on ἱερουργοῦντα, but on the whole conception of Paul's ministry, *i.e.*, on εἰς τὸ εἶναί με λειτουργὸν κ.τ.λ. For ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν, genitive of object, *cf.* Heb. x. 10. This great offering is acceptable to God (1 Pet. ii. 5) because it is ἡγιασμένη consecrated to Him ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. Those who believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, as the result of Paul's sacred ministry of the Gospel, received the Holy Spirit: this (as distinct from the ceremonial "without spot or blemish") was the ground of their acceptance (*cf.* xii. 1 f.).

Ver. 17. ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν: I have therefore ground of boasting. In spite of the apologetic tone of ver. 14 f. Paul is not without confidence in writing to the Romans. But there is no personal assumption in this; for he has it only in Christ Jesus, and only τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν in his relations to God. *Cf.* Heb. ii. 17, v. 1.

Ver. 18 f. All other boasting he declines. οὐ γὰρ τολμήσω τι λαλεῖν ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο δι' ἐμοῦ ὁ Χ.: in effect this means, I will not presume to speak of anything except what Christ wrought through me. This is the explanation of ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The things which Christ did work through Paul He wrought εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν with a view to obedience on the part of the Gentiles: *cf.* i. 5. This combination — Christ working in Paul, to make the Gentiles obedient to the Gospel—is the vindication of Paul's action in writing to Rome. It is not on his own impulse, but in Christ that he does it; and the Romans as Gentiles lie within the sphere in which Christ works through him. λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ: λόγος refers to the preaching, ἔργον to all he had been enabled to do or suffer in his calling. 2 Cor. x. 11, Acts vii. 22, Lc. xxiv. 19. ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων. σημεῖον and τέρας are the words generally employed in the N.T. to designate what we call miracle: often, too, δύναμεις is used as synonymous (Mark vi. 2). All three are again applied to Paul's miracles in 2 Cor. xii. 12, and to similar works in the Apostolic age of the Church in Heb. ii. 4: all three are also found in 2 Thess. ii. 9, where they are ascribed to the Man of Sin, whose Parousia in this as in other respects is

ἐθνῶν, λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ, 19. ἐν δυνάμει σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει Πνεύματος Θεοῦ·[1] ὥστε με ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 20. οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον[2] εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, οὐχ ὅπου ὠνομάσθη Χριστὸς, ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ· 21. ἀλλὰ, καθὼς γέγραπται, "Οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται·[3] καὶ οἳ οὐκ ἀκηκόασι, συνήσουσι".

1 1 Cor 17; ix. 16, 18; 2 Cor. x. 16.

[1] θεου ℵD²LP; αγιου ACD¹⁻³; om. B. B certainly seems right here, though W. and H. put [αγιου] in text. Both θεου and αγιου seem interpolations to complete the expression.

[2] φιλοτιμουμενον ℵACD²,³L, Orig.; φιλοτιμουμαι BD¹ (gr.) FP. Edd. seem to regard the latter as a change made to simplify the construction, and the case is one of those in which the value of B may be lessened by Western influence; hence they prefer, as a rule, the former reading. But Weiss reads φιλοτιμουμαι because it is exegetically necessary, and says he is not aware of any such arbitrary change of a participle into a finite verb.

[3] οψονται before οις B; and so W. and H. and Weiss. The order in received text conforms to the LXX and the next clause.

regarded as counterfeiting that of Christ. **τέρας** is always rendered "wonder" in the A.V., and, as though the word were unequal to the phenomenon, it is never used alone: in all the places in which it occurs σημεῖον is also found. The latter emphasises the significance of the miracle; it is not merely a sight to stare at, but is suggestive of an actor and a purpose. In this passage, "the power" of signs and wonders seems to mean the power with which they impressed the beholders: more or less it is an interpretation of ἔργῳ. So "the power" of the Holy Ghost means the influence with which the Holy Spirit accompanied the preaching of the Gospel: more or less it answers to λόγῳ: see 1 Thess. i. 5 and *cf.* the ἀπόδείξει πνεύματος κ. δυνάμεως, 1 Cor. ii. 4. **ὥστε με κ.τ.λ.** "The result of Christ's working through His Apostle is here stated as if the preceding sentence had been affirmative in form as well as sense" (Gifford). **ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ**: this agrees with Acts ix. 26-29, but this, of course, does not prove that it was borrowed from that passage. Even if Paul began his ministry at Damascus, he might quite well speak as he does here, for it is not its chronology, but its range, he is describing; and to his mind Jerusalem (to which, if let alone, he would have devoted himself, see Acts xxii. 18-22) was its point of departure. **καὶ κύκλῳ**: most modern commentators have rendered this as if it were τοῦ κύκλῳ—from Jerusalem *and its vicinity*, by which they mean Syria (though some would include Arabia, Gal. i. 17): for this use of κύκλῳ see Gen. xxxv. 5, Judith i. 2. But most Greek commentators render as in the A.V.—"and round about unto Illyricum". This is the interpretation taken by Hofmann and by S. and H., and is illustrated by Xen., *Anab.*, vii., i., 14 (quoted by the latter): πότερα διὰ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ὄρους δέοι πορεύεσθαι, ἢ κύκλῳ διὰ μέσης τῆς Θράκης. **μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ** can (so far as μέχρι is concerned) either exclude or include Illyricum. Part of the country so called may have been traversed by Paul in the journey alluded to in Acts xx. 1 f. (διελθὼν δὲ τὰ μέρη ἐκεῖνα), but the language would be satisfied if he had come in sight of Illyricum as he would do in his westward journey through Macedonia. **πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: have fulfilled (fully preached) the Gospel of Christ. *Cf.* Col. i. 25. Paul had done this in the sense in which it was required of an Apostle, whose vocation (to judge from Paul's practice) was to lay the foundation of a church in the chief centres of population, and as soon as the new community was capable of self-propagation, to move on.

Ver. 20. **οὕτω δὲ φιλοτιμούμενον** (1 Thess. iv. 11, 2 Cor. v. 9): making it my ambition, however, thus to preach the Gospel, etc. This limits πεπληρωκέναι: he had never sought to preach where Christianity was already established. A point of honour, but not rivalry, is involved in φιλοτιμούμενον. **ὠνομάσθη**: *cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 19 and Isa. xxvi. 13, Amos vi. 10. To name the name of the Lord is to confess Him to be what He is to the faith of His people. **ἵνα μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον κ.τ.λ.** The duty of an

22. Διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ[1] τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 23. νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τούτοις, ἐπιποθίαν δὲ ἔχων τοῦ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς [m] ἀπὸ πολλῶν[2] ἐτῶν, 24. ὡς ἐὰν[3] πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν, ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐλπίζω γὰρ διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ, ἐὰν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ [n] μέρους [o] ἐμπλησθῶ. 25. Νυνὶ δὲ πορεύομαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, διακονῶν

m Luke viii. 43.
n Ver. 15.
o Luke i. 53; vi. 25.

[1] τα πολλα ℵACLP; πολλακις BDF.

[2] For πολλων ℵADFL read ικανων with BCP, Weiss, W. and H., Alford.

[3] For ως εαν read ως αν with ℵABC. Om. ελευσομαι προς υμας ℵABCDF and all edd.

Apostle was with the foundation, not the superstructure. 1 Cor. iii. 10. The same confidence in his vocation, and the same pride in limiting that confidence, and not boasting of what Christ had done through others, or intruding his operations into their sphere, pervades the tenth chapter of 2 Cor.

Ver. 21. **ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται**: Paul's actual procedure corresponded with, and indeed led to the fulfilment of, a famous O.T. prophecy. Isa. lii. 11 exactly as in LXX. It is absurd to argue with Fritzsche that Paul found a prediction of his own personal ministry (and of the principles on which he discharged it), in Isaiah, and equally beside the mark to argue that his use of the passage is "quite in accordance with the spirit of the original". The LXX is quite different from the Hebrew, and Paul quotes it because he liked to be able to express his own opinion or practice in Scripture language. It seemed to him to get a Divine confirmation in this way; but an examination of various passages shows that he cared very little for the original meaning or application.

Vv. 22-33. The Apostle's programme. He is at present on his way to Jerusalem with the gifts which his Gentile churches have made for the relief of the poor Christians there. The issue of this visit is dubious, and he begs their prayers for its success. After it is over, he means to proceed to Spain, and on the way he hopes to pay his long deferred visit to Rome.

Ver. 22. **διὸ καὶ ἐνεκοπτόμην**: the work which detained the Apostle in the East also hindered him from visiting Rome. For another **ἐγκόπτειν** see 1 Thess. ii. 18. **τὰ πολλὰ** is more than **πολλάκις** in i. 13: it is distinguished in Greek writers both from **ἐνίοτε** (sometimes) and **ἀεὶ** (always) and is rightly rendered in Vulg. *plerumque*. As a rule, it was his work which kept Paul from visiting Rome, but he may have had the desire to do so (*e.g.*, when he was in Corinth) and have been prevented by some other cause. The rendering of R.V. "these many times" (apparently, all the definite times included in **πολλάκις** i. 13) is unsupported by examples.

Ver. 23. **νυνὶ δὲ**: but now — the sentence thus begun is interrupted by **ἐλπίζω γὰρ** and never finished, for the words **ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς** in T.R. are an interpolation. **μηκέτι τόπον ἔχων**: not that every soul was converted, but that the Apostolic function of laying foundations had been sufficiently discharged over the area in question. **κλίμα** is only found in the plural in N.T. 2 Cor. xi. 10, Gal. i. 21. **ἐπιπόθειαν**: here only in N.T. **ἀπὸ ἱκανῶν ἐτῶν**: the desire dated "from a good many years back". *Cf.* **ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου**, i. 20, Acts xv. 7.

Ver. 24. **ὡς ἂν πορεύωμαι εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν**: it is here the apodosis begins, which being broken in on by **ἐλπίζω** is never formally resumed, though the sense is taken up again in ver. 28 f. **ὡς ἂν** is temporal = *simulatque*: *cf.* 1 Cor. xi. 34, Phil. ii. 23: Buttmann, p. 232. The principle which Paul has just laid down as regulating his Apostolic work (ver. 20) forbids him to think of Rome as a proper sphere for it; great as is his interest in the capital of the world, he can only pay it a passing visit on the way to another field. **ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι ἐκεῖ**: it has been said that Paul expected or claimed "*quasi pro jure suo*" to be escorted all the way to Spain (by sea) by members of the Roman Church; but this is not included in **προπεμφθῆναι**. Practical illustrations are seen in Acts xx. 35, xxi. 5: similar anticipations in 1 Cor. xvi. 6, 11. For **πρῶτον** see Mt. vii. 5, viii. 21. **ἀπὸ μέρους** indicates that no such stay would be equal to the Apostle's longing

τοῖς ἁγίοις. 26. εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα [p] κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· 27. εὐδόκησαν γάρ, καὶ ὀφειλέται αὐτῶν εἰσιν. εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς [q] λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς. 28. τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας, καὶ σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον, ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν.

p Heb. xiii. 16.
q 2 Cor. ix. 12.

for fellowship with the Romans, but it would be at least a partial satisfaction of it.

Ver. 25. **νυνὶ δὲ** is not a resumption of **νυνὶ δὲ** in ver. 23: there is an entire break in the construction, and Paul begins again, returning from the Spanish journey, which lies in a remote and uncertain future, to the present moment. "But at this moment I am on the way to Jerusalem, ministering to the saints." **διακονῶν** does not represent this journey as part of his *apostolic ministry*, which might legitimately defer his visit once more (Weiss); it refers to the service rendered to the poor by the money he brought (see 2 Cor. viii. 4). For whatever reason, Paul seems to have used "the saints" (a name applicable to all Christians) with a certain predilection to describe the Jerusalem Church. *Cf.* ver. 31, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, ix. 12: all in this connection.

Ver. 26. **εὐδόκησαν γὰρ Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαία**: Macedonia and Achaia would include all the Pauline Churches in Europe, and we know from 1 Cor. xvi. 1 that a similar contribution was being made in Galatia. **εὐδόκησαν** expresses the formal *resolution* of the churches in question, but here as in many places with the idea that it was a spontaneous and cordial resolution (though it had been suggested by Paul): see chap. x. 1 (Fritzsche's note there), Luke xii. 32, Gal. i. 15, 1 Cor. i. 21, 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1. **κοινωνίαν τινὰ**: **τινὰ** marks the indefiniteness of the collection. It was no assessment to raise a prescribed amount, but "some contribution," more or less according to will and circumstances. For **κοινωνίαν** in this sense see 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13: where the whole subject is discussed. **εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων**: from the partitive genitive it is clear that not all the saints in Jerusalem were poor. But Gal. ii. 10, Acts vi. show that the community at least included many poor, towards whom it assumed a responsibility so burdensome that it was unable to discharge it unaided.

Ver. 27. **εὐδόκησαν γάρ**: they have resolved, I **say**. Paul felt bound to let this resolution affect his own conduct even to the extent of delaying his journey westward. Indeed he explains in 2 Cor., chaps. viii. and ix., that he expected great spiritual results, in the way of a better understanding between Jewish and Gentile Christianity, from this notable act of Gentile charity; hence his desire to see it accomplished, and the necessity laid on him to go once more to Jerusalem. **ὀφειλέται**: *cf.* i. 14, viii. 12. The resolve of the Gentile Churches to help the poor Jewish Christians, though generous, was not unmotived; in a sense it was the payment of a debt. **τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν**: the spiritual things belonging to the Jews in which the Gentiles shared are the Gospel and all its blessings—"salvation is of the Jews". All the gifts of Christianity are gifts of the Holy Spirit. **ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς**: the carnal things of the Gentiles, in which they minister to the Jews, are those which belong to the natural life of man, as a creature of flesh—the universal symbol of these is money. There is the same idea in a similar connection (the support of the Gospel ministry) in 1 Cor. ix. 11. In neither place has **σαρκικὰ** any ethical connotation. **λειτουργῆσαι** is simply "to minister to": no official, much less sacerdotal association. *Cf.* Phil. ii. 30.

Ver. 28. **τοῦτο οὖν ἐπιτελέσας**: having brought this business to a close. It is a mistake to find in Paul's use of **ἐπιτελεῖν** any reference to the performance of a religious rite: see 2 Cor. viii. 6, 11, Gal. iii. 3, Phil. i. 6. **σφραγισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον.** "This fruit" is, of course, the collection; it is one of the gracious results of the reception of the Gospel by the Gentiles, and Paul loves to conceive and to speak of it spiritually rather than materially. Thus in 2 Cor. viii. and ix. he calls it a **χάρις**, a **διακονία**, a **κοινωνία**, a **ἁδρότης**, a **εὐλογία**: never money. The point of the figure in **σφραγισάμενος** cannot be said to be clear. It may possibly suggest that Paul, in handing over the money to the saints, *authenticates* it to them as the fruit of their **πνευματικά**, which have been sown among the Gentiles (so S.

r Gal. iii. 14; Eph. i. 3; Heb. vi. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 9. s John iii. 36; Acts xiv. 2; xvii. 5.

29. οἶδα δὲ ὅτι, ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐν πληρώματι ʳ εὐλογίας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ [1] Χριστοῦ ἐλεύσομαι. 30. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Πνεύματος, συναγωνίσασθαί μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν· 31. ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ˢ ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, καὶ ἵνα [2] ἡ διακονία μου ἡ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ εὐπρόσδεκτος γένηται τοῖς ἁγίοις· 32. ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἔλθω [3] πρὸς ὑμᾶς διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, καὶ συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν. 33. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.[4]

[1] Om. του ευαγγελιου του ℵABCDF and all edd.

[2] After και om. ινα with ℵ¹ABCD¹. διακονια ℵACD²,³L; δωροφορια BD¹F. W. and H. regard δωροφορια as a Western reading which belongs to the inferior element in B, and therefore adopt διακονια; so Tischdf. But Weiss thinks διακονια obviously suggested here by its use in 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12 f., and puts δωροφορια, which occurs nowhere else in the N.T., in his text. The change of it to διακονια induced, he believes, the further change of εν before Ιερουσαλημ (which is also the reading of BD¹F) into εις (which is found like διακονια in ℵACD³L). This argument seems to have real weight, even though BDF is not always a strong combination of authorities.

[3] εν χαρᾳ ελθω. This is the reading of BDEFGLP, and is retained by Weiss. It has the critical advantage of making it possible to understand how B could have come to omit the clause και συναναπαυσωμαι υμιν, and the exegetical advantage of properly defining the end aimed at in the prayer, which was that Paul might come with joy to Rome, not that he might refresh himself after that. W. and H. put the received text in margin, but read in text ινα . . . ελθων . . . θεου συναναπαυσωμαι υμιν. ελθων is the reading of ℵ¹AC, and these MSS. also omit και. For θεου B has κυριου Ιησου; D¹F Χριστου Ιησου; *alii aliter*. Possibly the original reading was θεληματος alone (*cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 12), which has been variously supplemented.

[4] αμην om. AF; ins. ℵBCDLP and all edd.

and H.); or it may only mean "when I have *secured* this fruit to them *as their property*" (so Meyer). The ideas of "property," "security," "formality," "solemnity," "finality," are all associated with σφραγίς and σφραγίζω in different passages of the N.T., and it is impossible to say which preponderated in Paul's mind as he wrote these words. *Cf.* John iii. 33, vi. 27. ἀπελεύσομαι is simply *abibo:* the idea of *departing* from Jerusalem is included in it, which is not brought out in the R.V., "I will go on". δι' ὑμῶν: *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 16. εἰς Σπανίαν: there is no evidence that this intention was ever carried out except the well-known passage in Clem. Rom. I. 5 which speaks of Paul as having come ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως: an expression which, especially if the writer was a Jew, may as well mean Rome as Spain. But all the more if it was not carried out is this passage in Romans assuredly genuine; a second-century writer would not gratuitously ascribe to an apostle intentions which he must have known were never accomplished.

Ver. 29. For ἐρχόμενος . . . ἐλεύσομαι *cf.* 1 Cor. ii. 1. ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ. Paul's desire was to impart to the Romans χάρισμά τι πνευματικόν (i. 11), and he is sure it will be satisfied to the full. When he comes he will bring blessing from Christ to which nothing will be lacking. On πλήρωμα see xi. 12.

Ver. 30. παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς. In spite of the confident tone of ver. 29, Paul is very conscious of the uncertainties and perils which lie ahead of him, and with the δὲ he turns to this aspect of his situation. ἀδελφοί (which W. H. bracket) is an appeal to their Christian sympathy. διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. For διὰ in this sense see xii. 1. The Romans and Paul were alike servants of this Lord, and His name was a motive to the Romans to sympathise with Paul in all that he had to encounter in Christ's service. διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος,

XVI. 1. ΣΥΝΙΣΤΗΜΙ δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, οὖσαν[1] [a] διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς· 2. ἵνα αὐτὴν [b] προσδέξησθε[2] ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν χρῄζῃ πράγματι· καὶ γὰρ αὕτη [c] προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη, καὶ αὐτοῦ

a 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12.
b Phil. ii 29.
c Here only in N.T.

[1] After ουσαν ins. και ℵ³BC¹; so Weiss. W. and H. bracket.

[2] αυτην προσδεξησθε ℵALP; αυτην after προσδ. BCDF. For αυτου εμου read εμου αυτου with ABCL.

the love wrought in Christian hearts by the Spirit of God (Gal. v. 22) is another motive of the same kind. **συναγωνίσασθαί μοι, ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς.** **συναγωνίζομαι** is found here only in the N.T., but **ἀγὼν** and **ἀγωνίζομαι** in a spiritual sense are found in each of the groups into which the Pauline epistles are usually divided. What Paul asks is that they should join him in striving with all their might—in wrestling as it were—against the hostile forces which would frustrate his apostolic work. *Cf.* Just. Mart., *Apol.*, ii., 13: **καὶ εὐχόμενος καὶ παμμάχως ἀγωνιζόμενος.** **ἀγωνία** in Lc. xxii. 44 seems to denote awful fear rather than intense striving. **πρὸς τὸν θεόν** is not otiose: Paul felt how much it was worth to have *God* appealed to on his behalf.

Ver. 31 f. **ἵνα ῥυσθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων**: from the disobedient, *i.e.*, from the Jews who had not received the Gospel, 2 Thess. i. 8, chap. xi. 30. **καὶ ἡ διακονία μου κ.τ.λ.** It was not the unbelieving Jews only who hated Paul. To them he was an apostate, who had disappointed all their hopes; but even Christian Jews in many cases regarded him as false to the nation's prerogative, and especially to the law. There was a real danger that the contribution he brought from the Gentile Churches might not be graciously accepted, even accepted at all; it might be regarded as a bribe, in return for which Paul's opposition to the law was to be condoned, and the equal standing of his upstart churches in the Kingdom of God acknowledged. It was by no means certain that it would be taken as what it was—a pledge of brotherly love; and God alone could dispose "the saints" to take it as simply as it was offered. Paul's state of mind as seen here is exactly that which is revealed in Acts xx. 17-38, xxi. 13, etc. **ἵνα ἐν χαρᾷ ἐλθὼν . . . συναναπαύσωμαι ὑμῖν.** **συναναπ.** here only in N.T. but *cf.* **συνπαρακληθῆναι**, i. 12, and **συναγωνίσασθαι** ver. 30. "Rest after the personal danger and after the ecclesiastical crisis of which the personal danger formed a part" (Hort). The **ἵνα** here seems to be subordinate to, not co-ordinate with the preceding one. Paul looks forward to a time of joy and rest beyond these anxieties and dangers, as the ultimate end to be secured by their prayers. **διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ**: it depends on this whether Paul is to return or how. He did reach Rome, by the will of God (i. 10), but hardly in the conditions anticipated here.

Ver. 33. **ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης**: there is an appropriateness in this designation after ver. 31, but "peace" is one of the ruling ideas in Paul's mind always, and needs no special explanation in a benediction: 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Phil. iv. 9, 1 Thess. v. 23.

CHAPTER XVI. On this chapter see introduction. It consists of five distinct parts: (1) The recommendation of Phœbe to the Church, vers. 1 and 2; (2) a series of greetings from Paul himself, vers. 3-16; (3) a warning against false teachers, vers. 17-20; (4) a series of greetings from companions of Paul, vers. 21-23; (5) a doxology.

Ver. 1 f. **Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην.** **συνίστημι** is the technical word for this kind of recommendation, which was equivalent to a certificate of church membership. Paul uses it with especial frequency in 2 Cor., both in this technical sense (iii. 1, v. 12), and in a kindred but wider one (iv. 2, vi. 4, vii. 11, x. 12, 18). **τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν**: our (Christian) sister, 1 Cor. vii. 15, ix. 5. The spiritual kinship thus asserted was a recommendation of itself, but in Phœbe's case Paul can add another. **οὖσαν καὶ διάκονον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς**: who is also a servant of the Church in Cenchreæ. It is not easy to translate **διάκονος**, for "servant" is too vague, and "deaconess" is more technical than the original. **Διακονία** was really a function of membership in the Church, and Phœbe might naturally be described as she is here if like the house of Stephanas at Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 15) she had given herself **εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις.** That

ἐμοῦ. 3. Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκιλλαν [1] καὶ Ἀκύλαν τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 4. (οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν· οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν·) καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. 5. ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου, ὅς ἐστιν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας [2] εἰς Χρι-

[1] For Πρισκιλλαν (corrected by Acts xviii. 2) read Πρισκαν ℵABCDFL.

[2] For της Αχαιας LP, read της Ασιας with ℵABCD¹F. The wrong reading is due to 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

is, a life of habitual charity and hospitality, quite apart from any official position, would justify the name **διάκονος**. On the other hand it must be remembered that the growth of the Church, under the conditions of ancient society, soon produced "deaconesses" in the official sense, and Phœbe may have had some recognised function of **διακονία** assigned to her. Cenchreæ was on the Saronic gulf, nine miles E. of Corinth: as the port for Asia and the East, many Christians would pass through it, and a Christian woman who gave herself to hospitality (xii. 13) might have her hands full. **ἐν Κυρίῳ**: no mere reception of Phœbe into their houses satisfies this —their Christian life was to be open for her to share in it; she was no alien to be debarred from spiritual intimacy. **ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων**: with such kindness as it becomes Christians to show. **καὶ παραστῆτε αὐτῇ** (Jer. xv. 11): after the Christian welcome is assured, Paul bespeaks their help for Phœbe in whatever affair she may require it. He speaks indefinitely, but his language suggests that she was going to Rome on business in which they could assist her. **καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴ**: in complying with this request they will only be doing for Phœbe what she has done for others, and especially for Paul himself. **προστάτις** (feminine of **προστάτης**) is suggested by **παραστῆτε**. Paul might have said **παραστάτις**, but uses the more honourable word. **προστάτης** (*patronus*) was the title of a citizen in Athens who took charge of the interests of **μέτοικοι** and persons without civic rights; the corresponding feminine here may suggest that Phœbe was a woman of good position who could render valuable services to such a community as a primitive Christian Church usually was. When she helped Paul we cannot tell. Dr. Gifford suggests the occasion of Acts xviii. 18. Paul's vow "seems to point to a deliverance from danger or sickness," in which she may have ministered to him. It is generally assumed that Phœbe was the bearer of this epistle, and many even of those who regard vers. 3-16 as addressed to Ephesus still hold that vers. 1 and 2 were meant for Rome.

Ver. 3 f. Greeting to Prisca and Aquila. **ἀσπάσασθε**: only here does Paul commission the whole Church to greet individual members of it (Weiss). For the persons here named see Acts xviii. 2. Paul met them first in Corinth, and according to Meyer converted them there. Here as in Acts xviii. 18, 26 and 1 Tim. iv. 19 the wife is put first, probably as the more distinguished in Christian character and service; in 1 Cor. xvi. 19, where they *send* greetings, the husband naturally gets his precedence. **τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**: on first acquaintance they had been fellow-workers, not in Christ Jesus, but in tent-making: they were **ὁμότεχνοι**, Acts xviii. 3. **οἵτινες**: *quippe qui*. **τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον**: the singular (as Gifford points out) shows that the expression is figurative. To save Paul's life Prisca and Aquila incurred some great danger themselves; what, we cannot tell. They were in his company both in Corinth and Ephesus, at times when he was in extreme peril (Acts xviii. 12, xix. 30 f.), and the recipients of the letter would understand the allusion. The technical sense of **ὑποθεῖναι**, to give as a pledge, cannot be pressed here, as though Prisca and Aquila had given their personal security (though it involved the hazard of their lives) for Paul's good behaviour. **οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ κ.τ.λ.** The language implies that the incident referred to had occurred long enough ago for all the Gentile Churches to be aware of it, but yet so recently that both they and the Apostle himself retained a lively feeling of gratitude to his brave friends. **καὶ τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν**: these words do not mean "their Christian household," nor do they imply that the

στόν. 6. ἀσπάσασθε Μαριάμ,[1] ἥτις πολλὰ [d] ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς. 7. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀνδρόνικον καὶ Ἰουνίαν τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου καὶ [e] συναιχμαλώτους μου, οἵτινές εἰσιν [f] ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οἳ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γεγόνασιν[2] ἐν Χριστῷ. 8. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀμπλίαν[3] τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου ἐν Κυρίῳ. 9. ἀσπάσασθε Οὐρβανὸν τὸν συνεργὸν

d Ver. 12.
e Col. iv. 10 Philemon 23.
f Matt. xxvii. 16.

[1] **Μαριαμ** ℵDFL; **Μαριαν** ABCP, and so most edd. For **ημας** read **υμας** ℵABC[1]P.
[2] For **γεγονασιν** read **γεγοναν** with ℵAB.
[3] For **Αμπλιαν** read **Αμπλιατον** with ℵAB[1]F.

whole Christian community (in Rome or in Ephesus) met in the house of Prisca and Aquila. They signify the body of believers meeting for worship there, a body which would only be part of the local Christian community. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 19, Col. iv. 15, Philemon 2, Acts xii. 12. "There is no clear example of a separate building set apart for Christian worship within the limits of the Roman Empire before the third century, though apartments in private houses might be specially devoted to this purpose" (Lightfoot on Col. iv. 15). **ἀσπάσασθε Ἐπαίνετον τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου**: after Priscilla and Aquila, not a single person is known of all those to whom Paul sends greetings in vv. 3-16. **ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας**: Epænetus was the first convert in Asia (the Roman province of that name). *Cf.* 1 Cor. xvi. 15. There is no difficulty in supposing that the first Christian of Asia was at this time—temporarily or permanently—in Rome: but the discovery of an Ephesian Epænetus on a Roman inscription (quoted by Sanday and Headlam) is very interesting.

Ver. 6. It is not certain whether **Μαριάμ** (which is Jewish) or **Μαρίαν** (Roman) is the true reading. **ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν**: the much labour she had bestowed is made the ground (**ἥτις**) of a special greeting. **εἰς ὑμᾶς** is much better supported than **εἰς ἡμᾶς**: there is something finer in Paul's appreciation of services rendered to others than if they had been rendered to himself. *Cf.* Gal. iv. 11.

Ver. 7. Andronicus is a Greek name, which, like most names in this chapter, can be illustrated from inscriptions. **Ἰουνίαν** may be masculine (from **Ἰουνίας**, or **Ἰουνιᾶς** contraction of Junianus), or feminine (from **Ἰουνία**): probably the former. **τοὺς συγγενεῖς μου**: *i.e.*, Jews. *Cf.* ix. 3. It is hardly possible that so many people in the Church addressed (see vv. 11, 21) should be more closely connected with Paul than by the bond of nationality. But it was natural for him, in writing to a mainly Gentile Church, to distinguish those with whom he had this point of contact. *Cf.* Col. iv. 11. **συναιχμαλώτους μου**: this naturally means that on some occasion they had shared Paul's imprisonment: it is doubtful whether it would be satisfied by the idea that they, like him, had also been imprisoned for Christ's sake. The **αἰχμάλωτος** is a prisoner of war: Paul and his friends were all Salvation Army men. The phrase **ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις**, men of mark among the Apostles, has the same ambiguity in Greek as in English. It might mean, well-known to the apostolic circle, or distinguished as Apostles. The latter sense is that in which it is taken by "all patristic commentators" (Sanday and Headlam), whose instinct for what words meant in a case of this kind must have been surer than that of a modern reader. It implies, of course, a wide sense of the word Apostle: for justification of which reference may be made to Lightfoot's essay on the name and office of an Apostle (*Galatians*, 92 ff.) and Harnack, *Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, S. 111-118. On the other hand, *Paul's* use of the word Apostle is not such as to make it easy to believe that he thought of a large class of persons who might be so designated, a class so large that two otherwise unknown persons like Andronicus and Junias might be conspicuous in it. Hence scholars like Weiss and Gifford hold that what is meant here is that Andronicus and Junias were honourably known to the Twelve. **οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ**: they had evidently been converted very early, and, like Mnason the Cypriot, were **ἀρχαῖοι μαθηταί**, Acts xxi. 16. On **γέγοναν** see Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, § 82. The English idiom does not allow of a perfect translation, but "were" is more idiomatic than "have been".

Ver. 8. **Ἀμπλιᾶτον**: "a common Roman slave name". Sanday and Head-

ἡμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ, καὶ Στάχυν τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου. 10. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀπελλῆν τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ. ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου. 11. ἀσπάσασθε Ἡρωδίωνα τὸν συγγενῆ μου. ἀσπάσασθε τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου, τοὺς ὄντας ἐν Κυρίῳ. 12. ἀσπάσασθε Τρύφαιναν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν Κυρίῳ. ἀσπάσασθε Περσίδα τὴν ἀγαπητήν, ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ. 13. ἀσπάσασθε Ῥοῦφον τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ, καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ.

lam give inscriptions from the cemetery of Domitilla, which make it probable that a person of this name was conspicuous in the earliest Roman Church, and may have been the means of introducing Christianity to a great Roman house. **τὸν ἀγαπητόν μου ἐν Κυρίῳ**: Paul has none but *Christian* relations to this man.

Ver. 9. **Οὐρβανὸν**: also a common slave name, "found, as here, in juxtaposition with Ampliatus, in a list of imperial freedmen, on an inscription A.D. 115" (Gifford). **τὸν συνεργὸν ἡμῶν**: the **ἡμῶν** (as opposed to **μου**, ver. 3) seems to suggest that all Christian workers had a common helper in Urbanus. Of Stachys nothing is known but that he was dear to Paul. The name is Greek; but, like the others, has been found in inscriptions connected with the Imperial household.

Ver. 10. **Ἀπελλῆν τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ**: Apelles, that approved Christian. In some conspicuous way the Christian character of Apelles had been tried and found proof: see Jas. i. 12, 2 Tim. ii. 15. The name is a familiar one, and sometimes Jewish: *Credat Judæus Apella*, Hor., *Sat.*, I., v., 100. By **τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου** are meant Christians belonging to the household of Aristobulus. Lightfoot, in his essay on Cæsar's Household (*Philippians*, 171 ff.), makes Aristobulus the grandson of Herod the Great. He was educated in Rome, and probably died there. "Now it seems not improbable, considering the intimate relations between Claudius and Aristobulus, that at the death of the latter his servants, wholly or in part, should be transferred to the palace. In this case they would be designated *Aristobuliani*, for which I suppose St. Paul's **οἱ ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου** to be an equivalent. It is at least not an obvious phrase, and demands explanation" (*Philippians*, 175).

Ver. 11. **Ἡρωδίωνα τὸν συγγενῆ μου.** This agrees very well with the interpretation just given to **τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου.** In the household of Herod's grandson there might naturally be a Jew with a name of this type, whom Paul, for some cause or other, could single out for a special greeting. **τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου τοὺς ὄντας ἐν Κυρίῳ**: the last words may suggest that, though only the Christians in this household have a greeting sent to them, there were other members of it with whom the Church had relations. The Narcissus meant is probably the notorious freedman of Claudius, who was put to death shortly after the accession of Nero (Tac., *Ann.*, xiii., 1), and therefore two or three years before this epistle was written. His slaves would probably pass into the emperor's hands, and increase "Cæsar's househould" as Narcissiani (Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*).

Ver. 12. **Τρύφαιναν καὶ Τρυφῶσαν**: "It was usual to designate members of the same family by derivatives of the same root" (Lightfoot): hence these two women were probably sisters. The names, which might be rendered "Dainty" and "Disdain" (see Jas. v. 5, Is. lxvi. 11) are characteristically pagan, and unlike the description **τὰς κοπιώσας**, "who toil in the Lord". They are still at work, but the "much toil" of Persis, the beloved, belongs to some occasion in the past. **τὴν ἀγαπητήν**: Paul does not here add **μου** as with the men's names in vv. 8 and 9. Persis was dear to the whole Church.

Ver. 13. **Ῥοῦφον τὸν ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ**: for the name see Mark xv. 21. If Mark wrote his gospel at Rome, as there is ground to believe, this may be the person to whom he refers. In the gospel he is assumed to be well known, and here he is described as "that choice Christian". **ἐκλεκτὸν** cannot refer simply to the fact of his election to be a Christian, since in whatever sense this is true, it is true of all Christians alike; whereas here it evidently expresses some distinction of Rufus. He was a noble specimen of a Christian. **καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ κ. ἐμοῦ**: where she had "mothered" Paul we do not know. For the idea *cf.* Mark x. 30.

14. ἀσπάσασθε Ἀσύγκριτον, Φλέγοντα, Ἑρμᾶν, Πατρόβαν, Ἑρμῆν,[1] καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφούς. 15. ἀσπάσασθε Φιλόλογον καὶ Ἰουλίαν, Νηρέα καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ὀλυμπᾶν, καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους. 16. ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι[2] τοῦ Χριστοῦ· 17. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς [g] διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα, παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε, ποιοῦντας· καὶ ἐκκλίνατε[3] ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

g 1 Cor. iii. 3; Gal. v 20.

[1] Here ℵABCD[1]FP and all edd. transpose Ερμαν and Ερμην.
[2] After εκκλησιαι ins. πασαι ℵABCLP and all edd.
[3] For εκκλινατε read εκκλινετε with ℵ[1]BC, Weiss, W. and H., Tischdf.

Ver. 14. Of Asyncritus, Phlegon and Hermes nothing is known. Patrobas (or Patrobius) may have been a dependant of a famous freedman of the same name in Nero's time, who was put to death by Galba (Tac., *Hist.*, i., 49, ii., 95). Hermas has often been identified with the author of The Shepherd, but though the identification goes back to Origen, it is a mistake. "Pastorem vero *nuperrime temporibus nostris* in urbe Roma Herma conscripsit *sedente cathedra urbis Romæ ecclesiæ Pio eps. fratre ejus*": these words of the Canon of Muratori forbid the identification. **τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀδελφούς** indicates that the persons named, and some others designated in this phrase, formed a little community by themselves—perhaps an **ἐκκλησία κατ' οἶκόν τινος**.

Ver. 15. Philologus and Julia, as connected here, were probably husband and wife; or, as in the next pair, brother and sister. Both, especially the latter, are among the commonest slave names. There are Acts of Nereus and Achilleus in the Acta Sanctorum connected with the early Roman Church. "The sister's name is not given, but one Nereis was a member of the [imperial] household about this time, as appears from an inscription already quoted" (Lightfoot, *loc. cit.*, p. 177). Olympas is a contraction of Olympiodorus. **τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς πάντας ἁγίους**: see on last verse. The **πάντας** may suggest that a larger number of persons is to be included here.

Ver. 16. **ἀλλήλους.** When the epistle is read in the Church the Christians are to greet each other, and seal their mutual salutations **ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ.** In 1 Thess. v. 26 the **προιστάμενοι** apparently are to salute the members of the Church so. In 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, exactly the same form is used as here. The custom of combining greeting and kiss was oriental, and especially Jewish, and in this way became Christian. In 1 Pet. v. 14 the kiss is called **φίλημα ἀγάπης**; in Apost. Const., ii., 57, 12, **τὸ ἐν Κυρίῳ φίλημα**; in Tert. de Orat., xiv., *osculum pacis.* By **ἅγιον** the kiss is distinguished from an ordinary greeting of natural affection or friendship; it belongs to God and the new society of His children; it is specifically *Christian.* **αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ**: "this phrase is unique in the N.T." (Sanday and Headlam). The ordinary form is "the Church" or "the Churches of God": but in Matt. xvi. 18 Christ says "*my* Church": *cf.* also Acts xx. 28, where **τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου** is found in many good authorities. For "all the Churches" *cf.* ver. 4, 1 Cor. vii. 17, xiv. 33, 2 Cor. viii. 18, xi. 28. Probably Paul was commissioned by some, and he took it on him to speak for the rest. If the faith of the Romans were published in all the world (chap. i. 8), the Churches everywhere would have sufficient interest in them to ratify this courtesy. "Quoniam cognovit omnium erga Romanos studium, omnium nomine salutat."

Vv. 17-20. Warning against false teachers. This comes in very abruptly in the middle of the greetings, and as it stands has the character of an afterthought. The false teachers referred to are quite definitely described, but it is clear that they had not yet appeared in Rome, nor begun to work there. Paul is only warning the Roman Church against a danger which he has seen in other places. There is a very similar passage in Phil. iii. 18 f., which Lightfoot connects with this, arguing that the persons denounced are not Judaising teachers, but antinomian reactionists. It is easier to see grounds for this opinion in Philippians than here: but chap. vi. 1-23 may be quoted in support of it.

h Ch. xiv. 18.
i Here only in N.T.
k Rev. ii. 27.

18. οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ[1] Χριστῷ οὐ [h] δουλεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ· καὶ διὰ τῆς [i] χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἐξαπατῶσι τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων. 19. ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο· χαίρω οὖν τὸ ἐφ' ὑμῖν·[2] θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς σοφοὺς μὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν. 20. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης [k] συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν ἐν τάχει. ἡ

[1] Ιησου om. ℵABCDFP and all edd.

[2] χαιρω ουν το εφ υμιν ℵ[3]DF; but ℵ[1]ABCLP and all edd. εφ' υμιν ουν χαιρω. μεν after σοφους ℵACP; om. BDFL. Most edd. omit, but W. and H. bracket.

Ver. 17. σκοπεῖν: to keep your eye upon, either as an example to be followed (Phil. iii. 17), or (as in this case) as a peril to be avoided. τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα ποιοῦντας: both the persons and their conduct are supposed to be known; "*the* divisions" and "*the* scandals," which had been occasioned in other Churches, are assumed to be familiar to the Romans. τὰ σκάνδαλα refers more naturally to conduct which would create a moral prejudice against the Gospel, and so prevent men from accepting it, than to any ordinary result of Jewish legal teaching. But if the latter caused dissension and generated bad tempers in the Church, it also might give outsiders cause to blaspheme, and to stumble at the Gospel (xiv. 13, 16). παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε: ὑμεῖς is emphatic, and implies that *they* at least are as yet untouched by the false teaching. By "the teaching which you received" is meant not "Paulinism," but Christianity, though the words of course imply that the Roman Church was not anti-Pauline. ἐκκλίνετε with ἀπὸ in 1 Pet. iii. 11, Prov. iv. 15.

Ver. 18. οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι κ.τ.λ. Christians must not associate with those who do not serve the one Lord. τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Χριστῷ: this combination occurs here only in N.T. τῇ ἑαυτῶν κοιλίᾳ: *cf.* Phil. iii. 19, ὧν ὁ θεὸς ἡ κοιλία. The words need not mean that the teachers in question were mere sensualists, or that they taught Epicurean or antinomian doctrines: the sense must partly be defined by the contrast—it is not our Lord Christ whom they serve; on the contrary, it is base interests of their own. It is a bitter contemptuous way of describing a self-seeking spirit, rather than an allusion to any particular cast of doctrine. διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας: according to Grimm, χρηστολογία refers to the insinuating tone, εὐλογία to the fine style, of the false teachers. Examples from profane Greek bear out this distinction (εὔαρχός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος καὶ πολλὴν τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος καὶ εὐλεξις), but as εὐλογία in Biblical Greek, and in Philo and Josephus invariably has a religious sense, Cremer prefers to take it so here also: "pious talk". ἐξαπατῶσι: vii. 11, 1 Cor. iii. 18, 2 Th. ii. 2. ἀκάκων: all the English versions, except Gen. and A.V., render "of the innocent" (Gifford). See Heb. vii. 26. In this place "guileless" is rather the idea: suspecting no evil, and therefore liable to be deceived.

Ver. 19. ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ: What is the connection? "I give this exhortation, separating you altogether from the false teachers, and from those who are liable to be misled by them; for *your* obedience (ὑμῶν emphasised by position) has come abroad to all men. (*Cf.* i. 8.) Over *you* therefore I rejoice, but," etc. He expresses his confidence in them, but at the same time conveys the feeling of his anxiety. For χαίρειν ἐπὶ see 1 Cor. xiii. 6, xvi. 17. σοφοὺς μὲν εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν. For ἀκέραιος see Matt. x. 16, Phil. ii. 15, and Trench, *Syn.*, § lvi., where there is a full discussion and comparison with ἄκακος. The fundamental idea of the word is that of freedom from alien or disturbing elements. What Paul here wishes for the Romans—moral intelligence, not impaired in the least by any dealings with evil—does suggest that antinomianism was the peril to be guarded against. Integrity of the moral nature is the best security: the seductive teaching is instinctively repelled.

Ver. 20. ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης: used here with special reference to αἱ διχοστασίαι. *Cf.* 1 Cor. xiv. 33. συντρίψει τὸν Σατανᾶν: divisions in the Church are Satan's work, and the suppression of them by the God of peace is a victory over Satan. *Cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 14 f. There is an allusion to Gen iii. 15, though it is

χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[1] μεθ' ὑμῶν. ἀμήν. 21. Ἀσπάζονται[2] ὑμᾶς Τιμόθεος ὁ συνεργός μου, καὶ Λούκιος καὶ Ἰάσων καὶ Σωσίπατρος οἱ συγγενεῖς μου. 22. ἀσπάζομαι ὑμᾶς ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ. 23. ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Γάϊος ὁ ξένος μου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὅλης. ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Ἔραστος ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως, καὶ Κούαρτ ὁ ἀδελφός.

[1] **Χριστου** om. ℵB, edd.

[2] For **ασπαζονται** read **ασπαζεται** ℵABCD[1]F. Om. first **μου** B 67; W. and H. bracket.

doubtful whether Paul found anything there answering to **συντρίψει**. The LXX has **τηρήσει**. **ἐν τάχει**: *cf.* Ez. xxix. 5; Deut. xxviii. 20. The false teachers may come and cause dissension, but it will not be long till peace is restored. **ἡ χάρις κ.τ.λ.** This benediction can hardly be supposed to belong only to vv. 17-20. It rather suggests that some copies of the epistle ended here; possibly that vv. 1-20 (for there is another benediction at xiv. 33) were originally an independent epistle.

Vv. 21-23. Greetings of Paul's companions.

Ver. 21. **Τιμόθεος.** In many of the epistles Timothy's name is associated with Paul's in the opening salutation (1 and 2 Thess., 2 Cor., Phil., Col., Philemon). Perhaps when Paul began this letter he was absent, but had come back in time to send his greeting at the close. He was with Paul (Acts xx. 4 f.) when he started on the journey to Jerusalem mentioned in xv. 25. Lucius, Jason and Sosipater are all Jews, but none of them can be identified. For the *names* (which may or may not be those of the same persons) see Acts xiii. 1, xvii. 5, xx. 4.

Ver. 22. **ἐγὼ Τέρτιος ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν**: the use of the first person is a striking indication of Paul's courtesy. To have sent the greeting of his amanuensis in the third person would have been to treat him as a mere machine (Godet). **ἐν Κυρίῳ** goes with **ἀσπάζομαι**: it is as a Christian, not in virtue of any other relation he has to the Romans, that Tertius salutes them.

Ver. 23. **Γάϊος ὁ ξένος μου κ. ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας**: As the Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth this hospitable Christian is probably the same who is mentioned in 1 Cor. i. 14. Three other persons (apparently) of the same name are mentioned in Acts xix. 29, xx. 4, and 3 John. By **ὁ ξένος μου** is meant that Gaius was Paul's host in Corinth; **ὁ ξένος ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας** might either mean that the whole Christian community met in his house (*cf.* vv. 5, 14, 15), or that he made all Christians who came to Corinth welcome. **Ἔραστος ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως.** We cannot be sure that this is the Erastus of Acts xix. 22, 2 Tim. iv. 20: the latter seems to have been at Paul's disposal in connection with his work. But they *may* be the same, and Paul may here be designating Erastus by an office which he had once held, but held no longer. The city treasurer (*arcarius civitatis*) would be an important person in a poor community (1 Cor. i. 26 ff.), and he and Gaius (whose boundless hospitality implies means) are probably mentioned here as representing the Corinthian Church. **Κούαρτος ὁ ἀδελφός**: Quartus, known to Paul only as a Christian, had perhaps some connection with Rome which entitled him to have his salutation inserted.

Ver. 24. The attestation of this verse is quite insufficient, and it is omitted by all critical editors.

Vv. 25-27. The doxology. St. Paul's letters, as a rule, terminate with a benediction, and even apart from the questions of textual criticism, connected with it, this doxology has given rise to much discussion. The closest analogies to it are found in the doxology at the end of Ephes., chap. iii., and in Jude (vv. 24 and 25); there is something similar in the last chapter of Hebrews (xiii. 20 f.), though not quite at the end; Pauline doxologies as a rule are briefer (i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 36, Phil. iv. 20), and more closely related to what immediately precedes. This one, in which all the leading ideas of the Epistle to the Romans may be discovered, though in a style which reminds one uncomfortably of the Pastoral Epistles rather than of that to which it is appended, would seem more in place if it stood where AL and an immense num-

24. Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. ἀμήν.[1] 25. Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κατὰ [l] ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις [m] σεσιγημένου, 26. φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν, διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν, κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ, εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς

l Gal. i. 12; Eph. iii. 3.
m Here only in N.T.

[1] This verse is wanting in ℵABC; ins. in DFL. See Introduction, p. 578.

ber of MSS. place it—after xiv. 23. It may represent the first emergence and conscious apprehension of thoughts which were afterwards to become familiar; but it cannot be denied that the many distinct points of contact with later writings give it, in spite of all it has of imposing, a somewhat artificial character, and it may not belong to the Epistle to the Romans any more than the doxology in Matt. vi. belongs to the Lord's Prayer.

Ver. 25 f. **τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ**: *cf.* Eph. iii. 20, Jude v. 24. **στηρίξαι**: this word takes us back to the beginning of the epistle (i. 11.) Paul wished to impart to them some spiritual gift, to the end that they might be established; but only God is able (*cf.* xiv. 4) to effect this result. The stablishing is to take place **κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου**: in agreement with the gospel Paul preached. When it is achieved, the Romans will be settled and confirmed in Christianity as it was understood by the Apostle. For **τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου** *cf.* ii. 16, 2 Tim. ii. 8: also 1 Tim. i. 11, **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον . . . ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγώ.** The expression implies not only that Paul's gospel was his own, in the sense that he was not taught it by any man (Gal. i. 11 f.), but also that it had something characteristic of himself about it. The characteristic feature, to judge by this epistle, was his sense of the absolute freeness of salvation (justification by faith, apart from works of law), and of its absolute universality (for every one that believeth, Jew first, then Greek). **τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** is practically the same as **τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου.** It was in a preaching (1 Cor. ii. 4, xv. 14, Tit. i. 3) of which Jesus Christ was the object that Paul declared the characteristic truths of his gospel: and this preaching, as well as the gospel, may be said to be the rule according to which the Romans are to be established as Christians. **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου . . . γνωρισθέντος.** This passage "goes not with **στηρίξαι**, but with **κήρυγμα**" (Sanday and Headlam). This is the simplest construction: the gospel Paul preaches, the gospel in accordance with which he would have them established, is itself in accordance with—we may even say identical with—the revelation of a mystery, etc. The **μυστήριον** here referred to is God's world-embracing purpose of redemption, as it has been set out conspicuously in this epistle. One aspect of this—one element of the mystery—is referred to where **μυστήριον** is used in xi. 25; but the conception of the Gospel as a **μυστήριον** revealed in the fulness of the time dominates later epistles, especially Ephesians (*cf.* Eph. i. 9, iii., 3, 4, 9, vi. 19). The Gospel as Paul understood it was a **μυστήριον**, because it could never have been known except through Divine revelation: **μυστήριον** and **ἀποκάλυψις** are correlative terms. **χρόνοις αἰωνίοις**: the dative expresses duration. Winer, p. 273; *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 9, Tit. i. 2. For **φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν** *cf.* iii. 21. The aorist refers to Christ's appearing, though the significance of this had to be made clear by revelation (Weiss). **διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν . . . γνωρισθέντος**: for **τε** *cf.* ii. 16. The connection is meant to be as close as possible: the **γνωρίζειν** follows the **φανεροῦν** as a matter of course. The **γραφαὶ προφητικαί** are the O.T. Scriptures of which Paul made constant use in preaching his gospel (*cf.* **κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς** in 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4). For him the O.T. was essentially a Christian book. His gospel was witnessed to by the law and the prophets (i. 2, iii. 21, iv., *passim*), and in that sense the mystery was made known through them. But their significance only came out for one who had the Christian key to them—the knowledge of Christ which revelation had given to Paul. **κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ**: *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 1, Tit. i. 3. The idea is that only an express command of the Eternal God could justify the promulgation of the secret He had kept so long. For the "Eternal God" *cf.* Gen. xxi. 33, 1 Tim. i. 17 (**τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν αἰώνων**). **εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως**: *cf.* i. 5. **εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη**: in i. 5 it is **ἐν**

πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος, 27. μόνῳ σοφῷ [n] Θεῷ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, n Jude v. 25
ᾧ [1] ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

Πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Κορίνθου διὰ Φοίβης τῆς διακόνου
τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς ἐκκλησίας.[2]

[1] ω is wanting in B, in F-lat., Orig.-interp., Syr., and is bracketed by W. and H. But whether this is to be explained as an intentional correction to simplify the construction, or a mere oversight (of which Weiss gives examples, *Textkritik*, S. 93), it can hardly be right. Neither can αυτω, which is found in P, be original; it is too natural a correction. Hence edd. are practically unanimous in keeping ω. After τους αιωνας ℵADP add των αιωνων, but W. and H., with BCL and cursives, omit it. Weiss prints the addition in his text, yet argues for its omission (*Textkritik*, 89).

[2] προς ρωμαιους only, in ℵABCD.

πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν: for **εἰς** in this sense see iii. 22. It is very difficult to believe that such mosaic work is the original composition of Paul.

Ver. 27. **μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ**: this description of God suits all that has just been said about His great purpose in human history, and the hiding and revealing of it in due time. The true text in 1 Tim. i. 17 has no **σοφῷ**. The absence of the article here indicates that it is in virtue of having this character that God is able to stablish the Romans according to Paul's Gospel. **ᾧ ἡ δόξα**: it is impossible to be sure of the reading here. If **ᾧ** be omitted, there is no grammatical difficulty whatever: glory is ascribed to God through Jesus Christ, through Whom the eternal purpose of the world's redemption has in God's wisdom been wrought out. But its omission is almost certainly a correction made for simplification's sake. If it be retained, to whom does it refer? (1) Some say, to Jesus Christ; and this is grammatically the obvious way to take it. But it seems inconsistent with the fact that in **τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ** and **μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ** Paul wishes unequivocally to ascribe the glory to God. And though it saves the grammar of the last clause, it sacrifices that of the whole sentence. Hence (2) it seems necessary to refer it to God, and we may suppose, with Sanday and Headlam, that the structure of the sentence being lost amid the heavily-loaded clauses of the doxology, the writer concludes with a well-known formula of praise, **ᾧ ἡ δόξα κ.τ.λ.** (Gal. i. 15, 2 Tim. iv. 18, Heb. xiii. 21). This might be indicated by putting a dash after **Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ**. The thread is lost, and the writer appends his solemn conclusion as best he can.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL

TO THE

CORINTHIANS

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH OF GOD IN CORINTH.

The establishment of the Church of Corinth was the crowning work of Paul's second missionary journey, and one of the greatest achievements of his life. By repeated interventions crossing his plans of travel, the hand of God had compelled him to enter Europe, through the gate of Macedonia; thence Jewish persecution drove him onwards to Achaia, and prevented his returning to the work left unfinished in the northern province (1 Thess. ii. 14 ff., *cf.* Acts xvii. 5-15). At Athens, where he first touched Greek soil, the Apostle met with scant success; he arrived at Corinth dispirited and out of health (1 Cor. ii. 3, *cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 7), with little expectation of the harvest awaiting him. Loneliness aggravated the other causes of the "weakness and fear and trembling" that shook Christ's bold ambassador. His appearance and bearing conveyed an impression of feebleness which acted long afterwards to his prejudice (1 Cor. iv. 10, 2 Cor. x. 1-11, xii. 5, etc.). The new friendship of Aquila and Priscilla proved, however, a cordial to him (Acts xviii. 2 f., *cf.* Rom. xvi. 3 f.); and the return of Silas and Timothy with good news from Macedonia revived the confidence and vigour of their leader (Acts xviii. 5, *cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 6-9). Free from the anxiety which had distracted him, and rising above his late defeat, "Paul was *constrained by the word* [*cf.* for this verb 2 Cor. v. 14, and see Blass' *Acta Apostol.*, *ad loc.*], testifying to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ". The decision with which he now spoke brought about a speedy rupture. The Jews were affronted by the doctrine of a crucified Messiah, which Paul pressed with unsparing rigour (Acts xviii. 5 f., 1 Cor. i. 17, 23, ii. 2). In this crisis the Apostle showed neither weakness nor fear; shaking off the dust of the synagogue, he established a rival *ecclesia* hard by at the house of the proselyte

Titius Justus, marked by his name as a Roman citizen of the *colonia*, who could offer a secure and honourable refuge. The seceders included the Synagogue-chief Crispus and his family, with some other persons of importance. A vision in the following night assured Paul of success and personal safety at Corinth; accordingly "he sat down,"[1] resolved to make full proof of his ministry (Acts xviii. 9-11, *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 18 f.) and staying at least eighteen months in the city—a period much longer than he had spent in any place since first setting out from Antioch. The assault of the Jews miscarried through the firmness and impartiality of the proconsul Gallio. The Apostle found in the Roman Government "the restrainer" of the lawless violence which would have crushed his infant Churches (2 Thess. ii. 6 f.). At Corinth popular feeling ran against the Jews, and their futile attack favourably advertised Paul's work. The murderous plot formed against him some years later (Acts xx. 3) shows how fiercely he was hated by his compatriots in Corinth. He tells us that his success in Macedonia had excited public attention in many quarters, and prepared for his message an interested hearing (1 Thess. i. 8 f.). Outside of Corinth the Gospel was preached with effect throughout Achaia (2 Cor. i. 1); in Cenchreæ, *e.g.*, a regularly constituted Church was formed (Rom. xvi. 1). At his departure (Acts xviii. 18) the Apostle left behind him in this province a Christian community comparatively strong in numbers and conspicuous in the talent and activity of its members (1 Cor. i. 4-8, xiv. 26 ff.), consisting mainly of Gentiles, but with a considerable Jewish infusion (i. 12, vii. 18, xii. 13).

This city, the capital of Roman Greece and the fourth perhaps in size in the empire, was a focus of pagan civilisation, a mirror of the life and society of the age. The centre of a vast commerce, Corinth attracted a crowd of foreigners from East and West, who mingled with the native Greeks and adopted their language and manners. Though not a University town like Athens, Corinth nevertheless prided herself on her culture, and offered a mart to the vendors of all kinds of wisdom. "Not many wise, not many mighty, not many high-born" joined the disciples of the Crucified; but some of Paul's converts came under this description. There were marked social differences and contrasts of wealth and poverty in the Church (1 Cor. vii. 20-24, xi. 21 f., 2 Cor. viii. 12 ff., ix. 6 ff.). Along with slaves, a crowd of artisans and nondescript people, engaged in the petty handicrafts of a great emporium, entered the new society;

[1] ἐκάθισεν (Acts xviii. 11): the expression indicates that Paul had been up to this point unsettled, and made up his mind to remain; *cf.* Luke xxiv. 49.

"the foolish things of the world," its "weak" and "baseborn," formed the majority of its constituency (1 Cor. i. 27 ff.)—amongst them many who had been steeped in pagan vice (vi. 9 ff.).

The moral transformation effected in this corrupt material was accompanied by a notable mental quickening. The Hellenic intellect awoke at the touch of spiritual faith. This first Christian society planted upon Greek soil exhibited the characteristic qualities of the race—qualities however of Greece in her decadence rather than her prime. Amongst so many freshly awakened and eager but undisciplined minds, the Greek intellectualism took on a crude and shallow form; it betrayed a childish conceit and fondness for rhetoric and philosophical jargon (i. 17, ii. 1-5, etc.), and allied itself with the factiousness that was the inveterate curse of Greece. The Corinthian talent in matters of "word and knowledge" ran into emulation and frivolous disputes. "The habit of seeming to know all about most things, and of being able to talk glibly about most things, would naturally tend to an excess of individuality, and a diminished sense of corporate responsibilities. This fact supplies, under many different forms, the main drift of 1 Corinthians" (Hort, *Ecclesia*, p. 129). Even the gifts of the Holy Spirit were abused for purposes of display, edification being often the last thing thought of in their exercise (xii., xiv.). The excesses which profaned the Lord's Table (xi. 20 ff.), and the unseemly conduct of women in the Church meetings (xi. 3 ff., xiv. 34 ff.), were symptoms of the lawless self-assertion that marred the excellencies of this Church, and turned the abilities of many of its members into an injury rather than a furtherance to its welfare.

Still graver mischief arose from the influence of heathen society. For men breathing the moral atmosphere of Corinth, and whose earlier habits and notions had been formed in this environment, to conceive and maintain a Christian moral ideal was difficult in the extreme. Deplorable relapses occurred when the fervour of conversion had abated, and the Church proved shamefully tolerant towards sins of impurity (1 Cor. v., 2 Cor. xii. 20 f.). The acuteness of the Greek mind showed itself in antinomian sophistry; the "liberty" from Jewish ceremonial restrictions claimed by Paul for Gentile Christians was by some construed into a general licence, and carried to a length which shocked not merely the scruples of fellow-believers but the common moral instincts (vi. 12 ff., viii. 9-13, x. 23 ff., xi. 13 *b*). The social festivities of Corinth, bound up as they were with idolatry and its impurities, exposed the Church to severe temptation. To draw a hard and fast line in such questions

and to forbid all participation in *idolothyta*, after the precedent of Acts xv., would have been the simplest course to take; but Paul feels it necessary to ground the matter on fundamental principles. He will not acknowledge any dominion of the idol over "the earth and its fulness" (x. 26); nor, on the other hand, is it right to prevent neighbourly intercourse between Christians and unbelievers (x. 27 ff.). But where the feast is held under the auspices of a heathen god and as the sequel to his sacrifice the case is altered; participation under these circumstances becomes an act of apostasy, and the feaster identifies himself with the idol as distinctly as in the Lord's Supper he identifies himself with Christ (x. 16 ff.).

The working of the old leaven is patent in the denial of *the resurrection of the dead* made by some Corinthian Christians (xv.). Here the radical scepticism of the age opposed itself to the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, upon which the whole weight of Christian faith and hope, and the entire Christian conception of the world and of destiny, rest as upon their fulcrum and rock of certainty. The disbelief in bodily resurrection and the indifference to bodily sin manifested at Corinth had a common root. They may be traced to the false spiritualism, the contempt for physical nature, characteristic of the theosophy of the times, which gave rise a few years later to the Colossian heresy and was a chief factor in the development of Gnosticism. The teaching of chap. vi., that "your bodies are limbs of Christ," and the command to "glorify God in your bodies," are aimed against the same philosophical assumptions that are combated in chap. xv.; the demand for bodily purity finds in the doctrine of the resurrection its indispensable support and counterpart.

No reference is made in the Epistle to Church officers of any kind. Submission to "the house of Stephanas," and to others rendering like service, is enjoined in xvi. 15 f., but by way of voluntary deference. So early as the first missionary journey in South Galatia Paul had assisted in the "appointing of elders in every Church" (Acts xiv. 23; *cf.* Acts xx. 17, 1 Thess. v. 12, Rom. xii. 8, Phil. i. 1). He had refrained from this step at Corinth for some specific reason—a reason lying, it may be supposed, in the democratic spirit of the Church, which might have ill brooked official control. In xii. 28 the Apostle alludes, however, to "governments" as amongst the things which "God set [*as part of a plan*, Hort] in the Church"; and his promise to "set in order other things" (beside the Lord's Supper) when he comes (xi. 34) may cover the intention to remedy this defect, the consequences of which are painfully apparent (xiv. 26-33, etc.).

This Epistle discloses the interior life of an apostolic Church; hence its surpassing historical interest. We must not, indeed, apply its data without qualification to contemporary Christian societies, even those of Gentile origin. The Corinthian Church presented material of uncommon richness, but intractable to the founder's hand. Its turbulence and party heat are unparalleled in the N.T. records. But while the Church life here portrayed was exceptional in some features, and Paul's Church policy at Corinth may have differed from that pursued elsewhere, this Epistle is peculiarly full in its teaching on the nature and rights of the Church, and in the light it throws upon the conditions under which the first Gentile-Christian communities were moulded. Chaps. xii. and xiii. are the true centre of the Epistle. The very formlessness of this Church, its rudimentary and protoplasmic state, reveals the essence of the Christian society, its substratum and vital tissue, as these can hardly be seen in a more developed and furnished condition. The Apostle Paul is contending for the *bare life* of the Church of God in Corinth.

Corinth now became the advanced post and gateway for Christianity in its westward march. The *new* Corinth, in which Paul laboured, dates from the year 46 B.C., when the city was refounded by Julius Cæsar under the name *Colonia Julia Corinthus* (or *Laus Julii Corinthus*). Just a century earlier the old Corinth had been razed to the ground by Lucius Mummius, upon the defeat of the Achæan league which, with Corinth for its fortress, made a last despairing effort to retrieve the liberties of Greece. Corinth and Carthage fell and rose again simultaneously, marking the epochs at which republican Rome completed the destruction of the old world and imperial Rome began the construction of the new. The fame of ancient Corinth, reaching back to heroic times (see the *Iliad*, ii., 570; Pindar, *Olymp.*, 13)—where "the sweetly breathing Muse" and "death-dealing Ares" flourished side by side—and her later prowess as the bulwark of the Peloponnese and the maritime rival of Athens, were traditions with little interest or meaning for Paul and his disciples. The geographical position of Corinth gave to it enduring importance, and explains the fact that on its restoration the city sprang at once into the foremost rank. Corinth occupies one of the finest sites in Europe. With the Acrocorinthus (nearly 2,000 feet high) and the Oneion range shielding it on the south, it commands the narrow plain of the isthmus, and looks down, eastwards and westwards, upon the Saronic and Corinthian gulfs, which furnished the main artery of commerce between the Ægean and the Euxine seas on the one hand, and the Western Mediterranean upon the

other. (See the descriptions in Stanley's *Epp. to the Cor.*, p. 4, also article "Corinth" in Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*; and more at large, Leake's *Morea*, iii., 229-304, Curtius' *Peloponnesus*, ii., 514 f.; and for the antiquities, Pausanias, II., i., 2; Strabo, VIII., vi., 20-24; Dio Chrys., *Orat.*, 37; Ælius Arist., *Ad Poseid.*) The western port, Lechæum, 1½ mile distant, was linked by double walls to the city; Cenchreæ lay 8½ miles eastwards; and a shipway, running north of Corinth, connected the two harbours.

The presiding deities of this maritime city were the sea-god Poseidon, under whose patronage the famous Isthmian games were held (see ix. 24 ff. and notes), and Aphrodité, whose temple crowned the Acrocorinthus. The cultus of Aphrodité (worshipped in her debasing form as *Aphr. Pandemos*) dates back, it is supposed, to prehistoric Phœnician times; its features were more Oriental than Greek—especially the institution of the ἱερόδουλοι, or priestess-courtesans, of whom more than a thousand were attached to the shrine of the goddess. Temples of Serapis and Isis were also conspicuous at Corinth, representing the powerful leaven of Egyptian superstition that helped to demoralise the empire. The luxury and refinement of the elder Corinth were associated with its vice; so notorious was its debauchery that κορινθιάζεσθαι was a euphemism for whoredom; in our own literature "a Corinthian" still means a polished rake. By all accounts, the new Corinth more than rivalled the old in wickedness. Here the Apostle drew, from life, the lurid portraiture of Gentile sin that darkens the first page of his Epistle to the Romans. Within this stronghold of paganism and focus of Greek corruption Paul planted the cross of his Redeemer, rising out of his weakness and fear to a boundless courage. He confronted the world's glory and infamy with the sight of "Jesus Christ and Him crucified," confident that in the word of the cross which he preached there lay a spell to subdue the pride and cleanse the foulness of Corinthian life, a force which would prove to Gentile society in this place of its utter corruption the wisdom and power of God unto salvation. In "the Church of God in Corinth," with all its defects and follies, this redeeming power was lodged.

CHAPTER II.

PAUL'S COMMUNICATIONS WITH CORINTH.

ASSUMING 49 A.D. as the date of the conference in Jerusalem (Acts xv.), 57 as that of Paul's last voyage to the Holy City,[1] we calculate that he arrived at Corinth first in the latter part of the year 50, closing his mission in 52. He was engaged in the interval, until the spring of 56, mainly in the evangelisation of the province of Asia (Acts xix. 10, 22, xx. 1 ff.). When he writes this letter the Apostle is still at Ephesus, intending to remain until Pentecost, and with Passover approaching (xvi. 8 f., v. 7 f. : see notes). Paul's departure from Ephesus was hastened by the riot (Acts xix. 23-xx. 1); and we may take it that this Epistle was despatched in the early spring of 56, very shortly before Paul left Ephesus for Troas in the course of his third missionary journey.

The Apostle had previously sent Timothy and Erastus forward to Corinth, by way of Macedonia, to prepare for his arrival, in pursuance of the plan now sketched in his mind for completing his work in these regions with a view to advancing upon Rome and the further west (Acts xix. 21 f., *cf.* Rom. xv. 16-25). Timothy is likely to arrive soon after this letter, and will be able to enforce its prescriptions (iv. 17; see also xvi. 10 f., and notes). Apollos, who had migrated to Corinth fresh from the instructions of Priscilla and Aquila in Ephesus and had "watered" there what Paul had "planted" (iii. 6, Acts xviii. 27 f.), is back again at Ephesus in the Apostle's company (xvi. 12); he is clear of complicity in the party quarrels with which his name was associated in Corinth (i. 12, iii. 4-8, iv. 6). Quite recently "the people of Chloë" have brought an alarming report of these "strifes" (i. 11); and the Apostle learns from general rumour of the case of incest polluting the Church

[1] See article "Chronology of the N.T." in Hastings' *Bib. Dict.;* and for the latter date, article "Paul," i., 5. It is now generally recognised that the dates assigned to Pauline events by Wieseler and Lightfoot are, from 49 onwards, at least a couple of years too late.

(v. 1). More agreeable tidings have come with Stephanas and his companions (xvi. 17 f.), who bear a dutiful letter of inquiry addressed to Paul, which he answers in chap. vii. ff. Through their lips, as well as from the Church letter, he receives the assurances of the general loyalty and goodwill of the Corinthian believers. From all these sources occasion is drawn and material furnished for the writing before us.

This Epistle is not the first which Paul had addressed to Corinth. In chap. v. 9 the writer refers to *an earlier letter* forbidding intercourse with immoral persons. The terms of this admonition had raised debate. Some read it as though all dealings with vicious men were inhibited—a restriction that was as good as to tell Corinthian Christians to "go out of the world"! They could not imagine Paul to mean this; but his words allowed of this construction, and thus opened the door for discussion and for temporising. The tenor of the lost Epistle probably resembled that of 2 Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1 (see this Comm., *ad loc.*). This letter had arrived some months previously to our Epistle; for the Church had had time to consider and reply to it, and the condition of things to which it relates has undergone some changes. It may be referred as far back as the previous autumn (55 A.D.). Inasmuch as the Church-letter touched on "the collection for the saints" (xvi. 1: see note), it seems likely that the Apostle had made some appeal in the lost Epistle on this subject, eliciting a favourable reply (*cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2), but with a request for directions as to the mode of gathering the money.

There is reason to believe that *Paul had himself visited Corinth* not very long before writing the aforesaid letter. The allusions of 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, 20—xiii. 2 (see notes), imply that he had been *twice* in Corinth before the Second Epistle. If with Clemen (*Chronol. d. Paulin. Briefe*), Schmiedel (*Handcomm.*, 1 and 2 Kor., *Einleitung*), and Krenkel (*Beiträge z. Aufhellung d. Paul. Briefe*, vi.) we could spread the composition of 1 and 2 Cor. over two years, space would be found for interposing such a visit between them, but at the cost of creating fresh and insuperable chronological difficulties. In 2 Cor. i. 15 ff. the Apostle defends himself for having *failed* to come recently to Corinth; he had sent Titus, and with him a letter (2 Cor. ii. 4, vii. 8)—distinct, as the present writer holds, from 1 Cor. (a *second lost letter* of Paul to Corinth: see Hastings' *Bib. Dict.*, article "Paul," i. *d.*), and occasioned by an emergency that arose subsequently to its despatch —which gave a new turn to the Apostle's relations with the Church. Meanwhile he has himself left Ephesus (as contemplated in 1 Cor. xvi.), has pushed forward to Macedonia (2 Cor. ii. 12 f.), where at

last Titus meets him with the cheering news reflected in 2 Cor. i.-vii. As already shown, a space of but a few weeks elapsed between Paul's writing 1 Cor. and leaving Ephesus for Troas.

We have traced Paul's steps through the months separating the two Epistles, and neither time nor occasion is found for an interjected trip to Corinth. We are thrown back upon the period *before* the first Epistle. Yet 1 Cor. makes no express reference to any recent visit; and its silence, *primâ facie*, negatives the supposition of any such occurrence. There are circumstances however which relieve this adverse presumption. For one thing, the *lost letter* had intervened; this other Epistle, not our 1 Cor., was the sequel of the visit in question. The main thing that occupied Paul's mind on that occasion, and which caused the "grief" referred to in 2 Cor. ii. 1, had been the impurity of life manifest within the Church. Against this he had given solemn warning, while forbearing discipline (2 Cor. xiii. 2). It was with a moral situation of this kind that the missing letter dealt (1 Cor. v. 9-12); the alarm it expressed is still felt in 1 Cor. vi., x., xv. 33 f. Meantime, the horrible case of incest has eclipsed previous transgressions; and while Paul reaffirms the general directions already sent and prompted (*ex hypothesi*) by personal observation, he fastens his attention upon the new criminality just brought to his ears. That previous meeting had been so unhappy for both parties that Paul might well avoid allusion to it; it was an experience he was resolved never to repeat (2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 20). If he comes again under like conditions, it will be "rod" in hand (1 Cor. iv. 21, 2 Cor. xiii. 2). His forbearance had been misconstrued; some of the offenders were emboldened to defy him, and his Judaistic supplanters subsequently contrasted the severity of his letters with his timidity in face of the mutineers (2 Cor. x. 6, xiii. 1-7)—a taunt which drags from him the allusions of the second Epistle. After all, 1 Cor. is not without traces of the second visit. Nothing so well accounts for the doubts of Paul's disciplinary power hinted in 1 Cor. iv. 18-21 as the encounter supposed. When after his threat, and while the plague grows in virulence (1 Cor. v.) and his opponents challenge him to come (iv. 18)—still more, when he has announced, while fulminating anathemas on paper (v. 4 f., xvi. 22), that his return is postponed, without any imperative reason given for delay (xvi. 5 ff.)—after all this, it is no wonder that even his friends felt themselves aggrieved, and that the most damaging constructions were put upon the Apostle's changes of plan (2 Cor. i. 15 ff., x. 9 ff., xiii. 3 ff.). At last he explains, in 2 Cor., that the postponement is due to his continued desire to "spare" instead of striking. If, notwithstanding these

apprehensions, Paul speaks in 2 Cor. i. 15 of the double visit that had been for a while intended (a *third* and *fourth* from the beginning) as "a second joy" (or "grace"), he is probably quoting words of the Church letter. Further, one detects in 1 Cor. iv .1-10 a sharp note of personal feeling that indicates some recent contact between writer and readers, and ocular observation on the Apostle's part of the altered bearing of his spoilt children at Corinth. This Epistle manifests a mastery of the situation and a vivid realisation of its detailed circumstances such as we can best account for on the supposition that Paul had taken a personal survey of the development of the Church since his first departure, and that behind all he has heard latterly from others and seen through their eyes, he is also judging upon the strength of what he has himself witnessed and knows at first hand.

CHAPTER III.

THE TEACHING OF THE EPISTLE.

WHILE the doctrine of the companion Epistles to the Galatians and Romans lies upon the surface, the theology of this Epistle has to be disentangled from a coil of knotty practical questions. The Apostle writes under constraint, unable to count on the full sympathy of his readers or to say all that is in his mind (ii. 6, iii. 1). Instead of giving free play to his own reflexions, he is compelled through the greater part of the letter to wait upon the caprices of this flighty young Greek Church. At first sight one fails to observe any continuous teaching in the Epistle; a doctrinal analysis of its contents seems out of place. But closer attention discovers a real coherence behind this disconnectedness of form. While Paul comments on the sad news from Corinth and answers seriatim the questions addressed to him, his genius grasps the situation, and the leaven of the Gospel all the while assimilates the discordant mass. The Pauline standpoint is firmly maintained. The Christian principle shows itself master of the Gentile no less than the Jewish field, and gives earnest of its power to meet the changeful and multiplying demands that will be created by its expansion through the world. There is a unity of thought in this letter as real as that stamped upon the Epistle to the Romans, a unity the more impressive because of the baffling conditions under which it is realised.

Paul's Gospel stands here on its defence against the pretensions of worldly wisdom and the corruptions of the fleshly mind; from the height of the Cross it sends its piercing rays into the abyss of pagan sin disclosed at Corinth in its turpitude and demonic force. Amongst the four Evangelical Epistles, this is *the epistle of the cross in its social application.* It bears throughout a realistic stamp. "The Church of God that exists in Corinth," the men and women that compose it, are constantly present to the writer's mind—their diverse states and relationships, their debasing antecedents and surroundings, their crude ideas and conflicting tempers and keen ambitions, their high religious enthusiasm and their low moral sensibilities, their

demonstrative but fickle affections and unsteady resolutions. Two things he strives to bring into full contact—Christ crucified and these half-Christianised Corinthian natures. What Romans does for the Gospel in the field of theological exposition, and Galatians in that of doctrinal polemic, and 2 Corinthians in that of personal experience and ministerial vocation, this 1 Corinthians has done in respect of its bearing upon human intercourse and the life of the community.

The foundation upon which Paul had built at Corinth is "Jesus Christ"—*i.e.*, "Jesus Christ crucified" (iii. 11, i. 17 f., ii. 2, xv. 1-3). He does not, any more than in 1 Thessalonians, enter into an exposition of his λόγος τοῦ σταύρου. Not yet, in Corinth at least, had the legalists openly contested Paul's doctrine of salvation through the death of Christ; the first sketch of its argumentative defence appears in 2 Cor. v. 14 ff. The chief peril comes from the opposite quarter, from the dissolving influences of Hellenic scepticism and demoralisation. The form, rather than the contents, of Paul's message is just now in question; he is reproached with the μωρία τοῦ κηρύγματος (i. 18-25). But the form of presentation is determined by the substance of the truth presented; the cross of Christ cannot appear draped in the robes of Greek philosophy. The mere fact that it is "the word of *the cross*" convicts the Gospel of folly in the eyes of the Greek lover of wisdom, as of weakness before the Jewish believer in "signs". A "wise" world that knows not God (i. 21, ii. 6, 14, *cf.* Rom. i. 19-23) will not understand His message, until it learns its ignorance.

1. To *the source of the Gospel* must therefore be traced that scorn of the Corinthian world which so much troubles the Church. It was "the testimony of God" that Paul had first announced (ii. 1); the Corinthian believers are "*of Him* in Christ Jesus," and have learnt to worship God as "Father of us and of our Lord Jesus Christ" (i. 3, 26-31: observe the emphasis thrown in vv. 18-31 upon ὁ Θεὸς in contrast with ὁ κόσμος). Impotent and even absurd "the preaching of the cross" may appear to the Corinthian public; "to the saved" it is "the wisdom" and "the power of God".

(1) The λόγος τοῦ σταύρου is *God's power* at work in its most characteristic and sovereign energy, destined to shatter all adverse potencies (i. 27 ff., xv. 24 ff.). Veiled under a guise of weakness, it thus ensnares the world and exposes its folly (i. 19-21, ii. 6-8, iii. 19); it chooses for its instruments feeble and ignoble things to overthrow the mightiest. The power of God acting in this λόγος is administered by "our Lord Jesus Christ"—His mediator in the universe, and specifically in the Church (viii. 6)—whom the world crucified (ii. 8);

so that it is in effect *the power of Christ*, and "in Christ Jesus" men "come to be of God". God has made Him unto us "righteousness and sanctification and redemption" (i. 30, *cf.* vi. 11); with the "price" of His blood He "bought" us, the body not excepted, for God's property (i. 2, iii. 16, vi. 19 f.); from "the strength of sin" and the reign of death Christians are consciously delivered through the death, crowned by the resurrection, of the Lord Jesus and through faith in His name (xv. 1-4, 11, 17 f., 56 f.).

The Holy Spirit constitutes this mysterious power of God in operation. His "demonstration and power" attended Paul's mission to Corinth, giving it an efficacy otherwise unaccountable (ii. 1-6); all Christian revelations come by this channel (ii. 11-16). Only "in the Holy Spirit" does any man truly say, "Jesus is Lord" (xii. 3); "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God," the foulest sinners of Corinth had been "washed" and "sanctified" (vi. 11). The gifts possessed by this favoured Church are of the Spirit's "distribution," while of God's omnipresent "working" and held under Christ's dominion (xii. 4-11). The manifestations of the Spirit in the Gospel and in the Church differ from all forms of power the world has known; they reveal a kingdom rich in blessings such as "eye hath not seen nor ear heard, nor man's heart conceived" (ii. 9 f.).

(2) The word of the cross discloses, to those who can understand, *God's wisdom* hitherto shrouded "in mystery," whose manifestation was determined for this epoch from the world's beginning (ii. 6-9). By it the pretentious "wisdom of the age" will be overthrown. The world scorns to be saved by a crucified Messiah, and "the natural man cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God"; but wisdom is justified of her children. Bringing such a message, the Apostle discards adornments and plausibilities of speech; his word must speak by its inherent truth and force (ii. 1 ff.). As Christian men advance, the revelation of God increasingly approves itself to them; it discloses its σοφία τοῖς τελείοις. No longer does the opinion of the world sway them nor its temper cleave to them, they become "men of the Spirit," who "judge all things" and are "judged of none" (ii. 6-iii. 3). One day they shall "judge the world" (vi. 2).

From the standpoint thus gained, in view of the operation of God in whatever belongs to the Gospel, the Apostle defines in chaps. iii. and iv. the position of Christ's ministers: "We are God's fellow-workers"; Paul the planter, Apollos the waterer—they are nothing; God "gives the increase". "Assistants of Christ, stewards of God's mysteries," their qualifications are fidelity and

the possession of the Master's mind (ii. 10, 16, vii. 25, 40). To their Lord, not to their fellow-servants, they are answerable. By His "call" and "compulsion" they serve the Gospel (i. 1, ix. 16 f., xii. 28). How presumptuous for the Corinthians to be "puffed up for one against the other" of God's servants! All alike are theirs, while they are Christ's and Christ is God's (iii. 4 f., 21-iv. 6). Let men look above the stewards to the Master, above the instruments to God who "worketh all things in all" (xii. 4 ff.). The Christian teachers are God's temple-builders; heavy their loss, if they build amiss; terrible their ruin, if instead of strengthening they destroy the fabric (iii. 10-17). Their maintenance is not bestowed by the Church as wages by an employer, but enjoined on the Church by the Lord's ordinance, upon the same principle of justice which allows the threshing ox to feed from the corn (ix. 7-12).

The readers must learn what it means to belong to "the Church *of God*". Despite their presumed knowledge (viii.), "ignorance of God" is at the root of their errors (xv. 34). Newly emancipated from heathenism, they are slow to realise the character and claims of the God revealed to them in Christ. The first four chapters seek at every point to correct this ignorance; indeed, this underlying vein runs through the Epistle (*cf.* in this respect 1 Thess. *passim*). Πάντα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ is the maxim that Paul dictates to his readers (x. 31), and that governs his mind throughout the letter.

2. *The nature of the Christian community* is the subject of chaps. xii. and xiv., but it pervades the Epistle no less than that of the sovereign claims of God: "to *the Church* of God in Corinth" the Apostle writes.

The Græco-Roman cities at this time were honey-combed, in all grades of life, with private associations—trade-guilds, burial clubs and friendly societies, religious confraternities; their existence supplied a great social need, and formed a partial substitute for the political activity suppressed by the levelling Roman empire. These organisations prepared heathen society for Church life; and Christianity upon Gentile soil largely adopted the forms of combination in popular use, borrowing from the Greek club almost as much as from the Jewish synagogue. But it transformed what it borrowed. In the Churches of God established in Thessalonica and Corinth the first stones were laid of the Christian structure of society. New conceptions of duty and kinship are unfolded in this Epistle, which have yet to receive full development. Paul's sociology naturally met with resistance from men reared in Paganism; human nature is still against it. The Corinthians brought into the Church their

Greek contentiousness, their lack of loyalty and public spirit. The mental stimulus and large freedom of the new faith, where reverence and self-control were wanting, resulted for the time in greater turbulence rather than in a nobler and happier order.

(1) As we have seen, the Apostle insists above all that the Christian community is *the building of God.* Injury to this "temple of God" is the worst sacrilege (iii. 16 f.). The Church consists of those whom God has "called into the communion of His Son Jesus Christ" (i. 9); who "were, in one Spirit, all baptised into one body . . . and all were made to drink of one Spirit"—"the Spirit that is from God" (ii. 12, xii. 13). This creative, informing Presence determines the nature, constitution and destiny of the Church.

(2) In relation to each other, Christian men form *a brotherhood.* Paul addresses his readers as "brethren" not by way of courtesy or personal friendliness, but to enforce upon them mutual devotion. Each Christian looks upon his fellow as "the brother for whom Christ died"; to "sin against the brethren" is "to sin against Christ" (viii. 11 ff.). By communion of faith and worship in Christ a union of hearts is created more intimate and tender than the world had ever seen. Christians are to each other as eye to ear and hand to foot (xii. 14 ff.). Each has his honourable place in the body, fixed by God; each is necessary to all, all to each (xii. 21-31). The rapturous outburst of chap. xiii. is a song to the praise of Love as the law of Christian brotherhood. Knowledge, faith, miracles are useless or unreal unless yoked to love, which points out the "way" to the right employment of every faculty (xii. 31). "The collection for the saints" of Jerusalem (xvi. 1) was dictated by the affection that binds the scattered parts of the Church of God.

(3) The relations of Christians to God the Father, and to their believing brethren, alike centre in their relationship to Christ: *the Church is His body*—"a κοινωνία of the Son of God" (i. 9). The whole consciousness of the new life—personal or corporate—is grounded there; ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἐν Κυρίῳ, is the Apostle's standing definition of Christian states and relations. To use Paul's strong expression (vi. 17), "he who is *cemented to the Lord*, is one spirit". By the fact that they severally inhere in Him, men are constituted "a body of Christ, and *members individually*" (xii. 27). No man in Christ is self-complete; the eye finds its mate in the hand, the head in the foot. This reciprocal subordination dictates the law of the life in Christ Jesus and controls all its movements. The Apostle claims to be himself ἔννομος Χριστοῦ, because he "seeks not his own profit but that of the many" (x. 21 ff.). The question of i. 13,

μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός; reveals the radical mischief at work in Corinth. The Church was in the eyes of some of its members a kind of debating club or philosophical school, in which αἱρέσεις and σχίσματα were matters of course; to others it was a benefit society, to be used so far as suited inclination and convenience. Against all such debased notions of social life, and selfish abuse of Church privilege, this Epistle is a sustained protest.

This fellowship of Christ is symbolised and sealed by the bread and cup of the Lord's Supper (x. 16 ff.)—the "one loaf" and "one cup" in which all participate, since it is a "*communion* of the body of Christ" and "of the blood of Christ". The "word of the cross" is made by this ordinance a binding "covenant in Christ's blood". The Christian Society is thus known as the fraternity of the Crucified; evermore it "proclaims the Lord's death, till He come" (xi. 26). Such fellowship in Christ, appropriating the whole man, the body with the spirit (vi. 15, 19), excludes *ipso facto* all intercourse with "the demons" and feasting at their "table" (x. 20 ff.); their communion is abhorrent and morally impossible to those who have truly partaken with Christ (*cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff.).

The introductory thanksgiving signally connects the κοινωνία τοῦ Χριστοῦ with His παρουσία. Hope is a uniting principle, along with faith and love (xiii. 13, *cf.* Eph. iv. 4). The Church of God is no mere temporal fabric. The "gold, silver, precious stones" of its construction will brave the judgment fires (iii. 12-15). "Those who are Christ's, at His coming," form the nucleus of the eternal kingdom of God (xv. 23-28). "The day" which reveals the completed work of Christ "will declare every man's work, of what sort it is"; each of Christ's helpers will then receive his meed of "praise from God," and the approved "saints," as Christ's assessors, will "judge the world" and "angels" (iii. 13, iv. 5, vi. 2 f.).

(4) The regulation of *the charismata*, the wealth and the embarrassment of this Church, is deduced from the above principles. These powers, however manifold, are manifestations of "the same Spirit," who inhabits the entire body of Christ and whose "will" determines the various endowments of its several members (xii. 7-11). They are distributed, as the bodily functions are assigned to their proper organs, for the service of the whole frame. The possessor of one cannot dispense with, and must not despise, his differently gifted brother (xii. 14 ff.). Yet there is a gradation in the charisms; it is right to covet "the greater" among them. Love supplies the criterion; the most *edifying* gifts are the most desirable (xii. 31-xiv. 19). Self-restraint must be exercised by gifted persons, and

order enforced by the community, so that individual talents may be combined for the common good (xiv. 26-33). To the direction of these matters a manly practical sense must be applied; "the understanding" aids the service of "the spirit" (xiv. 14-20).

This charismatic ministry, diffused through the body of Christ, is the basis of all Christian agency. As yet there are only "functions, not formal offices" (Hort); the function is anterior to the office, and may exist without it. Each man in the Church of Corinth spontaneously speaks, sings, serves in whatever fashion (xiv. 26), in virtue of his χάρισμα,—the particular form which the common χάρις assumes in him for the benefit of others. The realisation of the life of Christ in the Christian Society is the aim imposed on each Christian by the Spirit whose indwelling makes him such.

3. The teaching of the Epistle takes a wide outlook in its consideration of *the relations of the Christian to the world.* This relationship is exhibited mainly on its negative side. The believer in Christ, "elect" and "sanctified" (i. 2, 27), built on the foundation of Jesus Christ into God's temple, is separated from the world. The Spirit he has from God makes him a πνευματικός; he has new faculties, and lives in a changed order of things. There are two worlds—a new world of the Spirit formed within the old κόσμος but utterly distinct from it, unintelligible to it, and destined soon to overthrow and displace it (i. 25-29, ii. 6-14, iii. 18 f., vii. 31).

(1) With the world's *sin* the Church of God holds truceless war. Living in the world, Christians cannot avoid contact with its "fornicators, extortioners," and the rest; but it can and must keep them out of its ranks (v. 9-13); the old leaven is to be "cleansed out" of the "new kneading," since Christ is our paschal lamb (v. 6-8). The sin of the world culminates in its idolatry; from this the Corinthians, unconditionally, must "flee" (x. 1-14).

(2) The Apostle recognises *the natural order of life* as one who sees through and beyond it. He cherishes, up to this date, the hope of his Lord's speedy return (xv. 51 f.). Hence the provisional character of his advices respecting marriage in chap. vii. He writes at a juncture of suspense, when men should keep themselves free from needless ties. He admits the necessity of marriage in the case of many Corinthians, and applies the law of Christ carefully to the mixed unions so troublesome at Corinth. He fears for his disciples the burdens imposed by domestic cares in times so uncertain, and in a society at war with the world. Christians may not "go out of the world," nor cease to "use" it; but they must hold it lightly and refrain from "using it to the full."

In discussing the question of the *idolothyta* Paul gives a glance to the more positive side of the Christian's relations with external nature. He recalls the attitude of the Old Testament towards earthly blessings by quoting, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof" (x. 28). The idols have no power to usurp God's creatures, nor to limit His children's use of them. An enlightened conscience will not scruple at the enjoyment of food sacrificed to an idol, though circumstances will often make this inexpedient (viii., x. 23 ff.). The Jewish distinctions of meat are obsolete (vi. 12 f.); it was in this sense that Paul had enunciated the much-abused maxim, "All things are lawful to me". The σαρκικὰ of life he enlists in the service of its πνευματικά; they serve to multiply and strengthen the bonds of mutual necessity arising from our kinship in Christ (ix. 7-12, *cf.* Rom. xv. 27, Gal. vi.).

In the relationship of man and woman the Apostle sees the natural and spiritual order blended; he passes from the one to the other with perfect congruity, and appeals to the teaching of "nature," expressed in secular customs of dress, as an exponent of the Divine will (xi. 1-15). While censuring the greed and arrogance displayed by the rich (xi. 17 ff.), he leaves distinctions of wealth and rank uncondemned; from the analogy applied in chap. xii. 13 ff. we infer that he viewed these as a part of "the fashion of this world," necessary but transient.

(3) *Death*, like sin which gives to it its "sting," belongs to the system of the present evil world. Since the resurrection of Christ, death is in principle "abolished" for those who are His (xv. 26, 55 ff.). The resurrection is no mere immortality of the spirit, such as philosophers conceived; it is the reversal of death, the recovery of the entire man from its power. Christ's people, to be sure, will not be reclad in mortal habiliments, nor resume the corpse that was laid in the grave. The new frame will differ from the old as the plant from its perished seed. Heavenly bodies must surpass earthly in unimaginable ways. Adam and Christ are types of two modes of being: in our present "natural body" we "wear the image" of the former; our future body will be "spiritual" after the image of God's Son (xv. 35-57).

This glorious and inconceivable change will supervene—for Christians living or departed alike (xv. 51 f.)—at "the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ," which the Corinthian Christians are awaiting (i. 7). This is "the end" of the course of revelation and of God's dealings with mankind—when Christ's redemption is complete, when His enemies throughout creation are overcome, and He

is able to lay at the Father's feet an empire wholly subdued and everywhere accordant with the Creator's will. Then "the Son Himself" will give the crowning example of submission, "that God may be all in all" (xv. 28). In this sublime issue the teaching of the Epistle culminates. The relation of the Church of Corinth to God, though marred upon its part yet real and sanctifying, which gave the Apostle his starting-point, has been unfolded in ever-widening circles, until it is seen to embrace the universe; there is formed within it the beginning of a Divine realm that stretches on into unknown worlds, and will bring all finite powers and beings under its sway.

Through this entire development of thought and life Christ is all things. His presence and lordship, the redeeming power of His cross, extend over every field within our view. They cover alike the relations of the individual man to God, of man to man within society, and of man, individually and collectively, to the world around him in the present and before him in the future. Christ is all in all, that through Him finally God may be all in all.

CHAPTER IV.

THE LANGUAGE, TEXT, HISTORY, AND CRITICISM OF THE EPISTLE.

1. LANGUAGE. "The dialect of these Epistles (1 and 2 Cor.) is not Hebraistic, but moves upon the lines of Hellenistic Greek. It finds its analogue, in a multitude of characteristics, in the language of Polybius, the classic of Hellenism, in Epictetus, in Plutarch, in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and others, in such a way as to imply for it and them *a common life-sphere*" (Heinrici). Paul has become in this Epistle, more than elsewhere, τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ὡς Ἕλλην. Its atmosphere and colouring and movement are distinctively *Greek of the period*,—when compared, *e.g.*, with the style of Romans or 2 Thessalonians. While Old Testament references are numerous in 1 Cor., they are employed by way of illustration rather than of proof, and in a Hellenistic not a Rabbinical manner.

The Epistle has a rich vocabulary. Out of the 5,594 Greek words of the New Testament it employs 963—103 peculiar to itself. In the *hapax legomena* one expects the idiosyncrasy of the Epistle to manifest itself. Sixty-eight of these—about two-thirds—are classical, occurring in Attic writers earlier than Aristotle; twenty-two belong to post-classical authors of the κοινή, or to the Greek of the contemporary inscriptions and papyri. In the residue there is one specifically Septuagint term, εἰδωλεῖον (viii. 10, see note); and the Aramæan sentence, μαρὰν ἀθά. Eleven words are left, so far unknown from other documents, or used only by Christian writers after Paul—διερμηνεία, -ευτής, εὐπάρεδρος, ὀλοθρευτής, πιθός (ii. 4), περίψημα, συνζητητής, τυπικῶς, ὑπέρακμος, χοϊκός, χρηστεύομαι; but every one of these has close kindred or analogues in common Greek; it is likely enough that all were current in the speech of Corinth: εὐπάρεδρος however, with its transparent sense, has the look of a Pauline coinage. The forty-two additional words of 1 Corinthians (24 if the Pastorals be excluded) limited in their N.T. range to the Pauline Epistles—*Pauline*, but not First-Corinthian, *h. lgg.*—yield a similar analysis.

Out of the 150 words enumerated by Kennedy in his useful *Sources of N.T. Greek* (pp. 88-91) as "strictly peculiar to the LXX

or N.T.," with the forty or fifty added to this list by including Philo Judæus, twenty-five occur in this Epistle; but apart from Hebrew loan-words (such as πάσχα), and excluding near relations and correlates of recognised classical or post-classical words, there remains, after the researches of Deissmann (in his *Bibelstudien* and *Neue Bibelstudien*) and other students of the Greek inscriptions and papyri, only a handful, perhaps half a dozen of the twenty-five, that can be called properly and exclusively "Biblical"—a scanty residue which further discovery may diminish. So far as 1 Corinthians is concerned, we may dismiss, with Deissmann, "the *legend* of a Biblical Greek". What is said of the Greek character of the vocabulary holds good in general of the grammar of this Epistle. The idioms of Paul's epistolary style form a distinct subject, on which it is not necessary to enter here.

2. Text. The Greek Text of this Epistle stands on the same footing as that of the rest—all usually contained in the collected volume entitled Ο ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ. Eighteen of the twenty-three known Pauline uncial Codices belong to 1 Cor.: ℵ$B_1AD_2E_3L_2$ are complete; $CF_2G_3K_2P_2$, approximately complete; S_2 contains half, and ב$H_3I_2M_2Q_2F^a$ fragments of the Epistle. ℵBAC were Codices of the whole New Testament; בKLPS included the Acts and Catholic Epp., P the Apocalypse also. In point of date, Bℵ belong to the fourth century; בACIQ to the fifth century; DH to the sixth century; F^a to the seventh century; the rest to the ninth century. Amongst the numerous correctors of ℵ, ℵ^c, of the seventh century, is important here as elsewhere. ב (a palimpsest in the Vatican Library) and S_2 (Athous Lauræ) are not yet critically edited or collated: see on these MSS., and for full details respecting the textual material, C. R. Gregory's *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's *N.T. Græce, ed. major.* Out of the 480 catalogued minuscule (or cursive) MSS. of Paul few deserve attention. "The ancient elements" found in them "appear with extreme irregularity in different places of the Epistles," and Western readings in a remarkably small proportion (Westcott and Hort, *Introd. to the N.T. in Greek*, § 212). The most notable, and those oftenest cited below, are 17 (same as 33 of Gospels and 18 of Acts), 37 (Gospels 69, Acts 31, Rev. 14), 47 (Gospels 49)—all extending to viii. 10; and 67 ** (Acts 66, Rev. 34)—the marginal corrections of an ordinary cursive, which "include a relatively large number of very ancient readings," akin to those of M_2(W.H.); 71; 109 (Acts 96). The 265 numbered Lectionaries containing Acts and Epistles are but partially explored; none as yet appear of sufficient value to be regularly cited.

The ancient Versions are of fairly uniform character through the N.T. The most valuable are all available here, except the Curetonian Syriac confined to the Gospels.

From the fourth century onwards Patristic references to 1 Corinthians become numerous and full, and afford the critic greater help than in some other Epistles. But the definite and certain aid forthcoming from this quarter is less than might have been expected.

Considering the length of the Epistle, it contains few conspicuous textual difficulties, none of grave exegetical importance. Its text has been from the first carefully preserved. In the following conspectus of various readings all Greek words are *spaced* in which the Textus Receptus is emended by the note. Where the reading is doubtful, a *query* follows the alternative reading supplied in the notes—a query *after the spacing* indicating a reading more likely than not, a query *without the spacing* indicating a possible but less probable reading. Orthographical corrections occurring *passim*, which belong to the N.T. written dialect as this is represented by the five great uncials and exhibited in the standard N.T. Grammars, must be taken for granted throughout.

Excluding the numberless corrections of the kind just noticed and those concerning only points of grammar or the *ordo verborum*, there are more than 200 emendations which affect the sense of the Epistle. Chapters vii. 29, 33 f., xv. 51 are instances of special complication. The restoration of the true text in iii. 1, 4, iv. 2, vii. 3, xi. 29, xv. 47 brings out the finer edge of Paul's style. The Received Text of vi. 20 and vii. 5 contains ecclesiastical glosses; in iv. 6 and ix. 15 it has helped out Paul's anacolutha; its habit of extending the shorter names of Christ blunts his meaning—notably in ix. 1 and xvi. 22. The group of (liturgical?) additions to the genuine text in xi. 24 ff. deserves particular attention. Συνηθεία (viii. 7) and ἱερόθυτον (x. 28) are interesting words restored by criticism. A few readings are noted in the digest which have little or no intrinsic worth, but are of interest in their bearing on the history of the text, especially where they illustrate the peculiarities of the "Western" tradition. One *conjectural emendation* is adopted, *viz.*, that of Westcott and Hort in ch. xii. 2.

3. History of the Epistle. This is the first N.T. writing to be cited by name in Christian literature. "Take up," says Clement of Rome to the Corinthians (1 Ep., xlvii.), "the letter of the blessed Paul the Apostle. What was the first thing he wrote to you in the beginning of the Gospel? Of a truth he wrote to you in the Spirit

touching himself and Cephas and Apollos, because even then you had formed factions." Like other post-apostolic writers, Clement shows an imperfect grasp of Pauline teaching, but his Salutation, with §§ xxiv., xxxiv. 8, xxxvii., xlix., and lxv. 2, bears unmistakable impressions of this Epistle. The Epistle of Barnabas (iv. 9-11, v. 6, vi. 5, xvi. 7-10; Hermas, *Mand.* iv. 4 (*cf.* 1 Cor. vii. 39); Ignatius, *Ad Eph.*, xvi., xviii., *Ad Rom.*, iv. 3, v. 1, ix. 2; Polycarp, *Ad Phil.*, x. 2, *Ad Diognetum*, xii. 5; the *Didachê*, i. 5, iii. 3, iv. 3, x. 6, etc., attest the use of this writing in primitive Christian times. From Irenæus onwards it is quoted as Holy Scripture. The Gnostics used it with predilection. The testimony of early Christianity to its Pauline authorship and Apostolic authority is unequivocal and full.

But our Epistle did not at first take a leading place among N.T. writings. Its influence has been "broken and fitful". It had little to say directly upon the questions (except that of the Resurrection) which chiefly interested the ante-Nicene Church. Tertullian, however, expounded it in his *Adv. Marcionem;* and Origen wrote annotations, partly preserved in Cramer's *Catena.* In the fourth century, when "controversies on Church discipline and morals began to sway the minds of thoughtful men, this Epistle came to the front" (Edwards). Many of the Church leaders of that time wrote upon 1 Corinthians. Only fragments of the Greek commentators earlier than John Chrysostom († 407 A.D.) are extant; later expositors—the most notable, Theodoret (420 A.D.), Oecumenius (*c.* 950), Theophylact (1078)—built upon him; his versatile powers shine in the exposition of this Epistle. The Latin commentaries of Pelagius (for long ascribed to Jerome) and of Ambrosiaster (Hilary of Rome?) testify to the wide use of this Scripture in the West in the fourth and fifth centuries. To Thomas Aquinas we owe the only interpretation of value bequeathed by the Middle Ages. Though subordinated, like all mediæval exegesis, to scholastic theology, his exposition contains fresh and vigorous thought.

Colet's Oxford Lectures on this Epistle (A.D. 1496), and the N.T. *Paraphrase* of Erasmus (1519), breathe the new spirit of the Reformation, which brought 1 Corinthians to the front again, along with Romans and Galatians. The adjustment of liberty and order, the application of evangelical faith to secular life, the reconstitution of the Church with its sacraments and ministry started a multitude of problems calling for its aid. Calvin excelled himself in his interpretation of this Epistle, offending many of his followers by his breadth and candour. Estius, his Romanist contemporary, is no mean rival. Amongst the German Reformers, Melanchthon, W. Musculus, Bul-

linger handled this Epistle with effect. Beza's *Annotationes,* and especially his Latin translation, are always worth consulting. The illustrious Grotius—Arminian, humanistic, practical—found here a congenial subject. In the seventeenth century 1 Corinthians suffered another eclipse; no Commentary upon it of any mark appeared between the time of Grotius and Bengel. All later interpreters are Bengel's disciples.

This Epistle at present suffers no lack of attention. Beside the larger critical N.T. Commentaries of Germany—those of De Wette, Meyer (re-written, in 1 and 2 Cor., by Heinrici), v. Hofmann, the *Handcommentar* (Schmiedel), and the *Kurtzgefasster* (Schnedermann)—and Alford's great work in this country, the following are of special value: Billroth's *Vorlesungen z. d. Briefen an d. Kor.* (1833), Rückert's *Der 1 Br. Pauli an d. Kor.* (1836), Neander's *Auslegung d. beiden Br. an d. Kor.* (1859),—above all, Heinrici's *Das erste Sendschreiben d. Ap. Paulus an d. Kor.* (1880), a work rich in illustration of Greek thought and manners, and throwing new light on the social development of primitive Christianity. Godet's *Commentaire sur la prem. ép. aux Corinthiens* (1887: transl. in Clarks' *F. T. Libr.*), though not his most successful exposition, is marked by his fine spiritual and literary qualities, and is full of instructive matter.

English scholars have addressed themselves zealously to 1 Corinthians, which interests them by its relations to the ethical and social questions of the time. A. P. Stanley (*The Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians,* 1855) has illuminated the historical and picturesque aspects of the Epistle, C. Hodge (American, 1857) its theological side. Beet tracks the thought of the Apostle with exceeding closeness, and presents it with concise force (*Epistles to the Corinthians,* 1882). Freshness and vivacity, with strokes of keen grammatical insight, distinguish the work of T. S. Evans in the *Speaker's Commentary.* Ellicott's interpretation (1887) is a model of exact and delicate verbal elucidation; no better book can be placed in the hands of a working Greek Testament student. The posthumous "Notes" of Lightfoot on chaps. i.-vii. (1895) are written with his ripe knowledge, balanced judgment, and sure touch. Edwards' *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (1885) ranks with Heinrici's and Ellicott's as a classical piece of exegesis; it is strong both on the linguistic and philosophical side, and shows a rare power of luminous statement. M. Dods supplies, in *The Expositor's Bible,* a genial and masterly homiletic application. Hort's *Christian Ecclesia* and Knowling's *Witness of the Epistles to Christ* exhibit,

in the use they make of this document, its decisive bearing on questions of early Church History and Apologetics.

4. Criticism. Until quite recently the authenticity and integrity of 1 Corinthians were never doubted. The criticism of F. C. Baur and the Tübingen School left it standing as one of the "four undisputed Epistles"; Bruno Bauer's attack (*Kritik d. Paul. Briefe*, 1851) was quite isolated. In Holland, however, a more radical criticism has arisen—whose exponents are Loman (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1882-86), Pierson and Naber (*Verisimilia*, 1886), van Manen (*Paulus*, i., ii., 1890-91; and *Prot. Kirchenzeitung*, 1882-86), Meyboom (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1889-91); aided by Steck (*Gal.-Brief*, 1888) in Germany, and "Edwin Johnson" (*Antiqua Mater*, 1887) in England—which sweeps away these four with the rest, leaving nothing but morsels surviving of the genuine Paul. These scholars premise a slow development, along a single line, in early Christian thought. They claim to be the uniformitarians, as against the catastrophists, of Biblical science. The universalism with which Paul is credited, they set down as the final issue, reached in the second century, of the continued interaction of Judaic and Hellenic thought. In support of this view they point out numerous alleged contradictions within the four Epistles and the traces of various tendencies and times affording evidence of compilation, so reducing them to a many-coloured patchwork, the product of a century of conflict and hardly won progress. They attempt to prove the literary dependence of the four on post-Pauline writings, both within and without the New Testament. This theory presents no consistent shape in the hands of its advocates, and has been subjected to a destructive examination by Holtzmann and Jülicher in their N.T. *Einleitungen* (recent editions), by Lipsius (Romans) and Schmiedel (1 and 2 Corinthians) in the *Handcommentar;* also by Knowling in chap. iii. of his "Witness of the Epistles". A sound exegesis is the best refutation of extravagances which are, in effect, the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Baurian method.

Another group of critics, maintaining the genuineness of the Corinthian Epistles in substance, desire *to redistribute their contents.* Hagge (*Jahrbuch für prot. Theologie*, 1876) finds *four* older documents behind the two; Völter (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1889) discovers *three*, making considerable excisions besides; Clemen, who discusses all the schemes of rearrangement in his *Einheitlichkeit d. paul. Briefe* (II., *Die Corintherbr.: cf.* Schmiedel in the *Handcom., an d. Kor., Einleitung*, ii.), dissects the canonical Epistles into *five* originals. These re-combinations are highly ingenious; Clemen's

scheme, which is really plausible, substitutes a carefully marshalled topical order for the spontaneity and discursiveness of the true epistle. The hypotheses of reconstruction have no historical basis, no external evidence in their favour; their sole appeal is to internal probability. The actual 1 Corinthians vindicates its unity to the sympathetic reader who transports himself into the situation.

Other critics, again, who regard the reconstruction of the Epistle as needless or impracticable, see reason to eliminate certain passages as *interpolations.* Holsten (*Das Evang. d. Paulus*, I., i., 1880), Baljon (*De Tekst d. Brieven aan de Rom., Cor., en Gal.*, 1884), Bois (*Adversaria critica de I. ad Cor.:* Toulouse, 1887), are fertile in suggestions of this kind. Heinrici will not exclude the supposition of "improvements in detail, attempts [made by the first editors] to smooth over or supplement rough or defective passages of the Apostle, which criticism may be able to detect". Such insertions he finds in the Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ of i. 12, and in xv. 56: so Schmiedel and Clemen in the latter place. We do not deny the abstract possibility of the Epistle having been "touched up" in this way; glosses such as those the Codices reveal in ii. 4, iv. 6, vii. 3, etc., for aught we know may have crept in *before*, as well as after the divergence of our extant witnesses. None, however, of the alleged "primitive corruptions" are made out convincingly,—except perhaps the transcriptional error which W.H. have detected in xii. 2. Some of these conjectures there will be occasion to notice in the course of the exposition.

Analysis. After the *Introduction* (i. 1-9), the body of the Epistle falls into six principal divisions, as follows: Div. I., *The Corinthian Parties and the Gospel Ministry*, i. 10-iv. 21; Div. II., *Questions of Social Morals*, v.-vii.; Div. III., *Contact with Idolatry*, viii.-xi. 1; Div. IV., *Disorders in Worship and Church Life*, xi. 2-xiv.; Div. V., *The Resurrection of the Body*, xv.; Div. VI., *Business, News, and Greetings*, xvi. Within these main Divisions, the matter is broken up for clearer elucidation into sixty short Sections, each furnished with a heading and prefatory outline.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE EXPOSITION.

acc. = accusative case.
act. = active voice.
adj. = adjective.
ad loc. = *ad locum*, on this passage.
adv., advl. = adverb, adverbial.
Al. = Alford's *Greek Testament.*

aor. = aorist tense.
art. = grammatical article.
Aug. = Augustine.
Bg. = Bengel's *Gnomon Novi Testamenti.*
Bm. = A. Buttmann's *Grammar of the N.T. Greek* (Eng. Trans., 1873).
Bn. = E. Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in the N.T.* (1894).
Bt. = J. A. Beet's *St. Paul's Epp. to the Corinthians* (1882).
Bz. = Beza's *Nov. Testamentum : Interpretatio et Annotationes* (Cantab., 1642).
cl. = classical.
Cm. = John Chrysostom's *Homiliæ* († 407).
comm. = commentary, commentator.
constr. = construction.
Cor. = Corinth, Corinthian or Corinthians.
Cr. = Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N.T. Greek* (Eng. Trans.).
Cv. = Calvin's *In Nov. Testamentum Commentarii.*
dat. = dative case.
Did. = Διδαχὴ τῶν δωδέκα ἀποστόλων.
diff. = difference, different, differently.
D.W. = De Wette's *Handbuch z. N. T.*
eccl. = ecclesiastical.
Ed. = T. C. Edwards' *Commentary on the First Ep. to the Corinthians.*[2]
El. = C. J. Ellicott's *St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians.*
Er. = Erasmus' *In N.T. Annotationes.*
E.V. = English Version.
Ev. = T. S. Evans in *Speaker's Commentary.*
ex. = example.
exc. = except.
Ff. = Fathers.
fut. = future tense.
Gd. = F. Godet's *Commentaire sur la prem. Ép. aux Corinthiens* (Eng. Trans.).
gen. = genitive case.
Gm. = Grimm-Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T.*
Gr. = Greek, or Grotius' *Annotationes in N.T.*
Heb. = Hebrew.
Hf. = J. C. K. von Hofmann's *Die heilige Schrift N.T. untersucht,* ii. 2 (2te Auflage, 1874).
h.l. = *hapax legomenon*, a solitary expression.
Hn. = C. F. G. Heinrici's *Erklärung der Korintherbriefe* (1880), or 1 *Korinther* in Meyer's *krit.-exegetisches Kommentar* (1896).
impf. = imperfect tense.
impv. = imperative mood.
ind. = indicative mood.
indir. = indirect.
inf. = infinitive mood.
interr. = interrogative.
Jer. = Jerome, Hieronymus.
Lidd. = Liddell and Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon.*

lit. = literal, literally.
Lt. = J. B. Lightfoot's (posthumous) *Notes on Epp. of St. Paul* (1895).
mid. = middle voice.
Mr. = Meyer's *Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (Eng. Trans.).
nom. = nominative case.
obj. = grammatical object.
Oec. = Oecumenius, the Greek Commentator.
opp. = opposite, opposition.
Or. = Origen.
P. = Paul.
parl. = parallel.
part. = grammatical particle.
pass. = passive voice.
pers. = grammatical person, or personal.
pl. = plural.
pr. = present tense.
pron. = pronoun.
prp., prpl. = preposition, prepositional.
ptp., ptpl. = participle, participial.
R.C. = Roman Catholic.
ref. = reference.
rel. = relative pronoun.
sbj. = subjunctive mood.
sing. = singular number.
Sm. = P. Schmiedel, in *Handcommentar zum N.T.* (1893).
s.v. = *sub voce*, under this word.
syn. = synonym, synonymous.
Tert. = Tertullian.
Thd. = Theodoret, Greek Commentator.
Thp. = Theophylact, Greek Commentator.
vb., vbl. = verb, verbal.
Vg. = Latin Vulgate Translation.
W.H. = Westcott and Hort's *The New Testament in Greek:* Critical Text and Notes.
Wr. = Winer-Moulton's *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (8th ed., 1877).

The ordinary contractions are employed in the textual notes. Other abbreviations will explain themselves. The references in the marginal parallels and textual notes are made to the Greek Text of the O.T.; in the Commentary, to the English text, unless otherwise stated.

ΠΑΥΛΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΥ

Η ΠΡΟΣ

ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ

ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ ΠΡΩΤΗ.[1]

I. 1. ΠΑΥΛΟΣ [a] κλητὸς [2] ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ [3] Χριστοῦ,[3] [b] διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ, καὶ Σωσθένης [c] ὁ ἀδελφός, 2. τῇ [d] ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ [d] Θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ

a Rom. i. 1, 6 f. (same double use), Jude. 1; 24 below; Rom. viii. 28; 2 Kings xv. 11. b 2 Cor., Eph., Col., 2 Tim.; Rom. xv. 32. c 2 Cor., Col., Phm.; xvi. 12 below; Rom. xvi. 23. d x. 32, xi. 16, 22, xv. 9; 2 Cor.; Gal. i. 13; 1 Th. ii. 14; 2 Th. i. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 5, 15; Acts xx. 28; Neh. xiii. 1.

[1] The oldest form of Title, in ℵABCD, is ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΙΟΥΣ Ā. This was gradually extended as the epp. came to be treated as separate books. FG read Προς Κ. αρχεται ά (G om. ά); so latt. with variations, and the oldest MSS. of vg. P: Παυλου επιστολη προς Κ. ά. L: τ. αγιου κ. πανευφημου αποστ. Π. επιστολη προς Κ. πρωτη. The minuscules furnish a great variety of titles. Stephens wrote Η προς τ. Κ. επιστολη πρωτη. The title of the T.R. and A.V. comes from Bz. and Elzevir, *without MS. authority*.

[2] AD, Cyr. om. κλητος.

[3] Χριστου Ιησου (?) in BDG, vg. (older copies), Chr., Ambrst., Aug.: the Western reading. Ιησ. Χρ., ℵALP, etc., cop. syrr., Cyr. Dam.: Alexandrian and Syrian. W.H. mark the group BDG as untrustworthy; but Pauline usage speaks for **X. I.**,—the certain reading in other Addresses where this combination occurs, exc. Rom. and Tit. The Edd. are doubtful; Tisch., Al., Tr., Nestle, prefer **X. I.**; W.H., **I. X.** in text, **X. I.** in margin.

The Introduction. § 1. *The Title and Salutation*, i. 1-3. Πρὸς Κορινθίους ά (see txtl. note) is a *sub-title*, marking the ep. as part of the collection bearing the general name Ὁ ἀπόστολος. With this agrees the oldest system of chapters (κεφάλαια), preserved by Cod. B, which divided the fourteen Letters into sections numbered consecutively throughout. In all ancient copies this ep. stands second in "The Apostle"; the Muratorian Canon sets it *primum omnium*.

Chapter I.—Vv. 1-3. The *salutation* is full and varied in the epp. of this group. As in Galatians and Romans, P. emphasises his apostleship (see ix. 1 f.), at present in dispute. The readers are (in 1 and 2 Cor.) "the Church" and "the saints"—a transition from "the ch." of 1 and 2 Thess. ("the churches," Gal.) to "the saints" of Rom. and later epp. Here stress is thrown with a purpose, (1) on *the sanctity* of the Cor. Church, (2) on *its fellowship with the general body of Christians.*

Ver. 1. Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος (so in Rom.)—not ap. by merit or human choice, but *called* thereto διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ (so in later epp.), *through an* express intervention of the *Divine will*, *cf.* ix. 16 f., Gal. i. 1, 15 f., Eph. iii. 2 ff., also Acts ix. 15, etc. "A called apostle" as the Cor. are "called saints": *he* summoned to be herald and dispenser (17, 23, iv. 1), *they* receivers of God's Gospel (26-31). The κλητοὶ are in P. identified with the ἐκλεκτοί (26 f., Rom.

ἐν Κορίνθῳ,[1] [e] ἡγιασμένοις [e] ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, [e] κλητοῖς [f] ἁγίοις, [g] σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς [h] ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ [h] ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

e vii. 14; Rom. xv. 16; Heb. x. 10, 29; Jo. xvii. 17.
f 2 Cor., Eph., Ph., Col., Acts ix. 13, etc.
g 2 Cor.; 2 Tim. ii. 22.
h Acts ii. 21, ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16; Rom. x. 13; Gen. iv. 26, etc.; Ps. cxvi. 4; Joel ii. 32; Zech. xiii. 9.

[1] BD*G, followed by Al., Tr., Tisch.[7], place τῃ . . . Κορινθῳ after ηγιασμ. . . . Ιησ.: probably a Western deviation.

viii. 29 f.), not distinguished as in Matt. xx. 16. The thought of the "call" of God as assigning to each Christian man his status is prominent in this ep.: see vv. 9, 24 ff., vii. 17-24.—**Σωσθένης ὁ ἀδελφὸς** is a party to the Letter, which notwithstanding runs in first pers. sing., as in Gal. after **οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ πάντες ἀδελφοὶ** of i. 2; otherwise in 2 Cor. and 1 and 2 Thess.: Sosthenes (only named here by P.) shares in this ep. not as joint-composer, but as witness and approver. He would scarcely be introduced at this point as amanuensis (*cf.* Rom. xvi. 22). S. is a person known to and honoured by the Cor., but now with the Ap. at Ephesus and in his confidence. He may, or may not, have been the Sosthenes of Acts xviii. 17—the name was fairly common. One ἀρχισυνάγωγος (Crispus) had been converted at Cor., why not another afterwards? P. would delight to make of a persecutor an ally. His former position would give an ex-Synagogue-leader weight, especially with Jewish Christians; and his subsequent conversion may account for Luke's exceptionally preserving Sosthenes' name as Paul's assailant (see M. Dods on the point, in *Exp. Bib.*). Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, i. 12) makes S. one of the Seventy of Luke x. 17—"a worthless tradition" (Lt.).

Ver. 2. **τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ** (in salutation of 1 and 2 Cor. only) gives supreme dignity to the assembly of Cor. addressed by the Ap. of Christ Jesus—the assembled citizens of God's kingdom and commonwealth (Eph. ii. 12, 19; *cf.* Tit. ii. 14, 1 Peter ii. 9 f.). **τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορ.**, "that exists in Corinth"—*lætum et ingens paradoxon* (Bg.): so far the Gospel has reached (2 Cor. x. 13 f.); in so foul a place it flourishes! (vi. 9 ff.). Not as earlier, "the assembly *of* Thessalonians," etc.: the conception of the *ecclesia* widens; the local Christian gathering is part of one extended "congregation of God," existing in this place or that (see last clause). To **τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τ. Θεοῦ** is apposed, by way of predicative definition (hence anarthrous), **ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, "the Church of God (consisting of men) sanctified in Christ Jesus": Church status is grounded on personal relationship to God in Christ. Now this relationship began with God's *call*, which summoned each to a holy life within the Christian fellowship; hence the further apposition, **κλητοῖς ἁγίοις** (see note on 1, and Rom. i. 7; *cf.* Acts xviii. 10, **λαός ἐστίν μοι πολύς κ.τ.λ.**). The pf. pass. ptp. expresses a determinate state: once for all the Cor. readers have been devoted to God, by His call and their consent. This initial sanctification is synchronous with justification (vi. 11), and is the positive as that is the negative side of salvation: **ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τ. ἁμαρτίας, ἐδουλώθητε τ. δικαιοσύνῃ** (Rom. vi. 16-19). "Sanctified *in* Christ Jesus" (="living to God in Christ Jesus," Rom. vi. 11) imports union with Christ (vi. 17, 19, xii. 11, Rom. viii. 9 f.) as well as salvation through Christ. His past work is the objective ground, His present heavenly being (implied by the name "Christ Jesus," as in this order) the active spring of this **ζῆν τῷ Θεῷ**: *cf.* ver. 30 and note. The repeated ref. to the *holiness* of the readers recalls them to their vocation; low practice calls for the reassertion of high ideals; *admonet Corinthios majestatis ipsorum* (Bg.). Cv. draws a diff. yet consistent inference: "Locus diligenter observandus, ne requiramus in hoc mundo Ecclesiam omni ruga et macula carentem". The adjunct **σὺν πᾶσιν . . . τόπῳ** may qualify **ἡγιασμένοις κ.τ.λ.** (so some moderns), or the main predicate (Gr. Ff.): *i.e.*, the Church shares (*a*) in *its Christian sanctity*, or (*b*) in *the Apostle's good wishes*, "with all that call upon the name," etc. (*b*) gives a better balanced sentence, and a true Pauline sentiment: *cf.* Eph. vi. 24, also the Benediction of Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.*, lxv. —**ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ**, an expression indefinitely large (see parls.), approaching "in all the world" of Rom. i. 8, Col. i. 6;

[l] ἐν [l] παντὶ [l] τόπῳ, [k] αὐτῶν τε [1] καὶ [k] ἡμῶν· 3. [l] χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ [l] εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

4. [m] Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ [m] Θεῷ μου [2] πάντοτε περὶ ὑμῶν, ἐπὶ τῇ [n] χάριτι τοῦ Θεοῦ τῇ [n] δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· 5. ὅτι ἐν παντὶ

i 2 Cor. ii. 14; 1 Th. i. 8; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Mal. i. 11.
k Cf. Rom. xvi. 13; Eph. vi. 9.
l Rom. i. 7, and other Pauline Salutations; cf., however, 1 and 2 Tim., 1 and 2 Pet.
m xiv. 18; Rom. i. 8; Ph. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Th. i. 2; Phm. 4.
n Twelve times in P.; in Jas. iv. 6 besides.

[1] **αυτων και ημων**, without **τε**; so ℵ*A* (seemingly) BD*G, latt. vg. syr^sch. cop., Or., Dam. **τε** a Syrian editorial insertion for smoother reading.

[2] ℵ*B, æth. *omit* **μου**: harmonistic insertion from parls.

there is nothing here to indicate the limit given in 2 Cor. i. 1. The readers belong to a *widespread* as well as a holy community; Paul insists on this in the sequel, pointing in reproof to "other churches". To "call on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ"—to invoke Him in prayer as "Lord"—is the mark of the Christian, by which Saul, *e.g.*, once recognised his victims (see parls.), the index of saving faith (xii. 3, Rom. x. 12 ff.). The afterthought **αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν**, correcting the previous **ἡμῶν** (Cm., Cv., Gd., Sm.), heightens the sense of wide fellowship given by the previous clause; "one Lord" (viii. 6; Rom. x. 12, xiv. 9, Eph. iv. 5) unites all hearts in the obedience of faith. To attach these pronouns to **τόπῳ** (*in omni loco ipsorum et nostro*, Vg.) gives a sense strained in various ways: "their place and ours,"—belonging to us equally with them (Mr., El., Ed.); "illorum (prope Cor.), nostro (ubi P. et Sosth. versabantur," Bg.); in non-Pauline and Pauline Churches (Hn.); and so on.

Ver. 3. **χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.**: Paul's customary greeting; see note on Rom. i. 7. "The occurrence of the peculiar phrase 'grace and peace' in Paul, John, and Peter intimates that we have here the earliest Christian password or *symbolum*" (Ed.). **κυρίου** might grammatically be parl. to **ἡμῶν**, both depending upon **πατρός**, as in 2 Cor. i. 3, etc.; but 1 and 2 Thess. i. 1 (**Θεῷ πατρὶ κ. Κυρίῳ Ἰ. Χ.**) prove *Father* and *Lord* in this formula to be parl.: *cf.* viii. 6, 2 Cor. xiii. 13; nowhere does P. speak (as in John xx. 17) of God as Father *of Christ and of men* co-ordinately, and for **ἡμῶν** to come first in such connexion would be incongruous. "The union of" **Θεοῦ** and **Κυρίου** "under the vinculum of a common prp. is one of the numberless hints scattered through St. Paul's epp. of the consciously felt and recognised co-ordination" of the Father and Christ (El.).

§ 2. THE THANKSGIVING, i. 4-9. The Pauline thanksgiving holds the place of the *captatio benevolentiæ* in ancient speeches, with the diff. that it is in solemn sincerity addressed to *God*. The Ap. thanks God (1) for *the past grace* given the Cor. in Christ, ver. 4; (2) for *the rich intellectual development of that grace*, according with the sure evidence upon which they had received the Gospel, and attended by an eager anticipation of Christ's advent, vv. 5-7; (3) for *the certainty that they will be perfected in grace* and found unimpeached at Christ's return—a hope founded on God's fidelity to His own signal call, vv. 8 f. Paul reflects gratefully on the past, hopefully on the future of this Church; he is significantly silent respecting its present condition: contrast with this the Thess. and Phil. Thanksgivings. He extracts from a disquieting situation all the comfort possible.

Ver. 4. On **εὐχαριστῶ κ.τ.λ.**, and the form of Paul's introductory thanksgivings, see Rom. i. 8. **ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι κ.τ.λ.**—**ἐπί** (at), of the *occasioning* cause; *cf.* xiii. 6, xiv. 16, etc. **τ. δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν** (aor. ptp.)—"the grace that was given you," *sc.* at conversion (see 6); contrast the pr. ptp. of continuous bestowment in xv. 57, and the pf. of abiding result in 2 Cor. viii. 1. For **ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**, see note on ver. 2. P. refers not to the general objective gift of grace in Christ (as in Rom. viii. 32), nor to its eternal bestowment in the thought of God (as in 2 Tim. i. 9), but to its actual conferment at the time when the Cor. became God's **κλητοὶ ἅγιοι** (2).

Ver. 5. **ὅτι κ.τ.λ.** stands in explicative apposition to the foregoing **τ. χάριτι τ. δοθείσῃ**, bringing out the matter of thanksgiving eminent in the conversion of the Cor.—"(I mean), that in every-

[o] ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν παντὶ [p] λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ [q] γνώσει, 6. καθὼς τὸ [r] μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ[1] [s] ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν· 7. ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ [t] ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ [u] χαρίσματι, [v] ἀπεκδεχομένους τὴν [w] ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ [w] κυρίου ἡμῶν [w] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· 8. ὃς καὶ [s] βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς [x] ἕως [x] τέλους [y] ἀνεγκλήτους ἐν τῇ [z] ἡμέρᾳ[2] τοῦ [z] Κυρίου ἡμῶν

o 2 Cor. vi. 10, ix. 11 only; 12 times in LXX, Gen. xiv. 23, etc. p (In this sense) 17, ii. 1, 4, iv. 19 f., xii. 8, and nine times besides in P. q viii. 1 ff., xii. 3, xiii. 2, 8, xiv. 6; thrice (so) in 2 Cor.; twice in Rom.; Eph. iii. 19; Col. ii 3; 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Pet. i. 5 f.; Lk. xi. 52. r ii. 1; 2 Th. i. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 8; *μαρτυρία* in John, exc. Rev. xv. 5. s 2 Cor. i. 21; Rom. xv. 8; Ph. i. 7; Col. ii. 7; twice in Heb.; Mk. xvi. 20. t viii. 8, xii. 24, xvi. 17; thrice besides in P.; Heb. xi. 37; Lk. xv. 14. u vii. 7, xii. 4 ff.; 2 Cor. i. 11; four times in Rom.; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 1 Pet. iv. 10. v Rom. viii. 19 ff.; Gal. v. 5; Ph. iii. 20; Heb. ix. 28; 1 Pet. iii. 20 only. w 2 Th. i. 7; thrice in 1 Pet.; *cf.* Gal. i. 12, 16; Rom. viii. 19. x 2 Cor. i. 13 only. *αχρι τ.*, Heb. vi. 11; Rev. ii. 26. *μεχρι τ.*, Heb. iii. 6, 14. *εις τελος*, 1 Th. ii. 16. y Col. i. 22; 1 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. i. 6 f. only. z iii. 13, iv. 3, v. 5; 2 Cor. i. 14; 10 times besides in P.; Acts ii. 20; Joel iii. 31, etc.

[1] **Θεου** in B*G, a few minuscc., arm.

[2] The Western reading is **παρουσιᾳ**: DG, etc. Ambrst., Pelagius, with vg., read *in die adventus* (conflate).

thing you were enriched," etc. For this defining **ὅτι** after a vbl. noun, *cf.* ver. 26 and 2 Cor. i. 8. The *affluence* of endowment conferred on the Cor. stirred the Apostle's deep gratitude (*cf.* 7, 2 Cor. viii. 9): this wealth appears in another light in iv. 6-10, v. 2, viii. 1-3; see also *Introd.*, p. 730 f. The Church doubtless dwelt upon this distinction in its recent letter, to which P. is replying. **ἐν παντὶ** is defined, and virtually limited, by **ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει** (kindred gifts, linked by the single prp.): the exuberance of grace in the Cor. shone "in all (manner of) utterance and all (manner of) knowledge". **λόγος** in this connexion signifies not *the thing said* (as in 18), but *the saying of it*, *loquendi facultas* (Bz.). "Relatively to **γνῶσις**, **λόγος** is the ability and readiness to *say* what one understands; **γν.** the power and ability to *understand*" (Hn.). "Knowledge" would naturally precede; but the Cor. excelled and delighted in "speech" above all: see ii. 1-4, 13, iv. 19 f., xiii. 1.

Ver. 6. **τοῦ Χριστοῦ** is objective gen. to **τὸ μαρτύριον**—"the witness to Christ,"—coming from both God and man (xv. 3-11, 2 Thess. i. 10); otherwise in ii. 1; *cf.* Rom. i. 2, "the good news of God about His Son". **μαρτύριον** indicates *the well-established truth* of the message (see, *e.g.*, xv. 15), **εὐαγγέλιον** its *beneficial and welcome nature* (see Rom. i. 16 f.).—**ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν**, "(the witness about Christ) was made sure among you"; its reality was verified. By outward demonstration—miracles, etc.; or by the inner persuasion of a firm faith, "interna Spiritus virtus" (Cv.)? The latter certainly, in Pauline usage (see parls.: but not to the exclusion of the former); *cf.* ii. 4 f., and notes; xii. 10, **ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων**; also 1 Thess. i. 5 f., ii. 13, Gal. iii. 5; the two went together—**πολλῶν θαυμάτων, ἀφάτου χάριτος** (Cm.). At first discouraged, Paul had preached at Cor. with signal power, and his message awakened a decided and energetic faith; see ii. 1-5, xv. 1, 11; Acts xviii. 5-11.

Ver. 7 describes the result of the firm establishment of the Gospel: **ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ.** (**ὥστε** with inf. of *contemplated result*: see Bn. §§ 369 ff.), "causing you not to feel behindhand in any gift of grace"; the mid. **ὑστερεῖσθαι** implies *subjective reflexion*, the consciousness of inferiority (Ev.): similarly in Rom. iii. 23, "*find themselves short* of the glory of God" (Sanday and Headl.); and in Luke xv. 14, "he began *to feel his destitution*". The pr. inf. and ptp. of the vbs. bear no ref. to the time of writing; their time is given by the governing **ἐβεβαιώθη**: the strong assurance with which the Cor. embraced the Gospel was followed by a shower of spiritual energies, of which they had a lively sense. A **χάρισμα** (see parls.) is **χάρις** in some concrete result (see Cr. *s. v.*),—a specific *endowment of (God's) grace*, whether the fundamental charism, embracing all others, of salvation in Christ (Rom. v. 16), or, *e.g.*, the special and individual charism of continence (vii. 7). No church excelled the Cor. in the variety of its endowments and the satisfaction felt in them. Chaps. xii.-xiv. enumerate and discuss the chief Cor. **χαρίσματα**, setting **ἀγάπη** in their midst; ethical qualities are included under this term, vv. 8 f.—**ἀπεκδεχομένους τ. ἀποκάλυψιν κ.τ.λ.**, "while you

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[1]· 9. [a] πιστὸς ὁ [a] Θεὸς, δι' οὗ [b] ἐκλήθητε εἰς [c] κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

a x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 18; 1 Th. v. 24; 2 Th. iii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 13; Heb. x. 23, xi. 11; Deut. vii. 9; Isa. xlix. 7. b Ver. 26, vii. 15 ff.; 10 times besides in P.; 1 Pet. i. 15, ii. 9, v. 10; 2 Pet. i. 3. c x. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 14 f.; Ph. iii. 10; 1 Jo. i. 3; *cf.* Heb. ii. 14, iii. 14.

[1] B om. **Χριστου**, *bracketed* by W.H. as doubtful; *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 14.

eagerly awaited (*or* eagerly awaiting, as you did) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ". The vb. is one of P.'s characteristic intensive compounds (see parls.). The anarthrous pr. ptp. implies a continuous state conditioning that of the foregoing clause: the unstinted plenty of Divine gifts continued while the recipients fixed their thought upon the day of Christ; xv. 12, 33 f. show that this expectation had been in many instances relaxed. Rom. viii. and Col. iii. (also 1 John ii. 28-iii. 3) illustrate the bearing of faith in the **παρουσία** on Christian character; *cf.* Matt. xxv., Luke xii. 32 ff., etc. It is an **ἀποκάλυψις**, an "*unveiling*" of Christ that the Cor. looked for; since although they are "in Christ," still he is hidden (Col. iii. 3 f.); His presence is a mystery (Col. i. 27, Eph. v. 32). "**Παρουσία** denotes the fact of Christ's (future) presence, **ἐπιφάνεια** its visibility" and splendour, "**ἀποκάλυψις** its inner meaning" (Ed.); **φανέρωσις** (it might be added: Col. iii. 4) its open display. The Cor. were richly blessed with present good, while expecting a good far exceeding it: "a tacit warning against fancied satisfaction in the present" (Gd.: *cf.* iv. 8).

Ver. 8. **ὃς καὶ βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς** echoes **ἐβεβαιώθη** (6); *cf.* the thanksgiving of Phil. i. 6. **ἕως τέλους** (see parls.) points to a *consummation*, not a mere termination of the present order; *cf.* Rom. vi. 21 f. **ἀνεγκλήτους**, "unimpeached," synonymous with **ἀμέμπτους** (unblamed), but judicial in significance,—in view of the **ἡμέρα τοῦ Κυρίου**: "free from charge when the day of the Lord shall come"; *cf.* Rom. viii. 33, **τίς ἐγκαλέσει;**—**ὃς** refers to the foregoing **κύριος Ἰ. Χ.**, not to the distant **Θεὸς** of ver. 4; the Saviour "who will make sure" the innocence of the Cor. on that day is the Judge who will pronounce upon it (*cf.* Col. i. 22, Eph. v. 27, where Christ is to "present" the Church "unblemished and unimpeached" before Himself): He will then *confirm* them and vindicate their character, as they *have confirmed* the testimony about Him (*cf.* Luke ix. 26). P. does not say the Cor. are **ἀνέγκλητοι** *now;* he hopes that they will prove so *then*. "The day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (*cf.* note on iii. 13) is the O.T. "day of Jehovah" (LXX, **τ. Κυρίου**), translated into the "day of Christ," since God has revealed His purpose to "judge through Jesus Christ" (Rom. ii. 16, Acts xvii. 31).—**ἐν τ. ἡμέρᾳ = ἐν τ. παρουσίᾳ τ. κυρ. Ἰ. Χ.** (1 Thess. v. 23, etc.), with the added connotation of *judgment*, to which the **ἀποκάλυψις** of ver. 7 leads up: for this connexion of thought, see Rom. ii. 5, 2 Thess. i. 7 ff. P. does not say "*His* day," though **ὃς** recalls **ὁ κύρ. Ἰ. Χ.**: *Christ's* name is repeated ten times in the first ten vv.—six times, as here, in full style—with sustained solemnity of emphasis (*cf.* the repetition of "God" in 20-29); "P. thus prepares for his exhortations these Cor., who were disposed to treat Christianity as a matter of human choice and personal liking, under the sense that in a Christian Church Christ is the one thing and everything" (Hf.).

Ver. 9. The ground of Paul's hope for the ultimate welfare of the Cor. is *God's fidelity*. His gifts are bestowed on a wise and settled plan (21, Rom. viii. 28 ff., xi. 29); His *word*, with it His character, is pledged to the salvation of those who believe in His Son: **πιστὸς ὁ Θεὸς δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε = πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν** of 1 Thess. v. 23 f.; the formula **πιστὸς ὁ λόγος** of the Past. Epp. is not very different. **δι' οὗ** is "through (older Eng., *by*) whom you were called"; *cf.* **διὰ θελήματος Θεοῦ** (1, see note), and **δι' οὗ . . . τὰ πάντα** (of *God*, Rom. xi. 36); similarly in Gal. iv. 7: God had manifestly interposed to bring the Cor. into the communion of Christ (see, further, 26-28); His voice sounded in the ears of the Cor. when the Gospel summons reached them (*cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 13). Christ (8) and God are both therefore security for the perfecting of their Christian life.—God's accepted call has brought the readers **εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν**—*i.e.*, not "into a communion (or partnership) *with* His Son Jesus Christ our Lord" (nowhere else has this noun an objective

10. [d] Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, [e] διὰ τοῦ [e] ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα [f] τὸ [f] αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες καὶ μὴ ᾖ ἐν ὑμῖν [g] σχίσ-

d iv. 16, xvi. 15; frequent in this sense in P.; also Heb. xiii. 19, 22; 1 Pet.; Jude 3. e Acts iv. 30, x. 43. f xii. 25; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Rom. xii. 16, xv. 5; Ph. ii. 2, iv. 2. g xi. 18, xii. 25; Jo. vii. 43, ix. 16, x. 19.

gen. of the *person:* see parls.), but "into a communion belonging to (and named after) God's Son," of which *He* is founder, centre and sum. In this fellowship the Cor. partake "with all those that call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2); **κοινωνία** denotes *collective participation*. The **κοινωνία τ. υἱοῦ** is the same, both in content and constituency, as the **κοινωνία τ. πνεύματος** (see xii. 13, 2 Cor. xiii. 13, Phil. ii. 1, Eph. iv. 4-6). Its content—that which the Cor. share in—is *sonship to God*, since it is "a communion of His *Son*," with Christ for "first-born among many brethren" (Rom. viii. 29 f.; *cf.* Heb. ii. 10-16), and consequent *heirship to God* (Rom. viii. 17, Gal. iii. 26-iv. 7). The title "our Lord," added to "His Son Jesus Christ," invests the Christian communion with present grandeur and certifies its hope of glory; Christ's glory lies in His full manifestation as *Lord* (xv. 25, Phil. ii. 11), and its glorification is wrapped up in His (2 Thess. i. 12, ii. 14; also 1 Thess. ii. 12). Ver. 9 sustains and crowns the hope expressed in ver. 8. For **κοινωνία**, see further the notes on x. 16 f.

Division I. The Corinthian Parties and the Gospel Ministry, i. 10-iv. 21. Paul could not honestly give thanks for the actual condition of the Cor. Church. The reason for this omission at once appears. The Church is rent with factions, which ranged themselves under the names of the leading Christian teachers. On the causes of these divisions see *Introduction*, Chap. i. Out of their crude and childish experience (iii. 1-4) the Cor. are constructing prematurely a **γνῶσις** of their own (viii. 1, see note), a **σοφία** resembling that "wisdom of the world" which is "foolishness with God" (18 ff., 30, iii. 18 f., iv. 9 f.); they think themselves already above the mere **λόγος τοῦ σταύρου** brought by the Ap., wherein, simple as it appeared, there lay the wisdom and the power of God. This conceit had been stimulated, unwittingly on his part, by the preaching of Apollos. Ch. iii. 3-7 shows that it is the Apollonian faction which most exercises Paul's thoughts at present; the irony of i. 18-31 and iv. 6-13 is aimed at the partisans of Ap., who exalted his **ὑπεροχὴ λόγου κ. σοφίας** in disparagement of Paul's unadorned **κήρυγμα τοῦ σταύρου.** Mistaking the nature of the Gospel, the Cor. mistook the office of its ministers: on the former subject they are corrected in i. 18-ii. 5 showing in what sense and why the Gospel *is not*, and in ii. 6-iii. 2 showing in what sense and to whom the Gospel *is* a **σοφία**; the latter misconception is rectified in iii. 3-iv. 21, where, with express reference to Ap. and P., Christian teachers are shown to be no competing leaders of human schools but "fellow-workmen of God" and "servants of Christ," co-operative and complementary instruments of His sovereign work in the building of the Church. The four chapters constitute an *apologia* for the Apostle's teaching and office, parl. to those of 2 Cor. x.-xiii. and Gal. i.-iii.; but the line of defence adopted here is quite distinct. Here Paul pleads against Hellenising lovers of wisdom, there against Judaising lovers of tradition. Both parties stumbled at the cross; both judged of the Ap. **κατὰ σάρκα,** and fastened upon his defects in visible prestige and presence. The existence of the legalist party at Cor. is intimated by the cry, "I am of Cephas," and by Paul's words of self-vindication in ix. 1 f.; but this faction had as yet reached no considerable head; it developed rapidly in the interval between 1 and 2 Cor.

§ 3. The Report about the Parties, and Paul's Expostulation, i. 10-17a. Without further preface, the Apostle warns the Cor. solemnly against their schisms (10), stating the testimony on which his admonition is based (11). The four parties are defined out of the mouths of the Cor. (12); and the Ap. protests esp. against the use of Christ's name and of his own in this connexion (13). In founding the Church he had avoided all self-exaltation, bent only on fulfilling his mission of preaching the good news (14-17a).

Ver. 10. "But I exhort (appeal to) you, brothers:" the reproof to be given stands in painful contrast (**δέ**) with the Thanksgiving. It is administered "through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," which the Ap. has invoked so often (see note on 8); all the authority and grace of the Name reinforce his appeal, "that you say the same thing,

ματα, ἦτε δὲ [h] κατηρτισμένοι ἐν [f] τῷ [f] αὐτῷ [i] νοῒ καὶ ἐν [f] τῇ [f] αὐτῇ [k] γνώμῃ· 11. [l] ἐδηλώθη γάρ μοι περὶ ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί μου, ὑπὸ [m] τῶν Χλόης ὅτι [n] ἔριδες ἐν ὑμῖν εἰσί· 12. [o] λέγω δὲ τοῦτο, ὅτι ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει, "Ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι [p] Παύλου," "Ἐγὼ δὲ [p] Ἀπολλώ," "Ἐγὼ δὲ

h In ethical sense, 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Gal. vi. 1; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. v. 10; Lk. vi. 40; Ps. xvi. 5.

i ii. 16, xiv. 14 ff.; 14 times besides in P.; thrice besides in N.T. k vii. 25, 40; 2 Cor. viii. 10; Phm. 14; Acts xx. 3; Rev. xvii. 13, 17 only; Wisd. vii. 16; 2 Macc. iv. 39, etc. l iii. 13; Col. i. 8; Heb. ix. 8, xii. 27; 1 Pet. i. 11; 2 Pet. i. 14; Ex. vi. 3, etc. m Art. thus used, Rom. xvi. 10 f. n Pl., 2 Cor. xii. 20; Tit. iii. 9. Sing., iii. 3; Rom. i. 29, xiii. 13; Gal. v. 20; Ph. i. 15. o In this sense, x. 29; Gal. iii. 17. p Same gen., iii. 23, xv. 23; Rom. xiv. 8; Acts ix. 2, etc.

all (of you)," instead of "saying, each of you, I am of Paul," etc. (12).—**Τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν**, "a strictly classical expression used of political communities which are free from factions, or of diff. states which entertain friendly relations with each other" (Lt.). **Τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν**, in 2 Cor. xiii. 11, etc., is matter of temper and disposition; **τὸ αὐτὸ λέγειν**, of attitude and declaration: the former is opposed to self-interest, the latter to party zeal. On the weakened use of **ἵνα** after **παρακαλῶ** (purpose passing into purport) see Wr., pp. 420 ff.: more frequently in P., as in cl. usage, this vb. is construed with the inf.; so always in Acts; with **ἵνα** regularly in Synoptics. For the meanings of **παρακαλῶ** see iv. 13.

"And (that) there be not amongst you **σχίσματα** (clefts, splits)," defines negatively the **ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες**. The *schism* (see parls.) is a party division within the Church, not yet, as in eccl. usage, a culpable separation from it; **ἔριδες** (11) signifies the personal *contentions*, due to whatever cause, which lead to **σχίσματα**; **αἱρέσεις** (xi. 18 f.: see note) are *divisions of opinion*, or sects founded thereupon (Acts v. 17, etc.), implying a disagreement of principle. The schism is a rent in the Church, an injury to the fabric (*cf.* iii. 17, xii. 25); hence the further appeal, reverting to the positive form of expression,—"but that you be well and surely (pf. ptp.) adjusted" (*coagmentati*, Bg.)—"the exact word for the healing or repairing of the breaches caused by the **σχίσματα**" (Al.). **καταρτίζω** has a like political sense in cl. Gr. (Herod., iv. 161; v. 28, in opp. to **στάσις**); "the marked classical colouring of such passages as this leaves a much stronger impression of St. Paul's acquaintance with cl. writers than the rare occasional quotations which occur in his writings" (Lt.). "In the same discernment (**νοΐ**), and in the same judgment (**γνώμῃ**)": "**νοῦς** geht auf die Einsicht, **γνώμη** auf das Urtheil" (Hn.); *gnomé* is the application of *nous* in practical judgment (see parls.). P. desiderates that **ὁμονοεῖν** and **ὁμογνωμεῖν** (see Thucyd., ii. 97, viii. 75; Aristot., *Polit.*, v. 6, 10; Demosth., 281. 21) in Christian matters, which will enable the Church to act as one body and to pursue Christ's work with undivided strength.

Ver. 11. The appeal above made implies a serious *charge*; now the authority for it: "For it has been signified to me about you, my brothers, by the (people) of Chloē".—**ἐδηλώθη** (see parls.) implies definite information, the disclosure of facts.—**οἱ Χλόης**, "persons of Chloē's household"—children, companions, or possibly slaves (*cf.* Rom. xvi. 10): there is nothing further to identify them. "Chloē is usually considered a Cor. Christian, whose people had come to Eph.; but it is more in harmony with St. Paul's discretion to suppose that she was an Ephesian known to the Cor., whose people had been at Cor. and returned to Eph." (Ev., Hf.). "Chloë's people" are distinct from the Cor. deputies of xvi. 17, or Paul would have named the latter here; besides, Stephanas was himself the head of a household.—**Χλόη** (Verdure) was an epithet of the goddess Demeter, as **Φοίβη** of Artemis (Rom. xvi. 1): such names were often given to slaves, and C. may have been a freedwoman of property (Lt.). "That strifes exist among you" (*cf.* iii. 3, 2 Cor. xii. 20) was the information given; these **ἔριδες**, the next ver. explains, were generating the **σχίσματα** (see note on 10).

Ver. 12. "But I mean this (**τοῦτο δὲ λέγω**), that each one of you is saying (instead of your all saying the same thing, 10), 'I am of Paul (am Paul's man),'—'But I of Apollos,'—'But I of Cephas,'—'But I of Christ'!"—**ἕκαστος**, distributive, as in xiv. 26: *each* is saying one or other of these things; the party cries are quoted as from successive speakers challenging each other.

The question of the *FOUR COR. PARTIES* is one of the standing pro-

[p] Κηφᾶ," "Ἐγὼ δὲ [p] Χριστοῦ". 13. [q] μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός;[1] μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ[2] ὑμῶν, ἢ [r] εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου [r] ἐβαπτίσ-

q In this sense, vii. 34; Mt. xii. 25 f.; 3 Kings xvi. 21.

r x. 2; Gal. iii. 27; Mt. xxviii. 19; Acts viii. 16, xix. 3 f.

[1] Thd. 168, *ad loc.*: **τουτο τινες αποφαντικως ανεγνωσαν, εγω δε αυτο κατ' ερωτησιν κεισθαι νομιζω.** Ambrst. interprets *affirmatively*; so Lachm. and W.H. *text*, R.V. *marg*. See note below.

[2] **περι** in BD* (hence W.H. *marg.*); all other Codd. **υπερ.**

blems of N.T. criticism. It is fully examined, and the judgments of different critics are digested, by Gd. *ad loc.*; see also Mr.-Hn., *Einleitung*, § 3; Weiss' *Manual of Introd. to the N.T.*, § 19. After all, this was only a brief phase of Church life at Cor.; P. had just heard of it when he wrote, by the time of 2 Cor. a new situation has arisen. The three first parties are easy to account for: (1) The body of the Ch., converted under P.'s ministry, adhered to its own apostle; P. valued this loyalty and appeals to it, while he condemns its combative expression,—the disposition of men "more Pauline than Paul himself" (Dods) to exalt him to the disparagement of other leaders, and even to the detriment of Christ's glory. (2) Apollos (*cf.* Acts xviii. 24 ff.) had preached at Cor., in the interval since Paul's first departure, with brilliant effect. He possessed Alexandrian culture and a graceful style, whereas P. was deemed at Cor. **ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ** (2 Cor. xi. 6). Some personal converts Ap. had made; others were taken with his genial method, and welcomed his teaching as more advanced than P.'s plain gospel-message. Beside the more cultured Greeks, there would be a sprinkling of liberally-minded Jews, men of speculative bias imbued with Greek letters, who might prefer to say **Ἐγὼ Ἀπολλῶ.** Judging from this Ep., the Pauline and Apollonian sections included at present the bulk of the Church, divided between its "planter" and "waterer". **Ἀπολλῶς**, of Attic 2nd decl., is probably short for **Ἀπολλώνιος.** (3) In a Judæo-Gentile Church the cry "I am of Paul," or "I am of Apollos," was certain to be met with the retort, "But I of Kephas!" Conservative Jewish believers, when conflict was afoot, rallied to the name of the preacher of Pentecost and the hero of the Church's earliest victories. The use of **Κηφᾶς**, the Aramaic original of **Πέτρος**, indicates that this party affected Palestinian traditions. Some of them may, possibly, have been Peter's converts in Judæa. Had Peter visited Cor., as Dionysius of Cor. supposed (Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, ii. 125: Weiss and Harnack favour the tradition), the event would surely have left some trace in these Epp. Judging from the tenor of the two Letters, this faction was of small account in Cor. until the arrival of the Judæan emissaries denounced in 2 Cor., who found a ground of vantage ready in those that shouted "I am of Kephas". In both Epp. P. avoids every appearance of conflict with Peter (*cf.* ix. 5, xv. 5). (4) *The Christ party* forms the crux of the passage:—(*a*) After F. C. Baur, **οἱ Χριστοῦ** has been commonly interpreted by 2 Cor. x. 7: "If any one is confident on his own part that he is Christ's (**Χριστοῦ εἶναι**), let him take this into account with himself, that just as he is Christ's, so also are we". Now P.'s opponents of 2 Cor. were ultra-Judaists; so, it is inferred, these **οἱ Χριστοῦ** must have been. But the Judaisers of 2 Cor. presumed to be "of Christ" as His *ministers*, *apostles* (xi. 13, 23), deriving their commission (as they maintained P. did not) from the fountain-head; whereas the Christ-party of this place plumed themselves, at most, on being His *disciples* (rather than P.'s, etc.): the coincidence is verbal rather than real. Upon Baur's theory, there were *two* parties at Cor., as everywhere else in the Church, diametrically opposed—a Gentile-Christian party, divided here into Pauline and Apollonian sections, and a Jewish-Christian party naming itself from Kephas or Christ as occasion served. Later scholars following Baur's line of interpretation, distinguish variously the Petrine and Christine Judaists: (α) Weizsäcker associates the latter with *James*; (β) Reuss and Beyschlag see in them strict *followers of the example and maxims of Jesus* as the **διάκονος περιτομῆς**, from which Peter in certain respects deviated; (γ) Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Hausrath, Sm., think they had been *in personal relations with Jesus* (it is quite possible that amongst the "five hundred" of xv. 5 some had wandered to Cor.); (δ) Gd. strangely conjectures that

θητε; 14. [s] εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ[1] ὅτι οὐδένα ὑμῶν ἐβάπτισα, εἰ μὴ Κρίσπον καὶ Γάϊον, 15. ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ ὅτι [r] εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα [r] ἐβάπτισα[2]· 16. ἐβάπτισα[3] δὲ καὶ τὸν Στεφανᾶ οἶκον· [t] λοιπὸν

s See i. 4.
t iv. 2, vii. 29; six times besides in P.; Heb. x. 13.

[1] ℵ*B, 67**, with Chr. and Dam. (in comment.), *om.* **τῳ Θεῳ**. A strong group of witnesses; parls. suggested to copyists the inserted words.

[2] ℵABC*, 67**, and several good minuscc., read **εβαπτισθητε**; instead of **εβαπτισα**, as in CcDGLP, etc.,—Western and Syrian reading, conformed to context.

[3] **βεβαπτικα** replaces first **εβαπτισα** in D*G, and second also in D*.

"they were *Gnostics before Gnosticism*, who formulated their title **οἱ Χριστοῦ**, after the fashion of Cerinthus, *in opp.* not merely to the names of the apostles, but even *to that of Jesus!*" He identifies them with the men who cried "Jesus is anathema" (xii. 2: see note). This notion is an anachronism, and has no real basis in the Epp.

(*b*) 1 Cor. iii. 22 f. (see notes, *ad loc.*) supplies a nearer and safer clue to the interpretation; this is the Apostle's decisive correction of the rivalries of i. 12. The human leaders pitted against each other all belong to the Church (not this teacher or that to this section or that), while *it belongs without distinction to Christ*, and Christ, with all that is His, *to God*. The catholic **Ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ** swallows up the self-assertive and sectarian **Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ**. Those who used this cry arrogated the common watchword as their peculium; they erred by despising, as others by glorying in men. "**Ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ** ad eos pertinet qui in contrariam partem peccabant; *i.e.*, qui sese unius Christi ita dicebant, ut interim iis per quos quos Deus loquitur nihil tribuerent" (Bz.); similarly Aug., Bg., Mr., Hf., El., Bt.

(*c*) The Gr. Ff., followed by Cv., Bleek, Pfleiderer, Rābiger, and others, saw in the **Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ** *the true formula which P. approves*, or even which he utters *propriâ personâ*. But the context subjects all four classes to the same reproach. It is a sufficient condemnation for the fourth party that they said "I am of Christ," in rejoinder to the partisans of Paul and the rest, lowering His name to this competition.

(*d*) Hn., finding the riddle of the "Christus-partei" insoluble, *eliminates it from the text;* "we are driven," he says, "to explain the **Ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ** as a gloss, which some reader of the original codex inscribed in the margin, borrowing it from iii. 23 as a counter-confession to the **Ἐγὼ μὲν Παύλου κ.τ.λ.**".

Ver. 13. In his expostulation P. uses, with telling contrast, the first and last only of the party names: "Is *the Christ* divided? Was *Paul* crucified on your behalf? or into the name of *Paul* were you baptised?" Lachmann, W.H., Mr., Bt., read **μεμέρισται ὁ Χ.** as an exclamation: "The Christ (then) has been divided!"—torn in pieces by your strife. But **μερίζω** (here in pf. of resultful fact) denotes *distribution*, not dismemberment (see parls.): the Christian who asserts "I am Christ's" in distinction from others, claims an *exclusive* part in Him, whereas the one and whole Christ belongs to every limb of His manifold body (see xii. 12; also xi. 3, Rom. x. 12, xiv. 7-9, Eph. iv. 3 ff., Col. ii. 19). A divided Church means a Christ *parcelled out*, appropriated **κατὰ μέρος**. **ὁ Χριστὸς** is *the Christ*, in the fulness of all that His title signifies (see xii. 12, etc.).—While **μεμέρισται ὁ Χ.**; is Paul's abrupt and indignant question to himself, **μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη**; (aor. of historical event) interrogates the readers—"Is it *Paul* that was crucified for you?" From *the cross* the Ap. draws his first reproof, the point of which vi. 20 makes clear, "You were *bought* at a price": the Cor. therefore were not Paul's or Kephas', nor some of them Christ's and some of them Paul's men, but only Christ's and all Christ's alike.

The cross was the ground of **κοινωνία Χριστοῦ** (9, x. 16); *baptism*, signalising personal union with Him by faith, its attestation (Rom. vi. 3); to this P. appeals asking, **ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε**; His converts will remember how *Christ's name* was then sealed upon them, and Paul's ignored. What was true of his practice, he tacitly assumes for the other chiefs. The readers had been baptised *as Christians*, not Pauline, Apollonian, or Petrine Christians. Paul's horror at the thought of baptising in *his* name shows how truly Christ's was to him "the name above every name" (Phil. ii. 9; *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 5).

οὐκ [u] οἶδα [u] εἴ τινα ἄλλον ἐβάπτισα [1]· 17*a*. οὐ γὰρ [v] ἀπέστειλέ με Χριστὸς [2] βαπτίζειν, ἀλλʼ [w] εὐαγγελίζεσθαι.[3]

17*b*. Οὐκ ἐν [x] σοφίᾳ [x] λόγου, ἵνα μὴ [y] κενωθῇ ὁ [z] σταῦρος τοῦ

u vii. 16; Jo. ix. 25; Acts x. 18, xix. 2.
v ix. 1 f.; Rom. x. 15; Acts xxii. 21, xxvi. 17; Jo. xvii. 18, xx. 21; with inf., Lk. i. 19, iv. 18, etc.
w Without obj., ix. 16, xv 2; Rom. i. 15, xv. 20; 2 Cor. x. 16; Gal. iv. 13; Lk. iv. 18 (Isa. lxi. 1), ix. 6, xx. 1; Acts xiv. 7; Nahum i. 15, etc.
x ii. 1, 4, 13, xii. 8; Col. ii. 23, iii. 16.
y ix. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 3; Rom. iv. 14; Ph. ii. 7 only.
z Gal. v. 11, vi. 12, 14; Ph. iii. 18.

[1] **βεβαπτικα** replaces first **εβαπτισα** in D*G, and second also in D*.

[2] **ο Χριστος** (for **Χριστος**), in BG—an instance of the faulty readings that mark B, or BD, in company of G.

[3] B, **ευαγγελισασθαι.**

Vv. 14-16. In fact, P. had himself baptised very few of the Cor. He sees a providence in this; otherwise he might have seemed wishful to stamp his own name upon his converts, and some colour would have been lent to the action of the Paulinists—"lest any one should say that you were baptised into *my* name". For **βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα**, *cf.* Matt. xxviii. 19 and other parls.; also **βαπτίζω εἰς**, x. 2; it corresponds to **πιστεύω εἰς**, and has the like pregnant force. "The name" connotes the nature and authority of the bearer, and His relationship to those who speak of Him by it. *Crispus* and *Gaius:* both Roman names (see *Introd.*, p. 733); the former a cognomen (*Curly*), the latter an exceedingly common prænomen. These two were amongst Paul's earliest converts (Acts xviii. 8, Rom. xvi. 23), the former a Synagogue-ruler. On second thoughts ("he was reminded by his amanuensis," Lt.; or by Steph. himself), P. remembers that he had "baptised the house of Stephanas" (see xvi. 15, and note), the first family here won to Christ. **Στεφανᾶς** (perhaps short for **Στεφανηφόρος**), like **Κηφᾶς**, takes the Doric gen. in **-ᾶ** usual with proper names in **-ᾶς**, whether of native or foreign origin (see Bm., p. 20).—**λοιπὸν οὐκ οἶδα εἴ τινα κ.τ.λ.**: P. cannot recall any other instance of baptism by his own hands at Cor.; this was a slight matter, which left no clear mark in his memory. **λοιπόν** (more regularly, **τὸ λοιπόν**), "for the rest"—in point of *time* (vii. 29), or *number*—a somewhat frequent idiom with Paul (*cf.* iv. 2). In **οὐκ οἶδα εἰ** (*haud scio an*), the conjunction is indir. interr., as in vii. 16.

Ver. 17a justifies Paul's thanking God that he had baptised so few: "For Christ did not send me to baptise, but *to evangelise*". The infs. (*cf.* ii. 1 f., ix. 16, xv. 11; Rom. xv. 17-21) are epexegetical (of *purpose*); and pres., of continued action (*function*). **οὐκ . . . ἀλλά**—no qualified, but an absolute denial that Baptism was the Apostle's proper work. For the terms of Paul's commission see Gal. i. 15 f., Eph. iii. 7-9, 1 Tim. ii. 7; also Acts ix. 15, and parls. Baptism was the necessary sequel of preaching, and P. did not suppose his commission narrower than that of the Twelve (Matt. xxviii. 19 f.); but baptising might be performed vicariously, not so preaching. "To *evangelise* is to cast the net—the true apostolic work; to *baptise* is to gather the fish already caught and to put them into vessels" (Gd.). It never occurred to P. that a Christian minister's essential function was to administer sacraments. The Ap. dwells on this matter so much as to suggest (Cv.) that he tacitly contrasts himself with some preachers who made a point of baptising their own converts, as though to vindicate a special interest in them; *cf.* the action of Peter (Acts x. 48), and of Jesus (John iv. 1 f.).

§ 4. THE TRUE POWER OF THE GOSPEL, i. 17b-25. To "preach the gospel" meant, above all, to proclaim the cross of Christ (17b). In Cor. "the wisdom of the world" scouted this message as sheer folly (18). To use "wisdom of word" in meeting such antagonism would have been for P. to fight the world with its own weapons and to betray his cause, the strength of which lay in the Divine power and wisdom embodied in Christ, a force destined, because it was God's, to bring to shame the world's vaunting wisdom (19-25).

Ver. 17b. **οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου** is grammatical adjunct to **ἀλλὰ** (**ἀπέστ. με Χρ.**) **εὐαγγελίζεσθαι**; but the phrase opens a new vein of thought, and supplies the theme of the subsequent argument up to ii. 6. In vv. 14, 17a Paul

Χριστοῦ. 18. ὁ [a] λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ [a] σταύρου [b] τοῖς μὲν [b] ἀπολλυμένοις [a] μωρία ἐστί, [b] τοῖς δὲ [b] σωζομένοις, ἡμῖν, [d] δύναμις [d] Θεοῦ ἐστί· 19. γέγραπται γάρ, "[e] Ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν καὶ τὴν [f] σύνεσιν

a In this sense, six times more in P.; Heb. v. 13; Jas. i. 18; Acts xiii. 26, xiv. 3, xx. 32. b 2 Cor. ii. 15, iv. 3; Acts ii. 47; Lk. xiii. 23. c Vv. 21, 23, ii. 14, iii. 19 only. d Ver. 24, ii. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 7, xiii. 4; Rom. i. 16; 2 Tim. i. 8; 1 Pet. i. 5; Mt. xxii. 29; Acts viii. 10. e Isa. xxix. 14. f Eph. iii. 4; Col. i. 9, ii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 7; Mk. xii. 33; Lk. ii. 47 only.

asserted that Christ sent him *not to baptise, but to preach;* further, what he has to preach is *not a philosophy to be discussed, but a message of God to be believed:* "L'évangile n'est pas une sagesse, c'est un salut" (Gd.). In this transition the Ap. silently directs his reproof from the Pauline to the Apollonian party.—In **σοφίᾳ λόγου** (see ii. 1-4, 13; *cf.* the opp. combination in xii. 8) the stress lies on *wisdom* (called in vv. 19 f. "the wisdom of the world")—*sc.* "wisdom" in the common acceptation, as the world understood it and as the Cor. expected it from public teachers: "in wisdom of word" = *in philosophical style.* "To tell good *news* in *wisdom* of word" is an implicit contradiction; "news" only needs and admits of plain, straightforward *telling.* To dress out the story of Calvary in specious rhetoric, or wrap it up in fine-spun theorems, would have been to "empty (**κενώθῃ**) the cross of Christ," to *eviscerate* the Gospel. The "power of God" lies in the facts and not in any man's presentment of them: "to substitute a system of notions, however true and ennobling, for the fact of Christ's death, is like confounding the theory of gravitation with gravitation itself" (Ed.).—For **κενόω**, factitive of **κενός** (*cf.* xv. 14), see parls.; the commoner syn., **καταργέω** (28, etc.), means *to deprive of activity, make impotent* (in effect), **κενόω** to *deprive of content, make unreal* (in fact).

Ver. 18. What P. asserted in ver. 17 as intrinsically true, he supports by experience (18) and by Scripture (19), combining their testimony in ver. 20.—**ὁ λόγος γάρ, ὁ τοῦ σταύρου,** "For the word, namely that of the cross". **ὁ λόγος** (distinguish from the anarthrous **λόγος** above) takes its sense from **εὐαγγελίζεσθαι** (17); it is "the tale" rather than "the doctrine of the cross," synonymous with **μαρτύριον** (6) and **κήρυγμα** (21).—**τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις . . . τοῖς δὲ σωζομένοις,** the two classes into which P. sees his hearers divide themselves (see parls.). The ptps. are strictly pr.—not expressing *certain expectation* (Mr.), nor *fixed predestination* (Bz.); the rejectors and receivers of "the word" are *in course of perishing* and *being saved* respectively (*cf.* xv. 2; contrast the aor. of **σώζω** in Rom. viii. 24, and the pf. in Eph. ii. 5). "In the language of the N.T. salvation is a thing of the past, a thing of the present, and a thing of the future. . . . The divorce of morality and religion is fostered by failing to note this, and so laying the whole stress either on the past or on the future—on the first call or on the final change" (Lt.). Paul paints the situation before his eyes: one set of men deride the story of the cross—these are manifestly perishing; to another set the same story is "God's power unto salvation". The appended pers. pron. (**τ. σωζομένοις**) **ἡμῖν,** "to the saved, viz., ourselves," speaks from and to experience: "You and I know that the cross is God's saving power". *Cf.* with the whole expression Rom. i. 16, also John iii. 14-17.—The antithesis to **μωρία** is not, in the first instance, **σοφία,** but **δύναμις Θεοῦ**—a *practical* vindication against false theory; saved men are the Gospel's apology. Yet because it is **δύναμις,** the word of the cross is, after all, the truest **σοφία** (see 30, ii. 6 ff.). The double **ἐστὶν** emphasises the *actuality* of the contrasted results.

Ver. 19. As concerns "the perishing," the above sentence agrees with God's ways of judgment as revealed in Scripture: **γέγραπται γάρ κ.τ.λ.** The quotation **Ἀπολῶ κ.τ.λ.** (suggested by **τ. ἀπολλυμένοις**) belongs to the cycle of Isaiah's prophecies against the worldly-wise politicians of Jerus. in Assyrian times (xxviii.-xxxii.), who despised the word of Jehovah, relying on their shallow and dishonest statecraft; their policy of alliance with Egypt will lead to a shameful overthrow, out of which God will find the means of vindicating His wisdom and saving His people and city. The O.T. and N.T. situations are analogous: Gentile and Jewish wisdom, united in rejection of the Gospel, are coming to a like breakdown; and P. draws a powerful warning from the sacred history.—**ἀθετήσω** (a reminiscence, perhaps, of Ps. xxxiii. 10) displaces the less pointed **κρύψω**: otherwise the LXX text of Isa. is followed; in the Heb. the

τῶν [g] συνετῶν ἀθετήσω". 20. [i] ποῦ σοφός; [i] ποῦ [k] γραμματεύς ποῦ [l] συζητητὴς[1] τοῦ [m] αἰῶνος [m] τούτου; οὐχὶ [n] ἐμώρανεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου[2]; 21. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τῇ [o] σοφίᾳ τοῦ; [o] Θεοῦ οὐκ [p] ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν [p] Θεόν, [q] εὐδόκησεν[3] ὁ [q] Θεὸς[4] διὰ τῆς [r] μωρίας τοῦ [s] κηρύγματος [t] σῶσαι τοὺς [t] πιστεύοντας·

Mt. xi. 25; Lk. x. 21; Acts xiii. 7only; Isa. v. 21; Jer. xviii. 18, xlix. 6. Gal. ii. 21, iii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 12; Heb. x. 28; Jude 8; Mk. vii. 9; Lk. vii. 30. i In this manner, xii. 17, 19, xv. 55; Rom. iii. 27; Gal. iv. 15; Isa. xxxiii. 18. k Epp., here only. Syn. Gospp., *passim*; Ezra vii. 6. l Here only; -τειν, Lk. xxii. 23, xxiv. 15; Acts vi. 9, ix. 29; six times in Mk.; -τησις, Acts xxviii. 29. m ii. 6 f., iii. 18; eight times besides in P.; Lk. xvi. 8, xx. 34; Mt. xii. 32. n Rom. i. 22; Mt. v. 13; Isa. xix. 11; Jer. x. 14. o Ver. 24; Rom. xi. 33; Eph. iii. 10; Lk. xi. 49. p xv. 34; Rom. i. 21; Gal. iv. 9; 2 Th. i. 8; Tit. i. 16; 1 Jo. iv. 6 ff.; Jo. xiv. 7; Heb. viii. 11 (from Jer.). q Gal. i. 15; Col. i. 19; Lk. xii. 32. r See ver. 18. s ii. 4, xv. 14; Rom. xvi. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 17; Tit. i. 3; Mt. xii. 41. xv. 2; Rom. x. 9; Eph. ii. 8; Jas. ii. 14, v. 15; Mt. ix. 22; Mk. x. 52, xvi. 16; 5 times in Lk.; Acts xiv. 9, xv. 11, xvi. 31.

[1] **συνζητητης**: all uncc. exc. LP. The unassimilated form of prp. in such compounds prevails in oldest MSS.

[2] **τουτου** *wanting* in ℵ*ABC*D*gr.P. Added in ℵcC3DcGL, syrr. cop. latt. vg.; the addition is late Western and Syrian. *Cf.* **τ. αιωνος τουτου** above, and iii. 19.

[3] **ηυδοκησεν**: C, Athan.; a characteristic Alexandrian emendation.

[4] For **ο Θ., τῳ Θεῳ** in G, latt. vg. (*placuit Deo*),—a Latinism.

vbs. are pass., "the wisdom . . . shall perish," etc. Isa. xxix. is rich in matter for N.T. use: vv. 13, 18 gave our Lord texts, in Matt. xv. 8 f., xi. 5 respectively; the Ap. quotes the chap. twice elsewhere, and ch. xxviii. thrice.

Ver. 20. **ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεύς;** and (possibly) **ἐμώρανεν . . . τὴν σοφίαν,** are also Isaianic allusions—to Isa. xix. 11 f. (mocking the vain wisdom of Pharaoh's counsellors), and xxxiii. 18 (predicting the disappearance of Sennacherib's revenue clerks and army scouts, as a sign of his defeat). The LXX **γραμματικὸς** becomes **γραμματεύς,** in consistence with the *sophēr* of the latter passage; **συνζητητής** (*cf.* **ζητοῦσιν,** 22), in the third question, is Paul's addition. — **γραμματεὺς** unmistakably points, in the application, to the Jewish Scribe (*cf.* our Lord's denunciation in Matt. xxiii.); of the parl. terms, **σοφὸς** is supposed by most moderns to be *general*, comprehending Jewish and Gr. wise men together, **συνζητητὴς** to be *specific* to the Gr. philosopher—a distinction better reversed, as by Lt. after the Gr. Ff. **συνζητέω,** with its cognates, is employed in the N.T. of *Jewish* discussions (Acts vi. 9, xxviii. 29, etc.), and the adjunct **τ. αἰῶνος τούτου** gives to the term its widest scope, whereas **σοφός,** esp. at Cor., marks the Gr. intellectual pride; **καλεῖ σοφὸν τὸν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ στωμυλίᾳ κοσμούμενον** (Thd.; *cf.* Rom. i. 23).—**ποῦ σοφός** (not **ὁ σοφός**); **κ.τ.λ.**: "Where is a wise man? where a scribe? where a disputer of this age?" These orders of men are swept from the field; all such pretensions disappear (*cf.* 29)—"Did not God make foolish the wisdom of the world?" The world and God are at issue; each counts the other's wisdom folly (*cf.* 18, 25, 30). But God actually *turned to foolishness* (*infatuavit*, Bz.: *cf.* Rom. i. 21 f., for **μωραίνω**; also Isa. xliv. 25) the world's imagined wisdom: *how*, vv. 21-25 proceed to show. On **αἰὼν** see parls., and Ed.'s note; also Trench's *Synon.*, lix., and Gm., for the distinction between **αἰὼν** and **κόσμος**; "**αἰών,** like *sæculum*, refers to the prevailing ideas and feelings of the present life, **κόσμος** to its gross, material character" (Lt.).

Vv. 21-25. The **ἐπειδὴ** of ver. 21 and that of vv. 22-25 are parl., the second restating and expanding the first (*cf.* the double **ὅταν** in xv. 24, and in xv. 27 f.: see notes), rather than proving it; together they justify the assertion implied in ver. 20b, which virtually repeats ver. 18.

Ver. 21. **ἐπειδὴ γάρ** (*quoniam enim*, Cv.) introduces the *when* and *how* of God's stultifying the world's wisdom by the **λόγος τοῦ σταύρου**: "For since, in the wisdom of God, the world through its wisdom did not know God, God was pleased," etc.—**οὐκ ἔγνω . . . διὰ τ. σοφίας τ. Θεὸν** records Paul's experience, *e.g.*, at Athens, in disclosing the **ἄγνωστον Θεὸν** to philosophers. Of the emphatic adjunct, **ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ,**

22. ἐπειδὴ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι [u] σημεῖον [1] [u] αἰτοῦσι, καὶ [v] Ἕλληνες [v] σοφίαν [v] ζητοῦσιν· 23. ἡμεῖς δὲ [w] κηρύσσομεν [wx] Χριστὸν [x] ἐσταυρωμένον,

u Mt. xii. 38 f., xvi. 1, xxiv. 3; Lk. xxiii. 8; 7 times in Jo.; Acts iv. 30. v Prov. ii. 4, xiv. 6; Eccl. vii. 26. w xv. 12; 2 Cor. i. 19, xi. 4; Ph. i. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Acts viii. 5, ix. 20, xix. 13. x ii. 2; Gal. iii. 1; Mt. xxviii. 5.

[1] σημεια: all uncc. (with anc. verss.) exc. L. T.R. conforms to Gosp. parls.

there are two explanations, following the line of Rom. i. 19 f. or Rom. xi. 32 f.: on the former view, the clause qualifies ἔγνω—"the world did not come to know God in His wisdom," evidenced in creation and Providence—so most interpreters ("amid the wisdom of God," Bt.; *in media luce*, Cv.; *in nature and Scripture*, addressed to Gentile and Jew, Bg.; Mr.); on the other hand, Rückert, Reuss, Al., Lt., Ev. attach the clause to οὐκ ἔγνω,—*in God's wise plan* of the world's government, the world's wisdom failed to win the knowledge of Him. The latter is the sounder explanation, being (*a*) in accord with Paul's reff. elsewhere to σοφία Θεοῦ, (*b*) presenting a pointed antithesis to σοφία κόσμου, and (*c*) harmonising with Paul's theory of the education of mankind for Christ, expounded in Gal. iii. 10-iv. 5 and Rom. v. 20 f., vii. 7-25, xi. "Through its (Greek) wisdom the world *knew not* God," as through its (Jewish) righteousness it *pleased not* God; both results were brought about "in the wisdom of God"—according to that "plan of the ages," leading up to "the fulness of the seasons," which embraced the Gentile "times of ignorance" (Acts xvii. 26-31) no less than the Jewish dispensations of covenant and law. "It is part of God's wise providence that He will not be apprehended by intellectual speculation, by 'dry light'" (Ev.). The intellectual was as signal as the moral defeat; the followers of Plato were "shut up," along with those of Moses, εἰς τ. μέλλουσαν πίστιν (Gal. iii. 22 f.).

Now that God's wisdom has reduced the self-wise world to ignorance, εὐδόκησεν σῶσαι: man's extremity, God's opportunity. "It was God's good will" (*placuit Deo*: see parls. for the vb.); εὐδοκία P. associates with θέλημα, βουλὴ on the one hand, and with χάρις, ἀγαθωσύνη on the other: God's sovereign grace rescues man's bankrupt wisdom. διὰ τ. μωρίας τ. κηρύγματος states the *means*, τοὺς πιστεύοντας defines the *qualified objects* of this deliverance. "Through the folly (as the wise world calls it, 18) of the κήρυγμα"—which last term signifies not the act of proclamation (κήρυξις), but *the message proclaimed* by God's herald (κῆρυξ, see parls.: *the heralding* suggests thoughts of *the kingdom*; *cf.* Acts xx. 25, Luke viii. 1, etc.). P. designates Christians by the act which makes them such—"those that believe" (see parls.). God saves by *faith*. Faith here stands opposed to Greek knowledge, as in Rom. to Jewish law-works.

Vv. 22-25 open out the thought of ver. 21: "the world" is parted into "Jews" and "Greeks"; μωρία becomes σκάνδαλον and μωρία; the κήρυγμα is defined as that of Χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος; and the πιστεύοντες reappear as the κλητοί. Both Mr. and Al. make this a new sentence, detached from vv. 20 f., and complete in itself, with ἐπειδὴ καί κ.τ.λ. for protasis, and ἡμεῖς δέ κ.τ.λ. for apodosis,—as though the mistaken aims of the world *supplied Paul's motive for preaching Christ;* the point is rather (in accordance with 20) that his "foolish" message, in contrast with (δέ, 23) the desiderated "signs" and "wisdom," *convicts the world of folly* (20); thus the whole of vv. 22-24 falls under the regimen of the 2nd ἐπειδή, which with its καί, emphatically resumes the first ἐπειδή (21)—"since indeed". God turned the world's wise men into fools (20) by bestowing salvation through faith on a ground that they deem folly (21)—in other words, by revealing His power and wisdom in the person of a crucified Messiah, whom Jews and Greeks unite to despise (22-24).

Ver. 22. Ἰουδαῖοι . . . Ἕλληνες—anarthrous; "Jews" *qua* Jews, etc.: in this "asking" and "seeking" the characteristics of each race are "hit off to perfection" (Ed.: see his interesting note); αἰτεῖν expresses "the importunity of the Jews," ζητεῖν "the curious, speculative turn of the Greeks" (Lt.). For the *Jewish* requirement, *cf.* parls. in the case of Jesus; the app., doubtless, were challenged in the same way—P. perhaps publicly at Cor.: "non reperias Corinthi signum editum esse per Paulum, Acta xviii." (Bg.). Respecting this demand, see Lt., *Biblical Essays*, pp. 150 ff. Such dictation Christ never allowed;

Ἰουδαίοις μὲν [y] σκάνδαλον, Ἕλλησι [1] δὲ [r] μωρίαν, 24. αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς [z] κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησι, Χριστὸν [a] Θεοῦ [a] δύναμιν καὶ [a] Θεοῦ [a] σοφίαν. 25. ὅτι [b] τὸ [b] μωρὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ σοφώτερον τῶν [c] ἀνθρώπων ἐστί, καὶ [d] τὸ [d] ἀσθενὲς τοῦ Θεοῦ [e] ἰσχυρότερον τῶν [c] ἀνθρώπων ἐστί.[2]

y Rom. ix. 33; Gal. v. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 8.
z See ver. 1.
a See ver. 18.
b Ver. 27, iii. 18, iv. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 9. For *neuter* idiom, Rom. ii. 4, viii. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 17, viii. 8.
c For constr., Mt. v. 20; Jo. v. 36; 1 Jo. ii. 2.
d Ver. 27, iv. 10, xii. 22; 2 Cor. x. 10; Gal. iv. 9; Heb. vii. 18; Wisd. ii. 11, xiii. 18. For constr., see b.
e Ver. 27, iv. 10, x. 22; Mt. iii. 11; Lk. xi. 22; Mic. iv. 3.

[1] **εθνεσιν**: all uncc. exc. C[3]D[c], all verss. exc. arm. **Ελλησιν** (as in context): all minuscc. exc. (about) twelve.

[2] **εστι** *wanting* in ℵB 17, 67**. ℵ[c]ACLP, etc. (Alex. and Syr.) insert at end; DG (Western), before **τ. ανθρωπων**.

His miracles were expressions of pity, not concessions to unbelief, a part of the Gospel and not external buttresses to it. Of the Hellenic **σοφίαν ζητεῖν** Philosophy is itself a monument; *cf.*, amongst many cl. parls., Herod., iv., 77, **Ἕλληνες πάντας ἀσχόλους εἶναι πρὸς πᾶσαν σοφίην**; also Ælian, *Var. Hist.*, xii., 25; Juvenal, *Sat.*, I., ii., 58 f.

Ver. 23. Instead of working miracles to satisfy the Jews, or propounding a philosophy to entertain the Greeks, "we, on the other hand, proclaim a crucified Christ"—**Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον**, *i.e.*, *Christ as crucified* (predicative adjunct), not "Christ the crucified," nor, strictly, "Christ crucified"; *cf.*, for the construction, 2 Cor. iv. 5, **κηρύσσομεν Χ. Ἰ. κύριον**, "We preach (not ourselves but) Christ Jesus as Lord". Not a warrior Messiah, flashing His signs from the sky, breaking the heathen yoke, but a Messiah dying in impotence and shame (see 2 Cor. iv. 10, xiii. 4: *hattalûy*, Deut. xxi. 23—*the hangèd*—He is styled in the Talmud) is what the app. preach for their good news! "To Jews indeed a **σκάνδαλον**": this word (cl. **σκανδάληθρον**) signified first the *trap-stick*, then any obstacle over which one stumbles to one's injury, an "offence" (syn. with **προσκοπή, πρόσκομμα**: see viii. 9, 13), a moral hindrance presented to the perverse or the weak (see parls.).—**τοῖς δὲ ἔθνεσιν μωρίαν**: for the "folly" of offering the *infelix lignum* to cultured Gentiles, see Cicero, *pro Rabirio*, v.: "Nomen ipsum crucis absit non modo a corpore civium Romanorum, sed etiam a cogitatione, oculis, auribus"; and Lucian, *De morte Peregrini*, 13, who mocks at those who worship **τὸν ἀνεσκολοπισμένον τὸν σοφιστήν**,—"that gibbeted sophist!" For reff. in the early Apologists see Justin M., *Tryph.*, lxix., and *Apol.*, i., 13; Tertull., *adv. Jud.*, § 10; Aristo of Pella, in Routh's *Rel. Sacr.*, i., 95; and the graffito of the *gibbeted ass* discovered on the wall of the Pædagogium in the Palatine. To Jews the **λόγος τοῦ σταύρου** announced the shameful reversal of their most cherished hopes; to Greeks and Romans it offered for Saviour and Lord a man branded throughout the Empire as amongst the basest of criminals; it was "outrageous," and "absurd".

Ver. 24. **αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς**, *ipsis autem vocatis* (Vg.): for the emphatic prefixed **αὐτοῖς**, *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 14, 1 Thess. 16, etc.; it "marks off those alluded to from the classes to which they nationally belonged" (El.)—"to the called however upon their part, both Jews and Greeks"—*cf.* the **οὐ . . . διαστολή** of Rom. iii. 9, 22 ff. "(We proclaim) a Christ (to these) God's power and God's wisdom." *Of God* reiterated four times, with triumphant emphasis, in the stately march of vv. 24 f. **Θεοῦ δύν., Θεοῦ σοφ.** are predicative, in antithesis to **ἐσταυρωμένον** (23): the app. "preach as power and wisdom" One who wears to the world the aspect of utter powerlessness and folly.—**Δύναμις** and **Σοφία Θεοῦ** were synonyms of the **Λόγος** in the Alexandrian-Jewish speculations, in which Apollos was probably versed; these surpassing titles Paul appropriates for the Crucified.—**Θεοῦ δύναμιν** reaffirms, after explanation, the **δύναμις Θεοῦ** of ver. 18; now **Θεοῦ σοφίαν** is added to it, for "power" proves "wisdom" here (see note on 30); the universal efficacy of the Gospel demonstrates its inner truth, and faith is finally justified by reason.—**δύναμιν** matches the **σημεῖον** of ver. 22 (see, *e.g.*, 2 Thess. ii. 9); believing Jews found, after all, in the cross the mightiest miracle, while Greeks found the deepest wisdom. The "wisdom of God," secretly

26. [f] Βλέπετε γὰρ τὴν [g] κλῆσιν ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι [h] οὐ [h] πολλοὶ σοφοὶ [i] κατὰ [i] σάρκα, [h] οὐ [h] πολλοὶ [k] δυνατοί, [h] οὐ [h] πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς·

f x. 18; Rev vi. 1. Impv. otherwise in iii. 10, etc. g vii. 20; Rom. xi. 29; Eph. iv. 1, 4; Ph. iii. 14; 2 Th. i. 11; 2 Tim. i. 9; Heb. iii. 1; 2 Pet. i. 10. h iv. 15; Acts i. 5, xxvii. 14. i x. 18; 17 times besides in P.; *cf.* Jo. viii. 15. k Acts xxv. 5. l Lk. xix. 12; Acts xvii. 11 (another sense) only; Job i. 3; 2 Macc. x. 13.

working in the times of preparation (20), is thus at length brought to human recognition in Christ. On **κλητοῖς** see note to ver. 2: this term is preferable to **οἱ σωζόμενοι**, or **οἱ πιστεύοντες**, where the stress rests upon God's initiative in the work of individual salvation; *cf.* vv. 9, 26, Rom. viii. 28 ff.

Ver. 25. What has been proved in point of fact, viz., the stultification by the cross of man's wisdom, the Ap. (as in Rom. iii. 30, xi. 29, Gal. ii. 6) grounds upon an axiomatic religious principle, that of the absolute superiority of the Divine to the human. That God should thus confound the world one might expect: "because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men". Granted that the **λόγος τ. σταυροῦ** is folly and weakness, it is *God's* folly, *God's* weakness: will *men* dare to match themselves with that? (*cf.* Rom. ix. 20).—**τὸ μωρόν** (not **μωρία** as before), **τὸ ἀσθενές** are concrete terms—*the foolish*, *weak policy* of God (*cf.* **τὸ χρηστόν**, Rom. ii. 4), the folly and weakness embodied in the cross.—**ἰσχυρός** (**ἰσχύς**) implies *intrinsic strength;* **δύναμις** is *ability*, as relative to the task in view.

§ 5. The Objects of the Gospel Call, i. 26-31. § 4 has shown that the Gospel does not come **ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου** (17b) by *the method of its operation;* this will further be evidenced by *the status of its recipients.* If it were, humanly speaking, a **σοφία**, it would have addressed itself to **σοφοί**, and won their adherence; but the case is far otherwise.

Ver. 26. **Βλέπετε γὰρ τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν, ἀδελφοί,**—"For look at *your* calling, brothers": God has called *you* into the fellowship of His Son (9); if His Gospel had been a grand philosophy, would He have addressed it to fools, weaklings, base-born, like most of you? P.'s experience in this respect resembled his Master's (Matt. xi. 25, John vii. 47-49, Acts iv. 13). This argument cuts two ways: it lowers the conceit of the readers (*cf.* vi. 9-11, and the scathing irony of iv. 7-13), while it discloses the true mission of the Gospel. On **κλῆσιν** see the note to **κλητοῖς** (2), also on vii. 20: it signifies not one's temporal *vocation* in the order of Providence, but one's summons to enter the kingdom of Grace; **ὑμῶν** is objective gen. For **τ. κλῆσιν ὅτι**, see note on **ὅτι**, ver. 5.—**οὐ πολλοί** (thrice repeated) suggests at least *a few* of each class amongst the readers: see *Introd.*, p. 730.—**οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοί**: "hinc *Athenis* numero tam exiguo lucrifacti sunt homines" (Bg.).—**σοφοὶ** is qualified by **κατὰ σάρκα** (see parls., and *cf.* **σοφία σαρκική**, 2 Cor. i. 12), in view of the distinction worked out in § 4 between the world's and God's wisdom: the contrast implied resembles that between **ἡ κατὰ Θεὸν λύπη** and **ἡ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη** in 2 Cor. vii. 9 ff. The "wise after the flesh" include not only philosophers (20), "but educated men in general, the **πεπαιδευμένοι** as opposed to the **ἰδιῶται**. The **δυνατοὶ** were men of rank and political influence, opp. to **δῆμος**. The **εὐγενεῖς** meant, in the aristocratic ages of Greece, men of high descent;" but in later degenerate times "men whose ancestors were virtuous and wealthy, the *honesti* as opposed to the *humiliores* of the Empire. Few intellectual men, few politicians, few of the better class of free citizens embraced Christianity" (Ed.). In a Roman colony and capital, the **εὐγενεῖς** would chiefly be men of hereditary citizenship, like P. himself; the **δυνατοί**, persons associated with Government and in a position to influence affairs; the former word is applied in an ethical sense to the Berœan Jews in Acts xvii. 11. "That the majority of the first converts from heathenism were either slaves or freedmen, appears from their names" (Lt.); the inscriptions of the Catacombs confirm this. The low social status of the early Christians was the standing reproach of hostile critics, and the boast of Apologists: see the famous passage in Tacitus' *Annals*, xv., 44; Justin M., *Apol.*, ii., 9; Origen, *contra Celsum*, ii., 79; Minuc. Felix, vii., 12 (*indocti*, *impoliti*, *rudes*, *agrestes*). As time went on and Christianity penetrated the higher ranks of society, these words became less strictly true: see Pliny's *Ep. ad Trajanum*, x., 97, and the cases of Flavius Clemens and Domitilla, cousins of the emperor Domitian (Ed.),

m See ver. 25. n Eph. i. 4; Ja. ii. 5; Acts i. 2, 24, xiii. 17, xv. 7; Mk. xiii. 20; Lk. ix. 35; Jo. vi. 70, xiii. 18, xv. 16. Lk. xiii. 17; frequent in O.T.

27. ἀλλὰ τὰ [m] μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου [n] ἐξελέξατο [1] ὁ Θεός,[1] ἵνα καταισχύνῃ [2] τοὺς σοφούς [2]· καὶ τὰ [d] ἀσθενῆ τοῦ κόσμου [n] ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός, ἵνα [o] καταισχύνῃ τὰ [e] ἰσχυρά· 28. καὶ τὰ [p] ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ [q] ἐξουθενημένα [n] ἐξελέξατο [1] ὁ Θεός,[1] καὶ [3] τὰ [r] μὴ [r] ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα

o xi. 4 f., 22; 2 Cor. vii. 4, ix. 4; thrice in Rom.; 1 Pet. ii. 6, iii. 16; p N.T. *h.l.*; in cl. Gr. commonly αγεννης. q vi. 4, xvi. 11; 2 Cor. x. 10; Rom. xiv. 3, 10; Gal. iv. 14; 1 Th. v. 20; four times besides. r Rom. iv. 17.

[1] AG, with above 15 minuscc., following some common (? Western) exemplar, jump from εξελεξατο ο Θεος in ver. 27 to the same words in ver. 28, omitting all between. Similar omissions occur in other individual MSS. in this context, where there is much repetition.

[2] τους σοφους καταισχυνῃ: all uncc. The T.R. rests on minuscc. only.

[3] ℵAC*D*G, 17, *om.* και; ins. by B and Syrian Codd. W.H. *bracket* the conj.

The ellipsis of predicate to οὐ πολλοί κ.τ.λ. is commonly filled up by understanding ἐκλήθησαν, as implied in κλῆσιν: "not many wise, etc. (were called)". Mr., Bt., and others, supply εἰσίν, or preferably ἐστέ: "(there are) not many wise, etc. (among you)," or "not many (of you are) wise, etc."; the omission of ὑμεῖς courteously veils the disparagement.

Vv. 27-28. "Nay, but (ἀλλά, the *but* of exclusion) the foolish . . . the weak . . . the base-born things of the world God did choose out (when He chose you)."—ἐξελέξατο (*selected, picked out for Himself*) is equivalent to ἐκάλεσεν (2, 9, 26), εὐδόκησεν . . . σῶσαι (21), τὴν χάριν ἔδωκεν ἐν Χ. Ἰ. (4); this word indicates the relation in which the saved are put both *to God* and *to the world*, out of (ἐξ) which they were taken (see parls.); nothing here suggests, as in Eph. i. 4, the idea of *eternal* election.—ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός: the astonishing fact thrice repeated, with solemn emphasis of assurance. The *objects* of God's saving choice and the *means* of their salvation match each other; by His τὸ μωρὸν and τὸ ἀσθενές (25) He saves τὰ μωρὰ and τὰ ἀσθενῆ: "the world laughs at our beggarly selves, as it laughs at our beggarly Gospel!" The neut. adj. of vv. 27 f. mark the *category* to which the selected belong; their very foolishness, weakness, ignobility determine God's choice (*cf.* Matt. ix. 13, Luke x. 21, etc.).—τοῦ κόσμου is partitive gen.: out of all the world contained, God chose its (actually) foolish, weak, base things—making "fæx urbis lux orbis!" In this God acted deliberately, pursuing the course maintained through previous ages, ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ (see note, 21): He "selected the foolish things of the world, that He might shame its wise men (τοὺς σοφούς) . . . the weak things of the world, that He might shame its strong things (τὰ ἰσχυρά), and the base-born things of the world and the things made absolutely nothing of . . . the things non-existent, that He might bring the things existent to naught". In the first instance a class of *persons*, immediately present to Paul's mind (*cf.* 20), is to be "put to shame"; in the two latter P. thinks, more at large, of worldly *forces and institutions* (*cf.* vii. 31, 2 Cor. x. 4-6). The pride of the cultured and ruling classes of paganism was to be confounded by the powers which Christianity conferred upon its social outcasts; as, *e.g.*, Hindoo Brahminism is shamed by the moral and intellectual superiority acquired by Christian Pariahs.—τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου, third of the categories of disparagement, is reinforced by τὰ ἐξουθενημένα (from ἐξ and οὐδέν, pf. pass.: *things set down as of no account whatever*), then capped by the abruptly apposed τὰ μὴ ὄντα, to which is attached the crowning final clause, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ. For καταργέω (*ut enervaret*, Bz.), see note on κενόω (17), and parls.; the scornful world-powers are not merely to be robbed of their glory (as in the two former predictions), but of their *power and being*, as indeed befell in the end the existing social and political fabric. In τὰ μὴ ὄντα, "μὴ implies that the non-existence is not absolute but *estimative*" (Al.); the classes to which Christianity appealed were *non-entities* for philosophers and statesmen, cyphers in their reckoning: contrast οὐκ ὤν, of objective matter of fact, in John x. 12, Acts vii. 5; also Eurip., *Troad.*, 600.—τὰ ὄντα connotes more than bare ex-

[s] καταργήσῃ· 29. ὅπως [u] μὴ [t] καυχήσηται [u] πᾶσα σὰρξ [v] ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.[1] 30. [w] ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε [x] ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν[2] σοφία[2] [y] ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, [z] δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ [a] ἁγιασμὸς καὶ [b] ἀπολύτρωσις· 31. ἵνα, [c] καθὼς [c] γέγραπται, "[t] Ὁ καυχώμενος, ἐν Κυρίῳ [t] καυχάσθω".

s ii. 6, vi. 15, xiii. 8, 10 f., xv. 24, 26; frequently in P. Only Heb. ii. 14; Lk. xiii. 7 besides; with Ezra iv. 21, 23, v. 5, vi. 8. t iii. 21, iv. 7, xiii. 3; 2 Cor., *passim*; nine times elsewhere in P.; only Jas. i. 9, iv. 16 besides. Rare and poetical in cl. Gr. u Hebraistic (or *ου . . . πας*), *lo' . . . khol*: Rom. iii. 20; Eph. iv. 29, v. 5; 2 Pet. i. 20; frequent in Epp. of Jo. and Rev.; Mt. xxiv. 22. v Frequent in P., Lk., and Rev.; never in Mt. or Mk. w viii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 18; Rom. xi. 36; Jo. viii. 23, 42, etc. x 2 Cor. v. 17, xii. 2; Rom. viii. 1, xvi. 7, 11; Gal. i. 22, iii. 28, etc. y Ver. 3, iv. 5, vi. 19, etc. z Rom. i. 17, iii. 21, 25; 2 Cor. v. 21. a Rom. vi. 19, 22; 1 Th. iv. 4, 7; 2 Th. ii. 13; 1 Tim. ii. 15. Only Heb. xii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 2 besides b Rom. iii. 24, viii. 23; Eph. i. 7, 14, iv. 30; Col. i. 14. Only Heb. ix. 15, xi. 35; Lk. xxi. 28 besides. c ii. 9; Rom. *passim*; 2 Cor. viii. 15, ix. 9; Acts vii. 1, 2, xv. 15; Mt. [illegible]vi. 24; Mk. i. 2, ix. 13, xiv. 21; Lk. ii. 23.

[1] **ενωπιον του Θεου**: all uncc. exc. C*, which is followed by minuscc., vg., both syrr., in reading **αυτου** (to avoid repetition).

[2] **σοφια ημιν** (in this order): pre-Syrian uncials.

istence; "ipsum verbum **εἶναι** eam vim habet ut significet in aliquo numero esse, rebus secundis florere" (Pflugk, on Eurip., *Hecuba*, 284, quoted by Mr.); it is **τὰ ὄντα κατ' ἐξοχήν**: *cf.* the adv. **ὄντως** in 1 Tim. vi. 19.

Ver. 29. God's purposes in choosing the refuse of society are gathered up into the general and salutary design, revealed in Scripture (see parls.), "that so no flesh may glory in God's presence" (a condens[illegible] quotation) = **πάντα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ** (x. 31). For **ὅπως**, which carries to larger issue the intentions stated in the previous clauses, *cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 14, 2 Thess. i. 12. Two Hebraisms, characteristic of the LXX, here: **μὴ . . . πᾶσα** (*khōl . . . lo'*), for **μηδεμία**; and **σάρξ** (*bāsār*), for *humanity* in its mortality or sinfulness. *Cf.*, for this rule of Divine action, 2 Cor. xii. 9 f.; also Plato, *Ion*, 534 E, **ἵνα μὴ διστάζωμεν ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρώπινά ἐστι τὰ καλὰ ταῦτα ποιήματα οὐδὲ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ θεῖα καὶ θεῶν . . . ὁ θεὸς ἐξεπίτηδες διὰ τοῦ φαυλοτάτου ποιητοῦ τὸ κάλλιστον μέλος ᾖσεν.**

Ver. 30. **ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ**: is **ἐν Χ. Ἰησοῦ** or **ἐξ αὐτοῦ** (*sc.* **τοῦ Θεοῦ**) the predicate to **ἐστέ**? Does P. mean, "It comes of Him (God) that you are in Christ Jesus"—*i.e.*, "Your Christian status is due to God" (so Mr., Hn., Bt., Ed., Gd., El.)? or, "It is in Christ Jesus that you are of Him"—"Your new life derived from God is grounded in Christ" (Gr. Ff., Cv., Bz., Rückert, Hf., Lt.)? The latter interpretation suits the order of words and the trend of thought (see Lt.): "*You*, whom the world counts as nothing (26 ff.: note the contrastive **δέ**), are *of Him* before whom all human glory vanishes (29); *in Christ* this Divine standing is yours". Thus Paul exalts those whom he had abased. The conception of the Christian estate as "of God," if Johannine, is Pauline too (*cf.* viii. 6, x. 12, xii. 6, 2 Cor. iv. 6, v. 18, etc.), and lies in Paul's fundamental appropriation, after Jesus, of God as **πατὴρ ἡμῶν** (i. 4, and *passim*), and in the correlative doctrine of the **υἱοθεσία**; the whole passage (18-29) is dominated by the thought of the Divine initiative in salvation. This derivation from God is not further defined, as in Gal. iii. 26; enough to state the grand fact, and to ground it "in Christ Jesus" (see note, 4).

The relative clause, "who was made wisdom," etc., unfolds the content of the life communicated "to us from God" in Christ. Of the four defining complements to **ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν, σοφία** stands by itself, with the other three attached by way of definition—"wisdom from God, *viz.*, both righteousness, etc."; Mr., Al., Gd., however, read the four as co-ordinate. On **σοφία** the whole debate, from ver. 17 onwards, hinges: we have seen how God turned the world's wisdom to folly (20-25); now He did this not for the pleasure of it, but for our salvation—to establish His own wisdom (24), and to bestow it upon us in Christ ("us" means Christians collectively—*cf.* 17—while "you" meant the despised Cor. Christians, 26). This wisdom (how diff. from the other! see 17, 19; Jas. iii. 15 ff.) comes as sent "from God" (**ἀπὸ** of ultimate source: **ἐξ** of direct derivation). It is a vitalising moral force—

II. 1. Κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἦλθον οὐ καθ' [a] ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας, [b] καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ [c] μαρτύριον [1] τοῦ Θεοῦ. 2. οὐ

a 1 Tim. ii. 2 only. In LXX, 1 Ki. ii. 3; 2 Macc. iii. 11, etc. b ix. 14, xi. 26; Rom. i. 8; Ph. i. 17 f.; Col. i. 28; often in Acts. c See i. 6; with τ. Θεοῦ only here.

[1] **μαρτυριον**: ℵcBDGLP, vg. sah. syrp., Gr. Ff.; W.H. *mg.*, R.V. *mg.*, Tisch., Tr. **μυστηριον**: ℵ*AC, cop. syrsch., Lat. Ff.; W.H. *txt.*, R.V. *txt.* The former is the Western and Syrian reading, the latter Alexandrian; the Neutral txt. is doubtful. **μυστ.** has rather the look of an Alex. harmonistic correction, due to ver. 7 (*cf.* iv. 1, Col. ii. 2, Rev. x. 7). **μαρτ.** suits better **καταγγελλων**: see note below.

δύναμις καὶ σοφία (24)—taking the shape of **δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός**, and signally contrasted in its spiritual reality and regenerating energy with the **σοφία λόγου** and **σοφία τ. κόσμου**, after which the Cor. hankered. Righteousness and Sanctification are allied "by their theological affinity" (El.): *cf.* note on vi. 11, and Rom. vi. *passim*—hence the double copula **τε . . . καί**; **καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις** follows at a little distance (so Lt., Hn., Ed.; who adduce numerous cl. parls. to this use of the Gr. conjunctions): "who was made wisdom to us from God—*viz.*, both righteousness and sanctification, and redemption".—**δικαιοσύνη** carries with it, implicitly, the Pauline doctrine of Justification by faith in the dying, risen Christ (see vi. 11, and other parls.; esp., for Paul's teaching at Cor., 2 Cor. v. 21). With the *righteousness* of the believer justified in Christ *sanctification* (or *consecration*) is concomitant (see note on the kindred terms in 2); the connexion of chh. v. and vi. in Rom. expounds this **τε . . . καί**; all **δικαιοσύνη ἐν Χριστῷ** is **εἰς ἁγιασμόν**. (Vbl. nouns in **-μός** denote primarily a process, then the resulting state.)—**Ἀπολύτρωσις** (based on the **λύτρον** of Matt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6, with **ἀπὸ** of *separation, release*), *deliverance by ransom*, is the widest term of the three—"primum Christi donum quod inchoatur in nobis, et ultimum quod perficitur" (Cv.); it looks backward to the cross (18), by whose blood we "were bought" for God (vi. 19), so furnishing the ground both of justification (Rom. iii. 24) and sanctification (Heb. x. 10), and forward to the resurrection and glorification of the saints, whereby Christ secures His full purchased rights in them (Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14, iv. 30); thus Redemption covers the entire work of salvation, indicating the essential and just means of its accomplishment (see Cr. on **λύτρον** and derivatives).

Ver. 31. "In order that, as it stands written, he who glories, *in the Lord* let him glory;" by "the Lord" the readers could only understand *Christ*, already five times thus titled; so, manifestly, in 2 Cor. x. 17 f., where the citation reappears. Paul quotes the passage as a general Scriptural principle, which eminently applies to the relations of Christians to Christ; **ἐν Κυρίῳ** belongs to his adaptation of the original: God will have no flesh (see note, 29) exult in his wisdom, strength, high birth (*cf.* the objects of false glorying in Jer.) before Him; He *will* have men exult in "the Lord of glory" (ii. 8; *cf.* Phil. ii. 9 ff.), whom He sent as His own "wisdom" and "power unto salvation" (24, 30). What grieves the Ap. most and appears most fatal in the party strifes of Cor., is the extolling of human names by the side of Christ's and at his expense (see notes on 12-15; also iii. 5, 21-23, and 2 Cor. iv. 5, Gal. vi. 14). Christians are specifically **οἱ καυχώμενοι ἐν Χ. Ἰ.**, Phil. iii. 3. The irregularity of mood after **ἵνα—καυχάσθω** for subj. **καυχᾶται**—s accounted for in two ways: either as in *anacoluthon*, the impv. of the origina. being transplanted in lively quotation (*cf* Rom. xv. 3, 21); or as an *ellipsis*, with **γένηται** or **πληρωθῇ** mentally supplied (*cf.* Rom. iv. 16, Gal. ii. 9, 2 Cor. viii. 13)—explanations not materially different. Clem. Rom. (§ 13) quotes the text with the same peculiarity.

§ 6. PAUL'S CORINTHIAN MISSION, ii. 1-5. Paul has justified his refusing to preach **ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου** on two grounds: (1) the nature of the Gospel, (2) the constituency of the Church of Cor.; *it* was no philosophy, and *they* were no philosophers. This refusal he continues to make, in pursuance of *the course adopted from the outset*. So he returns to his starting-point, *viz.*, that "Christ sent" him "to bring good tidings," such as neither required nor admitted of "wisdom of word" (i. 17).

Ver. 1. **Κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν . . . ἦλθον**:

γὰρ [d] ἔκρινα τοῦ [1] εἰδέναι [1] τι [1] ἐν ὑμῖν, εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦν [f] Χριστὸν [e] καὶ [e] τοῦτον [f] ἐσταυρωμένον [e]. 3. καὶ ἐγὼ [1] ἐν [g] ἀσθενείᾳ καὶ [1] ἐν [h] φόβῳ

d In this sense, vii. 37; 2 Cor. ii. 1, v. 14; Tit. iii. 12; Lk. vii. 43, xii. 57; Acts. iii. 13, etc.
e vi. 6, 8; Rom. xiii. 11; Eph. ii. 8; Ph. i. 28; 3 Jo. 5.
f See i. 23.
g xv. 43; five times in 2 Cor.; Rom. viii. 26; Gal. iv. 13; 1 Tim. v. 23; see also i. 25, viii. 11.
h 2 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. vi. 5; Ph. ii. 12; Gen. ix. 2; Exod. xv. 16; Ps. liv. 6, etc.

[1] **τι ειδεναι** (*om.* **του**), BD*CP 17, 37; **ειδεναι τι**, ℵAG; **του ειδεναι τι**, D[b]L and most others. The two other readings are successive grammatical emendations of the first; *cf.* Acts xxvii. 1, and the T.R. of vii. 37 below.

"And I at my coming . . . came": the repeated vb. draws attention to Paul's *arrival*,—to the circumstances and character of his original work at Cor. The emphasis of **κἀγώ**—"And *I*"—may lie in the correspondence between the message and the messenger—*both* "foolish" and "weak" (i. 25: so Ed.); but the form of the sentence rather suggests allusion to the nearer i. 26—"As it was with you, brothers, to whom I conveyed God's call, so with myself who conveyed it; you were not wise nor mighty according to flesh, and I came to you as one without wisdom or strength". Message, hearers, preacher matched each other for folly and feebleness! "I came not in the way of excellence—**καθ' ὑπεροχήν**, *cum eminentia* (Bz.)—of word or wisdom,"—not with the bearing of a man distinguished for these accomplishments, and relying upon them for his success: this clause is best attached to the emphatic **ἦλθον**, which requires a descriptive adjunct (so Or., Cv., Bz., Hf.: *cf.* 3); others make it a qualification of **καταγγέλλων**. Paul's humble mien and plain address presented a striking contrast to the pretensions usual in itinerant professors of wisdom, such as he was taken for at Athens.—**ὑπεροχή**, from **ὑπερέχω** (Phil. ii. 3, iii. 8, iv. 7), *to overtop*, *outdo*. For **λόγου ἢ σοφίας**, see note on **σοφία λόγου** (i. 17).

The manner of Paul's preaching was determined by its *matter;* with such a commission he could not adopt the arts of a rhetorican nor the airs of a philosopher: "I came not like a man eminent in speech or wisdom, in proclaiming to you the testimony of God".—**τ. μαρτύριον τ. Θεοῦ** (subjective gen.: *cf.* note on i. 6) = **τ. εὐαγγέλιον τ. Θεοῦ** (Rom. i. 2, 1 Thess. ii. 2, 13, etc.; *cf.* 1 John v. 9 f.), with the connotation of solemnly attested truth (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 18 f.); P. spoke as one through whom *God* was witnessing. **κηρύσσω** (i. 23), denoting official declaration, gives place to **καταγγέλλω**, signifying full and clear proclamation (see parls.).—**καταγγέλλων**, pr. ptp., "in the course of preaching"; *cf.* 2 Cor. x. 14.

Ver. 2. **οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινά τι** (or **ἔκρινα τὶ**) **εἰδέναι κ.τ.λ.**: "For I did not determine (judge it fit) to know anything (*or*, know something) among you, except (*or*, only) Jesus Christ, and Him crucified". This explains Paul's unadorned and matter-of-fact delivery.—**οὐ** negatives **ἔκρινα**, not **εἰδέναι** (the rendering "I determined not to know" contravenes the order of words); nor is there any instance of **οὐ** coalescing with **κρίνω** as in **οὔ φημι** (*nego*) and the like—these interpretations miss the point: had P. chosen another subject, he might have aimed at a higher style; he avoided the latter, "for" he did not entertain the former notion. His failure at Athens may have emphasised, but did not originate the Apostle's resolution to know nothing but the cross: *cf.* Gal. iii. 1, 1 Thess. iv. 14, v. 9 f., Acts xiii. 38 f., relating to earlier preaching. For the use of **ἔκρινα** (*statui*, Bz.) as denoting a practical moral judgment or resolution, *cf.* vii. 37, 2 Cor. ii. 1. Ev. renders **τὶ εἰδέναι** (thus accented), "to be a know-something" (*aliquid scire*)—to play the philosopher—according to the well-known Attic idiom of Plato's *Apol.*, § 6, and *passim*, where **οἴεται τὶ εἰδέναι = δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι**; *cf.* viii. 2, and the emphatic **εἶναι τὶς (τὶ)**; also iii. 7, Gal. ii. 6, vi. 3, Acts v. 36. This rendering accounts well for **εἰδέναι**, and gives additional point to the **ὑπεροχὴ** of ver. 1: P. brought with him to Cor. none of the prestige of the professional teachers, who claimed to "know something"; *Christ and the cross*—this was all he knew. For **εἰ μὴ** in the corrective sense "only," demanded by this interpretation, see vii. 17.—**εἰδέναι** is *to possess knowledge*, to be a master; **γινώσκειν** (i. 21), *to acquire knowledge*, to be a learner. On **ἐσταυρωμένον** (pf. ptp., of pregnant fact), *cf.* notes to i. 17, 23.

Vv. 1, 2 say how P. *did not come*, **vv.** 3-5 how he actually *did come*, to Cor.

καὶ [i] ἐν [h] τρόμῳ πολλῷ [i] ἐγενόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς· 4. καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ [k] κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν [l] πειθοῖς [1] ἀνθρωπίνης [2] σοφίας λόγοις,[1]

i xv. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 7; Rom. xvi. 7; Ph. ii. 7; 1 Th. ii. 5; 1 Tim. ii. 14; Lk. xxii. 44; Acts xii. 11; Rev. i. 10, iv. 2. k See i. 21. l *H.l.*; cl. Gr. πιθανος.

[1] **πειθοι . . . λογων,** or . . . **λογου,** in several minuscc., latt. am. (*persuasione sapientiæ verbi*), sah.: a translator's error due to the adj. being *h.l.* W.H. follow AD*P, and analogy, in spelling **πιθοις** (see Gm.).

[2] *Om.* **ανθρωπινης** ℵBDG 17, latt. am. syr^sch. Borrowed from ver 13.

Ver. 3. "In weakness": *cf.* i. 25, 27; also 2 Cor. x. 10, and xiii. 3 f. This condition was bodily—the Cor. had received an impression of Paul's physical feebleness; but the phrase expresses, more broadly, his conscious want of resources for the task before him (*cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 5). Hence he continues, "and in fear and in much trembling"—the inward emotion and its visible expression (see parls.). P. stood before the Cor. at first a timid, shaken man: on the causes see *Introd.*, ch. i.

For **γίνομαι ἐν** (*versari in*), *to be in a state of*, *cf.* parls.—**πρὸς ὑμᾶς** qualifies the whole foregoing sentence: "I was weak, timid, trembling *before you* (when I addressed you)": **ἐγενόμην . . . πρὸς ὑμᾶς** might be construed together, **ἐγενόμην** becoming a vb. of motion—"I came to (and was amongst) you in weakness," etc. (Ed., as in xvi. 10); this would, however, needlessly repeat ver. 1.

Ver. 4. "And my word and my message:" **λόγος** recalls i. 18; **κήρυγμα,** i. 21, 23 (see notes). The former includes all that Paul says in proclaiming the Gospel, the latter the specific announcement of God's will and call therein.

οὐκ ἐκ πιθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις, "not in persuasive words of wisdom": the adj. **πιθός** (= **πιθανός,** see txtl. note), from **πείθομαι,** analogous to **φιδός** from **φείδομαι.** "Words of wisdom," substantially = "wisdom of word" (i. 17); that expression accentuating the *matter*, this the *manner* of teaching—"exquisita eloquutio, quæ artificio magis quam veritate nitatur et pugnet" (Cv.). For the unfavourable nuance of **πιθός,** see Col. ii. 4 (**πιθανολογία**), also Gal. i. 10, Matt. xxviii. 14. Eusebius excellently paraphrases (*Praep. Ev.*, i., 3), **τὰς μὲν ἀπατηλὰς κ. σοφιστικὰς πιθανολογίας παραιτούμενος**). "With a contemptuous touch of irony that reminds one of Socrates in the *Gorgias* and *Apology* [*cf.* Ev., as previously cited, on **τὶ εἰδέναι**], he disclaims all skill in rhetoric, the spurious art of persuading without instructing, held nevertheless in high repute in Cor. But when the Ap. speaks of *the demonstration of the Spirit*, he soars into a region of which Socrates knew nothing. Socr. sets **σοφία** against **πειθώ**; the Ap. regards both as being on well-nigh a common level, from the higher altitude of the Spirit" (Ed.); since the time of Socrates, however, Philosophy had sunk into a **πιθανολογία.**—**ἀπόδειξις,** "the technical term for a proof drawn from facts or documents, as opposed to theoretical reasoning; in common use with the Stoics in this sense" (Hn.); see Plato, *Theæt.*, 162 E, and Arist., *Eth. Nic.*, i., 1; ii., 4, for the like antithesis (Ed.).

ἀποδ. πνεύματος καὶ σοφίας gathers up the force of the **δύναμιν Θεοῦ** of i. 24, and **ἐγένετο σοφία κ.τ.λ.** of i. 30 (see notes); the proof of the Gospel at Cor. was experimental and ethical, found in the new consciousness and changed lives that attended its proclamation: *cf.* vi. 11, ix. 1, 2 Cor. iii. 1 ff., 1 Thess. ii. 13 (**λόγος Θεοῦ, ὃς κ. ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τ. πιστεύουσιν**).—**πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως** are not objective gen. (*in ostendendo Spiritum*, etc.), but subjective: the Spirit, with His power, *gives the demonstration* (similarly in xii. 7, see note); *cf.* vv. 10, 12, 2 Cor. iii. 3-18, Rom. viii. 16, xv. 19, for Paul's thoughts on the *testimonium Spiritus sancti*; also John xv. 26, 1 John v. 6 f.—**Δύναμις,** specially associated with **Πνεῦμα** after Luke xxiv. 49 (see reff. for P.), is certainly the *spiritual* power that operates as implied in i. 30, vi. 11, but not to the exclusion of the supernatural *physical* "powers" which accompanied Apostolic preaching (see note on **ἐβεβαιώθη,** i. 6; also xii. 1, 7-11, and the combination of Rom. xv. 17 ff.): "latius accipio, nempe pro manu Dei potente omnibus modis per apostolum se exserente" (Cv.). The art. is wanting with **πνεύματος,** though personal, after the anarthrous **ἀποδείξει,** according to "the law of correlation" (Wr., p. 175: contrast this with xii. 7, also the double

ἀλλʼ ἐν [m] ἀποδείξει [n] Πνεύματος καὶ [o] δυνάμεως· 5. ἵνα ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν μὴ ᾖ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλʼ ἐν [p] δυνάμει [p] Θεοῦ.

6. Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς [q] τελείοις· σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος [r] τούτου, οὐδὲ τῶν [s] ἀρχόντων τοῦ [r][s] αἰῶνος [r] τούτου τῶν

m *H.l.* in N.T. See vb. in iv. 9. n In ver. 13, vii. 40; 2 Cor. iii. 3, 6; Rom. viii. 9, 13-15, and often in P., πν. is anarthrous in like connexion. o In combination with πν., xii. 10; Rom. i. 4, xv. 13, 19; 1 Th. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 7; Heb. ii. 4; Lk. i. 17, iv. 14, xxiv. 49; Acts i. 8, x. 38. p See i. 18. q xiii. 10, xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 13; Ph. iii. 15; Col. i. 28, iv. 12; Heb. v. 14; Jas. i. 4; Mt. v. 48, xix. 21. r See i. 20. s Jo. xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11, with κοσμου; in pl. *h.l.*; *cf.* Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12. οι αρχοντες, Rom. xiii. 3; Mt. xx. 25; Lk. xxiii. 13, 35, xxiv. 20; Acts iii. 17, and six other places; Jo. vii. 26, 48, xii. 42.

art. of 1 with the anarthrous phrase of i. 18). The prpl. clause affirms not the agency *by* which, but the sphere of action *in* which, Paul's word operated.

Supply to this verse ἐγένετο from the ἐγενόμην of ver. 3.

Ver. 5. The Apostle's purpose in discarding the orator's and the sophist's arts was this: "that your faith might not rest in wisdom of men, but in (the) power of God". The κἀγὼ ἦλθον of ver. 1 dominates the paragraph; P. lives over again the experience of his early days in Cor.; this purpose then filled his breast: so Hf., Gd., with the older interpreters; most moderns read into the ἵνα the *Divine* purpose suggested by i. 27-31. Paul was God's mouthpiece in declaring the Gospel; he therefore sought the very end of God Himself, *viz.*, that God alone should be glorified in the faith of his hearers (i. 31; *cf.* i. 15). Had he persuaded the Cor. by clever reasonings and grounded Christianity upon their Greek philosophy, his work would have perished with the wisdom of the age (see 6, also i. 19, iii. 19 f.).

The disowned σοφία ἀνθρώπων is the σοφ. τ. κόσμου of i. 10 (see note) in its moral character, a σοφ. σαρκική (2 Cor. i. 12)—"wisdom of men" as opposed to that of God,—ἀνθρωπίνη, ver. 13. Yet not God's *wisdom*, but primarily His *power* (see notes on i. 18, 24, 30) supplied the ground on which P. planted his hearers' faith. All through, he opposes the practical to the speculative, the reality of God's work to the speciousness of men's talk. The last ἵνα clause of this long passage corresponds to the first, ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταῦρος τ. Χριστοῦ (i. 17). ἐν should be construed with ᾖ (*consistat in*, Bz.) rather than πίστις, pointing not to the object of faith but to its substratum: for this predicative ἐν—"should be (a faith) in," etc.—*cf.* iv. 20, Eph. v. 18, Acts iv. 12.

SUMMARY. Thus the Apostle's first ministry at Cor., in respect of his *bearing* (ver. 1), *theme* (2), *temper* (3), *method* (4), *governing aim* (5), illustrated and accorded with the Gospel, as that is a message from God through which His power works to the confounding of human wisdom by the seeming impotence of a crucified Messiah (i. 17 *b*-31).

§ 7. THE GOSPEL CONSIDERED AS WISDOM, ii. 6-9. So far Paul has been maintaining that his message is a "folly," with which "wisdom of word" is out of keeping; yet all the while he makes it felt that it is wisdom in the truest sense —"*God's* wisdom," convicting in its turn the world of folly. If relatively the Gospel is not wisdom, absolutely it is so,—*to persons qualified to understand it.* This P. now proceeds to show (ii. 6-iii. 2: *cf. Introd.* to Div. II.). The message of the cross is wisdom to the right people (§ 7), qualified to comprehend it (§ 8).

Ver. 6. Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.: "(there is) a wisdom, however, (that) we speak amongst the full-grown". The anarthrous, predicative σοφίαν asserts that to be "wisdom" which in ironical deference to the world has been styled "folly" (i. 21 ff.). ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, *the mature, the initiates* (opp. to νήπιοι, παιδία, iii. 1, xiv. 20; see parls.) = πνευματικοὶ in contrast with the relatively σάρκινοι (iii. 1; *cf.* note on μυστήριον, ver. 7). "The curtain must be lifted with a caution measured by the spiritual intelligence of the spectators, ἐπόπται" (Ev.). This τελειότης the Cor. had by no means reached; hence they failed to see where the real wisdom of the Gospel lay, and estimated its ministers by worldly standards. ἐν signifies not *to*, nor *in relation to*, but *amongst* the qualified hearers—*in such a circle* P. freely expounded deeper truths. λαλέω (*cf.* 7, 13), *to utter, speak out:* P. uses the pl. not thinking of Sosthenes in particular (i. 1), but of his fellow-preachers generally, including Apollos (i. 23, and xv. 11, etc. iii. 6, iv. 6).

The "wisdom" uttered in such company is defined first *negatively:* "but a

[t] καταργουμένων· 7. ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν [u] σοφίαν [1] [u] Θεοῦ [1] ἐν [v] μυστηρίῳ, τὴν [w] ἀποκεκρυμμένην, ἣν [x] προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς [y] πρὸ τῶν [y] αἰώνων

t See i. 28. u See i. 21. v iv. 1; Eph. i. 9, iii. 4; Col. ii. 2, iv. 3; Rev. x. 7; Mt. xiii. 11. w Eph. iii. 9; Col. i. 26; Lk. x. 21; *cf.* Rom. xvi. 25. x Rom. viii. 29 f.; Eph. i. 5, 11; Acts iv. 28. y *H.l.*; *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. i. 2; also Eph. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 20; Jo. xvii. 24; see x. 11 below.

[1] **Θεου σοφιαν**: ℵABCDGP, 15 minuscc. **σοφιαν Θ.**, L, etc.; a Syrian emendation; *cf.* ver. 6.

wisdom not of this age, nor of the rulers of this age, that are being brought to nought". For **αἰών**, see note to i. 20; it connotes the transitory nature of the world-powers (i. 19, 28; *cf.* vii. 31, 2 Cor. iv. 18; also 1 John ii. 17, 1 Peter i. 24 ff.). The **ἄρχοντες τ. αἰῶνος τούτου** were taken by Marcion, Or., and other ancients, to be the *angelic, or demonic* (Satanic), rulers of the nations—*sc.* the "princes" of Dan. x.-xii., and Jewish angelology, the **κοσμοκράτορες τ. σκότους τούτου** of Eph. vi. 12 (*cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2, John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11—where **ἄρχων** is applied to *Satan*; also Gal. iii. 19, Acts vii. 53, touching the office of *angels* in the Lawgiving): so Sm., after F. C. Baur—"the angels who preside over the various departments of the world, the Law in particular, but possess no perfect insight into the counsels of God, and lose their dominion—from which they take their name of **ἀρχαί** (= **ἄρχοντες**)—with the end of the world (xv. 24)"; see also, at length, Everling, *Die Paulin. Angelologie u. Dämonologie*, pp. 11 ff. But these super-terrestrial potentates could not, without explanation, be charged with the crucifixion of Christ (8); on the other hand, i. 27 ff. shows P. to be thinking in this connexion of *human* powers. Unless otherwise defined, **οἱ ἄρχοντες** denotes "the rulers" of common speech, those, *e.g.*, of Rom. xiii. 3, Luke xxiii. 35. On **τῶν καταργουμένων**, see note to i. 17 (**κενόω**), 28, xv. 24, and other parls. The *Jewish* rulers, whose overthrow is certain and near (1 Thess. ii. 16, Rom. ix. 22, xi.), are aimed at, as being primarily answerable for the death of Jesus (*cf.* Acts xiii. 27 f.); but P. foresaw the supersession of all existing world-powers by the Messianic kingdom (xv. 24; *cf.* Rom. xi. 15, Acts xvii. 7); the pr. ptp., perhaps, implies a "gradual nullification of their potency brought about by the Gospel" (El.). P. cannot have meant by **οἱ ἄρχοντες** *the leaders of thought* (as Thd., Thp., Neander suppose, because of the association with **σοφία**); he held a broad, practical conception of wisdom (sagacity) as shown in *power;* the secular rulers, wise in their own way but not in God's, must come to nought. Statecraft, equally with philosophy, failed when tested by the cross.

Ver. 7. "(We speak . . . a wisdom not of this world . . .) but (**ἀλλά**, of diametrical opposition) a wisdom of God, in (shape of) a mystery."—**ἐν μυστηρίῳ** qualifies **λαλοῦμεν**, rather than **σοφίαν** (as Hn., Ev., Lt. read it—"couched in mystery"), indicating how it is that the App. do not speak in terms of worldly wisdom, and express themselves fully to the **τέλειοι** alone: their message is a Divine secret, that the Spirit of God reveals (10 f.), while "the age" possesses only "the spirit of the world" (12). Hence to the age God's wisdom is uttered "in a mystery" and remains "the hidden (wisdom)"; *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 4; also Matt. xiii. 13 ff. (**ἐν παραβολαῖς . . . λαλῶ**), Luke x. 21 f.: **λαλῶ ἐν μυστηρίῳ = ἀποκρύπτω.—μυστήριον** (*cf.* xv. 51) has "its usual meaning in St. Paul's Epp.,—something not comprehensible by unassisted human reason" (El.; for a full account see Ed., or Bt., on the term). The Hellenic "mysteries," which flourished at this time, were practised at night in an imposing dramatic form; and peculiar doctrines were taught in them, which the initiated were sworn to keep secret. This popular notion of "mystery," as a sacred knowledge disclosed to fit persons, on their subjecting themselves to prescribed conditions, is appropriated and adapted in Bibl. Gr. to Divine revelation. The world at large does not perceive God's wisdom in the cross, being wholly disqualified; the Cor. believers apprehend it but partially, since they have imperfectly received the revealing Spirit and are "babes in Christ" (iii. 1 ff.); to the App., and those like them (10 ff.), a full disclosure is made. When he "speaks wisdom among the ripe," P. is not setting forth esoteric doctrines diff. from those preached to beginners, but the same "word of the cross"—for he knows nothing greater or higher (Gal.

[x] εἰς [x] δόξαν [x] ἡμῶν. 8. ἣν οὐδεὶς τῶν [a] ἀρχόντων τοῦ [r a] αἰῶνος [r] τούτου [z] ἔγνωκεν, εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν, οὐκ ἂν τὸν [a] Κύριον τῆς [a] δόξης [b] ἐσταύρω-

z xv. 43; 2 Cor. iii. 18; iv. 17; 10 times in P. besides; *cf.* Heb. ii. 10; 1 Pet. v. 1, 4, 10; Jo. xvii. 22. a Jas. ii. 1; similarly, Acts vii. 2 (Ps. xxviii. 3, xxiii. 7, 9); Eph. i. 17; *cf.* Heb. ix. 5. b See i. 23; *cf.* Mt. xx. 19, xxvi. 2; Lk. xxiii. 33; Jo. xix. 18; Acts ii. 36, iv. 10.

vi. 14)—in its recondite meaning and larger implications,—as, *e.g.*, in xv. 20-27 of this Ep. (where he relents from the implied threat of iii. 1 ff.), in Rom. v. 12-21, and xi. 25 ff., or Col. i. 15 ff., Eph. v. 22-32.—**τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην** expands the idea of **ἐν μυστηρίῳ** (see parls.): P. utters, beneath his plain Gospel tale, the deepest truths "in a guise of mystery"—"that (wisdom) hidden away (**ἀπὸ τ. αἰώνων**, Col. i. 26), which God predetermined before the ages unto (**εἰς**, *aiming at*) our glory". That the Gospel is a veiled mystery to many accords with past history and with God's established purpose respecting it; "est occulta antequam expromitur: et quum expromitur, tamen occulta manet multis, imperfectis" (Bg.). The "wisdom of God" now revealed, was destined eternally "for us"—"the believers" (i. 21), "the called" (i. 24), "the elect" (i. 27 ff.), "those that received the Spirit of God" (10 ff.), as men who fulfil the ethical conditions of the case and whom "it has been God's good pleasure to save" (i. 21); see the same thought in Eph. i. 4 ff. This **δόξα** is not the heavenly glory of the saints; the entire "ministry of the Spirit" is **ἐν δόξῃ** and carries its subjects on **ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν** (2 Cor. iii. 8-18); His **ἀπαρχὴ** effects a glorious transformation, by which the base things of the world put to shame its mighty (i. 27 ff.), and "our glory" overthrows "the rulers of this world" (6), "increasing as theirs wanes" (Lt.), *cf.* Rom. viii. 30. This present (moral) glory is an "earnest" of "that which shall be revealed" (Rom. viii. 18 f.). For **προώρισεν**, *marked out beforehand*, see parls., and notes to Rom. viii. 29 f.

Ver. 8. **ἣν οὐδεὶς κ.τ.λ.**: "which (wisdom) none of the rulers of this age has perceived"—all blind to the significance of the rise of Christianity.—**ἔγνωκεν**, a pf., approaching the pr. sense (*novi*) which **οἶδα** had reached, but implying, as that does not, a process—*has come to know, won the knowledge of.*—**οἱ ἄρχοντες κ.τ.λ.**, repeated with emphasis from ver. 6—*sc.* "the rulers of this (great) age," of the world in its length of history and fulness of experience (see x. 11, and note; *cf.* Eph. i. 10, iii. 5, Rom. xvi. 25 f.). The leaders of the time showed themselves miserably ignorant of God's plans and ways in dealing with the world they ruled; "for if they had known, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory". The *Lord of glory* is He in whom "our glory" (7) has its manifestation and guarantee—first in His earthly, then in His heavenly estate (*cf.* xv. 43, 49).—**τῆς δόξης**, gen. of *characterising quality* (*cf.* Eph. i. 17, Acts vii. 2). This glory of the Son of God the disciples saw (John i. 14); of it believers now partake (Rom. viii. 29 f.), and will partake in full hereafter (2 Cor. iii. 18, Phil. iii. 21, etc.), when it culminates in a universal dominion (xv. 23-29, Phil. ii. 9 ff., Heb. i.). Paul's view of Christ always shone with "the glory of that light" in which he first saw Him on the road to Damascus (Acts xxii. 11). Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin, Pilate and the Roman court (*cf.* Acts xiii. 27 f., 1 Tim. vi. 13) saw nothing of the splendour clothing the Lord Jesus as He stood before them; so knowing, they could not have crucified Him. The expression **κύριος τῆς δόξης** is no syn. for Christ's Godhead; it signifies the entire grandeur of the incarnate Lord, whom the world's wise and great sentenced to the cross. Their ignorance was a partial excuse (see Luke xxiii. 34, Acts xiii. 27); but it was guilty, like that of Rom. i. 18 f. The crucifiers fairly represented worldly governments. Mark the paradox, resembling Peter's in Acts iii. 15: "*Crux* servorum supplicium—eo *Dominum* gloriæ affecerunt" (Bg.). The levity of philosophers in rejecting the cross of Christ was only surpassed by the stupidity of politicians in inflicting it; in both acts the wise of the age proved themselves fools, and God thereby brought them to ruin (i. 28). For **εἰ . . . ἄν**, stating a hypothesis contrary to past fact (the *modus tollens* of logic), see Bn. § 248; and *cf.* xi. 31.

Ver. 9 confirms by the language of Scripture (**καθὼς γέγραπται**) what has just been said. The verse is open to three different constructions: (1) It seems best to treat the relatives, **ἃ, ὅσα**, as in apposition to the foregoing **ἣν** clauses of vv. 7, 8 (the *form* of the pro-

c See i. 31. d Isa. lxiv. 4 and lxv. 16 (see note below). e Rom. xi. 8 (Deut. xxix. 4); Mt. xiii. 13, Acts xxviii. 27 (Is. vi. 10).

σαν· 9. ἀλλὰ [c]καθὼς [c]γέγραπται, [d]"Ἃ [e]ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδε καὶ [e]οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσε καὶ [f]ἐπὶ [f]καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ [f]ἀνέβη, ἃ [1] ἡτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς [g]ἀγαπῶσιν [g]αὐτόν".

10. Ἡμῖν δὲ [2] ὁ Θεὸς [3] [h]ἀπεκάλυψε [3] [i]διὰ τοῦ [i]Πνεύματος αὐτοῦ [4]·

f Hebraism: Acts vii. 23; Is. lxv. 17; Jer. iii. 16. With εν, Lk. xxiv. 38. g viii. 3; Rom. viii. 28; Mt. xxii. 37 and Lk. x. 27 (Deut. vi. 5); 1 Jo. iv. 20 f., v. 2; Lk. xi. 42; Jo. v. 42. h iii. 13, xiv. 30; Rom. i. 17; Gal. i. 16, iii. 23; Eph. iii. 5; Mt. xi. 25, xiii. 11. i Rom. v. 5, viii. 11; Eph. iii. 16; Ph. i. 19; 2 Tim. i. 14; Tit. iii. 5; Acts i. 2, xxi. 4.

[1] **οσα**, ABC, Clem. Rom., Cyr., Hier. **α**, ℵDGLP, etc., with many Ff.; Western and Syrian. **οσα** is easily corrupted into **α**, not *vice versâ;* and the simple relative in parl. clauses would make against **οσα** in copying.

[2] **γαρ**, B, 37 and seven minuscc., sah. cop., Clem., Bas., Euthal.; W.H., Tr. *mg.* **δε**, ℵACDGLP, etc., latt. vg. syrr., Or., Ath., Did., etc.; Tisch., Tr. *txt.* **δε** is superficially easier; **γαρ** intrinsically better.

[3] **απεκαλυψεν ο Θ.**: all uncc. exc. L; all oldest verss. exc. sah.

[4] *Om.* **αυτου** ℵ*ABC. Add **αυτου** ℵ[c]DGL, etc.; Western and Syrian.

noun being dictated by the LXX original), and thus supplying a further obj. to the emphatically repeated **λαλοῦμεν** of vv. 6, 7: "but (we speak), as it is written, things which eye," etc. (so Er., Mr., Hn., Al., Ed., El., Bt.). (2) Hf., Ev., after Lachmann, prefix the whole sentence to **ἀπεκάλυψεν** of ver. 10; but this subordination requires the doubtful reading **δέ** (for **γάρ**) in ver. 10, to which it improperly extends the ref. of the formula **καθὼς γέγραπται,** while it breaks the continuity between the quotation and the foregoing assertions (*cf.* i. 19, 31). (3) Bg., D.W., Gd., Lt., and others, see an anacoluthon here, and supply **ἐστίν,** *factum est*, or the like, as a peg for the ver. to hang upon, as in Rom. xv. 3—"But, as it is written, (there have come to pass) things which eye," etc. This, however, seems needless after the prominent **λαλοῦμεν,** and weakens the concatenation of vv. 6-9. The **ἀλλὰ** follows on the **οὐδεὶς** of ver. 8, as **ἀλλὰ** in ver. 7 (see note) on the **οὐ** of ver. 6. The entire sentence may be thus arranged:—

λαλοῦμεν Θεοῦ σοφίαν . . . τ. ἀποκεκρυμμένην,
ἣν προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.,
ἣν οὐδεὶς τ. ἀρχόντων . . . ἔγνωκν κ.τ.λ.·
ἀλλὰ . . . ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν . . .
ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τ. ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

The words cited do not appear, connectedly, in the O.T. Of the four clauses, the 1st, 2nd, and 4th recall Isai. lxiv. 4 f. (Heb., 3 f.)—after the Hebrew text; the 3rd occurs in a similar strain in Isai. lxv. 17 (LXX, 16); see other parls. In *thought*, as Hf. and Bt. point out, this passage corresponds to Isai. lxiv.: in P. God does, as in Isaiah He is besought to do, things unlooked for by the world, to the confusion of its unbelief; in each case these things are done for fit persons—Isaiah's "him that waiteth for Him," etc., being translated into Paul's "those that love Him"; **ἐποίησεν** is changed to **ἡτοίμασεν,** in conformity with **προώρισεν** (7). A further analogy appears between the "terrible things in righteousness" which the prophet foresees in the coming theophany, and the **καταργεῖν** that P. announces for "the rulers of this world". Clement of Rome (*ad Cor.*, xxxiv. 8) cites the text briefly as a Christian saying, but reverts from Paul's **τ. ἀγαπῶσιν** to the Isaianic **τ. ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν,** manifestly identifying the O. and N.T. sayings.

Or. wrote (on Matt. xxvii. 9), "In nullo regulari libro hoc positum invenitur, nisi in *Secretis Eliæ prophetæ*"—a lost Apocryphum; Jerome found the words both in the *Ascension of Isaiah* and the *Apocalypse of Elias*, but denies Paul's indebtedness to these sources; and Lt. makes out (see note, *ad loc.*) that these books were *later* than Paul. Origen's suggestion has been adopted by many expositors, but is really needless; this is only an extreme example of the Apostle's freedom in adopting and combining O.T. sayings whose substance he desires to use. The Gnostics quoted the passage in favour of their method of esoteric teaching.

ὅσα, of the last clause, is a climax to **ἃ** of the first—"so many things as God prepared for those that love Him": *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 20, Phil. iv. 8, for the pronomi-

τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμα πάντα [k] ἐρευνᾷ,[1] καὶ τὰ [l] βάθη τοῦ Θεοῦ. 11. τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων τὰ [m] τοῦ [m] ἀνθρώπου, εἰ μὴ τὸ [n] πνεῦμα [m] τοῦ [mn] ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; οὕτω καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν[2] εἰ μὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα

k Rom. viii. 27; 1 Pet. i. 11; Jo. v. 39, vii. 52; Rev. ii. 23.
l Rom. xi. 33; Eph. iii. 18, in this connexion; Rev. ii. 24, only other inst. of plural. *Cf.* Judith viii. 14.
m With generic art. in sing., Mt. xv. 11 ff., and in the expression ο υιος του ανθρωπου.
n v. 3 f., xiv. 14; Rom. i. 9, viii. 16, xii. 11; somewhat frequently in P. of human spirit; also Acts xvii. 16, xix. 21; Lk. i. 47; Jo. xiii. 21.

[1] **ερaυνᾳ**, ℵAB*C. So elsewhere in N.T.

[2] **εγνωκεν**, ℵABCDP, Euthal., Bas. (G **εγνω**). **οιδεν**, L, etc., conforming to first clause of the verse.

nal idiom.—In **ἡτοίμασεν κ.τ.λ.** Paul is not thinking so much of the heavenly glory (see note on **δόξα**, 7), as of the magnificence of blessing, undreamed of in former ages, which comes already to believers in Christ (*cf.* i. 5-7).—**τ. ἀγαπ. αὐτὸν** affirms the moral precondition for this full blessedness (*cf.* John xiv. 23)—a further designation of the **ἅγιοι, πιστεύοντες, κλητοί, ἐκλεκτοὶ** of chap. i.

§ 8. The Revealing Spirit, ii. 10-iii. 2. The world's rulers committed the frightful crime of "crucifying the Lord of glory," because in fact they have only "the spirit of the world," whereas "the Spirit *of God*" informs His messengers (10-12), who communicate the things of His grace in language taught them by His Spirit and intelligible to the spiritual (13-16). For the like reason the Cor. are at fault in their Christian views, being as yet but half-spiritual men (iii. 1-3).

Ver. 10. The true reading, **ἡμῖν γάρ** (*cf.* i. 26), links this ver. to the foregoing by way of illustration: "For to *us* (being of those that love Him) God revealed (them), through the Spirit": *cf.* i. 18, viii. 3, xiii. 2, 1 John iv. 7; also **ἀπεκαλύφθη τ. ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις κ.τ.λ.**, Eph. iii. 5, indicating the like ethical receptivity. **ἀπεκάλυψεν** echoes **ἐν μυστηρίῳ** and **τ. ἀποκεκρυμμένην** (7), signifying a supernatural disclosure (see notes on i. 7, xiv. 6); *cf.* esp. Rom. xvi. 25, **κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου**, and Eph. i. 17 in connexion with vv. 6 f. above. The tense (aor.) points to the *advent* of Christianity, "the revelation given to Christians as an event that began a new epoch in the world's history" (Ed.).—The Spirit reveals,—"for the Spirit investigates everything (**πάντα ἐραυνᾷ**), even the depths of God": He discloses, for He first *discovers*—**οὐκ ἀγνοίας, ἀλλ' ἀκριβοῦς γνώσεως τὸ ἐρευνᾶν δεικτικόν** (Cm.). The phrase describes an Intelligence everywhere active, everywhere penetrating (*cf.* Ps. cxxxix. 1-7). For the complementary truth concerning the relation of Father and Spirit, see Rom. viii. 27. The Spirit is the organ of mutual understanding between man and God. P. conceives of Him as internal to the inspired man, working with and through, though immeasurably above his faculties (see iii. 16, Rom. viii. 16, 26, etc.). **τὰ βάθη** (pl. of noun **βάθος**) are those inscrutable regions, below all that "the eye sees" and that "comes up into the heart of a man" (9), where God's plans for mankind are developed: *cf.* Rom. xi. 33 ff., Eph. 1. 9 ff., iii. 18, and by contrast Rev. ii. 24. These deep-laid counsels centre in Christ, and are shared by Him (Matt. xi. 27, John v. 20, xvii. 10, 25); so that it is one thing to have the Spirit who "sounds the deeps of God" and to "have the mind of Christ" (16). The like profound insight is claimed, in virtue of his possessing the Holy Spirit, by the writer of the *Wisdom of Solomon* (vii.), but in a **ὑπεροχὴ λόγου καὶ σοφίας** that goes to discredit the assumption; *cf.* also Sirach xlii. 18. The attributes there assigned to the half-personified "Wisdom," N.T. theology divides between Christ and the Spirit in their several offices towards man. The "Spirit" is apprehended in *Wisdom* under physical rather than, as by Paul, under psychological analogies.

Ver. 11. "For amongst men, who knows (**οἶδεν**) the things of the man, except the spirit of the man that is within him? So also the things of God none has perceived (**ἔγνωκεν**), except the Spirit of God." Far from being otiose, **ἀνθρώπων** is emphatic: P. argues from human to Divine personality; each heart of man has its secrets (**τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου**); "nor even the dearest soul, and next our own, knows half the reasons why we smile or sigh"; there is a corresponding region of inner personal consciousness with *God* (**τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ**). As the man's own spirit lifts the veil and lights the

τοῦ Θεοῦ. 12. ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐ τὸ [o] πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου [o] ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ [p] Πνεῦμα τὸ [p] ἐκ τοῦ [p] Θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ [q] χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν· 13. ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν, οὐκ ἐν [r] διδακτοῖς [s] ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν [r] διδακτοῖς [t] Πνεύματος Ἁγίου,[1] [u] πνευ-

o Rom. viii. 15; Acts viii. 15 ff., x. 47, xix. 2; Jo. xx. 22; *cf.* 2 Tim. i. 7. το πν. του κοσμου, *h.l.*; *cf.* Eph. ii. 2. p Rev. xi. 11; *απο* in same connexion, vi. 19; *παρα*, Jo. xv. 26. q Passive, Ph. i. 29; Phm. 22; Acts iii. 14; *cf.* Rom. viii. 32; Gal. iii. 18; Ph. ii. 9; Acts xxvii. 24. r Jo. vi. 45 (Isa. liv. 13); *cf.* 1 Th. iv. 9. s iv. 3, x. 13; Rom. vi. 19; Jas. iii. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 13; Num. v. 6 t See ver. 4. u iii. 1, xiv. 37; Gal. vi. 1.

[1] *Om.* **αγιου** all uncc. but DcLP. The insertion is a Syrian emendation.

recesses penetrable by no reasoning from without, so God's Spirit must communicate His thoughts,—or we shall never know them. This reserve belongs to the rights of self-hood. Paul's axiomatic saying assumes the personality of God, and man's affinity to God grounded therein. P. does not in this analogy limit the **Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα** by human conditions, nor reduce Him to a mere Divine self-consciousness (**τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ**, 12, guards us against this); the argument is *a minori ad majus* (as in Gal. iii. 15, Rom. v. 7, Luke xi. 13), and valid for the point in question. The Ap. ascribes to a man a natural **πνεῦμα** (*cf.* v. 5, 1 Thess. v. 23), which manifests itself in **νοῦς** and **συνείδησις** (Rom. ii. 15, vii. 25, etc.; see Cr. on these terms), akin to and receptive of the **Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ**; but not till quickened by the latter is the **πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπου** regnant in him, so that the man can be called **πνευματικός** (see note on 15).—On **οἶδεν**, as diff. from **ἔγνωκεν**, see note to ver. 8: "while **οἶδα** is simple and absolute, **γινώσκω** is relative, involving more or less the idea of a process of examination" (Lt.): "no one *has got to know* **τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ**"—has by *searching* (10) found Him out (Job xi. 7, xxiii. 9, etc.; John xvii. 25)—only His own Spirit *knows*, and therefore reveals Him.

Ver. 12. **ἡμεῖς δέ,** "But *we*": *cf.* the emphatic **ἡμῖν** of ver. 10 (see note) and the **ἡμεῖς δὲ** of i. 23, standing in contrast with the **σοφοὶ** and **δυνατοὶ** of the world. The **κόσμος** whose "spirit" the App. "did *not* receive," is that whose "wisdom God has reduced to folly" (i. 20 f.), whose "rulers crucified the Lord" (8), its spirit is broadly conceived as the power animating the world in its antipathy to God (*cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2, John xii. 31, etc., 1 John iv. 1-6). Others (Est., Cv., Bz., Hn., Sm.) read the phrase in a more abstract—perhaps too modern—sense, "sapientia mundana et sæcularis," or "the world-consciousness" (Hf.), or "l'esprit de l'humanité . . . ce que les Païens appellent *la muse* et qui se concentre dans les génies" (Gd.).—"(Not the spirit of the world we received), but the Spirit which is from (issues from: **ἐκ**, *antitheton* **ἐν**, Bg.) God" (compare **ὡς ἐκ Θεοῦ**, 2 Cor. ii. 17); the phrase recalls the teaching of Jesus in John xiv. 26, xv. 26; see also Rom. v. 5, Gal. iv. 6. "The spirit of the world" breathes in men who are a part of the world; "the Spirit that is from God" visits us from another sphere, bringing knowledge of things removed from natural apprehension (see Isa. lv. 9). **ἐλάβομεν** implies actual, objective receiving (*taking*), as in iii. 8, xi. 23, etc.—**ἵνα εἰδῶμεν κ.τ.λ.** (see note on **οἶδα,** 11; and *cf.* the emphatic **οἶδα** of 2 Cor. v. 1, 2 Tim. i. 12)—a bold word here—"that we may *know* (*certo scire*, Cv.) the things that by God were bestowed in His grace upon us". **τὰ χαρισθέντα**, aor. ptp., points to the historic gifts of God to men in Christ, which would have been idle boons without the Spirit enabling us to "know" them: *cf.* Eph. i. 17 ff., **ἵνα δῷ . . . πνεῦμα . . . εἰς τ. εἰδέναι. χαρίζομαι** (*to deal in* **χάρις**: see note on **χάρισμα**, i. 7), *to grant by way of grace, in unmerited favour* (*cf.* esp. Rom. viii. 32, Gal. iii. 18).

Ver. 13. **ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν**—the vb. of 6, 7 (see note): there opposed to **μυστήριον**, here to **εἰδῶμεν** (*cf.* John iii. 11)—"which things indeed we speak out"; knowing these great things of God, we *tell* them (*cf.* John xviii. 20; also 2 Cor. iv. 2 ff., Luke xii. 2 f., Acts xxvi. 16). P. has no esoteric doctrines, to be whispered to a select circle; if the **τέλειοι** and **πνευματικοὶ** alone comprehend his Gospel, that is not due to reserve on his part. "The **καὶ λαλοῦμεν** makes it clear that P. does not mean (in 6 and iii. 1 f.) to distinguish two sorts of Gospel; his preaching has always the entire truth for its content, but expressed suitably to the growth of his hearers" (Hn.).

ματικοῖς[1] [v] πνευματικὰ [w] συγκρίνοντες. 14. [x] ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ [y] δέχεται τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ· [z] μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστι,

v ix. 11, x. 3 f., xiv. 1 ff., Rom. i. 11, vii. 14, xv. 27; Eph. i. 3, v. 19, vi. 12; Col. i. 9, iii. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5. w 2 Cor. x. 12; see note below. x xv. 44, 46; Jas. iii. 15; Jude 19; four times in Lk. and Acts in this sense. y Thrice in 2 Cor., and in 1 and 2 Th. z See i. 18.

[1] **πνευματικως**: B, 17; so W.H. *mg*. A good binary group.

The *mode of utterance* agrees with the character of the revealing Spirit: **οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς κ.τ.λ.** "(which things we speak out), not in human-wisdom-taught words, but in (words) Spirit-taught"—*verba rem sequuntur* (Wetstein). The opposed gens. depend on **διδακτοῖς**, denoting *agent* with vbl. adj.—a construction somewhat rare, but cl. (so in John vi. 45, Isa. liv. 13; diff. in 1 Macc. iv. 7, **διδακτοὶ πολέμου**); they are anarthrous, signifying opposite *kinds* of wisdom.—**διδακτὸς** in earlier Gr. meant *what can* or *ought to be taught;* later, *what is taught* (*cf.* **γνωστός**, Rom. i. 19). Paul affirms that his *words* in matters of revelation, as well as thoughts, were taught him by the Spirit; he claims, in some sense, verbal inspiration. In an honest mind thought and language are one, and whatever determines the former must mould the latter. Cor. critics complained both of the imperfection of Paul's dialect (2 Cor. x. 10: see 1 above) and of the poverty of his ideas; here is his rejoinder. We arrive thus at the explanation of the obscure clause, **πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συνκρίνοντες**,—*combining spiritual things with spiritual*, wedding kindred speech to thought (for the ptp. qualifies **λαλοῦμεν**): so Er., Cv., Bz., D.W., Mr., Hn., Lt., El., Bt.; "with spiritual phrase matching spiritual truth" (Ev.). Ver. 13 asserts the correspondence of Apostolic *utterance and thought;* in ver. 14 P. passes to the correspondence of *men and things*. Other meanings are found for **συνκρίνω**, and **πνευματικοῖς** may be masc. as well as neut.; thus the following variant renderings are deduced: (1) *comparing sp. things* with *sp.* (Vg., E.V., Ed.)—forming them into a correlated system; (2) *interpreting*, or *proving*, *sp. things by sp.*—*sc.* O.T. types by N.T. fulfilments (Cm. and Ff.); (3) *adapting*, or *appropriating*, *sp. things to sp. men* (Est., Olshausen, Gd.), with some strain upon the vb.; (4) *interpreting sp. things to sp. men* (Bg., Rückert, Hf., Stanley, Al., Sm.). The last explanation is plausible, in view of the sequel; but it misses the real point of ver. 13, and is not clearly supported by the usage of **συνκρίνω**, which "means properly to *combine*, as **διακρίνω** to separate" (Lt.).

Ver. 14. With the App. all is *spiritual*—words and thoughts; for this very reason men of the world reject their teaching: "But a natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God" (*cf.* Rom. viii. 5; John xv. 18-21, 1 John iv. 5).—Of the vbs. for *receiving*, **λαμβάνω** (12) regards the object, **δέχομαι** the manner and spirit of the act—*to welcome* (see parls.); there is *no receptivity*—"non vult admittere" (Bg.). **Ψυχικός**, in all N.T. instances, has a disparaging sense, being opposed to **πνευματικός** (as **ψυχὴ** is not to **πνεῦμα**), and almost syn. with **σάρκινος** or **σαρκικός** (iii. 1 f.). The term is in effect *privative*—**ὁ μόνην τ. ἔμφυτον καὶ ἀνθρωπίνην σύνεσιν ἔχων** (Cm.), "quemlibet hominem solis naturæ facultatibus præditum" (Cv.),—positive evil being implied by consequence. Adam's body was **ψυχικόν**, as not yet charged, like that of Christ, with the Divine **πνεῦμα** (xv. 44-49. syn. with **χοϊκός**, and contrasted with **ἐπουράνιος**). "The word was coined by Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.*, III., x., 2) to distinguish the pleasures of the soul, such as ambition and desire for knowledge, from those of the body (**ἡδοναὶ σωματικαί**)." "Similarly Polybius, and Plutarch (*de Plac. Phil.*, i., 9: **ψυχικαὶ χαραί, σωματικαὶ ἡδοναί**). "Contrasted with the **ἀκρατής**, the **ψυχικὸς** is the noblest of men. But to the **πνευματικὸς** he is related as the natural to the supernatural" (Ed.: see Cr., *s. v.*). This epithet, therefore, describes to the Cor. the unregenerate nature *at its best*, the man commended in philosophy, actuated by the higher thoughts and aims of the natural life—not the sensual man (the *animalis* of the Vg.), who is ruled by bodily impulse. Yet the **ψυχικός, μὴ ἔχων πνεῦμα** (Jude 19), may be lower than the **σαρκικός**, where the latter, as in iii. 3 and Gal. v. 17, 25, is already touched but not fully assimilated by the life-giving **Πνεῦμα**.—**μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.**, rendered by Krenkel (*Beiträge*, pp. 379 ff.), "For

καὶ οὐ δύναται γνῶναι, ὅτι [a] πνευματικῶς [b] ἀνακρίνεται· 15.[1] ὁ δὲ [a] πνευματικὸς [b] ἀνακρίνει μὲν [2] πάντα,[3] αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ' οὐδενὸς [b] ἀνακρίνεται. 16. [c] τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν Κυρίου, ὃς [d] συμβιβάσει αὐτόν;

a Rev. xi. 8. b iv. 3 f., ix. 3, x. 25, 27, xiv. 24; Lk. xxiii. 14, and five times in Acts. c Is. xl. 13; Rom. xi. 34; cf. Wisd. ix. 13. d Eph. iv. 16; Col. ii. 2, 19; Acts ix. 22, xvi. 10, xix. 33.

[1] Ver. 15 omd in ℵ* and harl.*, by *homœoteleuton*, **ανακρινεται** being repeated in vv. 14 and 15 (*cf.* txtl. note on i. 27).

[2] Om. **μεν** ACDG; ℵ[a]BLP, etc., insert it. The foregoing **δε** would condemn it with stylists.

[3] **τα παντα**: ACD*P, 17; W.H. *mg.* (bracketed). **παντα**, ℵ[a]BGL, etc. The chief copies that omit **μεν**, substitute for it **τα** before **παντα**.

folly belongs (cleaves) to him, and he cannot perceive that he is spiritually searched" (*cf.* xiv. 24 ff., **ἀνακρίνεται**)—an ingenious and grammatically possible translation, but not consistent with the emphatic ref. of **μωρία** in ch. i. to *the world's judgment on the Gospel*, nor with the fact that "the things of God" (**σοφία Θεοῦ, πνευματικά**) are the all-commanding topic of this paragraph. We adhere therefore to the common rendering: "For to him they are folly; and he cannot perceive (them), for (it is) spiritually (that) they are tried"—and he is unspiritual. For **γνῶναι**, see note on **ἔγνωκεν** (8).—**Ἀνακρίνω** must be distinguished from **κρίνω**, *to judge*, *deliver a verdict;* and from **διακρίνω**, *to discern*, *distinguish* diff. things; it signifies *to examine*, *inquire into*, being syn. on the one side with **ἐραυνάω** of ver. 10, and on the other with **δοκιμάζω** of 1 Thess. v. 21 (see parls.; also Lt. *ad loc.*, and in his *Fresh Revision*[3], pp. 69 ff.): "**ἀνάκρισις** was an Athenian law-term for a preliminary investigation—corresponding *mutatis mutandis* to the part taken in English law-proceedings by the Grand Jury" (*cf.* Acts xxv. 26). The Gospel appears on its trial before the **ψυχικοί**; like the Athenian philosophers, they give it a first hearing, but they have no organon to test it by. The inquiry is stultified, *ab initio*, by the incompetence of the jury. The unspiritual are out of court as religious critics; they are deaf men judging music.

Ver. 15. "But the spiritual man tries (tests) everything"—a maxim resembling, perhaps designedly, the Stoic dicta concerning "the wise man". Paul sees "in the **Πνεῦμα**, the Divine power creatively working in the man and imparted to him, the **κριτήριον** for the right estimate of persons and things, Divine and human. The Stoa on its part was intently concerned 'to know the standard according to which man is judged by man' (Arrian-Epictetus, II., xiii., 16) . . . it found this criterion in *the moral use of Reason*. . . . The Christian believer and the Stoic philosopher both practise an **ἀνακρίνειν**; both are conscious of standing superior to all judgment from without; but the ground of this superiority, and the inferences drawn from it, are equally opposed in the two cases. The Stoic's judgment on the world leads him, under given conditions, to suicide ('The door stands open,' Epict.): the Christian's judgment on the world leads to the realisation of the victory of the children of God" (Hn.).—**πάντα** (not *every one*, but neut. pl.) is quite general—*everything; cf.*, for the scope of this faculty, vi. 2 f., x. 15, 1 Thess. v. 21, 1 John ii. 20 f., iv. 1, Rev. ii. 2. Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.*, III., iv.) says of **ὁ σπουδαῖος** (the man of character), **ἕκαστα κρίνει ὀρθῶς, καὶ ἐν ἑκάστοις τἀληθὲς αὐτῷ φαίνεται . . . ὥσπερ κανὼν καὶ μέτρον αὐτῶν ὤν**; Plato, *De Rep.*, iii., 409 D (quoted by Ed.), ascribes the same universally critical power to **ἡ ἀρετή**. Paul's **πνευματικὸς** judges in virtue of a Divine, all-searching Presence within him; Aristotle's **σπουδαῖος**, in virtue of his personal qualities and attainments. Paul admirably displays in this Ep. the powers of the **πνευματικὸς** as **ὁ ἀνακρίνων πάντα**. There are, of course, limits to the exercise of the **ἀνακρίνειν**, in the position and opportunities of the individual.

αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ' οὐδένος ἀνακρίνεται, "while he himself is put on trial by none,"—since none other possesses the probe of truth furnished by the **Πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ**; the **πνευματικὸς** stands on a height from which he overlooks the world, and is overlooked only by God. The statement is ideal, holding good of "the spiritual man" as, and so far as, he

ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ[1] ἔχομεν. III. 1. Καὶ[2] ἐγώ,[2] ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἠδυνήθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὡς [a]πνευματικοῖς, ἀλλ' ὡς [a]σαρκικοῖς,[3] ὡς

[a] σαρκινοις, 2 Cor. iii. 3; Rom. vii. 14; Heb. vii. 16; in LXX, 2 Chr. xxxii. 8; Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26.

[1] **κυριου**, BD*G (an untrustworthy group): conformed to parl. sentence.

[2] **καγω**: all uncc. but the Syrian L.

[3] **σαρκινοις**, ℵBC*D*, 17, 67**. **σαρκικοις**, DcGLP; late Western and Syrian. *Cf.* Rom. vii. 14, Heb. vii. 16.

is such. Where a Christian is **σάρκινος** (iii. 1), his spiritual judgment is vitiated; to that extent he puts himself within the measure of the **ψυχικός** (*cf.* 1 John iii. 1, iv. 5). If **μέν**, after **ἀνακρίνει**, be genuine, it throws into stronger relief the superiority of the man of the Spirit to unspiritual judgment: he holds the touchstone and is the world's trier, not the world his. This exemption P. will claim for himself, on further grounds, in iv. 3 ff.—**'Ανακρίνω**, used by P. *nine* times in this Ep., and in no other, was probably a favourite expression with the overweening Cor.—like "criticism" to-day.

Ver. 16. Of the three clauses of Isa. xl. 13, P. adopts in Rom. xi. 34 the 1st and 2nd, here the 1st and 3rd; in both instances from the LXX (which renders the Heb. freely), in both instances without the **καθὼς γέγραπται** of formal quotation.—**ὃς συνβιβάσει αὐτόν** (*qui instructurus sit eum*, Bz.: on the rel. pron. with fut. ind. of *contemplated result*, see Krüger's *Gr. Sprachl.*, I., § 53, 7, Anm. 8; Bn., § 318) indicates the Divine superiority to creaturely correction, which justifies the enormous claim of ver. 15*b*.—**Συνβιβάζω** means (1) *to bring together, combine* (Col. ii. 2, etc.); (2) *to compare, gather, prove by putting things together* (Acts xvi. 10); (3) widened in later Gr. to the sense *to teach, instruct*. The prophet pointed in evidence of God's incomparable wisdom and power to the vastness of creation, wherein lie unimaginable resources for Israel's redemption, that forbid despair. Here too the **νοῦς** in question is God's infinite wisdom, directing man's salvation through inscrutable ways (6-9); but the Apostle's contention is that this "mind" inspires the organs of revelation (10 ff.), and *its* superiority to the judgment of the world is relatively also *theirs* (14 ff.). Paul translates the **νοῦν Κυρίου** of Isaiah into his own **νοῦν Χριστοῦ**; to him these minds are identical (*cf.* Matt. xi. 27, John v. 20, etc.). Such interchanges betray his "innermost conviction of the Godhead of Christ" (El.).—**νοῦς** serves his turn better than the literal **πνεῦμα** of the original (*ruach*); the intellectual side of the **πνεῦμα** is concerned, the **θεῖον ὄμμα** (see note on **νοῦς**, i. 10). For the emphatic **ἡμεῖς**, *cf.* vv. 10, 12, and notes; for the anarthrous nouns, note on ver. 4; **νοῦν Χ.** is quasi-predicative—"it is *Christ's* mind—no other—that we have".—**ἔχομεν** is not to be softened into *perspectam habemus, novimus* (Gr.): Christ lives and thinks in the **πνευματικός** (vi. 17, 2 Cor. xiii. 3 ff., etc.; John xv. 1-8); the *unio mystica* is the heart of Paul's experience.

Chapter III.—Ver. 1. **Κἀγώ, ἀδελφοί**: The Ap. returns to the strain of ii. 1-5, speaking now not in general terms of **ἡμεῖς, οἱ τέλειοι**, etc.; but definitely of the Cor. and himself. *They* demonstrate, unhappily, the incapacity of the unspiritual for spiritual things. The **καὶ** carries us back to ii. 14: "A natural man does not receive the things of God . . ., and I (accordingly) could not utter (them) to you as to spiritual (men), but as to men of flesh". Yet the Cor. were not **ψυχικοί** (see note, ii. 14). For **λαλῆσαι**, see ii. 6; and on the receptivity of the **πνευματικός**, ii. 13 ff. *Cf.* Rom. viii. 5-9: **οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα ὄντες τὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος φρονοῦσιν.**—(**οὐκ . . . ὡς πνευματικοῖς**), **ἀλλ' ὡς σαρκίνοις**: "on the contrary, (I was obliged to speak to you) as to men of flesh"—grammatical zeugma, as well as breviloquence: the affirmative "I was able," carried over from the negative clause **οὐκ ἠδυνήθην**, passes into the kindred "I was obliged," that is necessarily understood (*cf.* Eph. iv. 29); ver. 7, vii. 19, x. 24, are similarly expressed, without the zeugma.—**Σάρκινος** (see parls.) differs from **σαρκικός** (3, ix. 11, etc.) as *carneus* from *carnalis*, *fleischern* from *fleischlich* (as *leathern* from *leathery*)—**-ινος** implying nature and constitution (**ἐν σαρκὶ εἶναι**), **-ικὸς** tendency or character (**κατὰ σάρκα εἶναι**). So **σάρκινος** is associated with **νηπιότης**, **σαρκικὸς** with **ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις**: see Trench, *Syn.*, § lxx. The distinction

[b] νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ· 2. [c] γάλα ὑμᾶς [d] ἐπότισα, καὶ [1] οὐ [e] βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ ἠδύνασθε.[2]

3. [f] Ἀλλ' [f] οὔτε [3] ἔτι [4] νῦν δύνασθε, ἔτι γὰρ [g] σαρκικοί [5] ἐστε· [h] ὅπου γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν [i] ζῆλος καὶ [i] ἔρις καὶ [6] διχοστασίαι,[6] οὐχὶ [g] σαρκι-

b xiii. 11, xiv. 20 (νηπιαζω); Rom. ii. 20; Gal. iv. 1, 3; Eph. iv. 14; 1 Th. ii. 7; Heb. v. 13; Mt. xi. 25, xxi. 16; Lk. x. 21; Ps. xviii. 8. c ix. 7; Heb. v. 12 f.; 1 Pet. ii. 2. d xii. 13, Rom, xii. 20; Rev. xiv. 8; Mt. x. 42. e In sing., viii. 8, 13, x. 3; Rom. xiv. 15, 20; Jo. iv. 34 f (αλλ' ουδε), iv. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 12; Gal. ii. 3; Acts xix. 2; Lk. xxiii. 15. g In this sense, 2 Cor. i. 12, x. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 11. h In the like sense, Col. iii. 11; Heb ix. 16, x. 18; Ja. iii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 11 i Rom. xiii. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; Sir. xl. 5. ζηλος alone, in this use, Acts v. 17, xiii. 45; Ja. iii. 14, 16. ερις, see i. 11.

[1] *Om.* **και** ℵABGP, 17, vg. syr. cop. Ins. **και** DGL, etc.: Western interpolation

[2] **εδυνασθε**: all uncc. but DL. Yet all but C have **ηδυνηθην** in ver. 1.

[3] **ουδε**: all uncc. but L. [4] B om. **ετι**, *bracketed* by Lachm. and W.H.

[5] D*G read **σαρκινοι** (twice), in conformity with ver. 1; G reads, perversely **σαρκικοις** there: instances of Western license.

[6] *Om.* **και διχοστασιαι** all uncc. but DGL. Harmonistic importation from Gal. v. 20.

is one of standpoint, not of degree: in the **σάρκινος** the original "flesh" remains (a sort of *excuse*, as in Rom. vii. 14); the **σαρκικὸς** manifests its disposition. Both words may, or may not (ix. 11, 2 Cor. iii. 3), connote *the sinful*, according to the **σὰρξ** in question.

The apposed **ὡς νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ** softens, almost tenderly, the censure: the Cor. are "*in* Christ"; they possess, in a measure, His Spirit; but they are "*babes* in Christ," not fairly grown out of "the flesh" (*cf.* Gal. v. 13-18); the new nature in them is still confronted with the old. The **νήπιοι** are the opp. of the **τέλειοι** (ii. 6; see other parls.). "I could not" suggests that Paul had attempted to carry his Cor. converts further, but had failed.

Ver. 2. "(Since you were babes), I gave you milk to drink, not meat:" a common figure for the simpler and more solid forms of instruction contrasted (see parls.). The teaching of 1 Thess. (see ii. 7 f.) is **γάλα** as compared with the **βρῶμα** of Rom. or Coloss.; so the Synoptics, in comparison with the Fourth Gospel. The zeugma **ἐπότισα . . . βρῶμα** is natural in Paul's conversational style; see ix. 7, *per contra.*—**οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε**: "for not yet (while I was with you) were you equal to it". This absolute use of **δύναμαι** (= **δυνατός εἰμι**) is cl., but *h.l.* for the N.T.; the tense impf., of continued state.

§ 9. God's Rights in the Church, iii. 3-9. One idea runs through this chapter and into the next,—that of *God's* Church, *God's* temple at Corinth, in whose construction so many various builders are engaged (5-17). For this building's sake, and because it is His, God beats down the pride of human craft, making all things, persons, times, serve His people, while they serve Christ, as Christ serves God (18-23). To God His servants are responsible; it is His to judge and commend them (iv. 1-5). Thus the thought that the Gospel is "God's power, God's wisdom," pursued since i. 18, is brought to bear upon the situation in Corinth. God who sends the message of the cross, admitting in its communication no mixture of human wisdom (ch. i.), chose and inspired His own instruments for its impartation (ch. ii.). What presumption in the Cor. parties to appropriate the diff. Christian leaders, and inscribe their names upon rival banners!

Ver. 3. **Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε**: "Nay, but not even yet (after this further interval), at the present time, are you strong enough (*immo ne nunc quidem adhuc potestis*, Bz.), for you are yet carnal". For **ἔτι**, *cf.* xv. 17, Gal. i. 10, v. 11; for **σαρκικοί**, see note on **σάρκινοι** (1). The Cor. are weak (otherwise than in x. 28) just where they think themselves strong (viii. 1), *viz.*, in spiritual apprehension; their gifts of "word and knowledge" are a source of weakness, through the conceit and strife they engender. The **ἀλλ' οὐδὲ** clause, with its strong disjunctives, is better joined to ver. 3 (Al., W.H., Sm.) than to ver. 2. The foregoing **οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε** sufficiently explained the **οὐκ ἠδυνήθην** of Paul's previous ministry (1); **οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε** describes *the present condition of the Cor.* (3 f.). It is reluctantly and with misgiving that the

κοί [1] ἐστε καὶ [k] [l] κατὰ [l] ἄνθρωπον [k] περιπατεῖτε; 4. ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ [m] τις, "Ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι [n] Παύλου," [m] ἕτερος δέ, "Ἐγὼ [n] Ἀπολλώ," οὐχὶ [2] [o] σαρκικοί [3] ἐστε; 5. τίς [4] οὖν ἐστι Παῦλος, [5] τίς [4] δὲ [6] Ἀπολλώς, [5] ἀλλ' ἢ [7] [p] διάκονοι δι' ὧν [q] ἐπιστεύσατε, καὶ ἑκάστῳ

k 2 Cor. x. 2 f.; Rom. vi. 4, viii. 4, xiv. 15; Eph. ii. 2; 2 Jo. 6.
l ix. 8, xv. 32; Gal. i. 11, iii. 15; Rom. iii. 5, vii. 22. m Lk. ix. 57, 59, 61; xi. 15 f. n See i. 12. o ανθρωποι, ver. 21, i. 25, etc.; frequent in P. in such disparaging use, Heb. vii. 28; Acts xiv. 11; Jo. iii. 19; Mt. x. 17, xv. 9 (Isa. xxix. 13); Gen. vi. 5 f.; Isa. ii. 22, etc. p In this sense, 2 Cor. iii. 6, vi. 4, xi. 15, 23; Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 7, 23, 25; 1 Tim. iv. 6. q See i. 21; also, in absolute use, 2 Cor. iv. 13; Acts viii. 13, xiii. 12, 48, xiv. 1, [illegible], xvii. 12, 34, xviii. 8.

[1] D*G read **σαρκινοι** (twice), in conformity with ver. 1; G reads, perversely, **σαρκικοις** there: instances of Western license.

[2] **ουκ** (before **ανθρ.**), ℵ*ABC, 17. **ουχι**, DLP; Western and Syrian: parl. to ver. 3.

[3] **ανθρωποι**: all uncc. but ℵcLP (Syrian) with syrutr., which carry over **σαρκικοι** from ver. 3.

[4] **τι** (twice), ℵ*AB, 17, latt. vg. æth., Lat. Ff. **τις**, CDGLP, syrutr. cop., Chr., etc.; seemingly a Western emendation, but not followed by Lat. cdd.

[5] **Απολλως . . . Παυλος**, in this order, all uncc. but DbL, which are followed by the bulk of minuscc. and syrutr., reversing the order to guard P.'s dignity.

[6] **τι δε εστιν**: ℵABCP, 17. Western and Syrian txts. om. **εστιν**.

[7] All uncc., but DbcLP, *om.* **αλλ' η**,—a Syrian insertion.

Apostle later in the Ep. enters into deep doctrine (βρῶμα, *cf.* note on ii. 6).—**ὅπου γὰρ ἐν ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ.**, "for where (not *when*, nor *whereas*—Vg. *cum*, Mr. *quandoquidem*) amongst you there is jealousy and strife": this seems to *limit* the censure (*cf.* xv. 12, 34); the use of party-names was universal (i. 12), but not due in all cases to **ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις**. Otherwise the **ὅπου** clause must be read as a general principle applied to the Cor. = **ὅπου γὰρ ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις, ὡς ἐν ὑμῖν**—a construction inconsistent with the position of **ἐν ὑμῖν**. *So far as* these evils exist, the readers are **σαρκικοί**, not **πνευματικοί**. For **ἔρις**, see note to i. 11; **ζῆλος** is the *emulation*, then *envy*, which is a chief cause of **ἔρις**. These are companion "works of the flesh" in Gal. v. 20: for the *honourable* sense of **ζῆλος**, prevailing in cl. Gr., see 2 Cor. vii. 7, etc.; also Trench, *Syn.*, § xxvi.; *zealous* and *jealous* reproduce the diff.

Paul seems to hear the Cor. denying the allegation made in 3*a*, **Ἔτι σαρκικοί ἐστε**, and so puts it to them again as a question prefaced by the reason (and limitation), **ὅπου ἐν ὑμῖν ζῆλος, κ.τ.λ.**, and with the further challenge, **οὐχί . . . καὶ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε**; To "walk according to man" (*non secundum Deum, humano more*, Bg.) is to behave as men are apt to do—the **σάρκινοι**, the **ψυχικοί**. This Pauline phrase (confined to the epp. of this group) has **κατὰ Θεὸν** for its tacit antithesis (*cf.* 4*b*); Mr.-Hn. quote the parl. **καθ' υἱοὺς τ. ἀνθρώπων εἶναι**, Sir. xxxvi. 28 (Vg. 25; E.V. 23); also Soph., *Ajax*, 747, 764, **κατ' ἄνθρωπον φρονεῖν**.

Ver. 4 is parl. to ver. 3. The protasis, **ὅταν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**, restates *in concreto* the charge made in **ὅπου γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**; while the interr. apodosis, **οὐκ ἄνθρωποί ἐστε**; gathers into a word the reproach of the foregoing **οὐχὶ σαρκικοί ἐστε κ.τ.λ.**: *where* and *when* the Cor. act in the manner stated, they justify P. in treating them as "carnal". To say "Are you not *men*?" is at once to accuse and to excuse: see parls.; also *'adām* (*mere man*) as distinguished from *'īsh* (Isa. ii. 9, etc.); *cf.* Xenoph., *Anab.*, vi., 1. 26, **Ἐγώ, ὦ ἄνδρες, ἥδομαι μὲν ὑπὸ ὑμῶν τιμώμενος, εἴπερ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι**; *Cyrop.*, vii., 2. 4; and the familiar saying, *Humanum est errare.*—**ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ τις**: "For whenever any one says" (pr. sbj. of recurring contingency); every such utterance shows you to be *men*. On **Ἐγὼ . . . Παύλου**, see note to i. 12. The Ap. refers to the Pauline and Apollonian parties only: (1) Because they suffice, by way of example, to make good his point; (2) the main cause of strife, *viz.*, the craving for **λόγος σοφίας**, lay between these two parties; (3) P. avoided bringing Cephas' name into controversy, while he deals freely with that of his friend and disciple, Apollos, now with him (xvi. 12).

Ver. 5. The Cor. Christians were

ὡς ὁ Κύριος ἔδωκεν; 6. ἐγὼ [r] ἐφύτευσα, Ἀπολλῶς [d] ἐπότισεν, ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς [s] ηὔξανεν· 7. ὥστε οὔτε ὁ [r] φυτεύων ἐστί τι οὔτε ὁ [d] ποτίζων, ἀλλ' ὁ [s] αὐξάνων Θεός. 8. ὁ [r] φυτεύων δὲ καὶ ὁ [d] ποτίζων [t] ἕν εἰσιν· ἕκαστος δὲ τὸν [u] ἴδιον [v] μισθὸν λήψεται κατὰ τὸν [u] ἴδιον [w] κόπον.

r Mt. xv. 13, figuratively as here. See ix. 7.
s Transitively, 2 Cor. ix. 10 only; see also 2 Cor. x. 15; Eph. ii. 21; Col. i. 10, ii. 19; Acts vi. 7, xii. 24, xix. 20.
t Neut., in this collective sense, xii. 12; Eph. ii. 14; Jo. x. 30, xvii. 11, 21 ff.
u vii. 7, xv. 23, 38; Gal. vi. 5, 9; Rom. viii. 32, x. 3; Lk. vi. 44; Jo. i. 11, v. 18, viii. 44, xiii. 1.
v ix. 17 f.; Rom. iv. 41; 1 Tim. v. 18; 2 Jo. 8; Mt. v. 12, 46, vi. 1 ff.; x. 41 f., xx. 8; Mk. ix. 41; Jo. iv. 36.
w xv. 58, and eight times in P.; Jo. iv. 38; Rev. ii. 2, xiv. 13.

quarrelling *over the claims of their teachers*, as though the Church were the creature of men: "What therefore (I am compelled to ask) is Apollos? what, on the other side (**δέ**), is Paul?"—**τί** is more emphatic than **τίς**; it breathes *disdain*; "as though Apollos or Paul were anything!" (Lt.). *Apollos* precedes, in continuation of ver. 4. For *both*, the question is answered in one word—**διάκονοι**, "non autores fidei vestræ, sed ministri duntaxat" (Er.); *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 24, iv. 5.: **ὁ Κύριος** in the next clause is its antithesis. Paul calls himself **διάκονος** in view of specific service rendered (2 Cor. iii. 6, vi. 4, etc.), but **δοῦλος** in his personal relation to Christ (Gal. i. 10, etc.). "Through whose ministration you believed:" *per quos, non in quos* (Bg.: *cf.* i. 15). To "believe" is the decisive act which makes a Christian (see i. 21); for the relation of saving faith to the Apostolic testimony, *cf.* xv. 1-11; 2 Cor. i. 18-22, etc. Some Cor. had been converted through Apollos.

The above-named are servants, each with his specific gift: **καὶ ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ Κύρ. κ.τ.λ.**, "and in each case, (servants in such sort) as the Lord bestowed (on him)".—**ἑκάστῳ** is emphatically projected before the **ὡς**; *cf.* vii. 17, Rom. xii. 3. The various disposition of Divine gifts in and for the Church is the topic of ch. xii. "The Lord" is surely Christ, as regularly in Paul's dialect, "through whom are all things" (viii. 6, xii. 5; Eph. iv. 7-12, etc.)—the sovereign Dispenser in the House of God; from "Jesus our Lord" (ix. 1) P. received his own commission; the Apostolic preachers are alike "ministers of Christ" (iv. 1): so Thp., Rückert, Bt., Gd. However, Cm., and most modern exegetes, see *God* in ὁ **Κύριος** on account of vv. 6-9; but the relation of this ver. to the sequel is just that of the **δι' αὐτοῦ** to the **ἐξ αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα** of viii. 6; *cf.* note on **ἐξ αὐτοῦ**, i. 30; and for the general principle, Matt. xxv. 14 ff.

Vv. 6, 7. The grammatical obj. of this sentence has been given by the foregoing context, *viz.*, the Cor. Church of believers (*cf.* iv. 15).—**Φυτεύω** Paul uses besides only in ix. 7; his regular metaphor in this connexion is that of ver. 10. "Planting" and "watering" happily picture the relative services of P. and Ap. **Ποτίζω**, *to give drink*, *to irrigate*, may have for obj. men (2, xii. 13, etc.), animals (Luke xiii. 15), or plants. In ver. 2, *Paul* was the **ποτίζων γάλα**. The vb. takes a double acc., of person and thing (Wr., p. 284).—The **ἀλλὰ** of the last clause goes beyond a mere contrast (**δέ**) between God and men in their several parts, *excluding* the latter from the essential part: "but *God*—He only, and no other—made it to grow". The planting and watering of Christ's servants were occasions for the exercise of God's vitalising energy. While the former vbs. are aor., gathering up the work of the two ministers into single successive acts, **ηὔξανεν** is impf. of continued activity: "God was (all the while) making it to grow." Several of the Ff.—Aug. *e.g.*—saw in **ποτίζειν** the baptism, in **φυτεύειν** the instruction of catechumens,—"illustrating a general fault of patristic exegesis, the endeavour to attach a technical sense to words in the N.T. which had not yet acquired this meaning" (Lt.).—**ὥστε**, *itaque* (*and so*, *so then*), with ind. (*cf.* vii. 38, xi. 27, xiv. 22), points out a result immediately flowing from what has been said: "the planter" and "the waterer," in comparison with "the Lord" who dispensed their powers and "God" who makes their plants to grow, are reduced to nothing; "God who gives the growth" (*qui dat vim crescendi*, Bz.) alone remains. To the subject, **ὁ αὐξάνων Θεός**, the predicate **τὰ πάντα ἐστὶν** is tacitly supplied from the negative clauses foregoing.—For **ἐστίν τι** (*anything of moment*), *cf.* Gal. ii. 6, vi. 3, Acts v. 36, and note on **τὶ εἰδέναι**, ii. 2. The pr. ptp. with **ὁ** becomes, virtually, a (timeless) substantive—*the planter*, *waterer*, *Increaser* (Wr., p. 444).

9. [x] Θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν [x] συνεργοί· Θεοῦ [y] γεώργιον, Θεοῦ [z] οἰκοδομή ἐστε

10. Κατὰ τὴν [a] χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν [a] δοθεῖσάν μοι, ὡς [b] σοφὸς [c] ἀρχιτέκτων [d] θεμέλιον [d] τέθεικα,[1] ἄλλος δὲ [e] ἐποικοδομεῖ· ἕκαστος

x 1 Th. iii. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 1; συνεργος more generally; nine times in P.; 3 Jo. 8.

y *H.l.* in N.T.; Prov. xxiv. 5, xxx. i. 16; γεωργος, Jo. xv. 1; -γειν, Heb. vi. 7. z In this sense (concrete), Eph. ii. 21; also Mt. xxiv. 1. a See i. 4. b In such connexion, here only in N.T.; *cf.* Exod. xxxv. 10. c *H.l.* in N.T.; *cf.* Isa. iii. 3; Sir. xxxviii. 27; 2 Macc. ii. 29. d Lk. vi. 48, xiv. 29. For θεμ., see also Rom. xv. 20; Eph. ii. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 19; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Heb. vi. 1. e Eph. ii. 20; Col. ii. 7; Jude 20; *cf.* Rom. xv. 20.

[1] εθηκα, ℵ*ABC*, 17: Neutral and Alexandrian.

Ver. 8. In comparison with God, Ap. and P. are simply nothing (7): in relation to each other they are not rivals, as their Cor. favourers would make them (4): "But the planter and the waterer are *one*" (ἕν, *one thing*)—with one interest and aim, *viz.*, the growth of the Church; *cf.* xii. 12, 20; also John x. 30. Their functions are complementary, not competitive: a further answer to the question, τί οὖν ἐστὶν Ἀπολλῶς κ.τ.λ.; The servants of God are nothing before Him, "one thing" before His Church: vanity and variance are alike impossible.

While one in aim, they are distinct in responsibility and reward: "But each will get his own (proper) wage, according to his own toil".—ἴδιος, *appropriate, specific* (*cf.* vii. 7, xv. 23, 28): "congruens iteratio, antitheton ad *unum*" (Bg.).—ἔργον (13-15) denotes *the work achieved*, κόπος *the exertion put forth* (see parls., and κοπιάω, xv. 10, etc.): τί γὰρ εἰ ἔργον οὐκ ἐτέλεσεν;—ἐκοπίασεν δέ (Thp.). The contrast ἕν εἰσιν . . . ἕκαστος δέ, between collective and individual relationships, is characteristic of Paul: *cf.* xii. 5-11, 27, xv. 10 f., Gal. vi. 2-5, Rom. xiv. 7-10. He forbids the man either to assert himself against the community or to merge himself in it. The fixed ratio between present labour in Christ's service and final reward is set forth, diff. but consistently, in the two parables of the Talents and Pounds, Matt. xxv. 14-30, Luke xix. 11-28.

Ver. 9. Θεοῦ . . . συνεργοὶ sums up in two words, and grounds upon a broad principle (γάρ), what vv. 6 ff. have set out in detail: "we are *God's* fellow-workmen"—employed upon *His* field, *His* building; and "we are God's *fellow*-workmen"—labouring jointly at the same task. The συν- of συνεργοὶ takes up the ἕν εἰσιν of ver. 8; the context (*cf.* xii. 6) forbids our referring it to the dependent gen. (*cf.* also 2 Cor. i. 24, vi. 1, Phil. iii. 17, 3 John 8), as though P. meant "fellow-workers *with God*": "the work (Arbeit) of the διάκονος would be improperly conceived as a *Mit-arbeit* in relation to God; moreover the metaphors which follow exclude the thought of such a fellow-working" (Hn.); also Bg., "operarii Dei, et co-operarii invicem".

As in regard to the labourers, so with the objects of their toil, *God* is all and in all: Θεοῦ γεώργιον, Θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε, "God's tilth (*arvum, land for tillage*, Ed.), God's building you are". For God as γεωργῶν, *cf.* John xv. 1; as οἰκοδομῶν, Heb. iii. 4, xi. 10. "Of the two images, γεώργ. implies the organic growth of the Church, οἰκοδ. the mutual adaptation of its parts" (Lt.); the one looks backward to vv. 6 ff., the other forward to vv. 10 ff.—Οἰκοδομὴ displaces οἰκοδόμημα in later Gr.—Θεοῦ, anarthrous by correlation (see note on ἀποδ. Πν., ii. 4): the three gens. are alike gens. of *possession*—"God's workmen, employed on God's field-tillage and God's house-building". Realising God's all-comprehending rights in His Church, the too human Cor. (3 f.) will come to think justly of His ministers.

§ 10. The Responsibility of the Human Builders, iii. 10-17. After the long digression on Wisdom (i. 17-iii. 2), occasioned by the Hellenic misconception of the Gospel underlying the Cor. divisions, the Ap. returned in vv. 3 ff. to the divisions themselves, dealing particularly with the rent between Apollonians and Paulinists. His first business was to reduce the Church leaders to their subordinate place, as *fellow-servants* of the one Divine cause (§ 9). They are *temple-workmen*—not himself and Apollos alone, but all who are labouring on the foundation which he has laid down—and must therefore take heed to the quality of their individual work, which will undergo a searching and fiery test.

Ver. 10. Κατὰ τὴν χάριν κ.τ.λ.: while "the grace of God" has been

δὲ [f] βλεπέτω [f] πῶς [e] ἐποικοδομεῖ· 11. [d] θεμέλιον γὰρ [c] ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται [d] θεῖναι [g] παρὰ τὸν [h] κείμενον, ὅς ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς [1] ὁ [1] Χριστός.[1] 12. εἰ δέ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν [d] θεμέλιον τοῦτον [2] [i k] χρυσόν,[3]

f Eph. v. 15; Lk. viii. 18. For βλεπω (impv.), viii. 9, x. 12, xvi. 10, and frequently.
g παρα = η, Lk. iii. 13; Heb. i. 4, xi. 4. See note below.
h Mt. v. 14; Rev. iv. 2, xxi. 16.
i Acts iii. 6, xx. 33; 1 Pet. i. 18. For χρυσ., 1 Tim. ii. 9; Heb. ix. 4; 1 Pet. i. 7; Rev. xxi. 18, 21.
k Rev. xvii. 4, xviii. 12, 16. For λιθ. τιμ., Rev. xxi. 11, 19.

[1] Ιησ. Χρ., ℵABLP, above fifty minn., syr[sch.] sah. cop. Χρ. Ιησ., C[3]D, some minn., latt. vg. syr[p.] (Western). Χρ., C*. Ιησ. ο. Χρ. (T.R.), a few minn.

[2] *Om.* τουτον ℵ*ABC*—a Western and Syrian addition, as in ℵ[c]C[3]DLP.

[3] χρυσιον, αργυριον: ℵB (C in latter inst., defective in former), 73, Clem., Or., Bas. B, æth. ins. και; so W.H. *mg.*

given to all Christians, constituting them such (see i. 4), to the Ap. a special and singular "grace was given," "according to" which he "laid a foundation," whereon the Church at Cor. rests: see the like contrast in Eph. iii. 2-9, iv. 7-16; and for Paul's specific gift as founder, xv. 10, 2 Cor. iii. 5 ff., Rom. i. 1-5, xv. 15 ff. The office of the founder is his own, and incommunicable: "you have not many fathers" (iv. 15).

σοφὸς is a correct attributive to **ἀρχιτέκτων**: see **σοφία (τ. ἀρχόντων)**, ii. 6, and note; so in the LXX, Exod. xxxv. 31, Isa. iii. 3, it characterizes the craftsman's skill; in Arist., *Eth. Nic.*, **σοφία** is the **ἀρετὴ τέχνης**—indeed this was its primitive sense (see Ed.). The Church architect (*Christ*, in the first instance, Matt. xvi. 18) is endowed with the **σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ**, the **νοῦς Χριστοῦ** (ii. 6-16; *cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 4-6, Rom. xv. 16-20). The Gr. **ἀρχιτέκτων** was not a designer of plans on paper; he was like the old cathedral builders, the *master-mason*, developing his ideas in the material. "As a wise master-builder, I laid a foundation (**θεμέλιον ἔθηκα**), but another builds thereupon" (**ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ**): P. knew that by God's grace his part was done wisely; let his successors see to theirs. Not "*the* foundation"—that will be defined immediately (11*b*): P. contrasts himself as *foundation-layer* with later workmen; hence the vbs. are respectively *past* and *pr.* The **θεμέλιον,** laid out once for all by the **ἀρχιτέκτων,** determines the site and ground-plan of the edifice (*cf.* Eph. ii. 20).—With the distributive **ἄλλος** *cf.* **ἕκαστος** (11): if Apollos, by himself, were intended, **ἐποικοδομεῖ** would have to be read as impf. (for **ἐπῳκ.,** *was building*: *cf.* aor., 14), since *he* is not now at Cor. Many Christian teachers are busy there (iv. 15). For this indef. **ἄλλος**, *cf.* xii. 8 ff., xv. 39; and for **ἐγώ . . . ἄλλος δέ**, Luke ix. 19, John iv. 37, xiv. 16, xxi. 18. For the compound vb., see parls.; **ἐπ-** points to the *basis*, which gives the standard and measure to all subsequent work.—Hence the warning, **ἕκαστος δὲ βλεπέτω πῶς κ.τ.λ.**: "But let each man see (to it) *how* he is building thereupon!" Working upon the foundation, he must follow the lines laid down; he must use fit material. Not "how he *is to build*" (as in vii. 32, aor. sbj.), but "how he *is a-building*" (pr. ind.)—the work is going on. For the moods of the Indirect Question, see Wr., pp. 373 ff., Bn., §§ 341-356.

Ver. 11 is a parenthetical comment on **θεμέλιον**: As to the foundation, that is settled; the workman has to *build upon it*, not to shift it, nor add to it.—**θεμέλιον γὰρ ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι παρὰ κ.τ.λ.**: "For another *foundation* none can lay, beside (*other than*. **παρά**, possibly suggesting also *in competition with*; or *contrary to*) that which is laid down, which is JESUS CHRIST;" other builders there are beside the architect, but no other *ground* for them to build upon.—**κεῖμαι** serves as pf. pass. to **τίθημι** (Phil. i. 16, etc.), connoting *fixity of situation* (*positum est*), and so *of destination*, as in Luke ii. 34. The work of the Apostolic founders is done, once and for ever; so long as the Church lasts, men will build on what they laid down.—**θεμέλιον**, here *masc.* (read as adj., *sc.* **λίθον**), as in 2 Tim. ii. 19, Heb. xi. 10, Rev. xxi. 14, 19, and sometimes in LXX; *neut.* in Acts xvi. 26, as in the **κοινή**, and commonly in LXX.—**ὅς ἐστιν**—continuative, rather than definitive (as in 5): "There is but one foundation, and it is Jesus Christ"; *cf.* ii. 2, xv. 1-11, etc.—**Ἰησοῦς Χριστός** (not **Χ. Ἰ.**, nor **ὁ Χ.**), the actual historical person, not any doctrine or argument about Him—"Jesus" revealed and known as "Christ": see Acts ii. 22, 36, xvii. 3, etc., for the formation of the

ἄργυρον,[1] [k]λίθους [k]τιμίους—[l]ξύλα, [m]χόρτον, [n]καλάμην—13. ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον [o]φανερὸν [o]γενήσεται· ἡ γὰρ [p]ἡμέρα [q]δηλώσει, ὅτι ἐν [r]πυρὶ [s]ἀποκαλύπτεται· καὶ ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον [t]ὁποῖόν ἐστι τὸ

l N.T., *h.l.*; Ezra v. 8.
m Elsewhere "grass," Mt. vi. 30, etc.
n N.T., *h.l.*; Exod. v. 12, xv. 7; Isa. v. 24.
o xi. 19, xiv. 25; Ph. i. 13; Mk. vi. 14; Lk. viii. 17; Acts vii. 13.
p See i. 8.
q See i. 11.
r In like connexion, 2 Th. i. 8; Heb. x. 27, xii. 29; 1 Pet. i. 7; 2 Pet. iii. 7; Jude 7; frequent in Rev. and Mt.; Mk. ix. 43, 48 f.; Jo. xv. 6.
s See ii. 10.
t Gal. ii. 6; 1 Th. i. 9; Acts xxvi. 29; Ja. i. 24.

[1] χρυσιον, αργυριον: ℵB (C in latter inst., defective in forn 73, Clem. Or., Bas. B, æth. ins. και; so W.H. *mg*.

name; and for this, with Paul the rarer, order, *cf.* ii. 2, Rom. v. 15, xvi. 25, etc.,—also Heb. xiii. 8; in each instance *Jesus Christ* connotes the recognised facts as to His life, death, etc. (*cf.* note on i. 2).

Ver. 12. After the interjected caution to let the *foundation* alone, P. turns to the *superstructure*, to which the work of his coadjutors belongs; **δὲ** indicates this transition.—**εἰ δέ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ, εἰ** with ind. (as in 14 f. etc.),—a supposition in matter of fact, while **ἐὰν** with sbj. (as in iv. 15) denotes a likely contingency. The doubled prp. **ἐπί** (with acc.)—an idiom characterising later Gr., which loves emphasis—implies growth by way of *accession*: "if any one is building-on,—onto the foundation"; contrast **ἐπὶ** with dat. in Eph. ii. 20. The material superimposed by the present Cor. builders is of two opposite kinds, rich and durable or paltry and perishing: "gold, silver, costly stones—wood, hay, straw,"—thrown together "in lively **ἀσύνδετον**" (Mr.). The latter might serve for poor frail huts, but not for the temple of God (17).—**λίθοι τίμιοι**, the marbles, etc., used in rearing noble houses; but possibly Isa. liv. 11 f. (*cf.* Rev. xxi. 18-21) is in the writer's mind. The figure has been interpreted as relating (*a*) to the diff. sorts of *persons* brought into the Church (Pelagius, Bg., Hf.), since the Cor. believers constitute the **Θεοῦ οἰκοδομή** (9), the **ναὸς Θεοῦ** (16)—"my work *are you* in the Lord" (ix. i.; *cf.* Eph. ii. 20 ff., 2 Tim. ii. 19 ff., 1 Peter ii. 4 f.; also the striking parl. in Mal. iii. 1 ff., iv. 1); (*b*) to *the moral fruits* resulting from the labours of various teachers, the character of Church members, this being the specific object of the final judgment (2 Cor. v. 10, Rom. ii. 5-11; *cf.* 1 Cor. xiii. 13) and that which measures the work of their ministers (1 Thess. ii. 19 ff., etc.)—so Or., Cm., Aug., lately Osiander and Gd.; (*c*) to *the doctrines* of the diff. teachers, since for this they are primarily answerable and here lay the point of present divergence (*cf.* viii. 10 f., Rom. xiv. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 1 ff., 13 ff., Gal. i. 7, etc.)—so Clem. Al., and most moderns. The three views are not really discrepant: teaching shapes character, works express faith; unsound preaching attracts the bad hearer and makes him worse, sound preaching wins and improves the good (see i. 18, 24; 2 Tim. iv. 3; John iii. 18 ff., x. 26 f.). "The materials of this house may denote *doctrines moulding persons*," or "even *persons moulded by doctrines*" (Ev.),—"the doctrine exhibited in a concrete form" (Lt.).

Ver. 13. "The work of each (**ἑκάστου** resuming the **ἕκαστος** of 10) will become manifest:" while the Wheat and Tares are in early growth (Matt. xiii. 24 ff.), they are indistinguishable; one man's work is mixed up with another's—"for the Day will disclose (it)".—**Ἡ ἡμέρα** can only mean *Christ's Judgment Day*: see parls., esp. i. 8, iv. 3 ff., and notes; also Rom. ii. 16, Acts xvii. 31, Matt. xxv. 19. "The day" suggests (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 2 ff., Rom. xiii. 11 ff.) the hope of *daylight* upon dark problems of human responsibility. But this searching is figured as the scrutiny of *fire*, which at once detects and destroys useless matter: **ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται**, "because it (the Day) is revealed in fire". For **ἀποκαλύπτεται** (pr., implying *certainty*, perhaps *nearness*), see notes on i. 7, ii. 10—a supernatural, unprecedented "day," dawning not like our mild familiar sunrise, but "in" splendour of judgment "fire": *cf.* 2 Thess. i. 8. This image comes from the O.T. pictures of a Theophany: Dan. vii. 9 f., Mal. iv. 1, Isa. xxx. 27, lxiv. 1 ff., etc.—**καὶ ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστι κ.τ.λ.**: "and each man's work, of what kind it is,—the fire will prove it". The pleonastic **αὐτὸ** is due to a slight anacoluthon: the sentence begins as though it were to end, "the fire will *show*"; **φανερώσει** is, however, replaced by the stronger **δοκιμάσει** suitable to **πῦρ**, and this

[t] πῦρ [1] [u] δοκιμάσει· 14. εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον [v] μένει [2] ὃ [s] ἐπῳκοδόμησε,[3] [w] μισθὸν λήψεται· 15. εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον [x] κατακαήσεται, [y] ζημιωθήσεται, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, [z] οὕτω δὲ [z] ὡς διὰ [r] πυρός. 16. [a] οὐκ [a] οἴδατε ὅτι [b] ναὸς Θεοῦ ἐστε καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ [c] οἰκεῖ [4] [c] ἐν [4]

u xi. 28; 2 Cor. viii. 8, xiii. 5; 1 Th. v. 21; Lk. xiv. 19; 1 Pet. i. 7; Zech. xiii. 11.
v xiii. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 11, ix. 9; Rom. ix. 11; Heb. x. 34, xii. 27, xiii. 1, 14; Jo. iii. 36, vi. 27, ix. 41. w Ver. 8. x Mt. iii. 12, xiii. 30, 40; 2 Pet. iii. 10; Jo. xv. 6. y Mt. xvi. 26 and parls., for this sense; *cf.* 2 Cor. vii. 9; Ph. iii. 8. z iv. 1, ix. 26; Eph. v. 28, 33; Ph. iii. 17; 1 Th. ii. 4; Jas. ii. 12; Lk. xxiv 24. a Ten times in this Ep.—v. 6, etc.; Rom. vi. 16; Jas. iv. 4. b vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 16; *cf.* Eph. ii. 21 f.; also 2 Th. ii. 4; Rev. iii. 12, xi. 1; Jo. ii. 19; Mt. xxvi. 61. c Rom. vii. 18, 20, viii. 9, 11; 1 Tim. vi. 16.

[1] **το πυρ αυτο δοκιμ.**: ABCP, 17, 37, 73, other minn., syr$^{sch.}$ Om. **αυτο** ℵDL, etc., latt. vg. sah. cop.: Western.

[2] **μενεῖ**: latt. (*manserit*), Aug., Ambrst., sah. cop. So Lachm., Tisch., Al., El., W.H., and nearly all modern edd.

[3] **εποικοδομησεν**: all uncc. but B^{3}C. See Wr., p. 84.

[4] **εν υμιν οικει** (?) BP, 17 (a good group); preferred by W.H. in *txt.*

altered vb. requires with it **αὐτό**, to recall the object **τὸ ἔργον**. Mr. and El. attach the pronoun to **το πῦρ**, "the fire *itself*," but with pointless emphasis. Others avoid the pleonasm by construing **ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον** at the beginning as a *nominativus pendens* ("as to each man's work"), resembling that of John xv. 2; but the qualification that follows, **ὁποῖόν ἐστιν**, makes this unlikely: *cf.* Gal. ii. 6, for the interpolated interr. clause.—**δοκιμάζω** is to *assay* (see LXX parls.),—suggested by the "gold, silver" above: "*probabit*, non *purgabit*. Hic locus ignem *purgatorium* non modo non fovet, sed plane extinguit" (Bg.).—**Ἕκαστος**, thrice repeated in vv. 10-13, with solemn individualising emphasis.

Vv. 14, 15. The opp. issues of the fiery assay are stated under parl. hypotheses: **εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον . . . μενεῖ . . . εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται**, "If any one's work shall abide . . . shall be burned up". The double ind. with **εἰ** balances the contrasted suppositions, without signifying likelihood either way: for the opposed vbs., *cf.* xiii. 8, 13; **μενεῖ** recalls **ὑπομενεῖ** of Mal. iii. 2.—**ὃ ἐποικοδόμησεν** (wanting augment: usage varies in this vb.; Wr., p. 83) reminds us that the work examined was built on the one foundation (10 ff.).—**μισθὸν λήμψεται** and **ζημιωθήσεται** are the corresponding apodoses,—**μισθὸν** being carried over to the second of the parl. clauses (Mr., Gd., Lt., Ed.): "He will get a reward . . . will be mulcted (of it)".—**ζημιόω** retains in pass. its *acc. of thing*, as a vb. taking double acc.; derived from **ζημία** (opp. of **κέρδος**: *cf.* Phil. iii. 7), it signifies *to fine, inflict forfeit* (in pass., *suffer forfeit*) of what one possessed, or might have possessed. "**αὐτὸς δέ**—opposed to **μισθός**: his reward shall be lost, but his *person* saved" (Lt.); **αὐτὸς** is nearly syn. with the **ψυχὴ** of Matt. xvi. 25 f., etc. The man built on the foundation, though his work proves culpably defective: **σωθήσεται** promises him the **σωτηρία** of Christ's heavenly kingdom (see i. 18, and other parls.). Such a minister saves himself, but not his hearers: the opp. result to that of ix. 27, etc. **αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός** (**δὲ** correcting **δέ**, as in ii. 6)—"yet so (saved) as through fire,"—like Lot fleeing from Sodom; his salvation is reduced to a minimum: "He rushes out through the flame, leaving behind the ruin of his work . . . for which, proved to be worthless, he receives no pay" (Bt.), getting through "scorched and with the marks of the flame" upon him (Lt.); "s'il est sauvé, ce ne peut être qu'en échappant à travers les flammes, et grâce à la solidité du fondement" (Gd.); to change the figure, "ut naufragus mercator, amissa merce et lucro, servatus per undas" (Bg.). For the prp., in local sense, see Gm., and Wr., p. 473; **διὰ πυρός**, proverbial for a hairbreadth escape (see Lt. *ad loc.*; Eurip., *Andr.*, 487; *Elec.*, 1182, and LXX parls.). The **διὰ** has been read *instrumentally*, "by means of fire,"—*sc.* the fire *of purgatory* (see Lt.); an idea foreign to this scene. Cm., by a dreadful inversion of the meaning, reads the **διὰ** as **ἐν πυρί**—"will be preserved *in fire!*" (**σώζω** nowhere has this sense of **τηρέω**): **εἰπὼν Σωθήσεται, οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἢ τὴν ἐπίτασιν τῆς τιμωρίας ᾐνίξατο.** For other interpretations, see Mr.

Vv. 16, 17. However poor his work,

ὑμῖν[1]; 17. εἴ τις τὸν [b] ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ [d] φθείρει, [d] φθερεῖ τοῦτον[2] ὁ Θεός· ὁ γὰρ [b] ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἅγιός ἐστιν, [e] οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς.

18. Μηδεὶς ἑαυτὸν [f] ἐξαπατάτω· εἴ τις [g] δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν,

d xv. 33; 2 Cor. vii. 2, xi. 3; Eph. iv. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 12; Jude 10.
e 2 Cor. viii. 10; Rom. vi. 2; Gal. v. 4; Jas. iv. 14; Acts vii. 53.
f 2 Cor. xi. 3; Rom. vii. 11, xvi. 18; 2 Th. ii. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 14.
g In this sense, viii. 2, xiv. 37; Gal. vi. 3; Ph. iii. 4; Jas. i. 26.

[1] **εν υμιν οικει** (?), BP, 17 (a good group); preferred by W.H. in *txt.*
[2] **αυτον**, ADG (Western).

the workman of ver. 15 built upon Christ. There are cases worse than his, and to the **εἴ τινος τὸ ἔργον** alternatives of vv. 14 f. the Ap. has a third to add in the **εἴ τις . . . φθείρει** of ver. 17. Beside the good and ill builders, who will gain or lose reward, there are *destroyers* of the house, whom God will *destroy;* the climax of the **βλεπέτω πῶς**, ver. 10. Gd. well explains the absence of connecting particles between vv. 15 and 16,—a "brusque transition" due to the emotion which seizes the Apostle's heart at the sight of "workmen who even destroy what has been already built"; hence the lively apostrophe and the heightened tone of the passage.—The challenge **οὐκ οἴδατε;** is characteristic of this Ep. (see parls.), addressed to a Church of superior knowledge (i. 5, viii. 1). For the form **οἴδατε**, of the **κοινή**, see Wr., pp. 102 f. —The expression **ναὸς Θεοῦ** (see parls.) accentuates the **Θεοῦ οἰκοδομή**, expounded since ver. 9: "Do you not know that you are (a building no less sacred than) *God's temple?*" Not "a temple of God," as one of several; to P. the Church was the spiritual counterpart of the Jewish Temple, and every Church embodied this ideal. For the anarthrous (predicative) phrase, *cf.* **Θεοῦ βασιλείαν**, vi. 9, and see note on ii. 4.—**Ναός** (see parls.) denotes the *shrine*, where the Deity resides; **ἱερόν** (ix. 13, etc.), the *sanctuary*, the temple at large, with its precincts.—**ὅτι** is not repeated with the second half of the question, **καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν οἰκεῖ**, the two propositions being virtually one; God's temple in Christian men is constituted by the indwelling of His Spirit: "and (that) the Spirit of God dwells in you?" *cf.* Eph. ii. 21, also 1 Peter ii. 5. The same relationship is expressed by other figures in xii. 5, Eph. iv. 4, etc. So the O.T. congregation of the Lord had for its centre the Shekinah in the Holy Place: Isa. vi., Ezek. xxxvii. 27; *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 16 ff. This truth is applied to the Christian person in vi. 19.

"If any one destroys the temple of God, God will destroy him"—*talione justissima* (Bg.). On the form of hypothesis, see ver. 14.—**φθείρω** signifies *to corrupt morally, deprave* (injure in *character*), xv. 33, 2 Cor. xi. 3, as well as *to waste, damage* (injure in *being:* see parls.)—mutually implied in a spiritual building. This Church was menaced with destruction from the immoralities exposed in chh. v., vi., and from its party schisms (i.-iii.), *both* evils fostered by corrupt teaching. The figure is not that of Levitical defilement (**φθείρω** nowhere means to *pollute* a holy place); this **φθορά** is a structural injury, to be requited in kind. —**ὁ Θεὸς** closes the warning, with awful emphasis (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 6, Rom. xii. 19); God is bound to protect His temple (*cf.* Ps. xlvi., xlviii., lxxiv., Isa. xxvii. 3, lxiv. 10 ff.).—The injury is a *desecration:* "for the temple of God is holy,—which (is what) *you are*". The added clause **οἵτινές ἐστε ὑμεῖς** reminds the Cor. at once of the obligations their sanctity imposes (see notes on **ἡγιασμένοις, κλητοῖς, ἁγίοις**, i. 2; *cf.* 1 Peter ii. 5), and of the protection it guarantees (2 Cor. vi. 14 ff., 2 Thess. ii. 13; John x. 29; Isa. xliii. 1-4, etc., Zech. ii. 8).—**οἵτινες**, the qualitative relative, refers to **ἅγιος** more than to **ναός**, and is predicate (see Wr., pp. 206 f.) with **ὑμεῖς** for subject.

§ 11. THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD, iii. 18-23. Affectation of philosophy, —"the wisdom of the world," which P. has repudiated on behalf of the Gospel (i., ii.)—was at the bottom of the Cor. troubles. Those who follow human wisdom exalt human masters at the expense of God's glory, and there are teachers who lend themselves to this error and thus build unworthily on the Christian foundation—some who are even destroying, under a show of building, the temple of God (iii. 3-17). That the warnings P. has given to his fellow-labourers bear on the popular **λόγος σοφίας** is apparent from the manner in which he reverts to the topic at this

ἐν τῷ [h]αἰῶνι τούτῳ μωρὸς γενέσθω, ἵνα γένηται σοφός· 19. ἡ γὰρ σοφία τοῦ [k]κόσμου [k]τούτου [l]μωρία [m]παρὰ τῷ[1] [m]Θεῷ ἐστί· γέγραπται γάρ, [n]"Ὁ [o]δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ [p]πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν"· 20. καὶ πάλιν, "Κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς [q]διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σοφῶν,[2] ὅτι εἰσὶ [r]μάταιοι". 21. ὥστε μηδεὶς καυχάσθω [s]ἐν ἀνθρώποις·

h See i. 20. i See i. 25. k v. 10, vii. 31; Eph. ii. 2; 1 Jo. iv. 17; six times in Jo. l See i. 18. m In this sense, Rom. ii. 11, 13; Gal. iii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; 2 Th. i. 6; Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. ii. 4; Mt. vi. 1; Lk. i. 30, ii. 52; Acts xxvi. 8. n Job v. 13; see note below. o N.T. *h.l.*; Lev. ii. 2, v. 12; Num. v. 26; Ps. ii. 12. p 2 Cor. iv. 2, xi. 3; Eph. iv. 14; Lk. xx. 23; Jos. ix. 10; πανουργος, 2 Cor. xii. 16. q In this sense, Rom. i. 21; Ph. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Jas. ii. 4; Mt. xv. 19, etc.; Lk. ix. 46 f., xxiv. 38; Ps. xciii. 11. r xv. 17; Tit. iii. 9; Jas. i. 26; 1 Pet. i. 18; Acts xiv. 15; Exod. xx. 7; Ezek. xi. 2. s See i. 31.

[1] Om. τῳ CDG.

[2] **ανθρωπων**, some eight minuscc., am., arm., Marcion as quoted by Epiph., Hier. (in free quot.), I XX.

point. § 11 resumes the strain of §§ 4-8, impressing on teachers and taught alike the true relationship of things human and Divine.

Ver. 18. Accordingly, the **Μηδεὶς ἑαυτὸν ἐξαπατάτω** looks forward, not backward: one may "deceive himself" about the mixing of man's wisdom with God's, but scarcely about the truth of the threatening of ver. 17. "If any one thinks to be wise amongst you, in this age (**αἰῶνι**, *world-period*: see parls.) let him become foolish, that he may become wise."—**δοκεῖ** not *videtur* (Vg., A.V.), but *putat*—"*seemeth to himself*, the usual (though perhaps not universal) sense of **δοκεῖν** in St. Paul" (Lt.: see parls., esp. xiv. 37): the danger is that of *self*-deception (*cf.* the irony in iv. 10, viii. 1 ff.), a danger natural in the case of teachers, esp. if intellectual and cultured—there were a few such at Cor. (i. 26); *cf.* the exhortations of James iii. 1, 13-18.—**ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ** is antithetical to **ἐν ὑμῖν** (put the comma between them), "amongst *you*"—God's temple, Christ's property (17, 23, etc.)—in accordance with ii. 6, 13, and with the contrast between the two wisdoms that dominates this whole Division. Men must not think to be wise in both spheres; the Church's wise are the world's fools, and *vice versâ*. The cross is **μωρία** to the world, and he who espouses it a **μωρὸς** in its opinion—a *fool* with a *criminal* for his Master; and one can only be a Christian sage—wise after the manner of ii. 8 ff.—upon condition of bearing this reproach (so Or., Cm., Luther, Hf., Gd., Hn.). Paul was crazy in the eyes of the world (iv. 10, 2 Cor. v. 13; Acts xxvi. 24), but how wise *amongst us!* *Cf.* Christ's paradox of *losing the soul to gain it*.

Ver. 19*a* gives the reason why the philosophy of the times must be renounced by the aspirant to Christian wisdom: "For the wisdom of the world is folly with God" (= i. 20); and since it is folly with *God*, it must be counted folly, and not wisdom, *amongst you* (18). *God's* judgment is decisive for His Church.—**παρὰ Θεῷ**, *apud Deum, judice Deo* (see parls.).

Vv. 19*b*, 20. That the above *is* God's judgment appears from two sayings of Scripture, bearing on the two classes of worldly wise—the men of affairs (such as the **ἄρχοντες** of ii. 6) and the philosophers (i. 20), distinguished respectively by **πανουργία** and **διαλογισμοί**. In the first text (the *only* N.T. quotation from Job: Phil. i. 19, perhaps an allusion), Paul improves on the LXX, possibly from another version, substituting the vivid **ὁ δρασσόμενος** (*He that grips*: *cf.* **δραξάμενος φάρυγγος**, Theocritus, xxiv. 28) for **ὁ καταλαμβάνων**, and **πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν** for **φρονήσει**,—both nearer to the Heb. (LXX reads **πανουργίαν** in ver. 12). The words (from Eliphaz) are "appropriated because of their inherent truth" (Lt.); they reassert the anticipation expressed in ii. 6. For **πανουργία**, see parls.; note its deterioration of meaning, as in Eng. *craft*. When the world's schemers think themselves cleverest, Providence catches them in their own toils.—The second text P. adapts by turning **ἀνθρώπων** into **σοφῶν**: what is true of the vanity of human thoughts generally (*machsh'both 'ādām*) he applies *par excellence* to "the reasonings of *the wise*".—**διαλογισμοί**, signifying in Plutarch's later Gr. *debates*, *arguings* (see parls.), recalls i. 19 f. above, echoing the quotation of that passage. On **μάταιοι**, *futile*, see note to xv. 14 (**κενός**).

Ver. 21*a*. **ὥστε μηδεὶς καυχάσθω ἐν**

22. πάντα γὰρ [t] ὑμῶν ἐστιν, [u] εἴτε Παῦλος [u] εἴτε Ἀπολλὼς [u] εἴτε Κηφᾶς, εἴτε κόσμος εἴτε [v] ζωὴ εἴτε [v] θάνατος, εἴτε [v w] ἐνεστῶτα εἴτε [v x] μέλλοντα· πάντα [t] ὑμῶν ἐστιν[1]· 23. ὑμεῖς δὲ [t] Χριστοῦ, Χριστὸς δὲ [t] Θεοῦ.

t For this gen., see i. 12, and ver. 4 above.
u In extended enumerations, x. 31, xii. 13, xiii. 8; Rom. xii. 6 ff.; Col. i. 16.
v Rom. viii. 38. ζωη, θαν. alone, 2 Cor. iv. 12; Rom. viii. 6; Ph. i. 20; 1 Jo. iii. 14; Jo. v. 24.
w vii. 26; Gal. i. 4; Heb. ix. 9.
x Col. ii. 17; Heb. ix. 11, x. 1.

[1] *Om. 2nd* εστιν all uncc. but DbcL.

ἀνθρώποις: "And so let no one glory in men".—**ὥστε** often, with P., introduces the impv. at the point where argument or explanation passes into exhortation; *cf.* note on ver. 7, and see iv. 5, v. 8, etc.—**ἐν ἀνθρώποις** states the forbidden *ground* of boasting (see parls.), supplying the negative counterpart of i. 31. Paul condemns alike the self-laudation of clever teachers, hinted at in ver. 18, and the admiration rendered to them, along with all partisan applause.

Vv. 21*b*-23 form an unbroken chain, linking the Cor. and their teachers to the throne of God. Not till the last words of ver. 23 do we find the full justification (sustaining the initial **γάρ**) for the prohibition of ver. 21*a*; "only when the other side to the **πάντα ὑμῶν** has been expressed, is the object presented in which alone the Church ought to glory" (Hf.); standing by itself, "All things are yours" would be a reason *in favour of*, rather than against, glorying in human power. The saying of ver. 21*b* is, very possibly, taken from the lips of the Cor. **δοκοῦντες** (18), who talked in the high-flown Stoic style, affirming like Zeno (in Diog. Laert., vii., 1. 25), **τῶν σοφῶν πάντα εἶναι**, or daring with Seneca (*de Benef.*, vii., 2 f.) "emittere hanc vocem, *Haec omnia mea esse!*" similarly the Stoic in Horace (*Sat.* I., iii., 125-133; *Ep.* I., i., 106 ff.): "Sapiens uno minor est Jove, dives, liber, honoratus, pulcher, rex denique regum!" Some such pretentious vein is hinted at in iv. 7-10, vi. 12 and x. 22 f., vii. 31. (**οἱ χρώμενοι τ. κόσμον**: see notes); the affecters of philosophy at Cor. made a "liberal" use of the world. As in vi. 12 and x. 22 f., the Ap. adopts their motto, giving to it a grander scope than its authors dreamed of (22), but only to check and balance it, reproving the conceit of its vaunters by the contrasted principle (**δέ**) of the *Divine* dominion in Christ, which absorbs all human proprietorship (23).

First amongst the "all things" that the Cor. may legitimately boast, there stand —suggested by **ἀνθρώποις, 21** — "Paul, Apollos, Cephas," the figureheads of the Church factions (i. 12),—enumerated with **εἴτε . . . εἴτε** (*whether* P. *or* Ap. *or* Ceph.), since these chiefs belong to the Church *alike*, not P. to this section, Ap. to that, and so on. *Christ* (i. 12) is not named in this series of "men"; a diff. place is His (23).—From "Cephas" the enumeration passes *per saltum* to "the world" (**εἴτε κόσμος**—anarthrous, as thought of qualitatively; *cf.* Gal. vi. 14), understood in its largest sense,—*the existing order of material things; cf.* note on i. 20. The right to use worldly goods, asserted broadly by Greek Christians at Cor. (vi. 12, vii. 31, x. 23 f.: see notes), is frankly admitted; *the Church* (represented by its three leaders) and *the world* both exist for "you," —are bound to serve you (*cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 2-4, iv. 8, vi. 17; Ps. viii., etc.); the Messianic kingdom makes the saints even the world's judges (vi. 2, Rom. iv. 13; Rev. v. 10, etc.).—**εἴτε ζωὴ εἴτε θάνατος**, by another bold and sudden sweep, carries the Christian empire into the unseen. Not Life alone, but Death —king of fears to a sinful world (Rom. v. 17, 21, Heb. ii. 15)—is the saints' servant (xv. 26, etc.). They hold a *condominium* (Rom. viii. 17, 1 Thess. v. 10) with Him who is "Lord of living and dead" (Rom. xiv. 9, etc.; Eph. iv. 9 f., Rev. i. 18); *cf.* **ἐμοὶ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός, καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος**, Phil. i. 21.—**ζωὴ** and **θάνατος** extend the Christian's estate over all *states of being;* **εἴτε ἐνεστῶτα, εἴτε μέλλοντα**, stretch it to all *periods and possibilities of time.* The former of these ptps. (pf. intransitive of **ἐνίστημι**) denotes what *has come to stand there* (*instans*),—is on the spot, in evidence; the latter what *exists in intention*,—to be evolved out of the present: see the two pairs of antitheses in Rom. viii. 38 f.; these things *cannot hurt* the beloved of God (Rom.), nay, *must help and serve them* (1 Cor.). See other parls. for "things present" (esp. Gal. i. 4) and "to come" (esp. Rom. viii. 17-25).

The Apostle repeats triumphantly his

IV. 1. [a] Οὕτως ἡμᾶς [b] λογιζέσθω [c] ἄνθρωπος [a] ὡς [d] ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ, καὶ [e] οἰκονόμους [f] μυστηρίων Θεοῦ. 2. [g] ὃ[1] δὲ[1] [h] λοιπόν,

a See iii. 15. b In similar constr., Rom. viii. 36, ix. 8; 2 Cor. x. 2; Ph. iii. 13; Acts xix. 27; Mk. xv. 28 (Isa. liii. 12). c xi. 28; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rom. ii. 1, vii. 24, ix. 20; Gal. vi. 1, 7. d Acts xiii. 5, xxvi. 16; Lk. i. 2; Jo. xviii. 36. e Tit. i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 10; Lk. xii. 42 (πιστος). f See ii. 7. g ωδε, similarly in Heb. vii. 8; Rev. xiii. 10, 18, xiv. 12, xvii. 9. h See i. 16.

[1] **ωδε**, all uncc. but DcEL; also oldest verss. **ο δε**, however, in Chr. and Gr. Comm. Lachm., following the bulk of minuscc., placed the full stop *after* **ωδε**.

πάντα ὑμῶν, having gathered into it the totality of finite existence, to *reverse* it by the words **ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ**, "but (not *and*) you are Christ's!" (*cf.* vi. 20, Rom. xii. 1 f., 2 Cor. v. 15). The Cor. readers, exalted to a height outsoaring Stoic pride, are in a moment laid low at the feet of Christ: "Lords of the universe—you are His bondmen, your vast heritage in the present and future you gather as *factors for Him*". P. endorses the doctrine of the kingship of the spiritual man, dilating on it with an eloquence surpassing that of Stoicism; "but," he reminds him, his wealth is that of *a steward*. Our property is immense, but *we* are Another's; we rule, to be ruled. A man cannot own too much, provided that *he recognises his Owner*.

Finally, Christ who demands our subordination, supplies in Himself its grand example: **Χριστὸς δὲ Θεοῦ**, "but Christ is God's". We are masters of everything, but Christ's servants; *He* Master of us, but God's Servant (*cf.* Acts iii. 13, etc.). For His filial submission, see xi. 3, xv. 22 ff., Rom. vi. 10, and notes; also John viii. 29, x. 29, etc. We cannot accept Cv.'s dilution of the sense, "Hæc subjèctio ad Christi *humanitatem* refertur"; for the **ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ**, just affirmed, raises Christ high over men. It is enough to say with Thd., **Χριστὸς Θεοῦ οὐχ ὡς κτίσμα Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ**: *cf.* Heb. v. 8. The sovereignty of the Father is the corner-stone of authority in the universe (xi. 3, xv. 28).

The Ap. has now vindicated God's rights in His Church (see *Introd.* to § 10), and recalled the Cor. from their carnal strife and pursuit of worldly wisdom to the unity, sanctity, and grandeur of their Christian calling, which makes them servants of God through Christ, and in His right the heirs of all things.

§ 12. CHRIST'S SERVANTS ANSWERABLE TO HIMSELF, iv. 1-5. The Ap. has shown his readers their own true position—so high and yet so lowly (§ 11); Paul, Apollos, Cephas are but part of a universe of ministry that waits upon them. But more is to be said about the Christian *leaders*, whose names are so much abused at Cor. If the Church is to understand its proper character, it must reverence theirs. They are its servants; it is not their master. They are its property, because they are *Christ's* property; and His instruments first of all. P. thus resumes the train of thought opened in § 10, where the work of Church-builders was discriminated in relation to *the building*; now it is viewed in its relation to *God the Householder*. Here lies another and the final ground of accusation against the Cor. parties: those who maintained them, in applauding this chief and censuring that, were putting themselves into Christ's judgment-seat, from which the Apostle thrusts them down.

Ver. 1. "In this way let a man take account of us, *viz.*, as servants of Christ, etc." **Οὕτως** draws attention to the coming **ὡς**: the vb. **λογιζέσθω** implies a *reasonable* estimate, drawn from admitted principles (*cf.* Rom. vi. 11; xii. 1, **λογικήν**), the pr. impv. an *habitual* estimate. The use of **ἄνθρωπος** for **τις** (xi. 28, etc.), occasional in cl. Gr., occurs "where a *gravior dicendi formula* is required" (El.). **Ὑπηρέτης** (only here in Epp.: see parls.) agrees with **οἰκέτης** (Rom. xiv. 4, *domestic*) in *associating* servant and master, whereas **διάκονος** rather contrasts them (iii. 5, see note; Mark ix. 35): see Trench, *Syn.*, § 9.—**ὡς ὑπηρ. Χριστοῦ κ. οἰκονόμους κ.τ.λ.**, "as Christ's assistants, and stewards of God's mysteries"—in these relations Jesus set the App. to Himself and God: see Matt. xiii. 11, 52. With P. the Church is the **οἶκος** (1 Tim. iii. 15), God the **οἰκοδεσπότης**, its members the **οἰκεῖοι** (Gal. vi. 10, Eph. ii. 19), and its ministers—the App. in chief—the **οἰκονόμοι** (ix. 17, Col. i. 25, etc.). The figure of iii. 9 ff. is kept up: those who were **ἀρχιτέκτων** and **ἐποικοδομοῦντες** in the rearing of the house, become **ὑπηρέται** and **οἰκονόμοι** in its internal economy. The **οἰκονόμος** was a confidential housekeeper or overseer, commonly a slave, charged with pro-

[i] ζητεῖται [1] ἐν τοῖς [e] οἰκονόμοις, ἵνα [k] πιστός τις [l] εὑρέθῃ. 3. ἐμοὶ δὲ [m] εἰς [m] ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν ἵνα ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν [n] ἀνακριθῶ ἢ ὑπὸ [o] ἀνθρωπίνης [p] ἡμέρας, [q] ἀλλ᾽ [q] οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν [n] ἀνακρίνω· 4. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ [r] σύνοιδα, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ [s] ἐν τούτῳ [s] δεδικαίωμαι, ὁ δὲ [n] ἀνακρίνων με

i In this sense, 2 Cor. xiii. 3; Lk. xii. 48, xiii. 6 f.; Mk. viii. 11 f.
k Ver. 17, vii. 25, in this sense; nine times besides in P.; also in Mt., Lk., Heb., 1 Pet., Rev.
l Of moral judgments, xv. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 12, xii. 20; Gal. ii. 17; Ph. iii. 9; 1 Pet. i. 7; six times in Rev.; Acts xxiv. 5.
m *Cf.* Acts xix. 27. Ειμι εις, *h.l.* in this sense.
n See ii. 14.
o See ii. 13.
p See i. 8.
q iii. 2; Acts xix. 2.
r Acts v. 2, xii. 12, xiv. 6 only; Lev. v. 1; Job xxvii. 6; 1 Macc. iv. 21; 2 Macc. iv. 41, etc. See note below.
s vi. 11; Rom. iii. 4 (Ps. l. 6), v. 9; Gal. ii. 17, iii. 11, 24, v. 4; 1 Tit. iii. 16; Acts xiii. 39.

[1] **ζητειτε**, ℵACDgr.Ggr.P: adopted in many minuscc. **ζητειται**, BL and most minuscc.; so latt. vg. cop. syrr. Doubtful whether the **-τε** (imperative) is a grammatical emendation, or a mere itacism; neither a clear Western nor Alexandrian reading, DG and AC, in each case, being deserted by their companion verss.

visioning the establishment. Responsible not to his fellows, but to "the Lord," his high trust demands a strict account (Luke xii. 41-48).—On **μυστ. Θεοῦ**, see notes to ii. 7, 9 f.: the phrase implies not secrets of the master kept from other servants, but secrets *revealed* to them through God's dispensers, to whose judgment and fidelity the disclosure is committed (*cf.* ii. 6, iii. 1).

Ver. 2. **ὧδε λοιπὸν** (*proinde igitur*) **ζητεῖται, ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις κ.τ.λ.**: "In such case, it is further sought in stewards (to be sure) that one be found faithful". **ὧδε** gathers up the position given to "us" in ver. 1; **ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις** is therefore pleonastic, but repeated for distinctness and by reference to the well-understood rule for *stewards* (Luke xii. 48). **λοιπὸν** brings in the supplement to an imperfect representation: it is not enough to be *steward*—a *faithful* steward is looked for (an echo of Luke xii. 42 f.). **ζητεῖται . . . ἵνα** resembles **παρακαλῶ ἵνα**, i. 10 (see note): the telic force of the conj. has not disappeared; one "seeks" a thing *in order to* "find" it.

Ver. 3. **ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλαχιστόν ἐστιν ἵνα κ.τ.λ.**: "For myself however it amounts to a very small thing that by *you* I should be put to trial, or by a human day (of judgment)." Fidelity is required of stewards: yes, but (**δέ**) *who is the judge of that fidelity?* Not *you* Cor., nor even my own good conscience, but the Lord only (4: *cf.* Rom. xiv. 4); P. corrects the false inference that might be drawn from iii. 22. **ἐμοὶ δὲ** takes up the general truth just stated, to apply it as a matter between *me* and *you*. P. is being put on his trial at Cor.—his talents appraised, his motives scrutinised, his administration canvassed with unbecoming presumption. For **εἰς** in this somewhat rare, but not necessarily Hebraistic sense, *cf.* vi. 16, Acts xix. 27; see Wr., p. 229. **ἵνα . . . ἀνακριθῶ** (construction more unclassical than in 1) equals **τὸ ἀνακριθῆναι**—unless the clause should be rendered, "that I should *have myself tried* by you,"—as though P. might have challenged the judgment of the Cor. (see ix. 2, 2 Cor. iii. 1, xii. 11) but dismissed the thought. **Ἀνακρίνω** (see note, ii. 15) speaks not of the *final judgment* (**κρίνω**, 5, v. 12, etc.), but of an *examination*, *investigation* preliminary to it. The "human (**ἀνθρωπίνης**, *cf.* ii. 13) day," of which P. thinks lightly, is *man's* judgment—that of any man, or all men together; he reserves his case for "*the* day (of the Lord": see i. 8).—**ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνακρίνω**: "nay, I do not even try myself!" The **ἀλλ᾽ οὐδέ** (*cf.* iii. 3) brings forward another suggestion, contrary to that just rejected (**ἵνα ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν ἀνακρ.**), to be rejected in its turn. In another sense P. enjoins self-judgment, in xi. 28-32; and in ii. 16 he credited the "spiritual man" with power "to try all things". **Ὁ ἑαυτὸν ἀνακρίνων**, *the self-trier*, is one who knows no higher or surer tribunal than his own conscience; Christ's Ap. stands in a very diff. position from this. This transition from Cor. judgment to self-judgment shows that no formal trial was in question, such as Weizsäcker supposes had been mooted at Cor.; arraigned before the bar of public opinion, P. wishes to say that he rates its estimate **εἰς ἐλαχιστὸν** in comparison with that of his heavenly Master.

Ver. 4. The negative clauses, **οὐδὲν γὰρ . . . ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ**, together explain, parenthetically, Paul's meaning in ver. 3: "For I am conscious of nothing against myself" (in my conduct as Christ's minister to you: *cf.* 10, 18; 2 Cor. i. 12-

Κύριός ἐστιν. 5. ὥστε μὴ [t] πρὸ [t] καιροῦ τι κρίνετε, ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ὁ Κύριος, ὃς [1] καὶ [u] φωτίσει τὰ [v] κρυπτὰ τοῦ [w] σκότους καὶ [x] φανερώσει τὰς [y] βουλὰς τῶν [y] καρδιῶν· καὶ τότε ὁ [z] ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἑκάστῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ [z] Θεοῦ.

t Mt. viii. 29 only. Sir. xxx. 24, xlvi. 28, li. 38. u In this use, 2 Tim. i. 10; *cf.* Jo. i. 9; Eph. i. 18; Heb. vi. 4, x. 32. v xiv. 25; 2 Cor. iv. 2; Rom. ii. 16, 29; 1 Pet. iii. 4; Mt. x. 26. w Rom. xiii. 12; eight times besides in P. in the ethical sense; 1 Pet. ii. 9; 1 Jo. i. 6; Mt. vi. 23; Jo. iii. 19; Acts xxvi. 18. x In this connexion, 2 Cor. v. 10 f.; Eph. v. 13; 1 Jo. ii. 19, iii. 2; Rev iii. 18; Mk. iv. 22; Jo. iii. 21. y Of *human* βουλη, Lk. xxiii. 51; Acts xix. 1 (some texts), xxvii 12, 42. In pl., N.T. *h.l.* βουλην καρδιας, Sir. xxxvii. 13. z Rom. ii. 29; επαινος (with *man* for obj.) generally, 2 Cor. viii. 18; Rom. xiii. 3; Ph. iv. 8; 1 Pet. i. 7, ii. 14.

[1] DG, Aug., om. **ος**: a Western variant.

17)—nothing that calls for judicial inquiry on your part or misgiving on my own—"but not on this ground (**οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ**) have I been justified". **Σύνοιδα** with reflexive pron. (*h. l.* in N.T.) has this connotation, of a *guilty* conscience, occasionally in cl. Gr. (see Lidd.); *cf.* the Horatian "Nil conscire sibi, nulla pallescere culpa" (Al.). "By" signifies "against" in Bible Eng. (see *New Eng. Dict. s. v.*, 26 *d; cf.* Deut. xxvii. 16, Ezek. xxii. 7); "I know no harm *by* him" is current in the Midland counties (Al.).—For **δικαιόω ἐν**, see parls. The pf. pass. **δεδικαίωμαι** defines an act of God complete in the past and determining the writer's present state. P. *has been and continues justified*—not on the sentence of his conscience as a man self-acquitted ("not of works of righteousness, which we had done," Tit. iii. 5 ff.), but as an ill-deserving sinner counted righteous for Christ's sake (i. 30, vi. 11, xv. 17; 2 Cor. v. 17-21, Rom. iii. 23 ff., iv. 25, vii. 24-viii. 1, etc.). This past "justification" is the ground of his whole standing before God (Rom. v. 1 ff.); it forbids presuming on the witness of his own conscience now. A good conscience is worth much; but, after P.'s experience, he cannot rely on its verdict apart from Christ's. Paul looks for his appraisement *at the end* (5), to the source from which he received his justification *at the beginning*. Accordingly *for the present*, he refers to Christ the testing of his daily course: **ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με Κύριός ἐστιν**, "but he that does try (examine) me is *the Lord*"—not you, nor my own conscience; I am searched by a purer and a loftier eye. "The Lord is alone qualified for this office" (*cf.* v. 3 ff., and notes; Rev. ii., iii., John v. 22, etc.). The Lord's present **ἀνάκρισις** prepares for his final **κρίσις** (5). The above interpretation, which maintains the Pauline use of **δικαιόω**, is that of Calovius, Rückert, Mr., Hn., Bt., and others. Cm., Cv., Est., Bg., Al., Ev., Ed., Gd., Sm., etc., insist on taking the term "in a meaning entirely diff. from its ordinary dogmatic sense" (Gd.), referring it iu spite of the tense, on account of ver. 5, to *the future judgment;* but this brings confusion into Paul's settled language, and abandons the rock of his personal standing before God and men (*cf.* Gal. ii. 15 ff.). Since P. accepted justification by faith in Christ, not his innocence, but his Saviour's merit has become his fixed ground of assurance.

Ver. 5. The practical conclusion of the statement respecting Christ's servants (see note on **ὥστε**, iii. 21): "So then do not before the time be passing any judgment". **τι**, the cognate acc. = **κρίσιν τινά**, as in John vii. 24. **πρὸ καιροῦ** (the *fit* time, not the *set* time) signifies *prematurely* (so Æsch., *Eumen.*, 367), as **ἐν καιρῷ** *seasonably* (Luke xii. 42). Our Lord gives another reason for not judging, in Matt. vii. 1 ff.; this prohibition, like that, points to His tribunal, bidding men hold back their verdicts on each other in deference to His (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 10). "Until the Lord come:" **ἕως ἂν** indicates contingency in the *time*, not the event itself; for this uncertainty, *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 2, Matt. xxv. 13, Luke xii. 39, Acts i. 7, etc. His coming is the **ἀποκάλυψις** toward which the hope of this Church was directed from the first (i. 7: see note); it will reveal with perfect evidence the matters on which the Cor. are officiously and ignorantly pronouncing.—**ὃς καὶ φωτίσει κ.τ.λ.**: "who shall also illuminate the hidden things of darkness". **φωτίζω** points to the *cause*, as **φανερόω** to the *result*, and **ἀποκαλύπτω** (ii. 10) to the *mode* of Divine disclosures. Christ's presence of itself illuminates (*cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 6, and other parls.); His Parousia is *light* as well as *fire* (iii. 13)—both instruments of judgment. **τὰ κρυπτὰ**

6. Ταῦτα δὲ, ἀδελφοί, [a] μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἐμαυτὸν καὶ Ἀπολλὼ [1] δι' ὑμᾶς, ἵνα [b] ἐν ἡμῖν [b] μάθητε τὸ μὴ [c] ὑπὲρ [c] ὃ [2] γέγραπται φρονεῖν, [3]

a 2 Cor. xi. 13 ff.; Ph iii. 21; 4 Macc. ix. 22. Also Joseph., *Ant.*, vii., 10. 5; Philo, *Leg. ad. Gai.*, § 11; Plato, *Leges*, x. 903 E. b *Cf.* Jo. xiii. 35; Gen. xlii. 33. c x. 13; 2 Cor. xii. 6.

[1] Απολλων, ℵ*AB*. See W.H., *Notes on Selected Readings*, p. 157. B³, by a curious blunder, **απο πολλων.**

[2] (υπερ) **α**, ℵABCP 17, 31, 73. Referring to Scripture at large.

[3] *Om.* **φρονειν** ℵ*ABD*G, latt. vg., Or., Aug., Ambrst. ℵcCDcLP cop. syrr., Cyr. insert (? Alexandrian); Ath., **φυσιουσθαι.**

τοῦ σκότους, "the secrets hidden in the darkness" (*res tenebris occultatas*, Bz.)—not necessarily *evil* things (see Rom. ii. 16, 2 Cor. iv. 6), but things impenetrable to present light.—Chief amongst these, "the Lord will make manifest (**φανερώσει**) *the counsels of the hearts*". These God (and with Him Christ, **ὁ ἀνακρίνων**: 4) already searches out (Rom. viii. 27; Ps. cxxxix., etc.); then He will make plain to men, about themselves and each other, what was dark before. The **καρδία** is the real self, the "hidden," "inward man" (Eph. iii. 16 f., 1 Pet. iii. 4, and other parls.), known absolutely to God alone (*cor hominis crypta est*, Bz.); its "counsels" are those self-communings and purposings which determine action and belong to the essence of character.—"And *then* (not before) the (due) praise will come (**ὁ ἔπαινος γενήσεται**) to each from God (not from human lips)." **ἀπὸ τ. Θεοῦ** for it is on *God's* behalf that Christ will judge; His commendation is alone of value (Rom. ii. 29; John v. 44). The Church is *God's* field and temple (iii. 9 ff.); all work wrought in it awaits His approval. **ἑκάστῳ** recalls the lesson of iii. 8, 11-13, respecting the discriminating and individual character of Divine rewards. "Praise" ambitious Gr. teachers coveted: let them seek it from God. "Praise" the Cor. partisans lavished on their admired leaders: this is God's prerogative, let them check their impertinent eulogies. Enough was said in iii. 15, 17, of *condemned* work; P. is thinking here of his true **συνεργοί** (1 f.), who with himself labour and hope for approval at the Day of Christ; little need they reck of the criticisms of the hour.

§ 13. Disciples above their Master, iv. 6-13. What the Ap. has written, from iii. 3 onwards, turns on the relations between himself and Apollos; but it has a wide application to the state of feeling within the Church (6 f.). To such extravagance of self-satisfaction and conceit in their new teachers have the Cor. been carried, that one would think they had dispensed with the App., and entered already on the Messianic reign (8). In comparison with them, P. and his comrades present a sorry figure, as victims marked for the world's sport—famished, beaten, loaded with disgrace, while their disciples flourish! (9-13.)

Ver. 6. **Ταῦτα δὲ κ.τ.λ.** (**δὲ** *metabatikon*, of transition): "Now these things I have adapted (in the way I have put them) to myself and Apollos".—**μετα-σχηματίζω** (see parls.), to *change the dress*, or *form of presentment* (**σχῆμα**), of anything. P. has put in a specific personal way—speaking *in concreto, exempli gratia*—what he might have expressed more generally; he has done this **δι' ὑμᾶς**, "for *your* better instruction,"—not because *he and Ap.* needed the admonition. The rendering "I have in a figure *transferred*" (E.V.), suggests that the argument of iii. 3-iv. 5 had no real connexion with P. and A., and was aimed at others than their partisans—an erroneous implication: see *Introd.* to Div. I. P. writes in the **σχῆμα κατ' ἐξοχήν**, aiming through the Apollonian party at all the warring factions, and at the factious spirit in the Church; his reproaches fall on the "puffed up" followers, not upon their unconsenting chiefs (4). We found certain *other teachers*, active at Cor. in the absence of P. and A., rebuked in iii. 11-17; the Cor. will easily read between the lines. This **μετασχηματισμὸς** is "id genus in quo per quandam suspicionem quod non dicimus accipi volumus" (Quintilian, *Instit.*, ix., 2).—**Ἀπολλών,** the preferable reading here and in Tit. iii. 13, like the gen. of i. 12, iii. 4, is acc. of Attic 2nd decl.; **'Απολλώ** (3rd) is attested in Acts xix. 1.

ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ Μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται: "that in our case you may learn the (rule), *Not beyond the things*

ἵνα μὴ [d] εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ [d] ἑνὸς [e] φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ [f] τοῦ ἑτέρου. 7. τίς γάρ σε [g] διακρίνει; τί δὲ ἔχεις ὃ οὐκ ἔλαβες; [h] εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔλαβες, [h] τί [h] καυχᾶσαι ὡς μὴ λαβών; 8. ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ, ἤδη [k] ἐπλουτήσατε, χωρὶς ἡμῶν [l] ἐβασιλεύσατε· καὶ [m] ὄφελόν γε [l] ἐβασιλεύσατε,

d 1 Th. v. 11; *cf.* x. 17; Gal. iv. 22; Eph. iv. 4 f.
e 18 f., v. 2, viii. 1, xiii. 4; Col. ii. 18; -ωσις, 2 Cor. xii. 20.
f vi. 1, x. 24, 29, xiv. 17; Ro. ii. 1, xiii. 8; Gal. vi. 4; Phil. ii. 4.
g *H.l.* with pers. obj.; *cf.* vi. 5; Acts xv. 9; Jude 22.
h For interr. after ει, xii. 17. See i. 29.
i Acts xxvii. 38; Deut. xxxi. 20.
k 2 Cor. viii. 9; Rom. x. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 9, 18; 5 times in Rev.; Lk. i. 53, xii. 21.
l xv. 25; Rom. v. 14, 17, 21, vi. 12; 1 Tim. vi. 15; Rev. v. 10, etc.
m 2 Cor. xi. 1; Gal. v. 12; Rev. iii. 15.

that are written": *cf.* the cl. **Μηδὲν ἄγαν.** The art. **τὸ** seizes the **Μὴ ὑπὲρ** clause for the obj. of **μάθητε**; for the construction, *cf.* Gal. v. 14, Luke xxii. 37, and see Wr., pp. 135, 644; the elliptical form ("Not" for "Do not go," or the like) marks the saying as proverbial, though only here extant. Ewald suggests that it was a Rabbinical adage—as much as to say, *Keep to the rule of Scripture, Not a step beyond the written word!* "**γέγραπται** in his libris semper ad V. T. refertur" (Grotius); but in a general maxim it is superfluous to look for particular passages intended. In iii. 19 f., and indirectly in vv. 4 f. above, P. has shown the Cor. how to keep their thoughts about men within the lines marked out in Scripture.—The 1st **ἵνα** is definitely applied by the second, apposed **ἵνα**: "that you be not puffed up, each for his individual (teacher) against the other". Scripture teaches the Cor. both not to "glory in men" and not to "judge" them (iii. 21, iv. 4 f.).—**φυσιοῦσθε** (**φυσιόω**, older Gr. **φυσάω** or **φυσιάω**, *to inflate*) is best explained as irreg. pr. *sbj.* (*cf.* **ζηλοῦτε**, Gal. iv. 17); John xvii. 3 is the only clear ex. of **ἵνα** with ind. in N.T.—see however Wr., pp. 362 f. Mr. obviates the difficulty by rendering **ἵνα** *where*, against Bibl. and later Gr. use. Fritzsche read **ὃ** (T. R.) for **ἃ** in the previous clause; then, by a double itacism, **ἕνα** for **ἵνα** and **φυσιοῦσθαι** for **φυσιοῦσθε**, thus getting ingeniously an inf. clause in 6*c*, standing in apposition to the **ὃ** of 6*b*—"Not beyond what is written,—*i.e.*, that one be not puffed up for the one," etc.).—**εἷς ὑπὲρ τ. ἑνός**, a reciprocal phrase (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 11), "one for the one (teacher), another for the other" (see i. 12),—zeal "for the one" admired master generating an animus "against the other" (**κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου**, *the second*) correspondingly despised. Those who cried up Apollos cried down Paul, and *vice versâ.*

Ver. 7. **τίς γάρ σε διακρίνει;** "for who marks thee off?" (or "separates thee?—*discernit*, Vg.")—what warrant for thy boasting, "I am of Paul," etc., for ranging thyself in this coterie or that? "The **διάκρισις** was self-made" (El.). The other rendering, "Who makes thee to differ?" (to be superior: *eximie distinguit*, Bg.)—*sc.* "who but *God?*"—suits the vb. **διακρίνω**, but is hardly relevant. This question stigmatises the partisan conceit of the Cor. as *presumptuous;* those that follow, **τί δὲ . . . εἰ δὲ καὶ . . .** marks it as *ungrateful;* both ways it is egotistic.—**τί δὲ ἔχεις κ.τ.λ.**: "what moreover hast thou that thou didst not receive?"—*i.e.*, *from God* (i. 4 f., 30, iii. 5, 10, xii. 6, etc.). For this pregnant sense of **λαμβάνω**, *cf.* Acts xx. 35.—"But if indeed thou didst receive (it), why glory as one that had not received?" The receiver may boast of the Giver (i. 31), not of anything *as his own.* **καὶ** lends actuality to the vb.; "**εἰ καί**, de re quam ita esse ut dicitur significamus" (Hermann); *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 3. **καυχᾶσαι**, a rare form of 2nd sing. ind. mid.; Wr., p. 90. For **ὡς** with ptp., of *point of view* (*perinde ac*), see Bm., p. 307; *cf.* ver. 3.

Ver. 8 depicts the unjustifiable "glorying" of the readers with an abruptness due to excited feeling (*cf.* the *asyndeton* of iii. 16): "How much you have received, and how you boast of it!—So soon you are satiated!" etc. The three first clauses—**ἤδη, ἤδη, χωρὶς κ.τ.λ.**—are exclamations rather than questions (W.H.). Distinguish **ἤδη**, *jam, by this time;* **νῦν**, *nunc, at this time* (iii. 2, etc.); **ἄρτι**, *in præsenti, modo, just now* or *then, at the moment* (xiii. 12, etc.). **κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ** (**κορέννυμι**, *to glut, feed full;* in cl. Gr. poetical, becoming prose in **κοινή**; for tense-form, *cf.* i. 10, **ἦτε κατηρτ.**: "So soon you have had your fill (are quite satisfied)!" The Cor. reported themselves, in the Church Letter (?), so well fed by Paul's successors, so furnished in talent and grace, that they desired nothing more.—**ἤδη ἐπλουτήσατε** (*aor.*, not pf. as before): "So soon you grew rich!" The Thanksgiving (i. 5) and the list of

ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν ὑμῖν [n] συμβασιλεύσωμεν. 9. δοκῶ γὰρ ὅτι [1] ὁ Θεὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους [p] ἐσχάτους [q] ἀπέδειξεν ὡς [r] ἐπιθανατίους, ὅτι [s] θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις· 10. ἡμεῖς [t] μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν, ὑμεῖς δὲ [u] φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ· ἡμεῖς [v] ἀσθενεῖς, ὑμεῖς δὲ [v] ἰσχυροί· ὑμεῖς [w] ἔνδοξοι, ἡμεῖς δὲ [x] ἄτιμοι·

n 2 Tim. ii. 12.
o See iii. 18, and note below.
p In this sense, xv. 8; Matt. xix. 30; Mk. ix. 35; Luke xiv. 9 f.; Jo. viii. 9.
q 2 Th. ii. 4; Acts ii. 22, xxv. 7. -ξις, ii. 4.
r *H.l.*
s N.T. *h.l.* in this sense; see Acts xix. 29, 31.
t See i. 25.
u x. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 19; Rom. xi. 25, xii. 16; Matt. vii. 24, x. 16, xxv. 2 ff.; Lk. xvi. 8.
v See i. 25.
w Eph. v. 27; Luke vii. 25, xiii. 17; LXX *passim.*
x xii. 23; Mt. xiii. 57; Mk. vi. 4; Isa. liii. 3.

[1] **δοκω γαρ, ο Θεος,** *without* **οτι**: all pre-Syrian uncc.

charisms in xii. appear to justify this consciousness of wealth; but ostentation corrupted Cor. riches; spiritual satiety is a sign of arrested growth: contrast Phil. iii. 10-14, and *cf.* Rev. iii. 17, "Thou *sayest,* **ὅτι Πλούσιός εἰμί καὶ πεπλούτηκα**". The climax of this sad irony is **χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε** (*aor.* again), "Without us (without our help) you have come to your kingdom!"—"Gradatio: *saturi, divites, reges*" (Bg.). Paul was given to understand, by some Cor., that they had outgrown his teaching: "Then," he says, "you have surely entered the promised kingdom and secured its treasures, if God's stewards have nothing more to impart to you!—*I only wish you had!*" so he continues in the words **καὶ ὄφελόν γε κ.τ.λ.**, "Ay, I would indeed that you had entered the kingdom, that we too might share it with you!" It is Paul's sigh for the end.—**Βασιλεύω** (see parls.) can only relate to the **βασιλεία Θεοῦ**, the Messianic reign (20, vi. 9 f., xv. 50; N.T. *passim; cf.* Luke xxii. 28 ff.; vi. 2 f. below; the *judicial* assumptions of the Cor., in 3 ff., square with this); and the aor. in vbs. of "state" is *inceptive* (Br. § 41)—not "you reigned," but "became kings" (**ἐβασιλεύσατε**). This, of course, can only come about *when Christ returns* (see i. 7, 9, and notes); *then* His saints will share His glory (2 Tim. ii. 10).—**ὄφελον** (losing its augm.) is in N.T. and later Gr. practically an adv.; it marks, with following ind. past, an impracticable wish (Wr., p. 377); **γε** (*to be sure*) accentuates the personal feeling. **Πλουτέω, βασιλεύω** remind us again of Stoic pretensions; see note, iii. 22.

Ver. 9 gives reason in Paul's sorrowful state for the wish that has escaped him. **δοκῶ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.** (**ὅτι** vanting after **δοκῶ**, as in vii. 40; so in Eng.): "For, methinks, God has exhibited (*spectandos proposuit,* Bz.) us, the apostles, last"—at the end of the show, in the meanest place (for the use of **ἔσχατος**, *cf.* Mark ix. 35; for the sentiment, xv. 19 below)—"as (men) doomed to death". One imagines a grand procession, on some day of public festival; in its rear march the criminals on their way to the arena, where the populace will be regaled with their sufferings. Paul's experience in Ephesus suggests the picture (*cf.* xv. 32); that of 2 Cor. ii. 14 is not dissimilar. "The app." (*cf.* ix. 1, xv. 5 ff.), not P. alone, are set in this disgrace: Acts i.-xii. illustrates what is said; possibly recent (unrecorded) sufferings of prominent missionaries gave added point to the comparison. **Ἀπο-δείκνυμι** (*to show-off*) takes its disparaging sense from the connexion, like **δειγματίζω** in Col. ii. 15. **ἐπιθανατίους** (later Gr.) = **ἐπὶ τ. θάνατον ὄντας.**—**ὅτι θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ** does not give the *reason* for the above **ἀπόδειξις**, but *re-affirms the fact* with a view to bring forward the spectators; this clause apposed to the foregoing, in which **ὅτι** was implicit: "Methinks God has set forth us the app. last, as sentenced to death,—that we have been made a spectacle to the world," etc. Hf. would read **ὅ,τι θέατρον**, "which spectacle," etc.—a tempting constr., suiting the lively style of the passage; but **ὅστις** occurs as adj. nowhere in the N.T. (unless, possibly, in Heb. ix. 9), and rarely at all in Gr. **θέατρον** "may mean the *place, spectators, actors,* or *spectacle:* the last meaning is the one used here, and the rarest" (Lt.). "To the world:" so Peter, *e.g.*, at Jerus., Paul in the great Gentile capitals. "*Both to angels* and men" extends the ring to include those invisible watchers—"**καί** singles them out for special attention" (Lt.)—of whose presence the Ap. was aware (see xi. 10, and other parls.); *angels*, as such, in contrast with *men*,—not the good or bad

y xi. 26, xv. 25; 11 times besides in P.; freq. in Acts and Rev.

11. [y] ἄχρι [z] τῆς [z] ἄρτι ὥρας καὶ [a] πεινῶμεν καὶ [a b] διψῶμεν καὶ [c] γυμνητεύομεν,[1] καὶ [d] κολαφιζόμεθα, καὶ [e] ἀστατοῦμεν, 12. καὶ [f] κοπιῶμεν [g] ἐργαζόμενοι ταῖς ἰδίαις [g] χερσί· [h] λοιδορούμενοι [i] εὐλο-

z Art. with *αρτι*, *h.l.* *Cf.* *εως αρτι*, 13; also *ο νυν καιρος*, Rom. iii. 26, etc. a xi. 21, 34; Phil. iv. 12; Lk. i. 53, vi. 21, 25. *πειν. κ. διψ*, Rom. xii. 20; Matt. v. 6, xxv. 35 ff.; Rev. vii. 16; Jo. vi. 35. b *διψαω* (alone), Jo. xix. 28. *λιμος κ. διψος*, 2 Cor. xi. 27. c *H.l.*; Dio Chrys. xxv. 3. d 2 Cor. xii. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 20; Matt. xxvi. 67. e *H.l.* *αστατος* in Arist. and later Gr. f In lit. use, Eph. iv. 28; 2 Tim. ii. 6; Acts xx. 35; Matt. vi. 28; Luke v. 5. g Eph. iv. 28; 1 Thess. iv. 11; Wisd. xv. 17; *εργαζομαι* (absolute) is fairly common. h 1 Pet. ii. 23; Acts xxiii. 4; Jo. ix. 28. i Absolutely, xiv. 16; Rom. xii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 9.

[1] **γυμνιτευομεν**: all uncc. but L (B*D* -*νειτ*-). From **γυμνιτης**, Wr., p. 114.

angels specifically (*cf.* note on vi. 3). Eph. iii. 10 f. intimates that the heavenly Intelligences *learn* while they watch.

Ver. 10 represents the contrasted case of the App. and the Cor. Christians, as they appear in the estimate of the two parties. "We" are **μωροί, ἀσθενεῖς, ἄτιμοι** (*cf.* i. 18-27, iii. 18, and notes; with ii. 3, for **ἀσθ.**); "you," **φρόνιμοι, ἰσχυροί, ἔνδοξοι**—the last adj. in heightened contrast to **ἄτιμοι**; not merely *honoured* (**ἔντιμοι**, Phil. ii. 29), but *glorious*—P. reflects on the relatively "splendid" (Luke vii. 25) worldly condition of the Cor. as compared with his own. **μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν**, "fools because of Christ" (*cf.* Matt. v. 11)—who *makes* us so, sends us with a "foolish" message (i. 23). Distinguish **διά** (ix. 23, 2 Cor. iv. 11, etc.) from **ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ**, which means "on Christ's behalf," as representing Him (2 Cor. v. 20, etc.). The Ap. does not call the Cor. **σοφοί** (see iii. 18), but, with a fine discrimination, **φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ** (*prudentes in Christo*); he appeals to them as such in x. 15, 2 Cor. xi. 19—the epithet was one they affected; writing at Cor., he is perhaps thinking of *them* in Rom. xi. 25, xii. 16. The **φρόνιμος** is the *man of sense*—no fanatic, rushing to extremes and affronting the world needlessly: this Church is on dangerously good terms with the world (viii. 10, x. 14-33, *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1); see *Introd.*, pp. 731 f.; "Christum et prudentiam carnis miscere vellent" (Cv.). They deem themselves "strong" in contrast with the "feeble in faith" (Rom. xiv. 1), with whom P. associates himself (ix. 22, etc.), able to "use the world" (vii. 31) and not hampered by weak-minded scruples (vi. 12, x. 23, viii.; see note on iii. 22). In the third clause P. reverses the order of prons. (*you . . . we*), returning to the description of his own mode of life. The **ἀγενής** (i. 28) is without the birth qualifying for public respect, the **ἄτιμος** (see parls.) is one actually deprived of respect—in cl. Gr., *disfranchised.*

Vv. 11, 12*a*. **ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας . . . ταῖς ἰδίαις χερσὶν** describes the **ἄτιμοι**, reduced to this position by the world's contempt and with no means of winning its respect—a life at the farthest remove from that of the Gr. gentleman. The *despicableness* of his condition touches the Ap. New features are added to this picture in 2 Cor. xi. 23-33. On **ἄρτι**, see note to **ἤδη**, ver. 8; *cf.* ver. 13.—*Hunger, thirst, ill-clothing*—the common accompaniments of poverty; *blows, homelessness, manual toil*—specific hardships of Paul's mission. The sentences are pl.: all Christian missionaries (9) shared in these sufferings, P. beyond others (xv. 10).—**γυμνιτεύω** (later Gr.) denotes *light clothing* or *armour; cf.* **γυμνός**, Matt. xxv. 36, Jas. ii. 15 (*ill-clad*).—**κολαφίζω** (see parls.), *to fisticuff*, extended to physical violence generally—sometimes lit. true in Paul's case.—**ἀστατέω**, *to be unsettled, with no fixed home*—to Paul's affectionate nature the greatest of privations, and always suspicious in public repute—*to be a vagrant.* On **ἐργαζ. τ. ἰδ. χερσίν**—at Eph. now (Acts xx. 34), at Cor. formerly (Acts xviii. 3)—see note, ix. 6; manual labour was particularly despised amongst the ancients: "Non modo labore meo victum meum comparo, sed manuario labore et sordido" (Cv.).

Vv. 12*b*, 13. Beside their abject condition (11, 12*a*), the world saw in the meekness of the App. the marks of *an abject spirit*, shown in the three particulars of **λοιδορούμενοι . . . παρακαλοῦμεν**: "id mundus spretum putat" (Bg.).—**λοιδορ.** (*reviled to our faces*) implies insulting abuse, **δυσφημούμενοι** (*defamed*) injurious abuse: for the former, *cf.* 1 Peter ii. 23.—**διωκόμενοι ἀνεχόμεθα**, "persecuted, we bear with (lit. *put-up* with) it"—implying *patience*, while **ὑπομένω** (xiii. 7, etc.) implies *courage* in the sufferer. The series of ptps. is pr., denoting habitual treatment—not "when" but "while we are reviled," etc.—**εὐλογοῦμεν . . . παρακαλοῦμεν**: to revilings

γοῦμεν, [k] διωκόμενοι [l] ἀνεχόμεθα, 13. [m] βλασφημούμενοι[1] [n] παρακαλοῦμεν· ὡς [o] περικαθάρματα[2] τοῦ κόσμου ἐγενήθημεν, πάντων [p] περίψημα, [q] ἕως [q] ἄρτι.

14. Οὐκ [r] ἐντρέπων ὑμᾶς γράφω ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ὡς τέκνα μου

k xv. 9; 2 Cor. iv. 9; Rom. xii. 14; Gal. i. 13; Phil. iii. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 12; Rev. xii. 13; Acts vii. 52, etc.; Matt. v. 10, etc. l Absol., 2 Cor. xi. 4, 20. m δυσφ., N.T. *h.l.*; 1 Macc. vii. 41. δυσφημια, 2 Cor. vi. 8. n Absol., 2 Cor. v. 20; Rom. xii. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 9; Luke iii. 18. o *H.l.*; Prov. xxi. 18. p *H.l.*; Tobit v. 19; Ignatius *ad Eph.* viii. 1, xviii. 1. q viii. 7, xv. 6; Mt. xi. 12; four times in John. r Active, *h.l.*; *cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 14; Tit. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 9, etc. εντροπη, see vi. 5. s 17, x. 14, xv. 58, and frequently in P.; Heb. vi. 19; Jas. i. 16, etc.; 1 Jo., *passim*; 1 Pet. ii. 11, iv. 12; 2 Pet. iii. and Jude, αγαπ. For τεκνα, in P., 2 Cor. vi. 13; Gal. iv. 19; Phil. ii. 22; 1 Thess. ii. 7, 11; 1 Tim. i. 2, 18; 2 Tim. ii. 1; Tit. i. 4; Phm. 10.

[1] δυσφημουμενοι, ℵ*ACP 17.
βλασφημ., ℵcBDG, etc., latt. vg.—Western and Syrian emendation.
[2] ωσπερει καθαρματα, G and six minuscc.

they retort with *blessings*, to calumnies with benevolent *exhortation;* "they beg men not to be wicked, to return to a better mind, to be converted to Christ" (Gd.); *cf.* the instructions of Luke vi. 27 ff. "It is on this its positive side that" Christian meekness "surpasses the abstention from retaliation urged by Plato" (*Crit.*, p. 49: Ed.).—**ὡς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου . . . πάντων περίψημα** (from **περι-καθαίρω, -ψάω** respectively, *to cleanse*, *wipe all round*, with **-μα** of result): the *ne plus ultra* of degradation; they became "as *rinsings* of the world,—a *scraping* of all things" (*purgamenta et ramentum*, Bz.),—the filth that one gets rid of through the sink and the gutter.

The above terms may have a further significance: "the Ap. is carrying on the metaphor of **ἐπιθανατίους** above. Both **περικαθ.** and **περίψ.** were used esp. of those condemned criminals of the lowest class who were sacrificed as expiatory offerings, as scapegoats in effect, because of their degraded life. It was the custom at Athens to reserve certain worthless persons who in case of plague, famine, or other visitations from heaven, might be thrown into the sea, in the belief that they would 'cleanse away,' or 'wipe off,' the guilt of the nation" (Lt.). **περικάθαρμα** (for the earlier **κάθαρμα**) occurs in this sense in Arr.-Epict., III., xxii., 78; also in Prov. xxi. 11 (LXX). This view is supported by Hesychius, Luther, Bg., Hn., Ed.; rejected, as inappropriate, by Er., Est., Cv., Bz., Mr., Gd., El. Certainly P. does not look on his sufferings as a *piaculum;* but he is expressing the estimate of "the world," which deemed its vilest fittest to devote to the anger of the Gods. Possibly some cry of this sort, anticipating the "Christiani ad leones" of the martyrdoms, had been raised against P. by the Ephesian populace (*cf.* xv. 32; also Acts xxii. 22).—**ἕως ἄρτι**, repeated with emphasis from ver. 11, shows P. to be writing under the smart of recent outrage. With his temper, Paul keenly felt personal indignities.

§ 14. PAUL'S FATHERLY DISCIPLINE, iv. 14-21. All has now been said that can be concerning the Divisions at Cor.—the causes underlying them, and the spirit they manifest and foster in the Church. In their self-complacent, ungrateful thoughts, the Cor. have raised themselves quite above the despised and painful condition of the App. of Christ; "imitabantur filios qui illustrati parum curant humiles parentes—ex saturitate fastidium habebant, ex opulentia insolentiam, ex regno superbiam" (Bg.). The delineation of Paul's state and theirs in the last Section is, in truth, a bitter sarcasm upon the behaviour of the readers; yet P. wishes to admonish, not to rebuke them (14). He states, in a softened tone, the measures he is taking to rectify the evils complained of. His severity springs from the anxious heart of a father (14 f.). Yet in the father's hand, before the paragraph ends, we see again *the rod* (21).

Ver. 14. **Οὐκ ἐντρέπων κ.τ.λ.**: "Not (by way of) shaming you do I write this, but admonishing (you) as my children beloved". It is in *chiding* that the Ap. addresses both the Cor. and Gal. as his "children" (2 Cor. vi. 13, xii. 14, Gal. iv. 19); **τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν** he applies besides only to *Timothy* (ver. 17 and 2 Tim. i. 2). Not intentionally here, but in vi. 5 and xv. 34 he *does* speak **πρὸς ἐντροπήν**.—**τὸ νουθετεῖν** (= **ἐν νῷ τιθέναι**) is the part of a *father* (Eph. vi. 4), or *brother* (2 Thess. iii. 15); "the vb. has a lighter meaning than **ἐντρέπειν** or **ἐπιτιμᾶν**, and implies

[s] ἀγαπητὰ [t] νουθετῶ.[1] 15. ἐὰν γὰρ [u] μυρίους [v] παιδαγωγοὺς ἔχητε ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀλλʼ οὐ πολλοὺς πατέρας· ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ[2] διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς [w] ἐγέννησα· 16. [x] παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, [y] μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε. 17. διὰ τοῦτο[3] [z] ἔπεμψα [z] ὑμῖν Τιμόθεον, ὅς ἐστι [a] τέκνον[4] μου[4] [a] ἀγαπητὸν καὶ [a] πιστὸν [a] ἐν [a] Κυρίῳ, ὃς ὑμᾶς [b] ἀναμνήσει τὰς [c] ὁδούς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ,[5] καθὼς [d] πανταχοῦ ἐν [d] πάσῃ

t Rom. xv. 14; Col. i. 28, iii. 16; 1 Thess. v. 12, 14; 2 Thess. iii. 15; Acts xx. 31.
u xiv. 19; Matt. xviii. 24.
v Gal. iii. 24 f.
w Phm. 10; *cf.* Gal. iv. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 7 f., 11.
x See i. 10.
y xi. 1; Eph. v. 1; 1 Thess. i. 6, ii. 14; Heb. vi. 12. For the vb., 2 Thess. iii. 7, 9.
z Phil. ii. 19; Acts xi. 29; *dat. commodi.*
a Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 2; Acts xvi. 15. πιστος, see ver. 2.
b 2 Cor. vii. 15; 2 Tim. i. 6; Heb. x. 32; Mk. xi. 21, xiv. 72. -σις, xi. 24.
c Pl., Rom. iii. 16, xi. 33; Heb. iii. 10; James i. 8; Rev. xv. 3; Acts ii. 28, xiii. 10; xiv. 16; freq. in O.T.
d Acts xvii. 30, xxiv. 3.

[1] **νουθετων** (?): so ℵACP 17 (Alexandrian, and perhaps Neutral), followed by Tisch., W.H., Tr. *marg.*, Nestle.
νουθετω BDGL, etc., latt. vg.—Western and Syrian.

[2] B om. **Ιησου**, with several Ff.

[3] (**δια τουτο**) **αυτο** (?) ins. ℵ*AP 17, syrp., Euthal.; so Tisch., W.H. *marg.*
Om. **αυτο** ℵcBCDGL, etc., syrsch.; W.H. *txt.*, Al., Tr., Nestle. The double pronoun is characteristic of Paul; **αυτο** might easily be lost through homœoteleuton.

[4] **μου τεκνον**, ℵABCP 17, 37, Euthal.

[5] **Χριστῳ Ιησου**, ℵCDb 17, 37, cop. syrp. Euthal.—Alexandrian.
κυριῳ Ιησου (om. **Χριστῳ**): D*G—Western.
Χριστῳ, ABDcLP, etc., syrsch.—Neutral and Syrian.

a monitory appeal to the **νοῦς** rather than a direct rebuke or censure" (El.).

Ver. 15. Reason for this lighter reproof, where stern censure was due—"For if you should have ten thousand tutors in Christ, yet (you have) not many *fathers!*" The relation of the **ἐποικοδομοῦντες** to the **θεμέλιον τιθείς** (iii. 10) is exchanged for that of the **παιδαγωγοὶ** to the **πατήρ**. The **παιδαγωγός** (*boy-leader*) was not the schoolmaster, but the *home-tutor*—a kind of nursery-governor—who had charge of the child from tender years, looking after his food and dress, speech and manners, and when he was old enough taking him to and from school (see Lt. on Gal. iii. 24). This epithet has a touch of disparagement for the readers (*cf.* Gal. iii. 25); as Or. says (*Catena*), referring to iii. 1 f., **οὐδεὶς ἀνὴρ παιδαγωγεῖται, ἀλλʼ εἴ τις νήπιος καὶ ἀτελής.**—**μυρίους** (xiv. 19) indicates the very many—probably too many—teachers busy in this Church (*cf.* Jas. iii. 1, and iii. 18 above), in whose guidance the Cor. felt themselves "rich" and Apostolic direction superfluous (8).—**ἀλλά** (*at certe*) introduces an apodosis in salient contrast with its protasis: "You may have ever so many nurses, but only one father!" From this relationship "non solum Apollos excluditur, successor; sed etiam comites, Silas et Timotheus" (Bg.): **ἐγώ** (I and no other) **ἐγέννησα ὑμᾶς** (*cf.* Philem. 10, Gal. iv. 19); in the Rabbinical treatise *Sanhedrin*, f., xix. 2, the like sentiment occurs, "Whoever teaches the son of his friend the law, it is as if he had begotten him"; similarly Philo, *de Virtute*, p. 1000.—**διὰ τ. εὐαγγελίου**: *cf.* 1 Peter i. 23; also i. 18 above, 1 Thess. i. 5, ii. 19; John vi. 63, etc.

Ver. 16. "I beseech you therefore (as your father), be *imitators* of me." **γίνεσθε** (pr. impr.) signifies, in moral exhortations, *be in effect*, *show yourselves* (*cf.* Eph. iv. 32, v. 17). **μιμηταὶ γίνεσθε** demands, beyond **μιμεῖσθε**, a *character* formed on the given model. Imitation is the law of the child's life; *cf.* Eph. v. 1; and for the highest illustration, John v. 17-20. It is one thing to say "I am of Paul" (i. 12), another to tread in Paul's steps. The imitation would embrace, in effect, much of what was described in vv. 9 ff.

Ver. 17. "For this reason"—*viz.*, to help you to imitate me as your father—"I sent to you Timothy, who is a beloved child of mine, and faithful in the Lord". Timothy had left P. before this letter was written, having been sent forward along with Erastus (possibly a Cor., Rom. xvi. 23) to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22), but with instructions, as it now appears, to go forward to Cor.; respecting his

ἐκκλησίᾳ [e]διδάσκω. 18. ὡς μὴ ἐρχομένου δέ μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς [f]ἐφυσιώθησάν [g]τινες· 19. ἐλεύσομαι δὲ ταχέως πρὸς ὑμᾶς, [h]ἐὰν ὁ [h]Κύριος [h]θελήσῃ, καὶ [i]γνώσομαι οὐ τὸν [k]λόγον τῶν [f]πεφυσιωμένων ἀλλὰ τὴν [kl]δύναμιν· 20. οὐ γὰρ ἐν [k]λόγῳ ἡ [m]βασιλεία τοῦ [m]Θεοῦ ἀλλ' [l]ἐν [kl]δυνάμει. 21. τί θέλετε; [n]ἐν [n]ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἢ ἐν ἀγάπῃ [o]πνεύματί τε [p]πρᾳότητος[1];

e Of Christian doctrine, Rom. xii. 7; eight times besides in P.; Heb. v. 12; 1 Jo. ii. 27; Gospp. and Acts, *passim*.

f See ver. 6 above. g In this sense, 2 Cor. iii. 1, x. 2; Gal. i. 7, ii. 12; 1 Tim. i. 6; 7 times in Pastt.; 2 Pet. iii. 9, 16; Jude 4. h James iv. 15; Sir. xxxix. 6. i 2 Cor. ii. 9, xiii. 6; Rom. vii. 7; Gal. ii. 9; Phil. ii. 22, iii. 10; 1 Th. iii. 5; 1 Jo. iii. 16; Rev. ii. 23, etc. k 1 Thess. i. 5; in similar contrasts, 2 Cor. x. 11; Rom. xv. 18; Col. iii. 17; 1 John iii. 18. l See i. 18; 10 times besides in like use in P. For εν δυναμει, xv. 43; 2 Cor. vi. 7; Rom. i. 4, xv. 13, 19; Col. i. 11, 29; 2 Th. i. 11, ii. 9; Mk ix. 1, etc. m vi. 9 f., xv. 50; Rom. xiv. 17; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; Col. iv. 11; 1 Th. ii. 12; 2 Th. i. 5; Rev. xii. 10; Mark, Luke, Acts, *passim*. n Rev. ii. 27, xii. 5, xix. 15; Isa. x. 24. o In like use, 2 Cor. iv. 13; Rom. viii. 15, xi. 8 (Isa. xxix. 10); Gal. vi. 1; Eph. i. 17, etc. p 2 Cor. x. 1; six times besides in P.; James i. 21, iii. 13; 1 Pet. iii. 15; Ps. xliv. 4.

[1] **πραυτητος**, ABC 17. So commonly, in oldest copies; see Wr., p. 48.

visit, see notes to xvi. 10 f. The Cor. had heard already (through Erastus ?) of Timothy's coming; P. does not *announce* the fact, he explains it: "This is why I have sent T. to you"; to the **τέκνα ἀγαπητά** (14) P. sends a **τέκνον ἀγαπητόν** (see Phil. ii. 19-22), adding **καὶ πιστὸν ἐν Κυρ.**, since it was a *trusty* agent, one "faithful in the Lord"—in the sphere of Christian duty—that the commission required. For **ἐν Κυρίῳ**, see parls., esp. Eph. vi. 21, Col. iv. 7; **πιστὸς τῷ Κυρίῳ** (Acts xvi. 15) denotes a right relationship to Christ, **πιστὸς ἐν Κυρίῳ** includes responsibility for others.—"Who will remind you of my ways, that are in Christ" (**τὰς ὁδούς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ**); the adjunct is made a definition by the repeated art. **ἀναμιμνήσκω** with double acc., like **ὑπομιμν.** in John xiv. 26, combines our *remind* (a person) and *recall* (a thing). Paul's "ways" had been familiar in Cor. (*cf.* Acts xx. 31-35; also 2 Cor. i. 12 ff.), but seemed forgotten; the **παιδαγωγοὶ** had crowded out of mind the **πατήρ**. He means by **ὁδοί μου** *habits of life* to be copied (16)—the **ἀγωγὴ** of 2 Tim. iii. 10 f.—not doctrines to be learnt; see further ix. 19-27, x. 33-xi. 1, 2 Cor. vi. 4-10, x. 1. For **ἐν Χριστῷ**, see note on **ἐν Χ. 'Ι.**, i. 2. In Paul's gentler qualities Tim. would strongly recall him to the Cor., by conduct even more than words.—"According as" (not how) "I teach"—in accordance with my teaching. Paul's *ways* and *teaching* are not the same thing; but the former are regulated by the latter; they will find the same consistency in Tim. "(As I teach) everywhere, in every Church:" the "ways" P. and Tim. observe, and to which the Cor. must be recalled, are those inculcated uniformly in the Gentile mission; see i. 2 (**σὺν πᾶσι . . . ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ**, and notes), also xi. 16, xiv. 33.

Vv. 18, 19. **ὡς μὴ ἐρχομένου δέ μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐφυσιώθησάν τινες**: "Some however have been puffed up, under the idea that I am not coming to (visit) you". The contrastive **δὲ** points to a group of inflated persons (*cf.* 6, v. 2, viii. 2) hostile to Paul's "ways". The wish was father to the thought, which was suggested to "some" by the fact of *Timothy's* coming. They bore themselves more insolently as not fearing correction;—or did they imagine that Paul is *afraid* of them! Amongst these, presumably, were mischievous teachers (iii. 11-17) who had swelled into importance in Paul's absence, partisans who magnified others to his damage and talked as though the Church could now fairly dispense with him (3, 6, 8, 15). On **ὡς** with ptp., see Bn. § 440 f., or Goodwin's *Syntax*, or *Grammar*, *ad rem; cf.* note on **ὡς μὴ λαβών**, ver. 7, also 2 Cor. v. 20, 2 Pet. i. 3: "because (as they suppose) I am not coming". The aor. **ἐφυσιώθησαν** points to the moment when they heard, to their relief, of *Timothy's* coming. **δὲ** is postponed in the order of the sentence to avoid separating the closely linked opening words (Wr., pp. 698 f.)—"But (despite their presumption) I shall come speedily, if the Lord will". They say, "He is not coming; he sends Tim. instead!" he replies, "Come I will, and that soon" (see xvi. 8, and note).—**ἐὰν ὁ Κύριος θελήσῃ** (see parls.), varied to **ἐπιτρέψῃ** in xvi. 7; the *aor.* sbj. refers the "willing" to the (indeterminate) time of the visit. "The Lord" is *Christ;* that **θέλω** and **θέλημα** (see note

V. 1. [a]Ὅλως [b]ἀκούεται ἐν ὑμῖν [c]πορνεία, καὶ [d]τοιαύτη πορνεία [d]ἥτις οὐδὲ [e]ἐν τοῖς [e]ἔθνεσιν ὀνομάζεται,[1] ὥστε [f]γυναῖκά τινα τοῦ

a vi. 7, xv. 29; Matt. v. 34.
b Mk. ii. 1; see note below.
c In like connexion, Matt. v. 34; Gen. xxxviii. 24; see vi. 13, 18.
d *Cf.* Heb. ii. 3.
e Rom. i. 13, ii. 24; Gal. i. 16, ii. 2; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 12; Acts xv. 12, xxi. 19.
f vii. 2, 29; Mt. xiv. 4, xxii. 28; Deut. xxviii. 30.

[1] *Om.* **ονομαζεται** all uncc. but ℵcLP, and all oldest verss. but syrr.—Added by Syrian emendation.

on xii. 11) are elsewhere referred by P. to *God* (Mr.) is no sufficient reason for diverting ὁ Κύρ. from its distinctive sense (*cf.* 17 above, and note on i. 31). *Christ* determines the movements of His servants (1; *cf.* 1 Thess. iii. 11, Acts xvi. 7, xviii. 9, etc.).

"And I shall know (take cognisance of) not the word of those that are puffed up (pf. pass. ptp., of *settled state*), but their power." "**γνώσομαι**: verbum judiciale; paternam ostendit potestatem" (Bg.). High-flown pretensions P. ignores; he will test their "power," and estimate each man (he is thinking mainly of the **ἐποικοδομοῦντες** of chap. iii.) by what he can *do*, not *say*. The "power" in question is that belonging to "the kingdom of God" (i. 18, 24, ii. 4).

Ver. 20. "For not in word (lies) the kingdom of God, but in power:" another of Paul's religious maxims (see note on i. 29), repeated in many forms: *cf.* 2 Cor. x. 11, xiii. 3 f., etc. The **βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ** always (even in Rom. xiv. 17) bears ref. to the final Messianic rule (see vi. 9 f., xv. 24, 50); the "power of God" called it into being and operates in every man who truly serves it. That Divine realm is not built up by windy words. To the same test P. offers himself in 2 Cor. xiii. 1-10. For **εἶναι** (understood) **ἐν**, see ii. 5 and note.

Ver. 21. **τί θέλετε;** "What is your will?"—what would you have? **τί** a sharper **πότερον**; the latter only once (John vii. 17) in N.T.—"*With a rod* am I to come to you? or in love and a spirit of meekness?" **ἐν ῥάβδῳ** (= **ἐν κολάσει, ἐν τιμωρίᾳ**, Cm.) is sound Gr. for "armed with a rod" (*cf.* Sir. xlvii. 4, **ἐν λίθῳ**; Lucian, *Dial. Mort.*, xxiii. 3, **καθικόμενος ἐν τ. ῥάβδῳ**; add Heb. ix. 25, 1 John v. 6)—the implement of paternal discipline (14) called for by the behaviour of "some" (18).

There is reason, however, in the *stern note* of this question, for connecting it with ch. v. 1 (so Oec., Cv., Bz., Hf.). P. is approaching the subject of the following Section, which already stirs his wrath. For the sbj. of the *dubitative question*, **ἔλθω**, see Wr., p. 356: **ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ πρᾶγμα κεῖται** (Cm.).—**ἐν ἀγάπῃ κ.τ.λ.** (**ἔλθω**); *cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 1; the constr. of ii. 3 above is somewhat diff. (see note). **πνεύματί τε πραΰτητος** defines the particular expression of love in which P. desires to come: *cf.* xiii. 6 f. The Ap. does not mean *the Holy Spirit* here specifically, though the thought of Him is latent in every ref. to the "spirit" of a Christian man. **Πραΰτης** (*cf.* 2 Cor. x. 1) is the disposition most opposed to, and exercised by, the spirit of the conceited and insubordinate **τινὲς** at Cor.

Division II. Questions of Social Morals, v.-vii. The Ap. has done with the subject of the Parties, which had claimed attention first because they sprung from a radical misconception of Christianity. But in this typical Hellenic community, *social corruptions* had arisen which, if not so universal, were still more malignant in their effect. The heathen converts of Cor., but lately washed from the foulest vice (vi. 9 ff.), were some of them slipping back into the mire (2 Cor. xii. 21). An offence of incredible turpitude had just come to the Apostle's ears, to the shame of which the Church appeared indifferent (v.). This case, demanding instant judicial action (1-5), leads the Ap. to define more clearly the relation of Christians to men of immoral life, as they may be found within or without the Church (6-13). From sins of *uncleanness* he passes in ch. vi. to acts of *injustice* committed in this Church, which, in one instance at least, had been scandalously dragged before the heathen law-courts (1-8). In vi. 12-20 P. returns to the prevalent social evil of Cor., and launches his solemn interdict against *fornication*, which was, seemingly, sheltered under the pretext of Christian liberty! It is just here, and in the light of the principles now developed, that P. takes up the question of *marriage or celibacy*, discussed at large in ch. vii. The fact that the Ap. turns at this juncture to the topics raised in the Church Letter, and that ch. vii. is headed with the

πατρὸς [f] ἔχειν· 2. καὶ ὑμεῖς [g] πεφυσιωμένοι ἐστέ; καὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον [h] ἐπενθήσατε, ἵνα [i] ἐξαρθῇ[1] [k] ἐκ [k] μέσου ὑμῶν ὁ τὸ [l] ἔργον τοῦτο ποιήσας[2]; 3. ἐγὼ [m] μὲν [m] γὰρ ὡς[3] [n] ἀπὼν τῷ [o] σώματι, [n] παρὼν δὲ τῷ [o] πνεύματι, ἤδη [p] κέκρικα ὡς [n] παρὼν τὸν οὕτω τοῦτο [q] κατερ-

g See iv. 6. h 2 Cor. xii. 21; James iv. 9; Rev. xviii. 11 ff.; Mt. v. 4, ix. 15; Mk. xvi. 10; Lk. vi. 25. i Col. ii. 14; Mk. xiii. 15; Jo. xvii. 15, xxi. f. k 2 Cor. vi. 17 (Isa. lii. 11); Col. ii. 14; 2 Thess. ii. 7; Acts xvii. 33, xxiii. 10; Mt. xiii. 49. l In this sense, Mt. xxiii. 3; Lk. xi. 48; Jo. viii. 41. m See xi. 18. n 2 Cor. x. 1 f., 11, xiii. 2, 10; Phil. i. 27; Col. ii. 5. o vii. 34; Rom. viii. 10; Eph. iv. 4; 1 Thess. v. 23. p Pf., vii. 37. See ii. 2. q In like sense, Rom. i. 27, ii. 9, vii. 8 ff.

[1] **αρθη**: all uncc. but L.

[2] **πραξας** (?), ℵAC, several good minn.; so Tisch., W.H., Nestle. Latt. *gessit*. **ποιησας**, BDGLP, etc. (vg. *fecit*)—probably Western and Syrian. So Treg., El., R.V.

[3] *Om.* **ως** (**απων**) ℵABCD*P 17, 37, vg., syr^sch. cop.

formula **Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατέ μοι**, must not be allowed to break the strong links of subject-matter and thought binding it to chh. v. and vi. Its connexion with the foregoing context is essential, with the following comparatively accidental.

§ 15. THE CASE OF INCEST, v. 1-8. About the party-strifes at Cor. P. has been informed by the members of a particular family (i. 11); the monstrous case of incest, to which he turns abruptly and without any preface (*cf.* i. 10), is notorious.

Ver. 1. **Ὅλως ἀκούεται κ.τ.λ.**: "There is actually fornication heard of amongst you!" No wonder that the father of the Church is compelled to show the "rod" (iv. 21). Not **ἀκούω**, as in xi. 18, but the impersonal **ἀκούεται** (*cf.* **ἠκούσθη**, Mark ii. 1), indicating *common report* in the Church (**ἐν ὑμῖν**),—and (**ὅλως**: see parls.) *undoubted fact.*—**Πορνεία** signifies any immoral sexual relation, whether including (as in Matt. v. 32) or distinguished from (Matt. xv. 19) **μοιχεία**.

The sin is branded as of unparalleled blackness by the description, **καὶ τοιαύτη πορνεία ἥτις κ.τ.λ.**: "Yes, and a fornication of such sort"—the **καί** *climactic*—"as (there is) not even among the Gentiles!" While mere **πορνεία** was excused—not to say approved—in heathen society, even by strict moralists, *such* foulness was abominated. Of this crime the loose Catullus says (76. 4): "Nam nihil est quidquam sceleris quo prodeat ultra"; and Cicero, *pro Cluent.*, 6, 15: "scelus incredibile, et præter hanc unam in omni vita inauditum"; Euripides' *Hippolytus* speaks for Gr. sentiment. Greek and Roman law both stamped it with infamy; for Jewish law, see Lev. xviii. 7 f., Deut. xxi 30. also Gen. xlix. 4.—**ἥτις**, of *quality* (as in iii. 17), in place of the regular correlative **οἷα** (xv. 48). Neither **ὀνομάζεται** (T.R.) nor **ἀκούεται** is understood in the ellipsis, simply **ἐστίν**—"such as does not exist"; the exceptional heathen instances are such as to prove the rule. The actual sin is finally stated: **ὥστε γυναῖκά τινα κ.τ.λ.**, "as that one (*or* a certain one) should have a wife of his father".—**ἥτις** defines the quality, **ὥστε** (with inf.) the content and extent of the **πορνεία**.—**γυν. τοῦ πατρός** (instead of **μητρυίαν**) is the term of Lev. xviii. 8. **ἔχειν** indicates a continued association, whether in the way of formal *marriage* or not; nor does **ἔργον** (2), nor **κατεργασάμενον** (3), make clear this latter point. That "the father" was living is not proved by the **ἀδικηθεὶς** of 2 Cor. vii. 12; P. can hardly have referred to this foul immorality in the language of 2 Cor. ii. 5-11, vii. 8-12; the "grief" and "wrong" of those passages are probably quite diff. The *woman* was not a Christian, for Paul passes no sentence upon her; see ver. 13.

Ver. 2. What are the Cor. doing under this deep disgrace? *Not even grieving.* **Καὶ ὑμεῖς πεφυσιωμένοι ἐστέ; κ.τ.λ.**: "And are you (still) puffed up? and did you not rather mourn?" For the grammatical force of **πεφυσ. ἐστέ**, see parls. in i. 10, iv. 8; and for the vb., note to iv. 6. P. confronts the pride of the Cor. Church with this crushing fact; no intellectual brilliance, no religious enthusiasm, can cover this hideous blot: "argumentatur a contrario, ubi enim luctus est, cessit gloria" (Cv.). The ver. is best read *interrogatively*, in view of the **οὐχὶ** in 2nd clause (*cf.* i. 20), and in Paul's expostulatory style (*cf.* iv. 7 f.).—**ἐπενθήσατε** (see parls.) connotes *funeral*

γασάμενον, 4. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου [r] ἡμῶν [1] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[2] [r] συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ οὗ [s] ἐμοῦ [s] πνεύματος σὺν τῇ [t] δυνάμει τοῦ [t] Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,[3] 5. [u] παραδοῦναι [v] τὸν [v] τοιοῦτον τῷ [u] [w] Σατανᾷ εἰς [x] ὄλεθρον τῆς [y] σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ [y] πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ

r H.I. for Epp.; in Gospp. and Acts, *passim*. s With pron., xiv. 14, xvi. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 13, vii. 13; Rom. i. 9; Gal. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; Phm. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Mk. ii. 8, viii. 12; Luke i. 47, viii. 55. t 2 Cor. xii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 16; Lk. v. 17. u In this sense, 1 Tim. i. 20. v Ver. 11, vii. 15, 28, xvi. 16, 18; 12 times besides in P.; 3 Jo. 8; Mt. xix. 14; Ac. xxii. 22. w vii. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 11, xi. 14, xii. 7; Rom. xvi. 20; 1 T . ii. 18; 2 Th. ii. 9; 1 Tim. i. 20, v. 15; Gospp. and Rev., *passim*. x 1 Th. v. 3; 2 Th. i. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 9; Prov. xxi. 7. y 2 Cor. vii. 1; Rom. i. 3 f.; Col. ii. 5; 1 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. xii. 9; M . xxvi. 41.

[1] *Om.* ημων all uncc. but P.

[2] *Om.* Χριστου ABD*; most critical edd. Copyists are apt to complete *the name.*

[3] *Om.* Χριστου ℵABDP 46.

mourning—over "a brother dead to God, by sin, alas! undone;" the *tense* signifies "*going* into mourning"—"breaking out in grief" (Ev.) when you heard of it. Of such grief the fit sequel is expressed by ἵνα ἀρθῇ ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν, "that he should be removed from your midst, who so perpetrated this deed". This is the later Gr. "sub-final" ἵνα, of *the desired result:* see Wr., p. 420; Bm., p. 237; *cf.* xiv. 12 f.—πράξας, as distinguished from ποιήσας (T.R.), implies *quality* in the action (see parls.).

Vv. 3-5. The *removal* of the culprit is, in any case, a settled matter: ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ, "For *I* at least" . . . ἤδη κέκρικα, "have already decided"—without waiting till you should act or till I could come. For ἤδη see note, iv. 8; κέκρικα, pf. of judgment that has determinate effect.—μέν *solitarium*—"I indeed (whatever you may do)".—ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, "while absent in the body yet present in the spirit": by absence the Ap. might seem disqualified for judging (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 20-xiii. 2); he declares that he is *spiritually present*, so present to his inmost consciousness are the facts of the case; *cf.* Col. ii. 5. "St. Paul's spirit, illumined and vivified, as it unquestionably was, by the Divine Spirit, must have been endowed on certain occasions with a more than ordinary insight into the state of a Church at a distance" (Ev.; *cf.* John i. 48; 2 Kings v. 26): "I have already passed sentence, as one present, on him that has so wrought this thing". ὡς παρὼν means "as being present," not "as though present"—which rendering virtually surrenders the previous ἀπών . . . παρὼν δέ.—κατεργάζομαι, *to work out, consummate* (see parls.); the qualifying οὕτως probably refers to the man's being a Christian (*cf.* 12 f.)—"under these conditions" (*cf.* iii. 16 f., vi. 15).

The judgment already determined in the Apostle's mind is delivered in ver. 5, supplying a further obj. (*of the thing ; cf.* for the construction, Acts xv. 38) to κέκρικα: "I have already judged him . . . (have given sentence), in the name of our Lord Jesus, to deliver him that is such (τὸν τοιοῦτον) to Satan for destruction of his flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus". The clauses of ver. 4, with their solemn, rounded terms, make fit way for this awful sentence; "graviter suspensa manet et vibrat oratio usque ad ver. 5" (Bg.). The prp. phrases ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τ. κυρ. Ἰ., σὺν τ. δυνάμει τ. κυρ. ἡμῶν Ἰ., may be connected, either of them or both, with παραδοῦναι or with the subordinate συναχθέντων; and the four combinations thus grammatically possible have each found advocates. The order of words and balance of clauses, as well as intrinsic fitness of connexion, speak for the attachment of the former adjunct to παραδ. Σατ., the latter to συναχθ. ὑμῶν: so Luther, Bg., Mr., Al., Ev., Bt., El. "In the name of the Lord Jesus" every Church act is done, every word of blessing or banning uttered; that Name must be formally used when doom is pronounced in the assembly (see parls.). The gen. abs. clause is parenthetic, supplying the occasion and condition precedent (*aor. ptp.*) of the public sentence; all the responsible parties must be concurrent: "when you have assembled together, and my spirit, along with the power of our Lord Jesus". Along with the gathered assembly, under Paul's unseen directing influence, a *third Supreme Presence* is necessary to make the sentence valid; the Church associates itself

[a] ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ [a] Κυρίου[1] [z] Ἰησοῦ.[1] 6. οὐ [a] καλὸν τὸ [b] καύχημα ὑμῶν· [c] οὐκ [c] οἴδατε ὅτι [d] μικρὰ [de] ζύμη [d] ὅλον τὸ [de] φύραμα [de] ζυμοῖ; 7. [f] ἐκκαθάρατε οὖν[2] τὴν [g] παλαιὰν [e] ζύμην, ἵνα ἦτε νέον [e] φύραμα, καθώς ἐστε [h] ἄζυμοι· καὶ γὰρ τὸ [i] πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν [1k] ἐτύθη

z See i. 8.
a In like sense, ix. 15; seven times besides in P.; Jas. ii. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 12, Mt. xv. 26, xxvi. 10; Lk. xxi. 5.
b ix. 15 f.; 7 times besides in P.; Heb. iii. 6.
c See iii. 16.
d Gal. v. 9. *μικρος*, *cf.* Jas. iii. 5; Mt. xiii. 32.
e Mt. xiii. 33, xvi. 6 ff., and parls. For *φυραμα*, Rom. ix. 21, xi. 16.
f 2 Tim. ii. 21; Deut. xxvi. 13; Judges vii. 4.
g In like sense, Rom. vi. 6; Eph. iv. 22; Col. iii. 9.
h Mt. xxvi. 17, and parls.; Acts xii. 3, xx. 6; Lev. ii. 4, etc.
i Mt. xxvi. 2, etc. From LXX (Heb. *pesach*); in 2 Chron. *φασεκ*. *πασχα θυω*, Mk. xiv. 12; Lk. xxii. 7.
k x. 20; Acts xiv. 13, 18.

[1] **τ. κυρ. ημων Ιησου Χριστου**, ACP, minuscc.[15], syrr. cop., many Ff. **τ. κυρ. Ι. Χριστου**, D Ambrst. *Cf.* ver. 4, i. 8, and 1 Thess. for Pauline usage.

[2] *Om.* **ουν** all uncc. but ℵcCLP; all critical edd.

"with the power" of its Head. Realising that it is clothed therewith, the Cor. Church will deliver the appalling sentence inspired by the absent Ap.—**σὺν τῇ δυνάμει κ.τ.λ.** is a *h.l.*; **ἐν δυνάμει** (ii. 5, etc.) is frequent in P. "Our Lord Jesus" is Christ the *Judge* (see i. 8).

"Delivering to Satan," in the view of many (including Aug., Cv., Bz., and latterly Hn.), is a synonym for *excommunication*,—a thrusting out of the condemned into "the kingdom of darkness," where "the god of this world" holds sway (2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12, Col. i. 13, etc.); similarly in 1 Tim. i. 20. But there is no proof that such a formula of excommunication existed either in the Synagogue or the early Church; and the added words, **εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός κ.τ.λ.**, point to some *physically punitive* and spiritually remedial visitation of the sinner. The **σάρξ** to be destroyed, it is replied, lies in the man's sinful passions; but these would, presumably, be strengthened rather than destroyed by sending him back to the world. "The flesh," as antithetical to "the spirit" (see parls.), is rather the man's *bodily nature;* and physical maladies, even death, are ascribed in the N.T. to Satan (2 Cor. xii. 7, Luke xiii. 16, John viii. 44, Heb. ii. 14), while on the other hand affliction is made an instrument of spiritual benefit (ix. 27, xi. 30 ff., 2 Cor. iv. 16 f., xii. 7, 1 Peter iv. 1 f.); moreover, the App. did occasionally, as in the cases of Ananias and Elymas (Acts v., xiii.), pronounce penal sentences in the physical sphere, which took immediate effect on the condemned. It appears certain that P. imposed in this case *a severe physical infliction*—indeed, if **ὄλεθρος** is to be pressed (see parls.), *a mortal stroke*—as the only means of marking the gravity of the crime and saving the criminal. "Il ne faut pas en douter, c'est une condamnation à mort que Paul prononce" (Renan); not however a sudden death, rather "a slow consumption, giving the sinner time to repent" (Gd.). The *ejection* of the culprit the Church of itself could and must effect (2, 13); for the aggravated chastisement the presence of the Apostle's "spirit," allied "with the power of the Lord Jesus," was necessary.—**ὁ Σατανᾶς** (Heb. *hassatān*, Aram. *s'tanā:* see parls.), "the Adversary," *sc.* of God and man, to whom every such opportunity is welcome (John viii. 44). That Satan's malignity should be (as one may say) overreached by God's wisdom and mercy (*cf.* iii. 19) is nothing very wonderful (see 2 Cor. xii. 7, Luke xxii. 31 f., also the temptation of our Lord, and of Job); hate is proverbially blind. On "*the day* of the Lord," when the ultimate salvation or perdition of each is fixed, see i. 8, Rom. ii. 5-16. That some Cor. afterwards sought *proof* of Paul's supernatural power goes to show, not that this sentence proved abortive, but rather that the offender averted it by prompt repentance.

Ver. 6. "Your vaunt is not good:" **καύχημα**, *materies gloriandi* (*cf.* **αἰσχρὸν κλέος**, Eurip., *Helena*, 135: Mr.), found in the state of the Church, of which the Cor. were proud (iv. 6 ff.) when they ought to have been ashamed.—**καλόν**, *good* in the sense of *seemly*, *of fine quality; cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 21, John x. 32, etc. For **οὐκ οἴδατε . . .;** see iii. 16.—The Cor. might reply that the offence, however shameful, was the sin of one man and therefore a little thing; P. retorts, that it is "a little *leaven*," enough to "leaven the whole kneading": *cf.* the Parables of Matt. xiii. 33 and Luke xii. 1. A sin so virulent held an indefinite power of corruption; it tainted the entire community. The **φύραμα** (**φυράω**,

Χριστός· 8. ὥστε [1] ἑορτάζωμεν,[1] μὴ ἐν [e] ζύμῃ [g] παλαιᾷ μηδὲ ἐν [e] ζύμῃ [m] κακίας καὶ [m] πονηρίας, ἀλλ' ἐν [h] ἀζύμοις [n] εἰλικρινείας καὶ [o] ἀληθείας.

l H.l. for vb. εορτη, Col. ii. 16; passim in Gospp.
m Rom. i. 29. κακια, xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; Tit. iii. 3; Jas. i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1, 16; Acts viii. 22; Mt. vi. 34. πονηρια, Eph. vi. 12; Acts iii. 26; Mt. xxii. 18; Mk. vii. 22; Lk. xi. 39.
n 2 Cor. i. 12, ii. 17; -νης, Phil. i. 10.
o In this sense, 2 Cor. vii. 14, xii. 6; Rom. ix. 1; Eph. iv. 25; Phil. i. 18; 2 Jo. 1; 3 Jo. 1; Acts xxvi. 25; Mk. v. 33.

[1] εορταζομεν, ADP, minuscc.[20]; by itacism.

to mix) is the lump of dough kneaded for a single batch of bread: see parls.

Ver. 7. **ἐκκαθάρατε,** "Cleanse out"—the aor. implying a *summary*, and **ἐκ-** a *complete* removal (see parls.; for simple **καθαίρω,** John xv. 2), leaving the Church "clean": an allusion to the pre-Paschal removal of leaven (Exod. xii. 15 ff., xiii. 7). For **τ. παλαιὰν ζύμην,** *cf.* Ignatius, *ad Magn.*, 10, **τ. κακὴν ζύμην τ. παλαιωθεῖσαν κ. ἐνοξίσασαν,** applying, however, to Judaism what here relates to Gentile vice. The "old leaven" (denoting not persons—the incestuous and his like—but influences: see 8) must be cleansed away, "in order that you may be a fresh kneading". **νέον,** *new in point of time* (see parls.)—the mass of dough, with the evil ferment removed, kneaded over again. The Cor. are to be clear of the **παλαιὰ ζύμη** "in accordance with the fact that" (**καθώς**) they "are **ἄζυμοι,**" a term not used literally—as though the Church was at this (*sc.* Paschal) season eating unleavened bread: such a **παρατήρησις** of Jewish law by Gentiles P. would hardly have encouraged (see Gal. iv. 9 ff.)—but *morally*, in consistency with the allegorical strain of the passage; "in the purpose and command of God, and in their own profession, they are separated from all sin, which is to them what, during the passover week, leaven was to the Jews. This objective use of *unleavened* corresponds to that of *sanctified* in i. 2" (Bt.). *Cf.* the **ἤδη καθαροί ἐστε** of John xv. 3; and for the general principle, i. 30, vi. 11, Rom. vi. 1-11, etc.

Ver. 8 explains the symbolical **ἄζυμοι.** Participation in the sacrifice of Christ presumes unleavenedness in the participants; the unleavened bread and the passover are related (objectively) as repentance and faith (subjectively): "For indeed our passover *has been slain*, even Christ". **τὸ πάσχα . . . ἐτύθη** (aor., of historical fact)—the Passover Lamb killed, and leaven not yet cast out: what a contradiction! The Law prescribed no exact time, but usage required every scrap of leaven to be got rid of from the house at the beginning (eve) of the day, Nisan 14, on which the Lamb was slain. **πάσχα** stands for the Paschal *Lamb*, the sacrifice of which legally constituted the Passover (Mark xiv. 12, *cf.* John i. 29).

"Our (Christian) passover," *cf.* Heb. xiii. 10; and for Paul's appropriation to the Church of the things of the Old Covenant, Rom. xi. 17, Gal. iv. 26, vi. 16, Phil. iii. 3. This identification of Christ crucified with the Paschal Lamb lends some support to the view that Jesus died, as the Fourth Gospel appears to represent, *on the* 14*th Nisan;* but the precise coincidence is not essential to his interpretation. The Pascha (Aram. *pascha* = Heb. *pesach*)—in O.T. "Jehovah's Passover"—was the sacrificial covenant-feast of the kingdom of God in Israel. It contained three essential elements: (1) *the blood* of the victim, sprinkled at the exodus on each house-door, afterwards on the national altar, as an expiation to God (*cf.* Rom. iii. 25), who "passes over" when He "sees the blood"; (2) *the flesh* of the lamb, supplying the food of redeemed Israel as it sets out to the Holy Mount and the Promised Land (see x. 16 f., John vi. 32, 51); (3) *the continued feast*, an act of fellowship, grounded on redemption, between Jehovah and Israel and amongst the Israelites; *cf.* x. 16-22, xi. 20, and notes.

With the leaven removed and the Passover Lamb slain, "let us keep the feast" (**ἑορτάζωμεν,** pr. sbj. of *continued action*)—this term again allegorical not literal (see **ἄζυμοι,** 7), "a figurative characterisation of the whole Christian conduct of life" (Mr.). **ἅπας ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ πανήγυρις ἁγία** (Clem. Al., *Strom.*, viii., quoted by Ed.); to the same effect Cm., **δείκνυσιν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ χρόνος ἑορτῆς ἐστι καιρὸς τ. Χριστιανοῖς διὰ τ. ὑπερβολὴν τ. ἀγαθῶν αὐτοῖς δοθέντων. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τ. Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος γέγονε καὶ ἐτύθη, ἵνα σε ἑορτάζειν ποιήσῃ;** *cf.*, earlier than P., Philo's interpretation of

9. [o]Ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν [p]τῇ [p]ἐπιστολῇ μὴ [q]συναναμίγνυσθαι [r]πόρνοις· 10. καὶ[1] οὐ [s]πάντως τοῖς πόρνοις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, ἢ τοῖς [t]πλεονέκταις ἢ[2] [u]ἅρπαξιν ἢ [v]εἰδωλολάτραις, [w]ἐπεὶ [x]ὀφείλετε[3] [w]ἄρα

p 2 Cor. vii. 8; Rom. xvi. 22; etc.
q 2 Th. iii. 14.
r vi. 9; Eph. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 10; twice in Heb., and in Rev.
s ix. 10, 22, xvi. 12; Rom. iii. 9; 4 times in Acts and Lk.
t vi. 10; Eph. v. 5; -τεω, 2 Cor. ii. 11, vii. 2, xii. 17 f., 1 Th. iv. 6.
u vi. 10; Mt. vii. 15; Lk. xviii. 11; -γη, Mt. xxiii. 25; Heb. x. 34.
v vi. 9, x. 7; Eph. v. 5; Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15.
w vii. 14.
x In this tense and sense (ωφειλ), 2 Cor. xii. 11; Heb. ii. 17; Lk. xvii. 10.

[1] *Om.* και all uncc. but ℵcDcLP.

[2] και (not η before αρπ.), all uncc. but ℵcDbcL.

[3] ωφειλετε, all uncc. but D³P.

the Feast, *De migr. Abrah.*, 16; *De congr. quærend. erudit. gratia*, 28. For **ὥστε** with impv., see note on iv. 5.—The **ἄζυμα** (unleavened cakes), to be partaken of by the **ἄζυμοι** (7), are described by the attributes **εἰλικρινίας καὶ ἀληθείας**, "of sincerity and truth"—a sound inward disposition, and a right position in accord with the reality of things. To the forbidden **ἐν ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ** (see note, 7) is added, by way of closer specification, **μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας κ. πονηρίας** (*malitiæ et nequitiæ*)—"**κακία** the vicious disposition, **πονηρία** the active exercise of it" (Lt.); see Trench, *Syn.*, § 11. The associations of approaching Easter, probably, suggested this train of thought (*cf.* xv. 23, **ἀπαρχή**); nowhere else does P. call Christ "the Pascha".

§ 16. A Previous Letter Misread, v. 9-13. The Cor. Church were taking no action against the offender of § 15; in this neglect they disregarded the Apostle's instructions conveyed by some recent letter. These instructions they appear to have misunderstood, reading them as though Paul forbade Christians to have any dealings with immoral persons, and asking for further explanation. Not improbably, they were making their uncertainty on the general question an excuse for hesitation in this urgent and flagrant case. Accordingly the Ap., after giving sentence upon the **πόρνος** of vv. 1 f., repeats with all possible distinctness his direction *to excommunicate persons of openly immoral life from the Church.* Profligates of the world must be left to God's sole judgment. P. felt that there was an evasion, prompted by the disposition to palter with sin, in the misunderstanding reported to him; hence the closing words of the last Section, condemning the "leaven of badness and wickedness" and commending the "unleavened bread of sincerity and truth". On the nature and occasion of *the lost letter*, see *Introd.*, chap. ii.

Ver. 9. "I wrote to you in the (my) letter"—the last the Cor. had received from P., which is recalled by the matter just discussed. The Ff., except Ambrosiaster (? Hilary of Rome, prob. Isaac, a converted Jew), referred the **ἔγραψα** *to this Ep.*, reading the vb. as *epistolary aorist* (as in 11; see Bn. § 44); but there is nothing in 1 Cor. to sustain the ref., and **ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ** seems "added expressly to guard against this interpretation" (Ed.). Modern expositors, from Cv. downwards, find the traces here of a lost Ep. antecedent to our First; 2 Cor. x. 10 f. intimates that the Cor. had received several letters from P. before the canonical Second. Some have found in 2 Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1 a stray leaf of the missing document; that par. is certainly germane to its purpose (see Hilgenfeld, *Einleit. in das N.T.*, p. 287; Whitelaw, in *Classical Review*, 1890, pp. 12, 317 f.). The ambiguity lay in the word **συναναμίγνυσθαι** (*to mix oneself up with*), which forbids social intimacy, while those who wished to misunderstand took it as a prohibition of all intercourse.

Ver. 10 gives the needful definition of the above injunction. **οὐ πάντως** is best understood as by Er. (*non omnino*), Cv. (*neque in universum*), Mr., Bt., Ed., El., as *not absolutely*, *not altogether*, **οὐ** negativing **πάντως** and making the inhibition a qualified one: "I did not altogether forbid your holding intercourse with the fornicators of this world". To make the **πάντως** emphasise the **οὐ** (as in Rom. iii. 9)—"Assuredly I did not mean to forbid association with fornicators outside the Church" (Lt.)—is to lend the passage the air of *recommending* association with unconverted profligates!—What applies to one sort of immorality applies to others: **ἢ τ. πλεονέκταις καὶ ἅρπαξιν ἢ εἰδωλολάτραις**, "or with the covetous and rapacious, or with idolaters". The **πλεονεκται** (from **πλέον** and **ἔχω**: see parls.) are *the self-aggrandising* in general;

y Eph. i. 21, iii. 15; Mk. iii. 14. z vi. 10; -ρειν, iv. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 23; -ρια, 1 Tim. v. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 9; Prov. xxvi. 21; Sir. xxiii. 8.

ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελθεῖν. 11. νυνὶ[1] δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν μὴ [q] συναναμίγνυσθαι ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς [y] ὀνομαζόμενος ᾖ [r] πόρνος ἢ [t] πλεονέκτης ἢ [v] εἰδωλολάτρης ἢ [z] λοίδορος ἢ [a] μέθυσος ἢ [u] ἅρπαξ, [b] τῷ [b] τοιούτῳ μηδὲ [c] συνεσθίειν· 12. τί γάρ μοι καὶ[2] [d] τοὺς [d] ἔξω κρίνειν; οὐχὶ [e] τοὺς [e] ἔσω ὑμεῖς κρίνετε, [d] τοὺς δὲ [d] ἔξω ὁ Θεὸς κρίνει; 13. καὶ[3] [f] ἐξαρεῖτε[4] τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν.

a vi. 10; twice in Prov., and in Sir. b See ver. 5. c Gal. ii. 12; Acts x. 41, xi. 3; Lk. xv. 2; Gen. xliii. 32; Ps. c. 5. d Col. iv. 5; 1 Th. iv. 12; Mk. iv. 11; Prol. to Sirach (εκτος). e *H.l.*; *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 16; Rom. vii. 22; Eph. iii. 16. f N.T. *h.l.*, Deut. xvii. 7, 12, xxiv. 7.

[1] **ν υ ν**, ℵ[c]ABD[c]GLP; Treg., W.H., Nestle. **νυνι**, ℵ*CD*[b]; Tisch.

[2] *Om.* **κ α ι** all uncc. but DL.

[3] *Om.* **κ α ι** all uncc. but D[3]L.

[4] **ε ξ α ρ α τ ε**: all uncc. but D[3]L (**εξαρειτε**); see Deut. (parl.).

ἅρπαγες, those who *seize with violence;* sins of greed are frequent in commercial cities. "Idolaters" (the first appearance of the word in literature: *cf.* notes on viii. 1 and x. 19) included the entire pagan world; Cor. idolatry was specially associated with sensual sin.—**ἐπεὶ . . . ἄρα κ.τ.λ.**, "since in that case"—the logical consequence of absolute non-intercourse—"you were bound to go out of the world!" — **ἑτέραν οἰκουμένην ὠφείλετε ζητῆσαι** (Thp.). One could not pursue any avocation at Cor. without daily contact with such sinners. **ὠφείλετε**, in the impf. tense of *the unfulfilled condition* (implied in **ἄρα**); for the omission, common with vbs. of this nature, of the **ἂν** of contingency, see Wr., p. 382, and *cf.* Heb. ix. 26. For the principle implied—as against *the cloister*—see John xvii. 14-19.

Ver. 11. **νῦν δὲ ἔγραψα**, "But now I have written"—in contrast to the **Εγραψα . . . ἐν τῇ ἐπιστ.** of ver. 9: "If any one doubted the purport of the former letter, it shall be impossible to mistake my meaning *now*". The *logical* (not temporal) sense of **νῦν** (or **νυνί**) is preferred by some interpreters: "But now—*after this, as things now appear*—(you must understand that) I wrote," etc., this **ἔγραψα** thus repeating the former. **Νυνὶ δὲ** bears the like emphatic temporal sense in 2 Cor. viii. 11, Eph. ii. 13.—**ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος**, "if any one bearing the name of *brother*"—the point of the amended rule, which P. in writing before had apparently left to the common-sense of his readers, but is compelled to make explicit. So the **μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι** clearly signifies *not to hold fraternal, friendly commerce* with vicious men: *cf.* xv. 33. Such a one may be "named," but is not, "a brother"; *cf.* Rev. iii. 1.—Among the kinds of sinners proscribed P. now inserts the **λοίδορος** (see note on iv. 12), the "railer," "reviler"—the foul-mouthed abuser of others; and the **μέθυσος**, "drunkard"—a word bearing in earlier Gr. a comic sense, *tipsy*, afterwards seriously used (Lt.): these sins are companions; *cf.* vi. 10.—**τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν**: "with him that is such (I bid you) not even to eat". The inf. is *pr.*—of usage, practice; *cf.* Gal. ii. 12. "Eating together is a sign of friendliness; business transactions are not. If the ref. be restricted to *Christian* fellowship (*sc.* the Agapé), the emphatic *not even* is out of place" (Ed.). To forbid intercourse to this extent implies expulsion from the Church, *and more; cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 14 f. (milder treatment), Mt. xviii. 17. That it should be possible for an actual "idolater"—not merely one who "sits in an idol's house" (viii. 10) as a place indifferent, or who still in some sort believes in its power (viii. 7)—to be in the Church is evidence of the laxity of Cor. Christianity. That this was really the case, and that some Cor., perhaps of philosophical, semi-pantheistic tendencies, wished to combine the worship of the heathen temple with that of the Christian Church, appears likely from x. 14-22; the same syncretism is found in India now; *cf.* the case of Naaman, 2 Kings v. 17 f.

Vv. 12, 13. **τί γάρ μοι τοὺς ἔξω κ.τ.λ.**; "For what business of mine is it (*Quid mea refert?* Cv.) to judge those that are outside? (Is it) not those within (that) you judge, while those without God judges?" By these questions P. justifies his excluding the impure **ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζ.** from the communion and social courtesies of

VI. 1. [a] Τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν [b] πρᾶγμα [b] ἔχων [b] πρὸς [c] τὸν [c] ἕτερον [d] κρίνεσθαι [e] ἐπὶ τῶν [f] ἀδίκων, καὶ οὐχὶ [e] ἐπὶ [g] τῶν [g] ἁγίων; 2. [h] οὐκ [1]

a Rom. v. 7; 2 Cor. x. 12; Acts v. 13; Esth. vii. 5; Job xv. 12. b *H.l.*; Thuc. i. 128; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 9. 1. c See iv. 6. d In this sense, Rom. iii. 4 (Ps. i. 6); Mt. v. 40; Gen. xxvi. 21; Job xiii. 19, xxxix. 34. e Acts xxiii. 30, xxiv. 19, xxv. 9; Mt. xxviii. 14. f In this sense, ver. 9; *cf.* αμαρτωλοι, Gal. ii. 15, etc.; απιστοι, ver. 6 below. g In this comprehensive use, xiv. 33, xvi. 1, 15; 2 Cor. viii. 4; Rom. xii. 13, xvi. 15; about 12 times besides in P.; Heb. vi. 10; Jude 3. h See ver. 6.

[1] η ουκ: all uncc. but D³L. **H** perhaps lost by confusion with final **N** of εγενηθημεν; hence Syrian text.

the Church. He holds jurisdiction over those *within* its pale; of their conduct the Church (ὑμεῖς) is bound to take note; the world outside must be left to the judgment of God: "cives judicate, ne alienos" (Bg.). The Ap. places himself and the Cor. on the one side (*cf.* 4; also xii. 25 f.), in contrast with God who judges **τοὺς ἔξω**. "Within" and "without" denoted in Synagogue usage members and non-members of the sacred community (see parls.): **οἱ ἔσω = οἱ ἅγιοι, οἱ οἰκεῖοι τῆς πίστεως, οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, etc. Yet this mutual judgment of Christians by each other has great limitations (Rom. xiv. 4-10; Matt. vii. 1 ff.); its sphere lies in vital matters of character essential to Church life; and there it is subject to the final Court of Appeal (see iv. 3 ff.).—**ὁ Θεὸς κρίνει** (not **κρινεῖ**): P. is not anticipating the Last Judgment, but laying down the principle that God is *the world's* Judge; see Rom. ii. 16, iii. 6, Heb. xii. 23, etc.—The interrog. **οὐχὶ** holds under its regimen the two clauses linked by the contrastive **δέ**; El. however reads **τοὺς δὲ ἔξω κ.τ.λ.** assertively, as a concluding "grave enunciation".

From his digression to the lost Ep. and the general social problem, the Ap. returns, with vehement emphasis, to the offender of vv. 1 f. and demands his expulsion in the solemn words of the Deuteronomic law. **τὸν πονηρὸν** is not *Satan* ("scelerum omnium principem," Cv.), nor "the wicked" in general—each case as it arises (Hf.); but "istum improbum" (Bz.), the case of notorious and extreme guilt which gave rise to the whole discussion.—**ἐξάρατε** (*cf.* **ἐκκαθάρατε**, 7) takes up again the **ἵνα ἀρθῇ** of ver. 2, with the added thought (**ἐξ- . . . ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν**) of the *riddance* effected by his removal. The terrible sentence of vv. 3 ff. had not, in so many words, prescribed ejection, though implying it; and P. needed to be very explicit: see note on ver. 9. The formal expulsion must proceed from the Cor.,—**ὑμεῖς κρίνετε**; the Church is a self-governing body.

§ 17. Law-suits in Heathen Courts, vi. 1-6. Beside the **πόρνος**, amongst those to be excommunicated at Cor., stood the **πλεονέκτης** (v. 11); fraud and robbery were only less rife than licentiousness; and this element of corruption, along with the other, had reappeared within the Church (8). Instead of being repressed by timely correction, the evil had grown rank; in several instances aggrieved Christian parties had carried their complaints before the civil Courts, to the scandal of the Church and to Paul's high indignation. Two links of thought connect chh. v. and vi.: (1) the kindred nature of *sins of impurity and of covetousness*, both prevalent at Cor., both destructive of society; (2) the lamentable *lack of Church discipline* (v. 12), which enabled these mischiefs to gather head.

Ver. 1. **Τολμᾷ τις ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.**; "Does any one of you dare?" etc.—"notatur læsa majestas Christianorum" (Bg.): **τολμᾶν**, *sustinere, non erubescere*. This also was matter of common knowledge, like the crime of v. 1. The abrupt interrog. marks the outburst of indignant feeling. You treat the Church, the seat of the Holy Spirit (iii. 16 f.), as though it were without authority or wisdom; you take your case from the highest court to the lowest! So the *appellant* is first censured; in ver. 4 the whole Church comes in for blame.—**Πρᾶγμα** (*res, negotium*), **κρίνεσθαι** (mid.; see parls.), **ἐπὶ** with gen., **ἐν** (2), **κριτήριον** (2), **καθίζω** (4), and perhaps **ἥττημα** (7), are all in this passage technical legal expressions.—**Οἱ ἄδικοι**—the term applied by the Jews (*cf.* Gal. ii. 15), and then by Christians, to the heathen—marks the action censured as *self-stultifying*—to seek for right from "the unrighteous"! P. himself appealed to Roman justice, but never in matters "between brother and brother," nor in the way of accusing his injurers (Acts xxviii. 19); only in defence of his work.—**Οἱ ἅγιοι** indicates by contrast the moral dignity of Christians (see i. 2, and note), a judicial attribute; *cf. sanctitas*

[h] οἴδατε ὅτι [g] οἱ [g] ἅγιοι τὸν [i] κόσμον [i] κρινοῦσι; καὶ εἰ [k] ἐν ὑμῖν [ik] κρίνεται ὁ [i] κόσμος, [l] ἀνάξιοί ἐστε [m] κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων; 3. [h] οὐκ

i Rom. iii. 6; Acts xvii. 31 (οικουμενην); 4 times in John. k Acts xvii. 31; Lk. xi. 15. l *H.l.*; -ως, xi. 27; ουκ αξιους, Acts xiii. 46. m Jas. ii. 6; Judges v. 10; 3 Kings vii. 7 (44); Dan. vii. 10.

fori (Quintilian, xi., 3. 58). There exists a similar Rabbinical inhibition: "It is forbidden to bring a matter of right before idolatrous judges. . . . Whosoever goeth before them with a law-suit is impious, and does the same as though he blasphemed and cursed; and hath lifted his hand against the law of Moses our Teacher,—blessed be he!" (*Shulchan aruch*, *Choshen hammishpat*, 29). The Roman Government allowed the Jews liberty of internal jurisdiction; the Beth-din (*house of judgment*) was as regular a part of the Israelite economy as the Beth-keneseth (*synagogue*). In Rom. xiii. 1 ff. P. regards the power of the State from a diff. point of view.

Ver. 2. **ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε κ.τ.λ.;** "Or (is it that) you do not know?" etc. If the appeal to non-Christian tribunals is not made in *insolence* (τολμᾷ) towards the Church, it must be made in *ignorance* of its matchless prerogative. That "the saints will judge the world" is involved in the conception of the Messianic kingdom (Dan. vii. 22; *cf.* Matt. xx. 21); Israel, with its Christ, is to rule, and therefore judge, the nations (Acts i. 6, etc.: *cf.* Gal. vi. 16). See Wisd. iii. 7 f., where participation in this Messianic power is asserted for "the souls of the righteous" in their future state. After the manner of Jesus, the Ap. carried over to the new Israel of God the promises of dominion claimed under the Old Covenant, transforming in transferring them (2 Tim. ii. 12; Rev. xx. 4, xxii. 5, etc.). Paul reminds his readers of a truth they should have known, since it belongs to the nature of "the kingdom of God" (9) and to the glory they look for at "the unveiling of Christ" (i. 7 ff.; *cf.* iv. 8, Rom. viii. 17, etc.). Cm. and others see here a *virtual* judgment of the world, lying in the faith of the saints as contrasted with its unbelief (*cf.* Luke xi. 31, John iii. 18 ff., Rom. viii. 3),—a thought irrelevant here. Ver. 3, moreover, carries the judgment in question into a region far beyond that of *Christian magistrates*, whose appointment some prosaic interpreters see here predicted. The Ap. argues *à majori ad minus*, from the grand and celestial to earthly commonplace. The early Church ascribed this dignity esp. to *the martyrs:* **τοῦ Χριστοῦ πάρεδροι . . . καὶ μέτοχοι τῆς κρίσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ συνδικάζοντες** (Euseb., *H.E.*, vi., 42; see Ed.).—**ἐν ὑμῖν**, *in consessu vestro*—picturing Christ and His saints in session, with "the world" brought in for trial before them. "It is absurd in itself, and quite inconsistent with the Divine idea and counsel, that any of you should now appear at *their* bar, who shall some day appear at *yours*" (Ev.).—**κρίνεται**, pr. tense, of faith's *certainty* (*cf.* v. 13).—**κριτήριον** (see 4) signifies *place* rather than *matter* of judgment (see parls.); for the latter sense lexical warrant is wanting. The question is: "Are you unworthy of (sitting on) the smallest tribunals?" of forming courts to deal with trifling affairs of secular property?—*cf.* our "petty sessions". Cm. reads the sentence as affirmative, **ἀνάξιοι** as *nimis digni*, and **τ. κριτηρ. ἐλαχ.** as the *heathen* tribunals: "It is beneath your dignity to appear before these contemptible courts!" But this does not square with ver. 4.

Ver. 3. The question of ver. 2 urged to its climax: "Know you not that we shall judge *angels?*" Paul already does this, hypothetically, in Gal. i. 8. *Instructed* through the Church (Eph. iii. 10), the heavenly powers will be subject to final *correction* from the same quarter. The angels were identified, in later Jewish thought, with the forces of nature and the destiny of nations (Ps. civ. 4; Dan. x. 13, xii. 1); they must be affected by any judgment embracing the **κόσμος**. "There is, it seems, a solidarity between the Princes of the nations (*cf.* Paul's **ἀρχαὶ κ. ἐξουσίαι**, xv. 24, etc.) and the nations directed by them; according to *Shir rabba*, 27 *b*, God does not punish a people until He has first humbled its Angel-prince in the higher world, and according to *Tanchuma*, *Beshallach*, 13, He will hereafter judge the nations only when He has first judged their Angel-princes" (Weber, *Altsynag. paläst. Théologie*, p. 165); Satan is **κατ' ἐξοχὴν** "the god of this world" (2 Cor. iv. 4; *cf.* John xiv. 30, Luke iv. 6), and has his "angels" whom P. styles "world-rulers" (Eph. vi. 12, Matt. xxv. 41). On the throne of world-judgment Christ will sit (Acts xvii. 31, Matt. xxv. 31 f.), and "the saints"—*sc.* after their own acquittal—as His assessors.—**κρινοῦσιν** in this context

[h] οἴδατε ὅτι [n] ἀγγέλους [1] κρινοῦμεν; [o] μήτι [o] γε [p] βιωτικά· 4. [p] βιωτικὰ μὲν οὖν [m] κριτήρια, ἐὰν ἔχητε τοὺς [q] ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τούτους [r] καθίζετε· 5. πρὸς [s] ἐντροπὴν ὑμῖν λέγω. [t] οὕτως οὐκ ἔστιν [1] ἐν ὑμῖν σοφὸς [2] οὐδὲ [2] εἷς, [2] ὃς δυνήσεται [u] διακρῖναι [v] ἀνὰ

n In like connexion, Rom. viii. 38; Gal. i. 8; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6; Job iv. 18.
o *H.l.*; class.
p Lk. xxi. 34; Aristot., Polyb., Philo. Al.
q See i. 28.
r Transit., Eph. i. 20; Acts ii. 30.
s xv. 34; Job xx. 3; Ps. xxxiv. 26, etc. *Cf.* iv. 14.
t Gal. iii. 3; Mt. xxvi. 40; Mk. vii. 18; Jo. xviii. 22.
u N.T. *h.l.*, in this sense. *Cf.* iv. 7; xi. 29.
v Mt. xiii. 25; Mk. vii. 31; Rev. vii. 17; Ex. xi. 7; Isa. lvii. 5.

[1] **ενι**, ℵBCLP, minn. [70] or more (*cf.* Gal. iii. 28, Col. iii. 11).
εστιν, DG 37, etc.: Western correction.

[2] **ουδεις σοφος**, ℵBC 17, 46, 73; so crit. edd.
ουδε εις σοφος, GP 37, Aug., Ambrst. (*quisquam sapiens*),—later Western; **σοφος** simply, D*, earlier Western (?); **σοφος ουδε εις**, D[3]L, etc.,—Syrian.

qualifies its objects as *culpable; cf.* **ἵνα καταργήσῃ** in xv. 24; also v. 12 above, and other parls. The anarthrous **ἀγγέλους** signifies beings of this order, in contrast with *men* (*cf.* iv. 9; also Jude 6); "P. does not wish to mark out this or that class of angels, but to awaken in the Church the sense of its competence and dignity by reminding it that beings of this lofty nature will one day be subject to its jurisdiction" (Gd.; also El.).—**μήτιγε βιωτικά** (*nedum quidem:* not surely a continued interrog., as W.H. punctuate) —in sharp contrast to "angels"—"(to say) nothing verily of secular matters!". —**μήτιγε** (*sc.* **λέγωμεν**) is a N.T. *h.l.*, —a sound cl. idiom (see Lidd. on **μήτις**, also El. *ad. loc.*),—negative syn. for **πόσῳ μᾶλλον** (Rom. xi. 12, 24); for the **γε**, *cf.* iv. 8.—**βιωτικός**, of later Gr. (after Aristotle), denotes matters relating to **βίος** (one's "living"), which differs from **ζωή** as *vita quam* from *vita qua vivimus* —"quae ad hujus vitæ usum pertinent" (Bz.), or "ad victum pertinentia" (Cv.); see Lt. *ad loc.*, and Trench, *Syn.*, § 27.

Vv. 4, 5*a*. Ver. 4 is rendered in three diff. ways, as (*a*) **τ. ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τ. ἐκκλησίᾳ** is taken to mean *the heathen iudges*, the **ἄδικοι** of ver. 1 whom the Church could not respect (**ἐν**, *in the eyes of; cf.* xiv. 11); then **τούτους καθίζετε** becomes an indignant question—"Do you set up *these* (as your judges)?" so Mr., Hn., Tisch., W.H., R.V. *text.* The position of **καθίζετε** and the strain put upon its meaning speak against this view—the Cor. Christians did not *appoint* the city magistrates; also the unlikelihood of Paul's using language calculated to excite contempt toward heathen rulers. (*b*) The prevalent construction (Vg., Syr., Bz., Cv., Bg., Ed., El., Lt., A.V., R.V. *marg.*) understands **τ. ἐξουθ. ἐν τ. ἐκκλ.** as the despised *of the Church itself* (**καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ἀνθρ.**, iii. 21, iv. 6 ff. implies such a counterpart); then **καθίζετε** is read as impv., and P. says in sarcasm, "If you have lawsuits in secular affairs, set up the lowest amongst you (for judges of these low matters)!" **κριτήρια** however (see note on 2, and R.V. *marg.*) signifies not *trials*, nor *matters of trial*, but *tribunals*, and is therefore an unsuitable obj. to **ἐὰν ἔχητε**: **βιωτικὰ κριτήρια** are the things *wanting* to the Church, which P. is advising them to set on foot. Moreover, Paul would hardly speak of Christians as "despised" among their fellows, without some touch of blame for their despisers. (*c*) For these reasons, it is better, as Hf. suggests, to put the comma *before*, instead of after, **ἐὰν ἔχητε**, attaching **τοὺς ἐξουθ.** to this vb. and reading **βιωτ. κριτ.** as a *nom.* (or *acc.*) *pendens* to the sentence (*cf.* Rom. viii. 3, Heb. viii. 1; and Bm., pp. 379 ff.): we thus translate, "Well then, for secular tribunals—if you have men that are made of no account in the Church, set these on the bench!" That this prideful Church *has* such persons is undoubted; P. puts the fact hypothetically, as a thing one does not like to assume. **μὲν οὖν** throws into relief, by way of emphatic resumption, the **βιωτικά . . . κριτήρια.**—**πρὸς ἐντροπὴν ὑμῖν λέγω,** "Unto your shame (*lit.* for a shame to you) I say (it)": this relates to the foregoing sentence (*cf.* xv. 34); it is a shame the Cor. Church should have members looked on with utter contempt (*cf.* xii. 21-25); but since it has, it is fitting that they should be its judges in things contemptible! P. writes with anger, whereas he did not, though he might seem to do, in iv. 14.

Ver. 5*b*. Laying aside sarcasm, the Ap. asks most gravely: "(Is it) so (that) there is no wise man found amongst you, who will be able to decide between his

[w] μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ; 6. ἀλλὰ ἀδελφὸς [w] μετὰ ἀδελφοῦ [d w] κρίνεται, [x] καὶ [x] τοῦτο [e] ἐπὶ [y] ἀπίστων.

7. Ἤδη μὲν οὖν [1] [z] ὅλως [a] ἥττημα ἐν [2] ὑμῖν ἐστιν ὅτι [b] κρίματα ἔχετε μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν· [c] διατί [3] οὐχὶ μᾶλλον [d] ἀδικεῖσθε; [c] διατί [3] οὐχὶ μᾶλλον [e] ἀποστερεῖσθε; 8. ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς [d] ἀδικεῖτε καὶ [e] ἀποστερεῖτε,

w Job ix. 3 (or dat.).
x Rom. xiii 11; Eph ii. 8; Phil. i. 28; 3 Jo. 5.
y vii. 12 ff., x. 27, xiv. 22 ff.; 2 Cor. vi. 14 f.; 1 Tim. v. 8.
z See v. 1.
a Rom. xi. 12; Isa. xxxi. 8; -αομαι, 2 Cor. xii. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 19 f.
b N.T. *h.l.*; Ex. xviii. 22.
c 2 Cor. xi. 11; Rom. ix. 32; Rev. xvii. 7; Acts v. 3; oftener in Gospp.
d Pass. (or mid.), 2 Cor. vii. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 12; Acts vii. 24; Rev. ii. 11. For act., 2 Cor. vii. 2; Gal. iv. 12; Col. iii. 25; Phm. 18, etc.
e vii. 5; 1 Tim. vi. 5; Mk. x. 19.

[1] Om. **ουν** ℵ*D* 17, latt. vg. cop. So Tisch.; not W.H.
[2] *Om.* **εν** all uncc.; all critical edd.
[3] **δια τι**: critical edd., except Tisch.

brothers?" **οὕτως** intensifies the question (*cf.* Gal. iii. 3)—**τοσαύτη σπάνις** (Cm.)—"so utter a lack of men of sense amongst *you* Cor., with all your talent and pretensions?" (i. 5, iii. 18, iv. 10). **ἐνί,** prp. with ellipsis of **ἐστίν** (Wr., p. 96)—*there exists, is found* (see parls.).—**ἀνὰ μέσον** (Hebraistic prpl. phrase) **τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ**—lit. "between his brother"—a defective expression, as though due to confusion of **τῶν ἀδελφῶν** with the more Hebraistic **ἀδελφοῦ καὶ ἀδελφοῦ**: an example of the laxity of Paul's conversational Gr.; unless, as Sm. conjectures, there is a "primitive error," and **τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ** should be corrected to **τῶν ἀδελφῶν.**

Ver. 6. "Nay, but brother goes to law with brother—this too before unbelievers!" This is an *answer* to the question of ver. 5, not a continuation of it. The litigation shows that there is no man in the Church wise enough to settle such matters privately; or he would surely have been called in. The **ἄδικοι** of ver. 1 here figure as **ἄπιστοι**; see parls; contrast with **οἱ πιστεύοντες** (i. 21).

§ 18. Warning to Immoral Christians, vi. 7-11. Behind the scandal of the law-suits there lay a deeper mischief in their *cause.* They were immediately due to unchristian resentment on the part of the aggrieved; but the chief guilt lay with the aggressors. The defrauders of their brethren, and all doers of wrong, are warned that they forfeit their place in God's kingdom (9 f.), and reminded that the sins they thus commit belong to their unregenerate state (11).

Ver. 7. **Ἤδη μὲν οὖν,** "Indeed then, to begin with": on **ἤδη** (*already, i.e. before litigation*), see note to iv. 8. **μὲν** here, otherwise than in ver. 4, suggests a suppressed **δέ**: "but ye aggravate matters by going before the heathen" (Lt.).—**ὅλως** (see v. 1) **ἥττημα** (cl. **ἧττα**): "it is absolutely a failure on your part"—not a mere *defect,* nor a *loss* (*sc.* of the Messianic glory: so Mr., in view of 9), but a moral *defeat* (see parls.). **Ἡττάομαι** (see Lidd., *s. v.*, I. 3) signifies *to be worsted, beaten in a suit* (Lat. *causa cadere*); this sense excellently suits the context and Paul's epigrammatic style: "Indeed then it is already an unmistakable defeat for you that you have law-suits"—*you are beaten before you enter court,* by the mere fact that such quarrels arise and reach this pitch.—**κρίμα** is the **πρᾶγμα** (1) ripened into an actual case at law. **μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν,** for **μετ᾽ ἀλλήλων,** implies intestine strife; the 3rd pl. reflexive pron. frequently serves all three persons (Jelf's *Gr. Gram.*, § 654, 2 *b*).—**ἀδικεῖσθε, ἀποστερεῖσθε,** mid. voice: "injuriam accipitis, fraudem patimini" (Vg.)—"Why do you not rather submit to wrong, to robbery?" (see Wr., p. 218). Paul reproduces the teaching of Jesus in Luke vi. 27 ff., etc., which applies more strictly as the relationships of life are closer; *cf.* His own example (1 Pet. ii. 23), and that of the Ap. (iv. 12 f., 16). **οὐχὶ μᾶλλον,** as in v. 2.

Ver. 8. **ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ.**: "Nay, but *you* commit wrong and robbery—this too (*cf.* 6) upon your brothers!" Mr. reads this, like the parl. **ἀλλὰ** clause of ver. 6, as a further question; it is the answer to the question of ver. 7—the sad *fact* contrasted with the duty of the Christian. The spiritual kinship which heightens the duty of submission to wrong, aggravates its commission.

Vv. 9, 10. On **ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε;** see note to ver. 2. The wrongers of their brethren are surely unaware of the fact that "wrong-doers (**ἄδικοι**) will not inherit

[x] καὶ [x] ταῦτα [1] ἀδελφούς. 9. [f] ἢ [f] οὐκ [f] οἴδατε ὅτι [g] ἄδικοι [h 1] βασιλείαν [2] [h] Θεοῦ [2] οὐ [i] κληρονομήσουσι; [k] μὴ [k] πλανᾶσθε· οὔτε [3] [l] πόρνοι οὔτε [3] [m] εἰδωλολάτραι οὔτε [3] [n] μοιχοὶ οὔτε [3] [o] μαλακοὶ οὔτε [3] [p] ἀρσενοκοῖται 10. οὔτε [3] [q] κλέπται, οὔτε [3] [r] πλεονέκται, οὔτε [3] [s] μέθυσοι, οὐ [3] [t] λοίδοροι, οὐχ [3] [u] ἅρπαγες [h 1] βασιλείαν [h] Θεοῦ οὐ [4] [i] κληρονομήσουσιν. 11. καὶ [v] ταῦτά τινες ἦτε· ἀλλὰ [w] ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ [x] ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλ'

f See iii. 16. With ἤ, ver. 2 above.
g See ver. 1.
h See iv. 20.
i xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Mt. xxv. 34. κληρον., Gal. iv. 30 (Gen. xxi. 10); Heb. i. 14, vi. 12; Rev. xxi. 7; Mt. v. 5, xix. 29, etc. (ζωην αιων.).
k xv. 33; Gal. vi. 7; Jas. i. 16; Isa. xli. 10.
l See v. 9.
m See v. 10.
n Heb. xiii. 4; Lk. xviii. 11; Job xxiv. 15; -ευω more freq.
o *H.l.*, of persons; Prov. xxv. 15, xxvi. 22. See note below.
p 1 Tim. i. 10. See Lev. xviii. 22.
q 1 Pet. iv. 15; Jo. xii. 6, etc.; ο κλεπτων, Eph. iv. 28.
r See v. 11.
s See v. 11.
t See v. 11.
u See v. 11.
v As if for τουτο, Jo. xv. 17; 3 Jo. 4.
w Acts xxii. 16; Job ix. 30; *cf.* Jo. xiii. 10; Rev. i. 5 (λουω); Eph. v. 26 and Tit. iii. 5 (λουτρον).
x See i. 2.

[1] **τουτο**, all uncc. but L.

[2] **Θεου βασιλειαν** (in this order: *cf.* ver. 10): all uncc. but L.

[3] **ουτε** *seven times* (**πορνοι . . . πλεονεκται**), *then* **ου** (**μεθυσοι**), **ου, ουχ**: ℵACP. BL, and Syrian text, read **ουτε** eight times, then **ου, ουχ**. D*, **ουδε** seven times, **ουτε** twice, then **ουχ**.

[4] *Om.* **ου** all uncc. but LP (Syrian); *cf.* ver. 9.

God's kingdom" (which nevertheless they profess to seek, i. 7 ff.)—an axiom of revelation, indeed of conscience, but the over-clever sometimes forget elementary moral principles; hence the **μὴ πλανᾶσθε**. Their conduct puts them on a level with the heathen (**οἱ ἄδικοι**, 1). **Θεοῦ βασιλείαν** (doubly anarthrous; see note on ii. 5), "*God's* kingdom"—the expression indicating the region and nature of the realm from which unrighteousness excludes; "the kingdom of God is righteousness" (Rom. xiv. 17; *cf.* Matt. v. 10, xiii. 43, Luke xiv. 14, Rev. i. 18, ii. 8 f., etc.). The *deception* taking place on this fundamental point springs from the frivolity of the Hellenic nature; it had a specific cause in the libertinism deduced from the gospel of Free Grace and the abrogation of the Mosaic Law (12 f., see notes; *cf.* Rom. vi. 1, 15, Gal. v. 13).—In vv. 9*b*, 10 the general warning is carried into detail. Ten classes of sinners are distinguished, *uncleanness* and *greed* furnishing the prevailing categories (*cf.* v. 9-11): "neither fornicators (the conspicuous sin of Cor.: v. 1, etc.; vii. 2) . . . neither covetous men—no drunkards, no railers, no plunderers (see txtl. note) will inherit," etc. *Idolaters* are ranged between *fornicators* and *adulterers*—an association belonging to the cultus of Aphrodité Pandemos at Cor. **μαλακοί**, *soft*, *voluptuous*, appears in this connexion to signify general addiction to sins of the flesh; lexical ground is wanting for the sense of *pathici*, suggested to some interpreters by the following word and by the use of *molles* in Latin. For **ἀρσενοκοῖται** (cl. **παιδεράσται**), whose sin of Sodom was widely and shamelessly practised by the Greeks; *cf.* Rom. i. 24 ff., written from Cor. The three detached classes appended by **οὐ** to the **οὔτε** list were specified in v. 11; see notes.

Ver. 11. **καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε**: "And these things you were, some (of you)". The neuter **ταῦτα** is contemptuous—"such abominations!" **τινὲς** softens the aspersion; the majority of Cor. Christians had not been guilty of extreme vice. The stress lies on the tense of **ἦτε**; "you *were*"—a thing of the past, *cf.* Rom. vi. 19, Eph. ii. 11 f.—"But you washed yourselves! but you were sanctified; but you were justified!"—**ἀλλὰ** thrice repeated, with joyful emphasis, as in 2 Cor. ii. 17, vii. 11. The first of the three vbs. is mid., the other two pass. in voice. **ἀπελούσασθε** refers to baptism (*cf.* Acts xxii. 16, Col. ii. 11 f., Eph. v. 26 f., 1 Pet. iii. 21; see i. 13 for its signal importance), in its spiritual meaning; the form of the vb. calls attention to the initiative of the Cor. in getting rid, at the call of God, of the filth of their old life; in baptism their penitent faith took deliberate and formal expression, with this effect. But behind their action in submitting to baptism, there was *the action of God*, operating to the effect described by the terms **ἡγιάσθητε, ἐδικαιώθητε**. These twin conceptions of the Christian state in its beginning appear commonly in the reverse order (see i. 30, Rom. vi. 19, etc.); in Rom. v.,

[y] ἐδικαιώθητε [y] ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου[1] Ἰησοῦ[2] καὶ [y] ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

12. Πάντα μοι [z] ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ πάντα [za] συμφέρει· πάντα μοι

y See iv. 4.
z x. 23 (same contrast); 2 Cor. xii. 4; freq. in Gospp. and Acts.
a x. 23, xii. 7; 2 Cor. viii. 10, xii. 1; Heb. xii. 10; Mt. v. 29 f., xviii. 6, xix. 10; Jo. xi. 50, xvi. 7, xviii. 14; Acts xix. 19, xx. 20.

[1] (Κυρ.) ημων (?), BCP, 17, 37, 73, vg., syrr., cop.; W.H. *bracket.*

[2] *Add* Χριστου all uncc. but ADcL; all crit. edd.

vi. they are seen to be related as the resurrection and death of Christ, and in Rom. vi. to be figured respectively in the ἀνάδυσις and κατάδυσις which formed the two movements of baptism; see notes *ad locc.*, also Tit. iii. 5 ff. The order of the words does not justify Calovius, Lipsius, and Mr., with Romanist interpreters, in finding here "the ethical *continuatio justificationis*,"—an explanation contrary to the uniform Pauline signification of δικαιόω; the Ap. is thinking (in contrast with vv. 9 f.) of the status attained by his readers as ἅγιοι (i. 2, iii. 17, vi. 1), *behind which* lay the fundamental fact of their δικαίωσις. The qualifying prpl. phrases both belong to the three closely linked vbs. Baptism is received "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (quoted with formal solemnity: *cf.* note on i. 2): "in the Spirit of our God" it is validated and brings its appropriate blessings (*cf.* John iii. 5-8: *water* is the formal, *the Sp.* the essential source of the new birth).

Βαπτίζειν ἐν Πν. ἁγίῳ was the distinctive work of Jesus Christ (Matt. iii. 11, etc.); to be ἐν Πνεύματι (Θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ) is the distinctive state of a Christian, including every element of the new life (19, ii. 12, iii. 16, 2 Cor. i. 21 f., Rom. v. 5, viii. 2, 9, etc.). *Sanctification* esp. is grounded in the *Holy* Spirit; but He is an agent in *justification* too, for His witness to sonship implies the assurance of forgiveness (Rom. viii. 15 ff.). *The name of our Lord Jesus Christ* sums up the baptismal confession (*cf.* Rom. x. 8 ff.); *the Spirit of our God* constitutes the power by which that confession is inspired, and the regeneration effectuated which makes it good: the two factors are identified in xii. 3 (see note). "Our God," in emphatic distinction from the gods in whose service the Cor. had been defiled (see viii. 4 ff., 2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2; *cf.* Ps. xcix. 9).

§ 19. THE SANCTITY OF THE BODY, vi. 12-20. The laxity of morals distinguishing the Cor. Church was in some instances defended, or half-excused, by appealing to the principle of *Christian liberty*, which P. had himself enunciated in asserting the freedom of Gentile Christians from the Mosaic ceremonial restrictions. From his lips the libertarians took their motto, Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν. The Ap. does not retract this sentence, but he guards it from abuse: (1) by setting over against it the balancing principle of *expediency*, οὐ πάντα συμφέρει; (2) by defining, in the twofold example of ver. 13, the sphere within which it applies, *distinguishing liberty from licence.* This leads up to a reiterated prohibition of fornication, grounded on its nature as a sin against the body itself, and an act which flagrantly contradicts the sanctity of its limbs, as they belong to Christ, being purchased by Him for the service of God (15-20).

Ver. 12. Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν stands twice here, and twice in x. 23; P. harps on the saying in a way to indicate that it was a watchword with some Cor. party—perhaps amongst both Paulinists and Apollonians; his μοι endorses the declaration (*cf.* viii. 8 f., x. 23 ff., Rom. xiv. 14, 20). Very likely it had been quoted in the Church Letter. This sentence, like those of ii. 14, iii. 21, iv. 1 (see notes), recalls the attributes of the Stoic ideal σοφός, to whom it belongs ἐξεῖναι ὡς βουλόμεθα διεξάγειν (Arr.-Epict., II., i., 21-28; see Hn. *ad loc.*).—ἀλλ᾽ οὐ πάντα συμφέρει: "Yes, but not all things are advantageous".—Συμφέρει (*conducunt*) signifies *contributing* to some one's benefit—here *one's own*, in x. 24 *one's neighbour's.*—Parl. to the former ἀλλ᾽ οὐ, is ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι κ.τ.λ.: "All things are in my domain; yes, but *I* will not be dominated by anything". That is "unprofitable" to a man which "gets the mastery" over him. "Such and such a thing is in my power; I will take care that it does not get me into its power. I will never by abuse of my liberty forfeit that liberty in its noblest part." This gives the *self-regarding*, as x. 23 f. the *other-regarding* rule of Christian temperance in the use of things lawful. *Cf.* the instructive chapter Περὶ

[a] ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ [b] ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπό τινος. 13. τὰ [c] βρώματα τῇ [d] κοιλίᾳ καὶ ἡ [d] κοιλία τοῖς [c] βρώμασιν, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς καὶ [e] ταύτην καὶ [e] ταῦτα [f] καταργήσει· τὸ δὲ σῶμα οὐ τῇ [g] πορνείᾳ, ἀλλὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ ὁ Κύριος τῷ σώματι· 14. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς καὶ τὸν Κύριον [h] ἤγειρεν, καὶ ἡμᾶς [1] [i] ἐξεγερεῖ [1] διὰ τῆς [k] δυνάμεως [k] αὐτοῦ. 15. [l] οὐκ [l] οἴδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν [2] [m] μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστιν;

b vii. 4; Lk. xxii. 25; Eccl. ix. 17.
c 1 Tim. iv. 3; Heb. ix. 10, xiii. 9; Mt. xiv. 15; Mk. vii. 19; Lk. iii. 11.
d In this sense, Phil. iii. 19; Mt. xv. 17; Rev. x. 9 f.
e For repetition, *cf.* vii. 7.
f See i. 28.
g See v. 1.
h xv. 4 ff., 2 Cor. i. 9, iv. 14, v. 15; Rom. *passim*; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 20; Col. ii. 12; 1 Th. i. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Heb. xi. 19; 1 Pet. i. 21, etc.
i Rom. ix. 17 (Exod. ix. 16), in diff. sense.
k See i. 18.
l See iii. 16, vi. 2.
m In like sense, xii. 12 ff.; Rom. xii. 4 f.; Eph. iv. 16, 25, v. 30.

[1] **εξεγερει**, ℵCD³KL, etc., syrr., cop., many Ff.; **εξεγειρει**, AD*PQ 37. **εξηγειρεν** (?), B 67** (a group preserving some valuable readings), cod. amiatinus of vg.; W.H. *marg.* Beza and Elzevir read **υμας**, with no certain MS. authority.

[2] **ημων**, ℵ*A.

ἐλευθερίας in Arr.-Epict., IV., i. For the play on **ἔξεστιν**, *cf.* ii. 15. The emphatic **οὐκ ἐγὼ** is the jealous self-assertion of the spiritual freeman, fearful of falling again under the dominion of the flesh: *cf.* ix. 26 f., Gal. v. 13, 16.

Ver. 13. The maxim "All things are lawful to me" has been guarded within its province; now it must be *limited to its province:* "Foods (are) for the belly, and the belly for its foods".—**τὰ βρώματα**, *the different kinds of food*—about which Jewish law, ascetic practice (Rom. xiv. 1 ff.), and the supposed defilement of the *idolothyta* (viii., x. 25 ff.) caused many embarrassments. The Ap., adopting the profound principle of Jesus (Mark vii. 15-23), cuts through these knotty questions at a stroke: the **βρώματα** are morally indifferent; for they belong to the **κοιλία**, not the **καρδία** (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 17). *Food* and *the stomach* are appropriated to each other; the main question about the former is whether or no it suits the latter.—A second reason for the moral indifference of matters of the table lies in *their perishing nature;* **κοιλία** and **βρώματα** play a large and troublesome part in the existing order, "but God will abolish both this and these". For the somewhat rare antithetic repetition of **οὗτος**, *cf.* vii. 7, also Josh. viii. 22 (LXX). The nutritive system forms no part of the permanent self; it belongs to the passing **σχῆμα τ. κόσμου τούτου** (vii. 31), to the constitution of "flesh and blood" (xv. 50) and the **σῶμα ψυχικόν**; hence the indifference of foods (viii. 8): "quæ destruentur, per se liberum habent usum" (Bg.; *cf.* Col. ii. 20 f.).—"But the body" has relations more vital and influential than those concerned with its perishing sustenance—it "is not for fornication, but for the Lord and the Lord for the body": the same double dat. clause of mutual appropriation links **τὸ σῶμα** with **ὁ Κύριος** as **τὰ βρώματα** with **ἡ κοιλία**; each is made for the other and requires the other. "The body"—regarded as a whole, in contrast with its temporary apparatus—is fashioned for the Lord's use; to yield it to harlotry is to traverse Christ's rights in it and disqualify oneself for a part in His resurrection (14). The Lord Jesus and **πορνεία** contested for the bodies of Christian men; loyal to Him they must renounce *that*, yielding to *that* they renounce Him. In Gr. philosophical ethics the distinction drawn in this ver. had no place; the two appetites concerned were treated on the same footing, as matters of physical function, the higher ethical considerations attaching to sexual passion being ignored. Hence the degradation of woman and the decay of family life, which brought Greek civilisation to a shameful end.

Ver. 14 is parl. to ver. 13*b* ("God" the agent in both), as ver. 13*c* to ver. 13*a*: the previous **δὲ** contrasted the several *natures* of **βρώματα** and **σῶμα**; this the opp. *issues*, **καταργήσει** and **ἐξεγερεῖ**. **ὁ Κύριος** is the determining factor of both contrasts. "God will abolish both the belly and its foods . . . but God both raised up the Lord, and will raise up us also through His power." P. substitutes "us," in the antithesis, for "our bodies," since *the man*, including his body (see xv. 35, 49), is the subject of resurrection. The saying **ἀπαρχὴ Χριστός**, of xv. 23, supplies the nexus between **τ. Κύριον ἤγειρεν** and **ἡμ. ἐξεγερεῖ**; *cf.* also 2 Cor. iv. 14, Rom. viii. 11, xiv. 9, Col. iii. 1, Phil. iii. 21; John v. 20-30, xiv. 2 ff., etc.

[n] ἄρας [1] οὖν τὰ [m] μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιήσω [o] πόρνης [m] μέλη; μὴ γένοιτο· 16. [l] ἢ [l] οὐκ [l] οἴδατε ὅτι ὁ [p] κολλώμενος τῇ [o] πόρνῃ ἓν σῶμά ἐστιν; "Ἔσονται γάρ," [q] φησίν, "οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν·" 17. ὁ δὲ [p] κολλώμενος τῷ Κυρίῳ ἓν πνεῦμά ἐστι. 18. [r] φεύγετε

n See v. 2. o Heb. xi. 31; Jas. ii. 25; Rev. xvii. 1 ff.; Mt. xxi. 31 f.; Lk. xv. 30. p Rom. xii. 9; Acts v. 13, etc.; Lk. x. 11, xv. 15; esp. Mt. xix. 5 (Gen. ii. 24). q 2 Cor. x. 10; Heb. viii. 5, in parenthetic use. r x. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 22; Sir. xxi. 2.

[1] **αρα ουν**, CP, and several minuscc. Final **σ** of **αρας** easily lost in following **ο**; and **αρα ουν** is plausibly Pauline (G, **η αρα ουν**).

The prefix in **ἐξ-εγερεῖ** is local—*out of* (*sc.* the grave; *cf.* **ἐξ-ανάστασις**, Phil. iii. 11); not *de massa dormientium* (Bg.). The raising of Christ (*cf.* Eph. i. 19 ff.), then of Christians, from the dead is the supreme exhibition of God's supernatural "power" (see Rom. iv. 17-24, Matt. xxii. 29, Acts xxvi. 8, etc.). Christ is raised as "Lord," and will rule our life yon side of death more completely than on this (Acts ii. 36, Col. i. 18, Phil. iii. 20 f.).

Vv. 15-17 unfold in its repulsiveness, by vivid concrete presentment, the opposition between the two claimants for bodily service already contrasted: the rival of Christ is **ἡ πόρνη**! "Or (if what I have said is not sufficient) do you not know that your bodies are *Christ's limbs?* Should I then take away the limbs of Christ and make them *a harlot's limbs?* Far be it!"—**Αἴρω** is *to remove*, *carry off*, as in v. 2 (see parls.), Vg. *tollens*, implying "a voluntary and determined act" (Ed.); for the introductory aor. ptp., see Bn., §§ 132, 138. **ποιήσω**, either (deliberative) aor. sbj. or fut. ind.—"Am I to make, etc.?" or, "Am I going to make?" The former idiom suits an act of *choice;* this question the tempted Cor. Christian must put to himself: *cf.* the interrog. form of Rom. vi. 1, 15 (**-ωμεν**).

What is true of Christian men individually, that they are **μέλη Χριστοῦ** and parts of the **σῶμα Χριστοῦ**, is true specifically of the physical frame of each; similarly in vv. 19 f. Paul applies to the Christian man's *body* the glorious truth stated respecting the Christian society in iii. 16 f. In the Hellenic view, the body was the perishing envelope of the man; in the Scriptural view, it is the abiding vehicle of his spirit. To devote the body to a harlot, one must first withdraw it from Christ's possession: to do *that*, and *for such a purpose*—the bare statement shows the infamy of the proposal. The Biblical formula of deprecation, **μὴ γένοιτο**, is frequent also in Epictetus; *cf. Odyssey*, vii., 316, **μὴ τοῦτο φίλον Διῒ πατρὶ γένοιτο.**

Ver. 16 justifies the strong expression **πόρνης μέλη** (15), implying that the alliance is a kind of incorporation: "Or (if you object to my putting it in this way), do you not know that he who cleaves to the harlot is one body (with her)?" **ὁ κολλώμενος** (see parls.), *qui agglutinatur scorto* (Bz.), indicates that sexual union constitutes a permanent bond between the parties. What has been done lives, morally, in both; neither is henceforth free of the other. The Divine sentence (uttered prophetically by Adam) which the Ap. quotes to this effect was pronounced upon the first wedded pair, and holds of every such union, whether lawful or unlawful—honourably true (vii. 4, Heb. xiii. 4), or shamefully. In Eph. v. 31 the same Scripture is cited at length, where the Ap. is making out the correspondence between wedlock and Christ's union with the Church: in that place the spiritual union is treated as parl. to the natural union, where this follows the Divine order; here it stands out as prohibitory to a natural union which violates that order. Here only Paul uses the parenthetical **φησίν** ("says He," *sc. God*) in citing Scripture; it is common in Philo, and in the Ep. of Barnabas.—**ἔσονται . . . εἰς** (Hebraism) = **γενήσονται.**

Ver. 17. **ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ Κυρίῳ κ.τ.λ.**: "But he who cleaves to the Lord is one spirit (with Him)". Adhesion by the act of faith (i. 21, etc.) to Christ (as *Lord*, *cf.* xii. 3, etc.) establishes a spiritual communion of the man with Him as real and close as the other, bodily communion ("tam arcte quam conjuges sunt unum corpus," Bg.), and as much more influential and enduring as the spirit is above the flesh. "*The* Spirit" is the uniting bond (iii. 16, Rom. viii. 8 f., etc.), but the Ap. is thinking of the *nature* and *sphere* of this union; hence the anarthrous, generic **πνεῦμα**, contrasted with **σάρξ** (16). In 2 Cor. iii. 17 "the Lord" is identified with "the Spirit," and believers are repeatedly said

τὴν [s] πορνείαν. πᾶν [t u] ἁμάρτημα ὃ ἐὰν [u] ποιήσῃ [v] ἄνθρωπος, [w] ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ [x] πορνεύων [y] εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα [y] ἁμαρτάνει. 19. [1] ἢ [1] οὐκ [1] οἴδατε ὅτι τὸ [1] σῶμα [1] ὑμῶν [z] ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν Ἁγίου [2] Πνεύματός [2] ἐστιν, οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ Θεοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὲ [a] ἑαυτῶν; 20. [b] ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ [b c] τιμῆς. [d] δοξάσατε [e] δὴ τὸν [d] Θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν καὶ [3] ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ὑμῶν, ἅτινά ἐστι τοῦ Θεοῦ.[3]

s See v. 1.
t Rom. iii. 25; Mk. iii. 28 f.; Isa. lviii. 1.
u 2 Cor. xi. 7; Jo. viii. 34; 1 Jo. iii. 4, 8 f.; Jas. v. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 22.
v See iii. 4.
w Prep., xv. 27; 2 Cor. xii. 2.
x x. 8; Rev. ii. 14, 20, xvii. 2, xviii. 3, 9; Mk. x. 19; Ps. lxxii. 27.
y viii. 12; Mt. xviii. 15; Lk. xv. 18, 21; Gen. xx. 6, 9.
z See iii. 16.
a Genitive, see i. 12.
b In this sense, vii. 23; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Rev. v. 9, xiv. 3 f.; ἐξαγορ., Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5.
c In this sense, Mt. xxvii. 6, 9; Acts iv. 34, v. 2 f., vii. 16, xix. 19.
d 2 Cor. ix. 13; Rom. i. 21, xv. 6, 9; Gal. i. 24; 1 Pet. ii. 12, iv. 11, 16; Lk. *passim*, etc.
e *H.l.* in P.; Heb. ii. 16; 4 times in Acts and Lk.

[1] **τα σωματα**, A²L, and minuscc.[45], cop.; *cf.* ver. 15.

[2] **πνευματος αγιου** (?): B 120, f. vg. So W.H. *marg.*

[3] *Om.* **και . . . Θεου** all pre-Syrian uncc. The vg. (after the old lat.) reads, *glorificate* (*clarificate*, Cypr., Ambrst.) *deum et portate* (*tollite*, Tert.) *in corpore vestro: portate* (*scil. Deum*) is probably due to the corruption of **αρα γε** (found in Methodius before **δοξασατε**) into **αρατε**. This error was widely spread; there are traces of it in Chrysostom. See W.H., *Notes on Selected Readings*, p. 114.

to be **ἐν Πνεύματι**; so that between them and Christ there exists a **κοινωνία Πνεύματος** (i. 9, 2 Cor. xiii. 13; John xvi. 14, etc.). For the intimacy of this association of members with the Head, see Gal. ii. 20, Eph. ii. 5 f., iii. 16 f., Col. ii. 10, iii. 1 ff., John xv. 1 ff., xvii. 23 ff., etc.

Ver. 18. With vehement abruptness P. turns from exposition to exhortation. "*Flee* fornication"—other sins may be combated; this must be *fled*, as by Joseph in Potiphar's house. **φεύγετε** the opposite of **κολλᾶσθαι** (16). The parl. **φεύγετε ἀπὸ τ. εἰδωλολατρείας** of x. 14 shows "the connexion in Cor. between impurity and idolatry" (Ed.: *cf.* the lists of sins in 9 and v. 11.)—Ἡ **πορνεία** contradicts Christ's rights in the body (13-17) and severs the committer from Him; P. has now to say that this is a sin against the nature of the human body: "Every act of sin (**ἁμάρτημα**) which a man may possibly do, is outside of the body; but the fornicator (**ὁ πορνεύων**) sins against his own body". The point of this saying lies in the contrasted prepositions **ἐκτὸς** and **εἰς**: all bodily sins "defile the flesh" (2 Cor. vii. 1), but other vices—those of the **κοιλία**, *e.g.*—look outside the body; this in its whole essence lies within our physical nature, so that, while it appropriates the person of another (16), it is *a self-violation*. Hence transgressions of the Seventh Commandment are "sins of the flesh" and "of the passions" *par éminence*. They engage and debauch the whole person; they "enter into the heart," for "they proceed out of the heart" and touch the springs of being; in the highest degree they "defile the man" (Mark vii. 20 ff.). That inchastity is extreme *dishonour* is realised in the one sex; Christianity makes it equally so in the other.

Vv. 19, 20. What a *deadly* sin, an act of high treason, this is for the Christian, Paul's final appeal shows: "Or (if you do not yet realise the heinousness of fornication), do you not know that your *body* is the temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you have (**οὗ ἔχετε**, gen. by *attraction* to **Πνεύματος**) from God?" The Holy Spirit dwells in the readers: *how but in their body*, since *they* are in the body? (iii. 16, *cf.* Rom. viii. 11; also John ii. 21): there is the same tacit inference from whole to part as in ver. 15; the same assumption that the body is essential to the man, which underlies the doctrine of the Resurrection (xv.). The Christian estimate of **πορνεία** is thus categorically opposed to the heathen estimate. In the temple of Aphrodité prostitutes were priestesses, and commerce with them was counted a *consecration;* it is an absolute *desecration* of God's true temple in the man himself.—"And (that) you are not your own?" This too P. asks his readers if they "do not know?" The possessor is *God*, who has occupied them by His Spirit, having first purchased them with His Son's blood: *cf.* i. 30, iii. 23; Rom. viii. 32, 2 Cor. v. 18 ff., Acts xx. 28. "For you were *bought* at a price!"—the **τιμὴ**

VII. 1. Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατέ μοι[1]· [a] Καλὸν [b] ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ [c] ἅπτεσθαι· 2. διὰ δὲ τὰς[2] [d] πορνείας[2] ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ

a vv. 8, 26 Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Tim. ii. 3; Mt. xviii. 8; Gen. ii. 18. b In this connection, Mt. xix. 5, 10 (Gen. ii. 24). c In this sense, N.T. *h.l.*; Gen, xx. 6; Prov. vi. 29. d See v. 1; Mt. xv. 19; Mk. vii. 21.

[1] *Om.* μοι ℵBC 17, 46, am. fu.*, Tert. So crit. edd.

[2] την πορνειαν: G, vg. syr[utr.], Tert., Ambrst.

P. does not need to state; it was τίμιον αἷμα (1 Pet. i. 18 f.; Eph. i. 7, Matt. xx. 28, Rev. v. 9). Ἀγοράζω, *to purchase*, syn. with (ἀπο)λυτρόομαι, *to ransom* (i. 30, Tit. ii. 14): the latter points to the means of redemption, the former to the proprietorship which it creates (*cf.* περιεποιήσατο, Acts xx. 28); both ideas meet in Eph. i. 14. The gen. of price, τιμῆς, indicates the value at which God *rates* His purchase.—**δοξάσατε δὴ κ.τ.λ.**: "Now glorify God *in your body*"—*sc.* by a chaste life (contrast Rom. ii. 23). δή (rare in N.T.; *h. l.* in P.), kindred to the temporal ἤδη, makes the command peremptory, breaking off discussion (*cf.* Acts xiii. 2). ἐν, *in*, not *with*, your *body*—the temple wherein each man serves as priest; here the ναός, in Rom. xii. 2 the θυσία.—**καὶ ἐν τ. πνεύματι κ.τ.λ.**, of the T.R., is a Syrian gloss, added as if to complete the sense; *cf.* vii. 34.

§ 20. MARRIAGE OR CELIBACY? vii. 1-9. At this point the Ap. takes up the questions addressed to him by the Cor. Church (see *Introd.*, chap. ii.). In replying to Paul's previous letter, they had asked for clearer instructions to regulate their intercourse with men living in heathen sins (v.); this request led up to the inquiries respecting the desirability of *marriage*, respecting the duties of married Christians, and the lawfulness of divorce for a Christian married to a heathen, with which ch. vii. is occupied. The headings of vv. 1, 25, chh. viii., xi., xvi., indicate various matters on which the Cor. had consulted their Ap. The local impress and temporary aim of the directions here given on the subject of marriage must be borne in mind; otherwise Paul's treatment will appear to be narrow and unsympathetic, and out of keeping with the exalted sense of its spiritual import disclosed in Eph. v. Indeed, ch. xi. 3-15 of this Ep. show that P. had larger conception on the relations of man and woman than are here unfolded. The obscurity of expression attaching to several passages betrays the writer's embarrassment; this was due partly to the low moral sensibility of the Cor., and partly to the uncertain continuance of the existing order of life (26-31), which weighed with the Ap. at the time of writing and led him to discourage the formation of domestic ties. In later Epistles, when the present economy had opened out into a larger perspective, the ethics of marriage and the Christian household are worthily developed (see Col. and Eph.).

Ver. 1. **Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε**: "Now about the things on which you wrote (to me)".—Περὶ ὧν = περὶ τούτων περὶ ὧν (not ἅ); *cf.* the constructions of rel. pron. in ver. 39, x. 30; see Wr., p. 198.—δὲ *metabatikon* leads to a new topic, in orderly transition from the last: "Now I proceed to deal with the matters of your letter to me"; the questions proposed about marriage are discussed on the ground prepared by the teaching of chh. v. and vi. They form a part of the wide social conflict between Christian and Pagan life at Corinth: see *Introd.* to Div. II. P. answers at once, affirmatively, the question of principle put to him: "It is *right* (καλόν, *honourable, morally befitting—pulchrum, conveniens*, Bg.; see note on v. 6) for one (ἀνθρώπῳ, *homini*: not ἀνδρί, *man* distinctively, *viro*) not to touch a woman" (to live in strict celibacy).—**καλὸν** contradicts the οὐ καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ present in the minds of some of the questioners, influenced by the sensuous atmosphere of Cor. Paul is not disparaging marriage, as though he meant καλλίον μὴ ἅπτ., but *defending celibacy* against those who thought it inhuman.

Ver. 2: a single life is good in itself, "but" is not generally expedient at Cor.—**διὰ τὰς πορνείας**, "because of the (prevalent) fornications" (the unusual pl. indicating the variety and extent of profligacy: *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 21); for this reason marriage, as a rule, is advisable here.—It must be *Christian* marriage, as opposed to heathen libertinism and Jewish polygamy: "let each (man) have his own wife, and each (woman) her proper husband". The pr. impv., ἐχέτω (*sc. directive*, not permissive), signifies "have and keep to" (*cf.* 2 Tim. i 13).

[e] γυναῖκα [e] ἐχέτω, καὶ[1] ἑκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω.[1] 3. τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν [f] ὀφειλομένην[2] εὔνοιαν[2] [f g] ἀποδιδότω· [h] ὁμοίως [h] δὲ [h] καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρί· 4. ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ [i] ἐξουσιάζει, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνήρ· [h] ὁμοίως [h] δὲ [h] καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ [i] ἐξουσιάζει, ἀλλ' ἡ γυνή· 5. μὴ [k] ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, [l] εἰ [l] μή [l] τι ἂν[3] [m] ἐκ [m] συμφώνου [n] πρὸς [n] καιρόν, ἵνα [o] σχολάζητε[4] τῇ νηστείᾳ[5] καὶ[5] τῇ [p] προσευχῇ καὶ πάλιν [q] ἐπὶ τὸ [q] αὐτὸ [q] συνέρχησθε,[6] ἵνα μὴ

e See v. 1.
f οφειλην, Rom. xiii. 7; Mt. xviii. 32.
g Rom. xii. 17; 1 Th. v. 15; 1 Tim. v. 4; Rev. xviii. 6; Mt. xviii. 28 ff., xxii. 21; Lk. x. 35.

h Jas. ii. 25; Mt. xxvii. 41; Lk. v. 10, x. 32. i See vi. 12. k See vi. 7 f. In this sense, Ex. xxi. 10. l 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Lk. ix. 13. m *H.l.* συμφωνως, Eccl. vii. 15; -νειν, Acts v. 9, xv. 15, etc.; -νησις, 2 Cor. vi. 15. n 1 Th. ii. 17; Lk. viii. 13; Wisd. iv. 4. o Mt. xii. 44; Ex. v. 8, 17; Ps. xlv. 10. p In sing., absol., Rom. xii. 12; Col. iv. 2; Acts i. 4. q (ητε) xi. 20, xiv. 23; Acts i. 15, ii. 47; Lk. xvii. 35.

[1] Om. **και εκαστη . . . εχετω**: G, Tert.; by homœoteleuton.

[2] **οφειλην**: all pre-Syrian uncc., 17, 46, 67**, vg. cop. **οφειλ. ευνοι.**: a gloss.

[3] *Om.* **αν** (?) B, Dam., Clem.; W.H. *bracket*. A copyist's grammatical addition (?).

[4] **σχολασητε**, all pre-Syrian uncc. (see note below).

[5] *Om.* **τη νηστειᾳ και** pre-Syrian uncc. and verss. An ecclesiastical gloss.

[6] **ητε**, all uncc. but KLP. Verss. render freely.

The variation **ἑαυτοῦ γυν. . . . ἴδιον ἄνδρα** distinguishes the husband as head and principal (xi. 3); "if this passage stood alone, it would be unsafe to build upon it, but this diff. of expression pervades the whole of the Epp." (Lt.: *cf.* xiv. 35; Eph. v. 22, etc.; Tit. ii. 5; 1 Peter iii. 1, 5). Throughout the passage there is a careful balancing of the terms relating to man and wife, bringing out the equality of the Christian law.—P. does not lay down here the *ground* of marriage, as though it were "ordained for a remedy against sin," but gives a special reason why those should marry at Cor. who might otherwise have remained single: see note on **δέ**, ver. 1.

Vv. 3, 4. Within the bonds of wedlock, "the due" should be yielded (3) by each for the satisfaction and according to the rights of the other (4). This dictum defends marital intercourse against rigorists, as that of ver. 1 commends celibacy against sensualists. The word **ὀφειλή** guards, both positively and negatively, the **κοίτη ἀμίαντος** (Heb. xiii. 4); what is due to one alone must be given to one alone (**τῇ γυναικί, τῷ ἀνδρί**). The gloss of the T.R., as old as the Syriac Version, is a piece of mistaken delicacy.—The precise repetition of **ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ** corrects the onesidedness of common sentiment and of public law,—both Greek and Jewish: *she* is as much the mistress of his person, as *he* the master of hers.—**ἐξουσιάζω** (= **ἐξουσίαν ἔχω**) implies *moral* power, *authority* (*cf.* vi. 12). **τοῦ ἰδίου . . . οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει**, "elegans paradoxon" (Bg.)—his (her) own is not his (her) own.

Ver. 5. **μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε κ.τ.λ.**: "Do not rob one another"—*sc.* of the **ὀφειλή**; the deprivation is an injustice (same vb. as in vi. 7 f.); "congruit hoc verbum cum verbo *debendi*" (Bg.). This also, with ver. 4, against the rigorists. The impvs. of this context are *pr.*, relating to habits of life.—**εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ.** qualifies the command not to rob, by stating an exception: this exception, however, the Ap. "valde limitat" (Bg.), first by **τι** (in *some measure, somehow*), next by **ἄν** (*haply, if the case should arise*), thirdly by **ἐκ συμφώνου** (*of consent:* making the separation no longer robbery), lastly by **πρὸς καιρόν** (*for a season*). Such separation may be made for specific religious ends—"that you may be disengaged for prayer" (*vacetis orationi*, Vg.), and with a view to renewed intercourse (**καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε**). So fearful was the Ap. of putting a strain on the ill-disciplined Cor. nature, with sensual incitements rife in the atmosphere: "lest Satan be tempting you because of your want of self-control".—**ἀκρασία**, later Gr. for **ἀκράτεια** (opp. of **ἐγκράτεια**, *cf.* ix. 25), signifies *non-mastery* of appetite.—**Σχολάζω** (here in *aor.*, of particular occasion; **πειράζητε**, *pr.*, of constant possibility), construed with dat. or **πρός τι**, in cl. Gr. often denotes leisure from ordinary for higher pursuits—*e.g.*, **σχολάζειν μουσικῇ, φιλοσοφίᾳ**; also used of scholars who "devote themselves" to a master: a negative condition of **προσκαρτερεῖσ-**

[r] πειράζῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ [rs] Σατανᾶς διὰ τὴν [t] ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν.[1] 6. τοῦτο δὲ λέγω κατὰ [u] συγγνώμην, οὐ κατ᾽ [v] ἐπιταγήν· 7. θέλω γὰρ[2] πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν, ἀλλ᾽ ἕκαστος ἴδιον [w] χάρισμα[3] ἔχει[3] ἐκ Θεοῦ, ὃς[4] μὲν [x] οὕτως ὃς[4] δὲ [x] οὕτως. 8. λέγω δὲ τοῖς [y] ἀγάμοις καὶ ταῖς [z] χήραις, [a] Καλὸν αὐτοῖς ἐστιν[5] ἐὰν μείνωσιν ὡς κἀγώ· 9. [b] εἰ [b] δὲ [b] οὐκ [c] ἐγκρατεύονται [d] γαμησάτωσαν· [e] κρεῖσσον[6] γάρ ἐστι [d] γαμῆσαι[7] ἢ [f] πυροῦσθαι.

r 1 Th. iii. 5 (πειραζ. ο πειραζων), Mt. iv. 1, 3; also x. 13 below. Jas. i. 13; Gen. xxii. 1; 3 Kings x. 1, etc.
s See v. 5.
t Mt. xxiii. 25; freq. in cl. Gr.; -της, 2 Tim. iii. 3. Antonym of εγκρατεια, Gal. v. 23, etc.
u N.T. *h.l.*; Sir. iii. 13.
v ver. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 3, ii. 15; Wisd. xiv. 16 (τυραννων επιταγαις).
w See i. 7.
x *Cf.* vi. 13.
y vv. 11, 32, 34. Of the *man*, Iliad iii. 40; of *woman* (rarely), Eurip. *Hel.* 690.
z 1 Tim. v. 3 ff.; Acts vi. 1, ix. 41; Jas. i. 27, etc.
a See ver. 1.
b ix. 2, xi. 6, xv. 13 ff. (δε), xvi. 22; Rom. viii. 9 (δε), xi. 21; 2 Th. iii. 10, 14 (δε); 1 Tim. iii. 5 (δε), v. 8 (δε); etc.
c ix. 25; Gen. xliii. 31; 1 Kings xiii. 12; -της, Tit. i. 8; -τεια, Gal. v. 23; Acts xxiv. 25; 2 Pet. i. 6. See ακρασια, ver. 5.
d vv. 10, 28 f., etc.; 1 Tim. iv. 3, v. 11, 14; etc.
e Phil. i. 23; 1 Pet. iii. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 21; Prov. iii. 14; *cf.* ver. 38 below, xi. 17; Heb. i. 4, etc.
f 2 Cor. xi. 29; Eph. vi. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 12; Rev. i. 15, iii. 18. *H.l.*, in this sense.

[1] B, Method. *om.* **υμων** (?); *bracketed* by W.H. May be a copyist's addition,—a case for the maxim, *Brevior lectio præferenda.*

[2] **δε** (?): ℵ*ACD*G 17, 46, latt. am. fu. cop., Or., Cyr., Dam., Cyp. (Western and Alexandrian). So Tisch., Tr., W.H., R.V., El., Nestle.
γαρ: B and Syrian uncc., syrr.

[3] **εχει χαρισμα**: all pre-Syrian uncc.

[4] **ο (μεν) . . . ο (δε)**: all pre-Syrian uncc.

[5] *Om.* **εστιν** all pre-Syrian uncc.

[6] **κρειττον**, ℵBD; **κρεισσον**, ACGLP, etc.

[7] **γαμειν** (?), ℵ*AC 17, 46. So Tisch., Tr. *marg.*, W.H. *text*, Nestle.
γαμησαι, BDGKLP, etc. W.H. *marg.*, R.V.

θαι τῇ προσευχῇ (Rom. xii. 12, Col. iv. 2).

Vv. 6, 7. **τοῦτο δὲ λέγω** points to the leading direction given in ver. 2, from which vv. 3-5 digressed: "I advise you to be married (though I think celibacy good, 1), **κατὰ συγγνώμην**," *secundum indulgentiam* (Vg.)—*i.e.*, **συγκαταβαίνων τ. ἀσθενείᾳ ὑμῶν** (Thp.); **οὐ κατ᾽ ἐπιταγήν**,—*ex concessione, non ex imperio* (Bz.). The rendering "permission" is somewhat misleading; **συγγνώμη** is quite distinct from the **γνώμη** opposed to **ἐπιταγὴ** in ver. 25; it signifies either *pardon* (*venia*, excuse for a fault), or, as here, *allowance*, regard for circumstances and temperament.—In **θέλω δὲ κ.τ.λ.** the Ap. states his personal bent, which he had set aside in the recommendation just given: "But I would have all men to be as indeed myself," *sc. cœlibem*—and contentedly so (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 29). **ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν**, *paratactic* acc. (attracted to **πάντας ἀνθρώπους**) = **ὡς καὶ αὐτός εἰμι**; **καὶ** emphasises the assertion that the writer *is* what he would like others to be. It is manifest (see also ix. 5) that the Ap. was unmarried, although Clem. Alex. and some moderns have inferred otherwise from Phil. iv. 3. *That he had never been married* is by no means certain. Two things, however, are clear: that if P. had known the married state, it was before his apostleship—"wife and children are never hinted at, he goes about entirely free from such ties" (Lt.); further, that if in early life he had entered this state, it was not **δι᾽ ἀκρασίαν**; he possessed the "grace-gift" (**χάρισμα**) of undisquieted continence (opposed to **πυροῦσθαι**, 9; *cf.* Matt. xix. 12), which was in his case an adjunct of his **χάρις ἀποστολῆς**. — "However (= I cannot have every one like myself, *but*) each has a charism of his own from God, the one in this shape and the other in that." **ὁ δὲ οὕτως** does not refer to the *married* Christian, as though his state were in itself a charism, but to any special endowment for service in Christ's kingdom other than that stated. On **χάρισμα** see i. 7; and *cf.* xii. 4-11.

Vv. 8, 9 re-state the answer given in vv. 1, 2 to the question concerning celibacy *v.* marriage. "But I say to the unmarried and the widows, it is right (**καλόν**; *cf.* 1) for them if they remain as indeed I (am)." The Ap. extends the

10. Τοῖς δὲ [d] γεγαμηκόσι [e] παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλ' ὁ Κύριος, [g] γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ [h] χωρισθῆναι·[1] 11. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ [h] χωρισθῇ, μενέτω [f] ἄγαμος ἢ τῷ ἀνδρὶ [i] καταλλαγήτω· καὶ ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ

g xi. 17; 10 times besides in P.; freq. in Acts; 8 times in Syn. Gospp.

h In this sense, Mt. xix. 6; Judges iv. 11.

i 2 Cor. v. 18 ff.; Rom. v. 10; αποκαταλλ., Eph. ii. 16; Col. i. 20 f.; διαλλ., Mt. v. 24.

[1] χωρίζεσθαι, ADG (Western).

reassurance given in ver. 1, and fortifies it by his own example, so that those out of wedlock who were under no constraint to enter its bonds might be free from misgiving and reproach. τοῖς ἀγάμοις, in contrast to τοῖς γεγαμηκόσιν, ver. 10: the term is *masc.*—"to unmarried men"; the case of "maidens" is discussed later (25 ff.). "The widows," who would frequently have the disposal of themselves, are included here—they are advised again to the like effect in vv. 39 f. Holsten omits καὶ ταῖς χήραις as out of place; Bois ingeniously suggests that this may be a primitive corruption for καὶ τοῖς χήροις, "the widowers".—As the πορνεῖαι without (2), so ἀκρασία within (5) might make abstention from marriage perilous; hence the qualification added in ver. 9: "But if they have not self-control, let them marry; for better it is to marry than to burn on (with desire)".—πυροῦσθαι, pr. of continued state—"occulta flamma concupiscentiæ vastari" (Aug.); the vb. is used of any consuming passion, as in 2 Cor. xi. 29. Not "*better* in so far as marriage is sinless, burning is sinful (Matt. v. 28),"—so Mr.; if marriage and parenthood are holy (14), the fire which burns toward that end surely may be so—"the sacred lowe o' weel-placed love"; but "better" as the unsatisfied craving is a continual temptation, and according to the rule of ver. 35. Better to marry than to burn; but if marriage is impossible, better infinitely to burn than to *sin*.

§ 21. Prohibition of Divorce, vii. 10-16. Pagan sentiment and law, while condoning fornication, were exceedingly lax in permitting *divorce* (see Hermann-Stark, *Griech. Privat-alterthümer*, §§ 30. 15, 17), as Jewish practice was on the side of the husband (Matt. v. 31 f., xix. 7 ff.); and marriages were often contracted without affection. Unfit unions became irksome in the extreme, with the stricter ethics and high ideal of the new faith; in many cases one of the partners remained a heathen (12 f.). It was asked whether Christians were really "bound" (δεδουλωμένοι, 15) by the ties of the old life formed under unholy conditions, and whether it was right for man and wife to live together while one was in the kingdom of God and the other in that of Satan. These questions, propounded in the letter from Cor., Paul has now to answer—(*a*) as respects Christian couples (10 f.), (*b*) as respects married pairs divided in religion (12-16).

Vv. 10, 11. "But in the case of those that have married (τ. γεγαμηκόσιν, pf. of settled fact), I charge . . . wife not to separate from husband . . . and husband not to send away (*or* let go) wife." The parenthesis, "not I but the Lord" (it is *His* command, not mine), refers the indissolubility of marriage to *the authority of Christ*. The exceptional cause of divorce allowed by Jesus, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9; also unmentioned in Mark x. 11, Luke xvi. 18), is not contemplated in the instance of wedded Christians (Paul is addressing *both* partners at once). The Apostle's tone is changed (*cf.* 6 ff.); he is *laying down the law*, and on Supreme Authority. He cites Christ's words in distinction from his own (12), not as though his word was insufficient (see, to the contrary, 40, ii. 16, v. 3 f., xiv. 37, etc.), but inasmuch as this was a principle upon which "the Lord" had pronounced categorically.—It is noticeable that the case of the *woman* seeking separation comes first and is dwelt upon; Christianity had powerfully stirred the feminine mind at Cor. (see xi. 5 ff., xiv. 34 f.). In some cases, not so much incompatibility as ascetic aversion (*cf.* 3 f.) caused the wish to separate.—The γυναῖκα μὴ χωρισθῆναι is qualified by the parenthesis ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ: "but if indeed she have separated, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband". P. is not allowing exceptions from the rule of Christ, but advising in cases where the mischief was done; the aor. sbj., χωρισθῇ, is timeless, taking its occasion from the context: see Bn., § 98. Her remaining unmarried is virtually included in the law of Christ (Matt. v. 32, xix. 9). καταλλαγήτω, pass., "let

[k] ἀφιέναι. 12. [1] τοῖς δὲ [1] λοιποῖς ἐγὼ [1] λέγω,[1] οὐχ ὁ Κύριος, εἴ τις ἀδελφὸς γυναῖκα ἔχει [m] ἄπιστον καὶ αὐτὴ[2] [n] συνευδοκεῖ [o] οἰκεῖν [o] μετ' αὐτοῦ, μὴ [k] ἀφιέτω αὐτήν· 13. καὶ γυνὴ ἥτις[3] ἔχει ἄνδρα [m] ἄπιστον καὶ αὐτὸς[4] [n] συνευδοκεῖ[5] [o] οἰκεῖν [o] μετ' αὐτῆς, μὴ [k] ἀφιέτω αὐτόν· 14. [p] ἡγίασται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ [m] ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί,[6] καὶ [p] ἡγίασται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ [m] ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀνδρί[7]· [q] ἐπεὶ [q] ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν [r] ἀκά-

k In this sense, *h.l.*; *cf.* Mt. xix. 29; Mk. i. 20; Lk. xviii. 28; Jo. xiv. 18; Herod. v. 39; Jos. *Ant.* xv. 7, 10.
l 2 Cor. xiii. 2; Rom. xi. 7; 1 Th. iv. 13, v. 6; 1 Tim. v. 20; same idiom in Rev., Acts, and Syn. Gospp.
m See vi. 6. n Rom. i. 32; Lk. xi. 48; Acts viii. 1, xxii. 20; *cf.* ευδοκ. with inf., i. 21. o *H.l.* in N.T.; Gen. xxvii. 44. p See i. 2. q See v. 10. r 2 Cor. vi. 17 (Isa. lii. 11); Eph. v. 5; freq. in Syn. Gospp., Acts, and Rev., of πνευματα; also Acts x. 14; Rev. xvii. 4.

[1] **λεγω εγω**: ℵABCP (pre-Syrian and non-Western).

[2] **αὗτη**, latt. vg., Tert.; crit. edd.: see **ουτος**, ver. 13. In uncc. no distinction.

[3] **ει τις**: ℵD*GP, latt. vg., Chr., Ambrst., Aug., Dam. (Western).

[4] **ουτος**, all uncc. but D^cKL.

[5] **ευδοκει**, B.

[6] DG add **τη πιστη**.

[7] **αδελφῳ**, all pre-Syrian uncc.; vg. and syrr., **ανδρι**.

her get herself reconciled": the vb. indicates the fact of alienation or dissension, but not the side on which it exists (*cf.* the theological use of **καταλλάσσω** in Rom. v. 10 f.); if the husband disallows her return, she must remain **ἄγαμος**.—Romanists have inferred from the text, after Aug., and notwithstanding Matt. v. 32, that even adultery leaves the marriage-vow binding on the wronged partner; but this question is not in view here (see Ed. *in loc.*).

Vv. 12, 13. "But to the rest"—as distinguished from Christian couples (10) —"say I, not the Lord": this is *my* word, not His. On the problem of mixed marriages, which Jesus had no occasion to regulate, the Ap. delivers his own sentence. Not that he *exhorts*, whereas the Lord commands (Cm.)—**λέγω** is a word of authority (virtually repeating **παραγγέλλω**, 10), as in xiv. 34, 37, xv. 51, 2 Cor. vi. 13, Rom. xii. 3; much less, that he *disclaims inspiration* upon this point (Or., Tert., Milton), or betrays *a doubt of his competence* (Baur): he quoted the dictum of Jesus where it was available, and on the fundamental matter, and indicates frankly that in this further case he is proceeding on his personal judgment. The Christian spouse is forbidden to cast off the non-Christian in terms identical for husband and wife, only **γυνὴ ἥτις** (or **εἴ τις**: 13) standing over against **εἴ τις ἀδελφός** (12). **Ἀφίημι**, used of the **ἀνὴρ** specifically in ver. 11, is now applied to *both* parties: cl. Gr. uses **ἀποπέμπειν** or **ἀπολύειν** (Matt. v. 31) of the husband as *dismissing* the wife, **ἀπολείπειν** of the wife as *deserting* the husband; "in the structure of the two verses, with their solemn repetition, the equal footing of man and wife is indicated" (Hn.; *cf.* notes on 2-4 above). **συν-ευδοκεῖ**, "is *jointly* well-pleased,"—implying that the **ἄπιστος** agrees with the Christian spouse in deprecating separation, which the latter (after 10 f.) must needs desire to avoid; *cf.*, for the force of **συν-**, Luke xi. 48, Acts viii. 1.

Ver. 14 obviates the objection which the Christian wife or husband (for the *order*, see note on 10 f.) might feel to continued union with an unbeliever (*cf.* Paul's own warning in 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff.): "Will not the saint," some one asks, "be defiled, and the 'limbs of Christ' (vi. 15) be desecrated by intercourse with a heathen?" To such a protest **ἡγίασται γὰρ κ.τ.λ.** replies: "For the husband that is an unbeliever, *has been sanctified* in his wife," and *vice versâ*. **ἡγίασται . . . ὁ ἄπιστος** is a paradox: it does not affirm a conversion in the unbeliever remaining such—whether *incipient* or *prospective* (D.W., and some others)—the pf. tense signifies a relationship *established* for the non-Christian *in the past*,—*sc.* at the conversion of the believing spouse; but man and wife are part of each other, in such a sense (*cf.* vi. 16 f., by contrast) that the sanctification of the one includes the other so far as their wedlock is concerned. The married believer in offering her- (or him-) self to God could not but present hus-

θαρτά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ ἅγιά ἐστιν. 15. εἰ δὲ ὁ [m] ἄπιστος [h] χωρίζεται, [h] χωριζέσθω· οὐ [s] δεδούλωται ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἡ[1] ἀδελφὴ ἐν [t] τοῖς [t] τοιούτοις. [u] ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ [u x] κέκληκεν ἡμᾶς[2] ὁ [x] Θεός· 16. [v] τί γὰρ [v w] οἶδας, γύναι, [w] εἰ τὸν ἄνδρα σώσεις; ἢ [v] τί [v w] οἶδας, ἄνερ,

s ix. 19; Rom. vi. 18, 22; Gal. iv. Tit. ii. 2 Pet. ii. 19; Acts vii. 6.
t Neut., Rom. i. 32, ii. 2 f.; Gal. v. 21, 23; Eph. v. 27.
u Gal. i. 6; Eph. iv. 4; 1 Th. iv. 7.
v Here only
w *Cf.* Acts x. 18, xix. 2; Jo. ix. 25; Jer. xxxvii. 6.

[1] ℵGP om. second η.

[2] υμας (?): ℵ*ACK 46, 73, cop. (Alexandrian); so Tisch., W.H. *txt.*, Nestle, R.V. *marg.*
ημας: BDGL, latt. vg., syrr. (Western); Treg., Al., W.H. *marg.*, R.V. *txt.*, El.

band (or wife) in the same act—"sanctified *in* the wife, brother," respectively—and treats him (or her) henceforth as sacred. "Whatever the husband may be in himself, in the wife's thought and feeling he is a holy object. . . . Similarly the Christian's friends, abilities, wealth, time, are, or should be, holy" (Bt.). Marriage with an unbeliever *after* conversion is barred in 2 Cor. vi. 14.

The (relative) sanctity of the unconverted spouse is made more evident by the analogous case of *children:* "Else one must suppose that your children are unclean; but as it is, they are holy!" P. appeals to the instinct of the religious parent; the Christian father or mother cannot look on children, given by God through marriage, as things unclean. Offspring are holy as bound up with the holy parent; and this principle of family solidarity holds good of the *conjugal* tie no less than of the filial derived therefrom. See the full discussion of this text in Ed.; it has played no small part in Christian jurisprudence, and in the doctrine of Infant Baptism; it "enunciates the principle which leads to Infant Baptism, *viz.* that the child of Christian parents shall be treated as a Christian" (Lt.).—On **ἐπεὶ ἄρα,** *alioqui certe, si res se aliter haberet,* see v. 10 and parls.; **νῦν δέ,** as in v. 11, is both temporal and logical (*cf.* xv. 20, Rom. vi. 22).

Ver. 15*a*. The Christian wife or husband is not to *seek* divorce from the non-Christian (12-14); but if the latter insists on separation, it is not to be refused: "But if the unbeliever separates, he may separate"—let the separation take its course (**χωριζέσθω,** pr. impv.): for this impv. of *consent*, *cf.* ver. 36, xiv. 38.—**οὐ δεδούλωται** (pf. of *fixed condition*) "the brother or the sister in such circumstances is not kept in bondage"; *cf.* ver. 39—the stronger vb. of this passage implies that for the repudiated party to continue bound to the repudiator would be *slavery*. Christ's law forbids putting away (10 ff.), but does not forbid the one put away to accept dismissal. Whether the freedom of the innocent divorced extends to *remarriage*, does not appear: the Roman Church takes the negative view—though contrary to the Canon Law (see Wordsworth, *in loc.*); the Lutheran Church the affirmative, allowing remarriage on *desertio malitiosa;* "in view of ver. 11, the inference that the divorced should remain unmarried is the safer" (so Hn., against Mr.). If, however, the repudiator forms a new union, cutting off the hope of restoration, the case appears then to come under the exception made in Matt. v. 31. With **ἐν τοιούτοις,** neut., *cf.* **ἐν τούτοις,** Rom. viii. 37; and **ἐν οἷς,** Phil. iv. 11.

Vv. 15*b*, 16. **ἐν δὲ εἰρήνῃ ὁ Θεός . . . σώσεις**; The Christian spouse forsaken by the heathen is free from the former yoke; *but such freedom is undesirable.* Two considerations make against it: *Peace* is better for a Christian than disruption (15*b*); and there is *the possibility of saving the unbeliever* by remaining with him, or her (16). Thus P. reverts, by the contrastive **δέ,** to his prevailing thought, that the marriage tie, once formed, should in every way possible be maintained. On this view of the connexion, the full stop should be set at **ἐν τοιούτοις,** and the colon at **ὁ Θεός.** "In peace," etc.—opposed to **χωριζέσθω,** like **καταλλαγήτω** in ver. 11—appeals to the ruling temper of the Christian life, determined once for all by *God's call* in the Gospel, "ex quo consequitur retinendum esse nobis infidelem, ac omnibus officiis demerendum; nedum ut vel eum ipsi deseramus, vel ad nos deserendos provocemus" (Bz.); *cf.* Rom. xii. 18, for the general thought. For the construction of **ἐν εἰρήνῃ,** *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 7, Gal. i. 6, Eph. iv. 4.—Ver. 16 follows up the

x Gal. i. 7, 19; see note below.
y In this sense, 2 Cor. x. 13; Heb. vii. 2; Mk. vi. 41; Lk. xii. 13; Josh. xiii. 7. *Cf.* i. 13.
z See i. 9 (God the caller).
a See iii. 3.

ʷεἰ τὴν γυναῖκα σώσεις[1]; 17. ˣεἰ ˣμὴ ἑκάστῳ ὡς ʸἐμέρισεν[2] ὁ Θεός,[3] ἕκαστον ὡς ᶻκέκληκεν ὁ ᶻΚύριος,[4] οὕτω ᵃπεριπατείτω· καὶ

[1] Add η μη (for ει μη of ver. 17) a few minn., hcl.-syr. marg., and Chr.; by itacism.

[2] μεμερικεν, ℵ*B. So most crit. edd.; see, however, El. in favour of the aorist. Possibly Rom. xii. 3 has influenced the copyists.

[3] (μεμερ.) ο Κυριος: all pre-Syrian uncc.

[4] (κεκλης.) ο Θεος: as above (ver. 15). See parls.

appeal to Christian principle, by a challenge addressed in turn to the wifely and the manly heart: "(Keep the peace, if you can, with the unconverted spouse), for how do you know, O wife, that you will not *save* your husband? or how do you know, O husband, that you will not *save* your wife?" That **εἰ** in this connexion (see parls.), after **τί οἶδας** implying a *fear*, may mean "that . . . not" in English idiom (as though it were: "How do you know? it may be you will save, etc.!") is admitted by Hn. and Ed., though they reject the above interpretation, which is that of the ancient commentt. from Cm. down to Lyra, of Cv. and Bz., and of Ev. and Lt. amongst moderns: see the convincing notes of the two last-named; "Confirmatio est superioris sententiæ: non cur discedente infideli liberetur fidelis; sed contra, cur ita sit utendum hac libertate, ut infidelem, si fieri potest, retineat fidelis ac Christo lucrificet" (Bz.).—**τί οἶδας;** connotes "not the manner in which the knowledge is to be obtained, but the extent of it" (Ed.)—"what do you know as to the question whether, etc.?"

The above sentences are curiously ambiguous; taken by themselves, they may be read as reasons either *against* or *for* separation. The latter interpretation is adopted, as to ver. 15*b* by most, and as to ver. 16 by nearly all recent exegetes (including Bg., Mr., Hf., Hn., Al., Bt., Ed., Gd., El.): "God has called us in peace (and peace is only possible through separation); for how do you know, wife or husband, that you will save the other?" As much as to say, "Why cling to him, or her, on so ill-founded a hope?" Grammatical considerations being fairly balanced, the tenor of the previous context determines the Apostle's meaning. In the favourite modern exposition, the essential thought has to be read between the lines. It should also be observed that the Cor., with their lax moral notions, needed dissuasives from rather than encouragements to divorce; and on the other hand, that to discountenance the hope of a soul's salvation is strangely unlike the Ap. (*cf.* x. 33). On the construction here adopted, P. returns at the close of the Section to the thought with which it opened—**μὴ χωρισθῆναι.**

§ 22. God's Calling and One's Earthly Station, vii. 17-24. In treating of questions relating to marriage, the Apostle's general advice—admitting of large exceptions (2, 9, 15)—had been that each, whether single or married, should be content with his present state (1, 8, 10-14, 27). The Christian revolution had excited in some minds a morbid restlessness and eagerness for change, which disturbed domestic relations (*cf.* Matt. x. 36), but was not confined thereto. This wider tendency the Ap. combats in the ensuing paragraph; he urges his readers to acquiesce in their position in life and to turn it to account as Christians. In Thessalonica a similar excitement had led men to abandon daily work and throw their support upon the Church (1 Thess. iv. 11 f., 2 Thess. iii. 6-15). Hn., in Meyer's *Comm.*, p. 229, points out the close resemblance, both in form and matter, between this section and certain passages in Epictetus (*Dissertt.*, I., xix., 47 ff.; II., ix., 19 f.). *The freedom of the inner man* and *loyal acceptance of the providence of God* are inculcated by both the Stoic and the Christian philosopher, from their differing standpoints.

Ver. 17. "Only, in each case as the Lord has apportioned to him, in each case as God has called him, so let him (the believer) walk." Under this general rule the exceptional and guarded permission of divorce in ver. 15 was to be understood. For **εἰ μὴ** in this *exceptive* sense (= **πλήν**), *cf.* Rom. xiv. 14, Gal. i. 7, 19; see Bm., p. 359. The repeated distributive **ἕκαστος** extends the principle pointedly to *every* situation in life; *cf.* vv. 20, 24, iii. 5, 8-13. On **μεμέρικεν,**

οὕτως ἐν [b] ταῖς [b] ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις [c] διατάσσομαι.[1] 18. [d] περιτετμημένος τις [z] ἐκλήθη; μὴ [e] ἐπισπάσθω· [f] ἐν [f] ἀκροβυστίᾳ τις[2] [z] ἐκλήθη[2]; μὴ [d] περιτεμνέσθω· 19. ἡ [g] περιτομὴ [h] οὐδέν ἐστι, καὶ

b Pl., xi. 16, xiv. 33 f., xvi. 1, 19; 7 times in 2 Cor.; 5 times besides in P.; Rev. i. 4 ff., xxii. 16; Acts xv. 41, xvi. 5. c Mid., xi. 34; Tit. i. 5; Acts vii. 44, xx. 13, xxiv. 23. In this connexion, xvi. 1. d Gal. ii. 3, v. 2 f., vi. 12 f.; Col. ii. 11; *cf.* Acts xv. 1, 5, xvi. 3, xxi. 21. e *H.l.*; Isa. v. 18. See note below. f Rom. iv. 10 ff. ακροβ. freq. in P.; Acts xi. 3. g Rom. ii. 25-29; often in P.; Jo. vii. 22 f., Acts vii. 8, x. 45, xi. 2. h xiii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 11; Mt. xxiii. 16, 18; Jo. viii. 54.

[1] **διδασκω**, D*G, latt. vg. (*doceo*). *Cf.* iv. 17.

[2] **κεκληται τις**: ℵABP 17, 37, 46. **τις κεκληται**: D*G, Dam. (Western). **τις εκληθη** (as in parl. clause), DcKL, etc. (Syrian).

see ver. 33 and i. 12: the Christian's secular status is a **μέρος** which "the Lord," the Disposer of men's affairs, has assigned him (*cf.* Matt. xxv. 14 f.).—**ὡς κέκληκεν**, on the other hand, refers not to the secular "vocation" but, as always (see 15, 18, 21 f., i. 9, 26, etc.), to the "call" of God's grace in the Gospel, which came to the individual readers under these circumstances or those.—**οὕτως περιπατείτω** enjoins the *pursuance* of the Christian life in harmony with the conditions thus determined at its outset. P. does not mean to stereotype a Christian's secular employment from the time of his conversion, but forbids his renouncing this under a false notion of spiritual freedom, or in contempt of secular things as though there were no will of God for him in their disposition.

The last clause of the ver. shows that the tendency here reproved was widespread; *cf.* i. 2, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 36.

Vv. 18, 19. The rule of ver. 17 applied to the most prominent and critical distinction in the Church, that between *Jew and Gentile*: **περιτετμημένος τις ἐκλήθη κ.τ.λ.**; "Was any one called (as) a *circumcised* man? let him not have the mark effaced".—**ἐπισπάσθω** alludes to a surgical operation (**ἐπισπάω**, *to draw over*) by which renegade Jews effaced the Covenant sign: see 1 Macc. i. 11 ff., Joseph., *Ant.*, xii., 5, 1; Celsus, vii., 25. 5; also Schürer, *Hist. of Jewish People*, I., i., p. 203, and Wetstein *ad loc.* Such apostates were called *m'shūkim*, *recutiti* (Buxtorf's *Lexic.*, p. 1274).—On the opp. direction to the Gentile, **μὴ περιτεμνέσθω**, the Ep. to the Gal. is a powerful commentary; here the negative reasons against the change suffice (17, 19).—The variation in tense and order of words in the two questions is noticeable: "Was any one a circumcised man at the time of his call (**ἐκλήθη**)? . . . Has any one been called (**κέκληται**) though in uncircumcision?"—To clinch the matter (*cf.* i. 31, iii. 7) P. applies one of his great axioms: "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but keeping of God's commands"—that is everything.

In Gal. v. 6, vi. 15 this maxim reappears, with **πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη** and **καινὴ κτίσις** respectively in the antithesis: this text puts the condition of acceptance *objectively*, as it lies in a right attitude toward God (*cf.* Rom. ii. 25 ff.); those other texts supply the *subjective* criterion, lying in a right disposition of the man. In Gal. v., **οὐκ ἰσχύει**—opposed to **ἐνεργουμένη**—signalises the *impotence* of external states, the other two passages their *nothingness* as religious qualifications.—"Those who would contrast the teaching of St. Paul with that of St. James, or exaggerate his doctrine of justification by faith, should reflect on this **τήρησις ἐντολῶν Θεοῦ**" (Lt.).

Ver. 20. Diff. views are taken of this ver., as **κλῆσις** is referred to the religious *call* or secular *calling* of the man; and as **ᾗ** is accordingly rendered "wherewith" (instrum. dat.: *cf.* Eph. iv. 1, 2 Tim. i. 9), or "wherein" (governed by the foregoing **ἐν**: *cf.* 15, 18, 24; see Wr., pp. 524 f.). The latter interpretation is negatived by the fact that it destroys the unity of sense between **κλῆσις** and **ἐκλήθη** (see note on 18: does **κλῆσις** in Gr. anywhere mean *avocation?*). Besides, "circumcision" and "uncircumcision" are not "callings". Yet P. is manifestly referring to outward conditions affecting the religious call. The stress of the sentence lies on **μενέτω** (*cf.* 24); and Gal. iii. 2 f., v. 2-6, give the clue to the Apostle's meaning. A change of secular condition adopted under the idea that circumcision or uncircumcision is "something," that it makes a diff. in the eyes of God, would be a change of religious princple, *an abandonment of the basis of our call* to salvation by grace and through faith; *cf.* Gal. ii. 11-21.

ἡ [g] ἀκροβυστία [h] οὐδέν ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ [i] τήρησις [i] ἐντολῶν [i] Θεοῦ. 20. ἕκαστος [n] ἐν τῇ [k] κλήσει ᾗ [k n z] ἐκλήθη, ἐν ταύτῃ μενέτω· 21. δοῦλος [z] ἐκλήθης; μή σοι [l] μελέτω· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ δύνασαι ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι, μᾶλλον [m] χρῆσαι· 22. ὁ γὰρ ἐν Κυρίῳ [z] κληθεὶς δοῦλος, [n] ἀπελεύθερος Κυρίου ἐστιν· [o] ὁμοίως καὶ [1] ὁ ἐλεύθερος [z] κληθείς, [p] δοῦλός ἐστι [p] Χριστοῦ. 23. [q] τιμῆς [q] ἠγοράσθητε· μὴ γίνεσθε δοῦλοι [r] ἀνθρώ-

i τηρ. (cf. Acts iv. 3, v. 18) εντ., N.T. h.l.; Sir. xxxii. 23; Wisd. vi. 18 (νομων). τηρειν εντ., Mt. xix. 17; Jo. xiv. 21, xv. 10; Acts xv. 5 (νομον); 1 Jo. ii. 3 f., iii. 22, 24, v. 3; Rev. xiv. 12. εντολ. Θε., Mt. xv. 3; Rev. xii. 17, xiv. 12; Ezra x. 3; cf. Κυρ. εντ., xiv. 37. k See i. 26. l ix. 9; 1 Pet. v. 7; Acts xviii. 17; 5 times in Gospp. m ver. 31, ix. 12, 15; 1 Tim. i. 8, v. 23; Acts xxvii. 17. n H.l.; see note below. o See ver. 3. p Rom. i. 1, etc.; Gal. i. 10; Eph. vi. 6; Col. iii. 21, iv. 12; Ja. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1. q See vi. 20. r Cf. Gal. i. 10; Eph. vi. 6; Col. iii. 22 f.

[1] *Om.* **και** ℵABP 17, 46, vg. syrr. **δε και**, DG 37. **και** only, KL, etc.

The Gentile who embraced circumcision in order to fulfil the law of God was severing himself from Christ and falling from grace. The "abide" of 1 Cor. is parl. to the "stand fast" of Gal.

Ver. 21. From the chief religious, the Ap. passes to the chief *social* distinction of the times: *cf.* Gal. iii. 28, Col. iii. 11. This contrast is developed only on one side—no freeman wished to become a slave, as Gentiles wished to be Jews; but the slaves, numerous in this Church (i. 26 ff.), sighed for liberty; their conversion stimulated this longing. The advice to the slave is read in two opposite ways: (*a*) "In slavery wast thou called? never mind (**μή σοι μελέτω**)! But still if thou canst also become free, rather make use of it (than not)"—so Ev. excellently renders, with Cv., Bz., Gr., Hf., Bt., Gd., Lt., supplying **τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ** for complement to **μᾶλλον χρῆσαι**; while (*b*) Est., Bg., D.W., Mr., Hn., Weiss, Weizsäcker, Al., El., Sm. supply **τῇ δουλείᾳ**, and suppose P. to recommend the slave, with liberty offered, to "make use rather" of his servile condition. **εἰ καὶ** may either mean (*a*) "if verily" (Luke xi. 18; so **ἐὰν καὶ** in xi. 28, Gal. vi. 1), or (*b*) "although" (Phil. ii. 17, Luke xi. 8, etc.). The ancient commentators differed on this text, with a leaning to (*b*). The advocates of (*b*) exaggerate the sense of vv. 20, 24, which condemns change not *per se* but, as in the case of circumcision, because it compromises Christian faith and standing. "Freedom" is the object proximately suggested to "rather use" by "free" just above; and the sense of **χράομαι** in ver. 31, ix. 12, 15—to "avail oneself of an opportunity of good" (Lt.)—speaks in favour of (*a*). The **οὐ δεδούλωται** of ver. 15 and the **μὴ γίνεσθε δοῦλοι ἀνθρώπων** of ver. 23 indicate Paul's feeling for freedom; and the **δύνασθαι ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι** was to the Christian slave a precious item in his providential **μέρος** (17).

Upon this view, **ἀλλὰ . . . χρῆσαι** forms a parenthesis, resembling in its connexion the **οὐ δεδούλ.** clause of ver. 15, by which P. intimates that in urging contentment with a slave's lot he does not preclude his embracing liberty, should it be offered. Having said this by the way, he supports his **μή σοι μελέτω** by the comforting reflexion of ver. 22*a*, which is completed in ver. 22*b* by the corresponding truth for the freeman.

Ver. 22. The two sentences, balanced by **ὁμοίως** (*cf.* 3 f.), do not precisely match: **ὁ ἐν Κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δοῦλος** is "the slave that was called in the Lord" (*i.e.*, under Christ's authority), but **ὁ ἐλεύθερος κληθεὶς** is rather "the freeman, in that he was called"; his *call* has made the latter Christ's slave, while the former, *though a slave*, is the Lord's freedman.—**ἀπελεύθερος**, *libertus* (the prp. implying severance as in **ἀπολύτρωσις**, i. 30)—*freedman of a Lord;* "Christ buys us from our old master, sin, and then sets us free; but a service is still due from the *libertus* to the *patronus*" (Lt.); *cf.* Rom. vi. 17 f.; also **ἔννομος Χριστοῦ**, ix. 21, with the same gen. of possession. Ignatius makes a touching allusion to this passage, *ad Rom.*, 4: "I am till the present time a slave; but if I suffer I shall be Jesus Christ's freeman, and I shall rise up [in the resurrection] free!"

Ver. 23. **τιμῆς ἠγοράσθητε** (see note on vi. 20) explains the position both of the **δοῦλος ἀπελεύθερος** and the **ἐλεύθ. δοῦλος** by the same act of purchase: the slave has been liberated from sin, and the freeman bound to a new Lord. The point of the appended exhortation, **μὴ γίνεσθε δοῦλ. ἀνθρ.**, is not obvious: we can scarcely imagine *free Christians selling*

πων. 24. ἕκαστος ἐν ᾧ [u] [x] ἐκλήθη, ἀδελφοί, ἐν τούτῳ μενέτω [s] παρὰ τῷ [1] Θεῷ.

25. Περὶ δὲ τῶν [t] παρθένων [u] ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου οὐκ ἔχω· [v] γνωμὴν δὲ [v] δίδωμι, ὡς [w] ἠλεημένος [w] ὑπὸ [w] Κυρίου [x] πιστὸς εἶναι. 26. νομίζω οὖν τοῦτο [y] καλὸν ὑπάρχειν διὰ τὴν [z] ἐνεστῶσαν [a] ἀνάγκην, ὅτι

s For sense of παρα, cf. Lk. i. 30, ii. 52; 1 Pet. ii. 4. t In this ch. and 2 Cor. xi. 2; Mt. i. 23 (Isa. vii. 14), xxv. 1 ff.; Lk. i. 27; Acts xxi. 9; Rev. xiv. 4. u See ver. 6. v See i. 10; γν. διδ, 2 Cor. viii. 10. w 2 Cor. iv. 1; Ph. ii. 27; 1 Tim. i. 13, 16. The vb., Rom. ix. 15 ff., xi. 30 ff.; Mt. v. 7. x See iv. 2. y See ver. 1. z See iii. 22. a 2 Cor. vi. 4, xii. 10; 1 Th. iii. 7; Lk. xxi. 23; 1 Kings xxii. 2.

[1] *Om.* τῷ all uncc. but A, which is followed by a considerable minority of minn.

themselves into slavery; and *subservience to party leaders* (so Mr., Hf., Lt., El.; *cf.* i. 12, ii. 4, etc.) appears foreign to this context. It is better to take the warning quite generally: as much as to say, "Let no human influence divert you from service to God, or infringe on the devotion due to your Redeemer"; *cf.* Gal. v. 1, vi. 14. Public opinion and the social pressure of heathenism were too likely to enslave the Corinthians.

Ver. 24 reiterates with urgency, as addressed to "brethren," the fundamental rule laid down in ver. 20. ἐν τῇ κλήσει ᾗ now becomes, abstractly, ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐν τούτῳ—"wherein each was called, in that let him abide in the sight of God"; here as there the *Christian* vocation is intended, the status of faith and saintship, with which no human power may interfere and which, when duly realised, will of itself control outward relations and circumstances (Gal. ii. 20, Rom. xiv. 23). For παρὰ Θεῷ, *cf.* iii. 19 and parls.

§ 23. Advantages of the Single State, vii. 25-35. Paul's opinion had been asked particularly, in this connexion, about the case of *marriageable daughters* (25): was it wise for fathers, as things were, to settle their daughters in marriage? He delivers his judgment on this delicate matter, turning aside in vv. 29-31 to a general reflexion upon the posture of Christians towards the perishing world around them; then returning to point out the freedom from care and material engrossment enjoyed by the unwedded (32 ff.), he restates in ver. 36 his advice περὶ τῶν παρθένων.

Ver. 25. Περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων: a topic pointedly included in the περὶ ὧν ἐγράψατε of the Church Letter (1). In vv. 1-16 P. had spoken of the conduct of self-directing men and women in regard to marriage; there remains the case of *daughters at home*, for whose disposal the father was responsible (36 f.). On this point Paul has no "command" to give, whether proceeding immediately (10, ix. 14) or mediately (xiv. 37) from "the Lord"; he "gives" his γνώμη, his settled and responsible "opinion". He pronounces "as (*i.e.*, feeling myself to be; *cf.* 29 ff., iv. 7, 18) one ἠλεημένος ὑπὸ Κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι"—conscious that he is "faithful through the mercy effectually shown" him (pf. pass. ptp.; *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 13, 16) "by the Lord,"—faithful in this pronouncement to his stewardship under Christ (see iv. 1 f., and ii. 16). His advice is therefore to be trusted. The distinction made is not between higher and lower grades of inspiration or authority (*cf.* note on 12); but between *peremptory rule*, and *conditional advice* requiring the concurrence of those advised. Paul's opinion, *qua* opinion, as much as his injunction, is that of the Lord's steward and mouthpiece.

Ver. 26. νομίζω οὖν τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.: "I consider therefore"—the formula by which one gives a γνώμη (contrast the παραγγέλλω, διατάσσομαι of 10, 17)—"this to be good because of the present straits": καλὸν ὑπάρχειν, "good in principle" or "in nature" (*cf.* xi. 7, xii. 22); the existing situation is such as to make the course recommended entirely right and honourable (see note on καλόν, 1, also 8, 38).—The ἀνάγκη—narrowness, "pinching stress" (Ev.)—belongs to the καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος (29), the brief earthly continuance visible for the Church, a period exposed to persecution (28) with its hardships and perils; this "might or might not be the beginning of the ἀνάγκη μεγάλη predicted by Jesus" in Luke xxi. 23 (Lt.). ἐνεστῶσαν signifies "present" rather than "impending" (see iii. 22, Gal. i. 4); the distress of the time, which P. was feeling keenly at Ephesus (iv. 9 ff., xv. 32), portended a speedy crisis.—ὅτι καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι is open to three constructions, as ὅτι is rendered *that*, *because*, or *which* (ὅ,τι): (*a*) makes

[y] καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ [b] οὕτως εἶναι. 27. [c] δέδεσαι [c] γυναικί; μὴ [d] ζήτει [e] λύσιν. [f] λέλυσαι ἀπὸ γυναικός; μη [d] ζήτει γυναῖκα. 28. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ [g] γήμῃς,[1] οὐχ ἥμαρτες· καὶ ἐὰν [1] γήμῃ ἡ [t] παρθένος, οὐχ ἥμαρτε· [h] θλίψιν δὲ τῇ [i] σαρκὶ [h] ἕξουσιν [k] οἱ [k] τοιοῦτοι, ἐγὼ

b Ver. 40; Jo. iv. 6. c Ver. 39; Rom. vii. 2. d In like sense, Rom. ii. 7; Col. iii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 11; Rev. ix. 6; Mt. vi. 33, xiii. 45. e N.T. *h.l.*; Eccl. viii. 1; Wisd. viii. 8. f Acts xxii. 30; Jo. xi. 44; Ps. cxlv. 7. g See ver. 9; also note below. h Jc. xvi. 33; Rev. ii. 10; Sir. ii. 3. i For *dat.*, 2 Cor. xii. 7; for use of σαρξ, v. 5. k See v. 5.

[1] **γαμησῃς**, ℵ(A)BP 17, 37, 46. **γημῃς**, KL, etc. **λαβῃς γυναικα**, DG, l tt. vg., Tert.

the clause *an expanded restatement* of **τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν**—"I think then this to be good . . . that it is good (I say) for a man to remain as he is" (so Mr., Ed., El., and most); (*b*) makes it *the ground*, lying in the principle stated in ver. 1, for Paul's specific advice in the matter of the **παρθένοι**—"I think this to be good (in their case) . . . because it is good for one (**ἀνθρώπῳ**; see note on 1) to remain as one is," *sc.* to continue single (Bz., D.W., Gd.); (*c*) by attaching **ὅ,τι** as relative to the antecedent **τοῦτο**, and defining it by the subsequent **τ. οὕτως εἶναι**, Hn. gets another rendering —"I think this to be good (in the case of maidens) because of the present straits, which is good (as I have said, 1) for one generally, *viz.*, to remain unmarried." (*b*) and (*c*), yielding a like sense, avoid the anacoluthon — the former at the expense of leaving **τοῦτο** undefined, the latter by an artificial arrangement of the words; both explanations are somewhat wide of the mark, for **διὰ τ. ἐνεστ. ἀνάγκην** supplies here the ground of advice, and ver. 1, on which they are based, is differently conceived (see note). In giving his advice "about the maidens," P. suddenly bethinks himself to widen it to both sexes (see 27 f.). So he recasts his sentence, throwing the **ὅτι καλόν κ.τ.λ.**, with characteristic conversational freedom (*cf.* iv. 9), into apposition to the incomplete inf. clause: "I think this to be good because of the present straits —yes, that it is good **ἀνθρώπῳ** (for any one, not **τ. παρθένοις** only) not to change one's state". **οὕτως εἶναι**, "to be just as one is" (see parls.)—a state defined by the context.

Vv. 27, 28 apply in detail the advice just given, and first as it bears on *men*, then on *maidens*.—**δέδεσαι, λέλυσαι**, pf. pass. of present state determined by the past; μὴ ζήτει, pr. impv., "do not be seeking". The two directions of ver. 27 reinforce, from the new point of view, the instructions of vv. 10-16 and 8 respectively.—**λέλυσαι**, as opp. of **δέδεσαι**, applies either to bachelor or widower.

In ver. 28 the *general advice* of 27 is guarded from being overpressed; *cf.* the relation of ver. 2 to 1 and ver. 9 to 8. The punctuation of El. and Nestle best marks the connexion of thought, closing ver. 27 with a full st p, each of the parl. **ἐὰν . . . ἥμαρτες** (-ν) clauses with a colon, and separating **θλίψιν δὲ** and **ἐγὼ δὲ** by a comma. In the second supposition (both with **ἐὰν** and sbj. of *probable contingency*) P. reverts to the case of "the maiden," from which he was diverted in ver. 26; he makes her, by implication, responsible for her marriage, although in 36 ff., later, the action of *the father* is alone considered.—**γαμέω** is used in the *act.* here, and in ver. 39, both of man and woman; cl. Gr. applies it to the latter in *pass.*; *cf.* note on the double **ἀφιέτω** in vv. 12 f. **ἔγημα** and **ἐγάμησα** are the older and later aors.—The *aor.* in the apodosis — **ἥμαρτες, ἥμαρτεν** — is *proleptic* (Bn. § 50; Bm., pp. 198 f., 202), rather than *gnomic* (Mr., Hn., Ed.), as though by way of general reflexion: the Ap. addresses specific instances— "thou didst not . . . she did not sin"; *cf.* for tense, John xv. 11, Rev. x. 7.

The marriage Paul discourages is no sin, but will bring *suffering* from which he would fain save his friends. "But affliction for the flesh such (as may marry) will have, but I am seeking to spare you." With **θλίψις** *cf.* **σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί** (2 Cor. xii. 7; also v. 5 above); there is some thought, possibly, of *recompense* to "the flesh" which has had its way against advice. The affliction that Paul foresees is aptly indicated by Photius: "More easily and with small distress shall we endure if we have no wives and children to carry along with us in persecutions and countless miseries". At such times, for those who have domestic cares, there arises "the terrible

δὲ ὑμῶν [l] φείδομαι. 29. [m] Τοῦτο δέ [m] φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὁ [n] καιρὸς [1] [o] συνεσταλμένος [2]· [p] τὸ [p] λοιπόν [2] ἐστιν [2] ἵνα καὶ οἱ [q] ἔχοντες [q] γυναῖκας ὡς μὴ [q] ἔχοντες ὦσι, 30. καὶ οἱ [r] κλαίοντες ὡς μὴ [r] κλαίοντες, καὶ οἱ [r] χαίροντες ὡς μὴ [r] χαίροντες, καὶ οἱ [s] ἀγοράζοντες ὡς μὴ [t] κατέχοντες, 31. καὶ οἱ [u] χρώμενοι τῷ [3] κόσμῳ [3] τούτῳ [3] ὡς μὴ [v] καταχρώμενοι· [w] παράγει γὰρ τὸ [x] σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου.

l 2 Cor. i. 23, xii. 6, xiii. 2; Rom. viii. 32, xi. 21; Acts xx. 29; 2 Pet. ii. 4 f. m xv. 50; see vi. 16. Cf. i. 12. n In like sense, 2 Cor. vi. 2; Rom. xiii. 11; Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 6; Rev. xii. 12; Lk. xix. 44; Jo. vii. 8. o N.T. h.l. (cf. Acts v. 6); Sir. iv. 31. p See i. 16; το λ., Ph. iii. 1, iv. 8; 2 Th. iii. 1; Heb. x. 13; Mk. xiv. 41. q See v. 1. r 2 Cor. vi. 10; Rom. xii. 15; Jo. xvi. 20. s See vi. 20. t In this sense, 2 Cor. vi. 10; Josh. i. 11. See xi. 2. u See ver. 21. v ix. 18. w Mt. ix. 9, etc.; mid., 1 Jo. ii. 8, 17. x Ph. ii. 8; Isa. iii. 17.

[1] Beza and Elzevir read **οτι ο καιρος**, after DG and the Western txt.

[2] **συνεσταλμενος εστιν το λοιπον**, ℵABD* (om. το) P 17, 37, 46, and many Ff. With this order of words, the *stop* follows **εστιν**: so B* (according to Tisch.); see note below. G 67**, latt. vg., Tert., Hier., Aug. write **εστιν** *twice*. **συνεσταλμ. το λοιπον εστιν**, DcKL, etc.—L, syrr. cop., followed by Elz. and Griesbach, put the stop at **εστιν**; Stephens, Bz., and most edd. of T.R. placed it before **το λοιπον**.

[3] **τον κοσμον** (*om.* **τουτ.**), ℵAB, cop. DG 17 add **τουτον**. **τῳ κοσμῳ τουτῳ**: Syrian uncc., etc.; a grammatical emendation.

alternative, between duty to God and affection to wife and children" (Lt.).—**φείδομαι** appears to be a *conative present* (see Bn. § 11; *cf.* Ro. ii. 4, Gal. v. 4).

Vv. 29-31. **τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί, κ.τ.λ.**: "This moreover I assert, brethren: *The time is cut short*".—**φημί**, as distinguished from **λέγω**, "marks the gravity and importance of the statement" (El.).—**Συνστέλλω** (*to contract, shorten sail*) acquired the meaning to *depress, defeat* (1 Macc. iii. 6, 2 Macc. vi. 12); hence some render **συνεσταλμένος** by "calamitous," but without lexical warrant.—**ὁ καιρός** (see parls.) is "the season," the epoch of suspense in which the Church was then placed, looking for Christ's coming (i. 7) and uncertain of its date. The prospect is "contracted"; *short views* must be taken of life.

The connexion of **τὸ λοιπὸν** and **ἵνα . . . ὦσιν** with the foregoing affords a signal example of the grammatical looseness which mars Paul's style. (*a*) As to **τὸ λοιπόν**: (1) Cm., the Gr. Ff., Bz., Al., Ev., Hn., Gd., Ed., R.V. *mg.* attach it to **συνεστ. ἐστίν**, in a manner "contrary to its usual position in Paul's epp. and diluting the force of the solemn **ὁ καιρὸς . . . ἐστίν**" (El.). (2) The Vg. and Lat. Ff., Est., Cv., A.V. read **τὸ λοιπὸν** as predicate to **ἐστὶν** understood, thus commencing a new sentence,—"reliquum est ut," etc.; this is well enough in Latin, but scarcely tolerable Greek. (3) Mr., Hf., Bt., El., Lt., W.H., R.V. *txt.* subordinate **τὸ λοιπόν**, thrown forward with emphasis, to the **ἵνα** clause (*cf.* Gal. ii. 10, Rom. xi. 31)—"so that henceforth indeed those that have wives may be as without them," etc.; this gives compactness to the whole sentence, and proper relevance to the adv. Those who realise the import of the pending crisis will *from this time* sit loose to mundane interests. (*b*) As to the connexion of **ἵνα . . . ὦσιν**: this clause may define either *the Apostle's purpose*, as attached to **φημί** (so Bz., Hf., Ed.), or *the Divine purpose* implied in **συνεστ. ἐστίν** (so most interpreters). Both explanations give a fitting sense: *the Ap. urges*, or *God has determined*, the limitation of the temporal horizon, in order to call off Christians from secular absorption. In this solemn connexion the latter is, presumably, Paul's uppermost thought.

Vv. 29*b*, 30 are "the picture of spiritual detachment in the various situations in life" (Gd.). Home with its joys and griefs, business, the use of the world, must be carried on as under notice to quit, by men prepared to cast loose from the shores of time (*cf.* Luke xii. 29-36; by contrast, Luke xiv. 18 ff.). From wedlock the Ap. turns, as in vv. 17-24, to other earthly conditions—there considered as *stations* not to be wilfully changed, here as *engagements* not to be allowed to cumber the soul. Ed. observes that the Stoic condemned the interaction, here recognised, between "the

32. θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς [y] ἀμερίμνους εἶναι. ὁ [a] ἄγαμος [a] μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, πῶς [b] ἀρέσει [1] τῷ Κυρίῳ· 33. ὁ δὲ [c] γαμήσας [a] μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς [b] ἀρέσει [1] τῇ γυναικί.[2] 34. [d] μεμέρισται [2] ἡ γυνὴ [2] καὶ ἡ [e] παρθένος [2]· ἡ [e] ἄγαμος [a] μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία καὶ [3] [f] σώματι [4] καὶ πνεύματι [4]· ἡ δὲ [c] γαμήσασα [a] μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ

y Mt. xxviii. 14; Wisd. vi. 16, vii. 23. μεριμ-να, Mt. xiii. 22, etc.
z See ver. 8.
a xii. 25; Ph. ii. 20, iv. 6; Mt. vi. 25 ff., x. 19.
b x. 33; Rom. viii. 8, xv. i. ff.; Gal. i. 10; 1 Th. ii. 4, 15, iv. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 4.
c See ver. 9, and note on ver. 28.
d In this sense, see i. 13; diff. in ver. 17.
e See ver. 25.
f See v. 3.

[1] **α ρ ε σ η** (thrice): all pre-Syrian uncc.

[2] A perplexed *varia lectio* :—

(1) **και** (**μεμερισται**), ℵABDgr.P 17, vg. syrsch. cop. Om. **και** DcGKL, etc. (later Western and Syrian).

(2) **και** (**η γυνη**): all uncc. but D*E, and most minn. Om. **και** D*, etc., codd. mentioned by Hier., syrsch. cop.

(3) **η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος** (**μεριμνᾳ**), BP 46, 73, four other minn., vg. cop., Eus., Amb., Hier., Pel. So Tr., W.H., R.V. *marg.*

η γυνη και η παρθενος η αγαμος (**μεριμνᾳ**), ℵADGKL, etc., latt. syrr. (? Western and Syrian). [ℵAFb 17 write **η αγαμος** after both **γυνη** and **παρθενος**.] So Tisch., R.V. *txt.*, El., Nestle. See, on punctuation, note below.

The text here adopted reads: (33) **μεριμνᾳ τα του κοσμου, πως αρεσῃ τῳ κοσμῳ, και μεμερισται.** (34) **και η γυνη η αγαμος και η παρθενος μεριμνᾳ τα του κυριου κ.τ.λ.** See Heinrici's conjecture, stated below.

[3] *Om.* **και** ADI²P 17, 37, syrsch. cop.

[4] **τῳ** (**σωμ., πν.**), ℵABP 17, 37, 46.

soul's emotions and external conditions; the latter he would have described as a thing indifferent, the former as a defect: **πᾶν μὲν γὰρ πάθος ἁμαρτία**" (Plut., *Virt. Mor.*, 10). "Summa est, Christiani hominis animum rebus terrenis non debere occupari, nec in illis conquiescere: sic enim vivere nos oportet, quasi singulis momentis migrandum sit e vita" (Cv.).—**ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες κ.τ.λ.**, not *like, in the manner of*, but "*with the feeling of* those who have not," etc., **ὡς** with ptp. implying subjective attitude—a limitation "proceeding from the mind of the speaking or acting subject" (Bm., p. 307); *cf.* ver. 25 and note.—**ἀγοράζοντες** (*marketing*) gives place in the negative to **κατέχοντες**, *possessing, holding fast* (*cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 10).—**Χράομαι** governs acc. occasionally in late Gr.; the case of **τὸν κόσμον** may be influenced by **καταχρώμενοι**, with which cl. authors admit the acc. The second vb. (with dat. in ix. 18) is the intensive of the first —*to use to the full* (*use up*); not *to misuse*—a meaning lexically valid, but inappropriate here. "Abuse" had both meanings in older Eng., like the Lat. *abutor;* it appears in Cranmer's Bible with the former sense in Col. ii. 22.

A reason for sparing use of the world lies in its *transitory form*, 31*b*—a sentence kindred to the declaration of ver. 29*a*.—**σχῆμα** (*cf.* iv. 6, and other parls.) denotes phenomenal guise—*habitus, fashion*—as distinguished from **μορφή**, proper and essential shape: see the two words in Phil. ii. 6 ff., with the discussions of Lt. and Gifford *ad loc.* "The world" has a dress suited to its fleeting existence.—**παράγει** affirms "not so much the present actual fact, as the inevitable issue; the **σχῆμα** of the world has no enduring character" (El.); "its fascination is that of the theatre" (Ed.); *cf.* 1 John ii. 17. The Ap. is thinking not of the fabric of nature, but of mundane human life—the world of marryings and marketings, of feasts and funerals.

> Then what this world to thee, my heart?
> Its gifts nor feed thee nor can bless.
> Thou hast no owner's part in all its fleetingness.
> —J. H. Newman.

Vv. 32-34. **θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.** (*cf.* 7): "But I want you to be unanxious (**ἀμερίμνους**);" *cf.* **φείδομαι**, ver. 28. This is the reason why P. labours the advice of this section; see our Lord's dehortations from **ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος** in Matt. vi. 25-34 and xiii. 22.—Vv. 32*b*-34 describe, not without a touch of humour, the exemption in this respect of the unmarried: *he* "is anxious in respect of the things of the Lord"—not "of the world, as to how he should please his wife!" After bidding the readers to be **ἀμέριμνοι**, P. writes **μεριμνᾷ τ. τοῦ Κυρίου**, with a

κόσμου, πῶς [b] ἀρέσει [1] τῷ ἀνδρί. 35. τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν [g] συμφέρον [2] λέγω· οὐχ ἵνα [h] βρόχον ὑμῖν [i] ἐπιβάλω, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ [k] εὔσχημον καὶ [l] εὐπρόσεδρον [3] τῷ Κυρίῳ [m] ἀπερισπάστως.

g συμφορον, x. 33; Eccl. ii. 3 (Symmachus).
h N.T. *h.l.*; Prov. vi. 5, vii. 21, xxii. 25.
i With dat., Mk. xi. 7, xiv. 46; Acts iv. 3; Prov. xx. 26.
k xii. 24; Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 12; Mk. xv. 43. *Cf.* xii. 23, xiv. 40.
l ευπαρεδρον, *h.l.* *Cf.* ix. 13; Prov. viii. 3 (παρεδρευω); Wisd. vi. 15, ix. 4 (-εδρος).
m *H.l.*; -στος, Wisd. xvi. 11; Lk. x. 40; Sir. xli. 2 (περισπασθαι).

[1] **αρεσῃ** (thrice): all pre-Syrian uncc. [2] **συμφορον**, ℵ*ABD* 17.
[3] **ευπαρεδρον**: all uncc. but KL.

certain *catechresis* in the vb., for the sake of the antithesis. The accs. are of *limitation* rather than of transitive obj. **πῶς ἀρέσῃ** is indirect question, retaining the deliberative sbj.—"is anxious . . . (asking) how he should please," etc. For the supreme motive, "pleasing *the Lord*," *cf.* iv. 1-5, 2 Cor. v. 9, etc. **ὁ γαμήσας**, aor. of the *event* (pf. in 10: *cf.* note), which brought a new care.—Accepting the reading **καὶ μεμέρισται. καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄγαμος**, with the stop at **μεμέρ.** (the only possible punctuation with **ἡ ἄγαμος** in this position: see txtl. note), then it is added about the married Christian, that "he has been (since his marriage) divided,"—*parcelled out* (see note on i. 12): part of him is assigned to the Lord, part to the world. Lt. says that this rendering (R.V. *mg.*) "throws sense and parallelism into confusion, for **καὶ μεμέρισται** is not wanted with ver. 33, which is complete in itself": nay, the addition is made just because the parl. would be untrue if not so qualified; the married Christian does not care *simply* for "the things of the world" as the unmarried for "the things of the Lord," he cares for *both* "and is divided," giving but half his mind to Christ (so Ewald, Hf., Hn., Ed.). The attachment of **καὶ μεμέρισται** to ver. 34, with the Western reading (see txtl. note), retained by Mr., Bt., El., Lt., Sm., A.V., and R.V. *txt.*, in accordance with most of the older commentt., gives to **μερίζω** a meaning doubtful in itself and without N.T. parl.: "And *there is a distinction between* the wife and the maiden". Gd. escapes this objection by reading **μεμέρισται κ. ἡ γυνὴ** as a sentence by itself, "the wife also is divided"—then continuing, "And the unwedded maiden cares for," etc.; an awkward and improbable construction as the text stands (but see Hn. below). Txtl. criticism and exegesis concur in making **καὶ μεμέρισται** a further assertion about **ὁ γαμήσας**, revealing his full disadvantage.

Hn., by a very tempting conjecture, proposes to insert a second **μεμέρισται** after the first: **πῶς ἀρέσῃ τ. γυναικί, καὶ μεμέρισται· μεμέρισται καὶ ἡ γυνή. ἡ ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ κ.τ.λ.**—"He that has married is anxious in regard to the things of the world, how he may please his wife, and is divided; divided also is the wife. The unmarried (woman), with the maiden, is anxious as to the things of the Lord." This would account for the double **καί**, which embarrasses the critical text; it gives a fuller and more balanced sense, in harmony moreover with Paul's principle of putting husband and wife on equal terms (2 ff., 11-16); and nothing was easier than for a doubled word, in the unpunctuated and unspaced early copies, to fall out in transcription. Placing the full stop at **μεμέρισται**, without the aid of Hn.'s emendation, **ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄγαμος καὶ ἡ παρθένος** are made the combined subject of **μεριμνᾷ** (34), "the unmarried woman" being the general category, within which "the maiden," whose case raised this discussion (25), is specially noted; the two subjects forming one idea, take a sing. verb.

The purpose **ἵνα ᾖ ἁγία κ.τ.λ.** is the subjective counterpart of the question **πῶς ἀρέσῃ** of ver. 32; note the similar combination in Rom. xii. 1, also 1 Thess. iv. 3; and see notes on **ἁγίοις, ἡγιασμένοις**, i. 2. Holiness **τῷ σώματι** (dat. of *sphere*; see Wr., p. 270) comes first in this connexion (*cf.* 4; vi. 20), and **τῷ πνεύματι** is added to make up the entire person and to mark the inner region of sanctification; "the spirit" which animates the body, being akin to God (John iv. 24) and communicating with His Spirit (Rom. viii. 16), is the basis and organ of our sanctification (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 23, 2 Thess. ii. 13).—Of **ἡ γαμήσασα**, "she that has married," on the contrary, the same must be said as of **ὁ γαμήσας** (33); she studies to "please her husband" as well as "the Lord".

Ver. 35. A third time P. declares that

36. Εἰ δέ τις [n] ἀσχημονεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον αὐτοῦ [o] νομίζει, ἐὰν ᾖ [p] ὑπέρακμος, καὶ οὕτως [q] ὀφείλει γίνεσθαι, ὃ θέλει ποιείτω· οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· [r] γαμείτωσαν.[1] 37. ὃς δὲ ἕστηκεν [s] ἑδραῖος[2] ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ,[2] μὴ [t] ἔχων [t] ἀνάγκην, [u] ἐξουσίαν δὲ [u] ἔχει περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου [v] θελήματος, καὶ τοῦτο [w] κέκρικεν ἐν τῇ[3] καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ[3] τοῦ[4] [x] τηρεῖν

n xiii. 5; Deut. xxv. 3; Ezek. xvi. 7 f. -ων, xii. 23; -οσυνη, Rom. i. 27.
o With inf., Acts viii. 20; 2 Macc. vii. 19; cl. Gr.
p *H.l.*; παρακμαζω, Sir. xlii. 9.
q Pres., in this sense, ix. 10, xi. 7, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 14; Rom. xv. 1; Eph. v. 28; 2 Th. i. 3, ii. 13; Heb. v. 3, 12, etc.
r See ver. 9.
s xv. 58; Col. i. 23.
t Heb. vii. 27; Lk. xiv. 18; Jude 3.
u Rom. ix. 21; 2 Th. iii. 9; Acts ix. 14; Lk. xii. 5, xix. 17; Mt. vii. 29, ix. 6; Mk. iii. 15; Jo. x. 18, xix. 10, 11; *h.l.* with περι.
v Of human will, xvi. 12; Eph. ii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 21; Lk. xxiii. 25; Jo. i. 13; 3 Ki. v. 8.
w See ver. 3.
x 2 Cor. xi. 9; 1 Th. v. 23; 1 Tim. v. 22, vi. 14; Jas. i. 27; Jude 21.

[1] **γαμειτω**, DG syr[sch.], Epiph., Aug.; ***non peccat si nubat***, latt. vg., Ambrst.

[2] **εν τη καρδια εδραιος**: so pre-Syrian uncc.

[3] **εν τη ιδια καρδια** (om. **αυτου**), ℵABP 31, 46.

[4] *Om.* **του** ℵABP, minn.[20]. Ins. **του** DGKL (Western and Syrian).

he is consulting for the welfare of his readers (*cf.* 28*b*, 32*a*), not insisting on his own preference nor laying down an absolute rule: "looking to (πρός) your advantage I say (it)". **τὸ σύμφορον** is the abstract of **συμφέρει** (vi. 12, x. 23).—The **βρόχος** is the *noose* or *lasso* by which a wild creature is snared: P. does not wish by what he says to deprive the Cor. of any liberty,—to *capture* his readers and shut them up to celibacy—"not that I may throw a snare over you". He aims at what is socially **εὔσχημον**, "of honourable guise," as belonging to the Christian decorum of life (see parls.); and at what is religiously **εὐπάρεδρον τῷ Κυρίῳ**, "promotive-of-fit-waiting on the Lord".—**ἀπερισπάστως** recalls the **περιεσπᾶτο** used of *Martha* in Luke x. 38-42, and suggests that the Ap. had this story in his mind, esp. as **μεριμνάω**, his leading expression in this Section, is the word of reproof used by Jesus there. Epictetus' dissuasive from marriage, in his *Dissertt.*, III., xxii., 67 ff., curiously resembles Paul's: **τοιαύτης οὔσης καταστάσεως οἵα νῦν ἐστιν, ὡς ἐν παρατάξει, μή ποτ' ἀπερίσπαστον εἶναι δεῖ τ. Κυνικὸν ὅλον πρὸς τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐπιφοιτᾶν ἀνθρώποις δυνάμενον, οὐ προσδεδεμένον καθήκουσιν ἰδιωτικοῖς οὐδ' ἐμπεπλεγμένον** (*cf.* 2 Tim. ii. 4) **σχέσεσιν, ἃς παραβαίνων οὐκέτι σώσει τὸ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ πρόσωπον, τηρῶν δ' ἀπολεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον κ. κατάσκοπον κ. κήρυκα τῶν θεῶν**; (69).

§ 24. Freedom to Marry, vii. 36-40. The question of the marriage of Cor. Christian maidens Paul has discussed on grounds of expediency. The narrow earthly horizon, the perils of the Christian lot, the division between religious and domestic duty esp. probable under these conditions, render the married state undesirable (28-34). The Ap. does not on these grounds *forbid* marriage,—to do so would entangle some of his readers perilously; he *recommends* what appears to him the course generally fitting, and advantageous for their spiritual interests (35 f.). If the parent's judgment points the other way, or if circumstances are such as to enforce consent, then so let it be (36). But where the father can thus decide without misgiving, he will do well to keep his daughter at home (37 f.). Similarly in the case of the Christian *widow*: she is free to marry "in the Lord"; but, in Paul's decided opinion, she will be happier to refrain (39 f.). The Ap. gives *inspired advice*, and the bias of his own mind is clearly seen; but he finds no sin in marriage; he guards sensitively the rights of individual feeling and conscience, and leaves the decision in each case to the responsible parties.

Ver. 36. By a contrastive **δὲ** P. passes from the **εὔσχημον** at which his dissuasive was aimed, to the **ἀσχημονεῖν** that might be thought to result in some cases from following it.—The vb. (= ἀσχήμων εἶναι) signifies either *to act unbecomingly* (xiii. 5), or *to suffer disgrace*, *turpem videri* (Vg.); the antithesis, and the adjunct **ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον**, dictate the former sense, which is post-classical.—On **νομίζει** (*is of opinion*), see ver. 26. It was socially discreditable, both amongst Greeks and Jews (*cf.* Sirach xlii. 9), to keep one's daughter at home, without obvious reason, for any long period beyond adult age; a Christian father might feel this

τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρθένον, [y]καλῶς [y]ποιεῖ.[1] 38. ὥστε καὶ ὁ [z]ἐκγαμίζων[2] [3] [y]καλῶς [y]ποιεῖ,[8] ὁ δὲ[4] μὴ [z]ἐκγαμίζων[5] [y a]κρεῖσσον [y]ποιεῖ.[6] 39. γυνὴ [b]δέδεται νόμῳ[7] [c]ἐφ᾽ [c]ὅσον [c]χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ [d]κοιμηθῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς,[8] [e]ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει [f]γαμηθῆναι, μόνον [f]ἐν [f]Κυρίῳ. 40. [g]μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν ἐὰν [h]οὕτω μείνῃ, [i]κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν [i]γνώμην· [k]δοκῶ δὲ[9] κἀγὼ [l]πνεῦμα Θεοῦ [l]ἔχειν.

y Ph. iv. 14; Acts x. 33; Jas. ii. 8, 19; 2 Pet. i. 19; 3 Jo. 6; 3 Ki. viii. 18.
z Mt. xxii. 30, xxiv. 38; Lk. xvii. 27, xx. 35.
a See ver. 9.
b See ver. 27. c Rom. vii. 1; Gal. iv. 1; *cf.* Mk. ii. 19; 2 Pet. i. 13. d xi. 30, xv. 6 ff.; 1 Th. iv. 13 ff.; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Jo. xi. 11 f., etc. e ix. 19; Rom. vi. 20, vii. 3; *h.l.* with inf. f xi. 11, etc., characteristic and peculiar to P.; *cf.* εν Χρ. g Of (human) persons, Rom. iv. 7 f. (from LXX), xiv. 22; Jas. i. 12, 25; 1 Pet. iii. 14, iv. 14; Rev. i. 3, etc.; Acts xxvi. 2; Mt. v. 3 ff., etc. Compar. *h.l.* h See ver. 26. i See ver. 6. k See iii. 18. l Rom. viii. 9; Jude 19. *Cf.* ii. 12.

[1] ποιησει, ℵAB 17, 46, 67**, cop. [2] γαμιζων, ℵABD 17, 46.

[3] γαμιζων την εαυτου παρθενον: ℵABDP 17, 37, 46, latt. vg. syrr.; BD put εαυτου after παρθενον (?).

[4] και ο μη: ℵ*ABDG 17, 37, 46. [5] γαμιζων, ℵ*ABDG 17, 46.

[6] ποιησει, ℵ*AB 17, 37, 46, 67**, cop., Bas.
Minn. 3 and 114 om. ver. 38 in consequence of the homœoteleuton ποιει (vv. 37 f.); through same mistake G and several other copies om. ver. 38*a*, ωστε . . . ποιει.

[7] *Om.* νομῳ (derived from Rom. vii. 2) ℵ*ABD* 17, 67**, the oldest copies of vg., Clem., Or., Athan., Tert.

[8] *Om.* αυτης ℵABKP, more than seventy minn.

[9] δοκω γαρ (?): B 17, 37, 67**, Cyr., Amb., Ambrst. Preferred by W.H.

discredit for his religion's sake (*cf.* x. 32), and might be reproached as doing his child and society a wrong. — ἐὰν ᾖ ὑπέρακμος, "if she be past the bloom (of youth)"—the μέτριος χρόνος ἀκμῆς, fixed by Plato (*Rep.*, vi., 460 E) at twenty, the *ætas nubilis.*—καὶ οὕτως ὀφείλει (see parls.) γίνεσθαι—"and so matters ought to proceed" (pr. inf.)—states a further presumable reason for consent: duty may require it—where, *e.g.*, the girl has been *promised*, or is so situated that a continued veto may give rise to peril or scandal (*cf.* 2). In such circumstances the father's course is clear: "let him do what he wills" (θέλει); *cf.* ver. 35. γαμείτωσαν — *i.e.*, the daughter and her suitor, the claim of the latter being hinted at in the previous ὀφείλει: pr. impv.; "Let the marriage take its course".

Ver. 37. For the opposite resolution, adopted by a father who "*keeps* his own virgin (daughter)" instead of "marrying" her (38), four conditions are laid down: (1) *unshaken firmness* in his own mind (ἕστηκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ἑδραῖος, *cf.* Rom. xiv. 5, 23), as against social pressure; (2) *the absence of constraint* (μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην) arising from previous engagement or irresistible circumstances; (3) *his full authority* to act as he will (ἐξουσίαν δὲ ἔχει κ.τ.λ.) — slaves, on the other hand, could not dispose of their children, and the unqualified *patria potestas* belonged only to Roman citizens (see Ed. *in loc.*); ἐξουσία, however, signifies *moral* power, which reaches in the household far beyond civil right; (4) *a judgment deliberately and independently formed* to this effect (τοῦτο κέκρικεν ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ καρδίᾳ). Granting all this, the father who "has decided to keep his own maiden, does well"—καλῶς, *rightly, honourably well* (see note on καλόν, 1). The repeated καρδία (the *mind*, the seat of thought and will, rather than the *heart* with its modern emotional connotation; *cf.* ii. 9, iv. 5, and notes), and the phrase περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου θελήματος, press on the father the necessity of using his judgment and acting on his personal responsibility; as in vv. 6 f., 28, 35, the Ap. is jealous of allowing his own authority or inclination to overbear the conscience of his disciples; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 4-10, 22 f.—This ἀνάγκη urges in the opp. direction to that of ver. 26; in both cases the word signifies compulsion, dictating action other than that one would independently have taken.—ἐξουσίαν . . . περί κ.τ.λ. is "power as touching his own resolve," the right to act as one will—in other

a x. 19; Acts xv. 29, xxi. 25; Rev. ii. 14, 20. VIII. 1. Περὶ δὲ τῶν [a] εἰδωλοθύτων· οἴδαμεν, ὅτι πάντες [b] γνῶσιν ἔχομεν. ἡ [b] γνῶσις [c] φυσιοῖ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη [d] οἰκοδομεῖ. 2. εἰ δέ [1]

b In this disparaging sense, xiii. 2, 8; Rom. ii. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 20; see also i. 5. c See iv. 6. d In this sense, x. 23, xiv. 4, 17; 1 Th. v. 11; Acts ix. 31, xx. 32; Mt. xvi. 18.

[1] *Om.* δε ℵABP 17, 46, 73, vg. (older codd.), cop.

words, mastery of the situation.—The obj., **τ. παρθένον,** suggests the tacit complement to **τηρεῖν** (see parls.): "to *keep intact*, in what he believes to be the best state" for the Lord's service (Ed.). "The will of the maiden is left wholly out of court" (Hn.); social custom ignored this factor in marriage; for all that, it might constitute the opposed **ἀνάγκη,** and might, in some circumstances, practically limit the paternal **ἐξουσία**; see ver. 28*b*, and note.

Ver. 38, the sum of the matter: either to marry one's daughter or refuse her in marriage is, abstractly viewed, an honourable course; the latter, in Paul's judgment, and for Christians in the present posture of things, is *better*. "Ce bien et mieux résument tout le chapitre" (Gd.).

Vv. 39, 40 dispose, by way of appendix to the case of the maiden and to the like effect, of the question of *the remarriage of Christian widows*. Ver. 39 is repeated in almost identical terms, for another purpose, in Rom. vii. 2.—On **δέδεται** and **γαμηθῆναι** (cl. **γαμεθῆναι**), see vv. 27 f.; **κοιμηθῇ,** the term for Christian death (see parls.).—"She is free to be married to whom she will," while the maiden is disposed of by her father's will (36 f.); **μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ** (*cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff., 1 Thess. iv. 3 ff.) forbids union with a heathen; it also forbids any union formed with un-Christian motives and otherwise than under Christ's sanction (*cf.* Thess. iv. 4 f.).—"But more blessed she is" (**μακαριωτέρα δέ**: see parls.)—not merely happier by exemption from trouble (26 ff.), but *religiously* happier in her undivided devotion to the Lord (32 ff.)—"if she abide as she is". This advice was largely followed in the Pauline Churches, so that before long widows came to be regularly enrolled for Church service (1 Tim. v. 3-16).—**κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην** (see note on 26): Paul's *advice*, not command.—**δοκῶ δὲ κἀγώ κ.τ.λ.**: "However I think, for my own part (however others may deem of me), that I have (an inspiration of) God's Spirit" (the anarthrous **πνεῦμα Θεοῦ**: *cf.* xii. 3, etc.); see for Paul's claim to Divine guidance, extending to his *opinions* as well as commands, ver. 25, ii. 10-16, iv. 1, ix. 2, xiv. 37.—On **δοκῶ,** see note to iv. 9; it is the language of modesty, not misgiving. The Ap. commends his advice in all these matters, conscious that it proceeds from the highest source and is not the outcome of mere human prudence or personal inclination.

Division III. Contact with Idolatry, viii.-x. We have traced in the previous chapters the disastrous reaction of the old leaven upon the new Christian kneading at Cor. But Christian society had its *external* as well as its internal problems—a fact already evident in the discussion of ch. vi. respecting the carrying of disputes to the heathen law-courts. A much larger difficulty, involving the whole problem of social intercourse between Christians and their heathen neighbours, had been raised by the Church Letter—the question **περὶ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων** (viii. 1). *Was it lawful for a Christian to eat flesh that had been offered in sacrifice to an idol?* Social festivities commonly partook of a religious character, being conducted under the auspices of some deity, to whom libations were poured or to whom the animals consumed had been dedicated in sacrifice. The "idol's house" (viii. 10) was a rendezvous for banquets. Much of the meat on sale in the markets and found on ordinary tables came from the temples; and without inquiry it was impossible to discriminate (x. 25-28). Jewish rule was uncompromisingly strict upon this point; and the letter of the Jerusalem Council, addressed to the Churches of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, had directed "the brethren from among the Gentiles" to "abstain from *idolothyta*" (Acts xv. 29). The Cor. Church, in consulting Paul, had expressed its own leaning towards liberty in this matter (viii.); what will the Ap. say? It is a real dilemma for him. He has to vindicate the broad principles of spiritual religion; at the same time he must avoid wounding Jewish feeling, and must guard Gentile weakness against the seductions of heathen feasts and against the peril of relapsing into idolatry through inter-

τις [e] δοκεῖ [f] εἰδέναι [1] [f] τι, οὐδέπω [2] οὐδὲν [3] ἔγνωκε [4] [g] καθὼς [g] δεῖ γνῶναι· 3. εἰ δέ τις [h] ἀγαπᾷ τὸν [h] Θεόν, οὗτος [i] ἔγνωσται ὑπ' [5]

e See iii. 18.
f εγνωκεναι, see ii. 8.
g Cf. Rom. viii. 26; Eph. vi. 20; Col. iv. 4, 6; 1 Th. iv. 1; 2 Th. iii. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 15.
h Rom. viii. 28; Mt. xxii. 37; Lk. x. 27 (Deut. vi. 5); 1 Jo. iv. 20 f., v. 2.
i Gal. iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 19 (Nu. xvi. 5); Mt. vii. 23, xxv. 12.

[1] **εγνωκεναι**, all pre-Syrian uncc., 17, 46, many Ff.

[2] **ουπω**, ℵABP 17, 46, 73. **ουδεπω**, Western and Syrian.

[3] *Om.* **ουδεν** all pre-Syrian uncc.—T.R. a grammatical emendation.

[4] **εγνω**, all pre-Syrian uncc. The **-κε** a doubling of the following **κα-**.

[5] Om. **υπ' αυτου** ℵ* 17, Clem.

course with unconverted kindred and neighbours. In theory Paul is for *freedom*, but in practice for great *restrictions* upon the use of idolothyta. (1) He admits that the question is decided in principle by the fundamental truth of religion, *viz.*, that *God is one*, from which it follows that *the sacrifice to the idol is an invalid transaction* (viii. 1 ff.; x. 19, 26). But (2) many have not grasped this inference, being still in some sense under the spell of the idol; for them to eat would be sin, and *for their sake stronger-minded brethren should abstain* (viii. 7-13; x. 23-30). To this effect (3) P. sets forth *his own example*, (*a*) in *the abridgment of* his personal *liberty for the good of others* (ix. 1-22; x. 33-xi. 1), and (*b*) in *the jealous discipline of bodily appetite* (ix. 23 ff.). The last consideration leads (4) to a solemn warning against *contamination by idolatry*, drawn (*a*) from *the early history of Israel*, and further (*b*) from *the communion of the Lord's Table*, which utterly forbids participation in "the table of demons" (x. 1-22). These instances show in a manner evident to the good sense of the readers (x. 15), that to take part in a heathen sacrificial feast is in effect a recognition of idolatry and an apostasy from Christ.

§ 25. Knowledge of the One God and One Lord, viii. 1-6. In inquiring from their Ap. "about the **εἰδωλόθυτα**," the Cor. had intimated their "knowledge" of the falsity of the entire system of idolatry. Here Paul checks them at the outset. The pretension betrays their one-sided intellectualism. Such matters are never settled by knowledge; *love* is the true arbiter (2 f.). After this caution, he takes up the statement of the Cor. creed made in the Church Letter, with its implications respecting idolatry (4 ff.).

Ver. 1*a*. **Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων**: another topic of the Church Letter, to which the Apostle continues his reply (see note on vii. 1; also *Introd.*, chap. ii.). The word **εἰδωλόθυτον** (see parls.), "the *idol*-sacrifice," substituted for the **ἱερόθυτον** (x. 28) of the heathen vocabulary, conveys an implicit judgment on the question in hand; see note on **εἴδωλον**, ver. 4, and on x. 19 f.; also Acts xv. 20, **τὰ ἀλισγήματα τῶν εἰδώλων**.—**οἴδαμεν—ὅτι πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχομεν**: the common rendering, "We know *that* we all have knowledge" yields a weak tautology, and misses the irony of the passage; otherwise than in **οἴδαμεν ὅτι** of ver. 4, this is the *causal* **ὅτι** (so Bg., Hn., Ed.). The Cor. in making their inquiry virtually answered it themselves; they wrote **Οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ** (4); and P. takes them up at the first word with his arresting comment: "'We know' (say you?) because 'we all have knowledge'!—Knowledge puffs up," etc.—For **γνῶσιν ἔχομεν**, *cf.* ver. 10; the phrase breathes the pride of the Cor. illuminati; in **γνῶσις** this Church felt itself rich (i. 5, iv. 10); its wealth was its peril.

Ver. 1*b*. The Ap. gives to Cor. vanity a sudden, sharp rebuke by his epigram, **Ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ**: "Knowledge puffs up, but Love builds up". Hn. aptly compares Aristotle's axiom, **Τὸ τέλος οὐ γνῶσις, ἀλλὰ πρᾶξις** (*Nic. Eth.*, i., 1). For **φυσιόω**, *to inflate*, see note on iv. 6. The appeal of the Church to Knowledge as decisive in the controversy about "meats" disclosed the great flaw in its character—its poverty of love (xiii. 1 ff.). The tacit obj. of **οἰκοδομεῖ** is the Church, the **Θεοῦ οἰκοδομή** (iii. 9, 16); Eph. iv. 15 f. describes the *edifying* power of love; see also Matt. xxii. 37-40, 1 John iv. 16-21. For the Biblical use of **ἀγάπη**, see note to xiii. 1. The divisive question at issue Love would turn into a means of strengthening the bonds of Church life; Knowledge operating alone makes it an engine of destruction (11 f.).

Vv. 2, 3. Loveless knowledge is *ruinous*

αὐτοῦ.[1] 4. περὶ [2] τῆς [k] βρώσεως [2] οὖν τῶν [a] εἰδωλοθύτων · [l] οἴδαμεν [l] ὅτι οὐδὲν [m] εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς Θεὸς ἕτερος [3] [n] εἰ [n] μὴ

k 2 Cor. ix. 10; Rom. xiv. 17; Col. ii. 16; Heb. xii. 16.
l iii. 16, vi. 2 f., etc.; diff., ver. 1.
m x. 19, xii. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Rom. ii. 22; 1 Th. i. 9; 1 Jo. v. 21; Rev. ix. 20; Acts vii. 41, xv. 20; see also ver. 1, v. 10. In LXX *passim*, for Heb. *'elilim*, and *gillulim*.
n For this use, see i. 14.

[1] Om. **υπ' αυτου** ℵ* 17, Clem. Alex.

[2] **περι δε της γνωσεως**, D*gr.; **περι της γνωσεως ουν**, P 121.

[3] *Om.* **ετερος** all pre-Syrian uncc.

(1*b*); more than that, it is *self-stultifying*. The contrasted hypotheses—**εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι** (= **δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι**, iii. 18) and **εἴ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν Θεόν**—define the position of men who build upon their own mental acquirements, or who make love to God the basis of life. For emphatic **δοκεῖ**, *cf.* iii. 18, vii. 40; it implies an opinion, well- or ill-founded, and confidence in that opinion. The pf. **ἐγνωκέναι** signifies *knowledge acquired* (for which, therefore, one might claim credit), while the aors. **ἔγνω** and **γνῶναι** denote the *acquisition of* (right) *knowledge*, rendered impossible by self-conceit—"he has never yet learnt as he ought to do". For **τι**—probably **τὶ** in this connexion, *something* emphatically, *something great*—*cf.* note on **τὶ εἰδέναι**, ii. 2. The *Enchiridion* of Epictetus supplies a parl. to ver. 2: "Prefer to seem to know nothing; and if to any thou shouldst seem to be somebody, distrust thyself"; similarly Socrates, in Plato's *Apology*, 23.

Ver. 3 is one of Paul's John-like sayings. In the apodosis he substitutes, by an adroit turn, "is known (**ἔγνωσται**: pf. pass. of *abiding effect* upon the obj.) by God" for "hath come to know God," the expected consequence—see the like correction in Gal. iv. 9; *cf.* Phil. ii. 12 f., iii. 12; John xv. 16; 1 John iv. 10. Paul would ascribe nothing to human acquisition; religion is a bestowment, not an achievement; our love or knowledge is the reflex of the divine love and knowledge directed toward us. Philo, quoted by Ed., has the same thought: **γνωριζόμεθα μᾶλλον ἢ γνωρίζομεν** (*De Cherub.*, § 32).—**οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ** (*sc.* **τοῦ Θεοῦ**), "*he* (and not the other) is known by Him". Ev. reverses the ref. of the prons.: "He (God) hath been known by him (the man loving Him)"—an unlikely use of **οὗτος**.

Ver. 4. After his thrust at Cor. **γνῶσις**, P. resumes, with **οὖν** (*cf.* xi. 17-20), from ver. 1 the question "About the eating of idolothyta," repeating the "we know" at which he had interrupted his correspondents. For **οἴδαμεν** in a *confessio fidei*, *cf.* 1 John v. 18 ff. That the theological statement given in vv. 4 ff. *comes from the mouth of the Corinthians* seems probable from the following considerations: (*a*) the repeated **οἴδαμεν** (*h.l.* in this Ep.; *cf.* the frequent interrog. **οὐκ οἴδατε;** of chh. iii., v., vi.; also xii. 2), by which P. *associates himself with the readers*, who are men of knowledge (i. 5, x. 15, etc.); (*b*) *the solemn rhythm* of vv. 4*b* and 6, resembling a confessional formula (*cf.* Eph. iv. 4 ff., 1 Tim. iii. 16)—ver. 5 may be an interjected comment of the Church Letter upon its creed; (*c*) the expression "gods many and lords many" applied to heathen divinities, which is foreign to Pauline as to Jewish phraseology, but natural *on the lips of old polytheists;* (*d*) the aptness with which **ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις** (7) fits in with this explanation, being understood as *Paul's reply* to his readers' declaration of their enlightened faith. See, on this question, W. Lock in *Expositor*, V., vi., 65. The articles of belief cited from the Cor. in vv. 4*b* and 6 had probably been formulated first by P., like the **Πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν** of vi. 12, and so would be fitly quoted to him.—**οὐδὲν εἴδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ** (*cf.* x. 19), being parl. to **οὐδεὶς Θεός κ.τ.λ.**, should be rendered not "An idol is nothing," etc., but "There is no idol in the world" (so R.V. virtually, Mr., Hf., Bt., Ed., Sm.). Existence is denied to the idol not absolutely (see 5, x. 19 f.), but relatively; it has no real place **ἐν κόσμῳ**, no power over the elements of nature; "the earth is the Lord's," etc. (x. 26); there is no Zeus in the sky, nor Poseidon ruling the sea, but "one God and Father" everywhere,—a faith emancipating enlightened Christians from every heathenish superstition.—**οὐδὲν εἴδωλον κ.τ.λ.** forms the polemic counterpart to **οὐδεὶς Θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς** (see parls.),—the cornerstone of Jehovism, which Christ has made the world's creed.—**εἴδωλον** (*sc.* a thing possessing **εἶδος**, *form* only), *semblance*, *phantasm*, renders in the LXX several Hebrew words for false gods—

εἷς· 5. καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἰσὶ [o] λεγόμενοι Θεοί, εἴτε ἐν οὐράνῳ εἴτε ἐπὶ τῆς[1] γῆς, ὥσπερ εἰσὶ θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ [p] κύριοι πολλοί, 6. ἀλλ'[2] ἡμῖν εἷς Θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, [q] ἐξ [q] οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς [r] εἰς [r] αὐτόν· καὶ εἷς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, [s] δι' [s] οὗ[3] τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς [s] δι' [s] αὐτοῦ.[4]

o Eph. ii. 11; 2 Th. ii. 4.
p Cf. Acts xxv. 26; 1 Tim. vi. 15; Lk. xvi. 13; Rev. xvii. 14.
q See i. 30.
r Rom. xi. 36; Eph. i. 5; cf. Col. i. 16.
s Rom. xi. 36; Col. i. 16; Heb. i. 2; Jo. i. 3, etc. Cf. xv. 57; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Rom. i. 5, v. 1 f., 17, 21; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 5, ii. 18; 1 Th. v. 9; Tit. iii. 6; 1 Jo. iv. 9.

[1] *Om.* της all uncc. and many minn.

[2] Om. αλλ' (?) B, basm., Ir[int.], Eus.; Lachm. and W.H. *bracket.* ημιν δε, 17, cop., Cyr[hier.], Epiph.

[3] ον (?) B, æth., Epiph.; W.H. *marg.*

[4] The minn. 55, 72**, 109, 178, supported by Gregory of Nazianzus orat. 39, 12, Basil in several passages, Cyr., Dam., make the addition και εν πνευμα αγιον εν ῳ τα παντα—a Trinitarian gloss. Chrysostom[202] expressly controverts this reading.

—esp. *'elīlīm, nothings*, and *hebhel, emptiness;* the term was applied first to the images, then to the (supposed) godships they represent, branding them as *shams and shows:* see 1 Thess. i. 9, Acts xiv. 15, Ps. xcvi. 5. The κόσμος reveals the being and power of the One God (Rom. i. 20); idolaters have no living God, but are ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (Eph. ii. 12).

Ver. 5: a comment of the Cor. on their confession of faith, showing their "knowledge" of its bearing.—καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἰσίν κ.τ.λ.: "For indeed, granting the existence of so-called gods, whether in heaven or upon earth, as indeed there are many (such) gods and lords, yet to us," etc. The -περ of εἴπερ and ὥσπερ enhances the supposition (see El., *ad loc.*), allowing its utmost possibility.—εἴπερ κ.τ.λ. admits their *existence* (in some sense) *as reputed deities;* ὥσπερ κ.τ.λ. points to their astonishing *multitude*, while distinguishing them, in a manner parl. to the distinction between ὁ Θεὸς and ὁ Κύριος, as "gods" in their assumed deity and "lords" in their assumed dominion. The repeated εἰσὶν asserts an actual being of some sort behind the εἴδωλον (see x. 19-22), but the θεότης or κυριότης is merely λεγομένη; for the force of this ptp., *cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 4, Eph. ii. 11. With πολλοὶ *cf.* κατείδωλον πόλιν, Acts xvii. 16, and the Gr. saying, Πάντα θεῶν πλέα.—Κύριος is a title often given to gods in Gr. inscriptions; a *h.l.* for Bib. Gr.: *cf.*, however, *'adonīm* in Isa. xxvi. 13; also Deut. x. 17; Ps. cxxxvi. 2 f.—*In heaven, on earth:* the two great domains of God's kingdom (Matt. vi. 10), usurped by the false gods.

Ver. 6 affirms in positive Christian terms, as ver. 4*b* stated negatively and retrospectively, the creed of the Cor. believers. The "one God" of O.T. monotheism is "to us one God the Father". "Of whom are all things, and *we* for Him:" the universe issues from God, and "we," His sons in Christ, are destined therein for His use and glory—He would reap in "us" His glory, as a father in the children of his house; see, on this latter purpose, Eph. i. 5, 10 ff., 18*b*, iii. 9 ff.; also 1 Peter ii. 9, Jas. i. 18, John xvii. 9 f., etc.; *cf.* Aug., "*Fecisti* nos ad Te". In the emphatic ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτὸν there speaks the joyful consciousness of Gentiles called to know and serve the true God; *cf.* xii. 2 f., Eph. ii. 11 ff.—The "one Lord Jesus Christ" is Mediator, as in 1 Tim. ii. 5—"through whom are all things, and *we* through Him"; again ἡμεῖς stands out with high distinction from the dim background of τὰ πάντα. The contrasted ἐξ οὗ, εἰς αὐτὸν of the previous clause is replaced by the doubled διὰ of this: God is the source of all nature, but the *end* specifically of redeemed humanity; Christ is equally the Mediator—and in this capacity the Lord (xv. 24-28)—of nature and of men. The universe is *of God through Christ* (Heb. i. 2, John i. 3): we are *for God through Christ* (2 Cor. v. 18, Eph. i. 5, etc.). Col. i. 15 ff. unfolds this doctrine of the double Lordship of Christ, basing His redemptional upon His creational headship.—It is an exegetical violence to limit the second τὰ πάντα, as Grotius and Baur have done, to "the ethical new creation"; in 2 Cor. v. 18 the context gives this limitation, which in our passage it excludes. The inferior

7. Ἀλλʼ οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ [t] γνῶσις, τινὲς δὲ τῇ [u] συνειδήσει [1] τοῦ [2] εἰδώλου [2] [v] ἕως [2] [v] ἄρτι [2] ὡς [w] εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσι, καὶ ἡ [x] συνείδησις αὐτῶν [y] ἀσθενὴς οὖσα [z] μολύνεται. 8. [a] βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ [b] παρίστησι [3] τῷ Θεῷ· οὔτε γὰρ [4] ἐὰν [5] φάγωμεν [c] περισσεύομεν,[5]

t See ver. 1.
u συνηθεια, xi. 16; Jo. xviii. 39. See note below.
v See iv. 13.
w See ver. 1.
x With subjective gen., x. 29; 2 Cor. i. 12, iv. 2, v. 11; Rom. ii. 15, ix. 1; Tit. i. 15, etc.
y The adj., in this sense, *h.l.* (see ver. 12, and Rom. xiv. 1 for -εω). For other sense of adj., i. 25, iv. 10.
z Rev. iii. 4, xiv. 4; -υσμος, 2 Cor. vii. 1.
a See iii. 2.
b 2 Cor. iv. 14, xi. 2; 5 times in Rom.; 4 times besides in P.; also in Acts, Lk., Mt. xxvi. 53.
c xiv. 12, xv. 58; freq. in P.; also in GG. and Acts.

[1] **συνηθειᾳ**, ℵ*ABP 17, 46, 67**, cop., Euthal., Dam. **συνειδησει**, DGL, etc.

[2] **συνηθειᾳ εως αρτι του ειδωλου** (in this order): all uncc. but ALP.

[3] **παραστησει**, ℵ*AB 17, 46, 67**, cop. basm.

[4] *Om.* **γαρ** ℵAB, am. tol. cop. basm.
Ins. **γαρ** DGLP, etc.—Western and Syrian.

[5] **εαν μη φαγ. υστερουμεθα . . . εαν φαγ. περισσευομεν** (in this order): A*B 17*, 46, oldest vg. cop. basm.; so Tr., Al., W.H., Nestle, El., R.V. The order of T.R. is that of Western and Syrian uncc., the minn., latt. and syrr.; ℵ and A** read **εαν μη φαγ. περισσευομεν . . . εαν φαγ. υστερουμεθα**: so Lachm. Tr. further follows B in reading **περισσευομεθα** for **-ομεν**.

reading **διʼ ὅν** (for **οὗ**: see txtl. note), "*because of whom* are all things," would consist with a lower doctrine of Christ's Person, representing Him as preconceived object, while with **διʼ οὗ** He is pre-existent medium of creation. The full Christology of the 3rd group of the Epp. is latent here. The faith which refers all things to the one God our Father as their spring, and subordinates all things to the one Lord our Redeemer, leaves no smallest spot in the universe for other deities; intelligent Christians justly inferred that the material of the idolothyta was unaffected by the hollow rites of heathen sacrifice.

§ 26. The Weak Conscience of the Old Idolater, viii. 7-13. The knowledge of the one Father and Lord upon which the Cor. Church prided itself, had not released all its members from fears respecting the *idolothyta;* in some the intellect outran the heart, in others it lagged behind. With the latter, through weakness of understanding or force of habit, the influence of the heathen god still attached to objects associated with his worship (7). For a man in this state of mind to partake of the consecrated flesh would be an act of compliance with heathenism; and if the example of some less scrupulous brother should lead him thus to violate his conscience and to fall into idolatry, heavy blame will lie at the door of his virtual tempter (10-12). Such blame P. declares that he will himself on no account incur (13).

Ver. 7. "But not in all is there the knowledge" (**ἡ γνῶσις**) which you and I claim to have (1, 10), expressed just now in the terms of the Church confession (4 ff.).—**τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου**, "by reason of their habituation up till now to the idol": for this dat. of *defining cause*, *cf.* Eph. ii. 1.—**ἕως ἄρτι** (*cf.* iv. 8, 11) qualifies the quasi-vbl. noun **συνηθεία**, actively used, which, as in 4 Macc. xiii. 21 and cl. Gr., signifies with the objective gen. (= **συνηθεία πρὸς** or **μετά**) *intercourse, familiarity with;* the other, passive sense is seen in xi. 16. The Western reading, **συνειδήσει**, preferred by some critics as the *lectio ardua*, gives the sense, "through relation of conscience to the idol" (Hf., Hn.).—**ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσι**, "as an idol-sacrifice eat (the meat in question)"—under the consciousness that it is such, with the sense haunting them that what they eat belongs to the idol and associates them with it; *cf.* x. 18 ff. and notes. "And their conscience, since it is weak (unable to get rid of this feeling), is soiled" (opp. of the **καθαρὰ συνείδησις** of 1 Tim. iii. 9, 2 Tim. i. 3). The consciousness of sharing in idol-worship is defiling to the spirit of a Christian; to taste knowingly of idolothyta, under any circumstances, thus affects converts from heathenism who have not the full faith that the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; now, "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" (Rom. xiv. 23).

Ver. 8. **βρῶμα δέ κ.τ.λ.**: "But *food* will not present us to God," *non exhibebit nos Deo* (Mr.): that on the ground of

οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ[1] φάγωμεν [d] ὑστερούμεθα.[1] 9. [e] βλέπετε δὲ [e] μήπως ἡ [f] ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὕτη [g] πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς [y] ἀσθενοῦσιν·[2] 10. ἐὰν γάρ τις ἴδῃ σε,[3] τὸν ἔχοντα [t] γνῶσιν, ἐν [h] εἰδωλείῳ [i] κατακείμενον, οὐχὶ ἡ [x] συνείδησις αὐτοῦ [y] ἀσθενοῦς[4] ὄντος[4] [k] οἰκοδομηθή-

d See i. 7; also xvi. 17, -ημα; Phil. iv. ii., -ησις.
e x. 12; Gal. v. 15; Col. ii. 8, Heb. iii. 12, xii. 25; Acts xiii. 40; Lk. xxi. 8. *Cf.* iii. 10, and reff.
f See vii. 37; also vi. 12.
g Rom. ix. 32 f. (Isa. viii. 14), xiv. 13, 20; 1 Pet. ii. 8; *cf.* -κοπτω, Rom. xiv. 21; εγκοπη, ix. 12 below.
h N.T. *h.l.*; 1 Esdr. ii. 9; 1 Macc. i. 47, x. 83.
i In this sense, Mk. ii. 15, xiv. 3; Lk. vii. 37. = ανακειμ.
k See ver. 1; here only ironical. See note below.

[1] **εαν μη φαγ. υστερουμεθα . . . εαν φαγ. περισσευομεν** (in this order): A*B 17*, 46, oldest vg. cop. basm.; so Tr., Al., W.H., Nestle, El., R.V. The order of T.R. is that of Western and Syrian uncc., the minn., latt. and syrr.; ℵ and A** read **εαν μη φαγ. περισσευομεν . . . εαν φαγ. υστερουμεθα**: so Lachm. Tr. further follows B in reading **περισσευομεθα** for **-ομεν**.

[2] **ασθενεσιν**, all uncc. but L.

[3] BG, vg., Aug., Ambrst. om. **σε**; *bracketed* by Lachm. and W.H.

[4] Many Latin interpp., including vg., read *cum sit infirma*, as if for **ασθενης ουσα**.

which the verdict turns may be said to "present" one to the judge. To "commend" is **συν-**, not **παρίστημι** (see parls.); for the *fut.* (see txtl. note), *cf.* Rom. xiv. 10, 2 Cor. iv. 14, Col. i. 28.—**βρώματα** do not enter into our permanent being (vi. 13; see note); *they* will not be the criteria of the approaching Judgment.—The alternative **οὔτε** clauses negative the two opposite ways in which "food" might have been supposed to "present us to God": "neither if we do not eat, are we the worse off (**ὑστερούμεθα**: see note on i. 7); nor if we eat, are we the better off (**περισσεύομεν**: do we abound, exceed others)". The latter predicate is appropriate to the "strong," who deemed themselves in a superior position, on a higher ground of faith.—Ver. 8, like vv. 4-6, represents the *pro* in the question **περὶ βρώσεως**, as vv. 7, 8-13 the *contra.* Chap. viii. is virtually a dialogue; the double (challenging and rebutting) **δὲ** of vv. 8 f., with the words "*your* right" of ver. 9, in accordance with Paul's dialectical style (*cf.* Rom. iii. 1-8), compels us to read this ver., like vv. 1, 4-6, as *from the mouth of the Cor.*, possibly from the Church Letter; "hic alter erat, vel esse poterat, Corinthiorum prætextus" (Cv.). At the word **μολύνεται** P. hears some of his readers interject: "The conscience of the weak brother is *defiled*, you say, by eating after my example. But (**δέ**) how so? You have taught us that God will not judge us by these trifling externals; abstinence or use of 'meats' makes no difference to our intrinsic state." This Paul admits, to set against it the caution **βλέπετε δὲ μὴ κ.τ.λ.**, on which the rest of the paragraph hangs.

Ver. 9. "Beware, however, lest this right of yours"—*sc.* to eat the idolothyta, for which many of the Cor. are contending, and probably in the Church Letter (1). For **ἐξουσία** in this use, *cf.* ix. 4 ff., 12, also **ἔξεστιν** in vi. 12, x. 23. The Jerus. Council (Acts xv. 29), to whose decree P. was a party, had not denied *in principle* the lawfulness of using idolothyta; it forbade such use to the mixed Judæo-Gentile Churches within a certain area, in deference to Jewish feeling. Paul comes in effect to the same conclusion, though he *advises* instead of commanding. The **πρόσκομμα** is an obstacle thrown in the way of "the weak," over which they may stumble into a moral fall, not having the strength either to overcome their scruples or to disregard an example contrary to their conscience.

Ver. 10 enforces (**γάρ**) the above warning.—**σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γνῶσιν**, "thee, the man that has knowledge" (see 1): the Cor. pretension to superior enlightenment, shown in vv. 2 f. to be faulty in Christian theory, now discloses its practical mischief. The behaviour of the Christian man of knowledge who "reclines (at table) in an idol's temple," is represented as a sort of bravado—a thing done to show his "knowledge," his complete freedom from superstition about the idol. This act is censured because of its effect upon the mind of others; in x. 18-22 it will be condemned on its own account. The form **εἰδωλίον** (or **-εῖον**) occurs in the Apocrypha; it follows the formation of Gr. temple names—**Ἀπολλωνεῖον**, etc.—**οὐχὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ, ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος κ.τ.λ.**; "will not his conscience, weak as he is, be 'edified' unto eating

σεται εἰς τὸ τὰ [w] εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίειν; 11. καὶ[1] [l] ἀπολεῖται[1] ὁ [m] ἀσθενῶν[2] ἀδελφὸς[2] ἐπὶ[3] τῇ σῇ [t] γνώσει,[2] δι' ὃν [n] Χριστὸς [n] ἀπέθανεν. 12. οὕτω δὲ [o] ἁμαρτάνοντες [o] εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ [p] τύπτοντες αὐτῶν τὴν [x] συνείδησιν [m] ἀσθενοῦσαν, [o] εἰς Χριστὸν [o] ἁμαρτάνετε. 13. [q] διόπερ εἰ [s] βρῶμα [r] σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, οὐ μὴ φάγω [s] κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου[4] [r] σκανδαλίσω.

l See i. 18. m Rom. iv. 19, xiv. 1 f., 21, in figur. sense. See ver. 7. n xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 15; Rom. v. 6 ff., vi. 8 ff., viii. 34, xiv. 9; Gal. ii. 21; 1 Th. iv. 14, v. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 18; Jo. xi. 50 ff. o See vi. 18. p N.T. *h.l.*; *cf.* 1 Kings i. 8; Prov. xxvi. 22. q x. 14. διο, see xii. 3. r Rom. xiv. 21; Mt. xv. 12, xvii. 27; Sir. ix. 5, xxiii. 8, xxxii. (xxxv.) 15. s Rom. xiv. 21, pl.

[1] **απολλυται γαρ**: ℵ*B 17, cop. basm., Clem.; **απολλυται ουν**, AP. **και απολλυται**: ℵcD*b 46, 67**, Bas. **και απολειται**: DcGL, etc., vg. syrr. (late Western and Syrian).

[2] **ο ασθενων εν τη ση γνωσει, ο αδελφος δι' ον κ.τ.λ.** (in this order): all pre-Syrian uncc.

[3] **εν**, all uncc. but L.

[4] The Western texts om. the second **μου**.

the foods offered to idols?"—not *because* he is weak (as though overpowered by a stronger mind), but *while* he is still weak, as under the lingering belief that the idol is "something in the world" (7): "his verbis exprimitur horror infirmi, tamen edentis" (Bg.).—Thus eating unpersuaded "in his own mind" (Rom. xiv. 5), he sins (Rom. xiv. 23), and therefore "is perishing" (11). The vb. "edified"—instead of "persuaded" or the like—is used in sad irony (*cf.* Tert., "ædificatur ad ruinam," *De Præscr. Hæretic.*, 3); P. probably takes up the word in this connexion from the Church Letter: the eaters of idolothyta thought their practice "edifying" to less advanced brethren—"*edifying*, forsooth!—to what end?"

Ver. 11. "For the weak man [whom you talk of building up!] *is being destroyed* through thy knowledge—the brother, on whose account Christ died!" (Rom. xiv. 15). This affirms, with terrible emphasis, the issue implied by ver. 10: "est ædificatio ruinosa" (Cv.).—**ὁ ἀσθενῶν** means (more than **ὁ ἀσθενής**) the man in a continued state of weakness.—**ἐν τῇ σῇ γνώσει**, "on the ground (*or* in the sphere) of thy knowledge"; in this atmosphere the weak faith of the other cannot live (*cf.* **ἐν** in ii. 4; Eph. iv. 16, **ἐν ἀγάπῃ**). His "knowledge" leaves the tempter inexcusable. "Notice the threefold darkness of the picture: there perishes, thy brother, for whom Christ died" (Bt.). Paul appeals to the strongest feelings of a Christian—brotherly love and loyalty to Christ. For the prospective **δι' ὅν**, *cf.* Rom. iv. 25; Christ's death is thus frustrated of its dear object (*cf.* Gal. ii. 21) by thy heartless folly!

Ver. 12. In such case, not only the weak brother sins by yielding, but the strong who tempted him; and the latter sins directly "against Christ" (for the construction, *cf.* vi. 18): "But sinning in this way against the brethren, and inflicting a blow on their conscience while it is weak, you sin against Christ".—**τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν**, not "their weak conscience" (**τὴν ἀσθεν.**), but "their conscience weak as it is": how base to strike the weak!—**τύπτω** describes as the violent wrong of the injurer, what is a **μόλυσμα** and **πρόσκομμα** (7, 9) in its effect upon the injured. A *blow* on the conscience shocks and deranges it.—For the bearing of such an act on *Christ*, see Matt. xviii. 6 ff., xxv. 40, 45; also Zech. ii. 8, etc. The principle of union with Christ, which forbids sin against oneself (vi. 15), forbids sin against one's brother.

Ver. 13 sums up the debate in the language of personal conviction: "Wherefore verily"—for this last reason above all—"if (a matter of) food (**βρῶμα**, indef.) is stumbling my brother, I will eat no flesh-meats for evermore, that I may not stumble my brother".—**κρέα** (pl. of **κρέας**) signifies the kinds of **βρῶμα** in question, including probably beside the idolothyta other animal foods which might scandalise men of narrow views, such as the vegetarians of Rom. xiv. 13-21 (see notes *ad loc.*).—Four times in vv. 11-13 P. repeats the word **ἀδελφός**, seeking to elicit the *love* which was needed to control Cor. knowledge (*cf.* 2 f.).—For "**σκανδαλίζω**,

IX. 1. Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος [1]; οὐκ εἰμὶ [a] ἐλεύθερος [1]; οὐχὶ Ἰησοῦν [2] Χριστὸν [2] τὸν [b] Κύριον ἡμῶν [b] ἑώρακα [3]; οὐ τὸ [c] ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Κυρίῳ; 2. [d] εἰ ἄλλοις οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος, [d] ἀλλά [d] γε ὑμῖν εἰμι· ἡ γὰρ [e] σφραγὶς τῆς [4] ἐμῆς [4] [f] ἀποστολῆς ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν Κυρίῳ.

a ver. 19; Rom. vii. 3; Gal. iv. 22 ff.; 1 Pet. ii. 16.
b Jo. xx. 18, 25; Acts xxii. 14 f.
c iii. 13 ff., xv. 58, xvi. 10; Rom. xiv. 20; Phil. i. 22, ii. 30; 2 Tim. iv. 5; Acts xiii. 2, xiv. 26.
d Lk. xxiv. 21; *cf.* Phil. iii. 8. For αλλα after hypoth., see iv. 15, viii. 6; 2 Cor. xi. 6, xiii. 4; Rom. vi. 5.
e Rom. iv. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Rev. v. 1, etc. -ιζομαι, 2 Cor. i. 22; Rom. xv. 28; Eph. i. 13, iv. 30; Rev. vii. 3, etc.
f Rom. i. 5; Gal. ii. 8; Acts i. 25; Deut. xxii. 7.

[1] . . . **ελευθερος; . . . αποστολος**; (in this order): ℵABP 17, 37, 46, vg. syr sch. cop.

[2] **Ιησουν** (without **Χριστον**), ℵAB 46, oldest vg. sah. basm.
Χριστον Ιησουν, G, Tert., Aug., Pelag.; **Ιησουν Χριστον**, DKLP, etc., syr sch. cop. *Cf.* note on ver. 4.

[3] **εορακα**, ℵB*DcGP; so Tisch., W.H., Nestle. See Wr., p. 108.

[4] **σφραγις μου της αποστολης**: ℵBP 17, 46.

to put a **σκάνδαλον** (cl. **σκανδάληθρον**, *trap-stick* = **πρόσκομμα**, 9) in another's way," *cf.* Rom. xiv. 21 and parls. The strong negation **οὐ μή** ("no fear lest": see Wr., p. 634 ff.) is further heightened by **εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα**, "to eternity". The rendering "while the world standeth" is based on the use of **αἰών** (*perpetuity*) in such passages as i. 20, where the context narrows its meaning; in this phrase the noun has its full sense, but used rhetorically.

§ 27. Paul's Apostolic Status, ix. 1-6. The Ap. is ready to forego his right to use the idolothyta, wherever this claim hurts the susceptibilities of any brother (viii. 13). He is "free" as any man in Cor. in such respects; more than this, he is "an apostle" (ix. 1), and the Church of Cor. is witness to the fact, being itself his answer to all challengers (2 f.). If so, he has *the right to look to his Churches for maintenance*, and that in the ordinary comfort of married life—a claim unquestioned in the case of his colleagues in the apostleship (4-6).

Ver. 1. **οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐλεύθερος;** This question, arising out of the foregoing §, properly comes first. The freedom supposed is that of *principle;* in ver. 19 it will take a personal complexion. P. is no longer bound by Mosaic restrictions in the matters under dispute (*cf.* ver. 21, x. 29, Gal. ii. 4, iv. 12, v. 1); he holds the right belonging to every emancipated Christian.—Far beyond this reaches the question, **οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος;** which P. answers by putting two other questions, one to his own consciousness, the other to that of his readers: "Have I not *seen Jesus our Lord?* Are not you *my work* in the Lord?"—**Ἰησοῦν . . . ἑόρακα** (*cf.* Acts vii. 55, ix. 5, 17, xxii. 8, xxvi. 15) is a unique expression with P.; it describes not a spiritual apprehension, the **γνῶναι Χριστὸν** of the believer, nor the ecstatic visions which he had sometimes enjoyed in a state of trance (2 Cor. xii. 1 ff.), but that actual beholding of the human and glorified Redeemer which befell him on the way to Damascus; from this dated both his faith and his mission (Acts ix. 1-32, Gal. i. 10-17). Paul seldom uses "Jesus" as the name of our Lord distinctively, always with specific ref. to the historical Person (*cf.* xii. 3, 1, 1 Thess. iv. 14; Eph. iv. 21; Phil. ii. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 10-14). The visible and glorious man who then appeared, declared Himself as "Jesus"; from that instant Saul knew that he had seen the crucified Jesus risen and reigning. Asking of his new-found Lord, "What wilt Thou have me to do?" he received the command out of which his commission unfolded itself. Personal knowledge of the Lord and a "word from His mouth" (Acts xxii. 14) were necessary to constitute an Apostle in the primary sense, the immediate "emissary" of Jesus (*cf.* Mark iii. 13, Acts i. 21 f.); in virtue of this experience, P. classes himself with "the other App." (xv. 7 ff., Gal. i. 16 f.); his right to do so was in due time acknowledged by them (Gal. ii. 6-9). The great interview, in its full import, was Paul's own secret; his Apostolic power, derived therefrom, was manifest to the whole world (2 Cor. iii. 1 ff., xii. 12), the Cor. Church supplying a conspicuous proof.

Vv. 2, 3. If not at Corinth amongst those who cried "I am of Cephas," elsewhere Paul's apostleship was denied by the Judaistic party, against whom he

3. ἡ ἐμὴ [g]ἀπολογία τοῖς ἐμὲ [h]ἀνακρίνουσιν αὕτη[1] ἐστί[1]· 4. [i]μὴ [i]οὐκ [k]ἔχομεν [k]ἐξουσίαν φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν[2]; 5. [i]μὴ [i]οὐκ [k]ἔχομεν [k]ἐξουσίαν ἀδελφὴν[3] γυναῖκα[3] [l]περιάγειν, ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ [m]ἀπό-

g 2 Cor. vii. 11; Phil. i. 7, 16; 2 Tim. iv. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 15 (with dat.); Acts xxii. 1, xxv. 16. h See ii. 14. i xi. 22; Rom. x. 18 f. k See vii. 37. l Trans., N.T. *h.l.*; Ezek. xxxvii. 2. *Cf.* Acts xiii. 11; Mt. iv. 23, etc. m In this sense, xii. 28 f., xv. 7, 9; 2 Cor. xi. 5 (?); Gal. i. 17, 19; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11; 1 Th. ii. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 2; Gospp. and Acts, *passim*.

[1] **εστιν αυτη** (in this order): ℵABP 17, 37, 46.

[2] **πειν**, B*; or **πιν**, ℵ*D*G. See Wr., p. 112.

[3] Clem. Al., Hier., Aug., Hil., with the arm. vers., read **γυναικας** or **αδελφας γυναικας**, conforming the obj. to **εχομεν**.

had afterwards to write 2 Cor. x. ff. In this trial he counts on the Cor. standing by him: "If to others I am no apostle, at any rate (ἀλλά γε, *at certe*, Bz.) I am *to you*". He does not say "*of* others," as though distinguishing two fields of jurisdiction in the sense of Gal. ii. 8, rather "*in the eyes of* others"; *cf.* the dat. of viii. 6. For ἀλλά γε, *cf.* Plato, *Gorg.*, 470 D., εἰ δὲ μὴ (δρῶ), ἀλλ' ἀκούω γε.—γε throws its emphasis on ὑμῖν; so P. continues: "The seal of my apostleship *you are*, in the Lord"; *cf.* Rom. iv. 11, 2 Cor. i. 22. This seal came from the hand of the Lord, affixed by the Master to His servant's work (*cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 1 ff.). Despite its imperfections, the Cor. Church was a shining evidence of Paul's commission; it was probably the largest Church as yet raised in his independent ministry. For ἐν Κυρίῳ, see note on iv. 15, and vii. 22.—"*This*"—referring to vv. 1, 2—"is my answer to those that put me on my defence": I point them to you!—ἀπολογία (see parls.) is a *self-exculpation*. For ἀνακρίνω, *cf.* notes on ii. 14 f., iv. 4.—It is Paul's ἀποστολή, not the ἐξουσία of vv. 4 ff., that is called in question; hence the vein of self-defence pervading the Epp. of this period. Granted the *apostleship* (and this the readers cannot deny), the *right* followed as a matter of course: this needed no "apology".

Vv. 4-6. The rights P. vindicates for himself and his fellow-labourers in the Gospel, are (*a*) the right *to maintenance*; (*b*) *to marriage*; (*c*) *to release from manual labour*.—(*a*) μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν; "Is it that we have not?"—ironical question, as in xi. 22—"Of course we have". P. writes in pl. *collegas includens* (Bg.), the ἀποστολή suggesting οἱ λοιποὶ mentioned in the next ver.—ἐξουσίαν φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν (later Gr. for πιεῖν), "right to eat and drink,"—*sc.* as guests of the Church: see Mark vi. 10, Luke x. 7, xxii. 30. The added καὶ πεῖν, and the illustrations of vv. 7 and 13, show that the obj. of the two vbs. is not the idolothyta, but the material provision for Christ's apostles, supplied by those they serve (11); this ἐξουσία is analogous to, not parl. with, that of viii. 9, belonging not to the ἐλεύθερος as such, but to the ἀπόστολος; *cf.* the *Didaché*, 13, "Every true prophet is worthy of his food". George Fox characteristically notes the moderation of the demand: "The Ap. said 'Have I not power to eat and to drink?' But he did not say, 'to take tithes, Easter reckonings, Midsummer dues, augmentations, and great sums of money'." ἐξουσίαν, as a verbal noun, governs the bare inf., like ἔξεστιν.—(*b*) Paul claims, in order to renounce, the ἐξουσίαν ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν—the "right to take about (with us) a sister as wife"—*i.e.*, a Christian wife: brachyology for "to have a Christian sister to wife, and take her about with us".—ἀδελφὴν is obj., γυναῖκα objective complement to περιάγειν, on which the stress lies; "non ex habendo, sed ex circumducendo sumtus afferebatur ecclesiis" (Bg.). The Clementine Vg. rendering, *mulierem sororem circumducendi* (as though from γυν. ἀδελφ.), gives a sense at variance both with grammar and decorum, not to be justified by Luke viii. 2 f. This misinterpreted text was used in defence of the scandalous practice of priests and monks keeping as "sisters" γυναῖκες συνεισακτοί, which was condemned by the Nicene Council, and often subsequently; so Jerome (Ep. 23, *ad Eustoch.*), "Agapetarum pestis . . . sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum . . . novum concubinarum genus" (see Suicer's *Thesaurus*, *s. vv.* Ἀγαπητή, Ἀδελφή).—From the ὡς καὶ clause it appears that "the rest of the App.," generally speaking, were married, and their wives often travelled

στολοι καὶ οἱ [n] ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ [n] Κυρίου καὶ [o] Κηφᾶς; 6. ἢ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρνάβας, οὐκ [k] ἔχομεν [k] ἐξουσίαν τοῦ [1] μὴ [p] ἐργάζεσθαι;

7. Τίς [q] στρατεύεται ἰδίοις [r] ὀψωνίοις [s] ποτέ; τίς [t] φυτεύει [tu] ἀμπελῶνα καὶ ἐκ [2] τοῦ [2] καρποῦ [2] αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐσθίει; ἢ [3] τίς [v] ποιμαίνει

n Gal. i. 19; Acts i. 14; Mt. xii. 46 ff., xiii. 55; Jo. ii. 12, vii. 3, 5, 10.
o 12, iii. 22, xv. 5; Gal. i. 18, ii. 9 ff., Jo. i. 43.
p In this usage, Rom. iv. 4 f.; 1 Th. ii. 9; 2 Th. iii. 8 ff.; see iv. 12.
q 2 Cor. x. 3; 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 4; Jas. iv. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 11; Lk. iii. 14; Isa. xxix. 7.
r 2 Cor. xi. 8; Rom. vi. 23; Lk. iii. 14; 1 Esdr. iv. 56; 1 Macc. iii. 28, xiv. 32.
s In this use, Heb. i. 5, 13; *cf.* Eph. v. 29.
t See iii. 6; with αμπ., Deut. xx. 6.
u Mt. xx. 1 ff., xxi. 28 ff.; Lk. xiii. 6; Isa. v. 1 ff., etc.
v *Vb.*, 1 Pet. v. 2 and Acts xx. 28 (ποιμνιον); Jude 12; Rev. ii. 27, etc., vii. 17; Jo. xxi. 16; Mt. ii. 6; Lk. xvii. 7 (with αροτριοω); 1 Ki. xxv. 16. *Noun*, Mt. xxvi. 31; Lk. ii. 8; Jo. x. 16; Gen. xxxii. 16.

[1] *Om.* **του** all pre-Syrian uncc.

[2] **τον καρπον**: all pre-Syrian uncc. **εκ των καρπων**, C[3], Dam.

[3] Om. **η** (?) BC[2]DG, latt. vg. sah. Tr., W.H., and Nestle *bracket*. **η** retained by ℵAC*KLP, cop. BDG is a suspicious group (W.H.).

with them; the "forsaking" of Luke xviii. 28-30 was not final (in the parl. Matt. xix. 28 f., Mark x. 28 ff., **γυνὴ** does not appear); according to tradition, John however was celibate. "The brothers of the Lord" were also orthodox Jews in this respect (on their relationship to Jesus, see Lt., *Essay* in Comm. on Galatians); indeed, they came near to founding a kind of Christian dynasty in Jerus. "And Cephas," separately mentioned as the most eminent instance of the married Christian missionary. The association of the **ἀδελφοὶ τ. Κυρ.** with the **ἀπόστολοι** does not prove that they were counted amongst these, or bore this title of office: while distinguished from the latter by their specific name (*cf.* Gal. i. 19), they are linked with them as persons of like eminence; see the position of James in Acts.—(*c*) The third **ἐξουσία, μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι,** Paul and his old comrade Barnabas had laid aside. Barn. had stripped himself of property at Jerus. in the early days (Acts iv. 36 f.); and he and P. together, in the pioneer mission of Acts xiii. f., worked their way as handicraftsmen. Now separated, they both continued this practice, which was exceptional—**μόνος ἐγὼ κ. Βαρνάβας.** The allusion implies wide-spread knowledge of the career of Barn., which ends for us at Acts xv. 39. Notwithstanding the **παροξυσμὸς** in which they parted, the two great missionaries remained in friendly alliance; *cf.* Paul's reff. to Mark, Barnabas' cousin, in Col. iv. 10, 2 Tim. iv. 11. For **ἐργάζομαι,** as denoting *manual* labour, see parls.; a cl. usage, like that of Eng. *workmen.* This third **ἐξουσία** was the negative side of the first (*cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 9, also 2 Cor. xi. 9, and **ἀδάπανον θήσω** of 18 below).—The three rights in fact amount to the *one* which Paul argues for in the sequel: he might justly have imposed his personal support, and that in the more expensive character of a married man, upon the Christian communities for which he laboured, thus sparing himself the disadvantages and hardships of manual toil.

§ 28. The Claim of Ministers to Public Maintenance, ix. 7-15*a*. Paul asserts his right to live at the charge of the Christian community, in order to show the Cor. how he has waived this prerogative (15*b*, etc.). But before doing this, he will further vindicate the right; for it was sure to be disputed, and his renunciation might be used to the disadvantage of other servants of Christ. He therefore formally establishes the claim: (*a*) on grounds of natural analogy (7); (*b*) by proof from Scripture (8-10); (*c*) by the intrinsic justice of the case (11); (*d*) by comparison with O.T. practice (13); finally (*e*) by ref. to the express commandment of the Lord (14). In ver. 12 he indicates, by the way, that "others" of inferior standing are making themselves chargeable on the Cor. Church.

Ver. 7 puts the question under three figures—virtual arguments from nature—drawn from the *camp*, the *vineyard*, the *flock*. These figures had been similarly used by our Lord: (1) in Luke xi. 21 f., xiv. 31; (2) in Matt. xx. 1 ff., xxi. 28 ff.; (3) in Luke xii. 32, John x., and xxi. 15 ff. *Cf.* in Paul for (1) xiv. 8, Eph. vi. 10 ff., 1 Thess. v. 8; (2) iii. 6 ff.; (3) Acts xx. 28, Eph. iv. 11. On **ὀψωνίοις,** see Gm.: it denotes primarily "rations" served out in lieu of pay; then military "stipends" of any kind; then "wages" generally; see parls.—**ἰδίοις ὀψων.,** not

[w]ποίμνην καὶ ἐκ τοῦ γάλακτος τῆς [v]ποίμνης οὐκ ἐσθίει; 8. μὴ [w]κατὰ [w]ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ,[1] [x]ἢ οὐχὶ[2] [x]καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα λέγει[2]; 9. ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωσέως[3] νόμῳ γέγραπται,[4] "Οὐ [y]φιμώσεις[5] βοῦν [z]ἀλοῶντα"· μὴ [a]τῶν βοῶν [a]μέλει τῷ Θεῷ, 10. ἢ δι' ἡμᾶς [b]πάντως λέγει; δι' ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἐγράφη, ὅτι [d]ἐπ' [d]ἐλπίδι[6] [c]ὀφείλει[6]

w See iii. 3. x η και, xvi. 6 (?); 2 Cor. i. 13; Rom. ii. 15; Lk. xi. 11 f., xviii. 11. Interrog. as here, Rom. iv. 9; Lk. xii. 41. y κημωσεις, if genuine, *h.l.* φιμωσεις, Deut. xxv. 4; so 1 Tim. v. 18; 1 Pet. ii. 15; Mt. xxii. 12, 34; Mk. i. 25, etc. See txti. and exegetical notes. z 1 Tim. v. 18 (Deut. xxv. 4); 1 Chron. xxi. 20. a See vii. 21. With gen., N.T. *h.l.*; usually περι, Mt. xxii. 16, etc. b See v. 10. c See vii. 36. d Rom. iv. 18, v. 2, viii. 20; Tit. i. 2; Acts ii. 26 (Psa. xvi. 9), xxvi. 6.

[1] λεγω, DG—characteristic Western alteration.

[2] η και ο νομος ταυτα ου λεγει; ℵABCD 46.
η ει και ο νομος ταυτα λεγει; G, arm. T.R. in KLP, etc.

[3] Μωυσεως: all uncc. but A. So *passim*.

[4] γεγραπται γαρ (om. rest of clause): DG, Hil., etc.—Western emendation.

[5] κημωσεις (?), B*D*G, Chr., Thdrt., Cyr. So Tisch., Tr., Al., El., Nestle, W.H. *marg.* See note 3 on last p.; on the other hand, κημ. is *h.l.*, and φιμ. might easily be borrowed from Deut.
φιμωσεις, ℵAB³CD^bcKLP, etc. So Lachm., W.H. *txt.*, and R.V.

[6] οφειλει επ' ελπιδι (in this order): pre-Syrian non-Western uncc.

"at his proper pay," but "at his private (as distinguished from public) charges": *cf.* xi. 21, Gal. ii. 2. The use of ποτὲ to widen negative, interr. (virtually negative), and hypothetical propositions, common in cl. Greek, is infrequent in N.T.—In the third question, a partitive ἐκ with gen. replaces the acc., the image suggesting *a share:* "the shepherd is still remunerated in the East by a share of the milk" (Mr.); or is P. thinking of the solid food (ἐσθίει) which comes "*out of* the milk"? For the cognate acc., ποιμαίνει ποίμνην, *cf.* 1 Peter v. 2, also John x. 16.

Vv. 8-10*a*. μὴ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον κ.τ.λ.; "Am I saying these things as any man might do"—in accordance with human practice (as just seen in 7)?—κατὰ ἄνθρ., in contrast with what ὁ νόμος λέγει; *cf.* Gal. iii. 15 ff. This dialectic use of μή, ἤ or ἢ καί, in a train of questions, is very Pauline; ἢ καὶ recommends the second alternative; *cf.* Rom. iv. 9, Luke xii. 41. —"The law" is abolished as a means of obtaining salvation (Rom iii. 19 ff., etc.); it remains a revelation of truth and right (Rom. vii. 12 ff.), and P. draws from it guidance for Christian conduct; *cf.* xiv. 34, Rom. xiii. 8 ff., and (comprehensively) Rom. viii. 4. The ethics of the N.T. are those of the Old, enhanced by Christ (see Matt. v. 17 ff.). Paul speaks however here, somewhat distantly, of the "law *of Moses*" (*cf.* vv. 20 f., x. 2); but of "the law *of Christ*" in Gal. vi. 2 (*cf.* John i. 17, viii. 17, x. 34, xv. 25).—Οὐ φιμώσεις κ.τ.λ., "Thou shalt not muzzle a threshing ox," cited to the same effect in 1 Tim. v. 18,—οὐ with fut. reproducing the Heb. *lo'* with impf. of emphatic prohibition. Deut. xxv. 4, detached where it stands, belongs to a series of Mosaic commands enjoining humane treatment of animals, regarded as being in some sense a part of the sacred community: *cf.* Exod. xx. 10, xxiii. 12, 19, Deut. xxii. 4, 6 f., 10. Corn was threshed either by the feet of cattle (Mic. iv. 12 f.), or by a sledge driven over the threshing-floor (2 Sam xxiv. 22).—μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ Θεῷ κ.τ.λ.; "Is it for *the oxen* that God cares, or on our account, by all means, does He say (it)?" The argumentative πάντως (*cf.* Rom. iii. 9, Luke iv. 23), "on every ground"—slightly diff. in ver. 22, more so in v. 10: not that "God is concerned *wholly* (*exclusively*) for us" in this rule; but *on every account* a provision made for the beasts in man's service must hold good, *à fortiori*, for God's proper servants; *cf.* Matt. vi. 26 ff., also x. 31, xii. 12. δι' ἡμᾶς, emphatically repeated, signifies not *men* as against oxen, but *nos evangelii ministros* (Est.) in analogy to oxen; the right of Christ's ministers "to eat and drink" is safeguarded by the principle that gives the ox his provender out of the corn he treads. Paul's method in such interpretations is radically diff. from that of Philo, who says, Οὐ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλόγων ὁ νόμος, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν νοῦν κ. λόγον ἐχόντων, *De Victim. offer.*, § 1: Philo destroys the historical sense; Paul extracts its moral principle.

Ver. 10*b*. δι' ἡμᾶς γὰρ (*cf.* 1 Thess.

ὁ [e] ἀροτριῶν [e] ἀροτριᾷν, καὶ ὁ [a] ἀλοῶν τῆς[1] ἐλπίδος[1] αὐτοῦ[1] [f] μετέχειν [d] ἐπ' [d] ἐλπίδι.[1] 11. εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν τὰ [g] πνευματικὰ [h] ἐσπείραμεν, [i] μέγα [i] εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ [k] θερίσομεν[2]; 12*a*. εἰ ἄλλοι τῆς [l] ἐξουσίας[3] [l] ὑμῶν[3] [f] μετέχουσιν, οὐ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς; 12*b*. ἀλλ' οὐκ [m] ἐχρησάμεθα τῇ [l] ἐξουσίᾳ ταύτῃ· ἀλλὰ πάντα [n] στέγομεν, ἵνα μὴ [op] ἐγκο-

e Lk. xvii. 7 (see note v); Deut. xxii. 10.
f x. 17 ff.; Heb. ii. 14, v. 13, vii. 13; Prov. i. 18, etc.
g In this contrast, iii. 1; Rom. vii. 14 (σαρκινος), xv. 27; *cf.* Eph. vi. 12, etc.
h In this sense, 2 Cor. ix. 6, 10; Gal. vi. 7 f.; Jas. iii. 18.
i 2 Cor. xi. 15; Gen. xlv. 28; Isa. xlix. 6.
k 2 Cor. ix. 6; Mt. xxv. 24, 26; Jo. iv. 36; Ps. cxxv. 5.
l With obj. gen., Rom. ix. 21; Mt. x. 1; Jo. xvii. 2; Sir. x. 4, xvii. 2.
m See vii. 21.
n xiii. 7; 1 Th. iii. 1, 5; Sir. viii. 17. Only Pauline in N.T.
o N.T. *h.l.* -πτω, Rom. xv. 22; Gal. v. 7; 1 Th. ii. 18; 1 Pet. iii. 7; Acts xxiv. 4.
p προσκ. διδ., 2 Cor. vi. 3.

[1] επ' ελπιδι του μετεχειν: ℵ*A (εφ') BCP 17, syrr. sah. cop., Or., Eus., Cyr., Aug.; *in spe fructus percipiendi*, vg., Pelag.
της ελπιδος αυτου μετεχειν: DG.
T.R. a conflate (Syrian) reading, combining the Western and non-Western texts.

[2] θερισωμεν, CDGLP, above thirty minn.; *metamus*, latt. vg., Latt Ff.: by itacism.

[3] της υμων εξουσιας (in this order): all uncc. but KL.

ii. 20, for γὰρ in affirm. reply) κ.τ.λ.: "Yes, it was written on our account (*cf.* Rom. iv. 23 f.)—(to wit), that the ploughing (ox) ought to plough in hope, and the threshing (ox) in hope of partaking" (ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν). The explanatory ὅτι clause (*cf.* i. 5, 26, iv. 9 and note) restates and amplifies the previous quotation. The Ap. is not explaining how the command came to be given ("because," E.V.), but unfolding the principle that lies in it.—The right of the ox in threshing also belongs in equity to the ox *at the plough;* all contributors to the harvest are included, whether at an earlier or later stage.—ὀφείλει, emphatic—*debet* (Vg.): the hope of participation in the fruit is *due* to the labourer —beast or man. The moral, as applied to Christian teachers, is obvious; it embraces the successive stages of the common work (*cf.* iii. 9, John iv. 36).—ἀροτριᾷν (sometimes "to sow"; so El. and some others here) contains the root of the Lat. *aro* and older Eng. *ear*.

Vv. 11, 12*a* appeal to the sense of justice in the Cor.; τὸ δίκαιον δείκνυσιν τοῦ πράγματος (Thp.): *cf.* Gal. vi. 6.—μέγα εἰ . . .; "Is it a great thing if . . . ?" = "Is it a great thing to ask (*or* look for) that . . . ?" *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 15; the construction is akin to that of θαυμάζω εἰ (see Gm., *s.v.* Εἰ, i., 4)—a kind of litotes, *suggesting* where one might have vigorously asserted. The repeated collocation ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν, ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν, brings out the *personal* nature of this claim: "*We* sowed *for you* the things of the Spirit; should not *we* reap *from you* the (needed) carnal things?"—τὰ πνευματικὰ (*cf.* ii. 12, xii. 1-13, Rom. viii. 2, 5 f., Gal. v. 22, etc.) include all the distinctive boons of the Christian faith; "the carnal things" embrace, besides food and drink (4), all suitable bodily "goods" (Gal. vi. 6).—The question of ver. 12*a* assumes that other Christian teachers received maintenance from the Cor. Church; the claim of Paul and his fellow-missioners was paramount (*cf.* iv. 15; also 2 Cor. x. 12-18, xi. 12 ff., 20, where this comparison comes up in a new form).—ὑμῶν is surely gen. of *object*, as in Matt. x. 1 (= ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ, Luke ix. 1), John xvii. 2,—"the claim *upon* you". Ev. and Ed. read the pron. as *subjective* gen.—the latter basing the phrase on iii. 22 f.—*sc.* "if others share in *your domain*," instead of "in *dominion over you*"; this rendering is sound in grammar, and has a basis in iv. 7-12, but lies outside the scope of ἐξουσία in this context. The expression "others participate" suggests a right belonging to these "others" in a lesser degree (*cf.* μετέχω in 10): the πατὴρ should be first honoured, then the παιδαγωγοί (iv. 15).

Ver. 12*b*. "But we did not use this right"—*i.e.*, P. and his comrades in the Cor. mission (2 Cor. i. 19).—ἀλλὰ πάντα στέγομεν: "Nay, we put up with everything (*omnia sustinemus*, Vg.), lest we should cause any (kind of) hindrance to the good news about Christ".—στέγω (see parls.), syn. in later Gr. with ὑπομένω, βαστάζω, "marks the patient and enduring spirit with which the Ap. puts up with all the consequences naturally resulting from" his policy of abstinence (El.). What this involved we have partly seen in iv. 11 ff.; *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 27, Acts xx. 34.—The ἐνκοπὴ he sought to obviate

πήν [1] τινα [1] [p] δῶμεν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. 13. [q] οὐκ [q] οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ τὰ [r] ἱερὰ [r] ἐργαζόμενοι ἐκ [2] τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσθίουσιν, οἱ τῷ [s] θυσιαστηρίῳ [t] προσεδρεύοντες [3] τῷ [s] θυσιαστηρίῳ [u] συμμερίζονται; 14. οὕτω καὶ ὁ Κύριος [v] διέταξε τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [w] καταγγέλλουσιν [x] ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου [v x] ζῆν. 15*a*. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐδενὶ [4] [m] ἐχρησάμην [4] τούτων.

q See iii. 16.
r *H.l. Adj.*, 2 Tim. iii. 15; Josh. vi. 7; 2 Macc. v. 16, etc. *Vb.*, in this use, Jer. xxxvii. 9.
s x. 18; Rom. xi. 3 (3 Kings xix. 10); Heb. vii. 13, xiii. 10; Mt. v. 23, etc.; Rev. vi. 9, etc.
t παρεδρ., N.T. *h.l.*; *cf.* vii. 35; Prov. i. 21.
u *H.l.*
v With dat., xvi. 1; Tit. i. 5; Mt. xi. 1; Acts xxiii. 31, xxiv. 23. With inf., Lk. viii. 55; Acts xviii. 2, xxiv. 23. With dat. and inf., thus, *h.l.*
w See ii. 1.
x Rom. i. 17 and Heb. x. 31 (Hab. ii. 4); *cf.* Mt. iv. 4 (Deut. viii. 3).

[1] τινα εγκοπην (in this order): ℵABC 17, 46. εκκοπην, ℵD*L; Tisch. ενκοπην, BG; W.H., Nestle.

[2] τα εκ: ℵBD*G 46. Om. τα ACD^bcKLP (Alex. and Syrian).

[3] παρεδρευοντες: all uncc. but ℵ^cKL.

[4] ου κεχρημαι ουδενι: all uncc. but K.

(military term of later Gr., from ἐνκόπτω, *to cut into*, *break up*, a road, so *to hinder* a march) lay (*a*) in the reproach of venality, as old as Socrates and the Sophists, attaching to the acceptance of remuneration by a wandering teacher, which his enemies desired to fasten on Paul (1 Thess. ii. 3 ff., 2 Cor. xi. 7 ff., xii. 13 ff.); and (*b*) in the fact that P. would have shackled his movements by taking wages from particular Churches (19), so giving them a lien upon his ministrations. For the Hebraistic phrase ἐνκοπὴν δίδωμι (= ἐνκόπτω), *cf.* xiv. 7, 2 Thess. i. 8.—τοῦ Χριστοῦ is always *obj.* gen. after εὐαγγέλιον; see Rom. i. 2 f., also μαρτύριον τ. Χριστοῦ, i. 6 above.

Vv. 13, 14. After the personal "aside" of vv. 11 f., Paul returns to his main proof, deriving a further reason for the disputed ἐξουσία from the Temple service. "Do you not know"—you men of knowledge (*cf.* iii. 16)—ὅτι οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσθίουσιν; "that those employed in the sacred offices eat what comes from the sacred place (the Temple)?"—"qui sacris operantur, ex sacrario edunt" (Cv.): see the rules *ad hoc* in Lev. vi. 8-vii. 38 and Num. xviii. 8-19. For ἐργάζομαι (of *business*, *employment*), *cf.* iv. 12, Acts xviii. 3, etc.—"Those that are assiduous at the altar," *qui altari assident* (Bz.)—*i.e.*, the priests engaged in the higher ritual functions—are distinguished from other Temple ministers; the position of Paul and his colleagues is analogous to that of these chief dignitaries.—παρεδρεύω, *to have one's seat beside*; *cf.* εὐπάρεδρον, vii. 35. P. argues by analogy from the Jewish priest to the Christian minister in respect of *the claim to maintenance*; we cannot infer from this *an identity of function*, any more than in the previous comparison with "the threshing ox".—τ. θυσιαστηρίῳ συνμερίζονται, "have their portion with the altar," *i.e.*, share with it in the sacrifices—"altaris esse socios in dividendo victimas" (Bz.); parts of these were consumed in the altar-fire, and parts reserved for the priests (Lev. x. 12-15). Some refer the first half of ver. 13 to Gentile and the last to Israelite practice; but "with the Ap., τὸ ἱερὸν is only *the sanctuary* of the God of Israel, τὸ θυσιαστήριον only *the altar* on which sacrifice is made to Him" (Hf.): *cf.* Acts xxii. 17, etc., and the Gospels *passim*, as to ἱερόν; x. 18, as to θυσιαστήριον; *cf.* x. 1-12, for the use in this Ep. of O.T. analogies.—"So also (in accordance with this precedent) did the Lord appoint for those that preach the good tidings to live of the good tidings."—ἐκ τ. εὐαγγ. in ver. 14 matches ἐκ τ. ἱεροῦ, ver. 13; τοῖς . . καταγγέλλουσιν, τοῖς . . . ἐργαζομένοις: *cf.* ἱερουργοῦντα τ. εὐαγγ. τ. Θεοῦ, Rom. xv. 16.—For the "ordinance" of "the Lord" (*sc.* Jesus), see parls.; the allusion speaks for detailed knowledge of the sayings of Jesus, on the part of writer and readers; *cf.* vii. 10, xi. 23 ff., and notes.—διατάσσω, act., as in vii. 17, xi. 34; mid. in xvi. 1.—ζῆν ἐκ, of source of livelihood (*ex quo quod evangelium prædicant*, Bz.), in cl. Gr. often ζῆν ἀπὸ (see parls.). For καταγγέλλω, see note on ii. 1.

Ver. 15*a*. "But for my part, I have used none of these things:" does Paul mean "none of the privileges" included in the above ἐξουσία? or "none of the

15*b*. Οὐκ ἔγραψα δὲ ταῦτα ἵνα οὕτω γένηται [y] ἐν ἐμοί· [z a] καλὸν γάρ μοι [a] μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν ἢ τὸ [b] καύχημά μου ἵνα [1] τις [1] [c] κενώσῃ.[2] 16. ἐὰν γὰρ [d] εὐαγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἔστι μοι [b] καύχημα· [e] ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι [e f] ἐπίκειται, [g] οὐαὶ δέ μοι [g] ἐστὶν ἐὰν μὴ [d] εὐαγγελίζωμαι.[3]

y So used, Mt. xvii. 12; Lk. xxii. 37, xxiii. 31; Jo. xiv. 30; 1 Jo. iv. 9.
z See vii. 1.
a Mk. ix. 42; Acts xx. 35; *cf.* Phil. i. 23.
b See v. 6.
c See i. 17.
d See i. 17, for absol. use.
e See vii. 37. *Iliad*, vi. 458, κρατερὴ δ' ἐπεκείσετ' ἀνάγκη.
f Heb. ix. 10; Acts xxvii. 20; Jo. xi. 35.
g Jude 11; Syn. Gospp., Rev., *passim*; with εστιν, N.T. *h.l.*; Hos. ix. 12.

[1] **ουδεις**, ℵ*BD* 17, sah. basm., Tert., Ambrst. **ουθεις μη**, A. **τις** (interr.), G 26. **ινα τις**: ℵcDbcKLP, etc., vg., Bas., Chr., Hier., Aug.

[2] **κενωσει**, all uncc. but K.

[3] **ευαγγελισωμαι** (?), BCDG, vg., Aug., Ambrst. So Tr., W.H. *txt.*, Nestle. **ευαγγελιζωμαι**, ℵAK (LP, -ζομαι), etc.; Tisch., W.H. *marg.* The Westerns (DG, etc.) have **-ισωμαι** *twice* in this ver.

reasons" by which they have been enforced (so Hf., Hn., the former with exclusive ref. to 13 f.)? The parl. sentence of ver. 12, and the **οὕτως γένηται** of the next clause, are decisive for the former view. "The authority" in question included a number of rights (4 ff.), *all* of which P. has foregone.—**ἐγὼ** emphasises, in preparation for the sequel, and in distinction from the broader statement of ver. 12, etc., Paul's individual position in the matter; and the pf. **κέχρημαι** (replacing the historical aor. of 12) affirms a settled position; the refusal has become a rule. From this point to the end of the ch. the Ap. writes in the 1st sing., revealing his inner thoughts respecting the conduct of his own ministry.

§ 29. Paul's Renouncement of Right for the Gospel's Sake, ix. 15*b*-23. The Ap. has been insisting all this time on the right of Christ's ministers to material support from those they serve, in order that for his own part he may explicitly renounce it. This renunciation is his "boast," and his "reward"; of his office he cannot boast, nor seek reward for it, since it was imposed upon him (15-18). In this abnegation P. finds his freedom, which he uses to make himself impartially the slave of all; untrammelled by any particular ties, he is able to adapt himself to every condition and class of men, and thus to win for the Gospel larger gains (19-22). For himself, his best hope is to partake in its salvation with those he strives to save (23).

Ver. 15*b*. "Now I have not written this (4-14) in order that it should be so done (*viz.*, provision made for 'living of the gospel') in my case." The epistolary **ἔγραψα** may refer either to a whole letter now completed (Rom. xv. 15), or to words just written (Wr., p. 347; *cf.* v. 11).—**ἐν ἐμοί** (the sphere of application), "in the range of my work and responsibility," not "to me" (dat. of person advantaged, as in vv. 20 ff.); *cf.* iv. 2, 6.—On the best-attested reading, **καλὸν γάρ μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν ἢ—τὸ καύχημά μου οὐδεὶς κενώσει,** the sentence is interrupted at **ἢ**: "For it is well for me rather to die than"—P. breaks off, impatient of the very thought of pecuniary dependence (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 10), and instead of completing the comparison by the words "that any one should make void my boast," he exclaims vehemently, "My boast no one shall make void!" (so Al., Ed.). **μᾶλλον ἢ** qualifies the whole clause, not **καλὸν** alone. This anacoluthon, or aposiopesis, if it has no exact parl. in the N.T., is only an extreme instance of Pauline *oratio variata* (such as appears, *e.g.*, in Gal. ii. 4 f. and again in ver. 6, and in Rom. v. 12-15), where an extended sentence forgets its beginning, throwing itself suddenly into a new shape; this occurred in a smaller way in vii. 37 above. Strong feeling (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 9 ff., on the same point) is apt to disorder Paul's grammar in this way. He began to say that he *would rather die than be dependent* on Cor. pay; he ends by saying, absolutely, he *will never be so dependent*. The T.R. attempts to patch the rent.—Other explanations of the older txt. are given: (*a*) Lachmann puts a stop after **καύχ. μου**—"Better for me to die than my boast; no one shall make it void!" (*b*) Mr. and Bt. make **ἢ** disjunctive, despite the **μᾶλλον**: "Better for me to die—or (*sc.* if I live) no one shall make void my boast!" (*c*) Ev. and El. read **οὐδεὶς κενώσει** as equivalent to **ἵνα τις κενώσει**, supposing **ἵνα** to be understood and the **οὐ** to be pleonastic—expedients for which there is a precarious grammati-

17. εἰ γὰρ [h] ἑκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω, [i] μισθὸν [i] ἔχω· εἰ δὲ [k] ἄκων, [l] οἰκονομίαν [m] πεπίστευμαι· 18. τίς οὖν μοι[1] ἐστιν[2] ὁ [i] μισθός; ἵνα [d] εὐαγγελιζόμενος [n] ἀδάπανον [o] θήσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ[3] Χριστοῦ,[3]

h Rom. viii. 20; Exod. xxi. 13. i See iii. 8. With ἔχω, Mt. vi. 1 ff.; *cf.* 2 Jo. 8. k N.T. *h.l.*; Job xiv. 17. l Eph. i. 10, iii. 2, 9; Col. i. 25; 1 Tim. i. 4; Lk. xvi. 2 ff.; Isa. xxii. 19, 21. *Cf.* iv. 1 ff. m In this sense, Gal. ii. 7; Rom. iii. 2; 1 Th. ii. 4; 1 Tim. i. 11; Tit. i. 3; Lk. xvi. 11; Jo. ii. 24. n *H.l.* o In this usage, Rom. iv. 17 (Gen. xvii. 5); Mt. xxii. 44 (Ps. cix. 1); Gen. xxxii. 12; Wisd. x. 21. Poetical in cl. Gr.

[1] μου, ℵ*ACK 17, 46, vg. syr^sch. sah. cop., Cyr., Hier. μοι, BD*GLP, etc., Chr., Aug. Seemingly Western.

[2] εσται μοι: D*G.

[3] *Om.* του Χριστου ℵABCD* 17, 46, vg. sah. cop.

cal analogy. (*d*) Lachmann also conjectured ἀποθανεῖν νὴ for ἀποθανεῖν ἤ, Michelsen and Baljon adding the easy insertion of ὃ before οὐδείς: "It is good for me rather to die! Yea, by my glorying (*cf.* xv. 31), which no one shall make void." (*e*) Hf., Gd., and others, in despair fall back on the T.R.

Vv. 16-18. Paul goes on to explain, by two contrasted suppositions (in *actual* and *conceivable* matter), that this is a point of honour with him. Forced as he had been into the service of the Gospel, in a manner so diff. from the other App., unless he might serve gratuitously his position would be too humiliating.

Ver. 16. The fact of his preaching supplies in itself no καύχημα: "For if I be preaching the good news (εὐαγγελίζωμαι), it is no (matter of) boasting to me; for necessity is imposed on me". For ἀνάγκη, see notes on vii. 26, 37; also Philem. 14, where it contrasts with κατὰ ἑκούσιον as with ἑκὼν here.—Ἐπίκειμαι is virtually pass. to ἐπιτίθημι (see parls.), "to lay" a task, by authority, "upon" some one: P. was, in the Apostolic ranks, a *pressed man*, not a volunteer,—"laid hold of" (Phil. iii. 12) against his previous will; he entered Christ's service as a captive enemy (*cf.* xv. 8, 2 Cor. ii. 14). While a gift of Divine mercy (vii. 25, 2 Cor. iv. 1, etc.), his commission was a determination of the Divine sovereignty (i. 1., etc.). For service rendered upon this footing there can never be any boasting; *cf.* Luke xvii. 10.—That all glorying in this direction was excluded, is sustained by the exclamation, "For woe is to me if I should not preach the Gospel!" ὅπου τὸ Οὐαὶ παράκειται ἐὰν μὴ ποιῇ, οὐκ ἔχει καύχημα (Or.).—ἐὰν μὴ εὐαγγελίσωμαι (contrast the pr. εὐαγγελίζωμαι, of former clause), *aor. sbj.*, of comprehensive fut. ref., from the standpoint of the original "necessity imposed"; *cf.*, for the construction, viii. 8, xv. 36. The interjection οὐαὶ is here a quasi-substantive, as in Rev. ix. 12. Had P. disobeyed the call of God, his course from that time onwards must have been one of condemnation and misery. To fight against "Necessity" the Greeks conceived as ruin; their Ἀνάγκη was a blind, cruel Fate, Paul's ἀνάγκη is the compulsion of Sovereign Grace.

Ver. 17 completes a chain of four explanatory γάρs (*cf.* i. 17-21). To make his position clearer, P. puts two further contrasted hypotheses, the former imaginary, the latter suggesting the fact: (*a*) "For if I am engaged on this (work) of my own free will (ἑκών), I have reward (*mercedem habeo*)"—*sc.* the supposed καύχημα of ver. 16, the right to credit his work to himself (*cf.* Rom. iv. 2, 4); not the *future* Messianic reward (so Mr. and others), for ἔχω implies *attained* possession (see parls.), much as ἀπέχω in Matt. vi. 2, etc. For πράσσω, see note on v. 2. (*b*) "But"—the contrasted matter of fact—"if against my will (ἄκων = ἀνάγκῃ, 16), with a stewardship I have been entrusted"; *cf.* iv. 1 f., 1 Tim. i. 12, etc.—The οἰκονόμος (see note, iv. 1), however highly placed, is a slave whose work is chosen for him and whose one merit is faithful obedience. In Paul's consciousness of stewardship there mingled submission to God, gratitude for the trust bestowed, and independence of human control (*cf.* 19, iv. 3).—The use of πιστεύω in pass. with personal subject and acc. of thing (imitating vbs. of *double acc.*), is confined to Paul in N.T.; see Wr., pp. 287, 326. To οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι one tacitly adds, from the contrasted clause, καὶ μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχω: "Christ's bondman, I claim no hire for my stewardship; *God's trust* is enough for me".

Ver. 18. Yet, after all, Paul has his reward: "What then (οὖν, things being so) *is* my reward?"—ὁ μισθός, "the

εἰς τὸ μὴ [p] καταχρήσασθαι τῇ [q] ἐξουσίᾳ μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ. 19. [r] ἐλεύθερος γὰρ ὢν [r] ἐκ πάντων, πᾶσιν ἐμαυτὸν [s] ἐδούλωσα, ἵνα [t] τοὺς [t] πλείονας [u] κερδήσω· 20. καὶ ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος,

p See vii. 31.
q See vii. 37.
r N.T. *h.l.* With απο, Rom. vi. 18, 22, vii. 3, viii. 2, 21; commonly bare gen. in cl. Gr.
s See vii. 15.
t x. 5, xv. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 6, iv. 15, ix. 2; Phil. i. 14; Heb. vii. 23; Acts xix. 32, xxvii. 12; Lk. vii. 43; Exod. xxiii. 2.
u 1 Pet. iii. 1 and Mt. xviii. 15, of *persons.*

reward" proper to such a case, is simply to take no pay: "that, while I preach the good news, I may make the good news free of charge" (**ἀδάπανον θήσω**, *gratuitum constituam*, Bz.). No thought of *future* (deferred) *pay*, nor of *supererogatory work* beyond the strict duty of the **οἰκονόμος**, but only of the satisfaction felt by a generous mind in rendering unpaid service (*cf.* Acts xx. 33 ff.). The Ap. plays on the word **μισθός**—first denied, then asserted, much as on **σοφία** in ii. 1-8; he repudiates "reward" in the mercenary sense, to claim it in the larger ethical sense. He "boasts" that the Cor. spend nothing on him, while he spends himself on them (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 9-12, xii. 14 f.).—**ἵνα** replaces the inf. in apposition to **μισθός**, "marking the purposive result involved" (El.)—*to make*, *as I intended*, *the Gospel costless.*—**θήσω** is *fut.*, intimating assurance of the purpose, as in Gal. ii. 4 (see Wr., p. 361).—**τίθημι** with objective complement, a construction of cl. Gr. poetry and later prose, which Heb. idiom demands frequently in LXX; *cf.* xii. 28, xv. 25.—"So that I might not use to the full (**εἰς τ. μὴ καταχρήσασθαι**: see vii. 31) my right in the gospel"—*sc.* that maintained in the former part of the ch.: a further purpose of Paul's preaching gratuitously, involved in that just stated, and bearing on *himself* as the **ἀδάπ. θήσω** bore upon the readers.—**Ἐξουσία ἐν τ. εὐαγγελίῳ** is "a right (involved) in (proclaiming) the good news," belonging to the **εὐαγγελιζόμενος** (14). P. was resolved to keep well within his rights, in handling the Gospel (*cf.* Matt. x. 8; also vi. 7*b*, 8*a* above). This sentiment applies to every kind of "right in *the gospel*" of gratuitous salvation; it reappears, with another bearing, in 2 Cor. xiii. 3-10.

Ver. 19. **ἐλεύθερος γὰρ ὢν κ.τ.λ.** serves further to explain, not **εἰς τ. μὴ καταχρήσ.** (the impropriety of a grasping use of such right is manifest), but Paul's general policy of self-abnegation (15-18). The real aim of this long discussion of ministerial **ἐξουσία** comes into view; the Ap. shows himself to the Cor. as *an example of superior privilege held upon trust for the community*, of *liberty asserted with a view to self-abnegation*: "For, being free from all, to all I enslaved myself, that I might gain the more".—**πάντων** is masc., like the antithetical **πᾶσιν** (*cf.* **τ. πᾶσιν**, 22); **ἐλεύθερος ἐκ**—a rare construction (commonly **ἀπό**)—implies *extrication*, escape from danger (*cf.* Luke i. 71, 2 Tim. ii. 26). In ver. 1 **ἐλεύθερος** signified freedom from needless and burdensome scruple, here freedom *from entangling dependence.* Paul freed himself from everybody, just that he might be everybody's servant; had he been bound as a salaried minister to any particular Church, his services would in that degree have been limited. For the motive of this **δουλεία**, *cf.* Gal. v. 13; and for Paul's aim, in its widest bearing, Rom. i. 14, xv. 1; also John xiii. 12 ff., Luke xxii. 24 ff.—**τοὺς πλείονας**, "the more"—not "the greater part" (as in x. 5; so Mr. and others), nor *quam plurimos* (Bg.), but "so much more" than could otherwise have been gained (*cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 15, Luke vii. 43; so Ed.). The expression **κερδήσω** is used for **σώσω** (22), in allusion to the charge of *gain-seeking* to which P. was exposed (2 Cor. xi. 12, xii. 17 f., 1 Thess. ii. 5; *cf.* Tit. i. 7, 11); "gain I did seek," he says, "and greedily—the gain of winning all sorts of men for Christ" (*cf.* Matt. iv. 19).

Vv. 20-22. This gain of his calling P. sought (1) *among the Jews, and those* who with them were *under law* (20); (2) amongst the body of *the Gentiles*, *without law* (21); (3) amongst *the weak believers*, who were imperilled by the inconsiderate use of liberty on the part of the stronger (22*a*). Each of these classes the Ap. saves by identifying himself with it in turn; and this plan he could only follow by keeping clear of sectional obligations (19). Ed., coupling vv. 20*b* and 21, distinguishes three points of view—"race, religion, conscience".—"I *became* to the Jews as a Jew," for Paul was no longer such in the common acceptation: see note on **ἐλεύθερος** (1), also Gal. ii. 4, iv. 12; for evidence of his Jewish conformity, see Acts xvi. 3, xviii. 18, xxi. 23 ff.; also the speeches in Acts xiii. 16 ff., xxii. 1 ff., xxvi. 2 ff.; and Rom. i. 16, ix. 1 ff., xi. 1, xv. 8, for his warm patriotism.—**τοῖς ὑπὸ**

ἵνα Ἰουδαίους [u] κερδήσω· τοῖς [v] ὑπὸ [v] νόμον ὡς [v] ὑπὸ [v] νόμον,[1] ἵνα τοὺς [v] ὑπὸ [v] νόμον [u] κερδήσω· 21. τοῖς [w] ἀνόμοις ὡς [w] ἄνομος, μὴ ὢν [w] ἄνομος Θεῷ[2] ἀλλ' [x] ἔννομος Χριστῷ,[2] ἵνα [u] κερδήσω[3] [w] ἀνόμους·[4] 22a. ἐγενόμην τοῖς [y] ἀσθενέσιν ὡς[5] [y] ἀσθενής, ἵνα τοὺς [y] ἀσθενεῖς [u] κερδήσω· 22b. [z] τοῖς [z] πᾶσι γέγονα τὰ[6] πάντα, ἵνα [a] πάντως[7] τινὰς[7]

v Rom. vi. 14 f.; Gal. iv. 4 f., 21.
w In this exact meaning, Acts ii. 23; also Wisd. xvii. 2. -ως, Rom. ii. 12.
x Acts xix. 39; "law-abiding" in cl. Gr.
y See i. 25 and iv. 10.
z x. 17; 2 Cor. v. 10, 15; Rom. xi. 32; Eph. iv. 13; Phil. ii. 21; Mk. xiv. 64.
a See v. 10.

[1] *Insert* **μη ων αυτος υπο νομον** all uncc. but K, and many minn., latt. vg. sah. syrp., Or., Cyr., Dam., Aug.—lost through homœoteleuton (repeated **υπο νομον**).

[2] **Θεου . . . Χριστου**: all uncc. but DcKL.

[3] **κερδανω**, all uncc. but ℵcDKL. The same MSS., **κερδησω** in context.

[4] **τους ανομους**: all uncc. but ℵcGKL.

[5] *Om.* **ως** ℵ*AB d e vg., Or., Cyp., Amb., Ambrst.

[6] *Om.* **τα** all pre-Syrian uncc.

[7] **παντας** (for **παντως τινας**), the Westerns, including vg.: *ut omnes facerem salvos.*

νόμον enlarges the category **τ. Ἰουδαίοις** by including circumcised proselytes (see Gal. v. 1-3); and **ὡς ὑπὸ νόμον** defines Paul's Judaism as subjection, by way of accommodation, to legal observance, to which the ptpl. phrase (wanting in the T.R.), **μὴ ὢν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον**, intimates that he is no longer bound in principle —**μὴ** with ptp. implying subjective standpoint ("not being in my view"), and **αὐτὸς** denoting *on my part, of and for myself* (*cf.* Rom. vii. 25). P.'s self-denying conformity to legal environment brought on him the reproach of "still preaching circumcision" (Gal. v. 11).—In relation to Gentiles also he takes an attitude open to misunderstanding and which he wishes to guard: "to those out-of-law (**τ. ἀνόμοις**) as out-of-law—though I am not out-of-law in respect of God, but in-law (**ἔννομος**) in respect of Christ". **ἄνομος** was the Jewish designation for all beyond the pale of Mosaism (see Rom. ii. 9-16, etc.): Paul became this to Gentiles (Gal. iv. 12), abandoning his natural position, in that he did not practise the law of Moses amongst them nor make it the basis or aim of his preaching to them; see Acts xiv. 15 ff., xvii. 22 ff. He was **ἄνομος** therefore, in the narrow Jewish sense; not so in the true religious sense —"in relation to God"; indeed P. is now *more than* **ὑπὸ νόμον**, he is **ἔννομος Χριστοῦ** (= **ἐν νόμῳ Χριστοῦ**; *cf.* Gal. vi. 2, Rom. iii. 27, 31, viii. 2)—*non existens exlex Deo, sed inlex Christo* (Est.). The Christian stands within the law as entering into its spirit and becoming one with it in nature; he is "in the law of Christ" as he is "in Christ" (*cf.* Gal. ii. 20, 2 Cor. v. 17). This **νόμος Χριστοῦ** P. expounds in Rom. xii., xiii. (esp. 10), Col. iii., Eph. iv. 20-v. 9, after John xiii. 34, Matt. v.-vii., etc. Its fulfilment is guaranteed by the fact that it is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Rom. viii. 1 ff.), who "dwells in" the Christian (iii. 16), operating not as an outward yoke but an implanted life.—**ἵνα κερδάνω τ. ἀνόμους** follows **τ. ἀνόμοις ὡς ἄνομος**, after the **μὴ ὢν** parenthesis, in the manner of the two **ἵνα** clauses of ver. 20 (**κερδάνω** and **κερδήσω** are the Attic and non-Attic forms of the 1st aor. sbj.). —Describing the third of his self-adaptations, P. resumes the **ἐγενόμην** of the first, coming home to the situation of his readers: "I became to the weak (not *as weak*, but actually) *weak* (see txtl. note), that I might gain the weak". So well did he enter into the scruples of the timid and half-enlightened (see *e.g.* viii. 7, 10, Rom. xiv. 1 f.), that he forgot his own strength (viii. 4, Rom. xv. 1) and felt himself "weak" with them: *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 29, **τίς ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ;**

Ver. 22b sums up (in the pf. **γέγονα** of abiding fact replacing the historical **ἐγενόμην**, and with the objective **σώσω** for the subjective **κερδήσω**) the Apostle's conduct in the various relations of his ministry: "To all men I have become all things, that by all means I might save some".—On **πάντως**, which varies in sense according to its position and context, see ver. 10, v. 10; here it is adv. of manner to **σώσω**, *omni quovis modo.* "That in all this description of his **οἰκονομία** or **συγκατάβασις** P. sets forth no unchristian compliance with men, but

[b] σώσω. 23. τοῦτο [1] δὲ ποιῶ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἵνα [c] συγκοινωνὸς αὐτοῦ γένωμαι.

24. [d] Οὐκ [d] οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ ἐν [e] σταδίῳ τρέχοντες πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν, εἷς δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ [f] βραβεῖον; οὕτω τρέχετε ἵνα [g] καταλάβητε. 25. πᾶς δὲ ὁ [h] ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα [i] ἐγκρατεύεται· ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν

b Of *human* action, Rom. xi. 14; 1 Tim. iv. 16; Jas v. 15, 20; Jude 23.
c Rom. xi. 17; Phil. i. 7; Rev. i. 9. -νειν Eph. v. 11.
d See iii. 16.
e In this sense, N.T. *h.l.*; *cf.* Lk. xxiv. 13, etc. See Herod. v. 22 αγωνιζεσθαι σταδιον.
f Phil. iii. 14; -ευω, Col. ii. 18, iii. 15.
g In this sense, Rom. ix. 30; Phil. iii. 12 f.; Exod. xv. 9.
h Col. i. 29, iv. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 10, vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7; Lk. xiii. 24; Jo. xviii. 36; Sir. iv. 28, etc.
i See vii. 9.

[1] **παντα**, all uncc. but KL, and all anc. verss. but syr. and go.

the practical wisdom of true Christian love and self-denial in the exercise of his office, this he expects will be self-evident to his readers, so well acquainted with his character (2 Cor. i. 12 ff., v. 11). This kind of wisdom is so much more manifestly the fruit in P. of experience under the discipline of the Spirit, as his temper was the more fiery and uncompromising" (Mr.); "non mentientis actus, sed compatientis affectus" (Aug.). This behaviour appeared to his enemies time-serving and duplicity (2 Cor. i. 12, iv. 2, xii. 16, Gal. i. 10).

Ver. 23. Paul's course in its chameleon-like changes is governed by a simple practical aim: "But all things I do for the gospel's sake". His one purpose is to fulfil his Gospel stewardship (17, iv. 1 ff., etc., Acts xx. 24); Phil. iii. 7-14 presents the inner side of the "one thing" he pursues. The intensity with which this end is sought accounts for the variety of means; the most resolute, in a complicated situation, becomes the most versatile of men. **διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον**, "on the gospel's account", with a view to spread the good news most widely and carry it into effect most completely: for **διὰ** of the end as a ground of action, *cf.* iv. 17, viii. 11, Rom. iv. 25. For himself Paul's sole ambition is "that I may be joint-partaker in it (with those I save)"—that he may win its salvation along with many others, the fruit of his ministry (*cf.* 1 Thess. ii. 19 f.; also John xiv. 3, xvii. 24).

§ 30. Paul's Asceticism, ix. 24-27. The last words of § 29 indicate that the writer feels his own salvation to be bound up in his mission to his fellowmen. The self-denial practised for the latter of these objects is necessary, in point of fact, *for both*. His example should teach the Cor. the need of stern self-discipline on their personal account, as well as in the interests of weaker brethren. From ix. 24 onwards to x. 22 P. pursues this line of warning, addressed to men who were imperilling their own souls by self-indulgence and worldly conformity. Of the danger of missing the prize of life through indiscipline P. is keenly sensible in his own case; he conveys his apprehension under the picture, so familiar to the Cor., of the Isthmian Games.

Ver. 24. **Οὐκ οἴδατε . . .**; *cf.* ver. 13, etc. **οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες, πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν, εἷς δὲ κ.τ.λ.**: "Those that run in the stadium, run *all* (of them), but *one* receives the prize". As much as to say, "Entering the race is not winning it; do not be satisfied with running, but make sure of winning—*So run that you may secure (the prize)*!" The art. is wanting with **σταδίῳ**, as often after prps., esp. when the noun is quasi-proper; *cf.* our "at court," "in church." The *stadion* was the race-course, always a fixed length of 600 Gr., or 606¾ Eng. ft.; hence a measure of distance, as in Matt. xiv. 24—*a furlong*.—For the antithesis of **πάντες** and **εἷς**, conveying the point of the warning, *cf.* the emphatic **πάντες** of x. 1-4 (see note); also vi. 12, x. 23.—**οὕτως** may point backward to **εἷς** ("run like that one": *cf.* 14, ii. 11), or forward to **ἵνα** (**καταλάβ.**)—a particle substituted for the regular correlative, **ὥστε** (*cf.* Acts xiv. 1, John iii. 16), where the result is an *aim* to be achieved; the latter connexion is more probable, since the following vv. dilate on the conditions of success.

Ver. 25. **πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος κ.τ.λ.**: "But every combatant is temperate in everything—they, to be sure, that they may win a perishable garland; but we an imperishable." The stress in the first clause lies on **πᾶς, πάντα**—no competitor can afford to be self-indulgent in anything; in the second on **ἐκεῖνοι, ἡμεῖς**—if *they* are so abstinent for so poor a prize, what should *we* be? For ten months before the contest in the Great Games, the athletes were required, under

ἵνα [k] φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ [m] ἄφθαρτον· 26. ἐγὼ [n] τοίνυν [o] οὕτω τρέχω, [o] ὡς οὐκ [p] ἀδήλως· [o] οὕτω πυκτεύω, [o] ὡς οὐκ [q] ἀέρα [r] δέρων· 27. ἀλλ' [s] ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ [t] δουλαγωγῶ, [u] μήπως ἄλλοις [v] κηρύξας αὐτὸς [w] ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι.

k xv. 53 f.; Rom. i. 23; 1 Pet. i. 18, 23.
l Phil. iv. 1; 1 Th. ii. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 8; Jas. i. 12; 1 Pet. v. 4; Rev. ii. 10, iii. 11, etc.; Mt. xxvii. 29, etc. -οω, 2 Tim. ii. 5. m xv. 52; Rom. i. 23; 1 Pet. i. 4, 23, iii. 4. n *H.l.* in Paul; Heb. xiii. 13; Lk. xx. 25; Isa. iii. 10, v. 13. o *Cf.* iii. 15. p *H.l.; -λος*, xiv. 8; *-οτης*, 1 Tim. vi. 17. q xiv. 9; Eph. ii. 2; 1 Th. iv. 17; Acts xxii. 23; Rev. ix. 2, xvi. 17; Wisd. v. 11 f. r 2 Cor. xi. 20; Acts v. 40, vi. 37, xxii. 19; Mt. xxi. 35, etc. s Lk. xviii. 5; *-πιον*, Prov. xx. 30. t N.T. *h.l.;* Diodorus, and Longinus. u See viii. 9. v See i. 23. Absol., xv. 11; Rom. x. 14 f.; 1 Pet. iii. 19; similarly in Syn. Gospp. w 2 Cor. xiii. 5 ff.; Rom. i. 28; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 16; Heb. vi. 8.

oath, to follow a prescribed diet (**ἀναγκοφαγία**) and regimen (**ἄσκησις**): Pausanias V. 24. 9; Philostratus *De Gymn.*, p. 4; Arrian-Epict., III. xv. 3, xxiii. 2; Xenoph. *Symp.* viii. 37; Horace, *Ars Poet.* 412 ff., "Qui studet optatam cursu contingere metam, Multa tulit fecitque puer, sudavit et alsit, Abstinuit venere et vino." **ἐγκρατεύεται** (see vii. 9) implies temperance in a positive degree—not mere abstinence, but vigorous *control* of appetite and passion; **πάντα** is acc. of specification. The "garland" of the victor in the Isthmian Games was of *pine-leaves*, at an earlier time of *parsley*, in the Olympian Games of *wild-olive;* yet these were the most coveted honours in the whole Greek world.—**φθαρτὸν** and **ἄφθαρτον** are again contrasted in xv. 53.

Vv. 26, 27. "Therefore I *so* run, in no uncertain fashion; *so* I ply my fists, not like one that beats the air." "*So*—as the context describes, and as you see me (*cf.* xv. 32)"; the Ap. feels himself, while he writes, to be straining every nerve like the racer, striking home like the trained pugilist: for this graphic **οὕτως**, *cf.* xv. 11, Gal. i. 6, 2 Thess. iii. 17; the adv. would be otiose as mere antecedent to **ὡς**.—**τοίνυν** (similarly **τοίγαρ** in 1 Thess. iv. 8) brings in the prompt, emphatic inference drawn from the last clause: "We are fighting for the immortal crown—I as a leader and exemplar; surely then I make no false step in the course, I strike no random blows." **ἀδήλως** is susceptible both of the objective sense prevailing in cl. Gr., *obscure, inconspicuous* (preferred by Mr. and Gd. here, as though P. meant, "not keeping *out of sight, in the ruck*"; *cf.* xiv. 8); and (preferably) of the subjective sense, *unsure, without certain aim* (Thuc., I. 2. 1; Plato, *Symp.* 181 D; Polybius)—"ut non in incertum" (Bz.); "scio quod petam et quomodo" (Bg.); **πρὸς σκοπόν τινα βλέπων, οὐκ εἰκῇ καὶ μάτην** (Cm.): *cf.* Phil. iii. 14. The image of the race suggests that of *pugilism* (**πυκτεύω**)· another exercise of the Pentathlon of the arena: the former a familiar N.T. metaphor, the latter *h.l.*—**ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων**, "ut non aerem cædens" (Bz.), "smiting something more solid than air" (**οὐκ** negatives **ἀέρα**, not **δέρων**),—esp. my own body (27); *cf.* Virgil's "verberat ictibus auras" (*Æn.* v. 377). P.'s are no blows of a clumsy fighter that fail to land—struck *in's Blaue hinein.* Bg., Hf., Ed. suppose him to be thinking of the **σκιομαχία**, *sham-fight*, practised in training or by way of prelude, without an antagonist. **δέρω** means *to flay*, then *beat severely, smite; cf.* our vulgar *hiding.*

Ver. 27. The fully-attested reading **ὑπωπιάζω** (from **ὑπὸ** and **ὤψ**, to hit *under the eye*) continues the pugilistic metaphor and suits Paul's vehemence; "contundo corpus meum" (Bz.), "lividum facio" (Cod. Claromontanus), "I beat my body black and blue": a vivid picture of the corporal discipline to which P. subjects himself in the prosecution of his work (*cf.* iv. 11—esp. **κολαφιζόμεθα**; 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff., Gal. vi. 17, 2 Tim. ii. 4). **ὑποπιάζω** (**ὑπὸ** + **πιέζω**; *cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 32, etc.)—preferred by Hf. and Hn., after Clem. Alex.—giving the milder sense, *to force under, subdue, subigo* (Cv.), is almost syn. with **δουλαγωγῶ**.

P.'s severe bodily suffering, entailed by the circumstances of his ministry, he accepts as needful for his own sanctification (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 7),—a physical castigation which tames the flesh for the uses of the spirit (*cf.* 1 Pet. iv. 1 f.; also, for the principle involved, Rom. viii. 13, Col. iii. 5). The practices of the Middle-Age Flagellants and similar self-torturers have been justified by this text; but Paul's discipline was not arbitrary and self-inflicted, it was dictated by his calling (12*b*, 23)—a cross laid on him by the hand of God, and borne for the Gospel's and the Church's sake (*cf.* Col. i. 24). In Col. ii. 23 he guards against the ascetic extravagances which this passage, perhaps even in his life-time, was used

X. 1. [a] Οὐ [a] θέλω δὲ [1] ὑμᾶς [a] ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οἱ [b] πατέρες [b] ἡμῶν πάντες [c] ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην [c] ἦσαν καὶ πάντες [d] διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης [d] διῆλθον, 2. καὶ πάντες [e] εἰς τὸν Μωσῆν [2] [e] ἐβαπτίσαντο [3] ἐν τῇ

a 2 Cor. i. 8; Rom. i. 13; 1 Th. iv. 13.
b Freq. in Acts; Jo. iv. 20, vi. 31.
c ix. 20; Gal. iv. 21, v. 18; Acts iv. 12; Jo. i. 49. d 2 Cor. i. 16; Acts ix. 32; Mt. xii. 43; Lev. xxvi. 5; elsewhere with acc. e Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27; Acts viii. 16. *Cf.* i. 13 and xii. 13. Mid. voice, here only; Mk. vii. 4 (?); Acts xxii. 16.

[1] γαρ, all uncc. but ℵ^cKL, all anc. verss. but syr.

[2] Μωυσην: see note on ix. 9.

[3] εβαπτισθησαν (?), ℵACDG 17, 46 (Western and Alexandrian); so Tisch., Tr. *marg.*, W.H. *marg.*, Nestle. εβαπτισαντο, BKLP, etc. (Neutral and Syrian); so Tr. *txt.*, W.H. *txt.*, El.—the more difficult reading: see note below.

to support.—This "buffeting" of his physical frame enabled P. to "lead (his body) about as a slave,"—as one might do a bullying antagonist after a sound beating. Paul's physical temperament, it appears, had stood in the way of his success as a minister of Christ; and the hindrance was providentially overcome by the terrible hardships through which he passed in pursuit of his ministry. This experience he commends to the Cor. He had felt the fear, from which the above course of rigorous self-abnegation in the interest of others has saved him, "lest haply, after preaching to others, I myself should prove reprobate" (ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι): the opp. result to that of ver. 23.—For κηρύσσω, see i. 23; the κῆρυξ at the Games summoned the competitors and announced the rules of the contest. With ἀδόκιμος, *rejectaneus*, *cf.* δοκιμάζω, iii. 13, and note; see 2 Cor. xiii. 5 ff., and other parls.—On the Gr. Games, see the *Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Antiq.* (Isthmia, Stadium); Hermann, *Lehrbuch d. gottesdienstl. Alterthümer*, § 50; also the supplementary Note on *Greek Athletic Festivals* in Bt.

§ 31. The Backsliding of Ancient Israel, x. 1-5. The Apostle has just confessed, in warning others, his own fear of reprobation. That this is no idle fear the history of the O.T. Church plainly proves. All the Israelite fathers were rescued from Egypt, and sealed with the ancient sacraments, and virtually partook of Christ in the wilderness; but, alas, how few of those first redeemed entered the Promised Land!

Vv. 1, 2. The phrase οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (see parls.) calls attention to something not altogether within the range of the reader's knowledge (contrast οὐκ οἴδατε; ix. 24, etc.); γὰρ attaches the paragraph, by way of enforcement, to the foregoing ἀδόκιμος. "Our fathers" is not written inadvertently to Gentile "brethren," out of P.'s "national consciousness" (Mr.); the phrase identifies the N.T. Church with "Israel" (*cf.* Rom. iv. 1, 11 ff., xi. 17 f., Gal. iii. 7, 29, Phil. iii. 3; also Clem. *ad Cor.* 4); the fate of the fathers admonishes the children (Ps. lxxviii. 8, xcv. 9, etc.; Matt. xxiii. 29 ff., Heb. iii., iv.). The point of the warning lies in the five-times repeated πάντες: "*All* our fathers escaped by miracle from the house of bondage; *all* received the tokens of the Mosaic covenant; *all* participated under its forms in Christ; and yet most of them perished! (5)"; *cf.* the πάντες μέν . . . εἷς δὲ of ix. 24, and note.—For ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην, διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης, *cf.* Ps. cv. 39, cvi. 11; also Wisd. x. 17, xix. 7. "The cloud" shading and guiding the Israelites from above, and "the sea" making a path for them through its midst and drowning their enemies behind them, were glorious signs to "our fathers" of God's salvation; together they formed a λοῦτρον παλινγενεσίας (Tit. iii. 5), inaugurating the national covenant life; as it trode the miraculous path between upper and nether waters, Israel was born into its Divine estate. Thus "they all received their baptism *unto Moses* in the cloud and in the sea," since in this act they committed themselves to the guidance of Moses, entering through him into acknowledged fellowship with God; even so the Cor. in the use of the same symbolic element had been "baptized unto Christ" (*cf.* Rom. vi. 3 f., Gal. iii. 27). For the parl. between *Moses and Christ*, see Heb. iii. Paul sees a baptism in the waters of the Exodus, as Peter in the waters of the Deluge (1 Pet. iii. 20 f.).—ἐβαπτίσαντο, mid. voice (see parls.), implies consent of the subjects—"had themselves baptised" (*cf.* ἀπελούσασθε, vi. 11)—aggravating their apostasy.

Vv. 3, 4. After deliverance came the question of *sustenance*. This was effected

f See iii. 2. g See ii. 13. h Heb. ix. 10; Ps. ci. 9; Dan. i. 16 (Theod.). i Rom. ix. 33 (Isa. viii. 14); 1 Pet. ii. 8; Mt. vii. 24, xvi. 18, etc.

νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, 3. καὶ πάντες τὸ[1] αὐτὸ[1] [f]βρῶμα[2] [g]πνευματικὸν[2] ἔφαγον 4*a*. καὶ πάντες τὸ[3] αὐτὸ[3] [h]πόμα[4] [g]πνευματικὸν[4] ἔπιον[4] · 4*b*. ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ [g]πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας·

[1] το αυτο om. ℵ*, æth.; A 46 om. αυτο.

[2] πνευματικον βρωμα εφαγον (in this order): ℵ*BC²P. πνευμ. εφ. βρ.: A 17, Mcion. βρ. πνευμ. εφ.: ℵᶜDGKL, etc.; Western and Syrian.

[3] æth., Chr. om. το αυτο. A 46 om. αυτο.

[4] πνευματικον επιον πομα (in this order): all non-Western pre-Syrian uncc.

in the desert by means no less miraculous and symbolic: "and they all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink"—the manna of Exod. xvi. 13 ff., etc., and the stream drawn from the rocks of Rephidim (Exod. xvii.) and Kadesh (Num. xx.).—The epithet πνευματικὸν does not negative the materiality of the βρῶμα and πόμα, any more than the corporeality of the ripe Christian man described in ii. 15; it ascribes to these nutriments a higher virtue—such as, *e.g.*, the bread of Christ's miracles had for intelligent partakers—*a spiritual meaning and influence*: for the bread, see Deut. viii. 2 f. (*cf.* Matt. iv. 3 f., John vi. 31 ff., Ps. lxxviii. 23 ff.); for the water, Exod. xvii. 7, Num. xx. 13, Ps. cv. 41, Isa. xxxv. 6.—In drinking from the smitten rock the Israelites "were drinking" at the same time "of a *spiritual* rock"—and that not supplying them once alone, but "following" them throughout their history. Ver. 4*b* explains 4*a* (γὰρ): P. justifies his calling the miraculous water "spiritual," not by saying that *the* rock from which it issued was a spiritual (and no material) rock, but that there was "*a spiritual rock* accompanying" God's people; from this they drank in spirit, while their bodies drank from the water flowing at their feet. The lesson is strictly parl. to that of Deut. viii. 3 f. respecting the manna. In truth, *another* rock was there beside the visible cliff of Rephidim: "Now this rock (ἡ πέτρα δέ) was *the Christ!*" The "meat" and "drink" are the actual desert food—"the same" for "all," but endowed for all with a "spiritual" grace; the "spiritual rock" which imparted this virtue is distinguished as "following" the people, being superior to local limitations—a rock not symbolic of Christ, but *identical with Him*. This identification our Lord virtually made in the words of John vii. 37. The impf. ἔπινον (4*b*), exchanged for ἔπιον (4*a*), indicates the continuous aid drawn from this "following rock".

Baur, Al., and others suppose P. to be adopting the Rabbinical legend that the water-bearing Rephidim rock journeyed onwards with the Israelites (see *Bammidbar Rabba*, s. 1; Eisenmenger, *Entd. Judenthum*, I. 312, 467, II. 876 f.). Philo allegorized this fable in application to the Logos (*Leg. alleg.* II. §§ 21 f.; *Quod det. pot. insid. solet*, § 30). This may have *suggested* Paul's conception, but the predicate πνευματικῆς emphatically discards the prodigy; "we must not disgrace P. by making him say that the pre-incarnate Christ followed the march of Israel in the shape of a lump of rock!" (Hf.). ὁ Χριστός—not the *doctrine*, nor the *hope* of the Christ, but *Himself*—assumes that Christ existed in Israelite times and was spiritually present with the O.T. Church, and that the grace attending its ordinances was mediated by Him. "The spiritual homogeneity of the two covenants"—which gives to the Apostle's warning its real cogency—"rests on the identity of the Divine Head of both. The practical consequence *saute aux yeux:* Christ lived already in the midst of the ancient people, and that people has perished! How can you suppose, you Christians, that you are secured from the same fate!" (Gd.).

Holsten rejects the parenthetical ἡ πέτρα δέ clause as a theological gloss; but it is necessary to explain the previous ἐκ πνευμ. ἀκολ. πέτρας, and is covered doctrinally by the δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα of viii. 6 (see note). Already Jewish theology had referred to the hypostatized "Wisdom" (see Wisd. x.), or "the Logos" (Philo *passim*), the protection and sustenance of ancient Israel. The O.T. saw the spiritual "rock of Israel" in Jehovah (Deut. xxxii., 2 Sam. xxiii. 3, Isa. xvii. 10, xxvi. 4, etc.), whose offices

ἡ δὲ [1] πέτρα [1] [k] ἦν ὁ Χριστός. 5. ἀλλ' οὐκ [l] ἐν [m] τοῖς [m] πλείοσιν αὐτῶν [l n] εὐδόκησεν [2] ὁ [n] Θεός· [o] κατεστρώθησαν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. 6. Ταῦτα δὲ [p] τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, [q] εἰς [q] τὸ [q] μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς [r] ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κἀκεῖνοι [s] ἐπεθύμησαν· 7. μηδὲ [t] εἰδω-

k ειμι in like use, Mt. xiii. 37, xxvi. 26; Jo. xv. 1; Gen. xli. 26 f.; Ex. xii. 11; Ezek. xxxvii. 11. l 2 Cor. xii. 10; Mt. iii. 17, and parls.; Jer. xiv. 12. m See ix. 19. n i. 21; Gal. i. 15; Col. i. 19; Mt. iii. 17, etc.; Lk. xii. 32. *Cf.* ευδοκια, Eph. i. 5, 9; Ph. ii. 13; Mt. xi. 26; Lk. ii. 14, x. 21. o Numb. xiv. 16. p In this sense, Rom. v. 14; diff. in Rom. vi. 17, etc. q 2 Cor. iv. 4; 2 Th. ii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 7; Acts vii. 19. r N.T. *h.l.*; Numb. xi. 34. A cl. word. s Absol., Rom. vii. 7, xiii. 9 (Ex. xx. 17); Gal. v. 17; Ja. iv. 2. t See ver. 10.

[1] η πετρα δε: ℵBD*c—irregular order.
[2] ηυδοκησεν, AB*C. On the augment, see Wr., p. 83.

of grace, in the N.T. view of things, devolve on Christ.—The Ap. does not in so many words associate the "spiritual food" and "drink" of vv. 3 f. with the Lord's Supper, as he did the crossing of the Red Sea with Baptism; but the second analogy is suggested by the first, and by the reference to the Eucharist in vv. 15 ff. In no other place in the N. T. are the two Sacraments collocated.

Ver. 5. "But not with the greater part (of them)"—a "tragic *litotes:* only Joshua and Caleb reached the Promised Land" (Num. xiv. 30: Mr.). The result negatives what one expects from the antecedents; hence the strong adversative **ἀλλ' οὐκ.**—**τοῖς πλείοσιν**—"the majority" of the **πάντες** so highly favoured; *cf.* xv. 6. **ηὐδόκησεν ἐν** (after the LXX), Heb. *chaphets b'*; the **ἐν** resembles that of ix. 15; see Wr., p. 291.—**κατεστρώθησαν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**, "For they (their bodies) were laid prostrate in the wilderness," gives graphic proof, in words borrowed from the O.T. narrative, of God's displeasure; sooner or later this doom overtook nearly all the witnesses of the Exodus (*cf.* Heb. iii. 17). "What a spectacle for the eyes of the self-satisfied Cor.: all these bodies, full-fed with miraculous nourishment, strewing the soil of the desert!" (Gd.).

§ 32. THE MORAL CONTAGION OF IDOLATRY, x. 6-14. The fall of the Israel of the Exodus was due to the very temptations now surrounding the Cor. Church—to the allurements of idolatry and its attendant impurity (6 ff.), and to the cherishing of discontent and presumption (9 f.). Their fate may prove our salvation, if we lay it to heart; the present trial, manifestly, is nothing new; and God who appoints it will keep it within our strength, and will provide us with means of escape (11 ff.). The whole is summed up in one word, "Flee from idolatry!" (14).

Ver. 6. **ταῦτα τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν** may mean (*a*) "These things have been made our examples," *typi nobis* (Cv.)—*sc.* exx. for our use; (*b*) "In these things (acc. of *specification*) they proved types of us"—*figuræ nostri* (Vg., Bz., Mr., Bt., R.V. marg.); or (*c*) "As types of us they became such" (so Hf.: *cf.* **ταῦτα . . . ἦτε**, vi. 11)—a construction clashing with that of the parl. ver. 11. (*a*) best suits the application of **ταῦτα** in the sequel (*cf.* 1 Pet. v. 3); to make the fallen Israelites prophetic "types" of the Cor. would be to presume the ruin of the latter!—**ἐγενήθησαν** is pl. despite the *neut.* pl. subject **ταῦτα,** through the attraction of the predicate: so **πάντα ταῦτα κακουργίαι ἦσαν** in Xenophon; the incidents included are *distinctly* viewed. For the deterrent "example," *cf.* Heb. iv. 11.—With **ἐπιθυμ. κακῶν** *cf.* **ἐφευρετὰς κακῶν,** Rom. i. 30: the double **ἐπιθυμητὰς . . . ἐπεθύμησαν** recalls Num. xi. 4 (LXX); in alluding to the old "lusting" for the diet of Egypt, the Ap. hints at the attraction of the Cor. idol-feasts; but his dehortation applies to all **κακά** (*cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 7, 1 Thess. v. 15, etc.). The general admonition is specialised in four particulars, with repeated **μηδὲ**—*idolatry*, *fornication*, *tempting of the Lord*, *murmuring*—based on the analogy furnished by vv. 1-5.

Ver. 7. **μηδὲ εἰδωλολάτραι γίνεσθε,** "And do not become idolaters": in apposition to the **εἰς τὸ μὴ** clause of ver. 6, the dependent sentence of purpose passing into a direct impv.; for the like conversational freedom, *cf.* i. 31, iv. 16, vii. 37, ix. 15, and notes. The repetition of this warning in ver. 14 shows its urgency. Even where eating of the **εἰδωλόθυτα** was innocent, it might be a stepping-stone to **εἰδωλολατρεία.**—Enforcing his appeal by ref. to the calf-worship at Sinai, the Ap. dwells on the *accompaniments* of this apostasy: here

λολάτραι γίνεσθε καθώς τινες αὐτῶν, ὡς[1] γέγραπται, "[u] Ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν[2] καὶ [v] ἀνέστησαν [w] παίζειν". 8. μηδὲ [x] πορνεύωμεν, καθώς τινες αὐτῶν [x] ἐπόρνευσαν καὶ [y] ἔπεσον[3] ἐν[4] μίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ εἰκοσιτρεῖς χιλιάδες. 9. μηδὲ [z] ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστόν,[5] καθὼς καί τινες αὐτῶν [a] ἐπείρασαν[6] καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν [b] ὄφεων ἀπώλοντο.[7] 10. μηδὲ [c] γογγύζετε,[8] καθὼς[9] καί[10] τινες αὐτῶν

u Exod. xxxii. 6; intrans. *passim*. v In this sense, opp. to *καθιζω* or the like, Acts ix. 6, 34, xii. 7, etc.; Mk. ix. 27; Lk. iv. 29, v. 25, etc.; Jo. xi. 31. w N.T. *h.l.*; *cf.* Judg. xvi. 25; 2 Ki. vi. 5; Jer. xxxviii. 4. x See vi. 18. y Of *persons*, Rom. xi. 11, 22, xiv. 4; Heb. iv. 11; Rev. ii. 5; Lk. xxi. 24. z Lk. iv. 12 (Deut. vi. 16), x. 25; Ps. lxxvii. 18. a Exod. xvii. 2, 7; Acts v. 9, xv. 10; Heb. iii. 9; (Jo.) viii. 6. *Cf.* vii. 5. b Numb. xxi. 6; Mk. xvi. 18; Lk. x. 19; *cf.* Jo. iii. 14. c Exod. xvi. 7; Numb. xiv. 29; Mt. xx. 11; Lk. v. 30; four times in Jo.

[1] ωσπερ, ℵABD^cL, many minn.: unusual in this connexion. ως, CD*KL, etc.

[2] πειν, ℵ (πιν) B*D*G; see note on ix. 4.

[3] επεσαν: all pre-Syrian uncc. So *passim*; see Wr., pp. 86 f.

[4] *Om.* εν ℵ*BD*G (Neutral and Western). Ins. εν: Alexandrian and Syrian.

[5] τον Κυριον, ℵBCP 17, 46, 73, syr^p. mg. cop., Epiph. τον Θεον A 2, Euthal. τον Χριστον DGKL, etc., latt. vg. syr^sch. sah., Mcion. (Western and Syrian).

[6] εξεπειρασαν (?), ℵCD*GP 17, 46, 73—assimilated to previous vb. επειρασαν, ABD^cKL, etc.; so W.H. *txt.*, Nestle, El.

[7] απωλλυντο, ℵAB: *h.l.* for the impf.

[8] γογγυζωμεν, ℵDG (Western)—assimilated to context.

[9] καθαπερ, ℵBP, Or., Bas.

[10] *Om.* και all uncc. but KL.

lay the peril of his readers who, when released from the superstition of the old religion (viii. 4), were still attracted by its feasting and gaiety: "The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to sport" (following the LXX precisely). This **παίζειν**, as in idolatrous festivals commonly, included singing and dancing round the calf (Exod. xxxii. 18 f.); there is no need to imagine a darker meaning. It was a scene of wild, careless merriment, shocking under the circumstances and most perilous, that Moses witnessed as he descended bearing the Tables of the Law.—**πεῖν**, *cf.* ix. 4 and note.

Ver. 8. **μηδὲ πορνεύωμεν**: here P. comes closer to his readers, adopting the communicative 1st pl. For the prevalence of this vice at Cor. and its connexion with Cor. idolatry, see vii. 2, vi. 11, and *Introd.*, p. 734 (*cf.* Num. xxv., 1 f. also Rev. ii. 14); for its existence in the Cor. Church, ch. v. above, and 2 Cor. xii. 21. Wisd. xiv. 12 affirms, of idolatry at large, **ἀρχὴ πορνείας ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων**; see the connexion of Rom. i. 24 with the foregoing context.—"23,000" is a curious variation from the figure given in Num. xxv. 9 for the slain of Baal-Peor, which is followed by other Jewish authorities, *viz.*, 24,000. It is more respectful to credit the Ap. with a trifling inadvertence than to suppose, with Gd., that he makes a deliberate understatement to be within the mark. Ev. gives no evidence for his alleged "Jewish tradition" in support of the reduced estimate. Possibly, a primitive error of the copyist, substituting **γ′** for **δ′** (Hn.).

Vv. 9, 10. The sins condemned in vv. 7, 8 are sins of *sensuality*; these, of *unbelief* (Ed.)—which takes two forms: of *presumption*, daring God's judgments; or of *despair*, doubting His goodness. The whole wilderness history, with its crucial events of Massah and Meribah, is represented as a "trying of the Lord" in Ps. xcv. 8 ff. (*cf.* Num. xiv. 22), a **δοκιμασία** (Heb. iii. 7-12); this process culminated in the insolence of Num. xxi. 4 f., which was punished by the infliction of the "fiery serpents". The like sin, of presuming on the Divine forbearance, the Cor. would commit if they trifled with idolatry (*cf.* 22) and "sinned wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth" (Heb. x. 26; Rom. vi. 1); *cf.* Deut. vi. 16 (Matt. iv. 7), Ps. lxxviii. 17 ff., for this trait of the Israelite character. **ἐκ-πειράζω** is to *try thoroughly*, *to the utmost*—as though one would see how far God's indulgence will go. The graphic

[e]ἐγόγγυσαν καὶ ἀπώλοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ [d]ὀλοθρευτοῦ. 11. ταῦτα [1] δὲ πάντα [1] [e]τύποι [2] [f]συνέβαινον [3] ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ [g]πρὸς [h]νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, [i]εἰς οὓς τὰ [i]τέλη τῶν [k]αἰώνων [l]κατήντησεν.[4] 12. ὥστε ὁ [m]δοκῶν [n]ἑστάναι [o]βλεπέτω μὴ [y]πέσῃ. 13. [p]πειρασμὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ [q]εἴληφεν [5] εἰ μὴ [r]ἀνθρώπινος· [s]πιστὸς δὲ ὁ [s]Θεός, ὃς οὐκ

d H.l.; -ευω, Heb. xi. 28 (Exod. xii. 23); -ευσις, Josh. xvii. 13.
e τυπικως, h.l.; -κος, in Plutarch.

f 1 Pet. iv. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 22; four times in Lk. and Acts; once in Mt. g In this use, vi. 5, vii. 35, xii. 7, etc. h Eph. vi. 4; Tit. iii. 10; Judith vii. 27; Wisd. xvi. 6; -ετειν, see iv. 14. i In this sense, *h.l.* *Cf.* Mt. xiii. 39; Heb. ix. 26; also Rom. x. 4; 1 Pet. i. 9. k Pl., in like sense, ii. 7; Eph. iii. 9, 11; Col. i. 26; 1 Tim. i. 17; Heb. i. 8, xi. 3. l xiv. 36; Eph. iv. 13; Ph. iii. 11; Acts xxvi. 7. In lit. sense, Acts xvi. 1, etc. m See iii. 18. n In this tense and sense, 2 Cor. i. 24; Rom. v. 2, xi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 19. Same inf. in Acts xii. 14; Lk. xiii. 25. o See viii. 9. p Gal. iv. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 9; Heb. iii. 8 (Ps. xciv. 8); Jas. i. 2, 12; 1 Pet. i. 6; Mt. vi. 13, etc. q λαμβανω with like subject, Lk. v. 26, vii. 16; Exod. xv. 15. r See ii. 13. s See i. 9.

[1] *Om.* **παντα** AB 17, sah., Mcion., Tert., Or., Cyr., Bas. **ταυτα δε παντα**: CKLP, etc., vg. syrr. cop. (Alexandrian); **παντα δε ταυτα**: ℵDG 46, Aug. (Western).

[2] **τυπικως**: all uncc. but DGL, which assimilate to ver. 6.

[3] **συνεβαινεν**, ℵBCK, twelve minn., Mcion., Or., Bas., Cyr. **συνεβαινον**, ADG, etc. (Western).

[4] **κατηντηκεν**, ℵBD*G, Bas., Euthal., Cyr. **κατηντησεν**, ACD^cKL, etc.—Alexandrian and Syrian.

[5] **ου** (*sic*) **καταλαβῃ**: G, latt. vg. (*non apprehendat*), Latt. Ff.

impf., **ἀπώλλυντο**, "lay a-perishing," transports us to the scene of misery resulting from this experiment upon God!—**ὑπὸ** of *agent* after **ἀπόλλυμι**—a cl. idiom, *h.l.* for N.T.—elsewhere construed with dat., or **ἐν** and dat., of *cause* or *ground* of destruction (viii. 11, Rom. xiv. 15, etc.).—The "murmuring" also occurred repeatedly in the wilderness; but P. alludes specifically to the rebellion of Korah and its punishment—the only instance of violent death overtaking this sin (Num. xvi. 41). The **ὀλοθρευτής** in such supernatural chastisement is conceived as the "destroying angel" (2 Sam. xxiv. 16, Isa. xxxvii. 36), called **ὁ ὀλοθρεύων** in Exod. xii. 23, Heb. xi. 28 (*cf.* Wisd. xviii. 25); in later Jewish theology, *Sammael*, or the Angel of Death (Weber, *Altsyn. Théologie*, p. 244). The O.T. analogy suggests that P. had in view the murmurings of jealous partisans and unworthy teachers at Cor. (i. 12, iii. 6, iv. 6, 18 ff.); at this point he reverts to the impv. of 2nd. pers., **γογγύζετε.**—**τινες** (*quidam*), used throughout of the Israelite offenders, may mean *many* or *few*, anything short of "all" (1-4); *cf.* ver. 5, also ix. 22, viii. 7, Rom. iii. 3.

Ver. 11. "Now these things befel them by way of example" (**τυπικῶς**)—or "typically," "prefiguratively," if the other rendering of **τύποι** in ver. 6 be preferred ("in figura contingebant illis," Vg.); the adv. became current in the latter sense in eccl. Gr. The judgments quoted were *exemplary* in their nature; the story of them serves as a lesson for all time—"they were written with a view to (**πρὸς**) our admonition".—**συνέβαινον**, *impf.*, of the train of events; **ἐγράφη**, *aor.*, of the act of record summing them up. For the admonitory purpose of O.T. writers, see Isa. viii. 16, xxx. 8 ff., Hab. ii. 2 f., Deut. xxxi. 19 ff.—"Unto whom the ends of the ages have reached" (**κατήντηκεν**, *devenerunt*, Vg.)—"whom they have overtaken". **καταντάω** signifies reaching a mark, "arriving at" a definite point, whether the ultimate goal or not (see parls.). **τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων** is syn. with **ἡ συντέλεια τ. αἰώνων** (Matt. xiii. 40, etc.) and other eschatological expressions (*cf.* 1 Peter i. 20, Heb. i. 2; also Gal. iv. 4, Eph. i. 10); the pl. indicates the *manifold* issues culminating in the Christian Church. "World-ages" (**αἰῶνες**) do not simply follow each other, but proceed side by side; so in particular the age of Israel and that of the Gentiles" (Hf.); "the ends" of Jewish and Pagan history alike are disclosed in Christianity; both streams converged, under God's direction (*cf.* Acts xv. 15 ff., xvii. 26 ff.), upon the Gentile Churches (**τέλος** has the double sense of *conclusion* and *aim*). The Church is the heir of the spiritual training of mankind; *cf.*, for the general idea, John iv. 37 f., 2 Tim. iii. 16 f., Gal. iii. 29, Eph. i. 9 ff.

Vv. 12, 13. The "examples" just set forth are full of warning (*a*), but with an

[t] ἐάσει[1] ὑμᾶς [u] πειρασθῆναι [v] ὑπὲρ [v] ὃ[2] δύνασθε, ἀλλὰ ποιήσει σὺν τῷ [p] πειρασμῷ καὶ τὴν [w] ἔκβασιν τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑμᾶς[3] [x] ὑπενεγκεῖν. 14. [y] διόπερ, [z] ἀγαπητοί [z] μου, [a] φεύγετε [a] ἀπὸ τῆς [b] εἰδωλολατρείας.

t With inf., Mt. xxiv. 43; Lk. iv. 41; 4 times in Acts.
u See ver. 9 above. v See iv. 6. w Heb. xiii. 7; Wisd. ii. 17, viii. 10, xi. 14. x 2 Tim. iii. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 19; Job ii. 10; Ps. liv. 12; Prov. vi. 33. y See viii. 13. z Ph. ii. 12; 2 Pet. i. 17; Mt. xii. 18 (Isa. xlii. 1). a See vi. 18. b Gal. v. 20; Col. iii. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 3; -τρης, ver. 7 above.

[1] **αφησει** DG—Western emendation.

[2] G and several latt. insert **ου** (*super id quod non*).

[3] *Om.* **υμας** all uncc. but ℵcDcK.

aspect of (*b*) encouragement besides. (*a*) "So then"—**ὥστε** with impv., as in iii. 21 (see note)—"he that thinks (**ὁ δοκῶν**: see note, iii. 18) that he stands, let him take heed (**βλεπέτω**) lest he fall!" For "such *thinking*, as it leads to trust in one-self, is the beginning of a perilous security" (Hf.); this vanity was precisely the danger of the Cor. (see iv. 6 ff., v. 2, etc.). For the pf. **ἑστάναι**, in this emphatic sense (*to stand fast*), see parls. A moral "fall" is apprehended, involving personal ruin (5, 8; Rom. xi. 11, 22).—(*b*) The example which alarms the self-confident, may give hope to the despondent; it shows that the present trials are not unprecedented: **πειρασμὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ εἴληφεν εἰ μὴ ἀνθρώπινος**, "It is only *human* temptation that has come upon you"—such as men have been through before. Ver. 13 follows sharply on ver. 12, **ἀσυνδέτως**, correcting a depressing fear that would arise in some minds.—**εἴληφεν** (see parls.) describes a situation which "has seized" and holds one in its grasp (pf.).—**ἀνθρώπινος** connotes both *quod hominibus solet* (Cv.) and *homini superabilis* (Bg.), *such as man can bear* (R.V.), —**σύμμετρος τῇ φύσει** (Thd.). Some give an objective turn to the adj., reading the clause as one of *further warning:* "It is only *trial from men* that has overtaken you" (so, with variations, Chr., Est., Gr., Bg.—*opponitur tentatio demoniaca*). But the sequel implies a temptation measured by the strength of the tempted; moreover, as El. says, P. would have written **οὔπω ἔλαβεν**, rather than **οὐκ εἴληφεν**, if foreboding worse trial in store; nor did he conceive the actual trials of the Cor., any more than those of the Thess. or Asian Churches (1 Thess. iii. 5, Eph. vi. 10 ff.), as without diabolical elements (see 20 ff., vii. 5, 2 Cor. xi. 3, 14).—**εἰ μὴ** is attached to **ἀνθρώπινος** alone: lit. "temptation has not seized you, except a human (temptation)"—*i.e.*, "otherwise than human".—**πιστὸς δὲ ὁ Θεός** contrasts the human and Divine; for the natural trial a supernatural Providence guarantees sufficient aid (see parls.). **ὃς = ὅτι οὗτος** (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 18): "God is faithful in that (*or* so that) He etc.". Paul ascribes to God not the origination, but the *control* of temptation (*cf.* Matt. vi. 13, Luke xxii. 31 f., James i. 12 ff.): the **πειρασμὸς** is inevitable, lying in the conditions of human nature; God limits it, and supplies along with it the **ἔκβασις**.—For the ellipsis in (**ὑπὲρ ὃ**) **δύνασθε**, *cf.* iii. 2.—The art. in **ὁ πειρασμός, τὴν ἔκβασιν**, is individualising: "the temptation" and "the egress" match each other, the latter provided for the former; hence **καί**, "also," *indivulso nexu* (Bg.). *Issue* is a sense of **ἔκβασις** in later Gr.; in cl. Gr. *disembarkation*, then *exit*, *escape*. In **τοῦ δύνασθαι ὑπενεγκεῖν** (for gen. inf. of *purpose*, see Wr., p. 408) the subject is not expressed; as coming under God's general dealing with men, it is conceived indefinitely—"that one may be able to bear". Shut into a *cul de sac*, a man despairs; but let him see a door open for his exit, and he will struggle on with his load. **ἔκβασις** signifies *getting clear* away *from* the struggle; **ὑπενεγκεῖν**, *holding up under* it, the latter made possible by the hope of the former. How different all this from the Stoic consolation of suicide: "The door stands open"! In the Cor. "temptation" we must include both the allurements of idolatry and the persecution which its abandonment entailed.

Ver. 14 gives the final point to all that has been urged, from ver. 1 onwards: the sad fate of the Israelite fathers, the correspondence between their trials and those of the Cor. readers, the possibility of effectual resistance, and the certain relief to which the Divine fidelity is pledged—these considerations combine to enforce the appeal, *Flee from idolatry; cf.* vi. 18*a*, and note.—**διόπερ**, as in viii. 13 (see note), points with emphatic finger along the line of past history; **ἀγαπητοί**

15. [c] Ὡς [d] φρονίμοις [e] λέγω· κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὅ [e] φημι· 16. τὸ ποτήριον τῆς [g] εὐλογίας ὃ [h] εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ [i] κοινωνία τοῦ [1] [k] αἵματος [1] τοῦ [k] Χριστοῦ [1] ἐστιν [1]; τὸν [l] ἄρτον ὃν [m] κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ

c 2 Cor. vi. 13; *cf.* Acts xvii. 22.
d See iv. 10.
e See vii. 29.
f xi. 25 ff.; Mt. xxvi. 27 (*cf.* 39), and parls.; see also Mt. xx. 22 f.; Rev. xiv. 10, etc. For position of noun, Jo. xviii. 11; Mt. xxi. 42, etc.
g Gal. iii. 14; Jas. iii. 10; Rev. v. 12 f., vii. 12; Gen. xxviii. 4.
h Mt. xxvi. 26; Mk. xi. 10, xiv. 22; Lk. xxiv. 30. Here only of *things*. See also iv. 12.
i With obj. gen., Ph. iii. 10. See also i. 9, and note on construction.
k xi. 25, 27; Eph. ii. 13; Heb. ix. 12, 14; 1 Pet. i. 2; Jo. i. 7; Rev. i. 5, v. 9, vii. 14, etc.; Mt. xxvi. 28, etc.; Jo. vi. 53 ff.
l xi. 23 ff.; Acts ii. 42, 46, xx. 7, 11, xxvii. 35; Mt. xxvi. 26, etc.; Jo. vi. 35 ff., xiii. 18, xxi. 13.
m xi. 24; Acts ii. 46, etc.; Mt. xxvi. 26, etc., xiv. 19, xv. 36; Lk. xxiv. 30.

[1] **κοινωνια εστιν του αιματος του Χριστου** (in this order): ABP. So Tr., W.H.—diff. from parl. clause. A has **εστιν** after **κοινωνια** in second clause also.

μου (*cf.* iv. 14) reinforces admonition with entreaty.

§ 33. The Communion of the Lord, and of Demons, x. 15-24. A further warning the Ap. will give against dalliance with idolatry, based on Christian practice as the former was based on Israelite history. He points to *the table of the Lord's Supper*, and asks the Cor. to judge as men of sense whether it is possible to take of Christ's *cup* and *loaf*, and then to sit at a table where in reality one communicates with demons! What can be more revolting than such conduct? what more insulting towards the Lord?

Ver. 15. **Ὡς φρονίμοις λέγω· κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὅ φημι**: "As to men of sense I speak; be yourselves the judges of what I affirm." With this prefatory appeal to the intelligence of the readers *cf.* the introductory phrases of Rom. vi. 19, Gal. iii. 15; the ground of admonition in this § lies entirely within the judgment of the Cor., as that of the last § did not (1). The Cor. are **φρόνιμοι,** intellectually clever and shrewd, not **σοφοί** (as some of them thought themselves to be, iii. 18); this compliment is consistent with the censure of iii. 1 ff.; see parls., also Trench *Syn.*, § lxxv. "The new conception of the **πνευματικὸς** caused the word **φρόνιμος** to sink to a much lower level in the N.T. than it occupied in Plato or Aristotle" (Ed.). Philo disparages **φρόνησις,** defining it as **μέση πανουργίας κ. μωρίας** (*Quod Deus immut.*, § 35); he says, **σοφία μὲν γὰρ πρὸς θεραπείαν Θεοῦ, φρόνησις δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρώπινον βίον διοίκησιν** (*De præm. et pæn.*, § 14).—On **φημί** (again in 19), *cf.* vii. 29, and note. For like appeals, see Luke xii. 57, Acts iv. 19. The questions that follow, the readers will easily answer from their knowledge of religious custom and feeling.

Ver. 16. **κοινωνία** is the key-word of this passage (see parls.); the Lord's Supper constitutes a "communion" centring in Christ, as the Jewish festal rites centred in "the altar" (18), and as "the demons," the unseen objects of idolatrous worship, supply their basis of communion in idolatrous feasts (21 f.). Such fellowship involves (1) *the ground of communion*, the sacred object celebrated in common; (2) *the association* established amongst the celebrants, separating them from all others: "The word *communion* denotes the fellowship of persons with persons in one and the same object" (Ev.). These two ideas take expression in vv. 16, 17 in turn; their joint force lies behind the protest of vv. 20 ff.—Appealing to the Eucharist —or *Eulogia*, as it was also called—P. begins with "the cup" (*cf.* the order of Luke xxii. 17 ff., and *Didaché* ix. 2 f.), the prominent object in the sacrificial meal (21), containing, as one may say, the essence of the feast (*cf.* Ps. xxiii. 5). **τ. εὐλογίας** is attributive gen. (like "cup of salvation" in Ps. cxvi. 13; see other parls., for both words); so Cv., "destinatus ad mysticam eulogiam," and Hn. (see his note). Christ blessed this cup, making it thus for ever a "cup of blessing"; *cf.* the early sacramental phrases, **οἱ τῆς εὐλογίας Ἰησοῦ ἄρτοι** in Or. on Matt. x. 25, and **τὰς εὐλογίας τ. Χριστοῦ ἐσθίειν** from the Catacombs (X. Kraus, *Roma sotteranea*, 217), cited by Hn. On this view, **ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν** is no repetition of **τῆς εὐλογίας,** but is antithetical to it in the manner of Eph. i. 3: *sc.* "the cup which gives blessing, for which we give blessing to God". The prevalent interpretation of **τ. ποτήρ. τ. εὐλογίας** makes the phrase a rendering of *kōs habb'rakah*, the *third* cup of the Passover meal, over which a specific blessing was pronounced (often identified with that of the Eucharist); or, as Ed. thinks (referring to Luke xxii. 20), the *fourth*, which closed the meal and was attended with the singing of the

[1] κοινωνία τοῦ [n] σώματος τοῦ [n] Χριστοῦ ἐστιν; 17. ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἓν σῶμα [o] οἱ [o] πολλοί ἐσμεν, [p] οἱ γὰρ [p] πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου

n xi. 24 ff.; Mt. xxvi. 26; Rom. vii. 4; Ph. iii. 21; Col. i. 22; Heb. x. 10; 1 Pet. ii. 24. o Ver. 33; 2 Cor. ii. 17; Rom. v. 15, 19, xii. 5; Heb. xii. 15; Mt. xxiv. 12; Mk. vi. 2. p See ix. 22.

Hallel. Such a technical Hebraism would scarcely be obvious to the Cor., and the gen. so construed is artificial in point of Gr. idiom; whereas the former construction is natural, and gives a sense in keeping with the readers' experience.—**τὸ ποτήριον, τὸν ἄρτον** are acc. by *inverse relative attraction*, a constr. not unknown, though rare, in cl. Gr. (see Wr., p. 204). Hf. thinks that, with the merging of these nouns in the rel. clause, the *act of blessing* the cup and *breaking* the bread becomes the real subject of **κοινωνία** in each instance—as though P. wrote, "when we bless the cup, break the bread, is it not a communion, etc.?" In any case, the "communion" looks beyond the bare **ποτήριον** and **ἄρτος** to the whole sacred action, the *usus poculi*, etc. (Bg.), of which they form the centre. "The bread" is "blessed" equally with "the cup," but in its case the prominent symbolic act is that of *breaking* (see parls.), which connotes the distribution to "many" of the "one loaf." Thus "the sacramental bread came to be known as the **κλασμός**: so *Did.*, § 9" (Ed.).—On the pl. **εὐλογοῦμεν, κλῶμεν,** Mr. observes: "*Whose* was it to officiate in this consecration? At this date, when the order of public worship in the Church was far from being settled, *any Christian man was competent*. By the time of Justin (*Apol.* i. 65) the function was reserved for the **προεστώς,** but on the understanding that he represented the community and acted in communion with it (see Ritschl, *Altkath. Kirche*,[2] pp. 365 f.). The pls. of our passage speak out of the consciousness of the Christian fellowship, in which it is matter of indifference who may be, in this instance or that, its administrative organ."—**οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος, τοῦ σώματος, τοῦ Χριστοῦ**; "Is it not a communion of (*or* in) the blood, the body, of Christ?" (*cf.*, for the gen. after **κοινωνία,** note on i. 9)—not "a communion *with* the blood, etc." The stress lies on **τοῦ Χριστοῦ** in both questions: through the cup and loaf believers participate together in *Christ*, in the sacrifice of His blood offered to God (Rom. iii. 25, Eph. i. 7, Heb. ix. 11 ff., 24 ff.), and in the whole redemption wrought through His bodily life and death and resurrection. **τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ** carries our thoughts from the incarnation (Phil. ii. 7), through the crucifixion (Col. i. 22), on to the heavenly glory of the Redeemer (Phil. iii. 21). The cup and bread are here styled "a *communion* in Christ's blood and body"; in His own words (xi. 25), "the *new covenant* in My blood,"—a communion on the basis of the covenant established by the sacrifice of the Cross.

Ver. 17 unfolds the assertion virtually contained in the question just asked: "Seeing that (**ὅτι**) there is one bread, we, the many, are one body"; so Vg., "Quoniam unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus," Cv., Bz., Bg., Hf., Bt., Hn., Gd., El., R.V. marg.; *cf.* the mutually supporting unities of Eph. iv. 4 ff. The saying is aphoristic: *One bread makes one body* (Hn.)—a maxim of hospitality (equally true of "the cup") that applies to all associations cemented by a common feast. "The bread" suggests the further, kindred idea of *a common nourishment* sustaining an identical life, the loaf on the table symbolising the **ἀληθινὸς ἄρτος** of John vi., which feeds the Church in every limb (xii. 13).—"For (**γὰρ** of explanation) we all partake from (partitive **ἐκ**, *cf.* ix. 7) the one bread"; eating from the common loaf attests and seals the *union* of the participants in Christ.

Ver. 17 is parenthetical, but no interpolation as Sm. thinks; it is necessary to develop the idea of **κοινωνία** in ver. 16, showing how vital to the Church is the fellowship of the Lord's Table, that was being violated by attendance at idol-feasts.—The elliptical **ὅτι . . . ἐσμεν** is often construed as a continued dependent clause under the regimen of **ὅτι**: either (*a*) "Since we, who are many, are one bread (loaf), one body" (A.V., R.V. txt., with several ancient Verss., Est., Al., Sm.); or (*b*) "Since there (is) one bread, (and) we, the many, are one body" (D.W., Mr.)—these renderings making the two statements a double reason for the **κοινωνία** of ver. 16, instead of seeing in the **εἷς ἄρτος** an evidence of the **ἓν σῶμα.** But (*a*) confuses two distinct figures, and identifies unsuitably "the bread" with the Church itself. (*b*) escapes this error by reading into the first clause the **ἐστὶν** required to match **ἐσμὲν** in the second; but the copulative "and" is

[q] μετέχομεν. 18. [r] βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ [s] κατὰ [s] σάρκα· οὐχὶ[1] οἱ ἐσθίοντες τὰς θυσίας [t] κοινωνοὶ τοῦ [u] θυσιαστηρίου εἰσί; 19. τί οὖν [v] φημι; ὅτι [w] εἴδωλόν[2] τί ἐστιν, ἢ ὅτι [v] εἰδωλόθυτόν[2] τί ἐστιν; 20. ἀλλ' ὅτι ἃ [x] θύει[3] τὰ[4] [y] ἔθνη,[4] [z] δαιμονίοις [x] θύει[3] καὶ οὐ Θεῷ[5]·

q See ix. 10. r See i. 26. s See i. 26. t 2 Cor. i. 7, viii. 23; Phm. 17; Heb. x. 33; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Pet. i. 4; Mt. xxiii. 30; Lk. v. 10. u See ix. 13. v See viii. 1. w See viii. 4. x Absol., Acts xiv. 13, 18 (with dat., as here); Exod. xxiii. 18. See v. 7. y See i. 23, v. 1, τ. ἐθνη. z Deut. xxxii. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 1; Acts xvii. 18; Jas. ii. 19; Rev. ix. 20, xvi. 14; Gospp. *passim*.

[1] ουχ, ℵACD*G. ουχι, B and Syrians; so W.H. *marg.*

[2] ειδωλοθυτον . . . ειδωλον (in this order): ℵ^aBC**DP 46, 73, latt. vg. sah. cop., Aug., Ambrst. ℵ*AC* om. η οτι ειδωλον τι εστιν, by homœoleuton—a circumstance tending to prove a common (Alexandrian?) ancestor. Similarly 17, 71 om. οτι ειδωλοθυτον κ.τ.λ.—a reading indicated also by Tert. and Aug.

[3] θυουσιν (twice), all uncc. but KL.

[4] Om. τα εθνη (?) BDG, Mcion., Tert. Lachm., Tisch., Al. *om.*; W.H. and Nestle *bracket* the words.

[5] και ου Θεῳ θυουσιν (in this order): ℵABCP 17, 37, 46.

artificially supplied; moreover, Mr.'s interpretation reverses the contextual relation of the ἄρτος and σῶμα, making the latter the ground of the former, whereas Paul argues that the bread assures the oneness of the body; through loaf and cup we realise our communion in Christ.

Ver. 18. "For look at Israel after the flesh: are not those that eat the sacrifice communicants of the altar?"—*i.e.*, participation in the sacrificial feast constitutes fellowship in the sacrifice.—τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα, in contrast with Ἰσρ. κατὰ πνεῦμα (Rom. ii. 28 f., Gal. iv. 29, vi. 16, etc.: see note on οἱ πατ. ἡμῶν, 1). The Ap. is not thinking of the *priests* specifically, as in ix. 13 (Hn.), nor of the *people* as *sharing with them* (Al.), but of the festal communion of *Israelites as such*—*e.g.*, at the Passover, the sacrificial meal κατ' ἐξοχήν: see Lev. vii. 11-34, Deut. xii. 11-28, 1 Sam. ix. 12 ff. The altar furnishes the table at which Jehovah's guests enjoy their covenant fellowship in the gifts of His salvation. The feasters are thus κοινωνοὶ τ. θυσιαστηρίου, recognising the altar as their common altar and mutually pledging themselves to its service.

Vv. 19, 20. Paul's appeal to the meaning of the Lord's Supper is leading up to a prohibition of attendance at the idol-feasts. Against this veto the men of "knowledge" will argue that idolatry is illusion (viii. 4 ff.), its rites having no such ground in reality as belongs to Christian observances; the festival has no religious meaning to them, and does not touch their conscience (contrast viii. 7); if friendship or social feeling invites their presence, why should they not go? Paul admits the non-reality of the idol in itself; but he discerns other terrible presences behind the image—"demons" are virtually worshipped at the idol-feast, and with these the celebrants are brought into contact. "What then do I affirm (the φημὶ of 15 resumed)? that an idol-sacrifice is anything (*has reality*)? or that an idol is anything? (to say this would be to contradict viii. 4). No, but that (ἀλλ' ὅτι) what the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to *demons*, and not to God; and I would not that you should be communicants of the demons!" How could the Cor., as "men of sense, judge" of a situation like this? The riot and debauch attending heathen festivals showed that foul spirits of evil presided over them: *cf.* vv. 6 ff., referring to the worship of Baal-Peor, with which the allusion here made to Deut. xxxii. 17 (*cf.* Ps. cvi. 37 f.) is in keeping. "That the worship of heathen cults was offered *quoad eventum*—not indeed *quoad intentionem*—to devils was, consistently with their strict monotheism, the general view of later Jews" (Mr.). Heathenism P. regarded as the domain of Satan (2 Cor. iv. 4, Eph. ii. 2, vi. 12; *cf.* Luke iv. 6, 1 John v. 19), under whose rule the demons serve as the angels under that of God (2 Cor. xii. 7, 1 Tim. iv. 1; *cf.* Matt. xii. 24, xxv. 41, etc.); idolatry was, above everything, inspired by Satan. δαιμόνιον (=δαίμων, of which it is neut. adj.) was primarily synon. with θεῖον—"δαίμων is related to θεὸς as *numen* to *persona divina*" (Cr.); τὸ δαιμόνιον οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἢ θεὸς ἢ θεοῦ ἔργον (Arist., *Rhet.*, ii., 23. 8); hence Socrates

[a] οὐ [a] θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς [t] κοινωνοὺς τῶν [z] δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι· 21. οὐ δύνασθε [f] ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ [f] ποτήριον [z] δαιμονίων, οὐ δύνασθε [b] τραπέζης Κυρίου [q] μετέχειν καὶ [b] τραπέζης [z b] δαιμονίων· 22. ἢ [c] παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν Κύριον; μὴ [d] ἰσχυρότεροι αὐτοῦ ἐσμεν;

a (*Nolo*). xvi. 7; 2 Cor. xii. 20; Rom. vii. 16; 2 Th. iii. 10; 3 Jo. 13; Rev. ii. 21; freq. in Gospp.; *cf.* x. 1. b Rom. xi. 9; Ps. lxxvii. 20; also Mt. xv. 27; Lk. xvi. 21, xxii. 21, 30. For τρ. δαιμ, *cf.* Isa. lxv. 11. c Rom. x. 19 (Deut. xxxii. 21), xi. 11, 14. d See i. 25.

called the mysterious guiding voice within him **δαιμόνιόν τι.** Ed. observes a tendency, beginning with Eurip. and Plato and accentuated in the Stoics, "to use the word in a depreciatory sense"; already in Homer it often suggested the *uncanny*, the supernatural as an object of dread. The word was ready to hand for the LXX translators, who used it to render various Heb. epithets for heathen gods. Later Judaism, which peopled the unseen with good and evil spirits, made **δαιμόνια** a general term for the latter, apart from any specific refer. to idols (see, already, Tob. iii. 8, etc.); hence its prominence in the Gospels, and the origin of the word *demoniac* (ὁ **δαιμονιζόμενος**): on the whole subject, see Cr. *s.v.*, also Everling's *Paulinische Angelologie u. Dämonologie.* For **κοινωνοὶ τ. δαιμονίων**, *cf.* Isa. xliv. 11, where the "fellows" of the idol signify a kind of religious guild, brought into mystic union with their god through the sacrificial meal (see Cheyne *ad loc.*); also Isa. lxv. 11. Ver. 20*c* is calculated to bring home to the Cor. the fearful danger of trifling with idolatry.

Vv. 21, 22. This lively apostrophe sets in the strongest light the inconsistency of Cor. Christians who conform to idolatry, the untenability of their position. "You cannot drink the Lord's cup and the cup of *demons*"—the two together! "You cannot partake of the Lord's table and the table of *demons!*" *Cf.* the **τίς μετοχή, κοινωνία, κ.τ.λ.**; of. 2 Cor. vi. 14 ff., and other parls. The nouns forming the obj. are anarthrous as being qualitative, the impossibility lying in the *kind* of the two cups; *cf.* note on ii. 5. "The *Lord's* cup" is that received at His direction and signifying allegiance to Him; in ver. 16, "the cup of (His) blessing."—Possibly, P. alludes here to Mal. i. 7, 12, where 'the table" signifies "the altar of Jehovah"; but the expression is borrowed without this identification. In this context table and altar are essentially distinguished; the altar *supplies* the table (*cf.* Heb. xiii. 10). "S. Coena convivium, non sacrificium; in mensa, non in altari" (Bg.). The **τράπεζα** includes the **ποτήριον** and **ἄρτος** of ver. 16 together. This passage gives its name of "the Lord's Table" to the Eucharist.—"Or (is it that) we provoke the Lord to jealousy?"—is this what we mean by eating at both tables? Paul includes himself in this question; such conduct is conceivable in his case, since he had no scruple against the idolothyta on their own account (see viii., ix. 1). Deut. xxxii. 21 (neighbouring the previous allusion of 20) sufficiently indicates the result of such insolence: see other O.T. parls. For this argumentative **ἢ** in Paul's questions, *cf.* vi. 9, etc., ix. 6.—If the Cor. *are* daring Christ's sovereign displeasure by coquetting with idolatry, they must suppose themselves "stronger than He"! As sensible and prudent men they must see the absurdity, as well as the awful peril, of such double-dealing: *cf.* Deut. xxxii. 6, 28 f. **ἰσχυρός** (i. 25) implies inherent, personal strength. Of the **δύναμις τ. κυρ. Ἰησοῦ** P. had given a solemn impression in ch. v. 4 f.; *cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 3 f.

§ 34. Liberty and its Limits, x. 23-xi. 1. The maxim "All things are lawful" was pleaded in defence of the use of the idolothyta, as of other Cor. laxities; so the Ap. has to discuss it a second time (*cf.* vi. 12). In ch. vi. he bade his readers guard the application of this principle for their own sake, now for the sake of others; there in the interests of purity, here of charity (23 f.). When buying meat in the market, or when dining at an unbeliever's table, the Christian need not enquire whether the flesh offered him is sacrificial or not; but if the fact is pointedly brought to his notice, he should abstain, to avoid giving scandal (25-30). Above all such regulations stands the supreme and comprehensive rule of *doing everything to God's glory* (31). Let the Cor. follow Paul as he himself follows Christ, in living for the highest good of others (32-xi. 1)

Ver. 23. On **πάντα ἔξεστιν κ.τ.λ.**, see notes to vi. 12. The form of that ver. seems to be purposely repeated here (**μοι** only omitted), with the effect of bringing out the *altruistic* as complementary to the *self-regarding* side of Christian ex-

23. [e] Πάντα μοι [1] [e] ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' [e] οὐ πάντα [e] συμφέρει· [e] πάντα μοι [1] [e] ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα [f] οἰκοδομεῖ· 24. μηδεὶς [g] τὸ [g] ἑαυτοῦ [h] ζητείτω, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ [i] ἑτέρου ἕκαστος.[2] 25. πᾶν τὸ ἐν [k] μακέλλῳ [l] πωλούμενον ἐσθίετε, μηδὲν [m] ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν [n] συνείδησιν, 26. [o] τοῦ γὰρ [3] Κυρίου [3] ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ [p] πλήρωμα αὐτῆς· 27. εἰ δέ [4]

e See vi. 12. f See viii. 10. g xiii. 5; Ph. ii. 4, 21; *cf.* Mt. xvi. 23. h Ver. 33, xiii. 5; 2 Cor. xii. 14; Ph. ii. 21; Neh. ii. 10. See i. 22. i Ph. ii. 21. ο ετερος, see iv. 6. k *H.l.*; see note below. l Mt. x. 29, etc.; *h.l.* in Epp. m See ii. 14. n See viii. 10. o Ps. xxiii. 1, xlix. 12. p In this sense, Mk. vi. 43, viii. 20.

[1] *Om.* **μοι** (supplied from vi. 12) all pre-Syrian uncc.
[2] *Om.* **εκαστος** pre-Syrian uncc. and verss.
[3] **του Κυριου γαρ** (in this order): all uncc. but AHKLP.
[4] *Om.* **δε** pre-Syrian uncc. and verss.

pediency. On Paul's dialectical use of the words of opponents, *cf.* viii. 1 ff. and notes. Closing his discussion about the sacrificial meats, P. returns to the point from which he set out in ch. viii., viz., *the supremacy of love* in Church life—there commended as superior to *knowledge*, here as supplying the guard of *liberty;* in both passages, it is the principle of *edification.*—The tacit obj. of **οἰκοδομεῖ** (see viii. 1, iii. 9-17) is "the Church of God" (32). Edification, in its proper meaning, is always relative to the community; P. is safe-guarding not the particular interests of "the weak brother" so much as the welfare of the Church, when he says, "Not all things edify".

Ver. 24. With **μηδεὶς τ. ἑαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ.** *cf.* xiii. 5, Rom. xiv. 7, xv. 2, Gal. vi. 2, Phil. ii. 1 ff. After **ἀλλὰ** understand **ἕκαστος**, from the previous **μηδείς**: *cf.* the ellipsis in iii. 1, 7, vii. 19 (Bm., p. 392). For **ὁ ἕτερος** (= **ὁ πλησίον**, Rom. xv. 2), wider than **ὁ ἀδελφός** (viii. 11; *cf.* 27 f.)—"the other" in contrast with oneself—see parls.; Gr. idiom prefers "the other" where we say "others".—**τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου**, implies some definite good—"his own, the other's interest": a N.T. *h. l.;* the pl. elsewhere in such connexion (*cf.* Matt. xxii. 21).

Vv. 25, 26. The above rule is now applied in the concrete. **πᾶν τὸ ἐν μακέλλῳ πωλούμενον κ.τ.λ.**, "Anything that is on sale in the meat-market eat, not asking any question of conscience". **μάκελλον** is a term of late Gr., borrowed from Latin (*macellum*): possibly a local word, introduced by the *colonia;* for the anarthrous **ἐν μακ.**, *cf.* note on **ἐν σταδίῳ** (ix. 24).—**μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ συνείδησιν** might mean "for conscience' sake (to avoid embarrassment of conscience) making no enquiry" (Cm., Er., Hf., El., Holsten), as though addressed to men of weak conscience—Bg. however, "propter conscientiam alienam" (referring to 29); or, "because of your (*sc.* strong) conscience making no enquiry"—since you are not troubled with scruples (Est., Mr., Ed.); or, "making no enquiry on the ground of conscience," the adv. phrase simply defining the kind of question deprecated (so Bz., Hn., Bt., Gd., Ev.): the last interpretation best suits the generality of the terms, and the connexion with ver. 26. For **ἀνακρίνω**, see ii. 14, iv. 3, ix. 3, and notes; it signifies enquiry with a view to judgment at the bar of conscience.—**μηδέν**, acc. of *definition*, as in Acts x. 20, xi. 12; Sm. baldly renders it as transitive obj., "examining nothing"—*kein Fleischstück untersuchend!* For **μὴ** in ptpl. clause, see Wr., p. 606.—The citation from Ps. xxiv. 1, recalling the argument of viii. 4 ff., quiets the buyer's conscience: consecration to an idol cannot deprive the Lord of anything that belongs to "the earth and its fulness," and which His providence supplies for His servants' need; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 6*b*, 14, 1 Tim. iv. 4.—**πλήρωμα**, in its primary sense, *id quo res impletur* (*cf.* Lt., *Colossians*, pp. 257 ff.); "terra si arboribus, herbis, animalibus etc., careret, esset tanquam domus supellectile et omnibus instrumentis vacua" (Cv.).

Ver. 27: a case parl. to that of vv. 25 f., attached therefore asyndetically; *cf.* the two clauses of ver. 16. When one buys for himself, the question arises at the *shop;* when he is the guest of another, it arises at the *table.* "If some one invites you, of the unbelievers, and you determine to go."—**τῶν ἀπίστων** is emphatic by position: in a non-Christian house sacrificial meat was likely to be used, and here the Christian's conduct

q Mt. xxii. 3 ff.; Lk. vii. 39, xiv. 7 ff.; Jo. ii. 2; Esth. v. 12.
r See vi. 6.
s Lk. x. 8; Mk. vi.41; Acts xvi. 34; Gen. xliii. 31 f.

τις [q]καλεῖ ὑμᾶς τῶν [r]ἀπίστων[1] καὶ θέλετε πορεύεσθαι, πᾶν τὸ [s]παρατιθέμενον ὑμῖν ἐσθίετε, μηδὲν [m]ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν [n]συνείδησιν· 28. ἐὰν δέ τις ὑμῖν[2] εἴπῃ, "Τοῦτο [t]εἰδωλόθυτόν[3] ἐστι," μὴ ἐσθίετε, δι' ἐκεῖνον τὸν [u]μηνύσαντα καὶ τὴν [n]συνείδησιν, [o]τοῦ[4] γὰρ Κυρίου[4] ἡ γῆ[4] καὶ τὸ [p]πλήρωμα αὐτῆς[4]· 29. [n]συνείδησιν δὲ [v]λέγω οὐχὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ,[5] ἀλλὰ [l]τὴν τοῦ [l]ἑτέρου· [w]ἱνατί γὰρ ἡ

t ιεροθυτον, h.l.; see txtl. and exeg. notes. u Lk. xx. 37; Acts xxiii. 30; Jo. xi. 57; 2 Macc. iii. 7, vi. 11, xiv. 37. v In this sense, see i. 12. w Mt. ix. 4, xxvii. 46; Lk. xiii. 7; Acts iv. 25, vii. 26.

[1] Add **εις δειπνον** DG, latt., some codd. of vg. sah.: a characteristic Western gloss.

[2] Om. **υμιν** G, latt. vg.

[3] **ιεροθυτον**, ℵABH, sah., some latt. codd., Julian (as instanced in Cyr.[229]) also Cyr.[233]. A Biblical *h.l.;* see note below.

[4] *Om.* **του γαρ Κυρ. . . . αυτης** all pre-Syrian uncc. and verss. (including vg.),—repeated from ver. 26; C[3] adds it to ver. 31 instead.

[5] For **εαυτου** D* has the correction **σεαυτου**; H and some others, **εμαυτου**.

would be narrowly watched.—**θέλετε** in N.T., as in cl. Gr. (see Lidd., under **βούλομαι**, as against Gm. under **θέλω**: *cf.* note on xii. 11), signifies *will, active purpose*, not mere *wish* ("are disposed to go," E.V.); the invited make up their mind to go, are *bent* on it (P. "non valde probat," Bg.; "a hint that it would be wise to keep away," El.); the next clause discovers them there, with the viands before them. P. assumes social intercourse of Christians with heathen—not with false Christians (v. 10 f.); there can be no question, after vv. 20 ff., of attending an idol-feast or **κατακεῖσθαι ἐν εἰδωλίῳ** (viii. 10).—**τ. παρατιθέμενον** replaces **τ. πωλούμενον** of ver. 25; the rest is a repetition: no more need to raise the question of conscience in the one case than in the other.

Vv. 28, 29*a*. **ἐὰν δὲ . . . εἴπῃ**, "But if any one say to you"—a probable contingency, as **εἴ τις καλεῖ κ.τ.λ.** (27) was an assumed fact; see Bn. on the forms of the Condit. Sentence, §§ 242 ff.—**δὲ** confronts this contingency with *both* the situations described in vv. 25 and 27. The information, "This is sacrificial meat," might be volunteered to the Christian purchaser in the market (by the salesman, or a by-stander), or to the Christian guest at the unbeliever's table (by the host, or by a fellow-guest), the communication being prompted by civility and the wish to spare the supposed susceptibilities of the Christian, or by the desire to embarrass him; whatever its occasion or motive, it alters the situation. The genuine reading, **ἱερόθυτον** (*slain-as-sacred*, i.e., *in sacrifice*), takes the statement as from the mouth of unbelievers; a Jew or Christian would presumably say **εἰδωλόθυτον**, as above and here in T.R.: Reuss and El. suppose the informant to be "a Christian converted from heathenism" using the inoffensive term "at the table of a heathen host"; but **τ. ἀπίστων** suggests *heathen* company, and **μηνύσαντα** *private* information. "Forbear eating (**μὴ ἐσθίετε**, revoking the permission of 25 ff.) for the sake of him that informed (you), and for conscience' sake."—**Μηνύω** (see parls.), *to disclose* what does not appear on the surface or is imparted secretly. The informant expects the Christian to be shocked; with his **συνήθεια τ. εἰδώλου** (viii. 7), he looks on the flesh of the sacrifice as having acquired a religious character (it is **ἱερόθυτον**); by saying **Τοῦτο ἱερόθυτον**, he calls conscience into play—*whose* conscience the next clause shows.—**διὰ τὸν μηνύσαντα καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν** form one idea, being governed by the same prp., **καὶ** adding an explanation; from regard to the *conscience* of the **μηνύσας**—not his possible contempt or ill-will—the Christian should decline the offered flesh or stop eating it.—**συνείδησιν δὲ λέγω, οὐ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ κ.τ.λ.**, "Conscience however I mean, not one's own, but that of the other". Ver. 29*a* explains the **διὰ τ. συνείδησιν** of ver. 28, and reconciles its instruction with that of vv. 25, 27, while it brings the matter under the governing rule laid down in vv. 23 f. By contrast with "the other," the 2nd pl. of ver. 28 becomes here 2nd sing. reflexive.

Vv. 29*b*, 30 justify, in two rhetorical questions, the Christian's deference to

[x] ἐλευθερία μου κρίνεται ὑπὸ [y] ἄλλης [a] συνειδήσεως; 30. [b] εἰ δὲ [1] ἐγὼ [z] χάριτι [a] μετέχω, [b] τί [b] βλασφημοῦμαι [c] ὑπὲρ [c] οὗ ἐγὼ [d] εὐχαριστῶ; 31. εἴτε οὖν ἐσθίετε εἴτε πίνετε, εἴτε τι ποιεῖτε, πάντα [e] εἰς [e] δόξαν Θεοῦ ποιεῖτε. 32. [f] ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε [2] καὶ [2] [g] Ἰουδαίοις [2] καὶ [g] Ἕλλησι καὶ τῇ [h] ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ [h] Θεοῦ· 33. καθὼς κἀγὼ πάντα πᾶσιν [i] ἀρέσκω, μὴ [k] ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ [l] συμφέρον [3] ἀλλὰ τὸ [m] τῶν

x 2 Cor. iii. 17; Rom. viii. 21; Gal. ii. 5, v. 1, 13; Jas. i. 25, ii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 19.
y *H.l.* in this use; *cf.* Job xix. 27.
z In this sense, xv. 57; 5 times more in P.; Lk. vi. 32 ff.
a See ix. 12.
b With *human* obj., Rom. iii. 8, xiv. 16; Tit. iii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 4. For interr. after ει, see xii. 17.
c For the ellipsis, *cf.* vii. 1, etc.
d Absol., xi. 24, xiv. 17; 1 Th. v. 18; see i. 4.
e See ii. 7.
f Ph. i. 10; Acts xxiv. 16; Sir. xxxv. (xxxii.) 21.
g In this antithesis, i. 24; Rom. i. 16, ii. 9 f., iii. 9, x. 12; Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; Acts xiv. 1, xviii. 4, xix. 10, 17, xx. 21.
h See i. 2.
i See vii. 32.
k See ver. 24.
l *συμφορον*, see vii. 35.
m See ver. 17.

[1] *Om.* δε all but a few minuscc., with Thd. and Oec.

[2] και Ιουδαιοις γινεσθε (in this order): ℵ*ABC, 17, 37, 73.

[3] συμφορον, ℵ*ABC.

the conscience of another: (*a*) **ἵνα τί γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**; "For to what purpose is my liberty judged by another conscience?" *i.e.* "What good end will be served by my eating under these circumstances, and exposing my freedom to the censure of an unsympathetic conscience?" *cf.* ii. 15, Matt. vii. 6. **ἵνα τί (γένηται)**; *ut quid?* (Vg.), signifies *purpose*, not *ground* as Mr. and others take it; there is *nothing to be gained* by the exercise of liberty in this case. For **κρίνω** in adverse sense, see parls. For the previous **συνείδ. τὴν τοῦ ἑτέρου** (*alterius*), **ἄλλης** (*alienæ*) **συνειδήσεως** is substituted (*cf.* xv. 29, 2 Cor. xi. 4), indicating a distinction not merely in the persons but in the *consciences* severally possessed. The Ap. says here of Liberty what he says of Faith in Rom. xiv. 22: **κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ.**—Question (*b*) intimates that, instead of any benefit resulting from the assertion of liberty in face of conscientious condemnation, positive harm ensues—thanksgiving leads to *blasphemy!* "If I with thanks (*or* by grace) partake, why am I blasphemed over (that for) which I give thanks?" The **τί** is *prospective*, as in xv. 29 f. = **εἰς τί** or **ἵνα τί**; The bare **χάριτι** can scarcely mean here "by (the) grace (of God)"—esp. in view of **εὐχαριστῶ**; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 6 and 16 (for **βλασφημοῦμαι**). Men of heathen conscience, seeing the Christian give thanks knowingly over food devoted to the idol, will regard his act as one of sacrilegious indulgence and denounce it accordingly; it seems to them a revolting hypocrisy; "*Quelle religion est celle-là?* devaient dire les païens" (Gd.)—a grievous **πρόσκομμα** both to Jews and Greeks (32); *cf.* Rom. ii. 24.—**ὑπὲρ οὗ** absorbs the dem. pron. governed by the same prp.; *cf.* vii. 39, 2 Cor. ii. 3. The repeated emphatic **ἐγὼ** points to the Christian as devout on his own part, yet incurring the scandal of gross irreverence.

Vv. 31, 32 conclude the matter with two solemn, comprehensive rules, introduced by the collective **οὖν** (*cf.* Rom. v. 9, xi. 22), relating to *God's glory* and *to man's salvation*. The supreme maxim of duty, **πάντα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ ποιεῖτε,** applies to all that Christians "eat or drink" (including the idolothyta),—indeed to whatever they "do"; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 20 ff., Col. iii. 17.—A second general rule emerges from the discussion: "Offenceless prove yourselves, both to Jews and to Greeks and to the church of God". **ἀπρόσκοποι** here act., as in Sir. xxxv. 21, *not causing to stumble;* elsewhere pass. in sense. For **γίνεσθε**, see note on vii. 23. The three classes named make up Paul's world of men: "Jews" and "Greeks" embrace all outside the Church (i. 22, ix. 20 f.); Christian believers alone form "the Church of God" (*cf.* i. 2, and note; also Gal. vi. 16). This text and xii. 28 afford the first ex. in P. of the comprehensive use of **ἐκκλησία**, as transcending local ref. "The church *of God*" is bound up with His glory (31); its sacredness supplies a new deterrent from self-indulgence. It contains "the weak" who are liable to injury (viii. 9, ix. 22).

Ver. 33, xi. 1. Paul's personal example played a large part in his argument (ix.); it is fitting he should refer to it in summing up. The negative **ἀπρόσκοποι γίνεσθε**, in 2nd person, now becomes the positive **ἐγὼ πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω** in the 1st: "As I also in all things please all." **ἀρέσκω** is *to comply with, accom-*

a See iv. 16. m πολλῶν, ἵνα σωθῶσι· XI. 1. [a] μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς κἀγὼ
b Vv. 17, 22; Rom. xv. 11; Lk. xvi. 8; -νος, iv. 5. Χριστοῦ.
c In this tense, 2 Tim. i. 4. 2. [b] Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί,[1] ὅτι πάντα μου [c] μέμνησθε, καὶ
Cf. iv. 17. μνημονευω common in this sense.

[1] *Om.* αδελφοι ℵABCP, 46, 73, sah. cop.—a Western addition.

modate oneself to, not *give enjoyment to* (*cf.* Rom. xv. 1, 3)—no need to speak of a "conative present," resembling ζητῶ ἀρέσκειν. Paul's universal compliance is qualified by its *purpose*, ἵνα σωθῶσιν, in the light of which the verbal contradiction with Gal. i. 10, 1 Thess. ii. 4, is removed; there is nothing in his power that P. will not do for any man, to help his salvation (*cf.* ix. 22*b*).—Between the ἀρέσκω and its purpose lies the μὴ ζητῶν clause, in which the Ap. professes for himself the rule commended to the Cor. in ver. 27. The "self-advantage" which P. sets aside, touches his highest welfare (*cf.* Rom. ix. 3); P. sacrificed what seemed to be his spiritual as well as material gain—spending, *e.g.*, weary hours in tent-making that might have been given to pious study—to secure spiritual gain for others; thus "losing himself," he "found himself unto life eternal." "The many," in contrast with the single self; *cf.* ver. 17, Rom. v. 15 ff. —Through his own pattern P. points the readers to that of his Master and theirs: "Show yourselves (γίνεσθε, see 32, vii. 23) imitators of me, as I also (am) of Christ". P. does not point his readers *backward* to the historical model ("of Jesus," or "Jesus Christ," as in Eph. iv. 21), but *upward* to the actual "Christ," whose existence is evermore devoted to God (Rom. vi. 10 f.) and to men His brethren (Rom. viii. 34 f., i. 30), "in" whom the Cor. believers "are" (i. 2, 30). Paul's *imitatio Christi* turns on the great acts of Christ's redeeming work (Eph. v. 2, Phil. ii. 5-11), rather than on the incidents of His earthly course.

Division IV. Disorders in Worship and Church Life, xi.-xiv. The Ap. returns to the internal affairs of the Church, which occupied him in Div. I., dealing however not as at the outset with the relations of the Cor. Church to its ministry, but with the mutual relations and behaviour of its members within the society. The questions arising under this head are bound up with the moral and social problems of Divs. II. and III., and several leading topics of former chaps. reappear in a new connexion—*e.g.*, the Christian relationship of the sexes (common to v., vi., and xi.), the Lord's Supper (x. and xi.), the superiority of Love to Knowledge (viii. and xiii.). The matters treated in these chaps. are well defined: (1) *the unveiling of the head by women* in public worship, xi. 2-16; (2) *profanation of the Lord's Table*, 17-34; (3) *the exercise of spiritual gifts*, xii. 1-11 and xiv.—.a subject which leads the Ap. into two digressions: (*a*) on *the corporate nature of the Church*, xii. 12-31; (*b*) on *the supremacy of love*, xiii. As in the earlier parts of the letter, the train of thought is objectively dictated; the matters taken up arise from the faulty state of the Cor. Church, and were supplied to the writer partly, as in chh. vii.-x., by the Church Letter, and partly by information conveyed in other ways (see xi. 18, and *Introd.*, chap. ii.), which indicated the existence of disorders and scandals within the community of the gravity of which it was unaware.

§ 35. The Woman's Veil, xi. 2-6. P. is glad to believe that the Church at Cor. is loyal to his instructions (2); he interrupts his censures by a word of praise. This commendation, however, he proceeds to qualify. First, in respect of a matter whose underlying principles his readers had not grasped: he hears that some women speak in Church-meetings, and that bareheaded! For a woman to discard the veil means to cast off masculine authority, which is a fixed part of the Divine order, like man's subordination to Christ (3 f.). She who so acts disgraces her own head, and only needs to go a step further to rank herself with the degraded of her sex (5 f.).

Ver. 2. The praise here given is so little suggested by the context, and to little accords with the tone of the Ep., esp. with what was said in the like connexion in iv. 16 f., that one conjectures the Ap. to be quoting *professions made in the Letter from Cor.* rather than writing simply out of his own mind: "Now I praise you that [as you say] 'in all things you remember me, and hold fast the in-

καθὼς [d] παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς [e] παραδόσεις κατέχετε. 3. [f] θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς [f] εἰδέναι ὅτι παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ [1] Χριστός ἐστι, κεφαλὴ δὲ [g] γυναικὸς ὁ [g] ἀνήρ, κεφαλὴ δὲ [h] Χριστοῦ [2] ὁ [h] Θεός. 4. πᾶς ἀνὴρ [i] προσευχόμενος ἢ [k] προφητεύων, [l] κατὰ [l] κεφαλῆς ἔχων, [m] κα-

d In this sense, ver. 23, xv. 3; Lk. i. 2; Acts xvi. 4.
e Gal. i. 14; Col. ii. 8; 2 Th. ii. 15, iii. 6; Mt. xv. 2, etc.
f Col. ii. 1; *cf.* x. 1 above.
g For the contrast, vii. 3 ff.; Rom. vii. 2; Eph. v. 22; Col. iii. 18 f.; 1 Tim. ii. 12-15; 1 Pet. iii. 1; Mk. x. 2 ff.
h i. 24, iii. 23, xv. 24-28, 57; 2 Cor. i. 19, iv. 6, v. 18 f.; Eph. i. 17, 20, iii. 21; Ph. ii. 5-11; Col. i. 15, 19; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Tit. iii. 6; Heb. i., iii. 6, etc.; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Jo. i. 1 f., xvii. 3 f., etc.; 1 Jo. iv. 9 f., etc.
i Absol., xiv. 14 f.; Eph. vi. 18; 1 Th. v. 17; 1 Tim. ii. 8, etc.
k xiii. 9, xiv. 1 ff.; Acts ii. 17 f., etc.; Mt. vii. 22; Lk. i. 67.
l Esth. vi. 12.
m See i. 27.

[1] Om. ο B*D*G; so W.H. *marg.*

[2] **του Χριστου**, ℵABD, 17, 37, 46, Clem. CGKLP om. **του**. See note below.

structions as I delivered them to you'". For such adoption by P. of the words of his readers, see notes on viii. 1 ff. Self-esteem characterised this Church (iv. 8 ff., v. 2); the declaration was sincere, and contained a measure of truth; P. accepts it for what it is worth.—**δέ**, introducing the new topic, marks also the connexion between vv. 1 and 2: "I bid you imitate me—but I am glad to know (from your letter) that you do".—**πάντα**, acc. of *definition* (not obj.), as in ix. 25, x. 33; the vb. regularly governs a gen. in N.T.: **μέμνησθε**, like *memini*, a pf. pres.—"you have been kept in remembrance of me".—**παρά-δοσις**, a "giving-over" (without the associations of our *tradition*), applies to historical fact, teaching, or rules of practice delivered, through whatever means, to the keeping of others: for reference to *fact* and *usage*, see ver. 23; to *fact* and *doctrine*, xv. 1; to the three combined, as here, 2 Thess. ii. 15; for its currency in Jewish Schools, Matt. xv. 2 ff., etc.—**κατέχετε**, as in xv. 2 = **κρατεῖτε**, 2 Thess. ii. 15. **καθὼς κ.τ.λ.** implies maintenance in *form* as well as substance, observance of the **τύπος διδαχῆς** (Rom. vi. 17).

Ver. 3. **θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι** (= **οὐ θέλω κ.τ.λ.** of x. 1; see note): "But I would have you know"—the previous commendation throws into relief the coming censure. The indecorum in question offends against a foundation principle, *viz.*, that of *subordination under the Divine government;* this the Cor., with all their knowledge, cannot "know," or they would not have allowed their women to throw off the **ἐξουσία ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς** (10). The violated principle is thus stated: "Of every man the Christ is the head, while the man is head of woman, and God is head of Christ". As to the wording of this sentence: **παντὸς ἀνδρὸς** bears emphasis in the 1st clause asserting, like the parl. 2nd clause, a universal truth which holds of the man (*vir*) as such; the predicate of the 1st clause is distinguished by the def. art.,—"Christ is the (proper, essential) head," etc. (*cf.* **ἡ εἰρήνη**, Eph. ii. 14, and see Bm., pp. 124 f.); **ὁ Χριστός**, in 1st and 3rd clauses, means "the Christ" in the wide scope of His offices (*cf.* x. 4, xii. 12, xv. 22); for anarthrous **κεφαλὴ γυναικός**, *cf.* note on ii. 5. That Christ is "every man's" true head is an application of the revealed truth that He is the "one Lord" of created nature (viii. 6; Col. i. 15 f.), combined with the palpable fact that the **ἀνήρ** has no (intervening) lord in creation (*cf.* 9); he stands forth in worship, amidst his family, with no visible superior, holding headship direct from his Maker, and brought by his manhood into direct responsibility to Him "through whom are all things". Ed., following Cm. and Mr. (not Hn.), limits this manly subordination to the Christian order of life; "the man is head of the woman in virtue of the marriage union, Christ of the man in virtue of union with Him through faith": but faith is common to the sexes, on this footing **οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ** (Gal. iii. 28); on the other hand, in Pauline theology, the law of marriage and the social order are grounded in Christ. Paul's argument has no force unless the parl. assertions rest on a common basis. The question is one that touches the fundamental proprieties of life (8-15); and the three headships enumerated belong to the hierarchy of nature.—"The Christ" of the 3rd clause is "the Christ" of the 1st, without distinction made of natures or states; He who is "every man's head," the Lord of nature, presents the pattern of loyalty in His perfect obedience to the Father (xv. 28, Gal. iv. 4; Heb. v. 5, 8, etc.); *cf.* iii. 22 f., where

ταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ· 5. πᾶσα δὲ γυνὴ [l] προσευχομένη ἢ [k] προφητεύουσα [n] ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ, [m] καταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν ἑαυτῆς,[1] [o] ἓν γάρ ἐστι καὶ τὸ [o] αὐτὸ τῇ [p] ἐξυρημένῃ· 6. εἰ γὰρ οὐ [q] κατακαλύπτεται γυνή, καὶ [r] κειράσθω· εἰ δὲ [s] αἰσχρὸν γυναικὶ τὸ [r] κείρασθαι ἢ [p] ξυρᾶσθαι, [q] κατακαλυπτέσθω.

n N.T. *h.l.*; Lev. xiii. 45.
o xii. 11.
p Acts xxi. 24; Numb. vi. 9.
q N.T. *h.l.*; Gen. xxxviii. 15, etc.
r Acts viii. 32, xviii. 18; 2 Ki. xiv. 26.
s xiv. 35; Eph. v. 12; Tit. i. 11; Gen. xli. 3, etc.

[1] **αυτης** (?) all uncc. but BDcK, in conformity with ver. 4. W.H. place **εαυτης** in *marg.* The reading **αυτης** has the appearance of a harmonistic emendation.

with the same δέ . . . δὲ a chain of subordinate *possession* is drawn out, corresponding to this subordination of *rule*. Submission in office, whether of woman to man or Christ to God, consists with equality of nature.

Vv. 4, 5: the high doctrine just asserted applied to the matter of feminine attire. Since man *qua* man has no head but Christ, before whom they worship in common, while woman has man to own for her head, *he must not and she must be veiled*. The regulation is not limited to those of either sex who "pray or prophesy"; but such activity called attention to the apparel, and doubtless it was amongst the more demonstrative women that the impropriety occurred; in the excitement of public speaking the shawl might unconsciously be thrown back. **προσευχόμενος κ.τ.λ.**, "when he (she) prays or prophesies,"—in the act of so doing.—**κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων**, "wearing *down from* the head (a veil": **κάλυμμα** understood), the practice being for the woman in going out of the house to throw the upper fold or lappet of her robe over her head so as to cover the brow: see Peplos in the *Dict. of Antiq.* **ἀκατακαλ. τ. κεφαλῇ**, "with the head uncovered," dat. of manner, as **χάριτι** in x. 30.—Is it the *literal* or *figurative* "head" that is meant as obj. to **καταισχύνει**? Ver. 3 requires the latter sense, while the sequel suggests the former; Al. and Ed. think *both* are intended at once. Hf. is probably right in abiding by the reading **ἑαυτῆς** (see txtl. note); he supposes that the Ap. purposely broke off the parallelism at the end of ver. 5, thus sharpening his reproof: the man who wears a veil "puts to shame his head"—*i.e.* Christ, whose lordship he represents (7); the woman who discards it "puts to shame *her own head*"—the dishonour done to the dominant sex falls upon herself. That the shame comes home to *her* is shown by the supporting sentence: **ἓν γάρ ἐστιν καὶ τὸ αὐτό** (*cf.* iii. 8) **τῇ ἐξυρημένῃ**, "for she is one and the same thing with her that is shaven" (Mr., Ev., Bt., Ed., El.); "It is one and the same thing," etc. (E.V.), would require **τῷ ἐξυρῆσθαι**. Amongst Greeks only the *hetæræ*, so numerous in Cor., went about unveiled; slave-women wore the shaven head—also a punishment of the adulteress (see Wetstein *in loc.*, and *cf.* Num. v. 18); with these the Christian woman who emancipates herself from becoming restraints of dress, is in effect identified. To shave the head is to carry out thoroughly its unveiling, to remove nature's as well as fashion's covering (15).

Ver. 6, with a second **γάρ**, presses the above identity; the Ap. bids the woman who discards the veil carry her defiance a step further: "For if a woman is not veiled, let her also crop (her head); but if it is a disgrace for a woman to crop (it) or to keep (it) shaven, let her retain the veil" (**καλυπτέσθω**, pr. impv., *continuous*). P. uses the *modus tollens* of the hypothetical syllogism: "If a woman prefers a bare head, she should remove her hair; womanly feeling forbids the latter, then it should forbid the former, for the like shame attaches to both." The argument appeals to Gr. and Eastern sentiment; "physical barefacedness led to the inference of moral, in a city like Corinth" (Ev.). **κειράσθω** and **κείρασθαι**, aor. mid., denote a single act on the woman's part, "to cut off her locks"; **ξυρᾶσθαι**, pres. mid.,—a shaven condition; the single art. comprises the infs. in one view.—Paul's directions do not agree precisely with current practice. Jewish men covered their heads at prayers with the Tallith (*cf.* the allusion of 2 Cor. iii. 14 ff.)—this custom, retained probably by some Jews at Christian meetings (4), P. corrects without censure; women were both veiled and kept behind a screen. Amongst the Greeks,

7. Ἀνὴρ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ [t] ὀφείλει [q] κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλήν, [u] εἰκὼν καὶ [v] δόξα [v] Θεοῦ [w] ὑπάρχων, γυνὴ [1] δὲ [v] δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστιν· 8. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀνὴρ ἐκ γυναικός, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ ἐξ ἀνδρός· 9. καὶ γὰρ οὐκ [x] ἐκτίσθη ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ γυνὴ διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα·

t See vii. 36.
u Gen. i. 26 f.; *cf.* xv. 49; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Rom. i. 23, viii. 29; Col. i. 15, iii. 10.
v *Cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 6; Ph. i. 11; Heb. i. 3; Jo. i. 14, xvii. 22; Ps. xviii. 1.
w See vii. 26.
x Rom. i. 25; Col. i. 16, iii. 10; 1 Tim. iv. 11; Mt. xix. 4; Mk. xiii. 19.

[1] η γυνη δε: ℵ^c ABD*G.

both sexes worshipped with *uncovered* head, although women covered their heads at other times (see Hermann, *Gottesdienstl. Alterthümer*, § 36, 18 f.; Plato, *Phædo*, 89B, C), while Roman men and women alike *covered* their heads during religious rites (Servius *ad Æn.*, iii., 407). The usage here prescribed seems to be an adaptation of Gr. custom to Christian conceptions. With us the diff. of sex is more strongly marked in the general attire than with the ancients; but the draped head has still its appropriateness, and the distinction laid down in this passage has been universally observed.—The woman is recognised by the side of the man as "praying" and "prophesying" (see note on xii. 10); there is no ground in the text for limiting the ref. in her case to the exercise of these gifts *in domestic and private circles* (thus Hf., Bt., and some others); on the contradiction with xiv. 34, see note *ad loc.* Under the Old Covenant women were at times signally endued with supernatural powers, and the prophetess occasionally played a leading public part (*e.g.* Deborah and Huldah); in the Christian dispensation, from Acts i. 14 onwards, they receive a more equal share in the powers of the Spirit (see Acts ii. 17 f., Gal. iii. 28). But in the point of **ἐξουσία** there lies an ineffaceable distinction.

§ 36. MAN AND WOMAN IN THE LORD, xi. 7-16. The Ap. has insisted on the woman's retaining the veil in token of the Divine order pervading the universe, which Christ exhibits in His subordination to the Father. But he has some further observations to make on the relative position of the sexes. In the first place, he bases what he has said of the headship of man on *the story of creation*, exhibiting man as the direct reflexion of God, woman as derived and auxiliary (7-9); in this connexion the ref. to "the angels" must be understood (10). At the same time, man and woman are *necessary each to the other* and *derive alike from God* (11 f.). Having thus grounded the matter upon Christian principle, P. appeals in confirmation to *natural feeling* (13-15), and finally to *the unbroken custom of the Church* (16).

Ver. 7. **ἀνὴρ** (not **ὁ ἀνὴρ**) **μὲν γὰρ κ.τ.λ.**: "For *man* indeed (being man) ought not to have his head veiled" (**καλύπτεσθαι**, pr. inf. of *custom*), in contrast with woman who *ought* (5, 10)—this is as wrong on his part as it is right on hers; **οὐκ** negatives the whole sentence, as in ver. 1. **ὀφείλει**, like **δεῖ** (19), denotes moral or rational necessity, the former vb. in a more personal, the latter in a more abstract way. For *him* to veil his head would be to veil the "image and glory of God"; Christ, *the* image of God, became **ἄνθρωπος** as **ἀνήρ**.—**ὑπάρχων** (see parls.), "being constituted" so. To accompany **εἰκών**, P. substitutes for the **ὁμοίωσις** (*d'muth*) of Gen. the more expressive **δόξα**—by which the LXX renders the synonymous *t'munah* of Ps. xvii. 15—God's "glory" being His likeness in visible splendour; *cf.* Heb. i. 3. P. conceives Gen. i. 26 to apply to Adam as **ἀνὴρ** primarily, although in ver. 27 it stands, "God created man in His own image . . . *male and female* created He them".—**ἡ γυνὴ δὲ κ.τ.λ.** presents a shortened antithesis to the **μὲν** clause; logically completed it reads, "But the woman (ought to have her head veiled, for she) is the glory of the man"—**δόξα ἀνδρός**—not of the race (**ἀνθρώπου**), but of the stronger sex. Paul omits **εἰκών**, which does not hold here; she is not man's reflexion, but his counterpart—not "like to like, but like in difference," wedded as "perfect music unto noble words"; she partakes, through him, in the **εἰκὼν Θεοῦ** (Gen. i. 27). That which in our common nature is most admirable —faith, purity, beauty—man sees more excellently and proportionately shown in hers. It follows that he who degrades a woman sullies his manhood, and is the worst enemy of his race; the respect shown to women is the measure and safeguard of human dignity.

10. διὰ τοῦτο [y] ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ [y] ἐξουσίαν [z] ἔχειν [z] ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, διὰ τοὺς [a] ἀγγέλους. 11. [b] πλὴν οὔτε ἀνὴρ [1] χωρὶς γυναικός,[1] οὔτε γυνὴ [1] χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς [1] ἐν Κυρίῳ· 12. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ γυνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναικός· τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ

y Cf. vii. 37; see note below.
z Rev. xiv. 14. ἐπι in like connection, Jo. xx. 7; Rev. i. 20, vii. 3, etc., xii. 1, etc. 31; Mk. xiii. 27; Lk. xvi. 22.
a In pl. abs., with art., xiii. 1; Heb. i. 4 ff.; Mt. xiii. 49, xxv. passim; Lam. iii. 3.
b Eph. v. 33; Ph. i. 18, iii. 16, iv. 14; Rev. ii. 25; Mt., Lk.,

[1] γυνη χωρις ανδρος . . . ανηρ χωρις γυναικος (in this order): all uncc. but DbKL, all anc. verss. but syrr. and vg.

Vv. 8, 9 add two more to the chain of *for's* extending from ver. 6: a double reason for asserting that woman is man's glory appears in the revelation of the origin of mankind made by Scripture (Gen. ii. 18-25: the *second* narrative of Creation, J of the critics), where Eve is represented as framed from a rib taken out of Adam's body to be his "help-mate". Woman originates *from* (**ἐστὶν ἐκ**), and was created *for* (*because of*, **ἐκτίσθη διά**) man, not *vice versa*.—"**ἐκτίσθη** differs from **ἐστὶν** as purpose from fact," (Ed.).—**καὶ γάρ**, "For *also*" (9)—the second statement goes to explain the first: Man was there already; and Woman was fashioned out of him for his need. Whether the story of the extracted rib is read as poetry or prosaic fact, the relationship set forth is the same.

Ver. 10 is the counterstatement to ver. 7*a*, undeveloped there: "*For this reason* the woman is bound to wear authority upon her head"—*sc.*, the reason made out in vv. 7*b*-9, that her nature is derived and auxiliary. The **ἐξουσία** (= **σημεῖον ἐξουσίας**) that she "has (wears)," is that to which she submits, with the veil "upon her head" for its symbol; *cf.* xii. 23, where **τιμή** = **σημεῖον τιμῆς**. So the soldier under the Queen's colours might be said to "have authority over his head". Ev. quotes Shakesp., *Macb.*, iii., 4, "Present him *eminence* both with eye and tongue," as a parl. expression for the authority of another pictured in one-self.—**διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους** suggests, by way of after-thought, a supplementary motive for the decent veil, which the Ap. merely hints, leaving a crux for his interpreters. In iv. 9 he adduced the "angels" as interested spectators of the conduct of Christ's servants, and in vi. 3 he spoke of certain of them as to be judged by the saints (see notes); in manifold ways these exalted beings are associated with God's earthly kingdom (see Luke ii. 13, xii. 8, xv. 10, Acts i. 10, etc.; Heb. i. 14, xii. 22 f.; Rev. *passim*); in accordance with Jewish belief, they appear as agents of the Lawgiving in Gal. iii. 19 (Acts vii. 53), and in Heb. i. 7 are identified with the forces of nature. The same line of thought connects the angels here with *the maintenance of the laws and limits imposed at Creation* (*cf.* Job. xxxviii. 7), reverence for which P. expresses in his own style by this allusion; see Hn., Ed., and Gd. *in loc.* With this general view the interpretation is consistent which regards the angels as *present in Divine worship and offended by irreverence and misconduct* (see 1 Tim. v. 21), as (possibly) edified too by good behaviour (see Eph. iii. 10); *cf.* the ancient words of the Liturgy, "Therefore with Angels and Archangels, etc." A familiar thought with the Ff.; thus Cm. *ad loc.*, "Open the eyes of faith, and thou shalt behold a multitude of angels; if the air is filled with angels, much more the Church"; and Thp., **τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αἰδουμένη**. Similarly Hooker, "The house of prayer is a Court beautified with the presence of Celestial powers; there we stand, we sing, we sound forth hymns to God, having His angels intermingled as our associates; with reference hereunto the Ap. doth require so great care to be taken of decency for the Angels' sake" (*Eccl. Pol.*, v. 25. 2). P. cannot mean ***evil*** angels subject to sensual temptation, as many, after Tert., have read the passage, basing it on a precarious interpretation of Gen. vi. 4 (see Everling, *Die paul. Angelologie u.s.w.*, pp. 32 ff.)—an explanation far-fetched and grossly improbable. Others have seen in these **ἄγγελοι** *pious men, prophets, Church-officers*, even *match-makers!* Others have proposed emendations of the text, substituting **διὰ τοὺς ἀγελαίους** or **τὰς ἀγέλας**, or **διὰ τῆς ἀγγελίας** (*during the preaching!*). Baur, Sm., and others would delete the troublesome words as a primitive *gloss*.

Vv. 11, 12. **πλὴν κ.τ.λ.** modifies and guards the foregoing; this conj. lies

Θεοῦ. 13. ἐν[1] [c]ὑμῖν [c]αὐτοῖς[1] [c]κρίνατε· [d]πρέπον ἐστὶ γυναῖκα [e]ἀκατακάλυπτον τῷ Θεῷ προσεύχεσθαι; 14. ἢ[2] οὐδὲ αὐτὴ[3] ἡ [e]φύσις[3] διδάσκει ὑμᾶς ὅτι ἀνὴρ μὲν ἐὰν [f]κομᾷ, [g]ἀτιμία αὐτῷ ἐστι· 15. γυνὴ δὲ ἐὰν [f]κομᾷ, δόξα αὐτῇ ἐστιν; ὅτι ἡ [h]κόμη [i]ἀντὶ

c *Cf.* Lk. xii. 57. κρινατε, x. 15; Acts iv. 19; Jo. vii. 24.
d Mt. iii. 15 1 Macc. xii. 11. -πει, Eph. v. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 10; Tit. ii. 1; Heb. ii. 10, vii. 26; Ps. lxiv. 1.
e Rom. i. 26, ii. 14, 27, xi. 24; Gal. ii. 15, iv. 8; Eph. ii. 3.
f *H.l.* in Bib. Gr.
g xv. 43; Rom. i. 26, etc. -μος see iv. 10. -αζω, see Rom. i. 24, etc.
h N.T. *h.l.*: Numb. vi. 5.
i Lk: xi. 11; Jas. iv. 15.

[1] D latt. vg., Ambrst., Pelag. (Western) read **υμεις αυτοι** for **εν υμιν αυτοις**.

[2] *Om.* η all uncc. but DcKL.

[3] **η φυσις αυτη** (in this order): pre-Syrian uncc.

between **δὲ** and **ἀλλὰ** in its force—*but besides, howbeit.* What has been said in vv. 3-10 must not be overpressed: woman is subordinate, not inferior; the sexes are alike, and inseparably necessary to the Christian order (11); and if man is the fountain, woman is the channel of the race's life (12). **οὔτε γυνὴ . . . οὔτε ἀνὴρ κ.τ.λ.**: "Neither is there woman apart from man, nor man apart from woman in the Lord." Here Tennyson is the best commentator: "Either sex alone is half itself . . . each fulfils defect in each, and always thought in thought, purpose in purpose, will in will, they grow . . . the two-celled heart beating, with one full stroke, life". **ἐν Κυρίῳ** (*cf.* vii. 39, etc.), *i.e. under the rule of Christ*, where woman's rights are realised as nowhere in heathenism (*cf.* Gal. iii. 28, Eph. v. 28; also the wording of vii. 3 f. above). For the contrast of **ἐκ** and **διά**, see viii. 6; "the woman has an equivalent in the Divine order of nature, that as man is the *initial* cause of being to the woman, so woman is the *instrumental* cause of being to the man" (Ev.). But the **ἀνὴρ** is only a relative source; God is absolute Father—**τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ** (*cf.* viii. 6, i. 30 and note, Rom. xi. 36). To Him man and woman owe one reverence.

Ver. 13. There is a constitutional feeling which supports the above inference in favour of the woman's veil; it was implied already in the **καταισχύνει** and **αἰσχρὸν** of vv. 5 f., and is now explicitly stated: "Amongst yourselves (*inter* rather than *intra vos ipsos*) judge ye; is it seemly for a woman unveiled to be engaged in prayer (pr. inf.) to God?"—an appeal to social sentiment (*cf.* Rom. ii. 15, **μεταξὺ ἀλλήλων**), recalling the **κρίνατε ὑμεῖς** of x. 15. **πρέπον** (neut. ptp.: see parls.), as distinguished from **ὀφείλω** or **δεῖ** (7, 19), denotes *befittingness*, suitability to nature or character. **τῷ Θεῷ** lends solemnity to **προσεύχεσθαι**.

Vv. 14, 15. The question **οὐδὲ ἡ φύσις αὐτὴ κ.τ.λ.;** summons *personal instinct* to the aid of social sentiment: "Does not even nature of herself teach you that, etc.?" For **ἡ φύσις**, see Rom. ii. 14; in this connexion it points to man's *moral constitution* rather than to external regulations; Hf. and El. however, taking **φύσις** in the latter sense, reverse the order of thought in vv. 13 f., seeing in the former ver. individual instinct (they render **ἐν ἑαυτοῖς** *within yourselves*), and in this ver. social rule.—Hf. and Hn., by a strained constr. of **διδάσκει**, render **ὅτι** "because," and draw the obj. of "teach" from ver. 13, seeing in **ὅτι κ.τ.λ.** the *ground* of the affirmative answer tacitly given to both questions: "Does not nature of herself teach (this)? (Yes), for if a man have long hair, etc." The common rendering is preferable; the teaching of nature is expressed in a double sentence, which gathers the *con sensus gentium* on the subject: "that in a man's case, if he wear long hair (*vir quidem si comam nutriat*, Vg.), it is a dishonour to him; but in a woman's, if she wear long hair, it is a glory to her". **ἀνήρ, γυνὴ** stand in conspicuous antithesis preceding the conj.: what is discreditable in the one is delightful in the other. Homer's warriors, it is true, wore long hair (**καρηκομοῶντες Ἀχαιοί**), a fashion retained at Sparta; but the Athenian youth cropped his head at 18, and it was a mark of foppery or effeminacy (a legal **ἀτιμία**), except for the aristocratic Knights, to let the hair afterwards grow long. This feeling prevailed in ancient as it does in modern manners (*cf.* the case of Absalom). In the rule of the Nazirites natural instinct was set aside by an exceptional religious vocation. The woman's **κόμη** is not merely

k Heb. i. 12 (Ps. ci. 26); Exod. xxii. 27; Job xxvi. 6; Ps. ciii. 6.
l See iii. 18.
m N.T. *h.l.*; Ezek. iii. 7. -κια, Lk. xxii. 24. -κειν, Prov. x. 12.
n See viii. 7.
o See i. 2; full expression, N.T. *h.l.* in pl. For pl. ἐκκλ., see vii. 17.
p See vii. 10.
q See ver. 2.

[k] περιβολαίου δέδοται [1] αὐτῇ.[1] 16. εἰ δέ τις [l] δοκεῖ [m] φιλόνεικος εἶναι, ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην [n] συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν οὐδὲ αἱ [o] ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ [o] Θεοῦ.

17. Τοῦτο δὲ [p] παραγγέλλων [2] οὐκ [q] ἐπαινῶ,[2] ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ

[1] **αυτῃ δεδοται**: CHP, 37, 46. Om. **αυτῃ** DG (Western). T.R., as in ℵAB, etc.

[2] **παραγγελλων ουκ επαινω**: ℵC³DᶜGKLP, etc.; some latt. **cop.** **So Tisch., W.H.** *txt.*, R.V., El., Nestle. External evidence fairly balanced.

παραγγελλω ουκ επαινων: AC*G, 17, 46, 67**, vg. syrsch. So Lachm., Tr., Al., W.H. *marg.* Both verbs in **-ων**: D*gr., 137; both in **-ω**: B. See note below.

no **ἀτιμία**, but a positive **δόξα**; herself the **δόξα ἀνδρός**, her beauty has in this its crown and ensign. And this "glory" is grounded upon her humility: "because her hair *to serve as a hood* (**ἀντὶ περιβολαίου**) has been given her"—not as a substitute for head-dress (this would be to stultify Paul's contention), but *in the nature of* a covering, thus *to match* the veil (*en guise de voile*, Gd.); *cf.* **χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος**, John i. 16; **ἀντὶ κασιγνήτου ξεῖνος . . . τέτευκται**, *Odyss.* viii. 456. **δέδοται** (pf. pass.) connotes a *permanent* boon (see 2 Cor. viii. 1, 1 John iii. 1, etc.). **περιβόλαιον** (from **περιβάλλω**), a *wrapper*, *mantle*, is here exceptionally used of head-gear.

Ver. 16 closes the discussion sharply, with its appeal to established Christian rule. If, after all that the Ap. has advanced in maintenance of the modest distinction between the sexes, any one is still minded to debate, he must be put down by *authority*—that of P. himself and his colleagues (**ἡμεῖς**), supported by universal Christendom; *cf.* xiv. 33, 37 ff.—**δοκεῖ φιλόνεικος εἶναι**, not "seems," but "*thinks* (*presumes;* see parls.) to be contentious"; **εἴ τις** takes ind. of the case supposed (as in x. 27), and too likely in quarrelsome Cor. **φιλόνεικος**, not *amans victoriæ* (Est.) as if from **νική**, but *avidus litium* (from **νεῖκος**),—a disputer for disputation's sake.—**ἡμεῖς**, in contrast with **αἱ ἐκκλησίαι**, means not "I and those like-minded" (Mr.), but "I and my fellow-ministers" or "I and the Apostles generally" (*cf.* iv. 6-13, xv. 11, 2 Cor. i. 19, iv. 13, etc.).—**τοιαύτην συνήθειαν**, the custom described in vv. 4 f. above, which gave rise to the whole discussion; not, as many understand it, *the custom of being contentious* (a *temper*, surely, rather than a custom): no one could think of the *App.* (**ἡμεῖς**) indulging such a habit! The advocates of feminine emancipation may have supposed that P., the champion of liberty, was himself on their side, and that the rejection of the veil was in vogue elsewhere; he denies both. For **συνήθεια**, Lat. *con-suetudo*, see viii. 7; for **αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ Θεοῦ**, i. 2, iv. 17, the pl. conveying the idea of unanimity amongst many. Those who explain "such a custom" as that of "being contentious," usually link this ver. with vv. 17 ff. It is true that the **σχίσματα** of the sequel, like the **ἔριδες** of i. 11, tended to **φιλονεικία**; in truth the disputatiousness of the Cor. ran into everything—a woman's shawl, or the merits of the Arch-apostles!

§ 37. THE CHURCH MEETING FOR THE WORSE, xi. 17-22. The Cor. Church had written self-complacently, expecting the Apostle's commendation upon its report (2). In reply P. has just pointed out one serious irregularity, which might indeed be put down to ignorance (3, 16). No such excuse is possible in regard to the disorders he has now to speak of, which are reported to him on evidence that he cannot discredit (18)—*viz.*, *the divisions apparent in the Church meetings* (19), and *the gross selfishness and sensuality displayed at the common meals* (20 ff.). Such behaviour he certainly cannot praise (17, 22).

Ver. 17. If the T.R. be correct, **τοῦτο** (repeated in 22*b*) points to the instruction about to be given respecting the Lord's Supper: "Moreover (**δέ**), in giving you this charge I do not praise (you), seeing that, etc.": so Cm. and Gr. Ff., Er., Est., Bg., Hf., Hn., Sm. In vv. 3 ff. P. rectified an error, now he must censure a glaring fault; "le ton devient celui du blâme positif" (Gd.); vv. 3 and 17 both detract, in different degrees, from the "praise" of ver. 2. **τοῦτο παραγγέλλων** has to wait long for its explanation; P. lingers over his preliminary rehearsal of

[r] κρεῖττον[1] ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ [s] ἧττον[1] [t] συνέρχεσθε. 18. [u] πρῶτον [uv] μὲν [v] γάρ, [t] συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ[2] ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀκούω [w] σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν [x] ὑπάρχειν, καὶ [y] μέρος [y] τι πιστεύω· 19. [z] δεῖ γὰρ καὶ [a] αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἵνα[3] οἱ [b] δόκιμοι [c] φανεροὶ [c] γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν. 20. [td] συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν [d] ἐπὶ τὸ [d] αὐτό, οὐκ ἔστι [e] Κυριακὸν [f] δεῖπ-

r See vii. 9.
s N.T. *h.l.*; Isa. xxiii. 8. Adv. in 2 Cor. xii. 15; *cf.* vi. 7 above.
t Vv. 33 f., xiv. 23, 26; Acts i. 6, etc.; Mk. iii. 20, etc.
u Rom. i. 8, iii. 2; Heb. vii. 2; Jas. iii. 17; without μεν, xii. 28; xv. 46, etc.
v v. 3; 2 Cor. ix. 1, xi. 4; Rom. ii. 25, iii. 2; Heb. vii. 18, xii. 10; Acts xxviii. 22.
w See i. 10.
x See vii. 26.
y Bibl., *h.l.*; Thuc. iv. 30; Xen., *Eq.*, i. 12, etc.
z See viii. 2.
a Gal. v. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 1; five times (sing.) in Acts.
b 2 Cor. x. 18, xiii. 7; Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 15; Jas. i. 12. αδοκ., ix. 27.
c See iii. 13.
d xiv. 23; with ειμι, vii. 5.
e Rev. i. 10. See note below.
f Jo. xiii. 2, 4; Rev. xix. 9, 17; Lk. xiv. 12 ff.

[1] **κρεισσον . . . ησσον**: all pre-Syrian uncc.

[2] *Om.* **τη** all uncc. and many minn.

[3] **ινα και** (?): BD*, 37, 71, vg. sah., Ambrst. So Treg., Lachm.; W.H., Nestle *bracket* **και**.

the founding of the Lord's Supper, and the "charge" is held in suspense; its gist becomes evident in vv. 20 f. Neither *the feminine indecorum* censured in the last § (to which **τοῦτο** is referred by Mr., Bt., Gd., El., etc.), nor *the contentiousness* glanced at in ver. 16 (by which Ev. and Ed. explain it), has been, strictly speaking, matter of a *charge;* moreover, the backward ref. of **τοῦτο** involves the awkwardness of associating **ἐπαινῶ** and its introductory ptp. with disconnected objects; these interpretations better fit the other reading, **παραγγέλλω . . . ἐπαινῶν.** With certain specific and solemn injunctions respecting the Eucharist in view, P. says, "I do not praise (you), in that not for the better but for the worse you come together".—**ὅτι,** with the like broad sense as in i. 5, ix. 10, gives at once the *content* and *ground* of dispraise. The general profitlessness of the Church assemblies reached its climax in the desecration of the Lord's Supper, their hallowing bond (x. 16 f.).

Ver. 18. The severe reproach, **εἰς τὸ ἧσσον συνέρχεσθε,** is justified by vv. 18-22, which lead round to the intended **παραγγελία.**—**πρῶτον μὲν** requires an **ἔπειτα δέ,** that is not forthcoming (*cf.* Rom. i. 8): the complement appears to lie in xii.-xiv.—*viz., the abuse of spiritual gifts,* a further and prominent ground of disapproval (Mr., Hn., El.). Bt. and Ed. find the antithesis in **τὰ λοιπά,** ver. 34*b.* Hf. renders **πρῶτον** "chiefly," dispensing with any complement, but **μὲν** supposes a mental **δέ.** Ver. 20 gives no *contrasted* ground of censure, it stands upon *the same ground.*—**συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ** (not **τῇ ἐκκλ.,** *in the Church*): "as often as you come together in assembly"—ptp. pr. of *repeated* occurrence; the **σχίσματα** in Church meetings were chronic. For **ἀκούω σχίσματα,** see i. 10 f.; the pr. "I am hearing" suggests (in contrast with **ἐδηλώθη** above) *continued* information from various quarters (*cf.* v. 1, **ἀκούεται**): hence the qualifying **μέρος τι** (acc. of *definition*) **πιστεύω,** wanting in ch. i.; P. does not "believe" everything reported to him, but so much as is stated he does credit.—**ὑπάρχειν** (see parls.) implies not the bare fact, but a *characteristic fact,* a *proprium* of this Church—"have their place (are there) amongst you": *cf.* Acts xxviii. 18.

Ver. 19. Paul is prepared to believe what he thus hears; these divisions were inevitable: "For indeed parties must needs exist among you".—**δεῖ** affirms a necessity lying in the moral conditions of the case (see note on **ὀφείλω,** 7).—**αἵρεσις** (see parls., and note on i. 11; from **αἱρέομαι,** *to choose*) is more specific than **σχίσμα,** implying *mental tendency* —in philosophy *a school, Richtung,* then a *sect* or *party formed on a basis of opinion:* see Cr., *s.v.*; also Trench, *Syn.* § 4; "Heresy is theoretical schism, schism practical heresy". These words designate, as yet, parties within the Church; in Tit. iii. 10, 2 Peter ii. 1, they verge toward their ecclesiastical use. —Now there is a true purpose of God fulfilled in these unhappy divisions; they serve to sift the loyal from the disloyal. "in order that also the approved may become manifest among you". These **αἱρέσεις** are a magnet attracting unsound and unsettled minds, and leaving genuine believers to stand out "approved" by their constancy; see 2 Thess. ii. 11 f., where the same thought is differently

νον φαγεῖν· 21. ἕκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον [f] δεῖπνον [g] προλαμβάνει [1] ἐν [2] τῷ φαγεῖν, καὶ [h] ὃς μὲν [i] πεινᾷ [h] ὃς δὲ [k] μεθύει· 22. [l] μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας [l] οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν; [m] ἢ τῆς [n] ἐκκλησίας τοῦ [n] Θεοῦ [o] καταφρονεῖτε, καὶ [p] καταισχύνετε τοὺς [q] μὴ [q] ἔχοντας; τί ὑμῖν [3] εἴπω [3]; [r] ἐπαινέσω [4] ὑμᾶς; ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ [r] ἐπαινῶ.

g Gal. vi. 1 (in diff. sense); Mk. xiv. 8; Wisd. xvii. 16. h xii. 8, 28; 2 Cor. ii. 16; Rom. ix. 21, xiv. 2, 5; 2 Tim. ii. 20; Jude 22; once in Acts, nine times in Syn. GG. i See iv. 11. k 1 Th. v. 7; Acts ii. 15; Mt. xxiv. 49; Jo. ii. 10. l See ix. 4. m For η in double interrogg., *cf.* i. 13, ix. 8, 10 x. 19, xiv. 36. n See i. 2. o Rom. ii. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 12, vi. 2; Heb. xii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 10; thrice in GG. p See i. 27. q Lk. iii. 11, xxii. 36. r See ver. 2.

[1] **προσλαμβανει**, A, some 20 minn. **προ** and **προς** often confused in comp. vbs.
[2] **επι τῳ φαγειν**: DG, vg. (*ad manducandum*).
[3] **ειπω υμιν** (in this order): all uncc. but KL.
[4] **επαινω**, BG, vg., Latt. Ff. For position of the *interrog.*, see note below.

applied; also Rom. v. 4, **ἡ ὑπομονὴ κατεργάζεται δοκιμήν**, 1 Peter i. 7; also Tert., *De Præscr. Hæret.*, 4, "ut fides habendo tentationem habeat etiam probationem". For **δόκιμος**, *accepted on proof*, see parls., esp. ix. 27; those approved with God thus "become manifest" to men; "l'effet est de manifester au grand jour les membres de l'église sérieux et de bon aloi" (Gd.). "Dominus talibus experimentis probat constantiam suorum. Pulchra consolatio!" (Cv.).

Vv. 20, 21 resume with emphasis the circumstantial clause of ver. 18 and draw out, by **οὖν**, the disastrous issue of the **σχίσματα**: they produce *a visible separation at the common meal of the Church, destroying the reality of the Lord's Supper*. Ch. i. 12, iii. 3 f., iv. 6, showed that the Cor. divisions were of a *partisan* character, and i. 19 that *intellectual* differences entered into them (*cf.* viii. 1-7); but *distinctions of wealth* contributed to the same effect. The two latter influences conspired, the richer and more cultivated Cor. Christians leaning to a self-indulgence which they justified on the ground of enlightenment; the **αἱρέσεις** sloped down toward **κραιπάλη καὶ μέθη**.—**ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό**, "to the same (spot)".—**οὐκ ἔστιν κ.τ.λ.** can hardly mean, "it is not to eat the Lord's Supper" (so Al. and others)—for the Cor. *intended* this, but by unworthy behaviour (26 f.) neutralised their purpose: P. says either "it (*sc.* your feast) is not an eating of the Lord's Supper" (A.V., Bz., Est., D.W., Bt., Hn., El., Gd.: "ce n'est pas là manger, etc."); or, "it is not (possible) to eat the Lord's Supper" (R.V., Bg., Mr., Hf., Ed., Ev.)—such eating *is out of the question*. Ver. 21 bears out the last interpretation, since it describes a state of things not merely nullifying but *repugnant to* any true **κυριακὸν δεῖπνον**; **οὐκ ἔστιν** carries this strong sense, negativing the *idea* as well as fact, in Heb. ix. 5, and often in cl. Gr.—The adj. **κυριακὸν** (=**τοῦ Κυρίου**) stands in emphatic contrast with **ἴδιον**, the termination **-κὸς** signifying *kind* or *nature*: "It is impossible to eat a supper *of the Lord*, for each man is in haste to get (**προλαμβάνει**—*præoccupat*, Bz.) *his own* supper when he eats,"—or "during the meal" (Ev.; **ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν**, *in edendo*, Bz.; not *ad manducandum*, as in Vg.). Instead of waiting for one another (33), the Cor., as they entered the assembly-room bringing their provisions, sat down at once to consume each his own supply, like private diners at a restaurant; **προ-** suggests, in view of ver. 22, that the rich even *hurried* to do this, so as to avoid sharing with slaves and low people at a common dish (22).—The **κυρ. δεῖπνον** was a kind of club-supper, with which the evening meeting of the Church commenced (18*a*, 20*a*), taking place at least once a week on the Lord's Day (*cf.* Acts xx. 7 ff.). This Church-supper, afterwards called the Agapé (see *Dict. of Christian Antiq. s.v.*; also Ed. *ad loc.*) was analogous to the **συσσίτια** and **ἔρανοι** held by the guilds and friendly societies then rife amongst the Greeks. Originating as a kind of enlarged family meal in the Church of Jerus. (Acts ii. 46), the practice of the common supper accorded so well with social custom that it was universal amongst Christians in the first century (see Weizsäcker's *Apost. Age*, vol. ii., pp. 279-286). Gradually the Eucharist was separated from the Agapé for greater decorum, and the latter degenerated and became ex-

23. Ἐγὼ γὰρ [s] παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃ καὶ [t] παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ [u] παρεδίδοτο [1] [v] ἔλαβεν [v] ἄρτον, 24. καὶ [w] εὐχαριστήσας [x] ἔκλασε καὶ εἶπε, "Λάβετε,[2] φάγετε[2]· τοῦτό μου [y] ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα [z] τὸ [z] ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον[3]· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε

s In this sense, xv. 1, 3: seven times besides in P.
t See ver. 2.
u Of *persons*, v. 5; 12 times besides in P.; in this connexion, Mt. x. 21, xvii. 22, xxvi. 2, 45 ff., etc.
v Mt. xiv. 19, xv. 26, 36, xvi. 5, 7, xxvi. 26; Lk. vi. 4; Jo. xxi. 13; Acts xxvii. 35.
w See i. 4.
x See x. 16.
y See x. 4.
z The ellipsis (without κλωμ.), *h.l.*

[1] **παρεδιδετο,** all uncc. but B³LP. See Bm., p. 47.

[2] *Om.* **λαβετε, φαγετε** (from Mt. xxvi. 26) all uncc. but C³KLP.

[3] *Om.* **κλωμενον** ℵ*ABC*, 17, 67**, Cyr.
Add **κλωμενον** ℵᶜC³Dᵇ,ᶜGKLP, latt. syrr.; **θρυπτομενον,** D*; **διδομενον** (Lk.), sah. cop. vg., Cyp. The three ptps. are various attempts to fill up a seeming ellipsis.

tinct; here they are one, as in the Last Supper itself. The table was provisioned at Cor. not from a general fund (as was usual in the **ἔρανοι** or *collegia*), but by each guest bringing his contribution in kind, a practice not uncommon in private parties, which had the disadvantage of accentuating social differences. While the poor brought little or nothing to the feast and might be ashamed to show his fare, the rich man exhibited a loaded basket out of which he could feed to repletion. All **κοινωνία** was destroyed; such vulgarity would have disgraced a heathen guild-feast. The *Lord*, the common Host, was forgotten at His table. **ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ**—*sc.* the poor man, whose small store was insufficient, or who arriving late (for his time was not his own) found the table cleared (*cf.* **προλαμβάνει**). **ὃς δὲ μεθύει,** "but another is drunk!" or in the lighter sense suggested by **πεινᾷ**, *plus satis bibit* (Gr., Hn.), "drinks to the full" (*cf.* John ii. 10); the scene of sensual greed and pride might well culminate in drunkenness. Of all imaginable schisms the most shocking: hunger and intoxication side by side, at what is supposed to be the Table of the Lord! This is indeed "meeting for the worse".—For the demonstr. use of the rel. pron. with **μὲν** and **δέ**, see Wr., p. 130.

Ver. 22. **μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε κ.τ.λ.;** "For is it that you have not houses to eat and drink in?" See ver. 34, and note. The **γὰρ** brings in an ironical excuse: "For I suppose you act thus because you are houseless, and must satisfy your appetite at church!" *cf.* **πῶς γάρ**; Acts viii. 31.—If this voracity cannot be excused by a physical need which the offenders had no other means of supplying—if, that is to say, their action is *deliberate*—they must intend to pour scorn on the Church and to insult their humbler brethren: "Or do you despise the church of God, and cast shame on those that are without means?" For **ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ**, an expression of awful dignity, see i. 2, x. 32. **τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας,** "the have-nots" (*cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 12)—**οἱ ἔχοντες** in cl. Gr. signifies "the men of property"; **μή** (of the *point of view*) rather than **οὐ** (of the *fact*), for the poor with their beggarly rations are shamed by the full-fed on this very account. What could show coarser contempt for the Church assembly?—P. shows a fine self-restraint in the *litotes* of the last sentence: **τί εἴπω ὑμῖν; κ.τ.λ.:** "What am I to say to you? Should I praise (you)? In this matter I praise you not". **ἐπαινέσω,** deliberative aor. sbj., like **εἴπω,** for the question refers not to the future, but to the situation depicted (see Wr., p. 356). **ἐν τούτῳ** has great point and emphasis when attached to the following **οὐκ ἐπαινῶ** (so R.V. marg., after early Verss., Bz., Est., Mr., Hn., Gd., Bt., El., Ed.); thus also **ἐπαινέσω** better matches **εἴπω,** and the last clause prepares for the important **ἐγὼ δὲ παρέλαβον** of the ensuing ver.

§ 38. UNWORTHY PARTICIPANTS OF THE LORD'S BREAD AND CUP, xi. 23-34. The behaviour of the wealthier Cor. at the Church Supper is scandalous in itself; viewed in the light of the institution and meaning of the Eucharistic ordinance, their culpability is extreme (23-27). The sense of this should set the readers on self-examination (28 f.). The sickness and mortality rife amongst them are a sign of the Lord's displeasure in this very matter, and a loud call to amendment (30-32). Two practical directions are finally given: that the members of the

[a] εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν [b] ἀνάμνησιν". 25. [c] ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ [d] ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ [c] δειπνῆσαι, λέγων, "Τοῦτο τὸ [d] ποτήριον ἡ [f] καινὴ [f] διαθήκη ἐστὶν [g] ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ [1] [g] αἵματι [1]· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, [h] ὁσάκις ἂν [2] πίνητε,

a For εις with vbl. noun, *cf.* Mk. i. 4, xiv. 9. 1 Th. iv. 17 and Mt. viii. 34 are Hebraistic. b Lk. xxii. 19; Heb. x. 3; Lev. xxiv. 7. c Lk. xxii. 20; Rom. viii. 26; Mt. xxi. 30; Lk. xx. 31; Prov. xxvii. 15. d See x. 16. e Lk. xxii. 20, xvii. 8; Rev. iii. 20; Prov. xxiii. 1; Tob. viii. 1. f 2 Cor. iii. 6; Heb. viii. 8 (Jer. xxxviii. 31), ix. 15. g Heb. ix. 22, 25; x. 19; 1 Jo. v. 6; Zech. ix. 11. h Rev. xi. 6.

[1] **αιματι μου** (Lk.): ACP, 17, 37, 46. [2] **εαν**, ℵBC, 17. See Wr., p. 390.

Church should wait until all are gathered before commencing supper; and that where hunger forbids delay, food should first be taken at home (33 f.).

Vv. 23, 24. Amongst the things the Ap. had "delivered" to his readers, that they professed to be "holding fast" (2), was the story of the Last Supper of the Lord Jesus, which the Church perpetuates in its communion-feast.—**ἐγώ**, antithetical to **ὑμῖν**: *I* the imparter, *you* the receivers, of these solemn facts.—**ἀπὸ** neither excludes, nor suggests (*cf.* i. 30, xiv. 36, etc.) as **παρὰ** might have done (Gal. i. 12, 1 Thess. ii. 13), independent impartation to P.; "it marks the *whence* of the communication, in a wide and general sense" (El.); the Ap. vouches for it that what he related came authentically *from the Lord.* **Παραλαμβάνω** denotes "receiving a deposit or trust" (Ed.). "The Lord Jesus," see i. 8.—The allusion to "the night in which He was betrayed" (graphic impf., "while the betrayal went on"), is no mere note of *time;* it throws into relief the fidelity of Jesus in the covenant (25) thus made with His people, and enhances the holy pathos of the recollection; behind the Saviour lurks the Traitor. Incidentally, it shows how detailed and matter-of-fact was the account of the Passion given to Paul's converts. For the irreg. impf., **παρεδίδετο**, see Wr., p. 95, note 3.—**ἔλαβεν ἄρτον**, "took a loaf" (*ein Brod: cf.* the **εἷς ἄρτος** of x. 17)—one of the flat and brittle unleavened cakes of the Passover Table.—**καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν κ.τ.λ.**, "and after pronouncing the blessing, broke it and said, etc." This **εὐχαριστία** was apparently the blessing inaugurating the meal, which was followed by the symbolic bread-breaking, whereas "the cup" was administered **μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι** (25); *cf.* Luke xxii. 17 ff. (see notes *ad loc.* in vol. i.), whose account is nearly the same as Paul's, differing in some important particulars from that of Matt. and Mark. Luke, however, introduces a *preparatory* cup of renunciation on the part of Jesus, "prolusio cœnæ" (Bg.). The *fractio panis*, the sign of the commencement of a household or social meal (Luke xxiv. 30; Acts ii. 42), is prominent in each narrative; this act supplied another name for the Sacrament.—Regarding the words pronounced over the broken loaf, we bear in mind (1) that Jesus said of the bread "This is my body," Himself sitting there in His visible person, when the identification of substance could not occur to any one; (2) that the parl. saying concerning "the cup" expounds by the word "covenant" (*covenant in my blood*, in Luke and P.; *my blood of the covenant*, in Matt. and Mark) the connexion of symbol and thing symbolised, linking the cup and blood, and by analogy the loaf and body, as one not by confusion of substance but by correspondence of relation: what the blood effects, the cup sets forth and seals. The bread, *standing for* the body, "is the body" representatively; broken for Christ's disciples, it serves materially in the Supper the part which His slain body is about to serve spiritually "for the life of the world". Our Lord thus puts into an acted parable the doctrine taught by figurative speech in John vi. 48 ff. "**ἐστὶν** is here the copula of *symbolic being;* otherwise the identity of subject and predicate would form a conception equally impossible to Speaker and hearers" (Mr.).—**τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν** (**κλώμενον** an early gloss), "that is *for you*"—in all its relations subsisting for men; for *our* advantage He wore the **σῶμα σαρκός** (2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 7, Heb. ii. 14 ff., etc.).—The **τοῦτο ποιεῖτε** clause is peculiar to Luke and Paul: their witness is good evidence that the words are **ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου** (23). The sacrificial sense put on **ποιεῖτε** by many "Catholic" exegetes (as though syn. with the Homeric **ῥέζειν**, and *'asah* of Exod. xxix. 39, etc.) is without lexical warrant, and "plane præter mentem Scripturæ" as the R.C. Estius honestly says; see also El. *ad loc.*—**εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν** (*cf.* **ὑμετέραν**,

εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν [h]ἀνάμνησιν". 26. [h]ὁσάκις γὰρ ἂν[1] ἐσθίητε τὸν [i]ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο[2] πίνητε, τὸν [i]θάνατον τοῦ [i]Κυρίου [k]καταγγέλλετε, [l]ἄχρις [l]οὗ ἂν[3] ἔλθῃ. 27. ὥστε ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον[2] ἢ πίνῃ τὸ [m]ποτήριον τοῦ [m]Κυρίου[4] [n]ἀναξίως,[4] [o]ἔνοχος

i Rom. v. 10, vi. 3, 5; Phil. iii. 10; *cf.* viii. 11, xv. 3; 2 Cor. v. 15; Rom. v. 6 ff., vi. 10, etc.

k See ii. 1. l xv. 25; Rom. xi. 25; Gal. iii. 19, etc. m x. 21. n N.T. *h.l.*; 2 Macc. xiv. 22. -ιος, see vi. 2. o Heb. ii. 15; Jas. ii. 10 (same constr.; also in Isa. liv. 17); Mk. iii. 29, xiv. 64. With dat., Mt. v. 21 f.; Deut. xix. 10.

[1] **εαν**, ℵBC, 17. See Wr., p. 390.

[2] *Om.* **τουτο** and **τοῦτον** all pre-Syrian codd.

[3] *Om.* **αν** all pre-Syrian uncc., and many minn.

[4] **αναξιως του Κυριου**, ℵDcL, above 20 minn., and seemingly Or. in one place.

xv. 31) **ἀνάμνησιν**, *in mei memoriam* (Cv.); Ed. reads it "*My* commemoration" in contrast to that *of Moses* (x. 2), making **τ. ἐμὴν** correspond to **καινὴν** of ver. 25.

Ver. 25. **ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον**: "In the same fashion also (He gave) the cup". The two ritual actions correspond, and form one covenant.—**μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι** (as in Luke)—"postquam cœnaverunt" (Cv.), or better "cœnatum est" (Rom. Liturgy)—is studiously added to "emphasise the distinction between the Lord's Supper and an ordinary evening meal; *cf.* vv. 20 f.—The eating of the bread originally formed part of the common meal (consider Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, **ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν**), and may still have so continued, but the cup was certainly afterwards" (El.)—a solemn close to the **κυριακὸν δεῖπνον**.—"This cup is (see note 24: **ἐστὶν** wanting in Luke) the new covenant, in my blood"; *cf.* notes on x. 16 f. for **τὸ ποτ.**, and the relation of **διαθήκη** to **κοινωνία**. The cup, given by the Lord's hand and tasted by each disciple in turn, is a virtual covenant for all concerned; *in His blood* it becomes so (**ἐν τ. αἷμ.** is made by its position a further predicate, not a mere adjunct of **διαθ.**: *cf.* Rom. iii. 25), since that is the *ground* on which God grants and man accepts the covenant. For **διαθήκη**, see Cr., *s.v.*; this term, in distinction from **συνθήκη**, indicates the initiative of God as *Disposer* in the great agreement. For P.'s interpretation of **ἐν τ. αἵματι**, see Rom. iii. 23 ff., Eph. i. 7, ii. 13 ff., Col. i. 20; also parls. in Ep. to Heb., Rev. i. 5, 1 John i. 7, 1 Pet. i. 18 f. For "*new* covenant," see parls.: **καινός**, *new in nature*, *contents*, as securing complete forgiveness and spiritual renovation (Jer. xxxi. 31 ff., etc.).—"This do . . . for the commemoration of Me": see ver. 24*b*; **τοῦτο** includes, beside the *act*, the accompanying *words*, without which the **ἀνάμνησις** is imperfect. **ὁσάκις ἐὰν** (late Gr. for **ἄν**) **πίνητε**: "so many times as (*quotiescunque*) you drink (it)"—*the cup* of the context; not "so often as you *drink*" (Hf.), *sc.* at any table where Christians meet. Our Lord prescribed no set times; P. assumes that celebration will be frequent, for he directs that, *however frequent*, it must be guided by the Lord's instructions, so as to keep the remembrance of Him unimpaired.

Ver. 26. *Familiarity* helped to blunt in the Cor. their reverence for the Eucharist; hence the repeated **ὁσάκις ἐάν**: "for *so many times as* you eat this bread and drink the cup, you are proclaiming the Lord's death, until He come". **γὰρ** has its proper explicative force: Christ bade His disciples thus perpetually commemorate Him (24 f.: **ποιεῖτε**, "go on to do"—*sustained* action), "for it is thus that you publish His death, and in this form the testimony will continue till He comes again." **καταγγέλλετε** (see parls.), on this view ind., is the active expression of **ἀνάμνησις**: "Christus de beneficio mortis suae nos admonet, et nos coram hominibus id recognovimus" (Cv.). The ordinance is a *verbum visibile*, a "preaching" of the entire Church in silent ministry: "Christi sanguis scripturarum omnium sacramento ac testimonio effusus *prædicatur*" (Cyprian, quoted by Ed.). **ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ** states the *terminus ad quem* given in the words of Jesus at the Table, Luke xxii. 18, Matt. xxvi. 29. The rite looks *forward* as well as backward; a rehearsal of the Passion Supper, a foretaste of the Marriage Supper of the Lamb. Paul thus "associates with the **καταγγέλλειν** of the celebrants the fear and trembling that belong to the *Maranatha* of xvi. 22" (Mr.). The pathos and the glory of the Table of the Lord were alike lost on the Corinthians.

ἔσται τοῦ [p] σώματος καὶ[1] [p] αἵματος τοῦ [p] Κυρίου. 28. [q] δοκιμαζέτω δὲ [r] ἄνθρωπος[2] ἑαυτόν,[2] καὶ [s] οὕτως ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου πινέτω· 29. ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων ἀναξίως,[3] [t] κρίμα ἑαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ [u] διακρίνων τὸ [p] σῶμα τοῦ[4] Κυρίου.[4]

p See x. 16. q See iii. 13. r See iv. 1. s In this sense, xiv. 25; Rom. v. 12, xi. 26; Acts vii. 8, xvii. 33, xxviii. 14. t 8 times besides in P.; 1 Pet. iv. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 3; Jude 4; Acts xxiv. 25; thrice in Rev., six times in GG. u Acts xv. 9; Jas. ii. 4; Job. xii. 11. *Cf.* iv. 7.

[1] **του αιματος**: all uncc., above 40 minn., and many Ff.

[2] **εαυτον ανθρωπος** (in this order): CDGP.

[3] *Om.* **αναξιως** ℵ*ABC*, 17, sah.,—a Western popular gloss; current in Ff.

[4] *Om.* **του Κυριου** ℵ*ABC*, 17, 67**, am.* fu.*.

Ver. 27 draws the practical consequence of vv. 20-26, stating the judgement upon Cor. behaviour at the Supper that a right estimate of the covenant-cup and bread demands: "So then, whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily, will be held guilty (**ἔνοχος ἔσται**; *reus tenetur*, Bz.; rather, *tenebitur*) of the body and blood of the Lord"; it is *this* that he ignores or insults; *cf.* ver. 29. On **ὥστε** with ind., see note to iii. 7. What "unworthily" means is patent from vv. 20 ff.—The *or*, for *and*, between **ἐσθίῃ** and **πίνῃ** supplies the single text adducible for the R.C. practice of *lay communion in one kind:* "non leve argumentum," says Est., "non enim sic loqueretur Ap., si non sentiret unam speciem sine altera sumi posse". But *and* appeared in just the same connexion in ver. 26, and reappears in vv. 28 f.; "or" replaces "and" when one is thinking of the parl. acts distinctly, and the same communicant might behave unworthily in *either* act, esp. as the breaking of the bread and taking of the cup at this time came in probably at the beginning and end respectively of the Church Supper, and were separated by an interval of time; see notes on **εὐχαριστήσας** and **μετὰ τ. δειπν.** (24 f.). **ἔνοχος** (from **ἐν-έχω**, *to hold in* some liability) acquires in late Gr., like **αἴτιος**, a gen. of *person against whom* offence is committed; see Ed. *in loc.* To outrage the emblem is to outrage its original—as if one should mock at the Queen's picture or at his country's flag. Except **ἔλθῃ**, the vbs. throughout this passage are pr. in tense, relating to habit.

Ver. 28. "But (in contrast with the guilt described, and in order to escape it) let a man put himself to proof, and so from the bread let him eat and from the cup let him drink." **ἄνθρωπος**, replacing **ὃς ἄν** (27), is *qualitative*, "containing the ideas of infirmity and responsibility" (Gd.); *cf.* iii. 4, x. 13. On **δοκιμάζω**, see iii. 13, and parls.; it signifies not *judicial examination* (**ἀνακρίνω**, iv. 3, etc.), nor *discriminative* estimate (**διακρίνω**, 31), but *self-probing* (*probet se ipsum*, Vg.; not *exploret se*, Bz.) with a view to fit partaking; any serious attempt at this would make the scene of vv. 20 ff. impossible: the impv. is *pr.*, enjoining a practice; the communicant must test himself habitually by the great realities with which he is confronted, asking himself, *e.g.*, whether he "discerns the Lord's body" (29).—**καὶ οὕτως**: scarcely *sic demum* (Bg.), but *hoc cum animo; cf.* Phil. iv. 1. **ἐκ . . . ἐσθιέτω, ἐκ . . . πινέτω**—a solemn fulness of expression, in keeping with the temper of mind required; the prp. implies participation with others (*cf.* ix. 7, 13, x. 17).

Ver. 29. Participation in the bread and cup is itself a **δοκιμασία**: "For he that eats and drinks, a judgment for himself (sentence on himself) he eats and drinks". The single art. of **ὁ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων**, combining the acts, negatives the R.C. inference from the **ἢ** of ver. 27 (see note). Contact with Christ in this ordinance probes each man to the depths (*cf.* John iii. 18 f., ix. 39); it is true of the Lord's *verbum visibile*, as of His *verbum audibile*, that he who receives it **ἔχει τὸν κρίνοντα αὐτόν** (John xii. 48). His attitude toward the Lord at His table revealed with shocking evidence the spiritual condition of many a Cor. Christian—his carnality and blindness as one "not distinguishing the body".—The two senses given by interpreters to **διακρίνω** are, as Hn. says, somewhat blended here ("Beruht jedes Urtheilen auf *Ent*scheiden und *Unter*scheiden"), as in *dijudicans* (Vg.): one "discerns (judges clearly and rightly of) the (Lord's) body" in the sacrament. and therein "discriminates"

30. διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ὑμῖν πολλοὶ [v] ἀσθενεῖς καὶ [w] ἄρρωστοι, καὶ [x] κοιμῶνται [y] ἱκανοί· 31. εἰ γὰρ[1] ἑαυτοὺς [u] διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν [a] ἐκρινόμεθα· 32. [a] κρινόμενοι δέ, ὑπὸ Κυρίου[2] [z] παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ [a] κατακριθῶμεν. 33. ὥστε, ἀδελφοί μου, [b] συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ

v 2 Cor. x. 10; Mt. xxv. 43; Lk. x. 9; Acts iv. 9 v. 15 f.
w Mt. xiv. 14; Mk. vi. 5, 13, xvi. 18; Mal. i. 8; Sir. vii. 35. -τειν, 2 Kings xii. 15; -τημα, Sir. x. 10; -τια, Ps. xl. 3.
x See vii. 39.
y Acts xii. 12, xiv. 21, xix. 19; Lk. vii. 11, viii. 32.
z 2 Cor. vi. 9; Tit. ii. 12; Heb. xii. 6; Rev. iii. 19; Prov. iii. 11.
a Rom. ii. 1 (*cf.* xiv. 23); also 2 Pet. ii. 6; Rom. iii. 6; Acts xvii. 31; Jo. iii. 17.
b See ver. 18.

[1] δε, ℵ*ABDG, 17, 46, latt. vg.
γαρ, Cℵ cCKLP, sah. cop., Bas., Cyr.; Alexandrian and Syrian.

[2] του Κυριου: ℵBC, 17, 37. Om. του ADGKLP, etc. (Western and Syrian).

the rite from all other eating and drinking—precisely what the Cor. failed to do (20 ff.). They did not descry the signified in the sign, the Incarnate and Crucified in His memorial loaf and cup, and their Supper became a mere vulgar matter of meat and drink. This ordinance exposed them for what they were—σαρκικοί (iii. 3).—τὸ σῶμα (*cf.* 24 ff.)—a reverent *aposiopesis*, resembling ἡ ἡμέρα in iii. 13 (see note); the explanation of some Lutherans, that τὸ σῶμα means "the substance" underlying the material element, is foreign to the context and to Apostolic times. On "the serious doctrinal question" as to what the unfaithful receive in the sacrament, see El. *ad loc.* Distinguish κρίμα (unhappily rendered "damnation" in A.V.), a *judicial sentence* of any kind, from κατάκριμα, the final *condemnation* of the sinner (32; Rom. v. 16).

Ver. 30. In evidence of the "judgment" which profanation of the Lord's Table entails, the Ap. points to the sad fact that "amongst you many are sick and weakly, and not a few are sleeping".—ἀσθενεῖς applies to maladies of any kind, ἄρρωστοι to cases of debility and continued ill-health—*ægroti et valetudinarii* (Bz.). The added κοιμῶνται (the Christian syn. for ἀποθνήσκουσιν) shows that P. is speaking not figuratively of low spiritual conditions, but literally of *physical inflictions* which he knows to be their consequence (διὰ τοῦτο). We must be careful not to generalise from this single instance (see John ix. 3). The mere coincidence of such afflictions with the desecration of the Eucharist could not have justified P. in making this statement; he must have been conscious of some specific revelation to this effect. For ἱκανοί (a *sufficient* number—something like our "*plenty* of you"), see parls.; "something less than πολλοί, though sufficiently numerous to arouse serious attention" (El.). The "sleepers" had died in the Lord, or this term would not have been used of them; it does not appear that this visitation had singled out the profaners of the Sacrament; the *community* is suffering, for widely-spread offence. Both in the removal and infliction of physical evil, the inauguration of the New Covenant, as of the Old, was marked by displays of supernatural power.

Vv. 31, 32. Such chastisements may be averted; when they come, it is for our salvation: "If however we discerned (*or* discriminated: *dijudicaremus*, Vg.) ourselves, we should not be judged".—διακρίνω is taken up from ver. 29 (see note); it is distinguished from κρίνω, which in turn is contrasted with κατακρίνω (32).—τῷ κόσμῳ in the sequel explains the bearing of διακρίνω here: it expresses a *discriminating* judgment, by which the Christian rightly appreciates his own status and calling, and realises his distinctive character, even as the διακρίνων of ver. 29 realises the diff. between the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον and a common δεῖπνον. The alliterative play on κρίνω and its compounds is untranslatable; *cf.* ii. 13 ff., iv. 3 ff. For the form of hypothesis, see ii. 8; for the *pers.* of ἑαυτοὺς, vi. 7.—κρινόμενοι δὲ assumes, from ver. 30, as a *fact* the consequence hypothetically denied in the last sentence: "But under judgment as we are, we are being chastised by the Lord, in order that we may not with the world be *condemned*" (κατακριθῶμεν, *judged-against*, to our ruin). Thus hope is extracted from a sorrowful situation; *cf.* Heb. xii. 6 f., Rev. iii. 19; νουθεσίας μᾶλλόν ἐστιν ἢ καταδίκης τὸ γινόμενον (Cm.). On παιδεύω, *to treat as a boy*, see Trench, *Syn.*, § 32. Plato describes παιδεία as δύναμις θεραπευτικὴ τῇ ψυχῇ; *cf.* the proverb, παθήματα μαθήματα. Ch. v. 5 is the

φαγεῖν, ἀλλήλους [c]ἐκδέχεσθε· 34. εἰ δέ[1] τις [d]πεινᾷ, [e]ἐν [e]οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω· ἵνα μὴ εἰς [b]κρίμα [b]συνέρχησθε. τὰ δὲ λοιπά, [f]ὡς [f]ἂν ἔλθω, [g]διατάξομαι.[2]

c xvi. 11; Acts xvii. 16; Jas. v. 7; Heb. x. 13, xi. 10.
d See iv. 11.
e xiv. 35; Mk. ii. 1; Deut. xi. 19 f.
f Rom. xv. 24; Phil. ii. 23; cf. xii. 2 below.
g See vii. 17.

[1] *Om.* δε pre-Syrian uncc., latt. vg. cop.

[2] διαταξωμαι, ADG, 37.

extreme case of such "chastening" unto salvation; *cf.* Ps. cxix. 67, etc.—**κρινόμενα** (pr.), a disciplinary *proceeding;* **κατακριθῶμεν** (aor.), a definitive *pronouncement*; *cf.* Acts xvii. 31, etc. P. associates himself, by 1st pers. pl., with the readers, sharing his Churches' troubles (2 Cor. xi. 28 f.).

Vv. 33, 34*a*. The "charge" (17) proceeds from inward to outward, from *self-examination* (28) to *mutual accommodation* respecting the Lord's Supper. Religious decorum depends on two conditions,—*a becoming spirit* associated with *fitting external arrangements*, such as good sense and reverence dictate: "And so, my brothers, when you meet for the meal, *wait for one another*".—**ἀδελφοί μου** adds a touch of affection to what has been severely said.—**συνερχόμενοι** carries us back to vv. 17, 20; the same train of admonition throughout.—**τὸ φαγεῖν** embraces the entire Church Supper; see notes on vv. 20 f.; the order **ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε** (*invicem expectate*, Vg.) forbids the hasty and schismatic **τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαβεῖν** (21); no one must begin supper till the Church is gathered, so that all may commence together and share alike. To *wait for* others presumes *waiting to feast with them.*—**ἐκδέχομαι** never means *excipio* (*receive:* so Hf., and a few others), but always *exspecto* in the N.T.; with the former sense in cl. Gr., it signifies *to receive* (a person) *from* some particular quarter.—Some might object that hunger is pressing, and they cannot wait; to these Paul says, "If any one is hungry, let him eat *at home*"—staying his appetite before he comes to the meeting; *cf.* vv. 21, 22*a*. The Church Supper is for good-fellowship, not for bodily need; to eat there like a famished man, absorbed in one's food—if nothing worse happen—is to exclude Christian and religious thoughts.—**ἐν οἴκῳ**, not **ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ** (18: note the absence of the art.).—"Coming together **εἰς κρίμα**" (for a judgment) defines the "coming together **εἰς ἧσσον**" of ver. 17 in terms of vv. 29-32. **συνέρχησθε**, pr. sbj., of the *stated* meetings, as in ver. 18, etc. This warning (**ἵνα μή**) closes the **παραγγελία** introduced in ver. 17. For a clear and impartial account of the various doctrines of the Lord's Supper connected with this passage, see Bt., pp. 206 ff.

Ver. 34*b*. **τὰ λοιπά**, an *etcetera* appended to the charge—"other matters," probably of detail connected with the Church Supper and the **κοινωνία**. Ed. takes this as the antithesis to the **πρῶτον μὲν** of ver. 18 (see note), and supposes **λοιπὰ** to refer to other *different* matters, of which P. would postpone discussion till his arrival—addressing himself notwithstanding to one of the principal of these **λοιπὰ** in xii. 1 ff.—**ὡς ἂν ἔλθω**, "according as I may come": the Ap. is uncertain *when and under what circumstances* he may next visit Cor. (*cf.* xvi. 5-9); his intention to set matters in order is subject to this contingency.—**διατάξομαι** (see parls.) refers, presumably, to points of *external* order, such as those just dealt with. Romanists (see Est.) justify by this text their alleged unwritten apostolic traditions respecting the Eucharist: *fasting communion*, *e.g.*, is placed amongst the unspecified **λοιπά**.

§ 39. The Various Charisms of the One Spirit, xii. 1-11. In treating of the questions of Church order discussed in this Div. of the Ep., the Ap. penetrates from the outward and visible to that which is innermost and divinest in the Christian Society: (1) the question of *the woman's veil*, a matter of social decorum; (2) the observance of *the Lord's Supper*, a matter of Church communion; and now (3) the operation of *the Spirit of God* in the Church, wherein lies the very mystery of its life. The words **διαιρέσεις** in ver. 4 and **πάντα ταῦτα** in ver. 11 give the clue to Paul's intent in this §. Many Cor. took a low and half superstitious view of the Holy Spirit's influence, seeing in such charisms as the "tongues"—phenomena analogous to, though far surpassing, pagan manifestations (2)—the proper evidence of His working, while they underrated endowments of a less striking but more vital and serviceable

XII. 1. Περὶ δὲ τῶν [a] πνευματικῶν, ἀδελφοί, [b] οὐ [b] θέλω ὑμᾶς [b] ἀγνοεῖν. 2. οἴδατε ὅτι [1] ἔθνη ἦτε, πρὸς τὰ [c] εἴδωλα τὰ [d] ἄφωνα, ὡς [e] ἂν ἤγεσθε, [f] ἀπαγόμενοι· 3. διὸ [g] γνωρίζω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς [h] ἐν [h] πνεύματι Θεοῦ λαλῶν λέγει [i] ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦν,[2] καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται

a See x. 3 f.
b See x. 1.
c See viii. 4.
d xiv. 10; 2 Pet. ii. 16; Acts viii. 32 (Isa. liii. 7).
e With impf. in rel. clause, Mk. vi. 56; Acts ii. 45, iv. 35; Gen. ii. 19.
f In trans. use, Mt. xxvi. 57, etc.; Lk. xxi. 12; Acts xii. 19, xxiii. 17, xxiv. 7.
g xv. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Rom. ix. 22 f., xvi. 26; Gal. i. 11; 11 times in Eph., Col., Phil.; 2 Pet. i. 16; 4 times in Lk. and Acts; Jo. xv. 15, xvii. 26.
h Eph. vi. 18; Rev. i. 10; Jude 20; Mt. xxii. 43; Lk. ii. 27, iv. 1; Mic. iii. 8.
i xvi. 22; Rom. ix. 1; Gal. i. f.; Acts xxiii. 14.

[1] **οτι οτε** (?): all uncc. but Ggr.Kmg.; K*, a few minn., and Ff., read **οτε** alone. W.H. conjecture **οτι οτε** to be a primitive error for **οτι ποτε** (?); *cf.* Eph. ii. 11, and the use of **ποτε** in Rom. xi. 30; Col. i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 10. The confusion of **π** with **τι** is a common scribe's error; and in the old continuous writing (**οτιποτε**), it is likely enough that the copyist's eye, in some primitive MS., *skipped* the **π**, esp. as no immediate countersense resulted to warn him of the oversight.

[2] **Ιησους**, ℵABC, 17*, 46*, cop. syrr. (seemingly), Euthal. **Ιησου**, F, 17**, vg. (*anathema Jesu*), Ath., Hil. **Ιησουν**, DGKLP, sah.,—Western and Syrian. See note below.

nature (31, xiii. 8, 13, xiv. 12). For the moment, Paul's object is twofold: first, to lay down *a general criterion* of the presence of Christ's Spirit (3), and then to show *the wide manifoldness* of His working in the community of believers (4-11).

Ver. 1. For the heading of the new topic, which runs on to the end of ch. xiv., see note on vii. 1. **τῶν πνευματικῶν** is *neut.*—"concerning spiritual things (gifts, powers)," as in xiv. 1 (*cf.* **πνευμάτων**, 12) and viii. 1; not "spiritual persons" (xiv. 37, ii. 15), as Hf. and some others would have it: not *the status of the persons* spiritually endowed, but *the operations of the Spirit* who endows them are in question. "**δὲ** is transitional, with a shade of antithesis to **τὰ λοιπὰ . . . διατάξομαι**: 'Whatever subject I postpone, I must not delay to explain the nature of spiritual gifts'" (Ed.). On **οὐ θέλω ἀγνοεῖν**, *cf.* note to x. 1: the Ap. has something to explain not quite obvious and highly important.

Ver. 2. On the critical reading, **οἴδατε ὅτι ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε . . . ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι**, there are two plausible constructions: (*a*) that of Bg., Bm. (pp. 383 f.), Ed., who regard **ὡς** as a resumption of the **ὅτι**, after the parenthetical **ὅτε** clause, and thus translate: "You know that, when you were Gentiles,—how you were always led to those voiceless idols, being carried away". There are two reasons against this construction —(1) the improbability of **ὅτι** being forgotten after so short an interruption; (2) the inversion of the proper relation between **ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε** and **ἀπαγόμενοι**, the former of which is naturally construed as subordinate and adverbial to the latter, the "leading to idols" supplying the condition under which the "carrying off" took place. (*b*) We are driven back upon the alternative construction, adopted by Est., Mr., Hn., Ev., Bt., Gd., El. (see his note, and Krüger's *Sprachl.*, § 354 *b*, *Anm.* 1 f., for similar instances), who regard **ἀπαγόμενοι** as chief predicate after **ὅτι**, and complete the ptp. by **ἦτε**, which is mentally taken up from the interposed temporal clause: "You know that, when you were Gentiles, to those voiceless idols, however you might be led, (you were) carried away". Since **οἶδα** *with ptpl. complement* occurs but once besides in N.T. (2 Cor. xii. 2, and there with *acc.* ptp., not nom. as here), the confusion between the ptpl. construction and the **ὅτι** construction after **οἶδα**, by which Mr. accounts for the grammatical irregularity, is not very probable. The emendation of W.H. (see txtl. note) is most tempting, in view of Eph. ii. 11; it wholly obviates the difficulty of grammar: "You know that *once* (**ὅτι ποτέ**) you were Gentiles, carried off to those dumb idols, howsoever you might be led".—The Cor., now belonging to the **λαὸς Θεοῦ**, distinguish themselves from the **ἔθνη** (see v. 1, x. 20); to be "led away to the (worship of the) idols" is the characteristic of Gentiles (viii. 7). **ἀπάγω** implies *force* rather than charm in the **ἀπάγων**; P. is not thinking of any earlier truth *from* which the heathen were enticed, but of the overwhelming current by which they were "carried off" (*abreptos*, Bz.), *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 4, 2

εἰπεῖν Κύριον[1] Ἰησοῦν[1] εἰ μὴ [h] ἐν [h] Πνεύματι Ἁγίῳ. 4. [k] διαιρέσεις δὲ [l] χαρισμάτων εἰσί, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα· 5. καὶ [k] διαιρέσεις [m] διακονιῶν εἰσί, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς Κύριος· 6. καὶ [k] διαιρέσεις [n] ἐνεργημάτων εἰσίν, ὁ δὲ[2] αὐτός[2] ἐστι[3] Θεὸς ὁ [o] ἐνεργῶν [p] τὰ [pq] πάντα [q] ἐν [q] πᾶσιν.

k N.T. *h.l.*; 1 Chron. xxvi. 1; 2 Chron. viii. 14; Ezra vi. 18; -ρειν, ver. 11.
l See i. 7. Pl. only in this ch., Rom. xi. 29, xii. 6. m Pl. *h.l.*; xvi. 15, 2 Cor. *passim*, eight times more in P.; Heb. i. 14; Rev. ii. 19; 8 times in Acts; also Lk. x. 40. n *H.l.* o 2 Cor. i. 6, iv. 12; Rom. vii. 5; Gal. ii. 8, iii. 5, v. 6; 8 times more in P.; also Jas. v. 16; Mt. xiv. 2; Mk. vi. 14. p See viii. 6.
q xv. 28; Eph. i. 23; Col. iii. 11.

[1] **Κυριος Ιησους**: ℵABC, 17, 46, 67**, 73, vg. syr[sch].
Κυριον Ιησουν: DGKLP, etc. See note below.

[2] **και ο αυτος** (?): BC, 37, 46; W.H. *txt.* **ο δε αυτος**: ℵAKLP, vg. syrr. **ο αυτος δε**: DG.

[3] *Om.* **εστι** ℵ*ACDGP, vg. Add after **αυτος** ℵcKL, etc.; after **ενεργων**, B.

Tim. ii. 26, Matt. xii. 29. With this agrees the qualifying **ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε** (not **ἀνήγεσθε**, as Hf. and Hn. read; this gives an irrelevant sense—"led up," "led in sacrifice"), indicating the uncertainty and caprice of the directing powers—"pro nutu ducentium" (Est.). For the right sort of **ἄγεσθαι**, see Rom. viii. 14, Gal. v. 18.—On the **εἴδωλα**, *cf.* viii. 4; the *voicelessness* of the idol is part of its nothingness (*cf.* Ps. cxv. 4-7, etc.); the Pagans were led by no intelligent, conscious guidance, but by an occult power behind the idol (x. 19 ff.).

Ver. 3. Their old experience of the spells of heathenism had not prepared the Cor. to understand the workings of God's Spirit and the notes of His presence. On this subject they had asked (1), and P. now gives instruction: "Wherefore I inform you". They knew how men could be "carried away" by supernatural influences; they wanted a criterion for distinguishing those truly Divine. The test P. supplies is that of *loyalty to Jesus Christ.* "No one speaking in the Spirit of God says ΑΝΑΘΕΜΑ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, and no one can say ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ except in the Holy Spirit." *Jesus is anathema*, *Jesus is Lord*, are the battle-cries of the spirits of error and of truth contending at Cor. The second watchword is obvious, its *inclusiveness* is the point of interest; it certificates *all* true Christians, with whatever **διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων** (4 ff.), as possessors of the Holy Spirit, since He inspires the confession of their Master's name which makes them such (see i. 2, Rom. x. 9, Phil. ii. 11, etc.). Not a mystical "tongue," but the clear intelligent confession "Jesus is Lord" marks out the genuine **πνευματικός**; *cf.* the parl. cry **Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ**, of Gal. iv. 6. "He shall glorify *Me*," said Jesus (John xvi. 14) of the coming Spirit: this is the infallible proof of His indwelling.—But who were those who might say at Cor., "Jesus is *anathema*"? *Faciebant gentes*, says Bg., *sed magis Judæi.* **Ἀνάθεμα** (see parls.) is Hebraistic in Biblical use, denoting that which is *cherem*, *vowed to God for destruction as under His curse*, like Achan in Joshua's camp. So the High Priest and the Jewish people treated Jesus (John xi. 49 f., Gal. iii. 13), using perhaps these very words of execration (*cf.* Heb. vi. 6), which Saul of Tarsus himself had doubtless uttered in blaspheming the Nazarene (1 Tim. i. 13); this cry, so apt to Jewish lips, resounded in the Synagogue in response to apostolic preaching. Christian assemblies, in the midst of their praises of the Lord Jesus, would sometimes be startled by a fierce Jew screaming out like a man possessed, "Jesus is anathema!"—for unbelievers on some occasions had access to Christian meetings (xiv. 24). Such frenzied shouts, heard in moments of devotion, affected susceptible natures as with the presence of an unearthly power; hence the contrast which Paul draws. This watchword of hostile Jews would be taken up by the Gentile mobs which they roused against the Nazarenes; see Acts xiii. 45, xviii. 6, where **βλασφημοῦντες** may well include **λέγοντες Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς.** Gd., *ad loc.*, and W. F. Slater (*Faith and Life of the Early Church*, pp. 348 f.) suppose *both* cries to originate in the Church; they ascribe the anathema to *heretics* resembling Cerinthus and the Ophites, who separated *Jesus* from *Christ* (*cf.* 1 John ii. 18 ff., iv. 1-6); but this identification is foreign to the situation and context, and is surely an anachronism.—The distinction between **λαλέω** and **λέγω** is well

7. ἑκάστῳ δὲ δίδοται ἡ [r] φανέρωσις τοῦ Πνεύματος πρὸς τὸ [s] συμφέρον· 8. [t] ᾧ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος δίδοται [u] λόγος [u v] σοφίας, [t] ἄλλῳ δὲ [u] λόγος [u v] γνώσεως, κατὰ τὸ [w] αὐτὸ [w] Πνεῦμα· 9. [t] ἑτέρῳ δὲ [1] πίστις ἐν

r 2 Cor. iv. 2; -οω, see iv. 5.
s Ptp., 2 Cor. xii. 1; Heb. xii. 10; Acts xx. 20; see also vi. 12 and vii. 35.
t For normal use of ος μεν, see xi. 21. ος μεν . . . αλλος δε, Mt. xiii. 4 f.; Mk. iv. 4. αλλος . . . ετερος, Mt. xvi. 14; Heb. xi. 35 f.; *cf.* Gal. i. 6. ετερος, see iii. 4. αλλος . . . αλλος, xv. 39, 41; Jo. iv. 37.
u See i. 5; λογ. σοφ., ii. 13.
v Rom. xi. 33; Col. ii. 3; Eccl. i. 16, 18, ii. 26. σοφια, i. 17; γνωσις, i. 5.
w ver. 11, 2 Cor. iv. 13, xii. 18. ἐν. πν., vv. 13 f.; Eph. ii. 18, iv. 4.

[1] *Om.* δε ℵ*BDG, 67**, vg. syr[sch]. A, with the Syrian codd., inserts.

exemplified here: **λαλεῖν ἐν** is "to speak in the element and sphere of, under the influence of" the Holy Spirit.

Vv. 4-6. "But," while the Spirit prompts in all Christians the simultaneous confession *Jesus is Lord*, this unity of faith bears multiform fruit in "distributions of grace-gifts, services, workings". These are not separate classes of **πνευματικά**, but varied designations of the **πνευματικὰ** collectively—a *trinity* of blessing associating its possessors in turn with *the Spirit*, *the Lord*, and *God* the fountain of all. What is a **χάρισμα** (see i. 7) in respect of its quality and ground, is a **διακονία** in view of its usefulness (see 21-25), and an **ἐνέργημα** in virtue of the power operative therein. The identity of the first and second of the syns. rests on that of "the Lord" and "the Spirit" (*cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 17 f.), and that of the second and third upon the relation of Christ to the Father (see John v. 17 ff., xiv. 8-14). For the Trinitarian structure of the passage, *cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 13, Eph. iv. 4 ff.—**Κύριος** and **διακονία** are correlative; all Church-ministry is directed by "the Lord" and rendered primarily to Him (iv. 1, vii. 12, viii. 6, Rom. xii. 11, xiv. 4-9, Matt. xxv. 40, etc.). **διακονία** embraces every "work of ministration" (Eph. iv. 12): gradually the term narrowed to official and esp. bodily ministrations, to the duties of the **διάκονος** (Phil. i. 1, etc.); see xvi. 15, and *cf.* Rom. xv. 31 with xi. 13 for the twofold use.—**ἐνέργημα** (*effectus*, rather than *operatio*, Vg.)—the result of **ἐνεργέω**; this favourite Pauline vb. signifies an *effective*, and with **ἐν** an *immanent* activity.—**τὰ πάντα** covers the whole sphere in which spiritual charisms operate: *cf.* Eph. iv. 6. Ver. 11 refers the same **πάντα ἐνεργεῖν** to "the Spirit," who is God indwelling; Power, in its largest, ultimate sense, "belongeth unto God" (*cf.* Eph. i. 11, etc., Phil. ii. 13)—"the same God, who works . . . in all" (Rom. iii. 29 f.), knowing no respect of persons and operative in the doings of every Christian man; *cf.* i. 30*a*, and note.—**διαιρέσεις** appears to be act., *dividings*, *distributings*, rather than pass., *differences*, *varieties;* see ver. 11. The pl. points to the constantly repeated *dealings out* of the Spirit's store of gifts to the members of Christ's body.

Ver. 7. **ἑκάστῳ δὲ κ.τ.λ.**—distributive in contrast with the collective **τ. πᾶσιν** of ver. 6; *cf.* Eph. iv. 6 f., and the emphatic **ἕκαστος** of iii. 5-13: "But to *each* there is being given the manifestation of the Spirit with a view to profiting"; *cf.* Eph. iv. 7-16, where the **δωρεὰ τ. Χριστοῦ** is similarly portioned out amongst the members of Christ, for manifold and reciprocal service to His body. The thought of mutual benefit, there amply expressed, is here slightly indicated by **πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον** (*ad utilitatem*, Vg.): see vi. 12, x. 23, 33, on this word.—**δίδοται**, *datur* (not *datum est*), indicates continuous bestowment; so in vv. 8 ff.: these charisms, blossoming out in rich, changeful variety, disclose the potencies of the Spirit ever dwelling in the Church.—**φανέρωσις** (opp. of **κρύψις**) governs **τ. Πνεύματος** in obj. gen.: to each is granted some personal gift in which he *shows forth* the Spirit by whose inspiration he calls Jesus Lord (3); for the constr., *cf.* 2 Cor., iv. 2. For the general idea, Matt. v. 14 ff., Luke xii. 1 f., 1 Peter ii. 9.

Vv. 8-10 exhibit by way of example (**γάρ**) *nine* chief manifestations in which the Holy Spirit was displayed: *word of wisdom*, *word of knowledge*, *faith*, *healings*, *powers*, *prophecy*, *discernings of spirits*, *kinds of tongues*, *interpreting of tongues*. The *fourth* and *fifth* are specially marked as **χαρίσματα** and **ἐνεργήματα** respectively; the *first* is said to be given "through," the *second* "according to," the *third* and *fourth* "in the same" (or "the one) Spirit," whose operation in the whole is collectively reaffirmed in ver. 12. In distinguishing the recipients, P. begins with

τῷ [w] αὐτῷ [w] Πνεύματι, [t] ἄλλῳ δὲ [1] χαρίσματα [x] ἰαμάτων ἐν τῷ [w] αὐτῷ [1] [w] Πνεύματι, 10. [t] ἄλλῳ δὲ [n] ἐνεργήματα [y] δυνάμεων, [t] ἄλλῳ δὲ [2] [z] προφητεία, [t] ἄλλῳ δὲ [2] [a] διακρίσεις πνευμάτων· [t] ἑτέρῳ [3] δὲ [3] [b] γένη

x vv. 28, 30; Jer. xl. 6. -σις, Acts iv. 22; -αομαι, freq. in GG. and Acts. y Pl. in this sense, vv. 28 f.; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Gal. iii. 5 (virtually); 2 Th. ii. 9; Heb. ii. 4, vi. 5; Acts ii. 22, viii. 13, xix. 11; GG. *passim*. z xiii. 2, 8, xiv. 6, 22; Rom. xii. 6; 1 Th. v. 20; 1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14; Rev. i. 3, etc.; Mt. xiii. 14. -ευω, see xi. 4; -της, ver. 28. a Rom. xiv. 1; Heb. v. 14; Job xxxvii. 16. -νειν, see vi. 5. b γεν. γλ., ver. 28; xiv. 10; Mt. xiii. 47, xvii. 21; Gen. i. 11, etc.

[1] **ἑνι**, AB, 17, 67**, latt. vg. So crit. edd.
αυτῳ, ℵDGKLP (Western and Syrian): harmonistic correction.

[2] BDG om. **δε** twice, after **αλλῳ**.

[3] *Om.* **δε** (after **ετερῳ**) ℵ*BDGP, latt. vg.
Add **δε** ACKL, syrr. cop.—Alexandrian and Syrian; *cf.* ver. 9.

the colourless **ᾧ μέν** (for the rel. pr. in this use, *cf.* xi. 21); but in continuation **ἄλλῳ δέ** (*to another*) is varied with **ἑτέρῳ** (*to some one else*); the latter seems to mark a more specific, qualitative difference: *cf.* the interchange in xv. 39 ff., also in 2 Cor. xi. 4, and **ἕτερος** in xiv. 21, Rom. vii. 23; **ἕτερος** moreover dispenses with the contrastive **δέ**, as conveying its own antithesis (Hn. however, against Mr., takes the prons. to be used indifferently). Accordingly, the third (*faith*) and eighth (*tongues*) in the chain of gifts indicate points of transition, in the writer's thought, from one sort of endowment to another; and the nine thus fall into three divisions, of two, five, and two members respectively, with **λόγος, πίστις, γλῶσσαι** for their titles, the first of which exhibits the **Πνεῦμα** working *through the* **νοῦς**, the second *in distinction from the* **νοῦς**, and the third *in supersession of the* **νοῦς**: for this basis of discrimination, *cf.* xiv. 14-20; also xiii. 8, where the like threefold distinction appears in another order. The above arrangement is that of Mr.; Ed. gives a more elaborate and somewhat diff. analysis.—(*a*) **λόγος σοφίας** and **γνώσεως** were the charisms most abounding at Cor.: see i. 5, and the relevant notes on i. 17, 30, ii. 1, . "Wisdom" is the larger acquisition,—the truth of God wrought into the man; "knowledge" is that truth intellectually apprehended and objectified: see Ed. *ad loc.*, who says, "The **παρέκβασις** of **σοφία** is mysticism, of **γνώσεως** is rationalism". Expressed in **λόγος**, both gifts serve the Church **πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον** (7); they are the qualifications of *pastor* and *teacher* respectively. "The Spirit" is the channel (**διά**) conveying Wisdom; "the same Spirit" is the standard (**κατά**) regulating Knowledge.—(*b*) **πίστις** impresses its character on the whole second series: standing alone, with emphasis, it implies an energy and demonstrativeness of faith (*cf.* **πᾶσα πίστις**, xiii. 2), *ein Glaubensheroismus* (Mr.): **ἰάματα** and **δυνάμεις** are operations of such faith in the *material* sphere, by way of miracle; **προφητεία** and **διάκρισις πνευμάτων**, in the purely *spiritual* sphere, by way of revelation. Faith however may be exhibited in conspicuous degree apart from these particular demonstrations (*cf.* Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21, Mark xvi. 17 f.). The first two of the five are imparted "in (*i.e.*, grounded upon, exercised in the sphere of) the same (the one) Spirit"; what is said of these is understood of the other three (*cf.* **ἐν** in ver. 3): "in the same Spirit" dwell the endowments of a fruitful understanding and of a potent faith; "in the one Spirit"—in His power and bestowment alone—all "gifts of healings" lie (*cf.* Mark iii. 28 ff.). The **ἰάματα** (*acts of healing*; see parls.) are **χαρίσματα** by eminence—*gracious* acts (*cf.* Luke vii. 21, **ἐχαρίσατο**): the **δυνάμεις** (*powers*; see parls.) display *strength* rather than grace, *e.g.*, in the sentence of v. 5 above, or that contemplated in 2 Cor. xiii. 2 ff., 10; they are "acts of energy".—**Προφητεία**, as an edifying gift of speech, is akin to the **λόγος** graces of (*a*); it is contrasted with **γλῶσσαι** (*c*) in xiv., as being an intelligent exercise. But prophecy, while employing the **νοῦς**, has a deeper seat; it is no branch of **σοφία** or **γνῶσις** as though coming by rational insight, but an **ἀποκάλυψις** of hidden things of God realised through a peculiar clearness and intensity of *faith* (2 Cor. iv. 13 f.; Heb. xi. 1, 13; Luke x. 21 f., etc.), and is in line therefore with the miraculous powers preceding; hence "the prophet" is regularly distinguished from "the teacher".—"Discernment of spirits" is the counterpart and safeguard of "prophesying,"

[b][e] γλωσσῶν, [c] ἄλλῳ δὲ [d] ἑρμηνεία [e] γλωσσῶν· 11. πάντα δὲ ταῦτα [e] ἐνεργεῖ τὸ [e] ἓν καὶ τὸ [e] αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, [f] διαιροῦν [g] ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ καθὼς [h] βούλεται.

12. [i] Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἕν ἐστι καὶ [k] μέλη ἔχει [1] πολλά,[1]

c In this sense, vv. 28, 30, xiii., xiv. *passim*; Acts ii. 3 f., 11, x. 46, xix. 6; Mk. xvi. 17. d xiv. 26; Sir. *prologue*, xlvii. 17. -ευτης, xiv. 28; -ευω, Heb. vii. 2. e See xi. 5. ἐν πν., and αυτ., see ver. 9. f Lk. xv. 12; Josh. xviii. 5. -σις, ver. 4 above. g N.T. *h.l.*; 2 Macc. iv. 34. h Of *God*, Heb. vi. 17; Jas. i. 18; 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Kings ii. 25. -ημα, Rom. ix. 19. i See x. 10. k See vi. 15.

[1] πολλα εχει (in this order): non-Western and pre-Syrian uncc.

demanding the like super-rational penetration; the true critic may not have originative faculty, but his mind moves in the same region with that of the originator and tracks his steps. **διακρίσεις**, pl., for this gift had many and various occasions of exercise: see parls., also for **διακρίνω**, vi. 5, etc.; as to the power itself and the need for its exercise, *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 20 ff., 2 Thess. ii. 2, 9 ff., 1 John ii. 18 ff., iv. 1-6, Matt. xxiv. 11 f. P. exhibits this **διάκρισις** admirably in ver. 3 above; it displays itself in Acts xiii. 8 ff., along with the **ἐνέργημα δυνάμεως**; *cf.* Acts v. 1-11.—(*c*) The "kinds of tongues," with their attendant "interpretation," constitute the third order of specific charisms; in this exercise the intelligence of the speaker is suspended. The **γλῶσσαι**, ranked first by the Cor. because of their sensational character, P. enumerates last in regard of "profiting" (7); ch. xiv. will justify this relative depreciation. The "tongues" of this Ep. cannot have signified the power to speak strange languages in missionary preaching, as many have inferred from the terms used in the account of the manifestation of the Day of Pentecost; see notes on Acts ii. 4-11. **γένη** implies that this ecstatic phenomenon was far from uniform; the "*new* tongues" of Mark xvi. 17, together with the indications of ch. xiii. 1 and xiv. of this Ep., point to the breaking out of an exalted and mystical utterance differing from all recognised human speech; this utterance varied at diff. times and places in its mode and attendant conditions, and in the impression it produced on the hearers; it is regularly spoken of in the pl. The necessity of **ἑρμηνεία** for the extraction of any benefit to the Church from the Tongues will be shown in ch. xiv.; sometimes the possessor of the Tongue became interpreter also (xiv. 13). On the **γλῶσσαι** generally, see Ed., *ad loc.*; also Hn.

Ver. 11 sums up the last par. (4-10), impressing on the Cor. with redoubled emphasis the *variety in unity* of the "gifts," and vindicating the sanctity of each: "But all these things worketh the one and the same Spirit" (*cf.* 9). In the qualifying clause, "dividing separately (*seorsim*) as He wills," **διαίρουν** takes up the **διαιρέσεις** of vv. 4-6; **ἑκάστῳ** is resumed from ver. 7; **ἰδίᾳ** adds the thought that the Spirit deals with each recipient by himself, *individually* and *appropriately* (*cf.* vii. 7, iii. 8, xv. 23); while **καθὼς βούλεται** signifies that He acts in the distribution upon His *choice and judgment*, where lies the hidden reason for the giving or withholding of each particular gift.—For **βούλομαι**, see parls.; and for its difference from **ἐθέλω**, *cf.* ver. 18; also iv. 19, 21, and parls. Eurip., *Hippol.*, 1329 f., supplies a good example of the distinction, **οὐδεὶς ἀπαντᾶν βούλεται προθυμίᾳ τῇ τοῦ θέλοντος, ἀλλ' ἀφιστάμεθ' ἀεί**: "None of us *likes* to cross the purpose of one that *is bent* on anything, but we always stand aside". No predicate could more strongly imply *personality* than does **βούλεται**.

§ 40. THE ONE BODY, OF MANY MEMBERS, xii. 12-20. The manifold graces, ministries, workings (4 ff.), that proceed from the action of the Holy Spirit in the Christian community, stand not only in common dependence upon Him (§ 39), but are mutually bound to each other. The Church of Christ is "the body" for the Spirit of God; and these operations are its correlated functional activities (12 f.). Differentiation is of the essence of bodily life. The unity of the Church is not that of inorganic nature,—a monotonous aggregation of similars, as in a pool of water or a heap of stones; it is the oneness of a living organism, no member of which exercises the same faculty as another. Without "many members," contrasted as foot with hand or sight with smell (14-17), there would be no body at all, but only a single monstrous limb (19). In God's creative plan, it is the integration and

πάντα δὲ τὰ [k] μέλη τοῦ σώματος τοῦ [1] ἑνὸς [1] πολλὰ ὄντα ἕν ἐστι σῶμα, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστός· 13. καὶ γὰρ ἐν [m] ἑνὶ [m] Πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες [n] εἰς [m] ἓν [m] σῶμα [mn] ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε [o] Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε [o] Ἕλληνες, εἴτε [p] δοῦλοι εἴτε [p] ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες [q] εἰς [2] ἓν Πνεῦμα [3] [q] ἐποτίσθημεν.[4] 14. καὶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα οὐκ ἐστὶν ἓν [k] μέλος

l Mt. iii. 11; Acts i. 5, xi. 16.
m See vv. 9, 11; ἐν πν., ἐν σωμ., Eph. iv. 4.
n See x. 2.
o See x. 32.
p Eph. vi. 18 (with ειτε); Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; Rev. vi. 15, xiii. 16, xix. 18. ειτε . . . ειτε, see iii. 22.
q See iii. 2. For acc. with pass. (without εις), 2 Th. ii. 15; Heb. vi. 9; Rev. xvi. 9; Mk. x. 38; Lk. xii. 47.

[1] *Om.* **του ενος** all uncc. but ℵcD, Hil., Ambrst. (*ex uno corpore*).

[2] *Om.* **εις** all uncc. but DcKL.

[3] **εις εν πομα**: a number of minn., with Macarius and (virtually) Clem. Al.

[4] **εφωτισθημεν**, L, and several minn.; A, **εσμεν**.

reciprocity of a multitude of distinct organs that makes up the physical and the social frame (18 ff.).

Ver. 12. "The one Spirit," the leading thought of § 39, suggests the similitude of "the body" for the Church (called in ch. iii. the *tillage*, *building*, *temple* of God), since this is the seat of His multifarious energies. In the Eph. and Col. Epp. **τὸ σῶμα** becomes a fixed title for the Christian community, setting forth its relation both to the inhabiting Spirit and to the sovereign Head; as yet it remains a plastic figure. Aristotle had applied this image to the State, the *body politic;* and the idea was a Gr. commonplace. The Ap. is still insisting on the breadth of the Holy Spirit's working, as against Cor. partisanship and predilection for miraculous endowments; hence the reiterated **ἓν** and **πολλά**, also the emphatic **πάντα** of the second clause: "but *all* the members of the body, many as they are (**πολλὰ ὄντα**), are *one* body". In applying the comparison, Paul writes not as one expects, **οὕτως ἡ ἐκκλησία** or **οὕτως ἡμεῖς**, but with heightened solemnity **οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός**, "so also is the Christ!" "Christ stands by metonomy for the community united through Him and grounded in Him" (Hn.). This substitution shows how realistic was P.'s conception of believers as subsisting "in Christ," and raises the idea of Church-unity to its highest point; "all the members are instinct with one personality" (Ed.): *cf.* Gal. ii. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 3, 5, for this identification in the case of the individual Christian. The later representation of Christ and the Church as Head and Body is implicit in this phrase. For **Χριστὸς** with art., *cf.* i. 12, x. 4, etc.; also Eph. v. 23 ff.

Ver. 13. **καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ Πνεύματι κ.τ.λ.**: "For indeed in *one* Spirit we *all* into *one* body were baptized—whether Jews or Greeks, whether bondmen or freemen—and we *all* of *one* Spirit were made to drink,"—*were drenched* (Ev.). An appeal to experience (*cf.* Gal. iii. 2 ff., iv. 6; also Acts xix. 2-6): at their baptism the Cor. believers, differing in race and rank, were consciously made one; *one* Spirit flooded their souls with the love and joy of a common faith in Christ.—For **βαπτίζω ἐν** and **εἰς**, see parls.: **ἐν** defines the *element* and *ruling influence* of the baptism, **εἰς** the *relationship* to which it introduces. P. refers to actual Christian baptism, the essence of which lay in the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit (John iii. 5 ff., Tit. iii. 5 f.); baptism represents the entire process of personal salvation which it seals and attests (Eph. i. 13, Gal. iii. 26 ff., Rom. vi. 2 ff.), as the Queen's coronation imports her whole investiture with royalty. That Jews and Greeks, slaves and freemen, had received at the outset an identical Spirit, shows that they were intended to form a single body, and that this body was designed to have a wide variety of members (11 f.).—**ἐποτίσθημεν** (see parls.) has been referred by Cm., Aug., Cv., Est., and latterly by Hn., to the **ποτήριον** of *the Lord's Supper* (x. 16, xi. 25), as though **καὶ** coupled the two consecutive Sacraments (*cf.* x. 2 f., and notes); but the *tense*, parl. to **ἐβαπτίσθημεν** (otherwise in x. 16, etc.), points to *a past event*, not a repeated act; and it is "the blood of Christ," not the Holy Spirit, that fills (symbolically) the Eucharistic cup. The two aors. describe the same primary experience under opposite figures (the former of which is *acted* in baptism), as an outward affusion and an inward absorption; the Cor. were at once *immersed in* (*cf.* **συνετάφημεν**, Rom. vi. 4) and *saturated with* the Spirit; the

ἀλλὰ πολλά· 15. ἐὰν εἴπῃ ὁ πούς, "ʳὍτι οὐκ εἰμὶ χείρ, οὐκ ʳεἰμὶ ʳἐκ τοῦ σώματος," οὐ ˢπαρὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ʳἔστιν ʳἐκ τοῦ σώματος[1]· 16. καὶ ἐὰν εἴπῃ τὸ οὖς, "ʳὍτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ ὀφθαλμός, οὐκ ʳεἰμὶ ʳἐκ τοῦ σώματος," οὐ ˢπαρὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ʳἔστιν ʳἐκ τοῦ σώματος[1]· 17. ᵗεἰ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ὀφθαλμός, ᵗποῦ ἡ ᵘἀκοή; ᵗεἰ ὅλον ᵘἀκοή, ᵗποῦ ἡ ᵛὄσφρησις; 18. ʷνυνὶ[2] ʷδὲ ὁ Θεὸς ˣἔθετο τὰ ᵏμέλη, ʸἓν ʸἕκαστον αὐτῶν, ἐν τῷ σώματι ᶻκαθὼς ᶻἠθέλησεν.

r Of *things* *h.l.* in N.T. Of *persons*, see i. 30; partitive as here, Mt. xxvi. 73; Acts xxi. 8, etc.; Obad. 11.
s N.T. *h.l.*, in this sense; cf. Gr., Lidd. *s.v.* I. 6; syn. with δια, Philo, I. 263.
t που, see i. 20. Interrog. after ει, iv. 7, x. 30, xv. 12, 32; 8 times more in P.; etc.
u 2 Pet. ii. 8. For other uses, see Rom. x. 16 f.; Gal. iii. 2, etc.
v *H.l.*
w Logical, vii. 14, xiii. 13, xiv. 6, xv. 20, etc.
x ver. 28; Rom. iv. 17; 1 Th. v. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12, ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; Heb. i. 2; Acts xx. 28; Gen. xvii. 5.
y Six times more in P.; freq. in Lk. and Acts; Rev. xxi. 21.
z Of *God*, xv. 38; without καθως, iv. 19; Rom. ix. 18, 22; Col. i. 27; 1 Tim. ii. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 10; Jas. iv. 15; Mt. xxvi. 39. *Cf.* θελημα Θε., i. 1 and parls.

[1] Pointed interrog. by Tr., as in T.R.; affirm. by other crit. edd. See note below.
[2] νυν (?) ABDG. So Tr., W.H. *txt.*, R.V., El., Nestle.
νυνι, ℵCD^bc^KLP. So Tisch., W.H. *marg.*

second figure supplements the first: *cf.* Rom. v. 5, Tit. iii. 5, 6.—**ποτίζω**, which takes double acc. (iii. 2), retains that of the thing in the passive.

Ver. 14 recalls, under the analogy of the **σῶμα**, the reason given in ver. 12 for the diversity of spiritual powers displayed in the Church: it is not "one member," but "many" that constitute the "body". This thesis the rest of the § illustrates.

Vv. 15, 16 represent with lively fancy the *foot* and *ear* in turn—organs of activity and intelligence—as disclaiming their part in the body, because they have not the powers of the *hand* and *eye:* an image of jealous or discouraged Cor. Christians, emulous of the shining gifts of their fellows. In each case it is the lowlier but kindred organ that desponds, *pars de parte quam simillima loquens* (Bg.): *cf.* ver. 21. — **οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος**, "I am not of the body"—not a mere partitive expression; it signifies *dependence* (*pendens ab: cf.* Gal. iii. 10, Tit. i. 10, etc.; Wr., p. 461), hence *derived status* or *character.*—Paul contradicts, in identical terms, the self-disparagement of the two chagrined members: **οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.** must be read as a statement—"it is not therefore not of the body" (R.V., Bg., Mr., Hn., Hf., Ed., El., Bt., Sm.); not a question (A.V., Cv., Bz., Est., D.W., Al., Gd.), which would require **μὴ** instead of **οὐ**—"Is it for this reason not of the body?" For **παρὰ** with acc. of *reason* (*along of this*), see parls.: "in accordance with this," *viz.*, the disclaimer just made (so Mr., Hn., Hf., Ev., El., Er.—*deplorans sortem suam*). The foot or ear does not sever itself from the body by distinguishing itself from hand or eye; its pettish argument (**ἐὰν εἴπῃ κ.τ.λ.**) leaves it where it was. Gd., Ed., and others, less aptly refer **τοῦτο** not to the *saying* of the foot, etc., but to the *fact* that it is not hand, etc. For double **οὐ**, *cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 9.

Ver. 17 expostulates in the vein of vv. 15 f. with those who exalt one order of gifts (either as possessing it themselves or envying it in their neighbours) to the contempt of others; the despised function is as needful as the admired to make up the body: "If all the body (were) eye, where the hearing? if all (were) hearing, where the smelling?" The senses are set in order of dignity; the ear wishes to be the eye (16), but then its indispensable service of *hearing* would be undischarged; so the nose might desire promotion to the rank of an ear, leaving the body impotent to *smell.* The discontent of the lower members and the scornfulness of the higher are alike signs of a selfish individualism, indifferent to the welfare of the body ecclesiastic.—**ἦν** (*cf.* ver. 9) is understood here.—**Ἡ ὄσφρησις** is "the sense of smell"—not *odor*, but *odoratus* (Vg.).

Ver. 18. "But now (argumentative **νῦν**, 'as things are': see v. 11) God has appointed the members, each single one of them, in the body as He willed." It is *God's will* that has ranged the physical organs—and by analogy the members of the Church—in their several places and offices (*cf.* i. 1, iii. 5). Dissatisfaction with one's particular charism, or contempt for that of another, is disloyalty towards *Him* and distrust of His wisdom. This is Paul's *ultima ratio:* **ὦ ἄνθρωπε, σὺ τίς εἶ κ.τ.λ.**; Rom. ix. 20.—

19. εἰ δὲ ἦν τὰ[1] πάντα ἓν [k] μέλος, [l] ποῦ τὸ σῶμα; 20. [m] νῦν[2] [m] δὲ πολλὰ μὲν[3] [k] μέλη, ἓν δὲ σῶμα.

21. Οὐ δύναται δὲ[4] ὀφθαλμὸς[4] εἰπεῖν τῇ χειρί, "[a] Χρείαν σου οὐκ [a] ἔχω·" ἢ πάλιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῖς ποσί, "[a] Χρείαν ὑμῶν οὐκ [a] ἔχω·" 22. ἀλλὰ [b] πολλῷ [b] μᾶλλον τὰ [c] δοκοῦντα [d] μέλη τοῦ [d] σώματος

a Eph. iv. 28; 1 Th. i. 8, iv. 9, 12, v. 1; Heb. v. 12, x. 36; thrice in Rev.; Acts ii. 45, iv. 35; freq. in GG.
b 2 Cor. iii. 9, 11; Rom. v. 9 ff.; Phil. i. 23, ii. 12; Mt. vi. 30; Mk. x. 48; Lk. xviii. 39.
c In first sense, 2 Cor. x. 9; Gal. ii. 2, 6, 9; Mt. xvii. 25, etc. For second, see iii. 18.
d See vv. 12 ff., vi. 15.

[1] Om. τα (?) BG, 17; Lach., Tr., W.H. *bracket*.

[2] νυνι, GP; see ver. 18.

[3] *Om.* μεν (?) BD, 73, Aug. So W.H. *txt.*; Lachm., Tr. *brackets*.

[4] ο οφθαλμος: all uncc. but K, and many minuscc.
Om. δε ACGP, 17, 37, syr^sch. cop. (Alex. and late Western); ℵBDKL, vg. retain.

For τίθημι in mid. voice, *cf.* ver. 28 and other parls.; the *tense* refers the Divine appointment constituting the body to past time generally—"has set" rather than "set". The prefixed ἓν *singles out* the individual for the Divine regard, distributed by ἕκαστον; each limb by itself has its part assigned by God.—ἠθέλησεν signifies determining *will*, as βούλεται (11, note) discriminating *choice*.

Vv. 19, 20 rehearse the doctrine of vv. 12-14, now vividly illustrated by vv. 15 ff., *viz.*, that *a manifold variety of organs* is indispensable for the existence of the Church. First the principle is *suggested* by a rhetorical question, in the strain of ver. 17: "But if all were one member, where (were) the body?" Secondly, it is *affirmed*, with grave conclusiveness: "But as the case stands (νῦν δέ)—*Many members, yet one body*".—Πολλὰ μέλη, ἓν δὲ σῶμα sums up the whole exposition in a concise epigram, which was perhaps already proverbial (*cf.* ix. 24).—ἐστὶν hardly needs to be supplied. *Cf.*, for the thought, x. 17, and notes on vv. 12, 14 above.

§ 41. The Mutual Dependence of the Body's Members, xii. 21-31*a*. Multiformity, it has been shown, is of the essence of organic life. But the variously endowed members, being needful to the body, are consequently *necessary to each other*—those that seem "weaker" sometimes the more so (21 f.), while the less honoured have a dignity of their own; thus all the members cherish mutual respect and fellow-feeling (23-26). This holds good of the Church, with its numerous grades of personal calling and endowment (27 f.). No one charism belongs to all Christians (29 f.). There is choice and purpose in God's distributive appointments, which leave, moreover, room for man's personal effort. We should desire *the best* of His gifts (31).

Ver. 21 personifies again the physical members, in the fashion of vv. 15 f.: there the inferior disparaged itself as though it were no part of the body at all; here the superior disparages its fellow, affecting independence. "The eye (might wish to say but) cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee! or the head in turn to the feet, I have no need of you!" The *eye* and *head* are imagined looking superciliously on their companions; in vv. 15 f. the *ear* and *foot* play the part of discontented rivals.—οὐ δύναται—a moral and practical impossibility (*cf.* x. 21): at every turn the eye wants the hand, or the head calls on the foot, in order to reach its ends; the keen eye and scheming head of the *paralytic*—what a picture of impotence! The famous Roman fable of *the Belly and the Members* is recalled by the Apostle's apologue. There is no such thing in the physical, nor in the social, fabric as independence.—πάλιν (*cf.* iii. 20, 2 Cor. x. 7, Rom. xv. 10), *vicissim* (Hn.), rather than *iterum* (Vg.) or *rursum* (Bz.), adduces another instance of the same kind as the former.

Vv. 22-24*a*. "On the contrary" (ἀλλά), instead of the more powerful and dignified (23) bodily parts dispensing with the humbler (21), it is "much more" the case that these latter—"the weaker" or "less honourable as they may seem to be" (τὰ δοκοῦντα . . . ἀσθενέστερα ὑπάρχειν)—"are necessary" in themselves (22), and treated with "more abundant honour" in our care of the body. By πολλῷ μᾶλλον (*cf.* Plato, *Phædo*, 80 E, ἀλλὰ πολλῷ μᾶλλον), *multo potius*

[e] ἀσθενέστερα [f] ὑπάρχειν [g] ἀναγκαῖά ἐστι· 23. καὶ ἃ [e] δοκοῦμεν [h] ἀτιμότερα εἶναι τοῦ σώματος, τούτοις [i] τιμὴν [k] περισσοτέραν [l] περι-τίθεμεν· καὶ τὰ [m] ἀσχήμονα ἡμῶν [n] εὐσχημοσύνην [k] περισσοτέραν ἔχει, 24. τὰ δὲ [n] εὐσχήμονα ἡμῶν οὐ [a] χρείαν [a] ἔχει· ἀλλ᾽ ὁ Θεὸς [o] συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα, τῷ [p] ὑστερουμένῳ[1] [k] περισσοτέραν δοὺς [i] τιμήν, 25. ἵνα μὴ ᾖ [q] σχίσμα[2] ἐν τῷ σώματι, ἀλλὰ τὸ αὐτὸ [r] ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων [r] μεριμνῶσι τὰ [d] μέλη· 26. καὶ [s] εἴτε[3] πάσχει ἓν μέλος,

e See i. 27.
f See vii. 26.
g 2 Cor. ix. 5; Ph. i. 24, ii. 25: Tit. iii. 14; Heb. viii. 3; Acts x. 24, xiii. 46.
h See iv. 10.
i Esth. i. 20. For τιμη., Rom. ix. 21, xii. 10, xiii. 7; 1 Th. iv. 4; 1 Tim. v. 17, vi. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 20 f.; 1 Pet. iii. 7.
k Compar., xv. 10; 2 Cor. ii. 7, x. 8; Heb. vi. 17, vii. 15; 9 times in GG.
l In this sense, Mt. xxvii. 28, Mk. xv. 17; *cf.* Mt. xxi. 33, xxvii. 48; Ruth iii. 3. -σις, 1 Pet. iii. 3.
m N.T. *h.l.*; Deut. xxiv. 1; *cf.* συνη, Rom. i. 27; Rev. xvi. 15, vii. 36.
n N.T. *h.l.*; in Plato, Xen. -ων, see vii. 35; -ονως, xiv. 40.
o Heb. iv. 2.
p See i. 7.
q See i. 10.
r See vii. 32. With υπερ, N.T. *h.l.*; Ps. xxxvii. 18.
s See iii. 22.

[1] **υστερουντι**, ℵᶜDGKL, etc.—Western and Syrian.

[2] **σχισματα**, ℵ*DGL, above 30 minuscc.—Western. So Tisch.[8], Treg. ***marg.***; other edd. **σχισμα**: *cf.* i. 10, xi. 18.

[3] **ειτι** (?) BG, some latt. vg. (*et si quid*), Ambrst. (Western). So Lachm., Treg. Favoured by its dissidence from the parl. **ειτε**. A omits altogether.

(Bz.) or *a fortiori* (Ev.), the position of ver. 21 is more than negatived; the inferior members are not merely shielded from contempt, but guarded with exceptional respect. By the "weaker" and "ignobler" parts P. cannot mean the *hands* or *feet* spoken of in ver. 21, for these are strong and usually uncovered (see **περιτίθεμεν**, 23); but members in appearance quite subordinate and actually feeble—*viz.*, the more delicate vital organs. Amongst these the **ἀσχήμονα** signify definitely **τὰ αἰδοῖα**, *quæ inhonesta sunt* (Vg.); *cf.* Rev. xvi. 15, **τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην**.—The **ἀσθενέστερα** and **ἀτιμότερα**, the "comparatively weak" and "feeble" (*comparativus molliens*, Bg.), are wide categories applicable to the same members from diff. points of view. *Weakness*, in the case, *e.g.*, of the heart, is compensated by needfulness; *ignobility*, as in the viscera, by careful tendance shown in ample clothing—"we put about them (clothe them with) a more abundant honour" (for the use of **τιμή**, *cf.* **ἐξουσία** in xi. 10). The *unseemliness* (indecency) attaching to certain organs, always guarded from sight, "brings with it (**ἔχει**, *cf.* Heb. x. 35) a more abundant seemliness". Against most commentt. (Gd., *e.g.*, thinks only of "les soins de la toilette"!), Ed. maintains that **εὐσχημοσύνη** (23) has a *moral* sense, looking beyond the honour of *apparel*; "the greater comeliness relates rather to function". Is any office more responsible than that of parenthood, anything more sacred than the mother's womb and mother's breast? (*cf.* Luke xi. 27; also Heb. xiii. 4).—**τὰ δὲ εὐσχήμονα κ.τ.λ.**: "But our seemly parts"—head and face, *e.g.* (*the human face divine*)—"have no need," their distinction being conspicuous; see xi. 7*a*, where this visible, but also moral, **εὐσχημοσύνη** is raised to its highest grade. From this text Bg. inferred the impiety of *patches!*—On **ὑπάρχειν**, see note to xi. 7; **δοκέω** has in vv. 22 f. its two meanings—non-personal and personal—of *seem* and *suppose;* like *methinks* and *I think*, Germ., *dünken* and *denken*.

Vv. 24*b*, 25. "But God compounded (**συν-εκέρασεν**, *mixed together;* Vg. *contemperavit*) the body." The assertion of *God's workmanship* in the structure of the physical organs (*cf.* 18) was necessary, when many thinkers affirmed the evil of matter and regarded physical appetites as degrading (*cf.* 1 Tim. iv. 3, Col. ii. 23; also vi. 13, 18 ff. above). This accounts for the adversative **ἀλλά**—"Nay but": P. tacitly contradicts those who saw nothing but **ἀτιμία** and **ἀσχημοσύνη** in vital bodily functions. For **ὁ Θεὸς συνεκέρασεν**, *cf.* Ps. cxxxix. 13-16 (where the womb is "God's laboratory," Delitzsch), Eccl. xi. 5, Job x. 8-11. Ed. reads the assertion as directed against philosophy; "where Aristotle says 'nature,' P. says 'God'".—**τῷ ὑστερουμένῳ περισσοτέραν δοὺς τιμήν**, "to the part which suffers lack (*opus habenti*, Cv.: *cf.* note, i. 7) having assigned more abundant honour"; so that the human instinct respecting the ignobler organs of the body (ver. 23) is the reflex of a Divine ordinance: *cf.* xi. 14 f., to the like effect.—"That there may not be division (**σχίσμα**:

[t] συμπάσχει πάντα τὰ μέλη· [s] εἴτε [u] δοξάζεται ἓν [1] μέλος, [v] συγχαίρει πάντα τὰ μέλη. 27. ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε [w] σῶμα [w] Χριστοῦ, καὶ [d] μέλη [x] ἐκ [x] μέρους [2]· 28. καὶ [y] οὓς μὲν [z] ἔθετο ὁ [z] Θεὸς ἐν τῇ [a] ἐκκλησίᾳ [b] πρῶτον [c] ἀποστόλους, [b] δεύτερον [d] προφήτας, [b] τρίτον [e] διδασκάλους, [b] ἔπειτα [f] δυνάμεις, [b] εἶτα [3] [g] χαρίσματα [g] ἰαμάτων,

t Rom. viii. 17.
u With human obj., 2 Cor. iii. 10; Rom. viii. 30, xi. 13; Rev. xviii. 7; Lk. iv. 15. *Cf.* vi. 20; *h.l.* of *body*.
v xiii. 6; Ph. ii. 17 f.; Lk. i. 58, xv. 6, 9.
w Eph. iv. 12, v. 30. *Cf.* vv. 12 ff.; Rom. xii. 4 f.
x xiii. 9 f., 12; 1 Kings xxiii. 26. *απο μερ.*, Rom. xi. 25, etc.; *μερος τι*, xi. 18.
y See ver. 8.
z See ver. 18.
a See i. 2. Earliest instance of *η εκκλ. absol.*, in supra-local sense; *cf.* Eph. i. 22, etc.; Col. i. 18, etc.; Mt. xvi. 18, xviii. 17.
b *πρ. . . δευτ.*, Heb. x. 9; Mt. xxi. 28, 30, xxii. 25 f. (*τριτος*), 38; Lk. xix. 16, 18; Rev. iv. 7 (*τριτ.*), etc.; *δευτ. . . . τριτ.*, Lk. xii. 38. *πρωτ. . . . επειτα* or *ειτα* (*ειτεν*), xv. 46; 1 Th. iv. 16 f.; 1 Tim. iii. 10; Heb. vii. 2; Jas. iii. 17; Mk. iv. 28.
c Pl., see iv. 9.
d Pl., thus, xiv. 29, 32; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11; Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32.
e Pl., in this sense, Eph. iv. 11 (with *αποστ.*, *προφ.*); 2 Tim. iv. 3; Heb. v. 12; Jas. iii. 1; Acts xiii. 1 (with *προφ.*).
f See ver. 10.
g See ver. 9.

[1] *Om.* εν ℵ*AB, Thdrt. So the crit. edd.

[2] **μελους**, D*, latt. vg. (*membra de membro*), syrp., and many Ff. (**ουκ ειπεν μελη εκ μελων, αλλα μελη πολλα εκ μελους ενος· μελος γαρ η κεφαλη του ολου σωματος**: Severian, in *Catena*). A characteristic Western variant.

[3] **επειτα**, all uncc. but KL. DG, Hil., Amb. omit.

see parls.) in the body"—the manifestation of the jealousy or scorn depicted in vv. 16 and 21, which have their counterpart at present in the Cor. Church (i. 10 ff., iv. 6, etc.).—The opposite state of things (ἀλλά), so desirable in the spiritual organism, is realised by Divine art in the natural: "God tempered the body together" in this way, "that . . . the members might have the same solicitude for one another". The physical members are obliged, by the structure of the frame, to care for one another; the hand is as anxious to guard the eye or the stomach, to help the mouth or the foot, as to serve itself; the eye is watchman for every other organ; each feels its own usefulness and cherishes its fellows; all "have the same care," since they have the same interest—that of "the one body". This *societas membrorum* makes the physical order both a parable of and a basis for the spiritual. For **τὸ αὐτό**, *cf.* i. 10, 2 Cor. xiii. 11, Phil. ii. 2, etc.—**μεριμνῶσιν** (see esp. vii. 32 ff., for this shade of meaning) is in pr. sbj., of *habitual* feeling; in pl., despite neut. subject, since the **μέλη** have been individually personified (15 f., 21).

Ver. 26 illustrates the unselfish solicitude of the bodily organs; the nervous connexion makes it a veritable **συμπάθεια** (**συμπάσχει**). Plato applies the same analogy to the State in a striking passage in his *Politicus*, 462C; see also Cm., *ad loc.*—**δοξάζεται** (*glorificatur*, Cv.; not *gloriatur*, Vg.) goes beyond nervous sympathy; "**δόξα** is more than **εὐεξία**" (Ed.): for **δοξάζω**, applied to the *body*, *cf.* xv. 40 ff., Phil. iii. 21. Cm. says finely, "When the head is crowned, the whole man feels itself glorified; when the mouth speaks, the eyes laugh and are filled with gladness".

Ver. 27. The figure of *the body*, developed from ver. 14 to 26 with deliberation and completeness, is now applied in detail to the Church, where the same solidarity of manifold parts and powers obtains (4 ff.): "Now you are (**ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε**) a *body* of (in relation to) Christ, and members severally"—scarcely "*the* body of Christ" specifically (El.), as if P. might have written **τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ** (as in Eph. iv. 12, etc.); this has not yet become the recognised title of the Church (see note on 12 above); nor is the anarthrous **σῶμα** to be read distributively, as though the Cor. Church were thought of as one amongst many **σώματα**. P. is interpreting his parable: the Cor. are, in their relation to Christ, what the body is to the man.—**Χριστοῦ** is anarthrous by correlation (*cf.* note on **Θεοῦ σοφίαν**, ii. 7).—**ἐκ μέρους** signifies the *partial* by contrast, not as in xiii. 9 with the *perfect*, but with the *whole* (body)—*particulatim* (Bz.): **ἐκ** of *the point of view*—"*from* (and so according to) the *part* (allotted to each)"; see ver. 11; *cf.* also **μερίζομαι** in vii. 17, etc.; similarly, **ἐκ μέτρου** in John iii. 34, **ἐξ ἰσότητος** in 2 Cor. viii. 13.

Ver. 28 expounds the **μέλη ἐκ μέρους**.—**οὓς μὲν** (*cf.* 8 ff.) should be followed by **οὓς δέ**; but **πρῶτον** intervening suggests **δεύτερον, τρίτον** in the sequel—"instead of a mere enumeration P. prefers an ar-

[h]ἀντιλήψεις, [i]κυβερνήσεις, [k]γένη [k]γλωσσῶν· 29. μὴ πάντες [c]ἀπόστολοι; μὴ πάντες [d]προφῆται; μὴ πάντες [e]διδάσκαλοι; μὴ πάντες [f]δυνάμεις; 30. μὴ πάντες [g]χαρίσματα ἔχουσιν [g]ἰαμάτων; μὴ πάντες [k]γλώσσαις [k]λαλοῦσι; μὴ πάντες [l]διερμηνεύουσι; 31*a*. [m]ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ [g]χαρίσματα τὰ [n]κρείττονα.[9]

h N.T. *h.l.*; Ps. xxi. 20; Sir. xi. 12; 2 Macc. viii. 19. -λαμβανεσθαι, Acts xx. 35.
i N.T. *h.l.*; Prov. i. 5, xi. 14, xxiv. 6. -της, Acts xxvii. 11; Rev. xviii. 17.
k See ver. 10; xiii. 1.
l xiv. 5, 13, 27; Acts ix. 36; Lk. xxiv. 27; 2 Macc. i. 36; -της, xiv. 28.
m In this sense, xiv. 1, 39; Sir. li. 18; -της, see xiv. 12.
n μειζονα, xiii. 13, xiv. 5; Jas. iv. 6; Mt. xxiii. 17, 19.

[9] **μειζονα**, ℵABC, 17, 37, 67**, cod. am. (of vg.), many Gr. Ff. **κρειττονα** (DG, **κρεισσονα**) is Western and Syrian.

rangement in order of rank" (Wr., pp. 710 f.); and this mode of distinction in turn gives place to **ἔπειτα**, at the point where with **δυνάμεις** abstract categories (as in 8 ff.) are substituted for the concrete—a striking instance of P.'s mobility of style; the last three of the series are appended asyndetically.—The nine functions of vv. 8 ff. are replaced by *eight*, which may be thus classified: (1) three *teaching* orders, (2) two kinds of *miraculous*, and (3) two of *administrative* functions, with (4) the one notable *ecstatic* gift. Three are identical in each list —*viz.*, **δυνάμεις**, **χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων**, and **γένη γλωσσῶν**, taking much the same position in both enumerations (see the earlier notes). The *apostles, prophets, teachers* (ranged in order of the *importance*, rather than the affinity of their powers) exercise amongst them the *word of wisdom, prophecy*, and *word of knowledge*—"the Apostles" possessing a rich measure of many gifts; these three will be expanded into the *five* of Eph. iv. 11. The **ἑρμηνία γλωσσῶν** (10), omitted at this point, appears in the sequel (30); and the **διάκρισις πνευμάτων** (10) is tacitly understood as the companion of **προφητεία**, while the **πίστις** of ver. 9 pervades other charisms. Nothing is really wanting here that belonged to the **χαρίσματα** of § 39, while **ἀντιλήμψεις** and **κυβερνήσεις**—"helpings, governings"—enrich that previous catalogue; "helpings" stands in apt connexion with "healings". The two added offices became the special functions of the **διάκονος** and **ἐπίσκοπος** of a somewhat later time (Phil. i. 1; *cf.* Rom. xii. 7 f.).—No trace as yet appears of definite Church organisation at Cor.; but the charisms here introduced were necessary to the equipment of the Christian Society, and the appointment of officers charged with their systematic exercise was only a question of time (see *Introd.*, chap. i., p. 732; ii. 2. 4). A sort of unofficial **ἀντίλημψις** and **κυβέρνησις** is assigned to Stephanas and his family in xvi. 15 f. These vbl. nouns, from **ἀντιλαμβάνομαι** and **κυβερνάω**, mean by etymology *taking hold of* (*to help*) and *steering, piloting*, respectively. The figurative use of the latter is rare outside of poetry; so **κυβέρνησις πολίων** in Pindar, *Pyth.*, x., 112, and in the newly discovered Bacchylides, xiii., 152. "Government" of the Church implies a share of the "word of wisdom" and "knowledge" (8); see 1 Tim. v. 17, 2 Tim. ii. 2, Tit. i. 9.—For **ἔθετο ὁ Θεός**, *cf.* ver. 18: "God appointed (set for Himself) *in the church*"—meaning *the entire Christian Society*, with all its "apostles" and the rest. The earliest N.T. example of **ἐκκλησία** in its ecumenical sense; see however Matt. xvi. 18, and note on i. 2 above.

Vv. 29, 30. In this string of rhetorical questions P. recapitulates once more the charisms, in the terms of ver. 28. He adds now to the **γλώσσαις λαλεῖν** its complementary **διερμηνεύειν** (see 10, and xiv. 13, etc.: **διὰ** in this vb. imports *translation*); and omits **ἀντιλήμψεις** and **κυβερνήσεις**, for these functions had not taken articulate shape at Cor.: the eight are thus reduced to *seven*. The stress of these interrogations rests on the seven times repeated *all*; let prophet, teacher, healer, and the rest, fulfil each contentedly his **μέρος** in the commonwealth of grace, without trenching upon or envying the prerogative of another; "non omnia possumus omnes": Thus by fit division of labour the efficiency of the whole body of Christ will be secured and all Church functions duly discharged.—**δυνάμεις** may be nom. (Bg., Hf., Hn., Al., Bt., Gd., El.), in the vein of the foregoing questions—"are all powers?" (*cf.* xv. 24, Rom. viii. 38, etc., for the personification—applied elsewhere, however, to *supernatural* Powers); but

31*b*. Καὶ ἔτι [o]καθ᾽ [o]ὑπερβολὴν [p]ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι. XIII. 1. ἐὰν ταῖς [b a]γλώσσαις τῶν [a]ἀνθρώπων [b]λαλῶ καὶ τῶν [a c]ἀγγέλων ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, [d]γέγονα [e]χαλκὸς [f]ἠχῶν ἢ [g]κύμβαλον [h]ἀλαλάζον·

o 2 Cor. i. 8, iv. 17; Rom. vii. 13; Gal. i. 13.
p See iv. 17.
a See iv. 9.
b xii. 30, xiv. *passim*; Mk. xvi. 17; Acts ii. 4 ff., x. 46, xix. 6 (και προφητ.).
c Acts vii. 38, viii. 26, xii. 8, xxiii. 9, xxvii. 23 f.; Rev. v. 2, 11, etc.; Mt. i. 20, etc., xxviii. 5 ff., etc.; Lk. i. 13, ii. 9 ff.; Zech. i. 13 f., etc.
d ver. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 11.
e Mk. vi. 8; Rev. xviii. 12; Gen. iv. 22.
f N.T. *h.l.*; Jer. xxvii. 42; ηχος, Acts ii. 2; Lk. xxi. 25.
g N.T. *h.l.*; 1 Chron. xiii. 8, etc.; Ps. cl. 5.
h Mk. v. 38; Josh. vi. 20.

these "powers" are in vv. 28 and 8 ff. so decidedly separated from the *teaching* and associated with the *healing* gifts, that **δυνάμεις** appears to look forward, and to be obj. (prospectively) to **ἔχουσιν** along with **χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων**: "do *all* possess powers? *all* grace-gifts of healings?" (so Bz., Mr., Ed.). For **δύναμιν ἔχω**, see Rev. iii. 8; also Luke ix. 1, Acts i. 8, Matt. xiv. 2.

Ver. 31*a* corrects the inference which an indolent nature or weak judgment might draw from vv. 29 f., supposing that God's sovereign ordination supersedes man's effort. Our striving has a part to play, along with God's bestowment, in spiritual acquisitions; hence the contrastive **δέ**. "But (for all that) be zealous after the *greater* gifts." A man must not, *e.g.*, be content to "speak with tongues" when he might "prophesy" (xiv. 1 ff.), nor to work miracles when beside that he might teach in the "word of wisdom".—**ζηλόω** (see parls.) implies in its good sense an *ardent*, in its bad sense (xiii. 4) an *emulous* pursuit. The *greater* (**μείζονα**) gifts are those intrinsically greater, or more beneficial (xiv. 5)—conditions usually coincident.

§ 42. THE WAY TO CHRISTIAN EMINENCE, xii. 31*b*-xiii. 3. Carefully and luminously Paul has set forth the manifoldness of the Holy Spirit's gifts that contribute to common life of the Church. *All* are necessary, *all* honourable in their proper use; *all* are of God's ordination. Some of the charisms are, however, more desirable than others. But if these "greater gifts" be sought in selfish emulation (as the **ζηλοῦτε** of ver. 31*a*, taken by itself, might suggest), their true purpose and blessing will be missed; gifts *of grace* (**χαρίσματα**) are not for men actuated by the **ζῆλος** of party spirit and ambition (*cf.* 4 f., iii. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 20, Gal. v. 20). While encouraging the Cor. to seek larger spiritual powers, the Ap. must "besides point out" the "way" to this end (31*b*), the way to escape the perils besetting their progress (4 ff.) and to win the goal of the Christian life (8-13). *Love* is the path to power in the Church; all loveless abilities, endowments, sacrifices are, from the Christian point of view, simply *good for nothing* (1-3).

Ver. 31*b*. **Καὶ ἔτι κ.τ.λ.** (*cf.* **ἔτι τε καί**, Luke xiv. 26)—"And besides"—adds to the exhortation just given (31*a*) an indication of the *way* to carry it out; the **ζῆλος** which aims at the **μείζονα χαρίσματα** must be that of **ἀγάπη**. This clause introduces and properly belongs to ch. xiii. (W.H.). **καθ᾽ ὑπερβολήν** (see parls.) is superlative, not compar.; P. is not pointing out "a *more* excellent way" than that of seeking and using the charisms of ch. xii. (with such a meaning he should have written **Ἔτι δέ**: *cf.* Luke xxiv. 41, etc.), but "a *super-excellent* way" (*une voie souverainement excellente*, Gd.) to win them (*cf.* viii. 1 *b*, 1 Jo. iv. 7). **Δείκνυμι** is "to point out" as with the finger.

Ver. 1. This *way* will be described in vv. 4-7, but first its *necessity* must be proved: this is shown by the five parl. hypotheses of vv. 1 ff., — respecting *tongues*, *prophecy*, *knowledge*, and *devotion of goods* or *of person*. The first supposition takes up the charism last mentioned (xii. 30) and most valued at Cor.: **ἐὰν τ. γλώσσαις . . . λαλῶ, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω** (form of probable hypothesis—*too* prob. at Cor.), "If with the tongues of men I be speaking, and of angels, but am without love,"—in that case, "I have become a sounding brass or a clanging cymbal"—I have gained by this admired endowment the power of making *so much senseless noise* (*cf.* xiv. 6-11, 23, 27 f.). With love in the speaker, his **γλωσσολαλία** would be kept within the bounds of edification (xiv. 6, 12-19, 27), and would possess a tone and pathos far different from that described. —"Tongues *of men*" does not signify *foreign languages* (so Or., Hf., Al., Thiersch), such as are supposed to have been spoken on the Day of Pentecost (see note on xii. 10); they are, in this whole context, ecstatic and inarticulate forms of speech, such as "men" do sometimes exercise: "tongues of angels" (**καὶ**

2. καὶ[1] ἐὰν[1] ἔχω [i] προφητείαν καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ [k] μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν [k1] γνῶσιν, καὶ[1] ἐὰν[1] [m] ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν [m] πίστιν ὥστε [n] ὄρη [no] μεθιστάνειν,[2] ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, [p] οὐδέν[3] εἰμι· 3. καὶ[1] ἐὰν[1] [q] ψωμίσω πάντα τὰ [r] ὑπάρχοντά μου, καὶ[1] ἐὰν[1] [s] παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα [t] καυθήσωμαι,[4] ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐδὲν[3] [u] ὠφελοῦμαι.

i See xii. 10.
k See iv. 1. μυστ. and γνωσ., Rom. xi. 25; Eph. i. 9, iii. 3 f., vi. 19; Col. ii. 2; Mt. xiii. 11.

l See i. 5. m Rom. xiv. 22; 1 Tim. i. 19; Acts xiv. 9; Jas. ii. 1, 18; Mt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21; Mk. iv. 40, xi. 22. n Isa. liv. 10. o Col. i. 13; Lk. xvi. 4; Acts xiii. 22, xix. 26. p See vii. 19. q Rom. xii. 20 (Prov. xxv. 21); Numb. xi. 4, 18, etc.; -ιον, Jo. xiii. 26 ff. r Heb. x. 34; Acts iv. 32; thrice in Mt.; 8 times in Lk. s *Cf.* Acts xv. 26. For like sense, 2 Cor. iv. 11; Rom. iv. 25, and parls.; Dan. iii. 28. t καυχησ., see i. 29. u Mk. v. 26; Mt. xvi. 26; Prov. x. 2. *Cf.* xiv. 6, and parls.

[1] Of the 4 instances of **και εαν** (T.R.), **καν** is given in (1) by AC, 17; in (2) by AB, 17; in (3) by ABC, 17; in (4) by AC. Al., W.H. read **καν** (?) throughout; Tisch., El., Nestle adhere to **και εαν**; Lachm. and Tr. vary. After **εαν, και εαν** is more likely: see vii. 28, xii. 15 f.; Mk. iii. 24 f.; Lk. xvii. 3 f. Nowhere else is **καν** well attested in such connexion.

[2] **μεθιστανα**ι (?), ℵBDG, 17. So Lachm., Tr., Tisch., El., Nestle. **μεθιστανειν**, ACKL, etc. (? Alexandrian and Syrian),—the rarer form; but **-ανω** forms of **ιστημι** and compounds are not infrequent in P. See Wr., pp. 94, 106.

[3] **ουθεν** (1): all non-Western uncc., accepted by crit. edd.; so Stephens (1550). **ουθεν** (2): ℵA, 17. Tisch. adopts this in *both*. See Wr., p. 48.

[4] **καυχησωμαι**, ℵAB, 17, cop. sah., Hier. (*ob similitudinem verbi, qua apud Græcos "ardeam" et "glorier" una litteræ parte distinguitur, apud nostros error inolevit. Sed et apud Græcos exemplaria sunt diversa*). Lachm., R.V. *marg.*, and W.H. adopt this reading, against other edd. See Note of the last-named, vol. ii., pp. 116 f., where Clem. Rom., Clem. Al., Or., are claimed on this side. **καυθησομαι**, DGL (**-ωμαι**, CK), latt. vg. syr^utr., and the bulk of Ff.—suspiciously like a Western emendation. See note below.

of the *climax:* "aye, and of angels!") describes this mystic utterance at its highest (*cf.* **λαλεῖ Θεῷ**, xiv. 2)—a mode of expression above this world. Possibly P. associated the supernatural **γλῶσσαι**, by which he was himself distinguished (xiv. 18), with the **ἄρρητα ῥήματα** heard by him "in paradise" (2 Cor. xii. 4); *cf.* the "song" (Rev. xiv. 2 f.) which only "those redeemed *out of* the earth" understand. The Rabbis held *Hebrew* to be the language of the angels.—**χαλκὸς** denotes any instrument of brass; **κύμβαλον**, the particular loud and shrill instrument which the sound of the "tongues" resembled.

Ver. 2. *Prophecy* in its widest range, and *faith* at its utmost stretch—in those lacking love, both amount to "nothing!" (**ἐὰν**) **εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα κ.τ.λ.**, "If I know all the mysteries (of revelation) and all the knowledge (relating thereto)," explains **καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω προφητείαν** by stating the source, or resources, from which "prophecy" is drawn: **πᾶσαν τ. γνῶσιν** (attached somewhat awkwardly to **εἰδῶ**), combined with **τ. μυστ.**, posits a mental grasp of the contents of revelation added to the supernatural insight which discovers them (see notes on **λόγος γνώσεως** and **προφητεία**, xii. 8 ff.), as *e.g.* in the case of *Isaiah*. Hn. supplies **ἔχω**, instead of the nearer **εἰδῶ**, before **τ. γνῶσιν** (*cf.* viii. 1, 10), reading "if I have all knowledge" as a second, distinct assumption following on "if I know all mysteries," on account of the incongruity of Prophecy and Knowledge; but the point of P.'s *extreme* supposition lies in this unusual combination—the intellect of a philosopher joined to the inspiration of a seer.—For **μυστήρια**, see note on ii. 1.—**πίστιν** (see note on xii. 9) **ὥστε μεθιστάνειν ὄρη**—an allusion to the hyperbolical sayings of Jesus *ad rem* (Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21; see notes in vol. i.); in the pr. (continuous) inf.—"to remove mountain after mountain" (Ed.). Whatever God may be pleased to accomplish through such a man (*cf.* iii. 9), *he* is personally worthless. On the form **οὐθέν**, see Wr., p. 48; for the thought, *cf.* iii. 18, 2 Cor. xii. 11, Gal. vi. 3.

Ver. 3. The suppositions of these three vv. cover three principal forms of activity in the Church—the spheres, *viz.*, of *supernatural manifestation*, of *spiritual influence*, of *material aid* (3); loveless men who show conspicuous power in these several respects, in the first in-

4. Ἡ ἀγάπη [v] μακροθυμεῖ, [vw] χρηστεύεται· ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ [x] ζηλοῖ, ἡ ἀγάπη [1] οὐ [y] περπερεύεται· οὐ [z] φυσιοῦται, 5. οὐκ [a] ἀσχημονεῖ· οὐ [b] ζητεῖ [b] τὰ [2] [b] ἑαυτῆς, οὐ [c] παροξύνεται· οὐ [d] λογίζεται [e] τὸ [e] κακόν, 6. οὐ [f] χαίρει [f] ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ [g] συγχαίρει δὲ [h] τῇ [h] ἀληθείᾳ· 7. πάντα [i] στέγει, πάντα πιστεύει· πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα [k] ὑπομένει.

v For both, cf. 2 Cor. vi. 6; Rom. ii. 4; Gal. v. 22. μακροθ., 1 Th. v. 14; Heb. vi. 15; Jas. v. 7 f.; Mt. xviii. 26, 29; Lk. xviii. 7; Prov. xix. 11. -μια, 10 times in P.; 4 in other Epp.; -μως, Acts xxvi. 3. w H.l. in Gr. x In this sense, Acts vii. 9, xvii. 5; Jas. iv. 2. Diff. in xii. 31, etc.; diff. again in Gal. iv. 17 f. y H.l. See note below. z See iv. 6. a See vii. 36. b See x. 24. c Acts xvii. 16. -σμος, Acts xv. 39; Heb. x. 24. d In this sense (act.), Rom. iv. 6, 8 (Ps. xxxi. 2); 2 Cor. v. 19; diff. in iv. 1, ver. 11 below. e Five times in Rom.; Jo. xviii. 23; 3 Jo. 11. f xvi. 17; 2 Cor. vii. 13; Acts xv. 31; Lk. i. 14; Mt. xviii. 13; Prov. xxiv. 19. g See xii. 26. h In this sense, 16 times more in P.; Heb. x. 26; Jas. v. 19; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 12, ii. 2; Jo. *passim*. i See ix. 12. k With acc., Rom. viii. 24; 2 Tim. ii. 10 (παντα); Heb. x. 32, xii. 2 f.; Jas. i. 12; Wisd. xvi. 22.

[1] *Om.* **η αγαπη** (?) B, 17, and a few other minn., f. vg. cop., and a number of Ff. So W.H., Tr.,; Nestle *brackets*. Tisch. reads **η αγαπη** thrice, but attaches the second to **χρηστ.**, and the third to **ζηλοι.**

[2] **το μη εαυτης**: B, Clem. The best codd. may contain a vicious reading.

stance are *sound signifying nothing;* in the second, they *are nothing;* in the third, they *gain nothing.* Those who make sacrifices to benefit others *without love*, must have some hidden selfish recompense that they count upon; but they will cheat themselves.—**ἐὰν ψωμίσω κ.τ.λ.**, "If I should dole out all my property". The vb. (derived from **ψωμός**—**ψωμίον**, John xiii. 26 ff.—a *bit* or *crumb*) takes acc. of *person* in Rom. xii. 20 (LXX), here of *thing*—both regular: "Si distribuero in cibos pauperum" (Vg.), "Si insumam alendis egenis" (Bz.).—The sacrifice of *property* rises to its climax in that of *bodily life: cf.* Job ii. 4 f., Dan. iii. 28, Gal. ii. 20, etc.; John x. 11, xv. 13.—But in either case, *ex hypothesi*, the devotion is vitiated by its motive—**ἵνα καυχήσωμαι**, "that I may make a boast" (*cf.* Matt. vi. 1 ff.); it is prompted by ambition, not love. So the self-immolator forfeits the end he seeks; his glorifying becomes **κενοδοξία** (Gal. v. 26, Phil. ii. 3; *cf.* John v. 44). **οὐδὲν ὠφελοῦμαι** signifies loss of *final* benefit (*cf.* Gal. v. 2, Rom. ii. 25, Luke ix. 25). This entire train of supposition P. puts in the 1st pers., so avoiding the appearance of censure: *cf.*, for the *usus loquendi*, xiv. 14-19, viii. 13, ix. 26 f.—**καυθήσωμαι** is a grammatical *monstrum*,—a reading that cannot well be explained except as a corruption of **καυχήσωμαι**; it was favoured by the thought of the Christian martyrdoms, and perhaps by the influence of Dan. iii. 28. Hn., Gd., Ed., El., amongst critical comment., are in favour of the T.R., which is supported by the story, told in Josephus (*B.J.*, vii. 8. 7), of a Buddhist fakir who about this time immolated himself by fire at Athens.

§ 43. The Qualities of Christian Love, xiii. 4-13. The previous vv. have justified the **καθ' ὑπερβολὴν** of xii. 31. The loftiest human faculties of man are seen to be frustrate without love; by its aid alone are they brought to their proper excellence and just use. But this "way" of Christian attainment has still to be "described," and the promise of xii. 31*b* fulfilled. So while vv. 1-3 have proved the *necessity*, the rest of the chap. shows the *nature and working* of the indispensable **ἀγάπη**. The Cor. may see in this description the mirror of what they ought to be and are not; they will learn how childish are the superiorities on which they plume themselves. (*a*) The *behaviour* of Love is delineated in fifteen exquisite aphorisms (4-7); (*b*) its *permanence*, in contrast with the transitory and partial character of the prized **χαρίσματα** (8-13).

Vv. 4-7. In vv. 1-3 Paul's utterance began to rise with the elevation of his theme into the Hebraic rhythm (observe the recurrent **ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω**, and the repeated **οὐδέν**) which marks his more impassioned passages (see *e.g.*, Rom. viii. 31 ff., Eph. i. 8 ff.; on a smaller scale, iii. 22 f. above). Here this rhythm dominates the structure of his sentences: they run in seven couplets, arranged as *one* (affirm.), *four* (neg.), and *two* (aff.) verse-lines, with the subject (**ἡ ἀγάπη**) repeated at the head of the 2nd line. The ver. which closes the middle, longer movement becomes a triplet, making a pause in the chant by the antithetical

8. ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε [l]ἐκπίπτει[1]· [m]εἴτε δὲ[2] [m]προφητεῖαι,[3] [n]καταργηθήσονται[2]· [m]εἴτε [o]γλῶσσαι, [p]παύσονται· [m]εἴτε [q]γνῶ-

l πιπτει, of *things*, Lk. xvi. 17; 1 Kings iii. 19. *Cf.* Rom. ix. 6; Acts xii. 7· Jas. i. 11 Of *persons*, see x. 8. m Rom. xii. 6. For ειτε, ειτε, see iii. 22. προφητ., see xii. 10. n See i. 28. o See xii. 10. p In this sense, Acts xx. 1; Exod. ix. 33 f. q See i. 5.

[1] πιπτει, ℵABC, 17, 67**. εκπιπτει, Western and Syrian.

[2] Om. δε C*D*GKP, latt. vg. cop. Tr. *brackets*. Required to effect transition from η αγαπη; easily dropped by copyist after ειτε.

[3] προφητεια, καταργηθησεται (?): B A (-εια, -σονται). So W.H. *marg*.

repetition of the second clause. The par. then reads as follows:—

"Love suffers long, shows kindness.
Love envies not, makes no self-display;
Is not puffed up, behaves not unseemly;
Seeks not her advantage, is not embittered;
Imputes not evil, rejoices not at wrong.
but shares in the joy of the truth.
All things she tolerates, all things she believes;
All things she hopes for, all things she endures."

The first line supples the general theme, defining the two fundamental excellencies of Love—her patience towards evil, and kindly activity in good. In the negative movement, the first half-lines set forth Love's *attitude*—free from jealousy, arrogance (*cf.* iv. 6*b*), avarice, grudge-bearing; while the second member in each case sets forth her *temper*—modest, refined in feeling, placable, having her joy in goodness. The third movement reverts to the opening note, on which it descants.—For the individual words: **μακροθυμέω** is *to be long-tempered* (*longanimis est*, Er.)—a characteristic of God (Rom. ii. 4, etc.)—patient towards injurious or provoking *persons;* this includes **οὐ παροξύνεται, οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν, πάντα στέγει**; whereas **ὑπομένει**, closing the list, signifies patience in respect of adverse and afflictive *circumstances;* the two unite in Col. i. 11: see Trench, *Syn.*, § liii.—**χρηστεύεται**—a vb. perhaps of Paul's coining—*plays the part of a* χρηστός (*benignus*), one who renders gracious, well-disposed service to others (Trench, *Syn.*, § lxiii): P. associates **μακροθυμία** and **χρηστότης** repeatedly (see parls.).—**οὐ ζηλοῖ** qualifies the **ζηλοῦτε** of xii. 31: directed towards right *objects*, **ζῆλος** is laudable ambition; directed towards *persons*, it is base envy; desire for excellencies manifest in others should stimulate not ill-will but admiring love.—The vb. **περπερεύεται** (parl. in form to **χρηστεύεται**) occurs only in Marc. Anton., v., 5 besides, where it is rendered *ostentare se* (the Vg. *perperam se agit* rests on mistaken resemblance)· *to show oneself off*: **πέρπερος**, used by Polybius and Epictetus, signifies *braggart, boastful* (see Gm., *s.v.*), its sense here.—He who is *envious* (**ζηλ.**) of superiority in others is commonly *ostentatious* (**περπ.**) of superiority assumed in himself, and *arrogant* (**φυσ.**) towards inferiors. Such **φυσιοῦσθαι** is a mark of bad taste—a *moral indecency*, from which Love is clear (**οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ**: see parls.); she has the instinct for the seemly; Love imparts a delicacy of feeling beyond the rules of politeness.—The absence of *pride* is the burden of the two former of the negative couplets, the absence of *greed* of the two latter. For **οὐ ζητεῖ κ.τ.λ.**, *cf.* parls.; 2 Cor. xii. 13 ff. supplies a fine illustration in the writer. Selfishness generates the *irritability* denied concerning Love in **οὐ παροξύνεται**; intent on one's own advantage, one is incessantly angered to find the world at cross purposes with him. Except Heb. x. 24, the only other N.T. parls. (Acts xv. 39, xvii. 16) ascribe *to P. himself* the **παροξυσμὸς** which he now condemns; as in the case of **ζῆλος** (see iii. 3), there is a bad and a good *exasperation;* anger *may* be holy, though commonly a sin. To "rejoice at iniquity," when seeing it in others, is a sign of deep debasement (Rom. i. 32); Love, on the contrary, finds her joy in the joy of "the Truth" (personified: *cf.* Rom. vii. 22, Ps. lxxxv. 10 f., 3 John 8, 12)—she rejoices in the progress and vindication of the Gospel, which is "the truth" of God (*cf.* Phil. i. 7, Col. i. 3-6; 3 John 4): **ἀδικία** and **ἀλήθεια** are similarly contrasted in 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12.—The four **πάντα** clauses form a chiasmus: the first and fourth relating to the bearing of ill, the second and third to expectation of good in others; the first pair belong to the present, the last to the future. For **στέγει**, see parls.; Bz. and a few others render the clause "omnia *tegit*," in accordance with the radical sense of the vb.; but *suffert* (Vg.) is its Pauline, and also prevalent cl. sense.—**Πίστις** appears

σις, [u] καταργηθήσεται· 9. [r] ἐκ [r] μέρους γὰρ γινώσκομεν καὶ [r] ἐκ [r] μέρους [s] προφητεύομεν· 10. ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ [t] τὸ [t] τέλειον, τότε[1] τὸ [r] ἐκ [r] μέρους [u] καταργηθήσεται. 11. ὅτε ἤμην [u] νήπιος, ὡς [u] νήπιος ἐλάλουν,[2] ὡς [u] νήπιος [v] ἐφρόνουν,[2] ὡς [u] νήπιος [w] ἐλογιζόμην[2]· ὅτε δὲ[3] [x] γέγονα [y] ἀνήρ, [u] κατήργηκα τὰ τοῦ [u] νηπίου. 12. [z] βλέπομεν

r *Cf.* xii. 27.
s See xi. 4.
t *H.l.* For the adj., see ii. 6; of *things*, Rom. xii. 2; Heb. ix. 11; Jas. i. 4, 17, 25; 1 Jo. iv. 18.
u See iii. 1.
v Abs., N.T. *h.l.*; Isa. xliv. 18.
w In this sense, 8 times more in P.; Heb. xi. 19; 1 Pet. v. 12; Jo. xi. 50. Abs., here only.
x See ver. 1.
y In contrast with *νηπιος*, *cf.* xiv. 20; Gal. iv. 1-5; Eph. iv. 13.
z 2 Cor. x. 7, xii. 6; Rom. vii. 23, viii. 24 f.; Heb. ii. 9, iii. 19; Jas. ii. 22; Acts i. 9, ix. 8; Mt. vi. 4, vii. 3, xiii. 13, etc., xv. 31; Lk. x. 23 f., etc.

[1] *Om.* τοτε all uncc. but DcKL.

[2] ελαλουν ως νηπιος, εφρονουν ως νηπ., ελογιζομην ως νηπ. (in this order): ℵAB, 17. All crit. edd.

[3] *Om.* δε ℵABD*, 67**. Here δε weakens the antithesis. *Cf.* note 8 above.

to bear in Gal. v. 22 the meaning of *faith in men* belonging to πιστεύει here. *Hope* animates and is nourished by *endurance:* ὑπομένει (*sustinet*, not *patitur*), the active patience of the stout-hearted soldier; see Trench, *Syn.*, § liii., and N.T. parls.

Ver. 8. Love, that bears, also *outwears everything:* "Love never faileth". That πίπτει denotes "falling" in the sense of cessation, dropping out of existence (*cf.* x. 8, Luke xvi. 17), not moral failure (as in x. 12, etc.), is manifest from the parl. clauses and from ver. 13. The charisms of chh. xii. and xiv. are bestowed *on the way* and serve the wayfaring Church, they cease each of them at a determined point; but the Way of Love leads indefinitely beyond them; οὐ διασφάλλεται, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ μένει βεβαία καὶ ἀκίνητος (Thd.). — "Prophesyings, tongues, and knowledge"—faculties inspired, ecstatic, intellectual—are the three typical forms of Christian expression. The abolition of Prophecies and Knowledge is explained in vv. 9 ff. as the superseding of the partial by the perfect; they "will be done away" by a completer realisation of the objects they seek,—viz., by *intuition* into the now hidden things of God and of man (xiv. 24 f.), and by adequate *comprehension* of the things revealed (see note on 12). Of the Tongues it is simply said that "they will *stop*" (παύσονται), having like other miracles a temporary significance (*cf.* xiv. 22); not giving place to any higher development of the like kind, they lapse and terminate (*desinent*, Bg.).

Vv. 9, 10: reasons why *Prophecy* and *Knowledge* must be abolished. Though amongst the μείζονα (xii. 31) and rich in edification (xiv. 6), these charisms are partial in scope, and therefore temporary: the fragmentary gives place to the complete.—ἐκ μέρους (see note, xii. 27, and parls.): coming *of a part*, our knowledge and prophesying are limited by the limiting conditions of their origin. For the conscious imperfection of *Prophecy*, *cf.* 1 Peter i. 10 f.; this text has some bearing on the much-discussed "inerrancy" of Scripture.—ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον, τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται, "But when there comes *the perfect* (*full-grown, mature;* see note on ii. 6), the 'in part' will be abolished": *cf.* Eph. iv. 13 f., where τέλειος is contrasted with νήπιος as here; also Phil. iii. 11 ff. This τελείωσις is brought about at the παρουσία—it "comes" with the Lord from heaven (xv. 47; *cf.* 1 Thess. i. 10, and i. 7 above); that of Eph. iv. is some what earlier.

Ver. 11 illustrates the abolition of the partial by the perfect through the transition from *the child to the man*—in speech (ἐλάλουν), in disposition and aim (ἐφρόνουν), and in mental activity (ἐλογιζόμην). These three points of diff. can hardly be identified with the γλῶσσαι, προφητεία, and γνῶσις respectively; though "spake as a babe" may allude to the childish fondness of the Cor. for γλωσσολαλία (*cf.* xiv. 18 ff.), and "to reason" is the distinction of γνῶσις. On the later-Gr. mid. form ἤμην, see Wr., pp. 95 f.—ὅταν with sbj. is the *when* of future contingency, ὅτε with ind. the *when* of past or present fact.—ὅτε γέγονα ἀνὴρ κατήργηκα κ.τ.λ.: "now that (*ex quo*) I have become a man (*vir factus sum: cf.* ἀνὴρ τέλειος in Eph. iv. 12), I have abolished the things of the child". Such is the κατάργησις which Prophecy and Knowledge (Scripture and Theology), as at present known, must undergo through the approaching "revelation" (i. 7). "Non dicit, *Quum abolevi puerilia, factus*

γὰρ [1] [a] ἄρτι δι' [b] ἐσόπτρου ἐν [c] αἰνίγματι, [a] τότε δὲ [d] πρόσωπον [d] πρὸς [d] πρόσωπον· [a] ἄρτι γινώσκω [e] ἐκ [e] μέρους, [a] τότε δὲ [e] ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ [e] ἐπεγνώσθην. 13. [f] νυνὶ [f] δὲ μένει πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα· [g] μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη.

a See iv. 13 *αρτι . . . τοτε*, 2 Th. ii. 7 f. b Jas. i. 23; Wisd. vii 26; Sir. xii. 11. See note below. c N.T. *h.l.*; Numb. xii. 8; Sir. xxxix. 3. d N.T. *h.l.*; Gen. xxxii. 30. *Cf.* 2 Jo. 12; 3 Jo. 14; Numb. xii. 8; also 2 Cor. iii. 18. e xiv. 37, xvi. 18; 8 times more in P.; 2 Pet. ii. 21; many times in Syn. GG. and Acts. For the antith., *cf.* viii. 2 f.; Gal. iv. 9. f See xii. 18 g See xii. 31. For compar. with *παντων*, xv. 19; Mt. xiii. 32; Lk. ix. 46.

[1] DG, latt. vg., Latt. Ff. om. γαρ.

sum vir. Hiems non affert ver; sed ver pellit hiemem: sic est in anima et ecclesia" (Bg.).—**γέγονα** and **κατήργηκα,** in pf. of *abiding result;* for **καταργέω,** *cf.* i. 28 and parls.

Ver. 12 figures in another way the contrast between the present partial and the coming perfect Christian state, in respect particularly of *knowledge:* it is the diff. between discernment by broken reflexion and by immediate intuition. "For we see now through a mirror, in (the fashion of) a riddle; but then face to face."—**βλέπω,** as distinguished from **ὁράω,** points to the fact and manner of *seeing* rather than the object seen (see parls.). On **ἄρτι,** see note to iv. 11; it fastens on the *immediate* present.—**δι' ἐσόπτρου,** "by means of a mirror": ancient mirrors made of burnished metal —a specialty of Cor.—were poor reflectors; the art of silvering glass was discovered in the 13th century.—**ἔσοπτρον = κάτοπτρον** (2 Cor. iii. 18), or **ἔνοπτρον** (cl. Gr.); not **διόπτρα,** *speculare,* the semi-transparent *window* of talc (the *lapis specularis* of the ancients), as some have explained the term. *Cf.* Philo, *De Decal.*, § 21, "As by a mirror, the reason discerns images of God acting and making the world and administering the universe"; also Plato's celebrated representation (*Repub.*, vii., 514) of the world of sense as a train of shadows imaging the real. Mr., Hf., Gd., Al., El. adopt the local sense of **διά,** "*through* a mirror," in allusion to the appearance of the imaged object as *behind* the reflector: but it is the *dimness,* not the displacement, of the image that P. is thinking of. —Such a sight of the Divine realities, in blurred reflexions, presents them **ἐν αἰνίγματι,** *enigmatically*—"in (the shape of) a riddle" rather than a full intelligible view. Divine revelation opens up fresh mysteries; advanced knowledge raises vaster problems. With our defective earthly powers, this is inevitable.—**πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον,** Heb. *panîm 'el-panîm* (see parls.), with a reminiscence of Num. xii. 8, **στόμα κατὰ στόμα . . . καὶ οὐ δι' αἰνιγμάτων** (referring to the converse of God with Moses): the "face" *to* which ours will be turned, is *God's*. *God* is the tacit obj. of ver. 12*b*, which interprets the above figure: "Now I know (**γινώσκω,** a *learner's* knowledge: see i. 21, etc.; contrast **οἶδα,** 2 above and ii. 11) partially; but then I shall know-well (**ἐπιγνώσομαι**), as also I was well-known". God has formed a perfect apprehension of the believing soul (viii. 3); He possesses an immediate, full, and interested discernment of its conditions (Rom. viii. 27, etc.); its future knowledge will match, in some sense, His present knowledge of it, the searching effect of which it has realised (Gal. iv. 9, etc.).

Ver. 13. **νυνὶ δὲ μένει κ.τ.λ.**—final conclusion of the matter, **μένει** being antithetical to **πίπτει κ.τ.λ.** of the foregoing: "But as it is (*nunc autem*), there abides faith, hope, love—these three!" they stay; the others pass (8 ff.). Faith and Hope are elements of the perfect and permanent state; new objects of trust and desire will come into sight in the widening visions of the life eternal. But Love, both now and then, surpasses its companions, being the character of God (viii. 3, 1 John iv. 8, 16); in Love is the fruition of Faith's efforts (Gal. v. 6) and Hope's anticipations; it alone gives worth to every human power (1-3). The popular interpretation, since Cm., has read **νυνὶ** as *temporal* instead of logical, identifying it with the **ἄρτι** of ver. 12, as though the Ap. meant that *for the present* Faith and Hope "abide" with Love, but Love alone "abides" for ever. But P. puts the three on the same footing in respect of enduringness—"*these* three" in comparison with the other three of ver. 8—pointedly adding Faith and Hope to share and support the "abiding" of Love; "love is *greater* among these," not more lasting.—For **μείζων** with partitive gen., *cf.* Matt. xxiii. 11, and see Wr., p. 303. For the pregnant, absolute **μένει,** *cf.* iii. 14, 1 John ii. 6, 2 John 2.

a Rom. ix. 30, xii. 13, xiv. 19; Ph. iii. 12, 14; 1 Th. v. 15; Isa. li. 1; Sir. xxvii. 8.

XIV. 1. [a]Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην· [b]ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ [c]πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα [d]προφητεύητε. 2. ὁ γὰρ [e]λαλῶν [e]γλώσσῃ, οὐκ [f]ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ ἀλλὰ τῷ[1] [f]Θεῷ· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἀκούει, [g]πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ [h]μυστήρια· 3. ὁ δὲ [d]προφητεύων, [f]ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ

b See xii. 31. c See xii. 1. d See xi. 4. e See xiii. 1. f See i. 25. g vv. 14 f.; Acts xvii. 16. h See ii. 7.

[1] *Om.* τῷ the pre-Syrian uncc.

§ 44. The Gifts of Tongues and of Prophecy, xiv. 1-6. The digression upon ἡ ἀγάπη has not diverted us from the subject of this Div.; Love has shown the way (xii. 31*b*) in which all **τὰ πνευματικά** (xii. 1, xiv. 1) are to be sought, the animating principle and ulterior aim that should govern their exercise. But the principle of Love supplies, further, a criterion by which the charisms are to be relatively estimated—*their use in edification* (3 ff., 12, 19, 26). Thus P. at length answers the question addressed to him from Cor. as to the worth of the several "spiritual powers," and in particular as to the relative value of Tongues and Prophesying. He has led up to this answer by his exposition of the general Christian truths bearing upon the matter—*viz.* the office of the Holy Spirit as the distributor of God's gifts (xii. 3-11), the organic nature of the Church (12-31), and the sovereignty of love in the Christian life (xiii.).

Ver. 1. "Pursue love"—follow intently this **καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδόν** (xii. 31*b:* see note): **διώκω** (see parls.: pr. impr.) signifies to prosecute to its goal (xiii. 13) a course on which one has entered. **ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά,** "but (continue to) covet the spiritual (gifts)": P. resumes xii. 31 (see note, also on xii. 1). Love is exalted in the interest of the charisms, not to their disparagement; it is not to be pursued by forgetting everything else, but opens the true way to everything else: "Sectamini charitatem, affectate spiritualia" (Cv.).—"But rather (in preference to other gifts) that you may prophesy": this is chief amongst "the greater charisms" of xii. 31. Perhaps the Cor. had asked specifically which of the two, Tongues or Prophecy, was to be preferred. **ἵνα προφητεύητε** (*cf.* **θέλω . . . μᾶλλον ἵνα,** 5) differs from **τὸ προφητεύειν** by making the object distinctly an *aim:* in striving after the charisms, Prophecy is to be set highest and to control the rest. For the use of **ἵνα,** *cf.* note on i. 10, also Bm., pp. 235 ff.

Vv. 2, 3. The reason for preferring Prophecy, on the principles laid down, is that one's fellows receive no benefit from the Tongues: except *God,* "no one hears" the latter—*i.e.* hears understandingly (*cf.* Eph. i. 13, iv. 29, etc.). There was *sound* enough in the glossolalia (xiii. 1), but no sense (23). **πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ κ.τ.λ.,** "but in spirit he is speaking mysteries"; **δὲ** points a contrast to the **οὐδεὶς . . . ἀκούει**: there is something worth hearing—deep things muttered by those quivering lips, that should be rationally spoken. For **μυστήριον,** see note on ii. 7, and Cr. *s.v.: mystery* in Scripture is the correlate of *revelation;* here it stops short of disclosure, tantalizing the Church, which hears and hears not. **πνεύματι,** dat. of manner or instr.,—"with the spirit," but without the "understanding" (**νοῦς**: 14 ff.; *cf.* note to xii. 8).—"But he who prophesies *does speak to men*—edification and exhortation and comfort." **παράκλησις** and **παραμυθία** are distinct from **οἰκοδομή**: prophetic speech serves for (*a*) "the further upbuilding of the Christian life, (*b*) the stimulation of the Christian will, (*c*) the strengthening of the Christian spirit" (Hf.). **παραμυθία** has ref. to sorrow or fear (see parls.); **παράκλησις** (far commoner) to duty; **οἰκοδομή,** in the widest sense, to knowledge and character and the progress of the Church: this last stands alone in the sequel.

Ver. 4. "He that speaks with a tongue edifies himself, but he that prophesies edifies a church (assembly)"—not one but many persons, not himself but a whole community. The impression made on the **γλωσσολαλῶν** by his utterance, since it was delivered in a rapture and without clear conception (12 ff.), must have been vague; but it powerfully confirmed his faith, since it left an abiding sense of possession by the Spirit of God (*cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 1-10). Our deepest feelings frequently enter the mind below the surface consciousness.

Ver. 5. Notwithstanding the above drawback, the Tongues are a real and desirable charism; the better is preferred

[l] οἰκοδομὴν καὶ [k] παράκλησιν καὶ [l] παραμυθίαν. 4. ὁ [e] λαλῶν [e] γλώσσῃ ἑαυτὸν [m] οἰκοδομεῖ, ὁ δὲ [d] προφητεύων [n] ἐκκλησίαν [m] οἰκοδομεῖ. 5. θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς [e] λαλεῖν [e] γλώσσαις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα [d] προφητεύητε· [o] μείζων γὰρ [1] ὁ [d] προφητεύων ἢ ὁ [e] λαλῶν [e] γλώσσαις, [p] ἐκτὸς [p] εἰ μὴ [q] διερμηνεύῃ, ἵνα ἡ ἐκκλησία [l] οἰκοδομὴν λάβῃ. 6. [r] νῦνι [2] [r] δέ, ἀδελφοί, ἐὰν ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς [e] γλώσσαις [e] λαλῶν, [s] τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω, ἐὰν μὴ ὑμῖν λαλήσω ἢ [3] ἐν [t] ἀποκαλύψει ἢ ἐν [u] γνώσει, ἢ ἐν [v w] προφητείᾳ ἢ ἐν [4] [w] διδαχῇ;

i vv. 12, 26; 2 Cor. x. 8, xii. 19. xiii. 10; Rom. xiv. 19, xv. 2; Eph. iv. 12, 16, 29. see ver. 4, -μεω.
k Freq. in P.; thrice in Heb.; 6 times in Lk., Acts.
l N.T. *h.l.*; Wisd. xix. 12. -ιον, Phil. ii. 1; -ευσθαι, 1 Th. ii. 11. m See viii. 1. n Naruse, anarthrous, see xi. 18. o See xii. 31. p xv. 2; 1 Tim. v. 19. For εκτος, *cf.* vi. 18. q See xii. 30. r See xii. 18. s Mt. xvi. 26; Mk. viii. 36; also xiii. 3; Rom. ii. 25; Gal. v. 2. *Cf.* xv. 32; Rom. iii. 1; Jas. ii. 14. t See i. 7. Abs., ver. 26; Gal. ii. 2; Eph. i. 17, iii. 3. u See i. 5. v See xii. 10. w ver. 26; *cf.* xii. 29. διδαχη., Rom. vi. 17, xvi. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 9; Heb. vi. 2, xiii. 9; 2 Jo. 9, 10; thrice in Rev.; 4 times in Acts; 11 in GG.

[1] **δε**, ℵABP, cop. **γαρ**, DGKL, etc., latt. vg. syrr. (Western and Syrian).
[2] **νυν** all pre-Syrian uncc. *Cf.* xii. 18.
[3] Om. **η** (first) ℵ, 17, 67**, cop.
[4] Om. **εν** (last) ℵDgr.Ggr So Tisch.; Tr. *brackets*.

to *the good*: "Yet I would have you all speak with tongues,—but rather that you might prophesy." **μᾶλλον ἵνα προφητεύητε** is repeated from ver. 1: what the Ap. bids his readers prefer, he prefers for them—not to the exclusion of the Tongues, for the two gifts might be held at once (6, 18), but as looking beyond them.—**θέλω ἵνα** occurs several times in the Gospels without any marked telic force (Matt. vii. 12, Mark vi. 25, ix. 30, John xvii. 24), but only here in P.; its substitution for the inf. (**λαλεῖν**) of the coordinate clause is significant.—"Moreover he who prophesies is greater than he who speaks with tongues"—attached by the part. **δὲ** where one expected **γάρ** (T.R.); P. is not justifying *his own* preference just stated, but giving a further reason why *the Cor.* should covet Prophecy more than Tongues: the main reason lies in the eminent usefulness of this charism (2-4); besides that (**δέ**), its possessor is a "greater" person (**μείζων**: *cf.* xii. 31) "than the speaker with tongues—except in the case that he interprets (his ecstatic utterance), that the Church may get edification". The power to interpret *superadded* to the glossolalia (see 13, 26 ff., xii. 10) puts the mystic speaker on a level with the prophet: first "uttering mysteries" (2) and then making them plain to his hearers, he accomplishes in two acts what the prophet does in one. **ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ** is a Pauline pleonasm (see parls.), consisting of **ἐκτὸς εἰ** (*except if*) and **εἰ μή** (*unless*) run together; "with this exception,—unless he interpret" (Wr., p. 756). For **εἰ** with sbj., in distinction from **ἐάν**, see Wr., p. 368; it "represents that the event will decide the point" (El.). To supply **τις** with **διερμην.**, supposing *another* interpreter meant, is ungrammatical; the *identity* of speaker and interpreter is the essential point. He interprets with the express intention that the Church may be edified (**ἵνα . . . οἰκοδομὴν λάβῃ**).

Ver. 6. What the Ap. has said touching the criterion of *edification*, he applies to his own approaching visit (iv. 18 ff., xvi. 5 ff.): "But at the present time, brothers,"—**νῦν δέ**, *temporal*, as in v. 11, etc.; not *logical*, as in vii. 14, xiii. 13, etc. (see Hf., against most interpreters). It is *the situation at Cor.* which gives point to this ref.: what help could the Ap. bring to his readers in their troubled state, if he were to offer them nothing but confused mutterings and ravings? (*cf.* 7-11)—an appeal to common sense.—The hypotheses are parl. (expressing by **ἐὰν** actual possibility, *cf.* 18; not mere conceivability) — the second the negative of the first: "if I should come to you speaking with tongues, wherein shall I profit you—if I do not speak in (the way of) revelation or knowledge, or prophesying or teaching?" In the four **ἢ** clauses, the second pair matches the first: revelation comes through the prophet, knowledge through the teacher (*cf.* xii. 8, 10, 28, etc.). For **ἔρχομαι** with ptp. of the *character* or *capacity* in which one comes—"a (mere) speaker with tongues," unable to interpret (see 5)

7. [x]Ὅμως τὰ [y]ἄψυχα [z]φωνὴν [z]διδόντα, [a]εἴτε [b]αὐλὸς [a]εἴτε [c]κιθάρα, ἐὰν [d]διαστολὴν τοῖς [e]φθόγγοις μὴ [z]δῷ, πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ [f]αὐλούμενον ἢ τὸ [f]κιθαριζόμενον; 8. καὶ γὰρ ἐὰν [g]ἄδηλον [z]φωνὴν[1] [h]σάλπιγξ[1] [z]δῷ, τίς [i]παρασκευάσεται εἰς πόλεμον; 9. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς γλώσσης ἐὰν μὴ [k]εὔσημον λόγον [z]δῶτε, πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ λαλούμενον; ἔσεσθε γὰρ εἰς [l]ἀέρα λαλοῦντες.

x Gal. iii. 15; Jo. xii. 42; 2 Macc. xv. 5.
y N.T. *h.l.*; Wisd. xiii. 17, xiv. 29.
z Mt. xxiv. 29; Isa. xiii. 10. ηχω διδουσα θορυβον, Eurip., *Hec.*, 1093.
a See iii. 22.
b N.T. *h.l.*; -λητης, Mt. ix. 23.
c Rev. i. 8, xiv. 2, xv. 2; Gen. iv. 21, etc.
d Rom. iii. 22, x. 12; Exod. viii. 23.
e Rom. x. 18 (Ps. xviii. 4); Wisd. xix. 18.
f Mt. xi. 17, αυλ.; κιθαρ, Rev. xiv. 2; Isa. xxiii. 16.
g Lk. xi. 44. See ix. 26.
h Mt. xxiv. 31; Rev. i. 10, viii. 13; Exod. xix. 16, 19. See xv. 52.
i 2 Cor. ix. 2 f.; Acts x. 10; Jer. xii. 5.
k N.T. *h.l.*; Ps. lxxx. 3. See note below.
l See ix. 26.

[1] σαλπιγξ φωνην, ℵAP. So Tisch., W.H. *txt.*, Nestle. φων. σαλπ.: BDGKL. So Tr., Al., W.H. *marg.*, El.

—*cf.* Acts xix. 18, Matt. xi. 18 f., Mark i. 39, Luke xiii. 7.

§ 45. Utterance Useless without Clear Sense, xiv. 7-13. P. has just asked what the Cor. would think of him, if in their present need he came exhibiting his power as a speaker with Tongues, but without a word of prophetic inspiration or wise teaching to offer. Such speech would be a mockery to the hearers. This holds good of sound universally, when considered as a means of communication—in the case, *e.g.*, of lifeless instruments, the flute and lyre with their modulated notes, or the military trumpet with its varied signals (7 f.); so with articulate speech, in its numberless dialects. To the instructed ear every syllable carries a meaning; to the foreigner it is gibberish (10 f.). Just as useless are the Tongues in the Church without interpretation (9, 12 f.).

Ver. 7. **Ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα,** "Quin et inanima" (Cv.); as in Gal. iii. 15, the part. emphasises the word immediately following, not **φωνὴν διδόντα** ("though giving sound") in contrast to **ἐὰν διαστολὴν . . . μὴ δῷ** (so however Wr., Gm., Mr., Sm.: "yet unless they give a distinction, etc."). The argument is *a minori ad majus*, from dead instruments to living speech: "Yet even in the case of lifeless things (**τὰ ἄψυχα,** generic art.) when they give sound, unless they give a distinction in their notes" (so Hf., Ed., Gd., El.).—**φθόγγος** denotes a measured, harmon ous sound, whether of voice (Rom. x. 18) or instrument; see Plato, *Tim.* 80.—**διαστολὴ** is referred by Lidd., and by Ev. *ad loc.*, to the *pause* between notes; by most others (after Plato, *Phileb.*, 17C; *cf.* Oec. *ad loc.*) to the *interval* (= **διάστημα**) or distinction of pitch; possibly (so Cv., El.) it includes both in untechnical fashion—whatever in fact distinguishes the **φθόγγοι.**—**πῶς γνωσθήσεται κ.τ.λ.;** "How will that which is being piped or harped be discerned?"—how will the air be made out, if the notes run confusedly into one another? The double art., **τὸ αὐλ. . . . τὸ κιθαρ.,** separates the two sorts of music. This comparison used applies to *inarticulate* **γλωσσολαλία,** not to foreign languages.

Ver. 8. To the *pipe* and *harp*, adornments of peace, P. adds for further illustration (**καὶ γάρ**) the warlike *trumpet*. This ruder instrument furnishes a stronger example: varied signals can be given by its simple note, provided there is an understanding between trumpeter and hearers; "unius tubæ cantus alius ad alia vocat milites" (Bg.). Without such agreement, or with a wavering, indistinct sound, the loudest blast utters nothing to purpose: "For if the trumpet also gives an uncertain voice, who will prepare for battle?" How disastrous, at the critical moment, to doubt whether the trumpet sounds Advance or Retreat!

Ver. 9 enforces the twofold illustration of vv. 7 f.: "So also in your case (**οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς**), if through the tongue you do not give a word of clear signification (**εὔσημον λόγον**), how will that which is spoken be discerned?"—**εὔ-σημος** (from **εὖ** and **σῆμα**, *a sign*) implies *a meaning* in the word, and *a meaning good to make out*; *cf.* Sophocles, *Antig.*, 1004, 1021.—**πῶς γνωσθήσεται κ.τ.λ.;** is an echo from ver. 7; and "the tongue" (**διὰ τῆς γλώσσης**: *cf.* iii. 5, vi. 4, vii. 17), as the means of *living* speech, is thrust before the **ἐὰν** in emphatic contrast to "the lifeless" pipe, etc. P. does not therefore refer in this sentence (as Est., Gd., Ed. would have it) to the supernatural Tongue

10. τοσαῦτα, [m] εἰ [m] τύχοι, [n] γένη φωνῶν ἐστιν [1] ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῶν [2] [o] ἄφωνον· 11. ἐὰν οὖν μὴ εἰδῶ [3] τὴν [p] δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς, ἔσομαι τῷ λαλοῦντι [q] βάρβαρος, καὶ ὁ λαλῶν [r] ἐν [4] ἐμοὶ [q] βάρβαρος· 12. οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐπεὶ [s] ζηλωταί ἐστε [t] πνευμάτων, πρὸς τὴν

m xv. 37 only, in N.T.; *cf.* xvi. 6, τυχον.
n See xii. 10.
o *H.l.* in this sense; *cf.* xii. 2.
p N.T. *h.l.* in this sense; Numb. vi. 21; Plat., *Crat.*, 394B, etc.
q Rom. i. 14; Col. iii. 11; Acts xxviii. 2, 4.
r *Cf.* vi. 2; Rom. xi. 25 (?). See Wr., p. 481.
s Gal. i. 14; Tit. ii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 13; four times in Lk. and Acts; *cf.* -οω, xii. 36.
t Pl., see xii. 10.

[1] **ειcιν**: all uncc. but KL. [2] *Om.* **αυτων** all pre-Syrian uncc.
[3] **ιδω**, by itacism, AD*L, 17, 46. G, **γινωσκω**.
[4] Om. **εν** DG, 67**, latt. vg. syrutr. cop.

(elsewhere, moreover, expressed by the *anarthrous* **γλῶσσα**: otherwise here), for it is precisely his objection to this charism that it gives an **ἄσημον** instead of a **εὔσημον λόγον** (16, 19, 23); he means to say: "As inanimate instruments by due modulation, and by the fixed meaning attached to their notes, become expressive, so it is in a higher degree with the human tongue; its vocables convey a meaning just in so far as they are ordered, articulate, and conformed to usage". Now this is what the Cor. Glossolalia *was not:* "for you will be (otherwise) speaking into the air"—the issue of uninterpreted Tongue-speaking (*cf.* 2, 17, etc.).—**εἰς ἀέρα λαλεῖν**, a proverbial expression (*cf.* ix. 26) for ineffectual speech, like our "talking to the wind"; in Philo, **ἀερομυθεῖν**.

Ver. 10. Speaking of vocal utterance, the Ap. is reminded of the *multitude* of human dialects; this suggests a further proof of his contention, that there must be a settled and well-observed connexion between sound and sense. "Ever so many kinds of voices, it may chance, exist in the world."—On **εἰ τύχοι** (*if it should hap* = **τυχόν**, xvi. 6), which removes all known limit from the **τοσαῦτα**, see note of El. For the anarthrous **ἐν κόσμῳ**, *cf.* 2 Cor. v. 19; "in the *world*"—a sphere so wide.—**καὶ οὐδὲν** (*sc.* **τῶν γενῶν**) **ἄφωνον**, "and none (of them) voiceless": not tautologous, but asserting for every "kind of voice" the real nature of a voice, *viz.*, that *it means something to somebody;* "nullum genus vocum vocis expers" (Est.); "aucune langue n'est une non-langue"; the Greeks love these paradoxical expressions—*cf.* **βίος ἀβίωτος, χάρις ἄχαρις** (Gd., Hn.). The Vg. and Bz. miss the point in rendering, "nihil est mutum".

Ver. 11. "If then I know not the meaning of the voice" (**τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς**, *vim* or *virtutem vocis*)—for every voice *has* a meaning (10*b*); on this very possible hypothesis, "I shall be a barbarian to the speaker, and the speaker a barbarian in relation to me" (**ἐν ἐμοί**, *cf.* Matt. xxi. 42, and perhaps ii. 6 above), or "in my ear". By this illustration of the futility of the uninterpreted Tongues, Paul implicitly distinguishes them from natural foreign languages; there is a **μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος** in the comparison, just as in the previous comparison with harp and trumpet; one does not *compare* things identical. The second figure goes beyond the first; since the foreign speech, like the mysterious **γλῶσσαι** (2), may hide a precious meaning, and is the more provoking on that account, as the repeated **βάρβαρος** intimates.

Ver. 12. **οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς** is parl. to ver. 9; but the application is now turned into an exhortation. P. leaves the last comparison to speak for itself, and hastens to enforce his lesson: "So also with yourselves; since you are coveters of spirits (**ζηλωταί ἐστε πνευμάτων**), seek that you may abound (in them) with a view to the edifying of the church"—or "for the edifying of the church seek (them), that you may abound (therein)". The latter rendering, preferred by Cv., Mr., Al., Hf., Sm., is truer to the order of the words, and reproduces the emphasis of **πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομ. τῆς ἐκκλ. ζητεῖτε** has its object supplied beforehand in the previous clause, and **ἵνα** (**περισσεύητε**) bears its ordinary sense as conj. of *purpose.* Spiritual powers are indeed *to be sought* (*cf.* 1, xii. 31), provided that they be sought for the religious profiting of others, *with a view to abound in service* to the Church. The **ἵνα** clause is thus parl. to **πρὸς τ. οἰκοδομήν** (*cf.* vii. 35, 2 Tim. iii. 16); *cf.* John x. 10, and other parls. for **περισσεύω**.—**ζηλωταί**, *zealots, enthusiasts after spirits* (Ev.),—used perhaps with a touch of irony (Hn.). The Cor. have already the eagerness that P. commends in ver. 1;

[u] οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ζητεῖτε, ἵνα [v] περισσεύητε· 13. διόπερ[1] ὁ [w] λαλῶν [w] γλώσσῃ [x] προσευχέσθω [x] ἵνα [y] διερμηνεύῃ.

14. Ἐὰν γὰρ[2] προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, τὸ [z] πνεῦμά μου προσεύχεται ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου [a] ἄκαρπός ἐστι. 15. [b] τί [b] οὖν [b] ἐστι; προσεύξομαι[3] τῷ [c] πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι[3] δὲ καὶ[4] τῷ [d] νοΐ· [e] ψαλῶ τῷ [c] πνεύματι,

u See ver. 3. v See viii. 8. w See xiii. 1. x ινα, Phil. i. 9; Col. i. 9, iv. 3; 2 Th. i. 11, iii. 1; Mt. xxiv. 20; Mk. xiv. 35; οπως, Acts viii. 15. y See xii. 30. z See ii. 11. a Eph. v. 11; Tit. iii. 14; 2 Pet. i. 8; Jude 12; Mt. xiii. 22; Jer. ii. 6; Wisd. xv. 4. b Ver. 26; Acts xxi. 22. c See ii. 11. Instrum. dat., ver. 2; Rom. viii. 13; Gal. iii. 3, v. 16, 25; 1 Pet. iii. 18, iv. 6. d Rom. vii. 25. e Rom. xv. 9 (Ps. xvii. 49); Eph. v. 19; Jas. v. 13; Pss. *passim*.

[1] διο, all uncc. but ℵcKL.

[2] Om. γαρ (?) BG, 17, sah. Hence Lachm. and W.H. *bracket*.

[3] προσευξωμαι (twice), ADGP, 46; ℵ, -ωμαι, -ομαι.

[4] Om. και GKP, latt. vg. sah.—Western variant.

but it is not prompted by the best motives, nor directed to the most useful end: this word was common amongst Greeks as describing the ardent votaries of a school or party, or those jealous for the honour of some particular master (*cf.* Gal. i. 14).—**πνεύματα** differs somewhat from **τὰ πνευματικά** (1), signifying not "the (proper) spiritual" powers, but *unseen forces* generally (see xii. 10, **διακρίσεις πνευμάτων**, 1 John iv. 1, and the warning of xii. 3; *cf.* the notes); "the Cor. sought supernatural endowments, no matter what their nature might be" (Ed.)—at any rate, they thought too little of the true source and use of the charisms, but too much and too emulously of their outward impression and prestige (see **πνευμάτων**, 32).—Everling (*Die paul. Angel. u. Dämonologie*, pp. 40 ff.) infers from this passage, along with Rev. xxii. 6, the conception of a *number* of Divine "spirits" that may possess men; but he overpresses the turn of a single phrase, in contradiction to the context, which knows only "the one and the self-same Spirit" as from God (xii. 11).

Ver. 13. "Wherefore (since thus only can the **γλώσσαις λαλῶν** edify the church) let him who speaks with a tongue pray that he may interpret": *cf.* ver. 5. It appears that the speaker with Tongues in some instances could recall, on recovery, what he had uttered in his trance-ecstasy, so as to render it into rational speech. The three vbs. are *pr.*, regulating current procedure.—The **ἵνα** clause, after **προσευχέσθω**, gives the *purport* of the prayer, as in Phil. i. 9; *cf.* i. 10 above, xvi. 12; Luke ix. 40, etc. Mr., El., and others, prefer to borrow **γλώσσῃ** from the next ver., and render thus: "Let him that speaks (with a tongue) pray (therewith), in order that he may interpret"; but this strains the construction, and **γλώσσῃ** appears to be added in ver. 14 just because the vb. **προσεύχομαι** had not been so understood before.

§ 46. THE ΝΟΥΣ THE NEEDED ALLY OF THE ΠΝΕΥΜΑ, xiv. 14-20. In § 44 the Ap. has insisted on *edification* as the end and mark of God's gifts to His Church, and in § 45 on *intelligibility* as a condition necessary thereto. Now the faculty of intelligence is the **νοῦς**; and we are thus brought to see that for a profitable conduct of worship, and for a sane and sound Church life (14, 17 ff., 23), the understanding must be in exercise: it is a vehicle indispensable (14 f.) to the energies of the spirit. On this point P. is at one with the men of Gnosis at Cor.; he discountenances all assumptions made in the name of "the Spirit" that offend against sober judgment (20). This passage, in a sense, counterbalances i. 18-ii. 5; it shows how far the Ap. is from approving a blind fanaticism or irrational mysticism, when he exalts the Gospel at the expense of "the wisdom of the world".

Ver. 14. The Tongue has been marked out as an inferior charism, because it *does not edify others;* it is less desirable also because *it does not turn to account the man's own intelligence:* "If I pray with a tongue, my spirit prays, but my understanding (**νοῦς**) is unfruitful". The introductory **γάρ** (see txtl. note) seems hardly needed; if genuine, it attaches this ver. to ver. 13, as giving a further reason why the **γλωσσολαλῶν** should desire to interpret—*viz.*, that his own mind may partake fruitfully in his prayers. In any case, the consideration here

[c] ψαλῶ δὲ[1] καὶ τῷ [d] νοΐ. 16. ἐπεὶ ἐὰν εὐλογήσῃς[2] τῷ[3] [e] πνεύματι, ὁ [g] ἀναπληρῶν τὸν [h] τόπον τοῦ [i] ἰδιώτου πῶς [k] ἐρεῖ [k] τὸ [k] ἀμὴν [l] ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ [m] εὐχαριστίᾳ, [n] ἐπειδὴ τί λέγεις οὐκ οἶδε; 17. σὺ μὲν γὰρ [o] καλῶς [p] εὐχαριστεῖς, ἀλλ᾽ [q] ὁ [q] ἕτερος[4] οὐκ [r] οἰκοδομεῖται. 18. [p] εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου,[5] πάντων ὑμῶν [s] γλώσσαις[6] [s] λαλῶν[7].

f See x. 6. g Precisely thus, Bibl. *h.l.* See xvi. 17. Found in Joseph. and Philo. h N.T. *h.l.* in this sense, Sir. xii. 12; *cf.* Lk. xiv. 9 f. i Ver. 23 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 6; Acts iv. 13; Prov. vi. 8. See note below. k 2 Cor. i. 20; λεγ. αμην, Rev. v. 14, etc. l 2 Cor. xii. 21; Heb. viii. 1; Acts xi. 19. m 12 times in P.; Acts xxiv. 3; Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12; -τος, Col. iii. 15; -τεω, *passim* in P. n See i. 21. o See vii. 37. p See i. 4, and m above. Absol., see xi. 24 q See iv. 6. r See viii. 1. s See xiii. 1.

[1] Om. δε (?) BG, 46. Lachm. om.; Tr. and W.H. *bracket.*

[2] ευλογης, all uncc. but GKL.

[3] εν πνευματι (?): ℵcBDP, 73, cop. sah. W.H. *bracket.*

πνευματι (?), ℵ*AG, 17, latt. vg. syrr. So Tisch., Tr., W.H. *txt.*, R.V., Nestle. τῳ πνευματι: KL, etc., Chr., Thdrt.—as in ver. 15.

[4] εταιρος, G, syr^sch.—an obvious itacism; see Mt. xi. 16.

[5] *Om.* μου all pre-Syrian witnesses.

[6] γλωσσῃ (?), ℵADG, 17, latt. vg. So Lachm., Tr., Tisch., W.H. *marg.*, Nestle —perhaps borrowed from vv. 13 and 19 (? Western).

γλωσσαις (?), BKLP, etc., cop. syrr. So W.H. *txt.*

[7] λαλω, all uncc. but KL. The ptp. a grammatical emendation.

brought in opens a new point of view. "The *fruit* of the speaker is found in the profit of the hearer" (Thd.).—"The νοῦς is here, as distinguished from the πνεῦμα, the reflective and so-called discursive faculty, *pars intellectiva*, the human πνεῦμα *quatenus cogitat et intelligit*" (El.): see Beck's *Bibl. Psychology*, or Laidlaw's *Bib. Doctrine of Man*, *s.vv.;* and *cf.* notes on i. 10, ii. 16 above; also on Rom. vii. 23, 25. Religious feelings and activities—prayer in chief (Phil. iii. 3, Rom. i. 9, etc.)—take their rise in the spirit; normally, they pass upward into conception and expression through the intellect.

Ver. 15. It is the part of *nous* to share in and aid the exercises of *pneuma:* "What is (the case) then? I will pray with the spirit; but I will also pray with the understanding: I will sing with the spirit; but I will also sing with the understanding".—τί οὖν ἐστιν; "How then stands the matter?" (*Quid ergo est?* Vg.): one of the lively phrases of Greek dialogue; it "calls attention, with some little alacrity, to the upshot of what has just been said" (El.).—ψάλλω denoted, first, *playing on strings*, then *singing* to such accompaniment; Eph. v. 19 distinguishes this vb. from ᾄδω. Ed. thinks that instrumentation is implied; unless forbidden, Gr. Christians would be sure to grace their songs with music. Through its LXX use, esp. in the title Ψαλμοί, *t'hillîm* (Heb.), the word came to signify *the singing of praise to God;* but the connexion indicates a larger ref. than to the singing of the O.T. Psalms; it included the "improvised psalms which were sung in the Glossolalia, and could only be made intelligible by interpretation" (Mr.). Ecstatic utterance commonly falls into a kind of chant or rhapsody, without articulate words.

Ver. 16. "Since if thou bless (God) in spirit": πνευματι, anarthrous—"in *spirit*" *only* without understanding; *cf.* ἐὰν προσεύχ. γλώσσῃ, ver. 14.—Εὐλογέω (*cf.* x. 16, Matt. xiv. 19) is used elliptically, of *praise to God*, like εὐχαριστέω (17, xi. 24); it bears ref. to the *form*, as εὐχ. to the *matter* of thanksgiving; possibly P. alludes to the solemn act of praise at the Eucharist, this ellipsis being peculiar to blessing at *meals.*—ἐπεί (*cf.* v. 10, vii. 14) has its "usual causal and retrospective force, introducing the alternative" (El.; so *quandoquidem*, Bz.; *alioqui*, Cv.).—ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου, πῶς ἐρεῖ κ.τ.λ.; "he who fills the position of the unlearned, how will he say the Amen at thy thanksgiving?" P. does not here speak of ὁ ἰδιώτης simply (*cf.* 24), as meaning one unversed in Christianity; nor can this word, at so early a date, signify the *lay* Christian specifically (as the Ff. mostly read it); the man supposed "*holds the place* of one unversed" in the matter in question

19. ἀλλ' [t]ἐν [t]ἐκκλησίᾳ [u]θέλω πέντε λόγους διὰ [1] τοῦ [d]νοός [1] μου λαλῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους [v]κατηχήσω, [u]ἢ [w]μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ. 20. ἀδελφοί, μὴ [x]παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς [y]φρεσίν· ἀλλὰ [z]κακίᾳ τῇ [a b]νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ [y]φρεσὶ [b]τέλειοι γίνεσθε.

t See xi. 18; also ver. 4 above.
u θελω η (*malo*), N.T. *h.l.*; 2 Macc. xiv. 42. "A common formula" in cl. Gr., Wr., p. 302. *Cf.* Lk. xv. 7, xvii. 2; Mt. xviii. 9. Numb. xxii. 6; Tob. iii. 6, etc., LXX.
v Rom. ii. 18; Gal. vi. 6; Lk. i. 4; Acts xviii. 25, xxi. 21, 24.
w See iv. 15.
x In like sense, Mt. xi. 16. See νηπιος, iii. 6, xiii. 11.
y N.T. *h.l.* Prov xviii. 2.
z See v. 8.
a *H.l.*; see xiii. 11; in Homer, νηπιαχεύω.
b See ii. 6; for the contrast, iii. 1.

[1] **τῳ νοι μου**: all uncc. but KL. *Cf.* ver. 15.

being an ἰδιώτης γλώσσῃ (*cf.* 2 Cor. xi. 6): Thd. rightly paraphrases by **ἀμύητος**, *uninitiated*. In cl. Gr., **ἰδιώτης** means a *private person* in distinction from the State and its officers, then a *layman* as distinguished from the expert or professional man. The ptp. **ἀναπληρῶν**, *filling up* (see parls.), represents the **ἰδιώτης** as a necessary complement of the **γλωσσολαλῶν** (xii. 30). Hn. and others insist on the literal (local) sense of **τόπος**, as equivalent to **ἕδρα** not **τάξις**, supposing that the **ἰδιῶται** occupied a separate part of the assembly room; but this is surely to pre-date later usage.—The united "Amen" seals the thanksgiving pronounced by a single voice, making it the act of the Church—"*the* Amen," since this was the familiar formula taken over from Synagogue worship; *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 18 ff. On its ecclesiastical use, see El. *ad loc.*, and *Dict. of Christian Antiq. s.v.*—**ἐπειδὴ τί λέγεις οὐκ οἶδεν** = the **οὐδεὶς ἀκούει** of ver. 2. El. observes, "From this ver. it would seem to follow that at least some portions of early Christian worship were extempore". indeed, it is plain that extempore utterance prevailed in the Cor. Church (*cf.* 14 f.).

Ver. 17. "For thou indeed givest thanks well"—admirably, finely (**καλῶς**: *cf.* Luke xx. 39, James ii. 19): words *légèrement ironiques* (Gd.).—**εὐχαριστεῖς** = **εὐλογεῖς** (16: see note, also on i. 4).—**ὁ ἕτερος**, *i.e.*, the **ἰδιώτης** of ver. 16 signifies, as in iv. 6, x. 29; the pron. a distinct or even opposite person. P. estimates the devotions of the Church by a spiritually utilitarian standard; the abstractly beautiful is subordinated to the practically edifying: the like test is applied to a diff. matter in x. 23, 33.

Vv. 18, 19. Again (*cf.* 6, iv. 6, ix.) the Ap. uses *himself* for an instance in point. Even at Cor., where this charism was abundant, no one "speaks with tongues" (mark the pl. **γλώσσαις**) so largely as P. does on occasion; far from thinking lightly of the gift, he "thanks God" that he excels in it. 2 Cor. v. 13 and xii. 1-4 show that P. was rich in ecstatic experiences; *cf.* Gal. ii. 2, Acts ix. 12, xvi. 9, xxii. 17, xxvii. 23 f., etc.—The omission of **ὅτι** after **εὐχαριστῶ** is exceptional, but scarcely irregular; it belongs to conversational liveliness, and occurs occasionally after a number of the *verba declarandi* in cl. Gr.: *cf.* note on **δοκῶ κ.τ.λ.**, iv. 9; and see Wr., p. 683. The Vg., omitting **μᾶλλον**, reads *omnium vestrum lingua loquor*, making P. thank God that he could speak in every tongue used at Cor.; Jerome, in his Notes, refers the **μᾶλλον** *to the other App.*, as though P. exulted in being a better linguist than any of the Twelve!—**ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κ.τ.λ.**: "but in church-assembly (*cf.* note on ver. 4) I would (rather) utter five words with my understanding, that I might indeed instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue!"—**ἀλλὰ** contradicts the seeming implication of ver. 18—"but for all that": one might have supposed that P. would make much of a power in which he excels; on the contrary, he puts it aside and prefers to use every-day speech, as being *the more serviceable*; *cf.* for the sentiment, ix. 19-23, 2 Cor. i. 24, iv. 5, 12, 15, xi. 7, xiii. 9, 1 Thess. ii. 6 ff. With his Tongue P. might speak in solitude, "to himself and to God" (2, 28, 2 Cor. v. 13); amongst his brethren, his one thought is, how best to help and benefit *them*.—For **νοῦς** in contrast with **πνεῦμα**, see note on ver. 14; for its declension, *cf.* i. 10.—**κατηχέω** (see parls.) differs from **διδάσκω** as it connotes, usually at least, *oral* impartation ("ut alios *voce instituam*," Bz.), including here prophecy or doctrine (6). On **θέλω . . . ἤ**, dispensing with **μᾶλλον**, see parls.; *malim . . . quam*, Bz. For the rhetorical **μυρίους**, *cf.* iv. 15.

Ver. 20. P. has argued the superiority of intelligible speech, as a man of practical sense; he finally appeals to the good sense of his readers: "Brethren, be not

21. Ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται, "Ὅτι ἐν [c]ἑτερογλώσσοις[1] καὶ ἐν [d]χείλεσιν [e]ἑτέροις[2] λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, [f]καὶ οὐδ' [f]οὕτως [g]εἰσακούσονταί μου, λέγει Κύριος". 22. ὥστε αἱ [h]γλῶσσαι [i]εἰς [i]σημεῖόν εἰσιν οὐ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ [k]τοῖς [k]ἀπίστοις· ἡ δὲ

c Isa. xxviii. 11 f.; Ps. cxiii.[?] (Aquila). d Rom. iii. 13; Heb. xiii. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 10; Mt. xv. 8 (Isa. xxix. 13). e *Cf.* Acts ii. 4; Exod. xxx. 9. For gen. ετερων, *cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 8. f See xi. 28. g Heb. v. 7; Mt. vi. 7; Lk. i. 13; Acts x. 31; Deut. i. 43. h See xii. 10. i In like sense, Rom. iv. 11; Rev. xii. 1, 3, xv. 1; Mt. xxiv. 30; Lk. ii. 12, 34. εις σημ., Gen. ix. 13; Isa. xix. 20, lv. 13; Ezek. xx. 12. k See vi. 6.

[1] ετεραις γλωσσαις: G latt. vg. (*in aliis linguis et labiis aliis*) and Latt. Ff.

[2] ετερων: ℵAB, 17, 67**, 73. So crit. edd.

children in mind" (see parls.)—"in judgment" (Ed.), "the reasoning power on its reflective and discriminating side" (El.); φρένες differs from νοῦς much as φρόνιμος from σοφός (see notes to iv. 10, x. 15). Emulation and love of display were betraying this Church into a childishness the very opposite of that broad intelligence and enlightenment on which it plumed itself (i. 5, iv. 10, viii. 1, x. 15, etc.). "It is characteristic of the child to prefer the amusing to the useful, the shining to the solid" (Gd.). This is a keen reproof, softened, however, by the kindly ἀδελφοί ("suavem vim habet," Bg.).—γίνεσθε, "be in effect," "show yourselves"; *cf.* xi. 1, etc. "In malice, however, be *babes* (act the babe); but in mind show yourselves full-grown (men)".—For the force of the ending in νηπι-άζω, *cf.* πυρρ-άζω, *to redden*, Matt. xvi. 2; the vb. is based on νήπιος, a kind of superlative to παιδίον—"be (not boyish, but actually) childish" (Ed.), or "*infantile*, in malice". For the antithesis of τέλειος (= ἀνήρ) and νήπιος, see ii. 6, xiii. 9 ff., and parls. For κακία, *cf.* note on v. 8: P. desiderates the *affection* of the little child (see Eph. iv. 32 f., for the qualities opp. to κακία), as Jesus (in Matt. xviii. 1 ff.) its *simplicity and humbleness*. Gd. excellently paraphrases this ver.: "Si vous voulez être des enfants, à la bonne heure, pourvu que ce soit quant à la malice; mais, quant à l'intelligence, avancez de plus en plus vers la maturité complète".

§ 47. The Strange Tongues an Occasion of Unbelief, xiv. 21-25. The Ap. has striven to wean the Cor. from their childish admiration of the Tongues by showing how unedifying they are in comparison with Prophecy. The Scripture quoted to confirm his argument (21) ascribes to this kind of manifestation a *punitive* character. Through an alien voice the Lord speaks to those refusing to hear, by way of "sign to the unbelieving" (22). These abnormal utterances neither instruct the Church nor convert the world. The unconverted see in them the symptoms of *madness* (23). Prophecy has an effect far different; it searches every heart, and compels the most prejudiced to acknowledge the presence of God in the Christian assembly (24 f.).

Ver. 21. This O.T. citation is adduced not by way of Scriptural proof, but in solemn asseveration of what P. has intimated, to his readers' surprise, respecting the inferiority of the Glossolalia; *cf.* the manner of quotation in i. 19, ii. 9, iii. 19. The passage of Isaiah reveals a principle applying to all such modes of speech on God's part. The title ὁ νόμος Jewish usage extended to Scripture at large; see Rom. iii. 19, John x. 34. P. shows here his independence of the LXX: the first clause, ὅτι . . . τούτῳ, follows the Heb., only turning the prophet's third person ("He will speak") into the first, thus appropriating the words to God (λέγει Κύριος); Origen's Hexapla and Aquila's Gr. Version run in almost the same terms (El.). Paul's second clause, καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακούσονταί μου, is *based on* the latter clause of ver. 12 (translated precisely in the LXX, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ἀκούειν), but with a new turn of meaning drawn from the general context: he omits as irrelevant the former part of ver. 12. The original is therefore condensed, and somewhat adapted. Hf. and Ed. discuss at length the Pauline application of Isaiah's thought. According to the true interpretation of Isa. xxviii. 9 ff. (see Cheyne, Delitzsch, or Dillmann *ad loc.*), the drunken Israelites are mocking in their cups the teaching of God through His prophet, as though it were only fit for an infant school; in anger therefore He threatens to give His lessons through

[l] προφητεία οὐ [k] τοῖς [k] ἀπίστοις, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν. 23. ἐὰν οὖν [m] συνέλθῃ[1] [n] ἡ [n] ἐκκλησία [n] ὅλη [m] ἐπὶ τὸ [m] αὐτὸ καὶ πάντες [h] γλώσσαις[2] [h] λαλῶσιν,[2] εἰσέλθωσι δὲ [o] ἰδιῶται ἢ [k] ἄπιστοι, οὐκ ἐροῦσιν ὅτι [p] μαίνεσθε; 24. ἐὰν δὲ πάντες [q] προφητεύωσιν, εἰσέλθῃ δέ τις [k] ἄπιστος ἢ [o] ἰδιώτης, [r] ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων, [s] ἀνακρίνεται

l See xii. 10. m See xi. 20. n Rom. xvi. 23; Acts v. 11, xv. 22. o See ver. 16. p Acts xii. 15, xxvi. 24 f.; Jo. x. 20; Jer. xxxvi. 26; Wisd. xiv. 28. q See xi. 5. r Eph. v. 11, 13; five times in Pastt.: Jo. iii. 20, viii. 46, xvi. 8, etc.; -γμος, 2 Tim. iii. 16. s See ii. 14.

[1] ελθῃ: BG^gr. **συν** easily lost in foregoing **ουν**.

[2] **λαλωσιν γλωσσαις** (in this order): all uncc. but DKL. G has **λαλησωσιν**. D puts **παντες** last.

the lips of foreign conquerors (11), in whose speech the despisers of the mild, plain teaching of His servants (12) shall painfully spell out their ruin. The **ὅτι** (*kī*) is part of the citation: "For in men of alien tongue and in lips of aliens I will speak to this people; and not even thus will they hearken to me, saith the Lord". God spoke to Israel through the strange Assyrian tongue *in retribution*, not to confirm their faith but to consummate their unbelief. The Glossolalia may serve a similar melancholy purpose in the Church. This analogy does not support, any more than that of vv. 10 f. (see notes), the notion that the Tongues of Corinth were foreign languages.—**εἰσακούω**, *to hear with attention, effect*, shares the meaning of **ὑπακούω** (*obedio*) in the LXX and in cl. Gr.

Ver. 22. The real point of the above citation from Isaiah comes out in **ὥστε αἱ γλῶσσαι εἰς σημεῖόν κ.τ.λ.**, "And so the tongues are for a sign not to the believing, but to the unbelievers"—*sc.* to "those who will not hear," who having rejected other modes of instruction find their unbelief confirmed, and even justified (23*b*), by this phenomenon. This interpretation (*cf.* Matt. xvi. 4; and for **εἰς σημεῖον** in the judicial sense, Is. viii. 18) is dictated by the logical connexion of vv. 21, 22, which forbids the thought of *a convincing and saving sign*, read into this passage by Cm. and many others. P. desires to quench rather than stimulate the Cor. ardour for Tongues.—**ἡ δὲ προφητεία κ.τ.λ.**, "while prophecy on the other hand" (**δέ**) serves the opposite purpose—it "(is for a sign) not to the unbelievers, but to the believing". **οἱ πιστεύοντες** implies the act continued into a habit (*cf.* i. 21); **οἱ ἄπιστοι**, the determinate character. For **ὥστε** with ind., see note on iii. 7.

Ver. 23 shows the disastrous impression which the exercise of the Tongues, carried to its full extent, must make upon men outside—a result that follows (**οὖν**) from the aforesaid intention of the gift (22): "If then the entire Church should assemble together and all should be speaking with tongues, but there should enter uninstructed persons or unbelievers, will they not say that *you are mad!*" If the Tongues are, as many Cor. think, the highest manifestation of the Spirit, then to have the whole Church simultaneously so speaking would be the *ne plus ultra* of spiritual power; but, in fact, the Church would then resemble nothing so much as a congregation of lunatics! A *reductio ad absurdum* for the fanatical coveters of Tongues.—The **ἰδιῶται** (here unqualified: otherwise in 16; *cf.* note) are persons *unacquainted with Christianity* (altogether uninitiated) and receiving their first impression of it in this way, whereas the **ἄπιστοι** are rejectors of the faith. The impression made upon either party will be the same. The effect here imagined is altogether diff. from that of the Day of Pentecost, when the "other tongues" spoke intelligibly to those religiously susceptible amongst non-believers (Acts ii. 11 ff.). The imputation of *madness* from men of the world P. earnestly deprecates (Acts xxvi. 24 f.).—Ed. renders **ἰδιῶται** "separatists"—unattached Christians; but this interpretation wants lexical support, and is out of keeping with ver. 16: did any such class of Christians then exist?

Vv. 24, 25. How diff. (**δέ**) and how blessed the result, "if all should be prophesying and there should enter some unbeliever or stranger to Christianity (**ἰδιώτης**: see previous note), he is convicted by all, he is searched by all, the secret things of his heart become manifest; and so he will fall on his face and worship God, reporting that verily God is among you!" This brings out two further notes of eminence in the charism of

ὑπὸ πάντων· 25. καὶ[1] οὕτω[1] [t] τὰ [t] κρυπτὰ τῆς [t] καρδίας αὐτοῦ [u] φανερὰ [u] γίνεται· καὶ [v] οὕτω [w] πεσὼν [w] ἐπὶ [w] πρόσωπον [x] προσκυνήσει τῷ Θεῷ, [y] ἀπαγγέλλων ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς[1] [z] ὄντως[2] ἐν ὑμῖν ἐστι.

26. [a] Τί [a] οὖν ἐστιν, ἀδελφοί; ὅταν [b] συνέρχησθε, ἕκαστος ὑμῶν[3] [c] ψαλμὸν ἔχει, [d] διδαχὴν ἔχει, [e] γλῶσσαν[4] ἔχει, [d] ἀποκάλυψιν[4] ἔχει,

t See iv. 5. With καρδ., 1 Pet. iii. 4
u See xi. 19.
v See xi. 28; ver. 21 above.
w Mt. xvii. 6, xxvi. 39; Lk. v. 12, xvii. 16; Rev. xi. 16; Numb. xvi. 4, xx. 6.
x *H.l.* in P., with Acts xxiv. 11. Freq. in GG. and Rev.
y 1 Th. i. 9; Heb. ii. 12; 1 Jo. i. 2 f.; GG. and Acts, *passim*; Gen. xiv. 13.
z Gal. iii. 21; four times in 1 Tim.; four in GG.
a See ver. 15.
b See xi. 18.
c Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16; Isa. lxvi. 20. βιβλ. ψ., Lk. xx. 42, xxiv. 44; Acts i. 20, xiii. 33. *Cf.* ver. 15.
d See ver. 6.
e See xii. 10. *Cf.* ερμηνευτης, ver. 28.

[1] *Om.* **και ουτω** all pre-Syrian witnesses, including vg.

[2] **οντως ο Θεος** (in this order): all pre-Syrian uncc. Om. **ο** ℵ*D*G: so Tisch., but not other edd.: probably a Western error: the **ο** easily lost between **ς** and **θ** in uncial script.

[3] *Om.* **υμων** ℵ*AB, 17, cop. So crit. edd. Obvious grammatical addition.

[4] **αποκαλυψιν . . . γλωσσαν** (in this order): all uncc. but L. K and many minn. om. **γλωσσ. εχει**, a few copies om. **αποκαλ. εχει**, by homœoteleuton.

Prophecy when compared with Tongues: (1) The former edifies the Church (3 ff.); (2) it employs a man's rational powers (14-19); (3) it can be exercised safely *by the whole Church*, and (4) *to the conversion of sinners*. That "all" should "prophesy" is a part of the Messianic ideal, the earnest of which was given in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost: see Num. xi. 23-29, Joel ii. 28, Acts. ii. 4, 15 ff.; the speaking of Pentecost Peter *identifies* with prophesying, whereas P. emphatically *distinguishes* the Cor. Glossolalia therefrom. Prophecy is an inspired utterance proceeding from a supernatural intuition, which penetrates "the things of the man," "the secrets of his heart," no less than "the things of God" (ii. 10 ff.): the light of heart-searching knowledge and speech, proceeding from every believer, is concentrated on the unconverted man as he enters the assembly. His conscience is probed on all sides; he is pierced and overwhelmed with the sense of his sin (*cf.* John iv. 29, also i. 48, viii. 9, Acts viii. 18 ff., xxiv. 25). This form of Prophecy abides in the Church, as the normal instrument for "convicting the world of sin" (John xvi. 8 ff.); it belongs potentially to "all" Christians, and is in fact the reaction of the Spirit of Christ in them upon the unregenerate (*cf.* John xx. 22 f.); **ἐλέγχεται** is the precise word of John xvi. 8.—**Ἀνακρίνω** (see ii. 14 and parls.) denotes not *to judge*, but *to put on trial*, *to sift judicially*. God alone, through Christ, is the judge of "the heart's secrets" (iv. 5, Rom. ii. 16); but the God-taught word of man throws a searching light into these recesses. In ver. 24 the **ἄπιστος** precedes the **ἰδιώτης** (*cf.* 23), since in his case the arresting effect of Prophecy is the more signal.—**προσκυνήσει** and **ὄντως ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.** are a reminiscence of Is. xlv. 14, following the Heb. txt. rather than the LXX (*cf.* note on 21).—**ἀπ-αγγέλλων**, "taking word away," *reporting*, *proclaiming abroad* (*cf.* parls.), thus diffusing the impression he has received (*cf.* John iv. 29).—**ὄντως** (*revera*, Cv.), *really*, *in very deed*—contradicts denials of God's working in Christianity, such as the **ἄπιστος** himself formerly had made.—**πεσών** (aor. ptp., of an act leading up to that of principal vb. and forming part of the same movement) indicates the prostration of a soul suddenly overpowered by the Divine presence. To convince men that "God is in the midst of her" is the true success of the Church.

§ 48. Self-Control in Religious Exercises, xiv. 26-33. The enquiry of the Cor. as to whether Tongues or Prophecy is the charism more to be coveted is now disposed of. P. supplements his answer by giving in the two last paragraphs of this chap. certain directions of a more general bearing relative to the conduct of Church meetings, which arise from the whole teaching of chh. xi.-xiv.: see the *Introd.* to Div. iv.

Ver. 26. **τί οὖν ἐστίν** (*cf.* 15), **ἀδελφοί**; "How then stands the case, brothers?" **οὖν** is widely resumptive, taking in the whole state of the Cor. Church as now reviewed, with esp. ref. to its abundance of charisms, amongst which Tongues and Prophecy are conspicuous; *edifica-*

ἑρμηνείαν[1] ἔχει· πάντα [f] πρὸς [f g] οἰκοδομὴν γενέσθω.[2] 27. [h] εἴτε γλώσσῃ τις λαλεῖ, [i] κατὰ δύο ἢ [k] τὸ [k] πλεῖστον τρεῖς καὶ [l] ἀνὰ [l] μέρος, καὶ εἷς [m] διερμηνευέτω· 28. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ᾖ [n] διερμηνευτής,[3]

f Ver. 12. For προς, Jo. xi. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 12.
g See ver. 3.
h Single, h.l.; completed by προφ. δε, in *oratio variata*.
i Distrib. with numb., Mk. vi. 40; *cf.* ver. 31. So ανα, Lk. ix. 3, x. 1; John ii. 6.
k The phrase, *h.l.*; πλειστος, Mt. xi. 20, xxi. 8; Mk. iv. 1.
l *H.l.*; *ανα μερος ᾳδειν*, Polyb. iv. 20. 10. Diff. from εκ μερους, xiii. 9; and απο μερους, Rom. xi. 25
m See xii. 30.
n *H.l.* See txtl. note.

[1] DG, διερμην[ε]ιαν; ADL, -ιαν for -ειαν, a common itacism.

[2] γινεσθω: all uncc., and all but a few minn.

[3] ερμηνευτης: B, with DG (which prefix ο). So Lachm., Tr., W.H. *marg.* διερμηνευτης: ℵAD^b,c KL, etc., Chr., Euthal., etc.; "vox apud antiquos Græcos non usitata" (Tisch.).

tion must once more be insisted on as the true aim of them all.—**ὅταν συνέρχησθε**, "whensoever you assemble" (*cf.* xi. 18 ff.): here *pr.*; the *aor.* of ver. 23 referred to particular occasions.—"Each has a psalm (to sing)—a teaching, a revelation (to impart)—a tongue, an interpretation (to give)." The succession of the objects of **ἔχει** perhaps reflects the order commonly pursued in the Church meetings. For **ἕκαστος**, *cf.* i. 12, etc.: every Cor. Christian has his faculty; there is no lack of gifts for utterance or readiness to use them; *cf.* i. 5, also iv. 6 ff. This exuberance made the difficulty; all wanted to speak at once—women as well as men (34); **ἔχει**, *in promptu habet* (Mr.)—"iteratum, eleganter exprimit divisam donorum copiam" (Bg.). The **ψαλμὸς** might be an original song (though not chanted unintelligibly, **ἐν γλώσσῃ**—the latter is enumerated distinctly: see note on **ψαλῶ**, 15), or an O.T. Psalm Christianly interpreted (see parls.); similarly Philo, *De Vita Cont.*, § 10, describing the Therapeutæ, **ὁ ἀναστὰς ὑμῶν ὕμνον ᾄδει εἰς τ. Θεόν, ἢ καινὸν αὐτὸς πεποιηκώς, ἢ ἀρχαῖόν τινα τῶν πάλαι ποιητῶν.** For N.T. psalms, see Luke i., ii., Rev. iv. 11, v. 9 f., 12 f., xv. 3 f.—**διδαχὴ** and **ἀποκάλυψις** (see 6 above; xii. 28 f.), the two leading forms of Christian edification. Beside the **γλῶσσα** is set the complementary **ἑρμηνία**, by which it is utilised for the Church: *cf.* xii. 10, 30; and vv. 1-19 *passim*.—**πάντα πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω** (pr. impv.), "Let everything be carried on with a view to edification".

Vv. 27, 28. The maxim **πρὸς τ. οἰκοδομὴν κ.τ.λ.** is applied to Tongues and Prophecy, as the two main competing gifts: "Whether any one speaks with a tongue (let them speak: *sc.* **λαλείτωσαν**) to the number of two (**κατὰ δύο**), or at the most three" (at one meeting)—"fiat per binos, aut ad plurimum ternos" (Bz.).—**καὶ ἀνὰ μέρος**, "and in turn," *idque vicissim* (Cv.)—not all confusedly speaking at once. Ed. ingeniously renders the **κατὰ** and **ἀνὰ** clauses "by two or at most three together, and in turns" (antiphonally), as though the Tongues could be combined in a *duet*—"the beginning of Church music and antiphonal singing amongst Christians": but this does not comport with the ecstatic nature of the Glossolalia; moreover, the sense thus given to the second clause would be properly expressed by **ἐν μέρει**, not **ἀνὰ μέρος** (Hn.).—"And let one person interpret": whether one of the **γλωσσολαλοῦντες** (13), or some one else present (**ἄλλος**, xii. 10); the use of several interpreters at the same meeting might occasion delay or confusion. "If however there be no interpreter (present), let him (the speaker with the Tongue) keep silence in the Church, but let him talk to himself and to God": unless his utterance can be translated, he must refrain in public, and be content to enjoy his charism in solitude and in secret converse with God (*cf.* 2 ff.); the instruction to "speak *in his heart, noiselessly*" (so Cm., Est., Hf.) would be contrary to **λαλεῖν**, and indeed to the nature of a *tongue*. "**ᾖ** for cl. **παρῇ**, *sit* for *adsit*; *cf.* Luke v. 17; *Iliad* ix. 688" (Ed.).

Vv. 29, 30. **προφῆται δὲ δύο ἢ τρεῖς κ.τ.λ.**: "But in the case of prophets, let two or three speak, and let the others discern" (*dijudicent*, Vg.). In form this sentence varies from the parl. clause respecting the Tongues (27); see Wr., p. 709, on the frequency of *oratio variata* in P., due to his vivacity and conversational freedom; the anarthrous **προφῆται** is quasi-hypothetical, in contrast with **γλώσσῃ τις λαλεῖ**—not "the prophets," but "supposing they (the speakers) be prophets, let them speak, etc." The

[o] σιγάτω [p] ἐν [p] ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἑαυτῷ δὲ λαλείτω καὶ τῷ Θεῷ. 29. [q] προφῆται δὲ δύο ἢ τρεῖς λαλείτωσαν, καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι [1] [r] διακρινέτωσαν· 30. ἐὰν δὲ ἄλλῳ [s] ἀποκαλυφθῇ καθημένῳ, ὁ πρῶτος [o] σιγάτω· 31. δύνασθε γὰρ [t] καθ' [t] ἕνα πάντες [u] προφητεύειν, ἵνα πάντες [v] μανθάνωσι καὶ πάντες [w] παρακαλῶνται· 32. καὶ [x] πνεύματα [2] [q x] προφητῶν

o Rom. xvi. 25; six times in Lk. and Acts. For change of subject, see Wr., p. 787.
p See xi. 18.
q See xii. 29.
r See vi. 5. s See ii. 10. t See ver. 27. For καθ' ενα, add Eph. v. 33; Jo. xxi. 25; καθ' εις, Rom. xii. 5; Mk. xiv. 19; Jo. viii. 9. u See xi. 5. v Absol., Col. i. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 7; Mt. xi. 29; Jo. vi. 45. w Frequent throughout P.; in Acts rarely; in GG., only Lk. iii. 18 with this sense. x Rev. xxii. 6. πνευματα, see xii. 10.

[1] Om. **οι αλλοι** D*GL—an example of Western license.

[2] **πνευμα**, DG, 67**, latt. (*not* vg.), syr^sch., Epiph., Latt. Ff.

number to prophesy at any meeting is limited to "two or three," like that of the Tongue-speakers; the condition **ἀνὰ μέρος** (27) is self-evident, where edification is consciously intended (3, etc.). "The others" are the other *prophets* present, who were competent to speak (31); these silent prophets may employ themselves in the necessary "discernment of spirits" (see xii. 10)—**διακρινέτωσαν**, acting as critics of the revelations given through their brethren. The powers of **προφητεία** and **διάκρισις** appear to have been frequently combined, like those of artist and art-critic. It is noticed that in the *Didachê* a contrary instruction to this (and to 1 Thess. v. 20 f.) is given: **πάντα προφήτην λαλοῦντα ἐν πνεύματι οὐ πειράσετε οὐδὲ διακρινεῖτε.**—The above regulation implies pre-arrangement amongst the speakers; but this must not hinder the free movement of the Spirit; if a communication be made *ex tempore* to a silent prophet, the speaker should give way to him: "But if anything be revealed to another seated" (the prophesier *stood*, as in Synagogue reading and exhortation: Luke iv. 1, Acts xiii. 16), "let the first be silent". **σιγάτω** does not command (as **σιγησάτω** might) an *instant* cessation; "some token would probably be given, by motion or gesture, that an **ἀποκάλυψις** had been vouchsafed to another of the **προφῆται**; this would be a sign to the speaker to close his address, and to let the newly illumined succeed to him" (El.). Even inspired prophets might speak too long and require to be stopped!

Ver. 31. By economy of time, every one who has the prophetic gift may exercise it in turn; so the Church will enjoy, in variety of exhortation, the full benefit of the powers of the Spirit conferred on all its members: "For you can (in this way) all prophesy one by one (**καθ' ἕνα**: *singulatim*, Cv.), in order that all may learn and all may be encouraged". Stress lies on the repeated **πάντες** (*cf.* xii. 12 f.): let *every* prophet get his turn, and *every* hearer will receive benefit (*cf.* 26*b*); even if the Church members were all prophets, as Paul imagined in ver. 24, and thinks desirable (1-5), by due arrangement, and self-suppression on the part of the eloquent, all might be heard.

Ver. 32. The maxim **πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται,** is coupled by **καὶ** to ver. 31 under the regimen of **γάρ**; it gives the *subjective*, as ver. 31 the main *objective*, reason why the prophets should submit to regulation. "How can I prophesy *to order?*" one of them might ask; "how restrain the Spirit's course in me?" The Ap. replies: "(for) also the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets"; this Divine gift is put under the control and responsibility of the possessor's will, that it may be exercised with discretion and brotherly love, for its appointed ends. An *unruly prophet* is therefore no genuine prophet; he lacks one of the necessary marks of the Holy Spirit's indwelling (see 33, 37). This kind of subjection could hardly be ascribed to the ecstatic Glossolalia. On the pl. **πνεύματα,** signifying manifold forms or distributions (xii. 4, 11) of the Spirit's power, see note on xii. 10.—**ὑποτάσσεται** is the pr. of a general truth: "a Gnomic Present" (Bn., § 12); *cf.* iii. 13, 2 Cor. ix. 7.

Ver. 33. The apophthegm of ver. 32 exemplifies the universal principle of order in God's works; *cf.* the deduction drawn in xi. 3. God's gift of the Spirit submits itself to the receiver's will, through whose direction its exercise is brought into regulated and edifying use: "For God is not (a God) of disorder (or *seditionis*, Cv.), but of peace". To suppose that God inspires His prophets

[q] προφήταις [y] ὑποτάσσεται· 33. οὐ γάρ ἐστιν [z] ἀκαταστασίας ὁ [a] Θεὸς ἀλλ' [a] εἰρήνης, ὡς ἐν [b] πάσαις ταῖς [b] ἐκκλησίαις [c] τῶν [c] ἁγίων.[1]

34.[2] Αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν[3] ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις [e] σιγάτωσαν· οὐ γὰρ [d] ἐπιτέτραπται[4] αὐταῖς λαλεῖν ἀλλὰ [y] ὑποτάσσεσθαι,[5] καθὼς καὶ

y xv. 27 f., xvi. 16. 15 times besides in P.; thrice in Lk. (πνευματα υποτασσ., x. 20); four exx. in Heb.; one in Jas.; six in 1 Pet. Prov. xxi. 8; Tob. iv. 13. -τος, Jas. i. 8.
z 2 Cor. vi. 5, xii. 20; Lk. xxi. 9; Jas. iii. 16;
a 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; 1 Th. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20; 2 Th. iii. 16 (ὁ κυρ. τ. ειρ.).
b See vii. 17.
c See vi. 1.
d Impers. pass., Acts xxvi. 1, xxviii. 16. See also xvi. 7; 1 Tim. ii. 12, Acts xxi. 39.

[1] ℵ by its punctuation distinctly attaches **ως . . . αγιων** to ver. 33. So Chr. and Ff.; so also the crit. edd., exc. Tisch., Weiss, W.H. *marg.* See note below.

[2] DG and several Latin authorities read vv. 34, 35 after 40.

[3] *Om.* **υμων** ℵAB, 17, vg. cop., Or., Mcion., Cyp.

[4] **επιτρεπεται**, all uncc. but KL.

[5] **υποτασσεσθωσαν**: ℵAB, 17, 73, syr[sch]. cop. basm., Mcion. **υποτασσεσθαι**: DGKL, latt. vg.—a Western emendation.

to speak two or three at a time, to make a tumult in the Church and refuse control, would be to suppose Him the author of confusion, of chaos instead of cosmos. —**ἀκαταστασία** (see parls.) is a word of the LXX and later Gr., denoting civil disorder or mutiny; it recalls the **σχίσματα** and **ἔριδες** of i. 10 f., xi. 18 f., to which emulation in the display of spiritual powers seems to have contributed.—"As it is in all the Churches of the saints": in evidence of the "peace" which God confers on human society, P. can point to the conduct of Church meetings in all other Christian communities—a feature proper to "assemblies *of the saints*". Here is a final and solemn reason why the prophets of Cor. should practise self-control and mutual deference: *cf.* xi. 16; also i. 2*b*, and note; xvi. 1.—On the connexion of the **ὡς** clause, see Ed. or El. W.H. attach it to ver. 31, regarding vv. 32, 33*a* as a parenthesis; but this breaks the continuity of vv. 31, 32; nor does it appear that "all the churches" had the superabundance of prophets that necessitated the restrictions imposed in vv. 29-31. Other leading editors (Tisch., Mr., Hn., Hf., Bt., Gd.) link this qualification to the following context; but it comes in clumsily before the impv. of ver. 34, and the repetition of **ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις** is particularly awkward. On the other hand, the ref. to the example of the other Churches appropriately concludes the Apostle's appeals on the weighty subject, of universal interest, which has occupied him throughout this chapter.

§ 49. Final Instructions on Church Order, xiv. 34-40. In vv. 34 ff. P. returns to the matter which he first touched upon in reproving the disorderly Church life at Cor., *viz.*, the irregular behaviour of certain Christian women (xi. 2-16): there it was their *dress*, now it is their *tongue* that he briefly reproves. Vv. 37 f., glancing over the injunctions of Div. IV. at large, commend their recognition as a test of the high pretensions to spiritual insight made at Cor. Ver. 39 recapitulates Paul's deliverance on the vexed question of Tongues *versus* Prophecy. Ver. 40 adds the final maxim of *propriety and order*,—a rule of administration as comprehensive and important as the **πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν** of ver. 26.

Ver. 34. **Αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν**: "Let women (Gr. generic art.) keep silence in the church assemblies, for it is not allowed them to speak"; *cf.* 1 Tim. ii. 12, where the "speaking" of this passage is defined as "teaching, or using authority over a man". The contradiction between this veto and the language of xi. 5, which assumes that women "pray" and "prophesy" in gatherings of Christians and forbids their doing so "with uncovered head," is relieved by supposing (*a*) that in xi. 5 P. refers to *private gatherings* (so Cv., Bg., Mr., Bt., Ev., El.), or means specifically *at home* (Hf.), while here speaking **ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ** is forbidden (35); but there is nothing in ch. xi. to indicate this distinction, which *ex hyp.* is vital to the matter; moreover, at this early date, the distinction between public and private Christian meetings—in *church* or *house*—was very imperfectly developed. Or (*b*), the instances admitted in xi. 5 were *exceptional*, "où la femme se sentirait

ὁ νόμος λέγει· 35.[1] εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν[2] θέλουσιν, [e]ἐν [e]οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας [f]ἐπερωτάτωσαν· [g]αἰσχρὸν γάρ ἐστι γυναιξὶν[3] [h]ἐν [h]ἐκκλησίᾳ[4] λαλεῖν.[4] 36. ἢ ἀφ' ὑμῶν ὁ [i]λόγος τοῦ [i]Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν; ἢ [k]εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους [k]κατήντησεν; 37. εἴ τις [l]δοκεῖ [m]προφήτης εἶναι ἢ [n]πνευματικός, [o]ἐπιγινωσκέτω ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν, [o]ὅτι τοῦ[5]

e See xi. 34. f Rom. x. 20 (Isa. lxv. 1); in GG. freq. g See xi. 6. h See xi. 18. i 2 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 2; Rom. ix. 6; Phil. i. 14; Col. i. 25; 1 Th. ii. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 9; Tit. ii. 5; occasional in other Epp.; freq. in Syn. GG. and Acts. k See x. 11. l See iii. 18. m See xii. 28; sing. thus, Acts xxi. 10; Tit. i. 12 (?). n See ii. 15. o 2 Cor. i. 14, xiii. 5; Acts iii. 10, iv. 13. For vb., see xiii. 12.

[1] DG and several Latin authorities read vv. 34, 35 after 40.

[2] **μαθειν**: ℵ[c]BDGKL, etc. So all edd. except W.H., who put **μανθανειν** (?) in *txt.*, following ℵ*A[2], 17, and a few other minn. with Greg.[Nyss.], and **μαθ.** in *marg.*

[3] **γυναικι**: ℵAB, 17, 73, vg., cop. basm.

[4] **λαλειν εν εκκλησιᾳ** (in this order): ℵAB, 17. GL, and a few others, **εν εκκλησιαις** (*cf.* ver. 34).

[5] *Om.* **του** all but a few minn.; *cf.* vii. 19.

pressée de donner essor à un élan extraordinaire de l'Esprit" (Gd.): but **πᾶσα γυνή** (xi. 5) suggests frequent occurrence. (*c*) Hn. supposes *participation in the ecstatic manifestations* forbidden, as though **γλώσσῃ** were understood with **λαλεῖν.** (*d*) Ed. thinks the tacit *permission* of xi. 5 here *withdrawn*, on maturer consideration. But (*e*), in view of the words that follow, "but let them *be subject*" and "if they want *to learn*" (contrasted with **λαλεῖν** by **δέ**), and on comparison with the more explicit language of 1 Tim. ii. 12, in view moreover of the principle affirmed in ch. xi. 3 ff., it appears probable that P. is thinking of *Church-teaching and authoritative direction* as a rôle unfit for women.—**ὑποτασσέσθωσαν** is the keynote of Paul's doctrine on the subject (*cf.* also Eph. v. 22 ff., etc.). This command cannot fairly be set aside as a temporary regulation due to the state of ancient society. If the Ap. was right, there is a **ὑποτάσσεσθαι** which lies in the nature of the sexes and the plan of creation; but this must be understood with the recollection of what *Christian subjection* is (see Gal. v. 13*b*, Eph. v. 22 ff.; also note on xi. 3 above).—What "the law says" was evidently in Paul's mind when he grounded his doctrine in ch. xi. on the O.T. story of the creation of Man and Woman. For Jewish sentiment in the matter, see Wetstein *ad loc.*, Vitringa, *Synag.*, p. 724; Schöttgen, *Hor.*, p. 658. For Gr. feeling, *cf.* Soph., *Ajax*, 293, **γυναιξὶ κόσμον ἡ σιγὴ φέρει** (Ed.); for Early Church rule, *Const. Apost.*, iii. 6, *Conc. Carthag.*, iv. 99 (quoted by El.).

Ver. 35. **εἰ δέ τι θέλουσιν μανθάνειν**: "But if they want to *learn* something" —if this is the motive that prompts them to speak. This plea furnishes an excuse, consistent with the submission enjoined, for women raising their voices in the Church meetings; but even so P. deprecates the liberty. As between **μανθάνειν** and **μαθεῖν** after **θέλω** and the like, El. thus distinguishes: "when attention is directed to the procedure of the action specified, the pr. is commonly used; when simply to the action itself, the aor." —In bidding the Cor. women of enquiring minds to "ask at home of their own husbands," P. is laying down a general rule, not disposing of all cases that might arise; since the impv. of ver. 35 admits of exceptions, so may that of ver. 34: the utterances of Pentecost (Acts ii. 4) proceeded from "all," both men and women (*cf.* 18 f.); there is also the notable instance of Philip's "four daughters which did prophesy" (Acts. xxi. 9). At Cor. there was a disposition to put men and women on an equal footing in public speaking and Church leadership; this is stigmatized as **αἰσχρὸν** (*turpe, inhonestum; cf.* xi. 6, 13 ff.); it shocks moral feeling. For **ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ**, see xi. 18.

Ver. 36. The Ap. adds the authority of Christian usage to that of natural instinct (*cf.* the connexion of xi. 14 and 16), in a tone of indignant protest: "Or (is it) from *you* (that) the word of God went out? or to *you only* did it reach?" —*i.e.*, "Neque primi, neque soli estis Christiani" (Est.). The Cor. acted without thinking of any but themselves, as though they were the one Church in the world, or might set the fashion to all the rest (see note on i. 2*b*; also 33 above, and xi. 16). For the self-sufficiency of this

[p] Κυρίου εἰσὶν[1] [p] ἐντολαί[1]· 38. εἰ δέ τις [q] ἀγνοεῖ, [q] ἀγνοείτω.[2] 39. Ὥστε, ἀδελφοί,[3] [r] ζηλοῦτε τὸ [s] προφητεύειν, καὶ τὸ [t] λαλεῖν[4] [t] γλώσσαις[5] [u] μὴ [u] κωλύετε.[5] 40. πάντα[6] [v] εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ [w] τάξιν γινέσθω.

p Lk. i. 6. εντ. Θ., see vii. 19. Cf. also ix. 14, vii. 40, ii. 16.
q 2 Cor. vi. 9 (pass.); Rom. ii. 4, vi. 3, vii. 1, x. 3; Gal. i. 22 (pass.); 1 Tim. i. 13. See also x. 1. Six times in N.T. besides (see esp. 2 Pet. ii. 12). Sir. v. 15.
r See xii. 31.
s See xi. 5.
t See xiii. 1.
u Mt. xix. 14, etc. For κωλ. in P., Rom. i. 13; 1 Th. ii. 16; 1 Tim. iv. 3.
v Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Th. iv. 12; -μων, see xii. 24; -οσυνη, xii. 23.
w Col. ii. 5; Lk. i. 8; Heb. v. 6, etc.; Job xxxviii. 12. Contrast ατακτος, -ως, 1 Th. v. 14; 2 Th. iii. 6, 11. Cf. xv. 23.

[1] **εστιν εντολη**: ℵAB, 17, cop., Aug. (ℵc, **εντ. εστ.**). D*G, 14, Or., Hil., Ambrst., **εστιν** simply (Western); so Tisch. **εισιν εντολαι**: Syrian emendation.

[2] **αγνοειται** (?): ℵ*A*D*G, Or., latt. vg., Amb., Ambrst., Hil.; so Lachm., Tr. *marg.*, Tisch., W.H. *txt.*, R.V. *marg.*, Nestle. Possibly a Western corruption. αγνοειτω (?): ℵcA²BDbc, etc.; retained by Tr. *txt.*, R.V. *txt.*, W.H. *marg.* See note below.

[3] **αδελφοι μου**: ℵAB*, 67**, syrr. cop. Om. **μου** Western and Syrian.

[4] **εν γλωσσαις**: BD*G, cop., Tr. *marg.*

[5] **το λαλειν μη κωλυετε γλωσσαις** (in this order): ℵABP, 17, 73—conformed by Western and Syrian edd. to usual order.

[6] **παντα δε**: all uncc. but KL.

church, *cf.* iv. 6 ff., v. 2. On **καταντάω εἰς**, see x. 11.—**ἢ** links this ver. with the foregoing, "Or (if what I have said is not sufficient), etc."

Vv. 37, 38. **ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν**, in the apodosis, includes, beside the last particular (34 ff.), the other instructions of this Ep.; **προφήτης** and **πνευματικὸς** in the protasis recall esp. the directions of chh. xii.-xiv.: *cf.* xi. 4, xii. 1, xiv. 1.—**δοκεῖ**, as in iii. 18 (see note), is *putat, sibi videtur* (not *videtur* alone, Vg.), denoting self-estimation. The term **πνευματικὸς** includes every one endowed with a special gift of the Spirit; *cf.* the pl. **πνεύματα**, ver. 12. Hf. and Hn. think however that the disjunctive **ἢ** narrows the ref. of "spiritual," by contrast with "prophet," to the sense of "speaker with tongues"; but this is a needless inference from the part.; the Ap. means "a prophet, or a man of the Spirit (in any sense)". The adj. **πνευματικός** (in masc.: see parls.) refers not to spiritual *powers* (**τὰ πνευματικά**, xii. 1, etc.), but to spiritual *character* (=**ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα, ἐν πνεύματι**, Rom. viii.), which gives insight in matters of revelation (*cf.* John vii. 17, viii. 31 f.). While the true "prophet," having a kindred inspiration (*cf.* 29), will "know well of the things" the Ap. "writes, that they are a commandment of the Lord" (**Κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή**, "are what *the Lord* commands"; *cf.* ii. 10-16, vii. 40, and notes, 2 Cor. xiii. 3), this ability belongs to "the spiritual" generally, who "judge all things" (ii. 15); being "of God," they hear His voice in others (*cf.* John viii. 42 f., etc.; 1 John ii. 20, iv. 6). The "Lord" is Christ, the Head of the Church, who "gives commandment to His Apostles" (*cf.* vii. 10, 25, xi. 23, xii. 3, etc.; Matt. xxviii. 20, etc.).—For **ἐπι-γινωσκέτω**, *cf.* xiii. 12—"judicet atque agnoscat" (Est.); the pr. impv. asks for a continued acknowledgment of Christ's authority in His Apostle.—"But if any one is ignorant (of this), *he is ignored*" (**ἀγνοεῖται**)—a retribution in kind. The professor of Divine knowledge who does not discern Paul's inspiration, proves his ignorance; his character as "prophet" or "spiritual" is not recognised, since he does not recognise the Apostle's character; *cf.* Matt. x. 14 f., 41, John xiii. 20, for this criterion as laid down by Christ; the Ap. John assumes it in 1 iv. 6.—**ἀγοεῖται**, is pr. in tense, *ignoratur* (not *ignorabitur*, Vg.), affirming an actual rejection—*sc. by the Lord*, who says to such despisers of His servants, "I know you not" (*cf.* viii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 19; John v. 42, etc.); but *by His Apostle* too, who cannot acknowledge for fellow-servants men who repudiate the Lord's authority in him (*cf.* 3 John 9 f.). Christ foretold that He would have to disown "many who had *prophesied*" in His name (Matt. vii. 22 f.). If **ἀγνοείτω** be read (still preferred by Mr., Bt., Ev., Gd., with R.V. txt.), the impv. is *permissive*, as in vii. 15: "sibi suæque ignorantiæ relinquen-

XV. 1. [a]Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ [b]εὐαγγέλιον ὃ [b]εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, [m]ὃ [m]καὶ [c]παρελάβετε, [d]ἐν [m]ᾧ [m]καὶ [d]ἑστήκατε, 2. δι᾽ οὗ καὶ [e]σώζεσθε· τίνι λόγῳ [b]εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, εἰ [f]κατέχετε, [g]ἐκτὸς

a See xii. 3. b See i. 17. In this constr., 2 Cor. xi. 7; Lk. i. 19, ii. 10; Acts xiii. 32. c See xi. 23. d Rom. v. 2; Col. iv. 12; Jo. viii. 44; *cf.* 2 Cor. i. 24. e Pr., see i. 18; also, beside ptpl. use, Heb. v. 7, vii. 25; 1 Pet. iii. 21, iv. 18; Jude 23; Acts xxvii. 20. f See xi. 2. g See xiv. 5.

dos esse censeo" (Est.)—a counsel of despair; contrast 2 Tim. ii. 24 ff.

Vv. 39, 40 restate the advice of ver. 1 in the light of the subsequent discussion, moderating the Church's zeal for demonstrative charisms by insisting on the seemliness and good order which had been violated by their unrestrained exercise (26-33). "And so, my brothers, covet to prophesy": **ζηλοῦτε**, *cf.* xii. 31; **τὸ προφητεύειν** replaces by the regular inf. the telic **ἵνα προφητεύητε** of ver. 1 (see note).—**καὶ τὸ λαλεῖν μὴ κωλύετε γλώσσαις**, "and the speaking with tongues do not hinder"; this is to be *allowed* in the Church, but not encouraged like Prophecy, of course with the proviso that the Tongue has its interpreter (13, 28). For **ὥστε** with impv., see iv. 5, etc.—**πάντα δὲ γινέσθω**: "But let all things be carried on, etc.": the **δὲ** attaches this caution specially to ver. 39; zeal for Prophecy and permission of Glossolalia must be guarded by the observance at all points of *decorum* and *discipline*.—**εὐσχημόνως** (see parls., and note on vii. 35), *honeste* (Vg.) or *decenter;* North. Eng. *mensefully* (*cf.* Eph. iv. 1, v. 4, and 33 above)—a sort of "ethical enhancement of the more mechanical **κατὰ τάξιν**" (El.). On the latter expression, opp. of **ἀτάκτως**, *cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 6 f., also xi. 34*b* above: the Cor. would interpret it by P.'s previous instructions—his **παραδόσεις, ἐντολαί, ὁδοὶ ἐν Χριστῷ**—and those given in this Ep.—**εὐσχημόνως** demands a right Christian *taste and deportment*, **κατὰ τάξιν** a strict Christian *method and rule of procedure.*

Division V.: The Resurrection of the Body, Chap. xv. Some members of the Cor. Church denied the resurrection of the dead (12), compelling the Ap. to enter on a systematic defence and exposition of this Christian doctrine. The question was not raised in the Church Letter; nor does Paul indicate the source of his information; the opinion of the **τινὲς** was openly expressed, and was doubtless matter of common report (*cf.* v. 1). Their position was incompatible with Christianity; it contravened, inferentially, the whole verity and saving worth of the Gospel (1 f., 13-19). Such scepticism nullified the faith and hope of the Church (11) as effectually as the party-divisions destroyed its love. While standing apart from the practical and personal questions upon which the Ep. turns (and accordingly reserved to the last), this doctrinal controversy has two important points of connexion with them, lying (1) in *the differences of opinion* prevalent at Cor. (*cf.* 12, **λέγουσιν ἐν ὑμῖν τινες**, with **ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες**, i. 10), and (2) in *the laxity of moral sentiment* associated with Cor. unbelief (*cf.* 32 ff. with v. 2, vi. 8 f., viii. 10, x. 14, 21 f., xi. 21, 29 ff.). This latter trait identifies the doubters of the Resurrection with the men who justified antinomian tendencies by the assumption of superior "knowledge" (see notes on vi. 12 and viii. 1, etc.); affecting "the wisdom of this world," they cherished the rooted prejudice of Greek culture, against the idea of a bodily redemption (see *Introd.*, p. 732). To men of this way of thinking the Resurrection was a folly even more than the Cross; some of those who had overcome the latter offence, still stumbled at the former. Unbelief in the Resurrection was sure to be excited wherever the Gospel spread amongst educated Greeks; the Ap. feels that he must grapple boldly with this difficulty at its first appearance in the Church; he puts forth his full strength to conquer it and to commend the truth that was impugned to the intelligent Corinthians.—Sceptics as they are in regard to the general doctrine, the **τινὲς** do not question the personal resurrection of Jesus Christ (a circumstance of great apologetic value); the Apostle's refutation starts from the assumption of this cardinal fact. They will not admit the recovery of the body as a part of the Christian salvation; they reject it as a principle, and a law of the kingdom of God. It was probably held that Christ's rising from the dead was a unique, symbolical occurrence, bringing about for believers in Him a redemption wholly spiritual, a literal and full deliverance from the

[g] εἰ μὴ [h] εἰκῇ ἐπιστεύσατε; 3. [k] παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν [l] ἐν [l] πρώτοις, [m] ὃ [m] καὶ [o] παρέλαβον, ὅτι [n] Χριστὸς [n] ἀπέθανεν [o] ὑπὲρ τῶν [o] ἁμαρτιῶν

h Rom. xiii. 4; Gal. iii. 4, iv. 11; Col. ii. 18; Prov. xxviii. 25. i See iii. 5. k See xi. 2. l N.T. *h.l.*; Gen. xxxiii. 2. m Rom. ix. 24; Gal. ii. 10; 2 Th. i. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 8, iii. 21. n See viii. 11. o Gal. i. 4; Heb., 4 times; Ezek. xlv. 22. *Cf.* περι αμαρτ., Rom. viii. 3, etc

flesh and the world of matter.—*Paul's* argument is in two parts: (A) vv. 1-34, concerning *the certainty*; (B) vv. 35-57, concerning *the nature* of the Resurrection. To establish its certainty (A), P. begins by (*a*) rehearsing *the historical evidence* of Christ's bodily resurrection, which had been preached by himself **ἐν πρώτοις** and so received by the readers (1-11); (*b*) he shows that *to deny the resurrection of the dead is to deny Christ's resurrection*, and so to declare the Gospel witness false and its salvation illusive (12-19); and further, (*c*) that *the risen Christ is the first-fruit* of a great harvest, whose ingathering is essential to the fulfilment of the kingdom of God (20-28); (*d*) he closes this part of the case by pointing to the *practical results of faith or unbelief in a future resurrection* (29-34). (B) The nature of the resurrection body is (*a*) *illustrated* by the difference between *the seed and the perfect plant*; also by the endless variety of material forms, instanced in animal organisms and in the heavenly bodies, which helps us to understand how there may be a future body of a higher order than the present human frame (35-43). (*b*) This difference between the **σῶμα πνευματικὸν** and the **σῶμα ψυχικὸν** being premised, it is argued that our investiture with the former is as necessary *a consequence of our relation to Christ* as our investiture with the latter is a consequence of our relation to Adam (44-49). (*c*) Only by this transformation, by *the victory over death and sin* thus achieved, can the promise of God in Scripture be fulfilled, His redeeming purpose effected, and the work of His servants made secure (51-58).—This is the earliest Christian doctrinal essay; in method and argumentative character it is akin to the Ep. to the Romans. Hn. ably defends its integrity against the attempts of Clemen and the Dutch School to make out interpolations and contradictions.

§ 50. The Facts concerning Christ's Resurrection, xv. 1-11. The doubt which the Ap. combats strikes at the fundamental, probative fact of his Gospel. He must therefore go back to the beginning, and reassert the "first things" he had taught at Cor. (1-4); to establish the resurrection of Jesus Christ is logically to destroy the theorem, "There is no resurrection of the dead" (12). Six successive appearances of the Risen One are enumerated—the first made to Kephas, and the last to Paul himself—(5-9); the list is not intended as exhaustive, but includes the names most prominent in the Church, the witnesses whose testimony would be best known and most accessible. The Ap. dwells on the astonishing mercy that was in this way vouchsafed to himself (9 f.), insisting finally on the unbroken agreement of the Apostolic preaching and of the Church's faith in regard to this supremely important event (11).

Vv. 1, 2. "Now I give you to know, brothers" (*cf.* xii. 3, for **γνωρίζω**): Paul writes, with a touch of blame, as though *informing* the Cor. of what the staple of his message had been, that on which their whole Christianity is built (*cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 5, Rom. vi. 3)—*viz.*, "the good news which," on the one hand, "I proclaimed to you (for cognate noun and vb., emphasising the *benefit* of the news, *cf.* ix. 18, etc.), which also," on the other hand, "you received; in which also you stand fast (*cf.* i. 6, xi. 2), through which also you are being saved". Ver. 11 similarly contrasts the correspondent part of proclaimers and receivers in attesting the saving facts (*cf.* xi. 23). The three relative clauses describe the inception, continuance, and progressive benefits of the faith of this Church.—**σώζεσθε** affirms a present, continuous salvation (*cf.* Rom. viii. 24, Eph. ii. 8); but "salvation," with Paul, always looks on to the future (see Rom. v. 9, 1 Thess. v. 8 ff.).—The connection of **τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν**; is difficult to seize. The two interpretations of the R.V., *txt.* and *marg.* (also A.V.), are those commonly adapted: (*a*) making the **τίνι λόγῳ** dependent on **γνωρίζω**, as appositive to **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κ.τ.λ.**, "I make known the good news . . . with what word I preached, etc." (so Bg., Hn., Ed.); (*b*) prefixing the clause, with an inversion of the normal order, to the hypothetical **εἰ κατέχετε**, which states the condition of **σώζεσθε**, "(you are saved), if you hold fast by what word I preached (it) to you" (Bz., Mr., Ev.,

ἡμῶν [p] κατὰ τὰς [p] γραφάς· 4. καὶ ὅτι [q] ἐτάφη, καὶ ὅτι [r] ἐγήγερται τῇ [s] τρίτῃ [1] [s] ἡμέρᾳ,[1] [p] κατὰ τὰς [p] γραφάς· 5. καὶ ὅτι [t] ὤφθη [u] Κηφᾷ,

p Jas. ii. 8. γραφαι, Rom. i. 2, xv. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 16; 14 exx. in GG. and Acts. Scrr. relevant in (1): Ps. xxi., Isa. liii., *Zech.* xiii. 7, Dan. ix. 24, etc.; in (2), Ps. xv. 10, Isa. xxv. 7 f., liii. 9 f., Hos. vi. 2; Jonah i. 17 (see Mt. xii. 40), etc. q Rom. vi. 4 (συνεταφημεν); Mt. viii. 21 f.; Lk. xvi. 22; Acts ii. 29, v. 6, 9 f.; Gen. xxiii. 4. r Vv. 13 ff.; see vi. 14. For pf. pass., outside this ch.; 2 Tim. ii. 8; Mk. vi. 14. s Mt. xii. 40, xvii. 23, xx. 19, xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40, 63; Lk. xiii. 32, xxiv. 7, 21, 46; John ii. 19 f. t In this tense, 1 Tim. iii. 16; Rev. xi. 19, xii. 1, 3; freq. in Acts; Mt. xvii. 3; Lk. i. 11, xxii. 43, xxiv. 34. *Cf.* ix. 1. u See ix. 5.

[1] τῃ ημερᾳ τῃ τριτῃ: ℵABD, 17, 37.

Gd., Bt., El., Sm., Wr., Bm.). There are convincing objections to both views, advanced by Mr. and El. against (*a*), and by Ed. and Hn. against (*b*): beside the harsh inversion it requires, (*b*) leaves the interrog. **τίνι** (the instances of **τίς** for **ὅς**, with **ἔχω**, adduced in Bm.'s *Grammar* are not really parl.), and the substitution of **λόγος** for **εὐαγγέλιον**, unexplained. Preferring therefore construction (*a*), one feels that at this distance the **τίνι λόγῳ** clause practically detaches itself from **γνωρίζω** (Hf.); the Ap. restates **τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν** in the altered shape of *a challenge to the memory and faith* of his readers—an interrogation prompted by the misgiving expressed directly afterwards in **εἰ κατέχετε**: "In what word (I ask) did I preach (it) to you?—(you will remember) if you are holding (it) fast!—unless you believed idly!" The **λόγος** is "the *word* of the gospel" (Acts xv. 7; *cf.* Eph. i. 13, Col. i. 5), "the story of the cross," etc. (i. 17), as *told* by P.—*quo sermone* (Bz.); not *qua ratione* (Vg.); nor *quo pacto* (Er., Cv.). Can it be that the Cor. have let this slip? or did they believe it **εἰκῇ**—not *frustra, in vain* (so Vg., and most others, as in Gal. iii. 4), but in the common cl. sense of **εἰκῇ**, *temere* (*cf.* Rom. xiii. 4, Col. ii. 18), *heedlessly, at random*, without serious apprehension, without realising the facts involved. The self-contradiction of the **τινὲς** (12) shows *levity* of belief. For **ἐκτὸς εἰ μή**, see xiv. 5.

Vv. 3, 4 answer the question put in ver. 2, reinforming the readers: "For I delivered to you amongst the first things, that which I also received".—**καὶ** emphasises the identity of the **παραδοθὲν** and **παραλημφθέν**, involved in the character of a "faithful steward" (iv. 1 f., *cf.* John xvii. 8, etc.). *How* these matters had been received—whether by direct revelation (Gal. i. 12) or through other contributory channels (*cf.* note on xi. 23 above)—is irrelevant.—**ἐν πρώτοις**, *in primis, in chief* (*cf.* 1 Tim. i. 15 f.). The things thus delivered are "that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He has been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures". Amongst the three **πρῶτα**, the first and third are **πρώτιστα** (*cf.* 2 Cor. v. 14 f., Rom. iv. 25, 1 Thess. iv. 14, etc.); the second is the link between them, signalising at once the completeness of the death and the reality of the resurrection (*cf.* Rom. vi. 4, x. 7): **ὅτι ἐτάφη καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται** is a more vivid and circumstantial expression for **ὅτι ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν** (12, etc.).—The two chiefest facts P. and the other Apostolic preachers (11) were accustomed to verify, both separately and jointly, from the Old Testament, **κατὰ τὰς γραφάς** (Acts xiii. 32 ff., xvii. 3, xxvi. 22 f., Rom. i. 2 ff.), after the manner of Jesus (Luke xxii. 37, xxiv. 25 ff., John iii. 14). But it was the *facts* that opened their eyes to the meaning of the Scriptures concerned (*cf.* John ii. 22, xx. 9). The death and burial are affirmed in the *aor.* as historical events; the resurrection is put with emphasis into the *pf.* tense, as an abiding power (*cf.* 14, 17, 20) = **ἐγερθεὶς . . . οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει** (Rom. vi. 9; *cf.* Heb. vii. 25).—"For our sins," see parls.—"pro peccatis nostris abolendis" (Bg.). "P. could not have said **ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν** if Christ's death were only an example of self-denial, not because **ὑπὲρ** must be rendered 'instead of' (*in loco*), but because the ref. to *sin* involves with **ὑπὲρ** the notion of expiation" (Ed.); *cf.* the excellent note of Mr.; see the exposition of the relation of Christ's death to man's sin in 2 Cor. v. 18 ff., Rom. iii. 23 ff., v. 6-11, Gal. iii. 10 ff., with notes in this Comm. *ad locc.*; also ver. 56 below, and note. The definition *on the third day* indicates that "in His case restoration to life ensued, instead of the corruption of the corpse that sets in otherwise after this interval" (Hf.). Jesus appears to have seen a Scriptural necessity in the "third day" (Luke xxiv. 46).

Ver. 5. **καὶ ὅτι ὤφθη Κηφᾷ, εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα**: so much of the *evidence* P.

εἶτα [1] [v] τοῖς [v] δώδεκα [2]· 6. ἔπειτα [t] ὤφθη [w] ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς [x] ἐφάπαξ, ἐξ ὧν [y] οἱ [y] πλείους [3] [z] μένουσιν [a] ἕως [a] ἄρτι, τινὲς δὲ καὶ [4] [b] ἐκοιμήθησαν· 7. ἔπειτα [5] [t] ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ, εἶτα [6] τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν· 8. [c] ἔσχατον δὲ [c] πάντων, [d] ὡσπερεὶ τῷ

v Acts vi. 2; above twenty times in GG.; *cf.* Rev. xxi. 14.
w Mk. xiv. 5. See Wr., p. 313.
x Rom. vi. 10; Heb. vii. 27, ix. 12, x. 10. See note below.
y See ix. 19.
z In this sense, Phil. i. 25; John xxi. 22 f.
a See iv. 13.
b See vii. 39.
c Adv., Mk. xii. 22 (with παντων); Num. xxxi. 2. For adj., see ver. 26.
d Bibl. *h.l.* See note below.

[1] επειτα (?), ℵA, 17, 37, 46. So Tisch., Tr., and W.H. *marg.* ειτα, BD^cKLP. μετα ταυτα: D*G.

[2] ενδεκα, DG, latt. vg., and Latt. Ff.,—a characteristic Western emendation.

[3] πλειονες, pre-Syrian uncc.

[4] *Om.* και pre-Syrian uncc. and verss.

[5] ειτα, D, Cyr.

[6] επειτα (?), ℵ*AGK, 17, 46. So Tisch., Lachm., Tr., W.H. *marg.* ειτα, ℵ^cBDLP, etc. *Cf.* note 2.

states as having been formally delivered to the Cor. along with the facts attested; for these two clauses are under the regimen of παρέδωκα (ver. 3). The manifold testimony was detailed with more or less fulness at diff. times; but P. seems always to have related *imprimis* the witness of Kephas and the Twelve, beside the revelation to himself (8). The Lord's manifestation to Peter (on the form *Kephas*, see i. 12) preceded that given to the body of the Apostles (Luke xxiv. 34). Peter's evidence, as the witness of Pentecost and ἀπόστολος τ. περιτομῆς, was of palmary importance, ἀξιόχρεων εἰς μαρτυρίαν (Thd.), esp. in view of the *consensus* to be asserted in ver. 11 (*cf.* i. 12).—ὤφθη with dat., *appeared* (pass. aor., in reflexive sense: see Bm., pp. 52, 187), is used of exceptional, supernatural appearances (see parls.). "The twelve," the college of the App., without exact regard to number: actually *ten*, wanting Judas Iscariot, and Thomas absent on the first meeting. Luke speaks on this occasion of "the eleven (the Western reading here) and those with them," xxiv. 33; Paul cites the official witnesses.

Ver. 6 carries forward ὤφθη into a new sentence, independent of παρέδωκα . . . ὅτι: the four remaining manifestations P. recites without indicating whether or not they formed a part of his original communication.—ἔπειτα (*cf.* 23, 46, xii. 28) ὤφθη κ.τ.λ.: "After t at (*deinde*) He appeared to above (ἐπάνω, *cf.* Mark xiv. 5) five hundred brethren once for all" (*semel*, Bz.). Nowhere else has ἐφάπαξ the meaning *simul*, *at once* (so Vg., and most interpreters, in violation of usage). This was the culminating manifestation of the risen Jesus, made at the general gathering to which His brethren were invited by Him *in a body*, as it is related in Matt. xxviii. 7, 10, Mark xvi. 7; the appearance to "the eleven" described in Matt. xxviii. 16 ff. is recorded as the sequel to this summons, and implies the presence of a larger assembly (see esp. the words οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν in ver. 17), such as P. alludes to; the great charge of Matt. xxviii. 18 ff., closing the First Gospel, corresponds by its importance to this ἐφάπαξ.—P. writes a quarter of a century after the event; the followers of Jesus were mostly young in age for "the majority" (οἱ πλείονες) to have been still alive. On ἕως ἄρτι, see iv. 13.

Ver. 7. "After that, He appeared to James"—*sc. James, the brother of the Lord*, as elsewhere in P. (Gal. i. 19, ii. 9, 12), included in the ἀδελφοὶ τ. Κυρίου of ix. 5 above (see note); associated with P. in Acts xv. 13, xxi. 18 (see notes). The manifestation to James—only mentioned here—the chief of our Lord's formerly unbelieving brothers (John vii. 5), explains the presence of "His brothers" amongst the 120 disciples at Jerus. (Acts i. 14) and James' subsequent leadership in the mother Church. His high position at the time of writing accounts for his citation in this place. Paul made acquaintance with James as well as Peter on his first visit to the Jerus. Church (Gal. i. 18 f.). The well-known story about the meeting of Jesus with James told by Jerome (*De viris illustr.*, 2) implies an earlier date for this than Paul's narrative admits of, since ἔπειτα signifies succession in *time;* succession of *rank* cannot be intended.—"After that, to all the

[e] ἐκτρώματι, [t] ὤφθη κἀμοί· 9. ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ [f] ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ [g] ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, διότι [h] ἐδίωξα τὴν [i] ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ [i] Θεοῦ· 10. [k] χάριτι δὲ [k] Θεοῦ εἰμι ὅ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ [l] χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ[1] [l] εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ [m] κενὴ[2] [m] ἐγενήθη, ἀλλὰ [n] περισσότερον πάντων [o] ἐκοπίασα· οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ, ἀλλ' ἡ [k] χάρις τοῦ [k] Θεοῦ ἡ[3] σὺν

e N.T. *h.l.*; Job iii. 16; Eccl. vi. 3.
f Of persons, Mt. v. 19, xxv. 40, 45. *Cf.* Eph. iii. 8; see also iv. 3, vi. 2, above.
g 2 Cor. iii. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 2 and Mt. iii. 11 (with inf.); Ex. iv. 10.
h Gal. i. 13, 23, iv. 29; Phil. iii. 6; Acts ix. 4 f., xxii. 4, 7 f., xxvi. 11, 14 f.; Rev. xii. 13; Mt. v. 10 ff., etc.
i See i. 2.
k See i. 4.
l 1 Pet. i. 10; *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 8; Rom. v. 15.
m 1 Th. ii. 1, iii. 5 (εις κενον). For κενος, see ver. 14.
n Adv., Mk. vii. 36; Heb. vi. 17, vii. 15. For comp. adj., see xii. 23.
o Rom. xvi. 6, 12; Ph. ii. 16; Acts xx. 35; Mt. vi. 28; Psa. cxxvi. 1. For κοπος, see iii. 8.

[1] Om. η DG, latt. verss. and Ff.—*gratia ejus in me.*

[2] **πτωχη ουκ εγενηθη**: DG (**γεγονεν**), some latt., Amb., Ambrst. (*pauper, egena*).

[3] *Om.* η ℵ*BD*G, latt. vg. So crit. edd., exc. W.H. *marg.* *Cf.* note 1.

apostles": in this formal enumeration, **ἀπόστολοις** bears its strictest sense, and could hardly include James (see Acts i. 13 f.; he is not certainly so styled in Gal. i. 19). Paul was, presumably, aware of the absence of Thomas on the occasion of ver. 5, and his consequent scepticism (John xx. 24 ff.); he therefore says distinctly that *all* participated in this latter sight, which coincides in point of time with Acts i. 6-12, not John xx. 26. The witness of the First App. to the resurrection was complete and unqualified.

Ver. 8. **ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων, ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι**: "But last of all, as it were to the abortion (a creature so unfit and so repulsive), He appeared also *to me*".—**ἔσχατον** (adv.) **πάντων** marks the conclusion of a long series; *cf.* iv. 9, also Mark xii. 22.—**ὡσπερεί**, a frequent cl. conjunction, "nonnihil mitigat—*ut si* [or *quasi*]: docet non debere hoc nimium premi. . . . Articulus vim habet (**τῷ ἐκτρώματι**). Quod inter liberos est abortus, inquit, id ego sum in apostolis. . . . Ut abortus non est dignus humano nomine, sic apostolus negat se dignum apostoli appellatione" (Bg.; similarly Est., Mr., Al., Ed., Sm.); **ἔκτρωμα** need not be pressed beyond this figurative and descriptive meaning. However, Cv., Gr., Bt., Gd., and many find in the phrase an indication of *the suddenness and violence* of Paul's birth into Christ; Hn. and El. see pictured in it, more appropriately, *the unripe birth* of one who was changed at a stroke from the persecutor into the Apostle, instead of maturing normally for his work,—"P. describes himself thus in contrast with those who, when Jesus appeared to them, were already brothers or apostles, already born as God's children into the life of faith in Christ" (Hf.). Sm. aptly suggests that **τὸ ἔκτρωμα** was one of the insulting epithets flung at Paul by the Judaists; in their eyes he was a *wirklich Missgeburt.* He adopts the title—"the abortion, as they call me"—and gives it a deeper meaning. His low stature may have suggested the taunt: *cf.* 2 Cor. x. 10, and *Acta Pauli et Theclae*, 3. An *abortion* is a living, genuine offspring.

Ver. 9. **ὁ ἐλάχιστος** corresponds to **ἔσχατον πάντων** (8); "the least" properly comes "last": *cf.* Eph. iii. 8, which enhances this expression; also 1 Tim. i. 15.—**ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι κ.τ.λ.**, "who am not fit to bear the name of apostle".—**ἱκανὸς** (lit. *reaching up to, hinreichend*), as distinguished from **ἄξιον** (*worthy:* xvi. 4), denotes *adequacy, competence* for office or work (*cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 5); the words are interchangeable "where the capacity to act consists in a certain moral condition of mind and heart" (Ed.: *cf.* Matt. iii. 11, and John i. 27).—**διότι** (*propterea quod*, Bz.) **ἐδίωξα κ.τ.λ.**, "because I persecuted the Church of God"—a remorse which never left the Ap. (*cf.* Gal. i. 13, 1 Tim. i. 13 ff., Acts xxvi. 9 ff.); the prominence of this fact in Luke's narrative is a sign of Paul's hand. The Church of Jerus., whatever opposition to himself might proceed from it, was always to Paul "the church of God" (Gal. i. 13, 22): on this phrase, see note to i. 2. For **καλέομαι**, in this sense, *cf.* Rom. ix. 25 f., Heb. ii. 11. This ver. explains how P. is "the abortion" among the App.; in respect of *his dwarfishness*, and *the unripeness of his birth* into Apostleship.

Ver. 10. "God's grace," which makes Paul what he *is* (see ix. 1 f.: the double **εἰμὶ** is firmly assertive—"I am what I verily am"), is the *favour*, utterly undeserved, that summoned Saul of Tarsus

ἐμοί. 11. [p] εἴτε οὖν[1] ἐγὼ [p] εἴτε ἐκεῖνοι, οὕτω [q] κηρύσσομεν καὶ οὕτως [r] ἐπιστεύσατε.

12. Εἰ δὲ [su] Χριστὸς [s] κηρύσσεται ὅτι [t] ἐκ [t] νεκρῶν [tu] ἐγήγερται, [v] πῶς λέγουσί τινες[2] ἐν ὑμῖν[2] ὅτι [w] ἀνάστασις [w] νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν;

p See iii. 22. q See i. 23. r See iii. 5 (ver. 2 above). s See i. 23. t Mt. xvii. 9, xiv. 2, etc. (απο τ. νεκρ.); Mk. vi. 14; Lk. ix. 7; Jo. ii. 22, xii. 1, 9, 17, xxi. 14; Acts iii. 15, iv. 10, xiii. 30; 1 Pet. i. 21; Heb. xi. 19; 8 exx. in Rom.; 7 in P. elsewhere. u See ver. 4. v Rom. vi. 2; Gal. ii. 14, iv. 9. w Rom. i. 4; in Acts five times; Heb. vi. 2; 1 Pet. i. 3; Mt. xxii. 31; Lk. xx. 35.

[1] *Om.* η ℵ*BD*G, latt. vg. So crit. edd., exc. W.H. *marg*. *Cf.* note 1 (p. 921).
[2] εν υμιν τινες: ℵABP, 17.

from the foremost rank of the persecutors to the foremost rank amongst the servants of the Lord Jesus: *cf.* 1 Tim. i. 14, Eph. iii. 8, ii. 7, Gal. i. 13 ff. The grace of Apostleship implies the antecedent grace of forgiveness and adoption.—**καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ κ.τ.λ.**, "and His grace that was extended (*or* went out) unto me, has not proved vain": *cf.* the emphatic **ἐμοὶ** of Eph. iii. 8; the repeated art. marks *me* as the signal object of this grace; for **χάρις εἰς**, *cf.* 1 Peter i. 10.—**κενή** (*cf.* 14) means not *void of result* (that is **ματαία**, 17), but *void of reality:* Paul's Apostleship was no titular office, no mere benevolence towards an unworthy man; the favour brought with it a *labour* quite as extraordinary—"nay, but (**ἀλλ'**) more abundantly than they all did I labour".—**κοπιάω** connotes *exertion*, *painful* or *exhausting toil;* see note on **κόπος**, iii. 8. So that, if last and least at the outset, and conspicuously unfit for Apostleship, *in execution* P. took the premier place: see 2 Cor. x. 13-18, xi. 23, xii. 11 ff., Rom. xv. 15-21.—**αὐτῶν πάντων**, presumably, *more than all the rest together:* by his single labours P. had extended the kingdom of Christ over a region wider than all the Twelve had traversed up to this date.—From the depth of Paul's self-abasement a new pride is ready to spring, which is corrected instantly by the words, **οὐκ ἐγὼ δέ, ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ σὺν ἐμοί**: "not *I*, however, but the grace of God (working) with me"—this really wrought the work; I was its instrument. See iii. 7 ff., xii. 6, Phil. ii. 12 f., Eph. iii. 20, Col. i. 29; and for the turn of expression, Gal. ii. 20.

Ver. 11 breaks off the comparison between himself and the other App., into which Paul was being drawn, to sum up the statement of fact and evidence concerning Christ's resurrection: "Whether then it were I (8 f.) or they (Kephas, the Twelve, the first disciples, James: 5 ff.), *so* we proclaim (3 f.), and *so* you believed (2)". For **εἴτε, εἴτε**, giving alternatives indifferent from the point of view assumed, *cf.* iii. 22, x. 31, etc.—**οὕτως** is emphatic: in the essential matters of vv. 1-4 and the crucial point of the resurrection of Jesus, there is not the least variation in the authoritative testimony; Peter, James, Paul—Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth—are in perfect accord, preaching, believing, with one mind and one mouth, that the crucified Jesus rose from the dead.—On **κηρύσσω**, see note to i. 23.—This closes the case on the ground of testimony.

§ 51. If Christ is not Risen? xv. 12-19. Paul has intrenched his own position; he advances to demolish that of his opponents. His negative demonstration, taking the form of a destructive hypothetical syllogism, has two branches: he deduces (*a*), in vv. 13-15, from the (supposed) non-existence of the fact of resurrection, *the falsity of the faith* (**κενὴ ἡ πίστις**) accorded to it, and *of the witnesses* attesting it; (*b*), in vv. 17-19, from the non-existence of the fact, *the unreality of the effects* derived from it (**ματαία ἡ πίστις**). Are the sceptics at Cor. prepared to affirm that the App. are liars? and that the new life and hopes of their fellow-Christians are an illusion? In arguing these two points, P. presses on the impugners twice over (13, 16), that their general denial logically and in principle excludes *Christ's* resurrection.

Ver. 12. **δὲ** contrasts with the affirmation of all Christians (11) the contradictory dogma of **τινὲς ἐν ὑμῖν**. For their sake P. made the rehearsal of vv. 1 ff. "But if Christ is preached, (to wit) that He is raised from the dead"—not "it is preached that Christ, etc.": the preaching of Christ *is* the preaching *of His resurrection;* **ἐγηγερμένος** and **ἐσταυρωμένος** (see i. 23 f., ii. 2) are, both of them, predicates inseparable from **Χριστός** (*cf.* Rom. iv. 24 f., viii. 34, x. 9, 2 Cor. v. 15;

13. εἰ[1] δὲ [w]ἀνάστασις [w]νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν,[1] οὐδὲ [u]Χριστὸς [u]ἐγήγερται· 14. εἰ δὲ [u]Χριστὸς οὐκ [u]ἐγήγερται, [x]κενὸν ἄρα[2] τὸ [y]κήρυγμα ἡμῶν, [x]κενὴ δὲ[3] καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν[4]· 15. [z]εὑρισκόμεθα δὲ καὶ [a]ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι [b]ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν [bc]κατὰ τοῦ [c]Θεοῦ ὅτι [d]ἤγειρε τὸν Χριστόν, ὃν οὐκ [d]ἤγειρεν εἴπερ[5] ἄρα [d]νεκροὶ οὐκ [d]ἐγεί-

x See ver 10; also ver. 58; Eph. v. 6; Col. ii. 8; Jas. ii. 20; Acts iv. 25.
y See i. 21.
z See iv. 2.
a Mt. xxvi. 60. *Cf.* Acts vi. 13, *μαρτ. ψευδεις*; *-ρειν*, Mk. x. 19; *-ρια*, Mt. xv. 19.
b N.T. *h.l.* *Cf.* *καταμαρτ.*, Mt. xxvi. 62; also Mk. xiv. 56 f. For vb., 2 Cor. viii. 3; Rom. iii. 21, x. 2; Gal. iv. 15; Col. iv. 13; 1 Tim. v. 10, vi. 13; in Acts and Heb. freq. in Mt. and Lk. once each; Rev., 4 exx.; Gosp. and Epp. of Jo. *passim*.
c *Cf.* Acts iv. 26, vi. 13; Mt. xii. 32.
d See vi. 14. *Cf.* Mt. x. 8, xi. 5; Mk. xii. 26; Lk. vii. 22, x. 37; Jo. v. 21; Acts xxvi. 8.

[1] ℵ*E, with several minn., om. **ει . . . εστιν**, the copyist's eye skipping from ver. 12*b* to ver. 13*a*. Several such omissions occur, in important ancient copies, in the duplicated clauses of this context.

[2] **αρα και** (?): ℵ*AD^gr.GKP, some 25 minn. So Tisch., Lachm., and Nestle (*bracket*); Tr. and W.H. *marg*. See ver. 18.

[3] *Om.* **δε** pre-Syrian uncc. and verss.

[4] **ημων** (?): BD*, 17, 67**, sah. basm., Cyr.-Hier., Epiph., Ruf.—witnesses few, but varied, and forming a strong group. So W.H. *txt.* and R.V. *marg.*
υμων, as in all other witnesses, R.V. retains in *txt.*, W.H. relegate to *marg.* Ver. 11 speaks for **πιστις υμων**.

[5] **ειπερ . . . εγειρονται** omd. by D, 43, sah. basm. syr^sch.; some latt. codd.
ει . . . εγειρονται omd. by P, 123, and two chief codd. of vg. See note 1 above.

Acts xvii. 18, 1 Peter iii. 18, 21, etc.). For the pf. **ἐγήγερται**, see ver. 4.—If this is so, "how (is it that) amongst *you* some say?"—a crying contradiction, that Christ is preached as risen and is so believed by the readers, and yet some of them say, **Ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν**, "There is no (such thing as a) resurrection of dead (men)!" (*cf.* the modern dogma, "Miracles never happen"),—a sweeping denial of anything of the kind. The doctrine of the Sadducees (Acts xxiii. 8); *cf.*, for the Greeks, out of countless parls., Æschylus, *Eumen.*, 639, **ἅπαξ θανόντος οὔτις ἔστ' ἀνάστασις.** —The deniers are "some" (not many), *quidam, quos nominare nolo* (Mr.: *cf.* 2 Cor. x. 2, etc., Gal. i. 7): "were they the 'few wise men' of i. 26?" (Ed.). Their maxim belonged to the current "wisdom of this age" (i. 20, iii. 19 f.). —**πῶς**, of surprised expostulation, as in Gal. ii. 14; for the emphasis on **ἐν ὑμῖν**, *cf.* John xiv. 9, **πῶς σὺ λέγεις;**

Ver. 13 opposes (**δὲ**) the thesis of the **τινὲς** by a syllogism in the *modus tollens* —"sublato genere, tollitur et species" (Gr.): if bodily resurrection is *per se* impossible, then *there is no risen Christ* (so Bg., Mr., Al., Bt., Ed., El., etc.); the abstract universal negative of the deniers ver. 16 will restate in the concrete. Hn. and Gd. (somewhat similarly Cm., Cv.) hold, on the other hand, that P. is making out the essential connexion between *Christ's* rising and that of *the Christian dead*—in which case he should have written **ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν**; he speaks of "the dead *in Christ*" first in ver. 18. Hn. and Gd. justly observe that the **τινὲς** might have allowed Christ's resurrection as an exception; but the point of Paul's argument is that *this is logically impossible*, that the absolute philosophical denial of bodily resurrection precludes the raising up of Jesus Christ; on the other hand, if *He* is risen, the axiom **Ἀνάστασις οὐκ ἔστιν** is disproved, the spell of death is broken, and Christ's rising carries with it that of those who are "in Christ" (18, 20-23, 1 Thess. iv. 14; *cf.* John xi. 25, Heb. ii. 15).

Vv. 14, 15. The implicit affirmative conclusion just intimated P. will develop afterwards. He has first to push the opposing axiom to further consequences. (1) if the fact is untrue, *the testimony is untrue*—"But if Christ is not raised, vain therefore is our proclamation, vain also your faith".—**κενός** (see note on **οὐ κενή**, 10; and *cf.* **κενόω**, i. 17, etc.) signifies *void*, *unsubstantial* (*inanis*, Vg.)—a *hollow* witness, a *hollow* belief, while **μάταιος** (17; see parls.) is "vain" as *ineffectual*, *frustrate*. For **κήρυγμα**, see note on i. 21; on its distinction from **λόγος** (2), see ii. 4: **ἡμῶν** includes P. and his colleagues (11). For **ἄρα**, see v. 10.—If "the message is empty," declaring a thing that is not, "the faith is also

ρονται[1]· 16. εἰ[1] γὰρ [d] νεκροὶ οὐκ [d] ἐγείρονται,[1] οὐδὲ [u] Χριστὸς [u] ἐγήγερται· 17. εἰ δὲ [u] Χριστὸς οὐκ [u] ἐγήγερται, [e] ματαία ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν,[2] ἔτι[3] ἐστὲ [f] ἐν ταῖς [f] ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν· 18. ἄρα καὶ οἱ [g h] κοιμηθέντες [h] ἐν

e See iii. 20.
f Jo. viii. 21, 24, ix. 34.
g See vii. 39.
h 1 Th. iv. 16. *Cf.* i. 2.

[1] **ειπερ . . . εγειρονται** omd. by D, 43, sah. basm. syr[sch.]; some latt. cod. **ει . . . εγειρονται** omd. by P, 123, and two chief codd. of vg. See note 3 above.

[2] Ins. **εστιν** (?): BD*. Lachm. and W.H. *bracket*. If original, easily dropped in view of ver. 14.

[3] **και ετι**: ℵ*A, 31, sah. basm. syr[sch.]; vg., *adhuc enim*. **οτι ετι**, 37, 43, Tert. **τι ετι**, d e (*quid adhuc*).

empty," building on the thing that is not; preaching and faith have no genuine content; the Gospel is evacuated of all reality.—For the character of P. and his fellow-witnesses this conclusion has a serious aspect: "We are found moreover (to be) false witnesses of God"—men who have given *lying* testimony, and that about *God*, "the worst sort of impostors" (Gd.)! **τοῦ Θεοῦ** is objective gen., as the next clause shows; it is always "God" to whom P. imputes the raising of Christ, who by this act gave His verdict concerning Jesus (Rom. i. 4, Gal. i. 1, Eph. i. 20; Acts ii. 36, xiii. 30-39, xvii. 31).—**δὲ καὶ** calls emphatic attention to another and contrasted side of the matter in hand.—**εὑρισκόμεθα** approaches the sense of **ἐλεγχόμεθα** or **ἁλισκόμεθα** (see parls.)—"discovered" in a false and guilty position.—Nothing can be stronger evidence than this passage to the objective reality, in Paul's experience, of the risen form of Jesus. The suspicion of *hallucination*, on his own part or that of the other witnesses, was foreign to his mind; the matter stood on the plain footing of testimony, given by a large number of intelligent, sober, and responsible witnesses to a sensible, concrete, circumstantial fact: "Either He rose from the grave, or we lied in affirming it"—the dilemma admits of no escape.—**ὅτι ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κ.τ.λ.**: "in that we testified against God that He raised up the Christ—whom He did not raise, if indeed then (as 'some' affirm) dead (men) are not raised up". **κατὰ τ. Θεοῦ**, *adversus Deum* (Vg., Est., Mr., Hn., Gd., Ed., Sm.), as always in such connexion in N.T. (see iv. 6 and parls.), not *de Deo* (Er., Bz., Al., El., A.V.); the falsehood (*ex hyp.*) would have *wronged* God, as, *e.g.*, the ascription of miracles to God traduces Him in the eyes of Deists.—**ἤγειρε τὸν Χριστόν**, "the Messiah," whom "according to the Scriptures" (3 f.; *cf.* Luke xxiv. 46, Acts xvii. 3, xxvi. 22 f., etc.) God was bound to raise from the dead.—**εἴπερ ἄρα**, *si videlicet* (Bz.), *supposing to be sure;* see viii. 5; and v. 10, for **ἄρα**.

Ver. 16 restates the position of the **τινές** (13; see note), in order to press it to another, even more intolerable conclusion: (1) vv. 14, 15 proved *the witness untrue*, if the fact is unreal; (2) vv. 17, 18 conclude *the effects unreal*, if the fact is unreal.

Vv. 17, 18 unfold this latter consequence in a form parl. to the former: **εἰ δὲ . . . ἄρα** (14). For **ματαία** (syn. with **ἀργή**, James ii. 20; with **ἀνωφελεῖς**, Tit. iii. 9), see note on **κενόν** (14); a faith is "frustrate," "null and void," which does not *save from sin;* now "Christ died for our sins" (3), but His *resurrection* makes His death valid, publishing it to men as accepted by God and availing for redemption (Rom. iv. 25, viii. 33 f., x. 9; Luke xxiv. 46 f.; Acts xiii. 32-38—observe the **γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω**); it is hereby that "God *gives* the victory" over both sin and death (57). In Christ's resurrection is the seal of our justification, and the spring of our sanctification (Rom. vi. 4-11); both are wanting, if He is still in the grave. The absence of both is implied in being "yet in your sins"—unforgiven, unrenewed. Now this is contrary to experience (i. 30, vi. 11); the Cor. readers *know* themselves to be saved men, as Paul and the App. know themselves to be honest men (15). P. leaves the inference, which observes the strict method of the *modus tollens*, to the consciousness of his readers (*cf.* 20): "We are true witnesses, you are redeemed believers; on both accounts it is certain that Christ has risen,—and therefore that there is a resurrection of the dead".—A further miserable consequence of the negative dogma emerges from the last: **ἄρα καὶ οἱ κοιμηθέντες . . . ἀπώλοντο.** "Then also those that were laid to sleep in Christ perished!"—*perished* (ptp. and vb. both aor.) when we laid them to rest, and with the

[h] Χριστῷ [i] ἀπώλοντο· 19. εἰ ἐν τῇ [k] ζωῇ ταύτῃ [lm] ἠλπικότες [1] ἐσμὲν [1] [l] ἐν Χριστῷ [1] μόνον, [n] ἐλεεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμέν. 20. Νυνὶ δὲ [o] Χριστὸς [o] ἐγήγερται [o] ἐκ νεκρῶν, [p] ἀπαρχὴ τῶν

i See viii. 11.
k Phil. i. 20; Jas. iv. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 10 (Psa. xxxiii. 12)
l Eph. i. 12; 4 Kings xviii. 5; *cf.* ελπιζ. εις, 2 Cor. i. 10.
m Pf., 2 Cor. i. 10; 1 Tim. iv. 10, v. 5, vi. 17; Jo. v. 45.
n Rev. iii. 17; for compar. with παντων, see xiii. 13.
o See vv. 4 and 12.
p xvi. 15; Rom. viii. 23, xi. 16, xvi. 5; 2 Th. ii. 13 (?); Jas. i. 18; Rev. xiv. 4; Exod. xxiii. 19, etc.

[1] **εν Χριστῳ ηλπικοτες εσμεν** (in this order): all pre-Syrian uncc.

"perishing" which befalls those "yet in their sins" (*cf.* i. 18, viii. 11, Rom. ii. 12, vi. 23, etc.; also John viii. 21, 24). They were "put to sleep *in Christ*" (*cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 14), as the sense of His presence and the promises of His gospel turned their death into sleep (John xi. 11, etc.). The **ματαιότης** of being lulled to sleep when falling into utter ruin! They thought "the sting of death" drawn (56), and lay down to rest untroubled: cruelly deceived! For the unclassical position of **ἄρα**, see Wr., p. 699.

Ver. 19 expresses the infinite bitterness of such a deception. In the right order of words (see txtl. note), **μόνον** is attached to **ἠλπικότες** (*cf.* Luke xxiv. 21): "If in this life we have *only* had *hope* in Christ"—no present deliverance from sin, no future inheritance in heaven—"we are more than all men to be pitied". For a hope without legitimate basis or ultimate fruition, Christians have sacrificed all material good! (*cf.* 30 ff., iv. 11 ff.; Heb. x. 32-46, Luke xviii. 22, etc.). **ἠλπικότες ἐσμὲν** = **ἠλπίκαμεν** (1 Tim. iv. 10), with stress laid on the actual condition of those who have formed this futile hope. **ἐν Χριστῷ** points to Christ as the *ground* of Christian hope (*cf.* Phil. ii. 19). **ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ** brings to mind all that the Christian forfeits here and now—losing "this life" for the vain promise of another, letting earth go in grasping at a fancied heaven; no wonder the world pities us!—Ed. *ad loc.* answers well the censure passed on the Ap., as though he made the worth of goodness depend on its future reward: (1) P. does not say "we are more *worthless*"—a good man may be very "pitiable," and all the more because of his worth; (2) on Paul's hypothesis (17), moral character is undermined, while future happiness is destroyed, by denial of the Resurrection.

§ 52. The Firstfruit of the Resurrection and the Harvest, xv. 20-28. Paul has proved the actuality of Christ's personal resurrection by the abundant and truthful testimony to the fact (5-15), and by the experimental reality of its effects (17). In ver. 20*a* he therefore affirms it unconditionally, having overthrown the contrary assertion that "there is no resurrection of the dead." But Christ never stands alone; He forms "a body" with "many members" (xii. 12); He is "firstborn among many brothers" (Rom. viii. 29, Col. i. 18, John xv. 5, etc.). His rising shows that bodily resurrection is possible; nay, it is *inevitable* for those who are in Him (18, 20*b*, 23). In truth, the universal redemption of Christ's people from the grave is *indispensable* for the realisation of human destiny and for the assured triumph of God's kingdom (24-28). The Ap. thus advances from the experimental (§ 51) to the theological proof of his theorem, much as in Rom. v. 1-11, 12-21.

Ver. 20. **Νυνὶ δέ** (*cf.* xii. 18) marks the logical point P. has reached by the *reductio ad impossibile* of the negative proposition attacked in ver. 12. Christ has been raised; therefore there is a resurrection of the dead (12-18): "now" the ground is cleared and the foundation laid for the declaration that *the Christian dead shall rise in Him*—"Christ has been raised from the dead, *a firstfruit of them that have fallen asleep*"; He has risen in this character and purpose, "not to remain alone in His estate of glory" (Gd.).—**ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων** (pf. of abiding state: *cf.* John xi. 11 f., Matt. xxvii. 52) = **ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν** and **πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν** (Col. i. 18, Rev. i. 5).—Cm. and Bg. are surely right in seeing here an allusion to the first harvest-sheaf (**ἀπαρχὴν του θερισμοῦ ὑμῶν**, Lev. xxiii. 10: *cf.* in this connexion Matt. xiii. 39 ff. with John v. 28 f. and Rev. xiv. 14 ff.) of the Passover, which was presented in the Sanctuary on the 16th Nisan, probably the day of the resurrection of Jesus; this allusion is in the Easter strain of v. 6 ff. (see notes). The first ripe sheaf is an earnest and sample of the harvest, consecrated to God and laid up with Him (*cf.* Rom. vi. 10 f.) in anticipation of the rest. The Resurrection has begun.

Vv. 21, 22 explain the identification of

[q] κεκοιμημένων ἐγένετο.[1] 21. [r] ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δι' ἀνθρώπου ὁ[2] θάνατος, καὶ δι' ἀνθρώπου [s] ἀνάστασις [s] νεκρῶν· 22. [t] ὥσπερ γὰρ [u] ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, [t] οὕτω [t] καὶ [u] ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες [v] ζωοποιηθήσονται· 23. ἕκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ [w] τάγματι· [p] ἀπαρχὴ

q See vii. 39.
r See i. 21.
s See ver. 12.
t xi. 12, xvi. 1; 5 exx. in Rom.; Gal. iv. 29; Jas. ii. 26; Jo. v. 21, 26.
u vii. 14; 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. ii. 17; Eph. i. 4, iii. 11; Acts iv. 2.
v Rom. iv. 17, viii. 11; Jo. v. 21; 4 Ki. v. 7.
w N.T. *h.l.*; 1 Ki. iv. 10; 2 Ki. xxiii. 13. See -ξις, xiv 40.

[1] *Om.* εγενετο all pre-Syrian witnesses. [2] *Om.* ο ℵABD*K, 17, 67.**

the risen Christ with those sleeping in death, which was assumed by the word ἀπαρχή. It rests on the fact that Christ is the antitype of Adam, the medium of life to the race as Adam was of death. This parl. is resumed in vv. 46 ff., where it is applied to *the nature of the resurrection body*, as here to *the universality of the resurrection*. These two passages form the complement of Rom. v. 12-21; the antithesis of Adam and Christ—who represent *flesh, trespass, death* and *spirit, righteousness, life* respectively—is thus extended over the entire career of the race viewed as a history of sin and redemption.—"For since through man (there is) death, through man also (there is) a resurrection of the dead": δι' ἀνθρώπου, "through a man (*qua* man)"—*through human means* or *mediation*. For ἐπειδή, *quandoquidem* (Cv.), see i. 21 f.; the first fact necessitated and shaped the second: *man* was the channel conveying death to his kind (Rom. v. 12), through the same channel the counter current must flow (Rom. v. 15, etc.).—This goes deeper than ἀπαρχή; Christ is the ἀρχή, the principle and root of resurrection-life (Col. i. 18).—"*Through* man" implies that Death is not, as philosophy supposed, a law of finite being or a necessity of fate; it is an event of history, a calamity brought by man upon himself and capable of removal by the like means.—ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ κ.τ.λ.: "For just as in the Adam all die, so also in the Christ all will be made alive". The foregoing double δι' ἀνθρώπου opens out into "the (representative) Adam and Christ"—the natural and spiritual, earthly and heavenly counterparts (45 ff.), the two types and founders of humanity, paralleled by ὥσπερ . . . καὶ οὕτως (*cf.* Rom. v. 12 ff.).—The stress of the comparison does not lie on πάντες, as though the Ap. meant to say that "*all* (men)" will rise in Christ as certainly as they die in Adam (so, with variations, Or., Cm., Cv., Mr., Gd., Sm., El., referring to John v. 28 f., Acts xxiv. 15): as Bt. says, the absence of ἄνθρωποι tells against such ref. to the *race* (contrast Rom. v. 12, 18), also the use of ζωοποιέω (see below). The point is that as death in all cases is *grounded in Adam*, so life in all cases is *grounded in Christ* (*cf.* John vi. 53, xi. 25)—no death without the one, no life without the other (Aug., Bg., Hf., Ed., Hn., Bt.). πάντες = οἱ πολλοί (Rom. v. 18 f.), as set in contrast with ὁ εἷς ἄνθρωπος.—Ζωοποιέω is narrower in extension than ἐγείρω (20), since the latter applies to every one raised from the grave (15 f., 35); wider in intension, as it imports not the mere raising of the body, but restoration to "life" in the full sense of the term (Hf.; *cf.* 45, Rom. vi. 8, viii. 11; John v. 21, vi. 63),—an ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς (John v. 29). A firm and broad basis is now shown to exist for the solidarity between Christ and the holy dead (οἱ κεκοιμημένοι) affirmed in ver. 20.

Ver. 23. But ἀπαρχή implies *difference* in agreement, distinction in order along with unity in nature and determining principle. Hence the added qualification, ἕκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι, κ.τ.λ.: "But each in his proper rank—Christ (as) firstfruit; thereafter, at His coming, the (people) of Christ". τάγμα signifies a military *division* (*cf.* xiv. 40). There are two τάγματα (*cf.* Matt. xiii. 8) of the resurrection host; the Captain (ὁ ἀρχηγός, Heb. ii. 10; *cf.* ἀπαρχή above), in His solitary glory; and the rest of the army now sleeping, to rise at His trumpet's sound (52, 1 Thess. iv. 16).—It is incongruous to make a third τάγμα out of τὸ τέλος (ver. 24) as Bg. and Mr. would do, paraphrasing this as "the *last act* (of the resurrection),"—*viz.*, the resurrection *of non-Christians*. *Their* introduction is irrelevant: P. has proved the resurrection of Christ, and is now making out that the resurrection of His sleeping ones is bound up with His own. *Christ and Christians* are the participants in the resurrection of life. ἔπειτα, opp. of πρῶτον (*cf.* 46) implied

Χριστός, ἔπειτα [x] οἱ [x] Χριστοῦ [1] [y] ἐν τῇ [y] παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ [2]· 24. [z] εἶτα τὸ [a] τέλος, ὅταν [b] παραδῷ [3] τὴν [c] βασιλείαν τῷ [d] Θεῷ καὶ [d] πατρί, ὅταν [e] καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν [f] ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν [f] ἐξουσίαν καὶ

x For gen. constr., see i. 12.
y 1 Th. ii. 19, iii. 13, v. 23; 1 Jo. ii. 28. The noun freq. with this ref. *Cf.* xvi. 17.
z Single, in temp. sense, Jas. i. 15; Mk. iv. 17, viii. 25; Lk. viii. 12; Jo. xiii. 5, xix. 27, xx. 27.
a 1 Pet. iv. 7; Mt. xxiv. 6, 14. See i. 8.
b *Cf.* Mt. xi. 27; Lk. iv. 6.
c See iv. 20. Abs., Acts xx. 25; Lk. xii. 32, xix. 15; Rev. i. 6, v. 10.
d 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31; Rom. xv. 6; Gal. i. 4; Eph. i. 3, iii. 14; Col. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3; Rev. i. 6.
e See i. 28.
f All three, Eph. i. 21. *αρχ.* and *εξουσ.*, Eph. iii. 10, vi. 12; Col. i. 16, ii. 10, 15; Tit. iii. 1. *αρχ.* and *δυν.*, Rom. viii. 38. *εξουσ.* and *δυν.*, 1 Pet. iii. 22; Rev. xvii. 13.

[1] **του Χριστου**: all Gr. MSS. The early printed texts omd. **του** by error.

[2] Ins. **ελπισαντες (οι εν τῃ παρουσιᾳ αυτου ελπισαντες)**: G, with several latt. codd. Hil., Ambrst.,—also *qui in adventu ejus crediderunt*; instances of Western license.

[3] **παραδιδῳ** (?), ℵADP, 67**. Or **παραδιδοι** (?), BG.; so Lachm. *txt.* and Tr. *txt.*, Nestle, R.V. See Wr., p. 360; Bm., p. 46.

in **ἀπαρχῄ**, is defined by **ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ**. Some attach the latter phrase to **οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ**, referring it to the *first* advent; but Christ's **παρουσία** in the N.T. always signifies His *future* coming. There is nothing to exclude O.T. saints (see x. 4; Heb. xi. 26, 40, John i. 11), nor even the righteous heathen (Acts x. 35, Matt. xxv. 32, 34, John x. 16), from the **τάγμα** of "those who are Christ's".

Ver. 24. **εἶτα τὸ τέλος**: "*Then* (is) the end"—sc., "at His coming". Christ's advent, attended with the resurrection of His redeemed to eternal life, concludes the world's history; then "the harvest" which is "the end of the world" (Matt. xiii. 39 f., 49; *cf.* Rev. xiv. 15 f.), "the end of all things" (1 Pet. iv. 7), the dénoûment of the drama of sin and redemption in which "the Adam" and "the Christ" have played out their respective parts, the limit of the human horizon.—As **ἔπειτα** was defined by **ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ**, so **εἶτα** by the two **ὅταν** clauses: "when He yields up the kingdom to His God and Father, when He has abolished every rule and every authority and power". The two vbs. denote distinct, but connected and complementary acts. **παραδιδῷ** (the reading **παραδιδοῖ** is sbj., not opt.: Bm., p. 46) is *pr.* sbj., signifying a proceeding, contingent in its date and manner of occurrence, but concurrent with **εἶτα**, which again rests upon **ἐν τ. παρουσίᾳ**. The *aor.* sbj. **καταργήσῃ** (Lat. *futurum exactum*) signalises an event lying behind the **παραδιδῷ** and by its nature antecedent thereto, —"when He shall have done away, etc."; every opposing force has been destroyed, *then* Christ lays at the Father's feet His kingdom. "Cum *tradat* (not *tradiderit*: so Vg., reading **παραδῷ**) regnum, etc., cum evacuerit omnem principatum, etc."—The title **τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πατρί**, "to Him who is God and Father," contains the reason for this **παράδοσις**: Christ's one aim was to glorify the Father (Luke ii. 49, John iv. 34, vi. 38, xvii. 4, etc.); this end was reached proximately at the cross (John xix. 30), and will be so ultimately when our Lord, having "subdued all things to Himself" (Phil. iii. 21), is able to present to the Father a realm dominated by His will and filled with His obedient sons (*cf.* Matt. vi. 9 f.). This is no ceasing of Christ's rule, but the inauguration of *God's* eternal kingdom: **παραδιδῷ** does not connote the *losing* of anything (see John xvii. 10); it is just the rendering to another of what is designed for Him (*cf.* 3, v. 5, Rom. viii. 32, Luke iv. 6, x. 22, etc.). "The end" does not mean the termination of *Christ's sovereignty*, which in its largest sense began before the world (John i. 1-3, xvii. 5) and is its goal (Col. i. 16); but the termination of *the reign of sin and death* (Rom. v. 21; *cf.* John vi. 37 ff.). At the **συντέλεια** "the throne of God and of the Lamb," "the kingdom of Christ and of God," fills the N.T. horizon (Eph. v. 5, Rev. xi. 15, xxii. 3).—**ἀρχὴν, ἐξουσίαν κ.τ.λ.**, should not be limited (with Ff. generally, Est., Ed., Gd., El., Sm.; Everling, *Paulin. Angelol. u.s.w.*, p. 44, in view of Eph. i. 21, vi. 12, Col. ii. 15, etc.) to *angelic powers*, or *demons*; nor (as by Cv., Gr.: *cf.* ii. 6) to *earthly rulers*: **πᾶσαν . . . πᾶσαν . . .** (see **πάντας τοὺς ἐχθρούς**, 25; **πάντα ὑπέταξεν**, 27; also Rom. viii. 37-39) embraces *all* forces oppugnant to God (Bg., Cr., Hn., Hf., Bt.), on earth or above it, whether they exercise *princely sway* (**ἀρχὴν**) or *moral authority* (**ἐξουσίαν**) or *active power* (**δύναμιν**). Death is a **βασιλεὺς** amongst these (Rom. v.

[f] δύναμιν· 25. [g] δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν [h] βασιλεύειν [i] ἄχρις [i] οὗ ἂν[1] [k] θῇ πάντας τοὺς [k] ἐχθροὺς[2] ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ· 26.[3] ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς [e] καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος. 27. "[l] πάντα" γὰρ "ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ·"[3] ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ ὅτι[4] "[l] πάντα ὑποτέτακται" ([m] δῆλον

g See viii. 2.
h See iv. 8.
i See xi. 26.
k Ps. cix. 1; Acts ii. 35; Heb. i. 13, x. 13; Mt. xxii. 44.
l Ps. viii. 6. In like connexion, Eph. i. 22; Phil. iii. 21; Heb. ii. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 22; see xiv. 32.
m Gal. iii. 11.

[1] *Om.* **αν** all pre-Syrian codd. *Cf.* xi. 26.

[2] Insert **αυτου** AG, 17, sah. cop. syr[sch].

[3] ℵ*, 17, om. **εσχατος . . . ποδας αυτου** (26, 27*a*), by skipping from the **ποδας αυτου** of ver. 25. See notes on vv. 13-16.

[4] *Om.* **οτι** (?) B d e, vg., and several Ff. Lachm. *brackets;* W.H. om. in *marg.*

14); and behind death Satan (Heb. ii. 14 f.), "the prince" and "god of this world" (2 Cor. iv. 4, John xiv. 30). On **καταργέω,** see note to i. 28.

Ver. 25 sustains the representation of the **τέλος** just given by prophetic words of Scripture (*cf.* 3 f.): "For He must needs reign, until He has put all the enemies underneath His feet". Not till *every* enemy of God is vanquished can Christ's existing kingdom reach its end. P. is thinking of the culmination, not the cessation, of Christ's kingship (see note on **παραδιδῷ,** 24).—**πάντας** is added to the text of the Psalmist, as if to say: "*Every one* of the foes proscribed in the Messiah's charter must submit, before He can present to His Father a perfect kingdom"; see parls., for other applications of this cardinal O.T. dictum.—On **δεῖ,** see note to viii. 2.—**ἄχρις οὗ**—radically "up to," rather than "until, (the time at) which"—in later Gr. takes sbj. of future contingency dispensing with **ἂν** (Wr., p. 371)—.The words of Ps. cx. are freely adapted: **θῇ** gets its subject from **αὐτόν,** viz. *Christ*—not *God*, as imported by Est., Bz., Bg., Hf., Gd., to suit the Ps.; it is parl. in tense-construction to **καταργήσῃ** (24, see note).

Ver. 26. **ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος**: "(As) last enemy death is abolished"—in other words, "is abolished *last* among these enemies".—**ἔσχατος** is the emphatic part of the predicate; and **καταργ.** (see i. 28) is in pr. tense, of what is true now in God's determination, in the fixed succession of things (*cf.* iii. 13). Death personified, as in ver. 55, Isa. xxv. 8, Rev. xx. 14. If *all* enemies must be subdued, and death is *last* to fall, then "the end" (24) cannot be until Christ has delivered His own from its power and thus broken Death's sceptre.—This ver. should close with a full stop. **Καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος** is the Christian counter-position to the **'Ανάστασις οὐκ ἔστιν** of Cor. philosophy; the **τινὲς** of ver. 12 say, "There is no resurrection"; P. replies, "There is to be *no death*". The dogma of unbelief has been confuted *in fact* by Christ's bodily resurrection (13 ff.); *in experience*, by the saving effect thereof in Christians (17); and now finally *in principle*, by its contrariety to the purpose and scope of redemption (21-26), which finds its goal in the death of Death. Hofmann makes **τὸ τέλος** in ver. 24 adverbial to ver. 26 ("at last," *cf.* 1 Peter iii. 8), with the **ὅταν** clauses as its definitions and the **γὰρ** clause parenthetical: "then *finally*, when etc., when etc. (for etc.), as *last* enemy death is abolished". His construction is too artificial to be sustained; but he sees rightly that this ver. is the climax of the Apostle's argument.

Vv. 27, 28 are a supplement to vv. 20-26. They reaffirm, in new words of Scripture, the unlimited dominion assigned to Christ (25-27*a*), in order to reassert more impressively the truth that only through His absolute victory can the kingdom of God be consummated (24*a*, 28*b*). The opening **γὰρ** adduces, by way of comment, a prophecy parl. to that cited in ver. 25 and specifically applied in ver. 26. Psalm viii. promised to man complete rule over his domain (*cf.* Heb. ii. 5 ff.); as *man* Christ here stands forth the countertype of Adam (21 f.) who forfeited our estate, winning for Himself and His own the deliverance from death (Heb. ii. 9, 14 f.) which seals His conquest and sets "all things under His feet". *But* (**δὲ . . . δέ**) this subjection of all things to Christ is no infringement of God's sovereignty nor alienation of His rights; on the contrary, it is the means to their perfect realisation. Such is the purport of the two **ὅταν** sentences, the second of which repeats in another way, after the interposed **δῆλον ὅτι** clause, what the first has announced, **τότε αὐτὸς**

[m] ὅτι [n] ἐκτὸς τοῦ [1] ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ [1] πάντα), 28. ὅταν [1] δὲ [1] ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα,[1] τότε καὶ [2] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς [1] ὑποταγήσεται τῷ [1] ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ [1] πάντα, ἵνα [o] ᾖ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ [3] [o p] πάντα [o] ἐν [p] πᾶσιν.

n In this sense, Acts xxvi. 22; Isa. xxvi. 13. *Cf.* vi. 18, and xiv. 5.

o Col. iii. 11; Herod., iii., 157, παντα ην εν τοις Βαβυλωνιοισι Ζωπυρος (Al.).

p See xii. 6.

[1] **οταν . . . παντα** omd. by ℵ*, and a few others, skipping from **τ. παντα** of ver.

[2] Om. **και** BDG, 17, 67**, latt. vg. Lachm. and W.H. *bracket*; Tr. omits.

[3] *Om.* **τα** ABD*, 17. So Lachm., Tr., W.H., Nestle. Tisch. retains.

ὁ υἱὸς furnishing their common apodosis (*cf.* 54); so Hf., R.V. marg., after the Vg. and Lat. interpreters. The two vv. then read as follows: "For 'all things did He put in subjection under His feet'. But when He hath said, 'All things are brought to subjection' (manifestly, with the exception of Him that put all things in subjection to Him)—yea, when all things have become subject to Him, then shall (also) the Son Himself become subject to Him that made subject to Him all things, to the end that God may be all in all".—*God* is the tacit subject of **ὑπέταξεν**, as supplied by the familiar Ps. and brought out by the ptps. in vv. 27*b*, 28*b*; but *Christ* is subject to **εἴπῃ**—not *God* speaking in Scr., or at the end of the world (so Mr., Ed., El., etc.), nor **ἡ γραφή** (D.W., and others), nor *propheta* (Bg.). "All things are subdued!" is the joyful announcement *by the Son* that the grand promise recorded in the 8th Psalm is fulfilled; "the **ὑπέταξεν** of God affirms the purpose, the **ὑποτέτακται** of Christ attests its accomplishment" (Hf., Hn.). Thus **ὅταν εἴπῃ** is simultaneous with **ὅταν καταργήσῃ** (24) and **ὅταν θῇ ὑπὸ τ. πόδας** (25): Christ proclaims the victory at last achieved; He reports that, with the abolition of death, His commission is ended and the travail of His soul satisfied. For anticipatory sayings of His, giving an earnest of this crowning word, see Matt. xi. 27, xxviii. 18, John iii. 35.—**ὅταν ὑποταγῇ κ.τ.λ.** (28) reassumes objectively, as matter of fact, what was given subjectively in **ὅταν εἴπῃ κ.τ.λ.** as the verdict of Christ upon His own finished work. Those who read **δῆλον ὅτι κ.τ.λ.** as a principal sentence, the apodosis to the first **ὅταν** clause (A.V., Mr., El., etc.), borrow from the protasis **πάντα ὑποτέτακται**—more strictly **ὑποτετάξεται** or (by zeugma) **ἔσται**, after the virtually fut. **εἴπῃ** (*cf.* 28*b*, 54*b*); this, however, makes a halting sentence: "But when He [God] says, 'All things have been made subject,' it is evident [that this will be, *or* that all things will be subjected] with the exception of Him, etc."—an affirmation of quite subsidiary importance, on which the writer has no need to dwell. The non-inclusion of *God* in the category of "things subjected" is rather a self-evident assumption made by the way, and serving to prepare for and throw into relief the real apodosis, "then shall the Son Himself also become subject, etc.," to which both the **ὅταν** clauses press forward. The advl. use of **δῆλον ὅτι** (perhaps better written **δηλονότι = δηλαδή**), signifying *manifestly* or *to wit* (*sine dubio*, Vg.), is familiar in Attic Gr.; no other certain instance occurs in the N.T. The remark that He who *gave* dominion is not Himself *under* it, reserves behind the Messianic reign the absolute supremacy of God, to which Christ will conform at the plenitude of His kingship.—**τὰ πάντα** (equivalent to "the universe") gathers into a totality the **πάντα** otherwise separate and diverse: *cf.* Col. i. 17, **τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν**.—**ὑποταγήσεται** (mid. in force, like the 2nd aor. pass. in Rom. x. 3, in consistency with the initiative ascribed to Christ throughout) has often been explained away, to avoid Arian or Sabellian inferences from the text; it affirms no other subjection of the Son than is involved in Sonship (see note on 24). This implies no inferiority of nature, no extrusion from power, but the free submission of love (**αὐτὸς ὁ υἱός**, "the Son of His own accord will subject Himself"—not in addition to, but in distinction from the **πάντα**), which is the essence of the filial spirit that actuated Christ from first to last (*cf.* John viii. 29, xii. 27, etc.). Whatsoever glory He gains is devoted to the glory and power of the Father (John xvii. 2, etc.), who glorifies Him in turn (John xvii. 5; Phil. ii. 9 ff.). **ὑποταγήσεται** speaks the closing word of Christ's mission, as **Ἰδοὺ ἥκω τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου** was its opening word (Heb. x. 7).—It is hard to say whether **ἵνα ᾖ ὁ Θεὸς κ.τ.λ.** is dependent

29. [q] Ἐπεὶ [r] τί [r] ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι [1] ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν,[1] εἰ [s] ὅλως [t] νεκροὶ οὐκ [t] ἐγείρονται [1]; [u] τί [u] καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ τῶν [2] νεκρῶν [2]; 30. [u] τί [u] καὶ ἡμεῖς [v] κινδυνεύομεν [w] πᾶσαν [w] ὥραν;

q See v. 10. r Acts xxi. 13; Mk. xi. 5; Jo. xi. 47; in LXX, Jer. iv. 30, v. 31; Hos. ix. 5. s See v. 1. t See ver. 15. u Here and Rom. viii. 24 (?) only. v Acts xix. 27, 40; Lk. viii. 23 (abs. as here); Isa. xxviii. 13; Jonah i. 4; -νος, 2 Cor. xi. 26. w N.T. *h.l.*; Ex. xviii. 22, 26; Lev. xvi. 2. *Cf.* Rom. viii. 36.

[1] Lachm., Tisch., Al., W.H., El., Nestle, and others, place the *interrog.* sign *after* **νεκρων**, attaching **ει ολως κ.τ.λ.** to the following sentence. Tr. puts it as far back as **βαπτιζομενοι**. See note below.

[2] **αυτων**, all uncc. but DcL.

on **ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγήσεται** (so most commentt.) or on **τ. ὑποτάξαντι** (so Hf., and some others). This solemn conclusion most fitly attaches to the princ. vb.; it expresses the loyal *purpose of the Son* in His self-subjection, whose submission exhibits the unity of the Godhead (*cf.* John x. 30-36, xvii. 23), and constitutes itself the focus and uniting bond of a universe in which God's will is everywhere regnant and His being everywhere immanent.—**πᾶσιν** *neuter*, like **πάντα**.

§ 53. THE EFFECT OF UNBELIEF IN THE RESURRECTION, xv. 29-34. To clinch the argument for the truth and the necessity of the Christian resurrection and to bring it home to the readers, the Ap. points out how futile Christian devotion must be, such as is witnessed in "those baptised for the dead" and in his own daily hazards, if death ends all (29-31); present enjoyment would then appear the highest good (32). The effect of unbelief in the future life is already painfully apparent in the relaxed moral tone of a certain part of the Cor. Church (33 f.).

Vv. 29, 30. There are certain conditions of interpretation bearing on the sense of the much discussed expression **οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν** which bar out a large number of attempted explanations: (*a*) **οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι**, unless otherwise defined, can only mean *the recipients of Christian baptism*, in its well-understood sense as the rite of initiation into the Christian state administered upon confession of faith (i. 13 ff., xii. 13, Rom. vi. 3 f., Gal. iii. 27, etc.). (*b*) **ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν** (not **ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν**, "on behalf of dead persons" as such: *cf.* 12, etc.) points to *a specific class of "the dead"* interested in the baptism of the living—presumably to "the (Christian) dead" of the last §, and probably to those amongst them who were connected with "the baptised" in question. (*c*) In following up ver. 29 with the words of ver 30 (**τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν;**) *P. associates himself with the action of* "those baptised for the dead," indicating that they and he are engaged on the same behalf (for **καὶ ἡμεῖς** associating "we" with persons aforementioned, *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 13, Gal. ii. 16, iv. 3, Eph. ii. 3, etc.). This last consideration excludes the interpretation, at present widely adopted (Ambrst., Anselm, Grot., Mr., Holsten, Al., Hn., Bt., El., Sm.), that P. alludes to a practice then (it is conjectured) in vogue at Cor., which existed much later amongst the heretical Cerinthians and Marcionites (see Cm. *ad loc.* in Cramer's *Catena;* Tert., *De Resurr. Carnis*, 48, *adv. Marc.*, v., 10; Epiph., *Hær.*, xxviii., 6), *viz.*, that of the *vicarious baptism* of living Christians as proxies for relatives or friends dying unbaptised. With such a proceeding P. could not have identified himself, even supposing that it existed at this time in the Church (of which there is no evidence), and that he had used it by way of *argumentum ad hominem*. An appeal to such a superstitious *opus operatum* would have laid the Ap. open to a damaging retort. Gd. justly asks, ' A quoi eût servi ce procédé de mauvaise logique et de bonne foi douteuse?" This objection tells less forcibly against the view, lately suggested, that P. alludes to *some practice of substitutionary baptism observed in the Pagan mysteries*, finding thus a witness to the Resurrection in the heathen conscience, **καὶ ἡμεῖς** adding thereto the Christian practical testimony; but condition (*a*) forbids this solution. As El. admits, condition (*b*) also bears strongly against the prevalent exposition. (*b*) moreover negatives the idea of Cm. and the Gr. Ff., maintained by Est. and Ev. (see the ingenious *Addit. Note* of the latter), that **ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν** means, as Thp. puts it, **ὑπὲρ ἀναστάσεως, ἐπὶ προσδοκίᾳ ἀναστάσεως**: if P. meant this, why did he not say it? The fol-

31. [x] καθ᾽ [x] ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω, [y] νὴ τὴν [z] ὑμετέραν [1] [a] καύχησιν [2] ἣν [a] ἔχω [a] ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν· 32. εἰ [b] κατὰ [b] ἄνθρωπον

x 2 Cor. xi. 28; thrice in Heb.; 13 exx. in Lk. and Acts; Mt. xxvi. 55. y N.T. *h.l.*; Gen. xlii. 15 f. z = obj. gen., Rom. xi. 31; so ἡμετ., Rom. xv. 4. See note below. a Rom. xv. 17. For the noun, Rom. iii. 27; 6 exx. in 2 Cor.; 1 Th. ii. 19; Jas. iv. 16. -ημα, see v. 6; -αομαι, see i. 29. b See iii. 3, and note below.

[1] ημετεραν: A, and many minn., Or., Thdrt. So Stephens and Beza, but not Elzevir.

[2] Ins. αδελφοι ℵABKP, and 15 minn., sah. cop. vg. syrr. Om[d]. by the Western and Syrian codd.

lowing ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν indicates that by ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν definite (dead) *persons* are meant. Ed. notices with approval the rendering of John Edwards (Camb., 1692), who supposed these "baptized" to be men *converted* to Christianity *by the heroism of the martyrs;* somewhat similarly, Gd. This points in the right direction, but misses the force of ὑπέρ (*on behalf of;* not διά, *on account of*), and narrows the ref. of τῶν νεκρῶν (*cf.* 18, 20, 23); there is no indication in the ep. of *martyrdoms* at Cor. (see, on the contrary, iv. 9 f.). P. is referring rather to a much commoner, indeed a normal experience, that the death of Christians leads to the conversion of survivors, who in the first instance "for the sake of the dead" (their beloved dead), and in the hope of reunion, turn to Christ—*e.g.*, when a dying mother wins her son by the appeal, "Meet me in heaven!" Such appeals, and their frequent salutary effect, give strong and touching evidence of *faith in the resurrection;* some recent example of the kind may have suggested this ref. Paul designates such converts "*baptised* for the dead," since Baptism seals the new believer and commits him to the Christian life (see note, xii. 13) with all its losses and hazards (*cf.* 30). The hope of future blessedness, allying itself with family affections and friendship, was one of the most powerful factors in the early spread of Christianity. Mr. objects to this view (expounded by Köster) that τ. νεκρῶν needs definition by συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων, or the like, to bear such meaning; but to each of these βαπτιζόμενοι those who had thus influenced him would be "*the* dead". The obscure passage has, upon this explanation, a large, abiding import suitable to the solemn and elevated context in which it stands; the words reveal a communion in Christ between the living and departed (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 9), to which the hope of the resurrection gives validity and worth (*cf.* 1 Thess. v. 10, 2 Thess. ii. 1).—For ἐπεί, *since otherwise, else* (*alioquin*, Vg.; Germ. *da sonst*), see note on v. 10.—τί ποιήσουσιν; (see LXX parls.) indicates that the hope on which these baptisms rest will be stultified, without a resurrection; it will betray them (Rom. v. 5).—εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ κ.τ.λ., "If absolutely (*omnino*, Vg.: see note, v. 10) dead men are not raised" (the axiom of the unbelievers, 12, 15, etc.), unfolds the assumption involved in ἐπεί as the protasis of τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν; which repeats, with emphasis on the pronoun, the former question—"Why indeed are they baptised *for them?*" how can *they* be interested in the baptism of survivors, if they have perished (18)? On this assumption, converts would have been gained upon *false hopes* (*cf.* 19), as well as upon *false testimony* (15).—"Why also do *we* run hazard every hour?"—further consequent of εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται: "our case (that of the App. and other missionaries, braving death unceasingly: see 11; iv. 9 ff., 2 Cor. iv. 10 ff., xi. 23 ff.; John xv. 18-xvi. 22) is parl. to theirs; as they, in love for the dead whom they hope to meet again, take up the cross of Christian profession, so we in the same hope face hourly peril".

Vv. 31, 32*a*. In no slight jeopardy do P. and his comrades stand; for his part he declares, "Daily *I am dying;* my life at Ephesus has been that of a combatant with wild beasts in the arena—*for what end*, if there is no resurrection?" With καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 10, xi. 23, Rom. viii. 36; referring to his present "affliction in Asia," P. writes in 2 Cor. i. 8 f., "We have had the sentence of death in ourselves". Ed. softens the expression into "self-denial, dying to self and the world": better Cv., "obsideor assiduis mortibus quotidie"; and Gd., "Not a day, nor an hour of the day, when they might not expect to be seized and led out to execution".—P. had not been in this extreme peril at

[c] ἐθηριομάχησα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, [d] τί μοι τὸ [d] ὄφελος; εἰ [b] νεκροὶ οὐκ [b] ἐγείρονται, [e] Φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, [f] αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν.

c *H.l.*; see note below. d Jas. ii. 14, 16; Job xv. 3; *cf.* xiv. 6, xiii. 3. e Isa. xxii. 13. f Adv., Jas. iv. 13; Acts xxiii. 20, xxv. 22; Lk. xii. 28, xiii. 32 f.; Mt. vi. 30; Exod. viii. 29.

Cor. (see Acts xviii. 9 f.), and his readers might think the description overdrawn; so he exclaims, **νὴ τ. ὑμετέραν καύχησιν κ.τ.λ.**: "Yea, by the glorying over you, brothers, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord!" *cf.* the protests of 2 Cor. i. 18, 23, xi. 10 f., 31, Rom. ix. 1. He protests by this **καύχησις** as by that which is dearest to him: *cf.* i. 4 ff., iv. 14, 2 Cor. vii. 3, 14 ff.; similarly in 1 Thess. ii. 19 f., 2 Thess. i. 4, Phil. iv. 1, etc. For this rare use of the pron., *cf.* xi. 24, **τ. ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν** (and note), 2 Cor. ix. 3. **νή** (= **ναί**) with acc. of adjuration, a cl. idiom.—Paul's "glorying" he "holds *in* Christ Jesus our Lord" (*cf.* i. 7); it is laid up with Christ as a **καύχημα εἰς ἡμέραν Χ.** (Phil. ii. 16; *cf.* iii. 8, iv. 3 ff. above, 1 Thess. ii. 19, Col. i. 4, etc.).—"If in the manner of men I have fought with wild beasts in Ephesus, what is the profit?" **κατὰ ἄνθρωπον** bears the stress, "humanitus—spe vitæ præsentis duntaxat" (Bg.: *cf.* iii. 3 f.); seeking the rewards—applause, money, etc.—for which men risk their lives. Instead of these, P. earns poverty and infamy (iv. 9 ff., Phil. iii. 7 f.); if there is no "day of Christ" when his "glorying" will be realised, he has been befooled (*cf.* 19 and note, Phil. iii. 14, 2 Tim iv. 8; Matt. xix. 27 ff., Luke xiv. 14, xxii. 28 ff.).—**ὄφελος** (from **ὀφέλλω**, *to increase;* nearly syn. with **μισθός**, iii. 8, etc.; or **κέρδος**, Phil. i. 21) signifies the consequent advantage accruing to P. from his fight; that it brings present moral benefit is obvious, but this is not the point (*cf.* ix. 24-27; see Ed. *ad loc.*, touching the diff. of pagan and Christian morality). — **ἐθηριομάχησα** is probably *figurative*, though Gd., Weizsäcker (*Apost. Zeitalter*[2], pp. 325 f.), McGiffert (*Christianity in the Apost. Age*, pp. 280 f.), with some older expositors, take it that P. had been actually a **θηριομάχος** in the Ephesian amphitheatre, despite his Roman citizenship. But no such experience is recorded in the list of his woes in 2 Cor. xi.; moreover it appears from Acts xix. 31-40 that P. had friends in high quarters at Eph., who would have prevented this outrage if attempted. Ignatius (*ad Rom.*, v.; *cf. ad Smyrn.*, iv.) applies the figure to his guards, borrowing it probably from this place. The metaphor is in the strain of iv. 9 (see note); *cf.* also Ps. xxii. 12, 16, etc., and the use of **θηρίον** in the Rev.—In view of this last parl. and of 2 Tim. iv. 17, Krenkel in his *Beiträge*, V., finds the "wild beast" of Paul's struggle in *the Imperial Power*, which K. thinks was already so designated "in the secret language of Christians" (*cf.* 2 Thess. ii. 5 f.). But nothing in Acts xix. indicates conflict on P.'s part with the magistrates of Eph. (and Lk. habitually traces with care his relations with Roman authorities); it was *the city-mob*, instigated by the shrine-makers, which attacked him; before the riot he had been probably in danger of assassination from this quarter, as well as from "the Asian Jews," who set upon him afterwards in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 27 ff.). Bt. observes the climax: **κινδυνεύω, ἀποθνήσκω, θηριομαχῶ.**

Ver. 32*b* states in words of Scripture the desperation that ensues upon loss of faith in a future life: "If (the) dead are not raised (the Sadducean dogma repeated a *sixth* time), 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die!'" **εἰ νεκροὶ κ.τ.λ.** is rightly attached by the early Gr. and most modern commentt. to the following clause. Paul is not drawing *his own* conclusion in these words, nor suggesting that the resurrection supplies the only motive against a sensual life; but he points out (*cf.* 33 f.) the patent fruit of the unbelief in question. This is just *what men were saying* on all sides; the words quoted voice the moral recklessness bred by loss of hope beyond death. Gr. and Rom. literature teem with examples of this spirit (see Wisd. ii. 6; Herod., ii., 78, Thuc., ii., 53, and other reff. furnished by Ed. *ad loc.*); indeed Paul's O.T. citation might have served for the axiom of popular Epicureanism. Hn. describes ancient drinking-cups, recently discovered, ornamented with skeleton figures wreathed in roses and named after famous philosophers, poets, and gourmands, with mottoes attached such as these: **τὸ τέλος ἡδονή, τέρπε ζῶν σεαυτόν, σκηνὴ βίος, τοῦτ' ἄνθρωπος** (written over a skeleton holding a skull), **ζῶν μετάλαβε τὸ γὰρ αὔριον ἄδηλόν ἐστιν.** *Cf.* our own miserable adage, "A short life and a merry one!"

Vv. 33, 34 deliver Paul's judgment

33. [g] μὴ [g] πλανᾶσθε· "[h] φθείρουσιν [i] ἤθη [k] χρήσθ' [1] [l] ὁμιλίαι κακαί [m]". 34. [m] ἐκνήψατε [n] δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε, [o] ἀγνωσίαν γὰρ [o] Θεοῦ τινες ἔχουσι· πρὸς [p] ἐντροπὴν ὑμῖν λέγω.[2]

35. [q] Ἀλλ' [q] ἐρεῖ [q] τις, "Πῶς [r] ἐγείρονται οἱ [r] νεκροί; [s] ποίῳ δὲ

g See vi. 9. h See iii. 17. i N.T. *h.l.*; Sir. xx. 26. k Elsewhere in N.T. *of persons* (*cf.* Jer. xxiv. 2); Rom. ii. 4; Eph. iv. 32, etc. -ευομαι, xiii. 4; -οτης, 2 Cor. vi. 6, and eight times besides in P. l N.T. *h.l.*; Ex. xxi. 10; Prov. vii. 21; Wisd. viii. 18. m N.T. *h.l.*; Gen. ix. 24; 1 Ki. xxv. 37; Joel i. 5, ανανηφω. n 1 Th. ii. 10; Tit. ii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 23; Lk. xxiii. 41; Deut. xvi. 20. o Wisd. xiii. 1. αγνωσ., 1 Pet. ii. 15; Job xxxv. 16. p See vi. 5. q Jas. ii. 16. r See ver. 15. s Rom. iii. 27; Jas. iv. 14; 1 Pet. i. 11, ii. 20; Rev. iii. 3; oftener in GG. and Acts.

[1] χρηστα, all uncc., many minn., and nearly all Ff. Printed χρησθ' for sake of metre. Read, doubtless, with elision of the α.

[2] λαλω, ℵBDP. λεγω, AGL, etc. A freq. variation; *cf.* vi. 5.

upon the situation: the disbelief in the Resurrection declared in the Cor. Church is of a piece with its low ethics (iii. 1 ff., iv. 18-v. 2) and its heathen intimacies (viii. 10, x. 14-22, 2 Cor. v. 14-vii. 1); it springs from **ἀγνωσία Θεοῦ**, from a feeble religious consciousness.—**μὴ πλανᾶσθε** (see parls.), "Be not misled (seduced)": the seduction lay in the specious philosophy under which sceptical tenets were advanced, concealing their demoralising tendency. The line the Ap. quotes (an ordinary senarius of the dialogue in the Attic drama: **χρηστά**, so *written* in the best copies, was probably *read* **χρήσθ'**, Wr., Hn.) is attributed to Menander (322 B.C.), of the New Comedy and an Epicurean, by Tert. and Hier., followed by most others. But this was a proverbial gnomé, and probably current long before Menander. **ὁμιλίαι** bears the narrower sense of *conversations* (A.V.; *colloquia*, Vg.), or the wider sense, more fitting here, of *intercourse*, *companionships* (R.V.).—**ἐκνήψατε δικαίως κ.τ.λ.** (*cf.* 32*b*, xi. 21; and parls. for **ἐκνήφω**): "Rouse up to soberness in righteous fashion, and cease to sin" (the first impv. is *aor.*, of a single action; the second *pr.*, of a course of action)—a startling call, to men fallen as if into a drunken sleep under the seductions of sensualism and heathen society and the fumes of intellectual pride. **δικαίως** signifies the *manner* of the awaking; it is *right* the Cor. should rouse themselves from self-delusion; P. assails their conscience.—**ἀγνωσίαν γὰρ Θεοῦ τινες** (*cf.* 12) **ἔχουσιν**, "For some have (maintain) an ignorance of God" (*cf.* the use of **ἔχω** in 31, viii. 1, Rom. iv. 2, v. 1, respecting *states of mind*); this asserts, beyond **τὸν Θεὸν ἀγνοοῦσιν**, a characteristic, a persistent condition, in which the Cor. **τινὲς** share with the heathen (xii. 2, Rom. i. 19 ff., etc.).—**πρὸς ἐντροπὴν ὑμῖν λαλῶ**, "I say (it) for a shame to you," otherwise than in iv. 14. "Ignorance of God" is a deeper evil than the ingratitude toward the Ap. which he censured earlier; this can only be remedied by a thorough inward reaction—"ad pudorem vobis incutiendum dico" (Cv.). That these wise Cor. should be taxed with "ignorance," and "*of God*" on the knowledge of whom they flattered themselves above all (viii. 1, 4), was humiliating indeed.

§ 54. THE MANNER OF THE RESURRECTION, xv. 35-42*a*. We enter on the second part of the Apostle's argument touching the Resurrection: see the analysis, *Introd.* to Div. V. He has established the truth of the doctrine and the certainty of the event, and proceeds consequently to set forth *the manner of its occurrence* and *the nature of the new body* to be assumed. P. has still in view the unbelieving "some," and pursues the dialectical and apologetic vein of the foregoing context. The deniers found in *the inconceivability of the process* (35) a further and, in their eyes, decisive objection against the reality of the fact. In vindicating his doctrine upon this side, P. therefore confirms its truth; he traces its analogies in nature, and its harmony with the order of Divine revelation; and the first half of his grand argument culminates in the second. See Edwards' subtle analysis of vv. 35-44.

Ver. 35. **Ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις**: this form of interlocution belongs to Jewish dialectic (see parls.); *cf.* ver. 12, also **ἐρεῖς μοι**, Rom. ix. 19, and the familiar Pauline challenge, **τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν;**—"How are the dead raised up? With what sort of (**ποίῳ δὲ**) body moreover do they come?"—two distinct questions. **δὲ** might indeed introduce the same question in an altered form (Mr., Bt., El., Sm.), but the vbs. and the interr. prons. are both different. The first (*cf.* Luke i. 34, John iii. 9, vi. 52, Heb. ii. 3, 1 John iii. 17)

σώματι ἔρχονται;" 36. [t]ἄφρον,[1] σὺ ὃ σπείρεις οὐ [u]ζωοποιεῖται ἐὰν μὴ [v]ἀποθάνῃ· 37. καὶ ὃ σπείρεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις, ἀλλὰ [w]γυμνὸν [x]κόκκον, [y]εἰ [y]τύχοι [z]σίτου ἤ τινος [a]τῶν [a]λοιπῶν· 38. ὁ δὲ Θεὸς αὐτῷ[2] δίδωσι[2] σῶμα [b]καθὼς [b]ἠθέλησε,

t Thus in Lk. xi. 40, xii. 20; Ps. xciii. 8; five times in 2 Cor. xi., xii. (ref. to P. himself); Rom. ii. 20; Eph. v. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 15. u See ver. 22. v *Cf.* Jo. xii. 24. w *H.l.* in this usage. For common use, see 2 Cor. v. 3, etc. x Jo. xii. 24. κοκ., Mt. xiii. 31, xvii. 20. y See xiv. 10. z In like connexion, Mt. xiii. 25, 29 f.; Mk. iv. 28. a See vii. 12, xi. 34. b See xii. 18.

[2] **αφρων**, all uncc. but KL.

[3] **διδωσιν αυτῳ**: ℵABP, 17—chief pre-Syrian and non-Western witnesses.

intimates *the impossibility of the thing*, and is answered in ver. 36; the latter, *the inconceivability of the manner*, answered in vv. 37 ff. (so Cm., Cv., D.W., Hf., Ed.). The sceptics advance their second question to justify the first: they say, "The resurrection P. preaches is absurd; how can any one imagine a new body rising out of the perished corpse—a body suitable to the deathless spirit?" The vbs. are *logical* pr., as concerned with general truths (*cf.* 26); "actio rei declaratur absque significatione temporis" (Er.).—**ἔρχονται** (*cf.* John v. 29; 1 Thess. iv. 14, **ὁ Θεὸς ἄξει**) graphically represents the difficulty of the objectors: "In what bodily form do we picture the dead coming on the scene?"

Ver. 36. **ἄφρων** (opposite of **φρόνιμοι**, iv. 10, x. 15) taxes the propounder of these questions not with moral obliquity, but with mental stupidity (see parls.). Wanting the art. (*cf.* Luke xii. 20), the word is an assertion rather than an exclamation: "Insensé que tu es, toi qui te crois si sage!" (Gd.). Some attach **σὺ** as subject to **ἄφρων**, but this weakens the adj., and the pron. is required to give due emphasis to **ὃ σπείρεις** following. With a little sense, the questioner might answer himself; every time he sows his garden-plot, he assumes the principle denied in regard to man's material form, *viz.*, that *death is the transition to a further life*—"that which thou thyself sowest, is not made alive except it die". This answers **πῶς ἐγείρονται**; by ref. to the analogy of nature. P. does not explain, any more than Jesus, the *modus operandi* of the Resurrection; what he shows is that the mystery raises no prejudice against the reality, for the same mystery is wrapped up in every vegetating seed.—**ἐγείρονται** in the question is substituted by **ζωοποιεῖται** in the answer (see note on 22; *cf.* other parls.), since it is *life* that rises out of the dying seed, and the Resurrection is an evolution, not a reinstatement. Our Lord uses the same figure with the like implication, but another application, in John xii. 23 f.

Vv. 37, 38 make answer to the second branch of the question of ver. 35, by the aid of the same profound analogy.—**καὶ ὃ σπείρεις, οὐ τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις**, "And what thou sowest—not the body that will come to be dost thou sow". It is the object of the sower to realise a new **ποιότης** in his seed. If any one interrupted him with the question, "What sort of a body can the grain take that you drop in the earth to rot?" the sower would dismiss him as a fool; he has *seen* in this case "the body that is to be". Now the actuality of the lower resurrection vindicates the conceivability of the higher.—**τὸ γενησόμενον** states not merely a future certainty (*that shall be; quod futurum sit*, Vg.), but a normal process (*oriturum*, Bz.: *quod nascetur*, Cv., Bg.).—**ἀλλὰ γυμνὸν κόκκον**, "but a naked grain"—unclothed with any body, wanting the appearance and furnishing of life (*cf.* 2 Cor. v. 3, **ἐνδυσάμενοι, οὐ γυμνοί**).—For **εἰ τύχοι** ("if it should chance, of wheat"), see note on xiv. 10: the *kind* of grain is indiff.—"or of any of the rest (of the seeds)". The grain of wheat gives to the eye no more promise of the body to spring from it than a grain of sand.—**ὁ δὲ Θεὸς** stands in opposition to **σὺ ὃ σπείρεις**—God the life-giver responding to the sower's trustful act. "But God gives it a body, according as He willed" (**ἠθέλησεν**)—not "as He wills" (according to His choice or liking), but in accordance with His past decree in creation, by which the propagation of life on the earth was determined from the beginning (Gen. i. 11 f.; for the vb., *cf.* note on xii. 18). To allege an impossibility in the case is to impugn the power and resources of the Creator (*cf.* Acts xxvi. 8), manifested in this very way every spring-time. The Divine will is the efficient nexus between seed and plant (*cf.* xii. 6).—"And (He gives) to each of the seeds a body of its own

καὶ ἑκάστῳ τῶν σπερμάτων τὸ[1] [e]ἴδιον σῶμα. 39. οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ [c]ἡ αὐτὴ σάρξ· ἀλλὰ [d]ἄλλη [d]μὲν σὰρξ[2] ἀνθρώπων, [d]ἄλλη [d]δὲ σὰρξ[3] [e]κτηνῶν,[4] [d]ἄλλη [d]δὲ [g]ἰχθύων,[5] [d]ἄλλη [d]δὲ[6] [f]πτηνῶν.[5] 40. καὶ σώματα [h]ἐπουράνια, καὶ σώματα [h][i]ἐπίγεια· ἀλλ' [k]ἑτέρα [k]μὲν ἡ

c Ver. 23. Anarthrous, Gal. vi. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 6, vi. 15; Tit. i. 3, 12, ii. 19; 2 Pet. i. 20, ii. 16; Acts xxviii. 30; Jo. x. 12. d Phrase, N.T. *h.l.* e Lk. x. 34; Acts xxiii. 24; Rev. xviii. 13; Numb. xx. 4, etc. f N.T. *h.l.*; Job v. 7. Prose for πετεινος (Rom. i. 23, etc.), which is poetical in cl. Gr. g Freq. in GG.; *h.l.* in Epp. h The antith. in Phil. ii. 10 and Jo. iii. 12. επουρ., vv. 48 f.; five times in Eph.; 2 Tim. iv. 18; six times in Heb.; Mt. xviii. 35. *Cf.* Eph. i. 10; Mt. vi. 9, etc. i 2 Cor. v. 1; Phil. iii. 19; Jas. iii. 15. *Cf.* τα επι της γης, Eph. i. 10, etc. k This form of antith., *h.l.* in N.T. For ετερος, see xii. 9.

[1] *Om.* το all pre-Syrian codd.

[2] *Om.* σαρξ all uncc., and very many minn.

[3] Om. σαρξ (before κτηνων): the Western witnesses.

[4] κτηνους, Western. K, 37, 47, om. this clause altogether, skipping to πτηνων, hrough homœoteleuton.

[5] πτηνων . . . ιχθυων (in this order): all uncc. but GKL; 17, cop. vg. syrsch.

[6] *Ins.* σαρξ (before πτηνων) all uncc. but AKLP. Ver. 39*b*, corrected, reads: αλλα αλλη μεν ανθρωπων, αλλη δε σαρξ κτηνων, αλλη δε σαρξ πτηνων, αλλη δε ιχθυων.

(ἴδιον)". This added clause meets the finer point of the second question of ver. 35; God will find a *fit* body for man's redeemed nature, as He does for each of the numberless seeds vivified in the soil. "How unintelligent to think, as the Pharisees did, that the same body that was buried must be restored, if there is to be a resurrection! Every wheat-stalk contradicts thee!" (Mr.)

Ver. 39. The rest of the § goes to sustain ver. 38*b*, showing the inexhaustible variety of organic forms in the Divine economy of nature and the fitness of each for the life it clothes. This is manifest, to begin with, in the varied types of animal life: οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἡ αὐτὴ σάρξ, "All flesh is not the same flesh"—in the zoological realm there is no uniformity, but endless differentiation. (Ed. makes πᾶσα σὰρξ predicate—"the same flesh is not all flesh," *i.e.*, physical assimilation means differentiation—getting out of the sentence a physiological idea obscure in itself and not very relevant to the context). Instead of *men*, *cattle*, *birds*, *fishes*, with their heterogeneous natures, being lodged in the same kind of corporeity, their frame and organs vary with their inner constitution and needs. If God can find a body for beast and fish, in the lower range, no less than for man, why not, in the higher range, for man immortal no less than for man mortal?—κτῆνος (from κτάομαι), denoting cattle as beasts of *purchase* in the first instance, is applied to four-footed beasts at large: *cf.* Gen. i. 25 ff., ii. 20.

Ver. 40. The possibility of a future body unimaginably diff. from the present is indicated in the contrast suggested by the diff. *regions* of the two: "Bodies also heavenly there are, and bodies earthly". The σὰρξ of ver. 39 is now dropped, for it belongs only to the σῶμα ἐπίγειον. What does P. mean by his σώματα ἐπουράνια? The previous context and the tenor of the argument lead us to think of *bodies for celestial inhabitants, sc.* the angels (Luke xx. 36, Matt. xxviii. 2, etc.), as suitable to their condition as the σώματα ἐπίγεια are for the forms of terrestrial life just enumerated (so Mr., D.W., Al., El., Sm.); moreover σῶμα is never used elsewhere in Bib. Gr., and rarely in cl. Gr., of inorganic bodies. On the other hand, ver. 41 in connexion with ver. 40*b* strongly suggests the *sun*, *moon*, etc., as the "heavenly bodies" in Paul's mind (so Bg., Hf., Hn., Ed., Bt., Gd., and most moderns). The former considerations preponderate, esp. when we find P. in vv. 47 ff. (see notes) resuming the same contrast in the antithesis between "the earthy man" and "the heavenly". Paul is thinking of *the risen Christ* whom he had seen, more than of the angels, as supplying the type of the σῶμα ἐπουράνιον; *cf.* Phil. iii. 20 f. Gm., Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Everling (*Die paul. Angelologie u.s.w.*, pp. 46 ff.) combine the above interpretations by attributing to P. the belief of Philo and the Jewish mystics that the stars are animated, and are to be identified with the O.T. "angels," as by the heathen with their gods. This

τῶν [h] ἐπουρανίων [l] δόξα, [k] ἑτέρα [k] δὲ ἡ τῶν [h l] ἐπιγείων. 41. ἄλλη δόξα [m] ἡλίου, καὶ ἄλλη [l] δόξα [m] σελήνης, καὶ ἄλλη [l] δόξα [n] ἀστέρων· [n] ἀστὴρ γὰρ [n] ἀστέρος [o] διαφέρει ἐν [l] δόξῃ. 42*a*. οὕτω καὶ ἡ [p] ἀνάστασις τῶν [p] νεκρῶν.

42*b*. [q] Σπείρεται ἐν [r] φθορᾷ, [s] ἐγείρεται ἐν [t] ἀφθαρσίᾳ· 43. [q] σπείρεται ἐν [u] ἀτιμίᾳ, [s] ἐγείρεται ἐν [l] δόξῃ· [q] σπείρεται ἐν [v] ἀσθενείᾳ,

l Thus in 2 Cor. iii. 7, 18; Lk. ix. 31 f.; Ex. xvi. 10. *Cf.* ii. 7 above.
m Acts ii. 20; Mt. xxiv. 29; Lk. xxi. 25; 4 exx. in Rev.
n Jude 13 (fig.); Mt. ii. four times, xxiv. 29; 14 exx. in Rev. o In this use, Gal. iv. 1; Dan. vii. 3 (Theod.). *Cf.* Rom. ii. 18, etc.; also iv. 7 above. p See ver. 12. q Ver. 36; see note below.
r Ver. 50; Rom. viii. 21; Gal. vi. 8; Col. ii. 22; 2 Pet. i. 4, ii. 12, 19; Jonah ii. 7. s See vi. 14.
t Rom. ii. 7; Eph. vi. 24; 2 Tim. i. 10; Wisd. ii. 23, vi. 18 f. u See xi. 14. v See ii. 3; and for antith., 2 Cor. xii. 9 f., xiii. 4 f., Heb. xi. 34.

notion is wanting in Biblical support. P. asserts that there are "bodies" for *heavenly* beings, just as there are for earthly (*cf.* 49); the adj. **ἐπουράνια** supplies the **ποιότης** desiderated in ver. 35. The heavenly and earthly bodies, alike as being "bodies," are far diff. in "glory".—**ἀλλὰ ἑτέρα κ.τ.λ.** traverses the mistaken inference as to the identity of nature in the two kinds of organism, which might be hastily drawn from ver. 39*b*: "But the glory of the heavenlies is indeed one (glory), and the (glory) of the earthlies another".—**ἑτέρα** (*cf.* note on xii. 8 ff.) implies a diff. wider, or at least more salient, than that connoted by the ἄλλη of vv. 39 and 41; where the two are distinguished in cl. Gr., **ἄλλος** marks a generic, **ἕτερος** a specific diff. How utterly diff. was the glory of the risen Lord, who appeared to P. (Acts xxvi. 13), from that of any earthly Potentate!

Ver. 41. Even amongst the **σώματα ἐπουράνια** there are varieties, just as amongst the **ἐπίγεια** (39), such as are indicated by the diff. of aspect in the visible celestial objects: "There is one glory of sun, and another glory of moon, and another glory of stars—for star differs from star in glory". While these luminous orbs are not to be *identified* with the "heavenly bodies" of ver. 40 (see note), they serve to symbolise the diversity of glory amongst them; all are glorious, but in degrees.—**ἄλλη**, as in ver. 39 (contrast 40), indicates diff. within the same order. The frequent symbolic association of sun and stars with *God*, *the angels*, *the righteous*, and with *the glorified Jesus*, may account for the asyndetic transition from ver. 40*b* (signifying *persons*) to 41. From the distinctions manifest amid the common glory of the visible heavens we may conjecture corresponding distinctions in the heavenly Intelligences and in the bodies appropriate to them.

Ver. 42*a* sums up what has been advanced in vv. 36-41, and presents it in six words: **οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν**, "So indeed is the resurrection of the dead". It is as *possible* as that plants of wholly diff. form should shoot from the seed sown by your own hand; and the *form* of each risen body will be determined by God, who finds a suitable organism for every type of earthly life, and can do so equally for every type and grade of heavenly life, in a region where, as sun, moon, and stars nightly show, the universal splendour is graduated and varied infinitely.

§ 55. The First Adam and the Last, xv. 42*b*-49. The Ap. has now removed à priori objections, and brought his theory of bodily resurrection within the lines of natural analogy and probability of reason. He has at the same time largely expounded it, intimating (1) that *the present is*, in some sense, *the seed of the future body*, and (2) that the two will differ as *the heavenly must needs differ from the earthly*. He goes on to show that this diff. has its basis and pattern in the diff. between *the primitive Adam and the glorified Christ*, who are contrasted in condition (42*b*, 43), in nature (44 ff.), and in origin (47 ff.).

Vv. 42*b*, 43. **Σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ . . . ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ . . . ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ**: "The sowing is in corruption (perishableness) . . . in dishonour . . . in weakness". It is better, with Cv., Wr. (p. 656), and Hn., to regard **σπείρεται** and **ἐγείρεται** as *impersonal*, since no subject is supplied; the vbs., thrice repeated with emphasis, are contrasted in idea; the antithesis lies between two opp. stages of being (*cf.*, for the mode of expression, Luke xii. 48). **σπείρεται** recalls, and applies in the most general way, the **ὃ σπείρεις** and **σπέρματα** of vv. 36 ff. To interpret this vb. as figuring the act of *burial* ("verbum amœnissimum pro sepultura," Bg.; so Cm., Gr., Mr., Bt., El., and many others) confuses the analogy (the "sowing" is expressly distinguished from the "dying"

[s] ἐγείρεται [w] ἐν [1] [w] δυνάμει· 44. [q] σπείρεται σῶμα [x] ψυχικόν, [s] ἐγείρεται σῶμα [y] πνευματικόν. ἔστι[1] σῶμα [x] ψυχικόν, καὶ[2] ἔστι[2] σῶμα[3] [y] πνευματικόν· 45. [z] οὕτω καὶ [s] γέγραπται, "[a] Ἐγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος[4] Ἀδὰμ [a] εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν·" ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ

w See iv. 20.
x See ii. 14.
y See ii. 15.
z Mt. ii. 5; Lk. xxiv. 46. *Cf* Acts xiii. 47; and ix. 14 above.
a Gen. ii. 7; Rom. xi. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 7; Mt. xxi. 42 and Acts iv. 11 (Ps. cxvii. 22); Acts v. 36; Lk. xiii. 19.

[1] **ει εστιν**: all pre-Syrian codd., and all ancient verss. exc. syrr.
[2] **εστιν και**: all uncc. but KL. [3] *Om.* **σωμα** pre-Syrian codd.
[4] BK, and several minn., om. **ανθρωπος**.

of the seed, 36), and jars with ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ (a sick man, not a corpse, is called *weak*), and with ψυχικὸν in ver. 44; *cf.* also vv. 50-54, where ἡ φθορά, τὸ φθαρτόν, τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο are identified with the *living* ἡμεῖς. Our *present life* is the seed-time (Gal. vi. 7 ff.), and our "mortal bodies" (Rom. viii. 10 f.) are in the germinal state, concluding with death (36), out of which a wholly diff. organism will spring. The attributes φθορά (*cf.* δουλεία τ. φθορᾶς, Rom. viii. 21), ἀτιμία (*cf.* Phil. iii. 21), ἀσθενεία (*cf.* 2 Cor. xiii. 4)—summed up in the θνητὰ σώματα of Rom. viii. 11 and μορφὴ δούλου of Phil. ii. 7—are those that P. is wont to ascribe to man's actual physique, in contrast with the ἀφθαρσία, δόξα, δύναμις of the post-resurrection state: see 2 Cor. iv. 7, 10, 16, v. 1, 4, Rom. i. 4, viii. 18-23. Thus, with variety in detail, Est. ("moritur corpus multis ante mortem miseriis et fœditatibus obnoxium, suscitabitur idem corpus omni ex parte gloriosum"), Cv., Hf., Hn., Ed. Gd. refers the threefold σπείρεται to the three moments of *burial*, *mortal life*, and *birth* respectively; van Hengel identifies it with *procreation*, quite unsuitably.

Ver. 44. "There is sown a psychic body; there is raised a spiritual body." This dictum grounds the antithesis unfolded in vv. 42 f. upon its proper basis; the diff. is not a matter of condition merely, but of *constitution*. Corruption, dishonour, feebleness are, in great part, penal inflictions (Rom. v. 12 ff.), signalising not a natural defect, but a positive subjection to the power of sin (53-56); man, however, is essentially ψυχὴ under the present order (45), and his body therefore is essentially ψυχικὸν as determined by that order (*cf.* vi. 13, and note; Col. ii. 20 ff., Matt. xxii. 30, etc.), being fitted to and expressive of the "soul" wherein his earthly being centres; see the note on ψυχικός, ii. 14. Though inadequate, "natural" is the best available rendering of this adj.; it indicates the moulding of man's body by its environment and its adaptation to existing functions; the same body is χοϊκὸν in respect of its material (47).—ψυχικὸν is only relatively a term of disparagement; the "psychic body" has in it the making of the "spiritual"; "its adaptation for the present service of the soul is the *sowing* of it, that is the initial step in its adaptation for the future uses of the spirit. An organism fitted to be the seat of mind, to express emotion, to carry out the behests of will, is in process of being adapted for a still nobler ministry" (Ed.): "he that sows to the Spirit (in the natural body), will reap of the Spirit (in the spiritual body)," Gal. vi. 8.—"If there is a psychic body, there is also a spiritual": a frame suited to man's earthly life argues a frame suited to his heavenly life, according to the principle of ver. 38*b* (*cf.* the argument from lower to higher in Matt. vi. 30); and the σῶμα πν. lies, in some way, germinally hidden in the σῶμα ψ., to be unfolded from it under "the universal law of progress" (Ed.).—ἔστιν (*existit*) bears emphasis in each clause; from the *fact* of sense P. argues to the *fact* of faith. Observe txtl. notes 1-3.

Ver. 45 puts into words of Scripture the law of development affirmed, thereby showing its agreement with the plan of creation and its realisation in the two successive heads of the race. Into his citation of Gen. ii. 7 (LXX) P. introduces πρῶτος and duplicates ἄνθρωπος by Ἀδάμ (*ha'adām*), to prepare for his antithetical addition ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. On the principle of ver. 44*b*, the Adam created as ψυχὴ was the crude beginning of humanity (the pred. ψυχὴ ζῶσα is shared by A. with the *animals*, Gen. i. 20, 24)—a "first" requiring a "last" as his complement and explanation. The two types differ here not as the sin-committing and sin-abolishing (Rom. v. 12 ff.), but as the rudimentary and finished man respectively, with their physique to match.—

εἰς πνεῦμα [b] ζωοποιοῦν. 46. ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ [y] πνευματικὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ [x] ψυχικόν, ἔπειτα τὸ [y] πνευματικόν· 47. ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος [e] ἐκ [e] γῆς, [d] χοϊκός· ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ὁ Κύριος [1] [e] ἐξ

b See ver. 22.
c Jo. iii. 31,—same antith.
d *H.l.*; see note below.
e 2 Cor. v. 2; Gal. i. 8; 1 Th. i. 10; 2 Pet. i. 18; freq. in Rev.; Mt. xxviii. 2; Lk. iii. 22, x. 18, xi. 13; Jo. i. 32, xii. 28; Acts ii. 2. Ref. to Chr., Jo. iii. 13, etc., vi. 31 ff.

[1] *Om.* ο Κυριος ℵ*BCD*G, 17, 67**, latt. vg. cop., many Ff.
Ins. ο Κυριος ℵcADb,cKLP, and syrr. Tert. censures this reading in Mcion. An instance of the Syrian readings followed by A, even in Paul.

Αδὰμ is repeated in the second clause by way of maintaining the humanity of Christ and His genetic relation to the protoplast (*cf.* Luke i. 23-38), essential as the ground of our bodily relationship to Him (48 f.; *cf.* Heb. ii. 14 ff.).—The time of Christ's γενέσθαι εἰς πν. ζωοπ., in view of the context and esp. of vv. 42 ff., can only be *His resurrection from the grave* (Est., Gr., Mr., Hn., Hf., El.), which supplies the hinge of Paul's whole argument (*cf.* Rom. i. 4, vi. 4 ff., x. 9, etc.); not *the incarnation* (Thp., Bz., Baur, Ed.), for His pre-resurrection body was a σῶμα ψυχικόν (Rom. viii. 3, etc.; 2 Cor. xiii. 4, Phil. ii. 7, etc.). By rising from the dead, Christ ἐγενήθη εἰς πνεῦμα—He entered on the spiritual and ultimate form of human existence; and at the same time, ἐγενήθη εἰς πν. ζωοποιοῦν—He entered this state so as to communicate it to His fellows: *cf.* vv. 20-23, Col. i. 18, Rev. i. 5; also Rom. viii. 10 f., 2 Cor. iv. 14; John vi. 33, xi. 25, xiv. 19, etc. The action of Jesus in "breathing" upon His disciples while He said, "Receive the Holy Spirit" (John xx. 22 f.), symbolised the vitalising relationship which at this epoch He assumed towards mankind; this act raised to a higher potency the original "breathing" of God by which man "became a living soul". "Spirit is life-power, having the ground of its vitality in itself, while the soul has only a subject and conditioned life; spirit vitalises that which is outside of itself, soul leads its individual life within the sphere marked out by its environment" (Hf.); *cf.* John iii. 34, iv. 14, v. 25 f.; Heb. vii. 25.—ὁ ἔσχατος ἄνθρωπος recalls the Rabbinical title, *ha'adām ha'acharōn*, given to the Messiah (*Neve Shalom*, ix. 9): Christ is not, however, *the later* or second, but *the last*, the final Adam. The *two Adams* of Philo, based on the duplicate narrative of Gen. i., ii.—the ideal "man after the image of God" and the actual "man of the dust of the earth" —with which Pfleiderer and others identify Paul's πρῶτος and ἔσχατος, χοϊκὸς and ἐπουράνιος 'Αδάμ, are not to be found here. For (*a*) Philo's *first* is Paul's *last*; (*b*) *both* Paul's Adams are equally concrete; (*c*) the resurrection of Christ distinguishes their respective periods, a crisis the conception of which is foreign to Philo's theology; (*d*) moreover, Gen. i. 26 is referred in xi. 7 above to the *historical*, not the ideal, First Man.

Ver. 46 might have been expressly aimed at the Philonian exegesis; it affirms a development from lower to higher, from the dispensation of ψυχὴ to that of πνεῦμα, the precise opp. of that extracted from Gen. i., ii. by Philo. (ἀλλ' οὐ) "Nay, but not first is the spiritual, but the psychic—after that (ἔπειτα: *cf.* 23) the spiritual". P. states a general law (σῶμα is not to be understood with the adjs.): the ψυχικὸν as such demands the πνευματικὸν to follow it (44); they succeed in this order, not the reverse. "The Ap. does not share the notion, long regarded as orthodox, that humanity was created in a state of moral and physical perfection. . . . Independently of the Fall, there must have been progress from an inferior state, the psychic, which he posits as man's point of departure, to a superior state, the spiritual, foreseen and determined as man's goal from the first" (Gd. *ad loc.*: see the whole passage).

Vv. 47-49 draw another contrast between the two "men," types of the two eras of humanity, which is suggested by the words χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς (*'aphār minha'adamāh*) of Gen. ii. 7. The first is ἐκ γῆς, χοϊκός (*terrenus*, Vg.; more literally, *pulvereus*, Bz.); the second is ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (om. ὁ Κύριος). The former epithets, and by antithesis the latter, point to *bodily* origin and substance (*cf.* 40, also 2 Cor. iv. 7, ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν), but connote the whole quality of the life thus determined.—The expression ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (*e cœlo*, Bz.; not *de cœlo*, Vg.) has led to the identifying of the δεύτερος ἄνθρ. with *the incarnate* Christ (see Ed.), to the confusion of

[e] οὐρανοῦ· 48. [f] οἷος ὁ [d] χοϊκός, [f] τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ [d] χοϊκοί· καὶ οἷος ὁ [g] ἐπουράνιος, [f] τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ [g] ἐπουράνιοι· 49. καὶ καθὼς [h] ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν [i] εἰκόνα τοῦ [d] χοϊκοῦ, [h] φορέσομεν[1] καὶ τὴν [i] εἰκόνα τοῦ [g] ἐπουρανίου.

50. Τοῦτο δέ[2] [k] φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι [l] σὰρξ καὶ [l] αἷμα [m] βασιλείαν [m] Θεοῦ [m] κληρονομῆσαι οὐ [n] δύνανται,[3] οὐδὲ ἡ [o] φθορὰ τὴν [p] ἀφθαρσίαν

f In this order, 2 Cor. x. 11; Mt. xiii. 19. οιος besides, 2 Cor. xii. 20; Phil. i. 30; 1 Th. i. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 11; Rev. xvi. 18

Mk. ix. 3. g See ver. 40. h Rom. xiii. 4; Mt. xi. 8; Jo. xix. 5; Jas. ii. 3; Prov. xvi. 23. i See xi. 7. k See vii. 29. l Eph. vi. 12; Heb. ii. 14; Mt. xvi. 17; Sir. xiv. 18; *cf.* Lk. xxiv. 39. m See vi. 9 (with κληρονομ.). n δυναται, for the compound subj. and sing. vb., *cf.* Mt. v. 18; there the pred. precedes. N.T. *h.l.* for such a *constr. ad sensum*, in this order. o, p See ver. 42.

[1] **φορεσωμεν**, all uncc. but B, with 46, and many minn. W.H. retain **-ομεν** in *marg.*, R.V. and Weiss in *txt.*, referring **-ωμεν** to *marg.*; other crit. edd., **-ωμεν.**

[2] **γαρ**, DG, Tert. [3] **δυναται**, ℵBP, 73, Or.

Paul's argument (*cf.* note on 45). This phrase is suggested by the antithetical **ἐκ γῆς**: the form of existence in which the risen Jesus appeared was superterrestrial and pneumatic (*cf.* 2 Cor. v. 2); it possessed a life and attributes imparted "from heaven"—by an immediate and sovereign act of God (Rom. i. 4, vi. 4, 2 Cor. xiii. 4, Eph. i. 19 f., 1 Peter i. 21, etc.). This transformation of the body of Jesus was foreshadowed by His Transfiguration, and consummated in His Ascension; P. realised it with the most powerful effect in the revelation to himself of the risen Christ "from heaven". The glorious change *attested*, indeed, the origin of Christ's personality, but it should not be confused with that origin (Rom. i. 4; *cf.* Matt. xvii. 5). From His resurrection onwards, Christ became to human faith the **ἄνθρωπος ἐπουράνιος** (Rom. vi. 9 f., Rev. i. 17 ff.), who was taken previously for a **θνητὸς** and **χοϊκὸς** like other men.—Baur, Pfleiderer, Beyschlag (*N.T. Theology*), Sm., and others, see in the **ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ** *the pre-existent Christ*, whom they identify with Philo's ideal or "heavenly man" of Gen. i. 26 (see note on 45 above); on this interpretation an entire Christology is based —the theory that Christ in his pre-incarnate state was simply the *Urmensch*, the prototype of humanity, existing thus, either in fact or in the Divine idea, with God from eternity, and being in this sense the Eternal Son. Doubtless the "second man" is ideally first and reveals the true end and type of humanity, and this conception is, so far, a just inference from Paul's teaching. But what P. actually sets forth is the historical relation of the two Adams in the development of mankind, Christ succeeding and displacing our first father (46, see note; 49), whereas the Baurian Urmensch is antecedent to the earthly Adam.

The above **χοϊκὸς** and **ἐπουράνιος** have severally their copies in **χοϊκοὶ** and **ἐπουράνιοι** (48). Is this a purely *physical* distinction, between pre- and post-resurrection states of the same men (*cf.* 44)? or is there a *moral* connotation implied, as Hf. and Ed. suggest? The latter seems likely, esp. on comparison of Phil. iii. 18 ff., Col. iii. 1-4, Rom. vi. 4, and in transition to the exhortation of ver. 49. Those who are to be "heavenly" in body hereafter already "sit in heavenly places" (Eph. ii. 6), while those are "earthy" in every sense "whose flesh hath soul to suit," **οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες.** — Admitting the larger scope of ver. 48, we accept the strongly attested hortatory **φορέσωμεν** of ver. 49: "Let us wear also the image of the Heavenly One". The **εἰκὼν** embraces the entire "man"—not the body alone, the **σχῆμα** and **σκεῦος ἀνθρώπου** (Phil. ii. 7, 2 Cor. iv. 7, 1 Thess. iv. 4)—in Adam and Christ respectively (*cf.* xi. 7, 2 Cor. iii. 18, Rom. viii. 29, Col. i. 15 iii. 10); and we are exhorted to "put on Christ" (Rom. xiii. 14, Gal. iii. 27), realising that to wear His moral likeness here carries with it the wearing of His bodily likeness hereafter: see vv. 20-23, Rom. viii. 11; 1 John iii. 2 f.

§ 56. Victory over Death, xv. 50-58. The second part of the argument of this chapter has now reached the same platform as the first (*cf.* §§ 51 and 54). The Resurrection of the Body, it has been shown, is an essential part of the Divine world-plan and necessary to the fulfilment of God's kingdom through Christ (20-27); and the transformation of the

q See ii. 7. r See vii. 39. s Rom. i. 23 (Ps. cv. 20); Gal. iv. 20; Heb. i. 12 (Ps. ci. 26); Acts vi. 14; Lev. xxvii. 33. t Bibl. *h.l.*

[m] κληρονομεῖ.[1] 51. ἰδοὺ [q] μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω· πάντες μὲν[2] οὐ[3] [r] κοιμηθησόμεθα,[3] πάντες δὲ [s] ἀλλαγησόμεθα,[3] 52. ἐν [t] ἀτόμῳ, ἐν

[1] **κληρονομησει**: C*D*G, vg. cop. syrr. [2] *Om.* **μεν** BC*D*.

[3] **παντες ου κοιμηθησομεθα παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα** (as in T.R., om. only **μεν**): BDbcKLP, etc., cop. syrr., Or., Cyr., Greg.-Nyss., Chr., Thdrt. So Tisch., Tr. *txt.*, Al., R.V., W.H., El., Nestle.

παντες κοιμηθησομεθα ου παντες δε αλλαγησομεθα: ℵ(A)CG, 17, Gr. codd. mentioned by Hier. and by Aug. So Lachm. and Tr. *marg.* A* reads **παντες κοιμηθ. οι παντες κ.τ.λ.**, afterwards correcting **οι** to **ου**, but then inserting **ου** before **κοιμηθ.** as well.

παντες αναστησομεθα ου παντες δε αλλαγ.: D*, d e f, vg. (*omnes quidem resurgemus* [or *resurgimus*], *sed non omnes immutabimur*); latt. codd. mentioned by Hier., by Aug. and Pelag., Hil. Hier. writes (*Ep.* 119): "Quæritis quo sensu dictum sit et quomodo in 1 ad Cor. ep. Pauli apost. sit legendum: *Omnes quidem dormiemus, non autem omnes immutabimur*, an juxta quædam exemplaria: *Non omnes dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur;* utrumque enim in Græcis codd. invenitur". The Patristic authorities from the 3rd to the 5th century stood in doubt as to the true reading, and the Gr. MSS. then presented great confusion. Intrinsic considerations are decisive in favour of the T.R., in adopting which the Syrian edd. showed excellent judgment. The unusual position of **ου** (after **παντες**), and the fact that **ου κοιμηθησ.** appear to express an anticipation that failed of fulfilment, led to the shifting of the **ου**. **αναστησομεθα** is a bold Western paraphrase. The reading of B and the T.R. alone agrees with Paul's situation (*cf.* 1 Th. iv. 15), and with the tenor of this passage. See note below. For full textual evidence and discussion, see Tisch.[8], *ad loc.*, also W.H., vol. ii., p. 118.

earthly into the heavenly, of the psychic into the pneumatic form of being, is involved in the present constitution of things and accords with the lines of development traceable in nature and revelation (36-49). In a word, P. holds the Christian resurrection to be grounded in the person and mission of Christ, as He is on the one hand the Son of God and mediatorial Head of His kingdom (24-28), and on the other hand the Second Adam and Firstborn of a spiritual humanity (22 f., 45-49). He finds the key to this great controversy, as to so many others, in the supremacy of Christ, the "one Lord, through whom are all things and we through Him" (viii. 6). It remains for him only to state the practical conclusion of this reasoning (50), to describe our anticipated transformation and victory over death (51-57), and to urge his readers in this confidence to accomplish worthily their life's work (58).

Ver. 50. **Τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί** (see note, vii. 29) introduces, with a pause, an emphatic reassertion of the ruling thought of the previous §—that of the opposition between the psychic body of the First Adam and the spiritual body of the Second; manifestly the former is unfit for God's heavenly kingdom—with the latter, it is assumed (48*b*; *cf.* Luke xx. 34 ff., 1 John iii. 2 f.), we must be clothed to enter that diviner realm: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit God's kingdom; nor indeed doth corruption (perishableness) inherit incorruption (imperishableness)". The second assertion explicates the first: **σάρξ κ. αἷμα = φθορά** (*cf.* 42, and note), since decay is inherent in our bodily nature; **ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος διαφθείρεται** (2 Cor. iv. 16; *cf.* Rom. viii. 10 f.). "Flesh" is the matter and "blood" the essence and life-vehicle of man's present corporeity. *Nature* forbids eternal life in this earthly dress (*cf.* note on 46). "Inherit" points to the kingdom as the *right* of the sons of God (Rom. viii. 17, etc.; *cf.* Matt. xxv. 34), but a heritage unrealised during the "bondage of corruption" (see Rom. viii. 21 ff.). Another, but removeable, disability of "flesh and blood" appears in Matt. xvi. 17.

Vv. 51, 52. This bodily change, indispensable in view of the incompatibility just affirmed, is the object of a momentous *revelation* communicated to P., to which he calls our earnest attention: "Lo, I tell you a mystery!" On **μυστήριον**, see note to ii. 1. P. began by demonstrating *the historical fact* of Christ's resurrection (1-11); he then *reasoned* upon it, in its bearings on religion and nature (12-49); now he adds *a new specific*

[u] ῥιπῇ[1] ὀφθαλμοῦ, ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ [v] σάλπιγγι· [w] σαλπίσει γάρ, καὶ οἱ [x] νεκροὶ [x] ἐγερθήσονται[2] [y] ἄφθαρτοι, καὶ ἡμεῖς [a] ἀλλαγησόμεθα. 53. [z] δεῖ γὰρ τὸ [a] φθαρτὸν τοῦτο [b] ἐνδύσασθαι [y] ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ

u Bibl. *h.l.* Eur. *Iph. Tr.*, 885; -ιζειν, Jas. i. 6. v See xiv. 8. w Mt. vi. 2; Rev. ten times. x See ver. 15. y See ix. 25. z See viii. 2. a See ix. 25. b 2 Cor. v. 3; Rom. xiii. 12, 14; Eph. iv. 24, vi. 11; Col. iii. 10; Ps. cxxxi. 9.

[1] D*G, 67**, and some others, read ροπῃ. Hier.: "εν ριπῃ sive εν ροπῃ οφθαλμου, utrumque enim legitur, et nostri interpretati sunt *in momento* et in *ictu oculi*".

[2] αναστησονται, ADGP.

revelation to crown his teaching. In doing so, P. challenges his opponents in the right of his inspiration and authority, hitherto in the background in this chap. Ver. 15 only vindicated his *honesty*.

In ver. 51*b* ἀλλαγησόμεθα (required by 50 and repeated in 52) bears the stress; to it the first πάντες (reiterated with emphasis) looks forward; οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα is parenthetical: "We shall all—not sleep, but—we shall all be changed". ἀλλάσσω is interpreted by ἐνδύομαι of ver. 53 and μετασχηματίζω of Phil. iii. 21. As much as to say: "Our perishable flesh and blood, whether through death or not, must undergo a change". That such a change is impending for the dead in Christ is evident from the foregoing argument (see esp. 22 f., 36, 42 f.); P. adds to this the declaration that the change will be universal, that *it will extend to those living* when the Last Trumpet sounds (52), amongst whom he then hoped that many of the present generation would be found: *cf.* i. 7; also 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff., where the like is affirmed ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου. This hope dictates the interjected οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, which disturbs the grammar of the sentence and necessitates the contrastive δὲ attached to the repeated πάντες (see txtl. note; Wr., p. 695; also El. *ad loc.*). There is no need to suppose a trajection of οὐ (as if for οὐ πάντες, or οὐ μὲν πάντες κοιμηθησ.), nor any diff. between the sense of ἀλλαγησ. in vv. 51 and 52: the certainty of change in *all* who shall "inherit incorruption" is declared (51), and the assurance is given that while this change takes place in "the dead" who are "raised incorruptible," at the same time "we" (the assumed living) shall undergo a corresponding change (52; *cf.* 2 Cor. v. 2 ff.). Thus in "all" believers, whether sleeping or waking when Christ's trumpet sounds, the necessary development will be effected (53 f.).—The critical moment is defined by three vivid phrases: ἐν ἀτόμῳ (cl. Gr., ἐν ἀκαρεῖ), ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ (*in ictu oculi*, Vg.; *in a twinkling*), ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι—the first two describing *the instantaneousness*, and the last (with allusion perhaps to the saying of Matt. xxiv. 31: *cf.* 1 Thess. iv. 16) *the solemn finality* of the transformation. The former idea is emphasized, possibly, to preclude the fear of a slow painful process. The σάλπιγξ was the war-trumpet, used for signals and commands (*cf.* ἐν κελεύσματι, 1 Thess. iv. 16); and σαλπίσει (*sc.* ὁ σαλπιγκτής) is indef. in subject, according to military idiom (*cf.* Xen., *Anab.*, I., ii., 17). 1 Thess. iv. identifies the "trumpet" with the "archangel's voice": any such description is of course figurative.

Vv. 52, 53. The necessity for change, negatively declared in ver. 50, is now reaffirmed positively, as a necessity lying in the nature and relations of the changed: "For this corruptible (perishable) is bound (δεῖ: *cf.* xi. 19) to put on incorruption (imperishableness), and this mortal to put on immortality". The double τοῦτο speaks, as in 2 Cor. v. 2, Rom. vii. 24, out of P.'s painful self-consciousness: *cf.* 2 Cor. iv. 10, Gal. vi. 17.—τὸ θνητὸν and τὸ φθαρτόν (*concrete*, of felt necessity: ἡ φθορά, 50, *abstract*, of general principle) relate, as in vv. 42 ff., to *the present*, *living body* of the ἡμεῖς, not to the dead body deposited in the grave. The aforesaid "change" is now represented as an *investiture* (ἐνδύσασθαι) with incorruption and immortality; the two ideas are adjusted in 2 Cor. v. 4, where it is conceived that the living Christian will "put on" the new, spiritual body "over" (ἐπ-ενδύσασθαι) his earthly frame, which will then be "absorbed" (καταποθῇ) by it.

Ver. 54. This clothing of the saints with immortality fulfils a notable O.T. word respecting the Day of the Lord: "Then will be brought to pass the word that is written, *Death has been swallowed up* (κατεπόθη, the vb. adopted in 2 Cor.

c 2 Cor. iv. 11, v. 4; Rom. vi. 12, viii. 11.
d 1 Tim. vi. 16; Wisd. viii. 13, etc.
e Ver. 28, xvi. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 10; Col. iii. 4; 1 Th. v. 3; Lk. v. 35; Jo. viii. 28.
f Mt. v. 18; Mk. xi. 23.
g Isa. xxv. 8 (see note below); in this sense, 2 Cor. v. 4, also ii. 7; Mt. xxiii. 24; Heb. xi. 29; 1 Pet. v. 8; Rev xii. 16.
h Mt. xii. 20; 2 Ki. ii. 26; Job xxxvi. 7.
i Hos. xiii. 14; Acts xxvi. 14; Rev. ix. 10.

[c]θνητὸν τοῦτο [b]ἐνδύσασθαι [d]ἀθανασίαν· 54. [e]ὅταν δὲ[1] τὸ [c]φθαρτὸν τοῦτο [b]ἐνδύσηται [p]ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ[1] τὸ [c]θνητὸν τοῦτο [b]ἐνδύσηται [d]ἀθανασίαν,[2] [e]τότε [f]γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος, "[g]Κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος [h]εἰς [h]νῖκος". 55. ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ [i]κέντρον[3]; ποῦ σου, ᾅδη,[4] τὸ [h]νῖκος[3]; 56. τὸ δὲ [i]κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ἁμαρτία,

[1] ℵ*C*IM, cop. vg., and several Ff., om. **το φθαρτον . . . και**, reducing the two **οταν** clauses to one—**οταν δε το θνητον τουτο κ.τ.λ.** G om. the entire double **οταν** clause, skipping from **αθανασιαν** in ver. 53 to **αθανασιαν** in ver. 54.

[2] **την αθανασιαν**: ℵAI, 17; so I in ver. 53.

[3] **νικος . . . κεντρον** (in this order): ℵBCIM, 17, cop. vg. (BD*I: **νεικος**, vv. 54 f.).

[4] **θανατε** *twice*: ℵ*BCDGI, 67**, cop. vg., and many Ff.; **ᾳδη** in Hosea.

v. 4 as above) *unto victory!"* **ὅταν**, with its double clause, recalls the double **ὅταν** of ver. 24 and of vv. 27 f. (see notes), which are parl. to each other and to this, alike marking the great "when," the epoch of the consummation. The destruction of the "last enemy" secures absolute "victory" for Christ and His own. Paul corrects the LXX txt. of Isa. xxv. 8, which makes Death the victor,—**κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος ἰσχύσας**; he appears to have read the Heb. passively *bulla'*, for Massoretic *billa'*: Theodotion's translation is identical with Paul's. *lanetsach* (*for ever*) is often rendered **εἰς νῖκος** (later Gr. form of **νίκη**) by the LXX, according to the Aramaic sense of the noun; its Heb. sense implies a final and unqualified overthrow of the King of Terrors, and therefore admits of P.'s application. "This is the farthest reaching of all O.T. prophecies; it bears allusion to Gen. iii." (Dillmann; see also Delitzsch, on the Isaianic txt.), and reverses the doom there pronounced.

Vv. 55-57. At this climax P. breaks into a song of triumph over Death, in the strain of Hosea's rapturous anticipation of Israel's resurrection from national death. [Many interpreters, however, put the opp. sense on Hos. xiii. 14, as though God were summoning Death and the Grave to ply all their forces for Israel's annihilation, and this accords with the prophet's context; but violent alterations of mood are characteristic of Hosea: see Nowack *ad loc.* in *Handkom. z. A.T.*, also Orelli's *Minor Prophets*, or Cheyne in *C.B.S.*] The passage has the Hebraistic lilt of Paul's more exalted passages; *cf.* xiii. 4 ff., and parls. there noted.

> "Where, O Death, is thy victory?
> Where, O Death, is thy sting?
> Now the sting of Death is Sin, and the strength of Sin is the Law;
> But to God be thanks, who gives to us the victory
> Through our Lord Jesus Christ!"

P. freely adapts the words of Hosea, repeating **θάνατε** in the second line, where Hosea writes *sh'ôl* (LXX **ᾅδη**), since *death* is the enemy he pursues throughout (Ed. notes that **ᾅδης** never occurs in Paul's Epp.); and he substitutes syn. terms for each of the other nouns to suit his own vein, **νῖκος** being taken up from ver. 54, and **κέντρον** preparing for the thought of ver. 56.—**τὸ δὲ κέντρον κ.τ.λ.** throws into an epigram the doctrine of Rom. iv.-viii. and Gal. iii. respecting the inter-relations of Sin, Law, and Death: "Mors aculeum quo pungat non habet nisi peccatum; et huic aculeo Lex vim mortiferam addit" (Cv.). *Sin* gives to death, as we mortals know it, its poignancy, its penal character and humiliating form, with the entire "bondage of corruption" that attaches to it: see esp. Rom. v. 12, 17, vi. 10, 23, vii. 24, viii. 10, 20 ff., Heb. ii. 14 f. Apart from sin, our present bodily existence must have terminated in the course of nature (44-46); but the change would have been effected in a far diff. way, without the horror and anguish of dissolution—as indeed it will be for the redeemed who have the happiness to be alive at the Second Advent (see 51 f., and parls.).

ἡ δὲ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος· 57. τῷ δὲ Θεῷ [k] χάρις τῷ διδόντι ἡμῖν τὸ [h] νῖκος διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 58. Ὥστε, [l] ἀδελφοί μου [l] ἀγαπητοί, [m] ἑδραῖοι γίνεσθε, [n] ἀμετακίνητοι, [o] περισσεύοντες ἐν τῷ [p] ἔργῳ τοῦ [p] Κυρίου πάντοτε, εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ [q] κόπος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔστι [r] κενὸς ἐν Κυρίῳ.

k See x. 30.
l As form of address, *h.l.* in P. Jas. i. 16, 19, ii. 5.
m See vii. 37.
n *H.l.*; *cf.* Col. i. 23.
o See viii. 8; in like connection, 2 Cor. viii. 2, 7, ix. 8; Rom. xv. 13; Phil. i. 9; Col. ii. 7; 1 Th. iii. 12, iv. 1, 10.
p xvi. 10; Phil. ii. 30; *cf.* Rom. xiv. 20 (τ. εργ. τ. Θ.).
q See iii. 8.
r See ver. 10.

For those who "fall asleep in Christ" (18, 20; 1 Thess. iv. 14), death, while it is still *death* and naturally feared (**οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι**, 2 Cor. v. 4), is robbed of its "sting" (*cf.* 1 John iv. 18; also John v. 24, viii. 51 f., xi. 25 f., 2 Tim. i. 10; Rev. xx. 6), *viz.*, the sense of guilt and dread of judgment—"tametsi adhuc nos pungit, non tamen letaliter, quia retusum est ejus acumen, ne in animæ vitalia penetret" (Cv.).—**κέντρον** is *sting* (as in Rev. ix. 10), not *goad* (as in Acts xxvi. 14); Death is personified as a venomous creature, inflicting poisoned and fatal wounds. Here Death reigns through Sin, as in Rom. v. 17; Rom. v. 21 pictures Sin reigning in Death: the effect through the cause, the cause in the effect.—While Death gets from Sin its *sting*, Sin in turn receives from the Law its *power*. **ἡ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος** condenses into six words Paul's teaching on the relation of Sin to Law (see Rom. iv. 15, v. 20, vi. 14, vii.; Gal. ii. 16, iii., iv. 21-v. 4)—the view, based on his experience as a Pharisee, that the law of God, imposing on sinful man impossible yet necessary tasks, promising salvation upon terms he can never fulfil and threatening death upon non-fulfilment, in effect exasperates his sin and involves him in hopeless guilt; **ἡ ἁμαρτία . . . διὰ τ. ἐντολῆς . . . με ἀπέκτεινεν** (Rom. vii. 11).—The exclamation of relief, "Thanks be to God, etc.," is precisely parl. to Rom. vii. 25*a*, viii. 1 f.—The believer's "victory" lies in deliverance through Christ's propitiatory death (Rom. iii. 23 f.; *cf.* i. 17 f., 30, vi. 11 above) from the condemnation of the Law, and thereby from "the power of Sin," and thereby from the bitterness of Death. Law, Sin, and Death were bound into a firm chain, only dissoluble by "the word of the cross—God's *power* to the saved" (i. 18; *cf.* Rom. i. 16 f., viii. 1 ff.). Thus the Ap. finally links his doctrine of the Bodily Resurrection and Transformation of Christians to his fundamental teaching as to Justification and the Forgiveness of Sins; ch. xv. is a part of the **λόγος τ. σταυροῦ** which alone P. proclaims at Cor. (ii. 1 f.).—God "*gives to us* the victory," won for us by "our Lord Jesus Christ," which otherwise Sin, strengthened (instead of being broken) by the Law, had given to Death. The pr. ptp. **τῷ διδόντι τὸ νῖκος** asserts the experience of redemption (*cf.* i. 2, vi. 19; 2 Cor. v. 21, xiii. 5, Rom. v. 1 f., Eph. i. 7); similarly **ὑπερνικῶμεν**, Rom. viii. 37, declares the continuous triumph of faith: for the sentiment, *cf.* Rom. v. 2-11, 1 Thess. v. 16 ff., Phil. iv. 4, 1 Peter i. 3-9.

Ver. 56 is set aside by Sm., and Clemen (*Die Einheitlichkeit d. paul. Br.*, *ad loc.*), after Straatmann and Völter, as a "marginal note" of some early Paulinist, on the ground that it is out of keeping with the lyrical strain of the passage, and with the absence of the anti-legal polemic from this Ep. But the ideas of this ver. fill the contemporary Rom. and Gal. Epp., and are uppermost there in Paul's highest moods (see Rom. viii. 31 ff., 2 Cor. v. 13-21); they are expressed with an originality and pregnant force unmistakably Pauline, and in a rhythmical, imaginative turn of expression harmonising with the context. In this Ep., which "knows nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified," the Ap. was bound to link his theology of the Resurrection to the doctrine of salvation by the Cross: see vv. 17 f., in proof that the **λόγος τῆς ἀναστάσεως** is one, in Paul's mind, with the **λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ**.

Ver. 58 briefly directs the previous teaching against the unsettlement caused by Cor. doubts. This unbelief was taxed in vv. 32 ff. with sensualism and ignorance of God; its ***enervating effect on Christian work*** is here indicated. For **ὥστε** with impv., *cf.* iii. 21, iv. 5, etc.—**ἑδραῖοι γίνεσθε**, "show yourselves steadfast": see note on vii. 23, also x. 32, xi. 1; for the adj., see parls. In Col. i. 23 the combination **ἑδραῖοι, ἀμετακίνητοι** ("not-to-be-moved") is almost identically repeated; similarly in Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.*, II., iv., 3, **τὸ βεβαίως καὶ ἀμετακινήτως ἔχειν** is specified as a con-

XVI. 1. Περὶ δὲ τῆς [a]λογίας[1] τῆς εἰς [b]τοὺς [b]ἁγίους· [c]ὥσπερ [d]διέταξα [e]ταῖς [e]ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας, οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήσατε.

a H.l.
b See vi. 1, and note below.
c See xv. 22.
d See vii. 17.
e See vii. 17; for pl. in local use, ver. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 1; Gal. i. 2 (τ. Γαλ.), 22; 1 Th. ii. 14; Rev. i. 4.

[1] **λογειας (?): B*or** and I.**

dition of all right and virtuous doing.—**περισσεύοντες κ.τ.λ.** adds the positive to the foregoing negative side of the injunction: "abounding (overflowing: see parls.) in the work of the Lord always". **τ. ἔργον τ. Κυρίου** (*cf.* ix. 1; Col. iii. 23 f., Matt. xxi. 28, Mark xiii. 34) is "the work" which "the Lord" prescribes, while "the work of God" (Rom. xiv. 20: *cf.* iii. 9 above) is "the work" which "God" does: contrast xii. 5 and 6 above.—"Knowing (as you do) that your toil is not empty in the Lord." **εἰδότες** implies assured knowledge, such as springs from the confirmation of faith given in this chap. On **κόπος**, see note to iii. 8; and on **κενός**, ver. 14: the "toil" is "empty" which is spent on illusion; "ce n'est pas là une activité d'apparat, accomplie dans le néant, comme si souvent le travail terrestre, mais un sérieux labeur, accompli dans la sphère de l'éternelle réalité" (Gd.); hence the pr. **ἐστὶν** rather than **ἔσται.**—**ἐν Κυρίῳ**: in the sphere of Christ's authority, wrought under His headship, which supplies the basis of all Christian relations and duties; *cf.* ver. 36, iv. 17, vii. 22, etc.

Division VI. Business, News, and Greetings, xvi. The Ap. has delivered his mind to the Cor. upon the questions which prompted this great Ep. He had reserved to the last the profound and solemn problem of the Future Life, in its treatment of which the conceit of intellect and the moral levity that spoiled this powerful Greek Church found their most characteristic expression. To the defence and exposition of the Christian hope of the Resurrection of the Body P. has devoted in chap. xv. all his powers of dialectic and of theological construction, bringing his argument to the glorious conclusion with which, in § 56, the thought of the Ep. culminates. He has thus carried his readers far away from the Cor. atmosphere of jealousy and debate, of sensuality and social corruption, infecting their Church, to seat them in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus. There remain a few matters of personal interest, to be disposed of in two or three paragraphs—concerning *the collection for Jerusalem* (1-4), *his own and Timothy's intended visits*, and *the invitation declined by Apollos* (5-12). These are followed by an energetic *final exhortation*, into which is woven *a commendation of Stephanas* and other Cor. now with P. (13-18), and by *the epistolary salutations* which are full and animated, a word of *severe warning* being attached to his own *affectionate greeting* and *autograph signature* (19-24).

§ 57. Concerning the Collection, xvi. 1-4. During his Third Missionary Journey P. was collecting money for the relief of the Christian poor in Jerusalem. Two chaps. in the middle of 2 Cor. are devoted to this business, which, as it seems, had moved slowly in the interval between the two Epp. The collection had been set on foot some time ago in Galatia (1); in Macedonia it had been warmly taken up (2 Cor. viii. f.); from Acts xx. 4 we learn that "Asians" also (from Ephesus and the neighbourhood) accompanied P. in the deputation which conveyed the Gentile offering to the mother Church. A little later, in writing to Rome (xv. 25-32), the Ap. refers to the collection, with great satisfaction, as completed. Every province of the Pauline mission appears to have aided in this charity, which, while it relieved a distressing need, was prompted also by Paul's warm love for his people (Rom. ix. 3), and by his desire to knit together the Gentile and Jewish sections of the Church, and to prove to the latter the true faith and brotherhood of the converts from heathenism (2 Cor. ix. 11-14). P. had taken part in a similar relief sent from Antioch many years before (Acts xi. f.); and in the Conference of Jerus., when the direction of the Gentile mission was committed to him, the heads of the Judæan Church laid on him the injunction to "remember the poor" (Gal. ii. 10). Foreign Jews were accustomed, as an act of piety, to replenish the poor-funds of the mother city. The Christian community of Jerus. suffered from chronic poverty. With little natural or commercial wealth, the city lived mainly upon its religious character—on the attractions of the Temple and the Feasts

2. [f]κατὰ [g]μίαν [h]σαββάτων[1] ἕκαστος ὑμῶν [i]παρ' [i]ἑαυτῷ τιθέτω, [k]θησαυρίζων ὅ,τι ἂν[2] εὐοδῶται[3]· ἵνα μή, [m]ὅταν ἔλθω, [m]τότε

f Distrib., see xiv. 27, xv. 31. g Acts xx. 7; Mk. xvi. 2; Lk. xxiv. 1; Jo. xx. 1, 19. h In this sense, Mk. xvi. 9; Lk. xviii. 12. i Mt. xxi. 25. παρα, *cf.* 2 Tim. iv. 13; Lk. xix. 7, etc. k 2 Cor. xii. 14; Rom. ii. 5; Jas. v. 3; 2 Pet. iii. 7; Mt. vi. 19 f.; Lk. xii. 21; 4 Ki. xx. 17. l Rom. i. 10; 3 Jo. 2; Gen. xxxix. 3, 23. m See xv. 54.

[1] σαββατου, all uncc. but ℵ* (σαββατω), ℵcKLM.

[2] εαν (?), BIM. So W.H., uniformly. [3] ευοδωθη, ℵcACIKM, etc.

thronged by Jews from the whole world; and the Nazarenes, while suffering from the intense bigotry of their compatriots in other ways, would find it esp. difficult to participate in employments connected with religion. 1 Thess. ii. 14 intimates that the Judæan Churches had recently undergone severe persecution.

Ver. 1. "But about the collection that (is made) for the saints" (τῆς εἰς τ. ἁγίους). This clause might be construed as subordinate to the following ὡς διέταξα; it reads more naturally as *a detached title* to the par.—indicating this, seemingly, as another topic of the Church Letter (*cf.* vii. 1, viii. 1, xii. 1). The subject is alluded to as one in which the Cor. were already interested (see 2 Cor. ix. 2).—λογία (more correctly spelt λογεία) = cl. Gr. συλλογή, or ἔρανος (*club-contribution*); elsewhere in Paul χάρις (3), εὐλογία (2 Cor. ix. 5), λειτουργία (2 Cor. ix. 12), κοινωνία (Rom. xv. 26). Till the other day this word counted as a *h.l.* in Gr. literature; but the Egyptian Gr. papyri furnish instances of it as a business term, denoting, along with λογεύω (from which it should be derived), *the collecting of money* either in the way of imposts or voluntary assessments: see Deissmann's *Bibelstudien*, pp. 40 ff., Hn. in Meyer's *Kommentar ad loc.*—The Cor. understand from previous communications who are meant by "the saints" (*cf.* Rom. xv. 31): Hf. thinks that the Christians of Jerus. are so called *by eminence*, but such a distinction is un-Pauline (Gal. iii. 28); rather, the fact that the collection is made for the *saints* commends it to saints (i. 2: *cf.* 2 Cor. ix. 12 ff.). Such ministry is part of "the work of the Lord" in which the Cor., a moment ago, were bidden to "abound" (xv. 58).—ὥσπερ διέταξα κ.τ.λ.: "Just as I gave order to the Churches of Galatia, so also do *you* act". This direction was either given by P. personally on his last visit to Gal. at the outset of the Third Missionary Journey (Acts xviii. 23), more than two years before, or through letter or messengers from Ephesus at a later time. This ref. fairly implies that the arrangement made had been successful in Gal.; the business being completed there some while ago, the Ap. makes no observation upon it in the extant Ep. to the Gal., which was probably contemporary with 1 and 2 Cor. (See Lt., *Introd.* to Gal.). On the question as to the *part* of "Galatia" intended, see *Introd.* to Gal. in this Comm., and notes on the relevant passages in Acts.

Ver. 2 rehearses the rule previously laid down for Galatia: "On every first (day) of the week let each of you by himself (= at home) lay up, making a store (of it), whatever he may be prospered in".—μίαν σαββάτου—*'echād shabbath* or *bashshabbāth*—according to Hebrew idiom (see parls.) for the days of the week, the term κυριακὴ ἡμέρα (Rev. i. 10) not being yet current, while the heathen name (*dies solis*) is avoided. The earliest mention of this Christian day, going to show that the First Day, not the Sabbath, was already the Sacred Day of the Church (*cf.* Acts xx. 7), appropriate therefore for deeds of charity (*cf.* Matt. xii. 12).—παρ' ἑαυτῷ, *apud se*, *chez lui* (see parls).—θησαυρίζων, "making a treasure," describes each householder "paulatim cumulum aliquem faciens" (Gr.), till at the end the accumulated store should be paid over.—εὐοδῶται (from εὖ and ὁδός, *to send well on one's way*) is pr. sbj., with ἂν of contingency and ὅ, τι in acc. of specification: any little superfluity that Providence might throw in a Cor. Christian's way, he could put into this sacred hoard (*cf.* 2 Cor. viii. 12). Many in this Church were slaves, without wages or stated income. The Vg. renders, "quod si bene placuerit," as though reading ὅ, τι ἐὰν εὐδοκῇ; and Bg. wrongly, "quod commodum sit".—ἵνα μή, ὅταν ἔλθω, τότε κ.τ.λ.: "that there may not be, when I come, collections going on then". P. would avoid the unseemliness and the difficulty of raising the money suddenly, at the last moment; and he wishes when he comes to be free to devote himself to

[n] λογίαι γίνωνται. 3. ὅταν δὲ [n] παραγένωμαι, οὓς ἐὰν [o] δοκιμάσητε,[1] [p] δι᾽ [p] ἐπιστολῶν[1] τούτους πέμψω [q] ἀπενεγκεῖν τὴν [r] χάριν ὑμῶν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ· 4. ἐὰν δὲ ᾖ[2] [s] ἄξιον[2] τοῦ κἀμὲ πορεύεσθαι, σὺν ἐμοὶ πορεύσονται.

5. Ἐλεύσομαι δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὅταν Μακεδονίαν [t] διέλθω, Μακεδονίαν γὰρ [t] διέρχομαι· 6. [o] πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ [u] τυχὸν [v] παραμενῶ,[3] ἢ καὶ[4] [w] παραχειμάσω, ἵνα ὑμεῖς με [x] προπέμψητε οὗ ἐὰν πορεύωμαι·

n Absol., Heb. ix. 11; Acts passim; Lk. xii. 51, xix. 16; Jo. iii. 23; Gen. xiv. 13. o In this sense, 2 Cor. viii. 8; Rom. i. 28, xiv. 22; 1 Th. ii. 4. *Cf.* iii. 13. p 2 Cor. x. 11; 2 Th. ii. 2, 15, iii. 14. q Rev. xvii. 3, xxi. 10; Acts xix. 12; Lk. xvi. 22; Mk. xv. 1. r In this sense, 2 Cor. viii. 6 f., 19. s With gen. of *thing*, Rom. i. 32; 1 Tim. i. 15, iv. 9, v. 18, vi. 1; 11 exx. in Lk. and Acts; Mt. iii. 8. Here only with inf.; *cf.* Lk. xxiv 25. t See x. 1. u Bibl. *h.l.*; cl. idiom; *cf.* xiv. 10. v καταμενω, Acts i. 13; παραμενω, Phil. i. 25; Heb. vii. 23; Jas. i. 25; Gen. xliv. 33. w Tit. iii. 12; Acts xxvii. 12, xxviii. 11. x 2 Cor. i. 16; Rom. xv. 24; Tit. iii. 13; 3 Jo. 6; Acts xv. 3, xx. 38, xxi. 5.

[1] Lachm., Tisch., Tr., W.H., R.V. *marg.*, *place the comma after* δι᾽ επιστολην, attaching this adjunct to δοκιμασητε: see note below.

[2] αξιον ῃ: ℵcABCIMP. So critt. edd., exc. Tisch.

[3] καταμενω (?): BM, 67**. So W.H. and Weiss: παραμ. looks like an assimilation to παραχειμασω; the stronger καταμενω is intrinsically fitting, by contrast with εν παροδῳ: see note below.

[4] *Om.* και (?) BM; W.H. *txt.*—και in *marg.*

higher matters (*cf.* Acts vi. 2)—"tunc alia agens" (Bg.).

Vv. 3, 4. The Cor. are to choose delegates to bear their bounty, who will travel to Jerus. with P., if this be deemed fit. Acts xx. 1-4 shows that in the event a large number of representatives of Gentile Churches voyaged with P., doubtless on this common errand.—δι᾽ ἐπιστολῶν may qualify either δοκιμάσητε (Bz., Cv., Est., A.V. and R.V. txt., Ed.) or πέμψω (R.V. marg., with Gr. Ff., and most moderns). Being chosen by the Cor., the delegates surely must have credentials *from them* (*cf.* 2 Cor. iii. 1, and Acts xv., for such letters passing from Church to Church; also 1 Clem. *ad Corinth.*). At the same time, as P. is directing the whole business, he will "send" the deputies and introduce them at Jerus. On δοκιμάζω, see note to iii. 13.—ἐὰν δὲ ἄξιον ᾖ κ.τ.λ., "But if it be worth while that *I* should journey too, they shall journey with me"—a hint that P. would only take part in presenting the collection if the character of the aid sent made it creditable; otherwise the delegates must go alone; he will not associate himself with a *mean* charity. The inf. (in gen. case), τοῦ κἀμὲ πορεύεσθαι, depends on ἄξιον—"worthy of my going," "si dignum fuerit ut et ego eam" (Vg.); it can hardly be softened into "if it be right (seemly on any ground: as in 2 Thess. i. 3, where ἄξιον is unqualified) that I should go" (Ed.)—as though the Ap. deprecated being obtrusive; he is guarding his self-respect, being scarcely sure of the liberality of the Cor. "Justa estimatio sui non est superbia" (Bg.).

§ 58. Visits to Corinth, xvi. 5-12. The arrangements for the Collection have led P. to speak of his approaching visit to Cor., and he explains more definitely his plans in this respect (5-9). *Timothy's* coming, though not certain, may be looked for speedily; and the Ap., with some solicitude, asks for him considerate treatment (10 f.). *Apollos* is not coming at present, as the Cor. seem to have desired and as Paul had urged upon him; he prefers to wait until circumstances are more favourable (12).

Vv. 5, 6. "But I will come to you, when I have gone through Macedonia." The Ap. writes from Ephesus some time before Pentecost (8), probably before Easter (v. 8; see note); he intends to traverse Macedonia on his way (διέρχομαι, repeated with emphasis, regularly denotes in the Acts *an evangelistic tour:* see xiii. 6, xvi. 6, xx. 25, etc.), completing the work of his mission, there so abruptly terminated (Acts xvi. f.). This task will require considerable time (it occupied the months of summer and autumn, during which the Ap. penetrated beyond Mac. into Illyria; Rom. xv. 19), so that P. expects to see Cor. not much before winter (6). He adds therefore in explanation, "For I am going through Macedonia (*travelling over* the region:

7. [y] οὐ [y] θέλω γὰρ ὑμᾶς [z] ἄρτι ἐν [a] παρόδῳ ἰδεῖν· ἐλπίζω δὲ [1] χρόνον τινὰ [b c] ἐπιμεῖναι [c] πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν ὁ Κύριος [d] ἐπιτρέπῃ.[2] 8. [b] ἐπιμενῶ δὲ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἕως τῆς [e] Πεντηκοστῆς· 9. [f] θύρα γάρ μοι [f] ἀνέῳγε μεγάλη καὶ [g] ἐνεργής,[3] καὶ [h] ἀντικείμενοι πολλοί. 10. ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος,[4] [i] βλέπετε ἵνα [k] ἀφόβως [c] γένηται [c] πρὸς ὑμᾶς· τὸ γὰρ

y See x. 20. z See iv. 11. a N.T. h.l. Gen. xxxviii. 14. b In this sense, Gal. i. 18 (with προς); Phil. i. 24; Acts six times. c See ii. 3; also 1 Th. iii. 4; 1 Jo. i. 2; Jo. i. 1; Mt. xiii. 56. d See xiv. 34. e Acts ii. 1, xx. 16; Tob. ii. 1; 2 Macc. xii. 32. f 2 Cor. ii. 12; Col. iv. 3; Acts xiv. 27; Rev. iii. 8, 20, iv. 1; Isa. xlv. 1. For θυρα (fig.), Lk. xiii. 24; Jo. x. 9; Hos. ii. 15. For the vb., 2 Cor. vi. 11; Rom. iii. 13; Rev. iii. 7; Mt. vii. 7 f., etc. g Phm. 6; Heb. iv. 12; -γειν, -γημα, see xii. 6; -γεια, Eph. i. 19, etc. h Gal. v. 17; Phil. i. 28; 2 Th. ii. 4; 1 Tim. i. 10, v. 14; Lk. xiii. 17, xxi. 15; Zech. iii. 1. i See i. 26. With ινα, Col. iv. 17; πως, see iii. 10. k Phil. i. 14; Jude 12; Lk. i. 74; Prov. i. 33; Wisd. xvii. 4.

[1] **γαρ, all uncc. but KL, and all anc. verss. but syrp. aeth.**

[2] **επιτρεψῃ, ℵABCM (P -ψει); -πῃ, Western and Syrian.**

[3] **εναργης, some latt. and vg., *evidens*; no extant Gr. codd.**

[4] **Τειμοθεος, a favourite itacism of B*D*.**

pr., of imminent purpose); but with you haply I will abide (**καταμενῶ**, as in Acts i. 13, signifies, by contrast to **διέρχομαι**, *keeping to Cor.* instead of touring through the province), or [even] spend the winter". Paul will time his visit, if possible, so as to make his winter-quarters in Cor.; in any case, when he arrives, he will give the Cor. the full benefit of his presence. He did so stay for three months (Acts xx. 3). For **πρὸς**, *in converse with*, see vv. 7, 10, ii. 3, and parls.—**τυχὸν** (acc. abs. of neut. ptp.) = **εἰ τύχοι** (see parl.)—another of the cl. idioms confined to this Ep.; it indicates the uncertainty of human plans, and is piously replaced by **ἐὰν ὁ Κύρ. ἐπιτρέψῃ** in ver. 7.—In this plan P. has a further aim, which he mentions to show his dependence on the Cor.: "in order that *you* may send me forward, wheresoever I may go"—*i.e.* probably, though not certainly, to Jerus. (4); *cf.* ver. 11, 2 Cor. i. 16, Rom xv. 24. It would help P., whose infirmities required friendly attentions, to have a good "send-off" on his leaving Europe. A generous "collection for the saints" would be a welcome lift (1, 4).

Ver. 7. "For I would not see you *now*, in passing; for (**γὰρ**) I hope to stay some length of time (**χρόνον τινὰ**) with you, if the Lord permit." P. could have crossed by sea and taken Cor. *on his way* to Mac. (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 15 f.); the Cor. had requested his speedy coming, which might have been so arranged. But such a visit could only have been **ἐν παρόδῳ** (explaining the **ἄρτι**), "in the way-by," as the summer must be devoted to Mac.; this flying visit would not be of service; there is much to be done at Cor. (xi. 34, etc.), and when the Ap. does come he means to stay "some time". His recent short visit had been very unsatisfactory (see *Introd.*, chap. ii.).—For **ἄρτι**, see note on iv. 11; it is in tacit contrast with the future, as in xiii. 12. For **ἐπιμεῖναι**, "to stay on" (in time)—distinguished from **καταμένω**, "to stay fixedly" (in place or condition: 6), see parls.—**ἐὰν ὁ Κύρ. κ.τ.λ.**, see parls., also to iv. 19,—*pia conditio* (Bg.): Paul's plans have been repeatedly overruled (Acts xvi. 6 f.; 1 Thess. ii. 18). He says "if the Lord *permit*," thinking of his visit as a pleasure; but "if the Lord *will*," in the parl. clause, iv. 18 f., viewing it as a painful duty.

Vv. 8, 9. "But I stay on in Ephesus until the Pentecost"—**τῆς πεντηκοστῆς (ἡμέρας)**, "the fiftieth day" from the 16th Nisan in the Passover Feast (see parls.). This suggests that P. is writing not very long before Whitsuntide; v. 6 ff. indicated a date for the Ep. immediately antecedent to Easter. Ver. 9 explains why the Ap. must remain at Eph. some time longer, although required at Cor.: "for a door is open to me, great and effectual, and (there are) many adversaries". This **θύρα** is defined in Col. iv. 3 (*cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 12) as a **θύρα τοῦ λόγου**—a door open to the *preacher;* in Acts xiv. 27 it is seen from the other side, as **θύρα πίστεως**—a door for the entrance of the believing *hearer;* see parls. for kindred applications of the figure. The door is **μεγάλη** in respect of its *width* and the region into which it opens, **ἐνεργής** in respect of the *influence* gained by entering it.—**ἀντικείμενοι πολλοί** (*cf.* xv. 32): an additional reason for not retreating; *cf.* Phil. i. 28. The terrible riot that shortly

[l] ἔργον [l] Κυρίου [m] ἐργάζεται ὡς καὶ ἐγώ[1]· 11. μή τις οὖν αὐτὸν [n] ἐξουθενήσῃ· [x] προπέμψατε δὲ αὐτὸν [o] ἐν [o] εἰρήνῃ, ἵνα ἔλθῃ πρός με· [p] ἐκδέχομαι γὰρ αὐτὸν μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. 12. Περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλὼ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ· [q] πολλὰ[2] [r] παρεκάλεσα αὐτὸν [r] ἵνα ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν· καὶ [s] πάντως οὐκ [t] ἦν [t u] θέλημα [u] ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ, ἐλεύσεται δὲ ὅταν [v] εὐκαιρήσῃ.

l See xv. 58.
m Acts xiii. 41 (Hab. i. 5); Jo. iii. 21, vi. 28, ix. 4; Mt. xxvi. 10; Ps. xliii. 1.
n See i. 28.
o See vii. 15.
p See xi. 33.
q Adv., ver. 19; Rom. xvi. 6, 12, xv. 22 (τα π.); Jas. iii. 2; ten times in Mk.
r See i. 10.
s See v. 10.
t Mt. xviii. 14.
u Jo. vi. 39 f. *Cf.* θελω ινα, Mt. vii. 12; Mk. vi. 25, x. 35; Lk. vi. 31; Jo. xvii. 24.
v Acts xvii. 21; Mk. vi. 31. -ρος, Heb. iv. 6; Mk. vi. 21; -ρως, 2 Tim. iv. 2; Mk. xiv. 11; -ρια, Lk. xxii. 6.

[1] **καγω**: ℵACKLP, and some minn.: so most crit. edd. **και εγω**: DG, etc. **εγω** (simply): BM. So W.H. *txt.*
The last reading best accounts for the others. It appears to be Neutral; **καγω** Alexandrian, **και εγω** Western and Syrian. The emphasis given by **και** is scarcely in keeping here, while it is perfectly suitable in vii. 8 and x. 33 (which may have suggested **καγω** to copyists here), and in 2 Cor. xi. 12; *cf.* Gal. iv. 12.

[2] ℵ*D*G, with corresponding latt. and some anc. codd. of vg., preface this clause with **δηλω υμιν οτι (πολλα κ.τ.λ.)**—an ex. of Western license.

afterwards drove Paul from Eph. verified this statement (Acts xix.). Evangelism flourishes under fierce opposition; "Sæpe bonum et, contra id, malum simul valde vigent" (Bg.).

Vv. 10, 11. **ἐὰν** (not **ὅταν**) **δὲ ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος**: "But if Timothy come"—his coming is not *certain.* He and Erastus have been before this sent to Macedonia (Acts xix. 21 f.) in advance of P., with instructions to go forward to Cor. (iv. 17 above); he might be expected to arrive about the same time as this letter. But local circumstances, or even the report of the unfriendly attitude of the Cor. (Ed.), might detain him in Mac. He is found in Mac. with P. when some months later 2 Cor. is written: there is no explicit ref. in that Ep. to Timothy's presence at Cor. in the interval; but *Titus'* visit and report are largely in evidence. Ed. says, "In point of fact he (Tim.) did not come" (*cf.* Lt., *Journal of Sac. and Cl. Philology*, ii., 198 ff.; also El.). But this assertion is too positive. In iv. 17 above P. announced Tim.'s coming definitely and laid stress upon it. Tim. shares in the Address of 2 Cor., and the fact that he is associated by the Ap. with himself in the significant "we" of vii. 2 ff. (*cf.* ii. 5-11) points to his being involved in some way in the "grief" which P. had suffered from Cor. subsequently to the writing of 1 Cor. Very possibly *Timothy* was the **ἀδικηθεὶς** of 2 Cor. vii. 12, in whose person, seeking as he did to carry out the directions of 1 Cor. iv. 17, Paul had been insulted by some prominent Cor. Christian (**ὁ ἀδικήσας**).—If this actually happened, the apprehensions expressed here about the treatment Tim. might receive, proved only too well-founded: "see (to it) that without fear he may be with you" (or *hold converse with you:* **γένηται πρὸς ὑμᾶς**, see ii. 3, and parls.) . . . "let no one then set him at naught". These words point to Timothy's diffidence, as well as to his comparative youth: see 1 Tim. iv. 12, and the vein of exhortation in 2 Tim. ii. 1-13 and iii. 10-iv. 18. Tim. was P.'s complement, as Melanchthon was Luther's—gentle, affectionate, studious, but not of robust or masculine character. The temper of the Cor. Church would be peculiarly trying and discouraging to him. Paul hopes that regard for him will have some restraining effect upon the Cor.—**τὸ γὰρ ἔργον Κυρίου** (*cf.* xv. 58) **κ.τ.λ.** identifies Timothy in the strongest way with P. himself: *cf.* iv. 17, Phil. ii. 20; similarly respecting Titus, in 2 Cor. viii. 23. For **ἐξουθενέω**, see parls.—"But send him forward *in peace*"—for if Tim. attempts the task indicated in iv. 17, a rupture is very possible, such as, we gather from 2 Cor. ii. and vii., actually ensued.—From the following words, "that he may come to me, for I am awaiting him," it appears that P. expects Tim's return before he leaves Eph.: *cf.*, for the vb., xi. 33.—It is doubtful whether **μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν** qualifies the subject—"I with the brethren"—those of vv. 12-18, the Cor. brethren now in Eph. and interested in Tim's success at

13. [w]Γρηγορεῖτε, [x]στήκετε ἐν τῇ πίστει· [y]ἀνδρίζεσθε,[1] [z]κραταιοῦσθε· 14. [a]πάντα [a]ὑμῶν ἐν ἀγάπῃ [b]γινέσθω. 15. [c]Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί—[d]οἴδατε τὴν [e]οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ,[2] [d]ὅτι ἐστὶν [f]ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας καὶ [g]εἰς [h]διακονίαν τοῖς [i]ἁγίοις [g]ἔταξαν ἑαυτοὺς— 16. [c]ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς [k]ὑποτάσσησθε [l]τοῖς [l]τοιούτοις, καὶ παντὶ τῷ

w Col. iv. 2; 1 Th. v. 6 10; Acts xx. 31; 1 Pet. v. 8; thrice in Rev.; 14 exx. in Syn. GG.
x In this sense, Rom. xiv. 4; Gal. v. 1; Phil. i. 27, iv. 1; 1 Th. iii. 8; 2 Th. ii. 12; Jo. viii. 44.
y N.T. *h.l.*; Josh. i. 6.
z Eph. iii. 16; Lk. i. 80, ii. 40; Neh. ii. 18. -αιος, 1 Pet. v. 6.
a This constr. of πας, *h.l.*
b See ix. 15.
c See i. 10; ver. 12.
d See iii. 20; with οιδα, 2 Cor. xii. 3 f.; 1 Th. ii. 1.
e Phil. iv. 22; Jo. iv. 53; Gen. l. 8.
f See xv. 20.
g Acts xiii. 48; *cf.* 2 Macc. vi. 21, προς and dat. For vb., Rom. xiii. 1; Acts xv. 2; Mt. viii. 9, etc.
h See xii. 5.
i See vi. 1.
k See xiv. 32.
l See v. 5.

[1] Ins. και AD, cop. vg. syr^sch.

[2] Στεφανα και Φορτουνατου: ℵ^cD and some minn., vg. (oldest codd.), cop., Dam.. Ambrst. C*G add και Αχαΐκου besides.

Cor., who are delaying their return until he brings his report (so Hf., Gd.); or the object—"I await him with (= and) the brethren," *i.e.* those, including possibly Erastus, whom P. expects to arrive at Eph. from Cor. along with Tim. (so most interpreters). The relevancy of the words on the latter construction is not obvious. On the former view, "the brethren" of vv. 11 and 12 are the same, being the deputies who had brought over the Cor. Church Letter to P., and who are now awaiting Tim's return before they themselves return home. This hints an additional reason why the Cor. should with all speed send Timothy back to Paul "in peace".

Ver. 12. The manner in which the clause **Περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλὼ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ** is loosely prefixed to the statement of this ver. ("Now about Apollos the brother"—) suggests that Apollos' coming had been mentioned in the Church Letter: *cf.* ver. 1, vii. 1, etc. Respecting *Apollos*, see notes to i. 12, and Acts xviii. 24 ff.—Considering the way in which Ap. had been made a rival to P. in Cor., it shows magnanimity on Paul's side to desire his return, and a modest delicacy on the side of Apollos to decline the request: **καὶ πάντως οὐκ ἦν θέλημα ἵνα κ.τ.λ.**, "And there was no will at all (it was altogether contrary to his will) that he should come now".—**εὐκαιρέω** (see parls.) denotes "to have good opportunity". The present ferment at Cor. affords no καιρὸς for Apollos' coming. For **πάντως**, and **θέλημα ἵνα**, see parls.

§ 59. Concluding Homily, xvi. 13-18. According to the Apostle's wont, at the end of his letter he gathers up the burden of his message into a single concise and stirring exhortation (13 f.). *Watchfulness*, *steadfastness*, *manly vigour*, above all *Christian love*, were the qualities in which this Church was lacking. Their "love" they would have a particular opportunity of showing to the family of Stephanas, who had been foremost in works of benevolence (15 f.); for St. is now returning home in charge of this Ep. with his two companions, after they had brought the letter of the Church to P. and cheered him by their society. The deputation has done a timely public service in the best spirit; their kindly offices must be duly acknowledged (17 f.).

Vv. 13, 14. **Γρηγορεῖτε, στήκετε** belong to a class of vbs. peculiar to later Gr.—presents based on older perfects; the former from **ἐγρήγορα** (ἐγείρω), the latter from **ἕστηκα** (ἵστημι). The first exhortation recalls xv. 33 f., the second iv. 17, x. 12, xv. 2, 11 ff.—**ἀνδρίζεσθε**, "play the man," *viriliter agite* (Vg.), adds an active element to the passive and defensive attitude implied in the previous impvs.; it looks back to xiii. 11 and xiv. 20 (relating to the *glossolalia*), but exhorts in general to the courageous prosecution of the Christian life by the Cor., who were enfeebled by contact with heathen society (x., 2 Cor. vi. 11 ff.). This word is common in cl. Gr.; *cf.* 1 Macc. ii. 64, **ἰσχύσατε κ. ἀνδρίζεσθε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ**, also the Homeric **ἀνέρες ἐστέ**.—**κραταιοῦσθε** enjoins manful activity, in its most energetic form (see parls.). **κράτος**, from which, through **κραταιός** (1 Peter v. 6), the vb. is derived (cl. Gr. **κρατύνω**), signifies *superior power*, *mastery* (see Col. i. 11, 1 Tim. vi. 16): "be [not merely strong, but] *mighty*". The four impvs. of ver. 13 are directed respectively against the *heedlessness*, *fickleness*, *childishness*, and *moral enervation* of the

m 2 Cor. vi. 1; Rom. viii. 28; Jas. ii. 22; Mk. xvi. 20; 1 Esdr. vii. 2; 1 Macc. xii. 1.

[m] συνεργοῦντι καὶ [n] κοπιῶντι. 17. [o] Χαίρω δὲ [o] ἐπὶ τῇ [p] παρουσίᾳ Στεφανᾶ καὶ Φουρτουνάτου [1] καὶ Ἀχαϊκοῦ, ὅτι τὸ [q] ὑμῶν [2] [r] ὑστέρημα οὗτοι [3] [s] ἀνεπλήρωσαν· 18. [t] ἀνέπαυσαν γὰρ [4] τὸ ἐμὸν [u] πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν· [v] ἐπιγινώσκετε οὖν [1] τοὺς [1] τοιούτους.

-γος, see iii. 9. n See xv. 10. o See xiii. 6. p In this use, 2 Cor. vii. 6 f.; Phil. i. 26, ii. 12; 2 Macc. viii. 12, xv. 21. *Cf.* xv. 23. q *υμετερον*, see xv. 31. r 2 Cor. viii. 13 f., ix. 12, xi. 9; Phil. ii. 30; Col. i. 24; 1 Th. iii. 10; Lk. xxi. 4; Judg. xviii. 10. -εω, see i. 7. s See xiv. 16; in this antith., Phil. ii. 30. t 2 Cor. vii. 13; Phm. 7, 20; Mt. xi. 28; 1 Chron. xxii. 9, 18. -σις, Mt. xi. 29, xii. 43; Rev. iv. 8, xiv. 11. u See xiv. 15. v 2 Cor. vi. 9; Deut. i. 17, xxxiii. 9. *Cf.* 1 Th. v. 12.

[1] **φορτουνατου**, all uncc. but KMP;

[2] **υμετερον**, all uncc. but ℵAKL.

[3] **ουτοι**, ℵBCKLP. **αυτοι**, ADGM, with vg. syrr.; so Lachm., Tr. *marg.*

[4] Ins. **και** DG, latt. vg., Ambrst.

Cor.: the fifth—"All your doings, let them be done (or carried on: **γινέσθω**) in love"—reiterates the appeal of chh. viii. and xiii. touching the radical fault of this Church; see also ii. 3, iv. 6, vi. 1-8, xi. 21 f., xii. 21, etc.

Vv. 15, 16 urge particular instances of the above **ἐν ἀγάπῃ γινέσθω.** The **ἵνα** clause of ver. 16 is complementary to **παρακαλῶ** (see note on i. 10), and is suspended to make room for the explanatory **οἴδατε . . . ἑαυτούς**: "you know that the household of Stephanas is the first-fruit of Achaia, and that they set themselves for ministering to the saints".—**τὴν οἰκίαν κ.τ.λ.**, acc. by attraction to **οἴδατε**, according to the well-known Gr. usage with vbs. of this class (Wr., p. 781). There were earlier individual converts in Achaia (see Acts xvii. 34), but with this family the Gospel took root in the province and the earnest appeared of the subsequent ingathering: *cf.* Rom. xvi. 5; also i. 16 above, and note. The St. family must have been of independent means; for **ἔταξαν ἑαυτοὺς** (*they arrayed* or *appointed themselves*—made this their business) implies a systematic laying out of themselves for service, such as is possible only to those free to dispose, as they choose, of their persons and their time; see this idiom in Plato, *Rep.*, ii., 371C.—"The saints" can hardly be the Jerus. saints of ver. 1, since **εἰς διακονίαν** is quite general, and the last words of ver. 16 imply *manifold* Christian labour; the present commission of St. to Eph. is an instance of "service to the saints".—P. "exhorts" his "brethren . . . that you also (in return for their service to you) submit yourselves to such as these (**τ. τοιούτοις**, referring to the interpolated **οἴδατε κ.τ.λ.**), and to every one that shares in the work and labours". These persons did not constitute a body of Church officers; we find no traces as yet of an official order in the church of Cor.: the Ap. enjoins spontaneous submission to the direction of those able and disposed to lead in good works. The prp. in **συν-εργοῦντι** refers not to St. specifically, still less to P., but generally to *co-operative* labour in the Church, while **κοπιῶντι** implies labour carried to the point of *toil* or *suffering* (see note on **κόπος**, iii. 8; also xv. 58). Loyal and hard work in the cause of Christ earns willing respect and deference in the Church: *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 12 f.

Vv. 17, 18. "But I rejoice at the presence (*or* coming) of Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaïcus." The stress lying on **παρουσίᾳ** explains the introductory **δέ**: "You must show respect to such men, when they reach home; but I am glad that just now they are *here*".—Fortunatus (Lat. name, and common) and Achaïcus (Gr., and rare) are Stephanas' companions in the deputation; the three will speedily return to Cor. Since P. thus commends them at the end of his Ep., written in reply to the Letter they had brought from Cor., perhaps they were to be its bearers also.—On *Stephanas*, see i. 16. The two latter names are also *h.ll.* in N.T.; a *Fortunatus* appears in Clement's list of emissaries from Rom. to Cor. (*ad Cor.* § 65). Ed. supposes all three to be *slaves* (*Achaïcus*, at least, resembles a slave-name), and identifies them with **οἱ τ. Χλοῆς** of i. 11; but this does not comport with the position given to Stephanas in vv. 15 f.; see, further, note on i. 11.—("I rejoice at their presence), because the (*or* my) lack of you these have filled up". **ὑμέ-**

19. [w]Ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς[1] αἱ [x]ἐκκλησίαι τῆς [x]Ἀσίας· [w]ἀσπάζονται[2] ὑμᾶς [y]ἐν [y]Κυρίῳ [z]πολλὰ Ἀκύλας καὶ Πρίσκιλλα,[3] σὺν [a]τῇ [a b]κατ' [b]οἶκον αὐτῶν [a]ἐκκλησίᾳ[4]· 20. [w]ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες.

w Finis of P.'s Epp., exc. Gal., Eph., 1 and 2 Tim. of other Epp., exc. 2 Pet., 1 Jo., Jude. x See ver. 1. y Rom. xvi. 2 ff.; see vii. 22 above, etc. z See ver. 12. a Rom. xvi. 5; Col. iv. 15; Phm. 2. b Acts ii. 46, v. 42; *cf.* εν οικῳ, xi. 34 above.

[1] CP, syr.sch. ins. πασαι.

[2] ασπαζεται, ℵCDKP. ασπαζονται: BGLM, etc.

[3] Πρισκα, ℵBMP, 17, vg. (best codd.) cop. See note below.

[4] DG, latt. vg., Clem., Pelag. add παρ' οις και ξενιζομαι (*apud quos et hospitor*)—an ancient gloss, contradicting the απο Φιλιππων of the Subscription.

τερον represents the *objective* gen. (*cf.* xv. 31): the presence of the three with P. could not make up any lack in Cor., but it made up to P. for *the absence of the Cor.*, supplying him, representatively, with their desired society. El. and others read the poss. pron. *subjectively*—"what you were lacking in (*i.e.*, your want of access) towards me": this constr. is consistent with the usage of ὑστέρημα (see parls.); but the former suits better the antithesis to παρουσία (Ed.), and Paul's fine courtesy.—"For they refreshed my spirit—and yours." ἀναπαύω (see parls.) describes the restful effect of friendly converse and sympathy. Paul adds καὶ ὑμῶν, realising that the comfort of heart received by himself will react upon his friends at Cor.: the Cor. will be cheered to know that their fellowship, in the persons of S., F., and A., has so greatly cheered him at a time of weariness and heavy trial (*cf.* 2 Cor. ii. 3, vii. 3).

Ver. 18*b* repeats in another form the advice of ver. 16: "Acknowledge (know well) then such men as these". For τοὺς τοιούτους, see parls., and ver. 16.—ἐπιγινώσκω (see parls.) denotes strictly *accurate knowledge*, of persons or things; but knowledge of personal qualities implies corresponding *regard to and treatment of* those who possess such qualities: *cf.* 1 Thess. v. 12 f.

§ 60. Final Greetings, xvi. 19-24. The Ep. closes with three public salutations from the Christians surrounding P. at Ephesus to their brethren at Cor. (19, 20*a*), followed by a request to the latter, such as appears besides in 1 Thess., 2 Cor., Rom., and Phil., to "salute one another" in token of brotherly union, and of communion with those who now send their greetings (20*b*). The letter is then sealed with the writer's personal salutation (21-24) penned by his own hand, and stamped with a characteristic double motto peculiar to this Ep., which expresses the supreme peril and supreme consolation of the Christian calling (22).

Vv. 19, 20*a*. Three successive clauses, headed by ἀσπάζομαι: "There salute you the Churches of Asia. There saluteth you in the Lord abundantly Aquila and Prisca, with the assembly (church) at their house. There salute you all the brethren". The pl. expression, αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Ἀσίας, accords with what appears elsewhere as to the general diffusion of the Gospel in the province of Asia during Paul's three years' ministry at Eph. (Acts xix. 10, 26; Col. i. 6, ii. 1, iv. 13, 16), and as to the solidarity of the Asian Churches gathered round Eph., to which collectively the Revelation of John, and probably the (so-called) Ep. to the Ephesians, were addressed. While P. had not personally visited all these communities (Col. ii. 1), he was in touch with them and knew their mind towards their brethren in Greece. Desiring a more catholic feeling in the Cor. Church (see note on i. 2), P. makes the most of these Church greetings.—The second salutation has a note of personal warmth, as the first of catholic breadth: Aq. and Prisca "send much greeting" (πολλά—*cf.* 12, etc.—in requests and wishes, implies *frequency* or *intensity*, or *both*); and "in the Lord"—not as a matter of ordinary friendship, but in the way of love and service to Christ. This worthy pair entertained the Ap. in Cor. when he first came there (Acts xviii. 1 ff.); on some occasion (perhaps about this time at Eph.) they risked their lives for his (Rom. xvi. 4). They had now migrated to Eph., where they reappear some years later in 2 Tim. iv. 19; see notes on Rom. xvi. 3 ff., for their further history. Thrice their names figure in the Acts, and thrice in the Epp.—*Prisca first* ("Priscilla" only in Acts) four times: see Hort's *Prolegom. to Rom. and Eph.*, pp. 12 ff., Sand.-Headlam, *Romans*, pp.

ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν [c]φιλήματι [c]ἁγίῳ. 21. Ὁ [d]ἀσπασμὸς, τῇ [e]ἐμῇ [d e]χειρί, ΠΑΥ'ΛΟΥ· 22. [f g]εἴ [f]τις [g]οὐ [h]φιλεῖ τὸν [h]Κύριον

c 2 Cor. xiii. 12; Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Th. v. 26; 1 Pet. v. 14. φιλημα besides, Lk. vii. 45, xxii. 48; Prov. xxvii. 6; Cant. i. 2. φιλεω in this sense, Mt. xxvi. 48, etc.; καταφιλεω, Acts xx. 37; 5 exx. in GG. d Col. iv. 18; 2 Th. iii. 17. The noun besides. Mt. xxiii. 7; Lk. i. 29, etc. e Gal. vi. 11; Phm. 19. f 2 Tim. iii. 10; Mt. xvi. 24; Rev. xiv. 11. g See vii. 9. h Jo. xxi. 15 ff. *Cf.* note c above.

418 ff., also Rom. *ad loc.* above, on the conjectures associated with this lady's name. The vb. is sing., the two sending one greeting.—The "ecclesia at their house" can scarcely mean the whole Eph. Church, but some neighbouring part of it accustomed to gather, more or less formally, at Aquila's hospitable hearth. If P. lodged with A. (see txtl. note), as he had done in Cor., the house would be a rendezvous for Ephesian Christians: *cf.* Rom. xvi. 5, Col. iv. 15, Philem. 2, Acts xii. 12.—**οἱ ἀδελφοὶ πάντες** comprise the whole body of Ephesian believers, in distinction from the smaller circle of Aquila's house, and from the mass of the Asian Christians.

Ver. 20*b*. **ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ = ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης** (1 Peter v. 14). This Heb. custom of the sacred kiss is retained, at Communion, by the Greek and Eastern Churches; it died out in the West from the 13th cent., after having been the subject of many Conciliar limitations, occasioned by its abuse in the decline of Christian simplicity. **ἁγίῳ** by position is predicative—"in a kiss that is holy". See Art. *Kiss* in *Dict. of Christian Antiquities.*

Vv. 21-24. Paul's autograph salutation, which authenticates the letter (*cf.* 2 Thess. iii. 17), includes the *title* of the greeting (21), the double *motto* (22), and the *greeting* proper—in two wishes (23 f.).

Ver. 21. **ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τ. ἐμῇ χειρί,—ΠΑΥ'ΛΟΥ**: "the salution, with my own hand,—of *PAUL*".—**Παύλου** apposed to **τῇ ἐμῇ**, and inscribed with the distinction of a personal signature. Up to this point, the Ep. was presumably written by another hand (*cf.* Rom. xvi. 22).

Vv. 22, 23. With pen in hand, Paul must needs give expression, in two words, to the pent-up feeling under which he has written—a fiery seal burnt upon the last leaf of the Letter; ch. vi. 12-17 of Gal. occupies a like place in that Ep. The sentiment, or motto, of the **ἀσπασμὸς** forms two clauses: (*a*) "If any one loves not the Lord, let him be anathema".—**οὐ** (instead of **μή**) in hypothetical clauses may rest upon the vb., constituting it a negative term—*sc.*, "*hates* the Lord" (so Ed.: *cf.* vii. 9, xi. 6, xv. 13; and Rom. vii. 20, where **οὐ θέλω** = *nolo*); but Wr. (pp. 599-602) rightly distinguishes such instances as this and ix. 2 (*cf.* note) from the above class of combinations, accounting for the **οὐ** as contradictory to some tacit assertion—"if any one does *not* love the Lord" (as he ought, or pretends, to do): it is a *spurious* love that is accursed—a cold, false heart which, knowing the Lord, does not really love Him (*cf.* viii. 1 ff., xiii. 1 f.). The use of **φιλέω** for **ἀγαπάω** (only in Tit. iii. 15 elsewhere in P.: *cf.* the interchange in John xxi. 15 ff.) is noticeable: for the distinction, see Gm., *s.v.* **φιλέω**; Cr., *s.v.* **ἀγαπάω**; Trench, *N.T. Syn.*, § 12.—**οὐ φιλεῖ** strikes a deep note of accusation; it is a charge of *heartlessness*—human affection to the Master is wanting, to say nothing of higher feeling, as with Judas and his traitor kiss (see Mt., xxvi. 47 f.); perhaps **ἐν φιλήματι** just above suggested this **φιλεῖ**.—Paul's curse on the Lord's false lovers recalls xii. 3 (see note on **ἀνάθεμα**): the haters of Jesus outside the Church, inspired by Satan, call Him "anathema" instead of "Lord"; and those who bow the knee to Him with a feigned heart are themselves anathema—this cry a retort to that.—**ἤτω** for **ἔστω** (see Wr., p. 85) prevails in N.T.; it is common in later Gr.

(*b*) The second clause of the motto, **Μαρὰν ἀθά**, is Aramaic transliterated into Gr.; the original cannot be quite certainly restored.—**Μαρὰν**, it is fairly certain, represents *Marán* (Syrian) or *Maran'a* (Aramaic: the final *'a* of the suffixed noun having coalesced with the initial *'a* of the vb.), and **ἀθά** the pf. Peal of *'ᵃtha'*, *to come.* But it is doubtful whether *'ᵃtha'* is strictly *past*—"our Lord hath come" (so Cm. and the ancients, with the Syriac Vers.; and Kautzsch in his *Gramm. d. Bib.-Aramäischen*, pp. 12 and 174; see also Field's *Otium Norvic.*, iii., pp. 110 f.); or whether the pf. should be rendered *proleptically*—"Our Lord cometh," "will come," "is at hand," after the manner of Phil. iv. 5, 1 Thess. iv. 14 ff., James v. 7 ff., Rev. i. 7, iii. 11, xxii. 20. The latter sense accords with the context, with the strain of ch. xv., and with the N.T. attitude towards our Lord's return: see i. 7, xi. 26, 1 Thess. i.

Ἰησοῦν[1] Χριστόν,[1] [l]ἤτω [k]ἀνάθεμα· [l]Μαρὰν ἀθά.[2] 23. Ἡ [m]χάρις τοῦ [m]Κυρίου[3] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ[4] [m]μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν. ἡ [n]ἀγάπη [n]μου μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. ἀμήν.[5]

Πρὸς Κορινθίους πρώτη ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Φιλίππων διὰ Στεφανᾶ καὶ Φουρτουνάτου καὶ Ἀχαϊκοῦ καὶ Τιμοθέου.[6]

l Jas. v. 12; Ps. ciii. 31; 1 Macc. x. 31.
k See xii. 3.
l *H.l.*; see note below.
m 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Rom. xvi. 20, 24; Gal. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; 1 Th. v. 28; 2 Th. iii. 18; Phm. 25; Rev. xxii. 21. Without μεθ᾽ υμ., 2 Cor. viii. 9; Acts xv. 11.
n Subj. gen., Phil. i. 9; Col. i. 8, 13; 1 Th. iii. 6; 2 Th. i. 3; Phm. 5, 7; Rev. ii. 4, 19; Mt. xxiv. 12; Jo. xv. 9 f. *H.l.* for this form of wish; *cf.* 2 Cor. xii. 15.

[1] *Om.* Ιησουν Χριστον ℵ*ABC*M, 17. KP, syr^sch., Victorin., Pelag. add ημων to Κυριον. Ιησ. χρ. is a Western and Syrian addition. The arm. vers., one cod. of vg., and a few Ff., add Ιησουν alone.

[2] Some edd. write μαρανaθa as a single word.

[3] ALP, many minn., cop. syr^sch., several Ff., ins. ημων.

[4] *Om.* Χριστου ℵ*B, 17, 73, oldest vg. go., Thdrt. So the crit. edd., exc. Lachm. and R.V., who retain Χρ.

[5] *Om.* αμην BFM, 17. So all crit. edd.; only Lachm. *brackets*. A liturgical addition.

[6] The Subscription, as in other Epp., varies much in form. ℵABC* read προς Κορινθιους α̅, as at the beginning of the Ep. The received Subscr., due probably to a misunderstanding of ver. 5 (Μακεδονιαν γαρ διερχομαι), appears first in the Syrian uncc. KL. B³P and a few others have, more correctly, εγραφη απο Εφεσου.

10, etc. So most moderns. Bickell, Gd., and a few others, would read *Maran'a tha'*, making the vb. *impv.*—"Our Lord, O come!"—in keeping with Rev. xxii. 20; but this is questionable in grammar, and less appropriate. The exclamation, like Ἀββᾶ (Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 6) and Ἀμήν, was probably caught up by Gentile Christians from the first preachers, who in moments of rapture naturally reverted to their mother tongue; *cf.* Ed. *ad loc.* Such salient and mystic phrases might serve as watchwords, or on occasion as passwords, amongst the early Christians. In *Didaché*, x. 6, Μαρὰν ἀθὰ stands as the closing formula of the Thanksgiving Prayer at the Eucharist, apparently in the sense of xi. 26 above. For other interpretations, numerous and often fanciful, see the digest in Mr.-Hn. *ad loc.*, also N. Schmidt in the *Journal of Bibl. Liter.*, 1894, i., ii., 50 ff.

Vv. 23, 24. Having uttered the great watchword of the waiting Church, Paul has only to add his personal *benediction upon the readers:* (1) in his favourite phrase of farewell, desiring them *Christ's grace*—a wish expanded in 2 Cor. into the Trinitarian blessing of ch. xiii. 13; (2) in the further wish, peculiar to this Ep. and fitting in view of the frequent censures of the letter, which might seem to indicate alienation on the writer's part (*cf.* iv. 14 f., 2 Cor. xi. 11, xii. 15; Gal. iv. 16 ff.)—"*My love* be with you all in Christ Jesus". Many Cor. Christians ranged themselves under other leaders, many criticised and opposed the Ap., some he has been obliged to threaten with the "rod" (iv. 21); nevertheless he desires his love to "all,"—and that abidingly, "*with* you all, *in Christ Jesus*," who is the basis and bond of love amongst His people. Mr., Hn., Bt. read the last sentence as a *matter-of-fact*, not a wish, understanding ἐστὶν instead of εἴη—"My love is with you, etc."; but this destroys the parallelism with ver. 23 (see El.). The sentence expresses an *aspiration* rather than an actuality. Paul's "love in Christ Jesus" is not, strictly speaking, *with* those who "love not the Lord" (21), nor with those who "destroy the temple of God" (iii. 17), nor with the culprit of v. 1-5.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE ABERDEEN UNIVERSITY PRESS